

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

The views expressed in the columns of the 'Indian Libertarian,' do not necessarily reflect the policy of the Journal

Vol. VIII No. 2

IN THIS ISSUE

April 15, 1960

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL	1	Cultural Freedom Since Independence by A. Ranganathan	12
Prospects Before the Swatantra Party by M. A. Venkata Rao	5	DELHI LETTER	13
Afro-Asian Solidarity by M. N. Tholal	8	BOOK REVIEWS	16
What is Socialism? by Leszek Kolakowski	10	GLEANINGS FROM THE PRESS	19
ECONOMIC SUPPLEMENT	I-IV	NEWS AND VIEWS	19

EDITORIAL

PRESIDENT NASSER IN INDIA

PRESIDENT Nasser is in India at the time of writing. He has shown much interest in India's economic development and methods and it is a reasonable guess that his discussions with our Prime Minister traversed the political and psychological aspects of Afro-Asian struggles with the rival blocs of the West and international communism led by Russia.

Within the ambit of the Asian field, we have the complication of the rivalry between the President's ambition for Pan-Arab nationalism and Mr. Kassem's Iraqi nationalism. India's President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, expressed approval of "Arab nationalism" in his welcome speech. But the question is irrepressible whether this Arab nationalism which India has endorsed envisages the subordination of all Arab peoples to President Nasser in an integral single State or federal association? Does this contemplate the eventual inclusion of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Tunisia, Lebanon and Iraq within his empire?

The Cairo Radio has made no secret of President Nasser's intentions in this regard.

Col. Kassem of Iraq has expressed an intention to visit India and secure India's recognition and friendship for the independent Statehood of his country. The Russian communists are playing a large part in the internal politics of Iraq, now supporting Kassem against Nasser's aggrandisement and now threatening the supremacy of Kassem's own regime. The triumphant survival of Col. Kassem amidst these hostile elements within his own state is yet under doubt. India has to tread warily in this field. It is easy to proclaim universal friendship but not so easy to satisfy all, for there is enmity and irreconcilable claims among rival states and regimes. To side one, is to antagonise another.

Another facet of this difficulty stemming from irreconcilable claims in the Middle East concerns the role of Israel in the Islamic area. Israel has carved for itself a state by dint of indomitable valour and the generous assistance of American Jewry and American officialdom.

As soon as Egyptian military forces approached the Israeli borders on both sides—from the Southern Egyptian Sinai side and from the North from the Syrian direction—Israel took alarm. Ben Gurion,

its Prime Minister, flew to Washington and met President Eisenhower and the Secretary of State, Christian Herter. It was clear that he was negotiating for adequate military aid by way of arms supplies to counteract the recent augmentation of supplies that President Nasser had received from Czechoslovakia and Russia. The Secretary General of the UNO, Mr. Hammerskoeld, hurried to study the situation and warn the two sides. So far, there is a suspense in the situation, as President Nasser was prompted to declare that his intentions were only **defensive!** The Cairo Radio had proclaimed jihad against Israel and had rallied Arab nations to unite to annihilate the Jewish state and reinstate old Islamic Palestine before the Partition effected under UNO auspices in 1948. This means the surrender of the area occupied by Jordan in the Israel-Egypt war.

India has formally recognised Israel but has refrained out of the fear of antagonising Egypt from establishing normal diplomatic relations with her, (which is the normal outcome of recognition.) It is said that President Nasser discussed his attitude to Israel with Prime Minister Nehru. He must have stated his intention of destroying Israel and absorbing it within his Arab empire-to-be. Pandit Nehru has hinted that India regards Israel as a permanent feature of the Middle Eastern landscape. Here is a fertile ground for the development of hostility between India and Nasser to which must be added India's recognition of Col. Kassem's Iraqi regime. Nehru is tying himself up into inextricable diplomatic knots and is not showing any great dexterity in the game of international chess.

There is the further complication of the role of

Pakistan in this arena of Middle East politics with its aura of Islamic ambitions. At present, President Nasser is keeping clear of Pan-Islamic ideas in his relation with India. **One step at a time**—seems to be his motto. But his book shows clear Pan-Islamic ambitions. He wants to rally Pan-Islam from Morocco to the Persian Gulf. Why only till the Persian Gulf? Mr. Jinnah had stated the Pan-Islam ideal as inclusive of Indonesia!

It is significant that President Sokarno has arrived in Delhi at this time. He will meet both Nehru and Nasser. For the time being, Nasser and Sokarno are both secular nationalists. To a question about a league of Islamic nations, President Nasser replied that it was meaningless and asked what would happen if similar leagues of Christian and Buddhist nations were formed? Sokarno is resisting the Masjumi party in his country that aims at an Islamic theocratic State.

But even General Ayub Khan has not been able to resist the desire of Pakistanis for an Islamic orientation to their new State.

Pakistan has been persistently developing the idea of Pan-Islam among Arab states.

Now India and Pakistan have formidable differences. Just as India has expressed neutrality as between Nasser and Kassem, President Nasser is going to Pakistan after his Indian visit as a neutral as between the two.

There is a race, as it were, between the pro-Indian and pro-Islamic aspects in the foreign policy of Arab nationalism and of Turkey and Iran.

The only safe conclusion is that we should regard Arab favour as only temporary liable to be turned into hostility as soon as things favour Pan-Islamic policies in any of these Middle Eastern states. We should beware of Pakistan's role in this matter, for to Pakistan, pro-Islam means anti-India. President Nasser was given an Honorary Degree at Aligarh University at which he exhorted Indian Muslims to keep to Islamic culture and to serve the country in which they live. He also said that Islamic values were universal. Are they? What about the Islamic theory that Muslims living in non-Muslim lands should do everything to bring it into the control of Muslim rulers, indigenous or foreign? What about the requirement of the Holy Koran that Muslims should convert the whole world to Islam? Islamic equality is applicable primarily to Muslims and only secondarily to non-Muslims.

What about the employment of force and fraud in conversion? It may be that there are injunctions that there should be no force in religion, but, in actual practice, Muslims have shown their belief in the rightness of forcible conversion, as Indian history shows abundantly. These are questions yet unsolved by societies in which Muslims constitute a sizable proportion in the population.

Congress leadership has failed to take note of

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 type-written 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.

the crucial problems of dual and plural societies with clashing cultures and divergent loyalties.

MR. H. M. PATEL ON DEFENCE MATTERS

Mr. H. M. Patel, a former defence secretary to the Government of India from British days, has expressed his views on certain defence matters to an interviewer of the journal *Current* of Bombay.

He is quite clear that India should take arms aid from America if we are to defend our borders against the Chinese aggressors effectively. China, he says, is a near First Class Power and India cannot tackle her with her present resources and equipment.

If we can take economic aid, he does not see why we should not take military aid directly. It all comes to the same thing, since the money we save in using American funds for economic development we are actually using in buying arms from abroad, some even from America.

He also revealed the significant fact that Pakistan ceased to threaten our Kashmir borders effectively as soon as a stern warning was issued to her from the Defence Department of India that if she crossed the cease fire line in force, India would take it as a declaration and act of war upon her and would consider herself free to enter Pakistan. This is the only language that Pakistan understands.

The only effective remedy against Chinese aggression is to enter into a formal defence Pact with the USA which will obligate the USA to go to our rescue in case of unprovoked aggression against us. This is the wisdom of Pakistan which has deterred the Chinese effectively from expressing even cartographic aggression against her by China.

The reiteration of the Policy of nonalignment in the presence of Eisenhower and Nasser in Delhi when they sojourned here has not been a move showing any wisdom and capacity to learn.

BOMBAY HIGH COURT ON GOVERNOR'S ORDER

The Bombay (Full Bench) High Court has given the judgment in the Nanavati Case that the Bombay Governor's Order suspending the High Court's judgment and providing for the retention of Nanavati in Naval Custody pending the results of his appeal to the Supreme Court has not been proved to be illegal, as the Governor has the power given to him by the Constitution to be exercised in emergencies calling for such extraordinary action. But two judges were of the opinion that the action was ultra vires of the Constitution. But on the whole the majority view was given as the final verdict of the Court in favour of the Governor's intervention, rather not against it in accordance with the letter of the law.

But the judgment stated clearly that in view of the spirit of the law, it was ill-advised, as the ame-

nity sought could have been prayed for at the hands of the Court itself and granted. Also, there was no national emergency to justify the extraordinary action of the Governor in setting the court judgment aside.

In effect it has been a sensational and undesirable interference of the Executive into the prerogative of the Judiciary and is a precedent damaging to the growth of respect for the Rule of Law which is the foundation of all good government as well as of democracy.

The extremely light-hearted and summary way in which the Prime Minister instructed the Governor by telephone at the instance of the Defence Minister and Navy Officers is disturbing. It is one more sign that the parliamentary instincts of the Prime Minister are suffering grave erosion and that dictatorial habits are developing in his mind, in spite of the volume of criticism he is having these days on the Chinese Aggression, transfer of Beru Bari Question, high prices etc.

It is disturbing to recall that once before when there was bitter criticism of his actions on his failure to protect East Bengal Hindus from Pakistani persecution, he was said to have mentioned the dictators of South America whose example he would follow if necessary and rule without Parliament.

The influence of the Defence Minister in persuading the Prime Minister to set aside the ruling of the High Court to favour a navy officer is also a matter of the gravest import. The charge levelled against the Defence Minister that he is using his influence with the Prime Minister to build up his own following in the Armed Forces is receiving increasing corroboration day by day. This is a matter to be watched zealously by the public and its parliamentary representatives as well as by the Press.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN RACE WAR

The South African Government of Dr. Voervoerd has come up against the swelling indignation of the Africans against his apartheid policies. Near Cape Town and other towns, they have risen in revolt against the requirement of the apartheid law that Africans should carry pass laws. They have rioted and defied the whites. Large scale police action has taken place killing hundreds of Africans mercilessly and wounding many more. The brutality of the repression has aroused indignation throughout the world. Large demonstrations of British people and coloured population in London have been held against the African atrocities. Angry questions were asked in the House of Commons by Labour members and the Government asked to warn the South African Government that the Commonwealth is in danger on account of these racial barbarities. All Africa and Asia would be antagonised and a bitter race war would be in the offing unless these policies are reversed and more human attitudes come to prevail on the part of the white

man in Africa. British possessions in Africa such as Kenya are already on the point of becoming independent. It is too late in the day to try to preserve the old colonial racial empires keeping coloured peoples under slavery any longer.

The UNO has agreed to discuss the question with USA support at the instance of the Afro-Asian Group. It is significant that the Indian representative was the leader in this UNO action. And it is to be noted that Britain and France abstained and that none voted against.

This is a pointer that the leading nations of the world are beginning to feel that it won't do, especially in view of the championship of the blacks by the Soviets, for the West to continue the old attitudes of racial superiority. The USA no doubt has its own troubles with its Negro population. Just now Negroes have taken to satyagraha for equal treatment in hotels for being served at the same tables and counters as white customers. But the USA has the advantage that leading circles in the country are decidedly for nondiscrimination among races and creeds in matters of law and constitutional rights. There is a bill before Congress aiming at removing difficulties facing Negroes in exercising their franchise in elections. There is some Southern opposition but the trend is all towards equality and equal rights will no doubt become the routine in course of time not too distant from now.

But the South African whites—the Africaner Boers—swear by white supremacy as an article of faith and are resolved to maintain it in defiance of world opinion. They live in the days of slavery. Even the United States freed slaves only as the result of a bitter four year fratricidal war in the 1860's. The Russian Czar freed the serfs only about the same time. But today events are marching more swiftly than of old and it is impossible for the South African Whites to live in the past any longer.

INDIA'S ATTITUDE TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN TANGLE

We fully sympathise with the poor blacks of Africa in their trouble as a people.

But our action as a nation and free government has to take note of consistency and the consequences of our words and deeds in this matter on our future relations with other nations.

The tone of passion with which our Prime Minister initiated discussion in the Lok Sabha on this question and sponsored a resolution condemning the action of the South African Government cannot but be regarded as unwise and detrimental to our national interests.

There was no need to pass a resolution in our parliament on questions primarily concerned—at least so far as law was concerned—with the internal affairs of other countries.

The lead taken by our representative in the UNO might be permitted but Governmental action should not have been taken as typified by the Lok Sabha resolution.

For one thing, it has shown up our double standards of morality in international relations too vividly. The Chinese Reds have killed thousands—even tens of thousands of Tibetans in suppressing their national freedom revolt during the last few months. In fact, the international jurists' committee of inquiry have published their conclusion after due enquiry that the Reds have committed the grave and colossal crime of genocide—i.e. the murder of the culture and way of life of a whole nation possessed of a distinctive and historic culture built up in their national home-land.

The crime of the Reds in Tibet is several times the size of that of Dr. Voervoerd. But we prevented or sought to prevent a discussion of the Tibetan question in the UNO. We argued that such a discussion would even go against the interests of the Tibetans themselves! The same arguments are being advanced to-day by Britain and France to oppose UNO consideration of the African atrocities!

We are afraid of antagonising China by seeming to champion the Tibetans. But we are not afraid of antagonising the South African Boers. Some day, when we are hard pressed by ruthless enemies the Boers may decide to take their revenge and join our enemies and harass us. Moreover, we are sworn to the friendship of all nations but we are doing everything to maintain the bitter hostility of South Africa, Pakistan, France, Portugal and other Powers. The Israelis have no respect for our poltroonery in refusing to follow up our formal recognition of their sovereign status by sending an envoy to that country for fear of the Arabs!

NEHRU CONDEMNS FRENCH ATOM BOMB TESTING

Mr. Nehru has condemned the second testing of atom bomb explosion in the Sahara by France.

Why should we do this and antagonise the French nation? Nothing that we say will have any effect on the mutual relations among atomic Powers. We succeed in this interference with factors (but remotely connected with our affairs and factors that we cannot hope to influence in any degree) only in antagonising powerful nations.

We are thus erecting the walls of isolation and even hostility around ourselves. We shall have to reap a poisoned harvest out of all this messy interference with world summit affairs.

PAKISTAN'S NEW INTRANSIGENCE

There are clear signs that President Ayub Khan has exhausted his patience with the policy of soft speech and conciliation towards India.

(Contd. on page 5)

Prospects Before the Swatantra Party

By M. A. Venkata Rao

It is clear that the Prime Minister does not know what to do with the growing strength of the Swatantra party. The party has challenged his leadership and administrative policies all along the line in every important sphere of their incidence on individual and social life.

In economic policy, the new party under the lead of Sri Rajagopalachari, Sri Ranga and Sri Masani has formulated a set of clear principles, first in the shape of 21 principles and later at Patna in March in the form of a challenging brochure entitled Prosperity through Freedom. It follows closely the successful philosophy and policy of Dr. Erhard of West Germany.

The Prime Minister speaks often of not being dogmatic and of his freedom from Marxism. But as a matter of fact, he clings to Marxist ideas, the most central of which is the annexation of all eco-

(Continued from page 4)

It appears that he has raised new questions in regard to the canal waters settlement demanding more water and more money from India than agreed upon and than is fair.

The Pakistani's are reopening the costing and calculations agreed upon at the time of Partition in regard to the sharing of public debts. They are whittling down her debts to ridiculously low figures.

The Defence Minister declared in Lok Sabha that Pakistani Planes were observed flying over Indian territories in the NEFA area. They were not pursued and warned, let alone giving them tit for tat for their shooting down of our Canberra!

The Defence Minister could not say why we could not identify Chinese planes at the same time. Perhaps his theory that the Chinese are not our enemies has come in the way of such identification?

PAKISTANIS WANT A RAILROAD FROM LAHORE TO DACCA

It is suddenly announced from Pakistan that a delegation is coming to India to discuss details of a through Corridor between Lahore and Dacca through the Gangetic Plain for a railway link between the two halves of Pakistan.

Now this is a major decision of Policy, carrying grave military and Defence Consequences, not to be indulged in without full public discussion and parliamentary debate. How could our Government have consented to the very principle of such a Rail Corridor? This is taking the public unawares. It will raise a storm of protest and add to the intense and growing displeasure of the people with the Government. This is playing with the security of the nation, which it will no longer view with equanimity.

economic power to the hands of the State. The state thus acquires economic power in addition to police and military power.

This principle is being followed systematically without let-up by Sri Nehru in his Five Year plans. The new small car manufacture is to be in the public sector! The new watch and film manufacturing units, the new machine tool units and innumerable other items under the anvil of public policy in collaboration with foreign companies and States are all to be in the public sector.

The Prime Minister re-affirmed his socialist faith before the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and asked the industrialists assembled as to why they hankered after large units? Why should they not content themselves with small units for which there is no official limit? He urged in criticism of this passion of big business for large units that they hanker, for economic power unduly and that such big business necessarily creates monopoly which is bad for the economy! Monopoly is the instrument of exploitation of the consumer by the capitalist class which cannot be allowed in social democracy! It is clear that the Prime Minister was in dead earnest about the abolition of the capitalist class in big undertakings in course of time not too distant from today!

We should set alongside, this declaration of his Nagpur dictation of the policy of cooperative joint farming in agriculture and of monopoly state wholesale trading in food grains. In effect, this entails the abolition of the capitalist farmer from the field of agriculture.

Private enterprise will as a consequence (when the policies get under way) be confined to small men in industry, commerce and agriculture. This is nothing but Maxism, pure and simple. The idea that he is free from dogmatic Marxism dwells in a corner of the Prime Minister's mind distant and isolated from the policy of Marxism that he is enforcing gradually, with the inevitability of a glacier movement down the mountain slopes, submerging towns and villages and fields and factories ruthlessly and irresistibly.

The Swatantra party has declared itself without ambiguity against this socialisation under way in the country under Congress party auspices. The full philosophy of freedom and the psychology of republicanism are being mobilised by the Swatantra leaders in their vision of an alternative policy based on individual freedom.

Sri Rajagopalachari adds the dimension of traditional social morality going under the name of dharma to the usual economic and political arguments. He supports freedom (from religious and

ethical dimensions) in terms easily intelligible to all ranks of the people. But the economic case for freedom is also supported from economic angles. This is more consciously done by Sri Masani. Mr. Masani has gone back to liberalism from his earlier youthful socialism. He has evolved a policy of mixed economy giving a limited place to Government in defence and certain big industries on account of practical considerations. But the bulk of the economic field should be left free to private enterprise. He claims that prosperity will come more naturally through the action of private enterprise than through Planning of the Soviet type that India has adopted. The present type of Planning can only be successfully carried out by jettisoning democratic freedoms. Inflation and hardship to the common man by neglect of his consumer needs are inevitable under the present type of planning. Such inflation and starvation of the common man's daily requirements at prices he could afford would soon destroy social and industrial peace, leading to strikes, food, riots and looting of shops and go-downs, which is the golden opportunity for which Communists are waiting!

Mob violence will inevitably lead to official violence, with democratic freedoms being curtailed on account of anarchical conditions. This way leads to dictatorship.

Rajaji has therefore declared unequivocally that ultimately and in the last resort democracy and socialism of the Marxist variety with centralisation of all power, economic and cultural, are a contradiction in terms! This is prescient as it sees the end in the beginning!

The Patna Convention therefore has called logically for the scrapping of the Planning Commission and the freeing of the annual budget from the strait jacket of the Five Year Plans. The Planning Commission has also developed into an extra-constitutional executive and policy-making authority not responsible to Parliament!

The great question of incentives has been settled in favour of unequal rewards and anti-socialist organisation of factory management even in communist countries! Socialism has not therefore brought equality of incomes for all.

In actual effect, socialism has meant only rapid industrialisation under State ownership, management and control without the glamour of equal distribution under which it gathered mass support. It has betrayed the masses—both labour and the common man in offices!

The Prime Minister and his advisers or followers have not replied to this barrage of criticism urged by the Swatantra party leaders. When plied in press conferences, he has confined himself to abuse! He said recently that the Swatantra leaders were beyond him, that they lived in the nineteenth century and that the party is useful as it is collecting all wrong thinking old fogies etc. etc!

This is a debate that is going on in thoughtful circles in Britain, America and other advanced countries as well. Recently there was a furore in the British Labour Party Conference over the policy of nationalisation and public ownership. The official leader of the party, Mr. Gaitskill, tried to get the party to drop the principle of nationalisation from the party Credo. But trade union elements who still cling to socialist dogma were not agreeable. Mr. Gaitskill was obliged to let the old principle remain but contented himself with getting an additional policy statement passed. It authorises the executive to determine the pace of nationalisation in accordance with the merits of individual cases.

It is not true therefore that the issues raised by the Swatantra party are old and exploded. They are live issues and the Prime Minister and his circle have not brought out any weighty reply.

In economic philosophy and administrative policy, the official party has not brought out any convincing line of answer. Thoughtful observers are therefore rallying more closely to the Swatantra party call.

It is extraordinary that no stalwart of the Congress party has yet tried to meet the arguments of Swatantra leaders on logical and experimental grounds.

Socialism appeals to bureaucratic classes as it gives security of employment and income with promotions to a sizeable number of the able among them. But bureaucratic services cannot expand indefinitely. The cost of the Indian Secretariat services at the Centre was around Rs. 36 crores in 1947. It is now around Rs. 267 crores. But there is no prospect of the bureaucracy being able to absorb all the new entrants into the employment field!

The middle classes therefore cannot all be absorbed in the Government and Government industrial services.

There is need for the development of opportunity for the educated elements in the professional services on an independent basis—those of doctors, nurses, teachers, lawyers, accountants, private engineers, technicians who can practice independently like electricians and building experts. The opportunity given to them in the public sector and the government welfare services cannot expand *pari passu* with the growth in the numbers of people trained for the tertiary services. To this must be added the disadvantage of the loss of independence entailed by government service on a salaried basis.

A socialist society that consists entirely of salaried ranks of employees (but for the ruling party) cannot maintain the degree of independence and self-reliance essential for the functioning of democracy.

It will also prohibit free debate on administrative and policy questions among their servants. A One-

Party, dictatorial State is therefore the inevitable result of the completion of the socialist programme, of the centralisation of all economic power (in addition to governmental coercive police and military power) in the hands of the governing group. There is no answer from Congress leaders to this line of devastating criticism of the "socialist pattern of society" adopted so facetly by them at Avadi.

Freedom means something precious to the middle and professional classes. Freedom is of the essence of their business and professional work. They also need capital to invest in their business or profession to start an independent career. They need it earlier to get an education of the level and kind necessary for their careers.

They understand the meaning of freedom and democracy. The Swatantra party is therefore rallying such elements of the population in most provinces. These groups are sick of the ever-encroaching tentacles of the bureaucracy and party officials in private life and business. It has become difficult to start new business on account of the innumerable vexatious forms to be filled up and regulations to be observed. These regulations put the businessman at the mercy of the petty jack-in-office. To get reasonable relief from them, business men too often have to take recourse to the services of the partymen in the neighbourhood, who acts as a costly mediator between citizen and government, a rank and office not recognised by the Constitution!

The Swatantra party has to offer something to workers without capital and to low-income employees of government and business firms to attract them to the party. They prefer wages, social security and pensions to freedom in the abstract. The Party has announced that it will not organise labour as yet. Whether this is a heroic self-denying ordinance to be maintained as a principle till the end or only a temporary measure is not clear. But labour is too large and organised a voting field, to be safely left out by any aspiring party.

The party will find support from business and professional classes and retired officialdom. People from Congress ranks will also drift into the Swatantra reservoir as time goes on and the unpopularity of the Congress grows. Though big business will maintain an appearance of support to the Congress and will contribute reluctantly to its funds, it will also on the sly contribute to the Swatantra funds! Workers for the party will also become available as funds increase.

Mr. M. R. Masani symbolises independent-minded businessmen, professional people like lawyers and doctors and city people in general. Prof. N. G. Ranga has been known as a peasant leader with an all-India reputation. He has also travelled abroad and is in touch with peasant parties in Europe and America. He has specialised in the slogan of peasant proprietorship and self-employed artisans like weavers and carpenters. The large field of

peasant voters is expected to be rallied by Professor Ranga helped by the large landlords who started the All-India Agricultural Federation. Planters in general will also follow the Swatantra party.

Sri Rajagopalachari is an asset from another dimension as well. In addition to being well-known to the entire country, (having been Governor General and Home Minister at the Centre and Chief Minister in Madras), he is specially respected particularly in the South as a religious-minded, moralist of no mean reputation. His fables and moral analogies are well-known and popular. He is also respected as an interpreter of the spiritual classics of Tamilnad and the Vedic scriptures as well. He has written extensively in Tamil on them and is recognised as a sage-like counsellor by young and old. He stands for the conservative element and reassures the large number of nervous people who are afraid of the rapid and volatile revolutionary changes being ushered in (with but little preparation) by Congress under the heady impulsion of Mr. Nehru.

Prof. Ranga sometimes refers to Gandhian socialism as contrasted with Marxist socialism with its class war and anti-national character.

Sri Rajaji has also stood for the defeat of the Indian Communist Party. He repeated in Calcutta in March his old and famous statement while Chief Minister of Madras that communist was his enemy Number One. This has encouraged the large numbers of propertied and conservative classes. Former Governor of Bihar, Mr. Aney declared at the very outset when the party was founded by Rajaji that it would save the country from Communism!

It is clear therefore that the Swatantra party has very solid chances of developing into a formidable opposition party, drawing support from influential classes of the population.

READ

FREEMAN

The Freeman is a monthly published by the Foundation for Economic Education, championing the causes of private property, the free-market, free enterprise, limited government and Libertarian ideals.

Available at:

LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE,
Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road,
Bombay-4.

Price per single copy is Re. ONE only, just enough to cover cost and postage

Afro-Asian Solidarity

By M. N. Tholal

“AFRO-ASIAN Solidarity” is one of those silly slogans which cannot bear a moment’s scrutiny, and yet it is indulged in with gusto, with or without the slightest provocation, whenever representatives of African and Asian nations meet one another. The raising of slogans is not exactly calculated to promote rational thinking, but even so it should not be calculated to prevent rational thinking, for to do so is to build one’s house on sand. It is indeed queer that we should fail to learn any lesson from the saddest of experiences. We raised the slogan of Hindu-Muslim Bhai-Bhai in the beginning of the twenties—the basis of the cry being Hindu support of that fanatical Muslim institution, the Khilafat—and the result was a series of bloody rioting which ultimately resulted in the division of the country. We have now for one of our chief slogans, particularly since the Bandung Conference five years ago, “Afro-Asian Solidarity,” and it is therefore worthwhile examining the content of this slogan to see what it is that makes it so popular among the thoughtless intelligentsia in this as well as other countries of Asia and Africa.

CART BEFORE THE HORSE

Before there is anything like Afro-Asian solidarity, there must obviously be Asian solidarity as well as African solidarity. Let us throw a glance nearer home at the kind of Asian solidarity that exists in the continent. When I ridiculed the slogan when the Bandung Conference was on, my ridicule was interpreted as lack of desire on my part for the coming into being of Afro-Asian solidarity and, therefore, of a subconscious willingness to promote the interests of imperialism, when all that I desired to point out was that, not only was the basis for such solidarity non-existent but, as a matter of fact, the leading nations of Asia and Africa were also working at cross-purposes and, insofar as they were not trying first to create a basis for it, they were putting the cart before the horse. How can there be solidarity, I then asked, between a Communist country like China and a democratic country like India? The progress of time has revealed the soundness of the query which was then far from evident, though not so obscure was the suggestion emanating from a similar query regarding the relationship between India and Pakistan. The whirligig of time brings its own revenges, and what seemed impossible then—although Chinese incursions into Ladakh had begun—is being witnessed today and, on the other hand, efforts are being made on both sides to improve relations between India and Pakistan.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was among the foremost in the land to emphasise the importance of ideology as the basis of affinity and it is not a little

surprising that he should now be among the foremost to ignore ideological considerations. During the days of our slavery he was in a minority, as it was generally agreed that the need of presenting a united effort to the enemy was paramount if freedom was to be achieved, and even he did not stress his ideological differences to breaking point. The desire to get rid of imperialism was then uppermost in our minds and it continues to dominate our minds. This domination is the basis of the slogan, regardless of the fact that the slogan is singularly inopportune in the altered circumstances of today. That we should want other countries, still under the heel of imperialists, to be free like us is only proper, but that desire should not lead us to flog a dead horse or train our guns on a liquidating imperialism and turn the Nelson’s blind eye to the advancing imperialism of Soviet Russia or Communist China, particularly when we have the latter stretching for thousands of miles on our own border.

ASIAN SOLIDARITY

Soon after independence we had the Asian Conference in Delhi as a proof perhaps of Asian solidarity, and then a few years ago an Asian Solidarity Committee was actually formed and it was decided that an Asian Secretariat was to be organised to promote the aims and objects of the Asian Conference. Among the members of the Asian Solidarity Committee were Pakistan (with which we were then, as now, on cease-fire terms) and China which had already begun her incursions into Ladakh, though our Government did not choose to acknowledge the incursions publicly, perhaps because the public admission would have interfered with Asian solidarity—on the principle that if the facts do not fit into your theory, disregard them, deny them, forget them. Jolly good going this, for a solidarity which only promotes incursions and invasions from neighbours! This only shows that there is no limit to wishful thinking on the part of our Prime Minister, that it is the heart that functions in Mr. Nehru and keeps the brain under its control. Since wishful thinking always leads to disaster, one need not wonder that we are now face to face with one right at the time when we were patting ourselves on the back for having Mr. Nehru as our Prime Minister.

Two nations cannot become brotherly by shouting Bhai-Bhai, by no means if the shouting is confined to only one, as seems to be the case in our relations with our “Bhais.” A concatenation of circumstances, chief among which was the fact that he was Motilal Nehru’s only son, put Jawaharlal in the forefront of the political arena, and it is not to be wondered at that he should have come

to the conclusion, with India attaining independence with him at the helm, that he was a Man of Destiny, destined to ride roughshod over leaders of nations, even as he was doing over leaders in the homeland. No less a man than the wily Khrushchev came in the nick of time to confirm Nehru's flattering conclusion by proposing his name for the summit meeting and making his condemnation of the western powers even more resounding. How thoughtless that condemnation was, in the pursuit of the will-o-the-wisp of Afro-Asian solidarity, is now plain even to those who were clapping their hands whenever the condemnation was pronounced.

Mr. Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier, was among the foremost to mouth the slogan of Afro-Asian solidarity. Even when he was doing so, his forces were invading India! Another champion of Afro-Asian solidarity is Col. Nasser, the Egyptian Premier. During his last visit to India, he declined, in answer to Pressmen's suggestion, to subscribe to Panch Shila, saying that they had their own principles of the Revolution. Anyone who has read Nasser's Philosophy of the Revolution knows that it can be summed up in four words: Limitless Power for Muslims. In his Philosophy of the Revolution he writes:

"When I consider the 80 million Muslims in Indonesia and the 50 million in China, and the millions in Malaya, Siam and Burma, and the close to 100 million in the Middle East, and the 40 million inside the Soviet Union, and the other millions in far-flung parts of the world, when I consider these hundreds of millions united by a single creed, I emerge with a sense of the tremendous possibilities which we may realise through the cooperation of all these Muslims... enabling them and their brothers in faith to wield a power without limit."

This is not even a veiled exposition of that Muslim nationalism which Congressmen have been combating all along and it is difficult to see how Mr. Nehru can be really friendly with Col. Nasser, unless he chooses to forget all he has been swearing by these forty years and more, in his hatred of those who opposed him on the Kashmir issue.

ARAB NATIONALISM

And what is this Arab nationalism of which we hear so much now-a-days? A nation is a distinct race or people having common descent, language, history or political institutions, while, nationalism stands for patriotic feeling, principles or efforts or a policy of national independence. Can Arab nationalism be said to possess any of these attributes? Were Arab nationalism confined to the people of Arabia or even extended a little beyond to Iraq, Jordan and Syria, one would have little to cavil at, on the principle that man-made frontiers cannot be regarded with the same sanctity as natural frontiers. But the Arab nationalism of today appears to be something which is neither Arab nor nation-

alism. It extends far beyond the frontiers of Arabia, right up to Morocco, and aims at embracing many nations. Truly speaking, it is international rather than national and embraces non-Arab nations in its fold, unless a common religion and a common language can be made to constitute a nation. The people of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq may have a common language and religion, imposed on them with the help of the sword centuries ago, but they certainly are not one people having a common descent or history. They cannot, therefore, be said to constitute a nation.

If we try to examine the mainspring of this popularism—popular even among Indians—we shall find that it is a very near cousin, if not indeed a twin sister, of an ism with which we Indians are mighty familiar, one indeed which we have been fighting for decades, i.e., Muslim nationalism. The support that our Government is extending to this ism is therefore all the more surprising, bespeaking as it does that we support abroad what we condemn at home—that, in short, we have no principles of any kind and continue to live politically from hand to mouth on the short-sighted policy of clap-trap, which makes our leaders appear great to our ignorant countrymen. It is strange that we should pursue this policy even after having paid the greatest possible price in the holocaust of 1947 and the division of the country, and after having been ashamed for decades of participation in the Khilafat movement which revived Muslim fanaticism in the land. We condemn cries of Jihad across the border in Pakistan but we make friends with the organisers and leaders of Fidayeens and Mujahideens (those who take up Jihad) in Egypt and Syria.

SECURITY COUNCIL VOTE

We go all out to support Muslim fanatics against those who gave us our freedom as a free gift after we had repeatedly failed to wrest it from their hands. This gift, unparalleled in the history of the world, was given at a time when the antagonism between the Hindus and Muslims, as a result of our freedom movements, had gone so deep that a hundred million Muslims were prepared to shed the last drop of their blood to prevent the transfer of power and a man like Churchill could have prevented it for decades by a bold execution of the policy of Anglo-Muslim alliance. It is not suggested that we should toe the British line as a result of favours received. But neither should those favours act as incentives for abuse and condemnation of those from whom they were received.

Madness as our support of Arab nationalism may appear at first sight, it is not without its proverbial method. We seemed to have thought that if we went all out in support of Nasser against Britain, France and Israel, the Arab states, Egypt and her allies, would be with India on the Kashmir issue.

The result has been the opposite of what was intended and could have been easily foreseen, had an attempt been made to assess the reactions of our policy. Our spectacular support of Egypt and dramatic condemnation of Britain, France and Israel so annoyed the western powers that they had their revenge on us by having the Kashmir issue resuscitated to condemn us in the Security Council by, as it happened, a ten-to-nine vote. And what was the result of this shocking ten-to-nine vote against us? The result was that the world, including the Arab states, came to believe that India had no case at all and that Indians are the aggressors in Kashmir. It was not an interested party like Pakistan telling them that this time. It was the voice of the world.

The Security Council vote was a vote against Messrs Nehru and Menon and the crudeness with which our foreign policy was conducted, rather than a condemnation of our stand on Kashmir. The very fact that the Kashmir affair lay dormant for years proves the truth of this assertion. But we asked for it and as a result the Arab states were shamed into sliding back into the Pan-Islamic mood of supporting a Muslim against a non-Muslim state on the Kashmir issue. Pakistan claims that all Muslim states, except one, are with her on the issue. Even Kabul Radio recently came out in open support of Pakistan's claim to Kashmir.

Pakistan began her career with Governor-General Jinnah proclaiming that Pakistan was surrounded by enemies on all sides. Within thirteen years we Indians are complaining that we are friendless in this wide world. If the object of a country's foreign policy is to be friendless and to be surrounded by enemies on all sides, we have certainly succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. No wonder the tables have been turned on us. Pakistan's Prime Minister does not jump at the dais of a national conference, as Mr. Nehru did at an annual session of the Congress, to go out of his way to denounce an Eisenhower Doctrine as soon as a news message enunciating it is handed over to him. The hurry could only have been dictated by the need of giving the "right" lead (incidentally anti-American) to his Arab friends, one of whom at least wants the lea-

dership of the Middle East for himself. Neither should it be forgotten that Mr. Nehru denounced the power vacuum theory and military aid to countries after having passed on 5,000 Indian rifles to Burma secretly.

DISAGREEMENT ON FUNDAMENTALS

And how can we deceive the Arabs into believing that we are their friends when we disagree with them on the fundamental issue of wiping off Israel from the map of the world? That is the only desire which gives sustenance to Arab nationalism. Mr. Nehru has declared that he does not want Israel wiped off the map. With this fundamental difference on the main problem agitating the Arabs, there can be no unity of purpose between the Arab states and India and all attempts at establishing solidarity on that basis must prove futile.

How far does the oft-repeated assertion of Arab Nationalists to wipe Israel off the map accord with the determination to maintain peace? How far is it in consonance with the UN Charter or Panch Shila? Indeed, it almost seems that those who drive their coach and four through Panch Shila earn our respect and admiration, instead of losing them, and we continue to proclaim lofty principles only to bypass them in practice.

Afro-Asian solidarity, Asian solidarity, Muslim solidarity, Arab solidarity—Col. Nasser would appear to stand for all these equally vehemently regardless of the self-contradiction that his stand involves. Arab solidarity reminds one of the fact that only two years ago King Saud was publicly named by a United Republic spokesman as "master-mind" behind a plot to assassinate Nasser and prevent the formation of the United Arab Republic. And we know that Iraq was forced to obtain Soviet aid to prevent her absorption in the United Arab Republic, and it was the fear of her going Communist that made Nasser soft-pedal his Arab nationalism, as far as Iraq was concerned.

At a time when public opinion in the country is turning pro-West, it is unfortunate that we should continue giving the impression that we are ganging up against the West.

What Is Socialism?

By Leszek Kolakowski

(The following article written by a Polish intellectual was for publication in the Polish student journal, "Po Prostu" which was banned in 1957. This article did not appear in print, but was circulated in manuscript form.)

WE will tell you what socialism is. But first we must tell you what socialism is not. It is a matter about which we once had a quite different opinion than we have today.

Well, then, socialism is not:

A society in which a person who has committed no crime sits at home waiting for the police.

A society in which it is a crime to be a brother, sister, son, or wife of a criminal.

A society in which one person is unhappy because he does not say what is in his mind.

A society in which a person lives better because he does not think at all.

A society in which a person is unhappy because

The Indian Libertarian

Economic Supplement

Why Free Economy ?

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

ECONOMIC development of underdeveloped countries has become an important objective in the post war period, but there are many obstacles. Economic development is a complex process requiring much more than the financial resources. The most important obstacles to the speedy development are the low level of education, the lack of intelligence, and skilful manpower which exists in most underdeveloped countries and the low health standards which also form a substantial obstacle to the development. Development is also hampered by the limited resources of domestic capital available for investment in most underdeveloped countries, as a result partly of the low level of national income and partly of inadequate machinery for encouraging savings and channeling them properly. It is necessary to create an appropriate environment for development and this task will have to be performed by the underdeveloped countries themselves. In the words of Dr. Gadgil "Rapid development means change in the traditional organization of production; it means rapid acceptance of change in techniques as a normal and continuing process; acceptance of change in occupation; and change over to urban surroundings for a large number of people and other concomitant changes. Readiness to accept change, to be mobile in occupation, habit and habitat is a necessary condition precedent of rapid economic development."

Many people choose to interpret economic development as something more than merely an increase in aggregate output; they denote a rise in the standard of living. This view requires economic development to be defined as a process whereby real per capita income of a country increases over the long period. At present our ruling party, namely Congress, is trying to achieve a rapid economic development of our country in order to remove poverty and the raise the standard of living of the teeming millions. To achieve that objective it has introduced planning based on Russian models and the methods adopted so far are communistic in character with the result that standard of living instead of increasing has actually gone down. This is mainly due to the fact population growth surpasses the increase in national output and as a consequence of this real per capita income falls.

There is a phenomenal growth in the population in our country and unless this is checked by means of family planning, exodus of new entrants will reduce further the real per capita income. There is need to tackle this problem and The Libertarian Social Institute of Bombay is doing its best with its limited resources, to tackle this problem.

Many who believe that development is desirable are turning to the study of economic development to find policy measures that development requires and the criteria by which to judge the merits and demerits of the various policies now being adopted. In our country we have adopted a centralised planning but the working of this policy during the last eight years has clearly proved that it has resulted more in chaos than economic development of the country. This is due to the State intervention in economic matters. What those calling themselves as planners advocate is not the substitution of planned action for letting things go but the substitution of planners own plan for the plans of other people. The planner behaves like a dictator and he wants to deprive all other people of the power to plan and act according to their plans. He only wishes to see the preeminence of his own plan.

It is assumed that a government which is not socialistic has no plan but what the people do in free economy is the execution of their own plans. From this point of view every human action is a kind of plan. No one objects to planning but what we object is centralised planning. Planning is not a peculiar to socialism. It is applicable to every economic system but it works well in free economy where consumers are sovereign. At present everything is managed from top and the individuals have no freedom to execute their own plans. In a free or market economy the focal point is market where the people freely choose goods and services; choose the work they do and firms choose what to produce and how much to produce. The socialist or centrally planned economy achieves all these things at the cost of freedom which is natural right of every individual. In a socialist state, freedom to change occupation, to move from place to place and to establish new firms are restricted. The free enterprise system or free economy is the only system that guarantees the maximum degree of freedom for the individual along with the high degree of productive efficiency. In a centralised

economy prices are directed by the government's central board of production management but in free economy it is fixed either by the prices fixed on the market by the buying and by the abstinence from buying on the part of the people. When a government controls a part of prices it results in chaos and social unrest. Free enterprise can work efficiently and effectively only if the area of government decisions are severely restricted. Mr. Nehru believes that free enterprise means creation of monopoly. He says "Free enterprise leads to the lack of free enterprise. It means inevitable growth of monopoly and monopoly leads to restriction of spirit enterprise of individuals, excepting a few." One fails to understand how free enterprise leads to monopoly. In this matter it would have been better if Mr. Nehru has consulted Prof. Gailbrath, the well known economist of America. Even if it leads to monopoly then the State has ample powers "to break up such arrangements designed to hold consumers to ransom and to prevent the entry of new entrepreneurs into the field." At present, in India, no monopolies are formed in the private sector. It is true that there is no sufficient competition but this is mainly due to import restrictions and other economic controls imposed in order to achieve speedy, regulates economic development of the country based on the ideological predilections of the party in power. Secondly, Government has ample powers to check the monopolies and it has been using them in various ways as for example, fixation of prices, regulation of production and distribution, licencing of industries and so on. At present there is hardly anything that a producer can do in the sphere of production and distribution without the permission of Government. If there are monopolies there are in the public sector and not in the private sector." It must be remembered in this connection that when the State has a monopoly the citizens have no effective means of checking the evil effects of centralisation of economic power in the hands of politicians. They have of course their vote but in countries like India, with monolithic political parties in power they are hardly of much consequence. Practical experience shows that in underdeveloped socialist countries only Communists and extreme left wing Socialists are able to capitalise the discontentment among the masses, arising from the growing statism and not those who preach the philosophy of free enterprise and peasant proprietorship. Statism when carried too far will tend to undermine the strength of democratic forces." As government becomes more powerful in economic affairs legislators administrators are subjected increasingly to pressures by organised groups seeking economic gain. Democratically chosen officials who wield great economic power are not likely to be the champions of the rights of the people as a whole. It is only in a free economy that many economic problems are solved without undue government direction of individuals and firms. It removes the whole area of economic decisions from government allowing such decisions to be made instead by millions of indi-

vidual families and businessmen. Free economy is a scheme of decentralization, a means of removing from the hands of the government officials the various economic decisions relating to what, how and for whom goods are produced. As means of decentralising economic control the free economy or competitive system can be considered one of the major bulwarks of political democracy. The importance of free economy has been stated by Von Mises in a beautiful manner. He says "In free or market economy the consumers are supreme. Their buying and abstinence from buying ultimately determines what the entrepreneurs produce and in what quantity and quality. It determines directly the prices of the consumers goods and indirectly the prices of the producers goods, i.e. labour and material factors of production. It determines the emergence of profits and losses and the formation of the rate of interest. It determines every individual's income. The focal point of the market economy is the market i.e. the process of the formation of commodity prices, wage rates, and interest rates and their derivatives, profits and losses. It makes all men in their capacity as producers responsible to the consumers. This dependence is direct with entrepreneurs, capitalists, farmers and professional men and indirect with people working for salaries and wages. The market adjusts the efforts of all those engaged in supplying the needs of the consumers to the wishes of those for whom they produce, the consumers. It subjects production to consumption. The market is a democracy in which every penny gives a right to vote. It is true that the various individuals have not the same power to vote. The richer may cast more ballots than the poorer fellow. But to be rich and to earn a higher income, in the market economy already the outcome of a previous election. The only means to acquire wealth and to preserve it, in a market economy not adulterated by government-made privileges and restrictions is to serve the consumers in the best and cheapest way. Capitalists and landowners who fail in this regard suffer losses. If they do not change their procedure they lose their wealth and become poor. It is the consumers who make the poor people rich and rich people poor. It is the consumers who fix the wages of a movie star and an opera singer at a higher level than those of a welder or an accountant."

From this one can easily see that the best way to achieve rapid economic development of our country is to adopt free economy and not centrally planned economy. Free market is not devoid of planning, but it is the sum of many individual plans. Every producer must be ready to plan afresh on the basis of the changing pattern of market. He must adapt his plans to those made by others. In a free economy planning is a continuous change, while in a centrally planning economy long term planning is the rule. In a free economy producer and consumer decide freely the development of economic process. It is the consumer who decide

(Continued on page IV)

Economic Chaos—A Way Out

A LITTLE PLANNING IS AS IMPOSSIBLE AS A LITTLE PREGNANCY

By M. V. Sastry

THIS is a plea for constructive thought on the present political situation in India. Rajaji indicated the way out when the Congress landed itself in a morass in about the year 1942. Now it is something different. The Congress of the day is seeking to land the people of the country in a morass. It is not a question therefore of helping the Congress out of an impasse. It is a struggle for existence on the part of the people against the Congress. There is no section of the people which is happy. The vulgar pomp and satisfaction of men in authority and power rouses the gorge of every decent citizen. Nehru's Socialistic pattern of Society is a myth.

All is fair in love and war, and therefore it may be legitimate for the critics of the Swatantra Party to distort its policy and make it out to be an outmoded laissez faire theory, or even just anarchy. It never seems to occur to them that the minimum of fairness demands that they should at least cast a cursory glance at the 21 principles of the party before launching on their criticism. Those who prefer to pin their faith in a Marxist economy of some shape or other, which had its roots in the 19th century and which has since been found to be decayed, may not prefer the progressive thought of the mid-20th century enshrined in the 21 principles of the Swatantra Party.

A monopoly does not cease to be such, simple because it happens to be held by the State. The State itself comes to be owned by the Party in power and we experience the phenomenon of the emergence of a 'New Class' which suppresses the individual and oppresses the people. This is what the Swatantra Party is up against. The negative aspect lies in its opposition to the 'New Class' and the positive in its belief in prosperity through competition. It is essentially a "programme party."

While the Party does not believe in a class war it takes into account two important interests which are not only not antithetical but can be made mutually beneficial, and which any sound economy should comprehend, viz. the interests of the consumer and the producer. The Swatantra Party considers the interest of the consumer to be paramount, in that it is an interest which, in a sense, is common to all the individuals that compose a society. There is a play of natural forces in 'free competition' which puts the trader or the producer under an obligation to make his profit through 'turn-over' instead of through a high rate of profit. It is this that works to the benefit of the consumer, and can lead to an expansion of trade and industry capable of solving the

extant unemployment problem. While this latter is conceived as a means to create and increase the volume of purchasing power, the purchasing power so created and increased is sought to be made substantial through a stabilisation of the 'currency'. That is why the Swatantra Party is against the exploitation of the Nasik Press and foreign loans, as the incidence of the total burden ultimately falls on the consumer. Ultimately even the tax payer's burden is transferred to the consumer. This is the reason for the Swatantra Party's opposition to crippling taxation which has come to include the newest type of Indirect Tax, in the shape of bribes to high and low, based on the principle 'every man has his price'—the slab being dependant on the status of the officer concerned. A trader or an industrialist will continue to make his profit willy-nilly, and this is achieved only by the transference of all the burdens to the consumer. We see therefore where the ultimate incidence is. And in the last analysis, you can never invest more than what you save.

We find ourselves in a crisis: If profit cannot be made in the face of oppressive and indiscriminate State interference, private enterprise necessarily winds itself up, even if it is not wound up by the State or in bankruptcy. This circumstance necessarily leads to the monopolistic operations of the State. Where such operations lead to, has been vividly described by Djilas in *The New Class*.

Bernard Shaw observed: 'It is vitally important that a Government, however convinced of the evil of private property and profiteering enterprise, must not confiscate the one nor stop the other until it is ready to carry on and find employment for all concerned without checking their productivity for a moment. Otherwise nothing will happen but unemployment and national impoverishment'. This about sums up the warning needed in our present situation. Under the auspices of the ruling party we find that the State can provide profit and employment not to all but only to those who belong to the party in power and their hangers-on in varying degrees. The entire machinery of the State is geared to the operations of the party in power. Besides a highly centralized party in power, we have quite a few extra-constitutional bodies like the Planning Commission and the National Development Council which are not responsible to anybody but their creator, the Prime Minister, though they are said to function as organs of Democracy!

Fundamentally, Government is not a business concern. It can never be and never should be such. When it comes to do business it is not doing so

with its own money but with somebody else's—the people's money. Moreover, Government is not a mythical entity. Factually, it operates under the authority of a group of individuals called the Party in power. Nobody could describe the resulting phenomenon better than Djilas: "The Communist leaders handle national property as their own but at the same time they waste it as if it were somebody else's" Adverting to State monopoly he says: "The worst and most harmful element in capitalism from the workers' standpoint—the labour market—has been replaced by the monopoly over labour of the ownership of the New Class. This has not made the worker any freer." It may really be to the businessman's interest to continue the system of licences and permits. But it definitely can be harmful to the interests of the consumer. The favoured businessman is always an anti-social factor. The authority which favours is equally so,

The present policies of the Congress and, under its auspices, of the Government are said to be very different from a Communist ideology and practice. This is partially true, and there is a chance yet 'to nip it in the bud,' so to say. 'A little planning is as impossible as a little pregnancy', and something should be done about it before a monster is born.

There is everything to be said for a people's capitalism as against State capitalism which is another name for Socialism, a compendious name for the business operations of the Party in power. That is the *raison d'être* of private enterprise and free competition, and the reason against every type of monopolistic business, private or public. Essen-

(Continued from page II)

and influences production while in a planned economy his decision is made for him and he becomes subject to government standardised consumption. In a planned economy production is divorced from the desires of the consumers but in free economy production is carried on according to the demand of the consumers. From all these points of view what is needed at present in our country is not the centrally planned economy but a free economy, whereby the people can play their role in the economic development of the country. Eight years of planned economy have created more chaos and so far we have not reached "the take off" stage. State intervention has undermined the spirit of enterprise, initiative and incentive. It has dried the capital accumulation and the nuisance taxes have aggravated the problem. All these ills can be eradicated only by adopting a free economy. Thus free economy and not centrally planned economy based on socialist pattern of society is the only remedy for the present ills. Centrally planned economy is worse than disease. It will only enhance the power of the State to gigantic dimensions where it turns the people into frightened beasts of burden whose shepherd is the Government.

tially the so-called public sector is more private than the most private sector. There is at least a check in the form of a Police State over the operations of a legitimate private sector; this is noticeably absent vis-a-vis the operations of the public sector. Where the interest of the consumer is paramount, there can be only one guiding principle—as much competition as possible, as much planning as necessary. We cease to make a farce of the 'common man', and take into account a characteristic which is common to every citizen (high and low, without distinction of class, caste or creed) when we give paramount consideration to the interest of the consumer.

A different cycle then presents itself: prosperity is reflected by the consuming capacity of the people. You cannot consume more than you can produce. Therefore, increase in the volume of consumption necessarily depends on the increase in the volume of production. The consumer is interested in production for use. Consequently, the manner and tempo of development also adjusts itself. Industry has to be decentralized in more ways than one.

The land problem cannot be solved by attempting the impossible—the satisfaction of land hunger. If it is not a demagogic device, it only presents the undignified picture of a cat running after its own tail. The uncertainties of the land policies of the party in power have succeeded in lowering food production. Instead of doctrinaire blundering, if a realistic land policy had been adhered to, it would have stepped up food production, resulting in the prices of essential foodstuffs coming down to their natural level and affording the needed relief to the consumer. This would have provided a firm base for an industrial superstructure capable of relieving the enormous pressure on land, and the extant unemployment and poverty.

SOUND GROWTH

There is only one way to achieve growth—that is by increased savings and by increased investment in the tools of production. Anti-inflationary policies encourage growth because people are inclined to save more when they have a conviction that a rupee they put aside today for future use will not be eaten up by the price increase of tomorrow.

Those who think that it is up to the government to create growth overlook the fact that increased productivity depends upon the intelligence, work and thrift of individuals and corporations. People, —not government, create growth. All the government can do is to encourage people to save and invest. This is accomplished by curtailing government spending and encouraging sound fiscal and monetary policies. Sound growth is achieved by fighting inflation, not by encouraging it.

—L. Fertig

he is a Jew, and another feels better for not being a Jew.

A state whose soldiers move into the territory of another country first.

A state where anyone who praises the national leaders is better off.

A state in which one can be condemned without trial.

A society whose leaders appoint themselves to their post.

A society in which ten people live in one room.

A society which has illiterate and smallpox epidemics.

A state which does not permit travel abroad.

A state which has more spies than nurses, and more people in prison than in hospitals.

A state in which the number of officials increases faster than that of workers.

A state in which one is forced to resort to lies.

A state in which one is compelled to be a thief.

A state which possesses colonies.

A state in which one is forced to resort to crime.

A state whose neighbours curse geography.

A state which produces excellent jet planes and bad shoes.

A state in which cowards live better than the valiant.

A state in which lawyers in most cases agree with the state prosecutor.

Empire, tyranny, oligarchy, bureaucracy.

A state in which the majority of people seek God in order to find solace in their misery.

A state which awards prizes to pseudo-authors and knows more about painting than the painters.

A nation which oppresses other nations.

A state which wants all its citizens to have the same opinions in philosophy, foreign policy, economics, literature and ethics.

A state whose government defines its citizens' rights, but whose citizens do not define the government's rights.

A state in which one is responsible for one's ancestors.

A state in which one part of the population receives salaries forty times higher than those of the remainder.

Any system of government toward which most of the governed are hostile.

A single, isolated state.

A group of backward countries.

A state which utilizes nationalistic slogans.

A state whose government believes that nothing is more important than its power.

A state which makes a pact with crime, and then adapts its ideology to this pact.

A state which would like to see its foreign ministry determine the political opinion of all mankind.

A state which finds it difficult to distinguish between enslavement and liberation.

A state in which racist agitators enjoy full freedom.

A state in which there is private ownership of the means of production.

A state which has difficulty differentiating between social revolution and armed assault.

A state which does not believe that people must be happier under socialism than elsewhere.

A society which is very melancholy.

A caste system.

A state which always knows the will of the people before it asks them.

A state which can mistreat the people with impunity.

A state which believes that it alone can redeem humanity.

A state in which a view of history is important.

A state in which the philosophers and writers always say the same as the generals and ministers, but always after them.

A state in which street maps of cities are state secrets.

A state in which the returns of parliamentary elections are always predictable.

A state in which there is slave labour.

A state in which feudal fetters exist.

A state which has a world monopoly on scientific progress.

A state in which an entire people, through no desire of its own, is moved to a new location.

A state in which the workers have no influence on the government.

A state which considers itself to be always in the right.

A state in which history is a servant of policy.

A state whose citizens may not read the greatest works of contemporary literature, not see the greatest works of contemporary painting, and not hear the greatest works of modern music.

A state which is always well pleased with itself.

A state which asserts that the world is very complicated, but actually believes it to be extremely simple.

A state in which one must suffer long before one can get a doctor.

A society that has beggars.

A state which believes everyone to be enamoured of it, whereas in truth it is the opposite.

A state which is convinced that nobody in the world can conceive anything better.

A state which does not mind being hated as long as it is feared.

A state which determines who may criticize it and how.

A state in which one must each day refute what one affirmed the day before and always believe it to be the same.

A state which does not like to see its citizens read back numbers of newspapers.

A state in which many ignoramuses rank as scholars.

That was the first part. But now listen attentively, we will tell you what socialism is: Well, then, socialism is a good thing.

Cultural Freedom Since Independence

—RECENT TRENDS IN REPUBLICAN INDIA

By A. Ranganathan

SINCE India attained independence, there has been a steady decline of liberal and cultural values. Indeed, we are being pushed into a maelstrom with the result that most of us are confusing science with scientism, democratic ideals with socialistic slogans, liberal ideas with out-dated ideological clichés, intellectual freedom with linguistic fanaticism and cultural renaissance with subsidised mediocrity. And the efforts to replace English by Hindi and other regional languages have generated a process which would result in isolating India (which in itself would be in the process of Balkanization) from the liberal currents of the West. And this is further complicated by the danger of the mediaevalist trend in our socio-cultural set-up (Dr. Chatterji in his Minority Report has stated that some have even started a slogan like this: Hind, Hindu and Hindi) getting mixed up with the authoritarian element implicit in the growth of the modern Welfare state based on the 'Socialistic Pattern of Society'.

It was a fashion among our "nationalist" politicians and writers to attack the British Government for its alleged interference in the affairs of the Universities in India. Indeed, the main charge was that the British Governors who were also Chancellors used to convert the universities into academic chancelleries implying that their Imperial writ ran through the Universities. And a solitary professor like Radhakrishnan was singled out for his assumed capacity to "preach sedition" in the guise of an "academic sermon" at the risk of irritating a Chancellor like Lord Hailey. Such overworked compliments were meant to convey that there were very few Radhakrishnans to confront the innumerable Haileys of the day. But what of Free India's Universities? Sir A. L. Mudaliar, who has been Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University since the forties, made the following observations in his Dada-bhai Naoroji Memorial Fellowship lectures: "This attitude of interference has been very prominent and felt by Universities since the attainment of independence by our country. I have been considerably distressed with the number of communications that have been sent to Universities on diverse topics by secretaries or Under-Secretaries at the centre or at the State level. It may not have been easily realized that a University has got a structure of its own, that there are authorities in the University who have not only definite responsibilities and duties to discharge but are zealous to maintain the freedom to exercise their discretion in the discharge of their duties." And in the Madras Legislative Council, Sir A. L. Mudaliar said with gentle sarcasm (which was unfortunately lost on Mr. C. Subramaniam)

that he never knew of consultation being construed as concurrence and complained that the Government were "undermining the whole fabric of University autonomy and laying the foundations for the University's functions becoming the departmentalized activities of the Government, whichever Government might be in power."

Some time ago, a great judge known for his brilliant intellect and moral integrity was characterized as 'lacking intelligence' simply because his findings were not palatable to the ruling party. Again, the Auditor-General was criticized for his "malicious over-statements" just because he dared to point out certain irregularities in a Ministry whose presiding deity has made it a pastime, (almost a profession) to offend people. And recent events like the Government's interference in the Nanavati Case, have shown the elasticity of the extent to which our authorities would stretch a point of administrative procedure to circumvent the due processes of law. If an erstwhile colleague does not approve of some new-fangled proposals of taxation, she is dubbed as a 'petty capitalist.' And if Rajaji warns against the hasty implementation of Hindi as the language of administration, he is accused of carrying on a cold war. In one of his press conferences (which has become a monthly ritual in our Socialistic Society) Mr. Nehru said: "I know editorial opinion is also strongly in favour of the Swatantra Party. How any sensible person can be that, I cannot understand! I can only come to the conclusion that editorial opinion is based on personal views and prejudices and may be financial backing." Here we are not concerned with the programmes and policies of the Swatantra Party as such. This strange inference of deduction by which a person is judged as "sensible" is unfortunate to say the least. And still worse is the implied meaning in the phrase 'financial backing.' Does it mean that the same charge can be levelled against the press, if it sings hymns in praise of the Congress Party? This line of approach reduces the philosophy of the fourth estate to a level of thinking which is hardly consistent with the ideals of democracy.

Khuswant Singh wrote that the Government of India had issued a fiat to its various publicity organisations not to publish anything written by Nirad C. Chaudhuri under the mistaken assumption that Nirad is an apologist of British rule in India. And yet when the Government wanted Nirad to write a series of articles on the plight of the Bengal refugees in a journal devoted to five year plan publicity, they offered to raise the ban. That the unbending Nirad refused to "raise his own ban on the Government of India" reveals Mr. Nirad Chaudhuri's courage, al-

though the whole incident does not redound to the credit of the Government of India. Again, in this context, one wonders why the Government of India should have thought it fit to ban "Rama Retold", although Aubrey Menen has not written anything that would wound the sentiments of the Hindus. And this is all the more surprising when we reflect on the activities of a certain political organization in the south in regard to this particular subject; it has been discussed merely intellectually by Aubrey Menen in his historical quest à la Schweitzer's historical quest of Jesus.

This writer was shocked to note a delegate at the recent All-India Writers' Conference at Madras making a plea for state control, by stating that he wanted the state which represented the working people "to direct the engineers of the human soul" along the path of Socialist reconstruction. This is of a piece with Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao's statement that "the acceptance of and preparedness to work for a socialist society being accepted as the basic objective of education".

It is perhaps an unfortunate commentary on Free India that the unbiased approach of academic historians should result in frozen frowns on the brows of the tin gods who sit guarding "nationalistic interests". In his fine work of historical scholarship on "The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857," Dr. R. C. Majumdar explains in his preface that he had to leave the Board of Editors "in connection with the compilation of the History of the Freedom Movement in India" set up by the Ministry of Education for no fault of his except for his academic manner of sifting the genuine historical material from the spurious when confronted with a secretary who "proposed to collect only those materials which support his point of view," as otherwise, it would, to use his own words "thoroughly upset our purpose." Surely, the history of a certain period cannot be written to order in a democratic set-up.

DELHI LETTER

Swatantra Alarming Congress & Jan Sangh

(From Our Correspondent)

BY far the most significant event in the country, from a long-range point of view, has been the rowdyism as a result of which a meeting at Banaras on April 3, which was to be addressed by Rajaji, ended in a fiasco. That the disturbance was planned is evident from the nature of the cries raised "Jai Hindī"—"Rajaji Wapas Jao." Had the meeting been organised to denounce Hindi, there might have been some justification for the cries, but, as Hindi or its antagonism does not form a plank on the platform of the Swatantra Party, it is obvious that Rajaji's inability to speak in Hindi

In his book entitled "The Social Function of Science," the left wing scientist, Prof. J. D. Bernal wrote: "In order to release the enormous potentialities for scientific development in the Indian people, it would be necessary to transform them into a self-reliant and free community. Probably the best workers for Indian science today are not the scientists but the political agitators who are struggling towards this end." How shocking! It is even more shocking to find a scientist making a plea for scientism instead of contributing towards the growth of a truly scientific outlook. Actually, science and technology are derived from a tradition of intellectual freedom. Switching on to India, one finds that a lot of publicity is given to some of Republican India's scientific achievement. One can certainly take legitimate pride in our efforts to set up atomic reactors in order to benefit from the peaceful uses of Atomic Energy.

But it is forgotten that the real need is to foster a scientific outlook, even more than setting up National Laboratories. It is necessary at this juncture not to imitate the Communist (despite Prof. Bernal's talk of a 'self-reliant and free community') who have rejected the spirit of modern science but taken over its technology and material results.

In conclusion, it may be stated that the danger of the contemporary socio-political situation lies in the fact that we are not faced with a sudden switch-over to Communism but a gradual sliding down to it owing to the studied indifference towards those values which contribute towards the fulfilment of cultural freedom. It is to be hoped that our statesmen would adhere to the democratic ideal instead of paying lip-service to it since it is the educational, academic, intellectual, scientific dimensions of cultural freedom which lend a distinctive flavour to a democracy. Viewed in this perspective, any unbiased commentator can only conclude that the climate in the recent past has been particularly bleak. This makes the future even more gloomy.

was hit upon as an excuse to prevent him from addressing the mammoth meeting. As Rajaji put it in a statement he issued after the incident, "there is no connection whatsoever between the slogans of compulsory Hindi and the ill India is suffering from, and which I have taken upon myself to tackle" and "their shout that I should speak in Hindi, which was kept up without cessation, was just a trick, for all of them knew that the demand was an impossible one."

ALARMING PROGRESS

The truth is that the phenomenal progress of

the Swatantra Party has alarmed those who stand to lose most by it—Congressmen and Jan Sanghis. Congressmen see in it a rival which may soon displace the ruling party. Jan Sanghis see in this phenomenal rise all their hopes of emerging as the rival to the Congress dashed to pieces. So both combined at Banaras to see the large crowd that came to hear Rajaji go away, disappointed. Rajaji himself has placed the responsibility "for the mammoth meeting having to go away without hearing" him on "young Congressmen and Jan Sangh people." It is not difficult to find out those responsible for an organised disturbance. Sometimes it even becomes known before the disturbance takes place, thanks to the bravado of the younger elements. But it is to be hoped, in the interests of the country, that the leaders of the Congress and the Jan Sangh will see to it that these low tactics are not repeated, for surely it cannot be the intention of any sane man that persons who do not know Hindi should not be allowed to address audiences in Northern India. On the same reasoning, crowds in the South can refuse to hear any one who does not address them in Tamil or Telugu. This is bound to happen if incidents like the one at Banaras are repeated elsewhere in Northern India to mar the prospects of the Swatantra Party. The cry then for another division of the country would not take long to raise its head.

Even in the North people are not so fanatical as to be unanimous on the need of thrusting Hindi on non-Hindi-speaking people and rioting can very well emerge as a result of matching determination on either side. The conclusion is hard to escape from incidents like these that the democratic instinct is yet to develop in us. Another equally evident conclusion—to put it in the words of Rajaji—is "that those who do not want the Swatantra Party to develop should find it necessary to organise rowdyism to prevent people from listening to what I say is a proof that they have recognised the growing strength of the Party and their own incompetence to meet it on the plane of reason."

COMIC RELIEF

In the tragic situation facing us Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and Shri M. S. Golwalkar between them are doing their best to provide comic relief. Dr. Lohia has called upon the people to extend their cooperation in making a success of the civil disobedience movement, which his Socialist Party is starting from May 1. There does not seem to be any particular issue on which he is starting his civil disobedience, except "the present misrule," but it must be conceded that no particular issue is needed for an advocate of "perpetual civil disobedience" like Dr. Lohia. He coined the slogan "Angrezi Hatao," not because he is a protagonist of Hindi—he has declared he is not—but because he does not like English. Whatever he does not like should go, including laws. The reason why he does not like English may be that even after reading and writing it for decades, he is not able to write or speak

English fluently and correctly. He has not yet told us why his Socialist monthly is published in English.

Being an all-rounder, Dr. Lohia's quarrel is not with the Congress only. He is glad that Mr. Rajagopalachariar was not allowed to speak in English at a public meeting at Banaras the other day by a noisy crowd. But he has also his disagreement with the crowd, which, he says, should have pressed him to speak in Tamil. He has expressed the hope that audiences elsewhere would compel the Swatantra leader to use any other regional language he likes but not English—preferably one which, presumably, the people cannot understand.

Shri Guruji Golwalkar, Supreme Leader of the RSS in the open and Supreme Leader of the Jan Sangh in secret, is a serious rival of Dr. Lohia in sheer muddleheadedness. The local Jan Sangh weekly has come out with an English rendering of a speech delivered by Guruji on March 20 last, which has enabled me to understand why these people are against English. What sounds reasonable enough in Hindi—like the word "Guruji"—sounds absurd in English, which is a language of rational people. For example, in the course of his speech Guruji said:

"It is repugnant to the very nature of Sangh, working as it does on the basis of Hindu Sanskriti, to aspire to capture power and set up a totalitarian regime. The Sangh is not a party or group; it seeks to organise the entire Samaj. It wishes that, notwithstanding its very many diversities, the society should be able to realise its basic oneness and that its members should be willing to merge their individual ego in the social ego and thus contribute to the well-being of both."

The obvious self-contradiction here is not apparent either to Guruji or to his followers, who do not seem to realise that totalitarianism is the same thing as merging the individual ego in the social ego.

Guruji is further of the opinion that "we can withstand not one but ten Chinas." What are our forces meant for? he asks and answers: "If they do not succeed we too will plunge in the fight." He is cocksure that every single person will rise to the occasion—although he has never done so before in the history of the country. (And please do not put the impertinent question how he will rise to the occasion.) "Not even a child will shirk his responsibility," Guruji assures us, adding the further assurance, "We will see that he doesn't." Now what more do you want, dear reader? If you are not duly impressed, the fault lies with the English language, and that is why Guruji does not speak in English and has for his followers people who do not generally understand English. Hyperbole, which is the soul of Hindi, is ridiculous in English.

FRIENDLY APPROACH TO ALL PROBLEMS

Addressing the annual meeting of the Indian Council of World Affairs, Mr. Nehru gave to geography the credit which he should have claimed for himself. "If geography had made frontiers live," he said, "they had to live with these in future." It was not geography which gave Tibet to China. History will bear witness to the fact that it was Mr. Nehru who did it, thus opening a Cinderella's box. Explaining the Government's policy of non-alignment, Mr. Nehru said India's approach to all problems had been friendly. (He too seems to be competing with Dr. Lohia and Guruji Gollwalkar.) One can understand being friendly with nations with which one agrees ideologically—even with nations which want to swallow you, on the non-violent principle of turning the other cheek—but what one cannot understand is this "friendly approach to all problems." The only result of being friendly with problems can be to accumulate them, and that our Prime Minister has been doing.

Perhaps what Mr. Nehru had in mind was the need of being friendly with enemies. That of course he has been, like his master, Gandhi—friendly with enemies and hostile to friends. Did he not make friends with the Ali Brothers? And did he not for decades refuse to have any truck with the cosmopolitan Jinnah? If Mr. Nehru were friendly with friends, what speciality would there be about it? And we must remember that we are a very very special people. But there is a limit to this friendliness with enemies, inasmuch as Nehru, like Gandhi, can be friendly with the enemies of the nation and the country, but not, again like Gandhi, with his own enemies or critics. (In the world of emotional integration, enemies and critics are synonyms.) And that, when all is said, sums up the secret of the success, measured by power and popularity, of both these great men.

CHINA CLAIMS EVEREST

Messages emanating from Chinese sources regarding Sino-Nepalese accord, as a result of the Nepali Prime Minister's visit to China, were taken here at their face value, in the belief that China, at loggerheads with India, would try to avoid appearing at loggerheads with Nepal also, for the sake of keeping up appearances as a devotee of peace. But all that has proved to be wishful thinking which did not take into account the ruthless character of Chinese Communism. A Press Conference at Kathmandu, at which the Nepali Prime Minister refused to go into details of the disagreement, has however revealed many disputed points in the Chinese map, chief among which is the Chinese claim to Mt. Everest. Things must be pretty serious to have made Mr. B. P. Koirala declare that "any aggression on Nepal would touch off a world war and in the event of aggression from China, Nepal would not be alone."

The part of wisdom for Nepal, as for India, is to have friends strong enough to deter aggression

and it is hardly enough to hope that one is not alone or to hope that a world war would follow Chinese aggression. Why any nation should necessarily come to the aid of countries which have been sporting their non-alignment and neutrality and tarring both camps with the same brush, passes one's comprehension, but if Nepal really wants to ensure non-aggression from her northern neighbour, the forthcoming visit of its King and Deputy Prime Minister to the USA will have to make history for Nepal. In any case, there can be little doubt that the Nepali visitors to the USA will hear some blunt truths in Washington—as Mr. Nehru heard them from President Truman during his first official visit to the USA—rather than the sort of fairy tales they have been hearing in New Delhi to lull them to sleep.

By handing over Tibet to China, instead of to the United Nations, Mr. Nehru has created the gravest problems not only for India but also for Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, and the amount of international tension that he has created would have entitled him to a Noble Prize, were there one for increasing tension, as there is one for peace. This is what he has done all his life—his friends would prefer to add, unwittingly.

The Nepal Premier has rejected the Chinese claim to Mt. Everest and told the Chinese that "the Nepal border will continue to be where it is and that it will not permit any encroachments." In view of the many disputed points in the Chinese map, it is difficult to see what the Chinese agreement to accept Nepal's "traditional boundry" is worth. Also, in view of the Chinese claim to Mt. Everest, the grant of permission to expeditions to Mt. Everest should also be claimed by the Chinese. Their claim that permission be granted to expeditions in consultation with the Chinese Government concedes a part at least of the sovereignty over Everest to Nepal. Perhaps this is in consonance with the Chinese Premier's policy of "step by step."

It is interesting to note that while the Nepali Premier says that the offer of a non-aggression treaty between Nepal and China would be further explored in Kathmandu—it is "just an idea" at present—China takes it for granted that Nepal will sign a "treaty of peace and friendship" with it when Premier Chou En-lai visits Nepal after his talks in New Delhi. A Chinese Government organ says that the two sides have agreed that they will discuss and sign this treaty during the Chinese Premier's coming visit to Nepal. No wonder the Nepali Prime Minister has thought fit to emphasise the fact that no non-aggression treaty can save a country, and history bears ample evidence of this. History bears ample evidence of Communist unreliability also, but neither Nepal nor India seem so far to have been much impressed with this historical truth.

GOVERNOR GADGIL'S LAPSE

Governor Gadgil of Punjab once again plunged

into controversial politics by attacking the Swatantra Party while addressing college students at Ambala the other day. He did so once during the Kerala crisis and was severely criticised for doing so, and he has done it again. A man who cannot keep his opinions to himself but must voice them publicly is unfit to hold the ceremonial office of Governor. That he should have done so in a gathering of college students, who are being advised by educationists to keep aloof from party politics in the interest of discipline, makes Governor Gadgil's lapse doubly unfortunate. The ceremonial office of governor was deliberately given a non-party character in the Constitution and the President and the Prime Minister are in duty bound to uphold the same. No Governor should be allowed to draw his coach and four through the provisions of the Constitution and it remains to be seen what steps are taken to show Governor Gadgil his place.

As a non-party man a Governor is respected by all parties, but, if he chooses to declare his fervent allegiance to a political party by severely criticising its opponents, he will have himself to blame if he himself is run down by those whom he criticises. It is now obvious that the choice of Mr. Gadgil for governorship was an entirely wrong one. Those responsible for his appointment cannot say that they did not know how very emotional he is. The sooner he resigns or is made to quit office, the better it will be for the country and the Constitution, for indications are not lacking that Governor Gadgil is entirely unrepentant for a lapse for which he has been twice responsible. If he feels so sore over the rise of the Swatantra Party, he should quit office, before throwing himself into the political arena against the Swatantra Party. But that obviously he is not prepared to do. He wants the best of both the worlds, and that is a sort of selfishness which should not be tolerated.

TIBET CONVENTION

At a largely attended Press Conference the other day here, Mr. Jai Prakash Narain firmly declared that there was nothing "inconsistent" in the holding of the Convention on Tibet and India's desire to settle the border issue with China. Tibet, he said, was an independent nation, and the people of Tibet would continue to have their right of self-determination even if the border disputes between India and China were settled. He reminded Pressmen that he had advocated the cause of Tibet long before the Indo-China trouble became known.

It was wrong, he told another questioner, to say that the people should not do what was right merely for the fear of the cold war spreading to India. People do not seem to realise that the cold war is already there. They do not realise it because they do not understand what cold war is, and it is that lack of understanding on their part that is being exploited by Mr. Nehru to condemn the cold war, which in fact is meant to prevent and is actually preventing war. It is this fear psychosis which

our Prime Minister has been exhibiting that is the most humiliating aspect of the Sino-Indian controversy. This fear psychosis should have no place in the mind of any one who understands the present international situation and has a firm grasp of it. This Hamlet-like indecision indicating a scatter-brained state bodes ill for the country, and Pressmen in private, lament it far more than the supposed might of China. The Prime Minister's father, Motilal Nehru, was very fond of the following English lines which his son would do well to mark, learn and digest, for they have in them a character-building quality lacking in any other lines in any language:

He either fears his fate too much,
Or his deserts are small,
Who dares not put it to the touch,
To win or lose it all.

With reference to the fear of the cold war spreading to India, Jai Prakash rightly said that "such fear will paralyse us completely," adding that the people have a right to express their indignation, as they did on the issue of Hungary.

Book Reviews

THE REVOLT IN TIBET by Frank Moraes, the MacMillan Company, New York. Pages 223. Price Rs. 7.50.

White man's burden has tumbled down and is tumbling down. Now the Red man has picked up the burden of civilising the world and "liberating" the people from themselves. Of course, Communists believe in self-determination. But they also believe that "whether it is appropriate for a nationality to be independent. . . . is for the Communist Party to decide." Indian communists, for example, supported the formation of Pakistan, but they oppose the same right to Tibet and it is so for the simple reason that Tibet has been occupied by the Chinese communists. Smacks of double standard? Oh! No. Consistency is the virtue of only fools and asses. And you know the Communist Party can do no wrong and has the divine right to decide what is what.

Kuomintang corruption, communist occupation of Yenan with arms from Russia and Manchuria and dissatisfaction among the peasantry conspired together to catapult the communists into the saddle of China. They were not mere land reformers, as some people suspected, wished and hoped. After all, "communism changes its mask, but never its character" as later the peasantry of China discovered.

It is not mere Red man's burden alone that has made China aggressive. Coupled with this are the historical facts of the Han Expansionism or the Yellow Peril and the population pressure. Even

Sun-Yat-Sen claimed for China all land from Korea to Ceylon. Tibet is only the first victim of the awakened giant. In the book under review, Mr. Frank Moraes in his inimitable style traces the history of the Roof of the World in a brief compass of 223 pages upto the flight of the God-King Da'ai Lama and his dilemma.

Many traditions have died in Red China, but the Chinese tradition of imperialism is not one among them. It is an irony of History (or is it a vengeance?) that they should claim "sovereignty or, if you please, suzerainty," as Nehru put it, over Tibet on the ground that it was a vassal state of China once upon a time. As a matter of historical fact China was also a vassal state of Tibet once upon a time.

"During the reign of Ti-Song Detsan, China paid a yearly tribute of 50,000 yards of Chinese brocade to Tibet" (35), says the author. "From prehistoric days until 1951 the Tibetans have functioned as a free people for around 3,500 years with two interruptions, each of about 200 years—the first during the Manchu Era." (152)

The Chinese claim has well been described as "a constitutional fiction" and "political affectation."

Chinese have tried to paint the revolt in the hideous colours of their moth-eaten cliches of class-conflict. Even the figures of 13,000 refugees who have come to India in a population of a few millions is enough to nail the lie. And the people have had enough reason to revolt. And here is what the Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party's Tibet Work Committee has to say:

"Great Han chauvinism in Tibet is manifested in the feeling of superiority of the Han race, repugnance at the backwardness of Tibet, discrimination against Tibet, distortion of Tibet, failure to respect the freedom of religious belief and traditional customs of the Tibetan people. . . . As a result, some cases have occurred where the nationalities policy was impaired, law and discipline were violated, and the freedom of religious belief and the customs of the Tibetans were not respected." (75-6)

This is straight from the horse's mouth.

Chinese have killed and deported thousands of Tibetans. They have imposed forced labour on many more. They have tried to extinguish and obliterate Tibet as a separate entity with a distant language, culture, religion and government.

"What at the moment appears to be attempted genocide may become the full act of genocide unless prompt and adequate action is taken" (78) says the report of the International Commission of Jurists.

Not all the perfumes of Arabia can sweeten and nor can all the waters of Ganga purify the hands that perpetrated this fate on Tibet.

So a new imperialism has emerged in Asia. Asians can also dominate over Asians.

Moral of the Tibetan tragedy—a tragedy too deep for tears and too near to be forgotten—is that the communist leopard cannot change its spots, that their pledges are like pie-crusts, made only to be broken, that the old law that bigger fish swallow smaller ones still holds good and that the non-communist Asia must join together to defend itself before it is too late, before the Chinese dragon develops a taste for the blood of weaker nations. If the rape of Tibet has made collective defense necessary, cartographic aggression, nibbling at the borders and swallowing large chunks of Indian territory have made it imperative. A giant nation should not be allowed to run riot like a giant.

—M. Devadas Kini in "Freedom First"

PANCHAYAT LANDLORDISM VERSUS PEASANT-ECONOMY by Prof. Ranga. Published by the Indian Peasants' Institute. New Delhi. Nidubrolu and Hyderabad. 44 pages. Price 50 Naya Paise.

This admirably written pamphlet is mainly concerned with the implications of Panchayat Landownership and the impending threat to small-landholders in the wake of the proposed land Reforms and the reflections of Acharya Vinoba Bhave on Panchayat ownership. As Prof. Ranga hints, there is more of politics (in its attempt to control every walk of life) rather than an attempt to fully comprehend the economic consequences of these so-called reforms. Prof. Ranga has also averred not without justification, that the Government are unfairly prejudiced towards the landed interests and poses a pertinent question: "Who can justify the Commission's proposals to exempt from ceiling huge holdings of cane, jute and cotton lands owned by capitalists or cooperative factories and to refuse to place any ceilings on urban, professional incomes and wealth, while imposing land ceilings?" It is in this context that Prof. Ranga analyses the grave implications of Acharya Vinoba Bhave's conception of Gramdan landownership. Actually this will lead to the entry of the Government by the back door. Acharya Vinoba Bhave might view the ideal of Gramdan on a philosophical plane; but frankly speaking, it will provide the philosophical justification for the Government to go ahead with the very schemes which are not conducive to individual freedom. And these so-called reforms—ceilings on land holdings and cooperative farming will result in making the peasant a mere cog in the wheel of the machinery of the Government. The peasant fought against the cruel zamindari system till now and today he has to prevent the super-zamindari of the State from crushing his initiative. As Prof. Ranga has put it eloquently, "the Damocles sword of cooperative farming and Village Panchayat landlordism with all its dangers is still being held over our peasant." If the Government really wish to do something, Prof. Ranga observes that it can "organise National Insurance Fund against floods and draught and Crop

Insurance at State levels." These are extremely original and constructive proposals which deserve implementation. One hopes that this pamphlet, is read carefully by our authorities of the planning Commission since one rarely comes across a pamphlet of this type—extremely readable, packed with facts and above all, written with very deep conviction.

—A. Ranganathan

CREDO OF WORLD PEASANTRY by Prof. N. G. Ranga. Published by the Indian Peasant's Institute, Nidubrolu, 504 pages. Price Rs. 7.50.

Prof. Ranga has formulated his world-view in this encyclopaedic volume on the subject of Peasant ideology. It is essentially a socio-economic study of the Peasant movement, viewed in a world-wide historical perspective. And the great merit of the book lies in the fact that he does not interpret his facts to fit in with any preconceived approach—neither Marxian nor Marshallian. However, he discusses the views of such authorities as Tawny, Massingham and Brailsford with a refreshing frankness. In fact, Prof. Ranga got the idea of writing this book as a result of his discussions with such thinkers as Cole, Radford, Henry Clay, Radford and others to put across the point of the view of the peasant (in his peculiar socio-economic environment in India and the East). Prof. Ranga, must be very glad indeed, to find that the trial of research blazed by him has been continued by Prof. F. B. Friedman of the Arkansas University and Prof. Irwin T. Sanders of the University of Kentucky who has made a study of "Research with Peasants in underdeveloped areas." There can be no doubt that Prof. Ranga is the symbol of a resurgent Peasantry, not only in India, but in its wider perspectives too!

Prof. Ranga's main theme has been that the peasants have been a revolutionary force in history, not in a Marxian sense but in the real sense of having preserved or struggled to keep alive the torch of liberty through the ages—the peasants have countered the Emperors, Kings, feudal lords, capitalists and their latest oppressors—the Communists. Indeed, he makes an original point (which deserves to be known more widely) that the recent Hungarian and Polish revolutions of 1956 are "the latest samples of the irrepressible readiness of the World Peasantry to fight for their freedom." The major portion of the book is concerned with the exploitation of the peasant in different set ups—Imperial Capitalist, the Soviet system that operates behind the Iron and bamboo curtains and the feudal set up in India that obtained till recently. As he says (supported by careful documentation) the peasants have had a raw deal, thanks to such cruel measures like the price squeeze. Even today, one finds that our Five Year Plans place the peasantry in a disadvantageous position. While he does not realize our ancient village commonwealth, Prof. Ranga has shown how the peasant has been the backbone of

our civilization based on non-exploitative cooperative institutions. It is interesting in this connection to recall that Sir Herbert Read has also written somewhere that the farmer has contributed much to the growth of European Civilization.

Prof. Ranga says that the Indian peasants are too socially advanced (unlike the Russian peasants of 1917) to accept the so-called leadership of the proletariat. In other words, the Marxian theory does not fit in our social conditions. Students of Indian Economics have always regretted the lack of a sufficient number of books dealing with theory—we have a number of books dealing with applied economics and most of our so-called economists "contribute" to Indian economic theory by applying the Marxian model or the Keynesian model in the most uncritical manner. Indeed, the failure (from the theoretical point of view) of our five year plans is essentially due to the lack of a well-thought-out theoretical structure. It is heartening to note that Prof. Ranga has made a really impressive study, which is as penetrating in its insight as it is world-wide in its sweep. This book can take its place along with such classics as Ranade's 'Essays on Indian Economics', Romesh Dutt's 'Economic History of India' and Dadabhai Naoroji's 'Poverty and Un-British rule in India.'

—A. Ranganathan

THE DEATH-KNELL OF KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS?

The unique contribution of Keynes to economic theory was his substitution of "full employment" as the goal of economic activity for the "maximum production" goal of the classical economists. Hailed as the new gospel 25 years ago, economists are now having second thoughts about the relevancy of Keynes' "General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money" to the changed environment of the post-war world.

In the 1930's we were anxious to secure full employment; now our main problem is to escape its exaggerations. Keynes, of course, foresaw this in 1930 when he made the prophetic utterance that "20 years from now Government departments all over the world will be talking about my doctrines and by that time they will be quite obsolete and dangerous."

ANALYSIS OF KEYNESIAN FALLACIES

This has been compiled in 450 pages as "The Failure of the 'New Economics'" by Henry Hazlitt of New York, published by the Princeton firm of D. van Nostrand & Co. at 358 Kensington High Street, London in 1959.

It is a salutary experience, and one recommended for all present-day economists brought up on Keynes, to read Henry Hazlitt's demolition of the whole structure of the Keynesian doctrine. Henry Hazlitt, a prolific writer and lecturer on economics and finance, has served on the staff of the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times. He currently contributes a regular column to "Newsweek."

Keynes, says Hazlitt, is the Karl Marx of the

twentieth century. As with Marx, his economics is demagogic — getting its vast influence from incitement of mass opinion. But whereas to Marx the capitalist is the villain, according to Keynes it is the "rentier" — the functionless investor in bonds and other securities. Keynes recommended the euthanasia of rentiers through reducing interest rates practically to zero. But the saver is still very much alive and kicking. After years of cheap money — a bank rate of 2% in 1937, 1948, 1950 etc. — the Bank of England was finally forced to tighten up to a discount rate of 7% in 1957. The world-wide trend is to higher interest rates, not lower. Interest rates on U.S. bonds are now at their highest for 30 years.

Keynes proposed to correct the "failure of demand" by artificial stimulation of "the propensity to consume." Capital must be put to work and demand "multiplied" by deficit government spending until "full employment" was created. But as Hazlitt proves, there is never any precise relationship between income, consumption, investment and employment. Keynes was expounding a dangerous myth. His "full employment" is utterly unattainable in a society which wants continuously rising productivity, an end to inflation, and the preservation of individual liberty.

Hazlitt points out that nothing is easier to achieve than full employment, once it is divorced from the goal of full production and taken as an end in itself. Hitler provided full employment with a huge armament programme. The war provided full employment for every nation involved. The slave labourers in Russia had full employment. Prisons and chain gangs had full employment. Coercion can always provide full employment. Hazlitt shows it is not true that budget deficits and low interest rates cure unemployment. The Keynesian prescription can only lead to a constant race between the money supply and the demands of the trade unions — but does not lead to long-run full employment.

Keynes' major weakness according to Hazlitt, lies in his "macro," national income approach to economic problems — the sin of mass generalisation, the assuming away of individual differences which make up reality. In Hazlitt's view, "the national income approach" has become one of the important incitements to inflation. For the easiest and surest way to get constantly bigger national income figures is not by increasing output and consumer satisfaction, but by constantly shrinking the measuring rod, by constantly depreciating the currency. In a masterly dissection of the General Theory, Hazlitt exposes error of detail on almost every page. Pet Keynesian nostrums such as the derision of thrift and saving; the alleged dependence of employment on the "propensity" to consume; the disparagement of the gold standard; the "liquidity preference" explanation of interest rates, the "multiplication" of demand by government investment, are all devastatingly attacked. Written more for the practical man of affairs, rather than the cloistered thinker, Hazlitt's indictment of Keynes deserves to be wi-

dely read. Nor can professional economists afford to neglect this compendium, so liberally documented with evidence which cannot be glossed over or ignored. —'Progress'

Gleanings from the Press

The Twentieth Century candidate for the post of "honest broker" in diplomacy is Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India. Nehru's claim to serve as compromiser between the Free and the Communist Worlds rests upon the assumption that he is the spokesman for the so-called neutralist countries in the Cold War. It is doubtful, however, that Nehru can be considered as an "honest broker." In 1947, after years of denunciation of violence and British imperialism, he employed armed force to establish Indian imperialism over Kashmir. Again, in ratifying the character of United Nations, India had accepted the obligation of all member states to assist the victims of armed aggression. Nevertheless, in 1950, Nehru gave on support to the United Nations Command to resist the Kremlin — instigated aggression in Korea. On the contrary, he used his influence in the United Nations to obstruct an expulsion of the Communist invaders from Korea. More recently, in 1955, he was instrumental in calling twenty-eight Asian and African states to meet Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of Red China, in the Bandung Conference, in an effort to detach all Asiatic and African states from any Western alliance and to win friends for the dictatorship of Mao Tse-tung. Again, although Nehru frequently denounces what he calls American "imperialism," he was strangely silent regarding the brutal suppression of the Hungarian workers in 1956 by Soviet Russia. Surely such actions bar any claims of Nehru as an "honest broker." But even more than this, the slanting of Nehru's philosophy toward Marxian Socialism (his colleagues in Gandhi's entourage used to call him the "Little Stalin") should warn the Western World that it can expect no effective compromise under such auspices.

—Kenneth Colegrave in "Modern Age"

News And Views

TACKLING CORRUPTION

The demand of C. D. Deshmukh for setting up a tribunal for investigation into corruption in high places has touched off fruitless controversies. The Congress ruling party in the legislature is of the opinion that a sort of Vigilance Committee of three persons with legal experience to tackle the problem should be set up. But such a Committee is bound to be useless, firstly, because it will not have the legal sanction to ensure ministers and government servants found guilty of corruption and secondly because the Committee which has to curry favour with the ruling party is prone to be always under

the influence of the ruling party and cannot discharge its duties effectively. Meanwhile, Mehar Chand Mahajan, former Chief Justice of India has pointed out that the Graft tribunal will be ultra vires of the Constitution. Other proposals include the appointment of a Graft Tribunal which will form a part of the judicial courts to which individual cases of corruption should be referred. But none of the proposals go to the root cause of corruption and they aim at rather suppressing the symptoms of the disease and not curing the disease itself. The source of corruption lies in the fact that the State has taken upon itself functions and duties which never belong to it. The Indian citizen today has to depend upon the government for favours, permissions and patronages in all matters touching upon every aspect of his life. The State has become today the manufacturer, trader, patron of education and arts transporter, ship builder, navigator, launderer, alcohol-distributor, rent controller, land-lord, banker, and a hundred other things. Under a climate when every citizen has to cringe to the government for one favour or the other, it is hardly surprising that ministers and bureaucrats demand a price for granting such favours. Corruption can never be routed out unless the State confines itself only to its legitimate duties. Therefore we feel that all the proposals to stop corruption which do not go to the fundamental source of corruption are practically useless since they miss the point.

"CHANNELISING RESOURCES" FOR PLANS—PRIZE BOND SCHEMES

There is nothing under the sun that our Gandhian rulers cannot achieve once they make up their minds. Eight years ago they wanted to "chan-

nelise" the resources of the country for our Five Year Plans and the Plan allocations were promptly "channelised" into the pockets of Congressmen and their contractors, also-relieving unemployment (among Congressmen) at one stroke. Some years ago they introduced Prohibition in order to channelise the drinking habits of men into "right" directions and today, Illicit Distillation has become a cottage industry. Now our Finance Minister Morarji Desai (a dyed-in-wool Gandhite) has hit upon a novel plan to "channelise" the gambling instincts of the public which has to raise more resources for our Five Year Plans (our borrowing capacity being exhausted) and has introduced a Prize Bond Scheme under which big prize offers will be made for the investors who gamble on the interests on their investments. It is estimated that more than fifty lakhs of rupees worth of Prize Bonds were purchased within a few days after the announcement of the sale of the Bonds and many offices where they are sold are reported to be out of stock of bonds. It is calculated by experts that the chance of an investor winning a prize in the lotteries once in five years is only 11% and the majority have to be content with just receiving back their investments. But our quarrel is not with the percentage of the chances of winning but with the subtle method that our Gandhian rulers employ for depriving the people of their hard earnings. While inflationary pressure is on the full swing and the value of the rupee falling down by 30 per cent. (thanks to the efficient working of the Nasik Printing Press), it is very unlikely that the investor will ever be able to enjoy the benefit of saving through this scheme.

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**