

THE

25  
L  
*Indian*

*Libertarian*

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

EDITOR: D. M. KULKARNI

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION Rs. 6.00

Vol. XI No. 9

August 1, 1963

IN THIS ISSUE

Page

EDITORIAL:

Language, Not Of The Essence Of a Nation 2

Karl Marx, India And Communism  
By M. A. Venkata Rao .. .. 5

The Barber's Gold  
By Seth W. Howard .. .. 8

The Way Of Careerists  
By M. N. Tholal .. .. 9

DELHI LETTER:

Nehru To Complete His Unfinished Task 11

Book-Review .. .. 13

The Mind of the Nation .. .. 13

News and Views .. .. 14

Dear Editor .. .. 15



## EDITORIAL

# Language, Not Of The Essence Of A Nation

**I**N a thought-provoking article in the issue of "SWARAJYA" dated July 13, 1963, under the caption 'For the sake of Harmony and Goodwill', the veteran national leader C. Rajagopalachari suggests a compromise formula for resolving the tangle of an all India Official Language. He rightly thinks that considerations of expediency and feasibility and 'the over-riding need for the equal treatment of the people of the various regions of India' should influence our decision on this matter more than a false sense of 'shame' at having to accept a 'foreign' language as the Union Official Language. He therefore recommends that English be declared as the Union and Inter-states Official Language and Hindi as the National Language of India and English be continued to be used exclusively for all official work and Hindi be recognised formally as an emblem of national unity, just to satisfy the nationalist susceptibilities of certain sections of the people, particularly those of the Hindi region. He considers the bilingual formula implied in the Official Languages Act and as interpreted by the Prime Minister Nehru, not only unworkable in practice but also capable of creating the greatest mischief and trouble in Government offices at all levels, between the proponents and opponents of Hindi and English.

### **UNTENABLE AND SLIPPERY**

It is well that Shri Rajgopalachari has brought forcefully this important aspect of workability and expediency, which is generally lost sight of, in the medley of sentimental outpourings indulged in by the contending parties to this dispute. Particularly the Hindi protagonists try to inflate the claims of Hindi on the ground of national prestige and honour. But this ground will be found to be slippery and untenable in the light of the history of the evolution of languages and the growth of nations and nationalities. The Jews, the Prussians and even the Celtic tribes of England who are now called 'the English' have been known to have changed their languages altogether several times in the course of their long history, very often incorporating freely foreign words and idiom in their own forms of speech and sometimes even materially changing their very spirit and structural form. Philologists are agreed that modern English language has very little to do with the original language of the Celts that prevailed in England before the sixth century. The speech of the conquerors like the low German tribes, the Angles, Saxons, Jutes and finally the Normans became successively the language of the land and the present English speech has been evolved out of the manifold mixtures and transitions. The Prussians

also abandoned their former language which was akin to Lettish and Lithuanian and the modern German language has no relation with the old Prussian language of Slavic origin. As the philologist Dur rightly maintains: 'There are few, perhaps, no, peoples who in the course of history have not changed their language, some of them several times.' The Jews are a standing example of a nationality that has successfully preserved its inner unity throughout its chequered and painful history, despite the fact that it had to adopt several languages and forms of speech of the respective regions which its members inhabited from time to time. It is notable that even small countries like Switzerland and Belgium have been able to maintain their own national entities, even though they use more than one languages. Thus language is not of the essence of a nation though under special circumstances, in a unilingual country it may greatly help consolidate national unity already existing.

This point has to be stressed again and again particularly in a multilingual country like India where Hindi is sought to be imposed on the unwilling non-Hindi speaking people under the pretext of national cohesion and national integration.

### **A PLEA FOR CLARITY OF THOUGHT**

Some clarity of thought is therefore called for, in a consideration of this important question of Official Language for India. In the first place, India had no one official language as such in the pre-British times. Various official languages prevailed in the different parts of India and the choice of language generally lay with the ruler of a particular kingdom or a principality. It was the British rulers who gave India for the first time in her history, an all India Official Language i.e. English. This is the one language that has come to be cultivated by all the educated people of India while all other indigenous languages till today have more or less confined themselves to the respective regions where they are spoken. None amongst the latter can compete with English in its utility as a vehicle of Inter-states communication and as a potent instrument of developing international contacts which are unavoidable in the modern world. Secondly, even on the ground of national sentiment, Hindi cannot hold its own against English. All educated people are deeply attached to English language not merely because it is a window to the outside world but also because it is the one language which has been mainly instrumental in developing national consciousness in our country as no other Indian language has done. While Hindi evokes a blind attachment to

it, only from the Hindi-speaking people of the North, English has the advantage over Hindi in that it has create sustained affection and respect for itself in the minds of all educated Indians throughout the length and breadth of the country, without rousing anything like strong reactions as Hindi does among the non-Hindi speakers when they are called upon to learn it compulsorily as the Union Official Language.

All these facts go to show that India could easily adopt English as her official language, with all other regional languages remaining as its associates in the particular areas where they are widely spoken and understood. As discussed above, nations have existed and maintained their 'consciousness of a kind' and kept in tact their innate unity even without having a national language of their own. India, that is Bharat, has had also a loose sort of cultural unity over all these centuries, despite the diverse forms of speech and languages extant within her borders. This innate unity of India could be now further strengthened and vitalised, not by the imposition of a regional language like Hindi on the whole country but by universalising among Indians the modern scientific spirit and liberal culture through the medium of English, accepted as an all India language.

#### ENGLISH AND NATIONALISM

We, therefore, heartily agree with Rajaji in his proposal to declare English as the sole Official Language of India for sound reasons of expediency, workability and acceptability. But we have to sound a note of warning against his other proposal that Hindi should be recognised as a National Language, though it may be motivated by his kindly feelings for Hindi protagonists. For, we should never lose sight of the historical truth that our present political unity, be it ever so incompetent and imperfect, has grown out of a gradual assimilation of the liberal spirit brought to India by the English language, by Indians into their thinking mould and cultural pattern and therefore an indigenous national language which has yet to be evolved, is not a desideratum of the Indian nation. It may also be pointed out that even nationalism is fast losing its appeal for the advanced thinking sections of humanity. Why not, then, India take the lead at least in this matter, in overstepping the narrow bounds of nationalism by making an international language like English her own for official and other nation-building purposes?

#### INDIANS IN EAST AFRICA.

Afro-Asianism which India under the leadership of Mr. Nehru tried to build up for well over fifteen years is having a trying time in the East African countries of Kenya and Tangyanika. All our co-operation and sympathy for these countries in the struggle for freedom from the White yoke, seem to have been simply wasted on them.

About a lakh of Indian people live in Tangyanika. On the advent of freedom in this country some nineteen months ago, Indians expressed their solidarity with the native people by disbanding their separate political party. But unfortunately all these gestures of goodwill have evoked a poor response from the newly constituted Government of the country. On the contrary the Government has lost no time to place intolerable restrictions on Indians in the fields of trade, commerce and Government services. Indians leaving Tangyanika and Kenya for their mother country are allowed to do so only on their depositing large amounts of money with the Government, which are liable to be forfeited in case they do not return from India. This step is taken to ensure that the wealth earned by Indians does not go out of East Africa. Getting disgusted with the treatment meted out to them, many Indians serving in the Posts and Telegraphs Departments in Kenya recently resigned their jobs.

This strong protest entered by Indians has roused the ire of the Kenya African National Union. It has issued a statement challenging the Indians in the East African countries to choose once for all between East African citizenship and Indian citizenship. The idea of a multi-racial nation no longer appeals to the resurgent African nationalism. Europeans have been hounded out of the land. India's turn has come now.

### THE INDIAN LIBERTARIAN

*Independent Journal Of Free Economy and Public Affairs*

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

*Published On the 1st and 15th Of Each Month*

**Single Copy 25 Naye Paise**

**Subscription Rates :**

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

#### ADVERTISEMENT RATES

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

BACK COVER..... Rs. 150

SECOND COVER..... Rs. 125

THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125

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

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

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

This tendency to squeeze out people not belonging to a particular religion, race, colour or nationality is fast spreading not only in Africa but also in Asian countries of Indonesia, Pakistan, Colombo and Burma. Let India therefore no longer run after the mirage of Afro-Asianism. Let her realise that close affinities, political or social are possible between countries which follow a common code of political and social conduct and behaviour, rooted in liberal-democratic aims and ideals, irrespective of the fact whether such countries are of the East or the West, white, brown, black or yellow.

### **'LET NOT YOU OVERWHELM THE COUNTRY, MR. NEHRU!'**

Of late Mr. Nehru has been doing a little bit of loud thinking like Hamlet over the question 'To be or not to be' in his office of the Prime Minister of India. A pretty large section of enlightened public opinion has now come to the decisive conclusion that things will not improve in the land unless Mr. Nehru resigns his office and pays more attention to the important work of reorganising the Congress Party, once so idealistic in its outlook and so glorious in its achievements but sadly enough so corrupt and moth-eaten at present. Unless a leader of the eminence of Mr. Nehru comes down with a heavy hand on the malpractices of Congressmen in power, after first relieving himself of his official duties and responsibilities, there seems to be no hope for the Congress to recover from the fatal disease that is afflicting it.

Obviously Mr. Nehru is today a split personality. On the one hand, the shameful spectacle of mutual mud-slinging going on between Ministers and Ex-Ministers in different States arising out of their corrupt power politics, rouses in him his former self-sacrificing spirit and sometimes makes him think he had better take to selfless Public service again as in the pre-freedom days. But the Prime Minister in him on the other hand rises in revolt against his better-self and prevents him from doing the needful for the Congress in this hour of her crisis. Somehow or the other, the Prime-Minister has persuaded himself to firmly believe that the country will go to rack and ruins without his leadership and that his Premiership of the country is inevitable. The Congress debacle at Farrukhabad, Amaroha and Rajkot by-elections to the Parliament has not yet shocked him out of his political self-complacency. Perhaps he and his close advisers are banking on the possibility of the Opposition in the country being still further divided at the time of the next General Elections, making it easy for Congress to command a majority in the legislatures even though the Congress might win less than 50% of votes again as in the past. In that event Mr. Nehru will be in a position to say as he did recently in

Punjab, that the country still needs him and that it is only 'a few noisy friends' who wish to see him out of office.

It is an undisputed fact that Nehru's leadership has become indispensable for the very existence of the Congress and this organisation will come down with a heavy thud, the moment his strong hand has been taken away from it. But from this Mr. Nehru will not be justified in concluding that his Premiership is also an absolute necessity for the good of the country. The fact of the matter is that it is not the people but the corrupt ministerial group and its henchmen in the country constituting the 'License-Permit Raj,' who for their own ends want him to remain indefinitely at this official post.

This deplorable situation created in the politics of our country by the supposed indispensability of Nehru's leadership of India Government cannot be allowed to continue for long without jeopardising the future of us all. All patriotic persons should therefore muster all their moral courage and make it a point to tell Mr. Nehru as often as possible: 'Please resign your office Mr. Nehru, lest your very august personality should completely overwhelm India in the end'.

### **ANTI-INDIA-DEFENCE LOBBY.**

An Anti-India-Defence Lobby appears to be vigorously functioning in the land. One can understand Communists getting hysterical about the proposed joint-air-exercises agreement and the VOA deal between the India Government and the U.S.A. Government. For, that is their job, trade and avocation. But one fails to see any rhyme or reason in the so-called nationalists and even some self-opinionated newspaper editors crying themselves hoarse over these agreements which have been made primarily for the purpose of strengthening India's defence system against China's aggression.

Strangely enough, these Patriots seem to be greatly concerned with maintaining what they consider to be sacred image of India as a country irrevocably committed to the cult of Non-alignment in foreign affairs. Do these sea-green Non-aligning friends think that India could stave off the Chinese attack on India by fighting it in the Gandhian non-violent style, till she is self-sufficient in her own military equipment and broadcasting stations and long-range powerful transmitters? What is one to think of these people who repeat parrot-like the 'mantram' of Non-alignment, even when they are fully aware that China, one of the two Big Brothers of the Red camp has thrown all Panchashila principles to the winds and is now out for India's very blood?

As for the VOA deal we on our part must congratulate the India Government on the Agreement, for obvious reasons of strategy and

(Contd. on page 10)

# Karl Marx, India And World Communism

By M. A. VENKATA RAO

Even today there are too many good citizens in all lands who think of Communism in terms of a humanitarian ethical movement for propagating of social justice and for quickening social conscience. But they forget that the Communist Party is primarily a conspiracy to win political power exclusively for itself as a one-party dictatorship extinguishing all democratic rights, the moment power is won and that it owes primary allegiance to international Communism rather than to its own nation and country. This attitude of the Communists is rooted in the theory and practice of Karl Marx himself.

IT is already rather late in the day to warn the country about the danger of communism to its independence and everything it values as a free nation. The Indian Libertarian and its supporting institutions like The R. L. Foundation and The Libertarian Publishers have each in its own way been warning the country of the danger of international communism not only as a propagandist organisation of unparalleled skill and equipment and funds but also as the medium of the foreign policy of Soviet Russia, Soviet China and other Soviet countries in the communist bloc. It is a Power Institution no less than an ideological machine.

But even today there are too many good citizens in all lands including Western countries like Britain who think of communism in terms of a humanitarian ethical movement for propagating notions of social justice and for quickening the social conscience. And in addition, they think of it on the analogy of democratic parties out to win power through honest propaganda for well-thought-out policies of redistributive justice and economic re-organisation with a view to obtain a better deal for the under-dog. Most fellow-travellers are quite innocent of the sinister implications of joining in the communist movement. They are not aware that more than being a simple democratic party, it is primarily a conspiracy to win political power exclusively for itself as a one-party totalitarian dictatorship extinguishing democratic rights the moment power is won!

Also, many good people are not aware that the communist party in their midst owes its primary allegiance to international communism by-passing loyalty to their own nation and country. They are pledged to obey the dictates of Moscow rather than those of Delhi in India. The only hesitation in the minds of some Indian communists concerns the relative importance of Moscow and Peking in their Authority over them!

This attitude of communists is rooted in the theory and practice of Karl Marx himself.

It appears that there are some socialists (strange as it may seem to students of the subject acquainted with the fundamental texts of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and the Resolutions of the world Congresses of all Communist Parties led by the Russian Communist Party) who hold that Karl Marx is innocent of all responsibility for the

doings of the Russian Revolutionists—Lenin and Stalin and the system they established and are carrying on—(today by Khrushchov.)

A letter appearing in The Indian Libertarian of 1st June 1963 over the signature of Mrs Goodman, secretary, Overseas Contacts, The Socialist Standard, London, asserts that the Socialist Party of Great Britain has taken up this position exonerating Marx of all taint of responsibility by doctrine and precept and example for the system established in Russia in 1917 and its operation ever since!

It must be conceded that England was led more by evolutionary communism or socialism than by the revolutionary variety which was more prominent in the thought and precept of Karl Marx. British socialists were primarily Fabian socialists who relied in gradual, educative methods for introducing socialism through the ballot box. Marx himself admitted once that perhaps in Britain and the United States (as also in Holland), peaceful democratic methods of persuasion might succeed in realising socialism—namely, the liquidation of the capitalist class.

But he also held more likely than not, the bourgeoisie will sooner resort to arms to preserve their privileges than surrender them even to the ballot box verdict!

Marx was always ambiguous about violence but he made no bones about it. He was not squeamish about its use when necessary for the sake of the revolution.

Dr. Karl Popper in his substantial two volume work **The Open Society And Its Enemies** has expounded the turns and twists of Marx's teaching on all these points in great detail which leaves no excuse for any innocence or ignorance on the part of fellow travellers to remain blind to the dangers of the Marxist revolutionary ideas.

Now, even Mr. Attlee's Government (socialist in character) proceeded to nationalise a good part of the economy—the commanding heights of the economy as they were called—i.e. road transport, railways, communications by air steel, the Bank of England and a number of other institutions. This policy curtailed personal freedoms to invest capital in accordance with one's own judgment.

The result was a marked degree of inflation, high prices, a decrease in production, a flight of capital from the land to foreign parts, lack of investment in capital goods in sufficient degree and so on. The result is that today the rate of England's production is lesser than Italy's and Germany's!

As a contrast, the experiment in free competition conducted boldly in West Germany by Dr Erhard has registered a remarkable success and has taken that country to the first place among European countries in resurgent economic development and prosperity.

Socialist Britain adopted Marxist economics to a significant extent and suffered markedly therefrom.

Socialist Russia adopted the same Marxist economy to a fuller extent but any success by way of higher rates of production there is vitiated by unprecedented repression and regimentation, force and intimidation. The difference is one of comparative freedom but the failure of economy stems from the same policy, namely, Marxist centralisation of economy and its identification with political power.

Marx was a-moral with regard to violence both as a means to achieve revolution and to maintain socialism after it was achieved. Hence Lenin and Stalin were only carrying out the letter and spirit of the Master's Word in applying force in day-to-day administration—the reign of terror.

The revelations of Khrushchov in 1956 in the Twentieth Congress of Communist Parties of the world in Moscow that shook the communist bloc and shocked the whole world concerned only the brutalities of Stalin with regard to his own official and party subordinates. They did not show any concern on the part of Khrushchov and his friends for the Russian citizen as such—the unknown man, the ordinary communist citizen and his dignity, his rights of person and property; what the free world is accustomed to think of as fundamental rights.

If Khrushchov is less terroristic than Stalin, it is only because he does not dare to! His power is not so secure and well-established as Stalin's was!

Stalin's violence in liquidating millions (for example eight millions of peasants to make co-operative and state farming secure!) is thus only a matter of degree! It does not transcend Marx's principles.

If British democracy behaves differently with greater regard to the sacredness of the human personality, it is more due to the 800 years of British history in which the Britisher and his race have fought his ruling groups to establish his rights as a free man. The British do not owe them to Marx or any socialist of them all.

The British socialist experiment during 1945-50 has already produced a reaction and second thoughts even among socialists. The New Fabian Socialist Essays edited by Crossman (a prominent British Labour Party ideologist M.P.) speaks of the new despotism, of the encroachments of the vast bureaucracy that had proliferated during Labour socialist rule. This is the **thin end of the wedge** which might make room for liberty to leak away in course of time! Socialism has a built-in tendency to damage democracy since it concentrates both political and economic power in the hands of Government—that is, the same party and ruling group! The dispersion of power among different semi-independent or totally independent groups, economic, legal, political, religious, educational, cultural etc. that is such a healthy feature of a free society will vanish in a society ruled by socialism which will become severely **monolithic** in power and affiliation.

Another angle of vision popularised by Marx which is also dangerous to independence of judgement and character is his economic determination of culture or class derivation of truth. In this view of the super-structure of culture as determined by the economic foundation which in turn is determined by the the pattern of property ownership in production (relations of production), Marx abandons his rationalist spirit and method and becomes a relativist in his view of truth and science, philosophy and culture. So truth will differ from class to class! That is to say, there is no such thing as objective, universal and necessary truth!

If so, there is nothing to choose between Fascism and Communism, Marx and Hitler! Why blame the bourgeoisie if they take to arms to crush the communist gangs? Marx himself gives up the quest for objective truth when he declares that the main thing is to **change history**—not understand it.

Another tenet of Marx was internationalism. He believed in the internationalism of the proletariat and repudiated nationalism.

But there can be different varieties of internationalism. One variety will recognise the nation as a social unit entitled to run its social affairs under a government of its own democratically chosen and democratically conducted.

Such democratically conducted national governments of particular national societies small or large can co-operate to establish a world federation with a minimum of Police Powers under a World Court interpreting a World Law confined to international relations. This would leave internal affairs to local autonomy.

The present United Nations Organisation would be mended in this direction or ended and a new One erected in its place. Meanwhile nations would proceed by collective security, all

nations entering into a pact to rush to the defence of any one of their number who may be attacked by any one.

But Marx's internationalism is erected on the abolition of existing national structures and the antagonising of all upper and middle classes not educated, leading classes in all countries. It is based on **class war** which is a totally unnecessary and false doctrine motivated more by universal hatred engendered by racial memory of the oppression of the Jews by Gentiles (Marx coming of Jewish ancestry).

Being founded on class war, any State founded on Marxism is bound to set itself in opposition, bitter and all-out, **against all other nations**. This is what we find in Soviet Russia and the Communist States adopting her ideology like China.

They cannot therefore feel safe until they conquer the whole world! The difference between different communist states is only about the pace and method and timing of war strategy against the rest of the world.

Consider the statement by Khrushchov:—

"It would be impossible for us to declare war on capitalist countries—to defeat capitalist countries in such a way. Let the working class of capitalist countries rise against their oppressors. Our sympathies are on the side of the working class. **We can help.**"

We have the means to do so. But we will never interfere in the internal affairs of other States. That means war and we are against war."—Khrushchov in a recent declaration.

This is pure Marxism, world revolution through class war and assistance to the working class of other States by the revolutionary proletarian State to overthrow their own upper class. This is the foreign policy of Soviet Russia and world Communism.

If British Socialists hold to Marx, as Mrs Goodman so believes they do, then they should tell Indians where they stand in this international class war! What is the brand of their internationalism?

The Communist Party of India is camouflaging its true position as an agent of international communism and of Soviet Powers, Russia and China. It is getting **respectability** by being recognised as a **patriotic party** and entrusted with negotiating with Communist States! **This is the limit.**

### MAO'S PROGRAMME

"While the attention of the United States, and indeed that of the rest of the western world, was rivetted on the events in the Caribbean, the Chinese began their push into the Indian subcontinent. Anyone who thinks that this move by

Mao is senseless is being victimized by the rules of reason of the West, which have no particular relevance in Peiping. The Chinese ideologists do not act or react the way people would in Washington, London, Paris or even in Moscow.

There is method in Mao's apparent madness. Whatever he can disrupt, he will; first China, now South East Asia, a few years from now Central Asia. Havoc, destruction, disillusionment, and finally acceptance of Chinese communism—this is Mao's programme of conquest. The man who knows this better than any one else is the man humbled in Cuba—Khrushchev. What happens next to this man, and to the others like him in the Kremlin, is most relevant to the fate of Western civilization.... I doubt very much that if Mao had Khrushchev's fire-power, he would have kept his finger off the fateful trigger."

— Challenge, New York University.

### CHANGE OF CLIMATE IN RUSSIA

Khrushchev's Government, which has estranged itself from its orthodox allies in the world-communist movement by dethroning Stalin, is now faced with the even greater danger of free-thinking in the sciences and the arts, which has begun to shake the once-inviolable principle of Omnipotent and Ubiquitous Party control and leadership.

After the World War II, the "new" ruling class of Soviet society, consisting of the new intelligentsia and the higher ranks of the Party, began to crystallize, over the functions and many of the shortcomings of the old pre-revolutionary Royal court. This privileged class holds absolute power over the workers.... In their spiritual rebellion (now), the younger members of the intelligentsia are openly opposing the stereotyped pattern which the Party and Government are trying to impose upon society. The search for truths applicable to all mankind, new goals and ideals, new criteria (for well-being) is increasing every year. There are signs of a return to the ethical, ideological and political criteria of the liberal Russian intelligentsia of the 19th century. From the young Soviet intelligentsia, the process of spiritual regeneration is spreading out to the Soviet intelligentsia as a whole, which is beginning to see itself as the "conscience" of society. It has become impossible to control or satisfy the youth with the old stereotyped formulae of communist theory, for the youth has turned from an "object" of indoctrination by the Party into a thinking "subject" insisting on the right to determine its own fate, to think freely, and to influence life and politics in its country.

The Soviet leadership (for its part) has reopened its campaign against the spiritual regeneration of Soviet society.

—The Institute For The Study of USSR Bulletin.

# THE BARBER'S GOLD

By SETH W. HOWARD

**M**ORARJI DESAI'S Budget and the luxurious and comfortable living of our Ministers, remind me of a story which runs as follows:—

In the old old days when there were no newspapers, telegraph or telephone, the Prime Minister and the palace servants were the only source of information for the King.

The Minister was naturally interested in telling the King what he thought fit that the King should know. So the King in order to verify the accuracy of their Prime Ministers' reports, were in the habit of checking them through independent sources.

A King asked his Minister one day the state of his subjects. The Minister gave a guarded answer...."none too good, none too bad, rains seem to have failed and threats of famine are generally feared in some places. People are a little perturbed and worried. Criminals are also reported to be active. However, we are alert and would see that justice is done."

The King listened to the Minister and decided to have the report checked up as usual.

Barbers are a garrulous lot. Since they invariably come in contact with the heads of various departments, they as a matter of fact are well informed. From time immemorial the barber has been a 'walking bureau.'

It was the day for the Royal shave and his Majesty engaged his barber in a *tete-a-tete*.

"How things are going in my state?"

"Splendidly, Sire."

"Have criminals become active?"

"None, Your Majesty. Under your protecting umbrella the weakest child is even safe from wrong."

"Have the rains failed? Are farmers in distress?"

"A thousand times no, Sire. The rains have been plenty and harvest abundant. There is no one of Your Majesty's subjects who does not own an egg-size piece of gold."

When the next Durbar was held, the King reprimanded the Minister for misguiding him. The King's own information was that the rains had not failed, people were not in distress and that there were no thefts. The economic condition was good and that each of his subjects possessed an egg-size piece of gold.

The Minister used his intelligence and was soon convinced that it could be no person other than the barber who carries all false reports to

the King.. He asked one of his private ministers to make an investigation into the matter. The barber was watched. He was observed to be very particular about a coconut shell-casket which he kept near his family deity and weighed it every day. The Minister put his plan into action.

The next time when the barber went to shave His Majesty, the King saw the face of the barber drawn and haggard.

"What ails you, man?" he asked.

"Times are bad, your Majesty."

"How come? What had happened? You were so happy last time when you came here. Everything was good everywhere. And you were so clear that there was none who did not own a egg size piece of gold?"

"The rains have failed. Criminals are active. There is not a subject who had a bronze pot to boil his milk-rice in."

The King was puzzled.

Next day when the Minister came, the King said to him. "You seem to have been right. The barber first told me that the people were prosperous and happy, and today he gave me quite the reverse story. Can you tell me why?"

"Yes, Your Majesty," said the Minister. He signed to an attendant. The attendant immediately came and placed before the King a bronze pot and an egg-size piece of gold.

"These," he explained the Minister "are from the barber's house. The gold was in a coconut-shell-casket kept near his family deity. The barber thought that since he had gold, everyone else also had an egg-size piece of gold. And when he had lost it, everyone else was cooking in an earthen pot."

Similar is the case with our Morarji Desai, Prime Minister and other Ministers who think that since they have plenty of everything, everyone else has plenty of everything and he can be taxed endlessly.

According to his own confession Mr. Desai had been receiving suggestions from sources other than his own to tax the poverty-stricken people of this country. But the day he is dismissed or relieved of his present portfolio Mr. Desai will then realize what great harm he has done to the people of this country. Taxes and money are not main factors that make for the defence of the country. Solid unity, determination and morale of the nation are equally, if not more valuable and important.



# THE WAY OF CAREERISTS

(By M. N. THOLAL)

Mr. Nehru's speech at Chandigarh shows what a true and devout disciple he is of the Mahatma. Indeed there is no other individual in the country who has so successfully applied Gandhian technique of success to life. Both have been careerists and the demands of their successful careers have not always been demands of patriotism.

**M**ANY are inclined to think that the real successor of Mahatma Gandhi is Vinobha Bhave and not Jawaharlal Nehru. That is a misconception based on a misunderstanding of the Mahatma as well as of Mr. Nehru. Outwardly, it is true, Bhave looks like carrying on the traditions of the Mahatma. The spinning wheel, and all that goes or should go with it, is there always with Vinobaji, and it is seldom there with Nehru. But, surely, deceptive paraphernalia cannot decide the succession when it is not based on kinship, and when the spiritual philosophy is there common between the two for all to see.

What was the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi? What was Gandhism? What was Gandhi? These questions bring to my mind three observations on Gandhi by three great Indians, two of them Congressmen. Motilal Nehru, when he went to see Gandhi at Juhu in the early twenties, to bring him round to support the Swaraj Party, greeted the Mahatma as he came out to meet him with the words: "I must say, Mahatmaji is a bit of a dandy". C. F. Andrews, who was present on the occasion and joined in the laughter provoked by the remark, has put this on record. It was intended to put the Mahatma in his proper place and served its purpose, for the remark showed Gandhi what kind of a man he had to deal with. Motilal won the battle with a sentence.

Then there was Mrs. Sarojini Naidu who used to tell her friends, "I have been telling Gandhiji, 'For God's sake, Mahatmaji, do not talk of your humble opinion; talk rather of your proud opinion'." Then there was that fellow-Gujarati, Jinnah, with his devastating—and unpardonable?—frankness, declaring in the forties: "Gandhi is a damned hypocrite". There is an unmistakable identity in these three observations—two of friends and the third of a man who became a foe and who could have truthfully said, "I came, I saw, I conquered." (And what else could he do but conquer with two of the greatest and cleverest Indians—Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru—always insisting on playing his game by turns?)

These similar observations indicate the basis of Mahatma Gandhi's political philosophy. When people pointed out to him, with reference to his dogmatic claims in various spheres of life—politics, economics, religion, morals health etc.—that he did not know his limitations, he started saying, "I know my limitations". A casual

perusal of his writings shows how cocksure he always was of the correctness of his half-baked opinions. The knowledgeable would put this down to his lack of education, which enables a man to know his limitations at least. His cocksureness carried conviction with the multitude, the more so as his opinions were almost identical with those of the mass mind, and the wise were left lagging far behind in the race for popularity. But in the end, despite his intimacy with the Almighty—which he hardly kept a closely-guarded secret—he was found at Noakhali lamenting and striking his forehead with the palm of his hand and exclaiming, "What should I do? What should I do?"

Gandhian politics, like the politics of these days, often reminded me of the saying, "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise", even as Gandhi often reminded me of the debate between two learned Pandits of a village, of whom the one who claimed there were eight Vedas—four of them females of the well-known four males—carried the day hands down amid the applause of the multitude which had gathered to hear the debate. Thus those who disputed the claims regarding non-violence or the spinning wheel were unable even to address audiences at public meetings and to criticise Gandhi was to invite the wrath of the public. The loin cloth put the finishing touch, as it were, on the supremacy and the unquestionable wisdom of the Mahatma, as it was intended to do.

The condemnation of foreign rule was not enough. The condemnation of what the foreigner taught, with a glorification of the country's past satisfied our pride and we seemed to be having our revenge on the hated foreigner by decrying everything he held up to us for imitation. We seemed to say, "As if we with our ancient lore have anything to learn from these monkeys who were swinging from tree to tree when we were at the zenith of our civilization." Democracy had started functioning in India and a short-cut to Swaraj was found in the Khilafat movement—i.e., in the incitement of Muslim fanaticism. (Still, many believe Jinnah founded Pakistan!) When people started questioning the means, Mahatma Gandhi started proclaiming the purity of his means! "I believe in the purity of the means," he said to the applause of the multitude, though he even denied the end and the main object, so far as to declare, as he did in February, 1922: "I do not work for the freedom of India; I work for non-violence and truth."

(Khilafat was apparently a non-violent and truthful institution.)

His high-sounding principles were camouflage for his questionable activities. The daily denial, in the affirmative form, of the principles underlying his activities constituted the essence of Gandhism and formed the spiritual content of his philosophy. Mr. Nehru's recent speech at Chandigarh on July 7 bears out his assertion, "we are what the Master made us," and shows what a true and devout disciple he is of the Mahatma. Indeed, there is no other individual in the country, or outside it, who can claim such earnest assimilation of the Master's principles and practices or such close application of the same to life. That for a very good reason. The Mahatma's technique spelt success and Mr. Nehru was after success. ("What's all this lathi-drilling for?" Gandhi asked the instructor at an RSS rally near Bhangi Colony, New Delhi, and hearing the answer "Physical exercise" blurted out, "I fool the whole world and you are trying to fool me!") Who can say it did not pay him to fool the world? Or that it is not paying Mr. Nehru to fool the world? The country is a different thing.

What is noteworthy here is that the demands of success were not, and are not, the demands of patriotism. They were and are often contradictory. Why is that so? That is so because those who can see through the game have not the courage to expose it, and careerists have the field free for them. "We kick out careerists," said Attlee significantly when he was here in India last. We Indians do not kick them out. The vast majority of us do not even realise that most of our leaders are careerists. Those of us who do, have not the courage to expose them. That in fact is our greatest weakness and does not make for the success of democracy. It makes, on the contrary, for the success of dictatorship, which we have had for the last forty-three years, except for a brief interregnum when Motilal Nehru and C. R. Das challenged it successfully. Subhas Bose tried to do so, was expelled from the Congress, arrested without Congress protest, and had to leave the country to carve out a glorious name for himself in a distant land.

Mr. Nehru knows what the people want him to do. So Gandhi-wise he anticipates their criticism and makes it himself, condemning his own weakness as if it was other people's. Here is what he said at Chandigarh on July 7:

"To aspire for a position is not bad, but to hanker after it and to cling to it and to take to wrong methods to achieve this end is objectionable." (This was his advice to the Panchayati Raj officers—and to the Union and State Ministers!)

"For any one to toy with the idea of indispensability is extremely dangerous", he cautioned. (That is that, although the reader may well wonder who can it possibly be who is toying with the idea of indispensability.)

Referring again to Panchayati Raj, he said,

"Diversified power, decentralised administration, and mass participation in governmental affairs will prevent the tendency of the multitudes looking to one man for guidance." So that is why Mr. Nehru will not have a national government even in such an emergency! "Mass participation in governmental affairs" but not by those who might outshine him, not by men like Rajaji! For not even two can share a throne!

(Contd. from page 4)

tactics in the cold war initiated in all its ferocity by China against India. India has too long neglected the propagandist side of this cold war, thus leaving the whole field open and free to her enemy to carry on a campaign of lies and falsehood against her in the Himalayan border regions and South Asian countries through her powerful broadcasting system. This Agreement will surely enable India to counteract this Chinese mischief on the air from the Calcutta broadcasting Station, where the U.S.A. Government has promised under the Agreement to install a million-watt medium wave transmitter at its own cost in return for the small concession to U.S.A. in the matter of relaying the Voice Of America broadcasts from that station only at appointed hours.

Such broadcasts from America and India against China coupled with the joint Indo-American Air-exercises within the Indian territory itself will create a healthy climate of confidence among neighbouring Asian nations regarding India's growing strength not only to throw out the Chinese enemy from the Indian soil but also to effectively check the onward march of Chinese imperialism in South Asia and to save Asian democracy.

India Government, it appears, has learnt the lesson however belatedly that it should do first things first and its foremost duty in this emergency is to defend India's freedom at all cost against Chinese aggression, without making a fetish of Non-alignment which, in the nature of things, cannot be a permanent feature of the foreign policy of any country in a fast-changing dynamic world.

— D. M. Kulkarni.

\* \* \*

#### FOOD FOR THOUGHT

"The function of the Government is that of seeing to it that the individual is free to make choices rather than that of forcing him to accept the state choices'.

— Prof. Howard Ellis.

\* \* \*

"The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of government power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberty."

— Woodrow Wilson.

# NEHRU TO COMPLETE HIS UNFINISHED TASK

(From Our Correspondent)

Prime Minister Nehru declared at Chandigarh on July 7 that his rejection of the resignation demand was not born of lure of office but out of the desire to complete the unfinished task. What unfinished task? That of throwing the Chinese out of our sacred soil? He does not seem to be in a hurry to undertake that task. Indeed, his failure to refer to it specifically in his speeches has been causing much speculation in the capital, while his daughter, who often acts as his mouthpiece in foreign countries, has been referring to the land occupied by the Chinese as barren. Mr. Nehru has himself been saying that the problem posed by the Chinese will take thirty or forty years to solve—i.e., the completion of the unfinished task will take thirty or forty years. Are we to understand that Mr. Nehru will remain in the saddle for thirty or forty years? There appears no other conclusion to draw from his statement that he is overwhelmed by the thought that it will not be proper to give up the job in the middle. No one ever heard of his being overwhelmed by the thought that he had made a mess of his job. This apart, does he, like his Guru Gandhi, want to live for 125 years? Or does he think he will live to be as old as that? Some wish him a long life fearing that his successor may be much worse—the Congress being what it is—but, surely, Mr. Nehru would appear to be taking too much on his old and aging shoulders.

He will not resign because of the noise of some friends, but he said, "I will step aside the moment the people want me to do so." If that is a sincere declaration, people should be allowed to give expression to their opinion freely. Neither official persuasion nor crores of rupees from businessmen are needed to help people declare their honest will. And, surely, Mr. Nehru does not mean to say that he cannot realise that he has been a colossal failure. Is that an immaterial factor in the matter? The implications of what Mr. Nehru says are rather frightening. If the Chinese occupy more territory, the reason for Mr. Nehru staying on as our Prime Minister would be greater not less. In other words, the more colossal the failure, the greater would be the reason for his staying on, in order of course, to rectify the blunder. The principle that the blunderer should rectify his blunders is rather unique in politics and would appear to put a premium on blundering. Perhaps that is India's contribution to politics.

Regarding the opinion of the people, it would appear to be rather intriguing that his self-denying desire to relax should have deserted

him when the country needs it most. He cannot even think of it now, lest the people, including some from his own party, acclaim it. His last threat to retire was pretty well-timed, when he alone knew what a colossal failure his policy had been and when the people had yet to see the fruits of that policy. Was it uttered for Chinese ears? For, the Chinese could not hope to see a greater pro-Communist in office in India.

The situation is reminiscent of the Gandhian period when Gandhi retired from the Congress in order to play a more effective role in the Congress—nominating the Working Committee members and, as if that was not enough, by drafting Congress resolutions. And after that he used to say his good offices were available for mediation—since he was not even a four-anna-member of the Congress—between the Government and the Congress and between the Muslim League and the Congress. Likewise, M. Nehru says his retirement will not mean that he will take to sanyas. No, indeed there is no compatibility between sanyas and power politics. Perhaps he means to say, "Find me a seat of greater power and I shall give up the prime ministership."

## POLITICAL CRISIS IN U.P.

A political crisis has developed in U. P. as a result of Chief Minister Gupta demanding the resignation "forthwith" of Forest Minister Algurai Shastri on a charge of "moral turpitude". It is feared in Congress circles that about a dozen ministers, who are in sympathy with Mr. Shastri, may resign en bloc from the ministry, if Mr. Gupta is allowed to have his way. They regard Mr. Gupta's action as "victimisation" of an old colleague. But, surely, if the charge of "moral turpitude" can be substantiated, there is no question of victimisation. What would appear needed, therefore, is to ask Mr. Gupta to substantiate his charge. But it seems that moral turpitude does not upset the Congress High Command as much as the fear of the Congress Party losing its hold on the people, and thus other factors come into play and assume greater importance than the moral factor.

The dissident leaders are of the view that Mr. Gupta is denying them the right to act freely in organisational matters—the right over which he quarrelled with Chief Minister Sampurnanand in 1960 resulting in the fall of that ministry. But that ministry fell, not because Mr. Sampurnanand was in the wrong and Mr. Gupta in the right but because the latter was

a much better organiser and the approaching elections needed a man of his drive to be at the head in U. P. Thus right and wrong changed places, as they often do in Congress politics.

In the UPCC executive last week the dissident ministers defied the Chief Minister and voted for the expulsion of 12 Congressmen for indiscipline, without giving them an opportunity to explain their conduct. In theory it seems all right that ministers should be free to vote as they like in organisational matters, but this freedom can be easily carried to the point of undermining the Chief Minister's position. The hurried expulsion of 12 Congressmen seems to indicate that the dissident ministers, who voted for it, were doing so with gusto. Of course Mr. A. P. Jain as the U. P. Congress President has a finger in the pie, and so has Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, whose stature is being raised by the Prime Minister himself as a reward for his sleepless loyalty to the Nehru family. It may well be that factor becomes the dominant factor in the solution of the U. P. crisis, but U. P. is not without its tough fellows and Mr. Gupta is one of them.

### HEROIC PRESCRIPTIONS

Opinion in the Capital is gaining ground that there is a definite race for succession to Nehru between Mr. Jaya Prakash Narain and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. Both have been close students of Gandhism, which was in essence only a technique of success in a country like India. Both seem to have come to the conclusion that the more absurd you are in your heroic prescriptions, the more popular you will be in India. No wonder their statements are being compared and analyzed to find out which of them is more irresponsible and more certain to make the country go to the dogs and finish the noble work begun by Mahatma Gandhi in 1919 with the unfurling of the Khilafat flag.

Addressing a public meeting at Makhdoom-pur near Gaya in Behar, Mr. Narayan was logical upto a point and his logic would have been unanswerable if he had not entirely forgotten the country's constitution, as if it was of no account. The logic of military preparations, he said, would lead India into an arms race with China, which would adversely affect her development plans and worsen the economic condition of the people, Sino-Soviet rift being a domestic quarrel—staged to fool us and the world, he might have added—Soviet Russia, he said, is not expected to give substantial military aid to India, which means India will have to depend entirely on America for such aid. (We could have avoided all this by alliance with the West but this does not strike him.)

America in turn would expect India to support the American stand on important questions, he said, and India would like to oblige her by

doing so. This, according to Mr. Narayana, would ultimately affect our non-aligned position in international affairs. Quite true, having regard in particular to what our non-alignment has been. But why should our Government be non-aligned when its Prime Minister is in duty bound to and has sworn to uphold the Constitution? Any one can see that our Constitution practically dictates our foreign policy and our alignment. Mr. Narayan must have read the noble Preamble to Our Constitution, forgotten almost by all parties, as if by tacit agreement. Here it is—eightyone words pregnant with democratic fire:

We, the people of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC and to secure to all its citizens:

JUSTICE, social, economic and political;  
LIBERTY of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;

EQUALITY of status and of opportunity;  
And to promote among them all FRATERNITY assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the nation;

In our Constituent Assembly this 26th day of November, 1949, do hereby adopt, enact and give to ourselves this Constitution.

The question surely arises: Did we solemnly resolve to constitute India into a sovereign democratic republic only to strengthen the hands of those who leave no stone unturned to rob republics of their sovereign and democratic character, who, indeed, boast that they would bury the democracies—yes, strengthen the hands of those who are trying their best to rob us of the justice, the liberty, the equality and the fraternity guaranteed in the Constitution?

If Mr. Narayan were to try to do some straight thinking, he would find there is no escape from the conclusion that our President as well as our Ministers, who have sworn to uphold the Constitution, are, by implication, in honour bound to subserve the purposes for which India was constituted into a sovereign, democratic republic, and that subservience dictates our foreign policy and our alignment. It prevents fishing in troubled waters for personal glory—which constituted the essence of Gandhism. It inhibits dictatorship at home and alliance with and admiration of dictatorship abroad.

Mr. Narayan, it is true, has not sworn to uphold the Constitution and is free to plead, as he is doing, "for preparing the people for non-violent defence against China" which alone, in his opinion, can "guarantee our national free-

dom and security and independent position in world affairs. Tibet's non-violent defence—dictated not by choice but by necessity—did not guarantee her national freedom and security. We all gratefully remember Mr. Narayan's stand for Tibet's freedom in contradiction to Mr. Nehru's, and the Committee he constituted therefor. Perhaps Mr. Narayan has plans for another Committee in mind—this time a Committee For the Restoration of Freedom to India operating from some distant land under his able guidance and is planning for the same with his rare insight. No Indian is going to oblige him by forming "the mountain of corpses" he is yearning for, but, if he forms that committee we shall not have even the courage to listen to the voice of FREE INDIA RADIO operating from his headquarters, Communist dictatorship being what it is.

## Book Review

**NEW HORIZONS IN CREATIVE THINKING,**  
A Survey and Forecast: Edited by R. M. MacIver. Thirteen Addresses by different Specialists. Harper and Brothers. New York. \$2. pp. 159.

Professor MacIver is well-known as the author of several standard works in political science and sociology like *Community, Society, The Modern State, The Web of Government* and others. He has edited this collection of luncheon addresses by thirteen thinkers on many aspects of current life and culture delivered at The Institute of Religious and Social Studies of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, during 1953-54. The subjects dealt with range from new astronomical vistas to new insights into human needs revealed by scientific management and industrial psychology traversing the familiar regions of philosophy, art, literature, morals and television.

The first speaker sweeps the horizon of the latest developments in astronomy and indicates how the enlarged vistas of the universe necessitate a refinement and redefinition of man's life and purpose in society. The universe is much more glorious than imagined by the prophets of old and the formation of a cosmic point of view has become an integral part of man's equipment for making a success of life on the planet.

Professor Boas gives a simple and rational survey of the need for a common framework of values for all men to solve the problems of living as they arise, which, he says, is the task of philosophical thinking to elucidate on the basis of the best knowledge available.

Professor Hofstadter gives an illuminating account of the role of fine art in helping us to realise the meaning of experience through art

products and to learn to make appropriate responses by way of enhanced experience—enhanced by way of expansion of consciousness and of depth.

New directions in painting, music, architecture, the novel, drama and literature in general are sketched appealingly by the others who offer a sharp and revealing spotlight on the major trends of contemporary culture—its doubts and self-division, its nihilism, its existentialist note, its passion for probing the depths of man's nature, its limitless hopes and dark despair and yet its continuous search for the central meaning of man's life and destiny. The great names in the arts of the century are mentioned in this context lit up by interpretative comment.

From the social and political point of view perhaps the most significant address is the last one by Professor Lasswell who wrote after the first world war about public opinion and propaganda and related subjects in a new and arresting manner. He here sums up the results of modern industrial psychology and scientific management from the standpoint of human happiness and efficiency. He lists the values of **affection**, or congenial interpersonal relations, of **skill** or expression of ability and aptitude, **elightenment** or giving the worker a knowledge of the work situation and its relation to the outside world to enlist his self-respect, **rectitude** value or the need for everyone to feel right and to have his **bona fides** respected, the **respect** value with a place in society and finally the psychosomatic effects of all these on health and sense of well-being—as essential values to be safeguarded in all socio-economic systems irrespective of ideology.

—M. A. Venkata Rao.

## The Mind of the Nation

### A 'RED' SOLUTION FOR SINO-INDIA DISPUTE

"The Communist Party of Ceylon and some Congressmen, presumably Communists and fellow-travellers Messrs. Krishna Menon, Malaviya and the like who have infiltrated into the Congress, have, it would appear, suggested to the Communist Party of India a new solution for the Sino-Indian 'dispute.' The Government of India refuses to hold talks with the Government of China until the Colombo proposals are accepted by the Government of China. Well, then, let the Government of India agree to hold talks with the Government of China in the presence of the Colombo powers. They will then be talking not only to the Chinese, but also to the Ceylonese, Egyptians, etc., etc. Could anything be fairer, i.e. more to the interests of the Communists generally and the Communist government of China in particular? "You won't be dragged to the Council table," says Chou. "Come now, let's make it a dinner-party with our old pals Sirmavo, Sabri and the rest. Surely you haven't the heart to miss the fun." That Messrs. Dange, Gupta, Nambodripad and the rest of the Communist Party

have very good assurances that Mao and Chou approve of the plan, we can take for granted. That they know that it amounts to surrender for India, and that they are not disturbed by this in the least, can also be taken for granted. They are loyal, not to their country, but to their party, a 'higher' loyalty they would no doubt maintain, if ever they could be candid. Making things as difficult as possible for India and Indians devoted to their country, they go about their usual avocations, some to stir up strife and disorganisation within its borders, some to report to Moscow and receive from the appropriate quarters advice, instructions, encouragement and help."

—Opinion.

## News & Views

### AIR DEFENCE DETAILS COMPLETED

NEW DELHI — All details, except the Cabinet's formal assent, have now been completed for Western participation in joint air defence exercises to strengthen the Indian Air Force against aggression by China.

Canada and Australia will not participate in the exercises for the time being, but the scheme is being implemented with their full support and such co-operation as they are able to give in the immediate future.

It is learnt, however, that the air exercises will not take place for several months. The first stage of the joint effort will be the installation of radar and other ground facilities and the training of Indian personnel to use the ground equipment.

#### "CONTINUOUS"

While the frequency of the air defence exercises remains to be determined it has been agreed that the process will be more or less continuous until the Indian Air Force has been fully trained to jointly act with the West in an emergency.

Meanwhile, it can be authoritatively stated that the Bhoothalingam military aid mission, which left for Moscow, has not gone to the Soviet Union in quest of a further supply of MiG-21's.

While Russian assistance in this field is appreciated, the MiG-21 in its present form has been ruled out as a substitute for Western supersonic fighters.

### CHINA USES PAK TO STOP ARMS FOR INDIA

WASHINGTON: China and Pakistan are collaborating in an effort to block the supply of certain categories of Western arms to India, according to reliable reports reaching here.

U.S. and Britain military intelligence is reported to have received information that the Chinese military attache has been advising Pakistan officials on the kind of equipment they should object to being supplied to India.

The Chinese are reported to have provided Pakistan with the arguments to use with its allies. These consist of descriptions of Chinese troop dispositions and equipment and of the border terrain presented in such a way as to make it appear that India cannot require such items as supersonic aircraft, tanks and other advanced equipment for defence against China.

It is then suggested that Pakistan officials use this material to suggest that India's request for such equipment is actually designed for offensive use against Pakistan.

### OVER 50,000 CHINESE FLED TO RUSSIA

WASHINGTON: The Washington Post said that between 50,000 and 70,000 refugees had fled last year from Communist China to the Soviet Union.

The article said that starvation appeared to be the main reason for the flight.

The main flight was across the 1,000-mile border between China's Sinkiang province and the Soviet Union's Kazakh Republic. Refugees who fled into the Soviet Union were welcomed and not turned back, the Post said.

\* \* \*

### THE BERLIN WALL: MRS. LAKSHMI N. MENON'S FRANK CRITICISM

"Great disappointment and sadness came over me when I saw the Wall", said Mrs. Lakshmi N. Menon, Minister in India's Ministry of External Affairs, after a visit to the Wall raised by the Communists on August 13, 1961, along the sector boundary in Berlin.

During a brief visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and Berlin Mrs. Menon spent some time in West-Berlin where a reception was held in her honour. Expressing her reaction, she said, she shared the feelings of depression of the people of Berlin. Their families were being kept separate by the Wall, and this at a time when borders were being abolished in Europe and man was about to travel to the moon.

A regime which had to erect a wall against its own population, according to Mrs. Menon, was only "accusing itself". The Minister expressed the hope that Germany would, one day, be reunited.

\* \* \*

### PEKING BANS RUSSIANS' ENTRY IN SINKIANG

NEW DELHI—Peking has banned the entry of Russians in the Sinkiang region, according to report reaching here.

The Chinese feel the recent massive uprising in the strategic mineral-rich region was caused by Russian technicians working on some projects there.

The Chinese communists are reported to have ruthlessly dealt with the area's Muslim population, which has become restive. Following the Chinese preparations to test the first atomic device in the Gobi Desert, the Muslims protested against conversion of their peaceful homeland into an arsenal.

Reports say the Chinese have banned listening to Radio Tashkent because the Russians have been advocating that the predominantly Muslim population of the Central Soviet Republics have had centuries-old cultural relations with the Muslims of Sinkiang. This is something which the Chinese do not like.

Peking's recent claims on large chunks of Soviet territory flanking Sinkiang are stated to have aggravated the Sino-Soviet disagreement.

\* \* \*

### PRO-CHINA TIBETAN LAMAS IN SPITI

JULLUNDUR: Buddhist lamas of Western Tibet have been paying regular visits to Spiti, according to an unconfirmed report.

Mr. Harbhajan Singh, chairman of the Punjab Praja Socialist Party, said that according to his information, lamas from Spiti and western Tibet had for some time now been exchanging visits ostensibly for religious purposes.

Mr. Singh, however, saw in these visits the possibility of a Chinese propaganda campaign in the border valley of Punjab.

He said it was possible indoctrinated Tibetan lamas were being sent from across the border to carry out anti-India propaganda in this snow-locked valley and to win over innocent Indians.

Mr. Singh said if his information was correct, more vigilance was required along the 70-mile Spiti-Tibet border. There was little check on the entry into India of Tibetan refugees on the Spiti border. Nor was there any system of giving identity cards to incoming Tibetans.

### NEPAL, U.S. AID PACT SIGNED

KATHMANDU: Nepal and the United States signed agreements today providing for cash American assistance totalling Rs. 1.24 crores (in Nepali rupees) for several joint Nepali-American projects. Nepal will be contributing Rs. 59.9 lacs as its share.

These projects relate to developments of panchayats, malaria eradication, training in accountancy and development of primary and secondary education.

American assistance is being given under PL-480.

These agreements were signed by the Secretary of Economic Planning, Nepal Government, on behalf of Nepal and the acting director of American AID mission in Nepal on behalf of the United States.

### BUT REDS OPPOSE NEPAL-U.S. ECONOMIC PACT

BANARAS: A resolution of the Nepalese Communist Party's national secretariat released to the Press here opposed the recent Nepalese-United States economic agreement.

The resolution said the agreement would hamper the growth of an independent national economy in Nepal and that U.S. capital would dominate Nepal's economic and political life.

It alleged that the agreement was first signed in 1960 during King Mahendra's visit to the U.S. but was kept secret so far.

### BASIC AIM OF JOINT FRONT IS TO OUST CONGRESS: LOHIA

LUCKNOW: Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, the Socialist leader, elaborated his programme for forming joint fronts with the opposition parties at a news conference.

Dr. Lohia said "the joint fronts would be on specific issues. They would have no connection with any ideology. The basic aim was to dislodge the Congress from power. It was immaterial who joined us in the process. Even Congressmen could participate in it."

Dr. Lohia said since there were different issues on which different parties could work with the Socialists, there might be several joint fronts.

For instance, there could be a joint front with Jan Sangh on the issue of banning English, with the Swatantra Party on the removal of the Nehru Government, with the Communists on nationalization and so on.

Dr. Lohia admitted the possibility of a new party emerging out of such developments. If the Socialists lost their identity in the process, so would others. If it was a good party, it would be welcomed.

## Dear Editor . . . .

The Letter of Mrs Goodman, Overseas Contacts Secretary, The Socialist Standard, London, published in The Libertarian of June 15, makes some critical remarks on my article on Karl Marx's Philosophy of History dissociating her socialist group (The Socialist Party of Great Britain) from communism in Russia and China today as not being Marxist in inspiration and character.

But beyond such verbal disclaimer, the writer offers no shred of evidence in support of her idea, strange as it must seem to all those acquainted with the literature.

Bertrand Russell has a stimulating essay on the **evil done by good people**. Many innocent, sentimental people, among them many who call themselves socialists of some brand or other and some even communists, entertain an attitude of homage to Karl Marx which are in India associated with divine avatars like Rama or Krishna. They can do no wrong.

Until Mrs. Goodman shows how her variety of Marxism—without class war, class-less-state Utopianism, violence (if necessary) for the social revolution, complete centralisation of the economy in the hands of the State, identifying economic with political power, dictatorship of the proletariat in lieu of democracy in the accepted sense, an amoral view of history and life generally including the family etc.—have **no basis in her authentic Marx** if his texts are not "twisted" as she alleges that others do, there is time enough to take her disclaimer seriously.

Meanwhile, I shall content myself with only **one** quotation from Marx for her to ruminate upon: "Revolution in permanence!" After the workers together with the bourgeois democrats have achieved revolution i.e. seized power, their battle cry must be "permanent revolution".

"They must act in such a manner that the revolutionary excitement does not collapse immediately after victory. For from opposing excesses, such as the sacrificing to popular revenge of hated individuals or public buildings to which hateful memories are attached, such deeds must not only be tolerated but their direction must be taken in hand, for example's sake." (Address to the Communist League 1850).

If later, Stalin liquidated un-precedented numbers of his fellow-Russians for the revolution's sake—for its **success**, can Mrs. Goodman tell us that he had no warrant from the text of Karl Marx himself? It is a question of degree.

Further, if, as Mrs. Goodman says, socialism is to be sought only on the "requisite of there being a sufficiency to satisfy the material needs of all," she only reveals her innocence of revolutionary politics! If already there is such abundance, no revolution can get under way! It is the resentment bred by want on a large scale—increasing misery as Marx puts it, that creates the army to be led by the revolutionaries.

Further, why do humanitarian reformers still cling to the name of Marx with his inextinguishable doctrines of class-war and other exploded ideas? Why can they not advocate equality for all in the name of **humanity** without commitment to dubious **totems** sullied with crime and bloodshed through the generations?

Bangalore,  
15-7-1963.

M. A. Venkata Rao

## ANNOUNCEMENT

We have a few back issues of "Freeman" a monthly journal published by the Foundation for Economic Education, U.S.A. They are available free on request to us. Requests for copies should be accompanied with 15 nP. stamps.

Write: Desk K. R.  
1st floor Arya Bhuvan,  
Sandhurst Road West,  
Bombay-4.

## GIFT OF THE MONTH

Choose your gift books from the following list. Do not request more than 4 books. This offer is good only for those new subscribers to **THE INDIAN LIBERTARIAN** enlisting during August and September.

1. Stop Legal Stealing. John C. Lincoln.
2. On Life and Death. James Peter Warbasse.
3. March of Conspiracy. Gopal Mittal.
4. No Gold on my chovels. Ifan Edwards.
5. Dayanand His Life and Work. Suraj Bhan.
6. Our Economic Problems. Unwin.
7. Explorations. Sibnarayan Ray.
8. Will Dollars save the world. Henry Hazlitt.
9. Conscience on the Battlefield. Leornard Road.

Write Desk : S. N. 1st Floor, Arya Bhuvan,  
Sandhurst Road, Bombay-4.

## THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

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



Write to:

THE MANAGER  
THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS  
B O M B A Y 4.

Telephone: 332105

Telegram: LOTEWALA