

# Indian Libertarian



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

INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY  
AND LIBERTARIAN DEMOCRACY

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

Price 25 Naye Paise

Vol. VII No. 21

IN THIS ISSUE

December 1, 1959

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL .. .. .	1	<i>Russia Scales the Himalaya</i> by A. R. Field ..	12
<i>A Party of Freedom</i> by "Democrat" ..	4	THE WORLD OF BOOKS by Daniel Bell ..	15
<i>Nehru Must Go</i> by M. N. Tholal .. .. .	7	NEWS DIGEST .. .. .	17
<i>Can India be Defined?</i> by Reginald Hargreaves	10	GLEANINGS FROM THE PRESS ..	19
RATIONALIST SUPPLEMENT ..	I-IV	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR ..	19

## EDITORIAL

### PANDIT NEHRU IS SEVENTY

Pandit Nehru reached his seventieth year on the 14th of November. Even in the midst of the deepest misgivings about the destiny of the country under his guidance, intensified by the Chinese Aggression on our northern borders, our people in all their ranks have renewed their emotional attachment to him. Newspapers, publicists and others have vied with each other in offering him their tribute of affectionate admiration and have refreshed their memories with the greatness of his career and his manysided contribution to the growth of national life under freedom. They have praised the dynamism of his socialist enthusiasm for ensuring the welfare of the common man and a striking rise in his standard of living through gigantic Five Year Plans. They recognise the stream of purposeful effort that he has caused to invigorate every sphere of administration. They have paid unstinted praise to his steadfast patriotism and the grandeur of his aims for the future of the country. They have recognised that he has secured the greatest cooperation from all ranks through his secularism which has been a sheet-anchor to the minorities in particular. He has kept revived nationalism after the sleep of a thousand years free from the murky waters of fanatical chauvinism and obscurantism. He has recognised and used talent from all parts of the country without provincial bias on a common national basis.

After associating ourselves with this universal

meed of appreciation and gratitude for all that Pandit Nehru has meant for the nation in so many spheres, we have in deference to truth and the future of the nation, to keep in mind also the negative side of the balance sheet.

Today the shadow of Chinese aggression covers every phase of national life and is causing a deep heart-searching in thinking people, while the masses are vaguely stirred and uneasy. It will be a failure on the part of publicists if they do not rise above idol worship and point out clearly the shortcomings of the supreme leader. It may be that we love not wisely but too well.

Both the internal and external policies initiated and carried on by Pandit Nehru as Prime Minister and External Affairs Minister have now begun to reveal their far-reaching sinister consequences for the welfare of the nation. The Five Year Plans with their faulty pattern devoid of economic wisdom and the external policy of non-involvement and panchsheel have both proved grave and catastrophic failures.

The Swatantra Party founded by such a Gandhian veteran as Sri C. Rajagopalachari is seized primarily with a vision and realisation of the stifling nature of socialism for the free, democratic life of the people. The twenty-one points of their manifesto spell out the ways in which the present policies of socialism in economic and other aspects of life are cribbing, cabbiting and confining the spontaneous activities and aspirations of the people

and are making towards a totalitarian state of affairs by their natural tendency.

The Chinese Aggression on the other hand has made wide masses of the people realise that the official policy of neutralism as between the two rival blocs, putting both on the same moral level with even a shade of preference towards the communist bloc as being morally on the side of the masses, has after all landed the country in a friendless quandary in the face of aggression by China—a vastly more powerful military power than ourselves. The Himalayas which were India's shield and protecting wall for thousands of years have now lost that function. The Chinese have descended towards our side of the slope and are claiming thousands of miles of territory as theirs by way of inheritance from their Tibetan region!

The entire army deployed on the Himalayan slopes would be all too insufficient. The scale of our military establishment in men and materials is Lilliputian when contrasted with that of the invading enemy!

The oppressing question weighing on the minds of the people is whether the Chinese will follow up their advantage and proceed to actual annexation of wide chunks of territory in the coming months and years? They have shown scant regard to the foreign policy of their Russian colleagues led by Khrushchev who wants a relaxation of tension at present. Khrushchev expressed a hope to an Indian pressman in Moscow recently that India and China would settle their border differences through friendly negotiations. To the suggestion that the Chinese might be considering strategic advantages in their aggression, he scoffed and said that generals will

discover such strategic situations in all places! He said that he did not trust the generals on such matters. But the Chinese shot down our police patrols in Ladakh even after this exhortation by Khrushchev!

India has now to scrap her old defence ideas and embark on large scale expansion and modernisation of her military establishments on land, sea and air.

Thoughtful correspondents are asking (like Mr. Verghese of the Times of India) whether the country is not paying too high a price for the leadership of Pandit Nehru!

### THE PRIME MINISTER'S REFERENCE TO RETIREMENT AGAIN

The Prime Minister is notoriously sensitive to public feeling, though he does not modify his policies in its light! He wishes to have public feeling behind his aims and activities, even while he is trying to channel it into courses against its own interest, as in the matter of cooperative joint farming and heavy industries.

In a television programme broadcast in the United States in connection with his birthday, Pandit Nehru is reported to have actually said that he had a feeling these days that it would be a good thing both for himself and for the country if he now relinquished the office of Prime Minister!

The country knows how on a former occasion his announcement to a similar effect dissolved in an overwhelming flood of pleadings from his loyal followers! Pandit Nehru gave then the impression that his threat was meant only to test the strength of adherence of his followers! We should not be blamed if we feel that on this occasion too he has no serious intentions of handing his mission and power over to others. Indeed he himself is reported to have added that he had no intentions of resigning his office! Why then should he trifle with the feelings of the people except for the sordid purpose of eliciting expressions of loyalty and renewed solicitation to him to continue in office by Congress and people in all their ranks. This procedure does not add to the stature of the Prime Minister.

It is remarkable that a number of publicists have begun to demand in public that Nehru should retire and yield place to others. Mr. M. R. Masani in a public meeting in Bombay is reported to have suggested that the President should call upon some other member of the Congress party leadership to take over the burdens of the Prime Minister's office on condition of a radical change of policy, particularly in foreign affairs.

It is reported from Bangalore that Mr. M. A. Venkata Rao, President, Bharatiya Jana Sangh of Mysore State, called for such retirement by Pandit Nehru in several public mass meetings. The audience did not show any disagreement with the suggestion. Some time before such suggestions in mass meetings would have been hooted down!

## **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 COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA AT MEERUT

At Meerut where the Communist party of India held their National Council meeting in November, there occurred a unique phenomenon which is a sign of the times.

The Communist party gathering wanted to proceed to the national memorial spire erected in 1957 in memory of the 1857 martyrs in the war of independence waged by the Sepoys of the East India Company's armies. This was a psychological tactic to display their national sentiment at a time when their siding with the Chinese aggressors in detriment to Indian security has called their patriotism in question. This was but an exploitation of national sentiment.

The PSP and Jana Sangh and other groups saw the insincerity and tactical nature of the communist move and stirred up the people of the city. Whereupon huge crowds assembled at the Memorial to prevent the communist processionists from placing their wreaths of flowers and honouring (in outward appearance) the national heroes and martyrs of the 1857 struggle for independence. Other crowds went to the town hall where the CPI leaders had gathered and demonstrated against their **anti-national attitude** to the Chinese aggression.

Luckily the police seemed to have handled the explosive situation with unusual tact. The communists cancelled their public meetings and processions and the crowds melted away without any mishap!

This incident is a remarkable revelation of public feeling and shows that when a clear and tangible issue such as aggression and national danger confronts the general public, they are capable of seeing the communist Front tactics through, and express themselves unambiguously against the traitors, however respectable they might seem, on a par with other national political parties.

This public awareness of the wicked nature of communist moves and aims showed itself in a solid manner in the struggle of the Kerala people under the lead of Mr. Mannath Padmanathan recently that ended in success and the overthrow of communist rule by presidential proclamation.

### MOB EXPLOSION AT KANPUR

Our remarks on the Meerut crowds should not be taken as an endorsement of mob action. In the case of the communists, mob action was justified as it remained nonviolent till the end and as it was necessitated by lack of official castigation of the communist party manoeuvres. The Government have conferred respectability on it and it became necessary for the people to act. But in Kanpur, mobs ran amuck against the police on rumours of a constable's misbehaviour with a woman in the lock-up. The knowledge that no punishment had been meted out to the offenders on similar cases in the past served to make the mobs uncontrollable. It is a lesson to the Government and Congressmen

that the moral foundations of their rule and influence with the people have vanished and cannot save them from popular displeasure.

The public too should find other leaders who will set a better example of moral feeling and conduct.

Pandit Nehru criticised all political parties for not having condemned the mob and said that it was a lapse in leadership. He is right but the provocation lies with the corruption of his own administration and the inadequacy of his hold on his own followers.

### INDO-CHINESE BORDER STRUGGLE

The Chinese have replied to India's latest letter with a proposal for the withdrawal of both sides on the border from their present lines to the extent of 12½ miles thus leaving a neutral **Noman's Land** of 25 miles to prevent clashes like those in Ladakh in which we lost 9 policemen killed.

The letter is couched in a conciliatory tone. But as Nehru's reply puts it, the proposals are impracticable as it leaves the Chinese still inside our borders in Ladakh, for they have penetrated some 50 miles into our territory.

We should insist that there can be **no negotiation** until the Chinese soldiers are withdrawn beyond our 1954 border.

Mr. Chou En-lai has suggested a meeting between himself and Nehru. This is also not advisable until the border line is restored to the **status quo ante bellum**.

Parliament has met and a second White Paper has been issued in which much historical evidence has been adduced for the Indian case.

Meanwhile Nehru has assured the country that the Army has been finally entrusted with the entire border defence. He should follow this up with financial backing in generous measure. There can be no priority higher than defence.

Nehru has still the old feeling that nothing should diminish the investment on the Third Five Year Plan. He harps on steel as essential for industrial power and for military power as well.

Public opinion should continue pressure on the Government to ensure full support to the Army. Even the Sarvodaya sentimentalist Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has asked for the throwing out of the aggressors. Meanwhile the utter silence of Vinoba Bhave with his **Shanti Sena** is significant. It betokens the bankruptcy of Gandhism!

### USA SECRETARY OF STATE'S NEUTRALIST TALK

Mr. Charles Herter the American Secretary of State startled the free world by his remarks at his press conference at Washington that America had no opinion about the **legal aspects** of the Indo-Chinese border dispute! He said that no American had studied this border region and that the

*(Continued on page 4)*

# A Party of Freedom

(THE SWATANTRA PARTY)

By "Democrat"

—:0:—

**T**HE newly started Swatantra Party of Shri C. Rajagopalachari, Prof. Ranga, and Mr. M. R. Masani is having widespread response throughout the country on a scale exceeding the expectations and hopes of the sponsors. The response is clear evidence that it fulfils a universal need for rethinking and reversal of the major lines of policy pursued by Nehru's Congress. Particularly after the passing of the Land Reforms Resolution at the Nagpur Congress, a keen sense of urgency developed among leaders of agriculture with the result that the All-India Agricultural Federation (started two years before) invited leaders of all provinces to meet at Madras on June 4 under the aegis of Sri C. Rajagopalachari, who had been persuaded meanwhile to lead the party as its "friend, philosopher and guide."

The members of the Bombay Forum of Free Enterprise have also been realising the utter need for a new political party to uphold the values of democratic freedom in the economic sphere and to resist the headlong career into communist socialism that the Five Year Plans were plunging the country into and to slow down the pace of centralisation of economic power that was engulfing vocation after vocation.

The Party is developing an All-India organisation in State after State. The Prime Minister and the Congress Party leaders are becoming increasingly aware of the genuine threat that the new party is developing to their hold on the country. The Swatantra Party has issued a 21 point platform of principles articulating the field of freedom in all spheres of life, while acknowledging the need for control of anti-social activities of individuals and groups and institutions.

---

*(Continued from page 3)*

USA could not take any definite stand on the rights and wrongs of the dispute! But he threw out a crumb of comfort with the remark that China was certainly wrong in having used force!

Even American officials together with pressmen were surprised and pained that the Secretary should have made such a cold neutralist statement on the eve of President Eisenhower's visit to India.

Anyway, it is a warning to India that she cannot take American help for granted when she should need it.

## A PARTY OF FREEDOM

The central principle held forth as the basis of the new policies to be followed by the new party in the event of success at the polls is announced to be "the freedom of the Individual." It is claimed boldly that the needed dynamics of progress in the economic and other spheres will be furnished more by individual freedom than by socialist control.

It is realised quite clearly that the present dominance of socialist philosophy and the reign of Marxist ideas of liquidation of individual property in production will lead ultimately to totalitarianism and the extinction of the free way of life.

Expansion of production and the emergence of plenty under socialism are moreover, seen to be dubious and whatever success it has attained in communist countries is at the expense of freedom and to the accompaniment of harsh control and repression.

The Swatantra Party therefore offers a straightforward challenge to the official philosophy and policies of the Nehru Government. It has called the bluff of the "illusion of the epoch" namely, socialism of the Marxist variety.

The times are propitious for a thorough audit of the overall effects of the present socialist policies of the Nehru Government. We are already midway in a controlled economy with the public sector growing at a phenomenal pace through the Five Year Plans. The State Trading Corporation has annexed over 50 items for its monopolistic sway.

The Life Insurance business in the whole country has been swept into the State orbit. Leftist advisers are urging that banking should next be taken over. The economists who have the ear of the Prime Minister have got their way in the matter of State Trading in Food Grains. It is to be taken over by Government eliminating the entire class of private wholesale merchants dealing with grains. Professor Mahalanobis seems to have estimated that a profit of Rs. 850 crores could be won for the State in the next five year plan period through State trading in food grains.

The targets of the Third Five Year Plan are set in the neighbourhood of Rs. 10,000 crores! The country has been unable to fulfil the Second Plan target of Rs. 4800 crores inspite of the special aid given by many creditor countries and inspite of the huge amount of deficit financing that may reach Rs. 1300 crores by the end of the plan period!

No wonder prices are soaring and the middle classes are being forced into lower levels unable to live in the way they were accustomed to with education for their children and some amenities.

In order to raise funds on this scale, the economic advisers of the Government, official and unofficial, have suggested that the State should give up its ailery or profits as a capitalist feature and to engage in industries and trades and add to prices over and above normal levels (calculated in the basis of markets and absorbability by the people) for creating a Plan Fund. Essential commodities may also be taxed higher so as to make all classes pay for the Plan. Since the limits of direct taxation are already reached, Property tax, expenditure tax and super-tax may also be raised by several counts gradually. Already, many commodities of essential use including food articles like sugar and oils bear forty to sixty per cent of their prices by way of taxes. Commodity taxes will intensify inflation still further increasing the hardship by several degrees. It remains to be seen if these Draconian measures will be tolerated by the people patiently. The bases of democratic government are likely to be loosened if these extreme measures are actually introduced in the next Plan period.

The whole design of the Planning adopted is modelled on the Soviet pattern—heavy industries, taking the lion's share, consumer industries starved, private enterprise cribbed, cabined and confined within the limits of the Plan, agriculture neglected and targets in all lines set high above the utmost mobilisable resources from all avenues, domestic and foreign; loan, aid and grant. This pattern creates an abnormal imbalance in the economy and sacrifices the present generation to the future and can be put through successfully **only** by the Government assuming more and more of the powers of a dictatorship.

The way in which the Nagpur Congress resolution on land reforms with its two features of land ceilings and cooperatives joint farming was hustled through as by a steam-roller (bringing to heel even senior Ministers who were antagonistic to the idea) is a clear first instalment of the **comouflaged dictatorship of Pandit Nehru**. This tactic will no doubt be applied to further stages for the sake of the Third Five Year Plan of the size envisaged already with an investment of Rs. 10,000.

Further, land ceilings are an important departure from democratic notions of private property. It is in fact a large **capital levy** on the unfortunate landowners. This generates a demand for similar levies on other forms of property—housing factory, transport etc. The anglers for votes will certainly play up to the hungry claimants for other people's property and create a "democratic" **popular demand** for new measures of confiscation.

And it is well-known to all students of the subject that cooperative joint farming is only the first stage of collective farming. And such collective farming reduces its members to the level of

**workers drawing wages** and deprives them of the magic of ownership, the opportunity to operate on their own farms in their own way at their own risk and responsibility. In fact it is the aim of the communist ideology to reduce independent peasant proprietors to the level of the proletariat who have nothing but their hands to earn their living. Complete dependence on the government for livelihood and improvement in all directions will be the net result of these measures, tantamount to a totalitarian society with no value set on individual freedom and self-directed activity.

Another consequence of this line of development is the proliferation and increasing dominance of the **bureaucracy** in every sector of life. Red tape will develop into impossible lengths and will stifle individual initiative and efficiency.

The citizen will become incapable of ordering his own life in his own way in accordance with his own judgement. The **sense of dignity** of the citizen will suffer grievous outrage at the hands of every petty jack-in-office. The grand idea of Rousseau that every citizen of a true democratic State is a **sovereign** by himself, a sharer in the sovereignty of the State in an equal measure will suffer attrition and lose its meaning in a system where economic power, through centralisation of all economic agencies and processes—production, distribution, exchange, currency banking, transport and communications.

The twenty-one principles of the Swatantra Party articulate these dire consequences of the growing despotism of the State and call a halt to the headlong rush in this direction.

Hence from every point of view—economic, political social and cultural, the emergence of the Swatantra Party is timely and opportune.

The special fault of the present policy-making leaders (In effect Pandit Nehru alone—others only catering to his whims) is their refusal to take evidence to the century into consideration. They refuse to consider the evil effect of jettisoning the free market system by way of increasing prices and reducing output in quality and quantity. They turn a deaf ear to the evil effects of excessive bureaucratisation both on the administration and on the public, crippling spontaneity and swelling the cost of service to abnormal levels.

They refuse to see the psychological effects of excessive dependence of the citizen on the government, sapping his republican self-reliance and capacity to look after himself.

They refuse to see that in the end the **only steady incentive** for enhancement of production and progress in invention and manufacture is individual profit, the confidence that each man can reap the benefits of his own contribution to society.

The way in which the British public considered the actual affects of the rule of the Labour Party in the past two sessions and voted for the Conservatives for the third time running is clear evidence

that a mature public is disillusioned with the promises of socialism, the doctrine that promises something for nothing for everybody!

Observers from the scenes of the British elections have returned with the conviction that there is now a steady trend away from the extremes of class war and nationalisation of industries all over Europe.

### THE SWING TO FREEDOM HAS DEFINITELY BEGUN

This journal and the Libertarian Social Institute of which it is the spokesman together with its predecessors like The Free Economic Review have been working for decades now to spread the ideas of free economy and free society. Knowing full well that the dominant trends in the two last decades were all set in the direction of socialism and controlled economy, it persisted in its faith that in the end man wants to be free and will not tolerate a dictatorial regime in the economy indefinitely. The group was sure that some day the tide would turn when ideas of libertarian economics and politics would be appreciated and used to build a saner and happier social order.

That day is dawning even in India as evidenced by the emergence of the Swatantra Party. A new social order can take root and establish itself only if the intelligentsia are convinced of its values and cooperate with conviction in administration and private spheres or vocations, law, education art, science, industry, trade and so on. The Libertarian Social Institute and journal under the lead of Mr. R. B. Lotvala have been silently and steadfastly working to create such an intelligentsia through encouragement to writers, students, journalists and others.

The leaders of the Swatantra Party are aware that they have to go farther and evolve a set of second principles applying the principles of freedom to every current problem so as to formulate policies. Today the new members joining the Party contain too many frustrated members of the old Congress Party. They have come for improving their political fortunes!

Also, there is no homogeneity among the different groups hailing from different vocations—big business, big agriculture, big bureaucracy (retired), big politicians (retired) etc. There is no accord on foreign affairs between the C. R. and Mr. Masani. There is no accord between the peasant leader Prof. Ranga and the others on the land question except in the objection to cooperative farming. Prof. Ranga still harps on Gandhian socialism! C. R. still harps on Gandhian unilateral non-violence and surrender and special consideration to minorities. Mr. Masani too would perhaps grant special regional States to the tribals—Jharkhand and Naga States.

They differ on the role of English and Hindi and on prohibition and so many other vital questions.

But they are agreed on democratic individualism tempered by social regulation consistent with op-

portunity for all. The most important thing is to cry a halt to the present plunge into communism in official policies. There will be time enough to evolve positive substitutes after achieving power. This seems to be the stand of the new Party leaders.

The Party if successful in capturing power at the next elections two years from now will give a new and healthier direction to the nation's affairs. There is no doubt about this healthy eventuality. But it would perform an essential service even if it wins a large minority of seats in the legislatures, becoming the largest opposition group, running close to the official majority.

Pandit Nehru is right in his feeling that the Swatantra Party is his most formidable opponent. It is to be hoped that he will retain his democratic conscience even while losing to the opposition and prevent the police from harassing the new leaders. The ranks of the Ministers too should refrain from the temptation to intimidate the merchant class, who are notoriously timid.

The PSP, the Lohia Socialists and the Communists are all Leftists and stand for State dominance over the individual. It is only the Jana Sangh and the Swatantra Party that stand for a different climate of individualism and freedom. But the Jana Sangh is growing too slowly for various reasons and is too much handicapped by the false propaganda of its opponents as well as by its affiliation to cultural moorings of the past. It is on the cards that the Swatantra Party will spread rapidly and will develop into a real threat to the ruling Party at the next elections.

The Jana Sangh executive has resolved sensibly to cooperate with the new Party on common economic grounds.

### DIALECTICAL THINKING

#### "Unity passing into its opposites"

Mr. Khrushchev in 1937, about the first Moscow trials: "These miserable nonentities wanted to destroy the unity of the party and the Soviet State. They raised their treacherous hands against Comrade Stalin.....Stalin.....our hope, Stalin.....our desire, Stalin.....the light of advanced and progressive humanity, Stalin.....our will, Stalin.....our victory".

Mr. Khrushchev on July 16, 1956, to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Soviet Union: "Stalin used extreme methods and mass repressions at a time when the Revolution was already victorious, when the Soviet state was strengthened....Stalin acted not through persuasion, explanation but by imposing his concept. Whoever opposed his concept, or tried to prove the correctness of his position was doomed to removal from the leading collective and to subsequent moral and physical annihilation".

\* \* \*

# Nehru Must Go

By M. N. Tholal

ANY one who knows Mr. Nehru and knows how sensitive he is to criticism—this sensitiveness to criticism is only the obverse of the craving for flattery—could not have failed to assess the tremendous effect on his mind of the memorable 10-0 vote against India in the Security Council on the Kashmir issue. What a world-wide censure on a man trying to be the head of a peace bloc or, to put it in Mr. Nehru's own words, of being the bridge between the East and the West. Those who remember that, to begin with, free India was with the western powers and against the Communist bloc, and had gone to the extent of supporting the former in their war on China in Korea, have to find reasons for the gradual shift in India's foreign policy until we see her Prime Minister—that same Prime Minister who was with the western powers in Korea—following in the footsteps of Khrushchev and condemning NATO and the BAGDAD PACT and SEATO as well as the cold war which followed their formation, which itself followed the subjugation of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria and East Germany by Soviet Russia. A sense of gratitude to Soviet Russia, which voted the proposal to send a UN force to Kashmir and thus saved Kashmir for India—for in a plebiscite in Kashmir, Pakistan would win hands down any day—cannot be said to be altogether unwarranted, but it is something more than gratitude which has been responsible for the complete metamorphosis of India's foreign policy under the same Prime Minister, leader of the self-same majority party and under the same democratic constitution.

## CANTANKEROUSNESS

Many of us took it for granted that the ten members of the Security Council who practically declared India the aggressor under the leadership of the USA and Britain were being unjust to us. The truth of the matter is—and the time has come for the sake of the safety of the country to be outspoken on the issue—that our police action in Hyderabad, in which tanks rolled into the state, vitiated the accession of Kashmir by the former's ruler after it was juridically complete—although the ruler himself was forced to abdicate. That was perfectly all right morally and juridically when it took place but with the forced occupation of Hyderabad our position became very much like that of the man who says: Heads I win, tails you lose. That is the crux of the matter. That is where non-alignment and refusal of military aid started. And we Indians shall make no headway towards a revision of our present suicidal stand on foreign policy, and towards survival as an independent nation, until we

hark back to the skeleton in our cupboard and acknowledge the fact, at least in our heart of hearts, that the USA and the UK were not altogether in the wrong and that any unbiassed individual could have acted likewise.

The point I wish to make here is that the cantankerousness with which we have since then perused the USA and the UK in particular has no basis in morality or in the desire for preservation of peace, about which our Prime Minister talks so much. For this cantankerousness there is a special reason. Mr. Nehru is a Kashmiri Pandit and, though it is decades since he gave up writing the prefix Pandit before his name and even forbade others doing so, he is, like most of us, extremely communal at heart. This is nothing to be wondered at. Communalism has its roots in emotion and Mr. Nehru, as every one knows, is highly emotional. Like every Kashmiri Pandit he wants his homeland to be in India. The very mention of some of our sacred places there—the writer too is a Kashmiri Pandit and like Nehru an atheist—stirs the deepest emotions in us, overriding, as it were, even our atheism and agnosticism. That the heart should want something can be sympathised with, even if that something cannot be quite equitably claimed, but that references to that inequity should arouse our ire to such an extent as to make us forget all canons of justice and fairplay and rush into the arms of the enemy who makes no secret of his preparations to swallow us, is, to say the least, like cutting our nose to spite our face. Mr. Nehru seems to think that it is the primary duty not of India but of the western powers to save us from communism. If that is so, his attitude is bereft of all patriotism and he is playing not only with the fortunes of his country but with his.

## LAUGHING IN HIS SLEEVE

On the dismal pages of India's history of a thousand years of slavery is writ large the story of Vanity—wounded vanity—and of how foreigners have always been exploiting it. That is exactly what is happening today. Soviet Russia has been fishing in troubled waters and exploiting Mr. Nehru's vanity. Russia is able to do so, because no one else counts in India. Disasters are often preceded by dictatorships. We saw the outcome of the dictatorship of Gandhi in the division of the country and the blood baths preceding and attending it. We are now witnessing the outcome of the dictatorship of Mr. Nehru. There is the oft-repeated desire of Mr. Khrushchev to see Mr. Nehru on the Summit. Mr. Khrushchev went so far at the Party Congress in the Kremlin on February 14,

1956, as to say that Soviet-American relations should be based on the Five Principles of Co-existence—as if these five principles dictated the Russian orders to the Communist Party chiefs in India. What a wonderful way to observe non-interference in others' affairs! But that is not what matters to Mr. Nehru—it does to a patriot like Nasser. What matters to Mr. Nehru is that he has been indirectly singled out for mediation between the two powerful nations and that Russia by implication regards Mr. Nehru as the soul of justice while the western powers regard him as an aggressor. Isn't that enough to fill the heart of any Indian with joy—any Indian who does not realise that the high priest of international communism who does not himself observe the high principles of Panch Sheel is only laughing in his sleeve.

So in the end it comes to this that Mr. Nehru is deceiving himself as well as his countrymen, who refuse to think for themselves and find refuge in a magician who, they feel convinced, will work wonders for them. This age of magicians started in 1920 with "Mahatma Gandhi" and it continues despite the disasters the country suffered under his leadership. It is not only the faith of the people that is tragic. What is even more tragic is the infinite capacity of our leaders to exploit the faith and devotion of their ignorant countrymen. All that is needed is brass on one side and credulity on the other. Those who condemn the exploitation by the capitalist, who creates unemployment at considerable risk to his money, have nothing to say to condemn the exploitation of the people for their own selfish ends without running any risk and for purposes which run counter to the interests of the country.

#### ACQUIESCENCE OF COMPLICITY?

It is a most extraordinary situation, a most fantastic situation—to use Mr. Nehru's own favourite words—which has been developing between India and China for the last five years since that panacea of Panch Sheel was signed between the two countries in 1954. The Chinese build a road hundreds of miles long in our territory in Ladakh and the Parliament—the sovereign body in the country—is told nothing about it. Years pass and when the newspapers of the land, taking their cue from foreign papers, begin raising a hue and cry, and the Chinese themselves threaten the passes on our Northern border, Prime Minister Nehru comes out with the story in dribbles to the amazement of his docile countrymen, each time hoping that there will be no more incursions. And what does he and his Defence Minister say about the nature of the territory—thousands of square miles—occupied by the Chinese? Only this that not a blade of grass grows there. What does that, what can it mean in the context of the occupation of the territory by the Chinese? Only this that that territory is not worth fighting for. Mr. Nehru goes farther and asks, who is going to fight up there in that bitter cold tens of thousands of feet above sea level? Well,

if this is not an invitation to the Chinese to stay where they are and feel quite at home or make farther incursions, I do not know what it is. On top of that he publicly declares we shall not seek military aid from any power. What greater encouragement can the Chinese have from Pandit Nehru? Is this acquiescence or complicity? It is for the reader to judge.

Despite what has happened, non-alignment holds the field. We Hindus prefer shibboleths to realities. Nehru has himself been hugging all kinds of illusions and delusions all his life—as did his guru, Gandhi, before him—for the selfsame object of world leadership. Khrushchev has not condemned the Chinese aggression and yet the Russian desire for an amicable settlement—because any other course lands India in the arms of the USA—is lauded here as something most extraordinary in a dispute between a Communist and non-Communist country. We are verily catching at straws like the proverbial drowning man.

What fate can possibly be in store for a nation which regards its enemies as its friends and its friends as its enemies? That is exactly what we have been doing since the advent of Gandhi in India politics. That is exactly what we have been doing under the leadership of Mr. Nehru, because our friends are frank and forthright and our enemies full of guile and duplicity. Non-alignment being a policy of friendlessness, what is Nehru to do now? He knows that China is a much powerful nation than India, and that for India to take to military measures without support from the western bloc, whom he has been abusing, would be to invite a disaster of the first magnitude. And to seek support of the western bloc would be the end of non-alignment and of Nehru the architect of non-alignment and the leader of non-aligners in Asia and elsewhere. Never did failure stare a nation's policies so squarely in the face as it is staring non-alignment today. Why should the Chinese negotiate when, on Mr. Nehru's own showing, they can have what they have forcibly annexed for keeps?

With Mr. Nehru it is not only a question of hiding the fact of aggression covering thousands of square miles from his countrymen. He has been denying aggression knowing that it has been taking place. Addressing a public meeting in 1956—two years after the Chinese incursions began—Nehru told his audience that he had not a shadow of doubt that there was not the slightest danger to the country from any external source but the danger came from internal weaknesses, such as linguism and provincialism and casteism.

#### MOST AMAZING CONDUCT

To say the least, this is most amazing conduct on the part of a leader of a country, unparalleled perhaps in the annals of the world.

And now Mr. Nehru has declared we shall fight with lathis, if need be, but not seek the latest arms from elsewhere. This enemy of the bullock-cart



age has turned out to be a protagonist of that age, after all. (Gandhi! Thou shouldst be living at this hour to see the triumph of thy prophecy. Didst thou not say that Jawaharlal would speak thy language when thou art gone?) And so we are going to defend with lathis Sikkim and Bhutan which we have taken under our protection, following the American and British example? We follow the example of those we condemn outright, but make sure that we do not do so effectively! Incidentally this quest for modern arms was one of the reasons for the rift between the defence forces and the Defence Minister, the latter turning down the Defence forces' request. Perhaps Mr. Menon knew Mr. Nehru's mind about fighting with lathis. What on earth do we need modern arms for? In the first place we have no enemies—we who are surrounded by enemies are told that that we have no external enemies. In the second place, if any should dare to raise their heads we shall smash them with lathis. That can only be after the Chinese enter the plains of India, for who is going to fight them in the bitter cold of mountain tops? If after that we do not shout "Jawaharlal Nehru Zindabad," well, we deserve utter damnation.

Egoism has been running amok in India since 1920, egoism of the most ridiculous kind, and we have been applauding it. Despite the historic tragedy and holocaust of 1947, which was the direct result of Gandhi's egoism, we continued to applaud the egoism of his successor. Gandhi had India only where he could preach and to some extent practice his silly doctrines. Since then we became free and his successor has been strutting on the international stage with the same ego-centric megalomania. "To arms, to arms," cried Jinnah, when he heard the Cabinet Mission say they were determined to quit, and laid Gandhi's nonviolence low in a jiffy. His advice to his followers was beg, borrow or steal arms. They did and we realised the situation and capitulated.

We doubtless realise the hopeless situation in which Mr. Nehru has landed us. At least Mr. Nehru does and that is why there is no action to halt the Chinese advance into Ladakh or force back the Chinese from their positions of vantage on the northern border, and still being occupied them in Ladakh. We know nothing of the latest incursions. How can we? We realise the situation only when it becomes too desperate for words, when it stuns us into silence. And then it is too late to do anything to prevent our worst fears coming true.

#### TREATS OF RETIREMENT

And now for every one to see emerges the pompous, ridiculous figure of Mr. Nehru and some of us want him to confess his sins of omission and commission—his Himalayan blunders—and make himself the laughing stock of the world. And that too, for the sake of the country which has never figured in his calculations, even as it never figured in the calculations of his master, Gandhi. We want him to retire because he has been wrong from A to Z. Power-mad politicians do not retire. They

are driven out. Did Gandhi retire when he saw his failure crowned with the division of the country? He made Jawaharlal Nehru—"I know he is loyal to me"—Prime Minister and to make assurance doubly sure gave a majority to Sardar Patel in Nehru's Cabinet. (He called it "purity of the means.") The whole world may try to rush to help us but we are in vanity bound to refuse all offers. One reason, it is being said, why Messrs. Nehru and Menon are not anxious to defend the country—at least the barren, mountainous part of it, may be that they fear they will be obliging the USA and UK by doing so, and perhaps even fall into the laps of those untouchables.

There is no generosity in politics and despite threats of retirement which Mr. Nehru has been holding out since 1954—it is not a mere coincidence that the year marked the beginning of Chinese incursions—he is going to do nothing of the kind. Is it for sudden retirement that he has packed the Parliament, the Cabinet, the Ministry with those loyal to Mr. Nehru? The threats are aimed at the Chinese, as if to tell them: "I am the peerless and you would not find any of my successors half as good as I am and you should in your own interest keep me in power and not force me to quit." And they are aimed at those among his Congress followers who are beginning to think that the best thing he can do is to retire. His threats, by invoking their emotion of love and pity, can arrest the processes of thought starting in their brains. But for how long? By hiding the fact of Chinese aggression for five years, Nehru has prolonged the lease of life of his prime ministership by five years. A man who can go to that length to keep himself firm on the saddle is not the man to retire of his own accord. He can only thank God that his countrymen are too dense to realise the implications of his threats and acts, and hold on to office for all he is worth.

But the whirligig of time brings its own revenges and the process has at last begun of dissolution of the Congress for which Nehru like Gandhi has shown nothing but contempt. If its magic name does not bring success to its candidates—as was partially shown in the civic elections in U.P.—there would be a stampede out of it which will leave Mr. Nehru aghast to stew in the juice of his own making.

#### ATTENTION

Scholarships granted to Post-graduate students in Economics, who are able to undertake research in Free Economy from Libertarian point of view. Send full particulars of age, qualifications and occupation etc. to:

The Secretary,  
R. L. Foundation,  
Arya Bhuvan,  
Sandhurst Road, West,  
Bombay 4.

# Can India Be Defended ?

If India can be won by conquest or subversion, neutralist Asia will fall into the Communist camp. There's a way, if Nehru has the will

REGINALD HARGREAVES

**T**HERE is a saying in India that "Conquerors always come over the mountains." With the brutal conquest of Tibet, Communist imperialism is poised and ready to exploit the softening up to which it has subjected India almost from the day it achieved its independence in 1947.

Ahmed Din, one of the country's leading Socialists, long since warned: "Tibet is being prepared as a military base for a military-political offensive against India. Roads are being built linking Tibet with China as well as the Soviet Union, thus making army movements easier. Aerodromes are being built hastily so close to India that Delhi is within easy bombing distance. Hindi is being taught to Chinese soldiers in Tibet; Communist agents are working in our midst in the guise of Buddhist monks." He might well have added that organizations long established on the Tibetan-Indian frontier, such as the Commercial Academy and the Border Affairs Office, have been utilized as training schools for agents and infiltrators, who have penetrated not only India but the neighbouring States of Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan.

With Tibet overrun if not yet pacified, Pandit Nehru must make up his mind whether he prefers to support Chou En-lai's "Five Principles of Panch Shila" (peaceful coexistence) by accepting the role of an Asian Grotewohl—and thereafter enjoy the sort of neighborly comradeship that Jonah experienced in the belly of the whale—or abandon his present state of degrading neutralism.

The defense of India does, of course, present many difficult problems. The country is enclosed north, east and west by a formidable barricade of mountains; but they are not impenetrable. In the east, Mao Tse-tung has constructed a highway to link up with the old Burmah Road, leading to the Brahmaputra Valley, through East Pakistan to Dinajpur and thence to Calcutta. The route out of Tibet by way of Tezpur is anything but easy going, as was painfully demonstrated by the time it took for the fugitive Dalai Lama to reach sanctuary. But this line of advance has the advantage of leading to Misamari with its invaluable railway and airstrip. Further west, in the northern marches of the Garwal District of Uttar Pradesh, Chinese troops have already penetrated the mountain barrier to occupy the valley outpost once manned by the Indian Army. There they are within less than 250 miles of Delhi, although difficult country separates them from the capital. Further west again, the Umassi Pass slices through the Himalayas less than 200 miles north of Lahore.

Since the Chinese have been at pains to construct airfields on the Tibetan flatlands, as close as pos-

sible to the mountain barrier, all the rich cities of the Gangetic Plain—Allahabad, Delhi, Lucknow, Benares and Cawnpore—lie within range of Communist bombers.

## INVASION ROUTES

Given Russian cooperation—covert or overt—the classic invasion route by way of the Khyber Pass would be open to any force based on Krasnovodsk, on the eastern shore of the Caspian Sea. There is also a difficult but not impossible route across the massif and passes of the Jamirs and Karakorams. Were Russian collaboration to go to the lengths of contributing a "volunteer" force of her own Mongolian auxiliaries, under nominal Chinese leadership, it would be possible to launch another invasion force—Korea fashion!—whose objective would be the Bolan Pass, below Quetta. The line of advance would be along the border separating Iran and Afghanistan. The latter is already riddled with Red agents, while Iran alone could oppose no serious opposition to a force advancing from Astara, on the southwestern corner of the Caspian.

All the approach routes cited pose movement and supply problems that the typical overburdened Western field force might well find insuperable. The Chinese soldier, like his Russian counterpart, can as Otto Skorzeny pointed out, "sleep without hurt in wringing wet clothes, and live on roots from the field, . . . as he can drink from marshes and shell holes, and subsist virtually without supply columns." His meager personal supplies and the ammunition he requires can be humped forward by a human chain of expendable peasants. This endows the Communist armies with a mobility it would be highly dangerous to underestimate.

Should Red China utilize Tibet as a stepping stone toward the attempted subjugation of India, even Nehru may be brought to realize that the power politics he affects to despise are nothing more nor less than the politics of not being overpowered. If that psychological *volte face* were followed to its logical conclusion, the world would be regaled with the unlooked-for spectacle of India's Prime Minister standing forth as the champion of armed resistance to Communist aggression.

To render such a stand even partially effective, however, Nehru would first have to reconcile the grave differences which have embittered relations between India and Pakistan ever since "the Separation." For without the cooperation and support of her neighbour, India could not hope to defend herself. Yet burying the hatchet would be anything but easy. Memory of the million slain and fourteen million uprooted and rendered homeless

# The Indian Libertarian

## Rationalist Supplement

---

---

### The International Congress of Freethinkers

(CONDENSED FROM ARTICLES BY COLIN McCALL AND CHARLES BRADLAUGH BONNER IN THE FREETHINKERS)

THE 33rd Congress of the World Union of Freethinkers took place in the Free University of Brussels from September 4th to 8th.

#### COMMON IDEAL

The International Congress is an assembly of men and women with a common ideal; an ideal that they think is the most important in the world; the liberation of the human mind. The Congress is a proclamation of the determination to fight superstition and supernaturalism, to eradicate religion from the minds of men; to destroy the power of the Churches and the priesthood and to assert the power of human reason to determine human destiny.

#### ORATORY

Andre Lorulot, speaking in front of the Ferrer memorial; his words uplifting as the symbolic statue itself, with its human figure, as it seems, thrusting the torch ever higher. Lorulot, best loved of French Freethinkers; self-educated, and now a great educator; loved as Chapman Cohen was in England; moving his audience—a vast crowd—Lorulot was at his magnificent best: the superb but sincere orator, who brought lumps into the throats of the audience but inspired them with the spirit of Ferrer and Freethought. Then Madame Sol Ferrer (daughter of the Spanish martyr), herself moved almost to tears, reading a greetings telegram from the Spanish Republican Minister of Justice in Exile in Domingo: speaking of the deep impression that the demonstration had made on her.

#### THE PROCESSION

The great procession was headed by President Charles Bradlaugh Bonner, flanked by Mme. Ferrer and her daughter, Dr. Olga Ferrer of Buffalo University, and followed by the General Committee of the World Union of Freethinkers.

Numerous Freethought and allied banners, and the Spanish Republican flag, were conspicuous as it moved off from the Place du Grand Sablon (traditional gathering point) and, after paying homage with dipped banners and a wreath to the outstanding Belgian Minister of State and Freethinker, Paul Janson (who died in 1913), passed through the Grand Place (the beautiful market square of Brussels) dipping flags again at the plaque to the 16th century martyrs to Philip II of Spain; then on to the Ferrer memorial itself.

Here wreaths were laid by the World Union of Freethinkers, the Belgian Federation, German Federation, German Freethought Youth and by the Anarchists. Then the speeches were delivered. The Rector, Dr. Henri Janne, philosopher and sociologist, welcomed the Congress saying that the University of Free Enquiry was happy to receive in its halls a Congress devoted to the quest of authentic truths, scientifically verifiable. Modern psychology, he went on, warns us to distinguish between reasoning and rationalisation; people commonly act according to their judgment as if these judgments were reasoned conclusions, whereas they are no more than beliefs with little investigated foundation. Nevertheless, such judgments serve to unite groups. Unless the judgments are to some degree sound the group will disappear. The duty of Freethinking is to extract the verifiable truth from the unsound trappings in which they may be wrapped. The Social Contract, as the sociologist sees it, is that he who denies any factor of the beliefs uniting a group by this quits the group. It is important that such dissent should be free. Hence Dr. Janne repudiated any claim to impose on the individual any form of belief, religious, political or social. The Free University of Brussels, established in 1834 has long maintained a struggle with the Roman Catholic Church, in the course of which

it has at times developed a fierce anti-clericalism. The aim of the Congress, said the President, was threefold: to commemorate the birth and assassination of Francisco Ferrer, martyred for his efforts to emancipate the children of Spain; to study the situation in the schools today as making for free and independent thinking; and lastly to learn from the lips of distinguished scientists to what extent humanity had been emancipated by scientific progress.

The first speaker was the granddaughter of Ferrer, Dr. Olga Ferrer, teacher of Spanish at the University of Buffalo, U.S.A., who analysed Ferrer's guiding principles. In the first decade of this century, scientific developments were still relatively slow, the penetration of ideas equally so, and the solidarity of the whole human race did not yet seem of importance; the political outlook was still dominated by that of a Liberal State based on the principles of the French Revolution and not overshadowed by systems of an all-powerful State. Ferrer had some presentiment of these problems and met them in his own way in the peculiar circumstances then reigning in Spain. It must be borne in mind that the Escuela Moderna of Barcelona was closed in 1906 and Ferrer, after a simulacrum of justice, was murdered in 1909, since when, in all Spanish educational centres, free enquiry has been extinguished. Ferrer's ideals were grounded on those of the philosophers of the 18th century and of the French Revolution of 1789; absorbed in his youth and crystallised during his 15 years in Paris. He held that to live a full life one should not be forgetful of the past, but should work for the future. Attracted by the philosophy of anarchism, he worked for a reduction of state interference and an increase in individual autonomy. The first and most important need was to raise the Spanish people from its profound ignorance; to teach the young to appreciate the beautiful, to love justice and to seek the verifiable truth. Among the unpublished works of Ferrer found recently by his daughter, Mme. Sol Ferrer, in the family home in Catalonia, is an outline of Principles of Rationalist Ethics which he composed while in prison in 1906-7. In this he foresees the destruction of the contemporaneous social state through the rapid development of scientific knowledge, bringing about a largely materialist outlook which would govern throughout the world all human relations. Rationalist Ethics must be based on a belief in the unity of the human race and must be opposed to all religious and political dogma which may produce schism; such a moral system must purge the human mind of all the poisons it has inherited from the past. In this alone lies the hope of a united world.

The second speaker "HemDay" warned his hearers against a too facile belief that today there may be greater liberty than when Ferrer was imprisoned and murdered; he then analysed Ferrer's thinking from an anarchist point of view, claiming

that he was of the same school as Proudhon, Godwin, Bakunin, Kropotkin and Reclus, with a belief that schools were a better mode of transforming society than were barricades and bombs.

Vice-President Lorulot, the third speaker, was one of the few—perhaps the only one—present who had known Ferrer personally; he recalled with emotion the day of 1909 when it was learned that Ferrer had been arrested and the shock of his death.

The first main study of the Congress, in line with the commemoration of Ferrer, who sought to establish schools without religious instruction and with an emphasis on science and scientific thinking, was to consider the situation of such independent thinking in schools the world over. Reports were read by Belgian, Dutch, French, Luxemburg and British experts with further information given in the national reports from New Zealand, Uruguay and Sweden. Where there is compulsory education, the school curriculum may be secular, i.e., without religious instruction or a religious assembly. The aim is then to form "free" men and women who can reach conviction by independent thinking.

The State schools may be secular; but subsidies may be given to sectarian schools. The State schools may offer non-sectarian religious teaching, as in England, or religious teaching of the dogmatic kind common in the country, as in Belgium; parents may withdraw their children from such religious instruction. This right of withdrawal is relatively little used today by Freethinkers, though taken advantage of by Jews, Roman Catholics, etc. State schools, nominally neutral in religious outlook, but dominated by a single sect, cease to be secular. Where there exist great educational institutions free of religious dogma, such as the Free University of Brussels, the whole outlook of the State schools tends to become emancipated.

In all countries, the religious institutions, the Churches, realising that with the spread of scientific knowledge and the increasingly swift application of science to everyday life, religious dogmas are becoming more and more out of touch with life, and are revealed in their true aspect of out-of-date superstitious speculation, are making tremendous efforts to obtain ever greater subsidies for sectarian schools and educational institutions, which are often combined with social activities, e.g., youth clubs, holiday camps, libraries, marriage advice bureaux, etc. For all these the Churches demand public money. By such means they hope to tighten their loosening grip on the minds of men. Where there are more sects than one, as in Great Britain and in Holland, a tug-of-war develops. In any case there is a social pressure in favour of some kind of religious conformism. As this may be largely sham, it may have a thoroughly bad influence on the children. Dominance of non-sectarian religious teaching leads mostly to disinterest in religion, if not to disgust, conscious or uncon-

scious. Dominance of sectarian teaching blocks critical thinking.

In most countries the Left-wing governments tend to adopt policies of appeasement towards the Church; they may have for many long years made repeated declarations in favour of secular schools, but in power, fearful of losing votes, apprehensive of the weight of religious political bodies these politicians rationalise, and cease to be rationalist.

The struggle to maintain the secular spirit of the State schools, and to oppose the demands of the Roman Church, is fiercest in France and Belgium. In New Zealand and Uruguay, the Catholic attack is least successful. Few of the reports really assessed the degree to which children are encouraged to think for themselves; it was taken for granted that, in a school without religious teaching, the children would have a maximum opportunity for independent thinking, which is not necessarily the case. Where the progressive forces are rallied in defence of the State schools as opposed to Catholic ones, the project of a rationalist school is looked on with disfavour. Where the State undertakes responsibility, in whole or in part, for schools with religious instruction either non-sectarian or sectarian, the project would gain State support automatically, if there were sufficient rationalist demand.

Generally in Western Europe, there would seem to be a marked retreat from the democratic and secularist principles of a century ago, to the great advantage financially, politically and socially, of the Churches. On the other hand, the spread of scientific knowledge and method has done much to undermine the authority of religious doctrine, so that the clerical gains are often more apparent than real.

On Saturday afternoon, the first public meeting was held in the Great Hall of the University. The first speaker was Mme. Jeanne Vandervelde, widow of the well-known Socialist leader in Belgium, Emile Vandervelde. There were not enough militant Freethinkers, she declared, far too many allowed themselves to be lulled into inertia or even conformity. The first duty of a good citizen was to cultivate impertinence; not to allow any reverence or veneration for the traditional or for common custom to silence his questioning nor his determination to obtain answer. Science was making the world ever more magnificent, but with the splendour there were terrible possibilities, to avoid which will require the best minds and clear knowledge of facts.

Professor Henri Laugier of the Sorbonne, former Assistant General Secretary of UNO, called on Freethinkers of all lands to rally together, for never had the liberty of the mind been so threatened as it was today. He warned his audience that this came in part from a false assurance of knowledge. Scientific advance was spreading ever faster and faster; the accumulation of factual knowledge be-

coming vaster and vaster. Attempts at popularisation of this knowledge were leading people to fancy they knew and understood things of which they had no proper knowledge or understanding. Once it had been possible for an encyclopaedic knowledge of facts and of methods to develop in the mind of a man; now this was becoming less and less possible. It was therefore necessary in the schools and universities to concentrate on the methods employed to arrive at a limited and circumscribed domain of facts. By encouraging independent thinking in such a small area the student should learn to apply his mind to other problems in a free and independent manner.

Professor George Homes, emphasised the need of the research worker in science for liberty; he must be freed from military, political and religious interference. Today he could obtain large sums of money for any scheme which was thought to have military value or to produce results redounding to the credit of the government in competition with some other country; but if he tried to obtain finance for any other sort of research, he could fritter away hours filling up forms and not get a five pound note unless he was a member of the right Church in the right sort of institution.

Sunday morning the Ferrer Commemoration Cortege provided a contrast which was as successful and impressive as anything we have had in recent congresses. It was preceded by a vanguard holding aloft a "calico" bearing in huge letters "Congrès International de la Libre Pensée, 1959"; then came the silken banner of the Belgian Federation flanked by stalwarts carrying sheaves of flowers to be placed, one on the monument to Paul Janson, the other on Ferrer's monument. Looking back I could see the procession, band and banners, winding its way out of the streets of central Brussels, some 600 yards in length, sometimes more and sometimes compressed to less by the helpful police. The sun shone brilliantly; all Brussels was beflagged. As we came into the great square and halted at the plaque to Egmont and Hoorn, the tourist multitude left their aperitifs and grabbed their cameras. Two coachloads of German Freethinkers were waiting for us by Ferrer's monument. At appropriate moments the trumpeters sounded their calls. After the speeches, the band played the Marseillaise most effectively and affectingly.

Prof. de Brouckere, said that the miracles of science throw those of the Bible into the shade; and men must free their minds of out-of-date rubbish and face up to the terrifying problems of today with unprejudiced minds if they wish to discover valid solutions.

Prof. J. M. Romein, History professor of Amsterdam University and UNESCO expert, followed, speaking in English. The human mind, he pointed out, has been dominated by three sets of influences, religious, political and social. The students of Natural Science began the emancipation of their studies from religious influence in the 16th and

17th centuries. Thanks to the freedom they gained, Natural Science was able to make immense progress in the following centuries. Nineteenth century liberalism allowed a relaxation of political influences; but political and social factors still hamper the progress of knowledge and thought. It is then the duty of the Freethinker to make men of science clearly aware of the influences under which they work, and hence to emancipate themselves so that Churches cannot fetter them, nor state dictate to them, nor social divisions hamper them.

The psychological equilibrium of the men today was Professor Ernest Kahane's subject; and he made of it a most moving plea for the freedom of the mind, a remarkable feat of oratory. "Confronted by the unknown, to which I deny the title of unknowable. I shall keep my mind free; between the known and the unknown there is continuity, as between the past, the present and the future. The future is soon the present and awaits its turn to become the past. What I do not know today is not of any other quality than what I know; it is potential knowledge. Serene in this certainty, in untroubled peace of heart and mind, I maintain the free working of thought which accepts no hindrance from any man.

The resolutions submitted by the Resolutions Committee were passed unanimously and were as follows:—

That the educational principles of Ferrer are more vital than ever and should inspire an active demand in all countries to further them, emancipating and reviving education.

The Congress expressed its sympathy with the Spanish people still under the heel of a clerico-fascist tyranny.

That the Congress considers sectarian schools produce a spirit of division and opposition among men from their early youth and that completely secular schools are alone capable of uniting men in a spirit of liberty, tolerance and brotherhood. The rights of children, still rarely observed, must be recognised and fought for.

That the Congress congratulates itself on having heard the addresses of such eminent scientists of several countries and disciplines, and declares its opinion that science and the scientific method have ever been, throughout the ages, the essential element in the progressive evolution of man-kind, and remain the chief weapon in the struggle with obscurantism in all its forms. In view of the prodigious developments in recent years of technical science, the Congress expressed the hope that these would give rise in the near future to a world in which mankind, living in peace, freedom and justice might make parallel progress towards its full evolution.

## FOR A NEW HUMANIST MANIFESTO

The International Humanist and Ethical Union had asked member organizations to prepare drafts for a new Humanist Manifesto, to be submitted to the next International Congress. The following is part of the text submitted by the BEU, and is here quoted from *News and Notes*, published by the International Humanist and Ethical Union.

"Humanists derive all their ideas of nature and of man ultimately from sense experience, that is to say, from the empirical sciences—exclusively. The distinctiveness of their position here is in the exclusiveness of their reliance on the sciences for public knowledge. This exclusiveness has mainly two meanings: (1) rejection of sacred scriptures, immemorial traditions, special revelations, and personal intuitions as an independent source of public knowledge; (2) rejection of the idea of an ultimate reality behind nature (God, Brahma, Absolute Being), not because such a belief can be disproved, but because it is a kind of treason to humanity to abandon allegiance to reason and court ideas that are not required by reason and themselves create embarrassing difficulties for reason."

## A SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE OF MIND

In a recently published high school text book, Dr. A. D. Graves, Professor of Education at the Humbolt state College, Arcata, Calif; lists the characteristics of one who possesses a truly scientific attitude.

1. He has an inquiring turn of mind; he wants to know the what, who, why, and the how of things.
2. He holds his conclusions subjects to revision in the light of new evidence.
3. His judgment are unprejudiced and impersonal.
4. He is careful and accurate in what he does.
5. He is free from dogma and superstition.
6. He is tolerant towards new ideas.
7. He plans before he executes.
8. He distinguishes between fact and opinion.
9. He respects the judgment of experts.
10. He appreciates the value of science in living.
11. He grows in the ability to do critical thinking.
12. He developes wholesome intellectual interests which lead to desirable use of leisure time.

My atheism, like that of Spinoza, is true piety towards the universe and denies only gods fashioned by men in their own image, to be servants of their human interests.—George Santayana

at the time of "the Separation" dies remarkably hard. Furthermore, Nehru's intransigence over the plebiscite ordered by the UN to determine Kashmir's future makes reasonable agreement on the problem of accessibility to the waters of the Indus difficult in the extreme.

Should Red China decide to invade India, its armies would have to move through a few relatively narrow mountain passes. These offer innumerable vantage points to defence forces based on Peshawar, Lahore and Rawalpindi, and therefore enjoying far greater axial lines of communication than those to which the would-be invader would be committed. Laterally, however, the defensive communications system leaves a great deal to be desired. Were Indian troops drawn off to a secondary front by a successful feint, it would be extremely difficult to switch them to the crucial theater in time for them usefully to intervene. This would also apply to a central reserve, always providing it were possible to build one up with the troops available and still allocate sufficient forces to ensure internal security—particularly in Communist Kerala and deeply suspect Calcutta. For the material resources available to maintain their forces are extremely limited, both in India and Pakistan.

With "the Separation," the Indian Army was divided, with fifteen infantry regiments, of two battalions, going to India and eight to Pakistan; with artillery and other ancillary arms in proportion. In addition, India took over six of the ten double-battalion Gurkha regiments. The Indian Army Command could mobilize up to half a million men and several air squadrons. Pakistan could add 150,000 partially mechanized ground troops, and an Air Force flying a certain number of Sabrejets.

No one who fought with or alongside the old Indian Army can harbor any doubt as to the fine fighting quality of the rank and file, but the High Command, both in India and Pakistan, is without experience in war organization and direction. Moreover, in a land so stratified by caste and tainted by Communist penetration, the lack of a sense of national unity would enormously handicap an alliance in which the partners already eyed each other warily.

In any case such limited forces, with monetary and industrial resources entirely inadequate even to peacetime needs, could not hope by themselves to hold off a prolonged, all-out Communist offensive. Ultimate salvation would have to come from outside. Nehru, of course, has always scorned to associate himself with such defence structures as the Baghdad Pact and SEATO. Pakistan, on the other hand, as a member of the Northern Tier alliance of Britain, Turkey and Iran, might be the medium through which vital aid in men and supplies could be funnelled.

#### COMMUNIST SUBVERSION

India's vociferous Congress Party repudiated not only British coercion and use of force, but all co-

ercion and all force. It objected not only to foreign entanglements imposed by the British, but to all foreign entanglements. In effect, its attitude was based upon the extraordinary belief that, once the British had departed, India could opt out of this sordid, contaminating world altogether. The endeavor to live up to this bubble-borne belief created a political vacuum of which Communist imperialism was swift to take advantage.

The Communist grip on rural co-operatives and village councils has grown steadily. Despite heavy U.S. subsidies to help expand its industrial potential, India remains a land of small village communities. The ryots, the impoverished peasant-cultivators, make up 80 per cent of the population. The average ryot, of a political naivete bordering on the infantile, is a positive gift to the Red propagandist. A similar susceptibility characterizes India's sixty Million "untouchables," whose miserable lot has, if possible, deteriorated under the Congress Party's regime of inflexible caste privilege.

The new chauvinism's shrill, intoxicating slogans were consistently employed as camouflage to disguise the Reds' real intentions, until even Nehru was forced to concede that "Communism invariably succeeds in India when it is allied to nationalism." It was not until 1957, however, that the politically myopic Prime Minister lugubriously revealed that a whole decade earlier, at a secret conclave of the Calcutta Communist Conference, it had been determined to bend every effort to impose Communism, tricked out as nationalism, on India, Burma, Malaya and Indonesia. By 1957 the steady progress of the Reds' campaign was self-evident. A series of Communist risings, lasting from 1947 to 1950, had culminated in the open dedication of the state of Kerala to the doctrines of Marx and Lenin. This territory, with its population of 13,600,000 constitutes a subversive corner on India's western seaboard; it would form an important link in any Sino-Russian drive first to isolate and then to conquer India.

India is the linchpin which holds together the whole precarious spikikin structure of the "neutralist" or "uncommitted" East. There are 450 million non-Sino Asiatics dwelling in the lands contiguous to India. Since their political destiny cannot be separated from that of their bigger neighbor, the fate achieved by, or inflicted upon, the sub-continent's 400 million inhabitants will inevitably be theirs also. And Red China stands massed on India's frontiers.

Although Nehru would hesitate to call on representatives of the race that jailed him for a total of thirteen years, still India could not be left to defeat before the trampling legions of Communist imperialism. For the weakness at the root of one state, once it spreads, can involve the whole world in tribulation.

Neither would subjugation of the Southeast Asia massif put a period to Communism's triumph. Mao's China has no navy; but "volunteer" subma-

*(Continued on page 12)*



# Russia Scales the Himalayas

Soviet policy is aimed at reducing Indian Influence in Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan

By A. R. Field

**A** NEW POLITICAL factor has been introduced into the sub-Himalayan region which can have unforeseeable effects upon India's search for security. The Kingdom of Nepal has gradually increased its diplomatic relations with a whole range of nations besides India. Nepal has obtained recognition from the United Arab Republic, Ceylon, France, Switzerland, Japan, Communist China, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. Hitherto all countries except Britain and India maintained dual diplomatic representation through New Delhi, supplemented by occasional visits to Khatmandu, the Nepalese capital.

In spite of Indian attempts to have all foreign representation operate through New Delhi, the Soviet Union has been the first nation to by-pass the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and reach direct agreement with the Nepalese Government to establish an embassy in Nepal. Soviet diplomatic moves have been relatively rapid. This seems to indicate that an overall Soviet policy has been prepared for the general Himalayan region. Russia would not lightly ignore Indian feelings in an area of vital strategic concern to New Delhi unless there were such a policy in existence.

On February 10, 1958, King Mahendra of Nepal accepted an invitation to visit the Soviet Union. No immediate date was set for the visit. India had been influential in delaying a prior state visit by the King to the U.S. The following May Khatmandu announced that the King and Queen would visit New Delhi on June 2, and after a two-day stopover there, they left by Soviet jet airliner for Moscow.

In December 1958, the Soviet Ambassador in New Delhi, Panteleimon K. Ponomarenko, spent 10 days in the Nepalese capital conferring with the King and his Council of Ministers. Shortly after the Russian's departure, Ellsworth Bunker, the U.S. Ambassador to India and Nepal, spent

*(Continued from page II)*

rines under the Red flag, with a token Chinese crew and unlimited Russian "advisers," could turn the Indian Ocean into a Communist lake. This would not only seal off the Suez Canal and stop all oil shipments from the Persian Gulf, but disastrously outflank America's whole system of Pacific defence, while writing off Australia in the process.

Apart from the ethical consideration that "to be neutral between right and wrong is to serve wrong," enlightened self-interest would counsel the West to cease regarding India and Southwest Asia as nothing more than an ever-extended begging bowl, and to start thinking about it as potentially the most vital, as well as easily the most likely, scene of "brush fire warfare" in the world today.

—National Review

six days in Khatmandu. On February 12, 1959, a team of 12 Soviet technicians arrived in Khatmandu. The Soviet Union hoped to sign a treaty of economic aid and cooperation with Nepal before the first all-Nepal general elections, which were scheduled to begin on February 18 and be completed on April 3. It was actually signed on April 24.

Under the terms of this agreement, Nepal is to receive an outright gift of 30 million rubles (\$3 million). Nepal is also to receive at no cost: a hydro-electric power plant, a sugar mill, a cigarette factory and a hospital. Soviet technicians will execute this program and a series of road surveys are to be undertaken. The only request the Soviet Union made in exchange for this "aid" was to seek permission to open an embassy in Katmandu. Moscow then replaced its ambassador to New Delhi. Indian ire had precluded the usefulness of any diplomatic mission which continued to be led by Ponomarenko. At this juncture, Rishikesh Shah, Nepalese delegate at the United Nations, was accredited as ambassador to the U.S.

It is becoming increasingly clear that Nepalese foreign policy decisions will be made less in New Delhi, as was done in the past, and more in Khatmandu. Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, during his June visit to Nepal, was said to have told the King, "Make new friends, but for God's sake do not forget your old ones." King Mahendra is scheduled to make a state visit to the U.S. next spring. Relations between the Soviet Union and India have become increasingly strained. Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev tendered a personal invitation to Nehru to visit Moscow. This was construed as an attempt to allay Indian concern regarding Soviet Russia's entry into the Himalayas. The invitation was politely but firmly refused.

The Soviet Union may be acting for Communist China, which desires direct representation in Nepal but has hesitated to alarm India by such a move. Ever since Communist China moved into Tibet and transformed India's northern frontier from a static to a dynamic arena, observers have been aware of the possibility of subversion. The social economy of the Himalayas with the rhythmic flow from North to South and back again appears to lend itself to such a purpose. Friendly contacts between related segments of populations on both sides of the frontier could be used as an instrument of state policy by whichever side managed to capture the imagination of these people.

There is, however, another possibility. Ever since Prithvi Narayan Shah captured Khatmandu Valley in 1769, there has been a steady eastward flow of sub-Himalayan peoples. The Gurkhas organized a military aristocracy and conquered Sikkim in the East, Kangra and Garhwal in the West, and moved against Tibet in the North. A Chinese



Emperor was forced to organize an army and send it over the Himalayas to check Gurkha expansion in 1792. Then the British met the Nepalese head on in a southern war which lasted from 1814 to 1816. It took the best the British had to prevent the Nepalese from taking the whole of the Terai. British respect for the fighting qualities of the Nepalese dates from this period. To this day, elite battalions of Gurkha Rifles are maintained by both the British and Indian armies.

It is possible that the Soviet Union plans to exploit these people, who are already south of the main Himalayan snowcrests and far beyond the borders of Nepal. The British stimulated the migration of Nepalese eastward, and have on several past occasions used them for Imperial Himalayan activities.

Adequate population statistics are not available for the whole of India's strategic northeast, outside of perhaps Nepal, and to a lesser degree Sikkim. The Nepalese are the predominant population in Sikkim and very likely in Western Bhutan. They are the tea plantation workers in Assam, and compose the great majority of troops which the Indian Government is using to hold the McMahon Line across Upper Assam. Colonies of Nepalese are found as far east as the Northwestern sector of the Kachin State of Burma.

The first modern all-Nepal census report completed and released in 1955 places the population at roughly 8.43 million. The estimated annual rate of increase is 2.5 per cent. Sikkim's population is around 175,000—137,700 immigrant Nepalese, 9,000 members of the Tibetan ruling class and 30,000 Lepchas who extend over into adjoining areas. Bhutan's population is placed at about 600,000. The majority of the population occupies the valleys of Ha, Pharo and Punakha, which constitute Western Bhutan. Lay education is carried on in the Nepali language in Bhutan. In fact, Nepali is the lingua franca of a goodly part of the Himalayan region. There are at least 10,000 Nepalese in Tibet, including the offspring of mixed Tibeto-Nepalese marriages.

Unfortunately, and perhaps unavoidably, the Indian Government, in its search for security, has on many occasions run roughshod over the growing nationalist feelings of the Nepalese and other Himalayan peoples. The Indians have faced violent outbursts of antagonism from the Nepalese. Even in the mountainous country of the North East Frontier Agency of Upper Assam, traditional ill-will is still manifested by tribes for past exploitation by the Indian traders of the Brahmaputra valley. This is one of the reasons why Indian citizens are not permitted to travel beyond the Inner Line of Assam without a special permit.

When Nehru returned from his September 1958 visit to Bhutan, he admitted that the Bhutanese were not too happy about receiving Indian aid. Sikkimese semi-independence was all but blotted out when India placed a protectorate over that country in 1950. The one thing that has held anti-Indian feelings in check in the general Himalayan area has

been the growing fear of Communist China. Nehru has frequently stated that any attack on Nepal, Sikkim or Bhutan would be considered an attack against India. Any large-scale operations that the Indian Army might in the future have to undertake in the hill country, without the aid of these hill peoples, would be difficult indeed.

How might Soviet policy unfold? Will it be necessary initially to stimulate the growth of the very small, and to date ineffective, Nepalese Communist party? The Soviet Union actually does not need subversion. All the Russians have to do is to stimulate and support Nepalese nationalism, raise the slogan of "The Greater Nepal Movement" and return the irrendentist lands to Nepal which the British took away in 1816.

An exploding Nepalese population has been locked in the mostly mountainous region of Nepal for over 140 years. Nepalese farmers have had to relocate as far east as Burma rather than southward into the adjoining plains of India, sections of which in the past were cultivated by Nepalese peasantry. The scarcity of agrarian lands and an outmoded system of land tenure have forced many hillmen to enter foreign service as mercenaries. A Greater Nepal Movement is perhaps the one factor that could unite every Nepalese—Hindu and Buddhist, Communist and non-Communist alike, whether he be Limbu, Magar, Gurung, Newar or Tamang—behind King Mahendra, the direct lineal descendant of Prithvi Narayan Shah. No doubt Soviet planners are aware of this fact.

Sino-Soviet foreign policy appears to be synchronized in the general Himalaya region toward detaching or wooing this area away from India, and secondarily, from contact with the West. During the Soviet Ambassador's visit to Nepal in 1958, the Chinese sent a note to New Delhi suggesting the "redrawing of the two countries' boundaries after surveys and talks with neighbouring countries." India's reaction was given publicly on December 2, 1958: India's international border is well known; "it will not be subject to negotiations."

Since the Tibetan uprising in March 1959, the Chinese Communists have increased their pressure along India's northern frontiers. The first border attack by the Chinese was not against Nepal, Sikkim or Bhutan. It was directed against Indian-held territory.

The meaning of this maneuver cannot have been overlooked by any of the political leaders of the associated Himalayan states. India was pledged to go to war if any of their territories were attacked, but India was not going to war when its own territory was captured. Nehru informed the Indian Parliament on August 31st that "we hope this will be settled by discussions and conferences, and we do not propose to go to war."

But it is not just to the Chinese Communists, with their Tibetan slaughter and demands for boundary adjustments, that India must be alerted. It would appear that the Soviet Union has developed a general Himalayan policy which could conceivably turn Nepalese nationalism totally against India.

On December 11, 1958, Donald Wise, a reporter for the London Daily Express, filed a dispatch from the Tibetan border stating that "a quarter of a million Chinese, working under the direction of Russian rocket experts, are carpeting the roof of the world in Tibet with the deadliest pattern of missile launching pads facing the free world." The recent uprising in Tibet might not be wholly unrelated to this "rumor."

In terms of missile geopolitics, West Berlin is closer to Lhasa than many people realize. Because of gravitational anomalies and poor flying conditions over the Himalayas, established missile-launching sites would be a very difficult target to obliterate. The eastward rotation of the earth on its axis would have the effect of shortening the trajectory of any Soviet missiles that might be launched westward, thus, bringing potential European targets within closer range. Sino-Soviet cooperation on ICBM launching pads in Tibet could in time dominate all of Western Europe, North Africa, Western Asia, the Western Pacific area and most of China. This is an eventuality that Western military planners cannot afford to overlook.

On August 13, 1959, members of the Indian Parliament queried Prime Minister Nehru regarding a secret plan of China "to constitute a federation of the Himalyan border states of Sikkim, Bhutan and Ladakh." The Dalai Lama issued a statement from his refuge in India to the effect that there are now "more Chinese in Tibet" than there are Tibetans.

The extermination of the Tibetan people and the attachment of the whole of the Himalayas to China would secure missile sites from sabotage by an unfriendly civil population and would control all southern approaches to such sites. This could not be accomplished without the active assistance of the Soviet Union. China does not have enough trucks to maintain and supply an ever-increasing army in Tibet, and so must depend, at least in part, upon the assistance of Soviet transport.

Prime Minister Nehru is trapped in a dilemma—how to secure India's frontiers without giving up his policy of "neutrality" and actively entering into a defensive alliance with the West. There is a partial answer to this dilemma, by which the Indian Government could blunt Sino-Soviet moves in the Himalayas. By a high act of statecraft, India could return all irredentist territory, including Sikkim, to Nepalese jurisdiction.

There is both British and Indian precedent for such action. In 1860, the British Indian Government returned to Nepal the lowland between the Kali and the Rapti rivers, plus the land between the Rapti and the district of Gorakhpur. India returned Dewangiri to Bhutan in 1949. India also returned a small parcel of land to West Tibetan jurisdiction in 1950.

Such a move by India would place a stronger, viable state between India and China. A strong ally, rather than a resentful satellite, would be to

India's advantage. Traditional Himalayan politics, which the British interdicted by maintaining Sikkim as a buffer between Nepal and Bhutan, would be revived. An Indian policy of this kind could very well be made contingent upon the withdrawal of the Chinese Communists from Tibet.

The stage would then be set for the establishment of a Himalayan Confederacy (as suggested by China) composed of Greater Nepal, Bhutan and Tibet. In the jargon of the Sino-Soviet world, "an area for peace" would thus be created. A treaty guaranteeing the absolute neutrality of such a Himalayan Confederacy might well be negotiated between all interested parties. Chinese failure to accept such a plan would turn the rising tide of nationalism in this area totally against her.

On the other hand, China's acceptance of such an Indian proposal would leave India free to devote her efforts to the economic betterment of her people. The Chinese Communists would be freed of any suspicion of "Western imperialist" counteraction in Tibet. Such an arrangement would even contain an element of security for the Soviet Union, for a large neutral buffer would be created between the southern marches of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic.

—The New Leader

## STATE OWNERSHIP IS A FAILURE

### Mr. Shroff's View

Mr. A. D. Shroff urged the need for free enterprise to function within socially desirable State regulations for eliminating poverty from the country and bringing about prosperity for all within a democratic framework.

Mr. Shroff, who was presiding over a general body meeting of the Forum of Free Enterprise, said that experience in European countries had shown that State ownership as advocated by Socialists and Communists was a failure. He stated that Socialism and Communism led to economic feudalism and, therefore, in the cause of democracy, "the people should give a decent burial to Socialistic, communism and other collectivist manifestations of a bygone era."

### STATE TRADING

He said that the State Trading Corporation had harmed the national economy "by its bureaucratic interference in established channels of trade." He warned against State trading in food grains and said, "It will mean State controls right from the farm to the retail shop in the remotest village."

Warning against further expansion of the State Trading Corporation, he said that "its presence in the national economy cannot be dismissed lightly as that of one more bureaucratic corporation in which Chota Hitlers thrive on the tax-payers' money."

Mr. Shroff warned the country against joint cooperative farming which, he said, would be nothing but Soviet model collectives introduced by the backdoor.

# The Meaning of Alienation--II

By Daniel Bell

(Besing some Notes along the Quest for the historical Marx. The first essay in the series appeared in the previous issue.)

THE goal of man for Hegel, as for Marx, was freedom—a state where man would be self-willed,<sup>1</sup> in which his essence would become his own possession. In the "kingdom of freedom", man would overcome necessity and alienation. Man would no longer be bound by the Promethean thongs of necessity, (i.e., the dependence on nature and its limitations), or be cloven by the Orphic separateness of alienation (the radical dissociation of the self into a subject that strives to control his own fate, and an object who is manipulated by others). Science might show us how to master nature, but how was one to overcome the radical separateness of subject and object?

Bruno Bauer, one of the first teachers and friends of Marx, felt that the answer lay in developing a "critical" philosophy which exposed the "mystery" of human relationships—the real motives behind the social acts—in order to create self-consciousness. Most human beings born into the world, said Bauer, simply accept it and are oblivious to the sources of their morals and beliefs, or of their rationality. By subjecting all beliefs to criticism, and making men self-conscious, reason would be restored to them, and therewith their self-possession.

Feuerbach, to whom Marx at first gave credit for making the real breach in Hegelian abstractions, sought to locate the sources of alienation in reli-

1. The most recent interesting discussion of the thought of young Marx can be found in the study by Hannah Arende, *The Human Condition*, (University of Chicago Press, 1958). There is also a comprehensive exposition of the early view of Marx in the unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard 1957) by Robert W. Tucker entitled *The Self and Revolution: A Moral Critique of Marx*, and I am indebted to Mr. Tucker for many insights. A more orthodox discussion of the early manuscripts can be found in Herbert Marcuse's *Reason and Revolution*, (Oxford University Press, 1941). A useful, if overly simple exposition of Marx's writings before *The Communist Manifesto* can be found in H. P. Adam's, *Karl Marx in His Early Writings*, (Allen and Unwin, London, 1940). The most ambitious attempt in recent years to reconstruct the works of the early Marx from a Communist point of view is made by August Cornu, *Karl Marx et Friedrich Engels. I Les Annees d'enfance et de Jeunesse. II La gauche hegelienne* (Presses Universitaire de France Paris, 1955). There is also, from a Catholic point of view, the work by Pere Jean-Yves Calvez, *La Pensee de Karl Marx* (edition du Sueil, Paris, 1956).

gious superstition and fetishism. Man took the best of himself, his sensibility, and projected it on to some external object or spirit which he called divine. The solution for alienation was to bring the divine back into man, and so reintegrate himself through a religion of humanity, not of God, and through a religion of self-love.

## BREAK IN HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Feuerbach, the most radical of all the left-Hegelians, called himself Luther II. Man would be free, he said, if we could demythologize religion. The history of all thought was a history of progressive disenchantment, and if, finally, in Christianity, God had been transformed from a local river deity to a universal abstraction, the function of criticism—using the radical tool of alienation, or self-estrangement—was to replace theology by anthropology,<sup>2</sup> to dethrone God and enthrone Man. Philosophy was to be directed to life, man was to be liberated from the "spectre of abstractions" and extricated from the thongs of the supernatural. Religion was only capable of creating "false consciousness". Philosophy would reveal "true consciousness". And by placing Man, rather than God, at the centre of consciousness, he would bring the "infinite into the finite".

This uncompromising attack on religion was a sharp attack on established institutions. But beyond that, the use of the concept of alienation itself had more radical consequences for it initiated a direct break in the history of philosophy, ushering in, as it did, the period of modernity. In classical philosophy, the ideal man was the contemplative one. Neither the middle ages nor the transitional period to contemporary times (the 17th to 19th century) was ever wholly able to detach itself from the ideal of the Stoa. Even Goethe, who gives us the first modern man in Faust, the man of ambition unchained, in his ethical image of the human

2. In an important sense, Feuerbach's view was the same as of the founder of anthropology, the study of man. Nineteenth century Science, with its evolutionary bias, felt that by studying the past or the primitive, who was seen as a relic of the past, one could uncover in the 'simpler societies' the real nature of man. Hence the turn to primitive society by anthropology as the study of man. Feuerbach, who saw human relations in "I-Thou" terms, was a key source for Martin Buber; and his idea of self-love anticipates the psychoanalytic humanism of Erich Fromm.

ideal reverted to the Greek. In discussing freedom, however, Hegel introduced a new principle, the principle of action, for man, in order to realize his self, had to actively overcome the subject-object dualism. In action a man finds himself; by his choices he defines his character. For Hegel, however, the principle of action remains abstract. In Feuerbach, alienation was a principle of generic Man. In Marx, action is given specificity in a radical new emphasis on work. Man becomes man through work: through work man loses his isolation and learns to become a social or cooperative being; through work he is able to transform nature.

In locating man's alienation in work, Marx had taken the revolutionary step of grounding philosophy in concrete human activity. The steps by which he "freed himself" from the tyranny of abstraction was a long and difficult one. As an Hegelian, Marx first thought of the alienation of work in terms of the idealistic dualities. Man, in working, reifies himself in objective things. This is labour (Arbeit) and is part of "an alien and hostile world standing over against him." Labour is driven, (*nicht freiwillig*). In labour, man is "under the domination, compulsion, and yoke of another man." In a state of freedom, however, man would transform nature himself, by free, conscious, spontaneous, creative work. But what stood in the way of achieving this freedom? The fact that in the alienation of work man lost control of the process of work and of the product of his labour. For Marx, the source of alienation lay in the property system whereby man sold his labour power and someone else appropriated it. In the organization of work—in labour becoming a commodity—man became an object used by others, and unable, therefore, to obtain satisfaction in his own activity; and by becoming a commodity, he lost his sense of identity; he lost the sense of himself.

### ALIENATION AND PROPERTY SYSTEM

The extraordinary thing was Marx had taken a concept which German philosophy had seen as an ontological fact<sup>3</sup> and given it a social content. As ontology, as an ultimate, man could only accept alienation. As a social fact, rooted in a specific system of historical relations, alienation could be overcome by changing the social system. But in narrowing the concept, however, Marx ran two risks: of falsely identifying the source of alienation only in the property system; and of introducing a note of utopianism in the idea that once the system was

3. And, at the other extreme Kierkegaard had taken the concept and given it a religious content. Thus alienation became universalized as a pervasive condition of man which, if understood, showed the world as completely *absurd*, since man, by rational act, could never overcome the subject-object dualism. Thus Kierkegaard introduced a thread of pessimism in the idea which held man to be completely bound. It is through Kierkegaard that the idea of alienation found its way into contemporary existentialism and literary discussion.

abolished, man would immediately be free.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, both risks proved hazardous, and the "vulgar" implications were drawn by Marx's followers.

The question why men were propertyless turned Marx to economics. For a man whose name is so linked with the "dismal science," Marx was never really interested in economics. His correspondence with Engels, in later years, is studded with contemptuous references to the subject (at one time he referred to the "economic filth"), and he resented the fact that his detailed explorations into the economic mechanisms of society prevented him from carrying on other studies. But he continued, because for him economics was the practical side of philosophy—it would unveil the mystery of alienation—and for him the categories of political economy, principally the concept of exploitation became the material expression of that alienation.

This is seen most clearly in the studies written in 1844, when Marx was twenty-six, called the Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts. The Manuscripts was an "anthropology," a discussion of the nature of man. But it is, in the history of Marxist thought, a key document for it represents the bridge from left-Hegelians to the Marxism we have come to know. In it one finds the first conception of alienation as the nature of reality—an obsession that led him to incorporate, in the very tissue and marrow of his plays, a great deal of specifically theoretical speculation about the nature of human personality, the elusiveness of all objective truth, the war to the death between the maddening

4. The abolition of private property, however, as Robert Tucker points out, does not, for the early Marx, usher in the state of human freedom. The abolition of private property produces only "unthinking" or "raw" Communism.

Marx clearly drew much of his notions about Communism from Proudhon's great study, *What is Property*. In his sketch of history, Proudhon drew a three stage picture of evolution: in the first, man lived in primitive Communism sharing equally all women and all means of production, in the second, the stage of private property, powerful individuals were able, by theft, to appropriate communal property for private use; in the third, higher stage, there would be individual ownership but cooperative work.

In discussing Feuerbach, Marx points out that the negation of a negation is not, *per se*, an affirmation. Similarly, he said (in the *Manuscripts*), the abolition of private property, the negation of negation, would not produce human freedom—but "raw Communism". This type of Communism, he said "completely negates the personality of man". It expresses "envy and a desire to reduce all to a common level". It is "universal" envy constituted as power. Raw Communism, however, is to give way to true Communism as a "positive transcendence of private property" and to a positive humanism in which "man recognizes himself in a world he has himself made". He returns, therefore, to his "species character". He is no

inconstancy of life and the equally maddening immutability of the forms imposed on life.

If this were all, one could call unique in his work, however, the plays would never have been performed—except, perhaps, in the more solemn little outposts off Broadway—and would be remembered, if at all, only as inert clumps of pompous closet drama. But the greatest of his plays are, in point of fact, among the most dazzlingly eloquent, living, actable dramatic masterpieces of the 20th century. And this new volume of stories demonstrates beyond all argument that he was an equally vigorous and original writer of narrative prose.

In the main, the stories which translator Lily Duplaix chose for this book were written before Pirandello turned his daring and inventive hand to the theatre. Yet they are such fine examples of the short-story form—satiric, compassionate, shocking, at times even wildly slapstick—that it seems incredible so few of them have been allowed out before now, in any English version, from under the rock of unfashionable oblivion.

Pirandello was able to bring alive, with an unflinchingly bold, sure hand, every corner of the gallery of Sicilian and Italian life we find in these stories—not “slices of life,” in the naturalist-cum-realism sense, but complex images of men and women caught in their separate traps of cowardice, self-delusion, corrosive pomposity and deceit, of mistakes made in youth that become the stranglehold realities of a human being's middle years and drain old age of all dignity and the slightest hope. Though Pirandello began as a kind of Verga-esque Sicilian regionalist, making his own powerful use of the world of the peasants and the men of pro-

---

longer partial man, bound by class behaviour, but once again generic Man, transcending human self-alienation and “returning to himself”.

Twenty-five years later, when Marx was again forced to confront the question of the nature of the future society, in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, the image of two-stages of the future society again was involved. It is clear, in this context, that when he spoke of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” as the “immediate transitional stage”, is was for him “raw Communism” that would be superseded by the idyllic world of true Communism where each man would live “from each according to his means, and to each according to his needs”. And it seems equally clear that Lenin, in his distinction of two phases of society, in *State and Revolution*, was aware of Marx's meanings. The transitional stage was, for Lenin, too, a distasteful phase Chiding Edward Bernstein, who had called the action of the Paris Commune in reducing all wages to a common level as “naive, primitive, democracy”, Lenin said “Bernstein, fails completely to understand that, first of all, the transition from capitalism to socialism is impossible without ‘return’, in a measure, to ‘primitive democracy’”.

From the criteria established by both Marx and Lenin, one would have to say that present day Chinese society is one of the most mis-shapen products ever seen of “un-thinking” or “raw communism”.

perty at home, he was able to move beyond Verga's verismo, later, into the urban modern Italy of Rome with which Moravia has been so exclusively concerned.

With a few exceptions, like the soap-operatic “The Umbrella,” these stories are brilliantly free from the least blurring lapse into sentimentality. The life Pirandello makes final. It sees the future as constantly open, and man as constantly potential.

(Concluded)

---

## **NEWS DIGEST**

### **U.K. WILL ADVANCE INDIA 19M. POUNDS FACT TO BE SIGNED SOON**

New Delhi Nov. 21: A new agreement under which the British Government will advance about £19,000,000 credit to India under the Export Credit Guarantee Act is likely to be signed next week in London.

Details of this second British loan to India are understood to have been recently completed in London by officials of the Indian High Commission there with representatives of the British Treasury. It is expected that Smt. Pandit, the Indian High Commissioner in London, will sign the agreement on behalf of India.

This second British loan is most likely to follow the pattern set by the first line of credit given to the Government of India by the Export Credit Guarantee Department in the U.K. But an outstanding future of the new agreement is that steps will be taken by officials in London to quicken the pace of loan withdrawals by simplifying the process of handling.

### **ASSURANCE TO DELHI**

It appears that an assurance has been given to New Delhi that, if necessary, the Export Credit Guarantee Act may be amended to enable speedy withdrawals from the British loan. At present the process of reimbursement, generally followed in the utilisation of British credit, is fairly complicated in the case of private sector firms who have to furnish a number of documents to prove that the amounts in question were paid to British Firms.

In fact, the process has been so slow that it took almost a year for the first British loan of £20,500,000 to be utilised by the Government of India. Last withdrawals are reported to have been completed only in October this year.

The second loan too is expected to be divided into two parts, one for which repayment will be due after 10 years, and the other portion after a period of 20 years. It is expected that the first portion of the loan will carry an interest of 4-1/2 per cent. The 20-year portion of the loan will carry a slightly higher rate of interest.

Meanwhile, London reports say that an examination of India's credit needs in the Third Five-Year Plan is being carried out at the British Treasury

though a firm picture will emerge only after the Third Plan is formulated here in April or May next year.

### **INDIA SIGNS NEW DEAL FOR U.S. FARM PRODUCE**

Washington: A new agreement between India and U.S. for the purchase of American surplus agricultural commodities was signed here.

The amount involved is nearly 239 million dollars, including the cost of ocean transport estimated at 37.6 million dollars.

The U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Thomas C. Mann, who signed for the U.S., said the American people had "a deep and abiding interest in the territorial integrity of India and in the welfare and prosperity of its people."

This agreement has brought to 915,500,000 dollars the total value of U.S. surplus farm products sold to India since 1956 under the multi-billion-dollar surplus disposal programme. The products had cost the U.S. Government an estimated 1,325 million dollars. Most of the products had been acquired by the Government under price supports which were above market-values.

Eighty per cent of the funds generated in India from the sale of the surplus commodities will be retained in that country to help it speed its economic development.

Half of the retained funds will be in the form of long-term loans to India and the other half in the form of grants.

### **'ACCORD' AMOUNTS TO NO-WAR PACT AYUB ON INDO-PAK RELATIONS**

Karachi: President Field Marshal Ayub Khan expressed here his 'firm' opinion that it should not take much time for India and Pakistan to settle all their differences.

The President said there was no need for any "no war declaration" because once the two countries settled their disputes it could in "substance mean no war declaration".

### **GROWING CONCERN IN S.E. ASIA OVER 'CHINESE EXPANSIONISM'**

Colombo: Samar Guha, Secretary of the All-India Tibet Convention, told a press conference here today that countries of South-East Asia, especially those bordering China, felt growingly concerned over "Chinese expansionism".

Guha arrived here after a tour of Burma, Thailand, South Vietnam, Cambodia, Japan, Hong-kong, Phillipines, Indonesia, Malaya and Singapore as personal representative of the Indian Sarvodaya leader, Jaya Prakash Narayan.

Guha said that in all the countries he visited except Cambodia, he had received "overwhelming support" for the proposed Afro-Asian Conference on Tibet.

In Burma especially he was promised the fullest co-operation, and elder statesmen, irrespective of party affiliations, would be attending the forthcoming conference.

### **DR. PRASAD'S MESSAGE**

New Delhi. The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, in a message to the U.S. President, has welcomed the visit of Mr. Eisenhower to the country.

The following is the text of the message: "It has given me much pleasure to learn that you have been able to accept our invitation to visit India. My Government and the people of India have long been hoping for such a visit and are happy that they will have the opportunity of welcoming you and showing you their affection and regard."

### **JUSTICE PARTYMEN ALLOWED TO JOIN SWATANTRA PARTY**

Sivaganga: P. T. Rajan, MLC, leader of the Justice Party, and a former Minister of Madras, directed his partymen "to join the Swatantra Party, if they wanted to."

Rajan addressing the students of the R. D. Memorial College here, said, "Loyal Justice Partymen want my guidance regarding their joining the Swatantra Party. The Swatantra Party is an All-India party. Small and parochial parties will not have any place hereafter, unless they attach themselves to an All-India party."

### **PROFIT MOTIVE IN RED CHINA**

Red China is re-exporting on a large scale the coconut oil she has been buying from Ceylon. She has been making very heavy purchases of coconut oil in Colombo recently for the obvious purpose of trans-shipping it across European and West Asian ports to Communist countries at a higher price. It just shows that the "profit motive" is not a monopoly of Capitalism.

### **NEHRU SHOULD RESIGN H. V. KAMATH'S CALL**

Jabalpur: H. V. Kamath, PSP leader, suggested at a press conference here that Prime Minister Nehru should at least tender a token resignation of his cabinet on the issue of Sino-Indian Border dispute and call on the Congress Party to elect a fresh leader.

He also suggested that the nations who constituted Bandung conference in 1955 should be invited to meet under an extra ordinary situation to discuss China's aggression.

### **NATIONALISATION OF BANKS NOT ADVISABLE**

#### **A. K. SUBRAMANIAM AT ITWARI ROTARY**

Nagpur: A. K. Subramaniam, Branch Manager of Canara Bank Ltd., expressed his opinion here that the country did not need nationalisation of banks as they were already well controlled by the Reserve Bank of India and the funds required by the Government for planning and projects were adequately made available by them.

## Gleanings from the Press

### COMING ECONOMIC COLLAPSE?

Week in week out in India the index of wholesale prices, though highly imperfect, has been going up. The Governor of the Reserve Bank, Mr. H. V. R. Iengar has given a warning that the value of the Indian rupee had declined by 30%. And yet no appreciable attempt is being made to arrest the rising tide of cost of living. The Plan has become more important than human beings and money has to be created to finance the Plan, other means having dried up. Created money means inflation. Inflation means hardship to millions. This aspect of the problem does not worry either the Government or the Congress.

The attitude of apresnous deluge is very clearly evident in the rulers of the country. With their head in the skies they are debating whether the next five year plan should cost only a miserly Rs. 10,000 crores or the more generous Rs. 40,000 crores, while the poor subjects are getting poorer everyday with the purchasing power of the rupee dwindling fast. The much vaunted river valley projects have cost three times their original estimates but have not given even a third of the calculated return. Instead of flood protection, the Damodar Valley project has itself caused devastating floods. The Bhakra Dam is seriously imperilled. The Community Development Project has signally failed of its objective. To hide these glaring failures, three new devices have been set up before the people as the cure all for all our economic maladies—co-operative farming, ceiling on land and State trading in food grains. (The third one is practically still-born). Mr. Nehru is the Indian version of Sir Robert Walpole who brooked no rivals and preferred as his colleagues yesmen of small ability, to able men who might differ from him.

—'Behar Herald'

### NEHRU'S FANATICISM

No country strong enough to defend itself will allow such a large scale aggression within its borders as the Nehru Government have permitted the Chinese to accomplish. The Chinese themselves will attribute the easy walk-over they have so far had to Indian weakness, and so will the rest of the world. The credit belongs to the Prime Minister of having exposed his country to this humiliating plight.

His heroic talk of non-alignment ill befits one within whose administrative jurisdiction foreign troops have already stationed themselves. Non-alignment means that we will not take sides for or against this or that power bloc, the Eastern or the Western, or any member of either. Non-alignment became dead the moment China encroached on India

by force, and now when the Prime Minister speaks of non-alignment it is a dead body from which the life has gone that he hugs to his bosom. Or does he still want to continue to be non-aligned against China, in fantastic fanaticism for an outmoded nostrum, whatever fate the country may be driven to thereby?

A Government which has failed to resist aggression so far cannot be relied on to fulfil its promise to do so hereafter. Other reinforcements have to be sought. It is now military strength that counts and not spirited heroics or quantum of hortative wordage. The present defence anchorage of the country is far from promising as Mr. Nehru has till now put on superior airs against nations joining together in mutual self-defence, and even if now approached by him, the Western powers in their new anxiety for peace with the Soviet Union may not be over-anxious to embark on fresh commitments of a military nature for the good of India, forgetting past rebuffs.

—SWARAJYA.

## Letters to the Editor

Madam,

It is reliably understood here that Pakistan had recently sent a note to China demanding whether China dares to claim some part of territories in the Gilgit area, as allegedly shown in the Chinese map. Pat came the reply from the Red Dragon: "We don't", followed by a humble apology. This is in direct contrast to the humiliating way that China has been treating Indian protest notes even after committing aggression on the Indian frontiers. The reason is not far to seek. While Pak is in the good books of the Western bloc, especially the Americans who have equipped them with up-to-date arms consequent upon the honest foreign policy of the Pak government, India has completely isolated herself by persuing a pseudo-neutral morally arrogant and pro-Communist foreign policy thanks to our blind obsession with such abstractions like non-violence and non-alignment. One needs a high degree of philosophical imagination to think that any country in the modern world where Luniks and Vanguard have conquered the space that the isolated country can escape consequences of war in the neighbouring country. While Nehru has his head high-up in the air lost in what is euphemistically called "plan consciousness" our Himalayas are melting and our borders disappear. In short history is repeating itself. Therefore the only honest and practical course left to us is to align ourselves with the free democratic West particularly America which has both the goodwill and resources to offer to India. For, it is poor statesmanship indeed which refuses to engage in "cold war" when the



"hot war" itself is at our doorsteps. Will the leaders of our country wakeup in time?

NEW DELHI

—R. L. Kapoor.

Madam,

Prime Minister Nehru has again reiterated his faith in non-alignment in face of Chinese aggression, and his pronouncements on the virtue of non-alignment have been promptly hailed by his henchmen. One is amazed at the Prime Minister's obstinacy to review his foreign policy, especially after the bubble of bhai-bhaism has burst. All the political parties, perhaps with the solitary exception of the C.P.I., are united in their determination to throw out the aggressors. But it is wishful thinking to hope that we will be able to do so without taking military aid from the West in the shape of arms, ammunition, planes, tanks, military stores etc.; for, China is a formidable enemy and is armed to the teeth by the Russians.

It is naive to think that our sovereignty will be lost merely because we take arms aid from our Western friends who are willing to help us. During the American War of Independence the Americans received military aid from France, which materially helped them to fight their British masters. During World War II Russia did not hesitate to receive military aid from the Allies (capitalists) to resist German aggression.

Those who pretend that India's "moral prestige" is high in the world because we do not seek foreign military help have no sense of shame when our Finance Minister tours the foreign countries with a begging bowl for economic aid. Besides, if we take economic aid from the Americans in terms of dollars and spend them on military purposes, it would amount exactly to the same thing—taking military aid from America: So why should we not be a bit more honest with ourselves and ask America to give us military aid, when the security of our country is threatened? Ideological shibboleths

### 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: 80205 Telegram: LOTEWALLA

should not be given precedence over practical measures to defend the country.

AJMER

—M. C. Gandhi.

### MR. NEHRU'S DESIRE TO RETIRE

(The Prime Minister occasionally raises hope in the minds of the Indian public at the prospects of his resignation, but never makes up his mind to retire, leaving the people more disillusioned. We take the liberty of reproducing below a letter to the *Times of India*, written by Mr. Raja Hutheesingh, which is a fervent appeal to the Prime Minister to resign. We fully endorse Mr. Hutheesingh's appeal, which demand, we hope will be shared by the readers of "The Indian Libertarian.")

Sir,—Once again the Prime Minister has casually expressed his desire to retire from office. Eighteen months ago a similar expression ended with the decision to continue. I had then pointed out regretfully that Mr. Nehru had ill served himself and the country by doing so.

The country today is facing both external and internal crises. Are the place and the timing of Mr. Nehru's desire chosen with a view to meeting public criticism against his policy, so that the people in their distress and bewilderment may cry "please stay on?" It would indeed be a clever move if it were so. Mr. Verghese at least has fallen for it, when he urges the Prime Minister in his column (November 18) not to retire, at least for the present.

Externally, the Prime Minister has led the country where it is unable to defend its integrity. India is today friendless and helpless. Of what avail is it to stand on a moral pedestal? For heaven's sake, get off it.

Internally, the country is on the brink of bankruptcy. The five-year plans have not added an iota to the common man's daily bread or given him a sense of economic security. The fantastic land legislation, pushed through in the name of the Nagpur resolution, now seeks to make the poor peasant poorer.

Can Mr. Nehru by continuing to be the Prime Minister help the country to get out of the deep morass in which it finds itself today. His public speeches, the correspondence with China, the incomprehensible hold of Mr. Krishna Menon on him and the illogical pursuit of policies which have failed, give no such assurance.

Mr. Verghese has ably catalogued the failures of Mr. Nehru's Government. Why then does he believe that Mr. Nehru can lead us out of the present crisis? A smaller man with no commitments to Mr. Nehru's wrong policies, guided by the wide vision and right instincts of an unburdened Mr. Nehru, can help the country better. Mr. Nehru, outside office can reflect public opinion, as only he can, more truly. I repeat this with all my regard and affection for him. Maybe, it is now too late; the opportunity was lost not eighteen months ago, but much before that.

BOMBAY

—Raja Hutheesingh.