

In the present world set-up, India's anxiety to avoid war at the national or international fronts was mistaken, by him and his European and American friends for her inclination to abjure force even to defend her own rights and to regain the small chunks of Indian territory like Goa languishing for centuries under foreign domination, to India's great shame and disgrace. Gandhiji's extremist views on nonviolence, in the eyes of some European Nations, represented the views of the Indian people and the Indian Government today. Nehru's pusillanimous attitude towards China's aggression on India and his repeated sermons to the Indian people who wanted him to physically push out the Portuguese from Goa, on India's firm policy to settle Goa issue peacefully, perhaps lent support to this mistaken belief. They thought that Nehru would go on tolerating endlessly the indignities and insults hurled at India by the Portuguese by imprisoning Goan patriots, shooting at merchant ships like "Sabarmati," killing a poor and innocent fisherman fishing in the sea and even violating Indian territory, just to maintain his reputation of questionable value and importance as a "peacemaker"—a role which comes so handy to the leading nations in both the camps in their troublesome moments of the cold war. They forgot that Nehru had also to carry out some duties by his countrymen and his Goan brothers and could not hold on indefinitely to this dubious role of a "peacemaker" without compromising national self-respect, honour and endangering na-

tional safety and security.

All the violent tirade carried on by Britain and America against Nehru in this matter, they must remember, will not fail to recoil on themselves in the international field. The valiant and admirable attempts so far made by them to safeguard the interests of the "Free" world against the International communist menace will be rendered nugatory, if they break off ties of friendship with a peaceful and democratic country like India, just out of an illconceived loyalty to an old white ally like Portugal which has consistently defied the directives given to her by the various U.N. resolutions in respect of her colonial possessions. They will do well to remember the salient fact that it is this naked and unabashed autocracy of Salazar which has brought the Goa crisis to a head and plunged the countries of the free world into the most unfortunate mutual wranglings and recriminations to the great delight of the opposite camp. It is indeed sad to think that America and Britain should have overplayed their part of being the faithful allies of Portugal. It is time they cried a halt to this game and sympathetically understood the realities of the position of Goa and India visavis Portugal.

The fear that India's example in regard to Goa might be followed by other countries is totally unfounded. The Kashmir question is purely a matter of a disputed territory between two adjoining countries and the U.N. is already seized of it. Democratic countries like England are slowly but surely liquidating their colonial rule Africa and Asia and voluntarily setting these territories on the path to freedom. Only the question of colonialism of dictatorial countries like Spain, Portugal, Russia and China has to be tackled. It is doubtful whether these dictatorial regimes will ever become amenable to peaceful and democratic solutions of this colonial question. So Goa's example can only be cited and followed, in equity, justice and good conscience, when democratic countries like India have to deal with dictators like Salazar, Franco, Mao and Khrushchev. India has shown by its energetic action in Goa that although its "peacefulness" is genuine and honest to the core, it should not be misunderstood as "nonviolence" in the extreme sense in which Gandhiji used the word and that it has not given up the use of minimum force to fight against manifestly violence-ridden autocratic regimes which have nothing but contempt and scorn for peaceful negotiations and only listen to the argument of force.

The liberation of Goa will, therefore, be all the more welcome to all lovers of rational and humane politics, Liberty and Freedom. The Indian Government was perfectly justified in reorienting its foreign policy in regard to Goa. It is to be expected that this reorientation will be reflected in the near future, in India Government's policy getting stern and dynamic towards

The Indian Libertarian
Independent Journal of Free Economy and Public Affairs
 Edited by; D. M. Kulkarni, B.A., LL.B.
 Published on the 1st and 15th of Each Month
 Single Copy 25 Naye Paise
 Subscription Rates:
 Annual Rs. 6; 3\$ (U.S.A.); 12s. (U.K.)
ADVERTISEMENTS RATES
 Full Page Rs. 100; Half Page Rs. 50; Quarter Page Rs. 25
 One-eighth Page Rs. 15; One full column of a Page Rs. 50
 BACK COVER..... Rs. 150
 SECOND COVER..... Rs. 125
 THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125
 Articles from readers and contributors are accepted.
 Articles meant for publication should be typewritten and on one side of the paper only.
 Publication of articles does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a Free Forum
 *Rejected articles will be returned to the writers if accompanied with stamped addressed envelope.
 Write to the Manager for sample copy and gifts to new subscribers.
 Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

China's aggression on India, thus setting at rest the doubt expressed in some quarters that this police action in Goa does not imply any appreciable change in India's hitherto imbecile and anaemic foreign policies especially towards communist countries but it is motivated only by considerations of power politics just on the eve of General Elections.

RED CHINA AGAIN REFUSED ENTRY INTO U.N.

Once again Communist China was barred from entry into the U.N. on December 16, 1961. The General Assembly on that day rejected by 48 votes to 36 with 20 abstentions the Soviet resolution to oust the K.M.T. from U.N. and to seat delegates from the communist main-land of China. The debate which lasted for well over a fortnight, brought out in bold relief the divergent views held by the various Camps and groups in the Assembly, on the interpretation of Charter requirements that have to be fulfilled before a country could be admitted to the membership of the U.N. One of the main requirements is that members of the U.N. must be "Peace-loving" Another important consideration that weighed with the "Free-Alliance" headed by America was whether it would be consistent with the principles of the U.N. Charter to expel Taiwan, one of the founder States of the U.N. to make room for the dictatorial and war-mongering Peking.

From the wording of the resolution sponsored by Russia, the communist Camp appeared to be bent not only on securing for the communist China a seat in the Assembly but also unseating the democratic China so that when once the democratic China was pushed out of the Assembly, Red China might be enabled to wage an aggressive and bloody war against the Chinese who, as the American Ambassador said "are still free in Taiwan." It was this most crucial issue that was raised by the American Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson who in a fighting and convincing speech, opposed Russia's resolution and who ultimately succeeded in persuading the Assembly to vote out the Russian resolution by a sizable majority. Britain, true to her genius for compromise voted in favour of Russia's resolution, making it absolutely clear at the same time, that her support to the resolution did not prejudice her stand on the question of continued representation of Formosa in the Assembly side by side with that of Red China.

But India's foreign policy again proved itself to be a queer mixture of democratic professions and pro-red inclinations, the latter, more often than not, out-running the former. Even if India could not go all the way with America in getting the U.N. Assembly to block China's admission to the U.N., she could have at least shown the same courage as Great Britain, in declaring her opinion

about the feasibility of two Chinas co-existing as independent countries and functioning as such in the Assembly. Though India voted in favour of the resolution, the only good point about it was that she kept studiously silent and did not canvass for it in a bellicose fashion as in the past. This cold attitude on the part of India must have indirectly strengthened the hands of the countries of Free Alliance, in throwing out Russia's resolution. Let us hope that by and by, India will be compelled by force of circumstances to show greater nerve and strength to support the Free Alliance in its attempt to consolidate the peace-loving, and democratic forces against the sabre-rattling communist forces in the Assembly.

HERE AND THERE

Mr. Nehru thinks that candidates for legislatures should be selected on the basis of their work and ideas. He should know that men with ideas and a record of selfless work do not generally apply for Congress tickets. In fact, they are already out of the Congress.

Jayachamaraja Wadiar, the Governor of Mysore in a speech at Bombay suggested spiritual revival as a remedy for all the ills of the country. He further bewailed that "religion has been put in a cold storage." We give him credit for his thorough honesty and candour. Spirituality and religion are truly inseparable concomitants, though Mr. Nehru and Vinoba Bhave try to distinguish between the two. But how can religion be revived without the backing of a Feudal King or a Dictator? Perhaps, revival of princely Order would be necessary to bring religion out of cold storage and make it warm, alive and kicking, as in the days of Ramrajya!

Replying to the question asked by Dayabhai Patel in the Rajya Sabha about the use of I.A.F. Planes for Premier Nehru's tour with other Congress leaders during Orissa Mid-term elections, the redoubtable Defence Minister pertinently observed, "The Prime Minister is a political personality and Head of the Government and the two cannot be separated." In other words the Government and the Congress are identical. India heading for Congress Dictatorship of Nehru-Menon?

THIS INDIA: Mr. P. V. C. Gowd convenor of the Telangana Tappers' Safeguard Action Committee, began "fast unto death" on December 11, 1961, as a counterblast to the fast undertaken by Sadhu Subramaniam who began a fast on November 22, 1961, demanding extension of prohibition to the Telangana area. In a statement Mr. Gowd said he wanted to bring to the notice of the Government the "untold misery and hardship prohibition would cause to thousands of Tappers in Telangana.

The Libertarian Pattern Of Society

By M. A. Venkata Rao

THE alarming lack of intellectual integrity and conscience (as of social conscience in general) prevalent today amongst our intelligentsia is responsible for the unhealthy ascendancy of the Prime Minister over his colleagues in Cabinet, Parliament, Party as well as over the large class of the educated in general in the country.

Even foreign observers have observed that the note of criticism of Shri Nehru and his policies has increased gradually over the years but the support he enjoys from partymen and the educated people generally has not diminished to any appreciable extent as a consequence of this inner divergence of opinion.

Many leading Congressmen express disagreement with the socialist and pro-Communist views and policies of Shri Nehru in private and even in meetings of non-party people. But they do not follow this up with the appropriate voting in the Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha or even in the Parliamentary party conclave or Congress sessions. The note of hypocrisy is sickening and is the principal source of the hollowness and devitalisation of Congress as a party. Outward conformity ignoring inward disagreement is the bane of our public life.

This has appeared again and again in our public life in recent years. When Nehru threatens to resign, Congressmen and others clamour for his continuance in office as if the heavens would fall if he quits office.

One reason for this state of affairs—(a social and moral condition in which democracy is bound to wilt away)—is the absence of ideas alternative to Nehru's views and decisions afloat in the country and in the minds of groups close to the decision-making seats of authority—Congress, legislatures, party caucuses, administrative bureaus, research departments etc.

Democracy is government by discussion. The habit of discussion of principles and facts and policies coming up for action in authoritative circles should be deliberately fostered by those anxious to acclimatise democracy in our midst.

Intellectual laziness and indifference coupled with a fatally easy conscience about conformism with the slogan—leave it to the Prime Minister (or other leader at lower levels)—are not factors that conduce to develop democracy as a going concern and make of it a beneficent institution surpassing autocracy and bureaucracy as methods of government.

Circles close to administration will catch this zest for discussion and ability to go into principles and implications of policies from long range points of view, if in society at large there

are groups of citizens from every walk of life having the habit of discussing current questions at periodical intervals. General discussion clubs are necessary in addition to clubs of members of professional and technical associations concerned with their specialities—bar councils, educational associations, engineers' societies, medical associations, civil service clubs, chambers of commerce, industrialists' federations, science and philosophy, art and journalism with their fraternal societies should conduct a vigorous life of exchange of thought. They should consider occasionally the broader political aspects of their specialities as well as their main interests in their vocations.

It is the chief characteristic of libertarian societies that such social exchange and association (and culture generally) is totally free from State control and regimentation, except for the universal subjection to civil and criminal law.

In totalitarian societies on the other hand, the State lays down the lines of thought to be accepted as a dogma in all professions. The case of Lisenko is relevant in this context. As a biologist, he had to defend the State doctrine of the transmission of acquired characters from parent to offspring without respect for his own personal opinion based on findings by his own research.

Even in art, the State in Russia (and her satellites) lays down the overall policy to be embodied by the artists in their creations—even in music, opera, drama, poetry, literature. The test laid down is Partiism; that is, the doctrine that the work should, in its overall effect on the reader or listener or spectator, have the effect of strengthening the Socialist sentiment. It should make them more resolved to go forth and put more will and energy into their work in the building of socialism! It should not raise doubts about Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism or Khrushchevism in the Soviet people!

The doctrine of State authority in the arts and sciences and philosophies and even in history and anthropology resembles the dogmatic theology of the Roman Catholic Church which is laid down only by the authorised clergy and should be believed in on pain of punishment even unto death:—Witness the claims of the dread institution of the Inquisition in the Catholic Church, which is sad to have got thirty thousand heretics burnt at the stake in the days of its power! The purges of Stalin are similar, though more extensive in numbers.

In recent years we have had the example of the literary man Dr. Pasternak whose work was disapproved by the Kremlin and who was prevented from accepting the Noble Prize award

from abroad. Even the friends who used to help him in his work were persecuted after his death!

In the libertarian pattern of society, cultural life in all its spheres—literature and the other arts, sciences, technologies, history, education etc. will be totally free from State interference both in their internal administration such as the appointments of experts and their honouring of deserving personnel as well as in the ideas they accept from time to time as the truth in their specialities.

They will be free to follow truth entirely on the guidance of their own experience and investigation, experiment, hypothesis and verification. Every accepted idea will be held subject to continued verification by others and so long as it satisfies their criteria of truth and verification.

Works of art will be appreciated solely on the ground of their appeal to qualified persons—as in music and art. Fashions may change but change will follow the free impulse of the devotees of the vocation or speciality. State ideology will not influence their ideas and appreciations.

Similarly in economic life. The libertarian society will not seek to pour the entire economic activities of the people into any strait-jacket of State Planned system of targets hemmed in by State-determined regulations of trade quotas, of licences and tariffs in import and export except to the extent necessary for revenue and probably for short periods for protecting nascent industries. Even then the degree of protective tariff will not shut our foreign goods altogether but will make them somewhat costlier so that the citizens may encourage swadeshi manufactures without too great a loss.

In socialism, there will be no private industry and commerce at all. We in India are moving in that direction, our mixed economy being in the nature of Lenin's New Economic Policy—a temporary make shift. All investment will be made by planning authorities without any say in the matter being granted to the consumer. In the libertarian society on the other hand, all investment will be made by private individuals in industrial plants established by industrialists. They will choose industries likely, on the strength of the market for the goods to be manufactured and of the efficiency likely to be attained by the Directors of the enterprise. There will be scope for the intelligence, knowledge and experience of the investor in putting his savings into industry. The consumer thus determines the lines of production in a free society. In socialism, he loses this *sovereignty* and has to buy whatever is put on the market by the State at prices determined by officialdom. He cannot plan his own economic life, his savings and his provision for the future.

Even banking will be run by the State in socialist countries with the result that interest rates are fixed by the State and will not attract voluntary deposits. Socialist dictatorships have the disconcerting habit of repudiating debt obli-

gations. Khrushchev declared two years ago that the Government Loans that had matured after twenty years would *not be paid*; he postponed payment to an indefinite future! Even the accumulated interest was not paid!

Moreover, since all income earners in Soviet Russia and other communist countries are government employees, the State collects forced Loans from them whenever necessary deducting them from their salaries! In a dictatorship, grumbling against such levies is dangerous and will be visited with dire punishment.

Moreover, the earnings of everybody in socialist States depend on their worth *as assessed by their official superiors* who watch their work day-in, day-out in factory or office. Human nature being what it is, it happens too often that it is *not* the conscientious worker that gets recognised for salary improvements and promotions to better posts, but he, who pleases the bosses by servility and extra-work service or complaisance! The subservient sychophant has better chances of rising than the honest and efficient worker or officer!

And since all employment depends on the *same State everywhere* within the country, the dissatisfied worker cannot seek justice elsewhere. If he leaves in search of better or alternative employment, he must carry a card giving clearance from his previous employing unit. No one will be taken anywhere without such clearance cards!

The worker therefore has no freedom worth the name in a socialist society. Marx spoke of the industrial workers under capitalist employers as *wage slaves*. But the workers in Socialist States are *more of such wage slaves*—(in fact actual *serfs* tied to work in the units allotted to them by the State)—than workers in free economy and free society. The first sufferers on the emergence of socialism are the workers who will lose their *right to strike* and deny their labour if dissatisfied with the terms and treatment they get.

Workers in a free society have the further advantage of having the freedom and opportunity of obtaining work from alternative establishment run by competitors of the Unit they are leaving. Workers in Bombay mills have been known to acquire skills and obtain better paid employment from time to time in other mills. Without the possibility of such alternative employment, a man cannot enjoy freedom in any real sense. Legal freedom is not enough though it is not to be despised. Variety of alternative opportunities as well as facilities acquiring higher skills by experience and in continuation technical schools are essential for the realisation of freedom. This is feasible only in a libertarian or free society with a free economy.

At all levels of capacity and income, whether that of the worker, foreman, mechanic, office clerk, accountant, manager or capitalist director and investor as entrepreneur, what functions as

(continued on page 8)

The Nehru—Menon Game

By M. N. THOLAL

IN the Rajya Sabha on December 6, Prime Minister Nehru denied that the Chinese building up of the three military posts in Ladakh, one in the north and two in the south, meant occupation of any large area by the Chinese. Earlier outside Parliament he had denied the occupation of any area by the Chinese as a result of the fresh incursions. Even in the Rajya Sabha after admitting the occupation of Indian territory by the Chinese—"the latter post on the Chip Chap river means occupation of Indian territory"—he said one could not talk of it in terms of occupation, as was being done, particularly in view of the fact that in Ladakh the Chinese and Indian posts were zigzagging. No amount of zigzagging and quibbling can hide the obvious fact that, if the Chinese have built a post ten or twelve miles inside our territory, a large part of the territory behind and around the post is in Chinese possession.

Mr. Nehru himself admitted that the northern post built by the Chinese on the Chip Chap river near the Karakorum was an important one and "no doubt the building up of roads behind and a succession of posts would have some military value." The Chinese do not have to stand on every square foot of territory they occupy behind and around their posts to prove that they are in possession of that territory. The Prime Minister holds the most important position of the greatest responsibility in a great country and he should not contradict himself again and again as he has been doing in Parliament and outside it, not even by implication much less explicitly.

MENON'S MASTERPIECES

Our Defence Minister seems to take a sinister delight in treacherous utterances and always goes one better than his Prime Minister to please him. Obviously he cannot do so over and over again without the instigation or at least the tacit consent of the Prime Minister. Mr. Menon said in Washington that there were no Chinese troops but only elements on Indian soil. What does he mean by 'elements'? Does he know what 'troops' means? Obviously not, although it is one of his boasts—and chief qualification in Prime Minister Nehru's eyes—that he has lived in England for 28 years. If an educated, or even a semi-educated man, can live in England for 28 years and not know what 'troops' means, the only inference to draw seems to be that he least deserves to be India's Defence Minister. 'Troops' means soldiers, and nothing else. Surely the Defence Minister ought to know what 'troops' means, or stop using the English language as a means of communicating his ideas.

And what did he mean by saying that there were only Chinese 'elements' on Indian soil? If he meant they were component parts of the Chinese Army on Indian soil, he was of course right, though in that case he contradicted himself in one and the same sentence—a feat achieved earlier, by his Prime Minister. Perhaps what he meant was that they were 'elemental' and could not therefore be driven out of the country. Or does he mean they are elementary, in the sense of being introductory, in which case of course more are expected to follow, as night follows day. It does not occur to our Defence Minister, even as it does not occur to our Prime Minister, that he should not provide the Chinese with ready-made answers to his own Government's protests. Even if there are only two Chinese soldiers on Indian soil, Chinese troops are there and its denial, together with the talk of 'elements', is sheer nonsense and bunkum, besides being entirely untruthful.

ANTI-INDIAN CONSPIRACY

Mr. Menon also said in New York that there was "no active hostility on the border." What is our Defence Minister's conception of "active hostility"? It seems to be the same as that of the pleasure-loving Wajid Ali Shah of Lucknow. When British troops were on the outskirts of the capital and he was informed of the fact, he wanted to know how far they were. On being told the approximate distance, he said, "They are far away. On with the dance!" We Kashmiris have a good deal of the culture of Wajid Ali Shah and intensely dislike warfare and all talk about it. No wonder Mr. Nehru denies the occupation of territory by the Chinese, entailing as it would—I should say 'might'—the need of driving them out. The British troops were marching in without resistance and there was no active hostility, as Mr. Menon would have put it to Nawab Wajid Ali Shah. And, indeed, how can there be active hostility when there is no resistance? Obviously, the Chinese are as peace-loving as the Indian. Down with war-mongering!

However, the Prime Minister of the country and the Government of India in their note to China say that the Chinese have built a check-post ten or twelve miles within Indian territory, while the Defence Minister of India says there is no active hostility on the border on the part of the Chinese, or, for that matter, on the part of Indians. Apparently occupation of Indian territory on the part of the Chinese is not the same thing for our Defence Minister as "active hostility." What is even more remarkable about these utterances is that Mr. Menon goes on making these anti-Indian and pro-Chinese statements and

is not disowned by his Chief. What is even more significant: there is no protest of any kind on the part of the Congress leaders. Is it illegitimate in the circumstances to conclude that there is an anti-Indian conspiracy in the Congress Party, overt or covert, so far as the aggression by China is concerned, and that the brave language at times used by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, regarding their determination to have the occupied territory vacated by the Chinese, is just electioneering propaganda?

The Prime Minister also said, with respect to two of the three new Chinese check-posts, that he could not definitely say whether the new check-posts set up by the Chinese were on "this or that" side of the border. Surely the Prime Minister realises the clear implication of the words he uses, and that, in this case, is that he does not know, and his Government does not know, where the border is. And yet we Indians were highly angry with Dulles when he said the border was undefined, though he was probably having his own back on the Indian Prime Minister for his criticism of Dulles. There can be no doubt about it in any sane mind that both the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister have by their unguarded and irresponsible utterances been strengthening the Chinese case against India and have been indirectly instigating the Chinese to continue occupying more and more of Indian territory with their tacit consent.

The hopelessness of the position was pointed out by Acharya Kripalani when, pinpointing certain observations made by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister in regard to the border dispute with China, he said, "One of the greatest difficulties which Indian officials faced when they met their counter-parts from China and presented facts and maps, was that the Chinese presented them with the utterances of the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister. They had no answer at all for them." Even more significant is the fact that when, amidst shouts of "shame, shame" from Praja Socialist members, Acharya Kripalani said that the Army on the border with Tibet had absolute orders to do nothing whatever the Chinese might do, his assertion was not challenged by any one on the Treasury Benches.

Acharya Kripalani also said there was righteous indignation in the country and the Government was not mobilizing the feeling to defend the country. Surely the Government is aware that there is righteous indignation in the country and if, with this knowledge, the Government is not mobilizing the feeling, it is obviously because it has no intention to defend the country against the Chinese. What other conclusion is possible under the circumstances? Even if the Government is hoping against hope, or even with the best of reasons in its possession, that the Chinese will not advance beyond a certain line, it is its bounden duty to mobilize the feeling in the country, as it is unmitigated folly to trust an

adversary who has laid certain definite claims to Indian territory, a great part of which it has already occupied, and who is advancing its claims to farther territory on acquiring what it has done.

NEED OF A FIRM STEP

Mr. Asoka Mehta said during the course of the debate on Chinese incursions in the Lok Sabha on December 4 that a firm step taken by India would not lead to war. He said so after declaring he was not advocating war or even severance of diplomatic relations with China. Elsewhere he clarified the firm step he was advocating by suggesting that our troops should blast one of the Chinese check-posts in our territory. That is the only way of putting an end to farther advance by the Chinese and should be resorted to at once if farther occupation of Indian territory by the Chinese is not desired by the Nehru Government.

Our strongest point in the situation today is that China is not prepared to go to war with India on the border issue, knowing that war with India would soon develop into a world war in which the Formosa Government will attack China with American help. Even after giving the USA more than hundred warnings and bombarding the offshore islands for months, China did not land her troops there, as she could have easily done. Why? The USA called the Chinese bluff by sending a few of her warships to the offshore islands as a warning signal. And that silenced the Chinese batteries. It is obvious that the Chinese Communist regime is not prepared to jeopardise the building up of Communist China by adventurist action which might see insurrection raise its head in the mainland, in support of invasion by the Kuomintang forces with the help of the American Navy and the American Air Force. Those who rule by sheer oppression have reason to fear the people. In any case, had the Chinese been prepared to risk war, they would have carried out at least one of their numerous threats to the USA, but they always drew the line at war and said to themselves not once but a thousand times, "We shall bark but we shall not bite." Every one knows that barking dogs do not bite and the Chinese must have realised it when they even stopped issuing warnings to the USA, after having done so hundreds of times.

PLAYING WITH DIVIDED CARDS

All condemnation of adventurism and war-mongering is befogging the issue and exploiting the instinct of self-preservation of the people. As Acharya Kripalani said, "To defend one's country is not adventurism" and "when righteous indignation is not mobilized, people get demoralised." This is exactly what the Nehru Government is doing. Instead of calling the Chinese bluff and blasting one of their posts the Indian Government is demoralising its own people by protesting to the Chinese every now and again, even after declaring that not another square inch

of Indian territory would be allowed to be occupied by the Chinese.

The extent of our demoralisation and spinelessness is evident from the fact that even after India's Prime Minister has charged China with aggression, his Defence Minister stands up and says, "The UN has not defined the term aggression." This can only be taken to rebut the charge of aggression against the Chinese made by Mr. Nehru. It is not as if Mr. Nehru is helpless. Mr. Menon has no standing in the Congress Party or the country and his only prop is Mr. Nehru's support. If, in these circumstances, Mr. Menon tries to rebut Mr. Nehru's main charge against the Chinese, that of aggression, Mr. Menon is obviously doing so with Mr. Nehru's consent. Mr. Nehru is an adept in stage-management. They are both playing with divided cards to fool the country, in pursuit of Mr. Nehru's ambition to play the arbitrator between the two blocs. The country is only a ladder for Mr. Nehru to rise higher and higher. That is the only purpose it can serve so far as he is concerned. What happens to the ladder, except as a means of ascent for him, does not worry him.

(Continued from page 5)

a powerful incentive to work and improvement is the knowledge that *every one can get the reward naturally accruing from the contribution*: It may be labour, supervision, office work, accounts, management, risk-taking with regard to investments or skill in salesmanship or knowledge of markets facilitating economical purchase—no one can work to the top of his capacity with zeal unless he has the assurance that social and economic institutions work in such a way as to harmonise skill and reward, effort and compensation, efficiency and monetary returns.

Progress in career should also depend, not on the opinion of superiors entirely but on objective tests of contribution. In free economy, the management have a motive in rewarding merit and efficiency in their own interest—namely that of maximising profits by the marketing of good articles of consumption needed by society.

The priorities of production in a free economy are those determined by the consumer.

A free economy therefore will show a bubbling enthusiasm and self-reliance on the part of all participants in production, marketing and distribution and will elicit the maximum levels and variety of production.

This does not mean that the State has no role to play beyond the maintenance of civil and criminal law in a libertarian pattern of society.

THE INDIAN LIBERTARIAN

The State has to watch the working of the economy in all spheres and aid it by means of fiscal and monetary policies to keep it at an even keel. It can encourage investments into priority lines of consumer goods by the offer of suitable inducements, such as tax reduction or subsidy. It can pioneer new industries such as steel manufacture in India if private enterprise is unready for it. But it should turn it over to private enterprise as soon as it is ready.

The State should maintain statistical institutions that gather and disseminate accurate information on important matters of commercial and industrial development.

It should also develop communications and transport either directly or indirectly through the encouragement of private bodies.

It should maintain educational and research institutions without monopolising them for itself. It should carry on international negotiations for the facilitation of foreign trade. It should not nationalise industries on a *doctrinaire* basis. Only the socialisation of the "economic vacuum" is permissible and *not the supplantation of citizen enterprise*.

WHY YOU SHOULD VOTE FOR SWATANTRA

HAVE you ever in your own person experienced the joy of doing the right thing without caring about results, success or failure, which in the *Gita* is called Yoga? You will experience this delight if you do your own little best in the battle against a purse-proud power-intoxicated party. Vote for the Swatantra Party and thereby withdraw your vote from the Congress at the next elections if you disapprove of confiscation of honestly acquired property and hate injustice. Do not sit despairingly if you despise fraud, such as is practised when Government confiscates property, pretending to give compensation for it. You should reduce the Congress by at least one vote—which is in your power. If you in your heart dislike the Congress Party helping persons of its choice to amass easy wealth in partnership with the party, by giving them a monopoly in some business which it pretends to 'regulate', condemn the practice by withdrawing your vote from that party. If you want this permit-licence-quota raj to disappear you should make up your mind not to keep that desire secret, but make your displeasure known by refusing to cast your vote for the Congress and giving it to the Swatantra Party.

—C. Rajagopalachari

Khrushchev's Policy Of Peaceful Co-extinction

BY C. L. SULZBERGER

MR. Khrushchev is trying to frighten somebody with his ghastly superbombs but it is not yet clear just whom. He is too shrewd to believe that the United States will be cowed by these vast explosions whose radioactive fall-out menaces Russians as much as anyone.

His massive testing has had the opposite effect of spreading fear here; it has spread anger. Likewise, although Mr. Khrushchev professes that Britain, France and Italy are his "hostages" because they are afraid to stand with us on Berlin, events prove the opposite. The British mood is stiffening and the French mood is, if anything, too stiff.

Yet the Soviet Premier appears to be seeking some objective by his horror programme. Something drove him to this ghastly step and we can only speculate on what.

September 5, in the Kremlin, Mr. Khrushchev told me: "We already have a one-hundred megaton bomb" and "we shall test it." Two days later he changed his mind and asked me to amend his words so they would read: "We already have such a bomb and we shall test the exploding device for it."

I deduced that after his September 6 conversation with India's Prime Minister Nehru, the Soviet Premier had decided to experiment only with the superbomb's detonator, not with the bomb itself.

TWO VAST SUPERBOMBS

Nevertheless, a few weeks later and during an argumentative Communist Party Congress, he reversed himself. He successively exploded not a detonator but two vast superbombs, one of between 30 and 50 megatons and one of more than 50 megatons. These are getting very close to the 100 megaton weapon of which he spoke and are far, far beyond the classification of "exploding device."

Now, of course, Mr. Khrushchev may be badly informed and may reckon this sort of terror is going to sap our morale. Or he may calculate that weaklings in Western Europe will revive the fly-blown slogan, Better Red than Dead. Evidence seems to point to the contrary. Most people shivering are shivering with rage.

Among the neutrals there is ill-concealed anger although the neutrals unhappily lack boldness in expressing this. Perhaps the Soviet Premier figures he will gain new neutral support by in-

creasing the fall-out over them; and perhaps, regrettably, he is right.

In some devious way this decision to fill the cold war sky with heat blasts seems related to Mr. Khrushchev's internal political disputes within the Marxist orbit.

Note the coincidence in timing: superbomb explosions, increasingly public rift with China, the final disgracing of Stalin whose monument is now made an unmonument, and preparations for a new party purge, vicious new pressures on Finland. Surely these events must be connected.

TO FRIGHTEN THE CHINESE?

If there were Chinese official observers at the last two blasts we could deduce that Khrushchev is trying also to frighten Mao Tse-tung and to convince him that, large as its population is, China could never survive atomic war. Mao has been known to boast that even if 300,000,000 Chinese were killed in such a conflict, as many would be left.

We don't know if there were any such observers but we do know Moscow has refrained from giving Peiping any atomic weapons—and not for lack of request. Is Khrushchev trying to brow-beat his allies under the pretence of brow-beating us and the neutrals?

Or does he intend to prove to the peoples of Communist lands and the jingos, allegedly led by Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovitch and others in the Soviet Union and by China's friends, like Albania, abroad, that any policy tougher than his own risks holocaust for everyone, Communists included? If so, Soviet propaganda has remained remarkably mute.

These facts remain. Khrushchev changed from an intention to explode only their detonators. Then he changed back again. And during the period of shifting, the only detectable new pressure on him came from within the Communist bloc.

If Russia decides to risk incredible world dangers as a result of internal pressures as well as a result of imagined external pressures, we are in for a grim Hobson's choice. War games played with 50-megaton gadgets are too dangerous. They make mockery of any pretense of peaceful coexistence, Khrushchev's watch-word. For the road he has seemingly chosen leads immutably to co-extinction.

—The New York Times

The Individual And The Indian Constitution

By A. Ranganathan

"Essentially the Indian Constitution" observed Sir Iver Jennings "is an individualist document. Its prophets are Burke, Mill and Dicey; yet some at least of the members of the Constituent Assembly thought in collectivist terms. The result is a curious dichotomy. On the one hand the individualism of the nineteenth century has sought to limit the powers of the government in the interest of liberty; on the other hand the collectivism of the twentieth century has sought to expand the powers of government in order that the state may regulate economic life and incidentally restrict liberty." And since Indian Independence, there has been a gradual but sustained effort to increase the powers of the executive at the expense of the courts. Indeed, Pandit Nehru had opposed the idea of the Supreme Court being the final arbiter of compensation on the plea that the Supreme Court ought not to make itself a "third House of Parliament".

It is well known that the Due Process Clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth amendments to the American Constitution constitute a source of reserved power for the judiciary to act as a restraining influence on legislative and executive bodies when they tend to limit the freedom of the individual. While there is no Due Process Clause as such in the Indian Constitution, the Indian judiciary became empowered to regulate property rights in India. The 'Right to Property' was originally guaranteed by Article 31 of the Indian Constitution. In the document as drafted in 1950, Article 31(1) read: "No person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of law". And Article 31(2) read: "No property, movable or immovable, including any interest in, or in any company owing any commercial or industrial undertaking, shall be taken possession of or acquired for public purposes under any law authorising the taking of such possession or such acquisition, unless the law provides for compensation for the property taken possession of or acquired and either fixes the amount of compensation or signifies the principles on which and the manner in which the compensation is to be determined and given."

However, On April 27, 1955, an amendment was passed which substituted for Article 31 (2) the following clauses: 31(2) No Property shall be com-

pulsorily acquired or requisitioned save for a public purpose and save by authority of a law which provides for compensation for the property so acquired or requisitioned and either fixes the amount of compensation or specifies the principles on which and the manner in which the compensation is to be determined and given; and no such law shall be called in question in any court on the ground that the compensation provided by the law is not adequate.

31 (2-A) Where a law does not provide for the transfer of the ownership or right to possession of any property to the State or to a corporation owned or controlled by the State, it shall not be deemed to provide for the compulsory acquisition or requisitioning of property, notwithstanding that it deprives any person of its property". The Article, as amended, creates a situation of intense uncertainty since we do not have clauses similar to the Due Process Clauses in the American Constitution. Indeed as pointed out by Mr. Justice Douglas (in his "We the Judges), it is clear that "India has broken with one tradition of the law of eminent domain—the 1955 Amendment casts a shadow over every private factory, plant or other individual enterprise in India. The legislature may now appropriate it at any price it desires, substantial or nominal. There is no review of the reasonableness of the amount of compensation. The result can be just compensation or confiscation, dependent wholly on the mood of Parliament". This new power of fixing the amount of compensation is theoretically vested in Parliament, but in actual practice will have to be delegated to the ruling party and finally administered by the executive officials. The situation is particularly gloomy if viewed in the light of the various measures which have followed in the wake of the 'Socialistic Pattern of Society'—the Nagpur resolution on Cooperative Farming, Nationalization of the Insurance, State Tradings, Ceilings on land holdings etc. It is well to recall that several years ago, Lord Hewart, a distinguished jurist and former Lord Chief Justice of England, pointed to the dangers of what he termed "the new despotism" of those in authority who are allowed to dominate the private sector. This is even more true in a country like India where (as accurately summed up by Mr. N. Raghunathan

Russia Dictating Our China Policy : Cat Out Of The Bag

(From Our Correspondent)

THE oldest Congressman of Rajputana, Jai Narayan Vyas, whose name has been one to conjure with, has declared a jehad to rid the State Congress corrupt elements. Since the Congress today is composed of corrupt elements, the jehad is in fact against the Congress itself. In this connection Master Tara Singh's brilliant indictment of Congressmen is worth recalling. He said the other day, "I don't say that all Congressmen are dishonest, but all dishonest men are Congressmen." Rajaji's indictment of Congress legislators is too well-known to need recalling here. It seemed a hard thing to say when he said

(Continued from page 10)

in his "Our New Rulers") "we have an illiterate public which plausible demagogues promising the millennium out of hand can sway with unpredictable results, a long tradition of docile submission to authority, and what is in reality a one-party State".

In the final analysis, the right to own property is linked with individual freedom. As argued by the liberal historian Prof. Massimo Salvadori, Karl Marx was correct when he said that those who owned property were free and those who did not were unfree, but was wrong when he deduced illogically that greater freedom would be achieved through the abolition of private property. Actually it is this concept of individual freedom as explained by thinkers like Locke, Turgot and Jefferson which gives democracy its distinctive profile. The belief of our planners who are perpetually thinking in terms of constitutional encroachments into the domain of the individual can only find its scope in gigantomania by building colossal structures and voicing the usual slogan of production and more production at the expense of urgent consumer needs and dismissing informed criticism as "reactionary or lacking even a grain of intelligence". It is high time that we halted this remorseless process of divesting the people of their property rights, if we are to preserve the spirit of democracy as distinguished from its outer trappings.

it, but now even one is saying the same thing and believing it.

Mr. Vyas said Mr. Nehru and Shri Sanjiva Reddy had not taken heed of the facts he had placed before them and he would therefore take the public into his confidence with a view to bringing moral pressure to bear on the Congress High Command. Mr. Vyas seems to forget that the Congress High Command today consists of one man and that man does not heed facts. Mr. Vyas has promised to tour the state to collect evidence against Congress nominees for the general election he regards as corrupt and publish a district-wise list of such persons. Mr. Vyas intends organising opposition from within the Congress to eradicate corruption, but he is hardly likely to be allowed to do so. But he may be able to gather together a band of Congressmen who may constitute a terrific force against the Congress candidates he opposes. He proposes to support all those who believe in good government, welfare state, elimination of corruption and corrupt people. Mr. Vyas may yet be forced to enrol the banner of Rajaji by the hotheaded Congress High Command.

COMMUNIST LEADER'S REVELATION

At a Press Conference here the General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, Mr. Ajoy Ghosh, disclosed after persistent questioning that the CPI does not agree with Chinese leaders in their assessment of India's foreign policy or their attitude to the country. The general elections are too near for Mr. Ghosh to agree with Chinese leaders, but what is significant is that the forthright statement of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the Communist M.P. on the Indo-Chinese border issue stands. Asked to condemn Chinese aggression on the border he retorted, "We will never do that." Mr. Ghosh took hours of busy journalists' time but failed to condemn Chinese aggression. It is no use his saying India's policy is one of peace India is a peaceful country, and Mr. Nehru is a man of peace undoubtedly, without condemning China for her aggression against India. For, if the Chinese have committed no aggression, Mr. Nehru, who has been charging the Chinese with aggression, is not a man of peace.

On the whole Mr. Ghosh fully endorsed the Prime Minister's policies. It is well-known that Mr. Nehru's policies are more enthusiastically supported by Communists than by Congressmen. The latter support Mr. Nehru out of fear,

the Communists from conviction, because they realise he is playing their game. They also seem to realise why he is doing so, for Mr. Ghosh reacted sharply to Peking Press comments on Mr. Nehru describing him as "a little man" and a "man of war." He completely disagreed with the description.

Mr. Ghosh revealed that the Soviet position on the border question was that it should be settled by negotiation. As has been pointed out in these columns time and again, Mr. Nehru has accepted the advice of the Russian Prime Minister in the matter and his determination to "negotiate and negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end" is the result of Mr. Khrushchev's advice. So at last the cat is out of bag and what I have been saying for years has been confirmed by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, who got it direct from Soviet leaders. It comes to this that our foreign policy, so far as it relates to China at least, is dictated by Russia. Apparently, as the area occupied by the Chinese grows larger, the need for negotiation will grow proportionately. Mr. Ghosh came out with the declaration that the CPI would support the Government in case the latter took all measures to repel the Chinese if they crossed the McMahon Line. Mr. Ghosh can hardly bind the CPI, much less the Communists of India. Neither will they ever be sure where the McMahon Line is!

CORRUPT CONGRESS

Rajaji has been on a tour of North India and has been driving home the corruptness of Congress Raj. That is now the main prop of the Congress, this corruption in the form of licences, permits and quotas. An industrialist who was very close to Gandhiji and became close to Mr. Nehru after him, used to say, "I can get anything done." Now he is pro-Russian and even contributes articles to the Press praising Soviet Russia. He certainly knows which way the wind is blowing. If you were to ask him, "What is this?" he would say truly enough, "Where would I and my industrial empire be without quotas and licences?" All businessmen are under the thumb of the Government and have to do everything to please it to remain in business.

These licences and quotas were there during British rule too, but on a very small scale, and they were granted to those who really needed them. (We now realise how honest the British administration was.) With the advent of independence the securing of licences and quotas and permits became a regular business and host of middlemen grew up, men with approach to the right quarters. Many journalists earned more here as such middlemen than as journalists. In New Delhi everything is a matter of approach. Is it a job? It is a matter of approach. Is it a licence? It is a matter of approach. Indeed, the word "approach" has become incorporated in all the languages spoken in New Delhi, Hindustani, Punjabi, Telugu, Tamil, Bengali, Gujarati, etc. That shows the

13 or 14 years I have asked several editors to extent of corruption in the Capital. What was surprising was that people did not identify this licence business with corruption. During the last start a crusade against this licence business, but they always replied with a blank look, for they stood to gain by it. It needed a man of Rajaji's stature to drive home the corrupt character of Congress Raj by hammering away at this vicious system. It need hardly be added that the system has become a kind of monopoly of Congressmen and their friends, and a source of putting money into their pockets. And that has been the refrain since independence: "Put money in thy pockets, put money in thy pockets," as Iago's friend advised him in Shakespeare's *Othello*.

NEED OF UNITY SAVES TARA SINGH

The annual session of the Akali Dal here underlined the need of unity after the demoralisation that set in as a result of Master Tara Singh giving up his fast without achieving the vowed Suba. The need for unity has in fact saved Master Tara Singh and he duly received a big ovation from the crowds lining the streets of Delhi which were out to cheer the mile-and-a-half long procession organised to commemorate the martyrdom of Guru Govind Singh. It is being said that, doubtful of his reception, Master Tara Singh decided to exploit the Martyrdom Day. The usual resolutions were passed, one of which only was unexceptionable. There is no reason why the forthcoming elections in Punjab should not be held on the same day with the rest of the country.

Among many ridiculous observations in his presidential address Master Tara Singh made the trenchant remark that the Congress Party was the one single factor which bedevilled the country's future and the panacea for all political ills lay in ridding the country of this "evil." (Obviously Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon has been lying heavy on his mind.) On the ridiculous side the palm must go to the remark that the Government had opened a "fourth front" against the Sikhs—the other three being against Portugal, China and Pakistan. He seems to have forgotten whom he was bracketting his community with. All this did not prevent him from pleading for Hindu-Muslim unity, or saying later that they had to safeguard the country against the forces working against her interests from within or without. Sant Fateh Singh has been emphasizing the astuteness of Master Tara Singh. The Master is in fact too astute, and it is useless to expect him not to contradict himself in the same speech. Witness his appeal to men of conscience everywhere to relieve the Sikhs of the social complex of mistrust by conceding the demand for Punjabi Suba, thereby enabling them to work wholeheartedly for the greater good of the country! It is not clear whether men of conscience include Congressmen who have, according to him, "set absolutely new standards of corruption."

Intrinsically the demand for Punjabi Suba is quite sound but Master Tara Singh has bedevilled it by his demand for an independent Sikh state and his unpatriotic utterances like the one about the four fronts referred to above. He creates enemies for his cause and then complains they are being communal. Any sensible man could have seen that the demand for an independent Sikh state, which even the British did not countenance, was not likely to be conceded by any national government worth the name. And yet Master Tara Singh made it directly as well as indirectly for years.

At a public meeting later Master Tara Singh reiterated his determination to campaign for the creation of a Punjabi-speaking state. He said he would "do or die." The time for dying is happily past, Master Tara Singh, by breaking his fast unto death, having shown a decided preference for living and doing. It may be uncharitable to say so, but even in his address there has not been the faintest suggestion of a fast unto death to achieve Punjabi Suba, though the resolve to do so remains as firm as ever.

POLICE ACTION IN GOA

As I write comes the news that Indian troops have entered Goa and the police action, like the one in Hyderabad, has begun.

If such is the police action of non-violent people the world may well wonder what their military action would be like. The inevitable has, however, happened. It is difficult to resist the temptation to say that the need of action might have been avoided if Mr. Nehru and his colleagues in the Cabinet had been less voluble and loquacious and had talked less of their adherence to nonviolence. As late as December 5 last, 12 days before the Indian Army began moving into Goa, Mr. Nehru had said in the Lok Sabha: "I am free to confess to this House that my soul reacts against war anywhere. That is the training I have received throughout my life and I cannot easily get rid of it at the age of 72." The Portuguese and the world should have been told in the clearest possible terms that the Indian Army would have to move into Goa if the Portuguese do not quit it. Instead the desire to pat themselves on the back often seized our Ministers, and they talked of what they had learnt under Mahatma Gandhi, even in seminar on colonialism held here last month. Perhaps what the Mahatma approved was more to the point. When bombers roared overhead on their way to Kashmir he said at his evening prayer meeting, "*Mera mun naach raha hai*"—my heart is dancing with joy—because the bombers were going to the aid of Sheikh Abdulla. We can safely allow hearts to dance with joy, adherence to nonviolence notwithstanding.

Book Review

NEHRU: A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY: By Michael Brecher. Oxford University Press 1959. Pages: 682.

This book by a Canadian Professor opens with a chapter on the portrait of Nehru as a Man and closes with another with Nehru as a leader. The author calls it a political biography. It is one of the best accounts of Nehru as leader of the national liberation movement and as moulder of India's destiny (as a free country since independence) that have appeared in recent years. It brings the story to the years of the Second Five Year Plan (and later till 1958).

It gives a graphic account of the early years of Nehru showing the main streams of influence that went into the making of his mind. It passes on through an understanding portrayal of India's freedom struggle with the British (complicated with the Muslim problem as it was), through a picture of the tumultuous parleys with the Cabinet Mission, the Interim Government and the Partition tragedies to the stabilisation of free status in the immediate aftermath of Independence. The role of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress stalwarts, Patel and Prasad and Azad vis a vis Nehru is brought out in just proportion.

The generation that grew up with the freedom struggle from around 1918 is fast passing away. To the growing generation it has become a matter of distant history. It is therefore necessary or the presentation of educative continuity in the governing class and the mass of educated intelligentsia that works of this kind should appear from time to time keeping the record up-to-date and helping them to recapture something of the passionate climate of the struggle for freedom.

The author has succeeded in capturing the spirit of the national movement with which he is in essential sympathy.

But the effort of sympathetic identification that the author makes so successfully does not blind him to the defects of his hero. The limitations of the philosophy of life that Nehru imbibed from the dominant Leftist circles of the time (when he was entering into years of maturity in the thirties), especially the over-valuing of the beneficent role of Soviet Russia in world affairs, the temperamental shortcomings of Nehru that prevented any effort towards an analysis of current views that went against the grain, impatience of detail and aversion to thoroughness in the realm of ideas, inability to judge men and their motives and character, an excessive personal loyalty to friends over-riding deeper values—are all brought out in relevant contexts.

While bringing out the factors that distinguish Nehru's world view and his major reformist or revolutionary interests in modernising his coun-

try, the author lets the reader catch glimpses of their one-sidedness and inadequacy without enfeebling the individuality of his subject.

The result is that we have a convincing and faithful picture of the towering personality of Nehru moulding the policies of socialism, secularism, industrialisation, land reform and social transformation (as through the Hindu Code legislation) during the years of freedom from 1947 as well as his controversial foreign policy of non-alignment.

The years 1950-57 see the picture of Nehru's India emerging through Five Year Plans, Community Development Projects, the promulgation of "the socialist pattern of society" and its implementation with relentless drive.

A chapter on Planning and Welfare gives a vivid account of this great drive. Another on India and the world sketches the foreign policies of Nehru non-alignment with the blocs, pro-Russian trends, Panchsheel, rapport with Muslim States, anti-imperialism. The running sore of Indo-Pakistan hostilities is also given its due place in the picture.

But it is clear that the entire climate of thought and value in the book is Western-oriented and takes its departure from current Western thought and problems. That makes it easy for the author to understand Nehru, for these ingredients of Nehru's thought and motivation are but Western influence absorbed by his sensitive mind.

The author does not attempt to put Nehru in the context of Indian culture and climate and does not try to assess Nehru's *Discovery of India* at its true worth.

As regards Russian communism, the author relates the view given by Nehru in an interview. Nehru says to the author that Russia is not interested in expansion of territory and will let the East European States go free, if the West ceases to threaten her with war-like attacks! This is revealing, coming as it does in 1958-after Korea, Laos, Hungary, (Lumumba's Congo area), Cuba and Guatemala. The Chinese story of border aggression came later, after the book was in print. Nehru's explanation for advocating China's inclusion in the UNO reveals the same naivete as regards the operative expansionist motives of international communism.

Another apercu reveals the reason for the dominance of Nehru in the Congress hierarchy. When Rajendra Prasad, Patel, Rajagopalachari and others resigned from Nehru's Working Committee on account of his unauthorised socialism, Gandhi gets them to withdraw their resignation with the chiding that they should have opposed Nehru's views openly on earlier occasions. This is a pointer to the collapse of their independent judgement before Nehru's ascendancy, which is the chief reason for the devitalisation of Congress today.

The author notes that the bulk of Congressmen do not agree but do not oppose his views in terms of reason. This shows the fatal consequence of neglecting serious thought for opposing extremes in a rational way. India is passing through revolution without adequate intellectual preparation.

—M. A. Venkata Rao

Gleanings from the Press

CONGRESS FUNDSTERS' DANDA

Congress lists for the coming elections are being finalized after the filtering of some ten thousand candidates sponsored by the two wings, ministerial and organizational, registered at State-level. They have turned a blind eye on practices, extortionate and deceitful, in the collection of funds which must now suffice for three elections and three floods, if the candidates adhere to ceilings of expenditure laid down by the law. The plea held out in some quarters that collections from business-houses are spontaneously rendered has been proved hollow. In Andhra where harmony after bitter struggle for selections is reported, the Chief Minister admitted in the State Assembly "that donations aggregating to Rs. 1,30,500 were made between 1956 and 1959 by certain government companies to the Congress Party". In Orissa the Opposition leader vindicated the allegation that "Congress Government was mis-using the funds of industrial concerns, in which the State had shares, for party purposes by appointing Congress partymen as members on the Board of Directors of these concerns". Nobody denies that other parties are also collecting purses offered, but, as Rajaji said, they seek aid as suppliants for a deserving democratic cause whereas Congress fundsters go the rounds with danda in hand, the Prime Minister gazing far on the horizon as if totally unaware of excesses.

—P.J. in Swarajya

News & Views

GOA FREED: PORTUGUESE SURRENDER

THE PORTUGUESE garrisons at Panjim, Capital of Goa, and at Daman and Diu surrendered to Indian forces on December 18, morning bringing the operations to an end, it was officially announced.

MAJOR-GENERAL K. P. CANDETH HAS TAKEN OVER AS MILITARY GOVERNOR OF ALL TERRITORIES WHICH WERE FORMERLY PORTUGUESE COLONIAL POSSESSIONS IN INDIA.

The Indian Flag fluttered all over Goa, Daman and Diu as India formally took over the administration of these territories on the successful completion of "Operation Vijay" which began 26 hours earlier, at dawn on December 18.

**RESOLUTION IN U. N.
FOR CEASE-FIRE IN GOA
NOT ADOPTED**

UNITED NATIONS,

THE UNITED NATIONS' 11-member Security Council adjourned indefinitely on Tuesday after failing to adopt a Western draft resolution calling on India to cease hostilities in Goa and an Afro-Asian proposal rejecting Portugal's complaint to the Council against India.

RUSSIA DID NOT WANT CHINA IN UN THIS YEAR

The defeat of the Soviet motion on the admission of China in the General Assembly was anticipated, but it raises several questions.

The entire debate was without interest and caused no excitement because no one intended to push it dramatically.

The Soviet Union did absolutely nothing to show that Peking's admission was a matter of vital interest to it.

Up to the last minute Soviet delegate Zorin's interventions were formal and without conviction.

The Soviet attitude, according to diplomats here, was due not only to well-known ideological differences with Peking but also to other, perhaps more important reasons. At the moment Russia is mainly interested in coming to an arrangement with the U.S. on Berlin and Central Europe. It realizes that President Kennedy is also working in the same direction. Had Peking been admitted to the UN, the reaction in the U.S. would have been so strong as to completely destroy the climate not antagonistic to accommodation with the Soviet Union in Europe.

SOVIET IMPERIALISM

New Delhi: Commenting on Soviet policy behind the continuous influx of Russians into Soviet Central Asia, Lt.-Col. G. E. Wheeler, director, Central Asian Research Centre, London, said here that the aim was to "create a standard Soviet man with a standard Soviet culture."

Beginning in the first decade of this century, the flow has accelerated in the following years, and now there was one non-Asian for every two natives in the five Central Asian republics, he said.

Col. Wheeler was speaking on "Soviet Central Asia" under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs at Sapru House.

Though "sovietization" of the area had been going on for a long time, there was no effective intermingling of non-Asians and the natives, he said. They lived side by side and not among one another.

CHINA BUILDS AIRFIELD NEAR SIKKIM BORDER

Darjeeling:—The Chinese have constructed a large airfield in Khampa Dzong plateau, adjoining

North Sikkim, according to an unimpeachable source.

Khampa Dzong, situated among the limestone hills, has some castles and forts where a large number of Chinese troops have been concentrated at present.

The airfield is believed to be the biggest ever constructed by the Chinese and is capable of accommodating Jet aircrafts and troop carriers.

It is difficult to surmise the utility of this airfield so near to Tuna airfield (15,000 ft.), situated 19 miles from Pharidzong near the Sikkim-Bhutan-Tibet border, and Tingri airfield at the base of the Everest.

Unless it is used specifically to dump strategic supplies and help quick troop movement to forward Chinese posts in Western Tibet, during the winters, the utility of Khampa Dzong airfield seems to be nothing, considering that already a good road links Pharidzong with Khampa Dzong, on identical route previously taken by Everest expeditions to scale the peak from Tibet.

**GOVT. CHECK ON TEXT BOOKS
MADRAS PANEL'S ADVERSE NOTE**

MADRAS: The State Assembly committee on estimates has expressed itself against the nationalisation of text books on the ground that it would naturally lead to regimentation of ideas and would be detrimental to the cause of education itself.

In its 15th report presented to the Assembly today by its chairman, Mr. C. R. Ramaswamy, the committee has suggested that the Government appoint competent personnel to write text books so that these would also compete with the text books published by private publishers.

It should be clearly laid down that books produced by the Government and private agencies should be screened and selected by competent selection committees free from all influences. This would result in the private publishers producing better books of better standards.

**UPSC DROPS IDEA OF HINDI EXAMS.
ENGLISH TO CONTINUE**

MADRAS.—Mr. C. Subramaniam, Madras Education Minister, told the State Legislative Council during question-time on Friday that English would continue to be the medium for examinations conducted by the Union Public Service Commission.

He was replying to a supplementary question put by Dr. A. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar, Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University and Leader of the Opposition, who asked if it was a fact that the U.P.S.C. was going to conduct its examinations in Hindi and English.

The Minister replied in the negative. "That proposal has been given up", he added.

The Minister replied in the negative to the main question whether the Government had re-

January 1, 1962

Regd. No. B 6520

ceived any communication from the Union Government about the introduction of Hindi for purposes of Central Government Services examinations.

Dear Editor

The articles published in the "Indian Libertarian", are very interesting and informative, and I hope that the standard would be kept up.

Indeed I shall be very glad to see the journal turn up to be a weekly. I wish the proprietors would take necessary action in this respect.

Wishing you, the worthy Editor, Mr. Tholal and the rest in your office who have worked for the good and success of the paper **A VERY HAPPY CHRISTMAS AND A PROSPEROUS NEW YEAR.**

Singapore.
9th December, 1961.

S. G. GOPAL

NOTICE

Our Allahabad readers may obtain their copies of "The Indian Libertarian", directly from:

Shri P. N. Singh M. A.,
332, Muthiganj,
Allahabad.

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

To Buy At Half The Price!

"CAUSES OF BUSINESS DEPRESSION"

By Levy Hugo Biligam. One of the
Best Books on Monetary Economics
Highly Praised by Economists

Original Price Rs. 15

Concessional Rate Until

February 1962: Rs. 7.50 nP.

ORDER SOON FROM

Libertarian Publishers, Arya Bhuvan,
Sandhurst Road, Bombay-4.

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

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



Write to:

THE MANAGER

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

BOMBAY 4

Telephone : 70205

Telegram : LOTEWALLA

Edited by D. M. Kulkarni B.A., LL.B., for the Libertarian Publishers Private Ltd., Printed by G. N. Lawande, at G. N. Printers, Indra Bhuvan, Tadwadi, Bombay 2, and published by him at the office of the Libertarian Publishers (Private) Ltd., 26, Durgadevi Road, Bombay 4.