

# Indian Libertarian

Price 25 Naye Paisa

Incorporating the 'Free Economic Review' and 'The Indian Rationalist'  
AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY  
AND LIBERTARIAN DEMOCRACY

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

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

Vol. VIII No. 5

IN THIS ISSUE

June 1, 1960

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL .. .. .	1	<i>Inflation Vs. Morality</i> by Henry Hazlitt ..	14
<i>To Prosperity through Freedom</i> by V. R. ..	5	DELHI LETTER .. .. .	15
<i>Summit for Propaganda</i> by M. N. Tholal ..	8	BOOK REVIEW .. .. .	17
<i>Peace and Freedom</i> by Sidney Hook .. ..	10	NEWS AND VIEWS .. .. .	17
RATIONALIST SUPPLEMENT	LIV	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR .. .. .	19

## EDITORIAL

### KHRUSHCHEV TORPEDOES THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

AT the time of writing, the long-prepared-for Summit Conference met at Paris but was torpedoed by a truculent opening speech by Khrushchev condemning President Eisenhower and the USA for sending the reconnaissance U 2 Plane deep into Russian territory which was shot down on May 1. Khrushchev was deeply stirred by the incident and protested to America leaving her the loophole of pretending that it was not officially authorised by Washington and in particular personally by President Eisenhower.

But official America decided to state the full truth as the better policy and confess to reconnoitering by photographic expeditions by high-flying U-2 Planes. The pilot Mr. Powers (30) was captured as he baled out after being hit by a Russian rocket, sent, it appears, by personal command of Khrushchev himself.

The wreckage was exhibited in Moscow with instruments intact but only the engine and wings

damaged. The theory put out by Russia is that the plane was brought down by a rocket at a height of some twelve miles. But it is highly unlikely that a powerful rocket will leave sufficient time for the pilot to bale out and that it will thoughtfully in the interests of Russian propaganda leave the incriminating instruments intact! It is therefore suggested that the pilot must have been forced to land by warnings and perhaps by machine gun fire sufficient to scare him. It is significant that the American request for an interview with the pilot was refused.

Khrushchev has made terrific use of the incident tarring the Americans for war-mongering and spying in peace time. He professes to be "horrified" that President Eisenhower should have authorised invasion of the skies of Russia in peace time. He says that such conduct is only permissible in war but not in peace and declares that Russian planes have never hovered over other people's lands!

Khrushchev has put on a moral pose and put the Americans in the dock of world public opinion.

The British unofficially have said quietly that all nations are in the habit of spying on each other's

territory as a matter of routine necessity. The American Secretary of State Mr. Herter stated the truth when he announced that America was forced to adopt this method of photographic expeditions by high flying planes to get vital information about any preparations for surprise attack like the sneak swoop on Pearl Harbour by Japan in the last war. This is unanswerable and Russian leaders cannot put themselves on a moral plane higher than the Western nations, in face of the unscrupulous character of Russian ideology with its goal of world conquest anyhow and its practice of maintaining subversive communist parties in all countries pledged by legal and illegal means to bring them under the control of the Kremlin in the last resort. As Churchill said in his famous Fulton speech in 1947, the Russians should be asked to roll up the iron curtain and to withdraw their fifth columnists from foreign countries and to withdraw their military forces from Eastern and Central Europe into their old Czarist frontiers. Even Dulles gave up this demand (in effect) content with containment leaving liberation for a later and more propitious time. Today the balance of power seems to have tilted against the West, what with the astonishing progress of Russia in rocketry and space missiles.

By the bye, the Summit meeting on the 16th May was preceded by another tremendous triumph of Russian space technology. They hoisted a 4½ ton space ship with room for a man-sized Robot to circle round the earth two hundred miles high, installed with many scientific recorders and transmitters. The idea is to prepare for sending a human being next time, if they have not already put one inside instead of the robot announced.

## **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.

They may announce the presence of the human being if he returns successfully!

And on the opening day, Khrushchev asked Eisenhower to pledge himself not to send any more spy-planes, to apologise (in effect) for Powers' intrusion in the U.2 Plane and withdrew his invitation to him to visit Russia. This was a great and unprecedented insult to America and the Western nations generally. America is made to look small in the eyes of the world. It remains to be seen whether the summit meetings would continue, as a result of the conciliatory efforts of MacMillan and De Gaulle. It will be known before this issue is in print. Khrushchev mentioned a postponement of the Summit meeting for eight months, probably keeping the American elections in view so as to have a new president to deal with. In his eyes President Eisenhower has lost caste completely. He refused to have tea with the Big Three on the eve of the Meeting!

The West has suffered a catastrophic propaganda defeat. To make the balance good, they should bring up the whole shady and monstrous character of the Russian system in ideology and totalitarian tyranny of the most complete and inhuman kind, surprising the Chinghiz Khans and Tamurlanes of old. They should initiate a full and many-sided campaign for Truth and reinforce it with many world-wide seminars attended by knowledgeable persons and experts. The free world is suffering by default in the propaganda war in spite of the better case they have in terms of humanism and democracy or at least civil liberties and the rule of law. The world would be safer in the hands of the West many times over than in those of Russia with all her technological superiority in space exploration.

## **PAKISTAN AND ALIGNMENT**

The Russian charge that Pakistan allowed her air base at Peshawar to be used by the American spy pilot to take off to Soviet Russia on his ill-fated mission on May 1 has caused supporters of non-alignment in India to say—"What did we say? India is safe from Russian threats because of her infinitely wiser policy of non-alignment."

Pakistan has shown nervousness at the Russian threat of wiping out her airbase city of Peshawar by rockets, if she harboured spy flights again. President Ayub Khan and Foreign Minister Qadar have said that they would formally protest to the USA if it is true that Pilot Powers had taken off from Peshawar to Russian air space.

But it is clear that Pakistan has no right to protest to the American authorities. She has received immense military equipment free of cost from America on the understanding that she would function as a brave and loyal partner in repelling any aggression from Soviet Russia or international communism generally which would include China! Her military and civil personnel have received huge

sometimes as part of military and economic Aid and now that the time may come for repaying the favour by standing by the great Ally, she is showing the white feather. No one can sympathise with this blowing hot and cold at the same time. President Ayub Khan was on better ground when he said that the Americans would go to the rescue of Pakistan if the Russians should attack.

India cannot for all time maintain her aloof neutralism in the closely tangled relations of the blocs. She has to take her choice. Since China has already annexed several thousand square miles of her territory in Ladakh and threatens to occupy some forty thousand more in NEFA and Upper Assam, there is no alternative for India but to cast her lot with the West and the USA. Neutrality pleases neither party. The present stubborn holding on to non-alignment in spite of the Chinese aggression can only be motivated by the hope and desire for Russian intervention in her behalf.

But Russia has not persuaded China to return the stolen lands but only insisted that India should take recourse only to peaceful methods such as talks and mediation etc. That means that ultimately India will have to enter the Russo-Chinese empire as a satellite, if her leader is not pressured to change his policy of non-alignment into one of alliance with the West. There is no other way left.

If military partnership means readiness to fight along-side the Allies, it holds the hope, the only hope of retaining independence after victory. To refuse to fight under all circumstances is not defence nor politics.

### THE COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE

The Commonwealth Conference met early in May. There were new members like the President of Ghana and Tunku Abdul Rahman of Malaya.

The most sensational topic for discussion related to the apartheid policy of South Africa which has recently led to widespread resistance by Africans and cruel suppression by the Whites. Prime Minister Voervoerd was shot at in the face by a white antagonist and is now out of danger. His place at the Commonwealth Conference was taken by Minister Louw. The Conference could not ignore the African impasse. There were several protest demonstrations even in London. There were demands from Labour members of Parliament for the expulsion of South Africa from the Commonwealth.

Finally, Minister Louw was persuaded to meet members unofficially and listen to their criticism or suggestion. There was no open discussion in full session. But even in private, Louw held to his guns and maintained that South Africa would continue its policy of segregation and inferior status of the blacks.

Tunku Abdul Rahman of Malaya left the meeting abruptly in protest against the obduracy of the South African Minister and declared that he would

initiate a campaign in Asia and Africa against the South African Apartheid policy. This created a sensation.

The South African Minister suffered a set-back in-as-much as the Conference would not commit itself to approve his country becoming a Republic like India and others while remaining a member of the Commonwealth.

In India, the old plea that we should sever our connection with the Commonwealth as an affront to our independent nationhood and as being of no particular use, has been revived by some publicists.

This is a matter requiring careful consideration from the national point of view, apart from our contribution to international solidarity. Burma, it is pointed out, has not suffered by remaining out of the Commonwealth.

As for inferiority complex, that depends on the psychology of our leaders. Nehru has been quite uncompromising and even offensive, as in his condemnation of the British invasion of the Suez canal under Eden. He has maintained his non-alignment policy alone in spite of the alignment of Britain and Australia and Canada and New Zealand. The real question is the use we derive from membership. The most important consideration is assistance in defence matters. India needs assistance in military training for her armed forces—the Army, the Navy and Air Force—in common exercises. It is better to have it continued with Britain than with others. Also, consultation in matters of policy is vital.

Members receive confidential information and appraisal of world events and the changing aspects of international matters which is very educative to new members like ourselves, yet unfamiliar to the responsibilities of independent nationhood. But of course it is a pity that our Prime Minister is above learning from others and from current happenings. He has remained stuck up in the views current among fashionable Leftist thinkers in the thirties like Front Populaire. The fact that most of the leading young thinkers of that decade, disillusioned by Stalin's purges and intervention in the Spanish Conflict and the magnitude of the cruelty his conduct displayed, gave up their prejudices and renewed their faith in freedom and democracy, has not had any effect on our leader. That is our ill-luck. But India would suffer if she deprives herself of the inside information and advice of Britain and other Members of the Commonwealth with regard to the world situation and its military and economic background.

The Commonwealth also discussed the economic situation resulting from the division of European economy between the Common Market Six and the Outer Seven with Britain as leader. This affects Indian trade and Commonwealth trade, particularly those with underdeveloped countries with agricultu-

ral raw materials for export. It was agreed that a concerted effort should be made to hasten and increase financial assistance to underdeveloped countries. Commonwealth relations might be a help and not a hindrance in this matter, though the Great Giver being America, leaving the Commonwealth may not matter much. But there is no disadvantage.

Also, in case of war, the Commonwealth relation would be very useful not only militarily but also in many matters of war-time trade and cooperation.

It is not necessary to be hasty in leaving the Commonwealth. There are no strings attached and even if there were expectations of mutual help, they are not bonds of steel but only bonds of cooperative sympathy.

It will also enhance our influence with both the white and black worlds.

### FOOD GRAINS FROM AMERICA, MINISTER PATIL'S 17 MILLION TON DEAL

Minister Patil has brought off his great Deal of 17 Million Ton purchase of food grains from the USA—16 million tons of wheat and one million tons of rice; three million tons a year for meeting possible deficits and five for a big Buffer Storage. The Food Scarcity should not trouble us until we step our production up to 110 million tons from the present 73 million tons in five years, as we should. This would be the second part of the Challenge Patil has to meet and not rest on his oars.

### NEHRU VISITS EGYPT AND TURKEY

In Egypt he is visiting rural areas and seeing the land reforms in operation there and the new projects of cooperative colonisation on the banks of the Nile in newly irrigated areas.

While President Nasser was in India a short while ago, he had been assured of India's support for Arab nationalism, a phrase which appeared in Rajendra Prasad's welcome speech. The communique mentioned India's sympathy with the Arab cause in Palestine and the Middle East generally.

But what is Arab nationalism? In Nasser's mouth and according to the Cairo Radio, it means the policy of sweeping all Arab lands—Saudi Arabia, Jordan, the Persian Gulf States and Iraq as well into one empire under the control or hegemony of President Nasser. Is it wise to commit ourselves to this ambition of President Nasser? If we do, we shall be antagonising Iraq's Kassem.

Khrushchev has the same dilemma. Recently he has announced his support to Arab States in their individuality apart from their allegiance to Egypt or Syria or UAR. He wants Kassem to remain independent of Nasser.

Also, to support the Palestine policy of Nasser is to antagonise Israel. The Arabs want to wipe Israel out of the map by a new drive in combination.

There is no Palestine now outside Israel except a bit absorbed by Jordan.

Mr. Nehru is reported to have told President Nasser that Israel has come to stay and that India cannot indefinitely ignore her in diplomatic relationship. At present, India has formally recognised Israel but has refrained from following it up with diplomatic offices and relationship as a normal day-to-day matter.

Here we have a nest of problems entailing the loss of some friends and the incurring of the charge of insincerity by others. Indian interests would demand the firm recognition of Israel.

---

### TOTALITARIAN AND FREE SOCIETIES

There is, first, the fundamental division between totalitarian and free societies. In the former, the citizen is the mere servant of the state, while in international matters, reliance on force and aggressive expansion is normal development, however much the words "peace" and "co-existence" may be used to camouflage or confuse. Free Societies, on the other hand, are based on the doctrine, however imperfectly realised in practice, that man has rights and duties above and beyond the states and governments which have been created by him in order to protect his freedom and security under law and justice.

—Lester B. Pearson

(Democracy in World Politics)

---

### POLITICIANS AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Politicians are a set of men who have interests aside from the interests of the people; and who, to say the most of them, are at least one long step removed from honest men. I say this with greater freedom being a politician myself.

—Abraham Lincoln

---

### TYRANNY OF THE STATE

.....THE STATE WILL SELL YOU UP, BLOW YOU UP, KNOCK YOU DOWN, BLUDGEON, SHOOT, STAB, HANG-IN SHORT, ABOLISH YOU, IF YOU LIFT A HAND AGAINST IT.....

—G. Bernard Shaw (Essay on Anarchism)

# To Prosperity through Freedom

(SWATANTRA PARTY'S PHILOSOPHY AND POLICY DECLARED AT PATNA ON 19 AND 20 MARCH 1960)

By V. R.

**L**IKE Luther at Godesburg, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari has nailed his Fourteen Points on the door of the Ruling Party in crucial challenge. The Patna Convention authorised a statement of policy on 19 and 20 March 1960 which is issued to the general public in the form of a brochure called: **To Prosperity through Freedom.**

The Congress cannot ignore it any longer. The Congress from the days of its founder Mahatma Gandhi has contented itself with practical programmes leaving ideology and refinement of ideals to the supreme leader. Moreover, the aim then was simple, namely, to get rid of the foreign ruler and to establish swaraj or government by the people. The governing sentiment was nationalism. The particular ideas and ideals developed by Gandhi in the course of his conduct of different campaigns had a general appeal but were not accepted by all on grounds of rational conviction. Even non-violence which Gandhi erected into an End in itself was accepted, for instance, by Jawaharlal Nehru as a Means necessary and inevitable under the circumstances of an unarmed people facing a modern fully-armed Government which could command every sphere of life and dominate every corner of the country through an all-pervasive network of government, roads, telegraphs, strategic railways and mobile military forces.

Khadi, prohibition, simplicity or even austerity of life, constructive work in preparing villages imbued by the Gandhian ideas, prayer, fasts, vows etc. were all accepted along with his theoretical notions of Hind Swaraj in a vague way.

One who was a Minister in Mysore told the present writer that there was no need to think afresh on social and political ideals and policies, because all that had been sufficiently and efficiently done by Gandhi long ago. He represented the closed mind so characteristic of the Congress intellectual and politician.

Today we have a similar situation in the country with Nehru as supreme leader. Congress leaders and rank and file take their ideology and policy from Nehru passively without much of a heart-searching and analysis or discussion. The very Constitution queers the pitch for the future by including socialist programmes in the directive principles of policy such as levelling the disparities of wealth, providing welfare through State control, the right of the State to take over any line of business from private hands for public purposes etc. The abolition of the zamindari

was accepted without discussion as something above and beyond reasonable challenge.

The Policy Declaration of 1948 regarding industrialisation laid down the dogma of State ownership and control of all key industries. This is socialism before Avadi (1955). The ideology of Nehru by way of Marxist economy has come into force from the very beginning of independent government in 1947 and has now reached proportions threatening the destruction of the democratic foundations and structure of free India.

The Patna brochure of the Swatantra party describes this state of crisis confronting the country in all its aspects, both general referring to the overall psychological effects on national character and specific referring to the actual policies, economic and social. It proceeds to delineate an alternative policy and programme designed to reverse these destructive trends and set the country on the true path of stability and progress.

In doing this, it takes issue in a frontal manner with the basic doctrine of socialism and traces the failures of Congress policy to the blind way in which the Soviet pattern of industrialisation with its undue stress on heavy industries and neglect of consumer goods and agriculture is being put into force despite all warning by knowledgeable persons, both Indian and foreign.

The Swatantra party is doing a genuine and much-needed service to the country by forcing a rational discussion of the philosophy and economy and polity of democracy in the light of our social and historical conditions. Democracy is government by discussion and it cannot be established securely without the development of an unusually large class of persons in all walks of life taking part in the discussion of public affairs in different degrees. A free press and platform and the habit of discussing public events and policy-proposals should be fostered in a democracy. So far the Congress Government is pursuing policy as if it were a private matter of the party and of its leaders. Publicity is sought only for approval and endorsement by the masses. Criticism is not welcomed. Day by day, the press is finding increasing pressure for conformity with ruling views.

In such a situation, the brochure of the Swatantra party as well as the challenging speeches of Sri C. Rajagopalachari, Mr. M. R. Masani, Mr. K. M. Munshi, Prof. Ranga, Mr. Ratnaswamy and others have initiated a debate on the fundamentals of socia-

ism versus democratic freedom as governing principles of national reconstruction and progress consistent with stability.

As regards the general aspect of the situation, the brochure points out that the great aspirations natural to a great country with a historic culture and civilisation imposes a special responsibility on the Government. It holds that the Congress government has not risen to the occasion but has caused a deterioration in the national fibre by its conduct with wide gaps between high professions and demoralising slackness in administration.

Nor has the lot of the common man improved in spite of huge expenditure on grandiose projects and industrial establishments. The middle classes in particular are being wiped out under conditions of great hardship and frustration due to the growing difficulty of maintaining their standards of education and simple comforts.

A small group of Congress leaders has come to exercise an excess of governmental authority irresponsible to public opinion, banking on the past services of the Indian National Congress.

Other Statist parties like the PSP have become but satellites of the ruling party with similar socialist ideals borrowed unintelligently from abroad.

In the last section, the brochure discloses the mission of the Party of winning for the individual citizen freedom in the context of democratic life, which the struggle for national independence won for the nation. It declares that it will train the country for freedom, continuing the work of Gandhi and claims that the Swatantra party is a party that the country needs in order to fulfil its destiny—the party of ordered progress in and through freedom.

Like the Congress, therefore, the Swatantra party also claims to be a movement for building a society of free individuals and realising greatness for the country in the comity of nations and fulfilling the promise inherent in the greatness of past culture and civilisation.

Man does not live by bread alone. He needs some overflow feeling, some overall objectives beyond bread and butter, some horizon to expand his outlook and yield large aims for his immediate activities. Hence we find the Westerner referring to the white man's burden. Even the South African Boer has the ideal of preserving Christian white civilisation. The Nazi dreamt of Nietzsche's goal of supermen lording it over the earth by virtue of superior aristocratic blood. Mussolini dreamt of reviving the glories of the old Roman empire. The communists have the heady goal of ruling the whole world and transforming the whole of human society into the pattern of a New Mass Man in a New Mass society in which Government fades away after producing self-sustaining Plenty. Gandhi dreamt of Hind Swaraj, a republic of autonomous villages living an Arcadian life of simplicity close to nature.

Nehru has the vision of socialised society with industrialisation carried to its apogee, full of science and technology.

To these glamorous visions, the Swatantra party opposes its own picture of a free society functioning in accordance with the principles of free economy with a minimum amount of social, political and legal regulation. Voluntary associations fill the scene in a free society with the State confining itself to the limited sphere of law, order, and justice. Perhaps it may pioneer industries in case of the unreadiness of voluntary groups to take them up.

Free self-realisation through self-chosen activities in all the spheres of knowledge and action, art and science, industry and commerce, transport and communications, education, amusement and relaxation and happy associated activity in excursions and fellowship of various kinds—this is the picture presented by the Swatantra party. Hegel proclaimed that the goal of human society and civilisation is the attainment of Freedom. Karl Marx (the perverse student of Hegel) also had some dim notion of Freedom as the culmination of his communist society—with the State withering away, all class oppression vanishing and everyone doing his best for State and Society and everyone obtaining from State and Society everything needed for human satisfaction and growth.

It is in the picture of proximate ideals, of actual governmental policies that social goals come to have vastly differing impacts on the day-to-day lives of the people, giving them the exhilaration of expanding freedom or cribbing, cabinning and confining them into narrow grooves charged with pain and frustration.

### COMMON ASPIRATIONS

It is agreed that society should have aspirations common to all and methods of fulfilling them common in a general way to all parties. For instance, that equality of opportunity should be available to all, is common to all parties. That democratic conventions and rules of running government with a multi-party system built on free franchise are common or should be common. It is doubtful if the communist party with its avowed antagonism to democracy should be recognised as a democratic party with the right to appeal to the public for votes.

### SWATANTRA PARTY'S OPPOSITION TO THE CURRENT PATTERN

The party makes out a case for a different party like itself by a trenchant and crucial criticism of the Present Pattern of Development pursued by the Congress Government under Nehru's supreme lead. It is here that the two outlooks come into frontal clash. The country has to make up its mind about the merits of this debate through a full canvas and consideration of all the implications and ramifications of the rival philosophies and programmes.

The Congress has accepted Marxism as its basic platform and Stalinist Five Year Plans for Rapid Industrialisation with self-sufficiency in heavy industries as its goal. The overtones of this programme are dictatorial in nature and tendency.

The Swatantra party points out the full consequences of such a programme and policy, illustrating them with the results already in evidence consequent on the attempts to run the two Five Year Plans.

The basic philosophy of the present pattern is a fundamentalist belief that the State or Government is the main instrument of economic and social advance, that in consequence, basic industries should be owned by and strategic points of economic vantage must be in the occupation of the State; that the private sector is reduced to inconsequential proportions; that the peasantry must somehow be persuaded to extinguish themselves in big "cooperatives" or collective farms; that the lion's share of capital investment must go into heavy industries; that while this process is in train, the people must be denied their reasonable consumption needs; that to secure these ends, Parliament should be subordinated to the party in power and the party itself to the decisions taken by a coterie of planners directed by a group of powerful party bosses under a supreme chief: Mr. Nehru in the present instance.

The Swatantra party rejects this approach and believes that it will inevitably end in the destruction of democracy.

But the Swatantra party is not averse to planning altogether. It only wants planning to be in consonance with democracy. Annual goals and budgets can take care of continuous industrial and other development under the direct control of Government and its Cabinet. Goals such as provision of food, clothing, shelter, public health and elementary education could be laid down and government could give all encouragement to private parties to provide abundance in these lines. A few defence industries and key industries like railways and communications can be kept in the hands of Government.

As attempt must be made to live within the resources of the people. Loans should not exceed capacity to repay. Taxation should not absorb all the spare incomes of the producers.

Concentration of power by the capitalist may be undesirable beyond a certain extent such as monopolies rendering the entry of competitors difficult in certain oligopolies.

But that the combination of political (i.e. police) and economic power in the hands of the same governing groups is infinitely worse—is the verdict of the Swatantra party.

The defenders of the present order i.e. Congress and its supporters have to join issue with this chal-

lenge thrown out by the Swatantra party in terms of reason and experience.

The opponents have to assess the disadvantages of Statism already making themselves felt in the life of the country as detailed by the Swatantra party. They have, again, to assess the claim that man produces more in conditions of freedom than in conditions of excessive regulation as would result, if most industries and commercial activities were to be annexed by the Government. They have to take into consideration the example of West Germany, Hongkong and Japan who have rebuilt their shattered economies in the course of seven or eight years to a level higher than before the war and than many of the victors in the war! They have done it on the basis of private enterprise, encouraged and regulated by the State which trusted the initiative, enterprise and capacity of the people. The Swatantra Party declares that it has such a faith in the energy, enterprise and capacity of the Indian people to develop industry and commerce rapidly, learning from the West and teaching ever-increasing groups of apprentices the secrets of western technology.

There is no incentive stronger, more stable and steady than that of working for one's own betterment when assured that one can be sure of the results of one's labour and capacity.

Socialism flouts the well-established psychological principle that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. Even in joint-stock companies managers can scarcely be as diligent and responsible as the private owner-entrepreneur-manager. A society with a large proportion of self-employed people is more resilient, progressive and happy than a society where the bulk of producers are government employees with fixed remuneration like civil servants.

Competition is like oxygen to the economy. State monopoly of economic enterprise will result in stagnation all round in the absence of competition. In Russia they try to impose competition between similar industrial units but it can scarcely resemble the real article.

It is not enough to condemn parrot-like that the Swatantra cry is merely the old cry of laissez-faire. The booklet points out that it is far from being the case. The Party accepts as much regulation as necessary to check anti-social, unfair exploitation on the part of industrialists and traders.

The debate ramifies into extensive spheres of life and needs to be carried on by politicians, teachers, journalists, administrators and the general public. The new party will start with better auspices for democracy if it is carried to power not on the strength of big money, or on the strength of Rajaji's fame but on that of rational conviction.

# Summit For Propaganda

By M. N. Tholal

**P**OLITICS is a game of putting the other fellow in the wrong and Mr. Khrushchev almost succeeded in doing so in Paris. At any rate he cleverly avoided being put in the wrong by the Western Powers at the Paris Summit Conference. It is being said that Mr. Khrushchev's hands were tied by the Stalinists in the Kremlin who are gaining the upper hand, and Mr. Khrushchev, by a seemingly thoughtless remark, himself lent support to this theory—the reference here is to his observation that he was under pressure of internal policy matters—but what is more probable is, that the realisation to exploit the U-2 plane incident to break the Summit Conference came to him and his policy-makers after his speech in Moscow in which he said the U-2 incident should not be allowed to mar the prospects of the Summit. The possibility of that speech itself being a part of the bluff cannot be excluded, but we can afford to be charitable to Mr. Khrushchev and admit its sincerity, as well as the folly implicit in that sincerity—from the Russian viewpoint—which must have become apparent to him as the days passed.

Mr. Khrushchev cries 'peace' 'peace,' but does he really want peace except on his own terms? Can a man who keeps a dozen nations under his iron heels be said to be really desirous of peace? Similarly, he has been declaredly wanting all these years a Summit Conference with Western Powers. What for? To bring about disarmament? How can success attend any effort in this direction unless the main cause of friction between the blocs—differences over unification of Germany—is removed? And how can differences over the German problem be removed so long as the Soviet Union does not recognise the right of the people in East Germany to have the kind of Government they desire? This Soviet Russia is absolutely unwilling to do, because it will result in East Germany passing over from her grip and uniting with West Germany to form a still more powerful member of the anti-Russian bloc. Since agreement on the issue was out of the question and discussion thereon, with the airing of differences thereon, would have put the Soviet bloc entirely in the wrong, it had to be avoided at all costs. How then can there be any difference of opinion on the issue in the Kremlin?

## SELF-CONTRADICTION

This also implies that his insistence on the Summit Conference was far from sincere—as insincere as his continuous talk of peace. It must be realised that one insincere pose leads to another, and talk of peace led inevitably to talk of disarmament and a summit conference, whose propaganda value

must have had great attraction for the great propagandist that Khrushchev is. Two thousand Press correspondents attended his Press Conference in Paris where he called the hecklers "riff-raff" and "bastards" while, as usual, he himself made contradictory statements. For example, he asserted that the Soviet Union would march forward until the victory of Communism and then said a little later that differences over socialism or capitalism were no reason for quarrels or war. Likewise he declared that he had not issued any ultimatum and that he was prepared to take part in the Summit conference under certain conditions, and then asked, "How can we hold a conference with an aggressor who has not admitted his aggression?" If he was sincere in putting the question, why did he come to Paris? To put a question which could have been easily put in Moscow? These dictators become used to contradicting themselves and talking nonsense, because no one dare criticise them at home.

Another reason for his trying to find excuses for not attending the Summit Conference is that he found President Eisenhower a tough fellow, and hopes that he will find in his successor eight months hence, a much more pliant individual. For one thing, he will be new to his job, for another, anxious to earn international goodwill. Mr. Khrushchev said President Eisenhower had not pledged a halt to U-2 flights but only a suspension. What a futile distinction to make for a man who is keen on disarmament as well as, it must be assumed, on its concomitants—open skies and the right of inspection! What a futile distinction to make for a man whose sputniks, as Gen. De Gaulle pointed out, are encircling the globe capable of photographing Paris and other places 18 times a day!

## KHRUSHCHEV'S AIM

Mr. Khrushchev's tactics in Paris were obviously designed to influence the American Presidential elections. The American people, he said at the Press Conference, would choose a candidate who most deserved election and "one day leaders would come to power with whom we can establish not only good but friendly relations". He must have had in mind leaders like those whom he appoints in Soviet colonies in Eastern Europe. His fondness for that great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is not difficult to understand, for it was Roosevelt's trusting nature that practically handed over to the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Albania at a time when the USA, the sole possessor of the atom bomb, could have dictated terms to Soviet Russia. In fact it was Roosevelt's blunder that is responsible for the cold

war between the two blocs after the growing aggression of Soviet Russia, since she exploded her own atom and hydrogen bombs. American distrust of British colonialism was fully exploited by the astute Stalin and Churchill's warnings to Roosevelt against concessions to Russia went unheeded, with the result that the liquidating imperialisms and colonialisms of Britain, France and Holland find themselves up against the rising and ruthless imperialisms and colonialisms of Soviet Russia and China. Russia at the time was so shattered that its spectacular rise within a decade could not be visualised. And now Mr. Khrushchev wants an American President who would trust him as President Roosevelt trusted Stalin. But that is hardly likely to come about as the Democrats in America have realised the folly of Roosevelt's policies as well as the Republicans.

Instead of creating a split in the western bloc, as Mr. Khrushchev had hoped, he has only made them come closer to one another. His threat, repeated again on the eve of his departure from Paris, that Russia will conclude a peace treaty with East Germany, as a result of which the western powers will lose their rights in West Berlin, is only likely to promote that process. Russia can conclude any treaty it likes with her vassal state, East Germany, whose Moscow-appointed Prime Minister will always be willing to sign on the dotted line. But in the event of conflict between the two Germanys, as a result of the signing of that treaty, Russia cannot be sure of the loyalty of the population of East Germany. At the end of the last war the population of East Germany was 17 million, and out of this three million have fled to West Germany. Half these were under 25. These three million refugees represent a fairly cross section of trades and professions in East Germany. The extent of the percentage desiring to leave this haven of the working classes can be assessed from the fact that, in the first nine months of 1959, the University of Leipzig alone lost 108 professors and teachers. This is the state of affairs when migration from East Germany is a punishable offence. On the basis of the records of the East German Government, the number of political prisoners in that Russian colony is over 10,000. This does not include shirkers, saboteurs, spies, etc., all the latter being only synonyms for active opponents of the Government.

### THE SOVIET SOLUTION

And what is the Soviet solution of the German problem? The verbal concern for German reunification is there on Mr. Khrushchev's lips, for opposition to it would make Russians extremely unpopular even among Communists in East Germany, but Russia would have German reunification without jeopardising the Communist dictatorship it has imposed on East Germany. In other words, Soviet Russia wants the right in perpetuity to have a puppet government of its own in East Germany, irrespective of the wishes of the population in East

Germany. (There has been no election in East Germany in the sense in which we understand the term). So Russia wants a confederation of the two Germanys in which East Germany, with a population of 17 million, has parity with the German Democratic Republic, which has a population of 50 million and whose Government is representative of its people. In effect Russia wants parity between the 50 million West Germans and a few hundred thousand—at the most a million—Communists in East Germany whom she can regard as her trusted agents.

This is the Soviet idea of peace with justice. Mr. Khrushchev is shrewd enough to realise that he cannot put forward such a proposition publicly without making himself the laughing stock of the world—at least the free world—and hence his reluctance to participate in the Summit Conference brought into being by the consummate skill of the British Prime Minister, Harold MacMillan. The Russian reluctance can be appreciated further by those who realise the fact that once the Russians lose their iron grip over East Germany, the process will extend itself naturally to all those Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe where Russian tyranny holds sway. An intimate knowledge of what is going on in the Kremlin is therefore hardly necessary to understand the reasons which made Mr. Khrushchev fight shy of the Summit Conference, though an oblique reference to it may be necessary for Mr. Khrushchev to justify his apparent *volte face*.

In a nutshell, peace depends upon disarmament and disarmament depends on a fair solution of the German problem, to which Russia, for obvious reasons, refuses to make her contribution. The U-2 incident was a godsend for Messrs. Khrushchev and Company and they utilised it as a face-saving device. And to make our flesh creep, Mr. Khrushchev kept his Defence Minister, Marshal Malinovsky always by his side. No one can say that Mr. Khrushchev does not succeed in making our flesh creep or in engendering fear in our hearts—fear of the might of Soviet Russia. And he hopes to create that fear in the heart of the rival giant, the USA, and there is no denying the fact that the eve of the presidential election is the best time for doing so.

### DEMANDS OF SELF-PRESERVATION

But in doing so, Mr. Khrushchev overhit the mark. In insulting the American President he insulted the United States and he has seen the result in the cheering and flag-waving reception President Eisenhower got on his return to Washington and in the mounting anger against him in the USA. In the result President Eisenhower has proved more of a gentleman than a diplomat. Mr. Khrushchev gave him an opportunity to escape responsibility for the U-2 flights, but President Eisenhower's avowal and refusal to use the convention of diplo-

(Continued on page 10)

June 1, 1960

# Peace And Freedom

By Sidney Hook

(The Soviet Prime Minister Khrushchev has wrecked the Summit even before it began and the Summit is still-born. Yet no leader was more hailed as "a man of peace" as Khrushchev and no other country in the world was said to be more interested in world peace than the U.S.S.R.. If the U.S.S.R. is truly sincere and trustworthy, there should be no difficulty in its agreeing to the Western proposal for an adequate system of inspection. But if the Soviet Union is neither sincere nor trustworthy, then failure to implement a system of inspection would result in disaster for the free world. There is every danger in taking the professions of the Soviet Union for granted and delusion awaits those Pacifists, Neutralists and their camp who advocate a blind compromise with the Communists in an attempt to purchase peace. Sidney Hook, Chairman of the Graduate Philosophy Dep. at New York University has something to say to such gullibles—in this case to the veteran philosopher Bertrand Russell who values 'peace' as being more important than freedom. The following article by Hook who resumes his famous exchange with Russell two years ago is reproduced from the New Leader with courtesy—Ed.).

IT IS WITH some misgivings that I return to the theme which led to a vigorous exchange with Bertrand Russell, 2 years ago. The misgivings do not flow from the threats made by David Zaslavsky, chief hatchet man of the Kremlin's journalistic goon squad, who in commenting on our exchange promised me speedy liquidation as soon as universal peace and Communism was established. Nor from Andrei Gromyko's denunciation of me before the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union because of my position in the debate. They arise from the realization that I am calling attention to problems which many well-meaning people throughout the free world would rather not face. Irritated by the difficulty of the issues once it is forced on their attention, I fear they will visit their resentment upon me. Nonetheless, these questions and problems keep on emerging. There is no escaping them. If they are to be solved, we must have the courage to recognize the dangers and costs of the proposals to meet them.

Readers of THE NEW LEADER will recall the statement Bertrand Russell made to Joseph Alsop

*(Continued from page 9)*

macy mark him out as a great gentleman who refused to tell a lie.

The issue is between self-preservation and respect for international law. Which comes first? Self-preservation, obviously. And if international law favours gangsters in a situation and not those who stand for self-preservation, it needs being modified to suit the demands of self-preservation. In any case, it has not been observed by any of the Powers—instances which were kept secret are now being published—and it is hardly for those whose hands are still red with the rape of Hungary to pretend to be horrified at the justification of the flight of a plane over Soviet Russia, particularly when their chief spokesman has been threatening their opponents with extinction almost every day.

and subsequently broadcast to the entire world, that if the Communists refused to accept reasonable control on disarmament, the West should disarm unilaterally even if this meant the universal triumph of Communism and all its evils. I criticized Russell's position as a piece of political foolishness of the first magnitude, and as inviting that very Communist intransigence which in the past he had deplored. Only at the close of our debate, and after pacifists, neutralists and pro-Communists throughout the world had wrung the last ounce of political propaganda out of his statement, did Russell withdraw from this position. He declared that he had been forced into an appearance of holding it by unfortunate reporting and that the statement was merely a proposition in pure theoretical ethics which had no practical relevance whatever. I was gratified that my criticism had occasioned a revision of his position, but I now wonder if that gratification was premature.

In a television discussion between Bertrand Russell and Edward Teller on Edward Murrow's "Small World," Teller argued forcefully and persuasively that it would be self-defeating for the free world to enter agreements to cease nuclear testing unless they could be properly policed. For if we honorably fulfilled the agreements and the Communists did not, then within a few years they would have such a preponderance of military power that they could easily impose their will on the world. Teller therefore proposed that we now agree to suspend testing nuclear weapons above ground because we can detect violations of the agreement, but for the time being, since no methods exist to distinguish between underground nuclear tests and minor earthquakes, he recommended we do not agree to suspend such tests until appropriate methods of detection are evolved. Inasmuch as fall-out danger is minimal in such tests, and may lead to diminution of fall-out in any kind of nuclear explosion including those employed for peaceful purposes, this proposal seemed reasonable enough. Surprisingly, Russell demurred on the ground

# The Indian Libertarian

## *Rationalist Supplement*

---

### The Social Reform Movement In South India

By S. Ramanathan

**C**ASTE in all its ugliness is manifest in the life of the people of Southern India. It is for that reason that Swami Vivekananda called the Southerners lunatics. But in their own way South Indians have been struggling to eradicate the evil. One characteristic feature of the Social Reform Movement in the South is its pronounced anti-Brahmanism, notwithstanding the fact that several Brahmins have actively participated in the effort to eradicate caste. This is due to the feeling that Brahmins created and imposed the system upon the people so as to exploit them for selfish purposes. Deep down in the ancient history of Tamil literature is visible this tendency to attribute the caste evils to the Brahmins. The popular songs attributed to the Tamil CHITARS are all of them anti-caste and anti-Brahmin. There is a legendary Tamil poet by name Kapilar who denounced Brahmins and Brahminism as probably no one else has done since. Though his name was Kapilar, he is not to be confused with Kapila the author of the Sankhya system of philosophy. Even modern Tamil literature is replete with this controversy. A few days ago the Tamil Writers Association was split into two factions, one was definitely anti-Brahmin and the other included Brahmin writers.

There was a Social Reform Association in South India functioning under the Presidentship of Sir Sankar Nair, who was then a Judge of the Madras High Court. After him Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, who was then the Advocate General but later became Congress President, took up the leadership and conducted the Association with great brilliance. He was a Brahmin. Prof. Lakshmi Narasu, a scientist, was an ardent social reformer. But he found the effort to eradicate caste so hopeless that he advised the Hindus to become Buddhists. The same attitude was later on taken up by Dr. Ambedkar. I remember in my student days there were fights between Brahmins and non-Brahmins in the Congress Camps. Wherever the annual session of the All-India or the Provincial Congress was held, provision had to be made for feeding the delegates. Only vegetarian meals were served and usually the catering was done by Brahmin cooks. Trouble arose in the actual serving of the food, because the Brahmins insisted upon being served separately nearer the kitchen, while the others had to be con-

tent to receive their food in the outer precincts. This led to unseemly quarrels. Wherever the annual session of the Congress was held, there used to be convened also the conference of the Social Reform Association. This feature was given up after the advent of Mahatma Gandhi into the Congress. The fight against caste is said to have now ended. I devoutly wish it were so. But the evil is still rearing its ugly head in the present and is manifest even inside the Congress organisation. I remember, at the Ramgarh Congress, a Muslim fellow-delegate complained to me that he could not get non-vegetarian food to which he was accustomed within the Congress Nagar. He argued with great heat: "you Hindus do not allow us to eat our food in the Congress camp even before you secure power. I dread to think what you will do to us when you do secure power". I do not know whether a similar feeling at the back of the minds of all Muslims was one of the reasons which created Pakistan. This feeling has nothing to do with religion. It is essentially a discrimination based on caste.

What I have said above is not ancient history. Anyone who travels in the South and moves among the people will discover for himself the active role that caste still plays in the life of our people. The youth is impregnated with caste hatred. Student indiscipline in the Universities is traceable to caste antagonisms. Recently the Government of India have come forward with a proposal to abolish all references to caste in Government records, in application forms for jobs, and so on. The Government fondly hope that the abolition of such references will tend to soften caste feelings. But I am humbly of opinion that this well-intended measure of the Government may have just the opposite effect. Indeed the non-Brahmins think this is a clever move by the Brahmins to deny the few facilities now available to the lowest castes. You cannot cure a fever by breaking the thermometer. Caste appellations are but the physical signs of a deep-rooted disease. Something more radical, something more revolutionary than the trimming of the appellations is called for if really the disease is to be cured.

The Government of India have also proposed to abolish reservations of certain posts in Government

*(Continued on page 11)*

# Immortality

By Christopher N. Finney

**T**HE belief in immortality is one of the very cornerstones of theism. The belief in prayer is another. When people stop believing that the world can be altered for good or ill by praying to the deity, religion will lose a great deal of its hold upon the human mind. When they cease to think that their souls are destined to eternal damnation or eternal felicity, religion will no longer be an important factor in their intellectual and emotional make-up. Men do not worship God because he created the Universe millions of years ago, but because they believe that he answers prayers and grants petitions now, and will save them or damn them at some future date.

Ever since primitive man fashioned, out of the shadow of his own consciousness, those nebulous and ghostly phantoms that have become the gods of the world's religions, men have believed that the human body is inhabited by an indwelling spirit that animates it during life and leaves it at death. According to some creeds, this "spirit" or "soul" enters the body of another human being or an animal, while others affirm that it departs to Valhalla, the happy hunting ground, or, in the case of the Christian religion, Heaven or Hell. That the belief in the immortality of the soul has its origin in the fancies of untutored savages is a fact about which there can be no two opinions. The writings of the great anthropologists, Tylor, Frazer and others, all testify to the same end. Moreover, it is a belief that is almost universal. It is embodied in varying degrees in many diverse forms, in the faiths and folk-lore of men the world over.

The belief in immortality, then, originated in the childhood of the human mind, and for many centuries went unquestioned. It was only when the belief began to wear a little thin that those who

held it began to put forward the quasi-philosophical arguments that are now advanced for its retention. This life, we are told, is a school for character, one in which we prepare for another existence beyond the grave. We must therefore assume that life in the next world will be similar to life in this, and that the "training" we receive now will stand us in good stead in the future life. If this life and the next one are not lived under the same conditions, then the one cannot satisfactorily be a preparation for the other.

What kind of existence, then, are we to look forward to, in the next world?

While I write I have beside me a little book by F. Addington Symonds entitled *Know Your Faith* which, according to the blurb, gives "authentic information about Catholic beliefs and practice . . . and has received the official imprimatur." In it I read that in the next life "there will be no need for food or for the procreation of children, nor will sleep be required." Moreover, we have it on the authority of the Gospel Jesus that in Heaven, people "neither marry, nor are given in marriage" (Luke, 20.35).

The natures and personalities of all of us are formed in relation to a specific and quite definite environment. If our environment were different, then our ideas and personalities would be correspondingly different. Yet the most important factors in our lives here are absent in the next world. Human life without reference to sex, the family, birth, the desire and necessity for food and sleep is not merely impossible, it is unthinkable! If Christianity be true, and this world is a preparation for the next, then we are all in the position of a man studying French in order to address an audience that understands only Chinese.

Yet all this leaves out of consideration one of the most mischievous delusions that has ever beset the human mind, and one that is inextricably bound up with the Christian belief in immortality—the doctrine of Hell. The dogma of eternal punishment is found in the Bible, and has always formed part of the teachings of the Roman Church and most Protestant sects. For centuries, Catholic vied with Protestant in depicting in sordid detail the sufferings of the damned in Hell. Father Furness, writing in a booklet designed to be read by children, said:—

Perhaps at this moment a child is going into Hell. Tomorrow go and knock on the gates of Hell, and ask what the child is doing. The devils will go and look. Then they will come

*(Continued on page III)*

---

*(Continued from page I)*

appointments for the backward classes. It is said that such reservations militate against the principle that only merit should count in the securing of Government jobs. But unfortunately in our country there obtains a social system which concentrates and confines all the available merit within a very narrow circle which is just 2% of the entire population, making the remaining 98% mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. If this monstrous system is to be destroyed, something has to be done which will violate this blessed rule of merit. Until and unless the powers that be, recognise the justice and the urgency of bringing about this revolution, setting at naught the so called rights based on merit, we shall not succeed in creating a social fabric based on justice and equality.

# Why Rationalists & Freethinkers Should Enjoy Lengthy Lives

By Walter Breen

It is well-known that worry is one of the prime causes for shortening the life-span, and unlike our friends the Christians who spend considerable time worrying about their Heavens and Hells, we Freethinkers on the other hand give no thought to such illusions. Believing as we do that this life alone is certain, we are freed from all such worries. While we feel that we must not waste our time, and that our "little day" must be usefully employed in providing for our daily expenses and a sufficiency for our later years, we feel on the other hand death ends all activities and so we must enjoy to the

(Continued from page 11)

back and say—the child is burning . . . Go in a million years and ask the same question, the answer is just the same—it is burning. So if you go for ever and ever, you will always get the same answer—it is burning in the fire.

Lest it be thought that this kind of intellectual sadism is confined to Catholics, I give the following from one of the most eminent Protestant preachers of the second half of the last century. Charles Haddon Spurgeon, as an example of the mental degradation that can result from an acceptance of the Christian belief in immortality:—

In fire exactly like that which we have on earth thy body will lie, asbestos-like, for ever unconsumed, all thy veins roads for the feet of pain to travel on, every nerve a string on which the Devil shall for ever play his diabolical tune of Hell's Unutterable Lament.

John Calvin, the "Pope of Geneva," asserted that unbaptised infants were destined to eternal fire, and an English cleric declared that Hell was situated in the Sun, and that sun-spots were multitudes of the damned. For hundreds of years fantastic and horrifying ideas like these ran riot, doctrines which, to borrow a phrase from G. K. Chesterton, no self-respecting modern Christian would be seen dead with in a field.

But the dogma of Hell is today on the wane, and the belief in immortality has suffered a corresponding decline. Men are learning to live this life without fear of any night-mare world beyond the grave. The average Englishman today is indifferent to the belief in Heaven and Hell, when he is not openly critical of it. Perhaps the day is not long distant when Man will relegate Immortality to the "ashcan of departed hypotheses," and say, with Omar Khayyam:—

One thing at least is certain—this Life flies;

One thing is certain, and the rest is lies;

The Flower that once has blown for ever dies.

—The Freethinker

utmost all the pleasures of life. This is a beautiful world, the only world we know anything about, so why not enjoy it as long as possible? And that is possible if we order our lives in a clever and sensible manner. No need to worry about someone else having a larger income than you have, or winning a political office or indulging in any sort of envy. These things are all ephemeral and persons who indulge in these visionary phantoms wear out their lives.

The Greeks and Roman were great folks and the intellectual classes among them pointed the way for us moderns. Catulus expressed the idea of oblivion in the after-life thus:

"Suns that set, again may rise,  
We when once our fleeting light,  
Once our day in darkness dies,  
Sleep in one eternal night."

(Lamb's Translation)

But for Freethinkers, the feeling should be "to-day is ours" and no genuine Freethinker should think of indulging in excess in any direction. Excess shortens life, and one who indulges soon has worries over his health. Worries curtail life and cause premature death, which ends all of the pleasures of life.

Freethinkers not believing in the Gods and their attributed system of rewards and punishments are freed from all these superstitions which the simple-minded indulge in. They feel that when the end comes it's a matter of an eternal sleep. Before the final passing they should order that the Christian practice of earth burial be not followed in their case, and direct the cremation of their remains. Cremation is not only scientific, but is classical and is a party badge of Freethought.

—'The Liberal'

## CORRESPONDENCE

### SECULARISM INDEED!

Madam,

Our Constitution enjoins the formation of a Secular Democratic State in our country. Nehru speaks in and out of season about the secular character of our state. Yet the actions of his followers belie his high-sounding proclamations. There is a wide gulf between their professions and practice.

Shri Kalluri Chandramouli, Minister for Hindu Religious Endowments and cooperation is touring the State of Andhra Pradesh trying to spread Hinduism by his speeches and actions. It cannot be gainsaid that he draws his travelling allowances from the State Exchequer. He misuses his office as Minister for Cooperation and directs the several

cooperative societies to contribute liberally to the Bhadradi Ramalayam Renovation Fund. The D.O. letter No. Rc. 67599/60-Q2 dated 15-4-1960 of the Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Andhra Pradesh addressed to all Deputy Registrars, Cooperative Central Banks, Apex societies etc. says in regard to this matter:—

"The Minister for cooperation has expressed the desire that cooperatives, big and small, shall contribute liberally from their common good fund for this purpose. If the societies do not have sufficient balance to the credit of Common Good Fund, they may make advances from their general funds and recoup the amounts in future years from the contributions to C.G.F. from profits.....Deputy Registrars are requested to bring this to the notice of District Central Banks, District and Taluk Marketing Societies, Urban Banks, Rural Banks, Credit Societies, Weavers' Societies etc., and see that substantial collections are made from each circle. The Minister for Cooperation and the Registrar are particular that cooperatives should contribute substantial sums to this noble cause. The Deputy Registrars are requested to take vigorous action in the matter and submit fortnightly progress reports of contributions made by cooperatives to the personal address of the Registrar".

It is obvious that this directive is objectionable. Firstly, it suppresses the basic fact that there is only one Sangham and fund for the renovation of Bhadradi Sri Ramalayam temple and the choultries. Secondly, it is gross abuse of power by the Minister and the Registrar of Cooperative Societies. Thirdly, it smacks of coercion. The drive and the implied opportunity of recognition of services of Deputy Registrars in this cause by the Registrar personally will create an atmosphere of coercion and undue influence. The Andhra State Apex Weavers' Society which has been reluctant all the while to increase the salaries of its lowpaid employees on the alleged ground that they do not have sufficient profits, has donated to the religious fund Rs. 1,116, presumably to please the Minister for Cooperation. It is pertinent to note that there are now several complaints pending enquiry against the present management of the said society before the government. Hence their indecent anxiety to curry the Minister's favour. It is evident that many wrongs and irregularities are sought to be covered by interested persons by making handsome contributions to this religious fund. The Minister for cooperation has already responded to the attempt by postponing the appointment of a committee of enquiry into the working of Apex Weavers' Cooperative Societies. Fourthly, it is wrong in principle. Cooperatives consisting of persons of several religious persuasions should not be directed to encourage and finance a particular religion. Fifthly, the Registrar and the Minister should not personally instigate the Cooperatives under their control to adopt irregular methods to provide funds for religious purposes. The directive to allot advances to the Common Good Fund from out of general

funds here and now illustrates the point. It is common knowledge that contributions to Common Good Fund arise only if there are huge profits.

Will the Andhra Pradesh Government and the Chief Minister who is reputed to have such a secular outlook that he took affirmation instead of the Oath when he assumed office, set things right,  
D/20-5-60 M. V. Ramamurty, B.A., LL.B.,  
Baptlee (AP) Advocate.

### "SPIRITUAL" FAKES

Sincere Hindus in Mysore State cannot but deplore the alarming growth in recent times of what may be termed miracle-mongering. Taking advantage of perceptible increase of interest in things spiritual and trying to exploit this trend for personal ends, a number of alleged spiritual leaders have of late invaded Bangalore and other large towns in the State. They claim extraordinary "spiritual" powers and try to impress those who would believe, by tricks which are no better than sleight-of-hand and other forms of magic.

Referring to this baneful trend, which is attaining rather grave proportions, an ardent member of the Ramakrishna Mission in Bangalore urged that there is real need for intensive propaganda about the correct approach to spiritual matters and putting down the fakes, who cause greater damage to religion by their miracle-mongering than frank atheists.

But leaders in Hindu society who are interested in the propagation of the correct approach to religious matters should do much more than they are doing to counteract the pernicious effects of such miracle-mongering.

If you go deep into the matter and investigate these miracles, they are nothing but sleight-of-hand tricks. A clap of the hand and out comes some vibhhothi or kumkuma from "nowhere". Or it is a small Hindu icon which comes from nowhere.

Spiritual growth and development have nothing to do with such tricks. If people want miracles they are available all around us and everywhere. Why cannot people be impressed with the rising sun, with the forms and colours of flowers which appear suddenly and from nowhere one fine morning in the garden, with the way a child grows in its mother's womb, how a spider spins its web? Well, if people want to wonder and be impressed, there are literally millions of things they can exercise their wonder at, instead of resorting to tricks which anyone can see at the roadside shows of our snake-charmers.

What is the value of a faith which refuses to see a miracle in a sunrise or sunset, or in the trees and flowers, or in the numerous forms of life all around us, but sees a miracle in a person producing a small icon from "nowhere" by sleight-of-hand?

There is urgent need to educate our people out of such miracle mongering: it is the duty of all organisations connected with religion to do it, and do it now.

—Orpheus in 'MYSINDIA'

that this evinced a degree of suspicion which was not auspicious for fruitful cooperation. When Teller made an eloquent plea for the survival of a free world, Russell said that although freedom (of which the presence of free speech was taken as the symbol) was, of course, important, peace was more important because it insured survival. The implication was plain. We must be prepared to sacrifice freedom if that is the price of peace. At one point Russell denied that he was arguing for unilateral disarmament, but only for general disarmament. But if there is an agreement on general disarmament by which we honorably abide, and there are no ways of effectively determining whether the Communists are doing so, may this not be tantamount to unilateral disarmament?

The question I want to ask is whether Russell has abandoned the position he took at the close of our debate. For it seems to me that if he were consistent in his revised position, as expressed in his book, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, published after our debate, he should have gladly agreed with Teller or disagreed with him on some other grounds. As Russell knows, Teller's contention that underground tests cannot at present be detected, has been confirmed by scientists of whose political bona fides he has no doubt. For example, Eugene Rabinowitsch, Editor of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (and a participant in the Pugwash meetings), wrote in the February issue of that magazine a very illuminating article "The Failure at Geneva," in which he places responsibility for this failure squarely at the door of the Soviet scientists who for purely political reasons refused to consider the new experimental and theoretical data to which Teller referred.

Is it necessary to remind Bertrand Russell of what he once knew so very well? If the West signs an agreement to cease testing or to destroy nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union can rely upon the provisions being fulfilled. The converse, alas, is not equally true. The reason is simple and I can best give it by way of a personal experience. One day in the Spring of 1929 during the Weimar period, I happened to be in the gallery of the Reichstag. A commotion broke out on the floor and there suddenly appeared a group of left-wing deputies dragging a huge artillery shell towards the podium. In the clamor of speeches and outcries I could hear the charge that here was the evidence that the *Reichswehr* with the connivance of the Government was violating the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which forbade manufacture of this kind of munitions. The newspapers blazoned forth the story and there was angry debate in many quarters. Such exposure was possible because the Weimar regime was a free culture.

If for any reason Great Britain and the United States were tempted to violate their agreements on nuclear disarmament, the slightest infraction would be broadcast to the entire world by a press, a radio,

a television system which the government does not control. Because of their free culture, Western nationals can find myriads of ways of informing the world of violations of trust.

But what of the Soviet Union? Where is the free public opinion which can make it possible for one of its citizens who detects a violation to expose it to the world? What newspaper would print his story? What radio would carry it? Even if he escapes the Secret Police, who will provide him with a job, housing, a bread card? It is not by happenstance that the scientific and technological secrets of the Kremlin are the best kept in the world. It would be suicide for a scientist publicly to proclaim that the Kremlin was rigging the controls or carrying on forbidden work in the Urals or Siberia to which foreigners are denied access. All this makes it obvious that the West must insist upon an adequate and reciprocal system of close inspection.

Russell cannot be altogether oblivious to those considerations. And as if to counter the argument drawn from them, he seems intent upon describing conditions in the Soviet Union as if freedom were increasing there and decreasing in the West. "I think we minimize the amount of free speech in the Communist countries which is more than is generally supposed. And I think we enormously exaggerate the amount of free speech that is possible to a man, without suffering serious damage, in Western countries." In the present context this is an extraordinary thing to say. It is certainly true that in the Soviet Union one can now express doubts about Lysenko, agreement with the theory of relativity, and criticize some of the old Stalinist clichés, though only along lines approved by Stalin's successors and former lieutenants. But where, oh where, is there any evidence of the minimum freedom of speech indispensable for forthright criticism of Government policy or exposure of Kremlin duplicity? If Pasternak is not permitted to publish his nostalgic novel of the past, is there any likelihood that anyone would be permitted to indict the Soviet regime for present betrayal of trust? So far the only ones permitted to criticize past Soviet crimes are those who helped compound them. No one has raised his voice to call Khrushchev to account for collaboration in the very crimes of Stalin which he exposed at the 20th Congress. We are thankful that Pasternak is permitted to live and that he did not suffer the rumored fate of Gorki under Stalin's rule. But would he or any-one else be permitted to draw another breath if he published the kind of criticism, however indirectly, of the political policy of the Kremlin which is daily directed against Downing Street or the State Department?

Russell agrees that freedom in the East is "lamentably deficient." "But still," he continues, "I found recently that I can get articles printed in Russian magazines that do express quite wholeheartedly what I think." Articles about what? About dialectical materialism? About Communist terror?

About what Russell wholeheartedly thinks of Lenin as a politician and philosopher or of Soviet foreign policy? About the difficulties anyone in the Soviet Union would have in staying alive if he tried to expose the Kremlin's violation of an agreement? Assuredly not! Russell's articles about the dangers of nuclear war, the desirability of disarmament, the possibilities of the peaceful use of atomic energy, and similar themes on which Russell's position is congenial to the Kremlin's present line are printed in the Soviet press. But not a word of Russell's fundamental political or philosophical criticism of Communism has appeared.

It is not inconceivable that some day the Kremlin may even permit Russell a kind of *Narrenfreiheit* to speak his real mind about the infamies of Communist oppression, blaming the past excesses on Stalin. But not until Soviet citizens themselves enjoy the same relative freedoms of speech and press exercised by the citizens of the West, and are protected by the same or similar legal guarantees, can we count upon a public opinion to support criticism of the Soviet state's infractions of its agreements. The truth is that the Kremlin regards Russell today as a valuable, if capricious ally, in its systematic campaign to disarm the West psychologically and technologically. In their eyes he is playing the same role—though enormously more influential—that Cyrus Eaton does in industry and Niemöller in religion. It is noteworthy that the philosophical hacks in the Soviet Union no longer call Russell "a running dog of imperialism" or employ other choice epithets when they have occasion to mention his philosophical views, although these views have not changed since the days of Zhdanov. Just as they now distinguish between Einstein, the physicist, and Einstein, the "idealistic" philosopher, so they are now distinguishing between Russell, the great "partisan of peace" who has seen the error of his ways, and Russell, "the subjective idealist." Russell, of course, has not in the least abandoned his convictions about the desirability of free philosophy, free speech and free culture. But he does not believe that they are as important as peace.

**T**HIS is only half the story. According to Russell, if the Soviet Union has much more freedom than we believe it has, the West, and especially the United States, has "not half as much [freedom] as we think." The two worlds apparently are approaching each other. I leave it to Russell's compatriots to do justice to this comparison as far as England is concerned, and to weigh, say, the "crime" of Gilbert Ryle in refusing to review E. A. Gellner's book in *Mind* against the Kremlin's refusal to permit critics of a milder stripe to live. As far as the United States is concerned only a cruel rage could blind anyone to the immense differences which separate the USSR from a country in which, however unjustly, the foreign policy of one President could be denounced as bordering on the treasonable, and the foreign policy of his successor, as

bordering on the idiotic. Political criticism in this country could certainly be more responsible: I do not see how it could be much freer.

There are areas of political life in the South, and there have been some political episodes in other parts of the country, of which all freedom-loving Americans are and have been ashamed. But the processes of political freedom have overcome most of the latter and are now engaged in struggling against the former with the help of government and law. But from the time Russell experienced a change of heart and began to believe that, if necessary, freedom must be sacrificed for mere survival, he has half-unconsciously described our imperfect freedoms as if they were a sham, as if America were really a police state, in principle hardly distinguishable from the Soviet police state. In that case, of course, it would be absurd to risk war to preserve merely the color of one's cultural straitjacket.

A couple of quotations from what Bertrand Russell has written about the United States in the last decade to support his view that "a reign of terror" exists or until recently existed here are illuminating. During the McCarthy era, he wrote things like this: "In Germany under Hitler, and in Russia under Stalin, nobody ventured to pass a political remark without first looking behind the door to make sure no one was listening. This used to be considered a mark of a Police State. It is no longer, for when I last visited America, I found the same state of things there.

"Professors of economics who are told that it is their duty to indoctrinate the young against communism are considered subversive if they know what the doctrines of communism are; only those who have not read Marx are considered competent to combat his doctrine by the policemen who have professors at their mercy."

Russell's exaggerations, sadly, were of the same order as those of McCarthy himself. I can personally testify that when Russell visited the United States many, if not most, of the people to whom he spoke on political matters openly denounced McCarthy in the strongest terms. About professors of economics he is simply romancing!

But even these exaggerations pale when compared to the picture of America Russell drew, after he had reached the conclusion that with the hydrogen bomb, peace was worth any price including the loss of freedom.

As late as 1956, not long before the FBI arrested and jailed Kasper, the racist rabble-rouser, for encouraging violation of a Federal Court order, Russell wrote in the English edition of Corliss Lamont's *Freedom Is as Freedom Does* (a story in itself!): "Members of the FBI join even mildly liberal organizations as spies and report any unguarded word. Anybody who goes so far as to support equal rights for colored people, or to say a good word for the

UN is liable to a visit by officers of the FBI and threatened, if not with prosecution, at least with blacklisting and consequent inability to earn a living. When a sufficient state of terror has been produced by these means, the victim is informed there is a way out; if he will denounce a sufficient number of his friends, he may obtain absolution."

In his "Open Letter to Bertrand Russell" (NL, January 7, 1957) Norman Thomas protested that Russell's exaggeration here is "so great as to approach falsehood." It does not approach falsehood: It is falsehood, and from one who in his personal life has always with proud and admirable scorn refused to employ falsehood no matter what the personal cost. It is not hard to predict that Russell will find the West, and particularly the United States, increasingly bereft of its freedom as the years go by, in order to make it appear more plausible to himself and others that freedom is not really being sacrificed on the altar of security.

There is an implacable logic involved in the view that everything must be sacrificed for peace which those who hold the view are loath to recognize. Yet it has been observed on a small scale many times in the past. If the enemy threatens war, then he must not be provoked by harsh criticism. Free speech becomes a threat to peace and dissenters are curbed as a menace to survival. Since this is apt to be done reluctantly, the enemy delivers an ultimatum demanding, in the interests of mutual peace and confidence, the surrender of the trouble makers. If freedom is not worth fighting for, a few trouble makers are certainly not worth fighting for. If the West ever surrenders its nuclear deterrent until such time as disarmament proposals are accepted and properly controlled, the Kremlin will confront it with a successive series of demands under threat of destruction. Since, on the assumption of those who wish to abandon the nuclear deterrent, there is no greater evil than war, they will with heavy hearts feel constrained to yield. And if the Communists demand it, they will have to turn over, hogtied hand and foot, anyone who puts freedom first and urges his fellow citizens to do the same. Of course it will be done reluctantly—but it will be done. More fantastic things than this have happened in history.

What stands out in the Russell-Teller exchange, all the more conspicuously because of Teller's deference and restraint, is Russell's refusal to grant that those of us who disagree with him are just as much concerned as he is with preserving peace and preventing war. What we fear is that the policy he advocates will tempt and encourage the Communists to go to war. On the other hand, if the Communists are convinced that they will not survive an all-out attack upon the West, they will never risk war. Their whole history provides over-whelming evidence for this conclusion.

In his final remarks in the discussion with Teller, Russell said that he had been studying the careers of "realists" in history and had discovered that

they rarely, if ever, achieved their goals. In this connection we might inquire whether "the idealists"—however that ambiguous word be defined—achieved their goals more often and more quickly. But Russell's reference to "realists" makes one wonder what lesson he draws from the "realists" who came to terms with Hitler at Munich in the fatuous belief that they had secured "peace in our time." I once heard Russell say that if Hitler had been certain that England and the United States would declare war against Germany if he invaded Poland, he would probably never have unleashed World War II. And Hitler was a mad-man! Khrushchev is not!

One of the most surprising events in my intellectual life has been the discovery that men like Winston Churchill have had much more common sense in political affairs than individuals immeasurably more gifted in powers of abstract reasoning. The explanation, I suppose, is that politics is essentially an historical and psychological discipline, not like a chess game.

There is no certainty that we shall be able to insure peace under the existing "balance of terror." But it is far more likely that we shall be able to do so than if this balance is destroyed and the West forced into a comparatively weak military posture. If the existing balance of terror is not sufficient to prevent war, the alternatives are not exhausted by the grim choice between mutual destruction or surrender. If the scientists of the Western world understand what is really at stake and under a wise political leadership are called upon to exercise their responsibilities in the same magnificent way in which they rallied to the defence of freedom when fascism threatened to engulf the world, I am confident that they will support the position taken by Teller and not by Russell. Even if war comes by accident or by the scheming of wicked men who outsmart themselves in the hope that a sudden attack on the West may be decisive, a proper scientific defence, including a vast system of shelters, may enable us to contain the war to a local area, and tremendously enhance the free world's prospects of survival.

In an article criticizing my position *vis à vis* Russell, Professor Lewis Feuer referred to it as an expression of "the death wish." There is no such thing as "the death wish," and every fair mind will understand that all my political proposals are motivated only by a wish to insure our life under freedom. But if there is no such thing as "the death wish," there incontrovertibly is "a wish to surrender." It is not necessary to draw on the mythology of Freudianism to establish it. It is conspicuously illustrated in the position of political bentniks in this country and England whom I have heard proclaim, "It is better to live on one's knees than to die on one's feet" or "It is better to be a live jackal than a dead lion." I am not, of course, imputing for a moment this moral vulgarity to either Feuer

(Continued on page 15)

# Inflation vs. Morality

By Henry Hazlitt

(In addition to the crushing taxation and the internal loans that the Government of India is raising to finance its lop-sided Plans, it has resorted to huge borrowing from abroad. The national debt is rising to new heights and there is no evidence to indicate that the national debt will be wiped out in the foreseeable future, unless the Indian Government, like its counterparts in the other countries resorts to pumping more currency into circulation with the inevitable result of creating inflation. That inflation is a great swindle practised by Governments on the innocent subjects is not a truth welcomed by the rulers. Henry Hazlitt points out the immorality involved in Inflation in the following article, reproduced from Newsweek to which he is a regular contributor.—Ed.).

**I**NFLATION never affects everybody simultaneously, and equally. It begins at a specific point, with a specific group. When the government puts more money into circulation, it may do so by paying defence contractors, or by increasing subsidies to farmers or social-security benefits to special groups. The incomes of those who receive this money go up first. They begin to buy at the old prices. But their additional buying forces up prices. Those whose money incomes have not been raised are forced to pay higher prices than before; the purchasing power of their incomes has been reduced. Eventually, through the play of economic forces, their own money-incomes may be increased. But if these incomes increased, are either less or later than the average prices of what they buy, they never fully make up the loss they suffered from the inflation.

Inflation, in brief, essentially involves a redistribution of real incomes. Those who benefit by it do so, and must do so, at the expense of others. The total losses through inflation offset the total gains. This creates class or group divisions. The victims of inflation resent the profiteers from inflation. Even the moderate gainers from inflation envy the bigger gainers. There is general recognition that the new distribution of income and wealth that goes on during an inflation is not the result of merit, effort, or productiveness but of luck, speculation, or political favoritism. It was in the tremendous German inflation of 1923 that the seeds of Nazism were sown.

## SPECULATION VS. WORK

An inflation tends to demoralize those who gain by it as well as those who lose by it. They become used to "unearned increment." They want to hold on to their relative gains. Those who have made money from speculation prefer to continue this way of making money to the former method of working for it. The trend in an inflation is toward less work and production, more speculation and gambling.

The profiteers from inflation tend to spend freely, frivolously, and ostentatiously. This increases popular resentment. The incentive for ordinary saving, in the form of savings-bank accounts, insurance, bonds, or other fixed-income obligations, tends to disappear. The spectacle of quick and easy returns increases temptation to corruption and crime.

## 'A JUGGLING TRICK'

It is not merely that inflation breeds the gambling spirit and corruption and dishonesty in a nation. Inflation is itself an immoral act on the part of government. When modern governments inflate by increasing the paper-money supply, directly or indirectly, they do in principle what kings once did when they clipped the coins. Diluting the money supply with paper is the moral equivalent of diluting the milk supply with water. For notwithstanding all the pious pretences of governments that inflation is some evil visitation from without, inflation is practically always the result of deliberate governmental policy.

This was recognized in 1776 by Adam Smith in "The Wealth of Nations." Though I have quoted the passage before, it bears repeating: "When national debts have once been accumulated to a certain degree, there is scarce, I believe, a single instance of their having been fairly and completely paid." There is either "an avowed bankruptcy" or "a pretended payment."

The pretended payment was inflation. The U. S. Government today is paying off in 47/-cent dollars the debts it contracted in 1940. Adam Smith went on: "The honor of a state is surely very poorly provided for, when, in order to cover the disgrace of a real bankruptcy, it has recourse to a juggling trick of this kind, so easily seen through, and at the same time so extremely pernicious."

**Govindjee Madhowjee  
& Co, Pvt, Ltd,**

**COAL MERCHANTS  
16—APOLLO STREET,  
FORT, BOMBAY.**

## Menon Gives Nehru Away

(From Our Correspondent)

**P**RIME Minister Nehru, the seniormost member of the Commonwealth Conference, was in a chastened mood in London and allowed the Malayan Prime Minister to steal the thunder that, by right of practice, belonged to him. The fact of the matter is that, finding himself as he does at daggers drawn with one of the two friends in the camp he has been befriending—and for whose benefit he has been antagonising India's natural friends—he could not ride the high horse of moral avalanche without inviting ridicule on himself at the Conference. However, there was one very significant statement among the many observations he made in London. In answer to a Pressman he said he had not extended an invitation to the Queen to visit India. In other words, Comrade Khrushchev remains the sole guide of India's destinies and of her future relations with China and of how she will behave with the Chinese. That does not, however, entail any corresponding obligation on the Chinese, who are our friends

again, according to Mr. Nehru, but who cannot be relied upon to follow the "advice" given them by Mr. Khrushchev! Why this should be so, passes one's comprehension since China is absolutely dependent on Soviet Russia for the striking power she possesses today.

### Menon's Pro-Chinese Propaganda

If one wants to understand Mr. Nehru's mind, one would do well to study—read, learn and digest—whatever Mr. Krishna Menon has to say. Mr. Nehru has now publicly admitted in Parliament—what I have been saying all along—that lack of confidence in Mr. Menon is lack of confidence in Mr. Nehru. The latter has to be duly grateful to Mr. Menon for saying those unpleasant things which Mr. Nehru cannot say without offending a large section of the Congress Party. Since Mr. Menon is not building himself up as a popular leader, he can afford to say things which annoy his countrymen and which Mr. Nehru cannot say without suffering a diminution in his stature as National leader. Mr. Menon in brief is drawing upon himself the wrath of the public for the policies and actions and decisions of Mr. Nehru. This is true loyalty to his leader. Of course there is no question of loyalty to the country—Congressmen since 1920 have seldom been trained to develop that virtue.

(Continued from page 13)

or to Russell. They would be among the first to defy a Communist dictatorship to the bitter end. But I have repeatedly heard sentiments like these expressed in varied ways by young nihilists without a cause, in Western Europe and America, and not only by them. In my travels in Asia as well as Europe I found that it was the unexpressed postulate of some forms of neutralism which did not distinguish between moral neutrality and questions of political alignment. It brought to memory the slogan of a group of Belgian anarchists on the eve of Hitler's aggressions against the West: Better slavery than death!"

Many who express this mood do not lack courage so much as an understanding of what it means to live like a jackal. But the unforgivable effect of their irresponsibility is that to the extent it becomes widely articulate and is taken as an expression of a strong popular sentiment, it hardens Communist resolution to hold off from honest negotiation and compromise in order to inherit the world with little or no cost. In answer, I can only repeat here what I wrote on the dedication page of my *Political Power and Personal Freedom*: "It is better to be a live jackal than a dead lion—for jackals, not men. Those who are prepared to live like men and, if necessary, die like men, have the best prospect of surviving as free men, and escaping the fate of both jackals and lions."

So Mr. Menon is serving a purpose—the great purpose of softening our hostility towards China and the Communist camp to which China belongs, and increasing our diminishing hostility towards the camp which was against us on the Kashmir issue, despite ideological affinities and, it may be added, for ideological reasons which did not appeal to us so far as Kashmir was concerned. In Mr. Nehru's mind any one who has been in England for some time becomes somewhat of a great man simply on that score, and Mr. Menon has been in England for 28 years, though, incidentally, without acquiring the power of expressing himself intelligibly in the English language. I shall not be surprised if Mr. Menon makes bold to tell Mr. Nehru occasionally, "You do not understand these Johnnies as well as I do. I know how to deal with them, and the best way of dealing with them is to snub them." And I can quite imagine Mr. Nehru being duly impressed by a man who talks of snubbing the British Prime Minister, even though Churchill is no longer there!

The latest pronouncement of Mr. Menon shows unmistakably the way the wind is blowing. By the way a man argues, he almost always gives himself away, and Mr. Menon has given himself as well as

his boss completely away by suggesting, as he did recently, that the Chinese had nothing to do with the alien planes which have been freely flying over the NEFA region. According to Mr. Menon the flight pattern of the alien planes does not indicate that they are interested in espionage in our territory, because some of the planes enter our territory from east of NEFA and then disappear over Tibet and some take the reverse route, suggesting that they were returning from their mission in Tibet. By the simple trick of reversing the chronological order Mr. Menon makes it appear that what we took for Chinese planes are in reality American planes. In other words, alien planes have been flying over Tibet, and over NEFA incidentally in the course of their espionage missions, and China has been afraid of even warning them, although China has already issued 95 serious warnings to the United States for violation of Chinese air space.

### A COMMON ANXIETY

What seems to have confirmed Mr. Menon in the belief that the alien planes violating Indian air space were not Chinese, is the retort Mr. Chou En-Lai gave him when Mr. Menon complained about the flights of Chinese planes over NEFA. The Chinese Premier asked him why he did not shoot them, knowing Mr. Menon has nothing to shoot them with, and his lathis cannot reach them. He must have known too that his friend Mr. Menon not only does not possess the instruments necessary to shoot them, but also does not want anything to shoot alien planes, being a most non-violent individual, at least so far as the Russians and the Chinese are concerned. After this in the interest of national self-respect, Mr. Menon had no alternative but to come out with the story that the alien planes flying over NEFA were not Chinese planes. The timing of the story should please Mr. Khrushchev, particularly as the disclosures regarding spying by Russians have been multiplying during the past few weeks. I dare say we shall hear more and more propaganda in favour of the Chinese from Mr. Menon. But does he or his boss ever think what the effect of such statements would be on the Chinese warlords, and that, in any case, that effect would not raise the stature of India in their eyes and would only induce them to go ahead with their aggression? Perhaps this consideration is immaterial in their minds and what weighs with them is the diminution of hostility towards China and Russia as a result of Chinese aggression, so that in the next elections the Congress headed by Mr. Nehru should come back to power. That is an anxiety shared by the Communist bloc and that is the pact implicit in the joint Nehru-Chou communique issued in New Delhi on the departure of the Chinese leader from India, and there is not a soul in India who seems to have realised the grave implications of that communique. Our journalists and special correspondents and leader-writers go on beating about the bush and, instead of thinking things out to their logical conclusions—to their patriotic conclusions—make smart phrases pass for

rational thinking and sound conclusions. In such a state of affairs, in which the guardians of the people's conscience lack the ability as well as the integrity necessary for the performance of their job, what can one expect, except one disaster following another in quick succession, because the leaders believe in fooling the people rather than in serving them?

### VINOBA BHAVE'S PROPAGANDA MILL

People may not be aware of it, but Acharya Vinoba Bhave has a propaganda mill of his own. I am not trying to criticise him, for it is indeed impossible to do anything these days without a propaganda mill. After all, if Acharya Vinoba Bhave had been doing things silently, instead of with trumpets blowing and conches sounding, it is easy to see that the response to his call would have been astonishingly small compared to what it has been. But the function of the propaganda mill being to make a small thing look great, it is only natural that the results of the functioning of normal political forces should be ascribed to the magic of Vinoba. He has suggested that the dacoit menace in U. P. and Madhya Pradesh can be eliminated by a complete withdrawal of the police operating in the Chambal Valley region, while the fact is that the dacoits' offer of surrendering to the Acharya is entirely due to the heavy pressure of the police force, which has already succeeded in liquidating some notorious gangs of dacoits. Those who are surrendering may be considered among those on the fringe who did not find their life as safe as they had imagined and to whom the lure of living dangerously has proved a mirage.

The menace persists not because of the failure of the police, but because of insurmountable conditions in the infected region. The people there are illiterate. Feuds among them arise over trifles. They fight, litigate and ultimately kill and then turn dacoits to escape the law. More than 80 per cent of the dacoits are the products of personal enmity which demands vengeance. The Chambal ravines provide excellent protection. Some may have taken to this life owing to poverty, but most have become habitual criminals owing to the traditions of dacoity in their families which make them carry guns to loot people and, if necessary, shoot them.

### CHINA PREPARING FOR INVASION

At a largely attended Press Conference, Dr. Raghuvira startled pressmen by the bald announcement that the Chinese Communists were preparing to reach India's southern seas through military conquest. The Congress M.P., who is considered an expert on Chinese affairs, showed a mass of photostat copies of secret Chinese documents to support his statement. He said the Chinese were making no secret of their plans or of the fact that they regarded Ladakh, Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan as "the four teeth with which they will grind their

way to the southern seas of India". He considered Chinese encroachment on Indian territory a bigger threat to peace than the Berlin issue, but if the Government of the country does not agree with him, what are the others to think? He also said that the prevailing belief in India about Russian neutrality over the India-China dispute was unjustified, as Russia was openly giving military aid to China and was even giving atomic secrets to her ally.

He forthrightly described India's foreign policy as one based on the false pride of "egotistic righteousness" far removed from reality. The policy of the Government of India was in essence, he said, "a search for an escape from preparations" for adequate defence of India's frontiers against the Chinese menace. He thought it farcical to see Berlin being discussed publicly in New Delhi while Aksai-Chin and Longju were being totally ignored. The result of the Government's policy was that India relied on Russia rather than on the USA for a solution of the India-China problem.

If Dr. Raghuvira had pursued his finding of "egotistic righteousness" a little further, he would have seen nothing farcical in ignoring Aksaichin and Longju, for it is necessary for the public to forget them if it is to vote back Mr. Nehru to power. Emphasis on Aksaichin and Longju is just the thing to remind people that Mr. Nehru has blundered, and Mr. Nehru's "egotistic righteousness" cannot tolerate that reminder. People have yet to realise that Mr. Nehru does not stand for his country. He stands for Jawaharlal Nehru and for nothing else. There is a method in the egotistic madness that has taken possession of our Prime Minister, and that method is visible to those who can see the obvious implications of his strange observations.

---

## Book Review

UNITED STATES AID AND INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, By P. T. Bauer.

COMMUNIST China excepted, no country in the world offers so many contrasts and problems as India. She has a population of 400 million plus (greater than all of South America, Africa, and Australia combined) and more than 700 dialects. The Indian nation is as poor as it is populous. Its \$60 per capita annual income is among the lowest in the world, about one-fortieth of that of the United States, and is reflected in its half a million unemployed.

India today is the largest recipient of American economic aid, having received from \$1.5 to \$2 billion, thereby raising an important question: Will this aid benefit the Indian citizen and at the same time cause that nation to align itself with the West?

Definitely not, says author P. T. Bauer, British economist. Given the current direction of Indian economic policy, increasing foreign aid "would be much more likely to retard the rise of general living standards in India than to accelerate it, and to obstruct rather than promote the emergence of a society resistant to totalitarian appeal."

There are many reasons for Bauer's conclusions, not the least of them being socialist Prime Minister Nehru's firm antipathy toward capitalism. The principal goal of Indian economic planning formally accepted by the Indian Parliament in 1954, and reiterated many times since—is "the adoption of the socialist pattern of society." This socialist system, with its Soviet-like five-year economic plans, shows itself in massive expenditures on heavy industry, small expenditures on agriculture, limitations on consumer goods, and the countless other restrictions which symbolize a collectivist economy.

Professor Bauer rejects aid to India (as proposed in the Senate by the Kennedy-Cooper Resolution) not so much because of the expense to the American tax-payer but because of the cost to India. The U. S., pursuing such a policy, "would make it inevitable that (India) is pushed further in the direction... of a completely socialized economy... in which the range of choice of individuals is severely circumscribed... and in which the state is all powerful."

What the author recommends is that U. S. aid be withheld until the Indian government pursues "policy designed to raise living standards and to promote an anti-totalitarian society."

"The shape and direction of the aid program of the United States," author Bauer writes, "will undoubtedly be a major factor in influencing the economic policy of the government of India. It is much to be hoped that the resources of the United States will be harnessed to policies designed to promote the welfare of the Indian masses, rather than to policies designed to socialize or even to Sovietize the most populous country of the non-Communist world." We hope that the Eisenhower Administration pays serious heed to what Prof. Bauer recommends regarding U. S. Aid to India.

---

## News And Views

### 200 OFFICERS TO REHABILITATE 200 FAMILIES?

The Dandakaranya Project supposed to rehabilitate displaced persons has been a big flop. Because of miserable living conditions, displaced families and refugees refuse to move in the camp. Though expected to provide for 10,000 families, very few were able to take advantage of the Dandakaranya largely due to bureaucratic inefficiency and red-tapism. By the end of July 1950, Dandakaranya had been able to receive only 200 families, and to take care of 200 families the Dandakaranya Development Authorities

had employed more than 200 gazetted officers. It is feared that if more families are not coming forth to take advantage of the Dandakaranya, the authorities will be obliged to "rehabilitate" Congressmen and their relatives in place of displaced persons.

### "CUT IN LAND REVENUE & ABOLITION OF SALES TAX"

The Swatantra Party leader, Mr. M. R. Masani, proposed four measures to act as "vitamins on the body politics,"

These were, the stoppage of deficit financing and the stabilisation of the value of the rupee, a 25 per cent cut in land revenue, the raising of the income-tax exemption limit and the abolition of sales tax.

Mr. Masani, speaking on "Planning for prosperity" under the auspices of the Bangalore centre of the Forum of Free Enterprise, said that these steps would act as "tremendous tonic" on the productive forces of the country.

On the question of balancing the budget, he said that unproductive expenditure by the Centre and the States should be eliminated, resulting in a saving of about Rs. 200 crores.

He said that the whole world had been moving away from the Soviet type of planning and State socialism. The contrast between democratic planning for prosperity and Soviet planning for "death and destruction" was symbolised in the two Berlins.

Mr. Masani added that the Government of India had unfortunately lifted the whole "paraphernalia of Soviet planning" and in its "shallow admiration for Soviet achievements" tried to fit it into a democratic set-up.

He said that his party, if it came to power, would disband the Planning Commission which "is an extra-constitutional body" whose actions marked the beginning of a totalitarian economy.

### HUTHEESINGH RESIGNS FROM THE SWATANTRA

Mr. Raja Hutheesingh has resigned from the Swatantra Party after 8 months of hectic activity exhorting his countrymen to join its ranks. The grounds for his resignation as he put them are: that the Swatantra's economic policies amount to laissez-faire which will lead to a ruthless exploitation of the underdogs and poor; that its advocacy of a joint-defence alliance with non-communistic countries is tantamount to giving up non-alignment. While we are no less sympathetic to the poor and the underdogs (whom the Swatantra is ready "to exploit ruthlessly") it is beyond us to comprehend how it happened that Mr. Hutheesingh with his highly elastic conscience which melts at the thought of exploitation, never had an opportunity all this time to study and understand the basic economic

and political objectives of the Swatantra, which were subjected to the widest possible discussion, examination and criticism all over the country in the press and platform alike. If the Socialist doctrines and non-alignment dogma of the Congress... which he seems to uphold now... were sound in his opinion, then surely he could have remained in the Congress fold as others with more honest thinking have chosen to. Or is it that he expected the Swatantra to become a mere rubber-stamp of the Congress voicing His Master's Voice? The reasons given by Mr. Hutheesingh for his resignation seem to us hardly convincing. We cannot help commenting that those who form a new political party with the least hesitation and desert it as lightly are fickle-minded, if not down-right opportunists.

### WANTED: PRIORITY FOR FAMILY PLANNING

POONA. Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain former food Minister made a strong plea for giving high priority to family planning in our Five Year Plans. Emphasising the point that India's problem was as much of low productivity as of a rising population, he said that no planning would succeed unless the urgent need of widespread and effective family planning was felt by the people. A rapid increase in the population would tend to nullify the effect of higher incomes and increased production, he added. Jan Sangh and the Catholic Church, take note!

### HEAVY BUREAUCRATIC EXPENDITURE

Estimates Committee of the Lok Sabha has called for a special study by the Planning Commission of the disproportionate rise in the estimated expenditure on non-development purposes. Out of Rs. 1,044.2 crores realised during the Plan period from the existing sources of revenue and taxation, the report said that only Rs. 439 crores were available for the Plan. The country owes gratitude to the Estimates Committee for drawing our attention to this mounting "non-development expenditure" which simply means the total expenses that have to be incurred for maintaining a vast army of officials who swell the ranks of the public sector. In the "socialistic society" that Nehru has patterned for us, the greatest possible danger is in the manner in which hordes of officials become parasites on the community who live on the tax-payer's money. The time has come when civil expenditure is curbed to the fullest extent lest the Bureaucratic State becomes intractable.

### INDIA WORST FED OF 40 NATIONS

U.N. H.Q., May 21.—India is the worst fed among over 40 countries, which supplied statistics to the U.N. according to the U.N. Statistical Year-book 1959, just published.

The Indian consumed 1,890 calories in 1954-56—the latest figures available—compared to the pre-war figure of 1,950 calories in 1934-38.

## THE FATE OF THE COMMUNISTS IN RUSSIA

The London Times recently collected some statistics on "What happens to Communists?" These are the statistics:—

9 out of 11 Russian Cabinet Ministers who have held office since 1936 have been shot.

5 out of 7 Presidents of the last Central Executive Committee 'died' likewise.

43 out of 53 Secretaries of the Communist Party Central Organisation have been executed.

15 out of 27 top Communists who drafted the 1936 Constitution faced the firing squad.

70 out of 80 of the Soviet war Council were executed.

Since 1917, 3 out of every 5 Marshals of the Soviet Army were shot as spies or traitors.

No record is available of the small fry.

### HEARD IN TOWN

What else could Khrushchev do? He couldn't have his Party give him a mandate for Summitry. He had either to wreck the Summit or face at home the prospect of spending his days in Siberia. Maybe as the Manager of one of his own virgin farms.

—Thought

### WAVE OF UNREST IN RED CHINA RIOTS IN 15 TOWNS: K.M.T. REPORT

TAIPEH, May 23.

A Kuomintang China Central News Agency report from Hong-Kong published here to-day claimed that a new wave of social unrest was surging in Communist China.

The report said a series of anticommune riots had broken out in at least 15 towns and villages in the past two months.

The riots, staged by disgruntled farmers in protest against the commune system, included "sabotage, arson, insubordination, strikes, assassination and rape," said the report.

The report did not give any details, nor identify the provinces where the incidents had been staged.

Citing only one incident, it said: "A good number of flood-stricken farmers at Swatow in Kwangtung province, Southern China, recently stormed into the country's administration office and wrecked all the furniture."

It said several rioters were arrested and troops were rushed to suppress the riot.

### CONGRESS PARTY'S POLICIES SHARP CRITICISM BY RUSSIA

NEW YORK, May 12. A recent Soviet publication has sharply criticised the Indian National

Congress for condoning "Capitalism exploitation" in the name of Socialism, according to the American Committee for Liberation, an anti-Communist organisation. It says:

"What is being developed in India is State Capitalism. It cannot alter the actual nature of Capitalism because economic and political power is in the hands of the Bourgeoisie....."

The assertion that State Capitalism creates elements of a socialist economy inside a capitalist society is designed to dispose of the question of the socialist revolution; it is an attempt to bring everything down to reforms, to a "transformation" of capitalism into socialism, the denial of revolution and class struggle."

## Letters to the Editor

### SPY PLANE INCIDENT AND ITS LESSON

Madam,

The recent American spy plane incident is being exploited by Mr. Khrushchev and the communists of the world for blackmailing the free world headed by America. The savage manner in which Khrushchev behaved at the Summit Conference has once again proved that even the biggest of the Communists does not deserve a place in discussions across the table with the leaders of free and civilised world. The impossible pre-conditions to the holding of the summit conference laid down by Mr. Khrushchev point to only one pertinent fact: that is Mr. Khrushchev was all along pretending to stand for peace while secretly preparing for war. The American President and the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Herter are well conversant with these tactics of the communists, and they are therefore perfectly justified in claiming the right to fly in the open skies to get information of the military preparedness of the countries behind the Iron Curtain, in the absence of any international machinery possessed of such powers. What else should the free countries do to safeguard their own freedom against the sudden attack of the communist countries?

This is not the time to shirk or to equivocate. The truth, however unpleasant, must be told. If espionage is such a horrible crime as Mr. Khrushchev makes it out to be, Russia is the arch-criminal in this respect. It is a wellknown fact that espionage is being carried on for several years by Russia through the infiltration of its agents in the military barracks, civil offices of foreign Governments, and through its fifth columnist National Communist parties, wings, and cells and even through their embassies. It is also carried on from the air and from under the sea. On 17th May 1960, it was reported from Athens that a 400 ton Soviet auxiliary Warship had been conducting espionage against Nato in the Mediterranean. The Warship identified as

"LOTS 97" was first spotted in the Aegean Sea about five months ago and was based in Albania. It is said to have appeared repeatedly in Greek territorial waters. The Swiss Government also recently had to expel certain members of Soviet Embassy from that country for espionage.

Let, therefore, the free world take a lesson from the recent deliberate attempt on the part of Russia to wreck the Summit conference. The lust for power and expansionism of communists cannot be curbed by wooing and hobnobbing with them. Communism should be dealt with firmly from position of strength. Russia's tall talk of co-existence and peace henceforth should no longer deceive the democratic forces of the world. The best way of meeting this communist challenge is to forge an unbreakable united front of the free world against the dictatorial communist countries.

Bombay.

B. Ramakrishnan

**"A LIGHT HOUSE"**

Madam,

The Land Ceiling Bill in Madras has given adequate room for criticism, controversy and conflict. Rajaji has rightly brought to the attention of the public that the Land Reforms Legislation is nothing

but an election strategy. While disapproving with the policy of nationalisation, Rajaji has pointed out the rising tendency in Railway fares, Postage rates, Bus fares and the like, in the public sector. 1 ir.

The encroachment of the State Government into the jurisdiction of the University, by way of introducing the regional language as the medium of instruction in the degree courses under the banner of a pilot project in Ciombatore, has created furore in the Legislative Council discussions and confusion and chaos in the minds of the public. There has been a regular tug of war between the Government and the University in regard to this issue.

The Chief Minister of Madras has been reported to have told a public gathering that the Swatantra Party's 'dharma' is to leave people to starve for food, clothing and shelter and that he would never allow that type of 'dharma' to reign in his land. Swatantra Party's principles and policies are as clear as the morning dew, and even before it could take the reigns of power and prove its mettle, no responsible minister could denounce the party, and just because he is prejudiced against it, the people will not be misled by such pronouncements.

The Swatantra Party is just like a lighthouse and it will guide the nation to the shore of plenty and prosperity.

Coimbatore.

Y. V. Visveswaran

**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 clear st and the most sanitary.



W.  
THE  
DUNCAN ROAD  
BOM  
LLS

Telephone: 70205

Telegram: LOTEWALLA