

Government of Congo held out threats to UNO, America and England that, if they did not fall in line with its erratic policies, it might even seek the military aid of Russia and other countries. Belgian Colonialists are undoubtedly to be blamed for playing one tribe against another, but it is no justification at least for neutral democratic countries like India upholding any single group or tribe only out of spite for the Belgians. It is a patent fact that the Government of Lumumba was, as it ultimately turned out to be, only an unhappy coalition of tribal chiefs who wanted to divide amongst themselves the spoils of victory against Belgian Colonialists and in the end fell out among themselves, when they could not do so successfully.

In the absence of an agreed solution among the different parties and groups in Congo, the only sensible course for the UNO which is seized of this matter, to follow for the purpose of bringing order and peace to the land, is to impose its collective will on the country and devise and establish a UNO regime there for a well-defined transitional period, and at the same time to associate the Congolese leaders with the governance of the country. Mr. Lester Pearson, the great Canadian statesman and a recognised authority on international problems, has come in, for a good deal of criticism in the Indian Press for his sane proposal, that the UNO should bring the troubled country of Congo under its Trusteeship, though he was very careful to suggest that the Trustee should be an Asian country like India. We entirely agree with this proposal except for the latter part of it. India today is only a formal democracy and has yet to build sound democratic traditions and conventions. In its hurry for rapid industrial progress, it is deliber-

ately following in the footsteps of Russian undemocratic methods of industrialisation. Occupied as it is, with its own difficult problem of equating democratic ideals with collectivist economic policies, it is doubtful whether it will rise equal to the task of saving Congo for democracy under UNO Trusteeship. It would be more advisable to appoint to that post, a country like England which has a long democratic tradition and which is voluntarily 'decolonising' itself. This done, Congo will have gradually a well-trained administrative cadre, conversant with democratic conventions and practices. The time has therefore come for all democrats of the world to do a lot of re-thinking on this issue of Independence vis-a-vis Freedom. It is not always that independence of a country connotes freedom of its people. National jingoism in a socially backward country like Congo, may even take it back to the times of savagery. But a country under the rule of a foreign benevolent and democratic power, or better still, under the benign rule of a world recognised democratic body like UNO with its charter of human freedom and welfare, may be freer and happier than an independent country under a tribal chief or under a dictatorship, proletarian or otherwise.

The world today is divided between self-governing countries and non-self-governing countries. According to Mr. Lester Pearson "a people who are governed by a dictator, whose power is based merely on military or police control, is not self-governing, even if the dictator happens to be of the same race, and to speak the same language as most of his subjects. The people of a puppet state, the satellite dictatorship of a totalitarian power, are non-self-governing to a greater extent than the people, for example, of a colony which is on the move though the move may seem to be too slow, to a national freedom under democratic self-government" ('DEMOCRACY IN WORLD POLITICS'). In our anger at the tragic death of Lumumba, let us not lose sight of these fundamental questions posed before Congo and before the whole democratic world. Independence needs to be harmonised with freedom; national patriotism, with human dignity and welfare; and democracy, with individual liberty. The world is coming closer than ever, with our scientific progress on the earth, in the air and in outer space. In modern world, therefore, mere nationalism is not enough. Let us realise it.

THE CONGRESS IN THE DOLDRUMS

The Glory that was Congress is no more. Congress that could once justifiably claim to represent the country, no longer commands even the loyalty and devotion of its members. The uninterrupted power that it has been enjoying for all these years in the aftermath of Freedom's struggle, has verily gone to the heads of Congressmen. As a result, all over the country there are rifts and fissures everywhere in the Congress organisation and its Parliamentary wings. As elections are drawing nearer and nearer, the struggle for capturing positions of power and vantage within the Congress organisation is growing more and more fierce. A small wing of Congress Legislative Party in Punjab is out for the blood of Mr. Kairon the Punjab Chief Minister. In U.P. Gupta-Sampurnanand factions are going about merrily

The Indian Libertarian
Independent Journal of Free Economy and Public Affairs

Edited by : D. M. Kulkarni, B.A., LL.B.,
Published on the 1st and 15th of Each Month
Single Copy 25 Naye Paise
Subscription Rates :
Annual Rs 6 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 typewritten 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.

with their game of vendetta against each other. The hurried journeyings, to and fro, of a Pant, between Delhi and Allahabad, and the long-winding but stale homilies of a Nehru on undesirability of groupism in Congress, have had no soothing effect on the frayed tempers of these cliques. The result was that the Governor of the State had to content himself with addressing recently only the rump of the State Assembly, owing to the planned absence of about 144 Congress members and other opposition members. The Congress High Command is completely upset, but has no nerve to bring the defaulting members to book, for fear that in the next elections the Congress might come off only as the second best, if it did so. The Orissa Congress is faring no better. Of late Ganatantra Finance Minister had been giving the Chief Minister a good deal of trouble and at last the Congress bosses agreed to the proposal of the Chief Minister to request the Governor to dissolve the Coalition Ministry. The disgraceful tactics of the newly elected Orissa State Congress chief Mr. Patnaik to bring in, an alternative Congress Ministry by inducing non-Congress members to join Congress by offering them baits, have so disgusted some fifteen Congress M.L.As. that they have offered to resign. In Mysore ordinary Congress members are frantically trying to bring about a re-approachment between Nijalingappa and Jatti the Chief Minister in face of impending elections.

Mr. Nehru, the all-powerful Congress super-leader, is richly reaping the fruits of his own policy of surrounding himself with less than mediocre talents in the organisation, as also in the Government, provided they pamper to his whims and ego-centrism. It may be said without any fear of contradiction, that the once powerful Congress, built up by tried leaders like Gandhi, Das, Motilal Nehru and C. Rajagopalachari and the old stalwarts like Dadabhai Naoroji, Mehta, Gokhale and Ranade has now fallen a prey to the impracticable and idealistic foreign and domestic policies of our Prime Minister. This personality cult has made it easy for people with no moral fibre and no scruples, to come to the top and has vitiated the Congress organisation from top to bottom. These people are corroding the Congress from within, and worms are already at it. This once Glorious organisation is now in the doldrums. Which other party will take its place to carry on the traditions of patriotism and selfless service to the country? One casts a wistful glance at the Swatantra Party under the inspiring leadership of C. Rajagopalachari.

AN INSIPID ADDRESS

The self-complacent address delivered by President Rajendra Prasad at the inauguration of the Budget Session of Parliament appears to be a none too successful effort to paint a rosy picture of what in fact is a colossal failure of the Indian Government on Home and International fronts. Since such an address is supposed to reflect the opinion of the Government, it was bound to dilate at great length on Foreign Affairs, in which subject our Prime Minister has 'specialised'. In fact, as much as half of the address is devoted to this matter alone, though there is nothing for the Government to be specially proud of, in this field. From a reading of the Address, one cannot get

away from the impression that the Government is firm only on one thing and that is on "adherence to the basic policy in Foreign Affairs". The principles of 'Panchashila', 'Peaceful Negotiation', 'Disarmament', 'Neutrality', which constitute the bedrock of the basic policy, have miserably foundered on the Indo-China and Kashmir Border Problems, as also at the UNO. Our Neutrality has come to mean for the democratic Western Nations, alignment on our part with anti-democratic forces in almost every major crisis occurring in the world today, e.g. Eisenhower-Khrushchev conflict, Congo debacle, Admission of China to UNO. The Indian Government's bubbling enthusiasm for peace among the leading Nations of the world, has outrun its professed concern for making the world safe for democracy, and this weakness of its Foreign Policy is very cleverly exploited by the totalitarian nations to further their own expansionist ambitions. The result is, that today, we seem to have made more enemies than friends in the International field, and our prestige in the free world is at its lowest ebb. As for the unfree World, Chinese aggression on our Northern Borders speaks volumes for the 'esteem' in which we are held in this circle. The conclusion is inescapable that India should learn to save herself first before trying to save the world.

The picture on the domestic front is no less dismal and disappointing. The President's Address has sounded a call to the country 'to dedicated attention and to tasks and burdens in front of us all' and 'to understanding and co-operation'. But it will not create much enthusiasm among the people, in face of the economic conditions prevailing in the country today. The increase in agricultural production referred to, in the Address, is quite inadequate to make the country self-sufficient in food, as adumbrated in our Plans. The Community Projects and Panchayat Raj in the rural areas have done very little so far to raise the standard of living of our rural population. The National Income, as the President has said, may have risen by 42%, but this can be offset against only 20% increase in per-capita income, coupled with spiral inflation. Against this background, the big advances made in industry have failed to create the necessary conditions for any appreciable improvement in agricultural techniques or living patterns of the rural masses. The common people remain as ever apathetic and inert, while leaders at the top are devoid of any creative thinking and constructive and energetic action. There is, therefore, little hope that the President's Address will have the effect of pulling the country out of the 'slough of the Despond' and despair that has overtaken it, in consequence of the impracticable and politically orientated economic plans. So with all the invocation 'to the tasks and burdens that are in front of us all,' the Address as a whole may prove to be insipid and not altogether inspiring to the common citizen.

GOVERNMENT IS DANGEROUS LIKE FIRE

"Government is not reason, it is not eloquence it is force! Like fire it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master: never for a moment should it be left to irresponsible action".

—George Washington.

MARCH 1, 1961.

What Next In Congo ?

By M. A. Venkata Rao

THE balance of opinion about Dr. Patrice Lumumba, first Premier of the Congo, is that he was murdered by Belgian officers in connivance with Mr. Tshombe, seceding President of Katanga province. The communist party of India has stirred up labour demonstrations against the Belgians in front of their embassy and consular offices in Delhi and elsewhere. Other party groups too (not to be left behind in the race for international "wisdom") have followed suit.

Indian political parties should have very little to do with the situation in Congo. They have enough to occupy their minds at home. Be this as it may, it is clear that affairs in Congo have reached a new crisis.

The Soviet representative in the U.N. has made use of the opportunity of the murder of Lumumba to re-emphasise his country's determination to get rid of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld as Secretary-General, unmindful of the fact that it would only result in the break-up of the U.N. For, the dismissal of the Secretary-General is sure to be followed by Soviet pressure for splitting the office into a three-man condominium—an arrangement which is essentially unworkable. Even India has refused to endorse this suggestion of the Soviets, pro-Russian as she is on most occasions.

President Kennedy has quoted Sri Nehru and endorsed his judgment that the UNO should be supported firmly, as its disappearance would precipitate catastrophe and hasten the dreaded world war III.

But the UN on its part should measure up to the situation. No personality or institution can survive for long unless it answers the needs of the situation for which it was constituted.

The UN began well, mobilising mainly African nations to furnish troops, including only small Powers among European Members like Ireland and Sweden so as to ward off suspicions of the recrudescence of Big Power imperialism on the sly.

But the unstable and volatile character of Dr. Lumumba and the all-out rivalry between tribal chiefs like Kasavubu and Tshombe and Kalonji, each relying on his tribal supporters soon introduced anarchic conditions. Kasavubu dismissed Lumumba and Lumumba dismissed Kasavubu. Tshombe refused to join the federal Government from the beginning, aided and abetted by the Belgians, official and non-official, who wished to salvage as much as possible of their large mineral concerns behind the facade of the seceding Katanga chief.

Lumumba showed pronounced pro-Russian leanings from the beginning, though he welcomed the UN mission at first.

Ghana under its enterprising and ambitious chief

President Nkrumah offered Lumumba full military assistance to support his independence in the hope of gaining sufficient influence with him in order to make a beginning with his grandiose scheme of an African Federation, a United States of Africa. Dr. Nkrumah was educated in the United States and the dream of emulating it in Africa is animating his diplomacy from the day of his assumption of office as president of Ghana. He has arranged a de facto, though original, federal union of Ghana with Mali and Guinea, his neighbours.

When Dr. Nkrumah offered to place his troops at his disposal and to give all-out help in asserting his independence as Chief of Congo, Lumumba jumped at the idea immediately without a thought as to its consequences and asked the UN Mission peremptorily to close down and depart!

As Lumumba showed a distinct and reckless desire to obtain massive help from any quarter and spoke the language of Leftism so common among radicals and so-called progressives, the Soviets took the opportunity unscrupulously to send military help to Lumumba outside the UNO on their own. Some aircraft and hundreds of Soviet military technicians alighted in out of the way fields and the fat was in the fire!

In contrast to Lumumba, President Kasavubu showed clear and decisive leanings towards the West. Since the Soviets entered the field on the sly illegitimately and looked as though they would soon have Lumumba and the Congo Government under their de facto protection and hegemony, the West got alarmed. The USA under Eisenhower countered the move by backing Kasavubu. Kasavubu visited the UN and got recognised by a majority vote in the Assembly as the legitimate Chief of State.

Meanwhile the Belgians saw that they had lost everything by way of investments in the mineral line. They had a treaty as part of the grant of independence to Congo whereby cooperation in economic and administrative affairs would continue on a basis of equality for mutual benefit. But the precipitancy of Lumumba and the revolt of the Congolese soldiery or militia called the Force Publique (which ran amuck and took fearful revenge on its erstwhile masters and officers) created chaotic conditions and the new Government representatives Kasavubu and Lumumba lost control of the situation. Soldiers attacked their officers for delay or insufficiency of pay and often for no particular reason!

It is true that the Belgians returned in strength to regain influence so as to salvage as much of their economic installations as possible in the mineral rich Katanga at least. They backed Tshombe and reorganised production and took responsibilities for defence of the area and personnel involved.

It is tiresome to read every day that the Belgians were the devil in the woodpile and must be thrown out. But independence does not mean that property rights of foreigners are wiped out. Conduct worthy of Dr. Castro of Cuba is bound to provoke retaliation in kind. Instead of cursing the Belgians all the time in a strident manner, statesmanship demands that due account should be taken of the investments of the Belgians and suitable guarantees given on behalf of the new Congo. If this is done, Belgians too would behave reasonably. They are not running amuck but trying to save something. The murder of Lumumba is of course inexcusable. If the UAR and Ghana and others might be allowed to foster their far-reaching ambitions in the Congo and if Russians could intervene, the re-entry of the Belgians in civil economy should be intelligible.

Belgians will withdraw if reasonable arrangements are made to safeguard their economic interests by way of compensation for acquisition or commercial treaty allowing for mutual cooperation between Government and foreign investor.

The need for governmental justice and protection of economic and human rights is inescapable. No arrangement and diplomacy or declamation and sentimental slogans will offer a substitute for solid understandings guaranteeing justice, national and international. If foreign investments are to be wiped out because of independence, on what grounds can new governments expect Aid from abroad to modernise and industrialise their undeveloped countries? Politicians like our Prime Minister have too little sense of the hard realities of economic and political institutions.

The USA allowed Belgian re-entry for economic salvage as a counter-move to Soviet Russia's unilateral action outside the UNO. Mr. Rajeswar Dayal's report went unheeded. Pro-communist observers are crying hoarse that the West has intervened without recognising that the West intervened only as a counter to Russian intervention.

There is a case for indicting Russia for this anti-UNO act (which is illegal and treacherous) rather than endorsing her charges against the Secretary General.

It must be said that the Secretary General also failed to seize the opportunity of asserting the supremacy of the UN and using force in a determined manner in the early days and to put down lawlessness. He acquiesced in the US move and resiled from the legitimate UN purpose of restoring law and order in Congo as the inevitable framework of government to sustain revival and extension of administrative developments in civil life. He lost nerve and became a helpless watcher of events beyond his control. He should have moved for a withdrawal of intervention by both sides and called for authority to act independently. Instead he kept on saying that the UN troops in Congo were not combat troops. What were they then? Parade guards of humour? He stultified himself and the UN by declaring that the UN troops would fight only in self-defence. But why should the UN troops go to dangerous places only to engage in self-defence? They could have avoided the need for self-defence by staying at home!

The basic fact is that the new Government of Congo never had a chance of governing or commencing the business of governing. The Constitution was set aside in the anarchy that ensued. The rivalry between Kasavubu and Lumumba was enhanced by outside Powers siding with them on opposite sides. The USA supported Kasavubu and Russia (and pro-communist Powers) sided with Lumumba. The African Powers who participated in the UN Mission by contributing armed forces--Ghana, UAR, Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Tunisia, Morocco sided with Lumumba which alarmed the West still more.

If these Leftist Powers should aid and abet Russian penetration through Lumumba, the game is lost for the free world.

In this condemnation of Western intervention, we should not lose sight of the larger implications of the situation. If Congo becomes subject to communist hegemony, it could strengthen the communist world beyond imagination. Their systematic exploitation of man-power and natural resources and the possibility of their sweeping in time the entire African world into their bloc even as they have come to dominate the entire Eurasian mainland east of Berlin up to Vladivostock and the Behring sea. Only the new conquest would be immensely richer.

The free world would have lost the cold war and would come within measurable distance of being overwhelmed in the hot war, when it supervenes as it will some day.

It is unwise to condemn the cold war day in and day out in a parrot-like manner. It is inevitable so long as Russia continues to have the grim goal of world power and world conquest either through peaceful co-existence or through hot war or by a combination of the two, with co-existence preparing for victory for the Reds in the hot war as a triumphant finale for a thousand years to come.

The intervention of the West through their backing of Kasavubu and his Col. Mobutu who is given the dignity of the post of army general should be viewed in this light of forestalling Russian penetration.

Sociologically, we should remember, that Christian influence on African leaders inclines them, or most of them towards the West. Kasavubu, Lumumba, Tshombe are all Christians. Nationalism and racial pride also work in them but on the whole Christian influence makes for collaboration with the West.

Some of the tribes have been converted to Islam. Islam is a successful competitor in proselytisation to Christianity. Africans are easily converted by Arab and other Moslems. Racial equality is easier to Moslems than to white preachers and administrators and settlers.

The UAR and the other Moslem Powers in North African-Morocco, Tunisia, etc. have their own ambition of Moslemising the Africans and extending their hegemony as against the West.

Pan-Islam thus competes with communism and Western influence for hegemony over the newly independent African States.

An interesting suggestion has been made by Canada's ex-Premier to the effect that India be given Trusteeship Mandate for a definite period with the UN giving all the technical assistance necessary.

This is a great tribute to India. India being the greatest viable democracy in Asia, (indeed in Asia, Africa and South America,) could very well take up the responsibility. If the officers entrusted with the task of establishing a decent government ruling by law and introducing democratic forms of governance and administration are given sufficient initiative and supported in their discretion, there is no doubt that India will make a resounding success of the Mandate.

But the idea is not likely to be accepted by the majority of the UN member States. For as already indicated, there are other States with their own irons in the fire and would be jealous and would more likely than not counter-act the move and nullify it. Even if India is finally given the onerous job, the interested African powers and leaders would torpedo it.

It is to be hoped that the Prime Minister will not commit the country to any acceptance of the responsibility. The Congolese themselves would react hotly and resolutely against domination by India. Tribal chiefs would resent outside sovereignty. They would condemn the idea as an insinuation of imperialism—this time from the Asian side!

The most urgent thing to be done in Congo is to refuse to recognise any person or group as wielding genuine constitutional power, for the constitution broke down immediately after the declaration of in-

dependence! The dismissal of Lumumba by president Kasavubu is not constitutional as it was not confirmed by parliament. The constitution perished as soon as Col. Mobutu prevented members of parliament from assembling!

The UN should therefore establish a regular interim Government in Congo with adequate military power. It should rule for a time and re-establish parliamentary institutions. Then a new constitution should be got passed through a Constituent Assembly. Rulers elected under its authority (after the new set-up has worked for a time) will form the legitimate government of Congo. Meanwhile all armed groups should be disbanded without hesitation and all so-called rulers like Kasavubu, Tshombe, Kalonji, etc. should be dislodged from authority. Let them cultivate the people meanwhile and cooperate with the UN administration in modernising the state of affairs in their country.

This should be done on the basis of an agreement with Russia which should be secured by confidential diplomacy by the UN and particularly the USA under its new president. To continue to recognise Kasavubu is to keep up the interventionist fiasco. No one should be recognised.

It remains to be seen whether this solution could be endorsed by Russia. Open discussion and debate will not help. It is only secret diplomacy and bargaining or threat of sanctions that can influence affairs for the better in this cauldron.

Failure Of Democracy In Asia

By M. N. Tholal

THE consensus of opinion in a seminar in Delhi recently on "South and South-East Asia have a second look at democracy" was that lack of proper political leadership, social cohesion, economic security and a strong administrative structure were the primary reasons for the overthrow of democratic governments by military regimes in most of the countries of South and South-East Asia. The truth really would appear to be that, far from being wedded to democracy, the people of Asia do not even know what democracy is. Had Indians, for example, been democrats, they would have ridiculed Gandhi instead of crying his "Jai". We had a Churchill in Britain who won the war for his country. Why did he not emerge as a dictator there? Because the people in Britain abhor dictatorship and, at the slightest evidence of a man gathering power in his hands, men of his own party begin to criticise and condemn him. Asians can neither understand nor practise democracy so long as they are afraid of speaking out their minds, i.e., so long as they are cowards. That seems to sum up the situation well, howsoever unpalatable it may be. Gandhi in his time exploited, as Nehru is exploiting today, the cowardice of the people. How can there be democracy in a country where even the edu-

cated people are afraid to give expression to their opinions publicly and fearlessly—where they in fact have two sets of opinions, one to please the powers-that-be and the other in their "individual capacity" which they sometimes make bold to express at home or among their friends?

NOT PREPARED TO FIGHT

There was general agreement among the delegates to the seminar that, in the course of the people's struggle for independence, their minds had been adequately prepared for the acceptance of the basic principles of democracy. But that is obviously not enough for the success of democracy in a country. The fact remains that their minds had not been prepared to fight for the basic principles of democracy, otherwise they would have made a bonfire of the charkha which they ridiculed and insisted on Nehru's dismissal by the President when they came to know that he had kept the invasion of India by the Chinese a closely-guarded secret for five or six years, thus setting at naught the sovereignty of Parliament itself. Where the people are not prepared to fight for their democratic rights, the eclipse of democracy is only a matter of time. In our own country the forms of

democracy remain; the reality has evaporated—as was underlined the other day by the deposition of the Maharaja of Bastar.

There was a feeling in the seminar that the institutions of government, based on the western models of parliamentary or presidential governments, could not cater to the needs and aspirations of the people. But what one would like to know is: "What are their aspirations?" The leaders wanted power and exploited the cry of freedom and democracy and self-determination—which is not the same thing as Gandhi-determination or Nehru-determination—and having got power they forgot the cries in which they never believed. Not only that. They threw away the ladder by which they had risen and began greedily accumulating all power in their hands. In India the latest position is that whatever falls from the lips of Mr. Nehru has to be accomplished, for it becomes a question of his national as well as international prestige. What otherwise will Mrs. Grundy say? In other words Mr. Nehru is assuming the attributes of absolute monarchy.

Even a man of the stature of Jai Prakash Narain talks of "party-less democracy", without apparently realising the contradiction in terms inherent in his phrase. In a democracy the people are free to give expression to their opinions. And what is more natural—if they really believe in what they say—than for them to unite and pool their resources in order that what they deem to be the truth may prevail? Our leaders do not believe in what they say. That is why they talk transparent nonsense. They only say what they do to hoodwink the people and make the masses admire them. If the educated performed their duty of exposing such leaders, the latter would not find the game worth the candle and give it up. It is no use blaming the masses for the absence among them of the same degree of "abstract" appreciation of the value of democracy as exists among the elite and the intellectuals. It is the latter's appreciation of the values of democracy which is defective. Can there be, I have often wondered, a greater example of brainlessness than for a man to talk of "partyless democracy"? And yet it is being done by one of the greatest amongst us.

It is difficult to resist the temptation to go into the reasons for such brainlessness. After all, there must be some provocation for such extraordinary intellectual feats. One of them is well-known and that is: the greater the nonsense you talk in this country the more widely you are likely to be admired. I have always found the provocation for such foolish observations in the desire to draw applause—in claptrap, in short. Obviously, partisanship is bad. Why should a man be a partisan? From this it is only another step to affirm, 'parties are bad'. Therefore we should do away with them and have a "partyless democracy." ("Prolonged cheers".) What is really wrong is "My party, right or wrong" and it is that attitude which should be condemned and not the party system.

"WE ARE COWARDS"

Partyless democracy, I have no doubt, will be an excellent proposition for headless or brainless men. But if any one thinks we Indians are brainless, he is

mistaken. That is the proposition on which the Communists thrive. But what is obviously true of almost all of us is that we are cowards and cowardice and democracy go ill together. Democracy requires continuous debate and how can there be a debate if people are afraid of giving expression to their opinions? One may go further and say we are cowards because we are selfish, and there will be a great deal of truth in the proposition. After all, the desire not to displease Mr. Nehru and to cultivate his goodwill is born of selfishness, even as the desire not to displease Mahatma Gandhi and be in his good books—because he was the leader-maker—was born of selfishness; and selfishness often makes cowards of us all. If the principal aim of one's life is to see which side one's bread is buttered, principles, truth and patriotism will count for little. Let me illustrate.

I have never seen so much ridicule poured on a man as on Gandhi when he blurted out "Pattabhi's defeat is my defeat", for he had been saying repeatedly, "I am not even a four-anna member of the Congress". If that ridicule had found public expression, even Mahatma Gandhi would have been afraid of public opinion and would have become more and more of a democrat and less and less of a dictator. But what was said privately by Congressmen was not uttered publicly by them for fear of the Mahatma, with the result that he went on developing his hypocritical ways and landed the country in partition. The Muslim leaders, headed by Jinnah, exposed this hypocrisy, but their exposure was confined to their community with the result that the gulf between the two communities grew wider and wider.

Dictatorship thrives on hypocrisy. If the elite and the intellectuals do not do their best to expose that hypocrisy—for whatever reasons they only deserve dictatorship, whether it is military or pseudo-military. No dictator ever says that he wants to be a dictator. Even when he becomes one, he denies the fact. Mr. Khrushchev is doubtless insisting that the collective leadership, with which he won over the popular Marshal Zhukov to his side and through him the Communist Party, still prevails in Soviet Russia.

If there is frustration among the elite and the intellectuals on account of their inability to participate in the decision-making processes, as was suggested at the seminar, they have themselves to blame for that inability. Today even the reason that existed in the Gandhian era—that we should present a united front to British imperialism—does not exist. To what are Congressmen presenting a united front today? To the forces of patriotism wanting to fight corruption and nepotism? Or to the forces of patriotism wanting to preserve the integrity of the country?

SHORTFALL OF PERFORMANCE

The shortfall of performance of democratic governments in relation to their promises was listed as the third factor for the failure of democracy. But surely what are the opposition parties for, in a democracy, if not to punish the governing parties by replacing them for the shortfall in their performance? Why should we go on voting Congress if we are dissatisfied with its performance? Why should not the Congress effort to get returned to power by hook or

crook create the determination in the people to frustrate its design? It is all a question of realising one's duty and doing it regardless of the consequences. If we, as a people, are afraid of voting against the Congress—and that is why the Congress is in power—it is no use blaming the failure of democracy on anything except our own cowardice. Of course the Congress Government will clench its teeth when it comes to a question of retaining power, but if it realises that clenching the teeth, far from intimidating the people, will only result in their clenching their teeth at the Congress, the Congress Government will abstain from clenching its teeth. That is what makes for the saying that every people have the government they deserve. We have the government we deserve. Mr. Nehru knows better than most men what kind of people he has to deal with, and it is not for nothing that he has been cultivating "flashes of temper". So far as I am aware, he encountered only one man in the Congress who could stand up to his "flashes of temper"—the words are his own about himself—and that man was the late Pandit Balkrishna Sharma, my friend and college-mate, whose retorts, verbal as well as physical, to Mr. Nehru became proverbial in the U.P. in the thirties. One man in three or four hundred people or one writer among thirty or forty thousand—I am referring to my far-from-humble self here—is nothing to be proud of. How can one man sustain a democracy?

Of course there is a reason for our cowardice: our thousand-year-old slavery. But is it not immoral

from the democratic point of view—from any point of view except the Communist—to give a fillip to that cowardice, which, so far as I am aware, is our only spiritual heritage? Go on giving a fillip to that cowardice—like the Central Minister who wants every one to touch his feet—go on driving fear into the hearts of the people by your "flashes of temper" and by deposing Bastards, and go on talking of "spiritual values". There is, indeed, need of such talk—of nothing else greater—from those who are making mince-meat of spiritual values, and sacrificing them at the altar of power politics, because an ignorant and cowardly people tolerate it. Nothing succeeds like drawing a red herring across the scent.

It is good to find that there was general agreement about the basic content of the concept of democracy—the dignity of man and his inalienable fundamental rights, from which follow the rule of law, the consent of the governed and the sovereignty of the people. This is putting the matter in a nutshell in the least offensive way. But that is hardly the way to make people understand what is wrong with us. With the abstract proposition enunciated above even Messrs. Nehru and Pant will heartily agree, thanking goodness that the people will not understand that their agreement is purely hypocritical and that they feel free, after that declaration of agreement, to draw their coach and four over the dignity of man and his inalienable fundamental rights. The people, even the educated people, have to be made to understand what their fundamental rights are. That would be a good beginning for democracy in the East.

Soviet Economists Part Company With Marx

By Trygve J. B. Hoff

KARL MARX is rightly looked upon as being the spiritual father of socialism (and communism). But it is the forceful appeal in the demagogic Communist Manifesto, not *Das Kapital* and his analysis of socialist theory, that gives him paternity rights. His theoretical contribution was his account of dynamic private enterprise, for the achievements of which he nursed considerable admiration, and not his labor theory of value, the weakness of which Marx himself recognized.

Marx was more concerned with tactical and political questions than with the theory and practice of socialism. He discussed how a capitalist order should be transformed into a socialist one, whether it was advisable to employ revolutionary or parliamentary tactics, by what means the capitalists could best be expropriated, what industries should be nationalized to begin with, and how rapidly the process of socialization could be carried on. Marx declared that no sensible person would think of working out recipes before the kitchen was ready, or words to that effect. The result was that in socialist circles it was considered downright heresy to discuss how the socialist communities should work in practice.

But, Russian economists have now begun to discuss the law of value.

At the meeting of the American Economic Association, held in December 1958, a clear indication was given of how the tide has turned. Attention was drawn to the fact that the change began with an article by a team of Russian economists headed by L. A. Leontiev, in the Russian Journal, *Pod Znamenem Marxisma*, No. 7-8 1943.¹ Russian economists constantly hark back to this article when they discuss economics with foreign economists visiting the Soviet Union.

Professor Carl Landauer (University of California), in the *American Economic Review* of June 1944, says that the Russian article breaks new ground: it proves that the law of value is valid in a socialist system too. Perhaps the most sensational feature of the article is its contention that this economic law relates to the universal factors: scarcity and utility, and that these factors have essentially the same content in socialist as in capitalist societies.

This is explosive material indeed; The Marxists have always ridiculed the concept of "eternal truths."

The Indian Libertarian

Rationalist Supplement

Sami Chidambaranar

By S. Ramanathan

SAMI Chidambaranar died at Madras on 17th January. His death was an irreparable loss to the rationalist movement and to Tamil literature. He was one of the pioneers of the Self-respect movement which shook Tamil Nad thirty years ago and threatened to engulf not only Southern India but the whole country in a revolution. Those who have participated in the movement in its early days would remember that Chidambaranar was one of its pillars. Though a great scholar in Tamil, he was a humble Tamil Pandit in one of the Schools in Tanjore District. He showed his courage when he defied all his relations and friends by contracting a marriage with a widow born in another caste. The value of this double reform was enhanced when he celebrated the marriage without priests or religious ceremonies in the simple manner prescribed by the Self-respect movement. A meeting of friends at which the bride and bridegroom were present and took an oath of life-long loyalty to each other was all the ceremony required by the movement. Chidambaranar was one of the very first who took the oath and initiated the movement. After him marched in, several lakhs of people who have defied custom and religion and set at naught priestly domination by contracting similar marriages. It must be said to Chidambaranar's credit that he did not follow many other leaders of the movement who fortified their Self-respect marriages by subsequent registration under the Civil Marriages Act. A doubt was expressed by the Courts in Madras that Self-respect marriages which became the fashion with the youth were not quite valid in law. Whether valid or not, a movement which engulfed lakhs of people within its orbit had to be recognised by law as a *factum valet*. To the end of his days, Chidambaranar

upheld the position that Self-respect marriages require no subsequent registration for their validation.

Chidambaranar's allegiance to the rationalist movement does not relate only to his marital relationship. Though originally he began his life as a Tamil tutor, he gradually developed into a speaker and evolved into an orator. He toured the length and breadth of the Tamil districts carrying the message of the new movement to every village. He was a constant companion to Periyar E. V. Ramasami, the leader of the movement and accompanied him in his perigrinations not only in India but also in foreign countries.

He also developed into a professional writer. His scholarship in Tamil was a great asset in that he could substantiate his tirades against the latter day evil customs and habits to which the Tamil people have fallen a prey. He could show from the classics of ancient Tamil literature that our ancestors were free from all these evils to which we were exposed owing to military domination by foreign conquerors. There are many writers of the Tamil language now-a-days who write in the same strain as Chidambaranar, but none could excel him in erudition, nor could they command the real spirit of the Tamil language which Chidambaranar had mastered in all its manifestations through the many stages of development it had undergone. Though in failing health, Chidambaranar was writing with avidity and was tireless in the publication of books and articles in the newspapers and magazines. His articles were in great demand and he earned a good income by writing, which usually is beyond the capacity of many Tamil writers. Of late, he took interest in organising writers in the Tamil language and was a patron to many progressive writers.

Chidambaranar was never a member of the Communist party although he was sometimes accused by the Congressmen of being a fellow-traveller. Which thinking Indian in India is not a fellow-traveller in the sense in which Sami Chidambaranar was? All of us at sometime in our lives have toyed with the idea of communism. Pandit Nehru than whom there can be no better Congressman is himself a crypto-Communist, and he is said to pave the way for the take-over by communists, of the political administration of India. It is a well-known fact that Sami Chidambaranar had a great dislike for the leadership of the Communist party in India. His final break with the Communists came when the leadership in Madras proclaimed Mr. T. Prakasam as the leader of their Legislative wing after the last general elections in 1952.

Chidambaranar took great interest in political theory and the future set up of society under ideal conditions. Naturally he discussed the rivalry between Russia and China to lead world communist opinion. Chidambaranar courageously took the view that China was in the right and was the true follower of the Marx-Engels-Lenin line of leadership. Communism progresses more by a change in the organisational set-up of human society than by the success or failure of technical achievement in production of commodities. The new line taken up by China in setting up communes, consisting of about 20,000 individuals in the rural as well as in the urban areas was, according to Chidambaranar, a distinct advance over the Russian method of clinging to the biological unit of the family. It may be conceded that the Russian emphasis on the importance of the family, was a kind of reaction to the capitalist criticism that the Soviet society was based upon nationalisation not merely in the economic sphere but also in the social sphere. People talked glibly of nationalisation of women! It has to be admitted that the Russians went too far in emphasising the importance of the family and, of late, Russian literature was full of glowing tributes to father-worship, mother-worship, brother and sister-worship, husband and wife worship etc. which is a direct contradiction of the line indicated by the original communist thinkers. Chidambaranar was of the view that real freedom for women could not be achieved except by the abolition of the individual family kitchen to which she was a slave, however educated she might be and however high a level of life she might lead. The only method of abolishing the family kitchen was by

abolishing the family itself as the social unit. In communist China they were attempting an experiment in abolishing the family kitchen and instituting a single kitchen for the entire commune consisting of about 20,000 individuals. This one reform led to many others. The children were taken care of by trained nurses and hence are happier than in the family nursery. The old and the sick were taken care of, by special services. More than all, the distinction between the village and the town was abolished by this method.

Chidambaranar in his last days discussed frequently about the problem of death and future life. Probably he had a premonition of the imminence of his own death. He exclaimed with vigour "I welcome death, I want to die". But when asked why he was so anxious to die, he had no ready reply. But he expatiated upon the difference between the attitude of materialists like him and the attitude of religious people. He said that materialists who take nature for granted think of life as a mixture of darkness and light and death was implicit in life itself and should therefore be considered as a matter of course with nothing to be wondered at. While religious people threw the entire blame and responsibility upon a super-natural being called God who, to fulfil his own desires and satisfy his own fancies, brought down death and other calamities. It was man's duty, according to religious people, to bow to the will of God whatever might be the disasters that God brought in. But the materialist cannot so easily escape responsibility in the matter. Whatever happens in the world is part of his own doing, inclusive of the many disasters brought in by nature because he is part of nature itself. He must take consolation in the idea that as a materialist he is committed to total responsibility in every happening. This attitude is probably more difficult than that of religious people. That is a problem for materialism to solve. But there is no doubt whatever that Chidambaranar met his end with fortitude and courage. He welcomed death and was not surprised when the end came.

As a man he was the most lovable of friends. He had very simple habits. He lived like a poor man although he could afford a higher level of living. He was easily accessible to one and all who sought his help and it is said that he secretly supported many young writers who gave promise of becoming professionals, although they were in very poor circum-

(Continued on page III)

Hinduism And Scientific World

By J. B. S. Haldane

THERE remains the last of the four great religions, Hinduism. It is not at all comparable with the others. It had no founder, and has no dogmas, nor a moral code binding on all its adherents. There is a wide choice of creeds and codes. And they include some of the best and some of the worst in the world. It is obviously like the pre-Christian religions of Europe. The various cults tolerate one another. One can perhaps distinguish four levels. At the bottom a lot of pretty nasty magic frightens its devotees into pretty nasty actions. There is a specially unpleasant group of female hobgoblins, such as Sitala who presides over smallpox and Manasa over poisonous snakes. On the third level we find a polytheism very like the saint worship of southern Europe. You may acknowledge the supremacy of Siva, but you turn to Ganesa for help in your financial transactions, to Annapurna to look after your crops, and so on. Moral lapses can be redeemed by ritual or by gifts to Brahmins or religious foundations. At its best it is very picturesque. The main support for the caste system, which is one of the great obstacles to Indian unity, comes from this level. The second level is a monotheistic religion, and at its best conducive to noble lives, as in the case of Gandhi. Monotheistic Hindus generally believe that certain beings, such as Ram Chandra, were avatars, or incarnations (literally descents), of the deity, and often admit Jesus to this list. In fact, for monotheists, they are remarkably tolerant. But, so far as I can judge, their doctrines are even less intellectually coherent than those of western (Christian and Islamic) monotheists.

(Continued from page II)

stances. His illness was very brief and his premature end came as a surprise and shock to his many friends. He has left behind a tradition of simple living and high thinking. His friends who are struck down by sorrow at his death will have to co-operate in publishing the many manuscripts he has left, and should keep alive the tradition of free thought which he so ardently built up.

In particular, they have not solved the so-called 'problem of evil', which of course is no problem at all unless one postulates the existence of a conscious almighty and all-knowing being. In particular, it is no problem if one thinks that the gods have finite power or knowledge, even though they may be vastly superior to those of men. Jupiter or Indra may be doing as good a job as he can with refractory material.

The highest level of Hinduism admits the existence of a being which in some sense is supreme. But it has no qualities. The common human belief that human beings are different from this being, and from other human beings, or animals, is said to be the product of ignorance. And according to the great philosopher Sankara, in this context ignorance is the false identification of subject and object. I translate (no doubt very inadequately) a sentence from the introduction of the Sankarabhasya: 'And yet the imposition upon one of the essence and properties of the other, failing to distinguish these two categories, and their properties, which are totally distinct, thus coupling together the true and the false when saying "I am this", or "This is mine", this is an inborn practice of ordinary life which rests on a false belief. This statement is not mysticism. On the other hand, any attempt to describe the self, even by negation, is more or less misleading. Human individuals have had experiences which they interpreted as a perception that they were not different from the one self. The word 'mystic' is derived from the Greek *muo*, meaning 'I close', particularly the lips. I wish they would.

Some of the fathers of British free thought at least took Sankara's difficulty seriously, even if they did not agree with him. W. K. Clifford spent many pages in attempting to show that 'ejects', or other people's minds, could be treated with the same logic as 'objects', or things. Sankara was probably not an idealist. At least he argued against contemporary Buddhist idealism. Nor did he call himself a monist, but an *advaita*, or non-dualist. Now modern physicists are up against a very similar problem to

Sankara. If two electrons are far enough away in space there is no objection to calling them 'this' and 'that'. But if they are close enough together, for example, in the same metallic conductor, there is no way of distinguishing between them: and this makes a difference to their observable properties. As a materialist, I see it as at least possible that the distinction between different minds is equally incomplete.

Almost all Indian philosophers since Sankara have been engaged in watering down his philosophy, even if they claimed to accept it. But a good many Indians, especially some groups of south Indian Brahmins, have adhered to it. Sankara denied that the existence of God could be proved by reason. But he was a theist, stating, in the words of Vice-President Radhakrishnan, that the reality of God 'is not a self-evident axiom, is not a logical truth, but an empirical postulate which is practically useful'. He accepted Scriptural statements on this matter. But in my opinion it is easy to become an atheist without ceasing to be an *advaita*. Most atheists in India are probably communists who have not always understood dialectical materialism very fully, because it is historically a revolt against Christian and to a less extent Jewish doctrine; so some parts of the Marxist classics are irrelevant to India. Others think more or less like non-Marxist European free-thinkers. But I certainly know—and admire—men who can best be called Hindu atheists. They have preserved a good deal of Brahmin ethics, for example will not eat meat, take learning more seriously than money, and so on. Further, their imagination has been moulded on Hindu mythology. I do not say that this is better than European mythology, but it is different. Some of its heroes led as questionable public and private lives as David or Theseus. But I at least find that they stimulate my imagination in somewhat new directions.

At its lowest level Hinduism is probably more anti-scientific than catholic Christianity at its lowest level. At its highest level Hinduism is certainly more compatible with science than is any other religion. This fact may be, and probably is, irrelevant to the future. In spite of the example of the Vice-President of India, the modern tendency in Hinduism is, I believe, towards idolatry and superstition together with a cult of celibacy which is Buddhistic or Catholic rather than in the spirit of the Vedas. In particular, rich men endow temples and go in for

a religion of unctuous devotion after office hours. Many intellectuals abandon religion altogether. Unfortunately the world view which they wish to substitute for it is commonly based on very crude popularizations of science and has little in common with the outlook which, for example, most of my scientific colleagues in England took for granted. So I do not think that Hinduism has much future in a scientific world; though it may have.

—From the article 'The Dark Religions' in
The Rationalist Annual, 1961,

DESCENT OF MAN

Three monkeys sat in a cocoanut tree
Discussing things as they're said to be.
Said one to the others, "Now listen, you two,
There's a certain rumor that can't be true,
That man descends from our noble race—
The very idea is a disgrace.
No monkey ever deserted his wife,
Starved her babies and ruined her life,
And you've never known a mother monk
To leave her babies with others to bunk,
Or pass them on from one to another
'Till they scarcely know who is their mother.
And another thing you'll never see—
A monk built a fence 'round a cocoanut tree
And let the cocoanuts go to waste,
Forbidding all other monks a taste;
Why, if I'd put a fence around the tree,
Starvation would force you to steal from me.
Here's another thing a monk won't do—
Go out at night and get on a stew,
Or use a gun or club or knife
To take some other monkey's life,
Yes, Man descended—the ornery cuss—
But, brother, he didn't descend from us!"
—Author Anonymous

FUTILITY OF STATE AND CHURCH

- B. What are soldiers then?
A. Protectors of the state.
B. And monks are the props of the church.
A. That for your church!
B. That for your state!
A. Are you dreaming? The state! The happiness which the state guarantees to every individual member in this life!
B. The bliss which the church promises to every man after this life!
A. Promises!
B. Simpleton!

—Lessing.

But if they now acknowledge that eternal truths exist in the economic field, why then should they deny their existence in other fields?

ABOUT FACE!

Now "value calculation" does not actually conflict with Marxist theory, for Marx concerned himself far more with criticizing capitalism than with explaining how the socialist system should work. But the Russian team of authors goes farther. It asks how the value shall be determined in the Soviet Union now that it has been established that Marx's labor theory of value cannot be applied. The point is that if utility is introduced, the labor theory of value must be abandoned. This means that the Soviet economy is now taking the road that leads from Marx back to Jevons, Walras, and Menger.

No one can doubt that the abandonment of the labor value theory is due to practical experience. "For the Soviet economist, the value theory is not a mere academic affair. Value is the 'single denominator,' which must be used in Soviet book-keeping for the 'comparison of the expenses of the firm in a given period with the whole mass of production for the same period,'" says Professor Landauer, quoting from the Russian article.

"If values reflected only labor cost," Landauer says, "they would not be usable for correct book-keeping." The Leontiev team, Landauer adds, is saying virtually the same thing as did Boehm-Bawerk and Cassel. He points out that others have also foreseen this development in socialist societies.

The professor goes on to say there was in the beginning an attempt to represent the team's article as a symptom of the Soviet Union's decreasing hostility to capitalism, but he claims that those who do this are on the wrong track. The Soviet economists several times express their conviction that the capitalist system must be abolished. They can hardly say anything else. The main point, however, Landauer goes on to say, is that the labor value theory has now been abandoned by the Soviet Union, a fact which "will free price analysis in Soviet planning from a severe handicap."

A PRACTICAL PROBLEM

It was not academic interest in economic theory that induced Leontiev and team to proclaim respect for the "value-law" in the socialist system. A contributory cause was the fact that some Russian factories managed to operate at a profit, whereas others ran at a loss. There may be many reasons for this, but one of them is that certain factories enjoy a favorable location with respect to supplies of raw materials, availability of labor or markets, while others were badly placed.

As the State owns all land and no rent is charged for use of land, this prime factor is not taken into account. Nor is interest charged on capital, the argument being that the State owns the factories so that such accounting is considered superfluous. However, as there is no need to pay interest, the managers of state-owned concerns are tempted to hoard materials—after all, it costs nothing. The consequence is that

a "value problem," or a calculation problem, was found to exist there, too. The question of interest was looked upon by the authorities as separate and subsidiary. But the significance of the fact that some concerns operate at a profit and others at a loss was understood to the full.

The Soviet authorities have endeavored to solve the problem—though not very successfully—by stipulating "regional transfer prices," by granting subsidies to the poorly placed factories, and by fixing "special settlement prices" to suit the various cases.

ECONOMICS OF AGRICULTURE

Khrushchev, himself, as a consequence of the poor results achieved in agriculture, has become aware of the need for calculation. In his notorious report of December 15, 1958, the Russian Premier declared: "It is impossible to carry on agriculture without a thorough analysis of the costs of producing the goods and without exercising control by means of the ruble." In so saying, Khrushchev is simply corroborating what sensible economists have always maintained.

In Russia there are a confusing number of price levels, that is, if the word "price" can be applied to numerical designations which are arbitrarily determined and have nothing whatever to do with markets. For retail prices alone, seven different price levels exist, of which probably the only reliable ones are those ruling on the black markets.

Of far greater importance than prices of consumer goods, however, no matter what the system, are the prices of raw materials and means of production. Where there are no markets—and there are none for means of production in socialist states, because the State, by definition, is the sole owner—there can be no market prices for the means of production. And where there are no market prices, there are no reliable calculation data.

The "transfer prices" which the Soviet authorities have employed are completely artificial. The drastic alterations continually being made in "relative prices" and the skepticism with which they are greeted by the Soviet authorities themselves show how worthless they are.

Further proof of the skepticism about prices in Soviet Russia is found in the comparisons which are being made constantly with prices in countries where private enterprise exists. The supreme socialist authority, Stalin himself, once declared that the price of cotton in the Soviet Union had to be set higher than the price of grain in the Soviet Union "because this is the case on the world market." This reference by Stalin to foreign price relations is not merely a confession of a fundamental defect in the socialist system. It reveals also that the existence of capitalist societies with price data constitutes an enormous advantage for the socialist states.

CAUTIOUS CRITICISM

There is widespread anxiety among Russian economists because their economy lacks serviceable criteria and stimuli for rational economic choice. The foremost politicians have likewise been seized by a

desire for rationality. However, Soviet economists have been warned against "revisionism."

Nevertheless, the Soviet economists now evince a tendency to criticize, but their criticisms are presented cautiously and obliquely. This is primarily an intellectual and academic trend, and there is nothing to indicate that Soviet Russia is endeavoring to bring about a return to the "market mechanism." This is understandable, as such a statement would be tantamount to a proclamation that socialism has failed. On the whole, therefore, discussions on allocation of resources have taken place *sub rosa*.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In a socialist society, the private ownership of means of production has been abolished, and as a result there are no markets for the factors of production. Without markets for production factors, one cannot obtain real calculation data, i.e., prices which reflect on the one hand the varying demand, on the other the scarcity of existing resources, which is also a variable, depending as it does on technical developments.

Because Marx did not concern himself with the way in which the socialist system would work in practice, socialist economists in the early days regarded discussion of such matters as rank heresy. A few nonsocialist economists, men who have thought deeply about the problems of calculation and value, are the ones who have brought to light this fundamental defect of socialism.

As early as 1854 the originator of the marginal utility theory, the German economist, H. H. Gossen, declared that only through private enterprise would it be possible to produce a yardstick by which to determine how much might rationally be produced with existing resources.

Other economists who have given the problem their attention include the Dutchman, N. G. Pierson, the French Professor Bourguin, Max Weber (in his *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*), and Professor Boris Brutzkus. The one who merits the greatest praise, however, is Professor Ludwig von Mises. His contention was submitted quite casually, almost in passing,

but it was found extremely provocative and sensational. "Because the socialist community is unable to calculate," he declared, "socialism is impossible."

As recently as twenty to twenty-five years ago, revelation of this flaw in the socialist program was greeted with a blend of indignation and irritation by socialist economists. One of the more polite criticisms leveled against it was that it was nothing more than abstract theorizing devoid of all practical significance. In view of this it is something of a sensation that Soviet economists to an increasing extent are being forced to admit that the nonsocialist economists were right. This admission does not stem from an academic urge to tell the truth, but from convincing object lessons. In Soviet Russia the muddle and lack of rationality in economic management have gradually become so obvious that the Russian economists themselves are no longer able to close their eyes to the situation. The same applies to the Russian political leaders.

To illustrate our point, we once asserted that in a socialist community there was a risk of molybdenum being used in the manufacture of toy swords. Some people thought we were joking and that this was a silly thing to say. However, at the plenary meeting in June 1959, Khrushchev raged against the results achieved by the system and said, among other things:

"Here, brass chandeliers are manufactured with the sole object of making them as heavy as possible. The heavier each chandelier, the more the factory earns on carrying out its production program."

Brass is not molybdenum, but the irrational use of metals provides a good analogy to our example.

The increasing, recognition — and admission — by Soviet economists and politicians that the value problem also exists in the socialist system gives ground for hope. Not for hope that this great defect can be eliminated; it cannot as long as Soviet Russia remains socialist, because that weakness is inherent in socialism. But it gives hope that the Soviet economists will be allowed to draw attention to the great flaw in socialism and in so doing pave the way for rejection of the socialist system.

(Reproduced with permission from 'Freeman').

DELHI LETTER

Sino-Indian Border Farce Part Of Election Tactics

(From Our Correspondent)

THE Indian officials' report on the Sino-Indian border talks emphasises the overwhelming superiority of the Indian evidence, and a perusal of the same, without a corresponding perusal of the Chinese officials' report, leaves the firm impression on the reader's mind that the overwhelming superiority claimed for the Indian evidence is justified. As was expected, the Indians and the Chinese were unable to agree on any point, and there are consequently two reports. Mr. Nehru himself, it will be

recalled, had said he did not expect anything to come out of these border talks. Why then were the talks undertaken or agreed to, despite his official assurance that there will be no talks with the Chinese until the aggression was vacated? Mr. Nehru's Government obviously wanted to pass time, since it did not and does not know how to deal with the aggression.

Mr. Nehru has often said he believes in negotiation and has openly said he will negotiate and negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end. What the bitter

end is that he has in mind is apparently one of his top secrets, but any observer can see that the bitter end is not to follow but has preceded negotiation, and 12,000 square miles of territory has been surrendered to the Chinese Communists. There is no other conclusion to draw from the Prime Minister's silence regarding the Chinese invasion extending to five years. The Indian side cited consistent and continuous evidence for each of the areas in dispute to establish that Indian authorities had always exercised effective administration and civil jurisdiction there, and that the traditional boundaries had been accepted by the authorities of both sides. But India's Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon, seems to be of the contrary opinion, for has he not been distinguishing between administered and unadministered territory by giving expression to his determination to fight for the former, implying the senselessness of fighting for unadministered territories such as those occupied by the Chinese.

A GOOD JOKE.

Time and again have our Prime Minister and our Defence Minister, the former's gramophone, given ample indication to the Chinese that they will not fight for the 12,500 square miles of territory that the Chinese have occupied, but of course they cannot say so openly lest they stand self-condemned, particularly in election time. That is a point the Russians as well as the Chinese doubtless appreciate, and in appreciation of the same Mr. Khrushchev has been proposing a seat on the Summit for Mr. Nehru. (The Summit, however, is farther away than ever.)

The Chinese seem to believe in the saying that possession is nine points in law, and they appear to have treated the Sino-Indian border talks as a good joke, for even the translation of the Chinese report supplied is "unofficial". After all, they stand to gain by lapse of time. The longer they occupy our territory the greater will be their hold on it. One of the most striking sections of the Indian report demonstrates that the traditional Indian alignment is confirmed by much of the evidence cited by the Chinese side, but if the translation of the Chinese evidence is unofficial, it doesn't obviously carry us very far, even in a "controversy" such as the Sino-Indian dispute is, in the words of the Prime Minister.

The report reiterates that, apart from the 12,000 square miles of territory occupied by the Chinese, the latter claim 50,000 square miles of Indian territory which has long been recognised as part of Indian territory. In the middle sector the Chinese claim seems to have been inflated even during the course of the discussions, for it was only five weeks after the talks began that the Indian side was informed for the first time that Barahoti, Sangchamanla and Lapthal were not separate units comprising about 10 to 15 square miles—as had been asserted by the Chinese Government till then—but parts of one large composite area of approximately 300 square miles. The Chinese would have been fools if they had not inflated their claim after the irresponsible anti-Indian statements of India's Prime Minister and Defence Minister. What is worth noting is that there

has not been one chance foolish statement but a series of statements by the two—which I can only call treacherous—obviously made as a matter of deliberate policy, after which only an absentminded fool can believe in their determination not to yield to China the territory forcibly occupied by her. Is there any other instance in the history of the world where the Prime Minister of a country has referred to the forcible military occupation of 12,000 square miles of its territory as a "controversy"?

No wonder if after that China has also gone back on the acceptance, as recent as April, 1960, by Premier Chou En-lai, of India's relations with Bhutan and Sikkim. China has, moreover, now come out openly on the Kashmir issue and has declined to recognise the accession of Kashmir to India. In other words, she has come out only on the side of one of the CENTO powers and America's allies—Panchsheel and our non-alignment notwithstanding. Mr. Nehru does not believe in "positions of strength" and India has to pay through the nose for his belief in negotiating from positions of weakness. China will forget her map while negotiating with Pakistan because Britain and the USA are behind Pakistan. China forgot her claims over Burmese territory because the then Burmese military Government started seeking US military aid. (There is no generosity in politics.) But China is going to be merciless towards India—the report makes that much plain for India is friendless and helpless and cannot even threaten what Burma threatened because Khrushchev is dangling the Summit before the man who holds the reins of power in India, and because the way to Europe, as Lenin said, lies through Peking and Calcutta. But the incursions into the 50,000 square miles of Indian territory will be after the general elections when Mr. Nehru has been returned to power for five years. Nothing will be done by China to mar his return to power. For where will China find another Nehru to proclaim his insistence on remaining helpless and friendless, come what may?

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

The President's Address to Parliament did not allay the apprehensions of the people in regard to the country's defence and integrity. It is very significant that the President did not use the word "effectively", or any word like it, before the word "faced" when he said: "My Government have faced the problems that rose by their strenuous endeavours and by firm adherence to the principles of their basic policy and with confidence in the future." How can there be any confidence in the future, it is being asked here, when the internal and external problems that arise are not faced effectively? The Government has to face the problems that arise, but it makes all the difference in the world whether the problems are faced effectively or ineffectively. Even the most ardent supporter of the Government does not claim that the Sino-Indian border problem is being faced effectively. Our Prime Minister does not believe in solving problems. He seems to believe in creating them—and that he has been doing very effectively—and this constructive part of his business holds true of his career since he became an effective Congress leader after his father's death. When the approach

to problems is personal, rather than national, the solution of problems has to be left to succeeding generations while activity is concentrated on creating them.

As the President said, "The problems of aggression and incursions into the sovereign territory of the Union have yet to be resolved". But few will agree with him when he says, "but my Government are well alert to them and their implications", for the "defensive arrangements" which "receive their careful and continuous attention" cannot throw the aggressor out of the territory he has occupied. Whether they will act as a check on further aggression remains to be seen. That farther aggression is intended seems clear from the Chinese refusal to recognise India's relations with Sikkim and Bhutan.

BASIC PRINCIPLES.

The President's Address reaffirmed, "The Government will seek to adhere firmly to the principles which this nation regards as basic in our relations with nations" and proceeded to observe: "The awakening of Africa and the emergence of many sovereign republics is a matter of gratification to us. We welcome especially their declarations to remain unaligned. This constitutes a welcome vindication, on merits, of the policy consistently followed by my Government in regard to international relations." But the analogy does not hold and therefore there is no vindication of the policy followed by the Government of India in regard to international relations. Is any of the sovereign republics, which has declared

its resolve to remain unaligned, threatened by an aggressor or submitting to the humiliation of thousands of square miles of its territory being under the military occupation of an aggressive neighbour? The answer obviously is: "Not one". There is in fact no parallel to the treachery which goes by the name of non-alignment in India. Our Government had only to move its troops to the Indo-Pakistan border to make the Pakistan Government seek and obtain American military aid. The guiding motive was patriotism and refusal to submit to aggression or threat of aggression. Threats apart, even aggression does not count for anything in India—it never has. In the present instance, it does not count because, the Prime Minister's eyes are presumably blinded by the dazzling vision of a place for him on the Summit suggested by Khrushchev.

If a country has not the strength to face aggression from a neighbour and does not want to submit to it, there is no alternative for her to seeking military assistance from whomsoever it can. This is a very simple proposition admitting of no contradiction. But if we have made up our mind to submit to aggression, as obviously seems to be the case, and are foolish enough to be sure that there will be no more of it, we need not think of foreign military aid and feel happy in our fools' paradise for so long as the Chinese let us. Yet the simple proposition enunciated above does not seem to be obvious to any one in the Government or even among party leaders. That is why I have been saying for decades that we Indians are born traitors. The thousand-year-old slavery, which the British Labour Party put an end to, proves it.

Book Review

Foreign Policy Of India

By S. R. Patel, Page: 282, Publishers: N. M.

Tripathy Private Ltd. Bombay 2. Price: Rs. 15-00

In this informative and stimulating book, the learned author pleads for a complete reappraisal of our foreign policy, based on the bed-rock of reality. Besides assailing the fundamental tenets of Nehru's foreign policy, the author has made some useful suggestions for the successful functioning of our External Affairs Ministry and the execution of our policies in regard to our external affairs.

The author could have reduced this bulky book by at least 100 pages but for his purposeless and meaningless repetition of same thoughts and statements and his fancy for tautology.

The author has ably exposed with unassailable logic Nehru's foreign policy, especially its inconsistencies, fumbleings, indecisions, vacillations, its biased approaches, shallow idealism, crass appeasement of evil, surrender to threats intimidations and violence, its false optimism, unjustified enthusiasm for the causes of others and woeful indifference to our

own problems, its silliness, its pretentious mugwumpery, its logic and its heresy ethic.

Whether it is China, Pakistan, Kashmir, Goa or Ceylon, it is precisely because of our craze for the doubtful international prestige, fame and name that we have failed to solve our disputes with our neighbours. Nehru's ill-considered foreign policy has not only failed to solve even a single of disputes with our neighbours but also has resulted in the loss of huge chunks of our territories to foreign powers. In spite of our espousing the causes (relevant or irrelevant) of others, we have failed to earn the sympathy of a single Nation on the issue of Kashmir. The resolution on the Kashmir issue passed by a 10:0 Vote in the Security Council in 1957, the author says, ultimately demolished the halo built round Nehru's much boasted foreign policy which has earned the distrust of both blocs. Neither the aggression on Suez nor the aggression on Hungary was so unani-

mously condemned as our just stand on Kashmir. Nehru expects us not only to forget all his mistakes but also expects us to acclaim his disastrous failure in foreign affairs as a piece of wisdom. His pride and prejudice, his likes and dislikes in utter disregard of our national interests have decisively governed his foreign policy which the author says is a one-man show meant only to glorify the Prime Minister himself.

The author has well exposed the myth created and propagated by the ruling party and the "kept" press about Nehru's "glorious" foreign policy and his role in world affairs. The stature of India, if at all it has risen on the international plane, is not because of his foreign policy but because of the size of our country, our mineral wealth, our industrial potentiality, the unique position it occupies in Asia and its power to tilt the balance of power in favour of this or that bloc in case of a final showdown between the two blocs. The Indian initiative or formula has succeeded in easing the world tension or ending local wars only when both sides for very good reasons were ready to call it a day to save faces. When both the blocs fail to solve a dispute by force and are tired and ready for a compromise, they throw out feelers for possible ending of war. It is then that the neutral countries come into the picture with their formulae which ultimately work out and are acceptable to both, for they save the faces of both. It is hence illogical, the author rightly says, to conclude that our initiatives and formulae have succeeded because of our stature or because of our neutrality.

Neutrality, according to the author, is not only an evasion of duty but also a refusal to go into the merits of a case or to define or state one's attitude on a crucial international dispute involving a moral issue. It is also immoral because it refuses to support the party which is in the right and this refusal to support the party which is in the right objectively strengthens the party which is in the wrong. Neutrality is meaningless in peace and muddled expediency in war. Neutrality did not save Belgium in the first world war nor did it save Denmark, Norway and Holland in the second. All the confusion about the word "neutrality" is because of the absurdity of its association with the phrase "cold war". Cold war is, however, not a war, anymore than a guinea-pig is a pig. The question of neutrality comes only in the case of an actual war. Neutrality in case of a war can be justified for it may not be desirable for a country to actively associate itself with others' affairs when she is far away from the scene of the dispute in question. Whether it will be allowed to remain neutral is another question. Neutrality in peace is meaningless for it is an evasion of a moral choice when one is clearly presented. We cannot afford to be neutral where it is a question of defining our attitude towards a dispute involving a moral issue.

Apart from the question whether Neutrality is good or bad, our policy of Neutrality today is suspected by some. We can call ourselves neutral only in case it is recognised by the entire world. We cease to be neutral the moment it is suspected by one party to the dispute. (The neutrality of Switzer-

land is the true neutrality.) In Congo, for instance, (as in Korea earlier) our neutrality is suspected by the Kasavabu-Mobutu group which has even demanded the expulsion of Mr. Dayal.

Red China's wooing of Pakistan, an ally of the arch-enemy of International Communism America is a tribute to Pakistan's glorious success in her foreign affairs. Not only not an inch of her territory is occupied by any foreign power but she has also added a little more to her territory. China did not dare to attack Pakistan because she is in military alliance with America and because of the fear of massive retaliation by America. China could dare to attack India because she is weak and has no powerful ally, being a neutral country. China knows fully well that no country is going to come to our help in case of our war with her as we are neutral and are opposed to military pacts and alliances. The very fact that China is trying to befriend Pakistan, an ally of China's Enemy No. 1, and has attacked a friendly neutral country which had all the while gone out of her way in championing her causes (good or bad) has proved beyond doubt that Nehru's opposition to military pacts and alliances was a big blunder.

The Chinese attack against a friendly neutral country like India, our inability to repel her aggression, the indifference of even America to the Chinese aggression against us, and China's successful attempts to isolate India by solving her disputes with Burma and Pakistan and weaning Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim away from our influence by alternate threats and appeasement expose the disastrous failure of Nehru's foreign policy. Never in history has the will of a single man been so disastrously inflicted on the whole Nation before. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru will go down in History as a Talkative Statesman who indulged in bravado speeches when silence was golden, developed cold feet when firmness was required, fretted and fumed when aggression was committed against other countries but lectured on peace and freedom when aggression was committed right on his door-steps. This is how one can sum up Nehru's 'glorious' foreign policy.

—S. S. Bankeshwar

Gleanings from the Press

A COUNCIL OF TRADE AND AGRICULTURE.

The Upper Houses in the States as well as that in Delhi have become mere dumping grounds for the exercise of political patronage in the hands of the majority party. These Houses were constituted and justified on other grounds which now are forgotten. What the country needs as a set-off against the unavoidable defects arising out of universal adult suffrage is a Council of Trades, Industries and Professions wherein every producing and servicing activity is properly and adequately represented, so that policies initiated in the Lower House by interested groups may be examined satisfactorily by men of experience in the working of the various branches of production and other national services. There should be a mechanism to prevent erroneous policy issuing out of a majority vote based on inexperience. Whatever is hastily sought to be done in the hope of improving national life or conceived for the benefit of parti-

cular interests holding power under the present system of voting must be exposed to the fire of analysis and critical examination in a House containing experienced representatives of agriculture and industrial production in all branches and of those who are concerned in the field of transport and distribution. We would then have provided for correlation and well-integrated legislation instead of hasty and ill-considered policies harmfully affecting the vital productive activities of the people. Such a House-of-Trades-and-Agriculture is one of the essential factors in the legislative organization of a State which seeks to be a Welfare State. Otherwise, it would be the handing over of the national household to a foolish crowd.

—C.R.

in Swarajya, 18th February 1961.

News & Views

TWO-FACED RESOLUTION ON SINO-INDIAN BORDER QUESTION

NEW DELHI, Feb. 18.—It is learnt that the controversy on China within the CPI National Council became unexpectedly prolonged and the council has had to defer its discussion on party organization and the agrarian situation in the country to its next meeting.

In a 600-word resolution on the border dispute passed this evening, the council has restated that it upholds the "traditional borders" in the western sector and the McMahon Line "as the de facto boundary" in the eastern region.

But the 101-member policy-making body of the CPI which has been bitterly debating the issue for more than a week has combined this partial endorsement of India's stand with much equivocation.

Direct political negotiations are indeed the recurring theme of the resolution which is manifestly an uneasy compromise between the two opposing views put forward by Mr. Dange and his nationalist supporters on the one hand and by the pro-Chinese elements in the party represented by Mr. Konar of West Bengal and Mr. Harkishan Singh Surjit of Punjab on the other.

A significant omission from the Communist Party resolution is any reference to the Sino-Burmese border treaty or to China's agreement with Nepal.

THE MOTIVE BEHIND 'LUMUMBISATION' OF BASTAR MAHARAJA

Many in Bastar will feel that the action against the Maharaja has been taken not because his activities were prejudicial to the security of the State but because they were prejudicial to the interests of the local Congress. The danger in the Government's decision is that if the people of Bastar feel that he has been unjustly treated, the result will be creation of the very situation which is sought to be averted by putting him in detention.

—The Times of India.

"TOTALITARIANISM OF CONGRESS"

Munshi Urges Check

Mr. K. M. Munshi, Vice-Chairman of the All-India Swatantra Party, said in Bombay recently that a two-party system was necessary for India to prevent the growth of a totalitarian regime.

"If the totalitarianism of the Congress is not checked, India will be completely totalitarian by 1965", he added.

Mr. Munshi was speaking at a meeting organised by the Bandra unit of the Swatantra Party at St. Andrew's Colony compound.

Mr. Munshi stated that the Congress was not a democratic party. The Swatantra Party stood for liberty, fraternity, equality and human dignity. Its aim was to check the octopus control of the Congress over the lives of the people, he said.

ORISSA COALITION MINISTRY TO BE DISSOLVED

The ill-fated Congress-Swatantra Parishad Coalition Ministry has been called upon to lay down Office by a decision taken jointly by the Chief Minister and Mr. Bijoyanand Patnaik, the Pradesh Congress President, in consultation with Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, the Congress President. The Assembly Congress Party and the Congress Parliamentary Board also have ratified the decision. The question of an alternative ministry is now engaging the attention of all Congressmen concerned. In this connection it may be noted that about 15 Congress M.L.As. of Orissa have sought permission of the Congress Authorities to resign their membership of the Assembly, if such an alternative ministry is to be formed after tempting non-Congress members to join the Congress party, as was done in the past. They state that if such shameful tactics be repeated, despite the bitter experience of the past, the Congress is sure to lose heavily in the coming elections.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE "LUMUMBA WAS WAR CRIMINAL" SAYS KATANGA INTERIOR MINISTER CITES EXAMPLES OF IMRE NAGI & OTHERS

At a press conference Katanga's "strong man," Mr. Godefroid Munongo, Interior Minister in the Government of President Moise Tshombe, said the actions of the villagers who killed Mr. Lumumba had been "perhaps a bit hasty, but excusable, because they thought the fugitives were armed."

Mr. Munongo, who was one of the three Katanga Ministers who identified the bodies, said, "I would be lying if I said that the death of Lumumba saddened me". He described the former Premier as "a common law criminal," responsible for the deaths of thousands of persons and who would have been sentenced to death had he been brought to trial.

He emphatically denied, however, that Mr. Lumumba had been "executed" by the Katanga authorities.

Mr. Munongo said, "We are accused of murdering them. I reply: prove it."

"RID OF PROBLEM"

Mr. Munongo told the press conference that the Katanga authorities could not honestly reproach the villagers for having rid Katanga, the Congo, Africa and the world of a problem which some people had grossly exaggerated, but which threatened to poison all humanity.

The Interior Minister went on: "Mr. Hammarskjöld himself has said that there was a question of veritable genocide against the Balubas in Kasai. It is for this that I am certain that at the end of the trial which would have been organised against him, Lumumba would have been sentenced to death."

Mr. Munongo accused the U.N. of having been inactive in the face of many further injustices, among which he listed "the extermination of thousands of Baluba tribesmen by Lumumba's supporters," the "poisoning of the Cameroons leader Felix Moumie", "extermination of millions of Russians in concentration camps of the U.S.S.R.", and the execution of Imre Nagy.

**CHINESE PAPERS ASSAIL COMMUNES
PARTIAL RELAXATION OF RIGOURS BY
GOVT.**

HONG KONG.—One of the indirect results of the critical food situation in China is the partial relaxation of some of the rigours of the people's communes and a half-hearted attempt at providing the masses with "material incentives to stimulate their enthusiasm for labour."

The paper Nan-fang Jih-pai says: "China is a poor and blank country. Her level of production is rather low, and the material life of the people cannot be raised to a high level at one stroke."

**ULTIMATE DANGER TO RUSSIA WILL COME
FROM CHINA**

London:— The Shah of Persia declares in a book being published here recently that it is gradually dawning on the Russians their ultimate danger comes from "sprawling, fast-breeding" China.

The Shah makes these comments in "Mission for My Country," a comprehensive story of his life and rule published here by Hutchinson.

"Russian intellectuals and theoreticians are slowly becoming more flexible than in the past. And gradually it is dawning upon the Russians that the ultimate danger is not the much-abused capitalist powers but the vast sprawling, fast-breeding giant of the Far East lying at their back door."

MAY THEIR TRIBE INCREASE

We have now three bachelor Chief Ministers in India—Dr. B. C. Roy (West Bengal), Kamraj Nadar (Madras) and Chandra Bhanu Gupta (Uttar Pradesh).

—Behar Herald.

Letter to the Editor

SOLVING INDIA'S ECONOMIC PROBLEM.

Sir,

India alone can solve her economic problem. Every advance of Foreign aid puts India back by the amount of that so called aid granted by an Alien power or Nation. All aid only aids the giver of that aid, whether of money credits, goods or services. These make the receiver a Debtor. If India wishes to be a nation of Free men and women, then India must increase its own national Bank Debt—Free currency sufficient to oust the International Loan Market which is strangling her. The amount of Funds squeezed out of her people by Government must, of course, end, and an issue of Bank Debt Free Currency made to pay for the goods and services bought by Government, instead of making the Taxed, borrow non-existing money as Credits to pay Taxes. The selling price of the Total production of India is of course the Total National Income. But as Taxes destroy income as purchase power by the

amount of the Taxes levied plus interest thereon, the Cause of India's Economic problem is evident. Alien and Native financiers are always ready to lend nothing as something at usury to people who have no more sense than to borrow Credits and to pay interest upon mythical funds. If the funds did exist as money, then there would be no point in borrowing Credits which are costless to the lender, when he is a Banker. Bank Credits being created by simply writing figures in a Ledger, the recipient must of course believe that he has received money, otherwise the Fraud would not work. It is remarkable that the people have so long believed that they have enjoyed a Capitalist economy when, in fact, they have only had a Debt economy and False Debt at that. They do not realise that it is only False National accountancy that makes them in Debt to the amount of the Taxes levied, plus an interest charge. If they enjoyed a factual accountancy system, wherein all the goods and services bought by Government were paid for, in Bank Debt Free Notes and coin of the Realm, they would then have a Capitalist state or condition Free of evil of national Debt. India is only one of the many nations who operate a False economy. Russia, China and the U.S.A. are also False Debt economies as is also the British Commonwealth of nations. No matter what alignment of nations we see, all are used and enslaved to False Debt through False accountancy by the operators of the Debt System. These operators of course blame Capitalism for the results seen. The results are a cover for the false accountancy which has made slaves of us all.

Okehampton, Devon England.

O'renshaw.

Read

**" Cooperative
Capitalism "**

**Shows you how you can become
share-holders in joint-stock
companies.**

Send 45. n. P.

To

**B. R. IRANI
LABOUR & CAPITAL COOPERATION
OFFICE, DEOLALI. P. O.**

Statement about ownership and other particulars about newspaper (The Indian Libertarian).

FORM IV

(See Rule 8)

- | | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| 1. Place of Publication | | 26, Durgadevi Road, Bombay 4. |
| 2. Periodicity of Its Publication | | Fortnightly. |
| 3. Printer's Name | | Govind Narayan Lawande. |
| | Nationality | Indian. |
| | Address | 449, King's Circle, Bombay 19. |
| 4. Publisher's Name | | Govind Narayan Lawande. |
| | Nationality | Indian |
| | Address | 449, King's Circle, Bombay 19. |
| 5. Editor's Name | | D. M. Kulkarni, |
| | Nationality | Indian |
| | Address | 55, Girgaum Road, Bombay 4. |
| 6. Names and addresses of Individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital. | | 1. Seth R. B. Lotvala, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Ram Baug, Lam Road, Deolali.
2. Mr. K. B. Rao, Director, 2/21, Bhuta Niwas, Vincent Road, Bombay-19.
3. Mr. T. Balraj, Director, Ram Baug, Lam Road, Deolali.
4. Miss Kusum R. Lotwalla, Managing Director, Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay-4.
5. Mr. H. K. Shah, Director, 55, Girgaum Road, Bombay-4.
6. Mr. N. T. Mehta, (Shareholder) 22, Wilson Street, Bombay-4.
7. Mr. R. N. Bhate, (Shareholder) 29, Bhavani Peth, Poona. |

I, Govind Narayan Lawande, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

G. N. Lawande.

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

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



Write to :

THE MANAGER

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

BOMBAY 4

Telephone : 70205

Telegram : LOTEWALLA