

This unhappy situation evidently called for the appearance of a political party which would boldly challenge this costly socialist experiment with the lives of the people, being carried on by the Congress with the full backing of the Communists. And the Swatantra Party was a reply to this challenge of the times, at once effective and inspiring to the people. During the election period, the much calumniated small industrialist, the ever-condemned but self-employing small land-holders, a few of, vilely abused but high spirited Maharajas, the much despised but thoughtful middle class intellectuals—all these groups and classes, dubbed as 'reactionaries' by the Congress Marxists like Nehru and Menon, at once shed off their inferiority and fear complexes, deliberately engendered in them by incessant and well-directed Congress and Communist propaganda, and rallied under the leadership of the great Swatantra Patriot, Rajaji. Mr. Nehru the Patron-Saint of these Marxists was made to look so small intellectually by the brilliant sallies of C.R. and the resounding thunders of Prof. Ranga and the intellectual polemics and ideological battle carried on by Masani, that a thing never heard of, in the annals of Independent India has happened. Unable to face this Swatantra Opposition Mr. Nehru had to bewail recently at Gwalior that though he was the Prime Minister and an important leader, he was not being properly reported in the newspapers and his speeches (which really contain, nowadays only abuses and curses) did not find enough space in them. Socialists and Congressmen

who till this day had all the public forum for themselves alone have now found in the Swatantra their peers in the art of the propagandist and in intellectual ability and in challenging effectively the so-called 'progressivism' of the Left. Thus the so-called Leftists are necessarily put on their defensive against the Swatantra's frontal on-slaughts all-round. The tide has turned full against these self-appointed and self-hypnotised benefactors of the masses.

The one good thing that the Swatantra has done in this third General Election is to educate public opinion vigorously about the dangerous implications of Marxian socialism masquerading in India under Nehru's clap-trap of Socialist pattern. Whatever might be the results of the elections—and we have no reason to doubt that the Swatantra and the Rightists will muster sufficient strength in the elections to form a strong opposition in the legislature to the Congress—undoubtedly this process of educating the Masters undertaken by the Swatantra has been in itself a great boon and a good gain to Indian democracy. The country will surely emerge from this electoral battle, with genuine democratic forces in the country, so far lying low and scattered, getting vibrant and dynamic and properly marshalled and organised under the banner of Parties of The Rightists headed by the Swatantra, to defend and if need be, even to fight for THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF THE PEOPLE.

BURY THE HATCHET

The Das Commission appointed by the Government of India in November last, on the voluntary termination by Master Tara Singh of his long fast undertaken to focus the attention of the Government and the public on the Punjabi Suba demand, has come to the conclusion that no case of discrimination against the Sikhs as alleged by Master Tara Singh has been made out. Though Master Tara Singh and his Akali Sikhs had already declared that the findings of the Commission would be in no way binding on them as the personnel of the Commission did not command their confidence, the closely reasoned report submitted by such eminent public men and jurists like Mr. S. R. Das, Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer and Mr. M. C. Chagla on the basis of the materials available before it, would lose none of its importance and value. The report has also indirectly brought out with an array of facts and figures, the sheer hollowness of the communal demand for a separate Punjabi State. It states that the two elections of 1947 and 1957 which were fought by the Akalis on this issue resulted in their complete rout at the hands of the nationalist Sikhs. Moreover, it must be remembered that the non-Akali Sikhs and Hindus who also speak the Punjabi language are also stoutly opposed to this demand. The Nationalist Sikhs' Memorandum submitted to the Commission only goes to prove

The Indian Libertarian

Independent Journal Of Free Economy and Public Affairs

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

Published On the 1st and 15th Of Each Month

Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Subscription Rates:

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

ADVERTISEMENTS RATES

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

BACK COVER..... Rs. 150
SECOND COVER..... Rs. 125
THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125

- Articles from readers and contributors are accepted. Articles meant for publication should be typewritten and on one side of the paper only.
- Publication of article does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a FreeForum.
- 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.

that Sikhs, if at all, stand to gain much more in the present State than in the proposed Punjabi Suba. Its only complaint was that Regional Formula was not being implemented as expeditiously as it should be. The Union Government, therefore, have rightly accepted the conclusions of the report.

It is therefore to be hoped that at least now Tara Singh and his followers will do a little rethinking about their illconceived demand for a Punjabi Suba and help the Government in applying vigorously the regional formula which fully serves both the interests of the Punjabi language and political aspirations of all Punjabi speaking people including the Akalis. Mr. Tara Singh had better bury this hatchet once for all in the interests of the Punjabi people and the safety and security of this border region of India.

LORD DALTON

In the death of Lord Dalton Great Britain in particular and world in general has lost a great expert on Public finance. India will always remember him as one of the illustrious members of Attlee's Labour Cabinet, viz., Attlee, Bevin, Morison and Cripps, who made India free despite the strong opposition of the British Conservative 'diehards'. The most exciting period of his political career was of two years from 1945 to 1947 when he was the Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was chiefly responsible for laying down sound financial policies of Britain's Welfare State. But a 'Leak' of some of the contents of his Budget Speech in 1947, as a result of his encounter with a journalist, made him tender his resignation of his post on the following day to Mr. Attlee and disappear from the scene of public life of Great Britain as suddenly and as quickly as he entered and rose up in it. Dalton and Cripps who succeeded the former as the Chancellor of Exchequer had many things in common; the public school and Cambridge academic background and rebelliousness against the pride and prejudices of the sophisticated high class society of England and their aggressive socialist intellectuality. Lord Dalton was at one time ear-marked for the Premiership of England but his strong intellectual independence and even arrogance came in the way and the office went to Mr. Attlee who had a knack for reconciling and resolving differences of opinion with the Labour Party.

It must be admitted, however, that but for the leakage of his Budget Speech, he would have passed off as one of the greatest Chancellors of the Exchequer of Great Britain. His name and fame will always be enshrined in the hearts of all students of Economics the world over as the greatest expert on public finance and as the distinguished author of a number of valuable books on Economics and particularly "The Principles of Public Finance," which has remained till this day, the standard text book on the subject.

HERE AND THERE

The P.S.P. leader Ashok Mehta at a public meeting in Bombay referred to a recent speech of Prime Minister Nehru in which the latter quoted Bhagawat Gita to advise C.R. against anger, as anger stripped a man of his wit and posed the question whether Lord Krishna had made an exception of Mr. Nehru who also very often lost his temper. But Mr. Mehta must know that Mr. Nehru does not believe in scriptures and their teachings are irrelevant for him, though like the devil, Mr. Nehru can very well claim the right to quote scriptures for the guidance or condemnation of others.

The Military Governor of Goa has announced that a High Powered Commission would be appointed shortly to go into the educational system of Goa. Goans must now be feeling nervous about the future of their education. For they must have heard of the great mess made in India by such High Powered Commissions, particularly the High Powered Fazal Ali Commission. Ordinary Commissions with definite terms of reference are found to be more useful. The High Power some times gets so much on the brains of the Commissioners that they sometimes do not know what they say, do and report.

Mr. Masani says that Mr. Menon is a 'bogus' Congress candidate. It may be pointed out that in respect of a Congress candidate, the word 'bogus' is redundant, since it is well-known that a Congress candidate is one who has joined the Congress just for election purposes. Congress candidature does not require any belief in Congress principles.

In a speech at Indore, Prime Minister Nehru said that India must have unity in every sphere and above all 'unity in mind'. Is there now any doubt that the Congress under Nehru's leadership wants even the intellectual regimentation of the whole country? No more silly talk henceforth of 'Unity in Diversity' which is considered to be the hall-mark of Indian culture!

"We have isolated China" said our Defence Minister Krishna Menon in Bombay, "there is no country in the world which endorses China's policy regarding India." "It is rather the other way round" say some political observers. China by pursuing in her own communist way, the 'Bhai-Bhai' policy on India's Northern Border, has exposed our Defence Minister in his true Red Colours and has thus brought about complete isolation of India from the Free and Democratic world. Goa and Kashmir are a pointer.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

By all accounts the Congress rebels are willing to go to Hell provided Menon does not accompany them there.

—Frank Moraes in Indian Express

Progressive Humanism

M. A. Venkata Rao

A close study of the current world-wide clash of doctrines in social philosophy will reveal the outlines of a progressive humanism as a constructive alternative to Marxist socialism and communism. It is the blue-print of a new society combining the values of freedom and justice, of individuality and social welfare. It will eschew the evils of Statism or totalitarian concentration of economic and other power in the hands of Government. On the contrary it will offer both stability and progress to the extent they are possible under existing circumstances.

The first thing that the new humanism will do is to distinguish between social antagonism as a matter of historical fact and present position in any actual society and inherent conflict. But it will refuse to accept this fact as the last word about human nature.

It will refuse to plunge incontinently into a psychological theory such as that of Marx that economic position determines absolutely the mind and valuation of classes and individuals. The economic position of a man inclines him to a certain view of society but will not necessitate him to any particular conclusion about the ultimate essence of human nature.

Humanism will eschew class war as a necessary doctrine springing from class antagonism but will look deeper to find that man can overcome the first impulses of his instinctive promptings and to sublimate them to forms carrying the values of social harmony.

It will also give up the Marxist doctrine that the State or government is necessarily the agent of the capitalist classes. It will see that government comes into existence to settle disputes between man and man continues to exist to defend the entire people under its care from external aggression and internal violence. It will function as the agent of all classes and groups and individuals in society. It represents the unity of the society of which it is the defender and chief coordinator.

Humanism proceeds with this background to the thesis that social good should include the good of all members of society. It will give up the class theory of society wherein a few enjoy the good things of life in abundance while the many remain either on the border of subsistence or not far above it. The distinctive inspiration of modernism is this humanitarianism or universalism which rejects the palanquin theory of society with its leisure class and the labouring many which latter

have but little hope to emerge into better levels in their life-time.

All social institutions like property and education and economic organisations should conduce to an ever-expanding horizon of opportunity for the betterment of the many.

Dynamism or progress means this increasing realm of opportunity in concrete terms of jobs and schools or new inventions favouring the rise of the many. To stability should be added therefore an element of change in the direction of betterment for the many in order to secure a just humanist society and state.

Karl Marx adopted the Malthusian theory of population and the iron law of wages which says that wages always tend to descend to the subsistence level. Any rise in them will increase the population in the long run which by increasing the supply of competitive labour will depress the wages again to the subsistence level which is lower than a decent human standard.

Humanism therefore should enter into this context and prescribe a national or human minimum wage for each occupation beginning with manual labour, industrial or agricultural. The economic law of demand and supply is only a law of tendency. It is not a prescriptive necessity or moral commandment. It should be resisted by society at the behest of conscience. Only those private entrepreneurs who will accept the rule regarding minimum wages prescribed should be allowed to start industries employing labour. Industry will then get accustomed to this new basic requirement of society and will plan accordingly.

The minimum wage will naturally be a little higher than would have resulted by the uncontrolled operation of demand and supply. But in time its level will get included in the wage bill as a matter of course and prices and other economic phenomena will get adjusted to the regulation.

The next step is to encourage invention and its employment for increasing productive efficiency. As productivity of man and machine rises to higher levels, workers will get a fair share in the benefits and will have rises in income.

The state should assist this process of labour securing a fair share in the rises in productivity by means of conciliation and arbitration between labour and employers.

The right to strike should not be denied but the temptation to indulge in the wasteful process

of stopping work collectively as a strategy of class war should be removed by fair and just measures of conciliation through the State.

The dismissal of labour consequent on rationalisation or employment of labour-saving new types of machine and factory management such as the assembly line should not be obstructed for fear of unemployment. Unemployment should be met by unemployment insurance and state assistance until industry demands further supplies of labour in new lines. To deny employers the right to dismiss labour is to obstruct progress in the use of new and more efficient machinery and methods of factory organisation.

In India dismissal is accompanied by heavy discouragement by way of ex gratia unemployment grants to be paid by factories, which discourages them from using new machinery. The stagnation in our textile industry is largely due to this short-sighted legislation.

The bulk of the economy should be in private hands working under conditions of fair competition. Monopoly and other unfair practices should be prohibited by law.

Equality of opportunity is another cardinal principle of a humanist society. But this social equality needs a number of measures in different spheres of social life for its effective and meaningful realisation.

It should be recognised that equality is not a natural fact. No two individuals are alike in every respect. Leibniz asked the members of a fashionable party in high society to walk around in the garden and bring any two leaves of any tree or plant that were exactly alike or identical in colour, shape and size etc. They could not do so.

Social equality is a condition to be provided by society such as universal education.

Secondary education for all—is an ideal now accepted and put into force largely in advanced countries. All pupils are at school till the age of 14 to 18. They attend evening continuation schools or polytechnics to improve their skill or to acquire an art that will increase their productive efficiency and that will enable them to earn higher emoluments.

In addition to stability and minimum wage or floor, workers should have several ladders or networks of opportunity by way of evening schools or workshops or laboratories where they can acquire the qualifications for betterment in their lives and careers.

No man should be condemned to remain at the level at which birth finds him in the lower economic fields of employment.

This is what is meant by concrete or positive freedom. Freedom in the abstract in the sense of an absence of restraints or compulsions (operating to deny the doors of ascent to individuals as in old type caste societies) is not sufficient to meet the demands of a progressive humanism. Talent

in human beings is more important than mines of silver or copper or oil in the earth.

It should be "exploited" or allowed to be used by its possessor for his own benefit and that of society at large. Self-expression and social service go together and result from one and the same process. This is the best form of social arrangement wherein individual progress combines in one and the same process with social contribution.

All obstacles such as notions of privilege on the part of the few placed in favourable positions should be removed by education and change in social conscience.

The nation as a society with self-government will naturally have priority as regards planning and social welfare. No society in the current world can plan for the whole world. But no society should plan for depriving other nations of their rights.

National economics should not be based on the disadvantage of other or weaker nations. If it does not positively promote the good of other nations, it should not consciously aim at using the resources of other peoples for the advantage of its own people. Hitler's *Lebensraum* aimed at converting Eastern Europe and the Ukrainian part of Russia to a granary for Germany and to a nursery for his huge armed hordes trained to conquer the world.

A humanist economics will be ready to negotiate with other nations for economic relations and treaties whereby mutual advantage could be secured on the basis of enlightened self-interest.

As more and more nations adopt such mutualist economic relations a natural specialisation of industry and agriculture will be evolved as between the peoples and regions of the world.

The procedure will inaugurate and stimulate a process of universal lowering of tariffs reaching world free trade.

Such a near-free trade world will favour and promote a world federation which is the only possible basis for perpetual peace in the world.

To heal the breach between owners and non-owners, measures can be initiated to encourage and enable the have-nots to acquire property themselves. In the U.S.A. most workers have investments in safe and paying industrial companies. This will produce a responsible and thrifty attitude in workers and encourage the habit of planning their own lives and providing for their future and the education of their children. The socialist voice of encouraging workers to demand something for nothing should be abandoned by responsible leaders of society prompted by selfish careerism and demagoguism.

Offering a share in management and profits are also ways to heal the breach between owners and have-nots. But these should

(Continued on page 6)

Bharatiya Culture

By M. N. THOLAL

SOME months ago a fellow journalist wrote to me from Lucknow that he was unable to understand the last portion of my article in the Indian Libertarian of July 1, 1961, entitled "National Integration", particularly the paragraphs relating to claptrap and Bharatiya Culture. I said in that article, "The problem before the country is really that of stopping the victorious procession of claptrap, which really means government by the ignorant." There are in our country, as in others, two kinds of leaders; those who enlighten people and show the path of reason and truth and those who exploit people's prejudices. Those who want to know the truth about anything can only do so through reason. There is no other way. In other words, they think with their heads and not with their hearts. Such people often incur unpopularity and its consequences.

The other type speak more often of truth and righteousness but they seldom say or do anything that will make them unpopular. Their aim in life is to become popular and more popu-

(Continued from page 5)

lar. To what end? To be able to dictate to people. To be the uncrowned kings of their lands. To hear the cries of their "jai" resound from one end of the country to another, regardless of what happens to the country. In any case, the country's interests are not of paramount importance to them, as in the case of the former type. Earl Attlee, during his visit to India last year, summed them up as "careerists" and said, "We kick out careerists." But what do we Indians do with careerists? We applaud them. We shout their "Jais". If any one tries to expose them, he is regarded as a crank, if not something worse. The country has seen two glaring examples of the type in Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Nehru.

MOHAMAD ALI JINNAH

We also saw a glaring example of the other type, without realising it, in Jinnah. It became fashionable to abuse the latter, and it was our ill-treatment of this honest man that resulted in the division of the country. I can recall some of his great sayings in his own words:

1. I want to be a Muslim Gokhale.
2. I am Indian first and a Muslim afterwards.
3. Do not mix religion with politics.
4. Pakistan is a poet's dream; it is a crazy scheme.

When his only daughter, his only child, married a Christian, he gave her a few lakhs in dowry and a beautiful bungalow in Bombay to live in, as much, presumably, as he would have done, had she married a Muslim. Readers of my articles in the Libertarian know how Gandhi and Nehru succeeded in transforming that great Nationalist into a great communalist who brought about the division of the country and became the founder of Pakistan. I knew Jinnah well and can say with the greatest assurance that it was his hatred of hypocrisy that made him hate Gandhi in course of time. When Gandhi came back from South Africa Jinnah was among those who paid him tributes at a public meeting. In the forties he used to refer to him as a "d-d hypocrite". The reader will excuse me, but there should be at least one man in the country to jot down historical facts. Or do we want our history also to be full of lies?

I referred in my article to that most foolish of all slogans "Angrezi Hatao" (Remove English) of Ram Manohar Lohia and the Socialists. Remove English by all means, but first agree on what is to replace it. As it is, the slogan seems to be only an excuse for stirring up strife all over the land, on a linguistic basis. Indeed, an attempt was made in this direction under the auspices of the Socialist Party when the Socialists of Banaras tried to prevent Rajaji from speaking in English

not be adopted as a matter of law and authority and thrust down the throats of unwilling employers. The failure of these devices so far wherever tried in Europe and America is due to this forcible way of introducing it.

Encouragement may be given to industrial units who adopt these measures out of their own free will and out of a motive to produce social harmony. In course of time, they will become general. Social harmony can come into existence only if tried in the beginning out of humanist faith.

"Mechanistic and dehumanised"—these harsh words were employed by an Industrial Correspondent in describing India's Plans. The writer is a distinguished economic student with a pronounced Leftist inclination. Coming from such a person, this judgment has all the greater value.

The Five Year Plans should be revised in a humanist direction giving priority to food, clothing, housing, education, medicine and other human necessities.

This in a nutshell is the blue-print for a progressive humanist social philosophy and planned advance. Details can be and should be worked out in all the principal departments.

The members of the Libertarian movement can take a significant share in the elaboration of such a humanist economic and social pattern in our country.

(Incidentally, Rajaji has done more for Hindi than any other man in the country.) The imposition of Hindi provides the platform to the secessionist DMK in Madras. In this connection, I remember the words of the Editor of a Jana Sangh weekly, "If they want to go, they can go" — i.e., form a separate state. He might have truly added, "I'll be getting my salary all right, and it is that that I want to ensure, not the unity of the country."

BAL GANGADHAR TILAK

There was a man—no moderate he—of the name of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, who did not talk of truth every day, but who blurted it out when the occasion demanded it. "Our very desire for freedom," he once said, "is the result of the British connection." He was obviously referring to the English language and English education. We have been slaves for a thousand years under a handful of foreigners. Did we ever, as a nation, try to shake off foreign rule before we had become freedom-loving as a result of English education?

If one were to ask me the chief reason of our thousand-year-old slavery, I should sum it up in our being unrealistic. Being unrealistic is the same thing as following untruth or being hypocritical. No nation can do so for long without paying the price for it. We are still being unrealistic, glaringly so in our foreign policy. "Nonviolence is the mightiest of all weapons," said our apostle of truth, Mahatma Gandhi. My retort was, "It is the greatest lie I have ever heard", but no one would publish it, not even the paper I served. Likewise, Guruji of the RSS is being unrealistic when he equates the USA and the USSR as two rival imperialisms. The respective size of the two countries proves the statement to be absolutely untrue. So does any estimate of how much the USA could have grown as the main victor of both the world wars, or as the sole possessor of the atom bomb in 1945. As claptrap from a pseudo-Daniel come to judgment, it may seem all right to the ignorant, but a mind that fails to revolt against statements like these is not an honest mind. It is a dishonest mind. We do not have even to know the ideologies of the two countries to condemn outright such foolish observations and sentiments which, so far as they affect our foreign policy, can only land the country in trouble.

At the bottom of this apparent dishonesty is the desire to seem honest cheaply, rather than take the trouble to make the people understand the truth. "You are pro-American," a journalist told me recently. "And you are pro-Chinese," I retorted. Stung to the quick he blurted out, "No, I am pro-Russian." "That comes to the same thing," I said, "If you are pro-Russian, you are pro-Chinese, despite all the quarrels they may stage to fool non-aligners like you." The problem is really very simple for an honest mind. How can any

honest democrat be neutral of non-aligned as between the USA and the USSR?

BHARATIYA CULTURE'S OUTPUT

We have good reason to be proud of Hinduism inasmuch as it has always stood for freedom of thought and belief. What is there in freedom of thought and belief that we should so admire it? Because freedom of thought and belief are the only two roads to truth. Destroy them and you imprison man in a cage of lies, as in the USSR. But Hinduism has also stood for the caste system and, by implication, for inequality. No one who knows what it has meant to be an untouchable can deny that, by Bharatiya culture people presumably mean Hindu culture. The phrase seems to have been coined in opposition to composite culture advocated by Mr. Nehru and seems to suggest the need of maintaining Hindu culture in all its (imaginary) pristine purity by excluding inroads thereon of Muslim and western culture.

The deep hold of the caste system on Hindus shows that the latter have not been very good democratic. Indeed, had Hindu culture been democratic, Gandhi and Nehru, far from attaining the popularity they did in India, would have been laughing stocks of the country. People would have been trying to expose them, instead of crying their "jais". We Hindus have this Idol worship in our blood, and as the Persian proverb says, "Joyanda, yabinda". (The seeker finds).

If we are to try to be a democratic nation, our culture cannot remain unaffected by the attempt, particularly if it is successful. In that case there will be no place in the country for "Gurujis", unless the meaning of that word is to change. The fact of the matter is that Hindus have cared little for liberty, equality or fraternity, the three watchwords of western civilization and western culture. Is our culture, is Bharatiya culture to imbibe any of these cardinal principles of the West? If it is to do so, it is bound to be transformed beyond recognition in the process. Indeed, it is already being transformed by the forces which gave birth to the famous cry in the West, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity".

While it is obviously absurd to say, as Gandhi did, that all religions are equally good, it will be even more absurd to say that everything in Islam or Christianity is bad or that Muslim or Christian culture is wholly rotten. The latter belief is implicit in the convictions of those who are opposed to composite culture and do not want to imbibe anything from Muslim or Christian culture. That is exactly the mentality that produces strife and narrowmindedness and, ultimately, degeneration. As a Hindu I can go so far as to say, after a good deal of intimate acquaintance with Muslim and European men and women, that, while I am not exactly ashamed of Hindu culture, I cannot place my head on my heart and say that it is by far the best, or even the best, much

less that we Hindus have nothing to learn from Muslims or Europeans.

MOTILAL NEHRU AND MALAVIYA

Some of my Jana Sangh friends wrathfully remind me of Motilal Nehru's statement that he was ashamed of having been born a Hindu — the reference presumably being to the cowardice of Hindus in those days of communal rioting. But was not Madan Mohan Malaviya, the great champion of Hindus, of the same mind as Motilal Nehru when he gave expression to his determination to teach Hindu women the art of using the revolver? "I cannot say of men", Malaviya is reported to have said — I am quoting from memory — "but before I die I shall at least teach Hindu women the art of using pistols and revolvers". That was hardly a tribute to Hindu manhood. And in what respect did it differ from the observation of Motilal Nehru, except that the latter, as usual, was brutally frank? Truth is always unpleasant, but to feel offended thereby is to betray an ignoble mind. Has our culture nothing to do with our cowardice?

Truth is nobody's monopoly, no nation's monopoly, no religion's monopoly. And, if culture is to be broadbased on truth, as it must in the last resort, assimilation from outside is clearly indicated, if one culture is not in course of time

to become the laughing stock of intelligent people. Why is it that today highly educated people all over the globe have the same ideas, the same culture? Because they are all rationalists. They use the sense that God has given them — except in Communist land where they are prohibited from using it — and give up their fanaticism. They give it up because they see no sense in it. The emphasis on Bharatiya culture betrays fanaticism and is out of place because it must have had something to do with our thousand-year-old slavery, which is a record in history. (That is the only record we hold as a nation.)

No one can say that our culture had nothing to do with our slavery, because it is the business of culture to unite and unity would have finished slavery. A culture that divides like the caste and makes people quarrel among themselves is no culture at all. Obviously our culture was of the latter variety. History shows that. Is it then something to be proud of? We should not in a fit of patriotism extol the evil which made us slaves for a thousand years, which despite the freedom the British forced on us, keeps us the slaves of a single man, and which makes the largest and biggest political organisation of the country, the Indian National Congress, a citadel of slavery of Jawaharlal Nehru.

WIN A PRIZE !

A prize of Rs. 200/- will be awarded to anyone who sends us an essay not exceeding 20000 words on:

ENGLISH AS THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

The next best essay will be awarded a prize of Rs. 150/-.

It must be type-written, double-spaced on one side only and must reach us by 15th May 1962.

Please write to:

SECRETARY
LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE
ARYA BHUVAN, 1ST FLOOR,
SANDHURST ROAD, (WEST),
BOMBAY-4.

An Opposition Flop Worries Mr. Nehru

(From Our Correspondent)

WRITING on the eve of the general elections I cannot help regretting that the Congress-opposition parties have failed to realise that, if they are to have a substantial opposition in parliament and the states, they should have displayed a spirit of accommodation towards one another in their own interest. They have failed to realise that, by dividing the opposition votes among themselves, they are playing the Congress game and, in the last resort, an anti-democratic game. In Outer Delhi constituency, for example, the Jana Sangh candidate for Parliament is pitted against a prominent Hindu Sabha candidate, who should have been supported by the Jana Sangh by virtue of his ability, integrity and long record of public service extending to four decades.

The Hindu Sabha candidate is complaining, and rightly, that the Jana Sangh did not agree to set apart even one Central constituency for the Hindu Mahasabha and the party is now propagating the lie that he has been put up by the Congress to reduce the Jana Sangh vote. He might as well have retorted that the Jana Sangh has put up a candidate against him to make sure of the return of the Congressman, a much-hated Congressman at that. That, in any case seems to be the inevitable result of what can only be considered to be a family quarrel. It seems that the Jana Sangh victory in the by-election last year in the New Delhi constituency — the most enlightened constituency in the land — has gone to the head inflating it with vanity. This is the result of losing sight of the cause which should be dear to all patriots, particularly at election time. One even hears enthusiastic Jan Sanghis say they must finish the Hindu Sabha first in order to secure all pro-Hindu votes in elections. The same old story of internecine warfare with which students of Indian history are only too familiar. Rajaji's words of wisdom in this connection have not been heeded by the little minds running the Congress-opposition parties and the Congress is bound to reap the harvest.

It is difficult to forecast the result but the Jana Sangh is certainly much stronger in the North than it was during the last general election and the Congress more unpopular. The display of Congress flags has an air of unreality about it. Quite a good number have been raised at the rooftops to please the ruling party by people who, if their words in private are to be trusted, are not going to vote Congress. Many, however, will doubtless go farther and vote against their convic-

tions for the Congress. This shows that the fear of the ruling party is still a factor which the Congress is exploiting to the full, and it will secure many votes not out of the voters' conviction but out of the voters' irrational fear. The truckloads of villagers who roam the city with Congress bags in their hands do not betray a spark of enthusiasm in their cynical faces. The opposition parties have failed to make a concerted effort to make the people vote honestly by telling them that their vote will be cast in secret and they need have no fear of any untoward consequences, should they vote according to their convictions. By this failure they may be losing thousands of votes in every constituency, though the loss this time will not be so great as in the last general elections.

PAKISTAN CRISIS

Events in East Pakistan have attracted considerable attention in India and correspondents have in their own columns been criticising a non-party Delhi daily for asking, "If soldiers go, as they must very soon, who else can take their place?" The reason the daily gave for its query was; "Nobody wants to see Pakistan's administration back in the hands of those unreliable and unpredictable people who ran it before." A correspondent asks why the paper assumes that the old gang will return to power if the erstwhile soldiers go now, and says the principal reason for Pakistan's political instability is that no party in power in Pakistan ever bothered to hold a general election.

These critics forget the background of the assumption of power by the Army. They forget the atrocities against the Ahmediyas, which had the backing of the popular Maulanas. They forget that the cause of the assumption of power by the military was the genuine fear — amounting to certainty — of those very Maulanas getting into power with the support of the people who were out to exterminate the Kafirs, the Ahmediyas. Could any set of sensible men see this happening unconcerned? Or could any set of sensible people stand for election with any chance of success with a programme of "Live and let live" or Down with the Maulanas?"

The crisis in Pakistan was therefore inherent in the formation of the Islamic state. The Maulanas and their adherents asked, and rightly, "What is the good of having an Islamic state in which Kafirs the Islamic fold itself can be allowed to prosper?" "Make the state truly Isla-

mic by exterminating them", they said, "or get out of the seats of government". And the people not only cheered them, but they also started exterminating the Kafirs. The only conclusion to draw from their fanaticism is that such people are unfit for democracy. The soldiers realised it almost unanimously and took over the reins of government. What then is the sense in saying that Field Marshal Ayub Khan has not received the necessary mandate from the people? He knows what the mandate will be and is opposed to its coming into being. And anybody who knows ignorant fanatical Muslims should know what the mandate would be. In the result, Pakistan has to start again from scratch and with the un-Islamic cry, "Do not mix religion with politics". But how can such an un-Islamic cry be popular in an Islamic state? If religion is not to be mixed with politics, why was Pakistan formed? Echo answers, why? The present rulers, as decent people, are really faced with the task de-Islamising the people, but they dare not say so. How can they?

Mr. Suhrawardy's detention may have sparked off the disturbances but it cannot be denied that East Pakistan has a genuine grievance against the Government of Pakistan, for having been neglected since the formation of Pakistan and for having been denied its due in the administration. The disturbances will doubtless persuade the Administration to deal out even-handed justice to the eastern half, particularly as it must be conscious of being a West Pakistan product. It is justice rather than democracy that the agitators there really want, and the Pakistan Government with President Ayub at its head is capable of supplying the need.

MR. NEHRU'S LOGIC

In Madras Mr. Nehru took out from his pocket a clipping from a Madras newspaper containing alleged abuses hurled by Mr. Rajagopalachari at the Congress in one of his speeches, and he said after reading out the same, "I can only explain them by saying that Rajaji must be a very angry man. Anger, as the Bhagwad Gita says, destroys one's capacity for reasoning." But in his zeal Mr. Nehru forgot that at least that day and from that same platform he should not do exactly the thing he was criticising Rajaji for, and added, "The other day I ventured to describe Swatantra politics in a phrase which I feel is rather a good phrase. Therefore I shall repeat it, I said that it (Swatantra politics) is bad economics, bad sense and bad temper." Obviously, Mr. Nehru thinks he alone has the right to abuse other parties; just as he thinks he alone has the right to rule over the country.

As for being angry, newspaper readers know that Rajaji has not criticised Mr. Nehru half so severely as Mr. Nehru has criticised Rajaji, and in any case Rajaji has not abused Mr. Nehru as Mr. Nehru has abused Rajaji, although in abusing the latter, particularly in the manner he did it,

he made a laughing stock of himself. Rajaji would not have formed a party at his age, if he did not think of the Congress or Congressmen in the terms he is describing them. Personally I am not sure Rajaji has yet done full justice to them. They are much worse than his descriptions. What else can abject flatterers be?

At Mangalore the day before Mr. Nehru said, "I think, if I may say so with all respect, that the Swatantra Party is a flop. It is a flop not because I say so, but because it is against the entire trend of the history of India". He might have added that Swatantrata (freedom) itself is against the entire trend of Indian history and thus justified his friendly attitude towards the Chinese. That would have been killing two birds with one stone. But, may one ask the Prime Minister, if the Swatantra Party is such a flop, why does he waste his time criticising it every day? Why is he so much worried at the abuse of the Congress hurled by its leader? His actions always belie his speeches and writings and yet, addressing a public meeting at Bangalore, he referred to the criticism of Rajaji that he was a pseudo-Communist and said, "I hope whatever I am, I am not a pseudo-anything, because I am fairly known as far as my views are concerned. I have written and spoken about these things all my life. You can easily find out what I am." There lies the rub. Mr. Nehru would like to be judged by what he writes and what he says in public, and not by what he does, as his actions are almost always at variance with what he says and writes. It is not what a man says but what he does, that proves the kind of man he is. Let us have a look at his latest action in Goa, and let Mr. Nehru reveal himself in his true colours in his own words:

MR. NEHRU ON HIMSELF

Speaking in the Lok Sabha on September 17, 1955, Mr. Nehru said, "What are the basic elements of our policy in regard to Goa? First, there must be peaceful methods. This is essential unless we give up the whole roots of all our policies and our behaviour. There is nothing I can argue with any person who thinks that the methods employed in regard to Goa must be other than peaceful, because we rule out non-peaceful methods completely... Remember that in our consideration of the entire question we are ruling out what is called military or police action...."

"It has been stated by some members opposite that after all it will be a minor fight, and that, since Goa is small, it will be a petty affair. I want to emphasise, however, that it is a matter of principle. If the points of the Opposition members were conceded, it would boil down to this: that the big countries of the world have a right to bring the smaller countries under their sway. That is a wrong stand. Once we accept the position that we can use the Army for the solution of our problems, we cannot deny the same right to other countries. It is a question of principle...."

"From the very outset our policy, both at home and abroad, has been to solve all problems peacefully. If we ourselves act against that policy, we would be regarded as deceitful hypocrites. It would be said that we say one thing and do another. If it is proved that we have no principles and that we are opportunists, what would be the result? The high reputation that we enjoy in the world today and the weight that our words carry are due to the fact that we adhere to and honour our principles. If we suddenly reverse our policy, the world will get an opportunity to say that we are deceitful, that we indulge in tall talk but that when the time for action comes, we swing to whichever side is winning and at the crucial hour fail miserably."

Book Review

PROSPERITY through FREEDOM: by

Laurence Fertig (Regnery, \$3.95)

The volume is journalistic in that it deals with a wide range of running problems. But, unlike most journalists, Mr. Fertig is far more concerned with basic principles than he is with merely presenting the news with a little innocuous "perspective" on the side. Great names—Locke, Lord Acton, Adam Smith—come to life in his columns as active opponents of such things as deficit spending, or price control, or industry-wide bargaining. One has a sense of the continuity of sound thinking throughout the ages in Mr. Fertig's writing as well as a sense of what is going on, say, in the sanctum of Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Bank.

As a follower of Ludwig von Mises in particular, Mr. Fertig knows that economics is motivated by choice, which is never wholly predictable. The sense of man choosing saves Mr. Fertig from making a fetish of statistics, which, however much they may tell you about the past, are merely tentative indicators of the future. More to the point in Mr. Fertig's economic science is his knowledge of man as a moral being. Economics, to him, is something to be deduced from the broad principles of human nature. When men make certain choices, the consequences are generally predictable no matter what the immediately available statistical evidence may or may not say.

VERBAL IMPRECISION

What troubles Mr. Fertig above all is that modern man wants something for nothing. To kid himself that such a violation of the law of conservation of energy is possible, modern man has developed the art of verbal imprecision to an extraordinary degree. Mr. Fertig hates semantic obfuscation—and goes after it like a tiger in every chapter of his book.

There is the verbal imprecision in the common use of the word welfare, for example. Why,

asks Mr. Fertig, is it only "welfare" when the state does it? Isn't it "welfare" also when private investment provides \$14,000 worth of tools per worker in industry? Isn't the Union Pacific Railroad's operation at Sun Valley, Idaho, where the accommodations are both excellent and cheap, just as much "welfare" as the U.S. government's operation at Yellowstone Park? Isn't it "welfare" to offer a customer a better car, a better refrigerator? Mr. Fertig wants to know.

Then there is the tissue of imprecisions clustering around the notion of the Gross National Product, or GNP. When three-fourths of the dollar in a year's increase in the GNP is accounted for by a rise in prices, of what value is the GNP as a measure of affluence? Again, Mr. Fertig wants to know.

Since Mr. Fertig is a consistent—i.e., an intellectually honest—man himself, inconsistency in others bothers him. Though he has no animus against big business as such, he is perfectly willing to say that certain officers of General Electric and Westinghouse were entirely in the wrong when they were party to price fixing agreements. Mr. Fertig doesn't like price fixing, period. But he thinks it comes with very poor grace when "liberals" who believe in such price fixing devices as rent control or agricultural crop supports or minimum wage legislation turn around and assail GE and Westinghouse with such ferocity for trying to get their share of economic "stability."

LABOR'S INCONSISTENCY

The inconsistency—or the intellectual dishonesty—of certain labor leaders is another target of Mr. Fertig's controlled wrath. For several generations labor spokesmen have carried on a bitter war against the shade of David Ricardo. According to those who haven't read him with proper allowance for his footnoted material or his afterthoughts, Ricardo held that wages and profits are in mortal conflict—i.e., you can't raise an employee's pay without taking it out of the stockholder's dividends.

Labor has always denounced this variant of "wage fund" thinking, and has rightly pointed out that a high individual wage in an efficient industry is quite compatible with a low unit cost of labor and a high dividend rate. It all depends on what labor does in a given amount of time to earn its money.

Mr. Fertig is willing to grant that labour should get something—though by no means everything—from increases in man-machine productivity. But if Ricardo was wrong at one point in his writing in implying that wages couldn't rise without taking it out of profits, then the modern labor leader is making the same type of mistake when he argues that high wages are a *sine qua non* of effective purchasing power. The wage rate is not at all the same thing as the wage total. The truth is that when wages are pushed beyond productivity, unemployment—and a consequent decrease in total purchasing power—

may be the result. If labor is to persist in beating the shade of Ricardo, it had better refrain from talking like Ricardo-in-reverse in confusing one arithmetical thing with another.

Another piece of intellectual dishonesty which angers Mr. Fertig is the modern "liberal's" double standard when it comes to the subject of law enforcement. When a government servant takes a vicuna rug or a mink coat for his wife, the modern "liberal" throws a tantrum. But when it comes to enforcing the law against feather-bedding, the "liberal" is usually silent. Despite the fact that the Taft-Hartley Act says that no employer should be forced to "employ or agree to employ any person or persons in excess of the number reasonably required to perform actual service," the producer of a Victor Borge one-man show (without props) was compelled to hire four idle musicians and eleven idle stagehands. It was "union rules" — which are evidently superior to the law of the land that is Taft-Hartley. If it is "reasonable" to charge a patron for non-playing a non-violin, then language has no more meaning — and Mr. Fertig might as well shut up shop with the rest of us. But Mr. Fertig is not one to admit the human race is lost, and the rest of us can take courage from his stalwart insistence on consistency as a test of probity.

This review has only barely scratched the surface of Mr. Fertig's compendious book. Practically every phase of the deleterious interventionist assault on the free economy is thoroughly canvassed in Mr. Fertig's pages. This is a book with a whole arsenal of live ammunition for libertarians. Happy hunting to all of you!

— Condensed from The Review by John Chamberlain (in The Freeman).

How and Why the Left is Losing

Gleanings from the Press

Nehru's Fixation On The Swatantra

Mr Nehru's fixation on the Swatantra Party is difficult to understand or explain. Why is the Prime Minister so worked up about Rajaji's ripples to his outbursts or about the organised opposition which the Swatantra Party is mounting at the polls? By training his guns on the Swatantra Party and ignoring the Communists, or for that matter the socialists, Mr. Nehru is focussing more and more public attention on a party that on paper does not appear to present so formidable a threat as he attempts to make out. Or does it?

Rather belatedly in the day a section inside the Congress has come to realise the far reaching implications of this policy but has not the courage to challenge it openly. But others outside the Congress, notably the Swatantra Party have challenged it forthrightly. Hence Mr. Nehru's ire against Rajaji and his suspicion and contempt against the muted rebels within the Congress ranks.

The coming elections, the third in the history of independent India, will undoubtedly see the Congress returned to power at the Centre in what will probably be Mr. Nehru's last lap of power. Hence the intensified sense of history and hustle which seems to have seized the Prime Minister. At the end of his official career as at the beginning, Mr. Nehru is very much a man in a hurry and during the next five years he is bound to accelerate the pace of this country's advance toward socialism. In order to do this he must have men in his cabinet on whom he can fully rely, Mr. Krishna Menon being one of these and Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari another.

The thunder from the left grows in volume, but so does the thunder from the right. At the end of his years of power Mr. Nehru faces a divided country and a divided Congress.

Paradoxically that would spell more stability, with a responsible opposition and ensure the growth of true democracy in our country. But to do this calls for more courage from the muted right wing of the Congress.

—Frank Moraes in Indian Express.

News & Views

History Moving Towards Pluralism

The ideological rift between Russia and China served only to prove that history was moving in the direction of "pluralism" — that the United States together with the free world believed in — rather than in the direction of monolithic Marxism, observed Mr. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Special Assistant to President Kennedy, in the course of a press conference.

The press conference was addressed both by Mr. Schlesinger and Mr. George S. McGovern, Director of the U.S. Food for Peace Programme, both of whom are now in Madras on a short visit.

Mr. Schlesinger, who was replying to a question on America's re-action to the rift between Russia and China said that it was possible that the Chinese reaction to Mr. Khrushchev's Utopian portrait of Soviet economy in 1980 was that the prospering Soviet Communist comrade could share his well-advertised prosperity with the hungry Chinese peasant. If the rift between these two great communist countries did prove anything, it was that the world was moving in the direction of pluralism and not monolithic Marxism, which was an important tenet of the Communist system.

"Even in the Communist world," Mr. Schlesinger pointed out "national differences remain."

Showdown Between China and Russia Imminent.

PARIS.

A showdown in the ideological and political field between the communist parties of the Soviet

Union and Peoples' China may be imminent, experts on communist bloc affairs said here.

the Chinese leaders were planning to submit their

They based their conclusion on reports that ideological and political differences with Moscow to an international conference of the communist parties of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Such a conference might, according to the reports, be held in Peking to the invitation of Peoples' China.

Observers here believed several communist parties — including the Indian Party, which has an important pro-Chinese wing, and several European ones — had recently received a memorandum from Peking, pleading in favour of the Chinese policy.

The memorandum was reported to reject categorically Soviet charges that the Chinese leaders were war-mongers and adventurers.

In turn, the message reportedly accused Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev not only of having dealt too off-handedly with the Albanian affair, but also of failing to fulfil his "international duty" toward the sister parties and of encouraging the intransigency of the Western Powers.

Already several weeks ago, different communist sources reported that the Chinese were planning — even before last October's 22nd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow — to place their divergencies with the Soviet leaders before a new international conference of communist parties.

These sources stated, however, that the Soviet leaders had categorically refused the idea of holding such a parley on the grounds that the resolutions adopted by the latest such conference, held in Moscow in November 1960, in their view were still valid, and that the Chinese only had to apply to the letter the texts of these decisions.

STUDENTS' CAMPAIGN FOR ENGLISH AT AHMEDABAD

The campaign in favour of introducing English in the secondary schools of Gujarat State, earlier than it is now, so far confined mostly to educationists has been taken up by the students also.

A signature campaign is now being conducted in support of the demand for the introduction of English and already 11,000 students have signed a memorandum which, with many more additions will be presented to the State Government.

A deputation, in this connection will meet the State authorities with the memorandum and it will among others consist of the office bearers of the college unions and other allied organisations.

Severe criticism of the Gujarat Government for denigration of English in secondary education was made here in a crowded meeting held under the auspices of the Rashtriya Vidyarthi Mandal, a students' organisation. Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, the cosmic scientist, presided.

Principal S. R. Bhatt, a member of the Gujarat University Syndicate, pointed out that while showing lip sympathy towards the importance of English the policy makers of education in the State were systematically eliminating English.

Kennedy Wants Mutual Settlement On Kashmir.

President Kennedy expressed the hope that India and Pakistan could make some progress towards a settlement on Kashmir between themselves after the forthcoming Indian elections were completed.

The President had been asked at his press conference, in view of the reported unwillingness of Prime Minister Nehru to accept his proposal of mediation by Mr. Eugene Black, the World Bank President, whether the President had any present plan "to try to move this issue off dead centre through some other approach."

"No. The United States did make an effort in this regard," the President replied. "We are giving assistance to both countries."

Congressmen's Revolt

Five hundred and sixty-seven Congressmen have been suspended from the party in different States for opposing official Congress candidates in the current general elections, according to reports received by the A.-I.C.C. office.

An A.-I.C.C. spokesman said that the Pradesh Congress Committees had been asked to debar indisciplined Congressmen from entering the organisation for six years.

The largest number of Congress "rebels" was reported from Uttar Pradesh, where 166 Congressmen had been suspended by the P.C.C. for filing nominations against official candidates.

A.-I.C.C. sources said that those expelled for Indiscipline in connection with the general elections would not be re-admitted to the party. The party would not spare punishment to those Congressmen who worked against official party candidates, these sources added.

'SOCIAL WASTE IN OUR PLANNING' AN ECONOMIST'S VIEW

BOMBAY.

The real take-off in our economy would come about when the predominantly agricultural economy becomes predominantly industrial, and it was here that our planning had not succeeded, observed Dr. M. B. Desai, Professor of Agricultural Economics at University of Baroda, in Bombay.

Speaking under the auspices of the Forum of Free Enterprise on "Some Crucial Issues in Indian Planning", Dr Desai said that the percentage of agricultural labour in total working force had increased from 66 per cent in 1901 to 69 per cent in 1951, and perhaps more in 1961. In economically advanced countries like the U.K. it was 5 per cent. Dr. Desai said that urgent attention to the cost aspect of our industries was needed to pro-

te exports. "In our anxiety to spend money for growth in two plans, the cost aspect has been over-looked," he added. The time has come when realistic "evaluation of social waste" in planning has to be made in the interests of rapid economic growth, according to Dr. Desai. He cautioned against over-emphasis on labour-intensive methods. That might, after a certain point, hamper economic growth. He warned against preoccupation with social justice at this stage, as that would affect productivity.

Muslim Liberation Force.

MADRAS.

Mr. S. Balakrishna Shetty, Inspector-General of Police, Madras, said here that a "gang styling itself as the Muslim liberation force" and having the declared objective of what it called "hoisting the Muslim flag in the Indian capital," had been unearthed.

Mr. Shetty, who was talking to newsmen, alleged that the gang was responsible for the armed raid on the Siruganur police station near Tiruchirapalli on Thursday. Five persons, including a teen-age high school student, were apprehended near Tiruchi yesterday, he said.

ARMS STOLEN

During the raid, the gang shot at and injured a sub-inspector and a writer. The miscreants decamped with six muskets and several rounds of ammunition. Mr Shetty said the gang was armed with swords and lathis, a 12-bore rifle and several rounds of ammunition. He alleged that the leader of the gang was an employee of the Southern Railway. The police officer said these Muslims had khaki uniforms and shoulder badges reading 'L.F.' (Liberation Force).

Four Major Issues Before The Country

"There is a concerted Marxist move, with Mr. Nehru's connivance, to make a coup d'etat and seize power in the Congress Party with a view to dominating the Union Government. It is because the Swatantra Party has been engaged opening the eyes of the people to these dangers that it has become the main target of Mr. Nehru's demagogic attacks. Whoever wins in the division lobby at the polls, Prime Minister Nehru has already lost the Great Debate. His cheap jibes and insinuations, his crude attempts at caricaturing his opponents, his heroic posturings, his pathetic apologetics for his crypto-communist pet in North Bom-

bay and his invitation to those in his own Party's ranks who do not see eye to eye with him to go to hell are all signs that he is trying to cover up by bluster the exposure of the Marxist attempt at domination."

Four major issues had emerged during the election campaign. The first was the need for a vigilant and effective opposition without which clean government would not be assured nor the future of Parliamentary democracy be made secure. The press in general and most intelligent people in the country had come to the conclusion that the only party that offered a clear-cut alternative programme and way of life to that of the ruling party was the Swatantra Party, while the others were mere satellites or ginger groups pushing the Congress faster down the slippery slope to totalitarian communism.

The second issue was that of Collective Farming vs. Peasant Proprietorship free of taxes on land. The latter was the Swatantra Party's position. In almost every speech he made, Mr. Nehru had referred to the fad of collective farming which forms part of the Congress Election Manifesto. Anyone who thought that the threat of collectivisation of the land on the Soviet and Chinese model under the misleading slogan of "Joint co-operative farming" had been dropped was living in a fool's paradise! Mr. Nehru had given every indication that he was determined to push collective farming down the people's throats despite its miserable failure to produce food in Soviet Russia and Communist China.

The third major issue was whether it is the centralised Soviet type planning on which the Congress Party had embarked or it is the system of people's enterprise in a competitive economy with minimum governmental controls for which the Swatantra Party stood which would carry India faster along the path of prosperity. Mr. Nehru had accused Rajaji of having "ignored the real question" of how to solve the problems of unemployment and poverty much faster than the State Capitalist methods of Mr. Nehru. Even the meanest intelligence should be able to grasp the fact that investing the larger part of the national resources in the manufacture of steel and other heavy industrial goods was the worst way to solve the problem of unemployment. These industries were capital-intensive and employed the smallest number of people for the largest investment. Mr. Nehru had slavishly copied this priority from Soviet Russia although we in India suffer from overpopulation while Russia had been short of manpower. No wonder the Third Five Year Plan admitted that, while there were nine million people unemployed at the end of the Second Five Year Plan, there would be twelve million unemployed at the end of the Third Five Year Plan. Mahatma Gandhi had foreseen the danger of this

and the Swatantra Party in its manifesto had adapted Gandhian politics and Gandhian economics to the problems of the day.

The pernicious principle of "ceilings" was now to be extended to urban incomes. This would further retard production and economic growth, already stagnant under the wet blanket of Statism. A blow would be struck at the people's savings, productive investment would shrink and there would be more unemployment.

In so far as poverty is concerned, all historical experience shows that, while Soviet Russia had failed over forty years to raise the standard of living of the people appreciably, during the same period almost all democratic and so-called "capitalist" countries had shot forward miles ahead in doubling, trebling and quadrupling the standard of living of their people! This was as true of industry as of agriculture, and as true of Asia as of Europe, Japan, Philippines and Hong-kong were striking examples in contrast to the misery of the people of the Chinese mainland. A free society delivered the goods while a communist society starved the people because, while one mobilised human nature, the other attempted to thwart and fight human nature.

During the last few days, Mr. Asoka Mehta, an ardent socialist, had repeatedly to admit that no progress had been made in dealing with unemployment and poverty at the end of the Second Five Year Plan and that "he was doubtful if the completion of the Third Five Year Plan would make any difference in the condition of the masses".

If any progress had been made in India during the past 15 years, observed Mr. Masani, it was due to the vitality of the productive forces of the Indian people in overcoming the fetters of restrictive governmental policies.

Referring to Mr. Nehru's query as to who sheds tears for the common man, Mr. Masani retorted: "It is the common man who is hardest hit by the State Capitalist pattern of Mr. Nehru. It is his land that is in danger. It is his cost of living that shoots up as a result of inflation. It is his right to strike that Mr. Nehru was attacked at Bhopal only two days ago. By denouncing these policies, isn't the Swatantra Party defending the small man's rights and interests?"

If the Swatantra Party's programme of harnessing the creative talent of the people, their spirit of enterprise and their capacity for hard work were given a chance, India would move much faster and the people enjoy a happier life.

The Speaker asserted that Swatantra Party was not against all planning, but only against centralised, Statist planning. Mr. Nehru seemed to think that the Soviet Five Year Plans were the only form of planning. But there was a great difference between democratic and communist techniques of planning. In France, for instance, officials engaged in the task kept on using the expressions "tres souple" (very supple) and "non-dogmatique" (undogmatic) to distinguish their kind of planning from the Soviet kind. In Britain too, planning was just about to re-emerge from the discredit brought upon it by the post-war policies as a result of too many controls. The National Economic Development Council of twenty proposed to be set up in Britain was to be a purely advisory body consisting of only three Ministers, two representatives of Nationalised industries, 6 representatives of private enterprise, 6 trade unionists, two independent non-officials and one ex-officio Executive Director of the Office. The Swatantra Party, which stood for the abolition of the National Planning Commission, would welcome its replacement by some such body.

It was a tragic accident, observed Mr. Masani, that free India's first Prime Minister should have happened to be a Marxist wedded to that outdated dogma and, while the rest of the world was moving away from collectivisation to a more pragmatic approach, eg., British Labour, German Social Democrats and Yugoslav Communists, India's progress was retarded by the mental confusions of the Prime Minister.

It was the same mental confusion that was making Mr. Nehru risk the defence and security of the country by entrusting them to an outright crypto-communist, Mr. Masani was glad that Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan had, despite his abstention from party politics, urged on Mr. Nehru to see in time the danger to India's security of communist infiltration and subversion, which was the fourth big issue in this election. Rajaji had given the warning as far back as June last year that, if this draft was not stopped, it would not be Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Jagjivan Ram or Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri who would succeed Mr. Nehru.

Mr. Masani was proud that the Communist Party had chosen the Swatantra Party as its enemy Number One, while professing to support "progressive" elements in the Congress like Mr. Nehru, Mr. Krishna Menon and Mr. K. D. Malaviya. The communists could certainly be trusted to know who were their friends and who their opponents.

—From M. R. Masani's Address to The Press Guild, Bombay

March 1, 1962

Regd. No. B 6520

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 | Digambar Mahableshwar 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seth R.B. Lotwala, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Ram Baug, Lam Road, Deolali. 2. Mr. K. B. Rao, Director, 2/21, Bhuta Nivasa, Vincent Road, Bombay 19. 3. Mr. Raj, Director, Ram Baug, Lam Road, Deolali. 4. Miss Kusum R. Lotwala, Managing Director, Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4. 5. Mr. H. K. Shah, Director, 55, Girgaum Road, Bombay 4. 6. Mr. N. T. Metha (Shareholder) 22, Dr. 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.

Dated March 1, 1962.

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 : 70206

Telegram : LOTEWALLA