

THE

Indian

Libertarian

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

EDITOR: D. M. KULKARNI

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION Rs. 6.00

Vol. X No. 23 -

March 1, 1963

IN THIS ISSUE

Page

EDITORIAL:

Patriots And Patriots 2

Marx's Philosophy Of History
By M. A. Venkata Rao 5

Prohibition: The Only Solution
By M. N. Tholal 7

Roosevelt's Interest In Indian
Independence
By Krishnan Gujral 10

RATIONALIST SUPPLEMENT I-IV

DELHI LETTER:

Flirting With Foreign Military Aid .. 11

Book Review 12

Gleanings from the Press 13

News and Views 14



PATRIOTS AND PATRIOTS

OF late, India is being glutted with all manner of 'patriots,' good, bad and indifferent; 'pure gold', '14-carat' and 'air copper'. The communists, so notorious for their extraterritorial loyalties are protesting their patriotism so much that even the genuine patriotism of true nationalists pales into insignificance before the jingling noise and deafening tumult that the former make about it.

These 'copper' patriots are now all rallied round the leadership of comrade Dange, the super Moscow-Patriot among the Indian Reds. They do not like the revolutionary proletarianism of the Ranadive group who, one must admit, have never concealed their pro-China leanings in the present India-China conflict and who are being true Marxist-Leninists when they say in effect that they will welcome the Chinese 'Liberators' of India with open arms.

'COPPER' PATRIOTS

But the tactics of the 'copper' patriots belonging to Dange group, are more sinister and dangerous. They recently held a meeting of the General Council of their party in India and passed flamboyant resolutions towing the Moscow line which they consider to be the safest line for their very survival in the present political climate of India which is becoming too hot for them. These 'patriots' perhaps think that they can easily fool Indian people by such resolutions purporting to support Nehru's policies as distinct from the India Government's policies. But the Indian people know too well that what Dangeites appreciate in Mr. Nehru is not his unalloyed patriotism and his firm determination to maintain and, if necessary, even to fight the China for the safety, security and integrity of his motherland, but his deeply ingrained pacificism which does not allow him to hit straight and hard, even when the Chinese enemy is knocking at the very gates of India. This softness or rather weakness of Mr. Nehru, these Red patriots want to exploit for their own purpose which is to create a division among the nationalist ranks and disrupt national unity and cohesion.

Nor do they honestly support Nehru's Democratic Socialism and his programme of 'expanding public sector and planned economy' as their resolutions hypocritically say. Everyone, by now, has come to know that Communists support him only for one thing and that is his Non-alignment Policy. To them 'Non-alignment' means no alliance in any form whatsoever with America and England but all alliance with Russia and other communists countries including even much-hated China. So they keep on repeating parrot-like that India's seeking military aid from U.S.A. and U.K. will in effect alienate the valuable sympathy and support of Russia. They object to 'air cover' proposed to be provided in an emergency to our cities

and industrial sites by U.S. and U.K. at India's own request. But they do not even think it necessary to explain how India could be defended with the miserable few Russian MIGs which could be manufactured in India only by 1966 at the earliest and what military aid Russia is willing to give India in the meanwhile, to enable her to defend herself against the Chinese attack expected in the near future. The conclusion is therefore irresistible that what these 'patriots' really want the Indian Government to do is to meekly accept China's 'cease-fire' proposals in toto, sign away India's honour, self-respect and independence and quietly come under China's tutelage.

Thus the subtle moves of these 'copper' patriots on the chess-board of Indian politics are fraught with such dangerous consequences on the security and safety of India that in any other country they would have been quickly put behind the prison-bars at this juncture. But on the other hand, one witnesses the strange but sad spectacle of Mr. Nehru still extending to them the indulgence of an audience with him and affording them an opportunity to demand of him non-chalantly, immediate release of all communists now under detention under the Defence of India Act for their nefarious, anti-national and subversive activities.

'14-CARAT' PATRIOTS

Then again we have another set of persons who may be styled '14-carat' Patriots. They are mostly drawn from Fellow-travellers who form the Red lobby within the Congress. Their leader is the illustrious ex-Defence Minister Mr. Krishna Menon. While the 'copper' patriots carry on their subversive activities from without the Congress, in the country, the '14-carat' patriots donning the Congress robe of patriotism, are doing the same from within the Congress and the Government where they hold positions of vantage and influence with Nehru's good grace and favour. But it cannot be denied that some of them have had to their credit some service to the country in the past. But today their Red ideological obsession has completely overtaken their patriotism. How these 'patriots' will react to a major crisis occurring in the course of India's struggle against the Chinese, is anybody's guess.

'PURE GOLD' PATRIOTS

But fortunately India has not yet fallen a prey to the machinations of these prophets of counterfeit patriotism. We have in our midst today genuine patriots who are pure gold and whose hearts are sound. They are to be found in overwhelming numbers among Congressmen and among the members of such nationalist parties as the Swatantra, the Janasangha, The Hindu Maha Sabha, the Forward Bloc, the PSP

and SP and among the general populace. They have no extraterritorial loyalties and have social and cultural moorings firmly rooted into India's democratic soil. Despite their political differences and widely differing social attitudes, they can very well function and work together within the framework of the Liberal-democratic Constitution of India that envisages the evolution of an Indian society, affluent, free and pluralistic, which is the common aim and goal of all these nationalist forces. In such a pluralistic society alone could be reconciled both genuine patriotism and cosmopolitan humanism and could the Socialist 'Left' and the Liberal-Democratic 'Right' compete and at times even join hands in the common endeavour to promote national welfare and universal brotherhood. It is only these patriotic parties and people wedded to democratic principles who could be relied upon to wage a relentless war against the Chinese bandits, till the last of them is thrown out of the last inch of Indian territory forcibly occupied by them.

On no account, therefore, could the 'copper' patriots and their fellow-travelling agents, '14-carat' patriots find a place among the ranks of such genuine national patriots who unreservedly stand for India's security, integrity and freedom and who are ready, if need be, to fight and die for their motherland.

PLANNED FAILURE IN INDIAN AGRICULTURE

India's Planners have now publicly owned a defeat on the agricultural front. But they are yet averse to making the necessary changes in their basic policies, as could be seen from the recommendations made by the sixty member panel of the Planning Commission appointed for carrying out a probe into causes for the failure of agricultural planning in India during the first two years of the Third Plan. Unable to face the problem squarely and boldly, their report could only traverse the same old ground already covered by previous probes conducted into this question during the British regime. The only new point made by the Panel is lack of co-ordination between the Centre and the State in implementing the agricultural policy laid down by the Planning Commission. Obviously this is an attempt to make the States a scapegoat for the miserable failure so well planned by our socialist Planners themselves.

It is rather strange that there should be lack of co-ordination between the Centre and the States even when all the States are being ruled by one and the same party, the Congress. The truth of the matter is that the faithful implementation of Planning Commission's directive to the State Governments to give a 'co-operative' (rather 'collective') bias to agricultural holdings with a view to ultimately bringing agriculture in line with the Socialist Pattern, has completely destroyed our agricultural economy, which had been considerably damaged already by the Tenancy Acts and Abolition of Zamindari Acts. These Acts encouraged the flight of capital from the country-side and consequently turned cultivable smiling lands into dreary wastes and transferred lands from the thrifty and hard working peasant-proprietors

to the inefficient and thriftless agricultural labourers. The net result was complete failure of India's Planning in stepping up agricultural production and setting India on the road to self-sufficiency in foodgrains.

It is a pity Russian and Chinese failures on the agricultural front and Poland's wise and timely deviation from a strictly doctrinaire approach to agricultural planning, have not yet opened the eyes of our rulers to the stern fact that collectivism will not simply do in agriculture which is essentially an individualistic, free and private enterprise.

THE MOSHI DEBACLE

The Moshi Conference has once again proved that democratic and free India had no honoured place among the newly emergent Afro-Asian nations. The reason is obvious. By her weak and pusillanimous postures in the Sino-Indian conflict, India has lowered herself in the estimation of these nations, as a strong and powerful non-European power whom they could look to, for help and guidance. On the other hand China seems to have gained immensely in this respect during the last few months. She is cleverly exploiting her recent military victory over India, her only Asian rival, for impressing upon the small and weak Afro-Asian countries, the inevitability of their accepting China's political leadership. It was therefore no wonder that the Moshi Conference dominated as it was by the Chinese roundly denounced the tottering and self-liquidating Western imperialism, while completely ignoring the militant expansionism

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.)

ADVERTISEMENT RATES

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

BACK COVER..... Rs. 150

SECOND COVER..... Rs. 125

THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125

• *Articles from readers and contributors are accepted. Articles meant for publication should be typewritten and on one side of the paper only.*

• *Publication of articles does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a Free-Forum.*

• *Rejected articles will be returned to the writers if accompanied with stamped addressed envelope.*

Write to the Manager for Sample Copy and gifts to new Subscribers.

Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

of China in South-East Asia and particularly her recent naked aggression on India.

The Indian delegation headed surprisingly enough by the Fellow-Traveler Diwan Chamanlal tried in vain to get the Conference to pass a resolution calling upon China and India to accept the Colombo proposals 'in toto'. But the resolution which was finally passed, only called upon both India and China to consider the Colombo proposals as a basis for further talks. India's delegation was thus simply double-crossed and humiliated at the conference under Chinese pressure. In the result, China won and India lost the game.

When will our rulers realise that this 'cruel' world as Mr. Nehru once so described it in the agony of his soul, is for the strong and the brave and not for the weak and the faint-hearted?

RUSSIA'S OPPOSITION TO BIRTH CONTROL.

All dictatorial regimes have been, as a rule, opposed to scientific birth control. For they look upon the people as cannon-fodder in the wars they wage against 'free' peoples. They, therefore, exhort their countrymen to procreate and multiply themselves as fast as they could and even award prizes to the mothers having the largest number of children. Russia is no exception to this rule.

This unprogressive and irrational attitude of Russia towards this problem was reflected recently at the meeting of the U.N. Population Commission. While India reaffirmed her faith in birth control as a permanent social policy, the Soviet delegate opposed it on the specious plea that industrialisation and improvement in the material well-being of the people were principal factors affecting population-growth rates and sought to deride India's efforts in this direction. If Family Planning could be achieved in this way, the highly industrialised Western European countries and America would not have to practise birth control methods as they have been doing all these years. As Mr. Bhadkamkar, the Indian delegate pointed out that, not to speak of the improved standard of living and urban life being able to check the growth of population, even war had not tended to lower population-growth rates. This, he said, was mostly due to the lowering of mortality rates resulting from better medical aid available to the people now.

India will surely not be deterred by such ill-informed and unscientific criticism coming from the so called 'leftist' countries, from vigorously pursuing her national programme of Family Planning which has been so well received and commented upon by the world's best enlightened opinion.

SPORTS WITHOUT COLOUR OR POLITICAL BIAS

The Sondhi incident at the Asian Games held sometime back at Jakarta drew world-wide attention

to the ugly fact that Communist politics had invaded the sports world. It will be recalled that Mr. Sondhi was brutally handled in Indonesia for protesting against Indonesia's refusal to permit Taiwan and Israel to compete in the Asian Games on political grounds. The Olympic Committee which met at Lusanne in Switzerland took the eminently fair and just decision after a full discussion of seven hours to suspend Indonesia from Rome Olympics for an indefinite period. Indonesia called for this trouble and must now pay the penalty for it. The Committee has also taken a strong exception to the refusal of the Philippines to permit Yugoslav sports team to enter the country for World Basket Ball championships at Manila and has even changed the venue of the sports, calling upon the Philippines Committee at the same time to meet the cost of this change. As for the colour bar observed by the South African Olympic Committee, the International Committee has given the former one year's time to mend matters in this regard on pain of being disaffiliated.

All this shows a healthy trend in International Sports. Though the attempt made this time to draw up an International Sports Charter failed to materialise, it is to be hoped that the Olympic Committee will in the near future fulfil this pressing obligation and free Sports from all national, racial or political tinge or bias.

D. M. KULKARNI

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

"To expect self-denial from men when they have a majority in their favour and consequently power to gratify themselves, is to disbelieve all history and human experience"

— Adams.

"Ability to launch a sputnik bears no relation to ability to create an everyday comfortable standard of living. With its absolute control of manpower and scientific and economic resources, a dictatorship can easily carry through a crash program for reaching the single economic or military objective, but no dictatorship either of the communist or the Fascist type has even succeeded in raising the living standard of its subjects above a very spartan level."

— William Chamberlin.

"The contemporary world has gone astray because it has sought freedom from the dangers and risks of liberty."

— Henry Hazlitt.

THE PERIL TO LIBERTY TODAY COMES FROM THE LEFT, FROM SOVIET AND CHINESE COMMUNISM.

— W. Chamberlin.

Marx's Philosophy Of History

By M. A. VENKATA RAO

Marx's 'historicism,' if believed in, would deprive men of their precious heritage of freedom, would make democracy, a meaningless dream and destroy all human values. We in India should recover mental 'Swarajya' and examine things sceptically and scientifically. What is required is a philosophy of History that would envisage freedom-loving national societies within the limits of an International Order, just as the dignity of the individual and integrity of the family can be acknowledged within the orbit of National Society.

It cannot be contended that a philosophy of history is necessarily a part of the blue-print of revolution or of the equipment of the devoted revolutionary. But in the case of the communist revolution of 1917 in Tsarist Russia and of its subsequent revolutionary influence till today, a philosophy of history has played a vital part in the shape that the founder of its whole ideology Karl Marx gave to it.

Every major sphere of human life (morality, aesthetics, political relations of individual and the State, Law, civil and criminal, ultimate questions of origin and validity or values) has its philosophy or reflective science devoted to a thorough consideration of its problems. So too human history can have its own part of philosophical discipline.

Karl Marx applied the metaphysical and logical ideas of Hegel included under the name of dialectic to history within the context of materialism and derived a philosophy of history of his own which he called historical materialistic dialectic in contradiction to Hegel's dialectic which was spiritually inspired. According to Hegel, the whole universe was an evolution containing many sub-evolutionary branches (astronomical, physical, chemical, biological, psychological and so on) which disclosed the self-realisation of a universal and infinite and eternal spirit or consciousness. This multiple evolution, according to Hegel, proceeded by stages from extreme to extreme through a synthesis of opposites—of thesis and antithesis in synthesis containing the elements of truth and value in each. The new synthesis in its turn will provoke its own extreme anti-thesis which will in turn elicit its own new synthesis at a higher spiral or level.

The basis of this movement was freedom. Its culmination was also freedom. Freedom of finite spirits fully realised in a world of law and inter-relationships was the goal of world history. Much contingency, error and evil will be encountered by the spirit on the way but in the end, spirit was bound to win, as its essence was freedom.

Karl Marx dropped the spiritual element of this scheme and substituted matter in its stead. That is why he said that he stood the Hegelian dialectic head, down and the right way up. Top and bottom exchange places in Marx's dialectic. But the procedure of dialectic or synthesis of opposites remains. And it is applied to classes to human economic organisation, for Karl Marx is more interested in the

economic set-up of human beings than in the cosmic process as a whole.

According to Karl Marx, economic classes conflict in dialectic fashion, one extreme swallowing the other and giving rise to a third. The feudal organisation of lord and serf working the land, the former annexing the cream of production on the ground of ownership and force is a thesis. This thesis will provoke the anti-thesis of commercial and industrial capitalism. The triumph of the latter will provoke by a dialectic movement its natural opposite or anti-thesis of the working proletariat which in turn will swallow the finance capitalism of the present stage. And that, says Karl Marx, is the end of the social process or evolution, for there will be no more classes to conflict with each other. Then All will belong to All. Then will dawn the earthly paradise of the communism of abundance when goods will be apportioned to each in accordance with need and work from each will be taken in accordance to his ability. Consumer and producer, owner and governor will be one. The gulf between exploiter and exploited will vanish. The eternal seed-plot of war will perish and the reign of perpetual peace will be ushered in. Such is the Utopia of Karl Marx. Marx detested the word Utopia as it was used with ignorant facility by soft-minded idealist reformers. He preferred to refer to his social vision as a scientific prediction, grounded on an unerring interpretation of history. He thought that his prediction had the certainty of astronomy in the forecast of the return of stars and planets to their places in their orbits.

Dr. Karl Popper, the author of the famous work *The Open Society and its Enemies* has subjected Marx's philosophy of history to a searching criticism which is unanswerable and robs it of its glamour.

The crux of the Marxist position that Dr. Popper takes for his target is that he calls the historicism of Marx. Popper exposes relentlessly the fallacy of this historicism.

By historicism—Popper means the idea that history displays a progressive trend, an increasing purpose, as the saying goes. This implies that the actions of men in the course of history in their social epochs and geographical regions are over-ruled by destiny or other invisible factor so as to make an over-all trend emerge and increase in strength period by period. This implies the doctrine of inevitable progress irrespective of what human beings do within

their limited ken and circumstances led by their individual, family, ethnic or national situations. From time to time, societies get ripe and reach their end and fulfilment in a golden age or earthly paradise, though as individuals and groups they might not have willed such outcomes consciously.

This is denied strenuously by Dr. Popper. He says that to believe such trends is to believe in pre-determination which is to deny the actual and palpable experience of freedom and voluntary choice. Men are not robots. And they do not intend the remote historical outcomes that may happen ages later. From a particular outcome in history we cannot argue to its being predetermined, and that no other course was possible.

Dr. Popper thinks that this doctrine, if believed in, would deprive men of their precious heritage of freedom and would make democracy a meaningless dream. It would also destroy all human values whatever. Freedom may not be the whole and sole value of man but it is the indispensable basis and medium of all other values. It is not enough by itself no doubt but it is indispensable as the oxygen to make other values viable.

Once we grant this basis of freedom as a characteristic of human life and activity, it would be difficult to believe in the predetermination of historical epochs irrespective of the play of human motive and action. Many human beings on the stage of history will pull in different directions and the result will be a "parallelogram" of forces whose culmination is unpredictable beforehand.

Nor can we accept the Hegelian scheme of the movement of history from thesis and antithesis through synthesis. This is too mechanical a mould to contain without remainder and without distortion the living movement of human impulses in their totality and inter-action.

Dr. Popper's criticism so far is entirely valid and is calculated to restore the human being to his natural capacity and nature as one endowed with freedom of choice within limits. The Russian Revolution cannot be said to have been inevitable, fated to occur by the historical and materialistic dialectic as described by Karl Marx.

It took place owing to the creative, free action of Lenin and his followers who used the confusion engendered by the defeat (in the war of 1914) of the Czarist armies at the hands of the German Wehrmacht. The form it took was due to the ideas entertained freely by Lenin and his fellow revolutionaries for a generation before about the type of a socialist or communist revolution. Far from having been predetermined, it was the result of the choice of the revolutionary leaders, the outcome of their freedom. If they had other ideas of a perfect society, the society established by them would have been different.

To think of a predetermined result for a course

of history is to commit the fallacy of historicism, according to Dr. Popper.

Dr. Von Mises and other Austrian and German thinkers have traced this error of historical fatalism which has become an integral part of Marxist communism to the Chiliasm or prophetic hope of the Kingdom of God expected on earth in historical times any moment by certain Christian sects in Europe. In fact, such a historical hope has been one of the consolations of Semitic religions—Hebrewism and Islam no less than Christian sects. It gives them hope to bear up in adversity and to work patiently for a bright future in the midst of despair-inspiring conditions of national defeat and frustration.

In any case, we in India have our own traditional doctrine of karma (which is also applied to societies) which has all the advantages and disadvantages of fatalism or predetermination. It is not necessary for us to accept the new communist doctrine of historicism or historical determination independent of human will in the name of science or scientific materialism. The essence of the doctrine remains extra-scientific and extra-logical (i.e. irrational) though Marx may claim scientific character for it. Dr. Popper is right in his criticism of it. What we need today in India is a fresh realisation of the ultimate value of truth and reason, of the ultimate value of rationalism as the supreme method of thought and basis of action and criterion of all beliefs, inherited as well as new fangled, taken over with modernism.

The modernism associated with Marxist Communism is full of error and practical danger. We should recover mental freedom; mental swaraj and rethink all beliefs and reformulate the outlook necessary for vigorous rebuilding of social and economic institutions. We should examine all things without prejudice as to their source, whether eastern or western, ancient or modern and accept truth that comes out successfully out of the fiery crucible of scientific, sceptical examination and verification rigorously conducted in accordance with scientific method.

From this point of view, what remains of Karl Marx's impressive and immensely popular system of social philosophy is a warm moral philanthropic enthusiasm, demanding equality of opportunity to all—to the poorest member of the proletariat, who owns nothing but his hands and his feet.

A critical reader reading *The Capital* and other controversial literature of Karl Marx, particularly, *The Communist Manifesto* may be as much impressed with the consuming hatred that burns in his pages for the well-to-do classes as by his burning sympathy for the underdog.

The creative revolutionist should try to do his best to retain faith in human nature and to preserve his zeal for social equality without giving way to class hatred, for hatred destroys more than it constructs.

Other parts of the philosophy of history of Marx

(Continued on Page 9)

Prohibition : The Only Solution

By M. N. THOLAL

IT is good news that the Government of Bombay has appointed a committee to go into the vexed question of prohibition, which has yet to be seriously tackled. The policy of drift which we have been pursuing in the matter is no policy at all. It remains to be seen whether the Committee means business or its appointment is only a way of shelving the issue. If it means business, it can give a lead to the whole country, if not to the whole world, in solving the liquor problem. The object of this article is to show how to do it.

To begin with, one must understand what the problem is. The craving for alcoholic drinks is not immoral, as it is generally regarded. It is a disease. It is born of a disorganised system. The craving is due to a lack of vital warmth in the system which alcohol temporarily alleviates. In course of time the system becomes used to alcohol and needs more and more of it to provide the same amount of warmth. It leads to immorality because alcohol deprives a man of his power of self-control. But the craving itself is a disease which has to be satisfied at any cost, like other cravings. It creates a demand and, where there is demand, supply follows.

The question therefore resolves itself into one of finding a remedy or remedies for this craving. There is only one system of medicine which provides cures for cravings of all kinds — homeopathy. Not only that, perverted cravings are leading symptoms in homeopathic treatment, that is, they are symptoms which have to be taken into account in the selection of a constitutional remedy for a particular patient. In this field of perverted cravings the allopath, the vaid and the hakim are alike helpless, because their treatment is diagnostic. They want to know the name of the disease in order to be able to treat him. For a homeopath the name of the disease is redundant. As William Boericke puts it in the therapeutic index of his famous "Pocket Manual of Homeopathic Materia Medica":

"In order to prescribe homeopathically the essentials for so doing must be observed,— i.e. to let the characteristic symptoms of the individual patient, largely independent of the pathological nature of the disease, be paramount in selecting the remedy."

Followers of other systems have no use for the characteristic symptoms of the individual patient, such as hot palms or perspiring palms, burning in the vertex, cold feet, etc., etc. For them the symptoms of the disease are all important, because they enable them to diagnose the disease and then treat it. In homeopathy, as Kent used to emphasize, the name of the disease is no business of the doctor. That explains how a man can pick up homeopathy at home and practise it successfully. Motilal Nehru

and Rabindranath Tagore were practising homeopaths. If diagnosis is not necessary, good knowledge of anatomy, pathology, physiology, etc. becomes unnecessary. That is why there are more than 3,00,000 homeopaths in the country.

These cravings for sour food, alcoholic drinks, salt, spices, sweets, tobacco, etc., are among the characteristic symptoms of the individual which lead to the selection of the proper constitutional remedy, i.e., a remedy which will do good to the whole constitution, including the brain. Sometimes a man has more than one craving. For example, the craving for alcohol and for tobacco often goes together. That makes the choice of the remedy easier, for the remedies common to both the cravings are few.

SOME CASES

To illustrate how homeopathy works like the wave of a magic wand, I shall here give a case from my own experience. When on the National Herald of Lucknow in the thirties, I happened to go to my home town, Kanpur, for a day and put up with Dr. T. Caul, M.B.Ch.B. (Edinburgh) L.M. (Rotunda), a retired Civil Surgeon. With him, her grand uncle, was putting up my niece with her infant son. When I saw the child coughing frequently, I asked Dr. Caul why he was not giving him something to cure him of his cough. "What can I give him?" said Dr. Caul, "You know he has been coughing since birth and his father is an asthma patient. The child has inherited asthma from his father."

A few minutes later the child came toddling along and to balance himself put his hand on my knee. The palm was burning hot. Dry heat in palms is a leading symptom of a homeopathic remedy. I took out a small phial of it from my case, gave him a dose there and then, and, handing over the phial to my niece, asked her to give him a dose of about five grains every day for a week. On my next visit to Kanpur a week later, Dr. Caul asked me, "What remedy did you give this child?" On my asking "why?" he said, "He is absolutely all right". I gave him the name of the remedy, but my surprise was yet to come. I asked my niece to return to me the phial I had given her. "What phial?" she asked, "You never gave me any phial". On my asking her to search her attache case, she found it there. "So you never gave him any dose?" I asked. She said she had completely forgotten the phial. So one dose had cured the child of his "hereditary asthma", in any case, his chronic cough.

Motilal Nehru used to suffer from chronic cough which used to give him a good deal of trouble in the mornings. One of his Bengali colleagues at the Bar

came to see him one evening with a homeopath whom he had sent for from Calcutta to treat his wife. "Panditji," he said, "I have specially brought this Calcutta homeopath to see you to cure your cough." "A homeopath!" laughed Motilal Nehru, "he will either give me a drop of alcohol or a grain of sugar. You know I take some alcohol every evening and several tea-spoons of sugar in my tea every day." The Bengali lawyer was not to be easily outwitted and he retorted, "But, Panditji, another drop of alcohol or another grain of sugar won't do you any harm." "That it won't," agreed the Pandit, "But I must tell you I have no faith in homeopathy, so don't turn round and say the medicine failed because I had no faith in it." "The medicine will not fail, Panditji," assured the homeopathic doctor, "I'll send you a dose which you may take on going to bed."

The medicine was taken as directed and, hey presto, there was no cough the next morning. When his family physician came on his usual round, Nehru said to him, "You bogus fellow, you have been treating me for my cough for years and telling me homeopathy is a bogus system. I took a homeopathic dose last night and my cough has disappeared!" A homeopath dose not need being told what the medicine was or that the cough was due to the intake of alcohol which was antidoted.

I once cured a leading fellow journalist of New Delhi of his abscess of the lungs on his leading symptom, dipsomania (craving for alcohol). It had defied the best doctors in the Capital. After the fever and cough had disappeared, and his regular doctors had pronounced him hale and healthy, I was foolish enough to tell him, "If you go on taking this remedy, your craving for alcohol will disappear and you will be in perfect health." (He used to spend all his four-figure salary on alcohol.) "Craving for alcohol will disappear!" he repeated in alarm and astonishment, and added, "I will never touch your medicine now. What would I live for without alcohol?" And he thankfully returned the little phial I had given him.

I have given this case to show the difficulty in the way of the solution of the problem. The addict himself is not likely to co-operate, so great is the enjoyment he gets out of his alcohol. But his wife and other near relatives will and can be coaxed to give his symptoms if he refuses to co-operate. Or homeopaths—and any one can become a successful homeopath for this limited field in a few days with the help of a leaflet—can be introduced to addicts as friends to find out their symptoms and ostensibly prescribe for them, without telling the addicts that the remedy will cure their dipsomania. The other symptoms will start disappearing with the craving for alcohol and the addict will have no reason to suspect that he is being fooled.

REMEDIES

There is a remedy a dose of which consisting of a few drops, produces disgust for alcohol. Those unwilling to give up their drink can be coaxed into taking that dose on some pretext or the other. If

this proves universally successful, the problem of prohibition will be easily solved. Otherwise homeopathic medicines, given according to their symptoms noted below, are known to have set the system in order and cured the craving for alcohol.

1. Zealous, fiery temperament; irritable, sullen, fault-finding. Cannot bear noises, odours, light. Region of stomach very sensitive to pressure. Nose stuffed up at night and outdoors; constipation with frequent ineffectual urging, incomplete and unsatisfactory evacuation, with feeling as if part remained unexpelled.

2. Ebullitions of heat; standing uncomfortable, catnap sleep; dry and hard hair and skin. Constant heat on top of head; sinking feeling at stomach at 11 a.m. Hot sweaty hands; burning in soles and hands at night.

3. Debility, exhaustion, restlessness. Great exhaustion after the slightest exertion. Burning in and oedema around eyes. Photophobia. Cannot bear the sight or smell of food. Worse from cold drinks.

4. Prostration and feeble digestion of alcoholics. Sore throat of smokers and drinkers. Bad odour from mouth. Much thirst but drinking causes shuddering.

5. Always feels cold. Scratching on silk or paper or linen unbearable. Undigested stools.

6. Tremor and weakness; hot flushes. Sour eructations set teeth on edge. Water causes coldness of stomach, must be mixed with liquors. Relaxed feeling in stomach.

7. Very marked acuteness of smell. Fermentative dyspepsia; constipation with very offensive breath.

8. Exhausted nervous system. Palpitation with weak heart and dyspnea. Noises in ear. Hoarseness or loss of voice.

9. Hereditary tendency to alcoholism. Excessive flow of saliva which runs out of mouth when sleeping. Always washing the hands. Fears the night and the suffering from exhaustion on awakening. Utter prostration and debility in the morning.

10. Great debility; extreme sadness. Headache over left eye, worse from walking in the sun, strong odours and tea. Sleep prevented by pulsations in all vessels.

11. Catarrh with a tough, viscid stringy secretion. Pains migrate quickly. Rheumatism and gastric symptoms alternate.

12. Cold knees. Digestion slow; food putrefies before it digests; eructations, heaviness, fullness, better from eructations. Abdomen distended. The simplest food distresses.

The remedy whose symptoms are given in No. 7 above, if mixed with three parts of alcohol and given

(Continued on Page 9)

(Continued from Page 8)

ten to 15 drops three times a day for several weeks, has been successful in subduing the craving for liquors.

These dozen medicines will be found to cover more than 90 per cent of alcohol addicts. During my practice of homeopathy extending to over 35 years I have generally been taking cases which the regular physicians will not touch—perhaps because they have no remedies for them—and which at the same time are not dangerous. The alcohol addict has frequently come among them and I have treated him for his craving—have had to treat him for his craving—to remove his complaint. If the alcoholics were to undergo homeopathic treatment for their troubles, their craving for alcohol will disappear with their ailments, whether the homeopath prescribes for the craving or not. So the wives and well-wishers of alcohol addicts will do well to persuade them to take to homeopathy even for their minor ailments. If they whisper to the physician concerned the patient's craving, it will be an important additional system given him. If they do that, they will find the craving slowly disappearing and the drunkard emerging a reformed man. For, it is impossible for a healthy man, who does not suffer from this craving, to seek the bottle or the company of friends who have it, or with either, or both, to indulge in drink.

What is certain is that there is no solution of this problem outside homeopathy, which our Government no longer disdains as an untouchable. If a leaflet of the type suggested is printed and distributed free in all the languages of India with the names of remedies and how to administer them—by means fair and foul, open and surreptitious, e.g., through sugar pills dissolved in earthen jars of water—many would be inclined to spend a quarter of a rupee to buy a drachm of the indicated homeopathic remedy—costing less than an anna to the pharmacy—for the reform of their near and dear ones. This will save the Government crores of rupees and prevent the spread of crime. As it is the Government is through prohibition creating a demand but making the supply criminal. This is the opposite of statesmanship and is bound to fail.

(Continued from Page 6)

concerns his notion of classes—the haves and the have-nots. He thinks of them as mechanical moulds, mutually exclusive of each other. He never succeeds in defining them with the result that we find Marxists in their revolutions displaying a baffling ambivalence and confusion in their treatment of the intellectuals who are mostly of bourgeois origin. Ultimately they come to treat everyone who identifies himself with the proletariat as a proletariat man, irrespective of his class origin. For strict theory would condemn the very leaders of Marxist communism like Marx and Lenin and Trotsky as bourgeois in origin and mentality!

Theory had to accept the grim fact that no proletariat ever led a revolution. It could only lend its force and support as a mass.

The other part of Marx's theory that economic organisation and status determines belief and that the whole upper layer of culture and civilisation is but the super-structure erected on the solid basis and foundation of economic position or way of life and status is also riddled by the fire of contemporary criticism. If the leaders of communist theory and action could be composed of many classes from many layers of society and economy, the foundation is knocked out of the theory of economic determination of history. The theory indicates a general tendency applicable as a whole like a kind of statistical probability but individuals and elite groups can and have traversed their origins and persuaded classes to accept decisions not related to their economic interests.

Proletarian internationalism has been dissolved by the passion of nationalism in war-time in 1914 and again in 1939-46.

A philosophy of history that envisaged national societies led by free thinking leaders and people could be persuaded to support an international world order or federation relegating all violence to police action by an international force at the disposal of a world court is possible and more constructive. Such a philosophy of history would avoid the error of Marx and restore freedom and creativity to human groups and personalities and acknowledge the validity of nationalism within the limits of international order just as the dignity of the individual and the integrity of the family can be acknowledged within the orbit of national society.

THIS PICTURE AND THAT

What an object lesson in democracy—the way it works in Canada and the difference between that and the way in which it fails to work in India! There was a question whether the Prime Minister Diefenbaker's attitude in respect of Canada's defence policy was right. We are not concerned with the merits of the issue. Immediately the question took shape, it was a matter of hours only, the Defence Minister resigned, a confidence motion was brought up, and the Prime Minister was given an adverse vote, with the result that Parliament has been dissolved and fresh general elections ordered. That is how democracy works where there is a balance of forces and no totalitarianism. No one raised the sobstuff of unity or national danger; the electorate moved and the nation proceeded to choose a new government. There are able men waiting to occupy the places of the dismissed Premier and his ministers. Here in India we have the lamentation about irreplaceable leadership and, therefore, of compulsory tolerance of universally complained error and mismanagement. Unless the nation's leaders, at all levels, make up their minds to help building up a strong and ready Opposition, democracy must continue to be a make-believe in India. It is just one other Asiatic monarchy dressed up in civilized clothes.

— C. R. in Swarajya

Roosevelt's Interest In India's Independence

By KRISHAN GUJRAL

The following article reproduced from U.S.I. Service to mark the birth anniversary of President Franklin D. Roosevelt on January 30 will give the readers a correct idea of U.S.A.'s long-term policy based on the Atlantic Charter towards India's Freedom and Independence—Ed.)

FRANKLING D. ROOSEVELT was many things to many people.

To the people of the United States, he was a great President, an apostle of social justice who fought a crippling economic depression with revolutionary social legislation.

To the people of Central and South America, he was a good neighbour who set new standards in hemispheric cordiality and co-operation.

To the people of Europe and Asia, he was a liberator who humbled the combined, seemingly invincible might of three of the biggest dictatorial powers of the world.

And, to the people of India, he was a friend and well-wisher who pressed for their independence even at the risk of alienating his closest war-time ally, Winston Churchill.

In spite of the fact of World War II, FDR never lost interest in India's welfare and, in various messages, asked Churchill for immediate settlement of the Indian question.

For instance, on March 10, 1942 he sent a long cable to the English Prime Minister, expressing his concern over the Indian situation and suggesting the formation of a provisional government.

According to him, this temporary government, besides exercising executive and administrative authority over certain public services, would be charged with the duty of "considering the structure of the permanent Government of India, such consideration to extend for a period of five or six years or at least until a year after the end of the present war."

Again, during the Cripps Mission to India, FDR sent a message to Churchill, urging "one more final effort" to save the negotiations, and warned: "If the Cripps talks failed and India was subsequently invaded with success by Japan, with attendant serious military or naval reverses for the Allies, the prejudicial reaction on American public opinion can hardly be over-estimated."

He bluntly told Churchill that public opinion in his country could not understand "why, if the British Government is willing to permit the component parts of India to secede from the British Empire after the war, it is not willing to permit them to enjoy what is tantamount to self-government during the war."

In a subsequent message sent to Col. Louis Johnson, FDR's personal representative in India, acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles, pointed out that prior to Cripps' departure from India "and up to the last moment, the President made every possible personal effort with the British Prime Minister to prevent the breakdown of negotiations."

Roosevelt's concern for India's independence was also evident from his message to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek sent on August 12, 1942, following the arrest of Indian leaders. Citing special interest in Indian situation because of its relation to the war effort, he affirmed basic U.S. policy in the following words:

"It is scarcely necessary to reiterate the deep interest of this government, both under its long-standing policy and especially under the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, in independence of those who aspire to independence. This policy has been stated and reiterated over a long period and up to this hour by the official spokesmen of the American Government."

This note of caution runs through the entire correspondence Roosevelt had with Churchill, showing his recognition of "the terrific complexities" of the Indian situation as well as his desire to contribute to its solution without resort to "objectionable pressure" on either side.

It was this very anxiety which prompted him to preface one of his messages to Churchill and his Cabinet colleagues with these carefully selected words:

"Of course, this is a subject which all of you good people know far more than I do and I have felt much diffidence in making any suggestions concerning it (the proposal for a provisional government)."

Students of Indo-U.S. affairs believe that the untiring efforts which Roosevelt made to accelerate India's independence considerably helped in laying firm foundations for the present solid relations between the two countries. The policies he initiated in this field have generally been followed by subsequent U.S. Administrations.

Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, four months before the end of the war, and two years and four months before the start of India's independence. He was not destined to witness either of the two developments to bring about which he had worked so hard and passionately.

Flirting With Foreign Military Aid

(From Our Correspondent)

At a meeting of the executive committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party in New Delhi on February 16, Mr. Nehru is reported to have described as highly unjustified the criticism of the Swatantra leader, Mr. Rajagopalachariar, that the Government had taken a complacent attitude in regard to the Chinese aggression. He said that the very fact that the emergency was continuing belied that allegation. It does nothing of the kind. For one thing, as is commonly observed here, the Chinese aggression came as a god-send to power-hungry politicians masquerading as patriots to gather more power in their hands and, as every one is loth to lose power, the emergency continues and will continue. If the Prime Minister had not taken a complacent attitude towards the Chinese aggression, the same would have been evident in his words as well as deeds.

What are or were his and his Defence Minister's words, and what are the Government's deeds? The Chinese aggression has been on for more than five or six years. It may indeed be said to have begun with the Chinese, starting the construction of the Aksai-Chin Road. What was said during these five or six years has a familiar ring. We all know almost by heart those notorious words—"unadministered territory" . . . "where grows not a blade of grass". The Defence Minister was reported even to have told the Army Chief of Staff: "Your enemy is on the East and West, not on the North." What an answer to the Chinese aggression! Is there any parallel to this gay insouciance in the history of the world? If so, where? Those of us who are inclined to blame the Colombo Powers remind one of the Urdu saying, "Muddayee sust, gawah chust" — "the plaintiff is indifferent but the witness is keen". No wonder the Chinese appear to have lost none of their respectability even after their massive invasion of India.

And what is the position now, after a massive invasion by the Chinese? Speaking at the concluding session of a seminar organised by the Press Institute of India and the India International Centre on February 17 Mr. Nehru said the situation was not yet safe, adding significantly, "Anything may happen any time". It would therefore, as he said quite truly, be dangerous to end the emergency. But the continuance of the declared emergency is by itself obviously no deterrent to anything happening any time. Is there nothing more to be done than the solemn declaration, absolutely justified under the circumstances, that anything may happen any time? At the very same meeting at which the Prime Minister condemned the Swatantra leader's criticism of Government's complacency, Mr. Nehru is understood to have told the Congress Parliamentary Party executive that there had been no talks or negotiations with the Western countries for an "air umbrella" for India. He is reliably believed to have said that India had neither

asked for nor been offered an "air umbrella" by any country and that reports to this effect were imaginary.

If anything can happen any time, as he says, why have we not asked for an air umbrella? One of our best Army experts anticipates, during the next Chinese invasion, an attempt to occupy the Assam oilfields by means of parachute landings of Chinese troops. It cannot be denied that this is included in anything happening any time, and the Prime Minister must be aware of it. If he is not taking any steps to guard against it, his attitude can only be regarded as one of complacency. It is true that Mr. Nehru informed his Party's 500 members on February 17 that India's military and economic strength would have to be greatly increased to meet the Peking menace and that the defence effort must be stepped up, for the struggle against Communist China was bound to be hard and long. But the question today is: what is he doing to prevent anything from happening any time? The great increase in our military and economic strength, which he envisages, is bound to take years and cannot prevent anything happening any time in the near future. And yet he regards Rajaji's criticism of Government's complacency in the matter as highly unjustified. Can anything be more unfair?

CRUX OF THE QUESTION

The crux of the question lies in the relative military strength of India and China today, and not what it is likely to be ten years or more hence. Mr. Harekrishna Mehtab, one of the most prominent members of the Congress Party, declared in Parliament on January 24 last: "I do not admit that the Chinese are more powerful than ourselves. We can defeat China by building up our strength". If the Chinese are not more powerful than ourselves, we should be able to defeat them even without building up our strength, for no one doubts the valour of our troops. The very fact that Mr. Mehtab at the same time talks of building up our strength to defeat them implies that we are weaker than China. Apparently Mr. Mehtab does not take air power into account in assessing the relative strength of the two countries. As against the heroic declaration of Mr. Mehtab is the assessment of Gen. Thimayya that the Chinese are 300 times stronger than we. If that is not so, and if they are not even a hundred times stronger than we, the Prime Minister should clear the air by a firm declaration that we are militarily as strong as China. He has to do that to prove that Rajaji's criticism of Government complacency in the matter is highly unjustified. As it is, he has gone on record with a startling and frightening statement regarding anything happening any time, which is indeed much more than Rajaji ever said, and implies a greater

condemnation of his Government's complacency than Rajaji ever made..

The fate of the country depends on Mr. Nehru's judgment. At this extremely critical moment in the history of the country, he should not try to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, denouncing the hare at one time and the hounds at another, as if it does not matter whom he denounces, himself or Rajaji. For, he denounced himself fairly strongly when he confessed some time ago that he and his fellow Congress leaders were living in a world of their own creation. His countrymen are entitled to make sure that he does not condemn himself as strongly when the next Chinese offensive starts, for the possibility of that invasion, indeed, its probability is inherent in his own statement that anything can happen any time. One is indeed inclined to beg of him to remember that this is no time for scoring imaginary debating points against those whose insight enabled them to forecast what happened in October and November last. He should make sure that no one in his party is a party to deceiving the country regarding her strength and that he himself, by no stretch of the imagination, can be said to be playing ducks and drakes with the country's destiny.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE PRESS

Addressing the Press Institute Mr. Nehru also complemented the Press in general for the manner in which it had conducted itself during the emergency. But, according to him, there were "some disgraceful exceptions". He said it was not the Government but usually the power of money which interfered with the freedom of the Press. As Mr. C. D. Deshmukh has been pointing out, Government also interferes with the freedom of the Press. It is this fact which made him say at the seminar that the Press should be free from the control of ultra-sensitive Governments. And is the letting on nominal rents of first-rate furnished Government bungalows in New Delhi to journalists—flunkies would be a better term—intended to promote the freedom and independence of the Press?

Mr. Nehru said the industries owning newspapers might not be interfering with their independence, but under such an arrangement the editor cannot be said to be enjoying the kind of freedom the editor of an independent paper had. Indeed, indeed, but for the fact that the editors of newspapers owned by industries dependent upon the Government for quotas and import licences had to restrain themselves to keep their masters' industries running, the criticism of the Government for the way in which it has been conducting itself in matters of defence and foreign policy would have been what it should have been, i.e., the same as was voiced in private, and the Prime Minister and his colleagues would have spent many a sleepless night recalling the words and phrases used to commend their intelligence and foresight. Newspapers under the thumb of industries under the thumb of Government need not and do not frighten the Government so much as newspapers, alas too few, who have independent editors.

SHASTRI THROWS OFF THE MASK

The Union Home Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur

Shastri, speaking at Allahabad on February 15, criticised the officials of Meja Tehsil for irregularities in the Irrigation, Co-operative and Revenue departments. The villagers had complained to him about certain irregularities, he said; adding that it was most painful that the officials in this part of Uttar Pradesh were not performing their duties satisfactorily and were not identifying themselves with the masses. For a Home Minister of a country thus to criticise publicly the officials of a tehsil (part of a district) appears to be most extraordinary. The villagers, presumably Congressmen, complained to him about certain irregularities. Since he is touring the country he could have hardly gone into the complaints or heard the other side also, presuming he has jurisdiction over those departments.

If he did go into the cases of irregularities and found the officials at fault, surely the officials deserved something much more than a public rebuke. If he did not, he should not have delivered judgment against them in a public meeting. His complaint that the officials were not performing their duties satisfactorily, and were not identifying themselves with the masses, appears only to mean that they were not dancing to the tune of local Congressmen who complained to him. The complaint that local officials are under the thumb of Congressmen is almost universal, and Mr. Shastri should have thought a thousand times before making the extraordinary speech he did at Allahabad. Does he want to make the administration a subservient branch of the Congress?

Book Review

THE LAST DAYS OF THE BRITISH RAJ by LEONARD MOSLEY. Published by Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1961. 25s.

In 1942 only five years before the advent of Indian independence, Mr. Winston Churchill had declared that he had not become the Prime Minister of Britain to liquidate her empire. But 1947 saw the unexpected and historic event take place in spite of the opposition of Tory diehard imperialists.

Britain left India after two hundred years of imperial sway, in many ways the most successful in history.

Dozens of books have told the story from many angles—reminiscent, administrative, journalistic. But the present book under review is perhaps the most considerable effort of sympathetic imagination that tries to capture the mood of the hour in Indian and Britisher alike, official and politician. It tries to do justice to all the parties involved in the fateful transaction. Mountbatten, Gandhiji, Jinnah, Sardar Patel, Nehru, Azad and last but not least the reforms commissioner V. P. Menon are vividly described and their decisive contributions to the final transfer of power are brought out impressively and convincingly.

The author was war correspondent in The Middle and Far East and Europe between 1939-45 when he had occasion to meet Indian leaders. He revisited India after Partition and spent three years

studying the records and interviewing the principal personalities of the story. The result is a human interest document that is bound to have value for the historian while it gives a fair and vivid account of the great event for contemporaries.

Many reflections are naturally started in us by the book, specially in Indian readers who have followed current events in the entire political epoch from the first world war of 1914-18, an epoch which may be called the Gandhian era.

One theme that recurs as one reads the book is that leaders have greater influence in starting a series of events and consequences than in controlling them to a predetermined end. The only group of men who fulfil their ambitions although with some sense of lack, is that led by Mohammad Ali Jinnah in his passion for Pakistan as a separate homeland for Muslims as a nation in their own right.

Gandhi is a tragic figure. He could not persuade Congress to accept his ultra-idealistic creed of non-violence, even to resist the Japanese. And his heart broke on the rocks of communal conflict of unprecedentedly savage proportions and quality reverting to the exploits of Chengiz-Khan.

The Boundary Force created by Mountbatten and the Interim Government dissolved in the irresistible cauldron of the Punjab holocaust. Famous contingents of the Indian Army ran amuck and many British officers lost their balance in resentment at the loss of empire. The pro-Muslim leanings of the British are frankly mentioned by the author, though he balances it by disparaging remarks on Congress leaders for their alleged hair-splitting and "legal" duplicity.

But he is right in indicating the unrealistic attitude of Nehru and the Congress leaders except Abdul Kalam Azad. They failed to realise the depth and tenacity of the Muslim sentiment for an equal share in the succession to the Moghul and British Raj.

Even in the Cripps proposals, there was a clear intention to Balkanise India if the British had to quit, for they included a provision to allow provinces to recede from the Union Government, if they did not wish to join. This was clearly to encourage the Muslims to revolt against Congress majority rule (which they interpreted as bound to become Hindu domination, in spite of the professions of secular nationalism and democracy of Nehru and Gandhi).

This fateful permission was included in the Cabinet Mission Plan later on. Moulana Azad was enthusiastic for it but Nehru and the others accepted it reluctantly and with mental reservations. Nehru blurted out his intention of changing it after the attainment of power, which alerted Jinnah who withdrew his support immediately.

Nehru had sufficient insight to see clearly the horror of such built-in provisions for civil war and chaos.

Mountbatten and his staff sent a simpler scheme for quitting for Cabinet approval which was equally bad. It aimed at withdrawing British power and British troops province by province even without a settlement for an agreed Centre. Nehru condemned it on sight, seeing its dangerous potentialities.

It was Mr. V. P. Menon's idea of Partition and

transfer of power to two central governments (India and Pakistan) on the basis of Dominion Status that won the day with the support of Sardar Patel.

Partition was thus the only means of an orderly transfer of power thereby avoiding chaos and civil war and necessitating foreign military intervention. Witness American intervention to rescue Greece in 1946 from communist guerilla havoc, (when Churchill pleaded British inability to do so herself).

One theme that recurs, as one reads the book is that leaders have greater influence in starting a series of dangerous consequences than in controlling them to a determined end. The only group who fulfil their ambition most nearly is that of Muslims under Jinnah.

Gandhiji is a tragic figure. Congress failed to follow him, in his ultra-idealistic dogma of non-violence even to resist the Japanese invaders, if they should advance from Burma and Malaya. Congress agreed to wage war against the Axis Powers if they were given power as the government of national India. But even for freedom, Gandhi was unwilling to agree to wage war. The Hindu-Muslim riots overwhelmed him and he lost himself in trying to pacify angry crowds in Bengal and Bihar and later in Delhi.

The British encouraged their friends the Muslims and the Princes, the former by providing for semi-sovereign provinces and the latter by freeing them from Paramountcy without transferring it to India as a successor Government. Partition solved the former problem, in a way. Sardar Patel solved the problem of the Princes.

The book is eminently readable and throws welcome light on the psychology of the parties to the transfer of power.

— M. A. Venkata Rao.

Gleanings from the Press

CONFERENCE TECHNIQUES

The Colombo mediators, as far as one can judge from available facts, are fortunately placed in contrast to these predecessors, due to Mr. Nehru's anxiety to keep them in the picture. This no doubt is due to Mr. Nehru's awareness that traditionally a victim of a potential or actual aggressor asks for trouble when he agrees to negotiations. Too many instances exist of this to be ignored. Before World War II, Austria negotiated directly with Nazi Germany and was swallowed up; Czechoslovakia allowed mediators to undermine her spirit of resistance and was lost; and, after war broke out, France negotiated a peace with Germany and only the existence of the French resistance and the support of the democratic nations brought about her post-war resurgence. In contrast, Abyssinia, Poland and Britain at different ranges refused to accept compromise in any form.

In contrast to the Congress attitude towards conferences, the Communist approach presents a more sinister picture—an approach not very different from the Communist attitude to war. It would be foolish to suppose that the Chinese Communists will attend a conference with India to give away any advantages which they feel they have secured by their aggression—particularly when India by the very fact of going to the conference indicates acquiescence in the aggression. In addition to the dis-

advantage from which democracies always suffer in talks with Communists, the Indian side is burdened with other defects. Firstly, there is no question of convincing the rest of the world because the rest of the world has already declared its feelings. Secondly, Mr. Nehru has no concessions to offer because he is pledged to evict the aggressor from Indian territory. Thirdly, over the past six years the points in dispute have been argued out between New Delhi and Peking, and the differences have proved unadjustable. Fourthly, the Chinese, as Mr. Nehru himself has conceded, are not amenable to world opinion.

— S. Natarajan in 'Opinion'

News & Views

KASHMIR A MATTER FOR SETTLEMENT BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Confirmation that Britain regards Kashmir as a matter to be settled between the Governments of India and Pakistan was given by the Duke of Devonshire, Minister of State for Commonwealth Relations, at question time in the House of Lords on February 12.

Asked by Lord Barnby what advice, if any, had been given to the Government of India to resolve quickly the Kashmir problem, and what the current ratio of British armament assistance was to Pakistan and India respectively, the Duke of Devonshire said: "Her Majesty's Government have, for many years, urged both the Governments of India and Pakistan to settle the Kashmir problem by mutual agreement. As the Commonwealth Secretary explained in the House of Commons on December 3, we have recently reiterated that advice. The nature of the solution of the Kashmir problem is a matter for the Governments of India and Pakistan.

"In answer to the second part of the question, there is no predetermined ratio of any sort between armament assistance to Pakistan and India."

Replying to another question, the Duke of Devonshire said: "I should make it quite clear to the House that the supply of arms recently given—and to be given—to India is solely for their use against China, and that it is clearly understood by the Indian Government."

INDIA IS HAVING UNEASY TRUCE: CHAGLA LONDON.

India will never trust China, Mr. M. C. Chagla, Indian High Commissioner to Britain, said, addressing an austerity dinner organized by the Indian Chamber of Commerce to raise money for the Indian Defence Fund. "I sometimes hear it said that now that the fighting has stopped in India there is no need for defence funds.

"That is a completely erroneous position. It is true that the fighting has stopped, but we are having an uneasy truce."

He added: "Even if ultimately there is a peaceful settlement between India and China, never again in our history will we accept the Himalayas as the natural frontier. We will never trust the Chinese again. It is, therefore, essential that we should be thoroughly prepared."

CHINESE TACTICS

The guerrilla warfare principle of withdrawing when the enemy advances is another reason for the cease-fire. When China advanced into Ladakh and the North East

Frontier Agency, India prepared for total war and Britain, the United States of America, and Canada came to the rescue.

Now with withdrawal, the heat goes down, and, most important, China has the opportunity to consolidate its gains. Mao Tse-tung's article, "On Protracted War" (1938), says that *war proceeds in stages: first, a base area is captured, then it is consolidated, then another attack is made.*

Tibet was captured in 1959 as the first base. In 1962, another forward move was made which must now be digested. In this regard, it should be recognized that once the McMahon Line is solidly breached by the Chinese, the Indians will be incapable of protecting the great plains below the mountains.

The line was originally drawn in 1912 on the British consideration that it represented the only line of defence against an army pouring down from the Tibetan plateau.

—Prof. Hsieh Cheng Ping

SLUGGISH WAR EFFORTS 'DUE TO PACIFISM'

Acharya J. B. Kripalani has blamed the Government for the fall in the tempo of the war efforts.

The Government's policy was such that people did not know what they were to fight for. Because of the efforts to appease China they did not know who their enemies were.

Acharya Kripalani was speaking on "End this appeasement" at a meeting arranged by the "Indians for Victory" at the K. C. College Hall, Bombay.

He said, the Chinese were fighting for the spread of communism and wanted to conquer our country, whereas India stood for an ideology which stood for spiritual and moral values.

All the Indians—Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis and others—knew that India's immortal values of "national dharma" must be preserved.

On the other hand, Prime Minister Nehru and his Government did not know what they had to fight for. "A time will come when the people will throw you aside and the people will go on fighting," he declared.

No country today could remain neutral. Except the United Arab Republic, the so-called non-aligned countries which participated in the Colombo Conference had come to terms with China.

CHINESE TROOPS MINE LADAKH LAKE AREA NEW DELHI.

The Chinese troops have mined the area west of the Spangur lake in Ladakh, which they occupied during the October-November invasion and part of which they have recently evacuated.

This is the interpretation given by the Chinese affairs experts to a recent Peking note alleging repeated intrusion into the area by Indian troops in "violation" of the cease-fire declared by the Chinese on Nov. 21.

The Chinese note, dated Feb. 7, says of two Indian soldiers who went into the area one of them trod upon and exploded a mine "which had been planted by Indian troops."

CONGRESS MP SUGGESTS ALL PARTY GOVERNMENT AND AUG. 15, 1947 LINE FOR CHINA TALKS

Mr. K. Hanumanthaiya, Congress M.P., called upon the Union Government recently to ally itself with the

anti-China nations to end the yellow peril for all times.

He was speaking on "Colombo Proposals" at the Law College Karnataka Sangha's valedictory function in Bangalore. Mr. B. Sadasiviah, Principal, presided.

Mr. Hanumanthaiya said, "India cannot fight China single-handed. So she should change her national policy of non-alignment and get modern military equipment from all friendly parts. If, in the other hand, the present policy is continued great danger can be expected."

"If the West had not come to her rescue at the hour of need, India would have been a satellite of China", he said and added that to win the 'battle of brains, we have to change the mode of fighting.'

He called upon party leaders to sink their differences, and help in preserving the democratic set-up of the country.

Reiterating his proposal to form an all-party national Government to achieve victory over the aggressor, Mr. Hanumanthaiya recalled former President Rajendra Prasad's appeal for forming a "Government of talented men."

He asked his colleagues in Parliament to stand by the "August 15, 1947 line as against September 8, 1957 line."

PRIVATE, PUBLIC SECTORS 'CASTE' DISTINCTION MUST GO

CALCUTTA.

The visiting spokesmen of the British Iron and Steel Institute recently strongly deprecated the caste distinction between the public and private sectors.

"It is a pity," Mr. M. A. Fiennes, president of the institute, said at a news conference, "that there should be this caste distinction. They are both working for India, no matter who owns what."

So long as the distinction was maintained, it would serve as a disincentive to the investors, he said.

Sir Charles Goodeve, a former president of the institute, pointed out that in the United Kingdom one would not know which industry was in the public sector and which in the private one. They were both treated alike.

They made these observations in reply to a question on the prospects of Equity participation by foreign investors in India.

Prefacing their answer with the qualification "it all depends," they gave indication of their preparedness for minority participation in Government or private enterprises. In ordinary circumstances, because of the low per capita consumption, investment in steel in India "is a sure finner," they said.

The only difficulty was about the curious political atmosphere." A foreign investor would first like to know whether the Government wanted it before committing himself to capital investment in India.

It was "bad business," they said, to go on building projects on loans. The day would come when, with the best intentions, there would not be the necessary foreign exchange to pay back the loans, they warned.

They did not know of any country in the world where industries were based on 100 per cent in loans.

Instead, the better course would be to invite foreign capital, so that the capital remained in the country and only the returns were repatriated, they added.

LAND REFORMS HAVE ONLY DONE HARM TRIVANDRUM.

Dr. Punjab Rao Deshmukh, has expressed the view that agrarian reforms have done only harm and no good to the country.

The reforms have not helped to increase production or give land to the landless, he said, speaking to newsmen here this night.

Dr. Deshmukh who arrived here to study the working of the State unit of the Farmers' Forum of which he is the president, urged that agrarian reforms should not be undertaken merely as a vote-catching device or as an ideological issue.

Agrarian reforms in the country, the former Agriculture Minister asserted, had not benefited any class of people but only done some damage.

Production had been hampered in many places, agriculturists were indifferent to cultivation and investment was shy. This was the outcome of the reforms, he said.

Dr. Deshmukh pointed out that there was very little land available for distribution to the landless.

He also stressed that the ceiling should not be very low in which case it would affect production.

He and the Farmers' Forum supported land reforms designed to increase production, Dr. Deshmukh added.

GIFT OF THE MONTH!!!

Choose your gift books from the following list:

1. Land Problem by Bhailalbhai Patel.
2. The Slavery of our Times by Leo Tolstoy.
3. Individualistic Anarchism by Henry Meulen.
4. Why Wages Rise by F. A. Harper.
5. Modern Idolatry by Jeffery Mark.
6. A Decade of Mao's China by Dr. Chandrasekhar.
7. The Science of Society by Stephen Pearl Andrews.
8. The Causes of Business Depression by Hugo & Biligram.
9. Dialectical Materialism by Phillip Spratt.
10. Root is Man Dwight Macdonald.

Note: This offer is for only new subscribers enlisting during March.

Write to:

The Indian Libertarian, Arya Bhavan,
Sandhurst Road West, Bombay-4.

Statement about ownership and other particulars about newspapers (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 newspapers 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 Nivas, Vincent Road, Bombay 19. 3. Mr. T. Balraj, 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. Mehta (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, 1963.

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

B O M B A Y 4 .

Telephone : 7 0 2 0 5

Telegram : **LOTEWALA**