

D
17 E

Indian berian

Vol. V No. 5

1 May 1957

Incorporating the 'Free Economic Review'

INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY
AND LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

Xm2, N5

IN THIS ISSUE

AMERICAN ARMING OF PAKISTAN

Motives Analysed

P.S.P.—“A Boneless Wonder”

Our Deceptive Foreign Policy

Make English the Lingua Franca of India

Unless specified publication of matter does not necessarily mean editorial endorsement

Price 15 Naye Paise

The Indian Libertarian

Independent Journal of Economic and Public Affairs

Edited by

MISS KUSUM LOTWALA

Published on the 1st and 15th of Each month

Single Copy 15 Naye Paise Annual Rs. 3.50

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

EDITORIAL	3
Land Reform—True & False		
By M. A. Venkata Rao		5
P.S.P.—A Boneless Wonder	7
A View-Point on Libertarian Society		
By James Kiely		7
In Defence of Israel By Sumanth Bankeshwar		8
American Arming of Pakistan By "Kamal"		9
Tito Hits at Moscow	11
Radical as Well as Humanist		
By Sushil Bhadra		12
Vigilant's Reply to Mr. Bhadra	..	13
Revolutionising Indian Life		
By Dr. K. N. Kini		14
"Waging Peace" By John F. Dulles	..	15
Our Deceptive Foreign Policy	..	17
BOOK REVIEWS	18

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		

COVER PAGE

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

Arya Bhuvan,
Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

Join

THE LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE

For

**Enlightened Views on Politics, Economics and
Sociology.**

A Certificate Course in Social Sciences will be started under the auspices of the Institute from May 1, 1957. Classes will be held twice a week in the evening in the premises of the Institute and conducted by eminent lecturers. Books may be borrowed from the well-equipped Library of the Institute. Examinations for awarding certificates will be held at the end of the whole Course.

For details apply to:

The Director,
LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE,
Arya Bhuvan,
Sandhurst Road,
BOMBAY 4.

R E A D

THE LIBERTARIAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY
THE LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE
Editor: B. S. SANYAL

CONTENTS OF VOL I. NO. I:

1. A Statement of Purpose
2. The Libertarian Perspective
by M. V. Balakrishna Rao.
3. Monopolies by Benjamin F. Tucker.
4. Justice With Freedom by K. D. Valicha.
5. A Survey of Rationalist Thought by
B. S. Sanyal.
6. Notes & Appraisements:
(i) Kashmir (ii) Politics of Freedom
(iii) Security and the Middle East.

Price As. 8 per copy; Annual Subscription Rs. 2.50

Apply to the Research Director,

R. L. FOUNDATION
Arya Bhuvan,
Sandhurst Road, BOMBAY 4

Editorial

EGYPT, ISRAEL AND INDIA

PRESIDENT NASSER continues his intransigence in regard to Israel's right of navigation through the Suez Canal and through the gulf of Aquaba to Eilath. He has no doubt, under India's advice, agreed to refer disputes about the interpretation of the Convention of 1888 to the World Court. But so far as Israel is concerned, he has nullified his concession with the stipulation that he will not allow her to send her ships through the Canal and the Gulf of Aquaba so long as she refuses to take back and rehabilitate the ten million refugees who fled from Palestine during the Israel-Arab war ten years ago. This is a new condition not intended to be the final one. For if it is perchance fulfilled, Egypt will no doubt find other reasons to put off a settlement, for Nasser and the Arab States have made no secret of their intention to wipe the Israeli State off the map.

Now there can be no approach towards the settlement of this problem until the Great Powers or the UN come to a decision on this issue and guarantee Israel's existence with all the resources at their command. The Western Powers (and even India) have made it known that they regard Israel as having come *to stay*. They should, therefore, make Col. Nasser understand once for all that they will *not* tolerate policies making for the destruction of Israel as an Independent State. This is the beginning of the resolution of the tangle. But knowing that Russia will surely make use of such an open guarantee in the cold war to rally the Arab world to her side, they are soft-pedalling this policy.

India And "Cold War"

But India is not committed to the cold war. On the contrary, she condemns the Powers for employing cold war strategies too often. But why does she encourage President Nasser in his tactics of using the cold war for his own benefit and to the detriment of Israel?

The Israeli Foreign Minister Mrs. Gold Meir complained that India does *not* extend to her the benefit of her impartial and benevolent attitude. The Indian attitude to Israel is a puzzle to many Indian citizens themselves. We preach fearless impartiality to others but we are afraid to recognise the justice of Israel's point of view in this dispute of hers with Arab nations.

Why should Mr. Krishna Menon argue that the Gulf of Aquaba falls within the territorial waters of Egypt and Saudi Arabia so as to justify the refusal of these States to allow passage to Israeli ships through it? But Israel, too, has a strip of territory at the head of the Gulf and as such she, too, has the right of territorial waters in the area. Egypt denies access to Israeli ships through the Canal as well, in the face of the stipulation in the Convention of 1888

(which Egypt professes to respect) that ships of member nations should be allowed to use the Canal in peace and war. Thus even granting the claim that the war between Israel and Egypt is not yet concluded, Egypt has no right to exclude Israeli ships.

India's Standing on Two Stools

In this matter India is contravening her own declared policy of non-intervention and non-alignment. She is intervening actively in the dispute of Egypt with Britain and France, in fact aiding and abetting her to the detriment of her own national interest. The goodwill (or at least the absence of illwill) on the part of the Western Powers is a greater good to us than the favour of Egypt. In this case as well, India is flouting the tested maxim of Kautilyan diplomacy that rulers should *not* trust those who should *not* be trusted. Nor has India secured any reciprocity. Egypt has *not* yet declared that she supports India's stand on Kashmir. No Muslim power has yet said so. Yet we side Islamic States blindly.

Railway from Turkey to Pakistan and Iran

The papers announced recently that the USA has agreed to aid the construction of a railway between Karachi and Teheran and from Turkey to Pakistan. No doubt this is part of the military strategy of the USA and Britain to *contain* Soviet Russia and is an extension of the military aid being given to Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Pakistan, the so-called Baghdad Pact States. We have nothing *directly* against this development but we have to note the *indirect* consequences of these alliances (sponsored by the Western Powers) to the future of our own country.

The governing fact in this situation, from the long range standpoint of Indian security, is the feebleness of the national sentiment among Islamic States. These alliances and the habit of collaboration, that they will engender and develop, are likely to carry over in the next period into the fusion of Muslim States into a federation or empire. Turkey, Pakistan and Egypt are competing for the leadership of this bloc. Iran is said to be busy now trying to convene a conference of Islamic States to persuade the Arab states, led by Egypt to join the Baghdad bloc. And our champion-ship of Nasser will not bring us any comfort, when such a consolidation of Muslim States matures. We should remember the historic attitude of those States to India, as the land they had invaded and looted and ruled times without number in the past. If modern India is to escape such a fate again, she has to be coldly realistic and more historical in her policy-making. If we do not wish to prevent such a consolida-tion, we might, at least, refrain from policies that are sure to aid and abet the process unwittingly.

Panchashila Is Fading

The Prime Minister of Poland Cyrankewicz declared that his country stood by the policy of Panchashila. It was a breath-taking statement for Poland is a member of the Warsaw Pact and is an unwilling satellite of Soviet Russia. She is no more free to pursue independent national policies than is Hungary. The first principle of Panchashila is respect for the sovereignty of nations which respect is *not* conceded to Poland and Hungary by Russia.

How in spite of this situation Poland can declare her adherence to Panchashila is to be interpreted only as the expression of a profound and heart-felt Wish.

Chou En-lai visited Hungary and Poland and issued joint statements with the representatives of those States declaring China's full approval of Russia's recent ruthless suppression of national aspirations in these countries. China is the kind of ally that Soviet Russia wants. Soviet Russia does not want *fence-sitting friends* like India, who insist on freedom of judgement and swear by non-involvement. That is why she has not so far voted on the Indian side in the UN in the Kashmir dispute. She *vetoed* only that part of the resolution which sought to induct UN Troops into Kashmir—an area which touches her territory above the Afghan border. But she abstained in the amended resolution that authorised the Jarring Mission. If she really believed that Kashmir belonged to India by right as Bulganin and Khrushchev declared on Indian soil during their visit, she should have voted for India at *every stage*.

It is clear that India can win Soviet support only on Soviet terms—which is a price too high to pay. Russia has no use for Panchashila and determining every question on its merits. What is the criterion of the merits or demerits of a question? Obviously the contribution they make to the advancement of the goal of Russian policy namely, world power.

Pakistan's Attack On India

The question now that Jarring has left India, is no longer—Will Pakistan attack India or not? but When she will do so? If there are still innocents in India, misled by her “idealistic” leaders who think that the attack will not come off are living in a fool’s paradise. The camp of the Muhajirin or Razakars at Wagah, led by the notorious Allama Mashriqui of the Islamic League is reported to have been moved further inwards on the Pakistan side. But suppose his volunteers march into India. If armed, perhaps our Buddhist leaders will let our armed forces resist them. But if they come unarmed, as Indian satyagrahis marched into Goa, what will our Buddhist-cum-Hamletian authorities do? Will they let them advance deep into our territory? If they are allowed to do so, they can take Kashmir ‘laughing.’

“Hanske lia Pakistan, Ladke layenge Hindustan.” This was the cry shortly after the ill-fated partition. Now it looks as though they have no need do any fighting!

Sri Krishna Menon

Sri Krishna Menon is reported to have said that the criticism of India's policy regarding Kashmir made

by Indian nationals during his advocacy of India's case before the UN at Lake Success was “*a stab in the back*.” This statement along with the other that he made in Parliament while dealing with the criticism of Mr. Kripalani cautioning members from speaking freely on international affairs lest the foreign Press make unfair use of it, mark a new stage in the development of official intolerance of free criticism. It is the end of the wedge destined to cut off the whole Fundamental Right of Freedom of Speech. Leaders of Public Opinion have to watch and nip this tendency in the bud.

Sri Krishna Menon also made another significant statement equally deserving attention. It was that if India conceded Pakistan's right to the area that she is holding illegally beyond the cease-fire line, she will only encourage the enemy to ask for more. It is something that wisdom seems to be dawning at last on our policy-makers. This point was stressed in grave accents to the present writer in 1948 in Delhi by a Sikh sepoy. He said that if we allow the Pakistanis to retain their ill-gotten gain, they will press for more in the Punjab and demand Delhi itself! But what have the Indian authorities to offer as an answer to this demand, if they declare beforehand that they will not use force in defence of India's rights? Why should they make such self-stultifying promises and declarations? They are not sanyasis and ascetics. Even if they were, they have no right to sign away the rights of their country. Arms are given to them to use in defence of their country and not as an ornament for display in parades. Something is wrong with the philosophy of our leaders.

FROM A LIBERTARIAN'S LIBRARY

Variety And NOT Regimentation

Is The Law Of Nature

There has never been nor will there ever be a time when all men are equal in their capacities and conditions here on earth. The nature of the individual as well as the nature and continuity of human society, demands these unfailing differences. Without the wide diversification of talents, tastes, abilities, and ambitions that now and always exist among men, Society could neither feed nor clothe itself. It is consequently a wise provision of providence that causes the perpetuation of endless variety in the desires and capabilities of human beings.. Sparked with personal liberty and the natural personal incentive to own property and advance economically, this conglomeration of inequality synchronizes into a great engine for the sustenance and progress of mankind.

Land Reform—True and False

By M. A. Venkata Rao

THIE Zamindari System has been abolished by law i.e. by force. Though there is a case for such abolition of the artificial class of revenue collectors for Government (created by the British long ago as a convenience of administration in Northern India,) there is none for the manner in which it was put through under the impulsion of ill-digested slogans. The guiding slogan was furnished by communist technique, namely "land to the tiller." The appeal of the cry derives plausibility because of the idea that there should be no middlemen, or at least, unnecessary middlemen, between the cultivator and the State. It is a question whether the class of Zamindars was really one of unnecessary middlemen. However, the great harm that the measure did to the stability and progress of society flows from the blow it gave to the institution of private property. Socialism and communism are committed to the abolition of private property, and it was in pursuance of socialism that the Zamindari was abolished with inadequate compensation.

Inherently Wrong Idea

The basic idea of socialism, namely the abolition of private property is inherently wrong. What is necessary for progress is only the limitation of private property to prevent monopoly and unjust use or non-use. If the Zamindar was not able to cultivate all his lands, or was unable to afford the capital necessary for improved methods of agriculture, all that was necessary was to create institutions like co-operative societies to make such facilities available. And to help those who were able to cultivate land, but were unable to obtain it on account of the paucity of such land, open to purchase on the free market, the State could have imposed ceilings above which lands were to be sold compulsorily to peasant bidders at the market rate. Land mortgage banks could have paid spot cash to Zamindars recovering it with a low rate of interest from the purchaser over a long period of time. This was the Danish way of re-distribution of land. It was a civilised way without the destruction of property rights *in toto* and the destruction of a whole class.

New Era Of Tyranny

Now we are approaching the second stage in this policy of vandalism; again under the glamour of the same slogan "land to the tiller." For, the abolition of the Zamindari did not solve the land problem. It only substituted the State for the Zamindar, which is not reform. In fact, it ushered in a new era of tyranny worse than the old, for the State is less easy to deal with by the cultivator than the old Zamindar.

Today the State is committed to the fulfilment of

the promise, contained in the slogan of "land to the tiller." And since land is held over the greater part of the country by two classes of persons—absentee landowners and cultivating peasants—the cry of "land to the tiller" involves the abolition of the class of landowners. Now the landowners are quite different in regard to their status from Zamindars. While the Zamindar owed his rights over land to the State, in return for the service of collecting land revenue, being only a tax farmer or contractor or licensee, the landowner in the ryotwari areas has acquired his rights in the land by fair purchase in the open market. His property rights were acquired through cash purchase. The present policy of depriving him of his right over his lands for the purpose of transferring them to the tenant, at rates of compensation to be determined by the State, stands on an altogether different footing from the policy of abolishing the Zamindari. It amounts to liquidation of real property, acquired legally in exchange for cash accumulated over the years through hard work, fair earning and thrifty savings.

People have to consider this proposal to liquidate the property of non-cultivating owners seriously and realise its economic and social implications before they permit the Government to proceed with this supposed reform. They have to inquire whether there is not an alternative way of realising the objective of enabling tillers to own lands sufficient for profitable cultivation at higher levels of production.

We have to consider whether there is any justification for liquidation of the property right of landowners, who have acquired them by purchase in the open market, in favour of cultivators and tenants. Some tenants are proprietors in their own right for part of the land they cultivate, while they are tenants in respect of other lands held by absentee or non-cultivating owners.

Socialist Interpretation Is Wrong

A class can be abolished with justice only if it is a parasite like that of beggars. Parasites perform no function but annex unfairly a share in the income earned by others. Many speculators in real estate and stocks and shares belong to this class of parasites. It should be considered whether landowners are comparable to this class of functionless exploiters. Now socialism uses the term "exploitation" in a very wide sense to include the earnings of all trade and industrial production. Every form of economic exchange, whether in commerce, capitalist production, transport, or agriculture, except the proceeds of labour, is considered to be "Exploitation" by socialist thinkers. That is why they advocate the abolition of private property, in any shape or form. But are we to accept this view of communism (Marxist Socialism) at its face value,

simply because the slogan "land to the tiller" is repeated and acquires the status of justice by the Goebbelsian salesmanship of the "Big Lie" shamelessly reiterated day in and day out, without any attempt at rational justification?

But there is a genuine justification for the emergence and continued recognition of the class of landowners. They may be middle men between the cultivator and the State. But they perform a genuine economic and social function.

One such function is that of enabling landless cultivators to have the use of land that they cannot purchase on terms of crop sharing. The class of tenants is enabled to have the use of land with a share in the agricultural product without the responsibility of paying land revenue. There is here a partnership between capital and labour with the proceeds of farming divided between them in accordance with custom. It may be that the proportion of the share accruing to each of the partners' needs revision. Usually the proportion is fifty fifty. Recently Mr. C. Rajagopalachari revised it to forty sixty in Madras tilting the balance in favour of the tenants. Other measures like the provision of facilities (credit, co-operative marketing and purchase etc.,) can be made through State loans and Land Mortgage Bank advances to make landless tillers purchase land in the neighbourhood from owners who have surplus lands. A ceiling can be fixed above which lands should be sold to bidders at market rates if they wish to buy them. This was the Danish way.

III-Digested Imitation Of Foreign Ideas

But the present policy of taking land forcibly from the landowner, and giving it to tenants and landless labourers at nominal rates, amounting to ten or fifteen years' revenue assessment has no justification whatever. It introduces vandalism as the foundation of the new socialistic pattern of society. And vandalism can never make for stability and progress. It creates the psychology of expecting "something for nothing" on the part of large sections of needy persons. It stimulates greed and gives it a coating of normal respectability. It popularises the false doctrine that all wealth is the result of unearned income and is tantamount to robbery. "All property is theft," said a socialist author, and this is acted on seriously by our leaders today.

This is the product of ill-digested imitation of foreign ideas. There is a case for the taxation of unearned income whether from land or buildings or machine-using factory. This was proposed by Mr. Henry George. Today it has taken the shape of taxation of capital gains. Land revenue assessment is raised from time to time for the purpose of obtaining a share for the State in the unearned enhancement of land value from the economic development of the country. To create a sense of confidence in the mind of the owner and to enable him to derive the benefits of capital investment, the interval is fixed at reasonably long periods. Twenty years of undisturbed possession and use have been found to be necessary to give a real chance to the owner to invest capital in improvements and to derive a reasonable income on an average over the period allowing for bad seasonal conditions for

other disasters like floods or drought. Stability of tenure for reasonable periods is a *sine qua non* of property in land and of progress through incentive.

Landowners And Their Social Function

There is another social function that is performed by landownership. It is to provide an avenue to secure investment yielding a certain average level of income, particularly in food grains. Stability of property rights in land has historically provided an incentive to countless small businessmen, officials and others to save and invest in land. The hope of assuring for themselves and their children and dependents a form of income chiefly in food grains has helped many generations of people to plan their lives from a long term point of view. The possibility of having food assured for oneself and family has been a great moulder of character. It has helped people to subordinate the allurements of current consumption to prospects of more enduring consumption in the future. It has created a sober, self-reliant class of householders who achieve *freedom from hunger* by their own efforts and savings without leave of bureaucrat, dictator or capitalist. Land investment has been an avenue of real freedom in the basic factors of food and has combined with investment in houses to produce a class of thrifty, self-reliant, self-controlled class of citizens. This is surely the main aim of a republican society and if landownership secured through savings from genuine earnings over a life-time can assure this result, surely it is a consummation to be devoutly wished for and retained, as the basic policy of republican society and constitution.

The word republican in the name of communist States is a misnomer and travesty of the truth. Real republicanism lives in independent or self-dependent citizens who plan their own lives and carry them out without fear or favour. It is the duty of republican State to create stable conditions of property and taxation to encourage such citizens to fulfil their own plans of life without interfering with each other unduly.

From this point of view, the preservation of the class of landowners is indispensable. The slogan "land to the tiller" should not blind us to the need for the preservation of the class of peasant proprietors and landowners, with facilities for successful tenants to acquire land through fair purchase. The right way to build a free economy and free society is to relate property to function. Such function includes individual self-fulfilment as well as social contribution.

Reliance On State Is Not Conducive To Human Welfare

IN proportion as each individual relies on the helpful vigilance of the State, he learns to abandon to its responsibility the fate and well-being of his fellow citizens. But the inevitable tendency of such abandonment is to deaden the living force of sympathy and to render the natural impulse to mutual assistance inactive.

—Wilhem von Humboldt

P.S.P.--“A Boneless Wonder”

THE Praja Socialist Party is a “boneless wonder.” In West Bengal, the P.S.P. feels no qualms about forming an alliance with the Communists on the basis of a minimum programme, to the point of looking forward to forming a coalition government. But in Kerala ideological reasons preclude the P.S.P. from co-operating with the C.P.I., and no one questions the wisdom of this strategy. But one cannot help noticing the ideological contradiction.

All the more amazing is the logic applied by the P.S.P. to explain its strange alliance with the Muslim League in Kerala. The Muslim League in the State is “not communal except in name,” Mr. Prem Bhasin, the spokesman of the P.S.P. protested to newsmen. He went on to console himself with the thought that “in spite of all efforts, Mr. Jinnah could not organise his party in that State, and it was only after independence that the League was formed.”

A Wrong Statement

Who told him that there was no Muslim League in Malabar before independence? Indeed, the Moplahs, who form the bulk of the Muslims of Malabar, have been noted for their religious orthodoxy and Malabar has been a stronghold of Muslim communalism, all long, from days long before independence. After independence, when the Muslim League had died

practically in the entire country, successful efforts were made in the South to revive the Muslim League, and the Malabar Muslims were in the forefront of that move.

In any case, the point at issue is whether the P.S.P. has no objection to associating itself with communalism. When Mr. Bhasin says that the Kerala Muslim League was “purely Indian,” and that it was started after independence, he seems to suggest that P.S.P. has no objection to communalism provided it is indigenous and is born after independence.

P.S.P. Support To Reactionaries

The P.S.P. support to the feudal, reactionary Ganatantra Parishad in Orissa as against the Congress is equally difficult to explain in the context of the party's claim to be socialist, progressive and secular.

In the meantime, a direct victim of the P.S.P.'s dabbling in a retrogressive movement like “linguism” is Mr. Asoka Mehta, an active and very capable front-rank leader of the party, who was defeated because of the lukewarm support, if not opposition, from his own party men operating from the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti platform. Mr. Mehta's absence from Parliament is a major loss to the P.S.P. and of course he will be missed by the entire Parliament.

—Times of India

A View-Point On

Libertarian Society

By James Kielty

THE tendency on the part of even libertarians to confuse libertarianism and utopianism is regrettable, for libertarianism can only be conceived of as an acceptance of the problems of human existence, and willingness to share in these problems and to take responsible action without supposing that any action will provide more than temporary solution.

Libertarianism, in other words, attempts to relate, at all times action to reality rather than imposing an institutional form upon ideas that can only at certain point and instance correspond to reality. Any one who is flippant enough, at this point, to ask what is reality, has missed the essential point. Reality has no verbal equivalent and this makes institutionalising process an idiotic one since verbal construction such as laws, mandates, and dogmas cannot correspond to something that is non-verbal and obviously highly unstable.

Basis Of Libertarian Society

If any one conceives of a libertarian society as being anything but a series of profound headaches, has been deceived. Libertarianism is not attractive because it will make life easier. Quite to the contrary. It is attractive because it would allow a whole society equal responsibility.

For the same reason, its achievements would be enormously difficult and its “Stability” (a word that probably should never enter into the discussion) at all times threatened. That again, however, is an essential point. There could never be a libertarian society without a general acceptance of responsibility and a general sharing of power. If a majority of society wished to shun responsibility and hand over power to a minority that wanted it, libertarianism would cease to exist as a social or quasipolitical system.

Turn over

Limitations Of Democracy

While a democratic society is a step on the road to libertarian society, its institutional and legal framework insures its decay and corruption as each individual becomes increasingly a victim rather than participant in the society's encumbering framework. At present "democracy" consists of a great number of organised groups exercising pressure for or against specific rather than universal aims.

A libertarian society would require a whole group that was essentially aimless. It would require a whole group that would have no truck with the concept of "hope"; that would act on the basis of

substituting for the intolerable the less intolerable, rather than acting on the basis of "solving the problem" or "making things right."

It would not be a society involved in the concept of a "better" world, thereby carrying with it always the immense burden of the "worse." Rather, it would move and catch from problem to problem allowing circumstances, spontaneous genius and the space of events that we call time to lift it over each hump and out of every depression. It would, in other words, act exactly as we do, but it would recognise that that was what it was doing.

—*Freedom (London)*

IN DEFENCE OF ISRAEL

By Sumant S. Bankeshwar

OUR whole foreign policy stems from a wrong reading of the history of aggressive Communism and Islam. While at least some of our responsible leaders and a section of our press are slowly realising the dangers inherent in our pro-Soviet foreign policy, nobody seems to appreciate the menace of Pan-Islam to the freedom and democracy of India which is no less dangerous than international communism, if not more. The immediate danger to the freedom of our country is not from Red China or Russia but from the consolidation of Islam under a single federation of all Muslim states from Morocco to Indonesia, and the whole Muslim world is hovering today between Pakistan and Egypt for leadership.

National Interests

Now that India is on friendly terms with both Red China and Russia and because they know well that America is sure to come to our rescue if they try to annex India, there is no immediate danger to our freedom from the aggressive international communism. But if we were to be attacked by aggressive Pakistan, no power bloc would intervene in favour of us, nor could we expect any help from Burma, Ceylon or Indonesia which are supposed to be our best friends. The only country which we may consider as a dependable ally is Israel, whose freedom is equally threatened by aggressive Pan-Islam. Under these circumstances, why should India support the aggressive Pan-Islamic policy of the Egyptian dictator against our ally Israel? Further, although Pakistan was clearly an aggressor in Kashmir, Egypt has so far not sided with India on the question of Kashmir. Why should we take her side now against Israel? Our foreign policy must be strictly based on reciprocity and guided by enlightened national self-interest. The immediate danger to the freedom of our country is from aggressive Pan-Islam and the potential danger is from international communism.

The recent action of Israel in Egypt was unanimously condemned by all in India without making

any attempt to understand the facts. What are the facts? Was the Israeli action in Egypt an unprovoked aggression on peaceful and innocent Egypt? Can we afford to forget the attack in 1948 of 7 Arab nations comprising a population of 40 millions on newly established Israel comprising a population of less than two millions, the bellicose outbursts of Col. Nasser and his threats to liquidate Israel, the repeated violations of the armistice line by Egypt and her Arab allies, Col. Nasser's military pacts with Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan and his establishment of a joint command with these countries, his piling up of arms and ammunition, the military aid from the communist countries his war preparations for a final showdown with Israel which Israel could have ignored only at her peril?

Some Questions

Was not Israel continuously harassed by the Arab nations? Did not Egypt consider herself to be in a state of war with Israel? Can you even technically call the Israeli action in Egypt "aggression" when Egypt had been considering herself to be in a state of war with Israel for the past 8 years? Hence, was not the Israeli action in Egypt just a counter offensive and a continuation of the war declared by 7 Arab nations against Israel in 1948?

The whole pro-Egyptian policy of our Congress Government stems from its desire not to offend Muslim sentiment in the slightest lest it may lose the Muslim vote without which the Congress can never hope to come to power, and is only an extension of its age-old traditional policy of appeasing and pampering the Muslim minority in India. This fact has been borne out by the latest general elections when the Congress could secure less than 50% Hindu votes and over 70% Muslim votes.

If our leaders are not saints but diplomats and lovers of freedom and democracy, we should cultivate friendship with Israel and the democratic countries of the West led by America as a counter-weight to the Islamic and Communist menace to the freedom of India.

Motives Analysed

AMERICAN ARMING OF PAKISTAN

By "Kamal"

IT is as unfortunate as it is true that we are not having very excellent Indo-American relations. U.S.A. has given us substantial economic aid, much more than U.S.S.R. Only the other day the Government of India, the Ford Foundation and the U.S. steel industry entered into a tripartite agreement to train some 1,000 Indians into higher steel technology in the States. Earlier they helped us out of a serious famine by donating 30 lakh tons of wheat. And yet there is a feeling of deep disquiet *vis-a-vis* America. The explanation for this lies almost entirely in American arming of Pakistan.

The Present Situation

We in this country can never view it as anything but an unfriendly act. The onus of proof of innocence lies wholly on American shoulders. But as yet there is no attempt at dispelling our doubts. We are sorry to note that with the passage of time the doubts are, if anything, only deepening.

Two weeks back Ambassador Hildreth gave Pakistan "credit" for honouring all the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council. In the same week Ambassador Bunker said that American arms could be used against any aggression and not only the communist variety. He dismissed the very real question of American attitude in case of a Pak attack on India as "hypothetical." So that Pakistan could use U.S. arms to war on us to repel "Indian aggression in Kashmir," and U.S.A. then would take its own time to let U.N.—decide—or not decide—who was the aggressor.

At the Bermuda talks Eisenhower and MacMillan agreed that atomic weapons should be stocked with American armies abroad, so that in case of war they could be easily transferred to allied armies. And there is the report that Pakistan has "agreed" with Ike's personal representative Richards, to have American forces on its territory.

We cannot afford to fall out far apart, it would hurt both of us. And we cannot manage to fall apart either, since our basic unities of faith in democracy and freedom bind us together in an abiding friendship. It is therefore all the more distressing that we should suffer the present coolness of relations.

The intelligent Indian tries to understand why exactly U.S.A. is arming Pakistan. The avowed object of this arming is "defence against communism." Now communism, we agree, is a bad thing. But how does this arming work out in practice? How does it defend Pakistan, Bharat, U.S.A. or anybody against communism?

In the first place defence is against attack. The assumption is that Pakistan is under actual or potential

danger of communist attack. But where is it? The high Himalayas and the rugged State of Afghanistan separate the two States of Russia and Pakistan. Is it seriously to be believed that Pakistan is under threat of Russian attack? If at all Russia ever decides on aggressive expansion it would strike out against Turkey or Iran—at once easier to attack, and more profitable to grab, than Pakistan. Why should it ever attack Pakistan?

And why is U.S.A. unmoved by Pakistan Foreign Minister's repeated statement that the one and only enemy of Pakistan is India? Mr. Bunker told his press conference last week that he was not aware of such a statement. We hope he has since looked up the files. Will he deny that Malik Feroze Khan Noon did say these things—and that more than once?

What Is "Subversion"?

What then is the American motive in arming Pakistan? Could it be directed against internal "subversion"? We do not know, but where are communists in Pakistan? What is their number and influence? Pakistan is a feudal State. If there is a movement for distribution of land to the tiller, would it be right to suppress it as "subversive"? If there is a movement in East Bengal to cast off the role of a colony to West Pakistan, could it be rightly suppressed as subversive? Is not U.S.A. underwriting the *status quo* in Pakistan by supporting the ruling cliques against the will and the interest of the people?

The Pak-American Military Pact was signed by Mohammed Ali of Bogra, erstwhile Ambassador in U.S.A., who had been installed in office as the result of a palace revolution. What is the legitimacy of a pact forged under these circumstances?

Pak People Against Military Pacts

The East Bengal United Front routed the Muslim League. One of its more important planks was opposition to military pacts. East Bengal constitutes the majority of the population of Pakistan. In West Pakistan also the Nationalist Party led by Mr. G. M. Syed is opposed to military pacts. And this party is strong enough to have threatened the existence of Dr. Khan Sahib Ministry—and so precipitated Governor's rule there. Strangely enough, even the Muslim League, for very different reasons, is critical of the Arms Pact. Under these circumstances, is not the military pact an anti-people act, an imposition on the people of Pakistan without their consent and against their will? When Hamidul Haq of U.F. became Foreign Minister he said that there were certain secret clauses to this Pact. What are these? One of the known provisions is that no party can end the Pact without a 12-month

notice period. Uncharitable critics would say that this notice period is prescribed to enable the U.S.A. to manipulate the situation, should an anti-Pact party—or parties—ever manage to come into power in Pakistan.

Could it be that American arming of Pakistan is directed against the danger of Bharat going communist? U.S.A. might think that the presence of American arms—and may be armies—in the Indian peninsula is necessary to prevent communism coming into power in India or Pakistan.

Nehru's Responsibility

We do not know to what extent—if any—this thinking obtains in the policy-making circles of U.S.A. But should it be there, our own government's responsibility for its existence would not be small. Pt. Nehru's thesis that communism is all right, only Indian communists are bad, is as contradictory, as it is atrocious. How can communism be good, but communists bad? Communists and communism are one and the same thing. We know communism by communists, and communists by communism. Each explains the other. Pt. Nehru, by praising communism gives respectability to communists. His extraordinary reception to communist leaders, and his no less extraordinary stand on Hungary, has made him suspect in American eyes. His explosive friend Shri. Menon is a sizeable factor in the present state of Indo-American relations. We also concede that these two nose-pokers of Indian diplomacy have a good share in our misunderstanding.

But why can't U.S.A. see that in this particular respect Pt. Nehru's responses are purely personal, unsupported by public opinion? Is it not vitiating the battle of freedom for the minds of men by backing a state like Pakistan against a great country like India? Why is U.S.A. spoiling relations with Bharat, just because it does not fancy Pt. Nehru, or his peripatetic friend? Pt. Nehru is an individual; India is an abiding entity. Our present relations will become part of history. Is not U.S.A. being short-sighted in darkening the pages of history?

Considering all the aspects of the situation it may be said with a fair measure of confidence that Bharat will never go communist. The whole thing is entirely against our grain. We have a stable polity, a progressive economy, a conservative tradition and a highly individualistic culture.. Our country is very much orientated towards the West because of two centuries of intimate association with that part of the world. Under these circumstances how far U.S.A. would be justified in taking overt steps in anticipation of a national possibility? Is it not, by such an attitude, only making communism a little less impossible in our country?

A Psychological Problem

Its arming of Pakistan forces us to buy more arms, and so retards our economic development, which is the only real and complete antidote to communist propaganda.

We know that if U.S.A. goes on arming Pakistan, more and more, it will queer the pitch for India. We

cannot run, for all times, an arms race in which Pakistan gets its arms free and we have to pay for ours. Russia does not have the necessary surpluses to aid us economically and/or militarily. Naturally its first priority is China which is its communist ally. Also acceptance of Russian arms would naturally involve increase of Russian influence in our country. At this stage the average citizen is bound to ask: if foreign aid is a necessity, why not get it from U.S.A., which is at once in a position to help or hurt us more than Russia? At such a stage India may find itself compelled by the logic of events to accept the American arms. But a thing of this kind would shatter our self-respect. Because after all the feeling that we should not get caught in the cold war is not confined to Pt. Nehru and Krishna Menon. We are an ancient people, free after a thousand years. We do not only want to be free, we want to feel free. If this thirst for freedom should make us ply our tongue a little too freely, surely U.S.A. should be able to appreciate our weakness. We don't meet talkative people with a whip-hand; a silent smile is more persuasive and prudent. However, should we be compelled to make a choice for American arms, there will be in our country two alternating feelings—a feeling of subservience and a feeling of resentment. Subservient allies make slaves; resenting allies make enemies.

Is It "Containing" Indian Communism?

In another way also, U.S.A.—if it subscribes to the logic that India is on way to communism, and so it must be contained—hurts our sense of self-respect; because it interferes with our right of self-determination. We have no intention to go communist. But why should anybody dispute our right to go to the dogs, if we must? The essence of freedom is that a person should have the right to be wrong. Is it a crime to make a mistake? If U.S.A. would rather war on us if we should, at any time, by a free vote, decide to change our politico-economic institutions, how can it object to Russia preventing this same change in Hungary? And after all what happens in Hungary affects neighbouring Russia somewhat more than would Indian developments affect distant U.S.A.

And yet it seems that "Indian communism" is quite a factor in the formulation of American policy in this part of the world. In East Bengal the ruling clique, supported by U.S.A., dubs the demand for regional autonomy as one inspired by "Communists and Bharati agents." In Karachi on the first Pakistan Republic Day anniversary Sardar Azam Khan addressed a meeting in U.S.I.S. offices. Here the minister said among other things that India was a hell for the Muslim minority, and that neutralism was even more dangerous than communism. Obviously the U.S. agrees with this thesis. Else it would not invite a Pak minister to revile India on its premises, or not dissociate itself from such a speech. And in Ceylon, America's most beloved Sir John loses no opportunity of conjuring a night-mare of a Communist India gobbling up little Lanka! How far is such an attitude in conformity with facts? Perhaps one of the ways of producing communists is to be always talking of them. Must we talk communists into being?

See page 11

Tito Hits at Moscow

Not the Cult of Personality But the System Has to be Blamed

Following are some of the extracts from the speech of Josep Broz Tito delivered before the Acting Body of the League of Communists at the Yugoslav Army People's Army Club at Pula:

"I would like to deal with what is happening today in Hungary and what took place in Poland, so that we may have an accurate idea of those developments, which are very complicated, notably in Hungary where it came to a large part of the working-class and progressive men fighting with arms in their hands on the streets against the Soviet armed forces.....

The First Shock

You are aware in the main of the causes which had led to the events in Poland and in Hungary. It is necessary that we go back to the year 1948, when Yugoslav was the first to give an energetic answer to Stalin and when she said that she desired to be independent, she desired to build her life and socialism in accordance with the specific conditions in her internal affairs. Of course, it did not then come to an armed intervention because Yugoslav was already united.....

Once the truth about our country had won and the period of normalizaiton of relations with the countries which had severed relations with us.....had set in, and when leaders of Eastern countries expressed that let bygones be bygones, and we accepted this only so as to have relations with those countries improved as soon as possible. But.....it is necessary to remind certain men who today again are beginning to villify our country and who stand at the head of the Communist parties in the Eastern countries....what they have been doing towards Yugoslavia for the last 4-5 years. We

should warn them to remind themselves and to keep this in mind today when they again wish to shift the blame for the events in Poland and Hungary on our shoulders.

Stalinism Again

This perfidious tendency originates from those hard-bitten Stalinist elements who in various parties have managed to still maintain themselves in their posts and who again wish to consolidate their rule and impose those Stalinist tendencies upon their people and others even.

It is a question not only of the Cult of the Individual, but of the System which had made possible the Cult of the Individual.

On its desire and initiative we have normalised our relations with the Soviet Union. When Stalin died, the new Soviet leaders saw that, thanks to Stalin's foolishness, the Soviet Union had landed itself in a very difficult situation, in a blind alley, where both foreign and internal policies were concerned, and thanks to his pegging and the forcing of his methods in other countries of the peoples' democracies as well. They grasped as to where lay the main cause of all these difficulties and at the Twentieth Congress they condemned Stalin's acts.....but they mistakenly laid the whole matter as a question of the cult of the individual AND NOT AS A QUESTION OF THE SYSTEM. And the cult of the individual, in effect, IS THE PRODUCT OF THE SYSTEM.

(Continued from page 10)

We should think that American motive in arming Pakistan is not purely military; it is not simply the containment of communism. Maybe also it is a case of "get what you can get." Pakistan soldiery might be useful as the policeman of oil-rich, turbulent Middle East. Muslims can manage Muslims better—in the name of Islam, of course,—though the arrangement has its dangers, with the constable over-night joining the rebel "in Islamic brotherhood." Maybe U.S.A. particularly likes Gilgit as an elevated gun position against Southern Russia. Also there are reports of oil finds in Sind and Baluchistan. Incidentally it gives employment to some more generals, and adds two of the best river systems of the world to the "American sphere of influence."

We are open to correction but we think that expansion is, with Americans, just a habit of the mind. The expansion is the "Wild West" is a live memory in American consciousness. For some of them the whole world is something like a "Wild West" to be subdued and Americanised. To them, perhaps. Indians are something like Red Indians, a "lesser

breed without the law," to be disciplined by Mr. Dulles' "missionary invasion teams."

Perhaps U.S.A. considers the Indian peninsula also as one vast vacuum. And perhaps it is scandalised that Pt. Nehru should assume the airs of leadership of a presumed great power. It remembers its power; but it forgets our pride, which is also power of a kind. It is perhaps surprised that the Prime Minister of India should not know how to please America and become a sort of glorified Nuri or Pibul, Mirza or Suhrawardy. Perhaps Pt. Nehru is the farthest we would go in westernism.

The essential question, therefore, is whether U.S.A. considers us a civilized nation with an inherent right to live our own life and determine our own future; something to be bought, or, if unpurchaseable, to be broken. We will put the issue so brutally as that, because we find that the present state of Indo-American relations is a high tragedy. The cruellest dissection is the best of service when correct diagnosis is more than half the cure.

—Organiser

Radical As Well As Humanist

By Sushil Bhadra

INDECENT nonsense, particularly when it does not hesitate to blaspheme the dead, should be ignored. One should not have taken the trouble to reply to Vigilant's observations in the *Indian Libertarian* (the issue of March 15, 1957), wherein the author used nearly 2,000 words of abusive language merely to state, "in a word," that "Kashmir—a Moral Test," an article published in the *Radical Humanist*, was "Neither Radical nor Humanist."

But then, Vigilant made these statements through a responsible journal of considerable independence, and has, in a not too graceful manner, put himself forward as a typical extreme case of nationalist perversion. A psychoanalyst might give the case up as hopeless, but a Radical Humanist, with his ultimate faith in the rationality of man, would prefer a discussion.

I called it a perversion, and it is, for a genuine concern for the well-being of the Indian people cannot be logically connected with a hatred against Pakistan. No sane man with a modicum of commonsense can fail to remember that co-operation with Pakistan is a pre-condition for an all-round progress in India. 'Pakistan Zindabad' can be a bugbear only to those who, motivated by a narrow suicidal outlook, choose to behave like Aesop's one-eyed deer. Exception can be taken to an appeal to reason only by a fool or a knave.

Roy Was Not The Sole Anti-Fascist

Only a fool or a knave, again, can question Roy's character, now that the whole world acknowledges as prophetic M. N. Roy's stand against fascism. No doubt he was during those fateful days swimming against the current, but history has vindicated the morality of his stand, exposing the moral blindness and political myopia of those who opposed him and pretended to be neutral in the anti-fascist war. It is a pity that Vigilant did not apply his reason to this historic problem; it is a greater pity that he not only does not realise his mistake, but continues to eulogise an irrational attitude even in the course of over a decade.

A Tall Claim

Those who have known Roy ascribed his 'failure' as a practical politician to his inability to compromise his conscience. He knew how to use his reason, and could, with a genuine courage of conviction, consider his moral position unassailable. What are we seeing around us, if not a slow un-acknowledged acceptance of Roy's ideas? Who can deny that there would possibly be no risk of India's going down in world opinion, had Roy's programme been given a chance in time? Who can assert with reason that the Royist

outlook does not offer a solution to the problems India is confronted with at home and abroad—problems which threaten on the one hand to tear to shambles of an imposed unity, only to blow away on the other hand her international prestige like a house of cards?

The *Radical Humanist* has in all humility suggested a way to save, nay, to salvage whatever is left of this prestige. If we have been critical, it is because of the short-sightedness that has antagonised world opinion to India. We hold that neither India, nor Pakistan, neither the Maharaja, nor Sheikh Abdulla should be accepted as the arbiter of fate of the people of Kashmir. If the Kashmiris are, as Vigilant claims, in favour of becoming a part of India, a plebiscite will give them a chance to reiterate their wishes, and there will be no rational basis for the suspicion that India does not care for the feelings of the people of Kashmir. India cannot have a clear conscience, so far as world opinion is concerned, unless she agrees to this reasonable means available at the moment.

Moral Pressure Or Mahatma's Blackmail?

Is it not natural for genuine patriots to want to see India regain her moral prestige in the world? Is it also not natural to become critical when the voice of reason goes unheeded? Is it our duty only to agree, and never to disagree with the Prime Minister? It is the Mahatma, Vigilant mentions, helped Pakistan in getting Rs. 50 crores from India. Is it not a fact that his request had been originally rejected, and that he had to take recourse to fast unto death to bring about moral pressure on his avowed followers? Was it not opposition to the Government?

Yes, it was; and the Mahatma was a patriot inspite of it. Vigilant has conveniently forgotten this part of the story, because he is after all a Hindu nationalist-chauvinist. Unfortunately, however, for him, the days of chauvinism are gone. Concepts like racial superiority and liberation by aliens no longer make any sense. Unless he outgrows his narrow medieval outlook, he cannot attain competence to judge matters from the Radical Humanist point of view. Let him get rid of this moral myopia and apply a little bit of reason, unfettered by Hindu-nationalist prejudices, and he will find that the article he has attempted to criticise is indeed Radical as well as Humanist. It is Radical, because it seeks to go to the root of the problem. And it is Humanist, because it is concerned not with the aggrandisation of this or that nation—here India or Pakistan—but about the freedom and happiness of the millions of human beings living on both sides of the border, and also of those living in the unfortunate and disputed territory—KASHMIR.

Turn over

VIGILANT'S REPLY TO MR. BHADRA

AS an answer to the article "Neither Radical Nor Humanist" appearing in the *Indian Libertarian* of 15-3-57 Mr. Bhadra stigmatises the author of the said article, Vigilant, as "an extreme case of national perversion". Of course, Mr. Bhadra is free to his own opinion of any person, including Vigilant, but there is nothing in that article to warrant such a criticism. In fact no reader other than Mr. Bhadra has cared to dub that article as an example of perverse nationalism.

Mr. Bhadra charges Vigilant with having written an article "using 2000 words of abusive language" but if strong, straightforward and blunt criticism is "abusive", according to Mr. Bhadra, one cannot help it. While Mr. Bhadra lectures on decency and against the use of abusive language he has NO OBJECTION in his own article to the free and profuse use of "dignified" words such as "fool", "knaves" and other choice epithets. This is an example of how easily are the "Royists" styling themselves as "radicals" and "humanists", betray their true nature. The very fact that they easily lose their balance of mind shows that they are anything but radical or humanists.

No Novice But A Seasoned Journalist

For the information of Mr. Bhadra it may be mentioned that Vigilant is a working journalist of over 30 years standing, and knew the late Mr. M. N. Roy personally and intimately. If, in the discharge of his duties as an honest journalist, he had to rake up the past of Mr. M. N. Roy, it was to show that character and integrity DO NOT ALWAYS GO TOGETHER with one's learning. That was all and it was not to blaspheme Mr. Roy. It was certainly not a pleasant job but TRUTH IS ALWAYS UNPLEASANT to persons who pose what they are not. That is why the reference to Mr. Roy's past has offended the Royists.

Mr. Bhadra Misses The Point

About Mr. Bhadra's attributing "moral myopia" and "Hindu Chauvinism" to Vigilant and passing a judgement on him that "he cannot attain competence to judge matters from Radical Humanist point of view" unless he overcomes the alleged defects, Vigilant would like to make it clear to Mr. Bhadra that his "radical humanist" viewpoint has been the sole theme of attack of Vigilant's article. Vigilant understands the plain meaning of the English words "Radical" and "Humanist" and no amount of vilification on the part of Mr. Bhadra are substitute for intelligent arguments and reasoning. Beyond asserting that the article in question "Is Radical because it goes to the root of the question" and "it IS Humanist because it is concerned NOT with aggrandisement of this or that nation," carries no conviction to any intelligent reader. The article in the "Radical Humanist" DID NOT GO to the root of the question when IT IGNORED Pakistani aggression in Kashmir and India's rushing to the help of Kashmir ON THE APPEALS of both the people and the Maharaja. That

is why Vigilant had to go hammer and tongs at the "Radical Humanist".

It is a perversion of words to style that article "perverse" when radicals and humanists conveniently ignore wanton aggression on the part of Pakistan and find fault with Hindu India which went to the rescue of Muslim Kashmir. This action on the part of India, perhaps, according to Mr. Bhadra, constitute "Hindu chauvinism" and "moral myopia". But these stark facts are not seen in their proper perspective by the "Royists" who equate a fanatic Muslim Pakistan with tolerant liberal secularist and civilized Hindu India. Mr. Bhadra may excuse my reference to Hindu India BUT THAT IS A FACT that cannot be disputed by Royists even.

As for India losing moral prestige, if she does not agree NOW for plebiscite in Kashmir had better be left to intelligent world opinion AND NOT to 'Royists' and Western nations, who have from the beginning had a hand in Pak aggression to safeguard their vested interest in Kashmir. Nowhere in the article "Neither Radical Nor Humanist" has Vigilant advocated "racial superiority" or betrayed Hindu Nationalist prejudices' which are left to be "discovered" by Mr. Bhadra alone.

And Here is More of "Royist" Bajaj

BREATHES there the man with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, this is my own, my native land? Well, yes, he does, and I had the occasion to hear him first a few days back.

In fact I am by nature too prosaic to believe in a poet's hyperbolic words, but when I saw Premnath Bajaj recently, and heard him talk, I knew that the poet was writing through his hat. Mr. Bajaj was talking of an anti-Indian book he had written on the problem of Kashmir, and was happy that it sold well in many countries. Will that mean that an Indian "spreading anti-Indian view throughout the world"? That does not matter. For facts are "Pak" (sacred) —and, of course, there are the fat royalties. But Bajaj was also proud that the TIMES of London noticed the book very favourably. Is Mr. Bajaj so simple as not know that the TIMES review of such a book must needs be more political than literary? And finally, Mr. Bajaj is writing some book in Urdu which he would prefer publishing in Pakistan—as it would sell there very well!

After all this talk, Shri Bajaj was introduced to a friend of mine as one of the most prominent leaders of Kashmir. I do not easily lose faith—for he is too cynical to have any in the first place. But when he remembers that a people get the leaders they deserve, he fears for the Kashmiris. Do they deserve only an Abdullah and a Bajaj?

—Organiser

REVOLUTIONISING INDIAN LIFE (Section II)

Annihilate Superstition (Part II)

By Dr. K. N. Kini, M.A. PH.D. (Columbia University)
Former Director of Public Instruction, Jodhpur.

(18) Religion has its roots in the instinct of man for self-preservation. He experiences various natural phenomena, namely wind, lightning, thunder, rain, earthquakes, floods, volcanic eruptions, and so on, which sometimes destroy his belongings and also himself and his kith and kin. He is then overcome by fear. He ascribes these happenings to higher powers or gods. His natural urge for self-preservation expresses itself in his utter surrender to these powers. He thinks that if he appeals to them by way of worshipping them, they will protect him from various such calamities and thus he and his relations will continue to live in safety. When man feels his powerlessness against nature, he imagines all kinds of ghosts, devils and demons, which, according to him, may be the souls of the departed human beings or may be other beings which harm him. He worships them too. Rituals are framed by the more intelligent and resourceful of the tribe for conducting worship. These rituals grow in numbers and magnitude as time goes on, until man becomes critical of their utility as scientific investigation and research progress and comes to more rational conclusions.

Primitive Conception

(19) In India, most people have not outgrown these primitive conceptions of gods, ghosts and devils. They do not know that natural phenomena and events occur on account of the natural forces and energies which exist in infinite abundance in nature. They are still addicted to worshipping all kinds of natural phenomena and objects and offer all sorts of sacrifices to imaginary gods, ghosts and devils. They worship the sun, moon, planets, trees and plants, stars, water, fire, wind, animals, termites, clergy, departed souls, stones, rivers, mountains, etc. and also images made of metal, stone, mud, wood, ivory etc. of the supposed gods. *Some of the objects and animals which should be consumed for acquiring strength and energy are worshipped.* In Taittiriya Upanishad it is said that food is Brahman (God) because from food these creatures are born. A very peculiar deduction indeed! The same Upanishad says "Those who regard food as Brahman verily attain all food." If this be so, India should not now be in want of food, because people in this country have been worshipping food as god for thousands of years. We are still wanting in food. Worshipping food has not enabled us to "attain all food". The truth of the matter is we have lost our power of discrimination, judgment and thinking. The clergy who get money for performing the rituals in worship are interested in making the simple and credulous folk persevere in these rituals.

(20) Not a day passes without some ceremony or other being performed in Hindu households to ward off evil or to satisfy some god or goddess or devil and

to obtain some supposed benefit or security. Stories are built around these ceremonies and rituals just to instil belief in the minds of the ignorant and unwary. The clergy also thwart the efforts of the laity to critically examine these stories.

Fostering Fear-Complex

(21) *Fear of all those natural phenomena and objects which are worshipped, is engendered in the minds of persons who worship them from their very childhood.* It is most difficult, nay almost impossible, to root out this fear when they grow up and are even educated to be more rational. People are told that if they do not worship these objects and phenomena, punishment follows. The prospect of divine punishment, which is an unknown factor, evokes more fear than the prospect of any punishment whose estimate can be made or known or imagined. If the fear impulse is allowed to operate unchecked, the individual "will be incapable of sublimating it and will remain a timid creature all his life."

(22) Students of Science, who know that many of the natural phenomena do occur on account of natural laws submit or resign themselves to the behests of their elders and priests and perform rituals out of fear of divine punishment. Eclipse is a purely natural phenomenon, governed by astronomical laws; still mathematicians and physicists wish to have holidays and do perform various rites to ward off the imaginary evil consequences of the eclipse.

Waste Of Energy

(23) In addition to the development and fostering of fear complex, much time, energy and money are uselessly spent on these rituals for dispelling supposed evils. The clergy tell people that God exists everywhere, in every thing and at all times and that therefore all things are sacred. The person of the priests and Swamies is sacred and has to be venerated and even worshipped. Contradicting anything that those religious dignitaries say is said to be sin. They will quote some slokas from some Sanskrit text or other, interpret them in their own way and impose upon the simple people and thus win their confidence and faith. When once the faith is rooted in men's minds, the simple folk will do anything to propitiate the clergy, wasting any amount of time, energy and wealth. Thinking people are gradually becoming tired of these superstitions and have now begun to say in public that, if religion can be banished from the country and if the time, energy and money now uselessly spent on it can be utilised for enhancing the happiness of the masses, more good will accrue to the nation.

(Continued on Page 15)

"Waging Peace"--Dulles on the Task Before Free World

THE US Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, addressing the World Affairs Council at Dallas, Texas, made some important statements on the need of military preparedness as "a deterrent" to the aggressors—great and small. In a broad but cursory survey of the world developments, specially since the end of World War II, Mr. Dulles forcibly defended for the different military pacts that the Free World had to enter into what he termed, "Waging Peace", which is as important if not more important, than talking peace and trusting the aggressors.

The recent events in the Suez Canal area, the developments in Poland, the naked Soviet aggression in Hungary highlight the danger mentioned by Mr. Dulles.

Said Mr. Dulles in the course of the address:—

"...I shall speak of the Suez Canal problem. It is an unfinished drama of suspense, which illustrates the kind of an effort, often called "Waging Peace", which will be required, day in and day out, for many years,

(Continued from Page 14)

(24) A few leaders have been openly preaching, especially in the South, that idols should be thrown away or destroyed. They break them into bits in public. Their preaching is having some effect as can be seen from the fact that in a few places, idols placed in public places have been removed. A regular crusade is also being carried on against the priests and their services are not taken during marriages by some classes as they used to do a few years ago. The old Hindu Shastras are being openly derided and repudiated, and occasionally the religious texts are burnt in public places.

Social Aspect Of Rituals

(25) Rites and ceremonies, though they are practised as religions, serve more as social activities. Their social aspect appeals more to people and is therefore meticulously preserved by them. During marriage, birth and death, and even long before birth and much after death, rituals and ceremonies are conducted more to satisfy the social urge of meeting to share joy or sorrow as the case may be than to appease religious hunger. In our temples too, most ceremonies are resorted to for attracting people, more especially the superstitious and simple minded folk, to collect money from them. Even highly educated persons are attracted by these rituals and ceremonies, and many sincerely believe in their efficacy in washing their sins and in warding off their evil consequences. The commercial and trading classes, who consciously adopt questionable methods in their daily transactions think that if they perform some *abhishekams* and worship in the temples, their supposed sins melt away. They spend large sums of money in building new temples or in renovating the old ones with this end in view. Thousands of people congregate here and the social and gregarious propensity is satisfied but superstitions are fostered.

(To be Continued)

in many matters, AS WE SEEK A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE.

Let me first speak of our military strength. THAT WE MUST HAVE. FOR MORAL STRENGTH ALONE IS NOT ENOUGH. If we were relatively feeble in relation to the vast military power possessed by unscrupulous men, THEN WE WOULD NOT BE THE MASTERS OF OUR OWN DESTINY.

Fortunately, it is not necessary for the United States alone to possess all of the military power needed to balance that of the Soviet bloc. We have Allies, and they contribute to the common defence. But we do have one special responsibility. WE ALONE HAVE THE ECONOMIC AND THE FINANCIAL STRENGTH, and the "know-how" to prevent the world from being dominated by atomic and nuclear weapons which the Soviet Union is feverishly developing. WE MUST POSSESS A CAPACITY TO RETALIATE on a scale which IS SUFFICIENT TO DETER AGGRESSION. We must have that capacity, not in the expectation of having to use it, BUT BECAUSE WE HAVE THAT CAPACITY WE SHALL PROBABLY NEVER HAVE TO USE IT.

But there may be local aggressions, so-called "nibblings", not initially involving the most potent weapons. We and our Allies should, between us, have the capacity to deal with these without our action producing a general nuclear war.

Thus, we and our Allies, in addition to having great nuclear power, should have conventional forces which can help to defend the Free World. The combined Free World military strength must be sufficiently balanced, sufficiently flexible; and so deployed, that it can deter or defeat both big and little aggressions.

Atomic Units in Pakistan

PARIS: The Soviet newspaper "Red Star" said that "top secret talks on the installation of United States atomic-equipped units in Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand would be held during the meeting of the South-East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO), in Canberra.

Danger Of US Plans

The newspaper, quoted by the Tass News Agency, said, "It is not necessary to point out the danger that these new American plans represent for these countries."

The "Red Star", which is the organ of the Soviet Defence Ministry, said that the SEATO meeting would also prepare "aggressive provocations and plans for undermining" other countries of South East Asia.

Putting Pressure On India

The SEATO nations would try to put pressure on India and Burma to get them to join SEATO, "Red Star" said. It was with this aim in view that the United States was increasing its arms shipments to Pakistan so as to pit Pakistan against India on the question of Kashmir. It was also for this reason that the US was aiding the 'reactionary rebels' of Indonesia.

The Mind Of The Nation

Should Not Lead To Stabbing Democracy

...the greatest danger to be anticipated by term of office of a Red Government in a State of the Union is psychological. It will confer respectability and prestige on the CPI. It will blur the sharp distinction that should exist in the public mind between genuinely democratic parties and parties selling their goods under false labels. It will assimilate "proletarian" or "peoples' democracy" to the genuine article in the public mind. This is the height of communist ambition in the present phase and our ruling party and Government are allowing them with open eyes to have an opportunity of realising it.

The democratic republican Constitution of the Union is or ought to be no suicide pact. Democracy cannot be fairly called upon to permit freedom to undemocratic parties and groups to destroy it body and soul, even as the rule of law does not, in a well conditioned State, permit the rise and growth of law-breakers, robbers and murderers, house-breakers etc. Conspiracy against life, liberty and property has to be traced and scotched by the police as a part of their routine duties. So in a democracy, conspiracy to subvert the State, albeit under democratic and philanthropic names should find no quarter. But today India has rightly or wrongly accepted the CPI as a legitimate democratic party and even though it has succeeded by dint of falsehood and deceitful propaganda in obtaining the suffrage of the people.....it has, by the rules of the game, to have, its innings as a government. Meanwhile it becomes the inescapable duty of those aware of the drama behind the scene to intensify their educative publicity regarding the dangers of international communism and the links of the CPI with the world policies of the Kremlin.

—M. A. Venkata Rao in *Freedom First*

Red Regime In Kerala—Democrats Must Be On The Alert

Even though the Communists in Kerala have come into power through democratic process it would be a mistake to believe that the leopard has changed its spots. We have it on the authority of no less a person than Nikita Krushchev, the arch-priest of International Communism, that the shrimps might learn to whistle but the communists would never give up its faith in class war which he described as the essence of Leninism.

The recent declaration over the signature of the Russian Party leaders and Janos Kadar of Hungary should also dispel any doubt that any communist party being allowed to practice a national road to socialism, independent of tutelage from Moscow. The thing that the democrats have to bear in mind in dealing with the communists is that they are up against the votaries of civil war. Kerala must be allowed to be

neither a fortress nor a sanctuary for fugitive from decency.

—Thought

A National Disaster

The choice of Shri Krishna Menon as Defence Minister is something of a national disaster. Shri Menon has distinct communist leanings. That such a one should be put in charge of national defence is something of a mockery. The American arming of Pakistan has made things pretty difficult for us. The induction of Shri. Menon as Minister of Defence would only make a bad situation very much worse. Irritable America may be trusted to arm Pakistan even more furiously than before, if for nothing else than to spite Mr. Menon. To put this gentleman in his new charge is to render the procurement of arms ever more difficult for he is a *persona non grata* in both London and Washington. Are we contemplating the import of communist arms *a la Nasser*, that we should put Mr. Menon in charge of our defence?....

What is the crime of our people that they should be condemned to be "defended" by indefensible Mr. Menon, and "educated" by half-educated Maulana Azad?

—Organiser

Disease That Afflicts The Congress

Following fast on the exhilarating experience of the General Elections comes the sobering knowledge of the factious spirit in which the Ministry-making in the State has had to proceed. Faction is no new thing in the Congress Party; that the age-old rivalry between Mr. S. K. Sinha and Mr. A. N. Sinha in Bihar which had defaced the State's politics, since Independence, was still alive was also known. But no friend of the Congress Party, in his most pessimistic moments, would have thought that it would be necessary for members of the Congress Assembly Party in Bihar to cast their votes for a leader in ballot boxes—which for fear of disturbances to the public peace—would need to be carried to, and counted in, Delhi. The Congress Party has rebuked itself intensely by this public demonstration of its internal acrimonies. Nor can a ballot box in Delhi or elsewhere can set at rest a deep disease within the soul.

Even when the election of a leader has been unanimous as in Madras one may have some questions as to whether unity is as real as it seems. Mr. Kamraj Nadar for all his skilful manipulations of the hustings in his difficult Tamil Nad, is a foreigner in Delhi. There is in fact between Jawaharlal Nehru and Jaya Prakash Narayan a deeper communion of spirit than there is between the Prime Minister and the Chief Minister of Madras. The Congress may look a solid block; but it is beginning more and more and in many places all things to all men.....It has already too much of its support in caste and local leadership for it to argue that it is truly a national party.

—Eastern Economist

Our Bangalore Letter

A DECEPTIVE FOREIGN POLICY

SPEAKING on India's foreign policy at a public meeting held under the auspices of the Libertarian Social Institute, Prof. M. A. Venkata Rao said that a darker era of slavery, much worse than the one we had suffered under the Western imperialism for four centuries would dawn on us if our Prime Minister continued to be under the saturnine foreign policy which had unfortunately become cent per cent identical with the Soviet foreign policy, endangering our very national freedom we achieved after centuries of slavery under the foreign domination and a long struggle for freedom.

Attacking Pandit Nehru's tirade against defence pacts entered into by the democratic countries of the West, Prof. Venkata Rao asked whether Pandit Nehru himself was not an advocate of collective security in the thirties against Hitler and whether it was not justifiable to enter into defence pacts against the aggressive Russian Communists who had become far more dangerous and powerful than the Nazis, with a third of the world in their hands.

A Book For Every Intelligent Student of Economics

WHY WAGES RISE

By F. A. HARPER

Published by:

Foundation for Economic Education, Inc.
Irvington-on-Hudson,
New York

Price \$1.50

Copies Available from the Libertarian Book House, Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

Members of the Libertarian Social Institute and subscribers of the Indian Libertarian can get it at 20% discount on application to the Manager, "Indian Libertarian", Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road, BOMBAY 4.

A NONSENSE

Pandit Nehru's argument against the defence pacts was utterly foolish and childish and was a typical communist argument. But for these pacts, the Russian and Chinese armies would have by this time swept over the whole of Asia and Europe. The greatest danger to Indian freedom came from the imperialist communist bloc and not from the Western imperialism which was on the decline and which was at least responsive to the world public opinion. Sir A. Eden, the former British Prime Minister who launched an attack against Egypt bowed to the world opinion and ultimately resigned whereas Messrs Bulganin and Khrushchev who raped Hungary were still growing stronger and daily issuing threatening statements. To equate Western imperialism which was on the decline and which was responsive to the public opinion with the aggressive, totalitarian and advancing Russian imperialism was nonsense. It was only for the 'Karma' of India that she was ruled by a set of emotional and sentimental leaders who had never cared to study the world history and were so blind to the realities of the present international military situation. If India did not follow a realistic foreign policy, guided by enlightened national self-interest, and continued to be indifferent towards the hostile moves and activities of her neighbours, another era of political slavery would dawn on us before long, warned Prof. Venkata Rao.

DO NOT DECEIVE YOURSELVES

Mr. Philip Spratt, presiding over the meeting, said that all countries of the free world were completely depending upon America for defence against the Russian aggression however much they might pretend that they were strong enough to pursue an independent foreign policy. None of the countries of the Soviet bloc had an independent foreign policy and if at all countries like India and Britain were pursuing an independent policy, it was only because they were in the free world protected

by the American H. bombs. Even a proud nation like Britain, which was still one of the biggest powers of the world, had now made no secret of the fact that it was entirely depending upon America for defence against Russia, and under these circumstances, it would be nothing but deceiving herself if India continued to pretend that she was quite powerful enough to defend herself against any foreign aggression. The psychological origin of India's so-called independent foreign policy was only the injured national pride.

Though Prof. Venkata Rao had taken an alarmist attitude in his speech, India's foreign policy was undoubtedly a case for alarm concluded Mr. Philip Spratt.

Earlier Mr. Sumanth Bankeshwar, the secretary of the Libertarian Social Institute, said that it was the height of stupidity to say that our foreign policy was a great success when we had failed to solve a single problem that concerned India whether it was Kashmir, Goa or the protection of the interests of the Indians abroad and when we had failed to get even a single vote in the Security Council on the Kashmir issue. It was high time this myth was exploded in the interests of India even at the risk of becoming unpopular and being slandered, said Mr. Bankeshwar.

JUST OUT!

The Challenge of Asia

By RALPH BORSODI
Chancellor of the University of Melbourne

A Study of Conflicting Ideas and Ideals

Price \$3.50

Available from:

The Libertarian Book House,
Arya Bhavan,
Sandhurst Road,
BOMBAY 4.

Book Review

"THE CHALLENGE OF ASIA" THROUGH LIBERTARIAN EYES

THE CHALLENGE OF ASIA by Ralp Borsodi Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, Florida. (1956). Price 3.50 Pages 237.

THE CHALLENGE OF ASIA by Borsodi is a resolute attempt to 'see things steadily and see them whole.' It is a comprehensive analysis of this 'war of the worlds'—Libertarian versus authoritarian, central versus regional, urban versus rural, Western versus Eastern, dovetailed inextricably in the conflicting 'ideas and ideologies' of today. There are two Asias to be understood—the old and the new. "The New Asia is Nationalist, Imperialist, Socialist, Communist. It is Capitalist, Industrialist, Urbanist." Old Asia contributes the *neglected values* to the solution of the crisis of our times. The values are that of the family, village and personal life.

"The schizophrenic conflicts of mankind today—including the conflict between the proponents of Capitalism and the proponents of Socialism—are really conflicts about the right organization of individual life, of family life, of community life, of world life.... To the doughty champions of Americanism, the right organization of individual life is everything; to the challenging protagonists of Russia nism, the right organization of social life is everything. That both may be wrong occurs to neither."

THE PROBLEM IN ASIA

The East will always find it easier to adopt the technical gadgets of the West than its individualism, and unless the village and the joint family are maintained, totalitarianism in the East is a foregone conclusion. "If so, we may ask if it is possible to combine the village and the joint family with modern technology of a kind, if we can build a quite new type of civilization which neither has to abandon the small community that has been the natural habitat of *homo sapiens* during all but one percent of his

existence, nor the use of modern tools, because without them human life becomes unbearable as populations grow and the fruits of hand labour alone would be clearly subject to the law of diminishing returns." For the requisite industrial decentralisation, the fact that two-thirds of industry can be *economically* decentralised is relied upon.

THREAT OF ISLAM

For a stable cultural background in Asia for the steady maintenance of his humane civilization—which is recommended not for *Asians only* but for America and the rest of the world as well—the author analyses the prevalent religions. He finds that everywhere in the world, excepting only in Asia Minor, the three great Semitic religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—are 'intruders'. Judaism, being non-evangelical, has done less to bedevil mankind than has Christianity and Islam. But all three are alike in being dogmatic and intolerant. "There is only one thing to do with fanatics who cannot be de-fanatized; they must be rendered powerless." Realising the potentialities of a Pan-Islamic movement, the author warns: "For those who believe that aggressive war should be abolished, Islam's renaissance is a threat which may doom the hope of achieving 'One World' for generations." As opposed to this, indigenous Asia is Brahmanist, Confucianist, Buddhist, Taoist; indigenous Europe, Pagan. "In Europe, Christianity is a super-imposition; in Asia, Islam is." (Italics are ours)

Of the competing ideologies in our world, eight are monistic and seven are pluralistic. The monistic and intolerant ones are: Nationalism, Colonialism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Communism, and Fascism. Statism, as practiced in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, though centralist in tendency, is pluralistic in its goals and tolerant in its methods. The seven pluralistic and tolerant ideologies are: Regionalism, Universalism, Bud-

dism, Taoism, Confucianism, Humanism and Capitalism.

To choose the right combination of these ingredients of panaceas, and to tone them down to sober humanistic rationalism, Mr. Borsodi recommends a double test. First, by the test of monism or pluralism, we can reject every movement which being monistic must necessarily be intolerant. Secondly, by the test of education or revolution, we can reject every movement which, being aggressive as to methods, is non-humanitarian.

SPEAK SOFTLY BUT CARRY A BIG STICK

Mr. Borsodi does not fail to stress the crucial point that intolerance of intolerance is not itself a fault. Any fair analysis of the wars and revolutions in our history will force us to recognise that there are situations in life in which fighting is "simply an expression of manhood." "Whenever facts indicate that it will work, non-violence is the only policy which is genuinely humane in nature. But in India itself even Gandhi himself failed when he tried non-violence against Mohammed Ali Jinnah. And it failed to work in Korea also..." The moral Mr. Borsodi draws is that in dealing with fanatic ideas and fanatic proponents of fanaticism, 'speak softly but carry a big stick.'

After this thorough going analysis, the author gives the main outlines of his new society in which the positive elements in all the discussed 'ideologies' are synthesized around the nodal values of human freedom and individual responsibility in his Pluralistic Society.

A LITTLE SLIP

Mr. Borsodi has uncritically accepted the allegation that India is the aggressor in Kashmir. Also all nationalism is not necessarily bad. A nationalism based on the genuine values of an Open Society of a 'Pluralistic Society' as Borsodi would put it, is not inherently aggressive. On the whole, *The Challenge of Asia* is a conscientious and fairly successful synthesis of the best elements of world culture. Here is a vindication of the vital values to which the Indian Libertarian is dedicated.

M. V. BALAKRISHNA RAO

"LIBERTARIAN"—FREE AND FEARLESS JOURNAL

SINCE the unfortunate and frustrating election of last month, which changed nothing and brought no alleviation of the threat of a gradual extinction of liberty and eventual absorption into the Russo-Chinese totalitarian empire, it is necessary for all anxious for the defence of freedom to increase their efforts. The sponsors of the *Indian Libertarian* have reacted to the challenge by issuing their paper as a fortnightly instead of a monthly. We congratulate them.

NO HEDGING

The *Indian Libertarian* is uncommon among journals for its outspokenness. No hedging. Say what you mean. The cover of every issue carries the legend in bold type: "Make English the Lingua Franca of India." Ninety percent of the educated public agree at heart, but how many dare say so? No even Nehru himself.

The *Libertarian* stands bravely for a free economy. It believes that socialism brings paralysis and eventually totalitarianism, so it must be opposed from the start. The remedy is to go back to the tried and

tested method of private capitalism, with the fairly well tried and tested safeguards against the abuses which were some small part of the cause of the unpopularity of capitalism.

The *Libertarian* differs with equal vehemence from the Nehru-Menon foreign policy. It believes that neither Russo-China nor Pakistan can be held off by sweet words. India must resort to the classical principle of foreign policy, clearly formulated by Kautilya: "my enemy's enemy is my friend." Our only safety lies in forming close ties with the Western powers, who alone can neutralise the overwhelming strength of Russo-China and of resurgent Pan-Islam; and of all the actual and potential power-groups, are the closest to us in their philosophy of internal democracy and international live-and-let-live.

We agree with the policy of the *Indian Libertarian*, and its blunt words give us courage. We hope it will prosper. —*Mysindia*

BRIEF REVIEWS OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

AN ANALYSIS OF USURY* by Jeffrey Mark. pp. 128 price Rs. 3/-.

A smaller book than the author's *The Modern Idolatry* and more profound. The effect of the control that the Banking system exercises over commerce is cleverly traced—though some of the arguments are not quite so plausible as they sound. This is at once a summary of earlier *The Modern Idolatry* and also a supplement to it.

* * *

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION* by Elsee Reclus. pp. 18 price As. 3.

An anarchist who holds that evolution is a revolutionary process. A socialist with his call war and social disintegration. The book can have only historical interest.

* * *

THE PRINCIPLES OF LAND VALUE, TAXATION & FREE TRADE* by E. G. Craigie. pp 20 price As. 4.

The author is an advocate of free trade and has presented admirably the case against land mono-

poly. Rent which is the payment for the use of land is a natural source of income. "No person having created land, it follows no person has a right to appropriate Rent for private purposes." Though somewhat elementary, the books should be read by every serious student of economics and should find favour with each and every libertarian. It can most profitably read by the layman also.

* * * * *
WHAT IS PLURALISM?* pp. 24 price As. 4.

Contains brief proposals for the establishment of the co-operative type of organization. The so-called modern socialists with all their high-flown ideals of justice could purge themselves with a perusal of this small book.

K. D. VALICHA

* * *

AMERICAN LOANED BOOKS TO R. L. FOUNDATION LIBRARY

Nearly 200 books on politics, economy and history are loaned to the R. L. Foundation Library, Arya Bhavan, Bombay 4, by the U.S.I.S. Bombay. These books are available to members of the Libertarian Social Institute as well as to subscribers of the *Indian Libertarian*.

A copy of list of books is available to the members of the Institute as well as subscribers on application to the Secretary, R. L. Foundation Library, Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road Bombay 4. Books will be issued against a deposit of Rs. 10 only.

* All these books and pamphlets are available from Libertarian Book House, Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Rd., Bombay 4.

A "Must" Journal

For Libertarians

FREEMAN

The best journal expounding Free Economy and Libertarian Philosophy. Price As. 12/-

Available from:

Libertarian Book House
Arya Bhavan,
Sandhurst Road, (West)
Bombay 4.

Leading News Magazine

ORGANISER

A National Views and News Weekly Published from Delhi with an ALL-INDIA circulation

Edited by K. R. MALKANI

Published By Bharat Prakashan (Delhi) Ltd. Delhi 6.

Single Copy As. 4

Annual Subscription Rs. 12.

May 1957

Regd. No. B 6520

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
DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS
BOMBAY 4

Telephone: 70205 Telegram: LOTEWALLA

Agents at Poona

LALDAS AMARSEE & SONS,
437, Raviwar Peth,
Poona—2.

Telegraph add: 'STELLATEA' Telephone: 2468

Before making any of your
INSURANCE CONTRACT
kindly consult:

Bhaichand Damodar Esq.
BOMBAY — CALCUTTA

A successful and immense underwriting is done since 20 years with cent per cent competency and sound experience.

Telephones:

38081/38082
Bombay

6181 City
Calcutta

**SANITARY
ENGINEERS
LICENSED
PLUMBERS
BUILDERS &
CONTRACTORS.**

VICTORIA SANITARY STORES
54, 3RD, BHOIWADA, BHULESHWAR.

SHRI V. H. MERCHANT
BOMBAY 2

Phone: Office 73530 Residence 40829

For every intelligent student this book shows the way out of present day chaos
THE ANALYSIS OF USURY
By Jeffrey Mark

Published by
The Libertarian Publishers Ltd.,
Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road,
Bombay 4.

Price: Rs. 3/-

This is a book that analyses the basis and foundation of Usury. Today in Capitalist countries the control of credit is monopolised by banking system. This is a perversion, for the community is made to pay large sums of money by way of interest to banks for hire of money which in the last analysis, is its own credit. On the other hand Socialists understand this perversion but Socialism is corrupted by political and personal ambitions and its leaders.

This book suggests a way out
ORDER YOUR COPY NOW