

The INDIAN LIBERTARIAN

Incorporating the 'Free Economic Review' and 'The Indian Rationalist'

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY AND LIBERTARIAN DEMOCRACY

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

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

| Vol. VIII No. 3 | IN THIS ISSUE | May 1, 1960 |
|--|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| | PAGE | PAGE |
| EDITORIAL | 1 | RATIONALIST SUPPLEMENT 11-14 |
| <i>Pakistan's Intransigence Again</i> by M. A. Venkata Rao | 5 | DELHI LETTER 15 |
| <i>Thy Will Be Done, Khrushchev!</i> by M. N. Tholal | 8 | BOOK REVIEW 18 |
| <i>Parliament In A Daze</i> by Pothan Joseph | 10 | NEWS DIGEST 19 |
| SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT | I-IV | |

EDITORIAL

TRANS-INDIAN RAILWAY FACILITIES OR CORRIDOR?

A JOINT meeting of the railway delegations of India and Pakistan are meeting in New Delhi to consider facilities for enlarged railway traffic, goods and passenger, from the west wing of Pakistan to the east wing and from Calcutta to Darjeeling through East Pakistan lands jutting into West Bengal enroute.

As the news item was first worded, it looked as though Pakistan had asked for cession of a strip of land through the intervening Indian territory for building and operating her own railways. But the latest news item seems on the surface more innocent demanding only facilities for travel through Indian railways and for the transit of goods.

All the same, the news should alert the Indian public, for it may turn out to be the thin end of the wedge leading to the demand for a land corridor with transfer of sovereignty over the land to be used by the Pakistan railway. If the relations between India and Pakistan were as cordial and devoid of aggressive intent on Pakistan's side as

those between Canada and the USA, even the land corridor could be contemplated with equanimity. But as things stand, Indians should never forget the ambitions of Pakistan. Mohammad Ali Jinnah asked his followers to use the present cession of Pakistan lands as the spring-board for further encroachments and a larger Pakistan and characterised the areas given in 1947 as but a moth-eaten, truncated Pakistan. Even while he was alive, foreign news correspondents were informed of the idea of a corridor between the far flung wings of Pakistan entertained by Jinnah and his colleagues to be urged upon India at some scitable time in the future!

Now under President Ayub Khan has come the proposal of extended railway facilities between the two wings. In conceding this request, Indian statesmen should take into consideration the future political repercussions that may be fostered by them. Care should be taken that control over Indian properties and territory is not conceded. Pakistanis may travel across India on Indian railways like Frenchmen on through-railway journeys across Germany.

Foreign precedents should be studied as to what

regulations of passport and visas etc. are suitable and necessary to safeguard against possibilities of political mischief.

It is as well if the administration announces what kind of negotiations are being conducted now, their scope and possible repercussions,

Proper publicity betimes is the only measure to safeguard public interests. One lamp is equal to ten policemen!

NEHRU CHOU EN-LAI MEETING ON THE 20TH ONWARDS

The Chinese Prime Minister has sent a new Note in answer to the Indian Note of December. It restates uncompromisingly the full Chinese demand.

Regarding the Ladakh areas including the Akasaichin road jutland in the Northeast, the Note says that it was always under Chinese occupation (i.e. Tibetan jurisdiction)! The claim of India for it based on administrative jurisdiction reinforced by police patrols is repudiated on the ground that since 1950 when the Chinese began to build their road to Sinkiang through Aksaichin, they encountered no Indian patrols! And so India herself had not regarded these areas as actually belonging to her!

But the Chinese do not seem to be quite correct in this matter. For there were news reports years ago that Chinese patrols had arrested some Indian officers found in this area who were told that it was Chinese territory. They were released months later after representations from the Indian Government!

Indian remissness regarding actual possession and administration in this area on account of its remoteness and inhospitable climate is now made the ground for the plea that India never regarded it as actually belonging to her!

In his absorption in Five Year Plans and world peace propaganda and the championing of unfree Asian and African nations and the thwarting of the anti-communist policies of the Western Powers, Shri Nehru found no time to look after territory actually belonging to us! Pakistan had complained to the UNO that India has annexed territories which she is unable to defend in Kashmir and Ladakh. And she was not far wrong, barring the annexation.

Now that the Indian public is awakened to the danger from China and the inadequacy of Indian policies so far, it is to be hoped that the failures of the past would be corrected. Military measures should be taken to safeguard the territories remaining to us in Ladakh, leaving it for the future to wrest what is taken from us after we are better prepared militarily. In this preparation, the diplomatic measure of securing American military aid should take pride of place.

In the forthcoming talks, it is better that India does not agree to the aggression and occupation already effected by the Chinese rather than accept the de facto possession and hope to change it later on through negotiation.

It is better that Ladakh remains in Chinese hands but unrecognised by us like the two-fifths of Kashmir and the Gilgit and Baltic provinces to her north in the hands of Pakistan and like Goa in the hands of Portugal. In these latter cases, India reiterates her claim to them and does not recognise the hold of the foreign states to be legal and legitimate.

While reiterating his resolve not to surrender any territory, Ladakh or other, Shri Nehru is letting fall hints that the talks will not succeed and that we will have to live with a dangerous frontier all along the northern Himalayan mountain walls.

Nations are made in their formative period through all-out sacrifice in war or in resisting enemies within. The psychological value of shared feeling and action in common tasks dictated by the safety and security of the nation is beyond question. Hatred of the enemy so long as he occupies our soil and threatens our safety is a natural asset. Pugnacity is given to man as a biological heritage for purposes of mobilising strength to meet danger. The Indian habit of singing songs of universal love and non-violence on all occasions and for all classes and professions, military as well as civil, is thus proved to be unwise as it foregoes the advantage of emotional integration in sight of the enemy. The boundary is made by our resolve and readiness to resist encroachment and not by lines in a map. Maps are no authority for enemies, no sacrosanct barrier to

The Indian Libertarian

*Independent Journal of Free Economy
and Public Affairs*

Edited by MISS KUSUM LOTWALA

Published on the 1st and 15th of Each Month

Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Subscription Rates:

Annual Rs. 6; Half Yearly Rs. 3

ADVERTISEMENTS RATES

Full Page Rs. 100; Half Page Rs. 50; Quarter Page Rs. 25.

One-eighth Page Rs. 15 One full column of a Page Rs. 50.

BACK COVER Rs. 150

SECOND COVER Rs. 125

THIRD COVER Rs. 125

- Articles from readers and contributors are accepted. Articles meant for publication should be type-written and on one side of the paper only.
- Publications of articles does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a Free Forum.
- Rejected articles will be returned to the writers if accompanied with stamped addressed envelope.

Write to the Manager for sample copy
and gifts to new subscribers.

Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

their advance. This elementary knowledge of statecraft has been beyond our Gandhian rulers, who have acquired power without war but as a largesse from a benevolent imperialist State in a crisis.

Also, the feeling that in this twentieth century of extraordinary progress in science as evidenced by sputniks, nations have outgrown power politics and crude tactics of conquest seems to have dominated our rulers, Mr. Nehru in particular. He claims to have a knowledge of communism. He must have read the classics of Communism, the resolutions passed in the World Congresses of International Communism (the Comintern, Cominform etc.) to little purpose if he has not grasped the plain meaning of the strategy and tactics spelled out in them. In Stalin's *Problems of Leninism* and other works, the objective of world conquest for world communism is plainly set forth. Russia's foreign policy since 1917 has been consistently governed by this supreme aim.

The writings of Mao Tse-tung are plain as a pikestaff in their adherence to the communist doctrine of world conquest. To say as the Prime Minister has said explicitly that it is the Han expansionism of historic China and not the communist doctrine adopted by Mao and his colleagues that is responsible for the present sample of inroads into Indian territories on the border does not put his reading of current history in a favourable light. It classes him as a partisan of communism and not a fair minded historical philosopher. Khrushchev himself said in Paris that he was doing everything possible to advance the cause of world communism!

NEPAL'S TREATY WITH CHINA

Mr. B. P. Koirala has returned from Peking with a treaty of non-aggression and neutrality in his pocket.

The Chinese have said that there were no disputes of border questions with Nepal and that only a few places need definition or delimitation which can be done by joint committees later. China has promised a large grant for economic development. Mr. Koirala has not taken the public into his confidence with regard to the places about which the Chinese want delimitation. It now transpires that the Chinese have staked a claim to Mount Everest itself, the crowning glory of the Himalayas which India regards as belonging as much to her cultural and political tradition as to Nepal. This claim has caused widespread dismay both in Nepal and India. Mr. Bharat Shamsheer the leader of the Gorkha Dal Party in Nepal took the Prime Minister to task in Parliament for not declaring that China was an aggressor into Indian soil. He reminded Mr. Koirala of the close ties with India in the matter of defence and of the obligation she was under, of joining India in defending the Nepalese borders and to stand by India on this

border question. He was alarmed that Nepal's foreign policy was veering away into appeasement of Red China and into eventual entry into the par'our of Chinese hegemony.

The treaty he had entered into with China contravened the agreement with India that Nepal would enter into consultations with India in any matter concerning foreign relations with a third Power. It is clear that the Nepalese Prime Minister has been influenced by fear of China in his hasty treaty with her. He had let down India. His attempts to answer the critics have not been satisfactory. It is said that King Mahendra is not satisfied with the terms of the treaty. He did not refer to it in his public speech made soon after the return of Mr. Koirala from Peking.

What is happening in Nepal will repeat itself in Bhutan and Sikkim, doubtless! India is facing the utter failure of her policy of keeping these border States bound to her in common defence and friendship. This is a natural consequence of the failure of India to stand up to Peking's challenge in the matter of the invasion of Indian borders in Ladakh and elsewhere. In politics, the first thing that counts is Power, one's own and that of one's treaty friends.

But even yet, Shri Nehru has declared that it is foolish to enter into military pacts! If a man is shamming sleep, we cannot wake him up. If a statesman will fully refuse to see danger even after invasion into his borders and knows that he is unable to defend his country unaided by more powerful nations and refuses to take counsel from more realistic advisers, the only remedy is for the people to remove him from office, which should be easy in a democratic set-up under which we are supposed to live today.

To add insult to injury he has declared as we write that our own strength is enough for defence and that we should not under-estimate our military power. We wish devoutly that he is right. But all the world knows that he is wrong and he himself knows that he is wrong! When asked why he does not take military action to throw the invaders out, if we are strong enough, he answers ruefully that it is not so simple! Shri Nehru's turns and shifts when confronted with questions on this colossal failure of his leadership would offer instructive lessons on the mind of a demagogue caught in his own toils!

The public of Nepal seems to have been thoroughly aroused. Sixteen organisations have held meetings and processions and sent a protest Memo to the Prime Minister Koirala demanding firmness in denying the Chinese claim to Everest. They demanded that the places in regard to which the Chinese want delimitation should be disclosed. It may be that Everest is one of them!

It is significant that it was the Communist Party alone that refrained from joining in the protest

against the Chinese demand! There is a sizable communist party in Khatmandu capable of much mischief but the present occasion has shown that the other nationalist groups and parties are thoroughly awake to the Red danger and will not act like fellow travellers in the coming struggle for the communisation of Nepal.

AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE ABOUT TIBET IN NEW DELHI

The successful convening of the proposed Afro-Asian Conference on Tibet in New Delhi by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and Acharya Kripalani is an event of importance in the public life of India. It is a landmark in democratic life independent of the leading strings of the Nehru Government. The Dalai Lama sent a thoughtful and bold message on the right of his unfortunate country for a free life.

Resolutions were passed supporting Tibet's claim for a free and independent national existence, condemning Chinese genocide and imperialist suppression of the independence of the people.

The verdict of the International Jurists that the Chinese had perpetrated genocide in Tibet, destroying the culture and integrity of the people's social and individual life was endorsed. The world was called upon to support Tibet's struggle for freedom and recovery. Similar resolutions were passed supporting the claim of the Africans and Algerians to freedom and national independence.

As many as a hundred delegates from forty countries attended the Conference. The moral leadership on this question of small and weak nations being entitled to freedom from imperialism and apartheid law has passed from Nehru in India to Jayaprakash Narayan. India has proved the vitality of her democratic conscience. Nehru declared himself as not being happy at the idea of convening the Conference but luckily he did not ban it by official dictat, as he did the opening conference of the Congress of Cultural Freedom in Delhi years ago.

It is now for the UNO to take up the question of Tibetan freedom.

Nothing may happen but the cause should be kept alive in the consciousness of free nations. An opportunity may arise in the unpredictable future when Tibetans may have a chance to come into their own. Such miracles have happened to Poland, Czechoslovakia and other nations several times in the past!

It is good to note that Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, the founder-leader of the Swatantra party was on the dais on the opening day of the Conference and gave it his approval and support. A permanent Council is to be formed which will pursue the matter with the UNO and take all opportunities to keep the cause of Tibetan freedom alive.

THE WORLD COURT'S VERDICT ON PORTUGUESE CLAIM FOR RIGHT OF WAY

The World Court has given its verdict on the Portuguese claim for right of way and entry into their erst-while enclaves of Dadra and Nagar Haveli from their port of Daman. They had claimed sovereignty over the enclaves as a treaty gift from former Mahratta rulers in the seventeenth century.

The court has held that they had no sovereignty over the areas in question as the Mahrattas had only given them revenues from the areas to the extent of Rs. 12000 per year but no land sovereignty. They could not be allowed access to them by right. Armed forces cannot be allowed entry through the intervening territory of India. So far the cause of India and of the people of the area may be said to have triumphed. The people rejoiced to hear of the decision of the World Court, since it meant that Portuguese forces could not reduce them to slavery again. It confirmed their freedom.

They have arranged to celebrate the event in a week-long festival.

But the Portuguese also claim success since the right of entry to private unarmed persons is conceded. But this avails them nothing since any entry of Portuguese personnel through Indian territory will have to conform to Indian passport and visa regulations which will enable the Indian authorities to watch the situation and prevent any serious subversive action (by force or guile) that may be attempted by the Portuguese.

The Indian authorities who arranged for legal defence of the Indian position in the World Court seem to have committed some blunders. They engaged a foreign legal expert to defend the Indian case who had expressed an opinion adverse to it in a legal journal some time before! It created an embarrassing situation when the opposing Counsel pointed this out and made much of it. But however, the end was not jeopardised and all is well that ends well. But this is another pointer to the slackness, carelessness and inefficiency of Indian administration in general and foreign service in particular!

ANOTHER AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE! (KONAKRY-GUINEA)

Another Afro-Asian Conference met in Konakry in Guinea and passed resolutions against imperialism and apartheid. They passed a resolution asking all ASIAN and African States to support the Provisional Government of Algeria, send funds, volunteers and arms to Algerian freedom fighters and help them in every way.

Indian fellow travellers like Mrs. Rameswari Nehru serving on the permanent secretariat of the Conference established last year at Cairo figure in the conference. This is clearly a Front organisation of

(Continued on page 5)

Pakistan's Intransigence Again

By M. A. Venkata Rao

THE new springtime of peace and friendship that appeared with the advent of the military ruler Ayub Khan in Pakistan seems to have been short-lived. It is passing into the old winter of suspicion and hatred entertained by that strange country towards India. After the settlement of border differences in a business-like manner with agreements for contingencies when nationals of the two countries might trespass into each other's areas, it seemed as though the old era of hatred of India punctuated by periodic cries of *jehad* against her whipped up by her politicians was definitely left behind. Everyone heaved a sigh of relief and felt that Pakistan had come of age. But now events have occurred unaccountably that shows that we were hallooing before we were out of the wood! The old intransigence has emerged again and under the new military set-up with its greater efficiency and readiness to take to force as evidenced by the continued use of martial law in the entire governance of the country, things may take a sharply warlike turn! And it happens just when the Chinese pressure is greatest on us—on the eve of the Nehru-Chou meeting on the 20th April. India is isolated and Pakistan seems determined to derive the utmost advantage out of her weakness!

There is a legend in the Mahabharata according to which the *yaksha* of a forest lake put some questions to the Pandava brothers as they approached the lake for water. One by one they fell dead for failing to answer the questions to the satisfaction of the *yaksha* until Dharmaraja the eldest came on the scene in search of his brothers. He answered the question and got his brothers revived by the *yaksha*.

India has had a long-standing problem before her culture and civilisation since the advent of Islam into the country in the ninth century. India assimilated the ruder tribes of invaders during earlier centuries—the scythians, sakas, hunas and others from the Mongolian steppes. They were beaten back from the days of the Sungas after the Mauryans time and again. Some remained and were assimilated into Indian groups. Some became the founders of famous Rajput royal dynasties.

(Continued from page 4)

international communism and shows the headway that it is making in the Afro-Asian field stealing a march over the leaders of the free West. Though we should express solidarity with unfree Asian and African nations in their struggle for freedom, we should take care that we do not become puppets of international communism.

Others became part of the Indian population in its different ranks and cultural levels. Buddhism tamed many tribes and their chiefs and established civilised thoroughfares along the caravan routes from India through the Hindukush and Karakoram mountain ranges through Sinkiang across the Gobi desert right up to Manchuria and northern China! Large monasteries and other relics of Buddhist culture have been unearthed along this old-time Highway.

But what happened to Indian rulers and their states at the time of the invasion of Mohamad Ghori. He is said to have invaded seven or seventeen times and carried off immense booty each time from the helpless country. And Raja Jaichand perpetrated the crowning act of treachery whereby his son-in-law Prithvi Raj was isolated and defeated by Ghori after being defeated ignominiously by him earlier and let off in clemency! That historic weakness of division and local conflicts surmounting fear of external danger, arguing lack of patriotism and even common sense seems to have marked Indian political history all along the long distressing corridor of time.

Indian society has failed to assimilate Islamic culture. No doubt it had its own traits making for resistance but Hindu society failed to take account of these rigidities and take measures to counter-act them and either survive in independence or create a new merger into a single nationalism.

The result is that even today the Hindu-Muslim problem remains as intractable as ever. The creation of Pakistan is but one result of the cultural failure of Hindu society. The political failure is to be traced to cultural factors forming the inheritance of ideas and emotions and attitudes in the whole circle of the inner life—religion, social ideals, social customs, caste and sectarian feelings—above all the persistence of primitive taboos in the higher planes of culture as in the mysterious custom of *untouchability*.

Even after two centuries of Western contact and British rule—a period when Western nations advanced in science and power and came to possess the whole earth in all the continents, India with her high philosophy and universalist sentiments and attitudes and unprecedented toleration of differing social ideas and customs and rituals has remained substantially static and unprogressive and a prey to any strong-minded aggressor, irrespective of right, legitimacy or justice. "The strong take what they can and the weak must submit"—seems to be the formula describing Muslim Hindu relations down the ages. This was the formula that the Greek imperialists stated to their weak colonies

after the Athenian victory over the Persians. The British took full advantage of our weakness and lack of unity and patriotism and ended up in mastery over the entire sub-continent.

Pakistan was allowed to be founded owing to this historic weakness of Indian society. It was a plural society, not merely dual. In addition to Hindu-Muslim differences, there were and are innumerable social groupings with feelings confined only to their own interdining and intermarrying fraternity. This is tribalism and caste is an expression of tribalism. Indian society has never, it seems, risen to the level of integral and homogeneous nationalism. Even if it had developed nationalism confined only to Hindus, things would not have fallen into such a sad condition of demoralisation as we find ourselves in today. Congress leaders had neither a nationalism inclusive of Muslims strong enough to rally nationalist Muslims to dominate separatist Muslims nor did they have the old nationalism confined to Hindus. They fell between two stools and are ruining the country. They are, in other words, neither Indian nationalists nor Hindu nationalists. They are negative, nondescripts, betwixt and between, neither fish nor flesh nor good red herring! Indian society or societies or conglomeration of tribes and castes, (no doubt with individual greatness of various sorts thrown in—which is entirely innocuous—with social cohesion insufficient for sustaining a large State from Amritsar to the Cape) seems to provide an admirable hunting ground for Nietzsche's barbarians, master races who have no qualms of conscience but have a robust, physical and psychological faith and instinct to appropriate the goods and lands of weaker peoples! It is the law of nature which is "red in tooth and claw." Nature is not a supporter of the milk of human kindness and Jain or Buddhist sentimentality regarding non-violence is repudiated by the law of the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest! The character of fitness for survival among national entities is social unity, courage and readiness to fight for one's rights and an undebated conviction of the supremacy of national values over all others—individual or group or sect. **This we lack.**

Just as the Prime Minister was saying in Parliament that there have been no violations of the border since the recent agreements, the papers have announced two such border firings in contravention of the agreement! This is a sign that the Ayub peace period is over. It looks as though the Pakistani dictator is piqued by Nehru's refusal to respond to his feelers for an Indo-Pakistani defence pact.

Nehru's refusal stems partly from the suspicion that Pakistan is trying to make capital out of India's trouble visavis China and use the crisis to wangle Kashmir out of her hands. Nehru has yielded national interests in all questions but Kashmir where he has been unusually obstinate. The old family sentiment for Kashmir seems to have

more to do with it than genuine Indian patriotism. He will not compromise on Kashmir even if it means Indian loss vis-a-vis China!

President Ayub Khan's offer seems to be—"You give me Kashmir and I will settle all other differences with you amicably!"

But finding that Nehru was adamant, he seems to have given the word for the resumption of the old cold war between the two countries. It began with the recrudescence of border firings on the eastern boundaries.

Another item in the new attitude (or reversion to the old attitude of implacable hatred towards India) is the new demands made by Pakistan's finance minister in his discussions with Mr. Morarji Desai with regard to Pakistan's claims and dues in financial matters. He raised fresh issues in regard to the price of military stores swelling the cost of Indian payments to unheard-of lengths! He reduced Pakistan's dues in regard to public debts to ridiculous levels using all sorts of untenable "principles" for calculation. Luckily, Morarji-bhai was not Nehru and he returned without signing any agreement under these circumstances! During the settlement of Partition in 1947, one of the members of the Committee on the division of assets as between the two countries told friends that Nehru's instructions were "to surrender rather than prolong the deliberations and bargains!" They cannot take away our mountains and rivers. Let everything else go." The new ruler of India, flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood as we thought, was surrendering Indian assets built up by the blood and sweat of our people during centuries as if they were but air and light to be had for the asking out of nature's largesse!

It is to be feared that in negotiations with Chou En-lai, our leader might surrender Ladakh rather than break-up without an agreement! That is why "Stand Firm, No Surrender!" meetings are being arranged on the 17th all over the country to stiffen the backbone of Sri Nehru, if he has one in this case!

Morarjibhai said clearly when asked by pressmen that the failure of the financial talks was due to Pakistani representatives. "Ask him," he said pointing to Pakistan's Finance Minister.

What is due to India should be whittled down to nothing or near nothing. What is due to Pakistan should be inflated until old Mother India is made to pay for the very upkeep of Pakistan making all her shortcomings good out of Indian largesse! In other words, India should function as the kama-dhenu-milch cow of the puranas with capacity to grant the fulfilment of all the wishes of Pakistan! Indian behaviour in the matter of unreasonable appeasement during all these years has but encouraged them in adopting this fruitful attitude, fruitful from their point of view. Such a situation has come to pass because Indian leaders in power have no depth

of feeling for the country adequate to safeguard the permanent interests of the land they govern. theme for keeping up a barrage of criticism against India in world capitals and the UNO!

Is it secularism as a philosophy that leads them to this facile attitude of surrender to intransigence? By secular, our leaders mean appeasement of non-secular, religious, fanatical nationalists of Pakistan! "Secularism" helps them to disregard Indian interests out of fear of being called communalists.

When Mr. Yadavendra Dube, member of Vidhan Sabha in Lucknow called attention to the pro-Pakistani cries raised by Muslim crowds some time ago, Congress members ejaculated that the Constitution was in the way of bringing the traitors to book! Mr. Dube replied that he could show how to deal with traitors even under the present Constitution (which is full of democracy and socialistic principles but is ominously silent regarding nationalism). But he was an opposition member and former ruler of Jaunpur and so without influence.

Another pointer to the new policy (or revival of old policy) by President Ayub Khan is the sudden postponement of the signing of the Canal Waters Agreement scheduled for May in London during the Commonwealth Conference of Prime Ministers. Mr. Nehru had let fall a hint that there might be an unexpected hurdle in the way when he told an interrogator in his press conference—"But the agreement must first materialise!"

It now appears that Pakistani representatives have raised new demands at the last moment when everything was supposed to have been settled in a vast new Plan to develop the Indus valley Water Resources with definite shares to Pakistan and India on the basis of three rivers to each. Britain and USA and Canada etc. were induced to contribute to the cost of the scheme with India having to pay part cost of construction of the new canals. The figure of India's contribution has been variously mentioned throughout the long years of the World Bank Mediation as ranging from Rs. 50 crores to Rs. 200 crores! It is now mentioned to be around Rs. 65 crores. It is not clear what the hitch now is. One guess is that Pakistan has withdrawn from the agreed stand that India could draw on a definite share of the waters of the three rivers that flow in her area after a ten year period. But now she demands that she is not entitled to draw any amount at all above the present level.

Another guess based on a casual remark of President Ayub Khan is that Pakistan now demands the prior settlement of the Kashmir problem since high dams are built in the hills, not on the plains! She wants to build dams in the Kashmir hills and therefore Kashmir should first be allotted to Pakistan before the Canal Waters dispute can be settled! So the two are linked together in the new Pakistani demand! It is clear that Pakistan is not keen on any settlement of disputes which are artificially maintained at fever-heat as a perpetual propaganda

The new spirit showed itself in what may be called philatelic aggression together with the cartographic aggression made familiar to us by China. Pakistan published recently stamps showing Kashmir and Ladakh as territories whose ownership was not settled. Also new maps showed Junagad and Manavadar in Gujerat as areas that had acceded to Pakistan and so disputed territories! Lucky that Hyderabad is not shown as disputed land!

The public should demand that the details of the proposals should be made available for public information before anything is settled or conceded on India's behalf. There is no use of protesting after the publication of the agreement to which Mr. Nehru will have committed the country as in the Berubari affair in East Bengal. The Prime Minister cannot be trusted to safeguard—Indian interests. He has proved himself to be a generous donor of Indian lands or funds except in the case of Kashmir. Even in Kashmir he has surrendered two-fifths of the State. He has agreed to the construction of a dam in the Azad Kashmir area which implies that India will never claim the Pakistan-occupied area at any time!

The way in which secret negotiations have been going on for six years and more, with officials staying for long periods in London, Geneva, Washington, New York etc. to carry on talks with the World Bank officials as mediators is unprecedented. The Indian public have been kept in the dark about successive proposals. What has leaked out from time to time has always been contrary to the interests of India, mentioning varying amounts as India's contribution to the cost of building new canals in Pakistan. No case has been made out as to why India should pay anything at all for this purpose? What Pakistan received in land and water as a result of the Partition is final and part of the inexorable condition of independence as a new state carved out of India. The natural thing to do is to let India share as much of the waters of the rivers flowing through her territories as is caught in the catchment areas within her borders. These are waters collected in India and naturally belong to her. Pakistan is entitled to the waters collected in her areas after the rivers pass into them. Why this simple rule is not to be applied and the affair settled once for all is not apparent to the unsophisticated understanding. If America is interested in helping the development of a new canal system in Pakistan, it is her affair and she is at liberty to offer her Aid in an open way, instead of linking it with settlement with Indian disputes with Pakistan. The whole thing is fishy and needs the wholesome air of full and honest publicity.

It is clear that Pakistan is using the military isolation of India vis-a-vis China to press her ad-

(Continued on page 8)

Thy Will Be Done, Khrushchev!

By M. N. Tholal

THE speeches at the airport on Mr. Chou En-lai's arrival in New Delhi were remarkable for the contrast they presented. While Mr. Nehru, welcoming the Chinese guest, used the words "Your Excellency, Mr. Prime Minister," the Premier's reply began with the words: "Your Excellency, Dear Prime Minister Nehru, Dear Indian friends." While Mr. Nehru referred to events which have put a great strain on the bond of friendship between the two countries and "which have given a shock to all our people", asserting that "our relations have been imperilled in the present and for the future and the very basis on which they stood have been shaken, the Chinese Premier asserted: "The friendship between the peoples of China and India is everlasting. Our two peoples have been friendly to each other over thousands of years in the past. We shall remain friendly to each other for thousands and tens of thousands of years to come. History will continue to bear out that the great solidarity of the one thousand million people of our two countries cannot be shaken by any force on earth." Not even, it may be added, by incursions and invasions from one side.

HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF

One of the services that Mr. Khrushchev rendered to the Chinese Government during his visit to India was by his insistence that the dispute was "a small misunderstanding between two friends", forcing Mr. Nehru to at least acknowledge the continuance of the friendship between the two countries, despite China's forcible annexation of 15,000 square miles of our territory. Thus it is not only the Chinese Premier who refers to that unbroken friendship. Mr. Nehru also does not deny the bond of friendship but confines himself to observing that recent events "have put a great strain on that bond of friendship". The meetings between the two Prime Ministers will not only

(Continued from page 7)

vantage home to extract the maximum benefit from her in all her differences with India.

The only remedy for India is to reverse her disastrous foreign policy of neutralism or non-alignment and enter openly into a straight military alliance with the USA (and Britain if Britain would join) for the defence of her borders and her national independence. All other suggestions like a cooperative Southeast Asian alliance without American military guarantee are futile palliatives or substitutes not capable of delivering the goods.

reveal their respective minds. They will reveal also the mind of Mr. Khrushchev, for he is the central figure in the drama and my sixth sense has almost been hearing both of them say to the Russian Premier: "Thy will be done!" For, when all is said, China cannot simply afford to disregard Russian advice seriously given and go against it on such a vital issue as the Indo-Chinese dispute. Nor can Mr. Nehru, for he has burnt his boats so far as western assistance is concerned and he has been making his country's helplessness against the Chinese quite plain in speech after speech by insisting that the only way to meet the Chinese threat lies in industrial progress, thus putting off resistance to China to the Greek calends.

It will be said by realists that, while it is true that China cannot afford to disregard serious advice from Russia, India is still a democratic country and in the Commonwealth, whose membership entitles her to seek assistance of fellow-members against external aggression. That is of course true. But how can Mr. Nehru, without eating the humble pie, ask for assistance of those whose cause he has been undermining all these years by mouthing Communist shibboleths? Request for assistance will at any rate involve an admission on his part that he has been in the wrong all these years; and that admission, as a self-willed man who has seldom put the country first since his father's death, he is not prepared to make, although the interests of the country clearly demand it. That makes it all the more necessary in the interests of the country that there should be a change of government in the land. Rajaji has been putting it as plainly as possible in public, without playing Mr. Nehru's game.

Here again history is repeating itself with a slight difference. In that famous series of Gandhi-Jinnah interviews, which lasted 18 days and during which the Mahatma danced attendance on Jinnah every day, the latter demanded a change of heart in the Mahatma. What Jinnah meant was that Gandhi should stop thinking in terms of self and begin thinking in terms of the country; that he should stop playing his own game or even that of the Congress and begin playing that of the country. (It wasn't exactly the game of the country which Mahatma Gandhi played, for example, when he practically advised double-crossing the Muslim League through the acceptance by the Congress of his formula of homogeneous cabinets, although U.P. Congress leaders were morally committed to taking Leagues in the U.P. Cabinet after the general elections of 1936-37. It was that double-crossing which laid the foundations of Pakistan).

THE COMMUNIST GAME

Mahatma Gandhi could have risen to the highest moral stature a man can boast of by pleading guilty to Jinnah's charge of egoism and egotism and by confessing the Himalayan blunder he made in 1937 under the guidance of his ego. The confession might have saved the division of the country. A noble gesture might well have evoked a noble response from the man whom all Indian journalists and leaders called "incorruptible". But instead, Gandhi said, "God alone knows men's hearts". That was hardly a straight answer to a straight demand from Jinnah. Men's hearts are easily known through what they say in public and still more easily through what they say in private. And the result of this evasion was that Jinnah and his lieutenants, knowing the strength of goondaism and the helplessness of non-violence, resorted to direct action to find, as they expected, Gandhi striking his forehead with the palm of his hand and crying: "Mai kya karoon"? (Vide "My Days with Gandhi" by Nirmal Kumar Bose.)

Gandhi had at least the heart and the patriotism to utter that cry. Does our Prime Minister, faced with a situation much worse for the country in the long run, ever have the patriotism to say anything like that in the presence of his closest confederates? If he does, he should know—no one better—that it is only his egoism which stands between him and his country's friends, and which has rendered the country absolutely helpless, and all that is required on his part is a change of heart through the latter making a determined effort to listen to the still small voice within, rather than to the self-seekers with whom he surrounds himself.

But for Mr. Nehru, who has put all his eggs in the basket of Mr. Khrushchev, that is now a vain hope, and the drama that will now begin to unfold itself is not difficult to foresee. The Nehru Government, which has been playing the Communist game, will continue helplessly to play the Communist game, for as long as it is in power. The point to remember is that it is in the interest of Communist Powers to see that Mr. Nehru remains in power in India. That is also Mr. Nehru's strongest card. It is in fact the only card he holds. And those who recall his threats of resignation without any apparent cause can now easily see—what they could not see then, unaware as they were of Chinese aggression—that those threats were directed to the Chinese and Russian Governments, rather than to the people of India, for whom they had no meaning at all. (Many of the observations of Mr. Nehru during the years 1954-59 bear a different interpretation after the revelation of the Chinese incursions which constitute by far the most important event of the Nehru regime and of which Mr. Nehru alone, unlike the public, was then aware).

SINO-INDIAN FRIENDSHIP CONTINUES

The reader should remember that India and

China continue to be friends. No less a man than Mr. Khrushchev told us so, told India so and told China so. We remain friends and shall continue to remain friends, irrespective of whether China occupies 15,000 square miles of our territory or 150,000 square miles of the same. That is the starting point provided by Mr. Khrushchev. It was in fact the miracle wrought by him during his stay in India, for Mr. Nehru himself was getting used to referring to China as the enemy—an awful thing to do, having regard to the fact that the Chinese are Russians' younger brothers, and we, who now solely depend on Russia for any crumbs that might fall from her table, can hardly afford to do that.

Now let us proceed. The friendship and non-aggression treaties with Burma and Nepal provide the clue to what is likely to be attempted by the Chinese Premier in India. And there is no reason why the Chinese should not succeed. After all, we are in no position to say NO firmly to the Chinese. What can India do except buy the status quo rather than risk more trouble on the border? Our policy of flattery and khushamad in which Mr. Nehru is a firm believer—he calls it emotional integration—will continue as a concomitant of our helplessness, which is also to continue. There being no generosity in politics, the inevitable results of helplessness will also continue to operate to the detriment of the country. That in brief is what we are in for during the Nehru regime, for as long as it lasts.

In the course of his speech at the banquet in honour of the Chinese Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru said: "Much has happened which has pained our people, much has been done which we think should be undone, and much has been said which had better been left unsaid." When things are done which should not have been done, they naturally evoke observations which would not have been made without the provoking cause. The restraint exercised by Mr. Nehru on this issue is perhaps unexampled in the history of the world. It has even given cause for the suspicion that India has no case. For five long years he kept the news of aggression to himself and even when he gave out the news, the language he used bore no resemblance to the words he used, for example, in connection with the Anglo-French attack on Egypt, as if Egypt was dearer to him than his own country. Indeed on more than one occasion, he was found almost defending the Chinese and his reference to what has been said "which had better been left unsaid" cannot surely apply to the Indian side, unless he was apologising for his "breach of trust" charge against the Chinese, in which case he might as well give the Chinese what they want straightaway.

BORDER STATES IN PERIL

In any case, there is hardly any Indian who will

(Continued on page 10)

Parliament In A Daze

By Pothan Joseph

In my college days we had an elegant character in our midst, ambitious and talented, whose future all of us knew would be a pleasure to watch. Sole heir to a large fortune, he on emerging from the University, found his prospects doubly brightened by elders contriving for him a marriage with a bride of the old demure type, long before the days of street-Romeos in Bombay and the urgen-

(Continued from page 9)

agree with Mr. Chou En-lai that the boundary question is "an issue of a limited and temporary nature" concerning "only one finger out of ten". The loss of one finger disfigures a man. It can also incapacitate him to some extent—in some matters to a great extent. The Chinese Prime Minister can afford to make light of it and talk of "mutual understanding" and "mutual accommodation" after seizing 15,000 square miles of our territory, but it is to be hoped, even against hope, that Mr. Nehru is not going in for appeasement, come what may, although, even before the incursions became known, he had been talking of his faith in appeasement. (That, again, must have been with reference to the Chinese incursions, about which the public then knew nothing.) And after the incursions he has been complaining that his difficulty is that there are "vested interests" in India opposed to a settlement with China!

The whole question has been so bedevilled by the scatterbrained manner in which it has been handled by the Indian Prime Minister that there seems now no way out of it except in appeasement, surrender and kowtowing to the Chinese by India which was bidding fair to stand up as the guardian of the small states bordering India and China. It is their existence that is at stake, primarily, in the talks between the two Prime Ministers now going on in Delhi. Our indirect confessions of helplessness vis-a-vis China are not likely to reassure them regarding our ability to protect them against the Chinese Communists. One sometimes begins to wonder if our Prime Minister is aware of the magnitude of the problems involved and is capable of keeping in mind that magnitude, with its various constituents, when dealing with the problem. Or has he come to the conclusion that, in view of the helplessness of the situation, it is no use thinking in terms of the border states, and that the time has come to leave them to their fate and save, for the moment, what we can of the land? Is the man who talks of mountains "where not a blade of grass grows" and who gave away Tibet to China, without realising the value of buffer states—he claims to be a historian—fit to be Prime Minister of India? That is the real question facing us.

cies of amending marriage laws to cope with modern problems. She added to the wealth of the common estate with the contribution of a huge dowry. Sails were set fair for a remarkable career when my friend developed traits of overweening confidence and self-indulgence. A coterie of sportsmen surrounded him and what he said about the turf was law with the parasitic flatterers. Those were sober pre-Prohibition days when the sound of revelry, by night could be heard up to the small hours, as in Brussels on the dawn of Napoleon's Waterloo. Nor did our hero neglect dance and music, though in those days strange spellings in the placarding of Advt's had not yet emerged like "Sangeet Natak-Akademi." Since the young mistress of the house adored her husband and left her fortune at his disposal, there was plenty to spend and his popularity widened, and he could not, thanks to traits of trustfulness, perceive that money was going down the drain. Late nights were explained to the young lady as being due to hard work in the firm of solicitors to which he had been affiliated first; and later he was supposed to have joined business which called for the late sittings of directors at board-meetings. He indulged in some speculative deals without whispering a word about the investment of the girl's patrimony. Growing wan, he took his symptoms to a doctor when his waster-companions were not looking. The doctor had no difficulty in tracing the causes of physical strain and the reason for the patient asking for an early course of rejuvenation. The doctor whilst compounding a mixture to suit treatment, advised the Gay Lad to pull up. Altogether? No, by degrees he could reduce excesses, like the modern plan of Russian disarmament at Geneva, namely, reduction by one-third instalments annually so that in the fourth year all countries would stand completely disarmed, with the danger of war completely eliminated. Wine, women and song had formed the round-the-clock schedule of the young hopeful who had, incidentally, reached the stage of a flutter at home when he proposed that family-jewellery should be taken to an expert from Amsterdam, just for valuation, that was all. He taking a deep breath looked at the doctor, and undertook to reduce dissipation by one-third. "I promise, Doctor, I promise, I will cut out strong!" The cutting out of "strong" must have been a sacrifice, but meanwhile the murmur of his confiding wife who had left at his disposal all her property, papers and cash, had become a bit strident. She wanted to see mortgage deeds in her alarm partly caused by the stuttering excuses and inconsistent stories told about pals in the city taking care of a lot of commitments. The wife was unfortunate; and she got so curious about accounts (em-

(Continued on page 15)

The Indian Libertarian

Special Supplement

Philosophy of Neo-Liberalism

by Patick M. Boarman

MANY have heard of the German miracle but few have bothered to investigate into the powerful economic causes that brought about the miracle.

The German miracle, as explained by Erhard, turns out not to have been a miracle at all, but the quite predictable outcome of replacing the rotted hulk of planned economy inherited from the Nazis by a "Social market economy." The illusion of "miracle" was due to the magnitude and speed of the change wrought by an economic system which restored the free play of supply and demand and threw off the paralyzing incubus of price control. As Roepke put it: "Even the bitterest enemy against the conditions which it had to overcome, it has furnished positive experimental proof of its superiority, as convincing a proof, in fact, as economic history has ever known." Statistics and the historical record support Erhard in his contention that it was not currency re-reform, nor American aid, nor the Korean War, nor the stimulus of pent-up German demand, nor Germany's initial freedom from the burden of armaments, nor even German "industriousness" which account for the astonishing pace of economic revival in the Federal Republic, but the establishment of a functioning economic system. It was only within the context of such a system that all these factors could have had any lasting economic effects. A series of relief measures and happy accidents do not add up to an economic miracle of the duration of the one experienced by West Germany.

ERHARD'S PHILOSOPHY

The economic Philosophy which Eucken, Roepke, and Erhard have in common is described usually as neo-liberalism (to distinguish it from the paleoliberalism of the nineteenth century) and sometimes also as neo-liberalism. Its principal concern is with "systems analysis," with the total politico-economic structures in terms of which the central economic problem of a developed society may be solved. That problem is how to ensure the continuous coordination of an incalculably large number of private economic activities in such a way as to maximize the return to society from its available economic means. Eucken envisaged three possible alternative "orders" or politico-economic systems which would permit, in varying degree, the solution of the econo-

mic problem. These are: 1. The centrally-administered economy (rejected because of its gross inefficiency in ascertaining and responding to consumer demand and because of its incompatibility with human freedom); 2. The market economy in a context of laissez-faire (rejected because it eventuates in oligopoly and other power formations which partially or totally paralyze the regulative forces of the market and to that extent paves the way for the advent of the centrally-administered economy); 3. The competitive market economy in which the State establishes and forces the degree of competition needed to permit optimal functioning of the market. It is this third alternative which is the core of the neo-liberal system.

Thus, the "newness" of neo-liberalism consists to a large extent in a new appreciation of the positive role of the State in creating the legislative, juridical, and monetary framework necessary to a viable market economy. At the risk of over simplification, the differences between the three politico-economic conceptions might be summed up as follows: In a market economy of the laissez-faire type, the State determines neither the economic system nor the day-to-day processes which take place within that system. In an economic system which is predominantly of the centrally-administered type, both the system itself and its day-to-day processes are directly determined by the State. In the competitive market, economy advocated by neo-liberals, the State takes whatever action is needed to support and preserve the market system, but does not itself interfere with the day-to-day processes of the system.

Neo-liberals thus reject not only the planned economy, but the "mixed economy", if this is interpreted to mean the direct intervention of the government into market processes as in the case of agricultural price supports, rent controls, etc. Such "mixture", they contend, produces only chaos by frustrating the functioning both of the Government's plan and of the market (in this sense a fully planned economic is more "efficient" than a half-planned one). At the same time, the neo-liberals assign to the State a degree of responsibility for the over-all well-being of the economic system which would have scandalized the Manchesterians. Moreover, in the neo-liberal version of the "humane Economy," the State is only one of a host of institutions—political,

monetary, cultural, moral, religious—which surround and support the market, softening the outcome of the competitive struggle and correcting, where necessary, gross distributive injustices. The neo-liberal has enormous respect for the market as the only mechanism by which an advanced industrial society can solve its economic problem and yet preserve its liberty. But he also knows that the borders of the "civitas humana" extend far beyond the market, that the market is really only a means to an end. If he has an axe to grind, it is in behalf of human freedom.

INGREDIENTS OF SUCCESS

What, then, were the specific ingredients of the formula which Erhard used to translate the theoretical concept of the social market economy into reality?

1. **The abolition of price controls and other remnants of the planned economy.** Price controls falsify supply-demand relationships and, in the absence of (or perhaps even in spite of) a totalitarian government with the will and means to enforce them, inevitably result in a worsening of the injustices the controls were designed to overcome. There is little point in talking about the justice of distribution until something has been produced which can be distributed. In the market economy, incentives to production are provided by the unhindered formation of prices in response to the forces of supply and demand. Quarrels about distribution are vain and dangerous if they interfere with this mechanism. "It is considerably easier to allow everyone a larger slice out of a bigger cake than to gain anything by discussing the division of a smaller cake." The efficacy of this policy was reflected in the great outpouring of goods and services in Germany beginning with the general decontrol of prices in 1948. Industrial output which stood then at 80 (1950=100) rose to 192 by 1956, i.e., an increase of 112%. By comparison, the index of U.S. industrial output advance in the same period is from 87 to 128 or only 41%.

2. **Competition.** Competition is the indispensable adjunct of a market economy. The absence of competition, like the presence of price control perverts and frustrates the functioning of the market, resulting in economic stagnation, destruction of incentives, and exploitation of the weak by the powerful. "The social market economy does not recognize the freedom of the entrepreneur to exclude competition through cartel agreements..... if the State must not decide who should be victorious in the market, neither, should an industrial organization such as a cartel. It must be the consumer alone.....Cartels are the enemies of the people." Moreover, competition has important stabilizing effects on the economy. "Patterns of consumption change continuously and supply must be able to adjust to this peculiarity. That can only be achieved if every businessman seeks 'to be right' in the market, to retain the goodwill of the consu-

mer, and to offer him consistently something better in order to survive in competition with his rivals."

3. **War on pressure groups and special interests.** The realization of the social market economy requires that it be understood by all the people as a total economic conception. The continuing demand by a variety of special interests for ad hoc intervention into market processes in their behalf, results from a failure to see the social market economy whole. Those who sing the praises of free enterprise and yet demand that the State guarantee their profits or their wages are the grave-diggers of free enterprise and of the general welfare. "Our economic policy serves the consumer; he alone is the yardstick and judge of all our economic activities....Any fragmentation of the national economy into vested interests cannot be allowed. It would be quite wrong to assume that I am the representative of the interests of industry or trade. To be responsible for economic policy means to be responsible to the people as a whole."

4. **Currency stability.** Inflation is utterly immoral. It amounts in effect to a forcible and deceitful redistribution of the nation's real income in favor of the powerful, i.e., those able to keep their wages and/or prices one jump ahead of the cost-of-living index. The robbery which is thereby perpetrated upon the weaker members of society adds a new and serious dimension to inflation as a problem in distributive justice and economic ethics. The idea that inflation is an inevitable concomitant of economic growth must be rejected as a dangerous assumption, refuted by the record of the German economy. Not only did the German mark emerge as the most stable currency in the world between the year 1950-57, but Germany's rate of economic growth outstripped that of every other country in this same period. "Currency stability is a basic human right which every citizen can demand from his government."

5. **Rejection of the Welfare State.** Concern for social policy is obviously an important ingredient in the social market economy and governmental outlays, for social services have trebled since 1950. But "larger social services in the future can be expected only because the market economy results in an ever increasing pie, not because wealth is being 'divided up.'" It is in this sense that "the Quest for security through the Welfare State, (which places impossible burdens on the market economy) is an illusion. Just as a people cannot consume more than it has first produced, so the individual cannot gain more real security than the whole people has gained as a result of its efforts.....legitimate social security is not the same as social insurance for all.....it is not achieved by passing individual responsibility to some group. At the start there must be responsibility for oneself and only where this is insufficient do the obligations of the State and the community begin." Pursuit of the Welfare State is a dangerous enterprise which yields us social security at the cost of economic paralysis and the gradual loss of freedom.

6. Rejection of laissez-faire capitalism. The conception of nineteenth century economic liberalism in which the State was reduced to the role of nightwatchman is wrong. "The modern state cannot afford to return to the role of nightwatchman. It was precisely this wrongly understood freedom which buried freedom and a free order. The businessman is responsible for his own business; there he can rightly demand that his activities should remain free from all State intervention.....I am at the head of those supporting the businessman in this demand. But the State alone must carry responsibility for economic policy. We know where it leads to if these two functions are confused.... I do not advocate a return to the economic liberalism of the past and the irresponsible freebooting methods that prevailed then."

COMMENTARY ON SUCCESS

This Erhardian formula, applied to a war-devastated rump state whose already dense poverty stricken population was swelled by the addition of 10 million homeless and property-less refugees, has yielded results which are a convincing proof of the "social" content of the social market economy. The facts (to cite but a few): between 1950 and 1957, German real wages rose 40%, with almost no labor strife; per capita consumption rose from 77 in 1949 (1951=100) to 126 in 1955, as compared with an increase from 96 to 107 in the United States; and in the same period, upwards of 4 million housing units were erected. The latter record was achieved with the help of incentives associated with the decontrol of rents for most new private construction, and provides a dramatic contrast to the melancholy performance of the French housing industry, plagued with rent controls since World War I. Nevertheless, in both the housing and the capital markets, government operations (as distinguished from regulations) are still far too large to suit Erhard. His critics are found of emphasizing the gap between the social market economy as ideally conceived and the existing situation in which the government continues to function as saver, investor and producer in areas which theoretically belong to the private sector. The criticism is beside the point for no one is more acutely conscious of the gap and more dedicated to the elimination of the remaining pockets of "mixed economy" than the Minister of Economics. "The social market economy," he notes, "is imperfect as are all things human.... it is precisely on this account that our common efforts should be directed to making it as perfect as can be."

What the statistical record of the social market economy further shows (and this may prove to be its most signal triumph) is that all this progress has taken place within the context of continuous full employment and a relatively stable price level. For the twelve years of its existence, the social market economy has been free of violent cyclical change, a record which invites comparison with the three sharp recessions experienced by the United States

in the same period? As of now, Erhard's policies appear to have broken the back of the business cycle—an epochal feat, if vindicated by the future course of events.

As another leaf in Erhard's garland of accomplishments must be mentioned his bold and effective leadership of the international economic community. It is Erhard who has been the tireless preacher of domestic monetary and fiscal discipline as the prerequisite of currency convertibility which in turn is the prerequisite of a return to a healthy multilateral trade. He has not waited for concessions from other nations before dismantling the remnants of Germany's own protectionist apparatus (with a few exceptions, private imports from the OEEC area have been liberalized almost 100% and from the dollar area 92.8%, while only 13.6% of total imports are still subject to tariff).

The effects of Erhard's dose of free trade medicine (combined with a stable German price level) on Germany's international accounts have been startling. The trade balance, which was negative in 1950, turned into an export surplus which had piled up \$6 billion in gold and foreign exchange in Germany by the end of 1957, making her the chief creditor nation in the European Payments Union.

In the final analysis, the greatness of Erhard's accomplishment must itself be measured against other than purely economic values. It is not only that he has proven to the faint-hearted and the pessimists the world over that it is possible to make economic truth prevail over political expediency and public apathy, to the ultimate benefit of all concerned. More importantly, his social market economy has provided a stable base for the growth of freedom and democracy in a country which had no experience in and little enthusiasm for these values.

The success of Erhard's social market economy with the voters of the Federal Republic has disconcerted but unfortunately not converted the hard core of his opposition. Partly from motives of political expediency and partly as the result of intellectual confusion, some Socialists are occasionally taken with fits of enthusiasm for "competition" and "market economy." Their attacks on the Minister of Economics then take the form of charging him with not pursuing others of his critics, from Marxists to medievalists, are unrelenting in their hostility to the social market economy. Their vested intellectual anti-liberal prejudices constitute a psychological block to their acceptance of the idea that a market economy could result in anything except social atomism, exploitation, and depression. They therefore seek to diminish Erhard's achievement by arguing as follows: the dose of the market economy medicine which was administered to Germany after 1948 was much diluted, hence it cannot have worked. As Wilhelm Roepke has aptly observed: "How wonderfully efficacious this medicine must have been if it worked even under such handicaps!"

FREE-MARKET vs. SOCIALISM

In a free-market system the determination of what articles are produced, and how many of each kind, depends ultimately upon what consumers are willing to buy. When the demand for an article increases its price rises and new labour is attracted into the production of it; when the demand decreases prices and profits fall and labour seek other occupations. It can safely be assumed that no consumer's demand will remain unsatisfied for long, and that no goods will be produced very much in excess of what consumers need. Capitalist practice is marred by the gross inequality in the effective demand of different classes of consumers, and by the fact that consumers are inadequately educated and are open to harmful advertising pressure. The remedy, however, is to reform the practice, not to abandon the principles.

Under Socialism the supremacy of the consumer is replaced by the supremacy of the officials who plan production. What is produced is determined, not by what the consumers actually want, but by what the planners think they ought to want. A planned production means also a planned consumption; the disposition of the available labour supply among the various kinds of consumption good means that those goods, and no others, will be available to consumers. Such a system might function efficiently if the planners had accurate knowledge of what the consumers wanted, and of how those wants might most efficiently be satisfied; but once the free market and the competitive price systems have been abolished, the acquisition of such knowledge becomes very difficult. In a system where all prices are fixed by the state instead of being regulated by competition, price is not dependent on demand but demand on price.

Since moreover, the planners can always be assured of a market for any article which they choose to produce, there is nowhere in the system any suffi-

READ

FREEMAN

The Freeman is a monthly published by the Foundation for Economic Education, championing the causes of private property, the free-market, free enterprise, limited government and Libertarian ideals.

Available at:

LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE,
Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road,
Bombay-4.

Price per single copy is Re. ONE only, just enough to cover cost and postage

cient incentive for creating, anticipating or satisfying a consumer demand. The enormous variety of consumption goods produced by competitive capitalism is caused by the incentive of profits, and by the willingness of individual entrepreneurs to take risks in the hope of making a profit. Under a system which has ended risks and abolished the profit motive, consumption goods are likely, as is actually the case in the Soviet Union, to be of poor quality and to lack variety.

When the Law by means of its necessary agent, force, imposes upon men a regulation of labour, a method or a subject of education—then the law is no longer negative; it acts positively upon people. It substitutes the will of the legislator for their own wills; the initiative of the legislator for their own initiatives. When this happens, the people no longer need to discuss, to compare, to plan ahead; the law does all this for them. Intelligence becomes a useless prop for the people; they cease to be men; they lose their personality, their liberty, their property.

—Frederic Bastiat in 'The Law'

Inflation, and the spirit which nourishes it and accepts it is merely the monetary aspect of the general decay of law and of respect for law. It requires no special astuteness to realise that the vanishing respect for property is very intimately related to the numbling of respect for the integrity of money and its value. And this is not the kind of foundation on which the free society can long remain standing.

—Wilhelm Roepke

THE CHALLENGE OF ASIA

By RALPH BORSODI

Is the world being gradually lost to Communism? What is the West doing to defend the young and independent nations of Asia against the onslaught of Communism? Are the leaders of Asia prepared to accept the leadership which is passing from the West to the East? These are some of the questions posed by the author who has visited Thailand, India, Burma and other Asian countries and has summed up his impressions in "The Challenge of Asia" which is a frank analysis of the political trends in Asia.

Price Rs. 6/-

(Free to new subscribers of "Indian Libertarian.")

Available from:

THE LIBERTARIAN BOOK-HOUSE,
Arya Bhavan,
Sandhurst Road,
Bombay-4.

The Indian Libertarian

Rationalist Supplement

A Humanist Looks at Buddhism (II)

By Ronald Fletcher

(This is the concluding part of the article which appeared in the Rationalist Supplement of 'The Indian Libertarian' of March 1, 1960.)

FOR Humanism life is an adventure, not an evil from which absence of desire is the only way of escape.

THERE is no doubt that there are many features of Buddhism with which a humanist must be in sympathy.

A humanist would share the Buddha's difficulty in conceiving a God who would make the nature of the world of our experience intelligible; his belief that there is no evidence to suggest the existence of a God who is of help to men in grappling with their predicaments; and his belief that God is not necessary as a guide to morality. The rational proof or disproof of the existence of God is beset with insuperable difficulties, and the Buddha seems right in saying that the pursuit of such a question does not seem profitable.

Moral principles and qualities are clarified with reference to human experience and do not have to wait upon prior proofs in theology. If God does not exist, our moral principles are unaffected and still stand firm. If God does not exist, and is good, then he will approve of those moral principles which we have clarified in our own experience. If God does exist, and is not good, and does not approve of these principles, then we would have no choice but to disregard him in these matters. The Buddha, is, in fact, a humanist in emphasizing that man must resolve his problems in the world by his own efforts and in the light of his own knowledge and evaluations.

POINTS OF AGREEMENT

Humanists would agree with the rejection of the efficacy of priests and of ritual for the purpose of attaining a satisfactory way of life. A man cannot uncritically accept the authority of priests and of ritual for the purpose of attaining a satisfactory way of life. A man cannot uncritically accept the authority of priests as possessing some sort of privileged insight into the nature of the world and the nature of the religious life; and unreflected ritual observation is of little value.

Again, humanists would approve of much of the Buddha's morality, and especially with his em-

phasis upon sympathy and human compassion. The fact is that most of the world religions have a common core of moral principles with which humanists are in agreement.

Humanists would also agree with the Buddha's view that much suffering—both within a man's own nature, and brought about by his conduct towards others—is rooted in all—considered and uncontrolled desire, and that the better government of such desire requires a certain inwardness inner thought, inner integrity, and inward endeavour. Indeed, humanists and Buddhists alike would agree that this emphasis upon the necessity of inward self-awareness and control was a needed corrective in modern times. Although material conditions and social circumstances may be considerably improved, they alone cannot bring a satisfactory state of mind and character to a man. Composure, contentment, happiness, clarity of mind and purpose cannot be simply provided for the individual from outside; they can only be attained through the individual's own understanding and government of himself.

KNOWING IS FOR DOING

Many humanists would also be inclined to sympathise with the Buddha's impatience with intellectual speculation and knowledge for its own sake. Knowledge, as Plato would put it, is for becoming something better. Buddhists and humanists alike, then, would be impatient with that kind of moral philosophy which explicitly dissociates itself from a concern for moral endeavour. Moral philosophy is of value in clarifying moral questions—but what is the merit of knowing what is right and good, and how properly to examine moral questions, if there is no concern for the attainment of right action and the achievement of moral qualities in the actuality of human life

There is much that humanists could agree with in the Buddha's psychology. His analysis of human experience in terms of the body, instincts, feelings, perceptions, etc., and of the nature of the 'self' as

a focus of conscious awareness of these interdependent elements could be stated, with little change, in modern psychological terms. The Buddha's analysis would fit quite well, for example, into the Freudian system of interpreting the nature of conflicts in human experience and the way in which to approach their resolution.

There are, then, many elements of Buddhism with which humanists can sympathize and agree. Even so, Buddhism is unsatisfactory in several respects from the humanist point of view.

Two criticisms can be directed to what seems to be an unwarranted continuation in Buddhism of elements of Hinduism.

WHERE AGREEMENT ENDS

The Buddha held that all elements of the world and of human experience are characterized by transience. Yet, in some curious way, Buddhists now claim to find in this flux of experience some element of permanence. They speak of 'Nirvana', for example, as the 'unity of mind with all-mind.' This seems no less than the return of the union between the Atman and Brahma of early Brahminic Hinduism. Somehow, an element and a realm of permanence and abiding worth has been introduced into the transience of things, and with it comes the desire for this permanence. This is a criticism of Buddhism as it now exists rather than a criticism of the Buddha Himself, for his emphasis seems to be out of keeping with his own teaching.

The Buddha himself claimed that he could not comprehend this kind of 'permanent nothingness,' and he certainly thought that one should not desire it. When he speaks of 'Nirvana', of the cessation of desire and suffering, he is referring to a state of mind which a man can attain in his life. And this is all that matters. Whether this entails a further existence, a further realm of permanence, is of no consequence. Only the attainment of the state of mind is of importance.

On this point, then, a humanist would be inclined to say (a) that this doctrine of the permanent in the impermanent, the unity of mind with all-mind, was a very dubious development out of the Buddha's own teaching, and seems rather to be an early Hindu belief, and (b) that he finds no intelligibility in it and cannot base his life upon an aspiration towards that end.

Secondly, the humanist would have two points of criticism with reference to the Buddha's continued, though qualified, belief in the doctrines of reincarnation and the law of Karma. The first is simply that there are no grounds for believing either of these doctrines to be true. It is true that what a man says, thinks, feels, and does can be held to have some determining influence upon his subsequent character as an individual; but when the law of Karma is linked to the belief in reincarnation and it is further maintained that everything in a man's sa-

ture—his size, his beauty or ugliness, his deformities, and so on are morally deserved since they are the inevitable outcome of his spiritual stature in former lives, then the humanist and the Buddhist must part company.

Second criticism is that these doctrines take an assessment of the world and man's experience which the humanist cannot accept. They lead to a completely negative and pessimistic account of the entire human situation. The humanist, though believing that the human situation does contain elements of tragedy and suffering, believes also that—in spite of its transience it also contains elements of joy, beauty, creative satisfaction, and a positive worth of human attachments. Indeed, the humanist is inclined to the view that these elements of experience are in a sense complementary; without the one it is difficult to see how we could experience the other.

It is just because of transience that human achievements seem to be of such considerable worth. It is only because of the high qualities of love that we feel sorrow at the prospect of losing that which we love. For the humanist, the, life, desire, and attachments to things, places, and persons have positive value in spite of their transience and the loss and sorrow which must inevitably accompany them. To the humanist, too, there seems to be an element of pusillanimity, even of cowardice, in avoiding attachments because they entail sorrow.

Should we avoid love because we shall suffer sorrow from the ultimate loss of love? The humanists' answer is certainly not! The degree of our sorrow is commensurate with the quality of our love; but to deny the experience of love, and some fulfilment of all our desires, would be to eliminate all those qualities which make life the richly rewarding experience we find it to be. It would be to reduce life to nothing.

A further criticism of Buddhism is that, although much suffering is due to desire, it does not seem to be true that all suffering can be so explained. The poverty that millions of people suffer throughout the world; the diseases to which they are a prey; the humiliations to which they are subjected in conditions of political tyranny; these kinds of suffering cannot be said to be caused by the desire inherent in the nature of all individuals. Today the individuals who suffer in these ways are morally blameworthy for their own conditions and that the only course for their removal is the way of individual inwardness is not only untrue but also morally repugnant.

Humanists believe that there are many causes of human suffering about which much can be done in terms of concrete activity, and they aim at practical, social and political action to eliminate such sources of suffering. Indeed, one of the things it is most difficult for the humanist to understand is that Buddhism, which so strongly emphasizes human compassion, should be so negligibly concerned for, and engaged in, purposive social reform.

(Continued on page III)

Building Up a Rationalist Organisation In India

By S. Ramanathan

OUR members may be aware that at the last Rationalist convention we held at Madras, we decided to enrol life members to the Association who should subscribe once for all Rs. 100/- each. It was also decided that the amount so collected should be accumulated as a permanent fund to sustain the activities of the Association. The active proponent of the scheme was Mr. P. J. Sabnis of Nasik who was as good as his word and paid up Rs. 100/- and became the first life member of the Indian Rationalist Association. But no one else has followed his noble example with the result that the scheme is not yet put into operation. It is too good a scheme to be missed altogether. I think that Rationalists in India should consider the proposal seriously. If rationalism is worthwhile as a mental attitude and as a guide to life, the movement must be saved from becoming extinct. Let us remember

(Continued from page II)

There is one final point which I believe to be worth making. It is frequently maintained that the contemplation and mysticism to be found in Eastern religions is more profound than anything offered by Western philosophy. I believe this to be thought; I believe that the humanistic tradition of the West, which has a central concern for concrete moral, social, and political matters; for a positive improvement of the condition of human life here and now as a basis for the widest fulfilment of human qualities and potentialities, is of more value to mankind than anything contributed by Eastern religion.

The Westernization of the world which is proceeding in the twentieth century does not stem from the spread of industrialization and science alone. It is also a consequence of the quality of the whole conception of life which has been built up in the Western traditions, and which is increasingly desired by people throughout the world.

The Humanist regards life—both for the individual and the race—as an explorative, creative human adventure, which involves both pain and joy, both ugliness and beauty, both tragedy and the richness of experience in meeting and overcoming it. He decides to experience all aspects of this adventure to the full. He does not seek to escape all the unfortunate elements of it, but seeks to meet them creatively and to make something of them; to utilize them in the building of human character; and he does not think it fitting to dwell too much upon, or to complain too much about those elements of sorrow which seem to be an integral and necessary part of that complex experience through which he comes to a full appreciation of worthwhile qualities, aims and achievements.

—Humanist

that the present Indian Rationalist Association, with its Head Quarters at Madras, is one of several attempts in the chequered history of India to incorporate freedom of thought in the lives of our people. Starting from Charwaka in pre-historic times, several adventurers in free-thought flourished for a while and left their footprints in the history of this country. The immediate predecessor of our Association had its Head Quarters at Bombay. They published a journal and there are still people living who have actively participated in that organisation. We ourselves were born as an organisation ten years ago and we are fortunate that our founder President, Sir Ragnath Paranjpye, is still in the land of the living and is rendering his utmost help to keep the organisation going. We have published a journal continuously for seven years. But later the journal is merged in the 'Indian Libertarian' which publishes a 'Rationalist Supplement' once a month. We have held six annual conventions and have done sufficient propaganda to be recognised as an important element in Indian national life. Our prestige abroad is very high and practically all rationalist journals published in many languages throughout the world give space to report our activities and to publish extracts from our journal. Having worked our way through to the present eminence it will be nothing short of a tragedy if we give up the attempt to go forward and render that active service to our people which is so important under modern conditions. The growth of science and technology has removed from peoples' minds the cobwebs of superstition and ignorance. The way is now clear for inaugurating the rationalist way of life for the masses at large, who after ages of religious thraldoms are emerging into the region of free thought. Educated people, men and women who have studied science and modern literature cannot but be opponents of supernatural religion and supporters of the rationalist endeavour. Members of the Indian Rationalist Association, if they gird up their loins and fight for their convictions they are bound to secure a major victory in the coming days. It is therefore incumbent on them to participate in building up the Indian Rationalist Association which will supply them the sinews of war for the coming struggle. It should not be difficult for us to secure a minimum of one thousand life members for our organisation who can contribute rupees one hundred each to build up the Association.

There is one objection to the building up of the organisation as I have indicated above which must be considered. It is said by some Rationalists that an organisation with property and vested interests will not promote the healthy growth of principles but will create factions and quarrels between members for the securing of control over property and

power. The example might be quoted of the late Mrs. Annie Besant who built up an extensive and healthy organisation with footholds in all the countries of the world for the propagation of Theosophy. Her ambition was to build up a Theosophical Church more wealthy and more powerful than the Vatican in Rome. Fortunately for the world, the messiah whom Mrs. Besant chose as the leader of the new Church, Mr. J. Krishnamurthi, turned a Rationalist when he attained majority. He saw through the game, dissolved the Church and returned the properties to the donors. It is Mr. Krishnamurthi's view that all organisations kill the spirit which they are intended to promote. He thinks it is best to approach individuals as such and work by converting their minds and inducing them to convert others and so on until the message reaches the masses.

The late M. N. Roy, who was a Vice-President of our Association, held more or less a similar view. He dissolved the Radical Democratic Party which he himself so laboriously built up. While I admit there is some truth in the contentions of Mr. Krishnamurthi and Comrade Roy, no principle can be

spread among the people at large in modern times except by building up an organisation to do propaganda for that principle. Even Krishnamurthi's teachings have to be propagated through the "Star Trust" which functions more or less under his guidance. Even Comrade M. N. Roy's teachings have to be propagated through the Renaissance Institute and the Radical Humanist Weekly, so ably conducted by Mrs. Ellen Roy. If an organisation is an evil, it is a necessary evil and Rationalists should not feel shy of shouldering the responsibility of building up their organisation keeping in view the fact that there are inherent dangers in such organisations. I have no hesitation whatever to appeal to all Rationalists in India to become Life Members and remit their contributions of Rs. 100/- each to our Office. Such contributions will not be spent for the day to day administration of the affairs of the Association but will be funded into a permanent Trust for the propagation of our principles to the masses at large. I shall be glad to have the views of the members in regard to this matter. Let us discuss the question in the columns of this journal.

Agadir—and God !

By F. A. Ridley

JUST before midnight on February 29th, an earthquake due, it is now thought, to the eruption of an underwater volcano, devastated the Moroccan town of Agadir on the North African coast. The earthquake itself did not take much time: to be precise, it lasted about 12 seconds. But it did its job—if that is the right expression!—with terrible thoroughness. The town is now a pestilence-ridden, corpse-strewn mass of rubble, while of its 50,000 or so inhabitants, about 12,000 are computed to have perished. The remainder are homeless, reduced overnight to the level of refugees—the latest additions to the world-wide problem which the current "Refugee Year" is just now endeavouring to impress upon contemporary human consciousness. There is, however, one significant difference between the refugees from Agadir and those in most other parts of the world. For, whereas the others represent the unhappy effects of human—of political and military—conflicts, these wretched Moors are victims of an "Act of God." A natural catastrophe, that is, which on the time-honoured principle that all acts for which no visible human cause exists, has to be attributed to God. The Lord—or so Genesis informs us—created the earth, and the earth—or at least that part of it around Agadir—went sadly wrong. The sorry result is all due, ultimately, to the bad workmanship

of the Creator. On the Creation hypothesis, no other assumption is possible. For Almighty God who made "the earth and the waters under the earth," by definition knew everything, including what was going to happen in Morocco on the night of February 29th, March 1st, 1960. It would be heresy to allege any alternative explanation. It would be to deny the Catholic faith, without belief in which a man cannot find salvation. Not to mention the local Muslim faith, which also teaches in a most unequivocal manner, that Allah, the Supreme and Only God, made Heaven and Earth, and all that is therein. Christian or Muslim (or any other) there is really no escape for the theologians, nor even for the rank and file theists of all creeds. God was ultimately responsible for Agadir. And, since responsibility for such a cataclysm necessarily includes its results, it is to God also, that the Theist must ascribe all the attendant horrors in the hopeless town during the hours and days that followed the earthquake; the helpless human beings trapped in the ruins; the children screaming hopelessly for parents who will never reply; the hordes or rats that took possession of the deserted streets and enjoyed a hideous, verminous carnival on the bodies of the dead and, it is much to be feared on those still living but trapped. For all this Chamber of Horrors, God must bear the blame.

—Freethinker

(Continued from page 10)

bracing daily income and expenditure) when in a fit of penitence and powerlessness he agreed that she should henceforth take over charge, especially for fear of falling further in the grip of two smiling, soft-spoken usurers who wanted him to be their captive for the despoilment, "shlowly, shlowly", of the entire estate. Reluctantly the wife attempted handling the difficult portfolio. Whenever the mail was delivered there would be a wad of long-standing bills, claims for arrears, threats of foreclosure, hints of eviction.

With lordly air, our friend would, like gentleman Jack, very graciously hand over the lot saying "Here are your papers, Kamala dear, it is for you to deal with finance now that you have taken over. You know I respect your discretion, I trust you entirely, never mind the past." With mounting literature of that commercial brand, the poor woman, staggered, soon became a shadow of her matrimonially self.

The relation between Pandit Nehru and the public is somewhat similar. In 1954 he in credulous hurry endorsed Chou En-lai's claim of suzerainty over Tibet without clarification, stirred by incontinent eagerness to proclaim Panch Sheel as the cure-all for the problems of the world over which the West was functioning; he consented to Chinese road-building in Ladakh; he bore with encroachment of Indian territory in 1956 behind Parliament's back. Now that China is intent

on expanding (with five principles frequently cited for India's titillation), the Prime Minister feels he had gone too far as sole expert in foreign policy. Without holding back Chinese correspondence any more, he takes Parliament into confidence dumping lengthy exchanges for people to see. A Peking despatch comprising thousands of words relating to history, geography and mythology was released to tell us on April 11 that China rejected India's claim, and that the "watershed principle is not acceptable." Panditji at the moment was in Poona, but the White Paper begins coolly: "The following is the text of the Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China to the Embassy of India in China on April 3."

Charges of secrecy can exist no more. Parliament has all the papers to deal with, right on the table: everything is open and above board. Still, people cannot escape the feeling that if India had early enough published the facts of Chinese aggressiveness instead of getting elated over the formulation of Panch Sheela, there might have been resistance enough to stop China from dictating. Jawaharlal has by constant drafts on public confidence as the *ustad* of foreign policy brought our prestige-asset into low waters. Weary of that kind of dissipation and disillusion he agrees to the Transfer of Power: and Parliament, now called to aid, stands stunned with the problem of retrieving solvency and security.

—'Swarajya'

DELHI LETTER

Rajaji Triumphs at Delhi

(From Our Correspondent)

DELHI was shocked to hear of what seemed to be an attempt on the life of Rajaji when he arrived to address a public meeting in Madras organised by the Swatantra Party on April 17 last. This is taken here as a reminder of the fact that people in India have no democratic traditions and are generally lacking in that intellectual development which is a necessary equipment of a democratic people. The rise of the Swatantra Party has been welcomed even by those who do not quite agree with the principles for which it stands because they believe that an everyday debate is necessary to make people think and choose for themselves. For the last forty years we have been accustomed to hearing Gandhi and Nehru and to taking their sayings for gospel truth. It is this fact more than anything else which has been responsible for the partition of the country and the holocaust that accompanied it, as well as for the present predicament in which we find ourselves helpless in the face of the Chinese invasion of the country. The fact that we do not

choose to call it an invasion or that our Prime Minister chose to hide it from us for full five years cannot deprive the act of aggression of its real character. At a moment like this the coming back into active political life of a giant who was practically hibernating, to tell us some plain truths about where we stand and what we are in for, as a result of Mr. Nehru's policies, is nothing short of a god-send, and those responsible for organising meetings to be addressed by Rajaji would do well to take all precautions to see that attempts like the one obviously made in Madras do not succeed and are nipped in the bud. Madras policemen seem to be a vigilant lot and deserve to be congratulated on their alertness in arresting the man as he was trying to approach Rajaji. What is worthwhile recalling in this connection is the fact that no such attempts are made in Britain and the United States.

ANTI-CHINA RALLY

On Sunday April 19 the Bharatiya Jan Sangh

took out a mile-long procession in New Delhi and later held a demonstration before the Prime Minister's House to convey to Mr. Nehru "the sentiments and apprehensions of the people in respect of China's aggression, as also about the forthcoming talks." The processionists shouted slogans like "Chinese Get Away: India is Ours," "Pandit Nehru Be Alert," "Down with Communist Imperialism" and "Life May Go But We Will Not Let Ladakh Go." The 15,000 people, who were shouting these slogans, did not seem to be aware of the fact that Ladakh—at least a substantial part of it—has already gone and we stand committed not to take it back by force, and that the Party which organised the procession has been forcefully helping in its departure from the country by its insistence on the policy of non-alignment. It is easy enough to cry "Down With Communist Imperialism," but a country whose Defence Department is busy producing trucks and cannot produce a single modern weapon of war worth the name is hardly likely to provide the sanctions necessary for implementing that cry.

Mr. Nehru has been bitterly opposed to the Jan Sangh, but the sudden rise of the Swatantra Party, with an old giant as its leader, must have melted his wrath against a party which, when all is said, stands by him in his non-aligned predicament. The Prime Minister may indeed have been saying to himself with reference to the Jan Sangh: "A friend in need is a friend indeed." It is not, therefore, surprising that he agreed to receive a deputation of Jan Sangh leaders heading the procession, and assured them that he stands by the policy he has repeatedly stated in Parliament on the issue, and they went back happy with the imaginary assurance that he would not surrender any part of Indian territory. The fact that NEHRU received them counts much more with the petty-minded leaders of the Jan Sangh than the fate which awaits the land under their self-complacent policy of non-alignment, but then Hindus, except for the almost evanescent renaissance produced by the Arya Samaj, have always stood four-square for suicidal policies, like their refusal to allow non-Hindus to become Hindus or even to reconvert ex-Hindus to Hinduism.

THE JEEP SCANDAL

That most interesting of scandals, the Jeep Scandal, with which the name of Mr. Krishna Menon has become immortally associated, provided another occasion for an uproar in the Lok Sabha on April 21, as the Prime Minister announced that a compromise had been reached between the Government and the London firm in the "Jeep Deal" case, which was due for hearing before the London High Court on May 2. Mr. Vajpayee said that doubts had arisen in the public mind that the "out of court" settlement had been reached in order to save the Defence Minister. Another member asked what the basis of the counter-claim made by the London firm was and if in any way

implicated the Defence Minister. Mr. Hem Barua inquired whether it was a fact that our solicitors had advised Mr. Krishna Menon that it would be better to withdraw the case as a lot of "dirty linen" would be washed in public if it came up in court. There was no answer to these questions. A firm which has no case generally does resort to blackmail by threatening to wash dirty linen in court—even if that dirty linen has to be fabricated—but there can be no questioning now the soundness of the Government decision to come to an "out of court" settlement, as the defendants, as Mr. Nehru said, are "broke" and there is no chance of recovering any damages from them. But he did not explain why Government had considered it necessary to file the suit when it was known that the firm was "broke". The most interesting fact that came out of the debate was that the firm's capital was not more than £100, and the Indian Government claimed damages worth about a quarter million pounds. Not only that. Mr. Nehru informed the House that the firm had made supplies to them worth millions of pounds, but he was of the opinion that the fact that they had a small capital had no relevance to the Rs. 30 lakhs loss to the Indian Exchequer! Did not the Government readily pay 75 per cent of the cost in advance, as Mr. Nehru himself admitted, because the firm had no capital worth the name, and thereby incurred the loss? Mr. Nehru is seldom able to relate the effect to the cause and prefers to raise a cloud of dust to confuse the issues. Anyway, as those who know him, know his motto in life has been to support his supporters, irrespective of whether they are in the right or in the wrong. (The principle is now operating furiously in the international field also.) No wonder he came out with the statement that Defence Minister Menon was not directly involved in the case. Indirect involvement lets the cat out of the bag oftener than direct involvement!

JOINT DEFENCE

Judging by the comments of the Pakistan Armed Forces' daily, "Hilal", on the Pakistan President's proposal of joint defence, it has to be conceded that there is a much greater display of realism in the Pakistan Press than is visible in its Indian counterpart. The paper said in an editorial recently. "We came out with this proposal in view of an obvious danger to the sub-continent from Communist aggression. But if Mr. Nehru believes that the hundreds of millions of his people should live in a state of constant insecurity, while they should not have friendly relations with Pakistan, we can hardly be blamed for that. We only tried to express our neighbourly feeling towards India, even though we know that in joint defence between the two countries we were accepting added responsibilities. Mr. Nehru, instead of showing any regard for our friendly sentiments, started counting dangers of our proposal, although in India itself prominent political leaders, like Mr. Rajagopalachariar and Mr. Jai Prakash Narain, still consider ours a very sound proposition."

It is of course obvious that the Pakistan proposal was born of enlightened self-interest, i.e., national interest, in the sense that non-Communist countries must hang together if they are not to be swallowed by the Communist countries one by one, but in India national interest is nowhere in the picture and self-interest means the interests of Mr. Nehru. The day our leaders begin to think in terms of the country; as Rajaji and Jai Prakash Narain are doing now, they will find, it is being generally forecast here, that there is no alternative to the proposal of the Pakistan President, if Communist aggression is to be resisted. Mr. Nehru has committed himself to a policy of undermining the West and upholding the Communist viewpoint to such an extent—all because of Kashmir—that there is no going back for him. The struggle for supremacy in India between the Congress and the Swatantra Party is likely to centre on foreign policy and Congress leaders will naturally try to exploit the people's sentiments of jingoism over Kashmir to make the Swatantra Party unpopular. On the other hand, Rajaji's proposal of joint defence among South Asian nations is still better and more comprehensive and will make it difficult for Congressmen to exploit the anti-Pakistan sentiment in the country, while Chinese aggression is a godsend for the Swatantra Party and the present anti-Chinese mood in the country should go a long way in promoting the process, already visible, of the Congress losing its hold on the people. There is a foreign saying that, in the face of the bigger enemy, the smaller enemy begins to look like a friend. That is exactly what is happening now in India. When Indian leaders themselves begin saying "We have no right to be in Kashmir"—as they are bound to say sooner rather than later—the fat will be in the fire. After all, how long can we afford to go on paying the Communist price for Kashmir? That is the real question facing India today.

RAJAJI IN DELHI

The visit Rajaji paid to Delhi in the second week of April can be truly summed up in the word "triumphant". He certainly has not been beating about the bush like Mr. Nehru. His words bear on them the stamp of statesmanship. "I think the Chinese threat is deadly," he told the Press Club of India on April 10, adding, "the Chinese Communist threat can be faced only through a united front." The Kashmir issue, in his opinion, was smaller and not so serious. "Kashmir can be put in the refrigerator," he said. "I can do it." The very large number of people who attended the meeting he addressed in Delhi on April 10 was a big surprise to every one, particularly in view of the fact that enough propaganda had not preceded it to attract people to the meeting—Kalkaji, a township seven miles away, knew nothing about it, at least no posters conveyed the news there—and people knew in advance that he would speak in English. I have not the privilege of knowing

Rajaji personally, but I have known almost all the big leaders of the land during the last forty years and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that he is the most brilliant man in the country today and the only other man who could sum up his ideas or situations in a few words as Motilal Nehru.

In an open letter to the Swatantra Party leader, seven Congress MPs have declared that socialism, as the ultimate goal of the country, has come to stay and anyone who sought to undo all that has been done in that direction by the Congress is "doomed to failure". Socialism carries different meanings for different people and it would not be exaggerating things to say that, if the socialists were made to write out what they mean by socialism in practice, there would be as many socialist parties in the country as there are Socialists. What is surprising is not the open letter, but the fact that only seven MPs could be persuaded to sign it. A very poor performance, indeed, for Minister K. D. Malaviya, who is as near to Communism as any Minister can be without risking his job.

AFRO-ASIAN CONVENTION

An important contribution to the Afro-Asian Convention was made by Mr. Purshotamdas Tricumdas, chairman of the Legal Inquiry Committee on Tibet, who explained Tibet's constitutional position to the delegates. Tibet, he said, was a sovereign state with full jurisdiction on her internal and external affairs, although occasionally she was subjected to Chinese and British imperialist impositions. He accused the Government of India of unilaterally renouncing its position in Tibet in a secret note to the Chinese Communist Government in 1950. The Government of India, he alleged, did not even inform the Tibetan Government of its stand. This encouraged the Chinese Government to launch their military action against Tibet in 1950. "India thus handed Tibet on a silver platter to China," said Mr. Tricumdas, "though the Indian Government did express the pious hope that the Chinese would recognise Tibetan independence." Within six weeks the Communists announced they would "liberate" Tibet. So now we know who is the author of all our troubles on the border!

The leader of the Hong-Kong Chinese delegation, Mr. Chang Kuo-Sin, warned us that the Chinese Communists' real object in suppressing Tibetan autonomy was to establish direct contact with the Indian Communists and thus to foster a civil war in India. Referring to Mr. Mao Tse-Tung's order to suppress the Tibet rebellion at all costs, even if all Tibetans had to be liquidated, he asked, "Why was all this importance attached to Tibet?" The purpose, he said, obviously was to push militant communism into India, as there could be no better place to establish political and military bases and training camps for guerillas than the fastnesses of Tibetan mountains. "When the

Communists kill and massacre in Tibet, their objective is actually not Tibet but India and the other neighbouring countries."

My only apology for reproducing what the two delegates said at the Afro-Asian Convention is that words such as these should be published over and over again, so that they may be burnt into our minds and it may be difficult even for persons suffering from lapses of memory to forget them. Mr. Chou En-lai flattered Mr. Nehru into withdrawing Indian troops from Tibet and acknowledging Chinese suzerainty over Tibet. Now we know what he had in mind. The whole world knows it now, including Mr. Nehru, whose life has been a long series of disillusionments after conceding to flatterers what they want. And still, past the psalmist's three score and ten, he is as susceptible to flattery as ever! Indeed, he wants nothing else in life, and if he is going to hold on to the prime ministership of the country for all he is worth, it is because he will not be able to get so much flattery elsewhere.

Book Review

TIBET FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM. Edited by Raja Hutteasing. Publishers: Oriental Longmans Private Ltd., Price Rs. 15.00.

This "White Book" presents to the reader a panorama of the tragic but heroic struggle waged by the people of Tibet against the Chinese Communists Imperialism, to maintain their national self-respect and independence and to preserve their rich heritage of distinct culture, language and religion. The events that took place from the first rising of Tibetan rebels on 9th March 1959, to the final dramatic escape of Dalai Lama into India on 31st March 1959, and further up to the end of July 1959, when the national revolt was ruthlessly put down by the Chinese with iron and blood, have been given in a chronological order. This fight for freedom, it is estimated, took a toll of about 90,000 human lives including those of women and innocent children, who were massacred, machine-gunned and buried in "Mass Graves." The account given in this book of the unspeakable atrocities the proud Tibetan people were subjected to, for no other fault than intense love of their mother-land and a deep regard for their cultural and religious sanctity, cannot but send a thrill of horror and indignation throughout the free and civilised world. The Communists and their fellow-travellers are never tired of harping upon the benefits of full autonomy enjoyed by national minority regions in Russia and China. But it appears that these pious platitudes are meant only for the consumption of the uncritical and gullible, living outside the Iron Curtain. Recent happenings in China as depicted in

this book, are a clear proof, if any proof were needed, that autonomy under a Communist regime is nothing but a sham and a myth. This fact has been well brought out in the historic statement issued by the Dalai Lama from Tejpur given on page 87. The statement makes it clear that the Chinese colonialists first marched their armies into Tibet in 1950 and thereafter in 1951, imposed an agreement on the Tibetan Government at the point of the bayonet, which recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet, guaranteeing at the same time full autonomy of Tibet. The Chinese Government, true to its communist traditions, did not hesitate to grossly violate even this imposed agreement. It sought to forcibly introduce in Tibet its own communist brand of social and political system. This is made more explicit in the statement issued by Dalai Lama at the Press Conference at Mussorie on 20th July 1959. He says, "Far from carrying out the agreement, they began deliberately to pursue a course of policy which was diametrically opposed to the terms and conditions they had themselves laid down. Thus commenced a reign of terror which finds few parallels in the history of Tibet—Forced labour, compulsory exactions, a systematic persecution of the people, plunder and confiscation of property belonging to individuals and monasteries and execution of certain leading men in Tibet. These are the glorious achievements of the Chinese rule in Tibet." Dalai Lama also further thoroughly exposes the lying propaganda of the Chinese Government that he was opposed to agrarian reforms. Though Dalai Lama earnestly desired that the land-tenure should be radically changed, the Chinese authorities deliberately put every obstacle in the way of carrying out the reform. It appears that Dalai Lama did not fully comprehend the communist strategy and their intense hatred for any other pattern of social change than that of Communism. He should have recalled to his memory how the German communists preferred Hitlerites to Social democrats and helped the rise of fascism in Germany in the thirties of this century. To the communists, the path to heaven lies only through communism and therefore no agreement and no treaty was so sacrosanct that it could not be repudiated without any qualms of conscience for spreading the light of their divine faith. We are apt to forget the classical definition of communist morality given by Lenin: "It is a fraud. Morality for us is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat". Is it therefore any wonder that the Chinese Government should repudiate the agreement imposed by itself on the Tibetan Government?

TIBETAN TRAGEDY AND INDIAN OPINION

The chapter "The Aftermath" gives a fairly good idea of the wave of righteous indignation and anger that spread from one end of India to the other, at this wanton Chinese aggression against Tibet. As the woes of the people of Tibet went on mounting, Dalai Lama despaired of getting any response from the Chinese Government for a just solution and

at last appealed to the United Nations for support to "this cause of freedom and justice." But our Indian Prime Minister who wanted to appease Chinese sentiment, strongly disapproved of this move of Dalai Lama with the result that India abstained from voting on the mildly-worded resolution proposed by Ireland and Malaya before U.N. Assembly on 21st October 1959. This act of the Indian Government was condemned by the leaders of public opinion in India as being against all democratic traditions of the country. Jayaprakash Narayan said that "the price of this blunder would have to be paid for dearly by the Afro-Asian nations. The stand taken by India would encourage the expansionist ambitions of China and embolden her aggressive designs." Shri Rajagopalachari characterized India's stand as "indistinguishable from abetment of oppression." Recent invasion of the Indian border by the Chinese shows how prophetic Jayaprakash Narayan's words were.

WRONG HEADEDNESS OF INDIA'S POLICY TOWARDS CHINA

The article by D. F. Hudson on the International aspect of the Tibetan problem is extremely informative and instructive. From 1912 to 1951 Tibet was 'defacto' independent and free and the British formally recognised the suzerainty of the Chinese in Tibet. This fact was embodied in the Simla convention of 1913 and the McMahon Line was fixed up by this convention and was ratified both by the British and Tibetan Governments and only initialled by the Chinese Government. The position remained the same till 1947. The National Indian Government did not do anything to change this policy of the British and accepted it meekly without having the strength of the British to ensure full autonomy to Tibet. This weak-kneed policy has had the effect of emboldening the Chinese Government not only to conquer Tibet but extend the frontiers of Chinese Empire to the Himalayas on the Indian side.

Editor Raja Hutteesingh's article sums up the bearings of Chinese conquest of Tibet on the future of South-East Asia and particularly India. Chinese aggression, in his opinion, shows a definite policy whereby China seeks to undermine the poli-

tical independence and economic progress in the rest of Asia. "For India, Tibet is the boundary between peace and war between survival as a free and democratic country and totalitarian domination." And we may add that this boundary line is fast disappearing and India's freedom itself is in jeopardy. The story, given as it is in the form of newspaper cuttings, of course lacks in a close coherence and continuity and the reader will have to knit together the difference pieces into a well-connected whole. None-the-less, this book would be useful as a reference work on this subject which has evoked so much interest in the whole world. The get-up and printing is good and the book contains some maps and pictures bearing on Tibet and the different phases of its fight for freedom.

—D. M. Kulkarni, B.A., LL.B.

—:0:—

News Digest

CORRUPTION AND SOCIALISM

Madras: Mr. C. Rajagopalachari stated here that corruption could be eliminated if frequent contacts between the Government officials and business men were avoided.

Mr. Rajagopalachari said that the Government's policy of socialism imposed too many controls on the activities of the people and drove them to the Government "for anything and everything." This in turn resulted in corruption, he said, and declared that where there was socialism there was bound to be corruption also.

Business men had to come into contact with officials at every stage due to the policies of the present Government and, "it is like taking fire to the haystack. How can you avoid the catastrophe after bringing fire and haystack together?" he asked.

SOCIALISTIC EMPIRES

Food Minister Patil has confessed in New Delhi on March 31st that his Ministry was almost an EMPIRE. He said that there were hundreds of departments in the Ministry employing thousands of officials with whom he never came into personal contact. He could only hope that they had some work to do.

It is said that as soon as there is a rumour of food shortage or when prices of food grain starts rising, hundreds of new posts are created in the Food Department "to cope with the situation." This has the double effect of removing food scarcity and that of reducing unemployment (among Congressmen).

FAMILY PLANNING

At the 12th meeting of the State Family Planning Committee of Bihar it was decided to establish at least 70 family planning clinics in urban and 140 in rural areas; each clinic to have the part-time services of a doctor.

READ

ENGLISH

or

LINGUISTIC CHAOS

(Our Language Problem in Perspective)

By

A. RANGANATHAN

Published by:

The Libertarian Social Institute,

Arya Bhuvan,

Sandhurst Road (West),

Bombay-4.

Price: 25 nP.

In order to popularise surgical methods of family planning, the Government of Madras has raised the compensatory allowance to Rs. 30 in public employment.

PAK ARMY PAPER CRITICISES INDIA

The Pakistan armed forces daily 'Hilal' (Rawalpindi, April 15), today strongly criticised India's attitude towards Pakistan on joint defence. The criticism was made in an editorial of the daily.

"Mr. Nehru, instead of showing any regard for our friendly sentiments, started counting dangers of our proposal, although in India itself, prominent political leaders like Mr. Rajagopalachari and Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan still consider ours is a very sound proposal."

The Hilal also referred to the Chinese claims to Mount Everest and said: "This claim may mean nothing to Mr. Nehru who is prepared to have friendship with China at any cost, but friendship with Pakistan only on his terms. For the time being, however, he would like to confine his friendship with Pakistan merely to Press statements so that he may not have to extend any emotional or material concessions."

COLLECTIVIZATION LEADS TO MASS FLIGHT

On Good Friday and Easter Monday alone, over 2,500 refugees from the so-called German Democratic Republic arrived in West Berlin. This was

the heaviest influx of refugees for 48 hours within the last three years. During the Easter holidays there was an endless stream of refugees until the figure rose to 5,000 on the evening of the 18th April. The refugees consisted of whole families of farmers. And this mass flight of people from the so-called German Democratic Republic is the result of the persecution of peasants under the campaign for the "socialization" of agriculture. This scheme is now reported to have been completed with the subjugation of the free farmers in the last 14 districts of Chemnitz.

THE STORY OF A DELEGATION

A delegation—consisting of a Minister, his deputy and an officer of Madhya Pradesh—was sent to Toronto. While the estimated tour expenditure per delegate was Rs. 7,500 the total expenses incurred on their account was Rs. 30,608. The Dy. Minister who had agreed to bear half the cost was granted advances aggregating Rs. 16,550. The delegation had gone way back in 1954, but the balance of Rs. 11,559 had not yet been refunded by the Dy. Minister.

DANGER OF SOCIALISM

The Social danger of Socialism lies not so much in the disregard of the individual for the mass, but in its assumption that economics and the material standard of life are supreme and permit any interference with psycho-social factors.

—Gerald Heard

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**