

Indian Libertarian

Price 25 Naya Paisa

Incorporating the 'Free Economic Review' and 'The Indian Rationalist'
AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY
AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT

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. X No. 4

IN THIS ISSUE

May 15, 1962

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL	1	DELHI LETTER	10
President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan by M. A. Venkata Rao	4	Book Review	12
Nehru Hoist With His Own Petard by M. N. Tholal	6	Gleanings from the Press	13
Nehru And The D. M. K. by P. Kodandarao	8	News & Views	13
ECONOMIC SUPPLEMENT	I-IV	Dear Editor	15

EDITORIAL

DEMOCRATIC DECENTRALISATION IN MAHARASHTRA

The celebrations of the Second Anniversary Day of the formation of the Maharashtra State fittingly synchronised with the inauguration of the Panchayat Raj which purports to devolve in a large measure the governmental and administrative responsibility on the rural population of various Zillas (Districts) of the State. This scheme is expected to enlist the sympathies of the people and ensure their active participation in the developmental activities of the State. The decentralisation of power now centred in the State Government among the three tiers of the administration set-up, viz., the Zilla Parishad (District Councils), Panchayat Samities (Village Block Councils), and Gram Panchayats (Village Committees) will be a unique experiment in introducing Direct Democracy at all these three levels in rural areas.

This three-tier Panchayat Raj has several distinctive features, most conspicuous of them being the direct elections to the Zilla Parishads based on adult franchise. Another feature is that the various executive committees to be formed to carry on the day-to-day work on behalf of the Parishad, will be elected under the system of pro-

portional representation so as to secure adequate representation on these Committees of all the important parties including the minority groups and interests within the Parishad. These Zilla Parishads are endowed with wide powers and authority over the whole sphere of administration excepting Justice, Law and Order and Development Plans requiring high technical knowledge and assistance. By way of further distributing power, the Panchayat Samities set-up for blocks of villages as intermediaries between Gram Panchayats and Zilla Parishads, are assigned certain definite duties and responsibilities, and in this work the Zilla Parishads will be required to extend their fullest co-operation and help to the Samities. The work of the Gram Panchayats will also have to be co-ordinated with the functions of these Samities. Thus these three tiers of Panchayat Raj will be linked up and brought together in a spirit of mutual co-operation and assistance.

On the whole, the Maharashtra scheme with the Zilla Parishads elected by direct elections as its focal point and with the wide powers conferred on these bodies to raise locally financial resources must be considered to be a great improvement on other such schemes extant in the country. It holds out a hope and a promise to diffuse and distribute power in a real sense which is now wielded by the State Government. But under the Five Year

Plan, the Central Government through its Planning Commission and its powers of allocating funds for the various developmental schemes, has been able to tighten its grip over the State Administration as, also, its lower units. How far this grip which, as experience has shown, has made a mockery of State Autonomy and Local Self-Government, will be loosened in the rural areas covered by the Zilla Parishads, remains to be seen. The power of appointing the executive officers of these Parishads and Samities reserved for itself by the Government, has been subjected to severe criticism in certain political circles. But it must be remembered that this is only a provisional arrangement which is expected to disappear when the people have had sufficient experience in working out the scheme. So also casteism and party factionalism might prove to be great hurdles in the way of the smooth working of the Zilla Parishads; but they will also, to a certain extent, be counter-balanced by the system of proportional representation.

Despite these undoubted difficulties and hurdles in the way, this bold experiment in introducing Direct Democracy at the District, Block and Village levels, is worth trying and will be watched with keen interest and sympathy especially by those who think that democracy can function effectively and fruitfully only when the people

are in a position to sense it as a direct, close and immediate day-to-day experience.

NUCLEAR WAR AND PEACE

Nuclear Age has come to stay, whether we like it or not, with all its attendant benefits and evils. As in previous periods of man's history, now also, war looms large on the horizon no less than peace, since with the increased knowledge and conquest of nature, man is equipped with powerful means both for construction and destruction. Although Atomic Energy came into play for the first time during the Second World War, it must not be forgotten that in the post-war period, it has also been employed for the purpose of making life brighter and healthier.

JAIROHI

So one should have thought that at least people of the stature of Nehru and Russell and others would not get panicky over resumption of nuclear tests by the U.S. after months of patient waiting for USSR to come to some reasonable understanding about signing a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty including effective international system of on-site inspection and control. Any proposal so far put forward by America and even the so-called Neutrals, however diluted or modified, calling for effective inspection and control is being persistently spurned by Russia for reasons best known to herself, though some say that such an inspection would lay bare the hollow claim of Russia to superiority in Nuclear Warfare and deprive her of the power to blackmail the Neutrals into abject surrender to her will. It will, therefore, be in the fitness of things if the world's great Peace-makers should direct their energies and talents to some kind of on-site inspection and put an end to the Nuclear race which they so much detest and abhor. All appeals made only to the Free World in this connection are, to say the least, misdirected and misconceived and only abet and encourage the bullying tactics of Russia.

The real crux of the problem is to create a climate of confidence in the Free World about the peaceful intentions of Russia. The blatant and nonchalant manner in which she violated the self-imposed Moratorium on these Tests in September — October last year, just to gain advantage in nuclear arms race and to threaten the Belgrade Neutrals into submission to her will should have been enough to convince neutrals like Nehru and Pacifists like Russell about the utter futility of attempting to manage the Communist world by high-flown and sweet words and phrases.

The Free-world must therefore get itself reconciled to the prospect, however unpleasant and unhappy, of a long drawn-out series of nuclear tests

The Indian Libertarian

Independent Journal Of Free Economy and Public Affairs

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

Published On the 1st and 15th Of Each Month

Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Subscription Rates:

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

ADVERTISEMENTS RATES

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

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

BACK COVER..... Rs. 150

SECOND COVER..... Rs. 125

THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125

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

being made by both the camps, communist and non-communist. It cannot be expected to commit Harikari by unilaterally stopping nuclear tests. Panicking about such tests by well-meaning world pacifists will bring Peace not an inch nearer. The problem of Test-Ban Treaty and the wider question of Total Disarmament need to be handled in a more realistic and practical manner, with a clear and full understanding and comprehension of the compulsions of the Nuclear Age.

KASHMIR AND THE FUTURE OF INDIAN DEMOCRACY

Evidently General Ayub Khan thinks that the enemy of one's enemy is one's friend and in his eyes India today is the arch enemy of Pakistan and therefore Pakistan can safely befriend even a communist country like China which, for the last few years, has been actively hostile to India. The soldier in Ayub Khan has now come out in his true colours. By hobnobbing with China on the Kashmir issue just by way of employing pressure tactics on U.S.A. at the meeting of the U.N. Security Council, Pakistan has not merely missed the bus but has also caught the wrong one. This stupidity on the part of Pakistan has already cost her the sympathy of all enlightened opinion in America and England. Pakistan should moreover remember that more than India, she will be the first victim of Chinese aggression on Northern border of the Indo-Pak sub-continent. India with its huge population and a pretty big size holds a much more strategic position in South Eastern Asia than the fragmented Pakistan and as such if Indian leaders should think of being less idealistic and more realistic they can at any time neatly turn the tables against Pakistan even in the matter of forging political alliances and out-bid her in her political opportunist manoeuvres.

In this situation Indian democrats should keep a keen watch on the steps the Indian Government takes to meet this challenge from Pakistan. Signs are not wanting to show that the so called 'Leftists' in the Central Cabinet at Delhi will not be slow in fishing in these troubled waters to gain their own ascendancy. Under the pressures of the foolish cold war started by General Ayub Khan against India, these Leftists are trying to stampede India into seeking military aid from Moscow which is now professing profuse sympathies for India's case on Kashmir. The press reports say that the Government of India has already negotiated an agreement with Russia to purchase some Supersonic Fighter Planes to counter-balance those Pakistan has obtained from

America. It is likely, therefore, that the whole country will be plunged before long into war-hysteria and people will be made to forget the greater menace to India from China.

It is not that there is no alternative course left open before the Government to tide over this rather complicated situation, but it is being studiously ignored with a purpose. The determination of Kashmir question at the Security Council meeting, with the common consent of all including that of America and England, proves that sympathetic understanding of India's case on this issue is not lacking among these leading democratic countries. These bonds with Western countries need only to be strengthened by a re-orientation of our foreign policies not only in the interests of India's security and peace but also in defence of Indian democracy itself. If this is done, a peaceful solution of the Kashmir problem will not be far off and then India will be enabled to take more energetic steps to fight the Chinese menace. Will India's democratic leadership within and without the Government circles rise equal to the occasion and force the hands of the Government to adopt this alternative policy, peaceful but not less effective, which is in complete accord with the country's democratic aims and objectives?

HERE AND THERE

Our Finance Minister Morarji's Central Budget for the year 1962-63 will surely hit the middle classes the hardest. The prices of necessities like cloth and tea will shoot up and others are also bound to follow suit when the full impact of the Budget comes to be fully understood. No wonder. The Budgets are adjusted to the requirements of the Five Year Plans. It is expected that at the end of the Third Year Plan there will be no third person other than the Rich and the Poor.

The question whether Stalin was a faithful friend and Associate of Lenin, is being debated in Moscow. Russia seems to be fast turning into a Bourgeois State, otherwise how could the sea-green communists lay such store by Bourgeois virtues like faithfulness and friendship?

A NEWS ITEM:

'The Indian Airlines Corporation, a Government concern, is widely advertising in the papers that "Bar Service" has been introduced on I.A.C's International Flights.' Obviously the Government at the Centre is split on this issue of prohibition, the majority trying to introduce 'Drinking' not through the back-door but straight from high up in the air.

President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan

M. A. Venkata Rao

By the time we go to the press, Dr. Radhakrishnan will have been duly elected on the 7th of May and installed in Rashtrapatibhavan in New Delhi as India's President. That puts the coping stone on the political and social side of the remarkable career of this exceptionally successful savant from university life.

The learned doctor is a complex personality with many sided gifts. In addition to zest for philosophical thought, he has always displayed a strong nationalist fervour. Early in his career he chose his goals in life of which the chief was to become an interpreter of Indian culture, past and present. Among his earliest books was his work on the philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore in which he expressed his nationalist and cultural enthusiasms through the medium of Tagore's thought and message to India and the world.

He later edited a co-operative volume of essays by distinguished writers, East and West, on Mahatma Gandhi, which was issued on the Mahatma's birthday.

He has discoursed to many audiences in England and America not only on Indian philosophy and religion but also on the spiritual contribution to world peace and progress that a free India could contribute. He has presented often the inwardness and strength of the Indian political demand of Gandhi and Nehru better than politicians. And he has been listened to with respect.

As India's Vice-president, visiting dignitaries of States from all continents have made it a point to meet the professor statesman and have the benefit of his brilliant exposition of the Nehru policies in force.

He has travelled widely and visited most heads of Governments and States as well as heads of universities and specialists in many branches of culture and has an unrivalled knowledge of world affairs animated by a passionate interest in the achievement of international peace with freedom and justice to all nations, particularly the backward and yet unfree under the outdated yoke of imperialism.

In addition to competence in technical philosophy, (particularly in relation to the philosophy and history of religion and ethics,) the professor has a vivid satirical bent of mind. He delights in etching in sharp, biting terms the hypocrisies

of current fashionable feelings and ideas with their search for made-easy substitutes for religion and morality without sacrifice and worry and fatigue. The current get rich quick attitude with their easy conscience and slack sense of duty and obligation and weak sense of responsibility, the all pervading tendency to put ease and pleasure above principle, and the shallow philosophies and educational practices (soft pedagogy) they render popular, the easy scepticisms without the labour of thought, the very fear of freedom and refusal to be ourselves preferring to merge ourselves in anonymous crowds and lose our feelings and opinions in prevailing fashions and idols of the theatre, of the cave, of the market place and of the party hustings come alive in the doctor's vivid, often mordant pages!

The penetrating insight of the professor fastens upon these debilitating fashions of the intellectuals of the present epoch in East and West and shows how these psychological traits show themselves in characteristic half-baked philosophies of scepticism, against materialism, hedonism, sex-dominated neurotic psychologies, economics — dominated deterministic theories of human personality and self-hood ect. all ending in various forms of nihilism and fatal erosion of established human values enshrined in traditional wisdom.

The entire writing of the professor on philosophy and religion at their best, focussing the best insights of East and West, stresses the note of universal human values. Though the thinker speaks from Indian tradition as its living voice and makes strenuous attempts to reconcile reason and revelation in terms of intuition, he moves within the realm of rational discourse, if not of rationalism in the materialist's sense. The ultimate criterion for practical purposes is of course pragmatic. If such a view reinforces the sense of universal human values in men of faith, it is to that extent justified and is constructive in effect. If those more sceptical of mind like Mr. Roy need a different philosophy, they will seek and develop a naturalist basis and metaphysics for their moral judgments and values. Mr. Roy's *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution* is of importance from this point of view of affording a rational philosophy for supporting universal moral values and a renaissance and revolution

conceived in its spirit to be realised in human institutions. In fact, Dr. Radhakrishnan and Mr. M. N. Roy occupy opposite poles of the mental heaven of our times and appeal to different groups of seekers.

Though a traditionalist in the best sense, Dr. Radhakrishnan is not a supporter of privilege and class whether of birth, of vested interests or of political power.

He condemns injustices of all kinds — racial persecution, imperial oppression and exploitation, the selfish tyranny of capital ownership and the aristocracy of birth and inherited rank.

In fact the accent of the preacher is heard much too often, it may be thought by many, in his writings and speeches. But there is one saving grace in this preaching and that is, it is *addressed boldly and forthright to the upper dog* — the privileged ones of the earth face to face, as it were. In Oxford, not merely from his Chair in the university but also from the Chapel his voice was heard condemning in strident tones the pride and pomp and arrogance of the powerful ones of the empire!

In fact, beneath an external air of conformity and belonging, the professor uses his opportunity to confront the powerful ones of his time and place, (whether in Britain, America or India) with the iniquities of their system and order! He gets away with it beneath his professorial gown!

The professor has thus been doing something of the work of the indignant prophet on behalf of the disinherited of the earth and the under-dog all along!

When he spoke to a joint Session of the American Congress, a prominent Senator noted the speaker's tone of moral teaching but said, "You are a world teacher, Dr. Radhakrishnan; we would not have taken it from anyone else!"

He argued in The League of Nations Committee for Intellectual Co-operation for the immediate fitness and readiness of India for self-government. He would not agree with the earnest but misguided exhortations of British leaders (of religion like Lindsay and politicians like Sir John Simon and scholars like Sir Gilbert Murray and men of letters like H. G. Wells) for delay and probation.

In politics he was *not a moderate* like the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri. He was for unadulterated independence forthwith.

The Prime Minister has been aware of Dr. Radhakrishnan's extra-academic political role

in high social and political circles in Britain and India just as he was aware of the work of Sri Krishna Menon in England for Indian Independence in British Labour party and Leftist circles generally.

So when Nehru chose the professor to succeed Smt. Vijayalakshmi Pandit as India's Ambassador at Moscow during Stalin's regime, those in the know were not surprised at the sudden emergence of the savant from academic shadows into the limelight of politics.

The doctor has always risen to the occasion and outgrew the position to which he has been called — the Calcutta professorship of philosophy, the Oxford professorship, the Moscow Ambassadorship, the Delhi Vice-presidentship. His accession to the Presidential Gaddi is thus but a natural and logical culmination of previous successful fulfilment of responsibilities in successive higher stations.

The professor has high administrative experience as Vice-Chancellor of universities at Andhra and Benaras. He has discharged the duties of Chairman of the Rajya Sabha with conspicuous ability and tact, often enlivened with wit and humour.

As President, he will not have the opportunity of stating his views and moulding public opinion directly. But like the *raja gurus* of old, he will have the opportunity of advising the rulers of the country in general *in camera* but *effectively all the same*. The Prime Minister is losing his intimate co-workers and trusted colleagues one by one by death and is becoming lonely. Public criticism is becoming more and more strident and radical to his policies especially as represented by Rajaji's movement. He needs the counsel of one like Dr. Radhakrishnan so ripe in wisdom, defensive outside but critical, and frankly corrective *in camera*. Radhakrishnan had the courage to ask Stalin to his face as to when he would allow civil liberties to his people! He mentioned to the Iron Dictator the example of the *British Dean who was a Communist* but was permitted to remain within the church hierarchy in spite of it!

The section on communism in his recent book *Recovery of Faith* lists criticisms of the doctrine and system which show that the professor has nothing to learn from any convinced and informed anti-communist expert in the world regarding the vices and crimes of the regime that has got a stranglehold on Russia and the countries of "the socialist camp".

Nehru Hoist With His Own Petard

By M. N. THOLAL

Mr. Nehru has been a gopeller of non-alignment and a policy of trust, and none should have been happier than him to find that he has got a redoubtable follower in a neighbouring country in the person of its ruler, King Mahendra. But, far from being happy, our Prime Minister is angry at the discovery of his gospel spreading to neighbouring lands. What is sauce for the gander is apparently no sauce for the goose. That, being the case, we are entitled to ask the reason why. Circumstances, it is said, alter cases, and that is all that can be pleaded in favour of the Indian contention that our policy of non-alignment and trust is unsuited to Nepal. And that implies that the policy of non-alignment and trust is not for all, that it does not admit of universal application, and that the peculiar circumstances in which a country finds itself can alone provide the justification for a policy of non-alignment and trust.

Nobody has disputed the last proposition: Switzerland is a classic example of a country which has always followed a policy of non-alignment and of trusting its neighbours, and the result has been safety and security for the land even when two world wars raged round it. Our countrymen's anger with Nepal makes one thing abundantly clear: that there can be something radically wrong with this policy of non-alignment and trust which our Prime Minister has been advocating with the zeal of a Mahatma, despite the fact that it has already lost the country twelve to fifteen thousand square miles of her territory: At the Congress Parliamentary Party meeting on April 29, only a few days after several meetings with the King of Nepal, Prime Minister Nehru again emphatically asserted the good old saying, trust begets trust, distrust begets distrust. Readers will remember that this same Prime Minister not long ago charged China with breach of faith and only a few days before this reassertion of the efficacy of trust had accused China of another incursion and another breach of promise.

BAD FOR NEPAL

It cannot be denied that almost all patriotic Indians are more or less angry with the King of Nepal and they are angry with him for one and the same reason. They are angry with him because he believes in a policy of non-alignment and of trust, both of which their own Prime Minister has been fervently advocating for years past.

Nevertheless, it will take a good deal of explaining on the part of Mr. Nehru or any of his followers, blind or unblind, why this policy of non-alignment and trust is good for India and bad for Nepal. Bad for Nepal: that must be our stand. Otherwise we have no moral justification for being angry with Nepal.

Apart from the question whether they can explain it successfully, the attempt to explain it obviously implies that non-alignment can be bad for some countries and, if it is good for a country, it is so only on account of some peculiar circumstances obtaining in a country. It implies further, that it may be good for Pakistan, from Pakistan's and not from India's point of view, and it may even be good for Nepal, not from India's but from Nepal's point of view.

I said above that the unsuitability of the policy of non-alignment for Nepal will take a good deal of explaining. It is a sad commentary on our democracy that, although that is the country's stand, it has not been advocated or debated in the country's press. No leader of any importance of any party has tried publicly to condemn the non-alignment of the present Government of Nepal, though we may take it for granted—unless we are to assume that the subject has been ruled out of their minds by themselves, which is an impossibility—that the reasons for their unvoiced condemnation have been agitating their minds. Much more than any other, they must have been agitating Mr. Nehru's mind.

And what is more. Although Mr. Nehru has not given expression to them publicly, it is only fair to assume that he gave a bit of his mind to the King of Nepal during his meetings with him recently. And it does not require telepathic powers of mind-reading to be able to assert that Prime Minister Nehru was not exactly persuading the King of Nepal to adopt a policy of non-alignment or of trust vis-a-vis India and China respectively, both of which are amply evident in the policies and decisions of His Majesty the King of Nepal.

OFFSHOOTS OF POLICY

Indeed, it may be stated without any fear of contradiction from any quarter, that our Prime Minister was patriotically advising the King of

Nepal to follow a policy of alignment with India and of distrust towards China and telling him, rightly, that would be for the best for both India and Nepal. And, in advising him in the manner he did, he must have given reasons to show how sound his advice was. Had he been in the habit of confessing his Himalayan blunders, like his Master, Gandhi, he might have even told the King of Nepal the result of his policy of trusting China: 15,000 square miles of territory gone and God knows how much more to go yet, thanks to his policy of trust and non-alignment which continues unabated, and is going to continue unabated, a dozen Chinas notwithstanding, for the simple reason that his only policy is pursuit of personal glory regardless of the cost to his country or countrymen, and non-alignment and trust are only offshoots of that policy.

Nor had he to go far to seek the reasons he must have given to the King of Nepal. He had only to ask one of his assistants to give him some of the brilliant expositions by American statesmen of the working of the Government machinery in Communist countries at the bidding of the Communist parties in those lands. Indeed, perhaps even that was not necessary, for Prime Minister Nehru has condemned the sayings and propositions of John Foster Dulles so many times that he must be remembering them by heart and could have reproduced the same from memory for the benefit of His Majesty the King of Nepal.

(Readers will remember that Mr. Nehru used to condemn the anti-Communist observations of US Secretary of State Dulles, when in fact China was demonstrating the truth of those observations by invading Mr. Nehru's own country, India — a fact which at the time, Mr. Nehru alone knew and which he kept a closely-guarded secret for years in order to be able to condemn Dulles effectively in the pursuit of his policy of non-alignment and trust. That was perhaps another example of our high moral standards of which he so often boasts.)

ANTI-NON-ALIGNMENT ADVICE

In any case, one thing should be quite clear to any one who has been following Mr. Nehru's speeches on international affairs and on non-alignment and that is, that the arguments advanced by Mr. Nehru to make King Mahendra change his mind must have been not only contrary to those he uses to advocate non-alignment, but must also have contradicted almost everything he has so far said in advocacy of the policy of non-alignment. I do not know whether King Mahendra had the presence of mind to tell Mr. Nehru that the latter was one of those people who believe in the maxim, "Heads I win, tails you lose," but is

about the only thing he could have appropriately said on the occasion, despite the fact, which every honest man should readily admit, that the King's pursuit of Mr. Nehru's policies is as unpatriotic on his part as it is on Mr. Nehru's own. Indeed, the King of Nepal in a lighter frame of mind might have even inquired of Mr. Nehru if he wanted to have a monopoly of fishing in troubled waters for personal glory, or if he wanted to be the only man in the world to let his ego have full and uncontrolled power to play ducks and drakes with his country's fortunes.

In any case, it is to be hoped that King Mahendra has been made to realise that he should not place both India and Nepal in jeopardy by allowing the projected Kathmandu-Lhasa Road to be completed by the Chinese and that it is not good policy to cut one's nose to spite one's face. His Foreign Minister, Dr. Giri, would appear to have said enough to prevent the External Affairs Department of the Government of India from taking Nepal for granted for years to come. And is it too much to hope that, in pointing the insanity of Nepal's policy of trust and non-alignment, Prime Minister Nehru has at last realised the insanity of his own policy of trust and non-alignment?

TRUE CHARITY

The socialist critics of competitive private enterprise, on grounds that it allows some to gain at the expense of others, obviously do not understand. For if they could understand, they would realize that socialism — despite its humanitarian, share-the-wealth appeal — does precisely what they deplore: it insists that some must lose what others are to gain. That is why socialism has to be compulsory. Every variation of the "welfare state" in the world to day is but a crude reversion to the ruthless law of the jungle: might makes right, one man's gain is another loss, to the victor belong the spoils.

The better alternative is competitive private enterprise and voluntary exchange — the only economic "game" that allows every player to win, the only social system that affords the maximum of true voluntary charity, and the only political concept consistent with the belief that individuals are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

— The Freeman.

Nehru And The D. M. K.

By P. Kodandarao

The threat of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to resist by war the secessionist demand of the D.M.K. was, if he meant it seriously, very unfortunate and is likely to win sympathy for the D.M.K., particularly when it confined itself to peaceful and constitutional agitation and did not resort to violence. The arguments of the D.M.K. for secession should be countered by superior arguments against it and not by sabre-rattling. The demands of the D.M.K., partly provoked by Mr. Nehru himself, should be examined sympathetically and be respected to the extent that they are reasonable and feasible, and the D.M.K. won over to the unity of India.

The problem may be viewed from the constitutional, the political and the emotional points of view. The decision of the American Supreme Court has often been quoted to prove that secession from a federation was unconstitutional and to justify the American Civil War to defeat it. It would seem, however, that the Court's decision came after the victory of the North in the War and that before it, the South had contended that secession was constitutional and pleaded that the issue should be referred to the Supreme Court for decision. But the South, fearing that the Court would or might declare secession constitutional, preferred to decide the issue by war. The fortunes of the War decided the issue in its favour, but not its constitutionality, which the Court alone was competent to do. It was only after the victory of the North in the Civil War that the Supreme Court held that secession was constitutional. It was a *post facto* judgement, more political than judicial, a phenomenon not uncommon in the history of the American Supreme Court.

In any event, no federation is beyond dissolution and no unitary constitution beyond amendment. They follow, and not veto, effective public opinion. Presently, the Central African and the West Indies Federations are being dissolved. The Unitary Constitution of India was amended by the British Government to give constitutional sanction for the secession of Pakistan from India. The post-Independence Constitution of India has been amended repeatedly to cede Berubari to Pakistan and incorporate Goa and to constitute linguistic States.

From the political point of view, the threat to use force to resist the peaceful demand for

Dravidstan seems fatuous when the Nehru Government yielded to violence to concede Pakistan and linguistic States. Its moral prestige suffered when it rewarded the Nizam with the Rajpramukhship of Hyderabad after he waged violent war against India and lost it, while it penalised the Maharaja of Kashmir by dethroning and exiling him after he had sought its protection and acceded to it; and when it used force to conquer Goa, but talked of peaceful methods to recover Indian territory forcibly occupied by Pakistan and China.

To the extent that the Indian Constitution is acknowledged to be federal rather than unitary, to that extent the secession of the federating units is rendered easier and without great strain on political psychology. The reorganisation of the Indian provinces on the linguistic basis has promoted secessionist tendencies. In each linguistic province one language exercises imperial sway over other languages in it. The citizens of one province have become aliens and foreigners in other provinces for all practical purposes. With the growing emphasis on the federal attributes of the centre and the autonomy of the linguistic states, the latter are likely to fall apart and aim at linguistic sovereignties, particularly if there be no single All-India language. So loyal and influential a Congressman as Mr. C. Subramaniam has repeatedly asserted that if English, the present common language of higher education and administration was to be replaced, it would be by Tamil rather than by Hindi. The alternative to English will generally be the Regional languages in the non-Hindi provinces and not Hindi. And that will lead to the Balkanization of India.

National unity is best maintained by emotional sentiment, shared by the citizens in common. It was strong on the eve of Independence. It has since suffered a sea-change, as is proved by the ultra-frantic efforts to restore emotional integration by committees and conferences and by pathetic exhortations, which as long as the causes of disintegration remain unchecked, fail to produce any but momentary responses. The greatest single factor which contributed to the tragic disintegration has been the anti-English and pro-Hindi policy of the Government of India, the coercive imposition of Hindi with all its power, administrative and financial, and the series of its broken promises. It is common

ECONOMIC SUPPLEMENT

Patent Pitfalls In
Planning—The Indian Experiment—II

By Prof. S. Kesava Iyengar

Proportion of public expenditure to national expenditure stands at 14.38 (First Plan) and at 23.10 (Second Plan). Although the increase of public expenditure rose considerably as percentage of national expenditure between the 2 Plans, the role of the public sector is still quite small compared to the national economy.

Plan Outlay compared to national expenditure works at lower percentages, respectively at 7.05, 12.55 and 12.89. These figures reveal that Plan outlay (including public and private sector) comprises but a fringe of the national economy. The main explanation is that a high proportion of the national economy is unorganised.

The relative position between public expenditure and Plan outlay is hard to explain away, at 52.44 and 54.34%. It is not at all clear why Planning did not cover the entire sphere of public expenditure, allowing the due margin for Defence and Debt Services. Almost a half of public expenditure is "non-Plan", and to that extent, indicates the fragmentary character of planning in India.

The role of the private sector in Plan outlay works at 47.87, 40.26 and 35.34% of total Plan outlay during the 3 successive Plan periods. An integrated Plan policy should have provided more and more scope for the private sector in order to ensure adequate coverage and cumulative progress, but so far, the trend is in the reverse direction, denoting a very unhealthy feature. The present trend must be attributed to the logic of a Socialist Society.

Plan outlay occupying a small place in the national economy, a Five Year Plan should be accompanied by a Five Year forecast of Public Revenue, but no such forecast has even been attempted. It would be something like reckoning without the host to adopt a Plan frame without an approximate estimate of Public Revenue.

Plan outlay is about a half of public expenditure, but less than a third if private sector is excluded.

Thus, the case for the Plan outlay covering a higher percentage of public expenditure, and for the Plan outlay by the private sector not only increasing but multiplying, is very strong.

According to estimates of the national income by the Central Statistical Organisation (New Delhi), National Income Analysis is as follows for 1957-58:

Government share in generation of net domestic product

	(Crores of Rs.)
1) Net out put of Government enterprises	510
2) Net out put of Government administration	660
Net out put of the Private Sector	10,240
Net domestic product	11,410

Corresponding figures for later years are not available, but the place allotted to the public sectors in the Third Plan (although showing an improvement on the previous two Plans), bears no relation whatever to the status of the private sector in the national economy, the relevant figures standing at Rs. 90,000 crores (national income in 5 years), Rs. 7,500 crores (public sector plan outlay) and Rs. 4,100 crores (private sector Plan outlay). In other words, out of Rs. 10,240 crores income of the private sector (it may be more at current prices during 1961-66), as little as Rs. 820 crores per annum is to be the Plan outlay in the private sector, working at 8%. On the other hand, the proportion of Plan outlay by the public sector to national income in the public sector works at 128.2%. Obviously, the difference between Government net income and Government Plan outlay is made up through deficit finance at home and borrowing abroad. The striking difference between 8% (private sector) and 128.2% (public sector) can at best be explained away partially by factors like the unorganised portion of the private sector, and the consumption needs of households, but in spite of this, a big portion remains untackled on account of the planning Commission contemplating predominantly an Official Plan, not a National Plan.

In a speech at New Delhi, the Soviet Ambassador said that the current Seven Year Plan (1959-65) was estimated to cost 1,970 billion Roubles. The Third Plan of India has been put at Rs. 11,600 crores for five years. This works at approximately Rs. 50 per-capita per annum. The Russian figure works at about 33 times the Indian figure, the population of the U.S.S.R. assumed at 200 million. The standard of life of the masses is about the same in both countries. What is the explanation for this gigantic difference in Plan outlay? The Indian Plan is predominantly official, taking into account a small share of the private sector which is responsible for more than 90 per cent of the flow of current incomes. The Russian Plan is national in scope, covering the entire population and pre-determining saving and investment through governmental agencies at the source.

It is a pity that even in the Third Plan, there is very little attention devoted to co-ordination between governmental and nongovernmental agencies as partners in formulating and implementing the Plan. For example Rs. 610 crores is allotted in the public sector for agriculture, animal husbandry, forestry, anti-erosion and anti-flood measures etc., but only Rs. 850 crores have been allotted to the private sector under this head, although about 50% (49.6% in 1958-59) of the national income was contributed by agriculture in the broad sense of the term, and investment on agriculture is only 14% of aggregate investment (Third Plan).

The same is the case with regard to industries and minerals. In 1958-59, income contributed by industries, commerce, transport and communication was 34.1% of the national income while the proposed outlay on this Head (Rs.4,306 crores) works at 41.4% of the aggregate investment during the Third Plan period. Thus, while Plan outlay, generally speaking, is quite inadequate compared to the scope, attention given to industries, communications and transport is more liberal than to agriculture (by far the biggest industry in the country). To some extent, the comparative inattention to agriculture is due to the activity being extensive and beyond the reach of the Planners, but it remains a fact that the improvement in national income in real terms is being impeded by the neglect of agriculture.

Service expenditure is analysed into "Development" and "nonDevelopment" Sections. Out of the former which projects comprise "Plan" outlay and which projects comprise "Non-Plan" expenditure may perhaps be ascertainable from files in Finance Ministries, but no information is available to the public on such a break-up. It would be more enlightening to study the behaviour of Development expenditure in the General

Budgets rather than in Plan Budgets and accounts, for the simple reason that the former picture is panoramic, and the latter a narrow cross-section.

Development expenditure (Revenue) of State Governments rose from Rs. 1,271.53 crores in 1951-56 to Rs. 2,271.06 crores during 1956-61 and is budgeted at Rs. 647.49 crores in 1961-62. The percentage increase between the two Plan periods works at 78.68 compared to 80.49 in Revenue Receipts of State Governments. Non-Development expenditure increased at a lower rate. Education ranks high in acceleration with Rs. 395.48 crores (First Plan), Rs. 763.25 crores (Second Plan) and Rs. 19.45 crores (1961-62 B.E.). Free compulsory elementary education would require a higher speed in expenditure increase during 1961-66 if the target should even be well approached. Agriculture, veterinary and co-operation started at a lower level, and the rate of progress has not been satisfactory. The hope is that with 64.09 per cent of Third Plan expenditure by States on agriculture, irrigation and power, etc., much more effective attention would be paid to this sector which caters substantially to the National income. Rural and Community Development exploded from Rs 51.14 crores to Rs. 200.66 crores (First and Second Plan) and on to Rs. 55.54 crores (1961-62). Service expenditure on this Head increased at a faster rate than Education, but evaluation Reports do not convey cumulative beneficial results. Under "Famine", the expenditure went down pro rate as between the Second Plan and 1961-62, showing how the authorities do not appreciate the vital importance of social security.

SERVICE EXPENDITURE

	(Crores of Rs.)		
	Total 1951-52 to 1955-56	Total 1956-57 to 1960-61	1961-62 (B. E.)
DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE			
Education	395.48	763.25	219.4
Medical and Public Health	181.01	314.50	92.95
Agriculture, Veterinary and Co-operation	160.60	275.69	82.67
Irrigation	98.27	133.09	35.50
Electricity Schemes	28.78	35.49	6.07
Rural and Community Development Projects	51.14	200.66	55.54
Civil Works	257.67	279.94	73.80
Industries and Supplies	36.15	96.73	27.68
Other Development Expenditure (a)	62.43	171.71	53.83
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT EXPEND.	1271.53	2271.06	647.49
NON-DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE*			
Debt Services (c)	64.46	265.90	79.84
Famine	44.97	69.53	8.88
TOTAL NON-DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE	1145.88	1698.86	409.87
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	2417.41	3969.92	1057.36

On the whole, Service Expenditure did not improve according to modern standards, although there is good room for economy accompanied by a higher level of efficiency and integrity. The Third Plan outlay target (including Revenue and Capital Accounts) of Rs. 3847.31 crores is not accompanied by even an approximate estimate of total development expenditure (leave alone total service expenditure) during the period.

Table V contains total Development and non-Development expenditure by State Governments, including Revenue and Capital Accounts at Rs. 2006.71 crores (First Plan), Rs. 3630.96 crores (Second Plan), and is budgeted at Rs. 981.69 crores in 1961-62. Compared to total expenditure by State Governments, these figures work respectively at 64.29%, 67.25%, 66.17% (for the two plan periods combined) and 69.67% (B.E. 1961-62) as referred to earlier. The distinction between "Development and Non-Development" items is by rule of thumb, and calls for immediate revision.

TABLE V

DEVELOPMENT AND NON-DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE REVENUE AND CAPITAL ACCOUNT

Item	(Crores of Rs.)			Total for 1961-62 First & Second Plan
	First Plan	Second Plan		
I. Development Expenditure:				
Revenue Account	1,271.53	2,271.06	3,542.59	647.49
Capital Account	735.18	1,359.90	2,095.08	334.20
Total Development Expenditure	2,006.71	3,630.96	5,637.67	681.69
II. Non-Development Expenditure:				
Revenue Account	1,145.88	1,698.86	2,844.74	409.87
Capital Account	-31.95	69.62	37.67	17.76
Total Non-Development Expenditure	1,113.93	1,768.48	2,882.41	427.63
III. Total Expenditure	3,120.64	5,399.44	8,520.08	1,409.32
IV. Percentage of				
I to III	64.29	67.25	66.17	69.67

Central Assistance consists of two categories --(1) for general purpose and (2) for Plan Projects. Under both these heads, such assistance comprises shared taxes, grants and loans. Table VI shows how Plan outlay was only 25.63% of total expenditure during the First Plan period, 32.56% during the Second Plan period, and 30.21% for the whole decade. Total First Plan outlay works at 63.52% of total Central assistance, the Second Plan percentage working at 72.75%

(69.72% for the whole decade). In other words, about a third of Central assistance was on Non-Plan account, covering the entire Plan outlay. On the other hand, Central assistance specifically for Plan projects works at 38.94% (First Plan), and 49.93% (Second Plan), the Third Plan target is 60.02% of Plan outlay. It is interesting to compare total development expenditure with Plan outlay.

During the First Plan period, Plan outlay was only 44.72% of total Development expenditure, the corresponding percentage for the Second Plan working at 57.93%. Thus, the difference between Plan outlay and Development expenditure is quite big, and it is hard to understand the connotation of "Non-Plan Development" expenditure. Figures in Table VI clearly reveal the fact that the distinction between "Plan Outlay" and "Development expenditure", as also the one between "Total Central Assistance" and "Central assistance for Plan Projects" are uncalled for and warrant an immediate rethinking by the Finance Commission and the Planning Commission. As is evident from Table VI, many a reader may wonder why only a moiety of Plan Outlay is shown as given by outlay by almost 50%! After all, the respective State Governments administer State Development activity in entirety, and the distinction between "Plan and Non-Plan" assistance actually hampers the discretion of State Cabinets.

TABLE VI PLAN OUTLAY AS PERCENTAGE OF EXPENDITURE, AND CENTRAL ASSISTANCE

Item	First Plan	Second Plan	Total for 1961-62 First and Second Plans	Third Plan
1. Total expenditure	3,489.3	6,445.1	9,934.4	1,700.0
2. Service expenditure	2,391.5	3,696.9	6,088.4	1,051.4
3. Development expenditure (Rev. & Capital)	2,006.71	3,630.96	5,637.67	981.69
4. Plan Outlay	897.50	2,103.16	3,000.66	999.33
5. Transfer of Funds by Centre (total)	1,412.97	2,890.77	4,303.74	800.95
6. Transfer of Funds by Centre for Plan outlay	349.70	1,050.00	1,399.70	2,809.00
7. Percentage of 4 to 1	25.63	32.56	30.21	35.29
8. Percentage of 4 to 2	37.54	52.93	47.15	50.76
9. Percentage of 4 to 3	44.72	57.92	53.22	61.13
10. Percentage of 4 to 5	63.52	72.75	69.72	64.93
11. Percentage of 6 to 4	38.94	49.93	46.64	60.02

The Causes Of Poverty: A Clinical View—II

Ambassador Galbraith's Address At Gujarat University

What are we to make of all this? I have said we have no diagnosis of poverty. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that we have a plethora of explanations, each superficially plausible, each inadequate for all or even a considerable number of the conditions it is called upon to explain.

But also in each explanation there is a little that is plausible. Thus nothing is currently more unfashionable, not to say insulting, than to attribute the absence of economic advance to the indifference of the people involved. Everyone wants improvement or advance. But in the United States for more than a century the Navajo, one of the great aboriginal tribes of North America, remained solidly aloof from what most people would agree was a considerable national ambition for economic improvement in the rest of America. The Navajo tended their flocks, spun their yarn, wove their cloth, ate their sparse simple food, and slept in their hogans. By the standards of everyone else in Arizona and New Mexico they were poor and it was partly because they did not ask for wealth. Kusum Nair tells in Blossoms in the Dust of the considerable tendency of Indian villagers to react to improved agricultural opportunity — to irrigation or improved methods of cultivation — with the argument that after all, they have enough.

But surely this is reasonable and what we should expect. Surely we would not expect the causes of low incomes in the sparse, illiterate population of northern Brazil to be the same as in the dense, relatively well-educated populace in the south of India. We should not expect to generalize from the semi-sensdom of some of the Central American states to the problems of organizing a new state in the Congo, to the endemic disorder of Laos. Each in a very different way can obviously be a cause of privation.

In particular, in the absence of any more precise understanding of what is wrong, we assume that the basic problem is a shortage of capital and, to a lesser extent, of technical "know-how". This is partly because these happen to be the things which are important in the more prosperous countries and also available for export. In the United States and Western Europe illiteracy is not a problem. There is no colonial or in most

countries serious class exploitation. We are not over-populated. People in the main are restless and concerned to advance themselves. The minimal requirements of public law and order are maintained. In these parts of the world the supply of capital and of technological innovation thus come to control the rate of increase in wealth. But to prescribe capital and technical assistance for poverty wherever it occurs is to follow the practice of the physician who has vitamins available and whose own health has been improved by taking them. He proceeds to prescribe his vitamin pills for all illnesses coming to his attention. These illnesses being variously caused by calcium deficiency, general malnutrition, slipped vertebrae, malaria, elephantiasis and acute neurosis, the remedy naturally has little real effect. The analogy to the present attack on poverty is exact.

— Our task in attacking poverty is to relate the remedy to the contributing cause in the particular values for example — must be accepted and our expectations of development altered accordingly situation. Some retarding factors — easy-going (I see no reason why all mankind must be assumed to have the restless, nervous ambitions of Americans, Russians or German?) Specific, identified causes will then require specific remedy. If the first and most urgent step is to overcome illiteracy and ignorance — if as I suspect these are the most common barriers to advance—then money and energy and assistance must go into organizing a school system. If organizing effective instruments of public administration is essential for getting a school system, then that will be the

Anything which so urgently commands our attention as the attack on poverty as urgently commands the right approach. We must now and promptly abandon the assumption that there is a single explanation with its fatal presumption that there is a single remedy. The provision of specific diagnosis, and of remedies appropriate to the particular form of the disease, will not be easy. This is a case where to be patiently right may even command less honour than to be grandly wrong. The author of the bold generalisation will continue to get the applause of those who believe that he is saving them from thought and do not see that as usual the price is error.

knowledge that Hindi won by a majority of one vote in the Party and opposition to it in the Constituent Assembly was subdued by frantic appeals for unanimity in the rush to complete the Constitution and by the promise that English would continue as the Official Language of the Government of India till at least 1965 and perhaps beyond, which would give time for reconsideration after the country had settled down to work the Constitution. But soon after, the Government took mean advantage of letter of the law as against its spirit, and started to push English out and push Hindi in. The non-Hindi leaders felt deceived and protested. To add insult to injury, the Hindi fanatics of the North proclaimed Hindi as the NATIONAL language of all-India and behaved like some Hindu fanatics who claimed that India belonged to Hindus because they were in a majority in the population and that the non-Hindu minorities should call themselves Hindus or submit to Hindu imperialism!

To arrest the deterioration in the national sentiment, Mr. Nehru publicly promised that English would continue until the non-Hindi leaders asked for a change. Subsequently, he practically went back on his promise and offered English the status of an Associate language! As recently as March 17, 1962, the Government of India's press release recalled that the Chief Ministers' Conference of August 1961 had welcomed the declaration that English would continue as the Associate language, and announced that a bill would be introduced in Parliament in "due course" for the use of English beyond 1965 and "as long as necessary." In using the words "as long as necessary" instead of "till the non-Hindi Indians asked for a change to Hindi", the Nehru Government has again gone back on its promise.

The Bill to make English the Associate language was to be introduced and enacted "in due course" and was not enacted before the last Parliament was dissolved. In sickening contrast was the enactment on March, 30, the day before the dissolution of the last Parliament, of the Bill to declare the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan as of "national importance" in spite of protests of some non-Hindi members and the gratuitous assurance that similar status would be given to the Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha and the offer to organise an All-India Federation of Hindi organisations, eligible to grants from the University Grants Commission! It is insulting enough for the Government to push Hindi in non-Hindi provinces with apostolic zeal, and it is even more insulting to finance the imposition from taxes

to which the non-Hindi Indians also contribute! It is the unkindest cut of all.

Though it is one of its major objectives, the D.M.K. is not alone in resisting Hindi imperialism. There are others, like Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, who are equally opposed to it, though they are equally opposed to secession to achieve that objective. They would persuade the Government to abandon Hindi imperialism and persuade the D.M.K. to abandon Dravidism.

When the British Government ignored the reasonable and constitutional plea of the Indian Moderates for Dominion Status within the British Empire, the Indian Extremists were driven to direct action, violent and non-violent, and to seek independence outside the Empire. But when the British Government granted Dominion Status, the Indian nationalists abandoned direct action and chose to remain within the Commonwealth and even acknowledge the British Sovereign as the Head of the Commonwealth! The present Government of India will do well to keep its promise to retain English till the non-Hindi leaders ask for a change, abandon Hindi imperialism, retrace the steps already taken to impose it and let Hindi flourish as a provincial language on a par with other regional languages and strengthen the hands of those who stand for Indian unity and win over the D.M.K. to it. It will be a most disappointing and tragic anti-climax for the great political career of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru if, after shaking off British Imperialism, he should fight a civil war with D.M.K. to impose Hindi imperialism!

SUPPORTERS OF SCHEMES

THE HARD-WORKED and over-burdened who form the great majority, and still more the incapables perpetually helped who are ever led to look for more help, are ready supporters of schemes which promise them this or the other benefit by State-agency, and ready believers of those who tell them that such benefits can be given, and ought to be given. They listen with eager faith to all builders of political air-castles, from Oxford graduates down to Irish irreconcilables, and every additional tax-supported appliance for their welfare raises hopes of further ones. Indeed the more numerous public instrumentalities become, the more is there generated in citizens the notion that everything is to be done for them and nothing by them. Each generation is made less familiar with the attainment of desired ends by individual actions or private combinations, and more familiar with the attainment of them by governmental agencies; until, eventually, governmental agencies come to be thought of as the only available agencies.

—HERBERT SPENCER,

Mr. Nehru Talks From A Position Of Strength

(From Our Correspondent)

Prime Minister Nehru seems to have been in a defiant mood on Thursday, the 3rd of May, 1962. For the first time in several years he spoke like the Prime Minister of a brave country. Referring to the Chinese note of April 30, in which the Chinese demanded that India should withdraw from two posts in Laddakh, failing which the Chinese would be compelled to "defend" themselves, Mr. Nehru told the Rajya Sabha that, if the Chinese took the steps which they had threatened to take on the border in their latest note, "we shall be prepared for them". He added, "There is nothing to be alarmed about, although the note, from the telegraphic summary, threatens all kinds of steps they might take." In the Lok Sabha he said on the same day: "We propose to remain where we are and not move because of Chinese threats. I do not think any serious situation has arisen by the sending of the latest Chinese note. But it is clear that the Chinese are apprehensive about our growing strength and hence their complaint."

The Chinese protests relate to two Indian checkposts which have been established near the Chinese border near Sinkiang. The new situation arises from India establishing a checkpost which is behind the Chinese checkposts and, according to the Prime Minister, "they are nervous about it". India has been protesting against the establishment of Chinese posts on Indian territory. Instead of withdrawing from the area, China is insisting on India pulling back farther south, for otherwise, if peace is to be maintained, China has no alternative to pulling back herself.

China's decision to "resume border patrols in the sector from the Karakoram Pass to the Kongka Pass" can only mean, if it is not mere bluff, that China is getting ready to move forward from her present line of occupation and control. Bluff or no bluff, the Prime Minister's firm declaration about the defence of India's frontiers with China would appear to have come in the nick of time, for, so far as the stopping of the Chinese advance is concerned, it seemed for India to be a question of "now or never". A Communist

daily of Hongkong has warned India that China will hit back, but, if the recent past of China's threats is any indication, particularly of threats directed to the Taiwan Government, it should not be amiss to conclude that Chinese threats are not meant to be implemented. The Chinese kept a regular count of their threats to the Taiwan Government and appear to have realised the absurdity of issuing threats and proclaiming the same as the "hundred and tenth" — to give an example — and so decided to stop issuing them. India will perhaps see similar threats directed towards her, though their number is not likely to approach the record figure directed against the Taiwan Government. The nature of the Chinese threat can also be concluded from the fact, revealed by the Indian Prime Minister, that the Chinese have not at any time given up patrolling which they threaten to resume. Mr. Nehru's assertion that the "Chinese are apprehensive about our growing strength" would appear to indicate that he is talking from a position of strength. That is something which he has been condemning in the case of the Western Powers, particularly when it was so summed up by their spokesmen who say the Communists understand nothing else. It is a curious irony of fate that Mr. Nehru has had to resort to the very devices of the Western Powers vis-a-vis the Communist Powers which he has all along been condemning. Is it too much to hope that he will now at last realise that his condemnation was unjustified and uncalled for?

The Prime Minister also disclosed on the same day, in the course of his reply to the Rajya Sabha debate on the President's Address, that for some months now Pakistan had been recruiting tribesmen as levies and asking them to go to Kashmir. He gave the warning that if the tribal invasion, about which Pakistan had been speaking in the Security Council, was ever attempted, the result would be all-out war. The Prime Minister blamed American military aid to Pakistan for the latter's war-like utterances on Kashmir, saying that, were it not for the arms received from the USA, Pakistan would talk "in a lower key". That holds

true also of China, and Mr. Nehru could have equally truly said that, but for the arms aid received by China from Soviet Russia, China would talk in a much lower key. That he has not said so would appear to suggest that he is not being equally frank in pronouncements regarding the Sino-Indian issue.

Winding up the debate on the President's Address in the Lok Sabha a day earlier, Mr. Nehru had said that India had taken many steps to strengthen her border defences. "Broadly speaking, we do not want", he said, "we dislike intensely a war with China. But that is not within our control", he added, "therefore we have to prepare for that contingency." The situation can be summed up briefly. On the one hand the Chinese keep advancing. On the other hand they say that the Government of India's contention that China should withdraw from the territory illegally occupied by her is tantamount to a summary rejection of the maintenance of status quo on the border. The retort to such an attitude, it is being pointed out here, is brinkmanship, which Mr. Nehru has been condemning but which he has had to resort to in his dealings with China. "We are prepared" in this context means nothing else. The same causes are producing the same situation for India, as they did for the Western Powers, and forcing Mr. Nehru to adopt the very attitude of the Western Powers which Mr. Nehru had been condemning all these years. No amount of hair-splitting can hide this simple fact.

SOCIALIST UNITY

The PSP's efforts for union with the Socialist Party have, as expected, ended in failure and are not likely to be revived unless the Socialist Party changes its attitude, which again is highly unlikely. After the general election of 1957 also, the PSP had tried for a merger of the two Socialist parties, through the agency of Mr. Jai Prakash Narain, but the Narain-Lohia talks broke down because of Dr. Lohia's insistence that the "PSP should accept in toto the constitution, programme and policy of the Socialist Party." This time Dr. Lohia's stand is much the same, with the slight difference that, in reply to charges of preserving his leadership, Dr. Lohia has had to say that the personnel of the leadership of the merged parties can be that of the PSP while the policy will be that of the Socialist Party. "You follow me," Dr. Lohia seems to say, "and I am your man."

The Socialist Party maintains that unity is possible only on the basis of its principles. "If there is any shortcoming in these principles," says the Socialist reply, "the PSP can let us know about

it." This, it is being pointed out, is not solving the controversy but giving it a fresh lease of life. The PSP can say the same thing to the Socialist Party, which does not seem to realise the implications of what it is saying. The average newspaper reader would perhaps like to know what the principles of the Socialist Party are. If implementation is any proof of their priority, the Socialist Party of India would appear to have but two main principles. One of them is summarised in the slogan "Angrezi hatao", i.e., "Remove English". The other is what Dr. Lohia has described as "permanent civil disobedience". The former can only lay the foundation of another division of the country, since its positive facet is "Introduce Hindi as the national language". Permanent civil disobedience against a democratically-elected government only means, "make a nuisance of yourselves and prevent the ruling party from doing any good to the country." If and when the Socialist Party comes into power—and it is doing its very best to prevent itself from coming into power—each of the other parties would have the right, on the same basis, of starting its own permanent civil disobedience—and a jolly mess they will together be able to make of the government of the country—without the Socialist Party being in a position even to object to the same.

When the Socialists say, "We cannot give up our principles," they are talking nonsense. There would not appear to be any difference of opinion regarding that in any honest mind. Who ever asks them to give up their principles? The PSP reply to such balderdash is dignified and the correspondence that has passed between the two parties (published by the PSP) should raise the PSP in the people's eyes. "Our call for unity," the PSP said, "was an earnest of our confidence in your spirit of comradeship and in dedication to common ideals. We were convinced that merger was only a recognition in form of a unity in ideals that already existed." As a PSP leader put it, the general election results showed that the Socialist parties in India should either unite or perish. The Socialist Party can contemplate the latter alternative with equanimity. That is the only inference to be drawn from the correspondence now published.

Book Review

A CENTURY OF CONFLICT by Stefan T. Possony (*Communist Techniques of World Revolution*) 1848-1950. Published by Henry Regnery Company Chicago. Pages 439 including Index. Price \$7.50.

The author is a professor of international politics in Georgetown University USA and has published several works in the field of strategy such as *Tommorow's War*, *Strategic Air Power* and *International Relations*.

He has lectured in the USA war colleges and has been contributing articles to military journals.

This work traces the Soviet techniques of world revolution as laid down in the proceedings of the Third Communist International Association of Working Men with its headquarters in Moscow. It traces the ideas on revolutionary strategy and tactics discussed by Karl Marx and Engels who took fruitful hints from the German master of war strategy Clausewitz. It follows up the course of communist doctrine on this all-important matter in the thought and precepts and practice of Lenin in building his revolutionary party and guiding the Russian Revolution after the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in October 1917.

Hitler laid down his plan for world conquest for all the world to see in his *Mein Kampf* which was sold and broadcast in multi-million copy editions during the height of his power between 1933-1939. Indeed its vogue began years before he seized power in 1933 and formed the substance of the faith and ideology that consolidated his hold on the new German generation burning to wipe out the eclipsing disgrace of the national defeat of 1918. But the dream of world conquest seemed so weird, improbable and mad that no serious politician took any notice of it until it was too late!

Today a similar situation has developed, Mr. Possony points out with conclusive and telling testimony based on irrefragable evidence (as frightening as it is thorough and indisputable), that the masters of International Communism in the Kremlin have spelled out a Blue-print for world conquest more elaborate and more scientific than Hitler's ever was!

And to-day the Soviet rulers are masters of the vast Eurasian land-mass with a population and natural resources not far behind those of the free world.

They have a single-minded plan entrusted to a ruthless organisation bound by an iron discipline and fired by an indomitable will-to-victory and faith in the dialectic of history. The Sixth and Seventh World Congresses of the Communist Parties held in Moscow in 1928 and 1935 lay down in detail the instructions to be followed by all communist parties in the different nations of the world to subvert their bourgeois governments and establish dictatorships of the proletariat under their own lead. All must obey the international leadership at Moscow!

The way in which, after the war of 1939-46, East European States like Czechoslovakia and Asian States like China were sucked into the Iron Curtain is described in great detail.

Today in India the book will be an eye-opener to educated persons anxious to preserve national independence.

— M. A. Venkata Rao.

Gleanings from the Press

Unbreakable Affinity Between Russia And China

Nine eminent Americans have contributed articles to the *New Leader* on the apparent schism between Moscow and Peking. The questions are whether the rupture is real and significant and if it is of any use to non-communists. On the whole, the inclination is to hold that there is a real break between them but that it can have little implication for the West. Most of the contributors hold that the doctrinaire assumption of the international solidarity of communist societies has broken down and individual nations have begun to reassert national interests. The Soviet Union has attained a degree of power and prestige which makes it believe in the ultimate triumph of communism throughout the world through peaceful means. But China cannot believe it. The co-existence slogan of the Soviet Union leader is not acceptable to Mao. Khrushchov does not now want international tension to be maintained, but Mao wants it. Most commentators agree in this, that today power and not ideology makes the difference between one communist centre and the other. Apart from all this high stuff, one commentator points out and emphasizes a warning. Once a totalitarian State has been set up, even a formal political break does not destroy the institutional affinity between the ruling class in the State and the bureaucracies of orthodox communist countries.

C. R. in Swarajya.

News & Views

ANTI-TEST OUTBURST IS DIRECTED TO WRONG PARTY

WASHINGTON:

The eight months of public debate preceding the U. S. resumption of nuclear testing resulted in solid public support for President Kennedy's reluctant decision to resume tests.

This backing, despite scattered protests by some pacifists and some communist front organizations, was evident today in a survey of the American Press. It was also apparent on Capitol Hill where legislators gave unanimous approval. The only newspaper campaigning against testing was "The Worker," published in New York by the U. S. Communist Party.

"The Worker" fails to mention the Soviet Union's 50 test series last fall and ironically there was no opposition newspaper in Moscow to chronicle local protests against the Soviet breaking off the three-year test moratorium.

In fact, as observers here have pointed out frequently, there was no public debate on the subject inside the Iron Curtain and Soviet citizens were kept ignorant of their own Government's testing until the U. S. made it public.

American public opinion today regarded as phoney any protest from neutrals or communist bloc about resumption of American atmospheric testing at this late date. For example, the "New York Times" said editorially: "The storm of protest being whipped up around the world against the American test is directed to the wrong address. It should be addressed to the Kremlin which can stop these tests at any time it is willing to comply with the U. N. resolution calling for a test ban treaty under 'effective international control'."

ANTI-RED UPRISING SEEN POSSIBLE IN CHINA

WASHINGTON: Western authorities, on the basis of intelligence reports, now believe that an internal uprising in China that would overthrow the communist regime is a distinct possibility, the magazine, "U.S. News and World Report," said recently.

In a round-up of reports from its correspondents in London, Hong Kong and Washington, the weekly magazine said: "A crack-up of Red China, long held by the West to be impossible, is beginning now to be regarded by Western authorities as something that could happen."

According to all reports, the magazine said, "life within Red China today is described as bordering on hopelessness." It added "Hunger is everywhere....communes that were to regiment the people are being abandoned. A 'great leap forward' in industry has ended with a jump backward. Farmers are being encouraged to return to their old, pre-communist ways of farming and marketing."

The "U.S. News and World Report" quoted one U.S. official as saying: "It is not inconceivable that the (Red Army) leaders, aware of the breakdown of the system that politicians have tried to impose on China, may conclude that this is no way to run a country and may then take matters into their own hands."

RUSSIA: A MASTER COLONIAL POWER

Soviet Russia squeezes about a billion dollars a year out of her seven European satellites through economic exploitation—according to a new study based on official Soviet statistics.

The trick is done by overcharging the satellites for Soviet exports, and underpaying them for Soviet imports.

A study of Soviet yearbooks, made for the Assembly of Captive European Nations by Aleksander Kutt, an economist from Estonia, showed this:

In 1956, Russia was buying wheat from the West at \$62.30 a ton—and selling wheat to East Europe at \$82.60 a ton. In 1957, Russia imported wheat at \$58.40; exported it to satellites at \$81.10.

In 1960, Mr. Kutt found overcharging up to 300 per cent in 41 commodities traded with East Europe. In 1959, Outer Mongolia was forced to pay twice as much as Japan did for Soviet crude oil.

The study's conclusion: Russia is a "master colonial power" engaged in economic "looting."

—U.S. News & World Report, April 23, 1962

SWATANTRA, REAL OPPOSITION TO CONGRESS

Having regard to the fact that it was founded just a short while ago, the performance of Swatantra Party at the elections is not at all discouraging. It is now the main opposition in several states and is the third largest party in the Lok Sabha.

There is some strength in the Swatantra claim that it is the only party with a clear-cut, alternative programme; all other opposition parties try merely to embellish or improve upon the Congress programme. As it is secular in policies and national in scope and objectives, it stands to attract all the elements opposing the Congress and Communist parties. Its stand on collective farming and abolition of land revenue is bound to have far-reaching effects tomorrow, if not today. As its ramifications penetrate into the countryside, it will become a force to reckon with.

If it is essential for the country to have parliamentary democracy, it is also necessary for the nation to have a party like the Swatantra in opposition to the Congress, for without an effective opposition, the ruling party is likely to degenerate into a tyrant. Opposition must have some distinct programme or policies of its own, which no other opposition party has at the moment.

—CARAVAN

ALL INDIA CONVENTION "TO SAVE DEMOCRACY" FROM CONGRESS MISRULE

An all-India convention of Opposition leaders held in New Delhi recently to "devise measures for saving democracy" urged the formation of a united front against the Congress in Parliament and the State Assemblies.

The convention recommended that inter-party liaison committees should be formed to combat the "dictatorial" moves of the ruling party. It appreciated the progress in the Punjab towards the formation of a united front.

The convention, called by the "Save Democracy Committee" formed by the Opposition leaders in the Punjab, expressed grave concern at the "corrupt" methods adopted by the Congress to win voters in the general election.

PRESIDENT'S RULE

It demanded that President's rule should be promulgated six months before every general election to ensure smooth and fair elections. It also wanted complete separation of the executive and the judiciary at all levels.

The convention was attended by representatives of the Akali Dal, the Swatantra Party, the Socialist Party, the Bharatiya Jan Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha, the Muslim League, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam and the Republic Party, Mr. Jaipal Singh M.P. and the leader of the Jharkand group in the Lok Sabha presided. Master Tara Singh, Akali leader, was present but he did not speak.

The convention accused the Congress of influencing directly and indirectly, the elections through Government machinery and said that results had been "cooked up in a most irregular manner in several constituencies to the benefit of the Congress, turning the entire process of elections into a farce."

The convention urged responsible leaders to mobilise public opinion against these undemocratic practices.

ENGLISH PROTAGONISTS PLAN AGITATION

IN GUJARAT

AHMEDABAD: Operational details of the campaign for restoration of English from Standard V in secondary education in the State were disclosed at press conference by Mr. T. S. Thakore, president of the Gujarat Secondary Teachers Federation, who is spearheading the movement.

Mr. Thakore, who is also a prominent Congressman, also announced his readiness to face disciplinary action which is reported to have been threatened against him by the Ahmedabad City Congress Committee.

The programme, which is to start soon, includes processions of batches of adult students numbering about 500 to 1,000 which may march to the residence of either the Chief Minister, the Education Minister or the Deputy Education Minister.

Mr. Thakore wanted each citizen to write a post card. He ruled out strikes and as for the use of students for this agitation, he stressed that as this was an issue of vital importance to the students themselves, they had a right to participate in the same.

He, however, emphasised that only adult students would be allowed to be associated with the movement.

ENTRY OF MISRA INTO CONGRESS "VIOLATION OF CODE OF CONDUCT"

BHUDANESWAR: Mr. R. N. Singh Deo,

President of the Orissa Swatantra Party and leader of the Opposition in the State Assembly, said yesterday the Congress decision to admit into its fold those who resigned from the Swatantra Party violated the code of conduct for political parties.

He was commenting on the resignation of Dr. Ram Prasad Mishra from his party and his subsequent admission into the Congress.

Mr. Deo said the resolution of the Pradesh Congress Executive in this regard was "opportunistic."

Mr. Misra was the president of the Ganatantra Parishad at the time of its merger with the Swatantra in March last.

Meanwhile, the Swatantra Party's Working Committee will meet to discuss Mr. Misra's resignation and measures to strengthen the party.

"BURMA NEEDS DEMOCRACY"

SOCIALISM DECRIED

RANGOON: While almost all the leading politicians of Burma have generally approved of the policy statement made by Gen. Ne Win, one outstanding personality to differ is U Pa Pe.

He preferred parliamentary democracy, he said, as it was conducive to the spreading of Buddhist tenets and practices.

To ensure economic progress he felt that the Government should take over large undertakings, transport, communications, broadcasting and industries like the Burma Oil Company and the Burma Corporation and leave the rest to private enterprise.

Socialism had been the cry in the country for the past 15 years under governments formed by the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League and the Union Party, but Burma failed to make any progress, said U Ba Pe.

PLAN MAY PROVE A FLOP—BIRLA TAXPAYERS BEAR STEEL PLANT LOSS

The fear that the Third Plan might be a "complete flop" if the Government continued to be smug about its inefficient administration, its over-planning and its "bad investment and fiscal policy," was expressed by Mr. G. D. Birla in a talk on the "general economic condition" held under the auspices of the Commerce Graduates' Association in Bombay.

While much progress had been made during the past ten years by way of increased agricultural and industrial production, this was not reflected in the 17 per cent. increase only in the per capita income because of the growth of population, he said.

Mr. Birla said that the present investment policy was "anti-production, anti-consumption and antisavings." Incentives should be offered to attract investments.

Regarding the steel plants run by the Government, Mr. Birla said that on an investment of Rs. 1,000 crores the net loss was Rs. 60 crores

after allowing for depreciation and interest on loans. The nation could ill afford such losses. While a private commercial enterprise faced with such losses would be forced into liquidation, a public sector enterprise continued to the detriment of the taxpayers, he said.

LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE, BANGALORE

Mr. G. S. Ullal, Advocate addressed a study circle meeting on 20-4-1962 on "Property as a Fundamental Right." Prof. M. A. Venkatrao presided.

Dear Editor

The advantage to the consumers of an industry being in the private, and not in the public sector, was convincingly exemplified by the action of President Kennedy when the American steel industry raised prices recently. He was able to restrain the producers in the interest of the consumers because his Government was not organically connected with the industry as owner or partner. If the industry had been nationalised and the Government itself raised the prices, the consumers would be victimised and have nowhere to go in appeal. The argument that prices in the public sector are fixed with the interest of the consumers in view is not generally true. For instance, the State Trading Corporation raised the prices of cement unconscionably high and took in profiteering if indulged in by the private sector. The fits which would be condemned as exorbitant profiteering further argument that the profits in the public sector are used for the benefit of the public rather than of private individuals is not generally true inasmuch as the Government is prone to treat the ruling party and its individual favourites as the public. Government should normally be above, and aloof from, economic activity and protect the consumers, who form hundred per cent of the citizenry but are unorganised, from profiteering by the private sector and should not itself indulge in profiteering at the expense of the consumers and in the interest of its party and favourites.

Bangalore.

P. Kodandarao

May 15, 1962

WIN A PRIZE!

A prize of Rs. 200/- will be awarded to anyone who sends us an essay not exceeding 10000 words on

ENGLISH AS THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

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

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

Please write to:

SECRETARY

LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE

ARYA BHUVAN, 1ST FLOOR,

SANDHURST ROAD, (WEST),

BOMBAY-4.

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

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



Write to:

THE MANAGER

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

BOMBAY 4

Telephone : 70208

Telegram : LOTEWALLA