

Indian Libertarian

Price 25 Naya Paise

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

IN THIS ISSUE

Vol. VIII No. 15

November 1, 1960

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL	1	<i>When a Philosopher Turns a Politician</i> by J. K. Dhairyawan	11
<i>The Role of Ideas in Politics</i> by M. A. Venkata Rao	4	<i>Factions and the Congress</i> by Vivek	13
<i>Neutral Nations' Claptrap—1</i> by M. N. Tholal ..	7	DELHI LETTER	15
<i>Lokayata—Indian Materialism</i> by S. Ramanathan ..	10	TIT-BITS	17
RATIONALIST SUPPLEMENT	I-IV	GLEANINGS FROM THE PRESS	18
		NEWS AND VIEWS	18
		LETTER TO THE EDITOR	19

EDITORIAL

NEHRU'S ROLE IN THE UNO

NEWSPAPERS and commentators have already expressed themselves on the upshot of Nehru's role in the recent Assembly sessions. Khrushchov's dramatic presence in Lake Success (in despite of American hostility to his presence again on American soil after his insults to Eisenhower at Paris) induced MacMillan to attend the sessions. Eisenhower too attended in order to clarify American policy on outstanding issues, particularly on the Congo and on disarmament.

The heads of neutral States were present as a body of whom Nehru was clearly the leader.

Nehru's opening speech on the world situation and the great and noble role that the UNO has to play in realising world peace was pitched in a characteristically exalted and philosophic key breathing the "Above the Battle" attitude of an Elder Statesman. It was rightly applauded. Nehru excels in the expression of noble sentiments from a wide historical and ethical point of view. It is when the time comes for action that he reveals his feet of clay—a fatal blind spot to reality.

The British used to accuse Mahatma Gandhi also with the same fateful drawback of being out of touch with historical reality and human nature in the political setting of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest among nations.

In spite of his claim for special knowledge of world conditions, Nehru is clearly deficient both in consistency and clear recognition of realities. He is unaware to what extent his own professedly exalted and selfless policies are interpreted by clear sighted observers in a mundane sense inconsistent with his professed principles. For instance, Nehru's pro-Arab policy as contrasted with his cold shouldering of Israel is seen as an instance of *appeasing* the more numerous and powerful group of Arabs to the detriment of the smaller nation! Nehru asks Western nations to eschew fear but in this case he is animated by the fear of offending Arab peoples!

Nehru is also seen as *appeasing* Russia and China to the detriment of Western interests out of a fear of their possible hostility on the Indian border. China has already given substantial reason for India to be afraid. But instead of writing Chinese goodwill off, he is still hoping to halt her ill-will and aggression by arguing for her seating in the UNO!

He is seen to be not strictly neutral but *more than neutral* in favour of Russia and its bloc!

It is this second aspect of Nehru's weakness that came out in his sponsoring of the neutral nations' resolution for the renewal of contacts between Khrushchov and Eisenhower.

The editor of the *Eastern Economist* notes the double unreality of the situation underlying the neutralist nations'

resolution. One was that of Nehru who should have known the strength of feeling against an Eisenhower-Khrushchov meeting without correcting the emotional situation created by the Paris debacle and the stream of Khrushchovian insults since then. Eisenhower had already declared that he would not meet the Russian Bear without preparation through diplomatic channels. The Russian was bent on meeting him through breaking his Will by pressure of neutralist and pro-Russian voting strength in the Assembly! Khrushchov succeeded in persuading the neutral nations' leaders—Tito, Soekarno, Nasser, Nkruma and Nehru to move a resolution asking Eisenhower to meet him! It was clearly a Khrushchov move in the tactics of the cold war. Talking incessantly against the cold war, Nehru yet could not see that he was made a cat's paw by Khrushchov to draw the chestnuts out of the fire for him! In this Nehru was clearly more neutral in favour of Khrushchev than in favour of the Western world! He did not say a word about the suppression of civil liberties in Khrushchov's iron empire while he joined Russia in demanding the "immediate" liquidation of Western empires or colonies. The West is dispossessing itself of its colonial heritage pretty fast—in fact faster than is good for the ex-colonies and the world at large—witness the Congo debacle and tragedy.

The West could not but scotch the Nehru Resolution which was only in form neutral but in effect was anti-West. Nehru went out of his way to give a certificate for communist empires saying that the satellites are not strictly to be regarded as colonial territories! This was totally uncalled for, while being notoriously false. Witness Tibet and Hungary, not to speak of the older annexations in the Baltic:—Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia on whom genocide by Russia has been charged!

Nehru's petulant outburst against the Australian statesman who urged an amendment was characteristic of the man in

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.

his dealings with the AICC and Lok Sabha in India but brought his prestige down in the international assembly.

The second unreality that the Eastern Economist editor has in mind is that of the Western Powers who opposed the neutral nations' resolution in not paying sufficient respect to the opinion of uncommitted nations. Uncommitted nations are becoming increasingly important members of the UNO by reason of the rapid de-colonisation policy of the holding Powers, who are immediately admitted to membership of the world organisation. In fact, Tito, Nasser and Soekarno even formally suggested to Nehru that he should head a neutralist bloc in the UNO to act as a counter-weight against the cold war blocs. Khrushchov favoured the proposal and made it a part of his suggestion for three Secretaries for the UNO in place of the present Secretary General—one each for the West, for the Russian bloc and for the newly to be recognised neutralist bloc or group.

It is lucky that Nehru refused to fall in with the idea and expressed himself against the proposal of three secretaries on the ground of its evident impracticability.

With regard to the Congo, Nehru's attitude was reasonable in that he supported the idea of allowing the parliament to function and form a new government with which the UNO could deal. There is no other way short of conquering the Congo by the UNO in a straightforward way like the old imperialists, for chaos has overtaken the new state, with rivals thwarting each other and allowing no one to function as the legal representative of the State!

But on the whole it would be well if Nehru realises that there are limits to what the Great Nations will take from him in the matter of advice for world peace and global war threat.

INDO-PAKISTAN CANAL WATERS AGREEMENT

At long last, after a negotiation with the mediation of the World Bank for eight years, off and on, this dispute between India and Pakistan about sharing the waters of the Indus and its tributaries has been settled. Nehru went to Pakistan on a four-day visit to sign the treaty. His actual presence in Pakistan was not strictly necessary, as he pointed out but he hoped to ease the tension by this gesture of a friendly visit, which was eagerly anticipated by General Ayub Khan and worked for by his envoy in India supported by Rajeswar Dayal, then our envoy in Pakistan.

As usual the agreement is on the whole unfavourable to India who has to accept it as a matter of concession by the Elder Brother. Even sources generally friendly to Pakistan among journalists and others in India have expressed themselves in criticism of the surrender of Indian interests so completely.

For one thing, India has the right to only 20 per cent of the total waters available in the Indus Valley while 80 per cent has been reserved for Pakistan. This imposes unjust limits on India's use of the rivers that flow in her own territory! We can use only token extents of the waters of Chenab, Jhelum and Indus that flow through Kashmir before they enter Pakistan. This is as good as surrendering sovereign rights over Kashmir rivers.

The President now talks of having engineers stationed on the upper reaches of his rivers in their Kashmir terrain to see that India keeps her word! From civil employees to military to defend them in emergencies (which can always be created) is a short step! How completely ignorant and innocent of military tactics and political bargaining skill our Prime Minister has been in such negotiations! So it was with regard to the Naga demands.

Even with regard to the three rivers supposed to be allotted entirely to India—the Ravi, Beas and Sutlej, India has agreed not to use her full quota for ten years (with a further grace period of three years) to give time for Pakistan to build alternative canals in her own areas to replace the waters she is now receiving from headworks in India upstream. This prevents us from irrigating the semi-desert lands of Rajasthan, a vast part of which could be converted into a garden if our plans go through. Rajasthan has now to wait ten or possibly thirteen years! Such a wait should not have been agreed to. It sacrifices Indian interests in a vital manner. Pakistan has in these years already built a large part of the replacement canals! It should have been examined and only as much of the waters as were still to be replaced could have been allowed to Pakistan for three or similar short period to enable Pakistan to complete her canal system. Negotiators usually keep experts equipped with the facts of the situation near them while engaged at the council table with representatives of other nations. But our hero-Prime Minister disdains such aid from knowledgeable experts and relies on his own intuitions which are more often animated by unthinking generosity to the hostile foreigner than by devotion to the interests of his own people and country. This has been a disastrous trait in our Leader for which India is paying heavily year after year.

The World Bank has placed the Indian treaty in a large context of a grandiose river valley development scheme for Pakistan that contemplates the whole of the Indus Basin with canal systems and multi-purpose projects for electricity, flood control and agricultural development. The whole scheme was thought of by Mr. David Lilienthal the first President of the American Tennessee Valley Project. It is estimated to cost Rs. 350 crores of which India is made to contribute Rs. 83.50 crores, the rest being advanced to Pakistan from Western countries: Britain, Germany, Canada and the USA.

The question inevitably arises as to why India should make any contribution at all? She has been allotted less than the legitimate share that should accrue to her by reason of geography and the boundary line between India and Pakistan. Originally the sum envisaged was Rs. 50 crores, then it rose to Rs. 60 crores but at the last moment as so often, Pakistan made a fresh demand for greater sums and Nehru yielded on the eve of going to Pakistan to the figure of Rs. 83.50 crores! Why and on what basis? That of being the Elder Brother?

Another onerous stipulation is that India should pay cash and should not adjust this amount against the large sums in the neighbourhood of Rs. 300 crores owed to us in respect of the share in public debt that India had taken over generously in 1947 to allow time for the new State to settle down. Not a pie of this has been paid so far! And India has not been able to obtain any payment for the

large amount of evacuee property amounting, (making all sorts of allowances and permitting transfers of property at the instance of Abul Kalam Azad and other Muslim high-ups) to Rs. 500 crores! Strictly speaking the balance of Indian property after adjusting Muslim property claims amounts to thousands of crores:—Some well informed persons put it at Rs. 5000 crores since most of the Property in West Pakistan from Lahore to Peshawar and down to Karachi was owned by Hindus! But India has accepted some figure based on no reasonable data (except the desire to appease) for a settlement (which is so elusive) in the neighbourhood of Rs. 500 :- And even out of this not a pie has been received and is not likely to be received so long as the Nehru Government continues in power with its appeasement mentality and weakness in bargaining.

The Commentator in *The Eastern Economist* says that at least payment in kind in cement and coal that Pakistan needs could have been arranged. But no, the Elder Brother should pay in sterling, even if he is himself in exchange difficulties! This is how the Elder Brother diplomacy works in favour of the aggressor and hostile neighbour. The fault lies not in them but in our governmental representatives, who are keener on winning a reputation for noble generosity for themselves than on securing the interests of their nationals!

PRESIDENT AYUB KHAN THREATENS WAR AGAINST INDIA

No sooner was the ink on the Treaty document dry than President Ayub Khan took an occasion to threaten India with military action for Kashmir! Speaking in the so-called Azad Kashmir shortly after the signing of the Water Treaty, Ayub Khan said addressing an army contingent that the Army could not stand idly by if India postpones indefinitely a settlement of the Kashmir problem!

This is a new note in the military dictator of Pakistan. He had begun a policy of *detente* and easing of tension since his assumption of power. He had stopped the wild cries of *jehad* with which Pakistani mobs were being excited by the old League politicians. He had invited Indian journalists to tour Pakistan and see for themselves the new friendliness of the people for India. He got his way in the canal treaty and won over Nehru for a *reconsideration* of the Kashmir problem on a basis other than that of the present status quo on the Cease Fire line. In fact Nehru seems to have offered the closure of the problem on the basis of the Cease Fire line. He had no right to do so, not having obtained the consent of Parliament for any such surrender of two fifths of Kashmir and Ladakh. But Ayub wants to use it as a jumping off ground or claiming a larger share! Obviously he is out for the Kashmir Valley in full! It is to be noted that the general-president has chosen the moment when Nehru was defeated in his neutralist resolution in the UNO Assembly for uttering his threat, a moment of low confidence reposed in Nehru by the Western Powers! Since he is a dictator talking to the Army, his threat is more serious than those of former League politicians.

Nehru's reply to the effect that any disturbance in the *status quo* would disturb human relations sending refugees in distress across state borders is singularly inept. He should have censured Ayub for speaking in war language

so soon after the friendly gesture of the Treaty settlement. He should have said that military settlement would not necessarily go in his favour, Indian forces not being a negligible factor in such business!

Nehru should have reminded the world and Ayub that Pakistan was an *aggressor* and had *no standing* in the Kashmir dispute. The only thing needing to be done now was her withdrawal into her own borders and restore her reputation as a decent law-abiding neighbour fit for international friendship. Such language is not to be expected from our Prime Minister. As many UNO observers remarked at the recent Assembly sessions—"Nehru is weak: Nasser is strong." It may be recalled that Nasser has scotched both the Muslim Brotherhood and the Communist Party of Syria and Egypt completely, whereas communists have free play and room for treacherous deployment in India, in spite of the traitorous stand of the party with regard to the Chinese invaders! An observer truly remarked that Nehru's condemnation of the communist party is like the quarrel between husband and wife—not to be taken seriously! Ultimately, they will be one!

NASSER'S MOVE FOR PAN ARABISM

Nasser's move in Iraq has reached a stalemate. President Kassim has succeeded in neutralising both the communists and the Nasserites to some extent, though at fearful cost. The Russians have been patient with him and have even sent him military equipment in spite of their dissatisfaction with his hostility.

So President Nasser has turned to Jordan. The recent explosion killing the Prime Minister and eight others in the office at Amman is suspected of being sponsored by Nasser. It was intended for the King himself but luckily he was not on the spot at the moment! No less a person than Glub Pasha, British maker of the Jordan army has written in the papers supporting the theory of Nasser's complicity.

What a set of friends for Nehru the pacifist! Nasser, Soekarno, Tito, Nkrumah who is a dictator in the making!

GROUP POLITICS WITHIN CONGRESS

At home, in Assam, the U.P., Andhra and Mysore, the quarrel between the official and organisational wings have reached a crisis. They are all bent on destroying the

ministries and Nehru is confronted with the fading of Congress!

The point of principle is never considered in these intra-Congress squabbles. The organisational party wing who are not members of the legislatures feel left out of the administration and its perquisites. They are jealous of the power of their friends in the Government. They try to have their way in patronage through influence. They tire of this indirect influence very soon and begin to build up a dissident legislature group strong enough to pass a vote of censure, even on flimsy grounds if no valid reasons are forthcoming. They speak of "*broadening*" the ministry if they are not likely to be able to oust the Chief Minister!

The need for steady government is ignored altogether. It is all a question of "*sharing the spoils*" and since it is not possible to give a Ministership to every member of the Congress Pradesh Committee and members of the legislature, the quarrel becomes distressing and sinks below decent levels.

The principle is that the parliamentary members of the ruling party ought to have superior status in the governance of the country *vis a vis* the unofficial members. For the *parliamentary members have been returned in the elections from the electorates who are sovereign in a democracy.*

The party has the functions only of *choosing* the governing group and *supervising* its implementation of policy. *It has no right of governing by itself.*

The dissidents should therefore be firmly told to cease their squabbles and confine themselves only to supervision. Once elected, the party leader in parliament should be allowed to choose his cabinet and to rule the State in consultation with the legislature undisturbed for the full electoral period of five years.

The Congress High Command has only stultified itself by neglecting such principles and trying to settle each problem in the light of expediency and personality influence! There is no salvation for such a body in a democracy:—Congress is continuing only because there is no alternative body to whom the people could transfer power in the next elections, unless the Swatantra party succeeds in building itself up on an All-India scale meantime in a convincing manner.

—:0:—

The Role Of Ideas In Politics

By M. A. Venkata Rao

THE pen is mightier than the sword. This adage is being illustrated in several spheres of life today in the world and particularly in our country. The idea of the sovereignty of the people as the basis and justification of democracy in particular is being enacted in politics before our very eyes.

Many of the sources of trouble in current politics is due to the prevalence of notions only imperfectly understood and applied hastily in garbled forms to justify partisan interests. This is an age of propaganda. Half truths with an aura of authority derived from some popular leader or author, Hitler or Nietzsche, Nehru or Gandhi are riding

rough-shod over our lives creating havoc and seem to be well-nigh uncontrollable.

The idea of linguistic States with the slogan of "one State for one language" is one such uprooting idea derived from the authority of the Gandhian Congress that is apparently going out of control. The hope of government of confining the idea to Andhra on the ground of simplicity and agreement as between Andhras and Tamils has been signally belied. The Maharashtriyans and Gujeratis took up the cry and succeeded after three years of fierce agitation in achieving two unilingual States in place of the old integral State of Bombay. The Congress found that it could not retain the allegiance of the Maharashtriyans and Gujeratis if they did not bow to the popular demand.

This concession has been a veritable Pandora's Box in current politics. It has naturally started demands for similar linguistic States.

Vidharbha is unhappy though it has the same language as the rest of Maharashtra. It clings to memories of former historical identity and greatness. It shows that the linguistic mantle is only a mask or pretext for independent territorial statehood. Such a statehood confers semi-sovereign powers on ruling groups with vast opportunities for exercising patronage out of state funds and of favouring their kith and kin. Politics is notorious for the pursuit of power and the more the number of states, the greater the chances of power for ruling groups in different areas.

This idea of 'one language-one province' was accepted long ago in the early days of the Congress movement under Gandhi. Provinces were delimited for Congress purposes cutting across existing administrative boundaries—Tamil Nad, Andhra, Karnatak, Maharashtra, Gujerat, Kerala etc.

It contains an element of truth from a democratic point of view. If people and government have one language, the cooperation between them is assisted in democratic administration. The people can follow government policies and deeds directly which will facilitate supervision and government's responsiveness to the people's will.

But unfortunately India has not one language but fifteen major languages! And if the slogan of one "language: one state" is applied strictly, the country will have to be divided into fifteen independent sovereign states.

Every group that has had any historical claim is putting up its demand for a separate state.

If the Maharashtriyans and Gujeratis can have states of their own, the Sikhs argue that they too are entitled to one of their own. If the Maharashtriyans adduce the historical claim of having wrested political power from the Moghuls and restored Indian self-rule over a great part of the country, the Sikhs too refer to their history as builders of the historic state of the Punjab carved out of the Moghul empire by Ranjit Singh, their supreme "national" hero! The argument is really political, territorial and historical. But since the main justification in outward controversy has turned on the issue of language as the basis of statehood, the Sikhs are drafting the Punjabi language with the gurmukhi script as their shield and anchor.

If they speak only of the Punjabi language, the Hindus of the area also claim to be Punjabis and speak the same language. To separate their claims and obtain exclusiveness

for their state, they universalise their script that was confined only to their religious books and want others to accept the untruth that the Punjabi language and Sikh script are integral parts of each other and are naturally and indissolubly associated with each other! This is not a fact but the needs of argument based on language have made the Sikhs to confer the status of Fact on this claim of theirs!

If Government accept this unreal "Fact", they cannot resist the demand for a separate Sikh State in the Punjab.

The acceptance in Congress of the claim of the Muslim League that Muslims were a separate nation led to the Partition of the country in rivers of blood in 1947.

Acceptance of an idea creates an irresistible social force in favour of its realisation in actuality, whatever the disadvantages that may flow from such realisation.

If the idea is not scotched in time by leaders in a position to influence the course of events, things will move in the direction of its realisation subterraneously. The minds of the people favouring an idea gets saturated with it. After a time, it becomes familiar and familiarity confers the status of fact and truth!

That Hindu widows should shave their heads and lead a life of extreme austerity and not think of re-marriage became familiar for centuries. It became a part of the natural order of things in the Hindu imagination. Departure from old customs in this regard became well-nigh impossible and even yet, it retains much of its force in large tracts of Hindu society.

Returning to the political sphere, we have plenty of examples of the continuing force and influence of out-dated ideas with but a shadow of truth trailed by them.

The stock of Gandhian ideas furnish many examples of ideas that are still plaguing us in current politics.

The linguistic state we have referred to above is one such! The linguistic state is sure to lead to the further creation of states, as for the Sikhs whose Punjabi Subah is likely to be conceded. Educated people are already arguing why it should not be conceded to such an important community as the Sikhs if the hostile Nagas with a population of some four lakhs in the remote hills of Assam could be granted a state for themselves.

The basis for the demand is a society or community with sufficient unity (and readiness to agitate and suffer for the cause) demanding a homeland. The parallel to Muslims is exact. Lord Passfield (Mr. Sidney Webb) as a member of the Cabinet Mission was asked whether the Muslims were not a nation. He replied that they were a great community. Nevertheless, British diplomacy helped the Muslim community to achieve nationhood with the acquisition of territory for a homeland. The Folk or People become a nation when they settle down on a piece of territory and link their destiny with it through the indefinite future.

The Nagas were a community who will now become a nation with the winning of a national homeland of their own. When the Sikhs secure their state, they will become a nation by themselves!

So too the Dravidas who want separation from India in every way and to become an independent sovereign nation by themselves.

The Vidarbha agitators have not reconciled themselves to merger with Maharashtra.

The Konkanis on the West Coast with a distinct language of their own have held a conference and put forth their demand for a state of their own.

Other hill areas in Assam have already sent in their memorandum to the Central Government for a state of their own, in the wake of the acceptance of the Naga demand for a state within the Indian Union.

We have other remnants of Gandhian ideas that are vexing current administration. Prohibition is a Gandhian heritage. It is no doubt good if people do not drink intoxicating liquor. But the question is whether the state is the proper agency to cure them of the deplorable habit. Prohibition in the United States of America passed into law in a period of exalted war-time emotion soon proved impracticable. People defied it in many ways. An act does not become a crime just by governmental edict. It is a part of popular morality which is a matter of customary inheritance crystallised through the course of centuries. It cannot be changed overnight by official decree.

That is also our experience since independence. The Government has lost huge revenues while the illicit liquor trade flourishes on the sly and has introduced a great deal of corruption into the enforcing officialdom.

Drinking or not drinking is a personal act within the liberty of the individual citizen. The state has no business to interfere in this province of individual life. The fact that excessive drink has a bad effect on character and lowers the efficiency of the person indulging in it is a matter pertaining to the private aspect of life. It may be a matter for persuasion by social leaders and religious institutions. But the state would be going out of its legitimate bounds if it tries to determine what a citizen should not drink. But the individual has no right to damage the interests of others by such drink. A soldier on duty or sentinel on guard would be guilty of an offence if they were found drunk to the point of becoming unable to discharge their duties in such positions and at such times. Motor or aeroplane drivers too would come under such a principle.

Also, no one has a right to behave in a disorderly fashion in public places owing to too much of liquor in them. Recently a batch of Olympic players ran amuck under the influence of drink at Madras aerodrome and one of them carried the unwilling airhostess in a wild dance round the area! Persons under drink may do worse. They should be liable not for drinking *as such* but for *drunkenness* and *disorderly* and *unseemly behaviour*.

There is great need for rethinking on the social and individual, legal and private aspects of the current prohibition laws. They empower the police to approach any man or woman and smell his or her mouth for liquor and imprison them pending trial! Such powers in the hands of the police gentry have led to much high-handedness and invasion of personal rights causing much hurt and indignity to individuals. But so long as the Gandhian half-idea is not analysed in terms of right and law, the abuses will continue. The present attitude of the authorities is one of helpless submission to the Gandhian idea out of a cow-

wardly fear of popular displeasure. The abolition of the law might cost thousands of voters from the ignorant masses!

The case with khadi is similar! The Government of India spends crores of rupees on the fad of khadi out of fear of the masses who associate it with Gandhi's benevolence for the poor man. There might have been some case for khadi during foreign rule when national leaders had no power to create a network of village or rural industries and find employment for the unemployed. It is true that villagers are largely idle during the dry season and even the few coppers they can earn through spinning yarn *all day* are not negligible. Old and infirm persons and children could also add to the family income for the day which in all might amount to four annas, which is something to the villager. But today with full sovereign power in their hands and spending thousands of crores in Five Year Plans, it is a ridiculous *atavism* to continue to patronise khadi out of state funds. It would be interesting to find out what percentage of the amounts ear-marked for the encouragement of khadi actually reaches the village spinner and what percentage is swallowed by over-head expenses incurred by the imposing emporiums in cities with their fashionable window-dressing and hordes of social workers and members of committees and advertisement charges in papers, books, exhibition stalls, souvenirs and so on! Petrol for official jeeps and travelling expenses are likely to figure largely in such an investigation.

It is high time to demand a rational and economic justification for such prestige expenses incurred more out of a blind adherence to Gandhian fads and out of a desire to keep in touch with mass sentiment from the election point of view! For the rest, it is a great waste of public funds. Rethinking is called for in this matter as well.

For the influence of ideas over social and political life, we need only refer to the ideas embedded in the Constitution adopted by India in 1950. Its preamble proclaims liberty, equality, fraternity and justice as the supreme objectives governing the New Society to be built in India after independence. The first three words are lifted bodily from the Declaration of the French Revolution of 1789.

These words have been guides to policy-making throughout the subsequent period in Europe and America often under pressure of revolution until today they constitute the unchallenged basis of social life and government in all countries including Asian and African newly enfranchised nations. But too little thought has gone into their clarification on the part of our intelligentsia. This is responsible for the fatally easy way in which the ideas of Shri Nehru are being built into policy and realised in governmental action. "The socialistic pattern of society" he got passed in Avadi in 1956 is contradictory to the basic principles of democracy with its individual rights to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness. His socialism has excused the liquidation of land property above a low ceiling. It has condoned insufficient and arbitrary compensation. It is threatening to proletarianise all peasants through cooperative farming. Too few intellectuals realise what is happening. The Industrial Policy and Five Year Plans are squeezing the private sector out of existence. It will not be long before full centralisation of the economy becomes a Fact, which is tantamount to communist-socialism of the Russian variety.

The intelligentsia will be squarely responsible for the calamity. The Planning Commission Reports embody socialist ideas authoritatively and if they are not confronted with independent thought and opinion, they will be translated into Fact and individuals will lose all liberty for which our intellectuals will be responsible at the bar of history.

THE ROLE OF IDEAS IN POLITICS

In medieval times in the West as well as in the East, the decisive part played by intellectuals in social leadership was clearly recognised. Since the determining knowledge in those times was largely scriptural in character, the most important kind of intellectual then was the priest who knew how to mediate between God and man in accordance with the holy books. But gradually the aura of importance was extended to cover mundane affairs as well and secular learning was also honoured.

In Europe the learned monk, in China the *mandarin* and in India the Brahmin Savant came to represent the value of knowledge in social leadership. In time, the word *veda* came to connote all branches of learning. Even the *Natyasastra of Bharata* was regarded as a *veda*!

Today the value and importance of relevant knowledge has been enhanced owing to the spread of secular ideologies like those of Marxism. Something like the rigidity of orthodox religions has come to characterise Marxist ideas in communist circles and States recalling medieval times with their quarrels regarding the right meaning of scripture and their hatred and persecution of heretical thinkers and believers.

Socialism has come to occupy the place of holy scripture

in socialist countries and lands like ours where the ruling circle is imposing socialist dogma on the people through Five Year Plan.

A clear analysis of current thought swaying authoritative groups and of the merits of alternative systems of reform are therefore urgently called for in India. Thinkers should explore the reach of current ideas and evaluate them both in the light of first principles stemming from a knowledge of human and physical nature and of second principles involved in the application of such ideas to current situations.

The theories stated in the Planning Commission's Reports as background for socialist proposals such as the necessity to abolish disparities of income, to liquidate mediators in land holding, the efficacy of cooperative joint farming, the need for uniform holdings of about 25 acres for all farmers in the first instance, the necessity for enlarging the public sector until full centralisation is achieved, the theory that such centralisation is absolutely essential for achieving full industrialisation and full employment, the iniquity of profits, the need for priority for heavy industries in industrialisation, the need for sacrificing the present generation for the sake of prosperity in the future, the need for regimentation in the last resort for achieving plenty etc. etc.—are all staring the Indian intellectual in the face. He has not yet made a resolute and thorough-going attempt to evaluate this *body of authoritative ideas*. It is his duty to society to do so. The Libertarian Social Institute has been among the first body of thinkers under the leadership of Mr. Lotvala of Bombay to undertake this essential social duty decades ago.

Neutral Nations' Claptrap—I

By M. N. Thotal

THE first question to arise naturally on the five neutral nations' resolution in the United Nations Assembly on renewal of contacts between the Big Two is: "Who are these five sponsors?" Do they deserve our respect and therefore our confidence? Honesty of purpose cannot be conceded whenever it is assumed by parties who may, on closer examination prove to be far from disinterested. It is therefore necessary to have a good look at them to see what they are and if they have the necessary qualifications to pass for crusaders of peace and if they are not just poseurs exploiting the credulity of simple folk.

Let us take first of all, the United Arab Republic's President. Col. Nasser has made no secret of the fact that the one and only purpose of his policy is to wipe off from the face of the world a neighbouring country called Israel, a member of the United Nations with as good a right to existence—whatever its origin—as any other. Obviously Col. Nasser does not believe in co-existence, and that not

only with reference to Israel, for his Arab nationalism demands the merger of all Arab states into Egypt, with himself, of course, as the Supreme Dictator. In his "Philosophy of the Revolution" Col. Nasser talks a great deal of revival of Islamic glory and also of consolidating the Muslims of the world into one nation—hundreds of millions of Muslims from Morocco to Indonesia, welded into one mighty force, to bring about Muslim renaissance. Students of history know what that means and that it does not mean peace. That our Prime Minister, who has been condemning the notion of a Muslim nation, should find himself in such company in his search of peace is indeed surprising, for it is only thirteen years since Muslim nationalism accounted for a million dead and ten millions uprooted from their homes in his own country. It is indeed most extraordinary—to use his own favourite phrase—for was it not this Muslim nation business that divided the country 13 years ago and brought about the holocaust of 1947?

THE INDONESIAN SURGEON

Let us now have a look at another advocate of the neutrals' nostrum, Indonesia. Its President, Dr. Soekarno, stated in the United Nations Assembly itself, about the time he put his signature to the five nations' resolution, that Indonesia was determined to reach a solution of the Dutch New Guinea (which Indonesia calls West Irian) problem by a "surgical effort". As the Netherlands Foreign Minister, Dr. J.M.A.H. Luns said, "Such an approach to the settlement of an international dispute constitutes a direct attack both on the principles of our character and on the means of settlement of disputes it sanctions and prescribes." In these days of anti-colonialism it is interesting to find Dr. Luns affirming in the UN Assembly that his Government was prepared to subject its policy and actions in Dutch New Guinea "to the continuous scrutiny and judgment" of the U.N. (That great "anti-colonial" power, the USSR, had refused to permit a UN delegation to go to Hungary after the latter's invasion by Soviet Russia in 1956).

Dr. Luns also declared that Dutch policy in the territory over which Indonesia claims sovereignty was "aimed at the speediest possible attainment of self-determination by the Papuan people, as could be seen from details set out in the latest Dutch report to the U.N." He also said that Indonesia wanted to annex part of the island of New Guinea to its own territory without allowing the population of the island to exercise its right of self-determination. Acceptance of the Indonesian claim would, in the circumstances, mean that the Papuan people of the western half of the island would be for ever deprived of the right of self-determination, while those of the eastern half, under Australian guidance, will determine their own future. Four times, between 1953 and 1957, Indonesia had tried to have the U.N. recognise its claim, and four times the Assembly had refused to do so, taking into account that Indonesia's claim was based on the interpretation of a treaty which Indonesia had unilaterally repudiated, while the Netherlands had offered to abide by the decision on that interpretation by the highest competent authority—the World Court. But Dr. Soekarno is determined to reach a solution by a "surgical effort," with which he has finished the free press of the country, the political parties of the country and the Parliament of the country. And yet it is being seriously assumed that Dr. Soekarno is a protagonist of peace.

CONTRADICTORY ATTITUDES

Let us have an objective look at our own country, India, and try to see ourselves as others see us. We accepted Kashmir's accession to India and made that accession conditional on a plebiscite of the people of Kashmir. We complained to the Security Council when Pakistan invaded Kashmir and, rightly or wrongly, the Security Council condemned us by ten votes against zero for not carrying out our pledge of plebiscite. We Indians believe that Kashmir is ours by right and Pakistanis equally fervently believe that Kashmir is theirs by the will of the people of Kashmir. In such a dispute between two parties, if war is to be avoided, who is to decide? "Where does the U.N. Assembly come in?" to quote Mr. Nehru's question put in the course of his speech on the five-nation resolution in the U.N. Assembly with reference to the question of disarmament. "What has the Assembly got to do with it?" as he asked. Is it a private matter between two countries?

The point is that those who are not prepared to accept the arbitrament of the United Nations Assembly in their own international disputes have no business to invoke the aid of that august body in the solution of other's international disputes. Nobody can deny that the problem of disarmament has become an international dispute among the four nuclear powers. "Only this Assembly should finalise the affairs of the world," said Mr. Nehru amid cheers, and the affairs of the world surely include the problem of Kashmir. Mr. Nehru cannot take up contrary and contradictory attitudes without inviting ridicule on himself. President Ayub Khan's recent declaration that Pakistan Army cannot afford to leave the Kashmir issue unsolved for an indefinite period, might easily have been provoked by the speech of Mr. Nehru on the five-nation resolution. President Ayub's declaration was made the day after Mr. Nehru's fighting speech in the U.N. Assembly.

Then there is Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. No Communist country in the world has been subjected to such intense political pressure by USSR as Yugoslavia. That pressure would have been transformed into armed intervention but for American military aid to Yugoslavia. Why was Yugoslavia being subjected to cold war methods by USSR? Was not Yugoslavia a Communist country? The answer is that the political system obtaining in the USSR is an imperialism, as ruthless as that in the days of the Czars. It is an imperialism much more than a variety of Communism and cannot brook independence even of a Communist country. The case of Yugoslavia proves two things. One is that Soviet Russia is after world domination, otherwise it would have let Yugoslavia alone. The other is that U.S. military aid has really no strings attached to it, except the maintenance of the independence of the state aided. Marshal Tito cannot but be aware of all this, more than any one else in the world. And yet he was prepared indirectly to equate the USA with the USSR through the five-nation resolution of which he was one of the sponsors. He could not have forgotten that as late as the spring of 1958 he aroused the Kremlin's wrath by stating that it was possible to bring about communism in a country peacefully and that the revolution need not necessarily be sponsored by a Marxist party.

MR. NEHRU'S SPEECH

Mr. Nehru's fighting speech in the UN Assembly on October 5 in support of the five-nation resolution calling for renewal of contacts between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev was one of the worst he ever delivered. No wonder it did not carry conviction with the audience, punctuated though it was with cheers whenever he tried to play to the gallery. As it is one of his most important pronouncements, it deserves detailed notice. It is a pity he could not rise to the occasion. The reason perhaps is that he spoke extempore, as the many faults in his language indicate. For his own reputation, as well as that of the country he represents, he would do well to write out his speeches, or at least prepare notes for guidance while speaking, as emotional individuals like him often go off the track and say things which they never intended saying or would not have said on second thoughts. A speaker cannot incorporate his second thoughts in his speech—they come to mind too late—while he can in the written one, and it is idle to try to win the day by making passion do the work of honest thought. After all, a speech of a

Prime Minister of a great country delivered in the UN Assembly is heard not only there but read by millions in cold print where one cannot easily get away with mere assertion. The eye is always more critical than the ear.

In commending his resolution to the Assembly Mr. Nehru said that if nothing was done now to arrest the process of deterioration, then it would become more difficult at later stage to have these talks. He implied that renewal of contacts between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev will arrest the process of deterioration, but that is a mere assertion for which there is no warrant in the most extraordinary behaviour of Mr. Khrushchev. Suppose the two were to meet and Mr. Khrushchev were to tell President Eisenhower, as is most likely at the present juncture: "Look here, I am not going to shake hands with you unless you apologise first." Would the break-up that would immediately follow in any way improve the international situation? It will, on the contrary, worsen it. Let us do everything by all means to arrest the process of deterioration but Mr. Nehru's resolution, if accepted by the Assembly and implemented by the two parties concerned, ran a very good chance, in Mr. Khrushchev's present table-thumping-with-his-shoes mood, of accelerating the process of deterioration. It was sheer optimism—if indeed it was not a trap for British voters at general elections—that made Prime Minister MacMillan arrange the Paris Summit meet that ended in a fiasco, making the international situation worse. There was no indication of any kind from Soviet Russia that it was really keen on establishing peace on earth. A country which cannot be at peace with a fellow Communist country, cannot be at peace with democratic countries whose abolition in his lifetime Mr. Khrushchev is declaredly working for. Surely, there should be a limit to optimism. I was never in doubt that the Paris Summit meet would be a total failure. The U-2 affairs came handy to Khrushchev and, after his initial failure to realise the value of the ace of trumps—for propaganda purposes—which had fallen into his hands in the shape of the U-2, he played the card as he should have done to disguise his real aims and objectives.

"SAME OLD TRICK"

Where was the ground for the assumption by Mr. Nehru and the four co-sponsors that renewal of contacts between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev will arrest the process of deterioration of the international situation? With that ground entirely lacking the five-nation resolution was neither simple nor straightforward, as Mr. Nehru claimed it to be. "My difficulty in dealing with this amendment," Mr. Nehru said with reference to the Australian amendment, "is that it proceeds, I imagine, from some kind of basic suspicion that it is a trick," and Mr. Nehru went on to make the almost vulgar observation: "The Australian Prime Minister cannot get hold of what the trick is, but there must be a trick because the idea has not come from him or his group." A guilty conscience pricks the mind and Mr. Nehru put the truth as suspicion in the mind of the Australian Prime Minister. Of course there is a trick

in it and it is the same old trick which runs through every pronouncement of Mr. Nehru on international affairs.

It is the same old trick which cut India into two and wrought the greatest holocaust in her history, consisting in equating the two blocs to fish in troubled waters for personal glory. Those with short memories should recall that almost as soon as Mr. Nehru sat on a chair of high office in the Government of India, he said in a broadcast from New Delhi, "We propose as far as possible to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another." Where was the sense in making this controversial announcement when the terrible situation in the country demanded that he carry all the major parties in the land with him, particularly the Muslims? Where was the sense in equating the two blocs when he said in the same broadcast, "We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war"? In making this major policy pronouncement had he consulted the Muslim League leaders, for whom he was ostensibly keeping the door open in the Constituent Assembly? Certainly not. And yet he had no hesitation in saying in the same broadcast, "We have kept the path of co-operation open and we invite even those who differ from us to enter the Constituent Assembly as equals and partners with us with no binding commitments." Apparently for Mr. Nehru his proclamation of non-alignment was not a binding commitment on behalf of the country.

That was how he addressed himself to the "urgent and vital task for us" which was—to use his own words—"to conquer the spirit of discord that is abroad in India" and which had only a month earlier resulted in "the terrible tragedy of Calcutta... because of the insensate strife of brother against brother". (All the quotations are from the same broadcast.) The spirit of discord, Mr. Nehru might have known, is not conquered by laying down the law for everybody. Indeed, he was speaking only for Left wing of the Congress and not even for the majority party there, whose leader was the Rightist Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. He forgot he was speaking as Prime Minister of India on behalf of a Cabinet in which he was the only Leftist. Sheer lack of responsibility, one would say, but springing from the desire to fish in troubled waters for personal glory. Was not Jinnah saying all along, "They want us to be their camp-followers." "There you are," he told the Viceroy and refused to join the Constituent Assembly saying he would have nothing to do with a man like that, and he would have another Constituent Assembly of predominantly Muslim areas. Was the British Cabinet to tell Jinnah: "No, you must join the Indian Constituent Assembly to please the leader of a minority group in the Congress and do as he says"? The British Cabinet, opposed originally to dividing the country as it believed in the theory of "defence in depth" against Russia, gave into Jinnah when Mr. Nehru proclaimed in London (again on his own behalf): "We shall be absolutely independent." "We too," said Jinnah and the partition was an accomplished fact, the British Cabinet agreeing with both.

Lokayata - Indian Materialism

By S. Ramanathan

(This is the third article in the series)

THE CHANTING DOGS

It is Mr. Chattopadhyaya's view that materialism was the basic urge of not only the pre-Aryan people of India who practised the tantric cult but also of the Aryans themselves in the Vedic age. The philosophy opposed to tantric materialism came in only at a very late stage during what may be called the post-vedic age. The author finds support for his view in the vedas themselves. In fact the chanting of the vedas was part and parcel of the process of search for food, and the sharing of it between the various members of the tribe. The different stanzas of the vedas were merely expressions of the desire for more and more food and the satisfaction of that desire.

As an illustration, Mr. Chattopadhyaya refers to the twelfth section of the first chapter of the Chandogya Upanishad. This rather obscure passage describes what are called "chanting dogs." A certain person named Baka Dalphyha went forth to study the vedas. Unto him there appeared a white dog. Around the white dog there gathered other dogs. These others said to the white dog 'we are very hungry, obtain food for us by singing.' Then the white dog made the others stand in a line and march along even as the priests do the chanting of the vedas. The dogs chanted, 'Om! let us eat. Om! let us drink. Om! Dava Varaha Prajapaka Savitri, gather food here. O! Lord of food, gather food here. Om!

This passage is usually interpreted as a heretic fulmination against the Vedic priests. Radhakrishnan says: "here are occasions when the sacrificial and priestly religion strikes the authors of the Upanishads as superficial and then they give vent to all these irony. They describe a procession of dogs to march like a procession of the priests, each holding the tail of its predecessors and saying piously 'Om let us eat. Om let us drink.' Several other scholars have echoed Radhakrishnan's opinion. Sankara says that the white dog was either a god or a sage who appeared in the form of a dog in order to impart the divine wisdom of obtaining food and satisfying hunger. He did not see any irony in it. In spite of Sankara there is a tendency amongst scholars to consider the passages as a caricature of the paratice of vedic chanting. Durant says "that there were doubters, even in the days of the Upanishads, appears from the Upanishads themselves. Sometimes the sages ridiculed the Priests as when the Chandogya Upanishad likens the orthodox clergy of the time to a procession of dogs each holding the tail of its predecessors and saying piously 'Om let us eat'. Om let us drink!"

In Mr. Chattopadhyaya's view both Sankara and the modern scholars are wrong. Sankara merely idealises and spiritualises the incident by elevating the dogs to the status of gods. Modern scholars take the dogs too literally and treat the whole incident as a mere caricature. Such caricature is not in tune with the inwardness of the Upanishads which extol the Vedas and the vedic practices.

One clue to the interpretation is that the original text in Chandogya Upanishad does not mention the tails at all for the dogs. It merely says that dogs 'glide hand in hand' as do the chanting priests. The author of the Upanishadic text would not have said so if he meant they were literally dogs. It is only later interpreters who interpolated the tails and said either each dog held the others' tail in front or that each dog held the tail of its predecessors during the chanting of 'Om let us eat. Om let us drink'. The fact of the matter, according to our author, is that they were not dogs at all, but men, only primitive men who belonged to a clan with dog as its totem. Totemism prevailed in ancient India as it did in ancient times in most parts of the world. The primitive sages sang for their food which they got by mere singing. The strange scene of singing dogs is intended to reveal what the authors of the Upanishads thought was the essence of vedic chanting. Vedic chanting was the wish fulfilment of primitive Aryans. Among people who were first a little more civilised than the animals chanting for food was identical with the actual getting of the food itself and the chanting was part of the acquiring of the food. It was not ordinary singing, for the singing was followed by some bodily action, some well defined movements of the limbs. As Thomson says: "Savages, like children, gesticulated when they talked. The function of gesticulation is not merely to help others. They gesticulate just as much when talking to themselves. For us, speech is primary, gesticulation secondary, but it does not follow that this was so with our earlier ancestors." The gesticulation has something to do with action to fulfil a desire. The procurement of food is the prime desire of early man and hence most of the early chanting of the vedas as in the case of the chanting dogs related to the one primary object of procuring food. So then we can now understand the inwardness of the vedas which was plain search for food and the satisfaction of elementary hunger. That is why the vedas are so full of verses that call upon this and that god to help in the procurement and in the preparation of food and to share in the enjoyment thereof. It was motivated by a thoroughly material objective, the elemental search for food and there was nothing spiritual about it though attempts were made in post vedic times to read a spiritual meaning into it.

There are survivals of the vedic practice of wish fulfilment by singing in the folk culture that is prevalent to-day in India. The practice of the vratas in many parts of India to-day is based upon the theory of wishfulfilment. Says Abanindranath in his book on *Vratas of Bengal*: "A vrata is just a desire. We see it represented in the pictures: listen to its echo in the songs and the rhymes, witness its reactions in the dramas and dances; in short, the vratas

(Continued on page 11)

The Indian Libertarian

Rationalist Supplement

"Spiritual Glory" Of India

By S. Ramanathan

I SHALL in this article deal with the second impediment to the growth of rationalism in India mentioned by Mr. Lotvala viz. the vaunted "Spiritual Glory" of India.

A spade is a spade. And a backward people must be designated as backward. They do not cease to be backward by merely calling them "spiritual." But there is an inferiority complex in men that refuses to accept the fact of our backwardness and pretends that we are not only not backward but really superior to others. We are "spiritual!"

The new fashion is to style backward people as "underdeveloped." There is a movement, in fact, there is a competition, between the two power blocs into which the world is divided, to aid "underdeveloped" nations like India, Pakistan and the new African states. All these backward nations have the privilege to share in the aid given by the more powerful and the more developed nations in the world. The fact of India being backward or underdeveloped is not being hidden from the view of the donor nations. In fact, there is anxiety displayed by our Government that we should not miss the chance of getting the aid and our right as a backward nation should be fully recognised before the whole world.

But such a view regarding our backwardness is not popular in India. We have, on the contrary, pretended to have been the sons and daughters of Rishis and Saints who have led all mankind in "spiritual glory" in times past. We have never admitted our backwardness before foreigners, some of whom at least knew the real truth about the matter. But these foreigners were either mere birds of passage and did not want to offend our sensibilities or had a vested interest in our good will and hence were inclined to flatter us although such flattery was at the expense of truth. There was a conspiracy, so to say, between the educated and the intellectual Indian and the scholarly European not to call a spade a spade. Hence there was absolute silence kept about our ignorance, our illiteracy and our poverty while tributes were paid to our "spiritual" greatness.

Mrs. Annie Besant was the classic example of the flatterer who had a vested interest in the flattery. Rationalists may recall with chagrin that she began her career by being the co-adjutor of Charles Bradlaugh, that great infidel of England and genuine friend of India. Mrs. Annie Besant spent her early years in the service of Rationalism but she soon discovered, as many rationalists have discovered to-day all over the world, that rationalism is too dry a doctrine and it does not pay. If you want to lead a colourful life, full of adventures and novel experiences, you have to sail clear of the rationalist way of life. So

then, Mrs. Besant, who was by nature endowed with a craving for a life of high adventure, turned towards the east and the superstitions engendered by the millions of India as a fruitful field for exploitation. Not that there were not others before Mrs. Besant who exploited the gullibility of Indians. Mention may be made of Max Muller, who, under cover of scholarship, started the myth of Aryan superiority which flattered the Indians but ended up in the Nazi cult which threatened to blast human civilisation before it was put an end to by world war No. II. But what Max Muller wrote in his learned tones was available only to the select few, but Mrs. Besant was a roving orator whose words reached the masses in every nook and corner of the world. It was a strange cult which Mrs. Besant developed full of Mahatmas reigning over Astral and other planes of existence and performing miracles for the delectation and edification of mortals assembled in many congregations. For a whole era she dominated the Indian intellectual world. She made theosophy fashionable. The elite of society, the judges, the leaders of the bar, the merchant princes and several of the princes themselves, all vied with one another in welcoming the new doctrine which sang so eloquently of the "spiritual glory" of India.

But soon there was an end to this craze, and it is to the credit of theosophy that the coup-de-grace was administered by someone in the theosophical movement itself rather than by an outsider. Mrs. Besant who was growing old, thought of bringing up a young leader for the movement under whom she planned to build up a church which would be richer and more glorious than the Roman Catholic church. A pretty boy was chosen from a Mysapore Brahmin family to act as the new messiah. Donations came pouring in from all parts of the world. Some rich individuals gave their all. Palaces and estates were bequeathed to the new church. The boy grew up. When he came of age he repudiated his messiahhood, disowned the church and returned every farthing donated to the donors themselves. If Krishnamoorthy has no other claims to greatness, this one act of having saved India from the clutches of the theosophical menace has earned him greatness.

But the need for the fiction of the "spiritual" greatness of India and of Indians did not die with Mrs. Besant and her theosophy. The need is there and will be there for our people to pretend to be "spiritually" great so long as they are in fact materially backward and an underdeveloped nation. It happened that after Mrs. Annie Besant, Gandhi took up the thread. If there were no Gandhi, somebody else would have stepped into his place.

(Continued on page IV)

The Emergence Of Organized Science

By P. Alan

The long struggle of science against superstition is recalled by the tercentenary of the Royal Society

THE emergence of science as an organized body of thought has been a slow process, but has rapidly gained momentum in recent years. The conditions in which the Royal Society came into existence some three hundred years ago are worth recalling.

Already in the thirteenth century the enlightened monk, Roger Bacon, had put the case for a scientific approach. 'I will tell,' he wrote, 'of the wonderful works of Art and Nature, in order to assign to them afterwards their causes and means; in these there is nothing of a magical nature. Hence it may be seen that all magical power is inferior to these achievements and unworthy of them.' And he goes on to forecast great ships 'without rowers,' chariots 'without any draught animal,' flying machines whose wings 'would beat the air after the manner of a bird flying,' cranes and submarines. He was repeatedly ordered by his Franciscan superiors to refrain from his writing and teaching, was imprisoned for fourteen years, but was finally released by Papal decree. About 250 years later another all round inventive imagination, this time coupled with the skill of a great visual artist, appeared in Italy—Leonardo da Vinci.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were a period of commercial expansion. In Europe, Leonardo, Copernicus, Giordano Bruno, Galileo, Descartes, and Kepler preceded the rapid scientific development in England. In Naples in 1560 was founded the *Accademia Secretorum Naturae*, a whole century before the Royal Society was founded in this country.

Commercial expansion first stimulated those sciences and techniques which had a direct effect on shipping, particularly astronomy and clockmaking. Moreover, the possibility of making long voyages opened up a new field for exploration, both geographical and historical. Sir Walter Raleigh, before he died, was able to set down his findings in a *History of the World*, which, for the first time, threw serious doubt on the chronology of Genesis. 'In Abraham's time all the then known parts of the world were developed,' he wrote. 'Egypt had many magnificent cities . . . which magnificence needed a parent of more antiquity than these other men have supposed.' And Francis Bacon, in his *New Atlantis*, his last work published before his death in 1626, foresaw the need for a temple of science in which man's knowledge could be further extended.

COMING OF THE MACHINES

The factory system had begun to be introduced in England already in the fifteenth century, with Jack of Newbury's factory on record as having employed as many as 600 workpeople. But the new factories met with opposition from guilds and craftsmen alike. In 1553 power-driven gigmills were prohibited at the insistence of the guilds, and under similar pressure Charles I in 1623 banned needle-making machines. The craftsmen of the day regarded machinery as an enemy, and sawmills and textile mills fre-

quently had their machinery smashed up by angry workers throughout the seventeenth century. But in spite of this, new and more profitable methods of production continued to be introduced, the development of the textile industry demanded new machines, the increased mining of coal demanded better pumps, and the development of pumping technique led to the practical utilization of the steam-engine. The progress of science was the natural accompaniment of the development of, and need for, further invention.

The spread of science and invention, however, would have been much more slow if it had not been for the fact that printing had been introduced to England from China. Whereas it was probably in use in China as early as 100 AD, printing only reached Spain, via Samarkand in Central Asia, in the fourteenth century. Thence it spread to Germany, and from there was brought to England by William Caxton in 1476.

The development of commerce, the introduction of printing, the spread of the factory system, and the resultant demand for new inventions, combined to make practicable that development of techniques which Roger Bacon and Leonardo da Vinci had clearly foreseen.

The rise of the factory system also meant a political revolution. The old feudalistic structure, symbolized by the autocracy of the Crown, became obsolete and had to be replaced. Parliament established its authority with the execution of Charles I in 1649, the revolution acted as a stimulus to new ideas, and when in 1660 Charles II was restored to the throne it was as a constitutional monarch and as a patron of the sciences. He granted the Charter to the Royal Society. From the Society's foundation it took just 150 years for Britain to achieve complete supremacy by 1800 as the 'workshop of the world.'

It was during this period that Englishmen came to the fore in large numbers in scientific and technical achievement. The names of Harvey, Newton, Boyle, Halley, and Wren are contemporary with the early period of the Royal Society.

Science was beginning to stake its claim against magic, but it would be wrong to suppose that there was as yet a very clear demarcation between the two. Samuel Pepys describes how the 'Royal Society' entertained. For example, the 'Duchesse' of Newcastle was invited, 'after much debate *pro* and *con* . . . with her women attending her.' 'Several fine experiments were shown her of colours, loadstones, microscopes, and of liquors: among others, of one that did while she was there turn a piece of roasted mutton into pure blood, which was very rare.' It seems that pure magic was not despised when it was a matter of interesting potential patronesses!

Pepys himself, at a later stage, was 'forced to subscribe to the building of a college,' yielding up £40 most reluctantly and commenting that this drive to raise money 'will spoil the Society, for it breeds faction and ill-will, and

becomes burdensome to some that cannot or would not do it.'

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

Newton, one of the Society's most renowned early presidents, reconciled science with religion by not accepting the Old Testament literally but nevertheless seeing the stars as originally launched in their courses by the Almighty. He spent considerable time and energy working out prophecies of future events from the Bible.

The first years of the Royal Society were made difficult, not only by the usual efforts to raise funds, but by political insecurity and the prevalent religious anti-scientific attitude. In 1667 the secretary, Henry Oldenburg, was imprisoned in the Tower for writing letters to France. And both Catholic and Protestant religions had opposed science continuously.

Galileo had died only in 1642, and ten years earlier he had been forced to 'abjure and detest the error and the heresy of the movement of the earth'. Though not actually tortured, he was openly threatened with it on the Pope's personal instructions, and bearing in mind the fate of Giordano Bruno he chose discretion as the better part of valour. One hundred years later, in Paris, Briffon was obliged to recant his geological findings, as a result of pressure from the Theological Faculty at the Sorbonne. He said: "I declare that I had no intention to contradict the text of scripture; that I believe most firmly all therein related about the creation, both as to the order of time and matter of fact. I abandon everything in my book respecting the formation of the earth, and generally all which may be contrary to the narrative of Moses."

SUPERSTITION DIES HARD

We must bear in mind that in the 1660's it was still widely believed that the earth was flat; St. Paul's reference to 'the ends of the earth' was cited as proof. The 'centre' of the earth was believed to be Jerusalem, which was alleged to lodge the identical site of the original Tree of Life and the Cross of Jesus. Hobbes's *Leviathan* was placed on the *Index*, and Harvey's theory of the circulation of the blood was excluded from Spain till as late as 1800. Illness was still attributed to 'possession' in a large number of cases, especially mental ones, and disgusting cruelties and indignities were applied to drive out the evil intruders. The belief in cures by the 'royal touch' was still current, though declining, being last applied in England by Queen Anne, but in France Louis XIV, though patron of the sciences, was said to have 'cured' 1,600 cases by this method.

Even more important is the fact that belief in witchcraft was still in vogue. Between 1450 and 1550 it is estimated that 100,000 witches were burnt in Europe. Coming to the throne in 1603, James I wrote a book on demonology and himself was present at the torturing of 'witches.' Notable was one, a Dr. Fian, who first confessed, then retracted, and despite being pulled apart literally piece by piece, refused to confess again. Nevertheless, he was burnt. As late as 1650 at Edinburgh a lay preacher, Major Weir, confessed to witchcraft and was burnt alive, his elderly sister, who testified against him, being hanged. Witchcraft was persecuted by Catholics and Protestants alike, and it was only in 1682 that the legal torturing of witches was stopped in England. It went on in America

till 1728. The persecutors of witches justified this aspect of 'God's work' on the ground that if the Almighty tortured the wicked for eternity, there was no wrong in men torturing the wicked on earth.

Protestants were as bigoted as Catholics both regarding witchcraft and in relation to the spread of scientific knowledge. Luther condemned Copernicus as an 'upstart astrologer' and Wesley in the eighteenth century was still preaching that astronomical teachings 'tend towards infidelity'. Wesley also lamented that 'the giving up of witchcraft is in fact giving up the Bible', maintained that 'sin is the moral cause of earthquakes' than which there is 'no divine visitation which is likely to have so general an influence', and believed that, prior to the Fall, 'the spider was as harmless as the fly'.

In opposition to the growing volume of scientific knowledge, Arnold's theory that fossils were God's 'models' at the creation was widely held, and Burt's *Sacred History of the Earth*, a rejoinder to Newton, kept selling well for a hundred years. In 1682 the Scottish Church proclaimed that comets were a divine sign, despite Halley's scientific forecasts having been proved correct. In Rome in 1680 a plague was attributed to the fact that St. Sebastian had not had a statue erected to him. The statue was belatedly erected and the plague abated.

In 1750 there occurred two earthquakes in London. William Whiston, editor of Josephus's *History of the Jews*, who had succeeded Newton as Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge (and was later discharged for unorthodoxy on the subject of the Trinity), took the opportunity to deliver public lectures in London on the coming end of the world. Whiston had worked out a theory that ninety-nine signs would be given, of which the London earthquakes were the ninety-second. Whiston, of course, is not the only academic character who, while qualified scientifically in one field, has dabbled in superstition in another.

In 1775 there occurred a disastrous earthquake in Lisbon, once again setting off a chain-reaction of speculation regarding the role of earthquakes as divine signals.

The formation of the Royal Society, following closely on a wave of revolution and monarchical restoration, was a landmark in the advance of science as a distinct department of human endeavour. But the age of superstition in which it arose, the extent to which even its own members accepted traditional superstitions, both within and outside their special subjects, and the constant fire of criticism against science waged by religious bodies, whether Catholic or Protestant, greatly retarded subsequent progress. It is pertinent to ask—if science has made the progress it has in the past 300 years, what could have been done in an environment in which anti-scientific views had not got enormous official encouragement?

Today the position is radically different from 300 years ago. Superstition still exists, receives tremendous publicity in Press and by radio, but materialism is increasingly widely accepted. Moreover, science is now international, and the International Geophysical Year showed that world scientific projects can now be organized and carried out jointly by governments which reject as well as by those which profess a religious outlook. The development of science and technique in the twentieth century is showing a phenomenal leap forward, and as a whole religious bodies have now

(Continued on page IV)

A Quick Glance at the People's Padres

By N. E. S. West

For the purpose of this article, let us use the word "padre" for the clergymen, priests, medicine men and witch doctors who claim to know the will of God. There has been a veritable horde of them throughout the ages—and they still flourish. Now, briefly, let us see what these padres have done for the people—these padres who pretend to know the will of God. J. Eric S. Thompson in his *The Rise and Fall of the Maya Civilization* (1954), relates how captured warriors were sacrificed in their thousands to appease God.

This God had to have human blood. The practice of this sacrifice was imposed by the padres and it continued for as long as the padres remained in power. These padres

(Continued from page I)

As a matter of fact Gandhi was there and he took up where Besant left off.

Leaving alone its many superstitions and occultism and clairvoyance, theosophy, in its essence, said that all religions are one. All religions believed in one God, though different religions called Him by different names and even said that He was many and not one and assumed fantastic shapes and took the form even of animals. This teaching controverts the historic fact that every religion has had to struggle against every other for mastery over the mind of people. There have been so many religious wars involving the death of millions since the early days that it needs no special argument from me to convince the reader that a larger quantity of human blood has been shed in disputes over religion than in any other single cause. Religion has on the whole, been a divisive force in history than a unifying one. This historic fact is unpalatable to the spiritualists. Hence the pretence that all religions has "spiritual" merit. As against the growing materialism of the educated there is an attempt to consolidate the conservative and the superstitious of the world. Unfortunately Gandhi came in at a stage when in the fight for freedom of thought and rationalism he had to take sides and as a religious man he took the side of the spiritualists. The result is writ large in India's history—the division of the country and the formation of Pakistan. Let us not forget that there would have been no Pakistan had there been no Kilafat movement in India which pretended that India's spiritual glory postulated the unity of Hindudom and Islamic rule, a conundrum whose meaning was plain only to spiritualists. In later life Gandhi dared to sing Ram Dhun at political gatherings where the people of diverse faiths gathered to hear their political leader. This was the final stone that broke the Camel's back of India's unity and drove the Muslims to seek a separate sovereign state in which they could sing the glory of Allah even as Gandhi was singing the glory of Ram in Hindu India. The division of the country was one of the fruits of the "spiritual glory" of our people. There will be an end to this "spiritual glory" only when the backwardness of our people is really removed and they came abreast of other civilised nations of the earth in material well being.

also instituted the practice of throwing infants into wells or over cliffs to appease the God. The Jews, apparently, practised the sacrifice of the first-born. After a time, God was appeased with burnt offerings. These offerings were sheep and cattle, so one would suppose the padres got plenty of meat.

Later, the Jews adopted the practice of tithing, i.e., paying one-tenth of their income to the church. In the case of the Roman Catholic Church the padres collect huge sums by means that are almost equivalent to force. Purgatory was invented and fees are collected for praying departed souls out of it. Wars have been promoted by the Popes and Bishops of this Church. It forced the Crusades on the people, hoping to hamstring Islam, and it burned thousands of witches and other non-believers at the stake. One notable instance was Joan of Arc. After burning her for her pride and disobedience, she was canonised. (And the Roman Catholic Church claims to be infallible.)

The padres throughout the ages have robbed the poor and have kept them in ignorance and poverty. The padres claim to have jurisdiction over the souls of men, and a man can only save his soul by paying fees for prayers and doing penance as dictated by the padres. The padres—especially those of the Roman Catholic Church—don't like to appear in civil court for their misdeeds. They prefer to be tried in the Church courts where there is no publicity. The padres have often preached peace, but often promoted war.

Today, the world is worried over excess population. The birth rate is particularly high in backward countries. Yet birth control is forbidden even though the progeny would most assuredly be doomed to poverty all its life. This is the outlook in much of India, China, South America, Spain and Italy. The areas dominated by the Roman Catholic Church show a very high percentage of illiteracy and illegitimacy. The people fear the Church and suffer as a result of that fear.

The heartless and dictatorial padres are not yet through this cycle of domination. Women become pregnant against their will and in due course give birth to children without drugs, thus fulfilling the Scriptures which command women to bring forth in pain. There are other padres who forbid blood-transfusions and even forbid their followers to seek medical assistance when sick. The results are just as tragic as the former practice of burning victims at the stake. There is said to be honour among thieves, but there is only hatred between competing padres.

—'Freethinker'

(Continued from page III)

to accept, rather than frustrate, the advancement of science, while still fighting guerilla actions on this or that particular front. It will be interesting to see how long into the atomic age and international scientific cooperation the superstitions of the pre-scientific era will still survive.

When A Philosopher Turns A Politician

By J. K. Dhairyawan

LORD BERTRAND RUSSELL, the noted British philosopher, has been recently talking rather loudly, and airing his views too freely. In an exclusive interview to the "Indian Express" (22-10-60) he has prescribed a remedy for the ills of the world. It is in the nature of a quack doctor's prescription. It is a decoction of pious platitudes and wishful-thinking. Like many of the leftist intellectuals, who have fallen in for the claptrap of the communist propaganda, Lord Russell seems to think that Soviet Russia is sincere and honest in her desire for peace and co-existence. This is one of the biggest mistakes which all the intellectuals of the Left, including Lord Russell, commit when they equate USA with USSR on the international plane. From this blurred thinking stems all their nostrums and their quack remedies. American democracy may have their own imperfections, and no human institution is without some imperfection or other. BUT today USA

(Continued from page 10)

are but desires as sung, the painted desires, desires as moving and living." The attitudes of those who practice the vratas are the attainment of desire, certain definite action and not the prostrating before gods and begging some favours of them. It is the attitude of fulfilling the desire through a certain definite action.

One element of the vratas is its collective nature, a number of persons participating in the same desire. It is possible for an individual to perform a dance but not a drama. Even so an individual may pray but not perform a vrata.

Altogether the vratas resemble the main characteristic of the vedic songs in that they are both aimed at the realisation of certain desires. While the vedic songs were masculine the vratas songs were feminine. Both were activated by the motive to secure plenty. While the vratas were aimed at agricultural prosperity, the vedic songs were aimed at securing food in the earlier stages and cattle breeding in the later stages.

The chanting dogs were not mere dogs but were primitive people and the chanting indicated the method of getting food. The entire object of the vedas was the securing of food in primitive times by primitive people. The object was entirely material and not in any sense spiritual. Hence the philosophy inspiring early Aryans was materialism and it was only later on when the crude object of securing food was fulfilled by other more modern means, that a spiritual meaning was read into them and the whole thing was turned into a spiritual quest for something beyond this world, something to be realised in the other world, something transcending nature and the physical world of which the earlier less sophisticated people so unaware of.

(To be continued)

stands four-square for democracy and civilised existence, as against totalitarianism and modern Dark Ages, of which Soviet Russia is a standing example, for the last 40 years and more.

Stemming from this blurred view of the international situation, it is not surprising that Lord Russell should prescribe to the world a remedy that is no remedy, and if followed, would end in the surrender of the free nations of the world, to be trampled upon by the jackboot of communist imperialism. Men like Lord Russell, and similar other thinkers of his kind, are unconsciously playing the part of the camp followers of the international communist conspiracy with its headquarters at Moscow.

Let us analyse some of the statements of Lord Russell. He begins the interview by saying, "India has a big role to play... if only Prime Minister Nehru is prepared to play it." According to Lord Russell India should take the initiative and bring together some neutral nations to draw up a programme for consideration of the East and the West." In a word, Lord Russell wants India to form a "Third Bloc" as against the rival blocs, the Free World and the communist World. In fact, he says so later on when he states, "I always thought India to be the leader of such a neutral group. It is Mr. Nehru's duty to give the lead to the neutrals. I hope he will get on with the job *without hesitation*." (the italics are mine).

Well, Barkis is willing. Our Prime Minister has been toying with that idea for a pretty long time with Bandung Conference and his woolly-haired principles of "panch-sheela," which have long evaporated into the thin air. Of course, this statement of Lord Russell would tickle the vanity of our Prime Minister and his cohorts of credulous and ignorant admirers. What can be more flattering to the vanity of an immature nation than that a noted philosopher like Russell should call on her Prime Minister to lead the world out of the impasse, and lead it to the haven of peace and co-existence? But the question is: Can Nehru bridge the gulf that separates the East and the West? Has Nehru the means to do it? And lastly, Can there be any compromise between the East and the West, when the former is out to conquer the whole world, and liquidate all the civilized values that humanity holds dear for centuries? Any intelligent man, with his head on his shoulders, knows by now that there can be only one answer to all the three questions. It is not possible for Nehru or any leader of the free world to bring about that compromise, and what is more, it is not in the interests of humanity. The grim international situation is that two great giants are facing each other to measure their strengths—USA and USSR. While USA stands for Democracy and civilised values, USSR has been playing the international bully and a gangster at home. It is a fight between righteousness and forces of evil. Sooner or later, the

question has to be decided by the arbitration of armed might, despite what "do-gooders" and "one-worlders" might think and say. There is no alternative. Today they are parrying at each other waiting for the psychological and the opportune moment. This is the stark reality, the grim international situation.

When once this naked fact of the situation is admitted, the duty of all those who believe in Democracy and the decencies of human civilisation is to strengthen the hands of USA as the acknowledged leader of Democracy and the only powerful nation that can withstand successfully the onslaughts on democracy by the communist conspirators. All other talk of a "third bloc" and all talk of playing the "honest broker" that Lord Russell wants Nehru to do between the East and West is all moonshine.

Let us see how far Mr. Nehru is competent enough to play that part that is expected of him by Lord Russell. If Lord Russell had read the current history of Free India under the stewardship of Mr. Nehru, he would have discovered that Mr. Nehru was the last man to act without hesitation and with firmness. Nehru's whole record is one long chapter of vacillation and hesitation. Whether it was the question of the Pakistan aggression against Kashmir or the problem of Goa or the latest aggression by communist China against India, Nehru has shown himself to be the Hamlet of the Indian scene. "To be or not to be" seems to eternally haunt him. That is the tragedy of Nehru and the tragedy that is Free India. To expect such a vacillating person to lead the so-called neutral nations of the world is the height of political immaturity on the part of Lord Russell.

That Lord Russell seems obviously not inclined to read between the lines of the public statements of the communist leaders and their spokesmen can be seen when one goes through the interview under review. Commenting on the American attitude and her policies, Lord Russell said, "he deeply deplored the American attitude. Americans are perhaps the greatest danger to world peace except China. And I do think that Americans at the moment are a greater danger to peace than are the Russians." No better propoganda for Moscow could have been done by her own spokesmen than what Lord Russell has done for Soviet Russia.

This muddled thinking on the part of Lord Russell does not stop here. He then continues and says that he does not like to be pro-American or pro-Russian. And yet he has not the slightest objection to pay a lefthanded compliment to Soviet Russia by saying that USA and NOT USSR are the greatest danger to the peace of the world. If as Lord Russell would like to be "pro-man and not pro-American or pro-Russian, he has to be on the side of democracy and civilised values of existence. If that were so, does it mean that Lord Russell is completely ignorant of the atrocities in Hungary and ruthless suppression of the attempt of the Hungarian people by the Russians under Khrushchev? If Lord Russell deeply deplores American attitude and policies, he has no comments to make on the Soviet Russian policies in Eastern Europe and the latest exhibition of bad manners on the part of Khrushchev at New York when he thumbed the table and flourished his shoes at the face of the President of the UN. Can a philosopher like Russell expect any decency

from a leader of the character of Khrushchev who forgot that he was in an international assembly of diplomats, and that he was expected to behave with dignity and correct decorum and good manners? To the credit of the President of the UN, he acted with the greatest of forbearance and tolerance at this barbarian exhibition on the part of Khrushchev. The President would have been within his rights to order out Khrushchev and the whole gang of Russian diplomats, even if it had meant the break up of the UN. It would have been a good riddance. That Khrushchev was playing to the world gallery and was bent on advancing the communist propoganda with communist methods of bullying and crudity was clear. And yet Lord Russell calls Khrushchev's behaviour as that of a naughty boy or a school boy when it was the behaviour worthy only of gangsters and crooks.

In this long-winded interview the only correct statement that Lord Russell has made is regarding Krishna Menon. Says Lord Russell, "I don't like the policies pursued by your Krishna Menon.....He is pro-Russian and pro-Chinese. Even when China has committed aggression against India, Krishna Menon has tried to defend and justify China and her policies." For this correct sizing up of Krishna Menon, Lord Russell deserves all praise from the people of India. But it is this Krishna Menon, who is the darling of his Nehru. What Russell could discover in Krishna Menon, our esteemed Prime Minister refuses to see. And yet Russell wants our Prime Minister to lead the nation of the world and solve East-West impasse. One has only to say what a mess philosophers would do if they changed places with the politicians.

DECEPTIVE TRIBAL FIGHT BETWEEN CONGRESSMEN AND COMMUNISTS

People should not be deceived by the antipathy between Congressmen and Communists and believe that there is material difference between their policies. Their political policy is the same—socialism—though they fight as tribals do. What we are concerned with are their policies, and where these are not conducive to production and progress, we have to oppose them even though it is Congressmen that pursue them. The fact that Congressmen carry on a tribal warfare against Communists should not mislead us and make us take sides with Congressmen and imagine that we thereby help a national cause. Political battles should not deteriorate into a kind of tribal conflict which is waged irrespective of policy. Congress has become a tribe and fights the Indian Communist party as an ancient enemy. It has adopted every shibboleth of the Communists. Socialism, atheism and class struggle are the basis of communism. These mark out the present Congress also, unless we make personal loyalty to Shri Jawaharlal Nehru a separate pillar and principle. The subordination of fundamental citizen-rights to government control and the elevation of the State to god-hood is the common faith of both the tribes. The men who obtain licences and permits may differ if the rulers be Congressmen or Communists, but the principle of total ownership by the State is common to both. The distribution of patronage may differ but they both agree on the suppression of the individual. That they fight one another is a misleading tribal phenomenon.

—C. Rajagopalachari

Faction And The Congress

By Vivek

FACTION has become the principal disease of the Congress. In quite a number of states the party is so split that the main task of the chief leaders of the central organisation has had to be the patching-up of differences. Not that the differences remain patched for long. Soon fissures appear again and threaten to widen into chasms, demanding fresh attempts at bridging. And so the process goes on, gathering greater impetus as the elections draw nearer.

In democratic political parties faction is nothing new. A wide diversity in points of view is often tolerated, and there is little insistence on complete conformity. Broad agreement on the general strategy of the party and on its electoral and governmental methods suffices. There may thus be even organised factions, with a distinct doctrinal tone, within a democratic party. And their existence need not affect detrimentally the essential unity and solidarity of the party, nor make awkward and difficult the functioning of a government dependent on it.

The factions in the Congress are not however of this type. Their basis is personal rather than doctrinal, their object the attainment of position for certain individuals rather than the success of particular lines of thought. Men, they press for, not policies; and if policies, only to the extent they benefit particular men or hurt the opponents of such men. Loyalty to the party, its principles and programmes they proclaim, even loyalty greater than that of the section in charge of the Government. About that they have no reservations. Their doubts all centre round the individuals in power. "They, all or some, (depending on the circumstances of particular areas) must go; we must take their place." Under all the glosses of their complaints and representations, that is the main burden. "They are unworthy; far worthier, we."

How has this state of affairs come about? Why have envy and rivalry obtained so strong a hold in the very Party that had been led for so long a time by Mahatma Gandhi? Some years ago I asked a senior and distinguished Congressman how he accounted for the fact that many men who had made genuine sacrifices for the national cause during the years preceding independence, on coming to power seemed to change so much, becoming not only wordly, but even, quite often corrupt themselves and encouragers of corruption? "Ah," said he with a sigh, "they feel they have given up everything for too long; so now when their opportunity has come at last they must make the most of it". Perhaps the real explanation is that "the standard of conduct imposed by the leader of the political movement was so high that the bulk of his followers could not lift themselves up to it, with the result that their acceptance of his doctrine was superficial. Moved by his personality they became fired with emotion and followed his lead. Emotion, however, is transitory and, when it dies down, leaves its subject morally exactly

where he was before he felt it. It does not impose upon him that deep discipline which, permeating the mind, burns away all dross. Hence, with the success of the movement, in many of its prominent followers there remained nothing but the original man; and the original man, more especially when enthroned in power and endowed with moral phrases, in a number of instances acted according to his nature rather than according to the tenets he had ostensibly accepted when emotionally inspired by his great master."

The rewards of office too were exceedingly attractive. To regular salaries, free bungalows, cars, chaprasais, were added the positions of leaders of society, men round whom gathered, and often lauded, important industrialists and influential business and professional men. For the first time in their lives many found their words had power. A whole, highly organised machine was there to carry out their wishes. A great deal could be done directly; for the rest, indirect methods were often available. Accordingly, quite a number of these new servants of the public also used their positions to serve themselves. The principal leaders at the Centre, particularly the Prime Minister and the President of the Congress, by prompt investigation, banishment from office in fit cases and other punishment, could have done a great deal to check this trend. They chose to ignore it completely then, and have not troubled about it particularly even later. They saw little reason, too, for those in office not to follow, and even improve upon, the standards of comfort and luxury in living of those whose place they took.

To acquire office thus became extremely important. Novel avenues, most pleasing vistas, opened out in front of the office-bearers. Why, then, felt ambitious men in the party, should they not partake of its charms? Most of those already there were not superior to them intellectually or morally. Chance or accident, sometimes mere seniority, had accounted for their inclusion. It was true that the party's coming to power had not left unaltered the position of such forward-looking men. Through the ministers many had begun to exercise considerable influence in their localities, often to the public detriment and the benefit of themselves and their friends. But why should they restrict themselves to that when they too could have office? Also ministers, conscious of their new power, would sometimes refuse to do what was wanted, turn a deaf ear not only to hints but even to open requests. Well, then, they must be taught a lesson. And so faction appeared within the party, individuals first and then groups, striving for their own hands, against individuals and groups that had already attained office and enjoyed its fruits. If party is, as Disraeli said, organised public opinion, then faction in this sense is organised self-interest. Such self-interest may occasionally have regard for the public interest, but primarily it is concerned with its own advantage.

Of faction at work within the Congress party, a good example is the Mysore State. Here time and again, for no public purpose at all but merely for self-assertion and the serving of personal interests, groups form, coalesce, attack, retreat, reattack, cause changes in ministerial personnel, overthrow existing and set up new ministries. Political manoeuvring has become the main business of Congress legislators and governments alike. Not that occasionally the removal of a particular individual from the position of minister is not very desirable in the public interest, but that even in such cases, the real grounds for the removal are personal rather than public. Similar situations exist in many parts of the country, though they may not be carried as far as in Mysore. Where faction is strong, impartial administration becomes difficult. Those in power are inclined to look at every action from the point of view of whether or not it will maintain or increase their support. What will not, even if called for otherwise, they will try and avoid. Enquiries into obvious misconduct by prominent politicians when in office will be shelved as too delicate and likely in their repercussions to upset the balance. Not to govern well but to keep the Ministry alive becomes the principal objective of those in power; not to assist through criticism as well as support in the obtaining and maintenance of good government but to make their way to power becomes that of the factions.

The harmfulness of factions of this nature is evident. But they cannot be got rid of, or perhaps even held in check, unless the conditions which breed them are altered. Some of the most significant are those which make the Minister's post so attractive to the vulgar mind, the trappings that go with the office, the bungalow, the car etc. The Minister should appear what he is, a public functionary. He should live simply, a three bedroom flat at

most being provided for him within easy distance from his office, to which, like the Swiss President, he should walk, bicycle or catch a bus. The provision of a special, generally large, car for him immediately puts him into an economic class which is consistent neither with his background nor his need to remain in close touch with the ordinary people. Three or four cars for all the ministers in a State to be used when visiting sites at a distance on official duty should be enough. The ministers' contacts with private individuals, industrialists, businessmen and others, and with officials should be at their offices not at their homes, so that there would be no occasion for the kind of obsequious levee, deeply gratifying to some, now often found at ministerial residences on many mornings and evenings each week. A careful watch over the conduct of Ministers, so that any devious operation for their own or their relatives' benefit would immediately come to notice, and a willingness on the part of the Prime Minister to have investigated by an independent tribunal any bona fide complaints made by responsible people, would also help to remind those aspiring to office through faction that ministerships carried with them responsibilities, duties and risks, not just, as is often thought now, opportunities of enjoyment, profit and patronage.

In so closely knit a party as the Congress, the real blame for the wide prevalence of faction cannot be avoided by the central authorities of the party, the President of the Congress and the Prime Minister. Had both these been vigilant throughout, insisted upon, and seen to, compliance with proper standards by the State ministers, even more, set an example of proper standards in respect of simplicity of living and complete straightforwardness at the Centre, faction would scarcely have become the problem it is. Considering that the choice of Congress candidates ultimately rests with the central Congress authority, that success in elections often depends upon the prestige of the Congress and the influence of the Prime Minister's name, to have allowed faction to secure a strong hold in so many areas, is proof both of lack of judgment and incapacity in action.

Faction is, of course, encouraged by the method of collecting funds that the Congress employs. Unscrupulous financiers and businessmen attempt to create lobbies of influence for themselves by backing particular factions, assisting them with contributions, which since they are the Congress representatives in the area, they would seem entitled to collect. Nothing in fact brings out so clearly the difference between profession and practice in the Congress as its reliance upon a comparatively few big businessmen for its funds rather than upon small contributions from a large number of people. So far from realising and remedying this, it proposes to make such collections easier for itself by amending the company law to enable public companies to make contributions to political parties. Such contributions would presumably be regarded as the expenses of business, so that in addition to the shareholders, the public revenues would also suffer. And yet the Chief Minister of a state, in which faction fortunately is not so strong as in others, maintains that the Congress will establish real Socialism in the country. Depending upon and with the funds of Big Business, presumably!!

—'Opinion'

BOOKS FOR YOUR SHELF

Bakunin's Writings by Guy Alred.
Nationalism and Culture by Rudolf Rocker
God and the State by Bakunin.
General Idea of the Revolution by Proudhon.
What is Mutualism by Swartz.
Causes of Business Depression by Hugo Bilgram.
Challenge of Asia by Borsodi.
Education and Living (2 vols.) by Ralph Borsodi.
Socialism by Von Mises.
Human Action by Von Mises.
The Conquest of China by Sitaram Goel.

Ask for a free catalogue of our publications and
 price-list

LIBERTARIAN PUBLISHERS,
 1st Floor, Arya Bhavan,
 Sandhurst Road West, BOMBAY 4.

India Fooled Again

From Our Correspondent

PRESIDENT Ayub Khan is evidently a statesman of a high order. Before the ink was dry on the signatures of the Canal Waters Agreement, he told a public meeting at Muzaffarabad on October 6 that Pakistan's Army, as the defender of the country, could never afford to leave the Kashmir issue unsolved for an indefinite period. That some such statement would come from him in due course was expected, but that it would come so soon after swallowing over Rs. 83 crores and the major portion of the waters of our rivers, was not expected even by cynics who believe in the dictum that there is no generosity in politics. That wise saying President Ayub Khan has again proved, as also the folly of our paying Rs. 83 crores to Pakistan for building its canals.

Unlike India Pakistan has some shrewd policy-makers. Our policies depend on the whims and fancies of a highly emotional Prime Minister. Small wonder that they are attended by disaster. Some people here are cynically inclined to call that sum of Rs. 83 crores "conscience money"—payment for the guilty feeling we have in regard to Kashmir, the feeling of guilt arising from our failure to fulfil the uncalled for offer of plebiscite there. One emotional folly—for what was that offer if not an emotional folly—succeeds another and passes for statesmanship, while Pakistan is cashing in on it. There is no mention anywhere of the Rs. 300 crores Pakistan owes us. Perhaps it is considered ungentlemanly to remind our neighbour of it. But we must go on paying Pakistan, with or without any excuse, war or cease-fire. In the days of the Nawabs of Oudh, Wajid Ali Shah in particular, it was considered ungentlemanly for a Nawab to refuse requests for loans, even though the Nawab, as usual, was himself heavily in debt. Mr. Nehru, coming from the same territory, has doubtless inherited some of the salient qualities of the Nawabs of Oudh, and the fact has generally become pretty well-known. That explains how the Canal Waters Treaty came to be signed.

It is being recalled here that Mahatma Gandhi forced the Government of India by a fast unto death to pay Rs. 55 crores to Pakistan when the latter was invading India. (After that, can any one seriously say that India considered that to be an invasion or even aggression?) That was much farther than any of the Nawabs of Oudh have ever been reported to have gone, but then, of course, they had not attained the spiritual eminence of the Mahatma or his disciple, Mr. Nehru. Where the word of one man is law and that man is a highly emotional individual, out for self-glory, anything can be expected to happen. What has been happening in this country, since the Gandhian era began with the Khilafat movement, can only be considered sheer lunacy—except on the basis that the

sole aim of our leader has since 1920 all along been to fish in troubled waters for the sake of personal glory. All India got for her Rs. 83 crores was the "enthusiastic" if stage-managed reception of Mr. Nehru in Pakistan with full-throated cries of "Nehru Zindabad". It now appears that those cries were being uttered by the people with their tongues in their cheeks.

U.P. CABINET IMBROGLIO

The Central Congress Parliamentary Board on October 18 adopted a resolution virtually granting permission to Dr. Sampurnanand to resign from the U. P. Chief Ministership. The resolution expressed regret that circumstances should have arisen which had induced the Chief Minister to offer his resignation, and placed on record its high appreciation of Dr. Sampurnanand's work as Minister and subsequently as Chief Minister, and left it to his judgment whether to resign or not. The inevitability of Dr. Sampurnanand's resignation was being recognised here, although there is considerable disagreement with his contention that a Chief Minister has to resign because the Provincial Congress Committee has elected as its President a person whom he did not favour for that office. The Central Parliamentary Board did not say so, but Mr. C. B. Gupta, the new President of the PCC, confirmed the rumour on returning to Lucknow that the Congress High Command had asked him to become Chief Minister after rejecting several other names. Mr. Nehru it was who decided that Mr. Gupta should be Chief Minister in conformity with the principle that power and responsibility should go together. But that was an oversimplification of the problem, as is evident from a meeting of all but two of the 28 members of the U. P. Council of Ministers, which pledged itself on October 19 not to join a Ministry formed by Mr. Gupta, even if he were elected leader of the Legislature Party.

The majority of the members of the U. P. Congress Parliamentary Party are for Dr. Sampurnanand, and if they are as keen on keeping Mr. Gupta out, as he is on coming in, his ambition is not likely to be fulfilled. Dr. Sampurnanand can easily remain where he is. It is neither constitutionally nor morally necessary for him to relinquish his office. That he is nevertheless bent on resigning only shows his high moral stature. Babu Purushottamdas Tandon apart—and he is too old and ailing for the job—there is no man in that State who can reach Dr. Sampurnanand's stature, and if the Congress High Command had seriously considered what that means in the context of power politics, they would have tried their best to persuade the doctor not to press his resignation. But Mr. Nehru's emotional and thoughtless intervention turned the scales in favour of Mr. Gupta, who does not command a majority in the U. P. Congress Legislature Party, and

that is what matters more than the majority in the U.P. Congress Committee. But the absence of lust for power in Dr. Sampurnanand is a factor which may go in Mr. Gupta's favour.

Mr. Gupta has been saying that his main interest lies in giving strength to the Congress organisation in the state, repair the damage caused to it by group politics and generally prepare for the next elections. It was a very broad hint to the Congress High Command that he was the man for the office Dr. Sampurnanand wants to vacate. He has undoubted organising ability but lacks the philosophical temperament of Dr. Sampurnanand. He is impetuous. His loyalties and his antagonisms are fierce, and—it follows—he is too much of a party man. Such a man cannot bring groups together, whatever he may say, and whatever the Congress High Command may like to believe. He has himself been defeated twice in contests for the Legislative Assembly recently—once at the general election and then at a bye-election when any other Congressman would have succeeded, the reason being that Congressman themselves and their friends worked for his discomfiture in secret. He is much better as power behind the throne than in power. It is reported that he had indicated indirectly that he was prepared to go along with Dr. Sampurnanand as a weighty colleague but not as an insignificant President of the State Congress. Quite frankly Dr. Sampurnanand did not like the weight he would carry, for Mr. Gupta's frankness can be mischievous without his intending it. When the "National Herald" was started in the late thirties, Mr. Gupta and his friends used to call it the "Saxena Herald," the reference being to the Managing Director, Mr. Mohanlal Saxena. They had their reasons and only a man devoid of all honesty would say that they were unjustified. But one thing appears certain. If Mr. Gupta had the good of the state Congress at heart, and nothing else, he would have persuaded Dr. Sampurnanand to stay on with all the emphasis at his command. The learned doctor is with all his philosophical faults, irreplaceable.

FEATHER ON SWATANTRA CAP

The Swatantra Party has certainly enhanced its reputation by the report now published of its Punjab Inquiry Committee. The Committee consisted of a galaxy of eminent men, with K. M. Munshi as its Chairman and Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, Sardar Kartar Singh Campbelpuri,

ANNOUNCEMENT

A Girl's Hostel is being opened at Deolali in airy, healthy and centrally located place. Accommodation for girls studying in Higher Secondary School classes only with boarding facilities. Private coaching in English under expert supervision arranged.

Charges very moderate.

Applications for admission should be sent to:

Secretary, R. L. Trust Hostel,
Ram Baug, Lam Road, Deo'ali,
P.O. Dist. NASIK.

a retired High Court Judge of Pepsu, and Mr. C. B. Agarwala, a retired High Court Judge of Allahabad, among its members. The Committee found the measures adopted by the Punjab Government in dealing with the Akali agitation to have been "excessive and indiscriminate". This judicial pronouncement rejected as unjustified the contention that in the case of the "Save Hindi" agitation the action taken by the Punjab Government was more drastic. The Committee has come to the inescapable conclusion that the general impression created in the mind of the ordinary Sikh was that the object of the present demand was to secure "a homeland for the Sikhs". That being so, how can the Akali leaders blame the non-Sikhs if that is also their impression? In any case it is obvious that nothing has been done by the Akalis to counter this impression among the Sikhs and it is therefore a case in which silence can be interpreted as consent. Surely, the Akalis cannot plead that they are unaware of the general impression created by their own speeches on the Sikhs in general.

The materials placed before the members of the Committee and their visits to gurudwaras left them in no doubt that the gurudwaras, protected by religious sanctity, were both "the backbone and the life-blood of the agitation" and that the impression of the overwhelming mass of Hindus in the State was that the agitation was directed against them. That the state of peace in Punjab is the result of Hindu forbearance is borne out by the conclusion reached by the Committee that the present agitation, though non-violent and peaceful so far, is likely to have a prejudicial effect on public order if at any stage the agitational activity by the Akali Dal is met with a counter demonstration.

The Committee feels that the arrest of the whole staff of the "Akali" and "Prabhat" and the continued sealing of the "Akash" and "Khalsa" presses showed "the scant regard in which the freedom of the Press is held by the Punjab Government" and, referring to the provisions of the Ordinance issued by the Punjab Government, comes to the conclusion that "it is difficult to come across such a drastic law during normal times in any civilised country which respects the rule of law."

REAL MEANING OF CO-EXISTENCE

Disagreeing with the view that Soviet foreign policy had changed after the death of Stalin, Professor Seton Watson of London University said here the other day that Russian leaders had always been and continued to be guided by the same basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and their aim to bring about a Communist revolution in the world remained unchanged. To prove that the Russians still adhered rigidly to this belief, Professor Watson referred to the manifesto signed by 12 Communist countries in November 1957, in which this view was endorsed. He recalled that in the spring of 1958, the Yugoslavs aroused the Russians' wrath by stating that it was possible to bring about Communism in a country peacefully and that the revolution need not necessarily be sponsored by a Marxist party.

According to the London Professor, a peaceful revolution was one in which their opponents capitulated without a struggle and were then exterminated, if necessary, with violence. Quoting recent instances, he said that for the Russians peaceful co-existence did not mean simultaneous

(Continued on page 18)

Tit-Bits

NOTHING TO WORRY ABOUT

According to official estimates, food production this year is not likely to exceed last year's low output.

But this is a matter of little concern, as we have put the burden of our food production on the American farmer, leaving us free to concentrate on building more and more steel plants to earn foreign exchange.

WEALTH OF IND

There is not the least doubt that India is the richest country in the world. The price of gold is about Rs. 60 a tola in world markets; here it is about Rs. 140 a tola. A first class diamond weighing a carat will fetch over Rs. 3500/- in India, while its international price in London, Amsterdam or New York is not more than Rs. 2000/-. It is believed that people possessing both money and foresight are buying gold and diamonds as a protection against the day when the paper rupee will be practically valueless due to excessive note-printing.

A MINOR MATTER

Some files were found to be missing from the Hydell Division of Uttar Pradesh's State Electricity Board at Roorkee.

Subsequently it was discovered that nearly 13 maunds (actually 12 maunds and 38 seers) of files had been sold by office clerks as waste paper.

U.N. ASSEMBLY SICK & NEEDS TREATMENT

Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev said at a reception given by Prime Minister Nehru that the U.N. General Assembly was "sick" and needed "treatment and a good doctor".

"But by treatment," he added, "I do not mean a pill-mean surgical treatment".

Contrary to report, Mr. Khrushchev did not invite Shri Nehru to visit the Soviet Union and their conversation at the reception was mainly concerned with drinks. When Shri Nehru apologized for not having any vodka to offer to the Soviet Premier, Mr. Khrushchev answered, "Some people think we never do anything but drink—but we work. India has a good anti-alcoholic tradition which should be emulated....."

Asked by a guest about the health of former Soviet Defence Minister Marshal Zhukov who retired from public life some time ago, Mr. Khrushchev said, "Marshal Zhukov is very well, he does not do much. He goes fishing and hunting. We are very good friends and he was a very good general."

Mr. Khrushchev remained at the Indian reception only about ten minutes.

The United States has made a gift of 1,500,000 pounds of dried milk powder to India. Under an agreement signed in Washington recently between the Governments of India and the United States, the milk powder will be distributed to the victims of floods in the state of Orissa.

Did You Know

By Scio



The remora fish, found generally throughout the world, is called the "living fishhook" because of its ability to attach itself by suction to other fish and hold on. By tying a line to its tail, some fishermen actually use the remora to catch other fish. It often attaches itself to sharks.



The African cobra can attack prey without touching it. The snake has the ability to squirt venom in the eyes of a victim from several feet away, blinding it and rendering it helpless.



The largest penal camp in the world is located at Vorkuta in northern Russia. Reliable sources estimate there are more than 223,000 prisoners, guarded by 12,000 Red soldiers, working in 40 mines in Vorkuta.

(Continued from page 16)

existence with others, it only meant the peaceful capitulation of countries with different ideological beliefs to Communism. For them peaceful co-existence was the same thing as "cold war," which meant that all means other than war are to be used to spread the Russian sphere of influence. Russia, was, therefore, at permanent war with the non-Communist world, in which all methods, including force, were legitimated weapons to be used as conditions dictated.

Mr. Khrushchev recognised, he said, that a nuclear war would be disastrous for Russia as well as other countries. This was a radical change from Stalin's view that a war would destroy only the Capitalist world. He also reminded us that Russia no longer concentrated on countries on her borders, and because of the emergence of the newly independent Asian and African countries—politically immature, he might have added—Soviet policy was no longer peripheral but global. There was also, according to him, the emergence of a more critical spirit in the country, particularly among the younger generation, but "to identify Mr. Khrushchev with the younger generation would be wrong and dangerous."

With the Chinese threatening "co-existence" from the north, there should be a greater awareness of the Communist threat in the country. Hence the summing up above of a remarkable address by Professor Seton Watson at the Indian Council of World Affairs in New Delhi. He might have given in brief the story of the rise of Mr. Khrushchev. After the death of Stalin, there was nobody automatically to take his place as Stalin did not believe in a second man. Marshall Zhukov was the darling of the people and the Russian Army, and Khrushchev had him recalled from disgrace. He cultivated his friendship and mouthed collective leadership to please him. After he had finished all rivals with his help, he finished Marshal Khrushchev politically, as well as collective leadership. The denunciation of Stalin was made to please Zhukov. There is no other explanation for it.

Gleanings from the Press

NOTHING DOING TILL 1962 TRUTH ABOUT CONGRESS LEADERSHIP

It is agreed among the Congress top leaders that as far as possible no Ministry will be allowed to crumble nor will any Chief Minister be encouraged or permitted to resign. The Chief Minister of Orissa wanted to resign—the Congress President frowned at his suggestion; the Chief Minister of Assam resigned—the Congress President would not look at the letter; the Chief Minister of U.P. offered to resign following the rout of his nominees in the U.P.C.C. elections—the Congress President did not understand why he should have thought of anything so foolish as that. If there is any trouble in any State, some kind of agreement will be brought about between the clashing teams or the rival groups, and till 1962, there should be no question of any Congress Ministry being pulled down or any Chief Minister being "let down". For the matter of that, there can be no acquiescence in attempts, in whatever quarters, to deprive even the Chief Minister of the Punjab, of his

occupation. No, nothing doing till 1962 for, whatever happens, Congress energies cannot be exhausted in minor exercises when the big election has got to be fought and won. It seems that even the Plan can wait till then!

The High Command will meanwhile swallow anything but dare not quell any mutiny in the regiment lest the worst should happen and the Congress itself disappear from the political map. It was a sight to see in U.P. persons of consequence like Mr. Lal Bahadur Sastri and Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim (Cabinet Ministers to boot and High Commanders too) going down in the party elections, and the influence of Mr. Gobind Ballabh Pant waning so spectacularly. But they will take it as otherwise fate might overtake the Congress. For the sake of the party at the next elections, not much "fuss" will be made over "trivial" things, for it is "absurd" that the Congress should be wiped out. Such is the psychology of Congress leaders.

Today one doesn't much hear of the old idealist talk of preferring defeat in a hundred elections to compromising with principles or tinkering with policies. This is hardly the time for fussing over political standards and moral values; this is essentially the time for shielding everyone and anything, for being able to muddle through the general election in 1962. Expediency comes first, ethics next—indeed last.

—Junius in 'Swarajya'

News And Views

BOTH NEHRU AND 'PRAVDA' CORRESPONDENT DISPLEASED WITH PRESS CRITICISM OF KHRUSHCHEV

In his latest Press Conference, Prime Minister Nehru seemed to broadly agree with the 'Pravda' Correspondent that the comments of "THE TIMES OF INDIA" on Mr. Khrushchev's crude behaviour in the United Nations and the Soviet policy were 'harmful to Indo-Soviet relations.' The Times of India in its issue of October 24, 1960, referring to this strange attitude of Mr. Nehru towards the freedom of the press editorially comments thus "By so elegantly advising us to 'stew in its own juice,' the Prime Minister has created the impression that our comment was indeed harmful to this country's relations with the Soviet Union, and furthermore refrained from challenging the Russian journalists' assumption that even in a democracy, Government has a right to interfere and influence the views of an independent newspaper. That the Soviet Union should be displeased, simply because Mr. Khrushchev was criticised is no occasion for any surprise; that the Indian Prime Minister should publicly associate himself with what is obviously a cold war attitude, is most disturbing and bewildering."

(The Prime Minister in his turn will be surely bewildered to see that Indian public opinion does not fully appreciate, as it should, his supreme efforts to turn our Democracy into the "Peoples' Democracy" with the help and goodwill of Russia.—Ed.)

NIXON'S PLAN TO MEET COMMUNIST THREATS

SERIES OF WESTERN SUMMIT MEETINGS SUGGESTED

Los Angeles: Vice-President Richard Nixon said last night that if elected President, he would seek a series of Western Summit meetings to meet the "threatening bluster" and "bullying tactics" of the Communist leaders.

"The Communist leaders, with their rude and threatening conduct at the current General Assembly meeting, have shown a pattern of intent reminiscent of Hitler and Mussolini prior to Munich," Mr. Nixon said.

"The same threatening bluster, the same bullying tactics are designed to frighten the free nations into paying an unpayable price for a phantom peace. This time the price is Communist domination of the United Nations itself.

"I say to the Communist leaders that the free nations will not be intimidated. There is to be no new Munich. . . .

"To help chart the course ahead I make a proposal tonight for a series of regional conferences of States—a bringing together of the heads and leaders of Government of all the free nations of Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia.

"These conferences would have as their objectives, first the strengthening of the peaceful mission of the United Nations, and second the strengthening of the free nations—politically, economically, socially and militarily.

TORIES CONFIDENT OF POWER FOR 10 YEARS

London, Oct. 16: With their main opposition shattered and split by internal dissension, the Conservatives who defeated Labour in three elections in a row are now confident of power for at least another decade.

This is the impression that has been left by the Conservative conference which was wound up yesterday by a supremely self-assured Macmillan.

It is true that the speakers at the conference studiously avoided crowing over the Labour debacle, but they could hardly conceal their certainty about the immediate future.

It was as if they were "savouring the satisfaction of the half-conscious assumption," as *The Times* put it, that the Conservative Party has a prescriptive right to supply the nation's Government.

MOSCOW LINE REJECTED WEST BENGAL REDS

SILENT OVER CHINESE AGGRESSION

Calcutta, Oct. 24: The West Bengal unit of the Communist Party of India has rejected the Moscow line in the ideological controversy now rocking the Communist world by 67 votes to 10, it is reliably learnt.

Support for Mr. Khrushchev's theory of permanent co-existence came, oddly enough, from the one-time leader of the extremist group, Mr. Somnath Lahiri, and two M.P.s. Mrs. Renu Chakravarty and Mr. Inderjit Gupta.

The official resolution adopted on Friday last following a three-day heated discussion condemns Mr. Khrushchev for "right deviation" in interpreting the Warsaw document, but it remains silent over Chinese aggression against India.

The resolution was understood to have been piloted by a C.P.I. Central Committee member, Mr. Harekrishna Kongar, who has just returned after attending the Communist Party Congress of North Viet Nam at Lao Dang, where he was reported to have met top Chinese leaders.

Letter to the Editor

THE BETTER WAY

Madam.

With due respect to the representatives of the five "neutralist" nations, India, Indonesia, Ghana, Yugoslavia and the United Arab Republic it is possible to hold that their resolution seeking the unanimous support of the General Assembly of the United Nations to call for a meeting of the American President and the Soviet Premier is misconceived. It would be a miracle if they met, and a greater miracle if they agreed on the problems that now divide them. Miracles may yet happen but the United Nations may not bank on them. No such resolution was necessary to persuade, say, the British Prime Minister to meet the American President and the Soviet Premier. The Five Nations have already written to the President and the Premier requesting them to renew their broken contacts. The endorsement of the United Nations General Assembly is intended to exert maximum moral force of world opinion on them for the purpose, and make it difficult for either of them to refuse to meet. If the purpose was merely to break the ice and bring about a physical meeting, the neutralist Five may have invited the American President and the Soviet Premier to a dinner.

The meeting of the two is at best a means to the end, namely, reaching agreements on the problems engaging the United Nations, namely, disarmament, Congo, the Secretary General, etc. The neutralist Five would do better if they formulated definite solutions on merits for the problems and sought the support of the General Assembly of the United Nations. If any member dissented, he would put himself morally in the wrong, as defying world public opinion. It is more dignified as well as appropriate for the General Assembly to suggest solutions for the world problems and exert its moral authority for their acceptance, than to request a personal meeting between the American President and the Soviet Premier, for the solutions concern the whole world and not only the two, however militarily powerful they may be. It is undesirable, even if it were possible, that America and Soviet Russia should come to an agreement between themselves and impose it on the rest of the world. Moral sanctions and rational solutions do not rest on armaments.

Bangalore

—P. Kodanda Rao

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: 70205

Telegram: **LOTEWALLA**