

THE

874

Indian

Libertarian

LIBERTARIAN JOURNAL OF INDIA

EDITED BY

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

DIWALI ISSUE

VOL. X NO. 15

NOVEMBER 1, 1962

PAGE

EDITORIAL	2
India At The Cross-roads by M. A. Venkata Rao	5
Statesmanship Or Megalomania? by M. N. Thotal	7
Kashmir by P. Kodanda Rao	10
Some Reflections On National Integration by A. Ranganathan	12
English As The Lingua Franca Of India by Indira Aicasty	14
DELHI LETTER : Nehru Has The Trump s. But Will Not Play Them	16
Book Review	17
Gleanings from the Press	18
News & Views	18



"We wish the readers and sympathisers of the

Indian Libertarian a happy Diwali."

EDITORIAL

WEST BERLIN, SIMPLY 'NON-NEGOTIABLE'

AN international crisis is reported to be brewing over Berlin. The cold war over this city is getting hotter and hotter. It may reach the boiling and even bursting point any time in next November, when Mr. Khrushchev threatens to sign a separate Peace Treaty with East Berlin Government, even in gross violation of all the Protocols reached among the Allied Powers, including Russia, in the aftermath of the Second World War.

This city of Berlin, once the pride and glory of European culture and civilisation, has had a chequered career, ever since it fell a victim to the Nazi aggression in 1932. Towards the close of the Second World War under Postdam Protocol of 1945, the city was put under the joint control of the four allied powers U.S.A., Britain, France and U.S.S.R. The allies took upon themselves, under this arrangement, the grave responsibility of establishing, in course of time, a reunited Germany which would be 'Peaceful and Self-Governing' under a democratic Government. All the four occupational zones under the control of these respective Powers, were to be treated as one economic unit. Berlin, so to say, lay at the very heart of this plan of the democratic reunification of Germany. It was, therefore, agreed by all these Powers including Russia, that though this city lay geographically within the Soviet occupied Eastern Zone of Germany, it was none-the-less to be administered jointly by the Big Four.

But the Communist rout in the free and democratic elections held in Berlin in 1946 upset the Soviets very much. They set about at once isolating the Eastern Sector of the city under their control, from the Western Sector occupied

by the Democratic Powers. Towards this end, the One-Party-Rule of the Communists was imposed upon East Berlin and East Germany, Trade and communication barriers were enforced between the two sectors. All these acts by Russia, coupled with the Berlin Blockade of 1949, made the division of Germany into mutually exclusive Western and Eastern Zones almost inevitable. Berlin, likewise, came to be riven into two sectors, one 'Free' and the other 'Red'.

West Berlin came under the control of a democratic administration and East Berlin, under that of the Communist puppet regime. Western Allies, true to their obligations, set up a popularly elected government of the German Federal Republic in the united West Germany, with her capital at Bonn, while the Soviets imposed a Communist government on East Germany under the fraudulent name of the German Democratic Republic. East Berlin was declared to be the capital of the Communist Government in further contravention of the Four Power Agreements. In 1954-55 a series of steps were taken by Russia, by way of granting some sovereignty rights to her puppet government in East Berlin. She transferred her rights of control of borders with West Berlin and control over transport, to the East Berlin Government.

This puppet government of the Communists which was not democratically elected by the people as required under the provisions of the Four Power Agreement, could not therefore be recognised by the Democratic Allies of the West. That the people of East Germany and East Berlin did not approve of this government forced upon them, was demonstrably proved by the spontaneous General Strike staged mostly by industrial workers in East Berlin in 1953. This

strike could be put down with iron and blood by the Communist Government, only with the help of Soviet tanks and troops. Frustrated in their uprising against the Communist tyranny, the people then began 'voting with their feet' against the Government, by their never-ending trek from East Berlin to West Berlin. This trekking was stopped, though not quite successfully, by the Berlin government, by erecting in August 1961 'the Shameful Wall' of barbed wires and cement blocks on the border between West Berlin and East Berlin. This one single act of the East Berlin government is more than enough to paint the true picture of the red tyranny, making its death-dance behind the Iron Curtain and the Cement Wall.

It is this revolt of the working class of 'the Workers Paradise' against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, that alarmed Mr. Khrushchev. To his dismay and discomfiture, the workers even risked their lives and escaped in a ceaseless stream into 'Free' Berlin from 'Red' Berlin, to be able to breathe in, the invigorating air of a free life. He found to his horror that despite the Wall that physically separated the two Sectors of Berlin, the hearts of the Germans residing on both of its sides beat in complete unison and harmony. It was, therefore, no wonder that he vowed 'to eradicate this splinter (Free Berlin) from the heart of Europe'. So since 1958, he has been threatening the Free World that he would sign a separate Peace Treaty with the East Berlin Government in utter disregard of the provisions of the Four Power Agreements, unless the Berlin question were settled to his satisfaction. He has further threatened to turn over the control of 'access' routes to West Berlin from West Germany to the East Berlin Government. But these bullying tactics have failed so far with the allied nations of the West. The democratic Allies on the other hand have expressed their firm determination to defend the freedom of West Berlin as also their rights of 'access' routes to West Berlin, at all costs and under all circumstances. Mr. Khrushchev's new proposal of placing West Berlin only, under the control of the U.N. while maintaining the status quo of East Berlin, has been also rejected, as a sly attempt on his part to paralyse the quick execution of any effective policy, in case an emergency should arise in Berlin out of Communist intransigence.

Having been foiled in all his attempts to get West Berlin surreptitiously under the control of the East Berlin Government, Mr. Khrushchev is now trying to drive a wedge between U.S.A. and her allies by his recent 'soft' and 'mild' proposals about both Berlin and Cuba. But disappointment awaits him in this matter too. For, the Western allies are fully alive to the fact

that the Freedom of West Berlin is simply 'NON-NEGOTIABLE.' In other words, there can be no retreat whatsoever from West Berlin on the part of the Western Nations who have solemnly pledged themselves to defend this 'free' city, the symbol of the future reunion of the whole of Germany under the banner of a popularly elected government.

INDIA'S POLICIES TOWARDS NEPAL AND PAKISTAN

With the Chinese hordes on our Northern borders at NEFA and Ladakh, India's policies towards her neighbours need a drastic revision and reassessment. The high glee with which Chen Yi, the Minister for Foreign Affairs in China, welcomed the Dussarah broadsides of King Mehendra of Nepal directed against India, indicates how cunningly China is spreading her Red net around Nepal, our traditional friend and ally. The anti-Indian tone of Government-controlled press of Pakistan, in regard to Chinese aggression on NEFA border and the recent Tripura episode, point to the desire of Pakistan to fish in India's troubled waters. Thus it is clear that our crypto-communist leadership that guides our Foreign Affairs, appears to have succeeded only in alienating the sympathies of these neighbouring countries without being able, in any appreciable measure, to develop India's fighting strength against the communist menace to our frontiers.

The vexed Kashmir problem between India and Pakistan is not incapable of being satisfactorily solved if a realistic approach be made to it. Nehru's secularism and the two-nation theory which created Pakistan and by which Pakistan still swears could be both accommodated in this way. Azad Kashmir may be conceded to Pakistan and the Hindu-majority region of Jammu to Hindustan. The central Muslim majority valley of Kashmir which, according to Nehru is very much pleased with the benefits that have accrued to it from the industrial progress made all these years with the help of India, may be permitted to opt out for India or Pakistan, by a democratic procedure agreed to between the parties.

Nepal's fears also could be allayed by India's unequivocal declaration that despite the fact that some of the Nepalese opposition leaders were comrades-in-arms of our leaders in India's struggle for freedom. Indian Government is not interested in supporting them openly or covertly in the internal politics of Nepal, against King Mehendra.

And above all what is needed for winning the whole-hearted support of Pakistan and Nepal is to convince them of our strength by hurling back the communist invaders on our Northern borders.

For bringing about all these changes in our foreign policies, our leadership itself will have to be internally transformed or replaced. But alas, neither is a possibility in the near future!

JAYAPRAKASH ON NATIONAL LANGUAGE

The political recluse Jayaprakash Narayan, is very much angry with Mr. Nehru for truthfully describing Hindi zealots' movement against continuing English as the medium of education and as inter-state language even after 1965 as 'utter stupidity'. This is an apt illustration to show how, in the heat of the controversy, even the tallest amongst our leaders are apt to forget that India till now has had no genuine national consciousness and no national language as such. Hindi is only one of the regional languages of this sub-continent of India. The fact is undeniable, that of all the languages extant in India, it is only English which to a certain extent has attained to the position of a National Language.

If ever English is to be replaced by Hindi as the lingua franca of India, Hindi people will have to make some sort of conquest, political or cultural, of non-Hindi regions. But cultural and literary conquest is impossible for Hindi, since it has been far out-distanced in this respect by other regional languages. Politically speaking even a semblance of Hindi political domination over the South will at once give rise to a revolt of the people against the North, such as that of D.M.K. in Tamilnad. But the case is different with English. By a historical accident, it has had to its credit the political conquest of the whole of India. In cultural and literary merit, it has already proved its superiority over our regional languages. Besides, its importance as an international 'link' language is unquestionable.

Hence, to speak of only an indigenous language becoming India's National Language as J. Narayan is doing is mere moon-shine. It is only English which is in a position to-day, to breed national consciousness and which, therefore, could justifiably claim for itself, the status of a National Language, in the peculiar conditions and circumstances prevailing in our country.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT:

'The nation which can be saved by one man and wants to be saved that way deserves a whipping.'

— Seume quoted in 'Nationalism and Culture' by Rudolf Rocker.

THE INDIAN LIBERTARIAN

'My affections centre round the little, near things; bacon, eggs, pipes and pubs and gardens and kisses and morning paper — and trees and flowers in a bowl and going for walks in the rain. So, I think do most men's and nearly all women's. I believe that out of little things big things come. I have never understood why the issues of politics turn rarely upon the little things that touch men's hearts.'

— C.E.M. Joad quoted in Freeman (U.S.A.).

'Culture and State are antagonists: the 'Culture State' is a modern idea. The one lives on the other, the one prospers at the expense of the other. All great periods of culture are periods of political decline. Whatever is great in a cultural sense is non-political, is even anti-political.'

— Freidrich Neitzche.

'Any healthy society must provide scope for the unusual idea, for the uncommon individual, for the man who is in some way 'different'. It would be a dull world in which everyone conforms to a common pattern of behaviour and no one ever got out of step with a neighbour'.

— Facts (Australia).

The Indian Libertarian

Independent Journal Of Free Economy and Public Affairs

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

Published On the 1st and 15th Of Each Month

Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Subscription Rates:

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

ADVERTISEMENTS RATES

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

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

BACK COVER..... Rs. 150

SECOND COVER..... Rs. 125

THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125

- Articles from readers and contributors are accepted. Articles meant for publication should be typewritten and on one side of the paper only.
- Publication of article does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a FreeForum.
- 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 Bhavan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

India At The Crossroads

(THOUGHTS ON DIPAVALI — 1962)

M. A. Venkata Rao

DIPAVALI DAY has been from immemorial times a day not only of festivities but also of stock-taking. Businessmen even now make up their annual accounts on the day, calculate the final results of the year's trading, write off or otherwise reckon with inevitable losses and make their resolves and plans for the next year. They carry out token business deals (moorat) with each other to invoke good luck for the new year on each other from the powers above.

The day is appropriate therefore for thinkers and writers to prepare a balance sheet of the nation's affairs of the year and indicate new ideas and plans for betterment in the next period. The procedure quickens the nation's conscience and strengthens national consciousness in the thoughtful citizen and induces even the care-free happy-go-lucky people in our midst to think of national affairs with a sense of identification, at least for a brief while.

There is a tradition that the festival of lights known as Dipavali, (which is celebrated with great eclat in Central and Western India, in particular,) takes its origin in the great national rejoicings occasioned by the decisive victory won by King Salivahana of Central India whose empire spread from sea to sea from Gujerat and Bombay to Orissa and Andhra, over the invading Hunas and Sakas and Scythians who had penetrated so far. Indeed the era of Salivahana is dated from that time—74 A.D. The Republic of Rome was then at its height and had recently passed into the hands of the Caesars.

The trans-Himalayan yellow hordes had begun to invade India a hundred years before and continued to enter the country through the northwestern passes off and on till they were finally driven off by the Gupta emperors. The Vikrama era of the north also takes its origin from such a great victory over the Huna invaders in 56 A.D.

We have today again after such a long lapse of time another period of the ancient menace of yellow hordes invading the country. The situation demands a great and wide-spread rally of the national forces under the banner: The nation in danger: Drive the invader out.

Nehru and Menon content themselves when roused by popular demonstrations with exhort-

ing the people to stand united and rally behind the Government to meet the invasion threat. But they do nothing to mobilise national emotion and national effort into constructive channels. The mere exhortation to stand united etc. is fruitless and frustrating in the absence of actual practical channels for the people's effort and patriotism to flow and make an impression on the national drive.

General Thimmayya has hinted at the measures necessary to mobilise the people in an article in Seminar. He writes that the Chinese are a hundred times stronger than ourselves i.e. the Indian armed forces. Perhaps he means that the Chinese have more manpower and also greater resources by way of military production—aircraft, tanks, munitions etc. He also hints that India has sufficient resources by way of tanks and munitions and smaller explosives and guns. She lacks fighter craft in sufficient numbers.

But apart from this necessity to step up the achievement of self-sufficiency in military production in all branches, (even at the cost of transforming the present civilian economic Planning targets,) General Thimmayya suggests a wide and intensive programme of training civilian guerilla and commando sections. They should be stationed in the hinterland of the border fronts. If the Chinese should enter the plains in strength, (as is too likely to judge from the lack of policy displayed by our Government and defence authorities so far,) these guerillas and commando groups should be helpful in harassing the enemy forces, cutting off their supplies, ambushing them, and generally preventing them from settling down and consolidating their hold in any part of the country—whether Ladakh, Jammu, Uttar Pradesh, Bhutan, or Assam. Small arms will do for this purpose and patriotic young men from all regions will enthusiastically serve in this glorious task of national defence and assist the regular armies.

Every city should have its own air defence squads with civil volunteers serving in them, so that invading bombers could be shot down and demoralisation through destructive air-bombing could be diminished and morale maintained. Otherwise, the machinery of civil government will be destroyed in no time and the vast country will become an easy prey to the invader.

Even in oratorical perorations while assuring the people of their determination to fight the

enemy "to the last man and the last gun," Krishna Menon interpolates the remark that "we will not shoot but shoot only when shot at"! The conviction of a life-time that communism is the "wave of the future" and that the Chinese communist State is a vanguard of the future "earthly paradise" and that no nation should resist it (and Russia) and that "Socialist States do no wrong" and that it is only wars waged by capitalist nations that are imperialist but that wars waged by communist states are not imperialist but wars for liberation etc. etc. has permeated the warp and woof of Krishna Menon's thinking. He is paralysed by his communist doctrine and incapacitated to take a strictly nationalist point of view in the matter of leading India's defence against communist China. On the other hand, he has no compunctions or hesitations in regarding the Pakistanis as the enemy, for they are not communist!

India's defence will never be galvanised and the people rallied to the great cause in a nationwide constructive effort on a long-term basis until there is a change in the Defence Ministry. Perhaps, it is also necessary to have a change in the Prime Ministership. For Nehru also shares in the communist ideas of Krishna Menon and his inhibitions of his own which add to his fateful deficiency as a war leader. Except sustaining an unintelligent but continuous drive for Big State-sponsored Economic Planned development à la Soviet Russia, Nehru has shown no other constructive quality of statesmanship. As a democratic leader, he has shown great capacity in keeping himself in the saddle by letting provincial small-minded leaders have a free hand in communalist, caste-ridden, corrupt exploitation of the people so long as they delivered the goods of returning Congress to power in the polls with himself at the head!

This brings us to the second great issue in respect of which also the nation finds itself at the crossroads today. It is the problem of national unity. The Government have resorted to the easy and time-consuming device of appointing committees of enquiry to side-track the grave problems that threaten the disintegration of the country.

The fissure in national sentiment and action revealed so tragically in Assam when the governing classes engaged in an organised orgy of arson, loot, plunder and collective massacre, (recalling the worst days of communal violence during British days and reminding us of the horrors of Noakhali killings over a wide area in what is now East Pakistan) remains without any treatment whatever on the part of leadership! The ruling Assamese groups have sought through murderous mass violence to drive the local Bengali population out. They have shown

no sense of danger at the obvious interest of the Muslim infiltrators from Pakistan whose cooperation in this nefarious business they have accepted.

The Assamese want the whole of Assam State including the tribal areas to be recognised as a political unit like Maharashtra and demands that all the heterogeneous elements—tribesmen, Bengalis, Nepalis, Bhutanis and other transregional immigrants should assimilate themselves into the Assamese nation or sub-nation. To this end, they are prepared to adopt Muslim League tactics. Gandhism and the nationalism of Victorian days are dead in Assam.

The leadership of Nehru is so inept that it is not prepared even to have an impartial enquiry into the massacres! It would lose votes to Congress!

So in the South. The separatist movement of the Dravida Munnetra Kazagam under Annadorai and its parent body under Ramaswamy Naicker have been allowed to run amuck. The fundamental rights as well as the criminal law against the fomenting of class hatred and the laws against treachery and treason are all forgotten and the separatist Dravidas have a field day!

The whole movement has been growing in all spheres of life and propaganda—in politics, official patronage, business, education, cinema, music, art, drama, novel etc. so long that it is now a veritable flood far beyond the capacity of the present leadership to control. The creative power of the national leadership evident in some degree during the anti-British struggle has now been exhausted. There is now no constructive genius displayed in official leadership. The nation needs a new leadership well-founded on a fresh realisation of patriotic and nationalist emotion buttressed by fresh thinking on all aspects of social reconstruction.

In the realm of thought, we should have new thinking on all aspects of social philosophy concerning free economy and free society. Thinkers should with a sense of mission, devote themselves to a fresh study and understanding of the postulates and safeguards of liberty as developed in the history of Europe and America in their great revolutions resulting in their "rights of man" legal and constitutional framework. We have accepted the ideals of the French Revolution as enshrined in the inspiring words—Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity and have added justice to the trio.

The new leadership in India should study the implications of these ideals of the constitu-

(Continued on page 7)

Statesmanship Or Megalomania ?

(By M. N. Thotal)

Mr. Nehru told members of Ceylon's Houses of Parliament on October 13 that it was an extra-ordinary situation that India, which had been conditioned to pursue a peaceful approach to problems since the time of Mahatma Gandhi, found herself today in a position to deal with situations that were far from peaceful. "We do not want to do certain things," said Mr. Nehru, "but we find ourselves in circumstances which compel us to do what we utterly and absolutely dislike," adding pseudo-philosophically that such situations were the contradictions of life. "It is a pity," he proceeded to observe in the same vein, "that a country like India that is so devoted to peace, with a passion for peace, and so conditioned for peace, should have to face contingencies like the one today which do not lead to peaceful happenings and may cause us more trouble."

(Continued from page 6)

tion, apply them to daily life and develop a strong and alert public opinion in the people at large. Even the un-lettered should be taught the principles of freedom through adult education schools and other media of mass communication.

Whether the Government assists in this task or not, it is the inescapable duty of the educated classes to do their bit to forward this great business of teaching the essentials of democracy to the mass of the people, irrespective of one's profession—trade, industry, transport, law, teaching, accountancy, journalism etc.

In addition to this intellectual educative work, we have a corresponding task of emotional leadership. We should set an example of reacting with the right emotions and sentiments to the great issues of the day—invasion or separatist treason or other anti-national movements. Anti-social ideas and actions should be publicly condemned irrespective of whom it hurts. "We should not insult truth for fear of offending men"—as Tagore said once.

As for action, everyone should become a member of a political party pledged to the defence of freedom and the construction of republican society in present day India. He should subscribe to periodicals devoted to freedom and nationalism, take part in discussion meetings and participate in the work of informing public opinion.

This is the moral obligation of the citizen in this grave hour.

Mr. Nehru said he was merely mentioning it to point out the contradictions in the life India was leading. But the contradictions lie really in the lives of her leaders, Mr. Nehru himself, and, before him, of Mahatma Gandhi. If you work for nonviolence and peace, and find yourself often enough up in arms, there is obviously something wrong with your *modus operandi*, granting your bonafides. But even bonafides cannot be taken for granted if, like Gandhi and Nehru, you indulge in self-contradiction every day and if the propositions you advance cannot, like theirs, bear a moment's scrutiny. Within fifteen years India has taken up (has had to take up, if you please) arms no less than three times—once in Kashmir soon after independence, then again against the Portuguese in Goa, and now against China in the North. India had been since her independence in favour of peaceful action, said Mr. Nehru, adding that they had indulged in it to an astonishingly successful degree. Are three wars in 15 years proof of the "astonishingly successful degree" of peaceful action? And "yet," he said, "here we find ourselves by a strange succession of events facing situations which are far from being pleasant and our country is having a great deal of trouble."

GREAT EXPECTATIONS

However naively Mr. Nehru may put it, there is nothing "strange" in the "succession of events". Mr. Nehru has all along been asking for it. They are as normal, as logical, as they possibly can be, and any man with a little insight and commonsense could have foreseen them, just as any man could have foreseen that Pakistan was going to come into existence years before it did, and that, too, on account of the doings of two men, Gandhi and Nehru. What is to be said of men to whom this famous couplet of Ghalib applies?

Hum ko unse wafa ki hai ummeed
Jo nahin jante wafa kya hai!

(We expect fidelity from those who do not know what fidelity is.)

Why should any sane man expect fidelity from ideological enemies? Why should he expect that the ideological enemy will give up his lifelong convictions in order to please him? And why should he not realize that, the moment he thinks of doing so, he will find himself in prison, stripped of all powers and positions, and unable to do anything to please him? We got freedom because freedom is in the British blood.

And no one under the Communist heels will ever get freedom because it is not in the Communist blood. At a Press Conference at Colombo a correspondent asked whether the present advance of the Chinese in NEFA was not contrary to the stand taken by the Chinese Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai, when he visited New Delhi in 1960, in agreeing to the maintenance of the status quo in NEFA. Mr. Nehru replied, "I do not think it will be correct to say that he had formally agreed to it. But that was the impression we got from the talks." Surely the impression Mr. Nehru and his assistants got could have been verified on the spot, in view particularly of the fact that a year earlier the Chinese had threatened to march into NEFA if their advance in Ladakh was resisted. Surely, it was not a trivial matter to be left in a vague and amorphous state in the mind without any attempt at clarification being made. If the answer to this criticism is that in any case the Chinese Premier's word could not be relied upon—and only in that case was clarification unnecessary—then there is no sense in Mr. Nehru's frequently expressed desire for talks with the Chinese Premier with or without conditions. What is the use of talks when they do not lead to any definite statements and both the sides are left with impressions which may or may not be justified?

Mr. Nehru's confession on this point leaves a very sad impression regarding the state of mind in which he approaches his important task. Was he afraid to seek a clarification on this very important point—lest the Chinese Premier's reply should reveal the failure of his policy of non-alignment in all its nakedness? The failure of a policy is one thing. After all policies are tried and modified when they fail. But to seek to hide the failure of a national policy—the result of which may be the loss of the country's freedom—is tantamount to treachery to the country. There can be no doubt about it in any honest mind.

THE BURMESE PARALLEL

Mr. Nehru added in reply to the correspondent's question that in a recent treaty between China and Burma they had in effect agreed to the continuation of the MacMahon Line as the border of Burma. "I think that applies to India too," he said, "It is the same border line". What he meant was that that should apply to India too because it is part of the same border line. But the latest incursion in NEFA proves that that does not apply to India. Why? Our Prime Minister should seek an answer to this question. Is it because the Burmese threatened to seek American aid and that was enough to frighten the Chinese out of their wits? This is what the well-informed in New Delhi think.

But Mr. Nehru's policy of non-alignment, praised so highly by Khrushchev and Company, prevents him from even threatening to seek aid from USA, for that would expose him and his policy to world ridicule. Nothing more than a threat of this kind is required to drive the Chinese out, but our Prime Minister would not utter it because it would imply a confession of failure of his policy of non-alignment. (How then can the Prime Minister say with any justification that India was continuing to face a situation which was not of her own making?) Like Mahatma Gandhi's "nonviolence can never fail," he will go on advocating non-alignment, come what may. And we know now what is coming—for generations to come. That is what Mr. Nehru himself has promised. It is the direct result of cleverness born of megalomania in an unquestioned leader of a country where the democratic instinct has yet to take root.

Mr. Nehru spoke of India's devotion to peace, of her passion for peace, and of her being conditioned for peace since the time of Mahatma Gandhi. But granting the devotion and the passion and the conditioning, what has been the result? During British rule the British rulers were said to be responsible for the riots in India. Who is responsible for them now when they have become much more frequent and numerous? Is the almost daily rioting in India a proof of our devotion to and passion for peace?

ANOTHER PARALLEL

Those who want peace, those who really want peace, and do not merely pay lip service to peace and nonviolence in the interest of their leadership, can really do so only if they have a passion for justice and do not seek fraudulent short-cuts to leadership in order to oust others. Those who seek peace, without seeking justice at the same time, merely pretend. They are not seeking peace. They are only seeking leadership and dictatorship.

Just as Mahatma Gandhi led the fanatical Khilafat movement and befriended the fanatical Ali Brothers, antagonising nationalists like Jinnah, and paved the way for Hindu-Muslim warfare in the land, and for Pakistan, Mr. Nehru has been making fanatical Communism respectable and befriending the Communist leaders and raising their status in the world, in order ultimately to raise his own. At the Bandung Conference, Mr. Nehru was chaperoning Chou En-lai and was angry at references to Russian or Chinese imperialism, while Afro-Asian solidarity seemed to demand denunciation of western imperialism at every step. Gandhi equated all religions saying they were all equally good. Nehru equates all systems of government despite his passionate devotion to democracy.

Addressing the Ceylon House of Parliament Mr. Nehru said, "The more experience I have gathered the less I feel inclined to say anything about the method of any country because the method of government depends on so many factors—past history, traditions, environment and so many other things—that I think it is not right for any one to think that the method of government in one's own country is necessarily the ideal for every country." Indeed, indeed, in appraising the method of government in other countries you should forget all your ideals, everything by which you swear and still consider yourself an honest man. Particularly, if it is necessary for your basic policy "to be friendly with all countries, some naturally more than others," as India under Mr. Nehru's guidance has tried her best to do. Indeed, we should be more friendly with countries where the method of government runs its coach and four through all our ideals, for our ideals make us suspect in the eyes of leaders of their governments and we have to remove that suspicion in order to be really friendly.

Mr. Nehru has been doing it to the best of his ability. He has turned Nelson's blind eye on Russian colonies while condemning western colonialism almost every day. He has no doubt about the desire for peace in the hearts of the Communists who have the East European nations under their iron heels. He turned over Tibet to China to prove his hatred of colonialism—how clever of him it was—and used the Bandung Conference to the best of his ability to prove what a good man Chou En-lai was. (Not at all like those bad fellows who granted India independence despite the best efforts of Gandhi and Nehru to prevent its achievement by promoting Hindu-Muslim warfare.) Gandhi was so fanatically pro-Muslim during the Khilafat movement that Maulana Mohammad Ali thought he must be a Muslim at heart and the fear of losing his influence with the Hindus prevented him from embracing Islam. Likewise Nehru is so fanatically pro-Communist that many Communists as well as non-Communists think he must be a Communist at heart and the fear of losing his leadership prevents him from declaring himself a Communist.

POLICY OF FLATTERY

This (clever) policy of flattery of natural enemies, of befriending enemies of the country and antagonising natural allies, which resulted in the greatest holocaust of Indian history in 1947, has resulted now in warfare with China. Mr. Nehru himself is very susceptible to flattery, just as Gandhi was. He should have the sense to realise that every one is not so susceptible and even if the persons flattered are so susceptible, they are not absolute rulers of their lands

dictating their policies. He should have the sense to realise that flattery makes an intelligent man suspect that an attempt is being made to fool him and that the natural reaction of flattery in every honest and developed mind is one of contempt for the flatterer, not immediate, maybe, but surely on second thoughts which are more abiding, and that contempt is not exactly the attitude of mind that makes for respect for the flatterer. Is it any exaggeration to say that undeserved flattery is born of cowardice or cupidity and desire for unjust gain? If not, do either of these qualities make for respect, so necessary even for peace and goodwill among nations? Do they not ultimately tend to invite trouble — the kind of trouble Mr. Nehru is now lamenting?

But Mr. Nehru has made a bugbear of himself and no one in the Government can point out to him the flaws obvious in his policies and the sayings and actions resulting therefrom. Is it unfair to conclude that he has made a bugbear of himself because he does not want those obvious flaws pointed out to him? The questions anyway arise: Is he such a fool as not to realise the normal consequences of his actions? Or is there in him some over-powering urge which makes him intemperately brush aside all normal cogitation in respect of his foreign policy, all corollaries of his numerous declarations of faith? The answer to the first question is obviously in the negative. No fool could have risen to the place he has done. The answer to the second question is obviously in the affirmative, as it was in the case of his leader, Gandhi. That overpowering urge is international leadership, which made Gandhi ask, after suspending his most powerful movement in 1922 without rhyme or reason, "Who is remembered better, Jesus or Julius?"

We are now witnessing what that insensate urge is leading the country to, just as we witnessed in the forties what it led to in the mind of Mahatma Gandhi. Mr. Nehru is in many respects the truest disciple of the Mahatma. Those who do not understand this proposition, for lack of fasting or a loin cloth on his person, do not understand what has happened to the country and why, or what is happening to the country and why. The mills of God grind slow but they grind exceeding small, and none are so blind as those who will not see. Nonviolence or non-alignment, we want some silly phrase to follow to work our ruin. Blessed indeed is the man who invents the phrase and makes us cry his "Jai", for his is the kingdom and the glory—and Devil take the motherland!

—♦♦—

Kashmir

By. P. Kodanda Rao

THERE can be no two opinions that the sooner the Kashmir issue is amicably settled the better for India and Pakistan and the United Nations. The matter has been pending before the international body for over ten years and seems to be no nearer solution, in spite of several commissions and mediators. It may be relevant to recall the main contentions which led to the impasse with a view to suggesting a rational and honourable solution.

The main obstacle has been the action of the Security Council, under the leadership of Britain and America, in by-passing India's complaint made on Jan. 1, 1948, that Pakistan aided and abetted tribal raiders into Kashmir and was, therefore, guilty of aggression against India. Two weeks later Pakistan not only denied she had given aid to the tribal raiders, but made countercharges of aggression by India. The Security Council appointed the U.N. Commission for India and Pakistan, UNCIP for short, to investigate the facts and facilitate a plebiscite. It should be noted that, while both India and Pakistan made charges of aggression against each other, neither of them invited the United Nations to help organise a plebiscite! Mr. Tsiang, of China, recalled in the Security Council on Jan. 24, 1957 that the Security Council never gave any serious thought to the complaints. He said:

The members of the Council, without consultation, all came to the conclusion that the charges of aggression should be by-passed. That charge was never taken up, never shifted, never given serious consideration.

In justification thereof, he said, "I believe that it was very wise of the Council to by-pass that charge." A few weeks later, on Feb. 15, 1957, the British Delegate, Sir Pierson Dixon, recalled in the Security Council said:

"When the Council first considered this question in 1948, it preferred to look forward to a settlement of the problem."

It may be granted that it was wiser to seek a peaceful solution to the problem than investigate aggression. But that should have been done with the cordial consent of India. The Security Council might have made a friendly approach to India and persuaded her to let her complaint lapse. But its action in by-passing it unilaterally was extremely undiplomatic and betrayed a lofty contempt for India.

India has never withdrawn her complaint, though she was willing to discuss proposals for

a plebiscite which she had volunteered unilaterally to Kashmir and which she expected would soon be held, after the aggression was vacated and status quo restored. In 1950 Sir Owen Dixon, Chief Justice of Australia, who acted as U.N. Mediator, reported:

Upon a number of occasions in the course of the period beginning with the reference on Jan. 1, 1948 of the Kashmir dispute to the Security Council, India had advanced not only the contention, to which I referred, that Pakistan was an aggressor, but to the further contention that this should be declared. (Security Council, Feb. 18, 1957).

Mr. Gunner Jarring, who acted as Mediator in 1957, reported:

The Government of India, which had brought the case before the Security Council on January 1, 1948, felt aggrieved that the Council had so far not expressed itself on the question of what, in their view, was aggression committed by Pakistan on India. In their view, it was incumbent on the Council to express itself on this question and equally incumbent on Pakistan to vacate the aggression.

Mr. Jarring commented:

I explained to the Government of India that the Security Council had properly taken cognisance of their complaint, and that it was not for me to express myself on the question whether its resolutions on the matter had been adequate or not.

The only cognisance that the Security Council took of India's complaint was to by-pass it with contempt!

The Delegates of Britain and America who dominated the Security Council in this matter, disclosed even greater contempt for India. On Jan. 29, 1948, the British Delegate in the Security Council

openly acknowledged Pakistan's equality of status (with India in the Kashmir issue), and re-affirmed his belief that the tribesmen were entitled to consideration as a party to the Kashmir dispute. (Michael Brecher, *The Struggle for Kashmir*, 1953 Toronto, p. 79).

A week later, on Feb. 4, 1948, the American Delegate suggested that assurances of an impartial plebiscite should be given to the tribesmen in order to induce them to withdraw from

Kashmir as he was opposed to driving them out of Kashmir! (ibid, p. 79). To treat the raiders, who committed outrages on innocent people of Kashmir, on a level with India, was very little short of an outrage on the part of Britain and America.

Regarding India's charge of aggression by Pakistan Sir Owen Dixon said:

I took up the positions: first, that the Security Council had not made such a declaration; secondly, I had neither been commissioned to make nor had I made any judicial investigation of the issue; and thirdly, that, without going into the cause of reasons why it happened, which presumably formed part of history of the sub-continent, I was prepared to adopt the view that when the frontier of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was crossed, as I believe on 20 October 1947, by hostile elements, it was contrary to international law, and when, on May 1948, as I believe, units of the regular Pakistan forces moved into the territory of the State that too was inconsistent with international law. (Security Council, Feb. 18, 1957).

The UNCIP discovered that Pakistan had deliberately concealed the entry of her regular forces into Kashmir, and politely ordered her to withdraw them. She has them there still!

The Security Council by-passed this second act of aggression by Pakistan, notwithstanding the observations of the UNCIP and Sir Owen Dixon. Its attitude has been pronouncedly partial to Pakistan and hostile to India. There is no hope of a peaceful solution till this deadlock between India on the one hand, and the Security Council and Britain and America on the other, is resolved by the latter taking up a more impartial attitude. The least that the Security Council can do is to endorse the mild findings of its own Commissions and Mediators insofar as they held that Pakistan had done something contrary to international law, and then request India to be content with it and not press her charge for full investigation, which would only lead to greater bitterness and recriminations. The Security Council does not need the consent of India or Pakistan to endorse officially the findings of its Commissions and Mediators. If it does it and then appeals to India, the latter is very likely to be content and not press her charge any further. Indeed, India has already offered that, once aggression was vacated, she would promote a friendly solution in consultation with Pakistan. (Security Council, Jan. 24, 1957).

The next issue is the plebiscite. The Security Council was justified in promoting a ple-

biscite to solve the Kashmir dispute, if only because India had volunteered it at the time of the accession. It was then anticipated that it might be held almost immediately. But it could not be reached because aggression was not vacated. If accession of Kashmir to India was subject to confirmation by a plebiscite, the plebiscite itself was conditional on the vacation of aggression by Pakistan and the restoration of status quo ante. In any event, it is inopportune now, after this long delay. It should be avoided at all costs in the interests of the people of Kashmir, which should be the paramount consideration. Pakistan has made it clear that she would exploit to the full the Muslim religious sentiment. No plebiscite Administrator would be able to prevent communal clashes and the atrocities and abominations that were perpetrated in Baramula, Kashmir and in India and Pakistan during the partition. Sir Owen Dixon opined that an overall plebiscite would create serious problem of refugee migrations and, therefore, proposed that it should be confined to the Valley of Kashmir and that the rest of the State should be partitioned. Mr. Jarring said that a plebiscite might give rise to "grave problems" and added that the implementation of international agreements years after they were concluded became increasingly difficult as the circumstances tended to change. The Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, said in Karachi in November 1958 that there was some change of thinking about the plebiscite in Kashmir.

As Pakistan will not vacate her aggression voluntarily and as India will not and dare not expel her by force, the only peaceful solution at the present time is to confirm the present partition of Kashmir along the cease-fire line, which will not involve any uprooting of peoples settled on either side, and will thereby avoid the problem of migration of refugees under distressing conditions. This solution has the added advantage that neither India nor Pakistan can claim victory or suffer defeat, since neither will get all or lose all. It would be an honourable compromise. The fact that partition was suggested by Sir Owen Dixon should make it easy for the Security Council to endorse it and to appeal to both parties to accept it. India has already offered to accept it. Pakistan should be persuaded to do likewise.

Even better it is for India and Pakistan to by-pass the Security Council, and by direct negotiations agree on partition and let their charges of aggression against each other lapse and bring peace to the peoples of India and of Pakistan, and, more particularly, of Kashmir, and relieve the Security Council of a difficult problem which has baffled it for over ten years.

Some Reflections On National Integration

By A. Ranganathan

IN his Minute appended to the Report of the Official Language Commission, Dr. S. K. Chatterji, the eminent philologist, observed that "the thread of our common Indian culture which is a historic thing and which is expressed through Sanskrit, to hold the people of India together as the nation can be strengthened (and this as a matter of fact has been strengthened) by the liberalizing force of English thought and culture in the present age through the international language". Indeed those dignitaries who are periodically accustomed to utter dithyrambic exhortations on national and emotional integration might reflect on the geographical factors, the main currents of history and the cultural processes which have a direct bearing on the evolution of Indian unity.

The concept of Indian cultural unity is no recent phenomena: it has evolved out of a continuous geographical process. Since the dawn of civilization, the forces of history have brought about a harmony between the two foci of Indian culture—the Indo-Gangetic valley and the Cauvery region. This cultural harmony arising out of an Aryan-Dravidian synthesis was reinforced by adopting Sanskrit as the cultural language of India. One has only to go through a work like Kalidasa's 'Megha Dhoota' to realise that the concept of India is not only a geographical reality but also a cultural expression. Again it would be hardly possible to think of India in which no Mughal had ruled, no Taj Mahal had been built, or to which the great monument of Akbar's statesmanship or the treasures of Persian art and literature were wholly foreign. However, it must be understood that India was not a nation in the political sense of the term as we understand it today. But the history of Indian cultural endeavour is one of continuity and advance, synthesis and enrichment, expansion and assimilation. Music from the Saman chants to the songs of Tansen and Tyagraj, poetry from the Ramayana to Gitanjali, religious texts from the Upanishadas to Radhakrishnan's interpretations of them and international ethic from Ashoka's edicts to Ram Mohan Roy's Universal Humanism, reveal the continuity of the Indian cultural tradition. Again the epic grandeur of Angkore and the delicate beauty of Burobudur are the standing monuments of ancient Indian cultural achievement in Asia. However, during the eighteenth century, India was a mere geographical expression, a sub-continent of

fighting clans and chieftains, each trying to carve out a territory at another's expense, a process which was facilitated by the disintegration of the Mughal Empire. The construction of Railways and the introduction of Telegraphs which resulted in the administrative unification of the country, recovery of the lost pages of Indian history and adoption of English as a *lingua franca* of the educated classes in India led to the birth and growth of the Indian national consciousness. The need to retain English is a historical necessity and arises not because we have no language of our own, but because we have fourteen national languages? As Rajaji put it succinctly: "There cannot be a single national language for India. The time is passed for the achievement of such an object. We are too many centuries late for it".

There can be no doubt that the shadow of a deeper conflict arising out of political and cultural tensions overhangs the Indian horizon to-day. This problem can be tackled at different leaves—cultural, political and administrative. For example the emergence of the DMK and the recent phenomenon of 'separation' in text books as reflected in our schools, can be traced to a deeper linguistic conflict which has sparked off a needlessly unfortunate political controversy. This overworked rivalry between Sanskrit and Tamil which threatens to result in an ideological vivisection of the country springs from an imaginary racial complex. It is forgotten that there are really no Aryans or Dravidians although there are Aryan and Dravidian languages. However, this phenomenon of separatism is but an extreme form of regionalism and is a direct consequence of the linguistic redistribution of States. This Himalayan blunder of the Congress Party in redrawing the map of India on a linguistic basis has accentuated regional feelings and bitter provincial rivalries and revived historical jealousies and linguistic fanaticisms. While it is too late to redraw the map of India once more, it is possible that the creation of new All India Services such as the Indian Medical Service, the Indian Service of Engineers and the Indian Educational Service, the adoption of a firm and enlightened policy in regard to English as the official language of India without indulging in semantic quibbling on devious methods of fixing a time limit, and launching of a National River Project Policy may greatly retrieve the situation. The ancient Indian prayer symbolising the mingling of the

waters of the Ganges, Jumna, Godavary, Saraswati, Narmada, Sindhu and Cauvery would sound strange to the ears of our modern Chief Ministers engaged in bitter river water disputes. The late S. Srinivas Iyengar and Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Iyer have been suggesting the inter-linking of our rivers since the twenties. Indeed Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Iyer has stressed the immediate linking up of the Ganges with the Mahanadi, which would provide a long inland water-way from the industrial belt of Bihar to the South. And he also visualised the possibility of connecting the Ganges and the Brahma-Putra at a later date. He has observed that National River project policy linking the Ganges, the Mahanadi, the Godavari and the Krishna with the rivers of the South beginning from the Pennar and Palar and going down to the Cauvery and the Tamaraparini might today seem a fantastically grandiose idea, but the ideal is well worth striving for, even if the work is taken up by stages and degrees. As a result of this scheme (it is necessary that the distribution of river-water must be a central subject), the entire volume of water must be used for the benefit of the nation. This would put an end to the petty river-water controversies of neighbouring States that are being hotly debated by our Chief Ministers — a wonderful example of national integration indeed?

While reflecting on the vistas of National Integration, it is well to realise the importance of the English language. The English language has linked us with development in the various spheres of liberal arts, science and technology; it has also helped us to expand our intellectual horizon and opened the 'magic casements' of the mind. And it has not only contributed to a new freedom of thought and speech, but also resulted in a deliverance from traditional beliefs and conventions relating to the Ancient Indian Caste System. It has brought about a revaluation of India's cultural heritage in terms of world thought. President Radhakrishnan has observed in his 'Hinduism and the West' that the Western influence generated by the English language "has widened the horizon of the Indian mind, opened up fresh channels and given it a more universal direction".

If the blue-print for National River Project Policy is worked out carefully, it might result in a confluence of ancient rivers and cultural traditions, and modern concepts of National Integration and scientific progress. However, the adoption of Hindi at the Centre and the various regional languages in the States will lead us into a feudal backwater. And allround progress in the larger interests of the country can be sustained on a creative plane of under-

standing, only if we continue to use and spread English.

SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF ECONOMICS

Although all people are involved in the operation of economic laws, few understand them. The need for clear thinking and right perspective in this matter is great. The following points deserve careful study:

1. That two and two make four.
2. That two taken from two leaves nothing
3. That we cannot divide more than we produce
4. That when some get more than they produce, others get less.
5. That production, and production alone, is the source of all purchasing power.
6. That mass production requires mass customers.
7. That increasing the number of receipts for production to workers who have not correspondingly increased their productivity, increases selling prices and makes it harder for other workers to be their customers.
8. That because the customer is the ultimate employer, price rises which drive away customers are a direct cause of unemployment.
9. That when Government continues to spend more than it receives, it places an extra burden on present and future generations.
10. That such action is not only morally wrong but harmful to national security and prosperity.
11. That "Economic Growth" depends entirely upon more productivity which comes only through more and better tools.
12. That anything that slows or obstructs the production of more goods, such as artificially shortened working hours, inadequate depreciation allowances, tax laws that remove the incentive for production, or any practice by Labour, Industry or Government which opens the door to inflation, is detrimental to National Growth.
13. That Nature's economic laws are incontrovertible and their violations by well-intentioned do-gooders and self-seeking politicians are primarily responsible for rapid rate of moral degradation.

— American Economic Foundation

English As The Lingua Franca Of India

By Indira Awasty.

TO the foreigner it may seem an extraordinary phenomenon that so many Indians read and speak English with great ease and facility. I once asked an American what had impressed him most about India. He said, "Your monuments and the extraordinary command of the English language the Indians possess."

The first thing to be considered is: How did it come to pass that a country as deeply steeped in her ancient culture as India took to an alien language on a nation-wide scale? The British rulers of the country realised very early in their career in India that in order to govern efficiently and permanently, a vast but richly diverse country like India, they must first unify it. Therefore, they started on their schemes of connecting the remote parts of the country by railways, roads etc. The most vital measure that they took in this direction and that had the most far reaching consequences was the introduction of the English language as the medium of instruction in schools and colleges and also the adoption of English as the official language of the country. The course of India's history might have taken a different direction, had this epoch-making step not been then taken.

For India, it marked the introduction of a new era. At first, public reactions were of a mixed character. Suddenly the vernacular schools lost popularity and fell into disuse. The middle class people were not slow in meeting this challenge of the times. More and more of them learnt this new language as a fair knowledge of English was an absolute necessity for those aspiring to Government posts and offices. Ambition and power are the basic instincts of man. In order to satisfy these and to get on in the world, English was the language to be mastered. Soon all the educated people were writing and speaking English. In other words, the intelligentsia of the country at least, came to adopt English as the Lingua Franca.

But this created rift between the common man who could not speak English and the educated man who formed a habit of thinking and expressing himself off and on in a foreign language not understood by the former. The educated people tended to look down upon those who were not in possession of this key to a proper understanding of the ruling race, its humours, habits of thinking and ways of living.

On its positive side, English opened the flood-gates of the wonderful store of knowledge that

the West had accumulated. It could be safely asserted that India might not have achieved her independence, had it not been for the impact of the western ideas of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity on the Indian mind. Social conditions in India improved. Sati was made a crime. A widow re-marriage act was legislated. A law against child marriage was put into force. A mighty awakening of the people was, thus, brought about. The political movement for independence was very closely linked with the socio-religious movements for reform.

Now that India has won her independence, it is quite understandable that some leaders in the political world and the world of thought, feel that Hindi should be accorded its due place of honour and position. If Hindi does not have a very highly developed literature, they assert, it is not due to the poverty of the language itself. It is so, because the growth and development of expression in vernacular literature was neglected during the British rule in India. The Indians rightly feel that their national languages must be revived, given impetus for development and one of them recognised as the Lingua Franca of the country.

Another argument for the substitution of Hindi for English is that people can express themselves best in their mother-tongue. This argument will hold good only if it can be shown that Hindi is the mother-tongue of the majority of people in India.

With Hindi as the Lingua Franca, it is argued, the rift between the English-speaking Indians and those who do not speak it will no more exist and Hindi will be the unifying factor threading together the whole of India.

All the arguments put forth to supplant English with Hindi as the Lingua Franca and give it a secondary status are inspired by noble ideas. But if this were done suddenly, it would give rise to a host of difficult problems. The world's great achievements in science, medicine, art and literature are made known to us through the medium of English. Even if it were possible to translate into Hindi all this highly technical data, it would involve a tremendous waste of time and effort. While we would still be translating, other countries would be discovering, inventing and forging ahead. It is an undisputed fact, that our language of Science could be no other than English. If this fact be accepted, it must also be realised that in order to understand

the intricacies of science and literature a very high standard of the knowledge of English is required.— This standard cannot be attained by relegating its study to a secondary status.

As regards the problem of National Integration, whereas Hindi will have to try all over again to establish itself as a common link, English already serves the same purpose. If Hindi is introduced as the medium of instruction and as the language of the Government, it is bound to create disharmony and discord rather than unity. For the South Indians, Hindi is just as alien as English. In fact, as most of the educated people already know English, it would entail less labour and hardship on the people to use English in public affairs. It is rather a far-fetched idea that Hindi and the South Indian languages are closely related through Sanskrit which is a dead language understood only by a few scholars.

When the world is talking of an international brotherhood and about world citizenship, it will not behove India to foster a spirit of separateness by her linguistic fanaticism. It is undoubtedly the best thing for a country to have her own language as the Lingua Franca. But this cannot be made a hard and fast rule. Every country has to grow and develop according to its peculiar and particular circumstances. We are already far behind other progressive countries of the world. We ought not to pull ourselves further back and start developing from the stage where the British started when they came here. The British have, fortunately or unfortunately, left an indelible imprint on India by raising English to the high position of Lingua Franca in our country. We should accept this historical fact as realists and exploit its usefulness in our other progressive activities, which will enable our nation to catch up with the rest of the world.

A compromise ought to be effected between the two languages. While English should be kept on as the Lingua Franca for many years to come, Hindi should be given equal status with it. The new generation ought to be equally proficient in Hindi and in English in order to satisfy our national and international needs and requirements. But at no time in the future, must English lose its equal status with Hindi, because in a fast contracting world, English will be much more helpful than Hindi which is understood by a very small section of world-population.

By adopting this course, India will be once again, exhibiting her peculiar genius for assimilation, adaptability and accommodation. She

should not let go this golden opportunity of incorporating such an internationally popular and useful language like English into her family of national languages and making it a part and parcel of her cultural life and being.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY

By

Stephen Pearl Andrews

A profound book on sociology, consisting of two essays bearing the following titles: "The True Constitution of Government" and "Cost the Limit of Price". This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

Price Rs. 5.00

Mailed post paid by :

The Libertarian Publishers, Ltd.,
1st floor, Arya Bhavan,
Sandhurst Road West, Bombay-4.

ATTENTION !!!

GIFT OF THE MONTH

A New Subscriber To

"THE INDIAN LIBERTARIAN"

is entitled to receive from us a free copy of

'ECONOMICS IN ONE LESSON'

By HENRY HAZLITT

Write To:

The Manager,
The Indian Libertarian,
Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road, \\\nBOMBAY 4.

Nehru Has The Trumps But Will Not Play Them

(From our Correspondent)

The Sino-Indian border situation is getting worse and worse, thanks to the doctrinaire approach of the Nehru Government, which demands the re-iteration of the policy of non-alignment, which can only be considered an invitation to the Chinese to go on with their aggression. What it will cost India is becoming plainer with the passage of time, but none dare speak out against it for fear of displeasing the apostle of non-alignment. What makes one wonder is the silence of non-Congress leaders, who should know that the mere threat of seeking military aid made powerful China come to terms with strife-torn Burma and accept the Burmese portion of the MacMahon Line as the Sino-Burmese border. Indeed, the only reason for the patriotic U Nu's handing over the Government to General Ne Win was that the latter could utter the threat with greater force than his non-aligning self.

Those of our leaders who do not accept Mr. Nehru as their Messiah should know that Communist China, like Communist Russia, cannot afford to see any strengthening of the Western bloc by the addition thereto of Burma or India. India, being a much bigger country than Burma, can play the same card with much greater effect than Burma, but Mr. Nehru does not do so for reasons of prestige. That is the general opinion here among unbiased political thinkers. He has the trumps in his hands but will not play them in the interests of his country, to preserve his leadership of the non-aligned bloc. But it should not fail to strike him that his helplessness on the Sino-Indian border front will burn its own lesson into the minds of his non-aligned friends.

In international affairs every policy is judged by its results. The needless loss of Indian lives and mounting military expenditure, at the cost of plans for the welfare of the people, in a country whose leader claims to be an advocate of disarmament and peace, will hardly be a proof of the success of the policy of non-alignment. With what face can we Indians plead disarmament when our military expenditure goes on mounting every year? And with what face can we claim to be advocates of peace when we find ourselves at war every now and again, and unable to face another Bandung to proclaim our faith in Afro-Asian solidarity? Policies which bring about results directly contrary to professed aims are either hypocritical

or foolish and it is for us Indians now to decide to which class we are entitled to belong, if not to both.

According to the US Defence Department, India has formally indicated that it is interested in buying high altitude transport planes from the USA. If such a request is made by India, "the USA will be prepared to give it due consideration", the Defence Department said. The USA and India have for long had an agreement under which considerable military equipment has been sold to India. But, as the New York Times says, a possible hitch in India buying planes may come over the payment for them, since India has declined any military aid and payment for any military purchases from the USA has to be made in dollars, which India has said she cannot afford. The paper pointed out that India had paid in commodities for the equipment it recently bought from the Soviet Union. As for the MIGs deal, do our military and political leaders think that the Soviet Union will supply her latest models to India and her oldest to China? The fact that U2s are being brought down by the Chinese should be an alarming lesson to India. They are obviously being brought down with Russian missiles. But nothing can alarm those who do not think in terms of the country and Gandhians have always consistently refused to do so.

CORRUPT DELHI

Inaugurating the seventh Conference of State housing Ministers in New Delhi on October 18, the Prime Minister blamed the "stick-in-the-mud" approach adopted by officials and the States for the country's huge housing problem. While speaking of the short-sightedness of officials in building houses and failing to provide any of the usual amenities that go with them, he got so angry that he found it difficult to speak. But who is ultimately responsible for the shortsightedness of officials? The Ministers of his own Party, who are his own favourites. Almost all the evils the country is suffering from are due to the quality of men who are chosen as Ministers, not for their qualifications but for reasons which should really disqualify them for their jobs.

The situation, as he described it, is "scandalous," in this as in other spheres, for lack of thoughtful planning. To take another example

to which he referred in particular—the need to remove slums which, as he said, reduced humans to a subhuman level and called for concentrated efforts. The results of concentrated efforts are becoming visible in Delhi. Slums are destroyed and slum-dwellers given quarters in colonies. They soon enough sell these quarters to those who can afford to pay and with a very small fraction of the money they thus get they go and build their slums somewhere else, leaving in the bargain their creditors in a quandary. Slum clearance is a paying business for the poor. What is even more surprising is that they come to know the localities marked out for slum destruction and choose them for building their new slums in order to get new quarters to sell out again.

As for building houses, the Building Department of the Delhi Municipal Corporation refuses to sanction any application unless the palms of its officials are lavishly greased. Last year the Mayor stated publicly that a bribe of Rs. 500 was demanded from a High Court Judge for sanctioning his building application. Even applications for sanctioning the raising of boundary walls to the permitted height are kept pending indefinitely unless the departmental palms are greased. They are not rejected, but they are not sanctioned. In some cases the applicants pay the required amounts through well-known agents. In others they raise their walls to the permitted height without sanction and pay the required amounts when proceedings are started to demolish the same or impose fines. Unauthorised structures on spaces that should be kept open are common enough even on main roads. Those for which bribes are not given are demolished with the help of the police. Such discriminatory action is common all over Delhi. No wonder there have been reports in papers of building department officials living like lords. On an application to raise the height of the boundary wall to the permitted extent, "proof of the existence of the existing wall" was demanded. A declaration from a Councillor to the effect that the walls have been in existence since the quarter was built was not accepted and an affidavit was asked for privately and verbally. The same was furnished but months have passed and the application has yet to be sanctioned. Bylaws like these encourage corruption. Where is the need of sanction when the height has been laid down in the bylaws?

SECOND BANDUNG

With the thoughts of the first Bandung Conference, where Mr. Nehru practised his emotional integration with Chou En-lai, recurring almost every day owing to Chinese aggression and reminding our Prime Minister of the blunder he committed there, it is only natural

that opposition to the proposed second Bandung Conference should be hardening in New Delhi. Like his other quixotic schemes, Afro-Asian solidarity, on which the Bandung Conference was based, is now in the doldrums, and many conflicts, which could have been easily foreseen, have come to the surface too prominently to be ignored. Indonesians have themselves chosen to fall foul of India at the instigation of their Government, and India's participation in the preparatory committee, which Indonesia proposes to hold in the middle of December, is considered most unlikely.

It is indeed strange that a man who has been condemning regional loyalties at home should be sponsoring them on a continental basis. Honestly loyalty can only be ideological. Others loyalties can only be makeshifts. At the first Bandung Conference the Ceylon Premier, Sir John Kotewallah, made the most sensible contribution and I remember having read his speeches again five years later with much greater admiration for the robust commonsense he displayed in his utterances. One whose past performances make him look foolish can hardly be considered a wise man.

Book Review

THE REPUBLIC OF POMPAPUR

by Sudhakar Dikshit, Chetna Ltd.

Bombay 1962, Rs. 12/-

This book which reminds us of the vistas unveiled by that classic work on the Penguin Island, is the work of a very unconventional, well-informed and subtle mind. Mr. Sudhakar Dikshit, who modestly terms himself as the 'self-appointed chronicler' of the Republic of Pompapur gives us revealing glimpses of Pompapur ranging from the controversy on the national language and Pancha-shila (composed of peace, poise, piety, presumption and pontification) to the devious methods of Pompapur Films unlimited and the personality of the Pompapuri pharaoh. Mr. Dikshit correctly says that the republic of Pompapur is "perhaps the only country where mere balderdash passes for public spirit, habitual balyhoo for oratory and mean cunning for business acumen". How true! Mr. Dikshit's pen-portrait of the rotund Pompapuri politician and his comic encounter with the distinguished journalist Mr. Rockbottom D'Souza makes delightful reading. The piece on the National Language in which stalwarts like Sheshanag Ghotalachari, Pidi Tom-tonji and Kulapathi, Mummipathi Gurarji participate is rollingly humorous. 'Mathubhai can do it' gives a neat and brisk account of the machi-

nery of corruption in the administration of the Pompapuri Government. 'A Minister's Dog interviewed' is unsurpassed for its Swift-like sarcasm. However, the most amusing piece is on the 'Bridge to the Moon' which is a product of a new discipline in economics known as astro-economics which enables the Pompapuri Government to demand from the people astronomical sums of money, irrespective of their capacity to pay.

Dip into its pages anywhere you like, since Mr. Dikshit is consistently and uniformly interesting. While the book is enjoyable reading, it makes us sad too. In part the author's wit and sadness have never been set to greater advantage than in the end where he adopts Tagore's famous lines in the following manner:

"Where the mind is never without fear and the head never held high..... into that hell of slavery, that perdition of Pompapur."

It is a most valuable book. Indeed the weapon of ridicule is even more effective than direct criticism based on the factual analysis and interpretative comment. Mr. Dikshit is superbly sarcastic, but always straight-forward and never bitter. Mr. Lakshman's suggestive cartoons add to the value of this book. Those citizens of the Republic of India who read this book on "The Republic of Pompapur" would find it most interesting indeed!

— A. Ranganathan.

Gleanings from the Press

ADVICE, LIKE CHARITY, SHOULD BEGIN AT HOME

The Prime Minister's appeal to the people to be united and to back the Government's action in NEFA "with discipline and increased production" was well-meant but unnecessary. His appeal could more appropriately have been directed to his Government and to the Congress party, both of whom are at sixes and sevens at all levels. Mr. Nehru was right when he observed that "any struggle is not merely carried on in the front line." But when a sense of unity and discipline is conspicuous by its absence in the front line at New Delhi, the people might legitimately suggest that advice, like charity, should begin at home.

It was hoped that on the Prime Minister's return to India the Union Cabinet would be stabilised and settle down to positive work. This has not happened. In the Prime Minister's absence abroad differences on vital matters of economic policy erupted to the surface among his colleagues. Politically the only decisions taken such as in Kerala which pitchforked the P.S.P. Chief Minister, Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai, out of the Cabinet into a Governorship was so

cynical as to denigrate the offices of Chief Minister and Governor, and to expose the Government of India to criticism which was well deserved. Internationally nothing, it would seem, can move without the Prime Minister's presence in Delhi though the Defence Minister utilised Mr. Nehru's absence to pooh-pooh the seriousness of the Chinese thrust in NEFA. Unfortunately for Mr. Menon the Chinese themselves have confounded his misplaced optimism.

There is very little wrong with the people of India but a great deal wrong with its leaders. Let the Government therefore first put its own house in order before mounting a pedestal and preaching to the people.

— The Indian Express

News & Views

RED IDEOLOGY WAR REACHES NEW HIGH

NEW DELHI.

The Sino-Soviet cold war over ideologies has reached a new high affecting the functioning of the so-called international mass fronts sponsored by the Communist Bloc.

It is understood a recent preparatory meeting in Colombo for an Afro-Asian economic seminar—sponsored by the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee—was boycotted by the Soviet Union.

In order to avoid a showdown, the pro-Soviet Solidarity Committee of India is believed to have sought an indefinite postponement of the seminar.

The Chinese now appear to be preparing for an open fight.

JOINT DUTY OF INDIA, PAK ON KASHMIR WASHINGTON.

Senator John Sparkman, a senior member of the Foreign Relations Committee, has told the Senate that India and Pakistan have a joint "responsibility" to settle the Kashmir question.

He said in a speech, reported fully in the Congressional record, devoted to Indian-Pakistan relations: "India and Pakistan must remember that the size, the capacities and the objectives of their societies are moving them in the direction of greater growth and influence."

He said the U.S. position on the Kashmir question corresponded to its position on other international disputes—it was primarily interested in a peaceful settlement. India and Pakistan were by far the largest single recipients of American aid and their economies "are—or should be—complementary," he added.

KENYA BACKS NEHRU

"RIGHT & FAIR TO OUST CHINESE" NAIROBI.

India's decision to throw out by force Chinese troops infiltrating her north-east frontier has

been supported in the press and by politicians here. The situation is regarded as a grave international crisis.

Mr. Masinde Muliro, Kenya's Commerce and Industry Minister and vice-president of the Kenya African Democratic Union, said today: "I don't think India, mighty nation as she is could just sit down and watch part of her territory being taken away by the Chinese just because she had committed herself to neutralism. It is only right and fair to India to take every positive measure to rid her territory of the Communist aggressors."

"Her decision proves the policy of neutralism works up to a given degree and beyond it one is forced to depart from it."

ANTI-E.C.M. ARGUMENTS REFUTED BY BRITISH LABOUR LEADER

Mr. Woodrow Wyatt, a leading member of the British Labour Party, outlined the reasons why he believes Britain's entry into the European Common Market would be beneficial not only to his country but also to India.

In an interview in Bombay the British leader, who last visited India 16 years ago described as "rubbish" the assertion that to be associated with E.C.M. would mean a neo-colonial status for Commonwealth countries in Asia and Africa.

Pointing out that the United States, which ceased to be a colony in the eighteenth century, exports vast quantities of wheat, tobacco and other agricultural products to Britain, the Labour Member of Parliament posed the question if it meant that the United States, the world's most highly industrialised nation, had a neo-colonial status. This was in reference to the allegation that E.C.M. aimed at keeping the newly independent lands of Asia and Africa mere suppliers of agricultural products and raw materials for European industries.

The Common Market with Britain included "will open up for India a kind of new market huge and rich, compared with Britain with its less than 50 million population," he emphasised. The disadvantages of Britain joining E.C.M. "will be temporary so far as India is concerned," he added.

Britain's "stagnant economy" will receive a big jolt that will push it forward to its next stage of development, he said.

CREATE SEPARATE HIMALAYAN ARMY N. G. RANGA'S CALL

LUCKNOW:

Prof. N. G. Ranga, president of the Swatantra Party, suggested the creation of a sepa-

rate Himalayan army to meet the Chinese offensive. People from NEFA, Ladakh, Bhutan and Nepal might be welcomed to join it on specially-attractive salaries, allowances and pensions.

Prof. Ranga, who was addressing a press conference, said that the basis of recruitment should be changed to attract the Himalayan people. They should feel that they were fighting for the protection and progress of their country.

The Himalayan people were the best fitted to operate on those heights where the Chinese had to be fought.

"More than anything else, a change in the leadership of our defence forces and external affairs is urgently called for, if confidence is to be created in our country and among our neighbours."—P.T.I.

MALAYAN DELEGATE CONDEMNS NEW COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM UN ASSEMBLY URGED TO TAKE STRONG LINE

The violation of human rights in Tibet and Hungary by the new Communist imperialism is a danger to small States which should concern the United Nations, said the Federation of Malaya's chief delegate, Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Rahman, in the UN General Assembly. He urged the Assembly to take as strong a line on this neo-imperialism as on any other colonial question.

Dr. Ismail said that while the progress in "decolonization" had brought the world nearer its objective, there were forms of human oppression which called for equally grave attention by the United Nations.

Tibet was but one example of a new form of imperialism which was endangering the existence and integrity of small nations. The people of Tibet continued to labour under the cruel domination of the People's Republic of China. The same danger was now evident in South Viet-Nam, where outside forces were conducting subversive activities and even open aggression in some provinces.

BARE INCREASE IN NATIONAL INCOME

NEW DELHI.

National income in the first year of the Third Plan has shown an increase of 2.2 per cent.

The Plan framers had assured a rise of six per cent a year.

Less output of food grains (78.6 million tons against 80 million tons) and smaller increase under mining and factory establishments are said to have resulted in such a poor performance.

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 : **LOTEWALA**