

Indian Libertarian

Price 25 Naye Paise

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

WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY
AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

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

Vol. X No. 11

IN THIS ISSUE

September 1, 1962

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL ...	1	Second Front For India's Disarmament by P. Kodanda Rao	9
The Public Sector And Economic Freedom by M. A. Venkata Rao	4	DELHI LETTER ..	12
Noose Round India by M. N. Tholal ..	6	Book Review ..	13
		Gleanings from the Press ..	14
		News & Views ..	14

EDITORIAL

NATIONAL LANGUAGE OR PROGRESSIVE LANGUAGE?

IN our last issue we raised the question: 'Self-Government or Good Government?', in the context of the experiences, good and bad, our countrymen have had, of Self-Government for well over 15 years. We contended that under certain circumstances, especially where people are not enlightened enough to promote their own welfare by governing themselves, even a 'Good Government' run by foreign but competent administrators might prove to be more beneficial to the common man than premature 'Self-Government'.

The same reasoning could be applied with equal force to the much debated question: Hindi or English as the Lingua Franca of India. In the heat of passion, some hard facts about Hindi language and its speakers are apt to be passed over, particularly by the Hindi zealots. The first thing to be remembered is that Hindi is at best a regional language mainly prevalent in U. P., M. P., Bihar and Rajasthan. Secondly, it is spoken by only 40% of India's population. Thirdly, out of this 40% only 4% are literate knowing how to read and write the language.

These facts are cited by non-Hindi speaking persons in support of their contention that the imposition on them of Hindi as the Lingua Franca of India would not only amount to a cruel coercion of the majority of the Indian population but also would set back the clock of progress they have been steadily making in scientific and cultural fields through the knowledge of English which, to all Indians Hindi-speaking or otherwise, has served as the gateway to scientific knowledge and modern culture permeated with the spirit of liberal-democratic ideas. Hindi, they say, could never stand any comparison with English language in this respect. They even go further and claim that Hindi could not even compete with the more developed regional languages of India such as Bengali, Tamil, Marathi and Gujarati.

As for English, it could be said without any fear of contradiction that it is, in a real sense, a window to the outside world in political and cultural matters, trade and commerce. With the world fast shrinking in distance, space and even time in this Atomic age, a fair knowledge of English which today occupies such a preeminent position as the vehicle of international communication, is quite essential even for an average educated man, not to speak of technicians and

scientists who are much in demand in an industrially developing country like India.

It is, therefore, feared not without good reason that if Hindi, so illequipped for meeting these requirements of the modern age, should replace English, it would take the country back to the middle ages with its narrow and parochial outlook and ideas. It is also apprehended that under a Hindi-dominated Indian administrative system, our National Unity so laboriously built up under the liberalising influence of English language and its literature, will be the first casualty and it will quickly become a thing of the past. A broad humanitarian culture which is on the order of the day among all civilised and democratic countries of the world, will have the least chance of taking deep roots in the uncongenial soil of India, if and when she comes to adopt Hindi as the national language.

For all these foregoing reasons, all the enlightened sections of Indian public opinion are agreed that English should continue as hitherto, to be the only Lingua Franca of India and Hindi should be treated as no better than any other regional language, to be fostered and encouraged only in limited spheres of local administration and lower levels of education. They also urge suitable amendments of the Indian constitution in this direction.

This simple and straightforward solution of the problem of a national language for India

The Indian Libertarian

Independent Journal Of Free Economy and Public Affairs

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

Published On the 1st and 15th Of Each Month

Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Subscription Rates:

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

ADVERTISEMENTS RATES

Full Page Rs. 100; Half Page Rs. 50; Quarter Page Rs. 25
One-eighth Page Rs. 15; One full column of a Page Rs. 50

BACK COVER..... Rs. 150
SECOND COVER.....Rs. 125
THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125

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

Write to the Manager for Sample Copy and gifts to new Subscribers.

Arya Bhawan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

apart, it may also be pointed out that the very further progress and development of the Indian regional languages demand a sound knowledge of English language and literature. To say that English has smothered our Indian language is a blatant lie invented by selfseeking politicians. Eminent linguists and literateurs have bestowed unstinted praise on English language for its pioneering work of infusing into the dry bones of our regional languages, fresh vigour and life in the form of inspiring and ennobling thoughts and ideas and enriching them with new literary forms and patterns. It is only the Gandhian fanatics like Kaka Kalelkar and Dr. Rajendra Prasad and some Janasangha leaders who in their blind hatred for everything English, have lost sight of the progressive role English language of Shakespeare, Milton, Bacon, Burke and Bright, Mill and Spencer, has played in moulding the political and cultural life of our country. It would have been indeed a surprise if the Gandhian ante-diluvians and Janasangha reactionaries had not come together and joined hands in this nefarious game of English-baiting, in the name of a cent percent national language which exists only in their idle musings and fanciful dreams.

It is therefore heartening to see Prime Minister Nehru at last coming out under the democratic pressure of public opinion, with his fullest support to the Bill proposed to be introduced in the Parliament, seeking to declare English an Associate Official Language with Hindi for an indefinite period. The Bill is designed to meet half way the claims of both English and Hindi and allay the fears among the non-Hindi speaking people that they might be reduced to a sort of inferior citizenship in an India with Hindi as her Official Language.

The modernism of Mr. Nehru seems to have at last triumphed over the reactionary forces in the midst of which unfortunately he has to work and function. All progressive forces in India stand stolidly by him in this bold move he has initiated, though with his accustomed faltering steps. As Dr. Sunitikumar Chatterjee the greatest living linguist of India has rightly pointed out, 'It is not a question of English vs. all the languages of India. All the languages are prospering and are having a square deal with English as the Neutral All India Language.' It has also got to be remembered that English, besides being an international language, has now assumed the character of a full-fledged Indian language. So if it comes to a choosing between progressive English and retrogressive Hindi, India will certainly opt out for English which, she knows, will alone enable her to evolve into a United Nation and also to catch up with the progressive countries of the world in scientific progress and cultural advancement.

C.P.I.'s SCHIZOPHRENIA

The C.P.I. National Council has passed a resolution supporting Mr. Nehru's policy of 'peaceful negotiated settlement' of India-China border dispute and welcoming the proposal of the Chinese Government to negotiate on the basis of the two reports submitted by the two teams of India and China respectively. By another resolution the Council has avowed its firm loyalty—which of course was never doubted by the non-communists in India—to international communism as expounded by Mr. Khrushchev. Reading between the lines of the resolutions all put together, one cannot but conclude that the Indian Communist Party is suffering from Schizophrenia and cannot yet make up its mind one way or the other on the most burning question of China's aggression. How there could be 'peaceful settlement' of this border dispute on the basis of the two reports of India and China when they have nothing in common to facilitate such an amicable settlement, only Communist Dialectics can explain. To our mind, China's desire to negotiate on the basis of these two conflicting reports, coupled with the announcement made by the Chinese Foreign Minister that the conflict between India and China would be only a local affair, indicates only China's dogged determination to pursue her aggressive designs against India, till the weak and vacillating Nehru Government, out of sheer exhaustion and weariness comes to a so called 'peaceful settlement' which is acceptable only to China. The Council's resolution, it may be noted, commits the party to tow the line of Khrushchev, but carefully evades any reference to the war-like activities of China on Ladakh front. In the case of a full-scale war breaking out between India and China despite the best efforts of Mr. Nehru to 'bring' about a negotiated settlement, what guarantee is there that Mr. Khrushchev will not change his line and go out all in support of Communist China against Bourgeois Democratic India and that C.P.I. as a faithful stooge of Khrushchev, will not follow in his foot-steps and sabotage India's war efforts against China from within?

MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE BOUNDARY MUDDLE

Clarity of thought and vision is conspicuously absent in the muddled politics of the Congress. The Congress Governments are firmly entrenched in power in both Maharashtra and Mysore States. But it is a disgrace that they have not yet been able to find common ground in this matter, though what is known as Pataskar formula which worked so successfully in the case of Madras-Andhra Border Dispute is readily available. The Formula takes the village as the basic unit and lays down that bare majority of the population speaking any one of the bor-

der languages and geographical contiguity to the adjoining regions, be accepted as the main criterion to determine where a particular village belongs. These principles have been accepted by the Maharashtra State not only for recovering Marathi areas from Mysore but also for restoring to Mysore any Kannad areas that might have been wrongly included in the Maharashtra State.

This stalemate should no longer be allowed to continue by the Central Government. It should straightway proceed to settle the dispute on the basis of the Pataskar formula and the express wishes of the border people in the absence of any better democratic method of deciding the issue.

HERE AND THERE

Mr. Krishna Menon, our Defence Minister while declaring open the New Army Medical College at Poona truly repeated the thoughts of the Congress leadership of the country when he said, 'An instructor talks about things he knows, while the Minister works on the things he does not know'. He added that the Minister uses his commonsense more than the knowledge of the expert in taking his final decisions. Now we know why Indians who have acquired abroad expert knowledge in different subjects refuse to come back to India and why, even when they manage to get some employment under the Congress Government they get disgusted in no time and even go to the extent of committing suicide.

It is reported that the Poona Congress leaders have decided to bring 'clean young blood' and to eliminate many veterans from the Poona Municipal Congress Party. Thus we have now three classes of Congressmen in our country, viz. (1) those who have 'clean young blood' (2) those Veterans who have 'impure old blood'; (3) the top leaders of the High Command who, though old and fossilised have discovered for their private and exclusive use the 'Life-Elixir' to keep their blood eternally 'pure and clean'.

Bhikshu Gyopsu Sato, leader of the four-man Japanese team of peace-marchers has appealed to India to take the lead in preserving the peace of the world by implementing the suggestion of Dr. Rajendra Prasad for India's Unilateral Disarmament. We have no doubt that India given to Facadism under Nehru and Prasad will feel highly flattered by this tribute. The Bhikshu must have been inspired to make this appeal to India, though not to his Buddhistic country, Japan, by Nehru's policy of 'Unilateral Disengagement' on the Ladakh front, however eager the Chinese troops might be to engage Indian troops.

The Public Sector And Economic Freedom

M. A. Venkata Rao

THE sentence of doom has been passed on the private sector of the Indian economy which is the sphere of economic freedom in the philosophy and blue-print of development announced in the Five Year Plans. They give effect in grim earnest to the provisions of the two Declarations of Industrial Policy proclaimed in 1948 and 1956, which demarcate the economic realm into three sections — that of the public sector which pre-empt certain lines of industry, that of a middle or mixed sector in which public and private sectors co-exist for a time and the third sphere in which private business will be allowed to operate but within the limit and conditions prescribed by the overall plans of the Government as embodied in the successive five year plans.

The second and third Plans make it clear beyond the shadow of any doubt that the public sector is intended to expand continuously in pursuance of State policy as consisting in the transformation of Indian society into that of a colonialist pattern.

As Von Mises has been the most clear sighted of the students of this philosophy, he has clarified the position that the common differentia that distinguishes all forms of socialism and communism (whether evolutionary and democratic in faith and intent or revolutionary and dictatorial in conviction and programme) is the assumption of full economic power by the State.

That means that the essence of socialism and communism, methods apart, is declared to lie in the transfer of all means of production from private citizen to the State or Government. The State becomes then the sole trader, producer, financier, transporter, distributor, employer-paymaster — in fact the sole determiner of the economic destiny of every single person in society under the political jurisdiction and power of the State.

This has been openly announced to be the goal of policy in the five year plans and in policy statements by the Prime Minister and the other authorities in the country.

This socialism understood in this sense of a totalitarian economic Leviathan is motivated by the Marxist theory that only in this way freedom can be assured to the worker and the citizen in all walks of life — those of the proletariat and of the communist party elite and cadre which are the only two walks left to people in a socialist society.

The socialist (Marxist) criticism of the bourgeois political freedom won by the French Re-

volution in 1789 and subsequently was that it was insufficient. It was urged that political freedom was no real freedom — being the freedom only to starve since the reality of economic power still lay in the hands of the capitalist class that owned and managed the means of production and so held the workers in their absolute power and mercy.

So Marx started his Working Men's International Communist Movement to win economic freedom for the working classes. Such freedom could come, Marx held and explained in mighty tonnes of economic theory and many trenchant pamphlets, (aided by his friend Engels,) only by the liquidation of the owning classes and the enthronement of the proletariat in their place as the holders of social and political sovereignty!

This theory was swallowed wholesale except for violence by the gentle and humanitarian Fabians of England led by Sydney and Beatrice Webb, Bernard Shaw, H.G. Wells and a host of others. In time it was accepted as the official policy of the British Labour Party which achieved power in 1945 after the war of 1939-45 (46).

It has been the misfortune of India that this well-intentioned but unwise philosophy and programme have been accepted by its Prime Minister Pandit Nehru and are making the country a prey to subversive forces in and through unwise doctrines and programmes.

It is the clear and manifest duty of libertarians (and intellectuals in general) to examine the congeries of borrowed theories and dogmas that are responsible for all the misery unnecessarily flowing from our much-needed development. The series of demonstrations and protests against high taxes and high prices that have been staged in the State capitals last month, (resulting sometimes in disorder and violence and the arrest of leading members of political parties and of Parliament) is a clear indication that the Plans are going awry and need radical re-thinking.

Lovers of freedom, particularly economic freedom like Libertarians should take a leading part in providing alternative ideas making economic freedom really possible and beneficial.

In the first place, it must be pointed out that the phrase: economic freedom: is susceptible of two radically different meanings.

The legitimate meaning is the liberty that private citizens have in an economic and social system to employ their own wealth and property at their own risk to produce and market goods and services in competition with others. This

is the real meaning of freedom in the economic sense. For it assures free action both to men of means and to consumers of all levels to choose goods and services unhindered in the market and so determine prices and future lines of production in quality and quantity.

But since in the early phase of the industrial revolution when Marx wrote there was some unemployment and under-employment and low wages prevailed, Marx thought that the whole system was irremediably wrong. So to obtain freedom to the worker, Marx jumped to the conclusion hastily that the employing class should be liquidated and that all economic means and activities should be concentrated in the hands of the new state formed out of the communist party. It was to exercise a monolithic dictatorship in order to prevent the possible resurgence of the capitalist class! The Communist should therefore sit for all time uneasily on a volcano — hence its violence and amorality.

This remedy and definition of economic freedom was wrong.

The real meaning of economic freedom on the contrary ensues from a free market economy where individuals and voluntary groups in partnerships, cooperatives and joint stock companies engage in the production, distribution, exchange and transport of goods in fair competition with each other for profit. But they can, under a fair system of law and regulation, gain such profit only by satisfying consumers with the goods they put on the market. Herein private and public good are harmonised.

To provide fair conditions of competition, law will prevent adulteration and fraud and deception in contracts. Labour will be free to bargain collectively for betterment. The government will provide or assist the provision of education, general and technical and of public health arrangements.

Private persons will provide for their own future security through insurance and the State will help in hard cases of disability, unemployment and sickness.

Institutions will rise to help thrifty and competent enterprisers to start and run new businesses. Thus a property-owning democracy will emerge in due course.

Property in the basis of freedom. To ensure freedom, property-less workers should be helped to cultivate the banking and insurance habit. They may be given loans to acquire shares in sound concerns and peasants to own land or extend their holdings.

Modern welfare States like Britain and the Scandinavian nations are passing beyond healthy limits in their provision of social security

and welfare benefits. They have passed from the principle of helping the casualties of progress with minimum levels of income and facilities to prevent starvation. They have adopted the wrong principle of re-distributing the incomes of well-to-do classes in the name of equality. Equality is fast pursued to the detriment of individual desert and responsibility and contribution to production.

Welfare is approaching a proportion of 25 per cent of national income in certain cases. As Colin Clark notes, this high percentage is dampening incentive in the capable groups and is leading to capital consumption.

High taxation being insufficient to meet the ever-growing demands of welfare provision, governments have taken to continuous inflation. The result has been a continual rise in price levels from 1945 in Britain and other European countries as well as to some extent in America.

High prices have led to trade union pressure for higher wages.

Mr. Graham Hutton in his remarkable study of post-war inflation called *Inflation and Society* has pointed out that in the course of a few years after 1945, three-quarters of the working population of Britain were enabled to rise to middle class standards of living of around £1000 per annum in real terms, while the remaining third lost heavily with the results that savings and new investment receded in rate of expansion. Britain lagged behind continental countries including the defeated nation: Germany in rate of growth.

Britain lost heavily also in economic freedom in pursuance of the socialist economy started by the Labour Party in power.

Incentives declined all round and much wealth that would normally have gone into new investment-capital was diverted to current consumption particularly of the classes benefiting from welfare policies.

The culmination of this policy of concentration of economic power in the hands of the central government will be the reduction of citizens to the status of wards of the State without initiative and self-respect, doing what they are told in return for security. Their condition will come to approximate that of Red Indians in their reserves in the USA—dispirited and helpless receivers of aid! Indeed it will not be much different from that of prisoners in jail who have all their wants taken care of by authority (including health)!

Freedom to pursue one's own livelihood in accordance with one's own gifts, inclinations and acquired qualifications, and freedom to employ oneself are an irreducible part of personal

(Continued on page 6)

Noose Round India

By M. N. Tholal

IN reply to the debate on Ladakh on August 14 in the Lok Sabha the Prime Minister castigated the Opposition for saying things which he variously described as "childish," "infantile," "ignorant," and "not very coherent" and "irrelevant," following the maxim that attack is the best form of defence. Mr. Nehru is past master in the art of exploiting the inferiority complex of people and, having regard to the fact that it is a common attribute of human beings, he succeeds admirably. He reserved his strongest condemnation for those who thought that India should "run to take shelter under the wing of some other country to seek protection against the Chinese". This he described as "dishonourable". The wisest of suggestions can be exaggerated to look ridiculous and dishonourable, but there was a time when Mr. Nehru himself used to extol the virtue of inter-dependence. He has ceased doing so now because it does not fit in with his policy of non-alignment. In condemning NATO and SEATO he is really condemning interdependence and hanging together against the Communist menace. And, if interdependence is dishonourable, most of the countries in the world in both the blocs are pursuing a dishonourable course. But of course it is nothing of the kind, while the unresisted annexation of thousands of square miles of a country's territory by a neighbouring power is humiliating in the extreme. Can it be seriously suggested by any one that what is humiliating is not dishonourable?

(Continued from page 5)

freedom. And for the consumer as well, freedom to choose his goods in a competitive market is inalienable and is part of the meaning of economic freedom.

Such freedoms are denied in socialism and communism on account of the economic supremacy of the public sector in their system. This condition is inseparable from intolerable distortions in the price pattern of necessary goods—like the three hundred roubles in Russia for a pair of pants and three hundred roubles for a pair of shoes and fifteen roubles for a lunch in a hotel. And add the indifference to house accommodation in Russia with its intolerable repercussions on domestic felicity and we can realise the havoc that Statism which is the culmination of our Five Year Plans will necessarily entail in our life!

CONSEQUENCE OF NON-ALIGNMENT

Mr. Nehru made the point repeatedly that the basic reason why his policy towards China was criticised by some was that they were opposed to the policy of non-alignment. That does not appear to be a fact. But, even if it is so, is our policy of non-alignment a part of our religion and something which cannot be given up even to safeguard the integrity of the country? Is it inherent in the Constitution of India? Our Constitution is democratic. It expects us to be true democrats, and it is part of the duty of a true democrat to promote the cause of democracy. By implication, therefore, our Constitution, which Mr. Nehru has sworn to uphold, demands our alignment with democracies elsewhere. And Mr. Nehru's Government has been doing just the opposite of what the Constitution of the country demands.

Can it be doubted by any one that the trouble with China is the direct consequence of our policy of non-alignment and of our forsaking the cause of democracy in Tibet? There is our neighbour, Pakistan, some of whose occupied territory is claimed by China. But has the latter annexed a square inch of that territory? why not? Because Pakistan is aligned with Powers of whom China is afraid. This is a fact obvious to everybody. Referring to the critics who condemn his policy towards China he said they wanted the cold war to come to India. But what is it if it is not something worse than cold war that is in existence now between India and China? Firing has started from both sides. China is being referred to as the "enemy" even by the Prime Minister. To whom else can the word "enemy" used by him refer when he said, while replying to the debate on Ladakh, that it is exceedingly important "not to allow the enemy to have control of the air"? It has been cold war for years with China. It is something worse than cold war now.

When Mr. Nehru says, "I do not think we shall maintain our independence for long if we go about seeking military aid from others to defend ourselves," he is only adroitly exploiting the fears of a long subjected race still being fed on the aggressive nature of self-liquidating imperialisms. Such a suggestion would be laughed at in independent countries like France and Britain. As I have been pointing out in these columns, the sudden departure from office of the two greatest American "stooges", Syngman Rhee and President Mirza, was proof positive of the disinterestedness, to all intents and pur-

poses, of the American policy-makers. It is no use saying that they would have liked them to stay. Probably everyone has his preferences, but every-one does not, like the Soviet Government, thrust his men on other countries to rule over them. It must be conceded, however, that Mr. Nehru has Indian traditions on his side. Rulers in India have always considered it dishonourable to seek the aid even of fellow rulers in the country to repel foreign aggression.

OBVIOUS REASONS DIFFICULT TO FIND

It is a question of interdependence and not of dependence. Great powers, like Britain and France, depend on the United States today for their security against the Communist menace. Do they not add to the strength of the USA? Does not even Pakistan add to the strength of the Western Powers? It is all a question of putting first things first in the country's interest. Non-violence is the mightiest of all weapons, said Mahatma Gandhi, whereas the fact is and was that a truly violent man is mightier than a truly nonviolent crowd of thousands because he can finish them one by one. Jinnah used to say truly enough, "We can give four hundred times more trouble". Why does not Gandhi's disciple, Nehru, advance the proposition that non-alignment is mightier than all alignments put together, adding, like the Mahatma, that in the end it will win even if it takes a thousand or a million years and we are subjugated in the process a hundred times? What is dishonourable in subjection if the means we employ are pure? Surely purity of the means is bound to win in the end. The fact of the matter is that there is no question of the means being pure when the end itself, self-glorification, is putrid, as it has been since 1920 in India.

Mr. Nehru said the reasons for the Chinese attitude were rather difficult to find out. Look at his naivete. Every body who saw him—Americans, Englishmen, reporters—asked him why China had taken this step against India, losing India's friendship in the hope of getting some bare mountains. Mr. Nehru said he had no answer to give them. But immediately after saying so he gave the answer in the Lok Sabha: "I can guess various things happening in Tibet, their own policy of spreading themselves out of and their imagining that, according to their maps, this is ours and let us, now that we are strong, bully others into submission." The Americans and the Englishmen and the reporters who wondered why, let us hope, were duds and were not talking with their tongues in their cheeks, and were ignorant of the fact that, even after China began occupying our territory, we went on pleading her cause in the United Nations. Mr. Nehru does not sense anything dishonourable in that. If Mr. Nehru were a true Christian, which he is not, believing in the say-

ing of Jesus, "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you," he should be translating the saying on the personal plane first and not playing ducks and drakes with the country's fortunes.

"It is extraordinary to me, the more I think of it, to realise how and why the Chinese have acted in this way," he said, adding, "It is no small matter that they should lose the goodwill of India." Loss of our goodwill for a piece of land where grows not a blade of grass? Tut, tut, Mr. Nehru; How can they lose the goodwill of India unless they lose that of a generous soul like you, who can always charm the Opposition into submission by uttering a few meaningless altitudinarian platitudes? (The Opposition withdrew all the amendments after hearing Mr. Nehru's reply which is the subject of this article.)

"Bully others into submission." In these four words quoted above the Prime Minister himself summed up China's policy, which is also Soviet Russia's policy. There is nothing new in it. "The way to Europe," said Lenin, "lies through Peking and Calcutta". Our Prime Minister, if he wants to understand international affairs, would be well-advised to have this saying of Lenin printed in bold letters and placed right in front of him on his table. For, his lapses of memory are as proverbial as those of his Master Gandhi, and Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad has stated in his "India Wins Freedom" that it was because he forgot one of the most important Congress commitments that Pakistan was born. If he follows my advice—and even his father used to seek it—he will understand the reasons for the Chinese attitude which seem to him so extraordinary and so difficult to find out. The Communist philosophy of life, he used to say, a quarter of a century ago, gave him comfort and hope. He is now face to face with the practices flowing directly from that philosophy, and there is neither hope in them nor comfort of any sort for Mr. Nehru or for his countrymen.

Mr. Nehru referred to the lunch he gave to the retiring Chinese Ambassador to India and said that some people had said that this should not have been done, adding, "This is an advice I am never going to follow so long as I am in authority." He also referred to the criticism made of the Defence Minister's clinking of glasses with the Chinese Foreign Minister in Geneva, saying it was his absolute duty as he (Mr. Nehru) had "told him that he must talk to him." The Prime Minister also said that the stand taken by some Opposition Members that there should be no talks with the Chinese unless the aggression against Indian territory was vacated, was "childish and displayed an infantile mind". In all these matters what counts is

the effect of the procedure in the circumstances prevailing. It may ordinarily be all right by itself and quite wrong under the circumstances. Obviously no hard and fast rule can be laid down to govern it. Does Mr. Nehru seriously mean to suggest that what is ordinarily all right should be done even under, to use his favourite word, "extra-ordinary" circumstances? Can anything be more infantile than that? Does he mean to imply that the lunches and dinners and the clinking of glasses should continue even if their effect on the "enemy" is to encourage him in his aggression? There has been enough of flattery in all conscience. It has been going on since the aggression began soon after the signing of the Panch Shila Agreement with Chou En-lai which, to use Mr. Nehru's words, was his "challenge to the world". At the Bandung Conference Mr. Nehru was, according to newspaper reports, angrier than Chou En-lai at references to Communist aggression and Communist imperialism. Turning over old files of a Delhi daily I came across the following headlines on a Bandung despatch:

**CHOU EN-LAI SMILES HIS WAY THROUGH
GREAT SUCCESS FOR CHINA:
NEHRU HAPPY**

That was a year after the signing of Panch Shila and some months after the Chinese aggression began. We all know Mr. Nehru's efforts to have China seated in the United Nations, admirable in themselves but humiliating—there is no other word for it—and therefore dishonourable for India. And much more than the humiliation and the dishonour involved in it, the adverse effect on the Chinese mind that all these things are bound to produce after that tell-tale declaration about the occupied land, "there grows not a blade of grass". Another heading from the old files:

NEHRU HOPES CHOU WILL TALK

In all these actions, it will be said, the intentions and motives were patriotic, in ignorance of the famous dictum that there is no generosity in politics. All these fundamentally right things are being said and done regardless of their effect or of their result. Is it a literal pursuit of the teaching of the Gita, a copy of which was recently presented to the American President on behalf of our Prime Minister with particular reference to the passage which preached right conduct regardless of results? We all know what the Gita really stands for.

Let us have a look at the result, the latest result, long after the declaration, "We will not concede another inch of Indian soil". "Though the Chinese might have advanced a mile or two in Ladakh broadly speaking" said Mr. Nehru (when he should have been speaking squarely, i.e., in terms of square miles, because a mile or two gives no idea of the extent of the loss of

territory), "we have held them in check there." He added, "We have succeeded in the first-step in preventing any kind of advance by the Chinese." An advance of a mile or two is no advance of any kind, according to our Prime Minister.

NOOSE ROUND INDIA

"Everything should be done to avoid war," as he said, "because the consequences of war would be very terrible for the world." But to avoid war Mr. Nehru has to give up his non-alignment policy, for surely he knows what Mr. Frank Anthony said in the course of the debate, "If there is any clash between India and China, Russia would definitely take the side of the Chinese." There lies the crux of the question. There lies Mr. Nehru's eternal difficulty. Howsoever strong India may become in the course of a few years or a few decades, there is no likelihood of India becoming stronger than Russia and China together. That is what rightly rules out war for Mr. Nehru and India under a policy of non-alignment. And it is no use threatening war. The Chinese may well be supposed to know that as well as any one else, and that is why some of the Chinese "posts have been gone beyond the Chou En-lai Line," to use Mr. Nehru's words. War aside, even diplomatic relations cannot be broken off, for the break may well be followed by another Chinese advance. It would be interesting to know from our Prime Minister if he envisages any circumstances under which it would be right for India to break off diplomatic relations with China, and, if so, what those circumstances are. We really cannot talk of war seriously and give up the friendly approach, sound and fury to allay the Opposition notwithstanding. It is this stranglehold of his own fabrication which the Prime Minister has to get rid of, this noose which he has placed round the neck of Mother India, wittingly or unwittingly.

"What I object to," said the Prime Minister, "is the mentality of running down in a matter of national importance." What does he expect after losing 15,000 square miles to the Chinese without a shot being fired? Boquets, with the enemy still advancing? This is all the good that his basic policies have done the country, and his only promise is, "We must be prepared to face it (the crisis) for years" With Mr. Nehru at the helm we must, for he has no intention of leaving his basic policies, which form the basis of the Chinese aggression.

In any case he has declared that "there can be no further advance by them without a major conflict" and that the Government of India would start negotiations with the Chinese, to resolve the differences between the two countries on the boundary question, only after the

(Continued on page 9)

Second Front For India's Disarmament

P. Kodanda Rao

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who inaugurated the Anti-Nuclear Arms Convention organised recently in New Delhi by the Gandhi Peace Foundation, sprung a surprise by suggesting that India should disarm unilaterally and give a lead to universal disarmament. He said that unadulterated non-violence or Ahimsa was the only line which the Foundation could take, and it could not associate itself with the use of force even for the attainment of peace. He could not be unaware that Mahatma Gandhi, while he advocated non-violence for the attainment of Swaraj and for resisting, the Japanese invasion, countenanced

(Continued from page 8)

present tensions are removed and the status quo of the boundary which existed before is restored. These are definite commitments. It should not take a prophet to foretell that, if the negotiations are held, they will be held without the status quo of the boundary which existed before being restored. For, to any one with a little insight, it should be obvious that Mr. Nehru's non-alignment, equivalent as it is of weakness and isolation, is a standing invitation to aggression and further aggression by the Chinese, just as Gandhi's non-violence was a standing invitation to the violence of the Muslim League, which clinched the issue in favour of Pakistan. The Hindus are not realists. The Prime Minister has this great factor in his favour. They suffer for their altitudinarianism. Non-alignment, like non-violence, is born of altitudinarianism. Mr. Nehru may have his own axe to grind, but the support that he gets is due to Hindu altitudinarianism, which is easy to exploit. They always like to stand for the impractical. In the ultimate analysis this stand is almost always traceable to hypocrisy. Mr. Anthony called it "ambivalence", which is a much more respectable and, therefore, much more acceptable term. But should it, therefore, be non-controversial?

The reader has been seen the poverty of the arguments used by the Prime Minister and his several self-contradictions in the course of one speech, which therefore is far from being very coherent. The debate revealed also the poverty of intellect in the Opposition which could not question (with just one word "Question!") what he considered dishonourable. That is a blessing for Mr. Nehru. He is indeed thrice-blessed now. The Communist philosophy of life gives him comfort and hope. So does the Hindu philosophy of life. For, where would he be without it?

violence on more than one occasion, as, for instance, the rescue of Kashmir. The Congress, of which Dr. Rajendra Prasad has been a strong pillar, offered to join the war-effort on certain conditions, used force in Hyderabad and Goa. If Dr. Rajendra Prasad aspired to excel Mahatma Gandhi in loyalty to unadulterated non-violence, he is entitled to unstinted admiration. It is not, however, clear if he, when he was President, had pressed his view, within the limitations of the Constitution, on the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Government of India, while they were spending ever-increasing sums of money on defence which could better have been spent on development, thereby reducing India's pathetic dependence on foreign economic aid and sustaining her self-respect. If he had done so, it is obvious that his advice was unacceptable to Nehru and the Government of India. What was his purpose in making the suggestion in public and after his retirement and have it turned down publicly by the Prime Minister? If Nehru's response was realistic and responsible, Dr. Prasad's suggestion must be held to be unrealistic and irresponsible, since both cannot be equally realistic and responsible. The only result is that Dr. Prasad wrote himself up as idealist, superior to Mahatma Gandhi, and wrote down Nehru as an opportunist who exploited the Mahatma but who was no better than most of the current run of politicians in the world. He would have done better to secure the assent of Nehru to his suggestion before he gave it publicity. As it is, he lowered Nehru in public estimation in India and, more particularly abroad, at this time when his influence touched a low ebb at the United Nations.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad was hopeful that, if India disarmed unilaterally, other nations would not allow her to fall a victim to aggression, even if they did not follow her lead in unilateral disarmament. The hope is not unjustified, subject to a possible Second Front. India has disputes primarily with Pakistan and China at the present time. If India disarmed unilaterally, both Pakistan and China are more likely to invade India than vacate their present aggression and restore peace. The reactions of other powers like Britain and America, France and Russia, or organisations like the NATO, CENTO and SEATO, are not likely to be uniform but criss-cross, as it were. Rightly or otherwise, India had drawn the ire of most of them for one reason or other. For instance, Britain and France are sore with her for her part in the Suez affair; Britain, France and America are against her over the

Kashmir question; the NATO powers are annoyed with her because of her part in episode of Hungary and her annexation of Goa by force against their advice and in disregard of the embarrassment caused to them by Portugal's membership of that organisation; they resent India's sustained pressure in the United Nations for the liquidation of colonialism and racialism in Africa; and they smart under the sharp tongue-lashes of Mr. Krishna Menon and smoulder against Mr. Nehru's invocation of Mahatma Gandhi's name to administer moral lectures to international politicians. In consequence, these nations itch to prick the bubble, as it were, and debunk India. If they do not go further and desert and disown India and still offer her economic aid, it is because they do not wish to drive her into the arms of Communism and hate Russia and China. Pakistan and Red China are against India, not only because of their territorial pretensions but also because they envy the economic progress which India achieved through her stable and democratic system, and would hamper her further and rapid progress by forcing her to divert her resources increasingly from development to defence, so that she may not out-distance them even more and discredit their political systems.

If India disarms unilaterally, Pakistan will be unable to resist the temptation, if such a temptation were necessary, to occupy whole of Kashmir in the first instance. America and Britain are unlikely to restrain her, though they may formally regret the use of force on general principles. China, which has a dispute with India currently, is likely to abet Pakistan in her adventure against India, but not for love of Pakistan. Pakistan has a quarrel with Afghanistan which may be tempted to harass Pakistan if the latter advances into India. Russia, which alone has stood by India in the Kashmir affair, may intervene to deter Pakistan. India has given repeated assurances that she would not use force to vacate Pakistan's aggression in Kashmir. But her invasion of Goa has discounted her credit for peaceful methods. Pakistan has made no such promise; in fact, she has repeatedly threatened violence. If Pakistan is given to understand that Russia and Afghanistan would open a Second Front on her if she invaded India, it will be possible and prudent for India to disarm unilaterally and to a considerable extent.

India will still have to deal with China. Notwithstanding the renowned valour and discipline of the Indian Defence Personnel, India will not be able to defend herself with her own resources against China because of the superior strength of the Chinese armed forces and the ruthlessness with which China will sacrifice her soldiers to win victory, a ruthlessness which India cannot inflict on her own soldiers. The very widely circulated Magazine, the Reader's Digest, of March

1962, published a condensation of Mr. John Frazer's article in the *Die Weltwoche*, Zurich, Switzerland, in which he said that India's armed forces were estimated at five hundred thousand and of China at five times that number. The Chinese forces have the advantage of fighting from atop the Tibetan plateau, while the Indian forces have to clamber up the Himalayas, as it were. Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, India's Defence Minister, revealed in his recent speech in Madras that India could not fight China from a "position of weakness" and expose her troops to unnecessary jeopardy, as she had not the necessary weapons.

It is obvious that India needs external aid to defend herself against China. Russia is unlikely to interpose openly against China in favour of India because of their common loyalty to Communism, though Russia may privately restrain China for fear of her growing into a more formidable rival to Russia. On the other hand, America and Britain are only too willing to contain China, because of their ideological antipathies and political rivalries, as they have been doing in Korea and South East Asia. Japan also stands to gain by limiting China's expansionism. India may well seek a defensive alliance with America, Britain and Japan against China. Their combined strength, which they maintain without any reference to India's interest, would be enough to restrain China without a hot war.

India need not be ashamed to seek such a defensive alliance, even as she is not ashamed to seek and receive foreign economic aid. She may well drop the pretence that she is not receiving foreign military aid, for foreign economic aid is indirectly military aid in so far as it releases indigenous resources for military purposes as is more explicit today. It is not acceptance of military aid that should hurt India's sovereignty and self-respect, but the purpose for which it is intended. American military aid to Pakistan was intended to be used against the Communist countries and not against India. Indeed, America went so far as to promise publicly that if Pakistan used the aid for aggression against India, she would rush to the aid of India against Pakistan. Similarly, if India accepts American military aid, she will be free to use it against China but not against Pakistan. The latter contingency will not arise, as India unilaterally promised not to use even her own forces to vacate Pakistan's occupation of part of Kashmir, and therefore, she is not likely to need or use American military aid for the purpose. If Pakistan defies the restrictions imposed by America against the use of American military aid for aggression against India, India would be free to use American military aid against Pakistan. The American restraints will be honoured by both or by neither. India will not be in a worse position than Pakistan.

If India needs foreign military alliance against Chinese aggression, both America and Britain, and perhaps Japan also, are likely to be only too willing to help, as it is in line with their own current policy. They can protect India and deter China without setting foot in India by opening a Second Front against China from Hong Kong, Formosa and Japan. America, by herself, has been able to prevent the invasion of Formosa by China. If British and Japan also join her, the three will be able to restrain China even without firing a shot or offering a gun to India.

But if India be unwilling to seek military alliance with Britain and America because of her current policy of non-alignment with either power bloc, she may seek such alliance with Japan alone, without undue strain on her non-alignment policy. If India is unwilling to do even that and refuses to seek military alliance with any foreign power, it is open to America, with or without the co-operation of Britain and Japan, to proclaim unilaterally a kind of Munroe or Truman Doctrine and firmly intimate China that if she attacked India, she or they would promptly open a Second Front on China. Some such Doctrine is presently operative in Korea and South East Asia. It does not require the consent or involvement of India.

Notwithstanding their disapproval of Mr. Krishna Menon personally and of Nehru's policies in Kashmir and Goa, Britain and America are vitally interested in the survival of India as a stable, democratic state, making heroic efforts with their generous and massive economic aid, to achieve commendable economic and social progress and out-distance China and justify democracy and discount Communism. They would not wish that their economic aid should be diverted if any indirectly by India to buy or build destructive military equipment and slow down her economic development to a level below that of China and discredit democracy. If America and Britain, and perhaps Japan as well, assure India of their own accord, that they will open a Second Front on China if the latter attacked India, it will cost them no more than their present efforts, but it will enable India to reduce her armaments considerably and divert the savings to economic development, which, in turn, will reduce her burden on them for economic aid and incidentally sustain the self-respect of India and vindicate democracy. It is a challenge worthy of the highest diplomacy.

WHAT IS ANARCHISM ?

Anarchism is the philosophy and ideal of individual liberty in human society. But true individual liberty is not possible without economic

independence, and therefore, the theory and philosophy of anarchism embrace the ideal of the economic independence of every individual. The conception of individual liberty excludes all social domination and all state coercion; the conception of economic independence precludes every form of exploitation and all special privileges.

Anarchism differs from the accepted basic principles of socialism in that socialism makes society the provider for individuals; society through its managers (More correctly-bureaucrats!) will provide the individuals with all the necessities of life. Anarchism, on the other hand, strives towards that social life in which each individual, alone or in co-operation with others, shall be enabled to provide for himself whatever he deems necessary.

Whoever undertakes to provide for another must assume the right to order him what he must do and how it must be done. A society which carries on its production through managers must necessarily wield its authority to dictate to everyone as to where, how and under what conditions he must do his work for the benefit of society. In practical life such an arrangement of affairs borders very closely on slavery, and there is no scarcity, indeed, of facts and instances, whether in ancient or in the most recent types of State communism, to prove that such is the outcome. Anarchism renounces such a social arrangement in the name of personal liberty. Anarchism does not conceive liberty as does the Marxist Kautsky, when he claims that "all that socialism has to offer to the human being is freedom from starvation." Anarchism demands freedom not only from starvation but also from domination and force, from subjection to the will of another, even if that other be the majority or the entire social group.

**Govindjee Madhowjee
& Co. Pvt. Ltd.**

COAL MERCHANTS
16—APOLLO STREET,
FORT, BOMBAY.

Nonalignment, A Green Signal For China.

(From Our Correspondent)

It must be said that Mr. Nehru emerged with flying colours from the debate on Ladakh in the Lok Sabha. Of course he was not expecting it, having a poor case, and that was why he was avoiding the debate and had not written it into the programme for the session, although the demand for it was a foreseeable certainty and almost so was the Government's yielding to the Opposition demand. If the Government chose to bow before the demand instead of forestalling it, it was obviously because it did not expect the Opposition to make such a poor show.

It is worthwhile repeating that Mr. Nehru would be well-advised to deliver prepared speeches on important matters, for he has just not got the flair for speaking and is unable to qualify and modify his statements to make them conform to what he has just said, let alone what he has been saying in the past. For example, while his prepared speech on August 13, initiating a discussion on the situation along the Sino-Indian border, is both logical and coherent, the same cannot be said of the next day's extreme performance while replying to the debate. He should take care that his own statements are not quoted against him when the time for talks or discussions or negotiation comes, as has indeed sometimes happened in the past, according to reliable reports. For example, here are two sentences uttered almost in the same breath by Mr. Nehru on August 14: "Though the Chinese might have advanced a mile or two in Ladakh, broadly speaking we have held them in check here We have succeeded in the first step in preventing any kind of advance by the Chinese."

While initiating the debate Mr. Nehru had declared in the Lok Sabha that the Government of India would start negotiations with the Chinese to resolve the differences between the two countries on the border question only after the present tensions were removed and the status quo of the boundary which existed before was restored. But the next day when, after the conclusion of Mr. Nehru's speech, the Swatantra leaders, Mr. P. K. Deo, asked the Prime Minister for a categorical statement that there would be no negotiations until the Chinese vacated their aggression, the Prime Minister replied: "I yesterday morning made a statement. I shall make no more categorical statement. I want freedom of action. I say frankly, first of all nothing can happen without this House being informed. Second, we

should agree that nothing should be done which, in the slightest degree, sullies the honour of India. For the rest, I want a free hand."

Mr. Dwivedi made a good point when he asked why we should appear to be hankering after talks. Like Mahatma Gandhi, he said, we should keep our door open for any one who may wish to come and talk, specially when, he might have added, the military balance is tilting in our favour. It is not a question of standing on one's dignity so much as of giving an impression of weakness, which may not be justified by our relative strength vis-a-vis the Chinese, not even if we bear in mind Mr. Frank Anthony's unsailable assessment of the situation made in the following words: "If there is any clash between India and China, Russia would definitely take the side of the Chinese." It is this unspeakable truth which makes the Government's China policy ambivalent, unspeakable for Congressmen because it amounts to a direct condemnation of the Nehru Government's policy of non-alignment. Our Prime Minister prefers keeping his head buried in sand like an ostrich, for fear of seeing things which he knows he will see if he takes it out. Mr. Anthony said the July 20 offer represented a definite recession from the position taken by India earlier. There are likely to be further recession for the reason advanced by Mr. Anthony himself. The categorical statement that Mr. Deo demanded of the Prime Minister should have been limited to a promise not to start negotiations with the Chinese if they make any further progress in their aggression. But what can the Prime Minister do when his basic policy of non-alignment is itself a green signal for the Chinese to advance? No wonder Mr. Khrushchev is so much in love with it!

THE AKALI IMBROGLIO

In the amusing tussle now going on between Master Tara Singh and Sant Fateh Singh, the latter seems to be winning. The Master's disciples, who claim to have mustered 231 delegates for the meeting of the general body of the Akali Dal, could not answer a reporter's question as to how so many could be accommodated in two small rooms, each measuring 15 feet by 7 feet, which can at best accommodate 50 people. The members of the Sant group had occupied the platform in front of the Akal Takht, thus forcing the Master's group to hold their meetings elsewhere. In occupying the platform the Sant's followers anticipated the tactics of the Master's

group, who could have allowed non-delegates to attend the meeting as delegates, to inflate the figure attending the meeting into a majority of the Akali Dal general body.

The question is being asked: why does not Master Tara Singh agree to an open unrestricted meeting of the general body of the Akali Dal to decide? What he obviously wants is a meeting of those members of the general body who are his followers. This is merely trying to retain the leadership of the Akali Dal by hook or crook and is not likely to add to the strength of his dwindling following. The Sikhs are apt to resort to force to enforce their wishes and Master Tara Singh is now reduced to resorting to the tactics, which he had so far reserved for non-Sikhs, against members of his own community. There seems now no possibility of a compromise between the two, but the means to be adopted to decide who has the majority with him can, given goodwill on both sides, be easily settled with the help of a few non-partisan mediators.

The dramatic midnight intervention of the Punjab Government resulting in the arrest of the leaders and some of their followers does the authorities credit. Hostilities had barely started and the Government was not expected to intervene until a few bloody clashes had occurred. Before the arrests took place the President of the SPGC had addressed a letter to the Government giving expression to his apprehension regarding a breach of the peace. Immediately before their arrests the Sikh leaders present at Circuit House on invitation had also applied for police protection, but they withdrew their application sensing they were playing into Government hands. As luck would have it, the victory of Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon over Master Tara Singh is now complete. As he puts it, both Master Tara Singh and Sant Fateh Singh are accusing each other of playing into his hands, while, so far as he is concerned, he would not touch either of them with a barge pole!

NEHRU'S DEFEAT IN MADHYA PRADESH

Mr. Nehru's defeat in the Madhya Pradesh has gone almost unnoticed. Dr. Katju's failure to defeat Chief Minister Mandloi in the election of the leader of the M.P. Parliamentary Legislature Party is really a defeat for the Prime Minister, at whose suggestion Dr. Katju is understood to have fought a by-election to return to the Madhya Pradesh legislature. The leaders of Madhya Pradesh stood the pressure from the Centre very well and very creditably. It may be said that they hoodwinked the Congress High Command by promising support to Dr. Katju against the present Chief Minister but voted for the latter when the time came for voting. Mr. Deshpande also played his cards very well, sacrificing his presidentship to win encomiums from the Congress High Command. The very object

of dissolving the MPPCC has been lost. What remains to be gained by it is yet to be seen. Things might have taken a different course had Mr. Nehru been in the best of health and been able to exert himself as much as he would have perhaps liked to do in favour of Dr. Katju, but then the resulting defeat would have been resounding. As it is, a photograph published in the papers, in which Messrs. Nehru and Katju are sitting close to each other and looking rather fierce appears to be about all that Mr. Nehru could personally do to frighten the opponents of Dr. Katju. In any case that was the interpretation generally put on the photograph.

Book Review

INFLATION AND SOCIETY: by Graham Hutton, George Allen and Unwin Pages 161. Prices 15s. net. 1960.

The author is an economist with a variety of experience and academic background. Born in 1904, educated in every kind of school-grammar, public and private in Britain, called to the Bar, he taught at the London School of Economics and joined the famous journal *Economist* of London. During the war he served in the Foreign Office and the Ministry of Information. In 1948 he entered business as an independent economic consultant and has been ever since writing, broadcasting and serving on important government and other inquiry commissions in addition to his economic practice.

Mr. Hutton published a book called 'We too Can Prosper' in 1953 which has been much commended by thoughtful economists, practical industrialists and others interested in economic growth on healthy long-term lines.

The interest evoked by this book under review on account of the far-reaching insight into the wider social psychology it displays influencing present inflationary tendencies in Britain and other forward countries (largely as a result of demagogic welfare legislation) whets one's appetite for his earlier book on how we too can prosper. He refers to Britain here but one can guess that the lessons he draws are bound to be of great practical interest and value to us in India who are caught in a much worse predicament owing to our raw and inexperienced policies of inflationary development.

Mr. Graham Hutton fetches a wide historical compass for his background and includes a brief survey of inflation in Roman history, in sixteenth century Europe after the discovery of gold and silver in Spanish America, in Germany after the two wars and in Britain, Scandinavian countries and even in the USA after the recent world war.

He draws the grim lesson that continuous indulgence in inflationary policies by weak govern-

ments (more intent on clinging to power by pleasing the masses than in building a sound economy) is the inevitable harbinger of social degeneration. It erodes into all constructive habits and values in the earning classes and ultimately "inflates away even democracy itself." For it benefits classes in an uneven way and by the redistributive ethics that it fosters under the name of social welfare, it transfers wealth from productive to less productive classes thereby damaging incentives and drying up the habit of savings and investment in long term capital goods. He shows how after 1945 under the Labour Government in Britain, the pound sterling lost 50 per cent of its value and the general price level rose 270 per cent from pre-war levels. But the welfare state raised the wages of the working classes by over 300 per cent. The result was a silent revolution in post-war Britain whereby the working classes rose to middle class levels in their standard of living with over £ 1000 per annum. They "never had it so good," as the slogan goes.

Three-fourths of the population benefited at the expense of the remaining fourth who were taxed beyond all conscience for the purpose. The outcome was an excess of consumption leaving too little in the hands of classes who used to save and invest in creative capital goods. Britain consequently registered a slower rate of growth than continental countries for example Germany. Her growth was even slower than that of France with all her class conflicts and Algerian war expenses.

One reason for this decrease in growth implying a fall in initiative, inventiveness and habits of saving and investment was the inflation by which public finance was supplemented to meet welfare policies. High taxation was not enough for the ever-growing social security demands of the weaker sections of the people. So credit expansion, cheap money and deficit finance became the order of the day and it is still continuing.

Mr. Hutton sees the inevitable culmination of these tendencies in social decay and the erosion of democracy, on account of growing demagoguery and appeasement at the expense of sound and creative finance.

The book has valuable lessons for us in India since we have launched into worse policies of high-cost economy under State-sponsored development plans after the Soviet pattern.

— M.A. Venkata Rao

Gleanings from the Press

SWATANTRA AND PLANNING

The Swatantra Party is not opposed to Planning of projects beyond the capacity and willing-

ness of private enterprise. It is opposed to Nationalisation, which consumes the taxes and loans of the people only for transfer of ownership to government without net gain to the country. It is opposed to controls because when the country is short of everything, they create monopolies which reduce production and increase prices.

The Swatantra Party, in fact, is for a bigger Plan, the people being allowed to do everything in their power and the Government doing the rest, with no controls so that the consumers are benefitted from the competition of the producers.

The Congress is even suggesting that the recent increase of land taxes is good for the people. The Swatantra Party is for abolishing land taxes because they form less than 5% of the revenues of government and are not even equal to the cost of their collection. In any case, the party considers it most unfair to collect taxes from the cultivators and spend them on clerks, politicians and projects which do not benefit the villages. The Swatantra Party would like every one to examine how any project has benefitted him to justify his own sufferings from shortages, inflation and the loss of opportunities for development of his own resources and values.

—Insight.

News & Views

AMERICA'S REACTION ON SOVIET OUTER-SPACE ACHIEVEMENTS

Washington:—Mr. James Webb, head of the national aeronautics and space administration, said on Wednesday he believed the United States would land an astronaut on the moon and return him to earth before the Soviet Union.

Mr. Webb described the Soviet achievement as "thoroughly professional job."

"We regard it as a demonstration of very real technical capacity".

Dean Rusk, U.S. Secretary of State, said he did not think the latest Soviet space achievement would have any significant effect on the Berlin problem, disarmament and other great issues.

"Russia has not got a space lead", Gen. Eisenhower said.

Gen. Eisenhower said the Russians "have admittedly and obviously gone ahead in certain things particularly in the making of great engines."

HUMPTY DUMPTY WAY OF NEHRU

U. S. PAPER'S COMMENT

NEW YORK: "The New York Times" commented that Mr. Nehru had adopted a Humpty Dumpty philosophy in justifying renewed Indian discussions with China over the Sino-Indian border dispute.

In an editorial, the paper recalled that Humpty Dumpty told Alice in Wonderland, "When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean."

The editorial added: "Employing the same philosophy, Mr. Nehru has justified renewed Indian discussions with the Chinese communists over the Sino-Indian border dispute.

"He has taken the view heretofore that there could be no negotiations with Peking unless the Chinese vacated territory they occupy in Ladakh that India claims."

"The Chinese refuse to withdraw but are willing to talk. So Mr. Nehru has approved contacts that he says will not be called negotiations but talks to ease tension."

NEHRU DEEMS ENGLISH LINK VITAL FOR PROGRESS

Only trained personnel like scientists and technologists "can make this world work" and we need such men for the country's industrial development and economic progress, emphasised the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, in Bombay on Sunday.

Pointing out the "amazing results" achieved by Germany, Russia and Japan during the post-war period with trained men and modern machines, Mr. Nehru said India should keep pace with the scientific and technological advance in the world — "if we want the same."

For all this, the connection with the English language — a window to the whole world of modern ideas of technology and science — needs to be maintained, he declared, while inaugurating the Sardar Patel College of Engineering, set up by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan at Andheri, before a large gathering.

HINDI FANATICISM DENOUNCED BY DISTINGUISHED LINGUISTS

The following are extracts from statement on the language policy of the Indian Union issued on behalf of the Association for the Advancement of the National Languages of India by Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, Dr. Srikumar Banerjee, Narendra Dev, Buddhadeva Bose, A. S. Ayub, Principal Latika Ghosh, Kazi Abdul Wadud, Jyotish Ch. Ghosh, Jyoti Prasad Banerjee, Hiran Kumar Sanyal and K. K. Sinha:

"The proposal to turn Hindi, a regional language of the Union Government and of all-India Services and inter-State communication was detrimental to the vital interests of a great majority of Indians, for less than 40 per cent of the people of India speak Hindi as their mother-tongue. It would have resulted in a violation of the principle of equity and justice by giving preferential treatment to the Hindi-speaking minority and by penalising the non-Hindi-speaking majority for no other fault than not having Hindi as the mother tongue.

The proposal naturally caused deep disappointment and resentment in many parts of India, and as a result of strong protests from these parts the Union Government has been compelled to change its mind and has decided to introduce

a bill for retaining English side by side with Hindi as an associate official language for use in the Central Government, Legislature and Services. This was the minimum concession that the Union Government could make to the wishes of the majority of Indian citizens, and we therefore fully support it. We are strongly opposed to the movement set afoot by a section of the Hindi fanatics to prevent this Bill from being accepted by the Parliament.

We in the non-Hindi-speaking areas of India do want English to remain, as English is not only the strongest bond of union among the different Indian States, but is also the only window through which we can get air and light from the outside world. The removal of English from the higher administration and education of this country will lead to an immediate disruption of the unity of India and to our cultural retrogression into the medieval ages.

SHRI PRAKASHA ON 'AFTER NEHRU WHAT?'

DEHRA DUN,

Mr. Sri Prakasa, the former Governor of Maharashtra, last night warned the people against the futile talk of "After Nehru, What?"

In a democracy, he told the local Lions Club, people must be prepared to shoulder responsibility at all times. They must find among themselves the right men for the right jobs. Too much dependence on and worship of individuals was not proper, he added.

'MEND THE CONGRESS OR END IT'

Mr. Mahavir Tyagi, Congress M.P. and senior member of the All-India Congress Committee, has, in a letter to the Congress President, said that "in the present state of affairs" the Congress organisation should be either dissolved or "some very drastic changes" made in its constitution. He is also understood to have written to Prime Minister Nehru on the question of Congress re-organisation.

Mr. Tyagi has stated in his letter to the Congress President that with millions of "bogus members" on the Congress rolls "It is illogical to expect the Congress organisation to hold its own."

There would be thousands from amongst the "old guard" of the organisation who would not like to get elected even as delegates to the Indian National Congress with the support of members who were not genuine.

LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE, BANGALORE.

BANGALORE, August -: Sri B. Sriramappa addressed the Study Circle Meeting on "United States of America and its Political, Educational and Economic Aspects".

Prof. M. A. Venkata Rao presided.

VITAL QUESTIONS.

For sixty known centuries this planet that we call the earth has been inhabited by human beings not much different from ourselves. Their desire to live has been just as strong as ours. They have had at least as much physical strength as the average person of today and among them have been men and women of great intelligence. But down through the ages, most human beings have gone hungry and many have always starved. Why? This and other vital questions are sought to be answered by Henry Grady Weaver in his momentous book "The Main Spring of Human Progress".

Get your copy from:

LIBERTARIAN PUBLISHERS (PVT) LTD.,

Arya Bhuvan, 1st Floor,
Sandhurst Road, (West),
BOMBAY-4.

BOOKS FOR YOUR SHELF.

1. **ESSAYS ON LIBERTY**
2. **THE RISE AND FALL OF SOCIETY**
By Frank Chodorov.
3. **OUR ENEMY THE STATE**
By Albert Jay Nock.
4. **MY POLITICAL MEMOIRS**
By N. B. Khare.

Available with the Libertarian Social Institute, Arya Bhavan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay-4.

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

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



Write to :

THE MANAGER
THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS
BOMBAY 4

Telephone : 70205

Telegram : LOTEWALLA