THE

Indian Libertarian

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

EDITOR: D. M. KULKARNI

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION Rs. 6.00

Vol. XI No. 17 December 1, 1963

Page

EDITORIALS:

Agricultural Progress or 'Collective' Chaos? 2

India And China 5
By M. A. Venkata Rao

What is Wrong with Groupism? 7
By M. N. Tholal

DELHI LETTER:

Nehru's Coup D'Grace 9

Guided Democracy 11
By Shrimati Prema Nandakumar

Book-Review 12

The Mind of the Nation 13

News and Views 14

PRICE 25 NAYAPAISA

EDITORIAL

Agricultural Progress or "Collective" Chaos?

THE Congress debacle on the food front has evidently upset and shaken the Congress leaders. They are now busy finding out scapegoats for explaining their unpardonable failure in this regard. The National Development Council, Mr. Nanda and Prime Minister Nehru are, therefore, all attempting to pass on their undoubted responsibility for this failure, to the shoulders of the poor State Governments, by accusing them of serious dereliction of duty in speedily implementing the programme of 'Land Reforms' and of thus retarding agricultural progress. Being geniuses in slogan-mongering, the Congress leaders are now giving the country the high-sounding slogan of 'more collectivization of agriculture' as a cure for these ills, even as they have given the mantram of 'more socialism' as overall panacea for the acute economic crisis through which the country is passing at present.

LAND REFORMS GALORE UNDER CONGRESS RAJ

The fact of the matter is that all the State Governments have been seized with this one consuming passion for 'Land Reforms' as no other, ever since they came to power in 1947. The Bombay State has been a pioneer in this field and has always acted with a zeal and singleness of purpose which could have been better employed for a worthier cause. The Bombay Government went on inflicting on the State people a never-ending series of hastily conceived Tenancy Acts purporting to eliminate the landlord class and the class of well-to-do peasant-proprietors through ceiling on land-holdings, arbitrary fixation of rent and gross interference with the operation of the free land-market and severe restrictions imposed on transfers of ownership rights in agricultural lands.

The results, as foreseen by all economists not still brain-washed by the Congress rulers, were disastrous. The so-called 'Landlords' were literally hounded out of their ancestral villages in search of a bare living. The gap thus created in rural leadership could not be filled up, by the inefficient Gram-Sevakas appointed by the Government, under the Community Development and Village Extension Service schemes. The agencies created by the Government to do the work of the Landlords who gave credit-loans to the villagers on a mutually workable basis, supplied tested seeds and manures to the farmers in season, and gave them agricultural implements if need be, repaired bunds and carried out minor local irrigation works, failed to rise equal to their task. So agriculture declined. The whole Western coastal side of the Bombay State, full of 'Khar' or saltish lands, once smiling with rich crops, was laid waste and presented a horried picture of thousands of acres of agricultural lands being inundated with sea-water, for want of proper repairs to the old bunds and embankments. The ceiling placed on agricultural holdings, carried the evil process of fragmentation still further and had the most deplorable effect of depressing the none too high standard of living and culture of the peasant-proprietors to the level of the rural proletariat.

This example of Bombay was faithfully followed by other States who also enacted Abolition of Zamindari Acts and Tenancy Acts, more or less on the same lines, with the same disastrous consequences on agricultural output and the standard of living of the middle class consisting of land-holders and peasants proprietors.

MORE RHETORICS THAN ECONOMICS.

It sounds therefore very odd to hear Mr. Nehru complain, as he has been doing in his recent speeches, that Land Reforms have not been properly carried out by the States Governments. One therefore is led to suspect that the phrase 'Land Reforms' connotes to him not merely giving the land to the tiller as is generally supposed, but something more radical and dangerous to the agriculturist class as a whole. It is evident that what ails the minds of Mr. Nehru and Mr. Nanda is not the disgraceful state of stagnation of agricultural output over the last two years, at the level of 1960-61, but the refusal or perhaps the sheer inability on the part of the State Governments to exploit the present agricultural crisis for the purpose of introducing more leftist Land Reforms in the direction of Nehru's new fad of 'Collective Farms', euphemistically called 'Co-operative Farms'. If the food crisis had really exercised the minds of Mr. Nehru and his Democratic Socialist colleagues, they would have cried a halt to the Land Reforms, in the light of the havoc these reforms have wrought in the country-side and this vital agricultural sector of our economy. The present debacle would have, then, brought home to these democratic socialists that though the extinction of the Landlord class might be perhaps justified on moral and egalitarian grounds, though not on strictly economic grounds, there was no justification whatsoever moral or economic, for the Congress to attempt the elimination of the rich and middle peasant classes who alone could increase the crop-yield per acre. It has now been proved beyond doubt that agricultural industry more than any other, requires individual attention, initiative and motivation and single-minded devotion which are found to be usually missing

among agriculturists barracked into Soviet 'Collectives' or Chinese 'Communes.'

The Government's chief concern therefore at this critical juncture, should be to rehabilitate at least the much-maligned peasant-proprietor, if not the socially useful 'Landlord', in the rural economy of the country by giving him an unqualified assurance that his peasant-proprietorship is safe and secure in its hands and no further inroads would be made on his ownership rights in the land and he could safely invest his money into it so as to improve it and make it yield richer crops. The land-system based on peasant-proprietorship has given better results in stepping up agricultural production in countries like U.S.A., Japan, France, Canada and Australia. There is no reason why it should not prove successful in our country and why it should stand condemned in the eyes of our rulers except for ideological reasons.

It is reported that even Russia and China have been compelled by force of circumstances to see the error of their ways in launching upon their plans of wholesale agricultural collectives and communes. Should India not take lessons at least from the bitter experiences of these communist countries passing now through acute food crisis? Must our Government still in a fool-hardy manner allow itself to be guided more by rhetorics than by real economics in formulating its agricultural plans and policies? In fact, agriculture has had already its sweet revenge on the Government for relegating it to the secondary position and unduly boosting the untenable claims of heavy industry at its cost, forgetting the patent fact that in a developing country like India with her limited resources, the heavy industries and even consumers' industries have to feed themselves largely on the surplus income accruing to the country from agriculture which in more senses than one, is the 'basic' industry, albeit the massive aid flowing to India from affluent countries like U.S.A.

CHAOS OF COLLETIVISM.

The Nehruvian Democratic Socialists too, if they really dared to accept the challenge of their critics, could still demonstrate the viability and usefulness of their pet plan of agricultural 'co-operatives', by first distributing about ten crores of Government waste lands available at present among the landless probletarians in the rural areas and bringing them all into co-operatives. The advantage of such a course of action would be, that if this experiment succeeds in stepping up agricultural production per acre and improving the living standards of agriculturists, it will surely act as a lever for further implementation of the 'co-operatives' plan even among the present peasant-proprietors; and even if it fails, it will do least harm to the present peasantry-dominated land system in the country which had stood the test of time over all these centuries.

But Mr. Nehru's recent speeches do not hold out any such hopes of a pragmatic and rational approach being made by this Government to this problem of increasing agricultural output, commensurate with the fast growing population of the country. It looks more likely that, with the general elections coming near, his power-crazy Government will, instead, offer to the ignorant and excitable multitude, a veritable socialist circus of confiscatory 'Land Reforms', which will inexhorably take the country towards the chaos of collectivised agriculture and the complete effacement of the self-employing peasant class, the last surviving symbol of decentralised political and economic democracy at the grass roots.

* * *

THE CRISIS OF BAATHISM IN THE ARAB LAND.

The Baathists of Iraq and Syria, and Nasserian Arab Nationalists are both known to have placed before themselves the common goal of 'Socialism and Arab unity'. But the main difference between the two seems to be centred over the question of Nasser's monolithic leadership of the Arab world. Moreover the Baathists claim that they are more democratic than Nasserites and as such, they can never accept the military dictatorship of Nasser over the Asian Arab counries. Ever since the talks among the three nations, viz., Egypt, Syria and Iraq, failed in April last, over the issue of bringing the three countries together under an enlarged edition of U.A.R., the Arab countries in West Asia

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.)

ADVERTISEMENT 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 articles does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a Free-Forum.
- Rejected articles will be returned to the writers if accompanied with stamped addressed envelope.

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

Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

have been split all over, between these two powerful camps of Nasserites and Baathists.

The Baathist movement which made its debut in 1940 under the leadership of Michel Aflak and Salah Al Ditar, first attracted world-wide attention in early 1963, when the Baathists overthrew leftist Kasim regime in Iraq and seized power for themselves. This was followed within a few days by a successful coup staged by the Syrian Baathists in Damacus. These two Baathist-dominated Governments of Iraq and Syria have naturally roused much ire and opposition from the ambitious Nasser and his followers.

Except for common religion and mythical common racial ties, the Asian Arabs properly so-called, have no cultural or social links with Egyptian Arabs. But Nasser wants to impose his own brand of Arab nationalism on Iraq, Syria, Jordan and other Asian Arab countries. It is evident that under the leadership of the Baathists, these different Arab communities are fighting back Nasser's political and cultural imperialism with their backs to the wall. The Baathists, for a time, made a good show of presenting a united front at least in Syria and Iraq, against Nasserism through military alliance and a well-laid plan for close economic, political, and cultural union of these two countries. The Sixth International Baathist Congress held in last October, even declared its intention of forming the Arab Democratic Peoples' Republic with its capital at Bagdad.

But Nasserits, scenting the grave danger from this move to their imperial ambitions, have swiftly struck a blow at this attempt to unite Asian Arab nations on the Baathist platform. They appear to have attained a measure of success in creating a division among the Baathist ranks in Iraq. The moderate Baathist leader and Vice-Premier of Iraq Ali Suleh Savdi was reported to have put down the abortive extremist anti-Nasser coup that took place in the second week of November in Iraq. But his victory was evidently short-lived. The news has now arrived that President Aref supposed to be pro-Nasser has taken over the reins of the Government with the backing of regular Iraqi army and the Baathists National Guards have capitulated to the army. President Nasser has openly welcomed this event and has even warned the Baathist Government of Syria against any intervention in the internal affairs of Iraq.

This dramatic turn of events in Iraq is certainly a serious blow to the Arab movement for regional autonomy and freedom to order its own way of life. Nasser's idea of forced Arab unity is incompatible with the UNO principle of self-determination of even small nations and its objective of welding them all into a voluntary world federation based on equal partnership of nations. The world democratic opinion is gradually veering round to the view that aggressive nationalism is a serious danger to world peace and the road to world unity lies not through such jingoistic nationalism but through voluntarily coming together in a world organisation, of free and self-governing regional communities and compact social groups in a spirit of mutual aid and co-operation.

* * *

WELL DONE, ALIGARH UNIVERSITY!

The Aligarh University was born essentially of the spirit of Renaissance which ruled over the minds of leaders of Muslim community who founded it. Though this University has remained, broadly speaking, even to this day, a seat of Muslim culture and learning, it has had to throw its portals wide and open to other communities as well, in keeping with the spirit of its basic ideals.

Now that India is a free country, the Aligarh University could not long remain unaffected by the spirit of the new awakening. The recent resolution it has passed enabling its institutions to switch over to English from Urdu as the medium of instruction particularly at the college level, will come as a pleasant surprise to those lovers of learning and knowledge in our country, who are not a little amazed and dumb-founded at the extremely tortuous and tantalising policies followed both by Central and Provincial Governments on the language issue.

In this connection one is reminded of the prophecy made by the late Mr. Natarajan the illustrious editor of "The Indian Social Reformer" in the early forties, in a series of articles on the future of English. He wrote that within fifteen years of Gandhiji's passing away, future generations would forget all about Gandhian fads about Hindi and white-cap which then symbolised the national dress and they will take to the English language and Western style of dress. That prophecy is remarkably coming out true today. Boys and girls of the present generation, though denied proper instruction in the English language, talk and read English more than Hindi and are dressed more in the Western style than the Indian one. Men and women have thus silently but unmistakably shown their likes and dislikes in these matters, which appear to have been determined by sound considerations of utility, convenience and inherent merit.

And it is now the turn of the Universities to carry on this urgent work begun by the common man. The Aligarh University has not only allowed English to be made the medium of instruction but also has taken the revolutionary decision that the Roman script be adopted as the associate script with Urdu in the University. It is up to the other Universities to follow suit in breaking the foolish 'icons' newly created by Hindi chauvinists who want to carry the country at least two centuries backwards.

If young men and women, the intellectuals and the universities unitedly give a bit of their mind to the Government boldly and persistently on this burning issue of an All India Language, there will be no need at all for the DMK in Madras to carry on an unconstitutional agitation to make even the deaf hear and the blind see the practical, true and rational side of this language controversy.

—D. M. Kulkarni

INDIA AND CHINA

By M. A. VENKATA RAO

China is an unsatisfied nation. Its goal is physical possession of the wealth of South Asia—India, Malaya, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Burma, Victnam, The Phillipines, Borneo, Formosa, reducing Japan to a subordinate status along with Southern Asia as part of the Chinese Co-prosperity Empire. India, therefore, needs an immediate re-orientation of her diplomacy, if she is to survive the present perilous crisis and meet the Chinese menace.

THE Jaipur meeting of the All India Congress has as usual echoed its Leader's master-sentiment (and "policy") of nonalignment as the all-sufficient *mantra* for the salvation of the country. The aggression by China in October (indeed its continued occupation of parts of Ladakh and of NEFA) and its irresponsiveness to the effete Colombo Powers has evoked no agonising re-appraissal in the Leader's mind of the old policies of nonalignment and panchsheel.

The members of the Congress party are as usual impervious to national peril but engrossed in their personal and party interests in the exploitation of the country. The Kamaraj Plan has done nothing to improve their awareness of the national need and national emergency. They continue to entrust the Leader with *Carte Blanche* as of old, divesting themselves of the grave responsibility they owe to the country as representatives of the people, particularly the members of the central and state legislatures.

What a contrast to the behaviour of the Conservative back-benchers in England two hundred of whom wrote to Mr. MacMillan to resign in the Profumo affair and make room for another leader! And he did, without seeking a "Kamaraj Plan" to save himself and his party!

To add to the gravity of the situation, it is reported that large numbers of members of the communist party in Bengal, Assam and along the U.P. and Bihar borders *belong to the Chinese faction.* Naturally, since it is the Chinese forces that are nearer the scene and are more likely to take-over in the next conflict when it comes on a larger scale! It is not Communal Papers and parties and groups alone that report rumours of "Lal Sena" formations in Tripura and adjoining areas. We have not heard of any counter-move on the part of the Government!

Meanwhile, what of the Chinese *intentions* and official estimates of their intentions and policies to meet them?

Beyond asking the people to beware and announcing some defence manufactures (and the recent Western joint air-raid exercises operation or shiksha), we are not aware of any deeper policy initiatives on the part of Government.

From international sources we gather that China is fast developing into a Third Force, a Third epicentre of world Power. Washington and Moscow and London and Paris are watching the rise of China as an independent centre of world diplomacy and world power. Peking is competing with both Moscow and Washington in every focus of world lines on every continent—particularly in Asia and Africa and Latin America.

It is learnt that Castro is turning to China for aid and support in his conflict with the West and is dissatisfied with Khrushchov!

China is attempting, not without success, to dominate newly enfranchised African nations and is arranging their rallies.

Ghana and Yugoslavia seem to be competing with each other for the leadership of neutral nations and India is relegated to the background after the debacle of October last on the Himalayan slopes and the easy triumph of the Red Chinese forces.

Unaware of the loss of prestige (and *magic,*) Shri Nehru continues to air his advice to other nations on world peace and world diplomacy— on South African aparthied, surviving colonialism, race prejudice in America and so on. It is pathetic and humiliating. Cannot we keep a dignified silence on international matters, working ably on committees to which we are called? Like the Swiss and the Swedish?

We should know when we are welcome and when we are not.

China has her own quarrels with Russia stemming from a long time with regard to her long land frontier from the Pamirs to Manchuria. She has asserted her complete sovereignty over Sinkiang and taken it over since 1949—a thing that Marshal Chiang Kaishek could not do. The province is being industrialised rapidly. Mines are being developed, industries are being set up, the old Muslim population is being educated in the Three R's and in industrial discipline. Cadres are being trained out of them. Technicians are being trained and the new world is fast emerging on the desert borders akin to modern urban centres in the West! The hold of the customs and religious rites of millenia is bting loosened apace. Motors, trucks, railways, cement roads, buses, factories cinemas, flats, radios, bush shirts, skirts are appearing in that remote area and transforming the psychology of the people.

China is transferring large numbers of Chinese people—of the Han extraction from the Middle kingdom, to these border areas from Sinkiang to Mongolia to stiffen the national character of the area. Nationalisation or *Sinisation* is going apace-irrespective of cost- also in Tibet.

A decade of this process will root out all possibility of revolt from ethnic diversity and alienation of stock!

Only a ruthless totalitarian regime can do this job compressing centuries of social process into decades!

The centre of gravity of Chinese national society and power is shifting from the coastal cities to the centre—more to the northern land-mass abutting the Russian Siberian territory.

Russians are apprehending conflicts along this long ancient frontier and are reinforcing their border troops at strategic frontier posts!

Thousands of Russian technicians are leaving China but the Chinese are proceeding with their programme of self-sufficiency in defence and power potential! Their self-confidence seems to be immense.

Their Great Leap of 1957-58 failed disastrously in agriculture and industry. Their targets had to be abandoned. They had to import food from capitalist countries and machinery as well from outside communist countries such as Britain. But they are confident of carrying out their plans with or without dependence on Russia and other communist countries.

They are competing with Russia as the home of communist leadership and source of communist ideology and example of Marxist-Leninist Progress to the Classless Heaven. They claim to be better guides to the strategy of world conflict for world conquest inasmuch as Mao and other Chinese leaders are older than Khrushchov in communist revolutionary experience and statesmanship. They made their revolution entirely independently of Moscow and in flat contradiction to Stalin's advice. They came to power not on the official orthodox basis of city, industrial proletariat but on the support of the peasantry. Mao built a great army out of peasants and fed and trained it out of his own mother-wit and genius—not with the help of the bookish maxims of Marx and Lenin at all!

Even today, the Chinese ideologists who insist on using war when opportunity occurs to further world conquest, as Stalin did in Korea and Vietnam, command a majority among communist nations.

But Khrushchov is more kenly aware of the danger of nuclear war and is not willing to risk it. He is aware of the Russian people's hunger for peace and industrial prosperity. His regime will crack if he leads his nation to war rashly. It is another thing if the West or China attacks Russia, when defence will lead the Russians to enthusiastic and sacrificial defence heroism.

But China is an *unsatisfied nation.* It wants empire: Its goal is physical possession of the wealth of South Asia—India, Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, the Vietnams, (South and North,) the Philippines, Borneo Formosa—reducing Japan to a subordinate status along with southern India as part of the Chinese co-prosperity empire.' Tht analogy is Russia with the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Austria with Greece and Turky added with hegemony over Persia, Afganistan and the Persian Gulf and Egypt with dominance over the Indian ocean'.

The resources, human and natural, of this rich and vast area will support the Power system of the new Chinese empire.

What is India's part in this vision—that of humble hewers of wood and drawers of water for their yellow masters! Also, as soldiers to fight the Yellow man's wars with the Russian and Western national alliances and empires or groups!

If India does not change her effete and suicidal policy be times, *this* or *something like it* will be her fate in the years to come. To be aware of the Peril is to be prepared against it - in the patriot's book, in the statesman's book. This book has other pages than the one monotonous *mantra* of nonalignment. It has the main motive of national defence carried out by preparedness to the limit of free economy. Free economy is to be supplemented by the military and economic aid of friendly foreign nations who have aims similar to ours- whose diplomacy and national aims include our national independence.

The cold fact is that the national aims of Russia and China as communist nations are "international" in the perverted sense of being identical with world conquest or world hegemony or world empire, whatever the phraseology in which it may be couched. This is the meaning of international proletarianism. They claim to be the natural leaders and protectors of the working classes of *every* nation over the heads of their own elected governments! This is an impertinence and intervention that should never be countenanced.

It requires the legal banning of the communist parties in every free country, particularly in India. For democracy cannot be interpreted to be a *suicide pact!* It is entitled to and is required by the necessities of the case to protect its people by immobilising the communist parties in its midst as treacherous groups with extra-territorial loyalties.

India needs an immediate re-orientation of diplomacy if she is to survive in the present perilous crisis and meet the Chinese menace.

She should immobilise the CPI whether of the Russian brand or pro-Chinese brand immediately.

India should comb out the Lal Sena groups of guerilla bands under comouflage in Assam and Tripura and other border areas thoroughly, village by village. Villager- recruited police constables will not be able to do this job. Educated young men fired with patriotic zeal should be recruited for the national defence for this purpose.

Land hungry farmers should be settled along the borders from Ladakh to Assam and Burma each with sufficient land for the support of a family and equipped with draft cattle, small tractors, fertiliser supplies, clothes for the mountain climate, rifles and

(Continued on Page 8)

What Is Wrong With Groupism ?

By M. N. Tholal

Groups based on affinity of ideas, are inherent in a libertarian society. But in India, Congressmen including their great leader, Mr. Nehru, swear by democracy and by the dignity of the individual, and yet are almost unanimously out to kill groupism. The real trouble in our country is that differences are not debated to make the people realise that they are over. Democracy can ill flourish in countries, where the people do not have the courage to speak out their minds.

THERE has been so much condemnation of groupism by Congressmen, following its condemnation by the Prime Minister, that it is worth while examining what groupism is and whether it is essentially bad. In all democratic countries groups exist, based doubtless on affinity of ideas, and no one has ever tried to condemn them, acknowledging that they are inherent in a society based on liberty. There are groups in Communist countries also, but they are not tolerated -- they live dangerously -- even as they were not tolerated in fascist Germany and Italy. The dictator is there to give to the people the direction in which they ought to pull, and it is none of the business of the people to think for themselves. But here in India Congressmen, including their great leader, Mr. Nehru, swear by democracy and by the dignity of the individual, and yet are almost unanimously out to kill groupism. Can anything be more absurd or hyprocritical?

The truth would appear to be that an attempt is being made to enthrone fascism in the Congress in the name of democracy. Mahatma Gandhi tried to do the same, but was balked, first by Deshbandhu Das and Pandit Motilal Nehru, and later by the latter's illustrious son, who is now our Prime Minister. But today there seems no one in the Congress who can take up the gauntlet thrown by Jawaharlal Nehru. There were great and far-seeing men in it but they all have left it,-mostly for the reason that they found it hopeless to challenge Mr. Nehru successfully within the Congress, with the result that Mr. Nehru in the Congress today is like a one-eyed man among the blind, and thus their natural leader. Mr. Nehru does not like able men who think for themselves and give expression to their convictions. He likes the lap-dog type which looks up to the Master for everything, and he is going to have it to the exclusion of other types. That is what the Kamaraj Plan, as amended by Mr. Nehru, is intended for.

Those conversant with the history of the Congress know that there have always been groups in the Congress. The split in the Congress at Surat in 1907 was due to what is called groupism. Tilak was then described as the arch-offender, who had brought about the ruin of the Congress, built up in a quarter of a century. When the delegates arrived at Surat, Tilak got together delegates of his way of thinking in a separate camp. Attempts were made by Tilak to bring about a compromise between the Moderates and the Nationalists, who were the Leftists of those days, but they failed. The session witnessed a melee. Chairs were thrown and sticks brandished. Even a shoe was hurled at the dais which grazed Surendranath Bannerjea and hit Sir Pherozeshah Mehta. The trouble arose because Tilak was not allowed to address the delegates on the proposal of the election of the President for the session, after it had been duly seconded. Tilak had a right to do so under the constitution, which gave the right to elect the President to the delegates.

The Moderates organised a convention and fixed a constitution for the Congress which practically excluded the Nationalists. In 1914 when there was an attempt to reunite the two wings of the Congress, Gokhale agreed first to such a reunion, but changed his mind afterwards. And no wonder, for it was only after the Surat split that Gokhale took a leading part in the Congress. Every one would admit that both Gokhale and Tilak were patriots of the highest order, and yet both were "guilty" of what is now called "groupism".

Jawaharlal Nehru himself belonged to a group in the late twenties, opposed to his own father. With Srinivas Iyengar he stood for independence at a time when his father used to say, "If I begin standing for independence today, Srinivas Iyengar would at once begin supporting Dominion status." I myself heard him say so. Later at the Calcutta Congress in 1928, Mr. Nehru had with Subhas Bose taken a stand against his own father who presided at the session and was threatening to resign if his stand was not approved by the Congress. Through the efforts of Gandhi a compromise was reached between the father and the son, but when the compromise resolution was taken up at the open Congress session, both Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru opposed it. Gandhi later severely criticised Mr. Nehru openly for going back on the compromise.

GANGING UP

What was it if not groupism--and unjustified at that—which made Motilal Nehru ignore a Hindu-Muslim settlement reached at the Madras Congress in 1927 as a result of the exertions of Srinivas Iyengar. It was the greatest piece of work any Congress leader ever did—for, as Jinnah used to say, "Hindu-Muslim unity is Swaraj"—and yet it was undone by no less a patriot than Motilal Nehru. The Agreement had been hailed by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya on one side and Jinnah and Maulana Mohammad Ali, on the other. What more could a patriot want? And yet it was brushed aside, almost treated as non-existent, and was followed by the Nehru Report, which proved to be an apple of discord. Even Gandhi took

no interest in the matter for fear of Motilal Nehru presumably—the latter was away in England but Gandhi was present at the Madras Congress. Obviously, the Mahatma should have thrown his whole weight on the side of the Agreement, but he did not.

We all know that it was groupism—again unjustified—which led in 1937 to what the Muslim Leaguers with a great deal of justification, called "double-crossing", when a purely Congress ministry was formed in U.P., although before the general election, which was run jointly by the U.P. Congress and the U.P. Muslim League, a coalition ministry had been agreed upon. The default proved calamitous as it led to the Muslim League demand for Pakistan. Even Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, in his *India Wins Freedom* blames Jawaharlal Nehru for this blunder. Gandhi was again wrong in not putting his foot down on the attempt to by-pass the gentlemen's agreement between the Congress and the League of U.P., which would easily have brought the two together all over the country.

The triple crown placed on the head of J. M. Sengupta by Mahatma Gandhi—it consisted of the presidentship of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, the leadership of the Bengal Congress Legislature Party and the Mayoralty of the Calcutta Corporation—ignoring Subhas Bose altogether, was one of the worst examples of groupism. Was it groupism or anti-groupism that made Jawaharlal Nehru come out of the prison in September 1935 with "Resist Wardha" on his lips? Never were two words more justified, but the fact remains that groupism was being attempted. That master tactician, the Mahatma, foiled the attempt by whispering to people that Jawaharlal was his "virtual successor", and the latter forgot all about resisting Wardha. 0 tempora, 0 mores! Prime Minister Nehru's attitude on the charges against Mr. Kairon is another glaring example of unjustified groupism. But that does not mean that groupism is always unjustified.

Groupism is bad if it is born of attachment or animosity to personalities, good if it is born of attachment to principles. No group is altogether bad and, vice versa, no group can be said to be altogether good. If a group becomes altogether or almost altogether bad, it will tend in course of time to fall apart and dissolve. And it cannot be altogether good because it is not in human nature to be wholly perfect. Even attachment to personalities is generally born of attachment to principles, when it is not due to the profit motive, as it can be said to be when a person is all-powerful and has it in his power to make men rich by the bestowal of jobs or licences or permits.

The Conservative Party of Britain, for example, has its groups—the Butler group, the Hailsham group, etc. —but they do not and cannot gang up against, one another, because the members of the group are too patriotic to permit unpatriotic action which will redound to the discredit of the group, that again because public opinion is too enlightened to permit anti-national or anti-social courses of action. This prevents careerism for personal gain and we see a man of the stature of Butler, losing the chance of becoming prime minister twice, without refusing to serve the Government under a new-comer.

The examples of groupism given above are extreme examples. They are instances really of ganging up against Tilak, against Srinivas Iyengar, against Subhas Bose, and ganging up, of course, should not be tolerated within parties. There is no reason why the leaders of groups within the party should not remain the best of friends conceding honesty to each other. Were not Gandhi and Srinivas Sastri the best of friends despite the great political gulf between them? The trouble in this country is that differences are not debated to make the people realise what the differences are over. This is due to the fact that there is too much fear of leaders who are cast in an undemocratic mould and resent criticism. Democracy can ill flourish in countries where the people do not have the courage to speak out their minds.

(Continued from Page 6)

ammunition for defence against wild animals and also for use against fifth columns when called upon. Ex-soldiers and their families should have the preference in this settlement programme. Volunteers from all areas, irrespective of stock, martial by inheritance or otherwise should be entertained. Volunteering is sufficient evidence of martial quality. Battalions as units can be allotted land blocks, also, as an additional plan.

Fruit orchards as well as plantations can be encouraged with suitable aid.

Elements from Ladakh, Punjab, Kashmir, North U.P., North Bihar, NEFA, North Assam, the Burma border such as the Nagaland areas should have these settlements.

Diplomacy should espouse the cause of Tibetan freedom in the UNO as a buffer. Russia and the USA and Britain should all be won over to this idea. Russia can be won over since she will *not* want *China* to be too powerful along her land frontier. India should also recognise Formosa as the true China and withdraw her Envoy from Peking and cut off diplomatic relations completely from China and declare her to be an *enemy country*. She should have the courage to call a spade a spade. The present wishy-washy position is demoralising as it continues the "Bhai Bhai" attitude in spite of the bloody aggression in Ladakh and NEFA. India should try to occupy the *military vacuum in South Asia* and undertake to take her fair share in the defence of the Free World. This is the condition that will win adequate aid from the USA and the Commonwealth.

DELHI LETTER

Nehru's Coup D' Grace

(From Our Correspondent)

Although a paper on democratic socialism was approved for circulation among affiliated bodies, many Congress leaders at the last AICC meeting at Jaipur gave proof of the fact that they do not understand what democracy is. Even the members of the Congress Working Committee come under this category. For, an elaborate statement on the Kamaraj Plan, prepared by the Working Committee, warned Congressmen that "fissiparous tendencies revealing themselves in groupism and factionalism in the organisation would have to be put down promptly and with a heavy hand". Every one knows whose heavy hand it is going to be that will promptly put down the fissiparous tendencies revealing themselves in groupism and factionalism in the organisation.

It was not thought necessary to leave it to surmise. The Working Committee's paper, Mr. Desai said, suggested frequent consultations between the organisational and parliamentary wings of the Party. To that end, he added, the High Command was thinking of steps to be taken against those who indulged in indiscipline, and necessary committees consisting of representatives of both sides — the ministerial and the organisation — and the Parliamentary Board were being set up in the states. Obviously, the representatives of the Parliamentary Board will decide by tilting the balance against the wing that is not absolutely loyal to the High Command.

All power would thus automatically pass into the hands of the High Command and the latter would exercise the same in the name of the committees which are being set up. It is thus obvious that the Kamaraj Plan provides the iron hand and the objective of democratic socialism the velvet glove which will hide the iron hand from public view. No wonder Mr. Nehru spoke so highly of Mr. Kamaraj — whose straightforward plan he has twisted and transformed for his personal benefit—" as a great and good man ..... whose place is assured for all time not only in the history of the Congress but also of the country".

Thus the Kamaraj Plan is clearly a fascist instrument in the hands of Mr. Nehru to strengthen his own hands and make him absolute dictator, and a paper on democratic socialism had to be prepared to cover up the intention behind implementation of the Kamaraj Plan..

Let us see what Mr. Desai's conception of democracy is. Some, he said, carried on the whispering campaign that some leaders were conspiring to oust Mr. Nehru from leadership. He added amid cheers that nothing would be more idiotic and senseless on the part of any Congressman than to harbour such a notion. Why? Is Mr. Nehru the repository of all wisdom in the world? Why should not Congressmen, if they are democrats, have the right to propagate the view that Mr. Nehru should be ousted from leadership, without being called idiots and senseless? He also said it was mischievous to categorise Congressmen as Leftists and Rightists, for Congressmen were all Congressmen wedded to Congress policies. But, surely, even thus wedded they can be Leftists and Rightists and that too legitimately. Mr. Desai also said that those who talk of groups and Right and Left should be dealt with a heavy hand. It certainly shows the way the wind is blowing in the Congress.

Mr. Harideo Joshi, the Rajasthan PCC President, went so far as to say that the Kamaraj Plan had enthused the rank and file of Congressmen and workers and had proved that India's millionns had full confidence and faith in Mr. Nehru's leadership. He is obviously one of those who feel somewhat alarmed at what happened immediately on the implementation of the Kamaraj Plan and say guardedly that it is too early to judge the Plan: He also said that the comon man in India felt and "rightly so" that the personality of Mr. Nehru was more influential and powerful than many a division of the Army. Perhaps he means to imply that nonalignment, like the nonviolence of old, is the mightiest power on earth. We have already seen some of its power.

The resolution on the Kamaraj Plan adopted unanimously by the AICC on November 3 listed, among other things, discipline and removal of groupism as needing special attention. Removal of groupism implies removal of differences of opinion. The question arises: Whose opinions are then going to be held by all? The answer is obvious. And discipline is necessary to enforce uniformity of opinion. Clearly therefore an attempt is being made to turn India into a totalitarian state. Mr. Sanjivayya said that in essence the Kamaraj Plan was intended to inculcate in the minds of Congressmen feelings of service and devotion to the organisation to which they all belong. He could have more truly that it was intended — after its amendment by Mr. Nehru — to inculcate in the minds of Congressmen feeling of service and devotion to Mr. Nehru. Congressmen should now all be Haris. Hari was a domestic servant of the Nehrus who became a member of the U.P. Legislative Assembly after getting a Congress ticket. I am not aware that Hitler or Mussolini, even in the heyday of their

dictatorship, ever had their domestic servant in the legislatures of their lands. (Mr. Nehru's typist is a Congress M.P.)

Nevertheless there was some frank and outspoken criticism. Mr. Mahavir Tyagi considered it an "unprecedented and unnatural step" taken by the High Command "to force the Chief Ministers of States to take into their Cabinets dissidents in whom the Chief Ministers lacked confidence" and he asked whether the High Command wanted a cabinet or a federation in the states. He might have put it more bluntly and said that the High Command was fishing in troubled waters. He almost hinted that when he said he wanted the High Command to look into things with an introspective eye and "see whether the fault did not lie with them". The motive behind the Kamaraj Plan was made almost obvious by Seth Govind Das when he complained that, while dissidents were consulted by the Congress High Command in U.P. and Behar before the formation of ministries there, the same principle was not applied in the case of Madhya Pradesh. What then happened in C.P. to the principle enunciated by Mr. Nehru at Jaipur in his declaration that the Congress High Comand had to intervene in the formation of ministries because it was anxious that the complexion of the entire party was reflected in the ministry and the right people were included in it on the basis of merit and not on the basis of personal allegiance to a person or group?

The Urdu verse Mr. Tyagi recited was a telling piece, the most appropriate line in it being, "Yaron ke sar kata diye Sardar bangaye". (Became the leader by cutting off colleagues' heads.) But steps to dictatorship are always taken on the bodies of colleagues. Mahatma Gandhi acknowledged Gokhale as his master but the first thing that he did on becoming a Congress leader was to drive away Gokhale's disciples from the Congress and even make it impossible for them to return to the Congress! (That is why this correspondent has been saying that Mr. Nehru is a true disciple of Mahatma Gandhi.) Prime Minister Bakhshi's was the most candid comment on the Kamaraj Plan when, pleading for more people retiring under the Plan, he quoted an Urdu poet to say, "Ham to doobey hain, Sanam, tujhko bhi le doobeyge". ("We have sunk but we shall take you down with us.") At least one of the retiring Chief Ministers has had the courage to equate retirement from office with "sinking" and to give expression to his natural intentions thereafter. But it was left to Mr. Amarnath Vidyalankar to put his finger on the ailing spot when he accused the Congress High Command of lending ears to backbiting which, he said, had encouraged group and faction mongers in the party. He also exposed the Plan saying that, although 12 top men had left their posts, thought had not yet been given to the work they were to do!

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The AICC also adopted a resolution on international affairs affirming India's firm resolve to repel Chinese aggression. Rajasthan Chief Minister Mohanlal Sukhadia, seconding the resolution, said that India could never tolerate aggression by either China or Pakistan. One wonders whether he knows that India has tolerated aggression by Pakistan for fifteen years. A man who does not know that, or can forget it, can also vehemently defend the policy of non-alignment.

Mr. Krishna Menon, who remains an authority on foreign affairs, said that even in the worst situation India could never negotiate with China and Pakistan on the basis of surrendering our territory. But is not our offer of a no-war pact to Pakistan as good as negotiation on the basis of surrendering our territory? Mr. Menon also said that the policy of non-alignment had stood the test of both peace and wartime. It certainly has, if we forget the aggression by China, and Mr. Menon seems to have forgotten it or is prepared to forget it.

Mr. Raghunath Singh of U.P., moving an amendment, wanted the resolution to protest strongly against the repression of Buddhists in South Viet-nam. Mr. Nehru described the amendment as "irresponsible" in the present context of a coup there and said it was highly improper to move such an amendment. But where lay the irresponsibility or the high impropriety? If the repression or suppression of Buddhists is condemnable, it should be condemned — at any rate any attempt to do so should not be termed irresponsible or highly improper unless the Congress has decided to say god-bye to ethics. As for the qualification "in the context of the coup", which was obviously pro-Buddhist, as it should have been under the situation, the amendment by implication approved the policies of the Government, which had already released Buddhists, and there was nothing offensive in the amendment against the regime, while the old regime had already been condemned with Mr. Nehru's approval by the Congress Parliamentary Party's executive. Mr. Nehru's high-handed intervention in the debate only shows the irresponsible manner in which he sometimes intervenes in debates.

The resolution referred to the recent historic march of U.S. Negroes in their struggle for equality. Was that march more historic than the burning of their live bodies by Buddhist monks? Mr. Subramanian, who moved the resolution, naturally could not, after Mr. Nehru's vehement intervention, accept Mr. Raghunath Singh's amendment. He put down his refusal to the "fast-changing situation there". But the debate took place on November 4 and the coup was over on November 2. Where then was the "fast-changing situation"? This is another example of how Mr. Nehru carries the day with his high-handedness, and yet there is no one in the world who condemns fear more than Mr. Nehru. Does he think the manner in which he sometimes intervenes in debates is not calculated to excite fear? Or does he condemn fear so often because he exploits the cowardice of Congressmen?

GUIDED DEMOCRACY

By SHRIMATI PREMA NANDAKUMAR

'Guided Democracy'; 'National Front'; 'Economic Democracy' — many of these words have a familiar ring. 'Newspeak', 'double-think' are alarming forces in the modern world. Words can be misused and reiterated often enough till the less appears the better reason, and Big Brother beams like Benevolence, and Dictator dons the great democrat's cap. As for 'Socialism', the Nazis were Socialists, and the Communists are Socialists too; so why should not Indonesians also be Socialists if they want? As Dr. Sukarno sees it, Socialism is simply the extension of the 'family system'; the whole nation becomes a family.

BURSTING with good intentions, the UNESCO have started the "Major Project on Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values"; and as a part of this *major* project, the 'Orient-Occident Week' was celebrated (presumably with subsidies from the UNESCO) in all the *major* (for only 'major' can respond to 'major') Indian Universities towards the end of September. The celebrations took the form of India-Indonesia Mutual Appreciation in Waltair, and no less a person than Dr. Ch. Anwar Sani of the Indonesian Embassy was present to highlight the exercise in Mutual Appreciation. There were lectures, film shows, music concerts, and a symposium, an exhibition, a catechism, and even a quiz. Indeed, a tight programme for a full week. Waltair Uplands must have been overflowing with the milk and honey of orient-occident mutual appreciation. The programme ended with a lucid lecture on the Gandhian Ethic by Prof. M. V. Moorthy and a spate of Indonesian music.

Which of the two participating countries (India and Indonesia) was *occident*, and which *orient*? Or, since both India and Indonesia are blissfully non-aligned in the Nehru-Menon way, are the terms 'occident' and 'orient' strictly irrelevant? Or might it not be that when the hectic pairing was done at 'headquarters', the occident-orient couples were all exhausted, and the two oriental countries — India and Indonesia -- were left to conduct some sort of dialogue (or two independent parallel monologues) on hospitable Waltair? Perhaps we are too curious in these matters; perhaps the meaning of terms doesn't matter at all, so long as some idle chatter of a transcendental kind can ensue and inundate the hearers.

From reports and from my own experience of attending some of the lectures, I have the uncomfortable feeling that the 'celebrations' did't exactly promote mutual appreciation. On the very first day, there was some misunderstanding as to whether the vast sheet of water traditionally known as the Indian Ocean shouldn't more appropriately be called the Indonesian Ocean. There were subdued murmurs of dissent in the excellent discourse on 'The Cultural Unity of South East Asia' by Dr. O. Ramachandraiya. The Principal made an odd (though casual) reference to Indonesia's 'militant' attitude. All the same, considering the explosive material for dissent available, the proceedings were tolerant enough.

I must, however, refer more in detail to Dr. Ch. Anwar Sani's second lecture, the subject of which was the political situation in Indonesia. Dr. Sani was speaking, he said, in his individual capacity and not as the official representative of Indonesia; but there was no doubt he was speaking with knowledge and authority. The upshot of the speech was that Dr. Sukarno was, is, and must be the life, mind, heart and soul of Indonesia. In June 1945, Dr. Sukarno enunciated the "five principles" that should guide the future Indonesian State: 1. Nationalism rather than the narrower localism); 2. Internalionalism (rather than the chauvinistic brand of nationalism); 3. Democracy (of the traditional type: i.e., governed, not by majority decisions, but by unanimous decisions); 4. Social Justice (in other words, a broadly egalitarian order); and 5. Belief in one Supreme God. These 'principles' underwent some processing before they were embodied in the Jakarta Charter of 22 June 1945 as belief in the one God, just and civilised humanity, Indonesian Unity, democracy, and social justice. After the capitulation of Japan, there followed the declaration of Indonesian Independence; and the preamble to the Constitution of the Republic more or less reiterated the 'principles' enunciated in the Jakarta Charter. It was stressed that the 'five principles' were really of an interlocking character, and the real task then was to reach a final agreement with the Dutch authorities. Holland 'recognised' the Republic in 1949, and next year the 'United States of Indonesia' were replaced by United Indonesia. Even so, the importation of the Western parliamentary system of 'government by political parties' led to frequent changes in government, chronic uncertainty in the political landscape, and the growth of fissiparous tendencies. The idea of 'guided democracy' mooted first by Dr. Sukarno in 1956, did not then prove acceptable to the political parties; but, after the abortive rebellion in Sumatra and elsewhere in 1958, 'guided democracy' was again offered as the panacea, and the presidential decree of July 1959 took the country back — so to say — to 18 August 1945 and the Five Principles and Dr. Sukarno's supreme and permanent overlordship. And Indonesia has been enjoying the blessings of 'guided democracy' during the last 4 or 5 years.

Dr. Sani did his best to explain the concept of Indonesian 'guided democracy'. Is 'guided democracy' but veiled dictatorship? No. Is 'guided democracy' a new universal solvent of all political ills? No again; "guided democracy is not for export". What, then, is the *raison d'etre* for 'guided demo-

cracy'? Dr. Sani said that since democracy without guidance led to chaos, and guidance without democracy led to dictatorship, Indonesia (under Dr. Sukarno's enlightened leadership) had opted for *both* guidance and democracy. "It is good for us", he said disarmingly, and added: "I don't know whether it will be good for others". Of course, we see 'guided (or basic) democracy' in action, not only in Indonesia, but also in Ghana, the United Arab Republic, Pakistan, and many other Afro-Asian countries. In India we have so far reached only the Kamaraj stage of guided resignations and guided 'unanimous elections'. Luckily we are so much preoccupied with the practice of the Yoga of Non-Alignment to have either the time or the inclination to experiment with 'guided democracy'.

There is, then, the phenomenon of Indonesian Socialism adjusted to the ethos of 'guided democracy'. Didn't dear old Stanley Baldwin say, "We are all socialists now-a-days?" The Nazis were national socialists, and the Communists are socialists too; so why shouldn't the Indonesians also be socialists if they want? As Dr. Sukarno sees it, socialism is simply the extension of the 'family system'; the whole nation becomes a family — one and all must work to create wealth for the enjoyment of one and all. The dynamics of Indonesian socialism would seem to comprise, firstly, peaceful methods; secondly, the proliferation of the family principle; thirdly, the elimination of 'superhuman' and 'subhuman' complexes in society; and fourthly, a sense of togetherness in work and division of results. Dr. Sani, however, admitted that 'nice' though these principles may be, there is still the paramount need to reckon with human nature. During 1950-57 (the years of party democracy) corruption had made rapid progress and seeped to the remotest ends. More recently, and especially after the expropriation of Dutch interests, Indonesian economy has been showing signs of recovery. Dr. Sani seemed to think that the extension of statism, radical land reform, the education of the people in skills and attitudes (especially *indepen dent* attitudes) and the mobilisation of a 'national front' should help Indonesia to achieve in "5 or 10 years" the blessings of socialistic prosperity. Have we the needed resources? Yes. Have we the needed man power? Yes. But what is lacking, then? The right mental attitude and the development of the requisite inner discipline — these are yet to emerge firmly. Meanwhile steady 'indoctrination' (the word is Dr. Sani's, and he repeated it with emphasis more than once) is going on. And what the shape of the future is going to be — "I don't know".

'Guided democracy'; 'five principles'; 'statism'; 'national front'; 'economic democracy'; 'indoctrination'; 'right attitude'; 'inner discipline' ....many of these words have a familiar ring. 'Newspeak', 'doublethink' and 'wordfact' are alarming forces in the modern world. Words can be misused and reiterated often enough till the less appears as the better reason, and Big Brother beams like Benevolence, and Dictator dons the great democrat's cap. For another view of contemporary Indonesia, I may quote a few sentences from an article by Paul Johnson in the *New Statesman* of 25 May 1962:

"Djakarta is a frightening and sinister city. Nobody will go there except on inescapable business.. Indonesia is running downhill at a terrifying speed ..The black market value of the rupiah is now 1,000 to the pound, against an official rate of 125 ....The writ of the government is no longer effective outside the capital (and not always within it) .. the country's eight year plan, introduced in 1961, which is based on a calculation of export earnings, bears no relation to what is actually happening .. it is pointless to enter into the labyrinth of Indonesian statistics, many of which exist only in the minds of those who compile them. Certainly they cause no loss of sleep to President Sukarno ...."

Happy Sukarno! Be the conditions what they may, he has built (with a Soviet loan) the largest Asian Stadium complex (where last year's Asian Games were held) and a skyscraper hotel (comparable to our own Ashoka); and he has got West Irian. Happy Sukarno!

Book Review

WILHELM Roepke's *Economics of the Free Society* (Regnery, $4.95, translated by Patrick M. Boarman).

Reviewed By J. Chamberlain

Released for German readers after the war, *Economics of the Free Society* presumably played some part in guiding Roepke's disciple, the Bonn government's Minister of Economics Dr. Ludwig Erhard, in the sparking of what has been called the "German miracle." Dr. Erhard has praised Roepke as "a great witness to the truth." This truth, as Erhard sees it, consists of a doctrine that calls for "freedom in the realm of of goods, discipline in the realm of money." The quotation is from *Economics of the Free Society,* but the identical bit of wisdom, phrased in various ways, is to be found in all of Roepke's books. "Free goods," of course, refers to free choice in the market, not to any give-aways.

Building on the "free goods, disciplined money" idea, the West German government made it possible "in a few years for a war-devastated rump state, swollen with refugees, whose cities had been destroyed to the extent of 50 per cent and more, to develop a 'hard,' fully convertible currency, to become the chief creditor of Europe, and finally, even to be found worthy of helping the leading power of the free world, the United States, out of its balance of payments difficulties with credits of one kind or another. German foreign trade, after having fallen to zero during and after the war, expanded within a decade to the point where Germany assumed the number two position in world trade (after the U.S.). Later,

Japan — using the same recipes — achieved similar results."

Aside from its verbal felicity, *Economics of the Free Society* differs from other basic texts in its insistence that economic activity always takes place in a moral and legal context. To have a functioning free international system, nations must subscribe to common legal, monetary, and moral values. If such values exist and have wide acceptance, a UN will work. But, by the same token, a UN in such circumstances would be largely superfluous. On the other hand, a UN whose members do not accept congenial ideas about legality, morality, or monetary standards and practices will be a place of bickering and attempted bullying. In short, it will be a place of battle-short-of-war. Part of Roepke's life crusade for the truth has been the effort to reconstitute the fabric of international society that existed in the West before the two world wars of the twentieth century. He is tired of a perpetual battle-short-of-war.

Carrying through with his insistence that a good economics system depends on its moral and legal framework, Roepke compares the views of two giants of economic theory, Adam Smith and John Maynard Keynes. Smith, at the dawn of the modern era, viewed economics as an organic part "of the larger whole of the intellectual, moral, and historical life of society." Keynes, coming in the twilight of the humanistic age when a "mathematical-mechanical universe" was being substituted for Smith's "living order" under an "invisible hand," was a "representative of the geometric spirit." Where Smith thought in terms of freeing men, Keynes thought in terms of manipulating them as one would manipulate statistics to make a desired point.

Where Smith's values result in a society in which enterprisers try to combine the factors of production in the most efficient — i.e., economical — manner, Keynes's values lead directly to arbitrary selection and the rule of force. Roepke does not deny that force can accomplish things. But it does so wastefully, and with terrible frictions. "Equilibrium" is established in "command societies" by such things as killing off kulaks, or putting old-fashioned liberals into concentration camps, or building walls and stringing up barbed wire to keep a slave labor force from escaping. "Command societies" can put sputniks into orbit, just as they can employ armies of human ants to build pyramids, but while the sputniks spin aloft, 50 per cent of the "commanded" population will be standing in the furrows of inefficient collective farms to watch the passage of one or two favoured birdmen through the skies. The "command society" does not know how to combine factors of production into a harmoniously functioning whole, for it has no rational methods of calculation at its disposal.

When Roepke was writing *Economics of the Free Society*, the world was worried about the "deadening" implications of mass production. And, quite in keeping with tht spirit of the nineteen thirties this book retains its author's old fears of a "proletarianized, centralized, mass-type society." We must, he says, have a "policy—going beyond cyclical policy—which seeks to mitigate the sensitivity and instability" of our mass society "through decentralization, de-proletarianization, the anchoring of men in their own resources, encouragement to small farmers and small business, increased property ownership, and the strengthening of the middle classes." Dell, Roepke is right in fearing "proletarianization" and "centralization." But do his fears apply in countries that have passed through the earlier phases of mass production?

Meanwhile, in spite of centralizing politics, other individuals in America fight to be themselves. Freed by automation from production line "serfdom," the true individual becomes a hotel keeper, a garage proprietor, a true surgeon. He buys a boat, he joins a bowling league, he takes up camping or fishing or skating or skiing or curling. He becomes a leisure-time student, one of the twenty-five million Americans who, according to a survey made recently by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago, are taking adult education courses in something or other.

Thus it is entirely possible that Roepke's fears of "bigness" and "mass" and "proletarianization" are misplaced. One wishes he would have a second go at his section on what he calls "the third road."

—Condensed from *'The Freeman'*

The Mind of the Nation

THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE

It is necessary to examine the implications of Earl Russell's hypothetical question. The question presupposes that the free world has to choose between being red and being dead, and that the former is a lesser evil since in the course of time the colour is bound to fade away and turn into pink. Incidentally, there is a secondary presupposition in this reasoning which needs being explicitly stated. It is to the effect that being red first and then turning pink over a period of a century is preferable also to not turning red at all. In other words, a 'temporary' communization of the world is better than its slow evolution into a social democracy of the type that distinguishes the Scandinavian countries or the U.K. It is on the basis of some such reasoning, never stated clearly, that Earl Russell indulges in an unseemly attack on Mr. Morarji Desai.

To come back to the major presupposition of Earl Russell's advice, how far is it true that free men have no choice, besides being red or being dead? If the experience of the last twelve years is taken into account if becomes clear that aggressive communism is neither invincible nor incapable of containment — provided the free world is firm and united in its determination to remain free. In other words, besides the two alternatives formulated by Earl Russell there also is a third practicable alternative as shown by the example of Western Europe, the U.S. and even tiny Taiwan, the Malaysia. If India has had a different experience, that was because her leaders were incapable of clear thinking and uninhibited action. Mr. Nehru was never reputed for

being a logician, nor did he ever claim that honour. But surely one like Earl Russell ought to have thought of this third alternative before ordinary men and women adopted it almost instinctively in many parts of the non-communist world. In any case, he should be able to see it now.

—The Radical Humanist

News & Views

FREE WORLD SECURITY IS U. S. SPACE AIM

President Kennedy again has made clear that the objective of the United States space programme is the security of the free world, and not just getting a man to the moon and back ahead of the Soviet Union.

The U. S. space effort, the President said at a recent press conference, is not determined by a so-called moon race with the Soviets. It is rather a question of acquiring the technical competence to develop the peaceful uses of outer spact and prevent anyone from using it for military purposes.

This has been a major objective of the Kennedy Administration for some time. Last year, for instance, the President pointed out that "space science like nuclear science and all technology, has no conscience of its own. Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on man. Only if the U.S. occupies a position of pre-eminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace or a terrifying theatre of war."

• • •

RED CHINESE TROOPS REVOLT

TAIPEH: Communist soldiers stationed in Haifeng village in the mainland province of Kwantung, killed 20 officers and fellow soldiers in a revolt in July last, the official Central News Agency reported.

According to the report, the revolt was provoked by punishment of soldier who had expressed discontent with the communist regime in letters to their families.

The soldiers, the report said, first raised a false alarm of air raid at about midnight on July 27 and as men came running out of their quarters, opened up on them with machine guns, killing 20 officers and soldier and wounding scores more.

The report did not give the number involved in the revolt. It said that the rebels had later joined the guerillas with their weapons.

• • •

'FREEDOM MUST BE DEFENDED — BOWLES

"Freedom will remain a myth unless we are always prepared to defend it," emphasised U.S. Ambassador Chester Bowles in Chandigarh. "My country took more than a century and a half to learn this lesson; the Chinese made it clear to India last fall."

Mr. Bowles made these remarks while addressing a gathering of prominent citizens, educators and students at an Educational and Cultural Week held at Panjab University.

"You are wise", noted Ambassador Bowles, "not to become so preoccupied with military strength that the job of building a new and prosperous India is neglected. The freedom of a country will be basically assured by what is done within that country to make freedom meaningful to all the people."

A Warning

He warned, however, that freedom cannot always be be achieved or preserved by hard work and good will alone. Sometimes it must be fought for.

• • •

MAO & CHOU EFFIGIES BURNT IN PAK-OCCUPIED KASHMIR

SRINAGAR: In Pakistan-occupied Kashmir, effigies of Mao Tse-Tung, Chou-En-Lai and some Pakistani leaders have been burned several times following reports that Chinese Communists have loosened a reign of terror in Muslim-populated Sinkiang.

The movement against Pakistan's collaboration with China has been organised by leading Muslim Ulemas not only in occupied-Kashmir but in West Pakistan as well.

Reports reaching here say that several Muslim religious organizations in occupied Kashmir have sent protests to President Ayub Khan, for collaborating with Chinese Communists who have given a bloodbath to the Muslim province of Sinkiang".

These protest notes have sarcastically asked, "Is this the way the world's buggest Muslim country, Pakistan, is serving Islam?"

Posters have condemned Chinese Communists for destroying mosques and shrines in Sinkiang.

These organisations have used posters and pamphlets which have poured ridicule on Foreign Minister Bhutto who early this year went to Peking to sign the hated agreement to delimit the borders of Pak-occupied Kashmir and China.

Bhutto has been asked to resign because he wants Pakistan to be friendly with godless China, which is repugnant to Islam.

Reports say that the Pakistan army is guarding mosques in occupied territory because Ulemas (theologists) speak from pulpits condemning Pakistan for collaborating with Communits, the "main enemies of Islam."

Pakistan is also reported to have arrested several Ulemas for the "seditious" activity of condemning China and the Sino-Pakistan border agreement. Apart from the Ulemas, political workers including students and servicemen have been arrested.

• • •

ALIGARH TO TEACH IN ENGLISH

ALIGARH: Aligarh Muslim University has decided to make English the medium of instruction.

More than 80 per cent of the students in the University are science or engineering students.

The Academic Council has decided that the papers set for the University examinations will have to be answered in English.

During the 1963-64, however, Part I and Part II students of the three-year degree Course have been permitted to answer sessional and other examination papers in Hindi, Urdu or English. It will, however, be incumbent on all students to answer at least 25 per cent of all papers at the sessionals in English.

DCITATORIAL WAY OF SOCIALISM NO GOOD —PATIL

Mr. S. K. Patil said in Bombay on Friday that only through eternal vigilance on the part of the people could democracy resist the imposition of all "limitations and regimentations."

He was speaking on "How Democratic is our Democracy?" at a meeting held under the auspices of the Indian Council of Work Affairs at the Tata Auditorium, Bombay House.

An unprecedented gathering which packed the spacious hall to capacity and spilled into the adjoining corridors listened to Mr. Patil in alternating bouts of pin-drop silence and deafening cheers.

Mr. Patil said as a private citizen he would not like for India the type of dictatorial socialism which flourished in Russia and China.

Russian socialism and Chinese socialism might be all right for Russia and China, "but surely all of us should be allowed to choose our own form of democracy".

He said it was not only what was enshrined in the Indian Constitution but also in an individual's day-to-day life that democracy had to function uninhibited and untrammelled and anything or anybody who sought to stand in the way of its unfettered growth should be removed, he said amidst loud cheers.

* * *

WHY R.B.I. COLLECTS DATA ON BANK SHARES

The Staff Correspondent of **'Current'** writes:—

While Mr. Nehru, at his press conference, brushed aside **Current's** story on the possibility of banks being nationalised with the remark: "Don't believe what you read in **Current**", the Reserve Bank of India has sent a circular to scheduled banks, asking them to furnish information about the ownership of bank shares as on October 31, 1963.

According to a report in the "Financial Express" (Nov. 7)—a paper of Press lord Ramnath Goenka, a close friend of the present Finance Minister, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari—"Banks have been asked to give data about the ownership of the bank shares held by banks, general insurance, investment and industrial companies and other companies and statutory corporations, like the Life Insurance Corporation.

"The data, which have to be supplied by the middle of November, include the number and the paid up value of shares.

"The Reserve Bank has not so far published any documents relating to the ownership of bank shares, and this is for the first time that RBI is collecting information regarding corporate holding of bank shares".

Strange coincidence, isn't it?

* * *

'FOREIGN DEBT' BURDEN HAMPERS PROGRESS

BANGKOK: The economic development has been hampered by their growing burden of fereign debt", according to a communique released at the end of the Colombo Plan Ministerial conference.

"Some developing contries have reached a stage at which the growing burden of foreign debt puts severe limitations on their capacity to borrow further and thus to press ahead with economic development.

"Many of these countries are obliged to devote a substantial proportion of current foreign exchange earnings to the services of foreign debt," it said.

The communique said agriculture appeared to be the "most sluggish and resistant and rapid growth" in countries of the Colombo Plan region."

Although there had been an average annual increase in production of about thret per cent over the past decade for the region, rising population had absorbed two-thirds of this increase.

BRIGHT PICTURE

The communique gave a bright picture of the industrial development of the Colombo Plan territories.

"The industrial sector has shown considerable dynamism and continued to grow at a rate of about eight per cent per annum," it said.

The communique urged developing countries of the world to contribute to the expansion of trade opportunities of developing countries by reducing various artificial restraints such as high tariffs, import quotas and high internal taxes.

These restraints in effect "restrict economic growth opportunities in developing countries and are likely to result in wasteful allocation or under employment of the resources available to a country," the communique said.

* * *

THE UNCEASING FLIGHT FROM THE SOVIET ZONE

Not A Day Passes Without a Defiance of Terrors

In spite of the Berlin Wall and the reinforcement of the barricades and minefields along the zonal border between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Zone, the flight to freedom has not ceased.

The reports that follow show that not a day passes without an inhabitant of the Soviet Zone crossing over to West Berlin or to Federal territory or sacrificing himself or herself in the attempt to escape:

Oct. 30: A woman was attempting to cross the zonal border and escape to the Federal Republic of Germany near Kassel in the State of Hesse. She struck a mine laid by the Soviet-Zone rulers and was severely wounded. A 22-year-old teacher and his friend had better luck.

Oct. 31: A 53-year-old East-Berliner escaped to West Berlin.

Nov. 1: Two teen-agers escaped in a small boat across the Werra river which separates the Soviet Zone from the Federal Republic. On the same day, a 17-year-old lad crossed over the border into Lower Saxony.

Nov. 2: Three young persons successfully crossed the barbed wire barricade at a point on the zonal border of east Bavaria. Two clerks of the East-Berlin Transport Undertaking also succeeded in escaping to West Berlin.

Nov. 4: A Soviet-Zone policeman murdered a German while he was trying to escape to West Berlin by swimming across the river Spree.

Nov. 5: A 21-year-old soldier of the "People's Army" succeeded in fleeing to Lower Saxony in the Federal Republic.

ANNOUNCEMENT

We have a few back issues of "Freeman" a monthly journal published by the Foundation for Economic Education, U.S.A. They are available free on request to us. Requests for copies should be accompanied with 15 nP. stamps.

Write: Desk K. R.
Ist floor Arya Bhuvan,
Sandhurst Road West,
Bombay—4.

GIFT OF THE MONTH

Choose your gift books from the following list.
Do not request more than 4 books. This offer is good only for those new subscribers to **THE INDIAN LIBERTARIAN** enlisting during December.

1. Stop Legal Stealing. John C. Lincoln.
2. On Life and Death. James Peter Warbasse.
3. March of Conspiracy. Gopal Mittal.
4. No Gold on my chovels. Ifan Edwards.
5. Dayanand His Life and Work. Suraj Bhan.
6. Our Economic Problems. Unwin.
7. Explorations. Sibnarayan Ray.
8. Will Dollars save the world. Henry Hazlitt.
9. Conscience on the Battlefield. Leornard Read.

Write Desk : S. N. Ist Floor, Arya Bhuvan, 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: 332105 Telegram: LOTEWALA

Edited by D. M. Kulkarni, B.A., LL.B., for the Libertarian Publishers Private Ltd., Printed by G. N. Lawande, at States' People Press, Janmabhoomi Bhavan, Ghoga Street, Fort, Bombay-1, and published by him at the office of The Libertarian Publishers (Private) Ltd., First floor, Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road West, Bombay 4.