

Emergency And The Press

S. Natarajan

LET us start with considering the relations subsisting between the Government and the Press in the present "national emergency." Several views have been expressed about the emergency, but the general opinion is that the emergency exists — the differences relate to how it should be dealt with. I would like to consider the subject somewhat more narrowly than political students do; Is there an emergency in Government—Press relations? In other words, was the Press as a whole presenting a threat to the Indian Government which necessitated the assumption of special powers and the establishment of special institutions? Or was the inclusion of a number of regulations in the Defence of India Rules relating to prejudicial reports and prejudicial acts quite superfluous? I think that it was unnecessary, possibly the result of a thoughtless imitation of the Defence of India Rules which were promulgated during World War II to meet a very different situation. And because the regulations are superfluous, I believe that their general effect will be harmful.

The Government of India in the forties faced a real Press emergency which arose out of the political struggle. Gandhiji, it must be remembered, directed an appeal to Hitler, and capped it with an appeal to every Briton who advocated non-resistance in its most extreme form — during a period of war which was particularly trying to the British. In India, the satyagraha campaign which had stressed non-violence and non-embarrassment of the British in their dire straits, had gone off its moorings, distinguishing subtly between violence to property (permissible), and violence to person (non-permissible); there was the campaign of Subhas Chandra Bose over enemy radio urging that no nation won its independence without outside help; there was the push-through of the Japanese forces in Malaya and Burma; and with all this internal conditions in India betrayed that absence of unity which was to end in the partition of the country.

It was not a state of affairs where the administration could turn an indifferent eye to the publication of even news. And the intensification of the national movements synchronising with adverse developments

in the war, the Government promulgated a series of ordinances which practically brought the Press to a standstill. It was as a result of this that some members of the Indian and Eastern Newspaper Proprietors Society, mostly Managing Editors, felt it necessary to convene an editors' conference which later developed into the All India Newspaper Editors Conference. At the first session, both the Government and the Press were confronted with an acute problem. Gandhiji had suspended the 'Harijan' on the ground that it was not possible for a journal to function under prevailing conditions. But the general feeling among editors was that every effort should be made to impress on the Government the danger of a controlled press rather than to go out of existence, creating a vacuum for all kinds of rumours to spread. The Government sought to control news at the source, by securing the registration of district correspondents; the editors were anxious to limit the opportunities of executive excess to a minimum.

This was the background in which the press advisory system came into being. For the pre-censorship the Government wanted, "consultative scrutiny" was substituted, which meant that articles likely to be prejudicial to the war effort were to be placed before a panel of editors. But it was press advising which took a firm hold of the situation, and the Newspaper Editors' Conference over the years secured the right to be consulted on all matters relating to the Press. It was continued after the war and the Congress Governments sought to utilise it in inducing restraint among newspaper writers on the communal disturbances. Out of this in turn grew what was variously known as "the gentlemen's agreement" or the "code of journalistic ethics", which the late Mr. S. A. Brelvi strongly commended, to the astonishment of democratic editors, at international conferences.

Two things are important results of this historical development: Firstly, the Congress had only experience of the operation of the Defence of India Rules (World War II style) as regards the Press, and there are few senior officials today in the administration who have practical knowledge of the why and wherefore of the Press advising system, or of its working. Even under the British, the system in the two provinces, Bombay and Madras, where it worked smoothly, was known for the understanding it fostered between the Government and the Press, both of whom were interested in preventing trouble rather than in challenging each other. Editors were helped to discharge their responsibility — they were called up to explain their writings — excused that offending matter had appeared owing to the slackness of junior staff, were readily accepted and the offence passed over. When

the Congress took office, relations grew so intimate between the Press and the Government that priorities for motor cars, extra rations of petrol and telephone allocations were smoothly negotiated.

Some editors in the past sixteen years became the intermediaries between their newspaper-proprietors and the Government; some Delhi correspondents, it has been said, were useful contacts for negotiating licences and the like; others stationed at Delhi found it convenient to share amenities with Members of Parliament. All this made for unhealthiness in the newspaper world. When the "emergency" occurred, the most energetic effort exerted was in re-establishing the press advisory machinery at the Centre — with this difference that editors of offending newspapers were not asked to explain their writings, and action in no case has been considered against those editors who favoured placating the Chinese. In reviving the Defence of India Rules, no consideration was paid to the fact that the Government of India of today was functioning under very different conditions from those confronting the British Government of India of the war years. It does not matter that there have been few instances of action being taken; this is less due to the restraint of the Government than to the studied policy of newspapers as a whole not to embarrass the administration, which has almost become a weakness of the Indian Press. It is contended legalistically that the Press has no greater freedom than the individual and that freedom of the Press is another term for freedom of expression. In practical terms, however, the newspaper is very differently placed from the individual. An individual may, if he chooses, keep silent over any controversial subject, and, provided he does not go out of his way to tell lies, no one will seriously object. Again, there is a limit to the public most individuals reach. With a newspaper, the position is very different.

The direct reference to the Press in the Defence of India Rules are very few, but a vast accumulation of unnecessary rules clutter up the legislation and most of them indirectly affect the newspaper more than the individual. A few of the tricky sections relate to "prejudicing" India's relations with any foreign power and the success of any financial measures taken by the Government. Others, obviously meant to prevent a no-tax campaign during the British period, have been resuscitated now when there is no intention of withholding payment of taxes. The trouble with the Defence of India Rules is that they are not formulated to meet the present emergency but the emergency of 1939-44 and, because of this, they are mischievous when enforced and irritating when left unused.

II

The habit of accepting a distinction between the role of the Press under a democratic State and that of its corresponding institution in a totalitarian State has led to a deterioration of standards. In democracy, it is accepted that one might be wrong without being necessarily evil-intentioned. It is accepted that the

public interest is best served by open discussion. A totalitarian State acts on the assumption of infallibility. When a political party claims to represent the people of a nation, it is virtually totalitarian and practically so in its attitude to the Press. It does not matter if when it comes to power it adheres to democratic forms. It considers its tolerance of free criticism as an act of grace and generosity to which the Press must in sheer gratitude respond by exercising restraint, moderation and almost self-suppression. When this does not happen, insinuations are put about that the press is controlled by vested interests.

A peculiarly striking example of confused thinking is Mr. Nehru's speech at the closing session of the seminar on the Indian Press organised by the Press Institute of India and the India International Centre. "I am unable to understand," observed the Prime Minister, "how a small group represents freedom of the Press although it may not be interfered with by the Government. Surely the power of money itself is a very important element which interferes with the freedom. . . . Big industries owning newspapers may or may not interfere with them but the fact of big industry by itself owning newspapers or chains of newspapers cannot be said to give them the kind of freedom which an independent editor has." Surely, if big industries owning newspapers do not interfere with them, newspapers are as free as they are when governments do not interfere with them. Why should ownership be made a criterion?

Mr. Nehru had a point which for some mysterious reason he evaded making — that is that the performance of the Indian Press is altogether bad. This is not because of who owns it, or of the average journalist's lack of intelligence and education but because of a complete misreading of the function of the Press. No one seems to keep in mind the public — for whose interests both newspaper proprietors and the Government profess great concern. And more often than not, governments find it convenient to deal with big newspapers because their owners can the more easily be brought to heel. If a candid appraisal were to be made, it would be found that the majority of proprietorial interferences with the running of newspapers have occurred because of some ministerial pressure; the other instances have been to suppress information bearing adversely on the interests of the owners themselves. Since, however, in all cases the purpose of suppression or misrepresentation is desired to be kept secret, a firm stand by the editor would put a stop to it — though very probably the editor would lose his job later on some trivial point of difference. This, however, is not a thing which any proprietor would wish to happen too often and, viewing the Press as a whole, a few assertions of independence by editors would lead to a stronger Press.

The reason why it has not happened in India is that the Press here is an emasculated Press. Mr. Nehru himself does not desire to have editors with strong convictions because they will not see anything else but their point of view, and he does not want editors who have no firm views of their own. As this has been the general attitude towards editors, it is

not surprising that the kind of editors who have generally arisen, are individuals who convey an appearance of firmness which for both governments and proprietors is much better than the genuine article. And the firmness manifested is towards the public which has not yet found a way to assert itself. One might concede all this, and yet reject the idea that the Government can by direct regulation of the Press bring about improvement. Mr. Nehru is discreet enough to realise that it cannot be done.

The Government of India has been particularly concerned about Indian Press comments on foreign affairs. On the assumption that foreign politics is a particularly delicate business in which the Government is engaged all the time and must not be disturbed, the Government in 1953 amended the Constitution so that the guaranteed freedom of expression was liable to be limited, among other things, in the interests of friendly relations with other powers. This

was done against the opposition of the entire Press which pointed out that in its own interests the Government would do well to recognise the responsibility of individual newspapers for opinion expressed in them — as all democracies did. In the nature of things, it is the totalitarian states which object to unfriendly criticism from the Press in other countries — the democracies usually do not bother about it, firstly because they have themselves a free Press and, secondly, because the opinion of one newspaper in a democracy is an individual opinion. With the amended Constitution, the Government just invited protests from the totalitarian States and would have been without any justification in answering any protests that might have come from the democracies. That this did not happen is not an argument for the amendment. The Government has just been lucky here as it has been lucky till 1962 with its foreign policy itself.

A Lethal Budget

M. R. Masani

THIS year's Union Budget (in particular the Super Profits Tax) is a lethal attack on the system of Joint Stock enterprise. Nothing less. It is a move to take advantage of the Emergency to strike a mortal blow at people's enterprise in an effort to establish a State Capitalist monopoly. The hand may be the hand of the Finance Minister, but the mind behind it is a Marxist mind. The Budget, professedly a measure to help combat Chinese Communist aggression, is thus in effect a victory for Communist expansionism in that it marks a step towards the undermining of free economic institutions and an advance towards the Soviet system.

What is joint stock enterprise? It is the coming together of small and big people, scattered throughout the country, in different walks of life, with different ideas, ideals and points of view, but coming together to meet the demands and the wants of the community for various commodities and services and, in meeting that want efficiently, to make a profit. It is the coming together of people who are prepared to risk their savings and capital so that the community on the one hand and they on the other might mutually benefit. The power to choose whether or not to invest or where to invest is rightly left in the hands of the owners.

Throughout the free world, joint stock enterprise has been accepted as the modern, the 20th Century way of producing the goods to meet the community's needs. This is the instrument through which one nation after another has achieved industrial prosperity and social justice in increasing measure, letting loose in this process tremendous vital forces.

Joint Stock enterprise is an application of the principle of co-operation to industry and those who believe in the co-operative principle can imagine would recognize in joint stock enterprise the response

to the needs of the day. If there is one kind of co-operation that has been successful in India and deserving of support, it is this. Unfortunately, in India, this institution is now faced with a challenge to its very existence.

There are two challenges — an external and an internal one. The external one comes from the world of Government and politics. The discussions in Parliament in 1959 on the Companies (Amendment) Bill revealed that Government on one side and a large section of members of all parties on the other looked upon joint stock enterprise as some kind of necessary evil to be tolerated for the time being. They felt it was a pity that it could not be eliminated overnight. That would, of course, adversely affect production and create chaos. Therefore it should be tolerated. But in due course it should be superseded either by State enterprises or by cooperative societies. The fact that the joint stock company was a cooperative society of investors was never once referred to by anyone except myself. That was the position three years ago. The Super Profits Tax is only the latest blow in the series.

That brings us to the second challenge — the challenge from within. Those who believe in joint stock enterprise have to meet this external challenge if they want it to survive. This internal challenge should take the form of introspection and self-criticism.

If joint stock enterprise is to meet the challenge to its existence and survive, there are three major tasks that will have to be undertaken. The first is that joint stock enterprise and management should put their house in order. The purpose of business is profit. There is no conflict between service and profit because profit is only the yardstick of efficient service. A man who makes a loss is not more honourable or socially minded than the man who makes a profit.

Judged by the test of profit and judged by the test of efficiency, however, certain things need to be put right. Some argue that there are many black sheep in Indian business. What is meant by black sheep is not the people who make a profit and give the community a commodity that is good in quality at a reasonable price. What is meant is that people make money while not giving any return. In other words, it means just taking and not giving, and that is something that no social organism tolerates for long. Gandhiji in that sense was well ahead of his time because he foresaw this when he said that business people should not be disturbed in their wealth, that nothing should be taken away from them, but they should try to use what was given to them by the cooperation of the community in a socially worthy manner, that they must bear in mind not only the personal angle but also the social angle. There is nothing unscientific in this. Dr. Ludwig Erhard, the author of the German miracle has tried to spell out what he calls "Social Enterprise", in other words free enterprise with a social orientation, with a social purpose. There is no conflict between competitive enterprise and social purpose. The obligations of the businessman are towards the shareholders, employees, community, the government or the state, and finally to the consumer. There should not be any difficulty in reconciling the spirit of Gandhiji's concept of Trusteeship with modern business as is practised by enlightened free enterprise in any part of the world.

The second thing to be done is to make it easier for the class of entrepreneurs to grow. It is true that in India we have a middle class. We are much more advanced and mature here than most of the countries around us. But even so our middle class is very small in terms of our population. That is a danger because it becomes isolated and a point of envy and attack. It is quite obvious that a system takes roots in a society to the extent that it is widespread. There is no doubt that to the extent that big business helps small business to grow, to the extent that every existing entrepreneur helps to bring into existence three or four enterprises in the next ten years, the attack on the business way of life can be more easily repelled. This raises a question of what organised business does to help the small entrepreneur, the small man trying to establish himself to get a fair deal to get a start.

The third thing is for the case for joint stock enterprise to be placed before the people. There is nothing unique about the environment in which Indian business functions. Walter Lippman in 1934 wrote about the American business community: "In the past five years, i.e. from 1929 (The Depression) the industrial and financial leaders of America have fallen from one of the highest position of influence and power that they ever occupied in our history to one of the lowest." That was in 1934. Nobody can say in 1963 that this position obtains today. American business and industry have changed the environment by their own activity and their attitude. This can be done in India also. This can be done by its standing up for its own way of life, by arguing its case. Till recently

business in India had failed to put forward its point of view. Its case had gone by default.

Quite apart from politics, there are other ways in which business can do its bit. For instance, in America in the last few years there is widespread growth of a movement called Business In Politics. Business In Politics consists of organised business giving facilities to its managers not only to be trained in management but to be trained in citizenship and, having been trained in citizenship, to take part in citizenship, to take part in the public life of the community, whether locally or nationally.

GEC and Ford have extensive departments for government and political affairs. They have done such a good job that they are receiving delegations from other enterprises who want to go home and copy their example. The process lies in getting groups of twelve to twenty supervisors and junior executives to spend a couple of hours every week for ten weeks or so, sometimes on company's time and sometimes on the managers' own time. They study the working and progress of all political parties, they study how campaigns are run, they study how parties' finance is raised, and they invite as guests lecturers and speakers from those major parties to supplement to the domestic teaching. Then these people are sent out for field work. They are trained to write letters to Congressmen, they are trained to go around and register voters on the voters' list in their environment and so on. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has a practical political course which is used by 162 firms and 479 local chambers, 20,000 American executives have gone through this particular course. The National Association of Management course has been accepted by 100 companies; 5000 executives have gone through that course. Universities run similar courses.

So one of the things that business needs to do is to educate its own ranks. There are many executives who do not believe in the system of business, who are sold out to the enemies of the very way of life which they practice. If industry cannot control its managers, how is it going to control its labourers and its consumers?

Graham Hutton said to the British Institute of Management not long ago: "Better be bloody, bold and resolute than timidly trying never to be unpopular, never to lose a vote anywhere, never to go against the masses. . . . The British people always respect leadership, guts, firmness and a good dash of eccentricity." Perhaps the Indian people are not very different.

.....AND A VERY HAPPY NEW YEAR
W. H. Von Dreele

"Abroad, we're modestly impressed
That Nehru's leaning toward the West.
Yes, Menon's gone! (It took the Chink
To sack the Pandit's weakest link.)"

(*National Review*, New York, January 15, 1963.)

This World Of Murky Business

Raman K. Desai

MUCH water has flown down the Ganges since Mr. Nehru in his first raptures over an Independent India, imbued with social purpose, demanded that black-marketeers be hanged on the nearest tree. Since then, very little has been done even to enforce existing laws on declared tax evaders and manipulators of high finance. In the U.S.A., the classical method of liquidating Chicago gangsters was through the use of income-tax sanctions. In India, in the business world, two distinct streams of thought seem to have co-existed. One school of thought believed in stepping just within the law, taking cover under expert legal advice, studying every new piece of legislation how best to get round it. The other believed in abiding by the sanctions of law in letter and in spirit. The two schools, after Vivian Bose Commission's Report on a group of organisations, must reconsider if any such co-existence is at all possible. It should be noted that the Commission's report reveals not merely past deeds but deeds committed even while the Commission was sitting. In the jungle of business world what prevails is not Darwin's law of the survival of the fittest but Gresham's law of bad coins driving good coins from circulation. The circle of honest men must gradually dwindle into a defeatist minority.

It is no wonder therefore that men who believe that evading every restraint of law, by ingenious methods, is not the correct approach even of business houses, primarily concerned with profits, should be distressed over the Commission's findings. The House of Tatas, the Mafatlal group and Ambica Mills group have tendered their resignations from the FICCI on the principle that persons found erring by the Commission should not occupy positions of authority in such a representative body. That the House of Tatas should adopt this attitude is only to be expected; it is a matter of pride that the pioneer in industry and the largest unit in industry should be the finest of its representative. But it is heartening to find some younger members of the community, in the heads of the other groups, joining the distinguished head of the House of Tatas. It is to be hoped that this fine gesture will be supported by other business houses and that this protest will lead to a new alignment.

Businessmen, if they desire a position of leadership in the country, must go a step further and recognise some fundamental principles. Law which enforces, through the police and the army, the lowest measure of agreement among the people, represents only such principles as are considered worthy of enforcement by physical punishment. It does not embody the highest principles of morality. The ethics and standards of moral law rise above the secular duties imposed by legislation. Businessmen must devise an organisation by which internal supervision over the reported misdeeds of their colleagues can be investigated and corrected, in the manner of an "Ombudsman". Those who connive at such misdeeds and look

the other way are inviting public contempt for the whole set of the business world.

But the most astonishing attitude towards such misdeeds comes from members of government themselves. On several occasions, Finance Ministers have railed against evil practices in business organisations. And yet, with all their powers of control and correction, the Ministers of Government have not taken the elementary step of a social boycott of known delinquents. They accept the hospitality of such persons, even Governors attend their social functions and bless their ventures on their foundation. Perhaps this pusillanimity is due to the fact that under the existing election practices, enormous funds are needed by candidates and enormous funds are no longer at the disposal of law abiding tax payers.

Much more is involved in the attitude of Ministers in such matters. The role of Government in business today is so encompassing, with licenses, permits, sanctions, loans, stoppage of imports that of modern business it may well be said of private enterprise, as Laski once remarked, that there is little private and less enterprise in private enterprise. The attitude of government affects the very quality of future leadership in politics and business. If intelligent people lose confidence in both these vital sectors, they will look for leadership in the spurious realms of communist myths or in equally futile army dictatorship.

It is true that Mr. Nehru explained at the meeting of the FICCI that his colleagues and himself felt reluctance at attending the meeting in view of the findings of the Commission which affected the outgoing President. What has happened to Mr. Nehru, the same Mr. Nehru who years ago launched a scathing attack on the business community at the Annual Meeting of another such representative body, an attack which staggered the gathering? That his presence must discomfit the House of Tatas, Mafatlals, Ambica group, is not the only result of his patronage. The gathering ended with paeans of praise for the outgoing President, almost amounting to a vote of confidence, in defiance of the Commission and may we suggest of Mr. Nehru himself? It seems it is idle to expect Ministers even to make a gesture of repugnance in the face of pronounced delinquency, when the seasonal demands for election funds dictate prudence. Why appoint such commissions and waste the talents of a distinguished jurist, such as Mr. Vivian Bose, waste public funds and advance not one step towards the realisation of better ethics in government and business enterprises?

Mr. Deshmukh, in a budget speech, had described the new tycoons as the true Karmayogis of today; they owned nothing, literally nothing, neither houses, cars, telephone, not even their clothes, for everything was charged to some limited company. Curiously, the Calcutta paper which published this speech, reported on the opposite page a visit paid by a high dignitary

on a social function, to the house of a tycoon whose palatial residence, had yielded, in a police raid, quantities of Hongkong gold, in flower pots. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, another Finance Minister, referred several times to the class which he said, harboured gold in their flower pots. And what have Finance Ministers done about it all? Mr. G. L. Mehta, not unfriendly to the business world, several times has cautioned this world in telling words, in his usual genteel manner and yet with fierce candour, also characteristic of this fine thinker.

One hopes that this protest will not end with the usual compromise of a few persons shifting in a charade of musical chairs. Firmly held and pursued this gesture should be the beginning of a clean-up of the stables. For, the stables, indeed, are Augean in their squalor. Since Independence there is hardly an American technique of fraud in company management which has not been tried here; strangely, some of the tactics date from the days when even a conservative like Theodore Roosevelt had to take stern action. The technique of taking a good company into liquidation and squeezing out other shareholders bears an ancient ancestry.

And yet it is not the lacuna of legislation, which has to be constantly amended, which is the prime culprit. The law has never been rigidly enforced. The whole basis of British rule which resorted law and order over a vast continent with a small police force, was the simple fact that when a man committed a crime, he knew he would be brought to justice and punished. It is this assurance of justice which is the foundation of a law-abiding society, neither a complex of law and bureaucratic organisation.

It is regrettable that the Vivian Bose Report re-

ceived neither wide publicity nor adequate comments in national newspapers; nor indeed was it taken up primarily by the opposition parties such as the Praja Socialist Party in whose province it obviously lay, nor Swatantra Party whose Manifesto does not inhibit its course in such matters but that the cause has been taken up by the agile members of the Communist Party.

There is danger in the passing over of such leadership. If I may venture on a prophecy I would suggest that in coming months, very soon, the defence expenditure of government coupled with deficit financing, will unleash forces of inflation in which the price line cannot be held, business profits will be stupendous, share markets booming. The danger of discontent among the middle and lower income brackets will be intensified. As it is, the image of business in the minds of the intelligentsia is heavily tarnished. If at this time the leadership is not taken by men of repute in business and in public life, the communists would take advantage of the situation to stage a come-back.

Those who plead for unrestricted production, consequent rate of growth and formation of capital are unaware of a logical conclusion. Capital has been formed most rapidly in Soviet Russia with its ruthless suppression of the consumer and the worker. Is that a comparison welcome to businessmen? Capital was formed rapidly by the ruthless exploitation of industrial labour in England in the early phase of the industrial revolution. But it is only in a welfare state, with government guiding such growth, and the public strongly controlling the government, that a balanced egalitarian society, free and liberty loving, can be nurtured.

The Myth Of Non-Alignment

V. B. Karnik

NON-ALIGNMENT, the cornerstone of our foreign policy, was the first casualty of the Chinese invasion. As soon as the invasion began and we started losing our posts after posts as a result of the Chinese superiority in numbers and in arms and ammunitions, we got over our hostility to the acceptance of military aid from Western countries and rushed to them asking for immediate and liberal military assistance. This was against the policy that Prime Minister Nehru had followed so long in the name of non-alignment as well as against the declarations that he had made from time to time. On January 31, 1954, he had stated in Parliament: "If we become foolish enough to accept military help from outside and stretch out our hands and beg for such aid, we will be only mortgaging our freedom and losing it ultimately." And yet immediately after the invasion we became "foolish enough" to stretch our hands and beg for military help from outside. It is that foolishness which helped us, it is now universally accepted,

save our freedom which might have been otherwise destroyed by the communist rulers of China.

Our freedom is still in peril and, in view of that peril, we are now assiduously engaged in building up our military strength in cooperation with our Western allies. High level delegations from those countries visit India and discuss with our experts our requirements in terms of military hardware, operational arrangements, training facilities and what not. As a result of those discussions arrangements are being made for the supply of various types of equipment and for training our personnel in their use. True to our policy of friendship with all countries, we are addressing our requests for assistance at the same time to communist nations. They respond some time, but the help that we get from them is just nominal compared to the vast help that we have already received and has been promised to us by the Western countries. Communist countries are in a difficult position. They cannot send arms to a non-communist country to help

it fight against a communist country. Naturally, in our struggle for the defence of our freedom and integrity, we turn more and more in the direction of our true friends who stood by us in the hour of our adversity and who have promised to stand by us again in the eventuality of another invasion.

The nation is thus getting more and more aligned with the West. The Chinese invasion and the prompt and generous help extended by Western countries, no doubt, helped the process. But there is a deeper reason behind that inclination. The memories of the anti-imperialist struggle and propaganda in favour of the fashionable cult of non-alignment had for some years obstructed that natural development. It is now being realised, however, that there is a basic similarity between our outlook and the outlook of Western countries, that there is a community of interests and an attachment to common values. These spiritual affinities are forging a new bond between India and the Western countries. The help that India received from them was due to those considerations. They helped India because she is a like-minded country, a country which is seeking to develop the common democratic way of life based upon the values of individual freedom and social development. It is this like-mindedness which is the basis of the new alignment that has developed.

Military necessities may carry this alignment much further in course of time. Arms and armaments are developing at such a rapid rate that it is becoming increasingly difficult for individual countries to rely on their own unaided strength for the defence of their freedom. It is this factor which led to the growth of military alliances and blocs. The leaders of our country believed that they would be better able to preserve her freedom if they kept her aloof from all military blocs. Chinese aggression has exposed the naivety and the unreality of that belief. Non-alignment or neutrality provides no guarantee against foreign aggression. Even a non-aligned country has to take adequate steps for the defence of its independence and integrity. Many of those steps require foreign assistance and some of them can be taken only in cooperation with other countries. Thus life negates non-alignment and makes it necessary for a country to choose its friends.

Choosing friends is not tantamount to tying oneself to all policies and actions of one's friends. Even amongst friends there can be disagreements and differences of opinion over individual issues. There are many such differences amongst the members of the Atlantic Alliance. And it is not even necessary to go to the extent of signing a formal alliance or agreement. In the case of India's conflict with China no Western country has asked for such an agreement. But there must be an acceptance of certain common values and an implied agreement to defend them whenever and wherever they may be attacked. The cult of non-alignment blinds one to that obvious duty and provides a facile justification for the failure to discharge it. Our policy of non-alignment led us unto those pitfalls on many occasions.

Non-alignment is at best a policy which must

justify itself by results. It is not a moral principle of an absolute and immutable character. On moral grounds there is nothing to prefer non-alignment to alignment. Morality demands alignment with the good and alignment against the evil. It is only in those rare cases where one cannot distinguish between the good and the evil or where both are equally good or evil that there may be some moral justification for non-alignment. The Prime Minister has stated that ours is not the holier than thou attitude of plague on both houses. We should be, of course, independent and should maintain our right to judge each issue on its merits. But having judged, we should have the courage of aligning ourselves with what we consider to be right. Having failed to do that, we have no right to parade our non-alignment as a moral virtue. It is a policy that was adopted on pragmatic considerations. For some time it yielded good results. It enabled us to get help for our economic advance from both the groups of countries. It made it possible for us to act on some occasions as a pacifying factor. It prevented to some extent the absolute polarisation of forces. These are some of the considerations which can be urged in favour of the policy of non-alignment. But the world situation has changed, and our country's condition has also changed materially after the Chinese invasion. The policy must be judged in the light of these altered conditions. Does non-alignment serve best under these new circumstances the main interest of our foreign policy which can only be the defence of the country's independence and integrity? That is the question to be considered objectively and dispassionately. Meaningless moral platitudes should not be allowed to hinder a proper consideration of that question.

So far as China is concerned, we are already in the camp of the imperialists. She does not, in the first place, believe in neutrality or non-alignment. According to Mao Tse-tung, "neutrality is a camouflage and a third road does not exist." The so-called neutrals are, according to him, only a transitional group who must eventually become "people" or "lean to the side of imperialism". To the Chinese Prime Minister Nehru is a person who has "betrayed the people" and "joined the enemy". This was the verdict of the communist rulers of China as far back as 1959. Their verdict after the invasion and after India received largescale help from Western countries to repel it is no different. *Peking Review* of December 28, 1962, gave expression to their verdict in the following words: "All this serves to show that the Indian Government has already cast to the winds its policy of non-alignment and neutrality.... All this shows that in international affairs, the Indian Government, far from being a representative of the 'newly developing forces' of Asia and Africa, is becoming more and more an accomplice of U.S. imperialism, acting behind a camouflage of 'non-alignment'."

The Prime Minister appears to be keen on continuing the policy of non-alignment in order to prove the Chinese wrong. But what is more important, proving the Chinese wrong or improving the defence of

(Continued on page 8)

Alliances And Tensions

Samuel P. Huntington

Professor of Government, Harvard University

THE dominant trend in world politics today is the change from a bipolar world to one characterized by the broad distribution of power. This diffusion of power has three important implications. First, it implies a differentiation of interests among nations. The probability of any two major or secondary powers sharing a number of overriding common interests is becoming less and less. The blocs are disintegrating. Relations between the Soviet and Chinese communist parties are almost completely ruptured. In attempting to hold together the remainder of the communist bloc Khrushchev himself has had to recognize the existence of diversity within communism. In the western alliance the "special relation" which made the United States and the United Kingdom the closest allies in the world is passing into history. The United Kingdom, France, and West Germany now have their own particular interests which at times conflict with those of the United States. The actions of the United States in the Cuban crisis and on the Skybolt issue plus the recent declarations of the President all indicate that in the future the United States will pursue its unilateral interests in positive fashion even when these conflict with those of its principal partners. Somewhat similarly, the Sino-Indian conflict has revealed significant differences between India and other Afro-Asian nations which supposedly shared India's non-alignment foreign policy. Thus, each country increasingly stands alone with its own distinct constellation of interests, which correspond only in limited and specific ways with those of other countries.

Secondly, the diffusion of power means a multiplication of conflict. The original Cold War has not ended; instead it has been supplemented by additional cold wars between China and India, China and the Soviet Union. As yet, the relations between the United States and its Western European allies have not disintegrated to the point of cold war, but the relationship between France and the United

States could hardly be described as better than "cold peace". Thirdly, the diffusion of power implies a tendency to moderate the tensions involved in any one conflict. The multiplication of conflict creates a pattern of cross-cutting cleavages in which conflicts restrain each other. Countries which are on opposite sides on one issue may be on the same side on another issue. At the present time, for instance, the United States and the Soviet Union have opposing interests in Berlin, but somewhat similar interests in limiting the Sino-Indian conflict. Increasingly, all international friendships are conditional, all international antagonisms limited.

Many factors including personality, geography, historical and political experience, and economic development contribute to the Sino-Soviet split. Many other factors have caused frictions within the North Atlantic alliance. One source of discord common to both, however, has been nuclear weapons and their implications. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have substantial nuclear arsenals and consequently some concept of the facts of life and the risks of death in the nuclear age. Their principal allies, however, lag behind them in nuclear development and, as a result, have different perspectives. Lacking nuclear weapons, the Chinese denigrate their importance and their destructiveness. The United States is held to be a paper tiger. War between capitalist and communist states is, in the long run, inevitable. Their attitude resembles that of the Soviets in the last years of Stalin before they had acquired a nuclear arsenal. Today, however, the Soviets emphasize peaceful coexistence and the extent to which a nuclear war would drastically set back progress toward communism. The Chinese stress the weakness of the United States despite its nuclear arsenal; the Soviets stress the danger of nuclear war despite the growing strength of the socialist countries. "The U.S.A. has 40,000 atomic or nuclear warheads," Khrushchev said at the East German Party Congress. "What would happen if one let all those bombs come down on humanity? Seven hundred to eight hundred million people would perish. Countries would be rubbed out. Would socialism gain by a thermo-nuclear war? No. You cannot build socialism in an atomic-infested territory."

In the western alliance the United Kingdom and France have tasted nuclear fruit but lack a nuclear orchard. Now in the first stages of nuclear development, they represent the opposite extreme from the Chinese and place undue influence on the importance of nuclear weapons. Indeed, they tend to identify their sovereignty and independence with the possession of an independent nuclear arsenal. Such a deterrent. The DeGaulleists proclaim, is the only safe-

(Continued from page 7)

our country? Whatever we may do, we shall not be able to make the Chinese change their views. And to the rest non-alignment will have no meaning if, as non-aligned, we are not able to defend our independence and integrity. Our ability to repel the aggressors will impress them far more than our non-alignment. Non-alignment has already become a myth. It should not be allowed to come in the way of whatever requires to be done in order to build up our strength. One need not oppose non-alignment if it does not hamper that process. But is it necessary to encourage a myth and then take pains to see that it does not produce undesirable results?

guard for an independent foreign policy. In similar tones, one of the most acute British strategists, Hedley Bull, has declared that British abandonment of its nuclear force "would tend to reduce Britain's role to that of a mere spectator of international politics." The western Europeans see nuclear force as the elixir of youth, the possession of which may to some degree compensate for the decline of their colonial empires. To the United States, on the other hand, the British and French obsession with nuclear weapons appears unrealistic and unnecessary. After a decade of effort and the investment of huge sums of money, the nuclear destructive power at the disposal of the British is only two percent of the American arsenal, and the future importance of the British force is still dependent upon American delivery mechanisms, such as Skybolt and Polaris. Thus, in many respects there are more similarities between the American and the Soviet views on the capabilities and limits of nuclear weapons than there are between the Americans and the western Europeans, on the one hand, or between the Soviets and the Chinese, on the other.

These conflicts stemming from different levels of nuclear development have significantly different implications for the communist bloc and for the western alliance. The Sino-Soviet conflict began in the late 1950s. At that time there were no specific territorial issues, comparable to Berlin, Ladakh, or Kashmir, dividing Russia and China. Nor was there military competition between them. There were some economic issues arising from the distinctive course of Chinese development and the extent of Russian assistance, but these were relatively minor and could have been easily resolved through negotiations. The original issue in the Sino-Soviet split involved not conflicting interests but rather conflicting estimates of the international situation after Soviet acquisition of long-range ballistic missiles. These were differences of attitude, of expectation, and of the proper course of strategy to be followed in achieving a common objective. If these differences had arisen between western countries, the conflicting interpretations would have been tested against the facts of the international situation. The argument would have been in terms of evidence, not ideology, and in the end a compromise strategy would have evolved. The strategic dispute between Russia and China, however, was reformulated in ideological terms. The function of an ideology is to give coherence and purpose to a political viewpoint. Ideology is intellectually integrative, but politically divisive. In the Sino-Soviet conflict the first issue was: What strategy is ideologically correct? And then: Who is ideologically correct? The original issue was not narrowed by empirical reference to the facts. Instead it was broadened by reference to ideology.

The western alliance, in contrast, is bound together not by a common ideology but by common values and by common interests. Individual differences are resolved without imperiling the entire alliance. The solution is found in political compromise, not ideological correctness. Each issue is seen as a discreet

problem which can best be resolved in its own terms without reference to its broader implications. The approach is pragmatic and *ad hoc*. Conflicts within the alliance, consequently, can more easily be limited and isolated. In 1956, for instance, British and French interests in the Middle East came into direct conflict with American policy there. The United States administered a public humiliation to its allies. Yet within six months the alliance had been patched up again. This restoration of more friendly relations was, of course, aided by the retirement of Eden, but this in itself was but one aspect of the greater flexibility and adaptability of democratic states which can change leaders and policies more frequently than dictatorships. In similar fashion, the current conflict over nuclear weapons between the United States and its western allies will be resolved by time and compromise. The Europeans want independent national deterrents; the United States a collective NATO deterrent. In due time, a compromise will be worked out on the basis of an independent but collective European deterrent to be jointly supported and controlled by the major western European powers. A strong united Europe, however, will in turn give rise to new differences between Europe and the United States, including economic competition and enhanced suspicions on the part of the Europeans that the United States may sacrifice their interests in order to achieve concessions which it considers important from the Soviet Union.

The ideological conflict between the Soviets and the Chinese has now produced significant differences in interest between them. They have become rivals for support among all the other communist parties of the world. The split undoubtedly is permanent, and it will gradually be institutionalized. Yet it would be a mistake to overestimate its significance. China and the Soviet Union will pursue independent foreign policies but at many points these policies will share common objectives and common methods. Some further degree of accommodation is also possible between the United States and the Soviet Union, and both are sympathetic to India in its struggle with the Chinese. Yet the Cold War between Russia and the West remains a reality. If the West contributes substantial help to India in its efforts against the Chinese, the West, in turn, has the right to expect some degree of Indian support on such issues as Berlin and nuclear weapons, which are vital to the West but of secondary concern to India. These relationships must be developed on an *ad hoc* basis, and they are far too complex to be summed up in a single slogan or concept. The diffusion of power has ended the era of simple foreign policies. Stalinism is out of date; so also is containment; so also is non-alignment. Having cast aside these simple dogmas, each of the several major powers in world politics must engage in the slow, difficult, but essential task of discovering the extent and the limits of its common interests with each of the others.

The Perquisitive Society

M. R. Pai

AT a time when the public of India has been called upon to make sacrifices and bear an "unprecedented" burden of taxes, the disclosure of the large amounts of water and electricity bills of Union Ministers paid from public funds has naturally raised a storm of protest.

A New Delhi daily was the first to point out the heavy expenditure incurred by the Union Ministers. It reported that a proposal to cut down water and electricity bills to Rs. 250/- per minister per month from the current level of about Rs. 1,000 had been turned down by them. Subsequently, at the Parliamentary Consultative Committee meeting on March 7, Mr. M. C. Khanna, Union Minister for Works and Housing, gave a full and accurate picture. According to his statement, the total monthly expenditure of all ministers on water and electricity comes on an average to Rs. 13,489. The furniture and portable electrical appliances supplied to them are valued at Rs. 13.04 lakhs.

The highest electricity bill runs up to Rs. 580 in one case; the highest water bill up to Rs. 120. These bills include the cost of water and electricity supplied to servants' quarters attached to each bungalow. They range from 6 to 16 quarters in different ministers' bungalows. Under the law, free water and electricity is to be supplied to all ministers. So, any cut cannot be enforced. It has to be voluntary.

Reactions to these disclosures have been sharp. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, Home Minister, declared his intention to pay his bills for six months. Mr. A. K. Sen, Law Minister, is reported to have launched an attack on the Works and Housing Ministry, for its inefficiency, and also complained to the Prime Minister that "I can't help feeling that the whole thing has been done without much thought or care."

Mr. Sen's complaint against his colleague is understandable considering the embarrassment which it has caused to the Ministers who have been preaching the slogan of sacrifice and austerity to the public.

Some two years ago, the Auditor & Comptroller General had disclosed in a report that although the salary of Central Ministers was only Rs. 2,250 per month, their emoluments totalled about Rs. 6,000 considering the perquisites — valued at about Rs. 4,000 per month.

Although M.P's enjoy the perquisite of free first class travel all over about 35,000 miles of Indian Railways, there are frequent demands for *free air travel*! Recently, contributory health scheme meant for government employees has also been extended to M.P's. There is strangely enough even demand for pensions for M.P's. No wonder that expenditure incurred on Parliament has increased from Rs. 1.72 crores in 1952-53 to Rs. 3.09 crores in 1962-63 (revised estimates). In spite of adequate quarters, a new multi-storied hostel is proposed for M.P's, which will no doubt make expensive space and ame-

nities available to them at a nominal cost.

State legislators have not been indifferent to their own interests. New hostels have been provided for them in almost every state. In Maharashtra, free travel in State Transport has been secured by M.L.A's. Municipal Corporators have followed the example by securing an honorarium. But the worst and least detected offenders are to be found in the large bureaucracy which numbers today about 75 lakhs at all levels. The cost of central general administration alone has increased over the last 10 years from Rs. 7.73 crores to Rs. 18.47 crores (1962-63 Budget, revised figures). Total administration cost has jumped from Rs. 23.30 crores to Rs. 76.39 crores in the same period.

These perquisites go on increasing year by year. For instance, recently it was reported that over and above the existing medical facilities, ministers and their families in Maharashtra will get a monthly checkup at their residence. Once these perquisites are granted, or rather surreptitiously added to the existing list, they cannot be done away with. For instance, a few years ago there was a furore in U.P. when the government proposed to withdraw some 30,000 vehicles from use of officers on economy grounds.

Perquisites are dangerous in a democracy because they conceal from the public the *real cost* to the country of maintaining persons who are supposed to be public servants.

The growth of a Perquisitive Society in our country, however, is not surprising. With the pressure of poverty, politics has presented to many an unworthy person an easy avenue of employment. The growing concentration of economic power into political hands — naturally the bureaucracy becomes the real boss in such a situation — has increased the possibilities of a perquisitive society.

In our country, quaint political attitudes such as "high thinking and simple living" have only aggravated the situation. Be there high, low or no thinking at all, the desire for *simple living* just does not exist any more. The very logic of an industrial society does not permit of a simple living. The concept has changed into one of good living using all amenities that modern technology and industrialism make possible. The "portable electrical appliances" have become demi-gods even in the New Pantheon of Socialism. This home truth is yet to be accepted. In the meantime, since the appearance of simplicity is to be kept up for political reasons, the salaries of ministers and government officers do not reflect the overall benefits enjoyed by them. Perquisites become the easy way out. In this unholy conspiracy against the public, politicians and bureaucrats have joined hands to the detriment of public interests. It is high time that *all* perquisites at all levels are eliminated and *honest*, high salaries are paid to public servants and it is also ensured that power and accountability go together.

Fate Of Muslims In Communist China

Adam Adil

REPORTS emanating from Hong Kong indicate that the conditions of Muslims in China have steadily deteriorated since the communist take-over. There are nearly sixty million Muslims in China.

Under earlier regimes — in fact for centuries — Chinese Muslims enjoyed considerable religious freedom; the traditional Chinese tolerance helped in the development of distinct Muslim culture which was enriched continuously by strong influences from Islamic countries. Muslims are concentrated all along the more than 4,000 mile frontier with the Soviet Union and Outer Mongolia. This is a very strategic area and can be legitimately called "China's Muslim Belt". This region includes Sinkiang as well as Manchuria. Muslims are also concentrated in South Western region of China which borders on Burma and Viet Nam. Further, Muslims are found in large numbers in bigger towns. In Peking, there is a sizeable Muslim population. The fact that there are 28 mosques and several Islamic institutions in Peking indicates that the Muslims there constitute a prosperous section of the Society. The Muslim regions of China are rich in mineral resources. For instance, Sinkiang and Manchuria are known for the deposits of oil and coal which the present Chinese regime needs so badly. The geographical situation of the Muslims in China makes them better off than many of the Chinese. They are generally peasant proprietors, landlords, traders and artisans. Culturally too, they are an advanced community. Throughout China, there are more than 1000 well conducted Muslim schools and educational institutions.

It is this compact, well-organised and prosperous section of the Chinese society that communists in China have not been able to subdue completely. The Chinese Communists have resorted to severe repression against Muslims in the hope that it will break their morale. Yet, the recent reports suggest that Muslims have not given in.

Soon after they came to power, the Chinese Communists had to confront Muslim opposition. Sinkiang province rose in revolt and disrupted the administrative system which the Communists set up. The province is still in turmoil and rumours emanating from Sinkiang through Tibet indicate that as late as the end of 1962, there was serious uprising in this strategic region. In Manchuria too, Muslims have not submitted to the Communist regime and been still facing the repressive measures of the Communist government. Probably the only Muslims who seem to have reconciled themselves to the inevitable are of the South-Western corner of China on Burmese and Viet Namese borders; but here too, the orthodox section is reported to be in constant conflict with the Communists.

The Chinese Communists have adopted various methods to break the resistance of the Muslims to their regime. The concentration of Muslims in provinces, which are politically and economically strate-

gic, is an eye sore to the Chinese Communists. Hence, the Communist Government is straining its every nerve to force the Muslims out of their home lands and scatter them throughout China. Muslim peasants and landlords have been deprived of their lands. Muslim traders are made to face almost insurmountable difficulties, with business and commercial facilities denied to them. Muslim schools and educational institutions are being closed down. Arabic, which is the religious language of the Muslims throughout the world and which is being taught as much in Muslim educational institutions in China as anywhere else, is being replaced by the official Chinese language.

Communist-propagandists make special efforts to influence the younger generation of Muslims. Groups of Muslim boys and girls are forced to gather in Communist Party offices and subjected to ideological harangues. Those boys and girls who become amenable to communist influence are made to denounce Islam and the Ulemas. Islamic history is distorted and presented in most lurid light. For instance, on the authority of the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia, Communists propagate that the Prophet of Islam was an agent of exploiting landlords and merchants of his times.

Yet, it is clear that the Muslims are presenting a determined opposition to the communists. Firstly, Muslims generally refuse to leave their homelands and migrate to areas where they would find themselves at the mercy of others. Secondly, inspite of stern measures against it, Arabic is being taught at home if not at the school; thirdly, young Muslim boys and girls make no secret of their boredom and dislike whenever they are subjected to long ideological harangues.

Faced by their failure to influence the Muslims, the Chinese Communists have intensified their oppression in Muslim provinces of China. Whenever the oppression has been unbearable, Muslims have risen in revolt. For instance, Sinkiang has experienced continuous revolt since the communist take-over in 1949. These revolts are suppressed with utmost severity and barbarism by the overwhelming Chinese Communist army.

As a matter of historical fact, Muslim unrest has become a regular feature of Chinese politics for well over a century. Inspite of all hurdles, Muslims in China have held the torch of freedom aloft. As an observer has recently put it: "Upto this day, the Muslims form a proud and independent-minded minority, whose demand for more autonomy is met only with the sternest measures of reprisals from Peking."

Today, the Chinese Muslims are isolated from the rest of the Islamic world. It is therefore, necessary, that world consciousness is roused regarding their lot and if possible, offer some help to them in their struggle against communist oppression and tyranny.

With Many Voices

"The deep
Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world."
—Tennyson.

In the ultimate analysis, the Government's budget would prove to be more dangerous than Chinese aggression.

—Rajaji, *The Hindu*, March 12

Now, if I were to promise you that you'll have three new suits next year, you'd say that I was drunk.

—Khrushchev, *Time*, March 8.

The national emergency would continue until China vacates every inch of Indian soil.

—Morarji Desai, *Hindustan Times*, February 12.

Indians cannot talk democracy and practise colonialism nor unreal idealism.

—Professor A. A. A. Fyzee in *London Observer*,
—quoted in *Blitz*, March 2.

Nehru is searching his soul over lining up with the West, where arms come from, or sticking to neutralism despite Red China, where invasions come from.

—*U.S. News and World Report*, March 4.

The Prime Minister is the real hindrance in the way of the country's defence against Chinese aggression.

—A. D. Gorwala, *Indian Express*, March 6.

Peaceful co-existence in the field of ideology is a betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, treachery to the cause of the workers and peasants.

—Khrushchev, *Times of India*, March 11.

We would do it again if an occasion arose and shout the slogan of *bhai bhai*.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Indian Express*,
February 26.

I stand by my statement that Communism has nothing to do with China's attack on India.

—Prime Minister Nehru to Mr. Robert Sherrod
of *The Saturday Evening Post*, quoted in *Blitz*,
March 2.

Krishna Menon is very patriotic, devoted and able.

—Prime Minister Nehru to Mr. Robert Sherrod
of *The Saturday Evening Post*, quoted in *Blitz*,
March 2.

If men like Mr. C. Rajagopalachari and Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan were at the helm of affairs in India, things might have been different.

—President Ayub Khan, *Times of India*, March 2.

On the one hand are the Nehru-Menonites aligned with the Soviet camp and on the other are the Nehru-Patilites aligned with the Atlantic camp.

—Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, *Indian Express*, March 15.

If Sukarno thinks he can control his Communists, he is the only man in the world who can. Nobody else has ever done it.

—Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman of Malaya,
U.S. News and World Report, March 18.

The Central budget this year really is an affair of long knives. It is a budget which only a Finance Ministry which is either completely ignorant or criminally indifferent to the nature of economic activity in an industrialising community would have dared to conceive.

—*Eastern Economist*, March 1.

The author of the Super Profit Tax appear to have the mind of a small-town money lender.

—Mr. M. R. Masani, *Economic Times*, March 18.

"Indian intruders buried here"

—Signposts on graves of Indian soldiers
buried in Ladakh, *Times of India*, March 19.

STATEMENT ABOUT OWNERSHIP AND OTHER PARTICULARS OF FREEDOM FIRST

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Place of Publication | Bombay |
| 2. Periodicity of its publication | Monthly |
| 3. Printer's Name | Adam Adil |
| Nationality | Indian |
| Address | The Inland Printers,
Bombay 7. |
| 4. Publisher's Name | Adam Adil |
| Nationality | Indian |
| Address | 127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1. |
| 5. Editor's Name | Raman K. Desai |
| Nationality | Indian |
| Address | 127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1. |
| 6. Names and addresses of individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital. | Democratic Research Service
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1. |

I, Adam Adil, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Adam Adil
Signature of Publisher

1st March 1963