

DECEMBER 1963

The Jaipur Thesis

K. K. Sinha

THE Congress Party met at Jaipur and prepared a thesis entitled "Democracy and Socialism" which sums up the ideology of the Party and this thesis has been generally approved to be the basis for a country-wide discussion among Congressmen before it is adopted in a plenary session of the Congress at Bhubaneswar in January 1964.

The issues involved are so basic in the thesis proposed at Jaipur that 2 months are hardly enough to discuss it intelligently. We fear it will meet the same fate as the famous resolution of Avadi, namely, the Session will enthusiastically and unanimously adopt it without understanding its implications.

I shall now give my reaction to this basic document, very briefly, in the hope that this will provoke a deeper study of the thesis in the context of the task facing the country. I have one advantage. I am not a Congressman, nor am I anti-Congress. Nor, also, am I involved in any way in either maintaining the party-in-power or in removing it. I am solely concerned with the welfare of the people of India. I think a critical appraisal of the document is vitally necessary.

The document is important in the context of the future development of our country. It would be extremely unwise to ignore it or to take the attitude many Congress leaders, who do not agree with some of the ideas contained in it take, namely, that to express criticism would be to risk exposure and thereby to risk one's position of high office or status in the organisation or government. A stage has now been reached where hypocritical unanimity or intellectual laziness or moral cowardice must stop, irrespective of the fact whether one finds oneself in a minority or a majority.

The document is a dangerous one, although it has an innocuous appearance. If the same document had been placed before the country in the 'thirties I would not have made this sharp comment. But thirty years of tragic human experience have gone by since then and I do think that our leaders should not be allowed to play Rip Van Winkle today in the world of ideology.

The reason for such a categorical statement on my part would be evident from the internal logic of the

document itself. There is a definite and continuous line of thought that runs throughout the Paper. The line may be summarised as follows:

Socialism (by democratic process) — rapid economic development — planning — discipline and regulation of economy — national minimum of necessities of life — reduction of disparities — public sector predominance — quick land reforms and cooperative rural economy — workers' participation in management — maintaining price level — promotion of science and technology.

Abstract this line further to the more essential elements:

Socialism — planning — regulation and control — reduction of disparities — public sector dominance — land reforms and cooperatives — workers' control in industry.

What does this basic line of thought really mean? It means that in order to promote rapid economic development and produce the national minimum of the bare necessities of life, socialism is essential; this means planning the entire economy from a centre and in order to execute such a plan the major part of the economic apparatus must be under State ownership and the rest must be under its rigid control both in terms of expansion, production and distribution. It also means that while the land will be taken away from those who have above a maximum, the entire rural economy will be socialised through the co-operative system, which will be artificially manipulated by the State, and would thus become another sector of the State apparatus. In the name of reduction of disparities practically the entire sector of the propertied community will be heavily taxed. From the top the Public Sector monopolies will exercise a grip on existing enterprises and from below in the name of "workers' participation in management" a state of

FREEDOM FIRST joins the countless millions in homage to John Fitzgerald Kennedy who followed the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor Abraham Lincoln, in upholding the dignity and worth of individual man, in life and in death.

FREEDOM FIRST extends its heartfelt condolences to his noble lady Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and to the gallant American nation.

instability and inequilibrium in them will be promoted.

The result of this process will inevitably be that (a) the State will become a vast octopus having a full grip over the entire economic life of the country; (b) "masses" will be mobilised into a frenzy against the individual entrepreneur, small or big, in trade or industry in the name of "reducing the disparity" in society; and (c) the entire middle class will be throttled and their independent existence almost obliterated.

The economic result of this policy will be dislocation of even the existing process and pace of production in every field and utter corruption, arbitrariness and waste that are inevitable with the growth of the public sector will reign. The "socialist economy" will naturally not function properly in such a context although some individual successes will be overdramatised. And the national minimum will not be achieved even in 2000 A.D.

The political implication would be that in order to pursue the logic of planning and its corollary, regulation and control in every sphere, political liberty of criticism and free election will be severely affected and the elite in power will try to brand critics as 'anti-people' and 'reactionary' and isolate them while the technique of manipulation of the 'masses' by power-loving 'progressives' and 'socialists' will be

brought into full play. The more the 'socialist experiment' will face a crisis the more openly aggressive will the ruling party be in putting the blame on the critics. This perspective of development is nothing new. It has been repeated in all Communist countries.

The Thesis, however, clearly says that "this change has to be achieved by peaceful means and with the consent of the people while preserving and fostering the democratic methods and values enshrined in the Constitution of India". But is it not also clearly stated in the Constitution of the USSR framed by Stalin just at the time when he was celebrating the Victory of Terror over his own colleagues? Here, it is not the question of intention of a few leaders. Once an economic and political dynamic has been created and set in its full momentum, they will not be able to arrest its logical weight of necessity, and all obstacles before its path will have to be removed. The well-intentioned Nehru may be replaced by an Indian Stalin and the former may be paving the way for him, albeit unintentionally.

The "democratic methods and values", as all are aware, are not yet rooted firmly in our country. The ruling party has indicated a tendency to manipulate the electorate and even in normal times uses its maximum official influence and pressure to win election. But the situation will be worse when the economy will be dominated by the Public Sector and the ruling party will be threatened with mass discontent arising from the stress and strains of "planned" economic development policies. The democratic methods and values will be there merely as pretence.

This, then, is the real implication of the line of thought of the thesis.

Rapid economic development of the country and rise in the standard of living of the people are goals that all will agree to. There is nothing socialist about it. The 'socialist' method suggested by the thesis is obviously hazardous. Some of the 'Socialist' i.e. Communist countries have tried this method and although their economy may have 'developed' rapidly their standard of living has not risen very much. The Soviet Union has of course developed faster but the human cost it has paid for this in the last 30 years has been of a magnitude that is staggering. The thesis offers this method but does not take into consideration this colossal human sacrifice. It only uses the terms 'discipline', 'regulation' and 'control' but behind these innocent words lies a tale.

The Americans, the West Germans, the Japanese, the French, the Scandinavians, the Austrians — all these have also made rapid economic development since World War II and have raised their standard of living very considerably. If therefore, our goals are common, why not study their methods and learn from them? Why is it suggested that we must call



"Good heavens! Here is a strange book which actually presumes to define socialism!"

Courtesy: Hindustan Times, Delhi

our efforts 'Socialist', 'planned', 'cooperative' and thus commit ourselves to a doctrinaire outlook, when these have not delivered the goods as other methods and approaches have done?

Democracy and Socialism do not really go together. Democracy means that a people undergo some experience under some policy and if they find that the results are not happy, they revise that policy or scrap it altogether. A political system that assures this process of continual rethinking of experience publicly and revising the governmental policies as a consequence constitutes the essence of democracy. But once a community is committed to an ideology of, say, Socialism, the democratic process will have to be pruned and restricted and curbed in order to remain loyal to and consistent with the ideology, even when actual experience might have proved too bitter. Therefore a democratic party cannot truthfully be an ideological party at the same time. But the admitted purpose of the thesis is exactly this — to transform the Party into an ideological one. Once ideology begins to become dominant in a party — particularly when it is a ruling one — fanaticism and monopolistic tendencies are bound to grow into it.

The appeal of "Socialism" consists of two elements. One, that every member of the community should in actual fact have adequate opportunity for normal growth and enjoyment of life. Secondly, when the community as a whole creates the wealth, it should not be *very sharply* divided between two substantial groups — one terribly impoverished and another living in unusual luxury. No sensible person who has a conscience would or does disagree with this today, after over two centuries of reform movements in the world, both in the name of Socialism or otherwise. One need not call himself a 'Socialist', and create unnecessary confusion, when he accepts these two basic norms of humanist decency. In fact all modern countries which do not at all call themselves Socialist — USA, Britain, Japan, France, West Germany etc. accept these goals and are far

ahead in achieving them than those who are aggressively Socialist or Communist. Better living standards, better educational facilities, better social securities, greater incomes, etc. have enabled them to widen their base of prosperity, and disparities are far less there than in avowedly Communist countries. The Community is much more cohesive and much less sharply divided in these western countries than in Communist ones.

The most vital thing for India is to discuss concretely not an ideology (i.e. a whole set of closely-knit and complete idea-systems) but how to produce more wealth and fast enough. Slogans like 'Socialism' even if adopted enthusiastically and with passion would be of little help in this. Let the Congress and its governments take the problems one by one and draw up concrete plans with an undogmatic and results-first attitude and get down to work. Its three Plans have not borne the fruits it expected. Instead of trying to shift the blame for this on others, let it be more humble and do some real reappraisal, including of some of its basic principles.

The Thesis, if accepted at Bhubaneswar, with a "sense of urgency", is bound to set the country into a direction and a pace of political and economic development which will lead us, not to new stages of creative endeavour, but to a period of tension and social antagonism and disunity, and even political instability and economic chaos, at least for a few years. It will generate forces that will break up the Congress. Whether it will, in consequence, bring into existence a healthy Opposition Party capable of accepting the leadership of the country in place of the Congress it too early to say. In any case, the new situation will provide excellent opportunity to those who fish in troubled waters of instability and who are experts in subversion.

Let us therefore hope good sense will dawn on the leaders of the Congress not to commit the organisation to the central line of thought contained in this document.

The Kairon Enquiry

A. G. Mulgaonkar

LORD DENNING, it is reported, is coming to India. Obviously the visit is at the invitation of the Government of India, which means at the invitation of Mr. Nehru. There should, of course, be a lot for Mr. Nehru to discuss with Lord Denning. In his six-page note to the President on the charges levelled against the Punjab Chief Minister by a deputation led by some leaders of the Opposition parties, Mr. Nehru has quoted from the Denning

report somewhat extensively like the cautious reviewer of a play or a poem who wonders if he has come up against something important. Mr. Nehru's quotations from the Denning Report hardly support the case he tries to build up in favour of his own premises and still less in favour of the Punjab Chief Minister. Mr. Nehru's note to the President is therefore worth considering in the context not only of the Denning Report but of the

far more transcendent question of ministerial corruption to which, unhappily for the country and the public interest to which Mr. Nehru so frequently refers in his note, he has been turning a blind eye. With a Nelson touch, he seems to say, "I have put my eye to the telescope and I did not see any corruption. Scandal? It is scandal to call it a scandal!" It is a national misfortune that those immediately around Mr. Nehru should not categorically tell him what the short-term and long-term results of this attitude have been. But, how can they? Public interest is perhaps not the thing many in the immediate vicinity of Mr. Nehru are there for, whatever else they are there for. If Lord Denning's visit to India has the effect of opening that closed eye of Mr. Nehru, India will have great reason to be thankful to Lord Denning. In the years gone by Mr. Nehru has in public referred to the crisis of character in public life but he has given little other evidence of his awareness, unless it was that he had in mind those that complained about it, as the Opposition leaders are doing in the Punjab Chief Minister's case. It may be that ministerial corruption started in a small way, almost like a snow-ball, fit for children to play with. But it will be a bold man today who can deny that it has now assumed the proportions of an avalanche.

Many among those who have read Mr. Nehru's note to the President carefully must have wondered what its purpose was. Nowhere in the long note is the slightest mention of what the charges were which had been repeatedly made by the Opposition leaders and which upto now he, equally repeatedly, had been brushing aside. He mentions that some more charges have now been added but he does not say that these have weighed with him in recommending to the President the appointment of the Commission to inquire into them. If there is one thing clearly stamped on the note, from beginning to end, it is the reluctance of the Prime Minister to have the charges, such as they are, inquired into. To some it must seem as if his hands have been forced by the President and that the note is an act of self-justification by a reluctant Prime Minister.

To understand the Denning Report it is necessary to remember what Lord Denning was asked to do: "To examine, in the light of the circumstances leading to the resignation of the former Secretary of State for War, Mr. J. D. Profumo, the operation of the Security Service and the adequacy of their cooperation with the Police in matters of security, to investigate any information or material which may come to his attention in this connection and to consider any evidence there may be for believing that national security has been, or may be, endangered and to report thereon."

And this is what Lord Denning considered were

the inadequacies of his own inquiry, "First, being in secret, it has not the appearance of justice; second, in carrying out the inquiry, I have had to be detective, inquisitory advocate and judge, and it has been difficult to combine them." A little later he adds "my inquiry is not a suitable body to determine guilt or innocence."

Lord Denning has also this to say about a tribunal as an alternative to an inquiry such as his. "The appointment of a tribunal under the Tribunal of Inquiries 1921, is an elaborate and costly machine, equipped with all the engines of law-counsel, solicitors, witnesses on oath, absolute privilege, openness to the public (so far as possible) and committal for contempt—but it suffers from the invincible drawback in doing justice that there is no prosecution, no charge and no defence."

Mr. Nehru in his note to the President, recommends, "such an inquiry should be made by a high authority under the Commissions of Inquiries Act of 1952. Within the terms of that Act, the inquiring authority will have full freedom to lay down its own procedure. This Act states that the inquiry may be either public or private and *in camera*." Mr. Nehru has, therefore, chosen a method of inquiry altogether different from the one over which Lord Denning presided. This was only natural considering the purpose in the two inquiries was altogether different. The Denning inquiry was concerned with, briefly speaking, with two matters: firstly, circumstances leading to the resignation of the former Secretary of State for War; secondly the operation of the Security Service and its cooperation with the Police in matters of Security. And, incidentally only, he was to examine any material (which in other words meant summons) which came to his attention for believing that national security has been, or may be, endangered. The inquiry in the Kairon case does not deal with summons or questions of national security but presumably with specific acts on the part of the Punjab Chief Minister, which, if true, must be regarded as rendering him unfit to hold that high office. How, then, can considerations which Lord Denning thought applicable or relevant to his inquiry or to his report apply to the Kairon case? Of course, it is possible that it is only a case of confused and not wishful thinking when Mr. Nehru picks up a sweet-sounding aphorism from the Denning Report that, "people were better off for not knowing what was not true." Mr. Kairon is going before the Tribunal which is still to declare what is and what is not true. Mr. Nehru airily quotes this from Lord Denning to fortify his own decision not to relieve Mr. Kairon of his office even temporarily during the course of the inquiry, because "that would imply that *prima facie* there was some truth in the charges made."

At this stage another matter, but intimately con-

cerned with this, has to be considered. The demand for relieving Mr. Kairon of his office arises from a fear which is twofold. It is possible that material evidence may not become available and that witnesses may not come forward fearing the avenging wrath of the Punjab Chief Minister. What manner of man, therefore, is this Pratap Singh Kairon, this Chief Minister of the Punjab about whom these suspicions are cast and whom Mr. Nehru is so anxious to protect. Perhaps some indications are available in the majority judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of Dr. S. P. Singh against the State of Punjab.

Dr. S. P. Singh, a Civil Surgeon in the State of Punjab, had proceeded on leave preparatory to retirement. He was compulsorily recalled from his leave, suspended and a departmental inquiry on charges of official misconduct ordered against him. Dr. Singh petitioned the Punjab High Court to quash these orders under Art. 226 of the Constitution; and when this was dismissed, he went in appeal to the Supreme Court. The petition of Dr. Singh, supported by sworn affidavits, alleged that, for various reasons which he gave, he had incurred the wrath of the Chief Minister and the orders of the Punjab government suspecting him and ordering an inquiry into his misconduct were *malafide*. In ordinary language, that is, that the orders were due to the desire of the Chief Minister to wreck his vengeance upon him. To start with the Supreme Court held: "It is common ground that it was the Chief Minister who was in charge of the Health Department in which the appellant was employed and it was therefore the Chief Minister as the Minister in Charge of that portfolio who initiated these proceedings though formal orders of the Ministry were issued by the Secretaries etc. of the Department in the name of the Governor." The Supreme Court further said: "In the present case there were serious allegations made against the Chief Minister and there were several matters of which he alone could have personal knowledge and therefore which he alone could deny, but what was, however, placed before the Court in answer to the charges made against the Chief Minister was an affidavit by the Secretary to Government in the Medical Department who could only speak from official records and obviously not from personal knowledge about the several matters which were alleged against the Chief Minister."

Mr. Nehru, in his note, repeatedly points out that it is a well-recognised principle that the decision of a court on a question of fact is binding only on parties to the case. But he omits from his consideration the limits of this principle. That Mr. Kairon was the Chief Minister against whom allegations were made by way of sworn affidavits; that he was using official powers to wreck private vengeance. If this was

held proved then it must render Mr. Kairon unfit to hold any position of power, still less to continue as the Chief Minister of the Punjab. Findings of fact bind only the parties concerned but their repercussions must react on the official position of the parties. No amount of quibbling can alter this fact. It seems, therefore, clearly unreasonable to retain Mr. Kairon as Chief Minister while the present inquiry is going on in view of the Supreme Court's findings of fact in Dr. S. P. Singh's case. What is, however, of great importance is that Mr. Nehru has directed that the matters considered by the Supreme Court in that case should be excluded from the purview of the inquiry. After all, the purpose of the inquiry is to ascertain whether the charges brought by some of the leaders of the Opposition are true or not. Surely if Mr. Nehru's contention that findings of fact of a Court bind only the parties thereto is not a petty-fogging quibble, then both he and Mr. Kairon should have welcomed an opportunity to disprove the matters considered proved by the Supreme Court in the absence of any sworn testimony from Mr. Kairon. But perhaps Mr. Kairon wisely chooses (and Mr. Nehru equally wisely refrains from advising him against it) not to reargue the matter.

It is more than possible Lord Denning's knowledge of English history goes beyond an outline of the subject. If asked, he is bound to point out how ruthlessly ministerial corruption has been put down in England. Even the first Duke of Marlborough regarded as the foremost military commander in English history, had to answer for some of his transactions even while he was winning some of his brilliant victories in the field. Even Sir Robert Walpole, the first to hold the office of Prime Minister in England and reputed to be the author of the tag that every man had his price escaped being sent to the Tower on charges of corruption during office by discreetly withdrawing from public life and keeping his mouth shut thereafter. In India the great Akbar, whose beneficent rule is recalled all over the country with gratitude after centuries, is reported to have hanged four of the dozen or so prime ministers in his reign for offences against the State.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 nP

Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor,
127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

The Radhakrishnan Report

A. B. Shah

✓
WHAT strikes one as unique and significant in Dr. Radhakrishnan's work is his effort to bring about a reconciliation between the East and the West, the Ancient and the Modern, the empirical and the intuitive. The Report of the University Education Commission, popularly known as the Radhakrishnan Commission, is to my mind the finest and the most valuable accomplishment of this quest for synthesis. It is not merely a statement of findings and recommendations concerning university education in India. It is also a masterly exposition of the twentieth-century philosophy of freedom and its application in one of the most important sectors of our national life. And this is achieved without sacrificing anything that is really universal in our own complex and heterogeneous cultural heritage, or forgoing any of the liberal values of the post-Renaissance West. Without minimizing the difficulties, the Report seeks to demonstrate that there are sufficient elements in our tradition which can provide native soil for the growth of an open society based on freedom and justice. Universities have a crucial role to play in this process both in ensuring its success and in accelerating its speed. The Radhakrishnan Report adumbrates the measures that should be taken and the larger framework of ideas and values in which this should be done, in order to enable the universities to play their role with credit. It is a document that deserves to be made obligatory reading not only for educationists and Ministers of Education but for every Indian who professes interest in the democratic reconstruction of our society. I am using these words deliberately and I mean them to be taken literally.

The University Education Commission was appointed by the Government of India on 4th November 1948, when Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was Minister for Education in the Union Ministry. Besides Dr. Radhakrishnan, who was named Chairman, and the late Professor N. K. Siddhanta, who was Member-Secretary, there were eight other members of the Commission. All of them were reputed scholars or educationists and included Dr. Zakir Hussain, Dr. James Duff, Vice-Chancellor of Durham, Dr. Meghnad Saha, and Dr. Arthur Morgan, President of Antioch and First Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The fact that the President and the Vice-President of India today were both members of this Commission does not seem to have been effectively noticed by those who should be the most interested in it. Let us, however, hope that with Dr. Radhakrishnan as President and Dr. Zakir Hussain as Vice-President, university education would now at least

get the priority that it deserves and that it already gets even in some of the less developed countries such as Nigeria.

The terms of reference of the Commission were to consider and make recommendations in regard to almost every aspect of university education in India. The aims of university education and research, the organisational pattern for universities, the maintenance and improvement of standards, salary scales and other conditions of service for teachers, courses of study, methods of instruction and examination, the medium of instruction, admission of students, facilities for working students—all these and more were the problems that the Commission was called upon to examine and suggest how to solve. And the solutions had to be practicable and in keeping with the democratic values enshrined in our Constitution.

The Commission discharged its obligation with a thoroughness of detail and a maturity of approach that stand witness to the competence and the sense of dedication that its members brought to bear on their task. Informing the Report throughout is a spirit of religiosity—not the crude variety expressing itself in attachment to dogma and ritual but the deep, authentic religiosity that distinguishes a passionate commitment to human values from mere expertise in the mechanics of their realization. Without implying disrespect to the other members of the Commission, I would submit that this pervasive spirit as that of Dr. Radhakrishnan, the Chairman of the Commission. And it is fortunate that one so deeply committed to freedom and the dignity of the individual is Head of the State at a time when our democracy is threatened as much by ideological subversion as by military aggression.

The Commission gathered its facts and impressions by circulating a comprehensive questionnaire to about 2,900 persons—members of the Constituent Assembly, Chief Ministers and Ministers of Education, Vice-Chancellors, Directors of Public Instruction, Principals of Colleges and Heads of University Departments, educationists, publicists and other prominent persons. About 600 replies were received, a percentage which, though normal with surveys by the questionnaire method, does little credit to the class to which the addressees belonged. The Commission also invited memoranda, visited all the universities then in existence and interviewed more than eight hundred persons, besides going through a vast mass of statistical material and theoretical and descriptive literature. The Report is divided into two volumes, of more than seven hundred pages each. The text

proper runs into nearly six hundred pages and is divided into eighteen chapters, which together with the eighteen appendices make up the first volume of the Report. The other volume contains the evidence tendered before the Commission. All this work, including the writing of the Report, was completed in nine months, from December 1948 to August 1949 — a remarkable achievement by any test.

I need not tell you in detail what the findings of the Commission were—anyone familiar with our university education can well imagine what they could have been. What is of interest about these findings is, not their nature but the quantitative measures that the Report gave of the condition of the universities in this country at the dawn of Independence. Things have improved since then, mostly on the lines recommended by the Commission. But the degree of the improvement so far achieved and the pace at which it is proceeding to-day bear no relation to what yet remains to be done. A few examples may therefore not be out of place.

The Commission found that in 1948 India spent on Education 5% of its total budget. The corresponding figures for Great Britain and France — both of which were just out of a devastating war—were 11% and 12% respectively. Also, the Commission notes, in a good university the library provision is about 6% of the total budget of the university, or Rs. 40 per student. For the complex of institutions known as Bombay university, the corresponding figure would be about Rs. 10/- per student. If we leave aside the University Library proper, the figure for the Constituent Colleges would work out still lower, about Rs. 8/- per student, or 2% of the total budget of the Colleges. What is true of expenditure on the library is also true of teacher's salaries and student amenities, size of the class, methods of instruction and the rest of it. For instance, the teacher-student ratio in our universities is about 1:40 as against 1:10 in a good university. This is reflected in an unusually high percentage of failures, varying between 28% and 67% as against only 10% in British universities. Nor is the high percentage of failures in our universities by any means a sign of high academic standards. Those who fail, do so in spite of all decent and indecent efforts of the examiners and *ad hoc* committees to pass them by gracing. And most of those who do pass show poor standards of attainment and critical thinking compared with their counterparts even in some of the newly liberated free countries of Asia or Africa.

This, however, is not new to us. Indeed, we have been so much used to evil that we have ceased to notice its presence in our midst and get angry over it. Not only that; occasionally, if someone comes up with vision and determination and sets out to clear the mess, we condemn him as an enemy of the people. In other words, evil has become part of us, even

of those of us who occupy the seats of power and talk of leading the people out of a depressed culture and a backward economy. It is precisely on this account that it is necessary to restore the universities to their legitimate estate—not as a favour to those who teach and study in the universities, but because a sound university system is indispensable for the cultural and economic viability of our democracy. Looked at from this standpoint, the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission are of far-reaching significance. However, they are to be looked upon as elements of a single, unified whole, not piece-meal as is done to-day. If this is done, I am certain that thereby we shall not only be transforming our educational system beyond recognition but also laying an enduring foundation for a free, prosperous and just social order. I shall mention here only a few of the major recommendations together with the theoretical framework from which they inevitably follow. For the rest, I must refer you to the Report, which unfortunately has for some time now been out of print, or to the Summary when it is published.

The first and basic question to which the Commission addresses itself is: What is a university? What are its aims and how are they related to the other goals accepted by a democratic society like ours? How are they different from the aims in a totalitarian society? The Commission's answer to this question is ringing and unambiguous, and deserves to be quoted. It says:

'The vision of free men in a free society is the living faith and inspiring guide of democratic institutions. . . . we must (therefore) train people not merely to be citizens but also to be individuals. Many systems of education tend to transform the individual, who might otherwise seek to rise above the type, into the representative of the community. On such a system we cannot get leaders, who with new values transform the community. There is no stimulus of individuality, to being in any respect different from one's surroundings. The aim of education should be to break ground for new values and make them possible'.

In other words, again of the Commission,

'If it is the function of universities to train men and women for wise leadership, they must enable young men and women to read with insight the records of human experience as they are expressed in (the) world's literature, to know the nature and consequences of ethical values, to sense the meaning of social forces operating in the world today, and to comprehend the complexities and intricacies of life, in all its immensity, physical, social and spiritual'.

These then are two of the major functions of a university—to train men not merely to be citizens

but also to be individuals, and to train them for wise leadership. From them follow almost every recommendation of the Commission. In particular, the Commission recommended that there should be a three years' course for the first degree examination, preceded by a twelve-year course of school instruction all over the country. This latter course should bring the student up to the present intermediate level, and the last four years of it, comprising the last two years of school and the first two years of college at present, should be taught in what the Commission calls Intermediate colleges. This means that university education proper would begin with the degree course, and the student when he enters it would have completed eighteen years of age in order that he should be mature enough to benefit properly from it. Another reform, which also has not yet been implemented relates to the size of a university and its organizational structure. The Commission recommends that there should not be more than 3,000 students in a unitary university and not more than 1,500 in a constituent or affiliated college of the federal or affiliating type of university. Also, no university of either of these types should have more than 40 or 50 institutions affiliated to it, so that the entire complex would be of a manageable size.

On the questions of the courses of study and methods of teaching and examining students, the Commission recommends that the compartmentalism and premature specialization should give way to general education-going hand in hand with specialized studies. There is also emphasis on tutorial and seminar work and self-study by students. The Commission recommends that English should in the course of time be replaced by the regional language as the medium of instruction. However, it is unequivocal in its emphasis on the need for a properly co-ordinated programme for the country as a whole in this matter and for ensuring that a living contact shall be maintained with English. The Commission also recognizes that the present system of examinations defeats its purpose to a large extent and results in a criminal wastage of human and material resources. It also leads to a lowering of academic standards by encouraging rote work in view of the intimate relationship between degrees and employment. The Commission therefore recommends that Government agencies should institute their own selection tests,

and the university should modify the nature of their examinations by introducing objective tests in the place of the present, completely essay-type examination.

The Commission's recommendations regarding the salary scales and other conditions of service for college and university teachers are well known and need no detailed mention here. What is not equally well known is its recommendation about the facilities for working students as also the recommendation for more selective admissions and more liberal provision for scholarship related to merit and means. While it agrees that higher education should not be closed to anyone on account of poverty, it is concerned to ensure that educational standards and academic values do not suffer in the name of encouragement to backward classes. In particular, it condemns the large-scale reservation of seats in colleges and universities on the basis of caste as practised by certain state administrations. For the working students, the Commission recommends their complete segregation from full-time students and a longer duration of the course in order that they may be able to do justice to their studies without neglecting their job or health.

Before I close, one last question demands an answer. To what extent have the Radhakrishnan Commission's recommendations been implemented by the Union and the State governments and by the universities? Well, as in most other fields of planning, here too the answer has to be: 'only partially, in a haphazard manner and often in a distorted form'. Here was a document which in its conception and significance for our democracy would rank next only to the Constitution in the post-Independence period. And yet, what we have done with it can only be characterized as vulgarization, unbecoming of an enlightened leadership, political or academic. And the indifference of the *nouveaux riches* has been equally criminal. Perhaps the Commission had a premonition of the fate that awaited the outcome of its labours. For at one place in the Report, it observes, 'when human action can remove the evils, inaction has the guilt of vice'. To-day this observation seems to have about it a touch of prophetic irony.

(Based on the speech delivered at the Theosophy Hall, Bombay under the auspices of the Indian Institute of World Culture and the P.E.N. All-India Centre on Tuesday, 19th Nov., 1963.)



RAYMOND ROYALTY, NEW YORK

Illustration by Ray Royalty, New York Times Weekly Bureau

SUPPRESSION OF OPINION

Raman Desai

THE Government of India has prohibited the sale or distribution of a book entitled *Peking Vs. Delhi* by Mr. George N. Patterson, published by M/s Faber & Faber Ltd., on the ground that it contained prejudicial reports. The order is issued under the Defence of India Rules. Mr. Patterson is an authority on Tibet and is a correspondent of high repute.

Without a perusal of the book, it is difficult to gauge to what extent Mr. Patterson's reportage would contain items prejudicial to the security and defence of the country. But from the general tenor of his writings it may well be that having studied the attitude and policies of the Government of India prior to the Chinese war, he might have indicted Mr. Nehru's foreign policies. If so, his indictment can be no stronger than that of a large number of Indians themselves within and without the congress, who have felt that the Chinese would never have dared to attack but for the pusillanimous and ambiguous foreign policy of Mr. Nehru, this policy allied with the counsel of the then Defence Minister who is a phenomenon in himself—a vegetarian, non-smoking, tea-drinking, non-violent except to pressmen, non-defence minister, equal to another India's invention, the figure zero in mathematics.

Strangely enough, it now appears that Mr. Bertrand Russell's book "Unarmed Victory" which contained views which were different from those of the Government and is reported to be anti-Indian has not been banned probably because of the high stature of the writer. But, by a peculiar piece of jugglery, the book publishers have been orally warned not to import the book and thus no copies of the book are available to us! It seems that Mr. Nehru, who never failed to harp on the praise of people like Mr. Appleby, and unknown admirers of his policies from abroad, is not prepared to allow the Indian public any access to literature which condemns his policies however factual the data may be, and however learned the criticism. Obviously, he regards the people of India as a dangerous type of morons who would be swayed, presumably, into conduct prejudicial to the security of India, if such comments as of Mr. Russell and Mr. Patterson were allowed to be brought to their notice.

I suppose Mr. Nehru and Mr. Nanda have reached a point where democratic values of complete liberty of thought, of erudite information which might assist formation of correct opinion, have no place if they adversely affect the image they have set up of themselves and their colleagues as men of vast wisdom and unique patriotism.

Without Comment

AGGRESSIONS AND AGGRESSIONS

IT would seem that Mr. Menon can no more improve his mind than a dog can straighten his tail. Even after his policies have brought a disgraceful dismissal to him, and a disgraceful defeat to the country, he continues to make the worse appear the better reason, and to distort and misrepresent the country's policies.

For example, at the AICC Session in Jaipur, he put China and Pakistan on par and found them equally guilty of "treachery and undeclared aggression." Honesty and discretion alike demand that we see, and recognise, the difference between the two aggressions.

When the partition of the country was decided on, religion was made the dividing factor for British India. The Muslim League, hoping to secure the accession of Hindu-majority States ruled by Muslim Princes—eg. Hyderabad and Junagadh—decided to go by the choice of princes. It actually secured the accession of Junagadh and very nearly that of Jammu and Kashmir State. Pakistan tried to be smart; India proved smarter. That, in brief, is the story of Kashmir.

The whole State of Jammu and Kashmir is today, in law, part of India; and much of it is part of India in fact. But it will be futile for Mr. Menon to pretend that Pakistan in 1947 did not have an arguable case in Kashmir. The National Conference leaders were not talking cabbages in Lahore in September 1947. The very fact that the Nehru Government agreed to a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir State—to decide its accession to India or to Pakistan—was itself an admission—very unnecessary and very unfortunate that Pakistan was not without a *locus standi* in that affair.

The case of China is entirely different. Here is a country which has forcibly occupied Tibet—where it did not have so much as an envoy for the preceding half century. For the first time in our history—and in theirs—Chinese troops have not only arrived on the Indian borders, but actually overrun them. To put the two cases on par is to do violence to historical truth.

Also, while we can always keep small Pakistan—divided within itself and dependent on USA—in its place, China is a much bigger menace to us. For that reason also it would be wrong to bracket them together as if they were two equal evils.

Nobody can accuse us of partiality for Pakistan. But honesty demands that we see the difference

(Continued on page 10)

Review

A New Look at Communism

Edited by A. B. Shah & Nissim Ezekiel, Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, Rs. 3

THIS publication includes some papers submitted at a seminar convened by the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom on August 30 to Sept. 1, 1963 along with a report on the general consensus of opinion of the participants. The main themes discussed were (1) the Myths of Communism and their appeal to intellectuals (2) The Communist Movement in India and South East Asia (3) The Schism in the Communist World, (4) The Consumer in the Communist Economy. The papers are erudite but, given some attention, easy reading and are notable in the clear analysis of the facts and problems presented. It seems to be generally agreed at the Seminar that modern wars, initiated by Communists, do not seek territory so much as extension of communist ideas; therefore, the resistance to such wars should be not merely at the level of military weapons, but in an informed repugnance to the motivating ideas behind the communist menace. Obviously, as an item of emphasis this argument may be permissible but one has only to look at the vast expansion of territory controlled by the U.S.S.R. after the last war, to appreciate that territory subordinated to the economic needs of the USSR had also to be politically servile and therefore politically dominated. In a similar fashion the Chinese expansion in Tibet and attempted push in the Himalayas, the pressures on South-East Asia, are the result not merely of a search for extension of the ideas but a definite demand for political control of territory. It may well be that the schism between the two Communist powers, USSR and China, may admit of two interpretations; one, that China seeks to conserve the pristine virtue of undiluted communist theory of world revolution through violent or a deceitful proletarian uprising in various countries assisted by the founder members of banditry, USSR and China, and the USSR is reluctant, in face of superior force, to pursue this line at the

(Continued from page 9)

between the two aggressions — and formulate our policy accordingly.

What is particularly objectionable in Mr. Menon's statement is the unstated — but well understood — implication that since both Pakistan and China are aggressors, and since we have not bothered to throw Pakistan out of Muzaffarabad, we need not bother to throw China out of Aksai Chin etc. either!

(Editorial in *Organiser*, Delhi, Nov. 18.)

present moment; the second, that the conflict is really based on the desire of the younger, more aggressive, communist partner, China, to assert itself to a full stature of prestige and power with the elder partner, and take over the leadership of the Communist world, with all the attendant perquisites of political and economic dominance over weaker surrounding states.

The Seminar rightly stressed that the appeal of Communists in the underdeveloped countries rests not on clear recognition of the facts prevailing in communist countries but rather on a complete ignorance of the actual situation; that this appeal to such underdeveloped people is the result of a decayed social and economic community in which the people, particularly the intellectuals, find themselves smothered and frustrated. Where centuries of traditional slavery, political and economic, have provided not only anti-democratic tradition but a pathetic belief and desire for paternal, if not despotic rule, the very basis for the growth of free independent thought and will to freedom does not exist. It is the purpose of such seminars, and their most valuable contribution, to nourish the roots of such independent thinking. The papers submitted at this Seminar provide valuable suggestions for further reading and research; as Mr. Laxmanshastri Joshi pointed out in his inaugural address, for "education of the people and their leaders in the habits of empirical analysis and libertarian values."

RAMAN DESAI

The China Quarterly — Special Survey of the Formosan Situation

Published by Information Bulletin, London, 5 Shillings.

ONE'S judgement about the Nationalist regime on Formosa depends primarily on one's evaluation of the Nationalist goal of recovering the mainland. Anyone who does not subscribe to it naturally feels inclined to consider the concentration of their energies and resources by the Nationalist on the efforts to attain their objective as unjustified, if not sheer waste. The Nationalists, for example, spend more than 80 per cent of their national revenue on the military. An expenditure of this proportion could be regarded as justified only if one approves of the objective for which it is made. Similarly, many consequences, social and political, follow from their decision to accord the highest priority to their goal of 'national recovery'. Here, again, one's assessment depends on how one views the Nationalist order of priorities.

The Editorial of the Special issue of *The China Quarterly* on Formosa points out that the existence of the Nationalist regime on Formosa is "one of the major problems of world politics and a possible flash-point for the start of the Third World War." This is equally true of Berlin, Cuba and many other

places in the world threatened by the Communists. But the fact is that none of them has yet sparked off a major conflict because the Western powers have so far remained firm in their positions in regard to these areas. Today because of the Sino-Soviet dispute, Formosa is less likely to be a cause of serious international conflict than it was before 1958. In the last few years, the Nationalists have, to some extent, consolidated their position in international affairs and have even made a few diplomatic gains at the expense of the Chinese Communists. Similarly, the strategic and political significance of the existence of the Nationalist regime has come to be more widely appreciated in Asian and other countries in recent years.

The need for a balanced assessment of the Formosan situation based on an understanding of the Nationalist case is therefore greater today than any time in the past. Unfortunately, the special survey of *The China Quarterly* fails to satisfy this need. It nowhere attempts to put forth and examine dispassionately the Nationalist case. Many of the contributors to the issue set out with the assumption that the Nationalist goal of retaking the mainland is a myth. Some regard Chiang Kai-shek as still an unregenerate dictator. The Nationalist achievements in the field of social and land reforms are cursorily

dealt with and their record of guerrilla operations on the mainland has been totally ignored. This omission is rather significant as even the Red Chinese have now begun seriously to take note of the Nationalist guerrilla activity in their midst.

Though the special survey does not give us a balanced assessment, it includes many informative articles on various aspects of life on Formosa. The review of Formosa's Economic Growth by Sheppard Glass is an objective account of Formosa's impressive economic progress and the serious problems posed by the huge military expenditure. The writer points out how the overriding goal of a return to the mainland, the oversized bureaucracy and other related factors pose a formidable barrier to further economic progress. Similarly, Joyce Kallgren, in his survey of the Nationalist Armed Forces, commends their efficiency and high degree of combat readiness, and deals with various problems that arise from the growing influence of local Formosans within the Services and the discrepancy between the Nationalist goals and the aims of the American programme. There are, besides, articles surveying the Nationalist record on the diplomatic front, Taipei's relations with Peking, and the dilemmas of American policy towards Formosa. The article "Intellectuals of Formosa" by Mei Wen-li discusses the plight of the intellectuals and the suppression of individual liberties by the regime. The Formosan intellectuals, a majority of whom feel alienated, are attracted by the American ideals and there is, on their part, an ideological commitment to the values of liberal democracy. This, as the writer points out, will certainly influence the future course of Formosa. The author also traces the conflict between the traditionalist authoritarian groups and the liberal sections within the Nationalist party. He also refers to "mass arrests and rampant secret police activities", which is an exaggerated description of the illiberal tendencies within the regime. The writer himself it should be noted, is a Chinese living in Formosa. The articles on Formosan Nationalism and Formosan Independence Movement deal with the conflict between the mainlanders who are a ruling class and local Formosans who constitute more than three-fourth of the population. This friction is inevitable under the prevailing circumstances, but over the last ten years the Nationalists have tried to conciliate the Formosans with some success.

The anti-Nationalist bias is quite evident in John Israel's article "Politics of Formosa". He exaggerates the Nationalist lapses and aberrations (which certainly deserve condemnation) and dubs the Nationalist regime as a "Police State" which "now seems unassailable". "The two minority parties", according to him, "are as impotent as their mainland counterparts." (Continued on page 12)



"Why these Chinese wouldn't even be communists if it weren't for us!"

Courtesy: *Time*, New York, August, 1963.

With Many Voices

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

The success of American leadership is dependent upon respect for America's mission in the world as well as for her missiles, and a clear recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

—Mr. J. F. Kennedy, late President of USA
Times of India, November 24.

The Stalins of the world mostly die in their beds. It is the Lincolns and the Kennedys who are shot down.

—Editorial in Daily Herald, London, *Times of India*, November 25.

Free economy has solved a problem which has never before in history been soluble and which has to be solved by socialism — the abolition of poverty as a mass phenomenon.

Nava Kultura, a leading Polish Communist publication, *March of the Nation*, November 30.

This (defining the concept of socialism) has been necessary as it is not possible so far to tell the people what the difference is between Communists and Congressmen.

—Mr. Mahavir Tyagi, *Indian Express*, November 4.

We try to resurrect humanity from the files.

—Sir Guy Powles, Ombudsman of New Zealand,
Hindu, November 6.

Wealth is not created by shouting socialism.

—Shri S. K. Patil, *Indian Express*, November 15.

Ever since the Congress was born, it had people having different views. It had been a consortium.

—Mr. K. D. Malaviya, *March of the Nation*, November 16.

I have not read Marx or Lenin, but I understand them, and have some sort of emotional rapport with them.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Blitz*, November 23.

The defects and crimes of political leaders cannot be proved like charges in a criminal case. When the accused person is in absolute power over the life, liberty and property of every possible witness, proof of that nature is impossible.

—Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, *Swarajya*, November 23.

Unless banks are nationalised, there is no hope socialism in India.

—Mr. Krishna Menon, *Patriot*, November.

Nobody has walked out of the ruling party though so few understand or accept socialism as conceived by Nehru.

—Mr. Arjun Arora, *Link*, November.

(FORMOSAN SITUATION — Continued from page 11)
parts" and the Nationalist attempt to establish institutional democracy is just an eyewash. This art reminds one of the band of American liberals before 1949 were insistent that the Chinese Communists were "democrats" and "agrarian reformers" while Chiang Kai-shek was an "absolute tyrant."

The truth is that to understand the Formosan situation one has, to bear in mind as noted above that the Nationalists accord the highest priority their goal of retaking the mainland from the Communists. They have subordinated everything else to this goal. They have been, besides, living under constant threat of a Communist invasion and consequently in a state of national emergency continuous for the last fourteen years. These two factors have naturally strengthened the military and the police and enhanced their role in the conduct of national affairs. Still, the fact remains that Nationalists have tried to establish institutional democracy and though there is an elaborate apparatus of the secret police and the martial law, they have done it with relative restraint and there is no system of mass repression.

It is misleading to judge the Nationalist regime by applying the standards of liberal democracy without taking into consideration the above factors which have produced a queer mixture of the "rule of martial law under a democratic constitution" coupled with the practice of "local tutelage". On an island where three-fourth of the population is "politically quiescent" and still not completely reconciled to the Nationalist regime and where the Confucian authoritarian tradition and culture are still strongly rooted, it is futile to expect that institutional democracy would flourish if only the Nationalists adopted liberal democratic policies. It would be more appropriate to judge the Nationalist record against the background of their own past as well as of the general political situation in South-East Asian countries.

B. K. D