

FEBRUARY 1964

## Bhubaneswar— Its Achievements And Failures

Saadi

people, that  
political. I  
s and power  
planning, or  
xes to create

December 7.

as the price

December 11. INSPITE of the best efforts of Congress leaders as well as rank and file to define clearly their concept

in insidious socialism, the resolution on democracy and socialism, adopted at the 68th Plenary Session of the Indian National Congress at Bhubaneswar is in no way less ambiguous than the ones adopted by the

December 13. organisation from time to time, embodying its social objectives, right from its Karachi session in 1931. The

It is obvious Bhubaneswar resolution too, at best, embodies pious wishes of a generation of Congressmen, who wanted

December 16. serve their country by vaguely trying to bring about social revolution in the country by peaceful

ister Nehru and legitimate means. Yet the Bhubaneswar resolution has its own achievements, for, it recognises certain

stated policy fundamental tenets of democratic socialism when it head of the organisation.

December 8. "socialism does not merely signify changes in the economic relations in the society. It involves

nd Five-Year fundamental changes in the social structure, in ways thinking and ways of living. . . . Caste and class

poorer now have no place in socialist order. . . . Old ideas about privilege on the basis of birth or caste or class or

ustan Times money or the hierarchy of office should be discarded. he dignity of labour should be recognised. Indeed,

December 6. the dignity of the individual in every grade of life could be ensured." Especially in the context of the

Mrs. Sucheta conditions prevailing in India today, recognition of these important social objectives is very essential; and

Centre her gain, in view of the tyrannies established in the name of socialism in communist countries, emphasis

le or parlia- the dignity of the individual is equally necessary. Apparently the so-called "progressives" — the left

December 14. wing extremists — were nearly successful in imposing their dogmas such as the nationalisation of banks

between the and the unrestricted extension of state enterprise in 1 to 80. ll sectors of economy, on Congress and that the

sh Congress generality of Congressmen were being unwittingly December 2. taken in by their rabid vehemence. This impression

g in the Up was created by newspapers who played up the speeches of the extremists, like Mr. Krishna Menon

d and begin and Mr. K. D. Malaviya. Actually, however, these constructive work- extremists could carry with them only an insignificant

ty. November 11. ty.

minority, who did not count in the organisational or governmental set-up. It was clear that the two leaders who dominated the Bhubaneswar scene and enjoyed the support of the vast majority of the delegates were Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri and Mr. S. K. Patil, who brought to bear sobriety and mature thinking upon the Bhubaneswar resolutions. Probably Mr. Nehru's absence also made a difference; the delegates applied their minds to the problems of the day with a sense of responsibility unlike other times when they would leave the thinking part to Mr. Nehru.

Whatever may be the weaknesses of the Bhubaneswar resolution, it must be admitted that it represents the genuine desire of the Congressmen to improve the lot of the Indian people. The difficulty involved in defining socialism concretely is a real one, for socialism means different thing to different people and as Professor C. E. M. Joad said socialism was like a hat which had lost its shape because too many people had worn it. Hence to blame Congress delegates for their failure to define socialism clearly at Bhubaneswar would be out of place. Even Karl Marx, who claimed to have evolved a scientific theory of socialism, could not define it clearly. Except that he was a good social thinker and made a comprehensive analysis of capitalist system, which with the passage of time, has proved partly incorrect. Marx could not bring out in any of his books, a clear picture of socialist society, beyond the stage of social revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. His concept of the ultimate withering away of the state is also a hazy one. All the subsequent efforts at defining socialism including those by Bernard Shaw, Sydney Webb and Harold Lasky have met with the same fate. Therefore, Congress performance at Bhubaneswar was in no way surprising.

The failure of Bhubaneswar, therefore, lies not in its failure to define socialism, but in its inability to tackle certain pressing economic problems, especially that of increasing poverty of the people. As a matter of fact, the preoccupation with the impossible task of defining socialism, diverted the attention of the delegates from the immediate need of increasing the wealth of the country by expanding industrial and agricultural production which alone can help to decrease the extent of poverty in the country. Further, there is the allied problem of stepping up exports, which is essential for imparting impetus to

industrial expansion and also of utilising the foreign loans properly and judiciously so as to quicken the pace of general economic progress.

It is true that it was vaguely realised that one cannot serve the poor by depriving the rich of the wherewithals at their command and that nationalisation of all means of production is no solution. But the point was not pressed in a positive manner. Mr. S. K. Patil, the keen realist that he is, has been saying that equal distribution of wealth would only mean an equal distribution of poverty — an argument which is forcefully borne out by the annual per capita income today which is less than Rs. 300. The moment it is realised that per capita income is an index of the income which will accrue to an individual if the entire wealth of the nation is equally distributed amongst all citizens, the theory of equal distribution falls to the ground. The solution of the problem of poverty lies in the increase in the national production, which with appropriate planning towards social welfare accompanied with democratic social legislation, can lead to equitable distribution — a lesson

which India can fruitfully learn from the examples of Britain, West Germany and Scandinavian countries. Bhubaneswar did not, however, apply its mind seriously in these directions.

Again, corruption was sought to be condemned, but no serious thinking at discovering its causes or the steps for its eradication was done. Therefore, the condemnation of corruption also remained merely a pious wish. The fact that the stranglehold of bureaucracy instead of loosening has tightened, and this, in turn, has led to corruption at all administrative levels thus vitiating even the effective functioning of democratic traditions, was also over-looked. The problem of bureaucracy, which is indeed a serious one, was not touched at all.

Yet, Bhubaneswar constitutes an important milestone in the history of Congress, as it represents the sincere desire of Congressmen to clear their minds of the ideological confusion, which was so characteristic of them in recent years, and to grapple with the problems of the day in a realistic manner.

## Israel And Arab States

Raman Desai

IT may be well to remember that the Arab states are mainly the residuary legatees of the Ottoman Empire. The Palestine Mandate in favour of the British in 1922, divided Palestine into Israel and Jordan, the latter comprising nearly four-fifths of the area. Britain gave up the Mandate in 1948. The United Nations General Assembly then intended to create an Arab State with 4,500 square miles of area which would have accommodated the displaced and nomadic Arabs totalling nearly a million persons. But this Arab State received no support from any of the participants and most of the territory intended for the Arab States was annexed by Egypt and Jordan. It is interesting to recall these events to show how far the sympathy for the Arab refugees governs the political manoeuvrings of the Arab leaders.

The population of Israel in 1961 stood at about 2.2 million persons. The non-Jewish population in 1962, Christian, Arab, Druse, numbered 2,45,000 persons. Ever since 1948, the Arab States have entered into sundry alliances to boycott Israel and join in armed attacks. But the relations between the Arabian states and Egypt have been invariably strained, varied only by repeated attempts by Egypt under President Nasser to undermine authority in those States which did not subscribe to his supremacy.

Ever since Nasser succeeded Naguib as Premier in 1954 and was elected President in 1956, it has

been the ambition of Nasser to create United Arab Republic, comprising all Arab states under a common socialistic parliamentary constitution. Egypt and Syria, joined in a federation, but after an experiment of three years, Syria withdrew in 1961. In April 1963, a tripartite union of Egypt, Syria and Iraq was proclaimed. The proclaimed aim of the U.A.R. was "unity is a revolution especially because it is strongly connected with the question of Palestine and the national duty to liberate it." The statement mentioned the need for military unity.

The internal situation in Egypt hardly justifies the bravado with which Nasser has conducted his foreign policy. Egypt has proclaimed itself the leader of the ill-assorted groups which have undermined the power of Britain in Arabia. It has promoted revolts in dissenting states. A vast army is bogged in Yemen and returning officers are presented with a Nasser baby car made in Egypt, to compensate for the destruction of half the forces in a hopeless war. Egypt, with a fertile basin, watered by the Nile for thousands of years, today, lives on American aid and bankers' loans. In the name of Socialism, individual business enterprise and the middle class have been stifled; there is no public opinion and no real criticism is permitted; voting for parliament is on the standard lines in a one party dictatorship.

In this situation Nasser has been eminently success-

ful in playing on the West and the communist countries for rivalry in foreign aid. Like all despots he turns his country's attention to the popular, if dangerous, target of Israel. Egypt has barred Israel shipping, and even cargoes destined for Israel, from the Suez Canal. In December 1963, the Arab states widened the boycott by threatening British firms, which dealt with Israel, with blacklisting and refusal of import licences in Arab states. In this threat, electrical firms, gold mining concerns and even insurance companies were involved. The matter came to a head with the resignation of Lord Mancroft, a Jewish Director of Norwich Union Insurance Company, with the object of not embarrassing the company's interests in Arabian states. The British people and the Government reacted strongly against this kind of interference in the domestic affairs of British firms and their right to trade overseas.

The latest attempt of the Arab states to unite in hate of Israel is the decision at a summit session on the 17th January 1964 to combine into a joint military command. The Assembly accused Israel of threatening Arab security and world peace through its scheme to use the waters of the Jordan river to fertilise the desert of Negev. The Assembly called for "liberation from Zionist imperialism" and agreed to unite for "organising the Palestine people and enabling them to liberate their own country." The Israel project on the Jordan was termed "aggression against the Arab waters." After all this the Assembly, understandably, declared its faith in non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, in the fashion of sanctimonious oriental incantation popularised by our Indian elders.

The present quarrel relating to Israel utilising the waters of the Jordan river, although in reality an excuse for a quarrel, has a long history. Israel has a coastal plain, fertile and watered; but it has also a semi-desert region, the Negev in the South. Negev extends from Beersheba to Aqaba on the gulf of the Elath. Rainfall is adequate in the North at about 40 inches in the year but meagre at 8 inches in the Central and totally inadequate in the South. Israel proposes to develop the Negev region, which when watered could accommodate a large number of immigrants, and has huge resources in phosphates, copper, oil, gas and potash. By bringing a 100-mile pipeline from the Jordan, it is proposed to irrigate one lac acres of land.

Israel plans to tap the Lake Kinneret which lies in its territory. The Lake has an area of 64 sq. miles and of its water content Israel will utilise only one-fifth. The Arab states claim that the neighbouring areas, through which Jordan passes, will be denuded of water. But Syria has two large rivers including the mighty Euphrates; Lebanon has several rivers and Jordan has three rivers which amply serve their needs. In 1953, Mr. Eric Johnston as Eisenhower's represen-

tative, undertook the task of negotiating an agreed policy of water control in these areas and after two years' research, the technical experts of Israel, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon agreed on a common scheme. This technically approved scheme was rejected by the Arab states, precisely on political grounds. When the Arabs insist that Israel as a State should be liquidated, there would appear to be no common ground at any technical level of cooperation in any field of activity. It has now been alleged that Israel is bent on diverting the Jordan unilaterally. But the Yarmak river, which also feeds Israel, has been diverted by the kingdom of Jordan since 1958 unilaterally and Syria has started drawing on the same river in the North. It is alleged that because of Israel's activities the waters of the lower Jordan will become saline; actually, it appears that it is the diversion of the sweet waters of the Yarmak, by the kingdom of Jordan, which sweet waters joining the saline waters of the Jordan river kept the latter at a low enough salinity to suit irrigation, which will make the waters too saline for crops. Thus the game of accusing the warden by the poacher, continues in the noisy world of Arab politics.

Our foreign policy which has supported the Arab States and Nasser in particular has hitherto been reticent in taking sides in this particular matter. Mr. Nehru has not been favourably inclined to Israel generally and one can, at best, expect him to remain non-aligned in this controversy. But there is no reason why public opinion in India should not stress unequivocally where justice resides. The parties in opposition should now combine to formulate a common rational foreign policy, based on our needs for security, when it is quite obvious that Mr. Nehru's foreign policy lies in shambles. And in this policy the first statement should be that members of the United Nations should not be permitted to form alliances to extirpate militarily an unwanted neighbour, and that Israel has come to stay notwithstanding the clamour of our fair weather friends from the Arab states. Our sympathies must surely lie with a people who have been hounded for generations and who only the other day suffered a massacre of over six million of their kinsmen at the hands of Hitler. Today in West Germany there remain only 21,000 Jews in a population of 5.5 crores and it is a fact that Adenauer would have liked to extend a cordial hand to Israel but was afraid of incurring the wrath of Arab States. No such inhibition should prevail with the people of India, whose proud racial memories include asylum to Christians, within a hundred years of Christ, to Jews after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, to Parsis 1200 years ago; and our pride is all the more robust that the descendants of these refugees have amply rewarded the country by their devotion.

# Ministerial Corruption

A. G. Mulgaonkar

IN recent months, the subject of corruption in high places has been receiving a great deal of attention, not only among the public, but also among leaders of the Congress and it would now appear as if even the Government is waking up. For long the official Congress attitude was: "Corruption? There is none; it is all character assassination. Didn't Lord Denning say in his report that public men are more vulnerable today than they were and further that scandalous information about well-known people has become a marketable commodity." But what is being conveniently forgotten is the very important addition to the first sentence of Lord Denning. What he actually said was that "public men are more vulnerable today more than they were; and it behoves them, even more than ever, to give no cause for scandal." The full implications of this addendum seem to have escaped a large number of people, including even Mr. Nehru. In his note to the President on the Kairon affair, he justified his own attitude to the whole question of ministerial corruption or rather to charges of corruption against ministers by quoting the authority of the first part of the sentence of Lord Denning and omitting the latter. The sentence in Mr. Nehru's note was: "public men have become more vulnerable since scandalous information is a marketable commodity which has buyers." The omission is significant as showing the whole attitude of Mr. Nehru and his Government and, indeed, the whole Congress Party to the question of ministerial corruption. Public men (more than others) are certainly more vulnerable today than they were, and therefore Lord Denning emphasises (and Mr. Nehru omits) that it behoves them, even more than ever, to give no cause for scandal. Correctly interpreted, therefore, that sentence means inexorably that whenever public men do give cause for scandal, they must necessarily answer for it. Instead, what we find is concerted effort at white-washing on every occasion a scandal involving a political figure (belonging to the ruling party) erupts.

In this connection a statement on Administrative Procedure, meant for the Secretariat officers, laid before Parliament by the Prime Minister, on the 10th August 1961, may be relevant. He stated that heads of department should report on corruption in their office and corruption should be dealt with in a planned manner. He went on to state: "Powers will also be taken by Government for weeding out officials who are ineffective and against whom suspicion exists amounting to moral conviction."

Thus the "suspicion amounting to moral conviction"

is good enough for a government officer but surely, in a far stronger measure the same criteria for enquiry must be adopted for Ministers. You cannot have a double standard for ministers and Government servants and if any such discrimination should exist, the severity should rest more heavily on the Minister than on Government servants.

In dealing with the problem of corruption in high places in its several aspects including its eradication we have first of all to consider its origin. When we talk of corruption in high places, we necessarily mean not only the politicians (i.e. political leaders irrespective of their party affiliations) but also high officials of government at Secretariat level. Therefore in considering the whole question unless we keep in mind the distinction between the two kinds of corruption, political and official, some confusion is likely to arise. In any case, the remedies to deal with them must of necessity differ although it is, of course, possible that cases may arise in which one has been influenced by the other. To any one who has had a fairly close contact with political life in this country during the last thirty or forty years and also with official life, the deterioration in both is most disheartening and causes a serious doubt in one's mind about the growth of democratic institutions in this country. There cannot be the slightest doubt that if corruption on the scale it exists at present continues unchecked the future of this country is dark and the prospect of a democratic way of life taking root is poor. If we take a good look at some of the Latin American countries, and even some nearer to our borders, we will find their democratic institutions floundering in the mud of political corruption. Let us therefore recognise the evil of corruption for what it is: that it is a dire peril facing the country and that it is second to none, not even to the Chinese menace, in its dangerous possibility. India's history is replete with examples of corrupt ministers being in treacherous league with the enemy across the border at the same time.

The question, therefore, one must answer is, why corruption has increased so many times over since independence. One main cause can easily be pointed out and it is that the Congress and the country no less, have allowed themselves to be dominated by slogans. Indeed, Congress Raj has become principally a slogan raj. The latest example of this is Mr. Nanda's recent declaration that corruption was on the wane and that within two years it would be rooted out. Can anyone believe this? If Mr. Nanda himself believes this, then it must be one of the worst cases of

self-deception. Mr. Morarji Desai claims that corruption today is much less than in British days. Let us be frank and admit that corruption has taken deep roots and can only be rooted out by the sternest measures even when sometimes, as is bound to happen, some prominent figures in public life are involved. During the last forty years a climate of hypocrisy has pervaded in the public life of the country. In that climate, men of straw, talking glibly of their own worth and services, even of their purity, have succeeded in climbing the band-wagon of the Congress organisation, eventually, in quite a few instances, reaching ministerial rank. It is India's tragedy that many such men being in power (or having been in power because the icy hand of death or nemesis otherwise has overtaken some few) should guide its destinies and shape its future. In India, we see a curious phenomenon, which must be peculiar to this country, that men discarded as having lost the confidence of their countrymen for one reason or another (including want of probity) should continue to be prominent in public life instead of retiring into a well-merited oblivion. Cromwellian integrity was the term applied recently by a foreign correspondent to a well-known Congress leader, forgetting that Cromwell nominated his own son, Richard, successor in his own office of Lord Protector. Poor fish that Richard was, within a few weeks of succeeding his father, he desired nothing better than to retire to the country, thus making the return of the Stuart Charles II easy and the collapse of the Cromwellian revolution certain. Slogans, long after they have become nothing but empty shibboleths (as in the case of prohibition) continue to hold powerful attraction for Congressmen, leaders and followers alike. It is small wonder that in this political atmosphere the phoney ascetic or the big-mouthed hypocrite should come to the top. Is it surprising that when such a politician has reached a position of power that he should use it for the purpose of enriching himself? This, then, apart from the innumerable opportunity provided by a large licence-hungry section in the commercial and industrial world, is at the root of corruption. It is to be expected as only logical from this that contact men should flourish in this foul environment and that some of these contact men should be near relations or close friends of such politicians.

Having reached this conclusion we naturally ask ourselves the question: how do we combat this situation? Before this, perhaps, we have to ask another question: do we really and seriously mean to combat this situation? Of course, primarily it is the task of the Government and the ruling party. But left to itself the ruling party and the Government have shown little inclination to tackle this matter seriously. They have to be acquitted of any seriousness because they refuse to take one simple step

which would have effectively curbed this evil i.e. of calling upon (by legislation, if necessary) every minister to declare his own and his dependents' assets. True a minister may say that he has no control even over his son but legislation can take care of that.

In Britain, since the early 17th century, when Sir Francis Bacon was heavily fined for corruption and deprived of his office of Lord Chancellor, the most rigorous steps have always been taken to put it down. In recent years, J. H. Thomas was thrown out of Cabinet office and public life for giving advance information about budget taxation; and Belcher for using his ministerial position to thwart some prosecution against a social contact, suffered a similar fate in the post-war era. The judges in England have repeatedly urged that as social conditions and standards change, the law must meet the situation and remedy the evils which have sprung up. Lord Macmillan's famous statement (individual judgements in the House of Lords are called statements) "the conception of legal responsibility may develop in adaptation to altering social conditions and standards. The criterion of judgement must adjust and adapt itself to the changing circumstances of life", is often cited. English judges do not hesitate to say as Lord Denning did that a country which failed to give a remedy in this case (involving huge losses owing to a carelessly prepared balance sheet) would scarcely be in a state of civilisation.

Let us, therefore, frankly admit the existence of this evil of ministerial corruption — whether on a large or small scale matters little and take a firm decision to deal with it sternly. Like Sir Francis Bacon, ministers may claim that they often decide against those that pay and that the payments were made to others or to causes like party funds. The mere fact of payment must be deemed sufficient to invite an inquiry if it was made to procure a favour. A political reason why the time has come for the Congress to set its house in order may be mentioned here. The Congress which has been since 1947 in overwhelming power not only at the Center but in every constituent state, no longer enjoys its former prestige in the country. Pride and prestige are said to go before a fall; in any case the Congress organisation, in most states, is a house divided against itself and Goa is more than an indication. The Congress itself has been passing legislation of an oppressive and confiscatory nature; in some cases, with retrospective effect, by amending the constitution. Property, vested generations ago, has been diverted; similarly, liability fastened posthumously. Let Congress leaders remember that these constitutional subterfuges to which it has resorted to push through its controversial programme bound to show in future to many in the opposition ranks the way to remedy an evil which the Congress in its days of power would not.

Once there, the decision to deal with this situation is taken with intention to carry it out vigorously, the question of ways and means to implement it is not difficult to solve. The idea of instituting the office of Ombudsman in this country has attracted many. It is therefore useful to see what functions he performed in the countries where this office has been already in existence for some years. In Sweden and Denmark the Ombudsman has already been functioning for several years and in New Zealand since recently. In Denmark, the Ombudsman is elected by Parliament and once elected, parliament cannot interfere with him; he can only be dismissed. His authority extends to the police, the armed forces, the prisons, the hospital and mental health authorities and to the whole civic service, including the staffs of ministries and Government departments. Parliament, the Law Courts and autonomous local councils are outside his jurisdiction. Whenever he considers that a minister should be made answerable at law he can recommend Parliament to take action. He cannot himself alter any administrative decision nor impose any penalties or award damages to anyone. He can order the Public Prosecutor to prosecute or require Government department to institute a disciplinary inquiry. It is claimed that the authorities almost always act on his suggestions. The number of complaints remains steady at around 1,000 a year. In New Zealand, the recently appointed Ombudsman claims: "My staff and I find many cases of real distress caused by what appears to be cold, impartial and often implacable application of the rules. We try to resurrect humanity from the files." In England, too, the idea of creating the office of an Ombudsman does figure from time to time in newspapers and in public discussions but the trend of informed opinion seems to be in the direction of functional committees of the two Houses of Parliament. The reason for this seems to be the appalling growth of power in the hands of ministers and the belief that the only constitutional check permissible is by Parliament.

It is clear from what is stated above that the institution of the Ombudsman is almost entirely for the purpose of dealing with administrative lapses, i.e. where power has been wrongly used or wrongly unused. It does not deal with ministerial corruption at all. Therefore we, in India, have to devise something different to meet the situation and to do so within the framework of our Constitution if possible. In India, the best solution would be to empower the President and the respective Governors of the States to order such inquiries whenever enough material is placed before them, either by affidavit or otherwise, to warrant this step. The first essential step, of course, would be to legislate for every minister to file a full list of his own assets and of his dependents. The President and the Governors should also be provided

with independent secretarial assistance where the information provided by the ministers themselves or brought to their notice in any other manner could be scrutinised. It may be necessary to provide by law for information from the income-tax department to be made available to his Secretariat provided to the President or the Governor. The President or the Governor (with a right of appeal in the case of a Governor to the President) in the light of the material laid before him, in his individual judgement, will have power to decide whether an inquiry is called for. He may request the Chief Justice of the State High Court to nominate a judge to advise him whether a *prima facie* case is made out or whether further proof of any particular nature is necessary before a full inquiry can be ordered. In the case of the President, it will be a judge of the Supreme Court who will advise him. When it is considered that a *prima facie* case exists, a full and public inquiry must be ordered. At this stage the procedure should be like any judicial trial and the tribunal may be consisting of only one or more judges, who are at the moment in active service in any one of the High Courts or the Supreme Court. It is not possible to indicate more than a bare outline of a possible way to meet a situation, which threatens the national well-being for generations to come, brought about by a nonpossumus attitude on the part of the leaders of the ruling party. But if the pressure of public opinion brings about a change in its attitude, the people of this country can well congratulate themselves.



Zeno in Der Kurier, West Berlin

"But you have no relatives on our side."  
Desk labeled: "Visitor's passes." On dress: "freedom."  
Courtesy: New York Times Weekly Review

# New Prohibition Policy

S. R. Mohan Das

WHEN Mr. V. P. Naik announced a revision of the State Government's Prohibition Policy, the entire articulated reaction has been one of acclamation. Different groups have acclaimed the revision of policy for different reasons, but the acclamation is there. After the first flush of welcome for his policies, Mr. Naik has had to face also angry opposition from some powerful quarters. Former Union Finance Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, and the Maharashtra wing of the Indian National Trade Union Congress have strongly reacted against any relaxation of the Prohibition policy by Mr. Naik's Ministry. Mr. Morarji Desai has used strong expressions in denouncing the relaxation and challenged that if given an opportunity, he would show that the evils arising out of Prohibition policy could be rooted out within a year in Bombay. He has gone further and reportedly said that if a Government could not make a success of prohibition, it should get out.

The Maharashtra INTUC issued a call to its members to ignore altogether the relaxation of prohibition; in other words, it exhorted on its members not to avail themselves of the facilities that would be available under the relaxation. At the recent Bhubaneswar session of the All India Congress Committee, Mr. Nanda spearheaded the opposition to Mr. Naik's proposed relaxation, particularly in regard to the free availability of drinks containing alcohol percentage of 3.5. Mr. Naik hurriedly withdrew, at least for the nonce, this particular commitment of his relaxed policy, pending consideration of Tek Chand Committee report.

Both the acclamation of the new policy and the rigid condemnation of any relaxation, are based on superficial and often emotional reactions. Much of the acclamation or condemnation is on grounds that have nothing to do with alcohol or its consumption in drinks. Many persons who never drink and therefore have not been directly affected by even the rigidest form of Prohibition policy, have welcomed the relaxation on the simple ground that it is impossible to legislate people into temperance, morality and goodness, that evils of alcoholism are of such a complex and psychological nature that they cannot be eradicated by the simple expedient of Prohibition which has flopped in practically all the countries where it was tried out.

Similarly, the relaxation has been welcomed for the political implications in the policy. Prohibition, along with numerous other fetishes nurtured in Free India, had become another "sacred cow" which could be

ill-treated, beaten, starved, but could never be insulted with impunity in terms of symbol-worship! Prohibition along with Khadi, is all that is left in both the Central Governmental policies and Congress High Command policies, of the Gandhian policies we so enthusiastically endorsed and inherited when we became free. These are the two remaining vestiges of Gandhian influence existing within the Congress Party of today, merely as the shadows and symbols of Gandhian mantle to compensate for the total loss of the substance of Gandhian teachings in Congress ranks. When one such shadow is sought to be discarded, there is a cry of outrage arising out of guilt feelings and fears at the exposure of illusions.

Other acclamations of the relaxation arise from the so-called "economic reasons", the loss of revenue etc. Such arguments are as shallow as the righteous indignation over the relaxation.

What precisely are the problems involved in Prohibition and the revision of Prohibition policy? The first significant fact is of course the one already mentioned, viz. morality, temperance and good conduct cannot be brought about by legislation. The second significant fact is alcoholism which is sought to be prevented by prohibition cannot be done so. But equally true is the fact that alcoholism is an important psychological and sociological problem that a society must tackle if it wants to survive as a healthy and dynamic community. If blanket prohibition does not solve the problem of alcoholism, scrapping of prohibition still leaves the problem as it is.

While articulate opinion has welcomed the relaxation for the various reasons cited above, it would be dangerous to assume that prohibition has been an unmixed evil. If a survey is taken among the women population of Bombay exclusively, there will be a surprising amount of support for continuing Prohibition, in spite of the admitted futility of its effectiveness with regard to chronic drinkers. The support will come in relation to the fact that the new generation at least has managed to come up without being habituated. In other words, Prohibition, during the past 15 years, has atleast helped in quarantining the new generation away from acquaintanceship with alcoholic drinks and to this extent has contributed constructively.

The striking thing about consumption of alcohol is that it is not a goal in itself for the person wishing to indulge in it. It is a symbol of escape from a series of problems and tensions created by them. It is also an escape from ennui and boredom when prevailing conditions do not offer immediate and long range goals for life. Similarly prohibition is not an end in

itself, but a restraint through which it is hoped to emancipate the escaping individual away from alcohol. But restraints have never been cures at any time, and Prohibition, even as alcoholism, has tended to become end in itself. For the moral crusader, Prohibition is the end in itself and for the chronically disintegrated personality alcoholism is.

Most of these questions were understood and realized in USA, U.K., France and Finland and while the restraint method of blanket Prohibition was tried and given up in USA as no cure, other remedies were thought of and have been constantly evolved and worked out. For it has been realized that alcoholism is a difficult psychological and sociological problem which needs perennial and long-term methods with a lot of ingenuity to control and might not be wholly solved in terms of the absolute mathematical solutions that the moral crusaders insist upon.

The tendency to sink into desperate forms of escape from tensions is assuaged by allowing "safety-valve" type of escape from tensions. This is done by allowing drinks upto 3.5% alcohol, by the setting up of non-alcoholic beverage stands like tea and coffee shops, cold drink bars etc. In U.K. Mr. Lloyd George encouraged temperance not by blanket and rigid prohibition, but by setting up numerous attractive and cosy tea shops in areas where people, after a hard day's work needed some pleasant relief from drudgery and tended to run to the pubs. He banned selling of liquor by itself, and instead permitted its serving along with food. By such intelligent measures, it was possible to divert and channelise the urges of the people.

In Maharashtra, the relaxation of the Prohibition

policy will have no tangible significance if it is not bolstered up with constructive policies concerning the methods to deal with problems of alcoholism. Allowing free sale of drinks with 3.5% alcoholic content would result in serious abuses unless the Government ensures such supplies with the prescribed alcohol content and nothing more. If manufacture of such alcoholic beverages are allowed by non-governmental agencies, a proper supervision should be ensured that the alcoholic content does not exceed 3.5%.

Secondly, great care must be taken in setting up centres for consumption of drinks. There is understandably a lot of anxiety that only economic considerations will prevail with the current tendencies in the Government for augmenting revenues by any means. In other words, there is a fear that in the setting up of shops and centres for selling alcoholic beverages, all sorts of unhealthy forces will play a dominant part and the State Government, basking in the sunshine of acclamation over the relaxation of prohibition should do well to exercise great caution about this problem and not be tempted by the possibility of realising large amounts of money in such measures as auctioning of liquor shops that are to be opened. It would do well to obtain information from countries like the U.K. on every one of these questions if it wants to tackle the problems in a healthy manner.

Finally the policy-makers should never forget that the problem of alcoholism will be always there. As was aptly remarked: "Alcohol preserves many things, but Dignity is one thing that cannot be preserved by alcohol."

## New Delhi And China

A. G. Noorani

NOWHERE has the Government of India been so hopelessly and so consistently wrong as in its policy towards China. With a safe majority and a weak opposition in Parliament, it persisted with appeasement to the point where all hopes of an honourable settlement were ruled out and the choice was narrowed to abject surrender or a prolonged impasse.

In this episode the Indian press, barring, of course, the red-yellow journals and the CPI chain, played a worthy role and made up to a certain extent for the weakness of the opposition. Among the commentators who kept a vigil was Mr. N. J. Nanporia.

Week in and week out his column would pour forth

its turgid prose with its cultivated eccentricities of style, but also its close, incisive analysis of New Delhi's doings. Right upto the invasion he wrote, ceaselessly crying out against the ditherings of our rulers. He predicted that the Chinese would withdraw. Withdraw they did and Mr. Nanporia graduated into punditry. He was avidly read for any light he could throw on the baffling situation. Mr. Nanporia willingly obliged. He modestly reprinted extracts from his prophetic articles to dispel the "general bewilderment". But the more articles he wrote later, the more the "general bewilderment" grew. Only this time the subject was not New Delhi but Mr. Nanporia.

He has published in a book form his articles\* of the period between September 1962 and June 1963 "as a convenient reference for interested readers". They

\*THE SINO-INDIAN DISPUTE by N. J. Nanporia *Times of India* Rs. 3.

are useful if only because they help explain much that he writes now.

Earlier in the day, we find the author bemoaning his New Delhi's "lack of an overall policy in reference to which immediate answers can be found from time to time". The criticism was only too well merited then (It is equally justified today). "Any 'tranquilisation' of the border involving a reduction of tensions to the point where no dispute apparently remains will be quite contrary to the Indian interest. The issue must be kept alive, at whatever cost, by a readiness to react to every Chinese provocation without debate or hesitation. Only in this way can adequate pressure be maintained on the Chinese and can they be persuaded that they cannot get away with a *fait accompli*".

Mr. Nanporia was in favour of a coherent policy whose aim was to keep up pressure on the Chinese till they withdrew.

As he remarked on the morrow of the invasion, "uncompromising toughness is the direct and only road to peace". The entire article was an excellent piece of analysis. "The NEFA offensive is a military affair but with a political objective—that of pressurising New Delhi into negotiating a compromise in Ladakh in exchange for a Chinese recognition of the McMahon Line". What was his recipe? "The only possible Indian answer to this is to demonstrate — by action and not verbally — New Delhi's outright rejection of any negotiations for the duration. One such demonstration may be to sever diplomatic relations which will be consistent with the admirable resistance of the Indian forces in NEFA". He was all for action. "To restrict Indian forces to the southern part of the (McMahon) Line may be to place them at a disadvantage".

What of U.S. aid? "The suggestion that non-alignment will be compromised if in a situation like the present one India accepts aid from wherever it is available is quite ridiculous. Should non-alignment and the national interest conflict there should be no hesitation in abandoning non-alignment".

It is very interesting to note that in all the articles predicting the Chinese withdrawal the prediction was coupled with an advice — don't negotiate. "Negotiations will mean complete surrender of the conditions New Delhi insisted upon upto September 8 and also a concession to the Chinese of the objective they have patiently, fanatically and ruthlessly worked for during all the years after their initial invasion of Ladakh". (New Delhi's principal condition was that China should withdraw prior to the negotiations.) Mr. Nanporia would have had India go so far as to refuse to discuss not only "a settlement" but even "a reduction of tensions".

He repeated the prediction. "When the positions of September 8 are restored", he cautioned, "New Delhi must be fully prepared for the next phase of

the overall Chinese manoeuvre. Peking will have been suitably impressed by India's determination to answer force with force. It will also be necessary to persuade the Chinese either that New Delhi refuses to talk or that if it does the purpose will be simply to insist on a complete Chinese withdrawal from all sectors".

Two days after this was written the Chinese declared a cease-fire. Mr. Nanporia's prediction had come true. Neither the false lull nor the second offensive shook his faith in the prediction he made, nor in the advice he tendered. They went together. Consequently, now that the soundness of his analysis had been proved in the most telling manner, one would have expected him to press his advice all the more strongly on New Delhi.

But within a month we find him suggesting "a formula which arranges for the withdrawal of Chinese troops to the positions of September 8, 1962 and for a demilitarised zone *which does not deprive India of the right to reoccupy lost territory at a later date, if necessary*" (italics mine). Quite apart from the fact that this contradicted his earlier objection to "tranquilisation", as well as to talks for "reduction of tensions", his formula was inherently contradictory. A demilitarized zone is intended to and does effectively foreclose future action.

In keeping with this shift, when the Colombo Proposals were published, Mr. Nanporia advocated their acceptance and wrote contemptuously of Mr. Nehru's "Critics in Disarray".

The Colombo Proposals not only provided for a demilitarized zone but one to be jointly "*administered*" by the aggressor and his victim. How the latter could ever regain the remoter areas if the forward belt is stabilised in a joint administration, neither New Delhi nor its recent convert could explain. The latter could only console himself: "It does not follow that negotiations on the substantive issue are inevitable or necessary".

The critics had made two points. First, that the Colombo Proposals favoured the Chinese; next, that they ruled out recovery of the lost territory. Mr. Nanporia, without admitting it, later (March 11, 1963) recognised both. "Peking's refusal so far to accept the Colombo Proposals does not mean that there is anything in these proposals inconsistent with Peking's interests". (The reader might incidentally recall here Mr. Nanporia's earlier dictum "anything that suits Chinese interests can hardly be consistent with Indian interests".)

"New Delhi's insurance against the dangers of negotiation is the very feeble self-assurance that negotiations *can* be divided into three neat stages — for a formal cease fire, for the reduction of tensions and, presumably, for a discussion of the substantive issue" (italics mine). This is precisely what the

critics had pointed out, that no such division was possible, that negotiations *without preconditions* would ensue, and, with China's gains stabilised, Indian interests would suffer. Mr. Nanporia had then thought that negotiations were neither "inevitable" nor "necessary". Apparently his appreciation had improved.

Without his realising it he had awakened to the dangers the critics, he so lightly dismissed, had pointed out. "Since China's purpose has always been, even during the October-November invasion, to bring India to the negotiating table its overall manoeuvre *will be helped forward* if, with the psychological advantage on its side, *Peking accepts the Colombo Proposals* with all the appropriate gestures". (italics mine)

Peking, naturally, was in no hurry to accept the Colombo Proposals. It already enforced in the stalemate its two reservations to the Proposals: Indian troops did not go up to the McMahon Line and kept out of the demilitarized zone in Ladakh. Mr. Nanporia was too alert not to recognise this. "As time passes the sense of crisis will diminish and Peking will be encouraged to believe that the *status quo* is being accepted, even in India, as the equivalent of a final solution". Thus he very belatedly woke up to the fact that the Proposals were in Peking's interests and paved the way to negotiations on Peking's terms. The book ends with the plea that "it is essential to break the present stalemate and confront the Chinese with the choice of having either to accept the Colombo proposals or to retaliate in force. The probability is, as we have seen, that the Chinese will negotiate which, for India, will have the further advantage of unsettling the *status quo* and acquiring a further instalment of time for the next step."

Concretely, he suggested Indian reoccupation of the evacuated areas. Beyond that he could shed little light. In the six months since this latest advice was given India has taken no such military initiative. It has not even withdrawn its acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, for reasons similar to its withdrawal of the concessions on Kashmir to Pakistan. Peking has not accepted the Colombo Proposals.

What would one expect Mr. Nanporia, logically, to do? Advise rejection of Colombo Proposals? Against negotiations? Nothing of the sort. On January 13, 1964 there was a veiled hint that we need not even insist, as hitherto, on China's unreserved acceptance of the Colombo Proposals. The week following he made himself all too plain:

"Simply to insist on the Colombo proposals as the only magic mantra by which the problem can be solved is to confuse a tactical step with a principle. It was for tactical reasons necessary for New Delhi to accept the proposals and insist on the accompanying clarifications but these reasons are now no longer valid and India's insistence has had the boomerang

effect of paralyzing its own policy and denying it the choice of action it should have."

The wheel has turned a full circle. The advocate of firmness has become the apostle of appeasement. Only on April 22, 1963 Mr. Nanporia had written:

*"If under the Colombo proposals substantive negotiations are opened India will have conceded to China what Peking has always wanted. The failure of the October-November invasion will then be transformed into a victory which is the meaning of the Chinese precept that in certain conditions a withdrawal or an advance can equally serve the same purpose."* (italics mine)

Now he is suggesting much worse. Apparently, Mr. Nanporia has radically revised not so much his views on the Colombo Proposals, as his entire approach to China. Thus in his latest article he writes, "Grievous though India's experiences have been on the border the dispute with China is an *incident* whereas France's initiative (for recognition) represents a trend with incalculable consequences for the future" (italics mine). This very Chinese view is diametrically opposed to the view Mr. Nanporia held when he advocated firmness:

"China, of course, will not evacuate Ladakh simply because New Delhi stands firm but this is a problem the nation must learn to live with indefinitely, patiently and with determination *because firmness or weakness in relation to it will determine the course of Sino-Indian relations in the decades to come.*" (italics mine)

The pity of it is that even the memory has undergone a revision and facts have become "unfacts." In January 1964 we are told that "the Colombo Powers specifically remain either strictly neutral or are beginning to allow their sympathies for India to be drained away as the border problem continues to fester". In the very hour of our need we know which way these nations turned. Even Mr. Nehru remarked "What is clear to us is not so clear to them". And Mr. Nanporia? Well, in the very first of the prophetic articles, "A Trap in the Making" (Nov. 5, 1962) he spoke derisively of "The Soviet Union, President Nasser with his peace-loving associates, and the larger mass of indifferent observers elsewhere are standing at the sidelines eager to persuade Mr. Nehru to negotiate at the slightest opportunity". To urge the victim to negotiate at the behest of the aggressor is a very odd way of being "strictly neutral". It might perhaps be necessary for you to dissemble your love. But why did you kick me downstairs? India might ask.

The question, however remains. Why the change? It is a question which every reader must ask for himself. It could hardly be an isolated revision. One suspects it has something to do with a certain shift on the larger question. A year ago Mr. Nanporia

could write "the impression has been created over the years that the West was always eager to acquire the privilege of sending arms aid to India and thereby compromise the carefully protected and delicately nourished non-alignment policy. It can now be seen that the West is not in the least interested in this policy and will provide aid only in the degree that it is necessary to counter the Chinese manoeuvre at the level prescribed by Peking."

But by last April the iron had entered his soul. "There does appear to have been a subtle, yet by no means slight, modification of the U.S. attitude towards New Delhi and its possible role in South East Asia". Neither the ever sensitive Mr. Nehru nor even Mr. Menon could speak of a "modification". But never mind. Mr. Nanporia was convinced, far too convinced to care to let the reader know the factual basis for his warning. All he could say was "nothing so obvious as an identification with the western bloc has been suggested or implied by Washington. Yet references to India's role in South-East Asia, to the need for a 'true perspective', and to a policy by India of setting an example for the other Asian States appear to anticipate some fundamental adjustments in Indian policy". Not a single statement was quoted in support. From then on came opposition to the air exercises, to the VOA agreement and to the U.S. Seventh Fleet.

The climax is reached in the latest article (Jan. 20, 1964), "France's ability to act as a kind of counter force to the U.S. in South-East Asia will be considerably strengthened if it manages to establish a *modus vivendi* with Peking". Peking's isolation is coming to an end and the French initiative is "a very welcome fruition of New Delhi's own policy". So open the door and settle up with the former Bhai. End China's isolation is the latest theme.

Alas! Only a year ago this very writer was ridiculing this very idea:

"New Delhi clearly pictured itself even at this point, particularly in the international field, as a champion of communist China, an interpreter of its motives and as a sort of more articulate "big brother" who would explain Peking to the outside world."

A publicist has every right to revise his opinions. He does owe it to himself no less to his readers to say as much, and to explain why his opinions have changed. Mr. Nanporia has not cared to do either, yet continues confidently to contradict himself. Like the country court judge, he almost proclaims, "This court may often be in error. It is never in doubt."

When a writer contradicts himself so endlessly, only two conclusions are possible. Lack of candour, sometime or the other; or, a hopeless confusion of mind. In Mr. Nanporia's case, I believe, it is the latter.

## Without Comment

### THE US 7TH FLEET

Among China's armoury are said to be, besides several warships, about 29 submarines, and when some of them surreptitiously surfaced near our east coast early in 1963 (with what purpose is not known), the country took choked breath. That was the time when the Chinese invasion and despoilation of our northern frontiers was still fresh in our minds. As far as is known, we do not yet possess a submarine; we are probably going to buy some in due course. True the Chinese submarines did not do what "Emden" did in World War I; but the discovery of their presence near our coasts in the Bay of Bengal was disconcerting indeed. Britain has a fleet in the Malaysian region, nevertheless, it is apparent that the entire bottom of South-East Asian sub-continent is bare and exposed to the ill-winds of aggression and piracy. The American 7th Fleet based around Formosa has obviously contained China's expansionist aims in the eastern Pacific; China broke out, however, along land frontiers of many neighbouring countries. The presence of her submarines in the Bay of Bengal showed that she could break out of the ring of the American Fleet. The extension of the US 7th Fleet's operation, therefore, was in itself an extension of the purpose of the American Fleet. There is no international law to restrict the movement of ships of any nation on the 'open' high seas; territorial waters up to 12 miles from coast of any country are however respected. The extension of the American 7th Fleet's operation to the Indian Ocean, therefore, does not strictly infringe any international law or the sovereignty of any country. In the context of China's growing expansionist and aggressive mentality, the US 7th Fleet's presence in the Indian Ocean may serve a wholesome purpose.

(Occasional Comments in AICC Economic Review, January 9.)

### 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.

# With Many Voices

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

The best fertiliser for a piece of land is the foot-prints of its owner.

—President Lyndon B. Johnson, *Newsweek*, Jan. 20.

A committee consists of the unwilling selected from the unsuitable to do the unnecessary.

—Mr. John Marsh, Director — British Institute of Management, *Guardian*, Manchester, January 18.

Control of exchange, when inadequate, will lead to corruption, and when complete, to communism.

—Mr. Lobo Prabhu, *Swarajya*, January 11.

It takes brains and capital to catch up with the United States.

—Mr. Khrushchev, *March of the Nation*, January 4.

One word may be said about the craze for ceilings. May I suggest, as a change, a little more concern for the floor?

—Mr. Purshottam Trikamdas, *Hindustan Times*, January 3.

The Nehru Era, which started with a bold, inspiring flourish, seemed to be content with a whimpering finale.

—Mr. Romesh Thapar, *Economic Weekly*, January 11.

Instead of writing a lot about Capital, make a lot of Capital.

—Karl Marx's father in a letter to his son, *Time*, January 17.

I never use the word 'hate'. I think it is the most despicable word in the English language.

—Mr. Barry Goldwater, *Time*, January 17.

My restless son, don't tire yourself any more.

—Calcutta newspaper addressing Mr. Nehru, quoted in *Time*, January 17.

Americans are "Ivanhoes" who are perpetually in love with the underdog, but confused about who the underdog really is.

—Mme. Nhu, *National Review*, November 5.

Probably no American can understand the Asiatic concept of "face". This is perhaps fortunate. In view of how much "face" the U.S. has lost in the Orient, we would have to burn Washington to recover it.

—Mrs. Clare Booth Luce, *National Review*, November 5.

The Left had another handicap at the (Bhubaneswar) session. Nehru suddenly fell ill. If he were present during the deliberations, he would have accommodated the Left half way.

—Blitz, January 18.

To build steel plants with foreign aid, with foreign technicians and know-how is no industrialisation.

—Mr. Patnaik, *Current*, January 14.

How strange that Soviet Asia does not know the ceiling fan!

—Mr. Ralph Parker, *Times of India*, January 3.

I will not change my beliefs to win votes. I will offer a choice, not an echo.

—Mr. Barry Goldwater, while announcing candidature for Republican nomination for Presidency, *Time*, January 10.

I distrust anyone who foresees consequences and advocates remedies to avert them.

—Lord Halifax on eve of World War II, quoted in *Time*, January 10.

It has now been established that to become a political leader in Cyprus you must have the right qualification — you must have killed someone.

—Mr. Zekia Bey, Judge of Cypriot Supreme Court, *Time*, January 10.

There is only one reason for Bombay, the fine practice of making money.

—Bombay editor, quoted in *Time*, January 10.

The range of dissent between Dr. Lohia and myself is narrower than that between Mr. Patil and Mr. Menon.

—Mr. M. R. Masani, *Times of India*, January 24.