

MOMENT OF TRUTH

M. R. Masani

DR. B. S. MINHAS, in his letter of resignation from the Planning Commission, has certainly spilt the beans and in what fine style he has done it! Disgusted with the chicanery and dishonesty of the Union Government and the Planning Commission, he has turned his back on them and is returning to academic life. He deserves the thanks and good wishes of all decent people for this service he has done to the country.

According to Dr. Minhas, the Fifth Plan is unrealistic and any attempt to implement it will only aggravate the economic crisis. But that is not all. It is not a mere error of judgement on the part of his colleagues against which he has protested. It is the lack of integrity and honesty. According to Dr. Minhas, the figures of the economic resources have been "cooked up" in order to justify highly optimistic assumptions for political reasons. For instance, there are assumptions that the State Plants will work at 90% of their full capacity—a performance not even remotely achieved so far! The manner in which the figures of foreign trade have been "doctored" has also disgusted Dr. Minhas.

Dr. Minhas has thus justified the criticism of the 2nd, 3rd and the 4th Plans (of which the 5th is only a continuation) made repeatedly by your Editor and many others on the floor of Parliament through the sixties.

Unanimously Ignored

More shocking than Dr. Minhas's disclosures is the manner in which the politicians in office in New Delhi have failed to take note of them. The Prime Minister, the Cabinet and the National Development Council have uniformly turned a Nelson's eye to this exposure of the basic irresponsibility of their whole pattern of planning and have gone ahead with affixing their rubber stamp on this dishonest document. Mr. Y. B. Chavan, Finance Minister, perhaps reflects best the mood of the criminal lunatics in office by the cynical remark he made: "How does it matter if the targets are unrealistic? After all, have we ever achieved targets in

previous plans?" The Prime Minister, competing as usual with her colleague, delivered herself of the prescient observation that "even reality will prove to be a dream and dreams will prove to be a reality", whatever that may mean!

Evidently, the Union Cabinet proposes to continue its slipping down the slippery slope to economic doom.

Mr. Sham Lal, no opponent of planning and socialism, has in a signed article in the *Times of India* on 11th December referred critically not only to the unreality of the Plan but the amazing behaviour of ministers both at the Centre and the States. "What Dr. Minhas has said", he writes, "can be passed over in silence or ignored. But the logic of the harsh economic facts cannot be so easily defeated."

It is precisely such demagoguery that led to the overthrow of Sukarno in Indonesia, Nkrumah in Ghana and Allende in Chile. "Those whom the gods wish to destroy", goes the old saying, "they first drive mad."

IN THIS ISSUE

In his article the Editor highlights the importance of the disclosures made by Dr. Minhas who has resigned in disgust from the Planning Commission and the brazen failure to answer his charges on the part of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Commission, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Mr. D. P. Dhar.

We publish Bertram Wolfe's Open Letter to President Nixon questioning the dependability of the detente. It could well have been addressed to the Indian signatories to the Indo-Soviet Treaty and the recent supplementary agreements in Delhi.

Prof. P. N. Driver writes about Gokhale and English Education.

Between You & Me and The Lamp Post



IAC Vs the People

LIBERALS in India have for years tried to explain that, while all monopolies are bad, a government monopoly is the worst. The reason is simple — that while against all other monopolies there is a government to which to appeal, against a government monopoly there is no one whom the citizen or the consumer can appeal. One of the unintended consequences of this kind of "socialism" is the capacity of state monopolies to be blackmailed by its own employees. The manner in which the IAC and the people of India have been held to ransom by certain Trade Unions of IAC employees under communist inspiration could never have taken place if, as in other countries, there had been two or three private airlines competing with the IAC.

Air Chief Marshall P. C. Lal, the newly appointed Chairman of the Corporation, has evidently felt appalled at the conditions in the Corporation under his charge. Not only has the IAC one of the highest labour costs throughout the world but its productivity in 1972 was less than half that of IATA carriers in 1955. During the past two years the average annual rate of growth of IATA carriers has been 2½ times that of the IAC, notwithstanding the fact that the aircraft available to IAC are comparable in sophistication to those used by airlines in advanced countries.

In an attempt to stop the IAC from being a wasteful drag on the country, Air Chief Marshall Lal has sought to put an end to the policy of appeasement on the part of the Union Government which has during the past two decades shown an unholy fear of questions in Parliament or reports in the Press instigated by the communists and IAC trade union leaders.

It is good to know that Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, who being a Communist considers it his duty to interfere in labour disputes and encourage disruptive attitudes, has been put in his place. At the Labour Ministers' Conference, Mr. Reddy made certain sly references to the alleged "harassment of workers" and the "aggressive" attitude of management, referring obviously to the IAC. These remarks have been rightly resented by Mr. Raj Bahadur and Air Chief Marshall Lal and he has been told to keep his hands off this affair. As a result the Labour Minister has pleaded his helplessness to his "comrades" of the ACEU when they approached him and asked for his intervention.

As it happens, the state of affairs in the IAC is fairly representative of the larger number of government undertakings in India. If Air Chief Marshall Lal succeeds, it may encourage the managements of other government enterprises to develop some backbone. If

not, it would be a sad day for all State undertakings in general. Hence the need for public opinion to support the IAC Chairman. Fortunately, there is every indication that even the air passengers who are suffering the most are solidly behind the management. "Once and for ever" seems to be the mood of the passengers, and they are right.

Back to the Bullock-Cart?

THE wicked rise in the excise duty on petroleum, for which there is no justification whatsoever and which has quite rightly evoked widespread protests from the taxi trade and private car owners and their organisations, has been followed by an amazing amount of ballyhoo attacking the citizen's use of the automobile. The fury with which this campaign has been pursued in certain quarters reminds one of the Luddites who went about smashing machines in the early 19th century in England.

That 'leftist' demagogues should try to work up the class hatred and envy in this manner is understandable, but that somebody as intelligent and mature as Mr. Ajit Bhattacharjee, the Assistant Editor of *The Times of India*, should have given the weight of his prestige to this campaign is indeed sad. Starting with the false antithesis of private *versus* public transport, he allowed himself to make a plea not only for promoting public transport, which was perfectly legitimate, but for curbing the use of automobiles by citizens. This in turn led him to make the amazing suggestion that India should "skip the private car stage of urban development". He went on to say: "What is needed is a firm decision to restrict private cars from a progressively larger area of big cities as fast as alternative ways of transport are provided."

The joker in the pack is, of course, the last few words of Mr. Bhattacharjee's suggestion. Where are the "alternative ways of transport" for citizens? To cite just three newspaper headlines picked up at random: *The Hindustan Times* of December 4 carries a UNI report from Calcutta under the headline "Bus Fare Protestors Turn Violent", *The Indian Express* of December 7 carried a story from its Staff Reporter entitled "The Terrible Task of Train Travel", while Mr. Bhattacharjee's own newspaper of the same date carried a report from its Staff Reporter entitled: "Commuter Ire Over Rail Cancellations". With public transport in this miserable condition, is it not madness to suggest the abolition of automobile transport?

There was a similar approach to the motor car under Stalin in Russia. When Khrushchev took over, how-

ever, he denounced this attitude of treating Russian citizens "like a herd of cattle to be transported in trucks and buses" and looked forward to the day when every Russian would own a car of his own, as in the USA.

What India needs is thousands and thousands of more automobiles of all kinds on its roads and highways. While the per capita consumption of petrol in the U.S. per year is 900 gallons and in Britain 450 gallons, the Indian uses a miserable 9 gallons per year! The policies of the Union Government are certainly pushing India back to the days of the bullock cart, but should an intellectual basis be provided for such reactionary policies?

People's Justice?

THE deterioration in the moral fibre of our public life has many facets, but perhaps one of the clearest symptoms that has recently come to light is that of innocent traders, not found guilty of any crime by any court of law, being paraded in public in shackles through the streets of Calcutta. The State government of West Bengal ought to be ashamed of itself for this shocking violation of the elementary principle of law that a man is innocent till he is proved guilty.

This bad example is likely to be infectious. A few days later, on November 21, the Haryana Government announced that it would not put black-marketeers and hoarders before a magistrate for trial but parade them in public and then detain them without trial by a shameless misuse of the Defence of India Rules. If coming events cast their shadows before, it will not be long before one sees "People's Justice" of the Mao-Tse-Tung variety emerging from the underworld into the open.

Is Delhi Spelt MOSCOW?

MR. K. C. PANDA, Swatantra Member of Parliament, has, in a statement to the press on November 27, complained that while volunteers of the Swatantra Party in Delhi were putting up posters in anticipation of the arrival of Mr. Brezhnev, they were beaten up by a group of hooligans who had followed them in an Ambassador car and that there was no protection from the police against this assault. Mr. Panda is aggrieved that the right to dissent guaranteed under the Constitution should have been thus undermined.

Our curiosity stimulated, we managed to get hold of the posters for scrutiny. We find that they read as follows:

"RECOGNISE OUR FRONTIERS, CHANGE YOUR MAPS"

"INDIA IS NOT A SOVIET SATELLITE, PLEASE REMEMBER, MR. BREZHNEV"

"COLLECTIVE SECURITY IS COLLECTIVE SURRENDER"

Each of these posters bears the names of those who sponsored it. They are Prof. Balraj Madhok; K. S. Chavada, M.P.; Loknath Misra, M.P.; Sundermani Patel, M.P.; Maj. Ranjit Singh; G. L. Chaudhary, M.P.; K. C. Panda, M.P.; R. R. Singh Deo, M.P.; and U. M. Trivedi.

There is, of course, nothing in the least objectionable in the text of these posters. Nor was there anything objectionable in the leaflets which courageous men and women distributed in the Red Square in Moscow in 1968 against the armed occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviets. In Moscow, it was the Secret Service men who indulged in the assault on the dissidents. Presumably, the goondas in Delhi were non-official members of the same fraternity. One cannot, evidently, shake hands with malefactors, even when they come as honoured guests, without getting infected with their habits.

Six Super Soothers
in the strong rub for colds
RUBEX
Specially formulated to relieve colds faster.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON

Bertram D. Wolfe

Honorable Richard M. Nixon
President of the United States

Dear Mr. President:

Thank you for the courtesy you show me in asking John Richardson of the Department of State to reply to my recent letter to you on internal Soviet repressive policies and U.S. relations with that country. (As one who has served in the State Department under two presidents, I venture to conclude that if you direct the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs to answer me, it suggests that you are receiving many comments similar to mine and you yourself have worked out with Mr. Richardson the general line of response.) If I write directly again to you, Sir, it is because the matters raised are of supreme importance and Mr. Richardson's letter to me does not contain a satisfactory answer to the questions which trouble us all.

The gist of Mr. Richardson's letter lies in its two concluding sentences, containing the following assurance:

"As closer ties are established between our two countries, we believe the Soviets will realize that it is not in their interest to undertake actions which may cause legitimate public concern in the United States. Closer relations between us should benefit all the people of both countries."

Mr. President, I am moved to ask two questions. What in the recent behaviour of the Soviet Government toward its own citizens can possibly lead to those conclusions? And what in their whole past behavior each time we have tried closer ties and even liberal generosity can possibly lead to those conclusions?

During the 56 years of the existence of the present Soviet regime, we have tried a half dozen times closer relations and the granting of generous aid to the Soviet Government when it was in distress. Let me recall three such efforts and their consequences.

1. In 1921, Lenin's policies of suppressing trade between town and country, plus a drought in the lower Volga region produced a famine so severe that Lenin said, "If the peasants plant this Spring, we will survive; if not our regime will fall." Knowing that his attacks on all the Governments of the West made it impossible for him to appeal for aid, he authorized Maxim Gorky to set up a Russian Famine Relief Committee of reputable, non-Communist public figures. Thereupon Herbert Hoover cabled to Maxim Gorky offering massive

relief. Since the cable was addressed to Gorky personally, Lenin took that as a license to dissolve Gorky's Committee and condemn all of its public figures to death. Only the personal intervention of Herbert Hoover and Fridtjof Nansen and the angry protest of Gorky himself saved their lives. Lenin commuted their sentence to perpetual exile and loss of citizenship in the land of their birth.

2. In the period of Stalin's forced industrialization, we again were generous with technicians, engineers, industrialists, and capital loans. While our Hugh Cooper was directing the construction of the famous Dnieper Dam, Henry Ford constructing their first auto plant, and German engineers reconstructing the coal mines which Russia had let fall into ruin, Stalin took that as license to stage his famous show purge trials: the Shakhty Coal Mine Wrecking Trial framing German and Russian mining engineers; the trials of the non-existent Industrial Party, and the likewise non-existent Peasant Party, and finally his own party members by the hundreds of thousands.

3. During the infamous Stalin-Hitler Pact, when Hitler double-crossed his accomplice and invaded Russia, our President sent Harry Hopkins to offer Stalin tanks, trucks, planes, guns, munitions, and food, absolutely without any conditions. After Pearl Harbor we gave unstinting aid to Stalin as our ally, again without conditions. The period of the Hopkins visit opens with the murders in the Katyn Forest, continues with the framing of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, and continues with the crushing of all Jewish communal cultural life, and the deportation of entire tribes and nationalities from their millennial homelands, all this while Stalin was an ally of our democracy.

Thus the whole history of the past half century and more cries aloud its warning that we must not now try a new period of rapprochement and of providing credits, know-how, advanced computerization, installation of entire factories, including huge truck and auto plants that may easily be converted into tank factories to overrun Western Europe, not to mention the most favored nation privilege, without first exacting some guarantees of sufficient freedom in public life so those of their citizens concerned with peace may give warning if their government secretly violates arms agreements, as our citizens can give warning. The names of Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn, Amalrik, and hundreds of others of the best of their public-spirited citizens who are being savagely persecuted, sent to prison, camp, or insane asylum, for the sole crime of trying to warn us and their own leaders that detente must be genuine

and not a fraudulent and dangerous deception. No sooner had you, Mr. President, held your meetings with General Secretary Brezhnev than this campaign against these noble and public-spirited citizens was stepped up.

My career for the last four decades, Mr. President, as writer, as Professor of Russian History, and as Senior Research Fellow, has caused me to keep close and continuous track of these matters. I shall be glad indeed to supply documentation and lists of victims, accounts of how *samizdat* publications are crushed, sane men sent to lunatic asylums under the direction of police psychiatrists who strap their victims to their beds with wet thongs and give men like the brilliant mathematician Plyushkin massive injections of Halperidol, on which drug I have secured detailed accounts from the American Medical Association's Drug Evaluation reports. We cannot go into a dubious detente with Soviet rulers who will commit such barbarisms on the best of their scholars and intellectuals without ourselves beginning to bear some responsibility.

Spokesmen of your administration, Mr. President, have reassured our people that "quiet diplomacy" is more effective than open statement to remedy such evils. But you yourself must know, as I do, that there are over 600 cases of American citizens and the wives and children of American citizens, some of them for as long as twenty years and in at least one case, twenty-five years, trying in vain to get a permit to go to America. Our representatives have pressed these cases by "quiet diplomacy" for decades with high Soviet officials and gotten nowhere. This is not a case of Jews wanting to migrate to Israel, though I believe they are entitled to this right. These 600 or so American citizens, their wives, children, and other close relatives, have been growing old while we have been trying "quiet diplomacy" with a government that seems to yield only to public outcry and open protest.

As you know, even after the visits and detente talks began, we once more presented their names and circumstances to a Deputy Foreign Minister and to Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington, yet to date there are 570 of them on which we have not even been given the courtesy of an answer. And this has happened before we have thrown away our few trump cards such as generous credits, and most favoured nation treatment. What satisfaction will these Americans and their families be likely to get if we give up all the Russians want without getting in return even common diplomatic courtesy?

Mr. President, it has been said that we cannot make conditions on their "internal affairs." But are these internal affairs? Are we safe in arms reduction agree-

ments if no one in the Soviet Union may speak up and warn us when in his opinion these agreements are being secretly violated, as in our country men may speak up? Is it not true that in the age of totalitarian regimes, such matters are not internal affairs? Have we forgotten our experiences with the treatment of Jews in Germany, and the German invasion of Czechoslovakia, because there was a German minority there, both treated as "internal affairs"? When the Russians in turn invade and occupy Czechoslovakia because there was a minority of Soviet puppet Communists there, and we did nothing, were we not condoning a similar dangerous international tragedy disguised as an "internal Communist affair"? Are we forgetting that those who will not learn from history are condemned to repeat their mistakes?

Forgive me, Mr. President, for having written at such length, but the issues are grave and the danger increasingly clear. We have now heard public protest and public warning from the representatives of many lands. Chancellor Brandt of Germany warned that freedom of movement of persons and ideas comes first, if peace is to be secure in a time of danger. This was followed by a flat refusal from Gromyko, then protests from Foreign Minister Van Der Stoep of the Netherlands, Foreign Minister Andersen of Denmark, from Sir Alec Douglas-Home of Great Britain, from spokesmen of country after country of Western Europe, and from all the great organs of opinion of those lands. Why is it that we alone are silent? Will not our silence make us into accomplices of the acts of tyranny on some of the best and most public-spirited citizens in the modern world?

Indeed, whatever our official spokesmen will now do, our record is not one of silence. The American PEN and International PEN, to which I have the honor to belong, have spoken clearly and strongly. So has the American Publishers Association. So have the psychiatrists of this and other lands. Most important of all, our Academy of Sciences has sent a solemn warning to the Russian Academy that no matter what governments may sign, if the Soviet rulers crush such men as Sakharov, they will make cooperation of our scientists and theirs impossible. And both the Houses of our Congress have spoken clearly on the connection between freer trade and greater human freedom. The honor roll is long! I will not enlarge it farther.

But reluctantly and with heavy heart, I must close by asking: "Why does not your voice ring out more clearly, along with that of our Secretary of State? In the age of totalitarian regimes, the world needs our voice as the greatest democracy. I pray that it may not falter.

Respectfully yours,

BERTRAM D. WOLFE

GOKHALE AND WESTERN EDUCATION IN INDIA

P. N. Driver

IF there is one lesson which Indian history can teach us, it is that our people have always been regional minded and could not develop for centuries together the idea of being one nation politically. In spite of a cultural unity among ourselves, co-operation with foreign invaders in order to destroy our own neighbours has been a common and incontrovertible fact of our history. Many events since Independence have shown how fragile was our latter-day national feeling which perhaps we killed in the hour of its birth instead of nurturing and nursing it. We are perhaps the only country to have a Government Secretariat and Radio manufactured hotch-potch of a "national" language without being a nation first. We thus create disunity in the name of unity, which mistake we can avoid if we can only try to understand our history properly, and also study the basic viewpoint behind the acceptance of western education through the English medium by our early leaders like Gokhale and Ranade, among many others. The price we have had to pay for neglect of this is high. We passed our Independence Resolution with great fervour at Lahore not many years ago, only to find now that Lahore is "foreign" territory and as difficult to go to freely as Washington or Moscow or London. Pakistan too has learnt this lesson about herself.

We shall confine ourselves to Mr. G. K. Gokhale's views on education here. All fair-minded persons, from Gandhiji downwards, have looked upon Gokhale as having been one of the greatest among the men who made modern India. Gandhiji called him "Mahatma Gokhale" and also looked upon him as his *Raj Guru* or political master, as has been pointed out by Mr. P. Kodanda Rao in his masterly address delivered some time ago at Mysore University on "Gokhale and Sastri". Mrs. Sarojini Naidu characterised him as "the greatest saint and soldier of national righteousness". When Gokhale visited hostile and anti-Indian South Africa, a veteran South African statesman told him; "Sir, when men like you visit our country they purify the atmosphere". To Gandhiji, Gokhale was all that he wanted in a political worker—"pure as a crystal, gentle as a lamb, brave as a lion, chivalrous to a fault, and the most perfect man in the political field". The very critical and almost anti-Indian writer of that time, Sir Valentine Chirol called him "the greatest servant of India". When we realise what a large portion of his short life he spent in the service of his country (31 or 32 years out of 49 years) we cannot but agree with the eminent educationist, Prof. R. P. Patwardhan

(in his Introduction to 'The Select Gokhale') that in this matter Gokhale is really without a rival among the eminent men of India.

"Providential"

Gokhale and his great master Ranade felt, in common with a large number of our national leaders of the time, that the connection between India and Britain was "a Providential arrangement". In fact in the Preamble to the Constitution of the Servants of India Society founded by Gokhale in 1905, it was clearly mentioned that whilst "self government" was the goal of the Society, the members "frankly accept the British connection, as ordained, in the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, for India's good". Gandhiji himself must have known about this and accepted it when he tried to join the Society at one time. Gokhale's faith in this was based on a careful study of India's weaknesses and an equally careful study of the high character and strength of the *average* Englishman produced by the educational system there.

Gokhale felt strongly on this matter *not* because he was not patriotic or not proud of India's remote past. To him India had been the birth-place of great religions and the cradle of knowledge and civilization at a time when Europeans did not know the meaning of civilization. But he wanted India to be free, self-governing and united and she did not have what was required for this. As he said: "God does not give everything to every people, and India in the past was not known for that love of liberty and that appreciation of free institutions which one finds to be so striking a characteristic of the West." Gokhale was worried about the historical reality that India was really "enveloped in obscurity" as he called it and that, "with all her contributions to human progress in many fields India did not develop the *national* idea or the idea of political freedom as developed in the West". It was due to this "peculiar development" as he called it, "that the establishment of British rule, so far being resented, was actually regarded with feelings of satisfaction, if not enthusiasm, by the people over the greater part of the country".

Gokhale despaired of the weaknesses of India revealed by the absence of both a truly national feeling and of the love of free institutions and self-government. He knew and admitted that the acceptance of British rule was due to the relief it gave the masses from utter disorder. He also pointed out that "in many essential respects the standards of government of the new rulers compared favourably with those of the

indigenous powers that were then struggling for supremacy in the land". These facts of course showed clearly that India before British Rule was neither a nation nor did it have any efficient administration that could give the masses stability, peace and order. But he could not accept the idea that even though it was for these essential reasons, our people should continue to regard the question "who exercised the sovereign authority as a minor matter, so long as it was well exercised and did not seriously interfere with their religious, social or communal life". With the unerring instinct of a statesman, Gokhale could see what was required to set right the whole historical situation.

Gokhale declared that, if India was to rise again to the full height of her capacities from her present obscurity, she would have to give up her out-dated social system and her unscientific ways of thinking. She required a long process of discipline, purification, training and real adjustment to the necessities of the modern age, taking much from the West — specially the educational system that had made England so powerful. He would have nothing less than popular self-government for India but knew that this required long training in the practice of liberty and free institutions where self-government would have to be shared by all classes and races of the country, and where a *genuine* feeling of national unity, capable of bearing a considerable strain on occasions, was evolved. He told the Indian National Congress that we lack practical training and the sense of responsibility required for "the proper exercise of the political institutions of the West" which we in fact needed most. He looked upon British rule as providential precisely because it was clear that England alone could help and guide India in the matter.

Change

Gokhale after all was an Indian who was searching for a national identity but at the same time he was too great a statesman not to see that this search could only be in a world that was fast becoming inter-dependent from the beginning of the 20th century. He stressed the close relations between East and West before the Universal Races Congress in 1911. To him things "western" or "foreign" were things required and not to be avoided. For him also the search for national identity could not be ignored but he felt that if India was to search her soul seriously, she had to see the need for change, the need to liberate her mind and come out from the old rut of centuries. India's out-of-date old world ideas could only spell isolation and ultimate death. Apart from the need for national unity and political freedom, there was much in other directions which we also lacked and which we had to set right if we were to grow at all into a nation. Foremost in his mind was the need for elevation of the depressed classes who had to be brought up to the level of the

rest of the people. The lessons taught by his saintly teacher Ranade he could never forget. Once when Ranade had been insulted in a railway compartment by a young English civilian who was an assistant judge he could have taken action as a judge of the High Court himself, but he told Gokhale; "Is our own conscience clear in these matters? How do we treat members of the depressed classes — our own countrymen... We are not prepared to give up the privileges of the old ascendancy... How can we then, with a clear conscience, blame members of the ruling race who treat us with contempt?" Gokhale accepted the view that castes may be eminently useful for the preservation of society but they were utterly unsuited for purposes of progress. He emphasised that if we did not modify the system we would be standing where we are for a thousand years.

Speaking to students of Pachaiyappa's College in Madras in 1904, Gokhale explained what things required to be set right by our western educated college leadership. Our masses in general were plunged in ignorance and superstition and their level had to be raised. We had also to elevate the status of our women since "a whole sex shut out from the intellectual life of a people is not good for any country". There was work to be done also about religion itself since "in religion many of our old institutions were existing only in form and the spirit seems to have fled from them." He stressed also the need for industrial development on scientific lines. He drew special attention to the fact that the *whole country* was on a low level in regard to political existence and this level had to be raised. Gokhale enunciated the important principle that "a nation's true greatness depends upon its average man and woman". Speaking of his experience of England and what he had seen there, he continued, "What struck me most was that the greatness of England was due to the fact that the average men and women there led more earnest lives, recognised their responsibilities better than we do, endeavoured to prove more serviceable to society than is the case here". He concluded that the strength of a nation really lies in the life, thoughts and actions of its average citizen. It may be added here that Gokhale had learnt from Ranade that there was something in our race which is "unequal to the strain of sustained exertion" and he wanted this to be set right.

Liberation

Our early statesmen and nation builders like Gokhale had no false pride or national ego. Far from this defect they realised clearly that British rule was the result largely of co-operation of the mass of the people who had been fed-up with the disorders and misgovernment of the indigenous rulers who had been governing independently of each other, in several parts of the country. Gokhale had no doubts on this and expressed

openly the fact that the character of the average citizen in England was higher than what was noticeable in India. Seeking for the real cause of the success of England compared to the socially-torn and politically still-born society of ours, he ascribed the matter to the system of education prevalent in England. He stressed the fact that western education was a *liberating force*, capable of assimilating the best and as such was valuable, necessary and of prime importance to India. When he introduced the Indian Universities' Bill in the Legislative Council of 1903, he said:

"To my mind the greatest work of western education in the present state of India is not so much the encouragement of learning as the liberation of the Indian mind from the thralldom of old-world ideas and the assimilation of all that is highest and best in the life and thought and character of the West. For this purpose *not only the highest but all Western education is useful*". He was particular about emphasizing the last point and made it clear more than once when he said: "This is a matter of deep conviction with me — that in the present atmosphere of India, *all western education is useful and valuable*. If it is the highest that under the circumstances is possible, so much the better. But even if it is not the highest, it must not on that account be rejected." In short, Gokhale wanted the Indian mind to be less speculative and more scientific by adopting western education.

Means to an end

To Gokhale it was quite clear that what India required was a dedicated group of men who could serve the country as *Indians* first, and *not* merely their own petty regions. The education required for the creation of this leadership could only be systematic and scientific western education in the English medium in all the colleges of India. Without saying so perhaps in so many words, Gokhale drew a clear line of demarcation between the higher education that was required for producing our national leadership and the primary education required for the masses. He wanted both and knew that the creation of a large group of western educated men like himself was absolutely essential. I am sure he would have regarded the creation of regionalists through the regional mediums as fatal to India's development. The real freedom of India required a love of free institutions and he held that "Western education, among other things, inspires one with a *love of free institutions*" which we needed most. He made it clear that there was no alternative for us in this matter for we had no real feeling of nationalism of *our own* as the Japanese people had. Japan had adopted no doubt western methods "forty years ago", as Gokhale put it in 1904, but her intense national feeling was peculiarly her own. Gokhale contrasted this with the complete absence of such national feeling in India and felt that it could be developed through

western education slowly. He warned us that such feeling "was bound to be a plant of slow growth" with us.

It will be seen from the reference to Japan that to Gokhale western education through the English medium was a means to an end — the objective being the growth of a free and strongly united India with free institutions as the basis of freedom. He had of course good reasons to feel he was not wrong at all here, for by 1904, as Joint Secretary of the Congress, he could point out how there was a national impulse among the different provinces of India and how throughout the country we had learnt to share common hopes and rejoice over the same successes. He regarded this as "a test of a growing nationality, if ever you had a test". In 1905, in founding the Servants of India Society, he referred again clearly to "the growth during the last fifty years of a feeling of a common nationality". We shall refer to this phenomenon again below at some length, but we may note that Gokhale personally did not require much proof of the correctness of his views as he could recollect easily those who had influenced him directly and personally — the foremost here being his own guru and teacher in Economics, Justice M. G. Ranade, besides of course Dr. Bhandarkar and Principals Agarkar and Gole of Fergusson College, Poona. Prof. Gole had written a book in Marathi on *Brahmins and Their Education* exposing the basic defects in the indigenous system of the past — as reported by my own teacher, Prof. R. P. Patwardhan.

We cannot afford to forget in this context that far from being "foreign", the system of western education in the English medium was responsible for producing a large number of truly "national leaders" for the first time in India, quite contrary to the belief our petty regional politicians hold that Macaulay's system produced only "clerks". This system in fact produced veritable giants, men of truly national stature — from Aurobindo to Agarkar, Bannerjee to Bose, Chatterjee to Chandavadar, Dadabhai to Das, Gokhale to Gandhi, Iyer to Iyengar, Kitchlew to Karve, Lala Lajpatrai to Lokmanya Tilak, Malaviya to Pherozshaw Mehta, Ranade to Rajaji, Sengupta to Sherwani, Tayabji to Tagore, Wagle to Watcha — and many others one can easily recall if one wants to face the truth and realise what a mistake we have made after Independence in working against and weakening the English language. But for the English language it would have been clearly and positively impossible to organise even the Indian National Congress itself. In the words of Gokhale: "No Indian could have started the Indian National Congress". It is not too late to undo the wrong and to remember that we have practically ceased to produce national leaders to the extent required.

(This is the first part of Prof. P. N. Driver's article. The second half will be published in the February issue.)

World-wide petition addressed to Mr. Leonid BREZHNEV

Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Profoundly attached to the cause of international détente, we earnestly hope that you will use your prestige and authority, so that the USSR will cease to be the only country in Europe where forced labour camps exist, and in which men and women are forcibly interned in mental hospitals due to their beliefs and opinions.

NAME, FIRST NAME	ADDRESS, TITLE	SIGNATURE

This petition to be returned, duly signed by readers and friends, to the international Committee for the Defence of Human Rights in the U.S.S.R., Place Flagey, 28 - B-1050 BRUSSELS, Belgium.

WITH THE COMPLIMENTS
OF A
WELL WISHER

Reviews

POLITICO-ECONOMIC ORTHODOXY

Dissent on Development by P. T. Bauer (Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd; Rs. 75; pp. 550).

ONE major outcome of the so-called colonial era in world history has been the unification of the world of ideas and the consequent emergence of its first truly international class—that of the intellectuals. The ideas and the visions now discussed in academic common rooms have an impact not merely on the western economies but on the peoples of the globe, viz that small handful of the urban elite who, in the underdeveloped world, are the only effective ruling group.

Virtually all of these came into contact with western ideas at a time when western intellectuals had ceased discussing—if they understood at all—those institutions that had led to its unprecedented mass prosperity; what the future leaders of the underdeveloped world learnt instead were the dreams and visions of those who now took this prosperity for granted and were unable to explain how it occurred. These western academics could not see that the alternatives they sought to create would threaten the foundations of the very mass abundance they took to be natural and irreversible. The profligate or even the sober heirs of a fortune several generations old are hardly in a position to really understand how the capital they inherited and live off so freely came to be built up.

This then is the background against which the current politico-economic orthodoxy relating to the underdeveloped areas has been constructed. P. T. Bauer's *Dissent on Development* chronicles the author's persistent, courageous, and virtually single-handed opposition to some of the most firmly-entrenched and widely-accepted dogmas of this orthodoxy—namely, the vicious circle of poverty; the moral and economic necessity for foreign aid; the axiomatic argument for central planning; the alleged adverse effects of population growth; the inevitability of foreign exchange shortages; the secular deterioration in terms of trade of the poorer countries, and the identification of a heavily-subsidised manufacturing sector with general economic growth. As Professor Bauer demonstrates, these tenets are neither empirically nor analytically valid; and they are reinforced in the current orthodoxy by three substantive omissions. Firstly, such elementary economic propositions as the functional relationship between prices, and supply and demand; or the opportunity cost of resources; or the interrelation between the balance of payments, domestic monetary policy, and the exchange rate are simply ignored. Secondly, the economic history of the underdeveloped areas is almost totally neglected. Thirdly, little attempt is made at any positive analysis or discussion of the

institutional framework—i.e. the political, social and economic structure within which the people of these countries must operate. In short, direct observation and primary data are neglected, so that this new orthodoxy adds up to an almost impervious screen of misconceptions, virtually blocking off contact with the diverse realities of the underdeveloped world; economists, too often, literally don't know what they are talking about. Greater insight is frequently found in the writings of anthropologists, historians, and even novelists.

Professor Bauer draws up this formidable indictment of the current state of the subject on the basis of a trenchant analysis of policy documents, such as the various UNCTAD reports and the World Bank reports on Nigeria; an empirical and scholarly examination of trade and traders in West Africa and the effects of state monopolies, and a series of unsparing review articles of the major works of such writers on the subject as Dr. G. Myrdal and Lord Balogh, as well as such economists as Professors W. A. Lewis and Benjamin Higgins. Throughout, Professor Bauer repeatedly exposes the fundamental poverty of the major tenets of the current orthodoxy. Thus, the vicious-circle-of-poverty thesis is refuted not only by the very existence of the developed nations, but by the rise of prosperous groups and individuals in the underdeveloped areas themselves. As regards overseas aid, all the now-developed nations grew without the benefit of foreign subventions. Moreover, these subsidies are granted to governments and their effects are dependent on the policies followed by these governments—and these, as Professor Bauer points out, are willing to 'plan' when

AN APOLOGY

We apologise for the failure in our December issue to mention that the review of *Europe & The US* was by Mr. Girish Bhatt.

they can scarcely govern. In any case, a compulsory transfer of resources involves no morality on the part of the 'giver'. Again, no developed nation used comprehensive 'planning' in the course of its development—on the contrary, in these areas, governments concentrated on just those activities that the rulers of the underdeveloped areas are unwilling to perform. Central planning centralises power—both political and economic; it does not add to the stock of resources. Such concentrations of power attract the power-hungry; and it is not obvious that the power-hungry will pursue policies that will augment the stock of resources. On population growth, Professor Bauer emphasises that policies to limit population size can effect income-growth, if at all, only after several decades; moreover, under conditions of under-deve-

lopment, rising population implies an increase in real incomes inasmuch as numbers of people are now enabled to survive who might otherwise not have done so. (Other authors have pointed out that, in subsistence agriculture, which employs the bulk of the population in the poor countries, the 'busy' seasons, especially sowing and harvesting, are characterised by labour shortages; a reduction of labour force in this context would imply food shortages).

Analysis of the terms-of-trade are crucially affected by the base year selected for comparison. The experiences of no two countries (or commodities) are uniform in this respect. In any case, conventional calculations make no allowances for changes in quality, nor—more important—do they give the *factoral* terms-of-trade—i.e. the volume of imports obtainable with one unit of resources of the exporting country. Foreign exchange problems are clearly related to exchange rate policy and to the domestic monetary policy of a country. With regard to the supposed virtues of manufacturing activity, many developed countries are still highly agricultural—notably Denmark and New Zealand; while the heavy subsidies and protection granted manufacturing industries in underdeveloped areas are an indication of the low and perhaps negative productivity of the resources invested in these industries; a corollary is that development of both agriculture and of alternative lines of production is thereby hampered for lack of resources.

Professor Bauer lays great stress on human and social factors in development, pointing out the differences in material achievements of different groups in the underdeveloped areas. While economic qualities and responsiveness to opportunities for material advance *do* vary from individual to individual and group to group, Professor Bauer perhaps does not give sufficient credit to the need for an appropriate political and economic framework within which these personal qualities and characteristics—and economic opportunities—can manifest themselves. Thus, the institutions found in medieval Europe or in Czarist Russia, or in the Soviet countries today, can hardly be said to offer any scope for leading to material advance; such potentialities as the population of these societies may have in this respect, must remain unrealised. In this connection, we may note that the superior economic achievements of many immigrant communities occur *outside* their societies of origin: immigrants had to emigrate in order to find an environment favourable to the development of their innate talents.

Now, as was pointed out earlier, the very ideologies and policies responsible for the weakening of modernising forces in many underdeveloped countries today were learnt from their *western* mentors by the ruling elites of these areas. It is the western academic adviser and the western development 'expert' who has played such a crucial role in formulating and imple-

menting those ideologies and policies that reinforce other historical forces and institutions inimical to economic growth in the underdeveloped areas today. And this is scarcely surprising, since today's academics and intellectuals cannot really completely understand the nature of the institutions and the historical forces which led to their prosperity.

In the world of ideas, only a small handful come from the underdeveloped areas; not unexpectedly, we *must* remain followers. As Professor Bauer demonstrates so trenchantly here, the doctrines we have learnt from our western intellectual leaders have been not merely inadequate, but positively harmful to the best interests of the underdeveloped areas.

SUDHA R. SHENOY

SUPPRESSION OF DISSENT

Dissent In The Soviet Union; Compiled by A. P. Jain (Institute of Public Affairs, New Delhi; Rs. 3/-; pp. 92.)

THIS is a booklet about the recent suppression of dissent in the Soviet Union. It begins with a brief survey of the dissenters and the manner in which they are being suppressed. Then follow statements of some prominent dissenters and reactions of Indian writers and the press. The last portion is devoted to the reactions of the foreign press ranging from *The Guardian* in England to *Time* in the United States.

The reactions of all writers, journalists and thinkers,

Discerning men the world over choose Raymond's ...

Because Raymond's have perfected the *a la mode* look, that soft comfortable and luxurious feel which is naturally wool. They also offer *Tenrol*—a superb mixture of Polyester Fibre and wool. *Tenrol* has the best of both. And *Knitting wool* too—in a variety of lovely shades, making trend-setting knitteds. All Raymond's products are moth-proof—treated by the Dicelmoth process.

Raymond gets around... in the best circles everywhere

Raymond's woollens

A J. K. PRODUCT
Manufactured by:
THE RAYMOND WOOLLEN MILLS LTD., Bombay 1.

are hostile. That should give the rulers of Russia some idea of how the world views their cruel treatment of dissenting poets, novelists, philosophers and scientists. The dissenters have done nothing beyond giving expression to their views. And yet, they had to spend long years in jails, in extermination and in lunatic asylums, apart from losing their jobs and being denied the opportunity to publish their writings. The dissenters are world-famous figures like the scientist Sakharov, the historian Amalrik, the poet Brodsky and the Nobel Prize winning writer, Solzhenitsyn. A country should be proud to claim them as its citizens and yet the communist rulers of Russia denounce them as traitors and anti-social elements and subject them to inhuman treatment.

Russia has secured recognition as a super power, but it will not secure recognition as a civilized state as long as its rulers continue to prosecute some of its outstanding citizens for their dissenting opinions. Mr. Jain has done well to prepare and publish this compilation so that the people may not forget the dark side of the current euphoria over Russia.

V. B. KARNIK

CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S AILING ECONOMY

Czechoslovakia: The Bureaucratic Economy by Ota Sik (International Arts and Sciences Press, New York; Price \$10; pp. 138).

OTA SIK belongs to the school of Socialist Economists who believe that no economic system, not even a socialist one, can function without a value system in which prices are fixed by the forces of supply and demand. This is the basic principle underlying his present book in which he has analysed the economic advances of Czechoslovakia during the two decades following the year 1948. The conclusions are largely based on a comparison of Czechoslovakia's economic conditions with that of the U.S.A., W. Germany, France, Sweden and Austria. The book is compiled from a series of television lectures delivered by the author just before the thaw, but the analysis once again becomes relevant in the context of these processes reappearing in Czechoslovakia after the Russian invasion in 1968.

Sik attributes the major causes of economic ills of the country to over-centralization of planning. Central planning implies that the central authority take decisions on all such matters as what is to be produced, how much is to be produced, who is to produce, and most important at what price it is to be produced. Such a system inevitably leads to undesirable and unrealistic targets with respect to production because the precise needs of the consumer are impossible to determine. It also leads to low productivity, poor quality and inefficiency. For instance, the targets of industries in terms of how much to produce are usually set at an

unrealistically high level by the central authority with the result that industries tend to underestimate their potential and overestimate their costs. The channels of information about needs, reserves and potentialities no longer remain objective and the qualitative aspects of development are completely lost in the myriad of quantitative targets. Blueprints are handed down for all the minute industrial relationships which exist, with such ease and automaticity in a free economy.

These economic consequences flow from the political ideology of Czechoslovakia which seeks to control all spheres of the economy. The principal drawback in the system is the negation of the value system. The mechanism of prices if lost in an economic system results in a meaningless economic world in which production is carried on and transactions are made without consideration of the real needs of the producer and the consumer. Sik does not attack the essence of the socialist system but he does believe in keeping the natural market mechanism to determine the demand, the supply and the prices. Allowing the natural value system to operate in a socialist economy is not as inconsistent as many socialist economists believe. Sik puts across this point well and in fact believes that the survival of socialism in Czechoslovakia depends on certain drastic changes in its present political and economic model.

DEEPA AWAL

Good Roads do most
to develop the country and
**CONCRETE
ROADS*
ARE BEST**



* with **ACC CEMENT**

LAST TANGO IN PARIS

IT is Paris in summer, the avenues lined with trees and a pale gold. Paul, wearing his thinning yellow hair in a sort of anguish, meets Jeanne in an empty apartment both are thinking of renting. He is newly bereaved, having lost his wife to a razor and a bathtub; she is recently engaged to be married to a somewhat over-enthusiastic film director. Strangers, they eye each other perfunctorily, then come together with a sudden brutality that cannot be simplified to an instant attraction.

So begin a series of encounters that are, if sexually explicit, curiously incomplete in their intensity; this may be what is called a minimal relationship. He does not want them to even exchange names. They are to be anonymous lovers, despising convention if not belittling bestiality. Sex is an insatiable god to appease, so well may the niceties be sacrificed. This then is the central theme: a middle-aged American and a twenty year old Parisian making a primitive pact in an old and civilized city that could be the last refuge of the romantic.

Other threads run through as well. Paul, fighting a middle-aged despair, is not helped by the fact of his French wife's suicide and the sleazy 'pension' she owned, which is now his dubious heritage. The undesirables that haunt it, and his mother-in-law's stifling presence, drive him to a macabre monologue beside his wife's dead body. There seems little to do, and less to turn to, alleviate a growing sense of futility. But Jeanne, young and vital, liberated by the mores of her generation, finds her entanglement with her fiancé scarcely reaching beyond posturing for him in different locales, involved as he is in shooting a T. V. film about her.

These are their external lives; but in the bare and once elegant apartment, they unleash their fantasies in the only immediate way they know how. Bertolucci suffuses the violent love-making and the circular room in a luminous golden glow, capturing the lovers as in a womb or a cocoon. Brando translates his moods in a sexual aggression that are at once a mockery and a need; and Schneider responds almost in spite of herself, for she cannot now control what began as a brief encounter. He is as brutal with her reminiscences as with her body; yet when he indulges in his own, the pathos is unmistakable. In the seclusion and false security of the apartment, alone and together, they enact a private life that would not survive beyond the door; and their feelings are a symbiosis of something bordering on affection and a very real loathing.

One day it ends as suddenly as it began. Jeanne returns to find the place empty, its temporariness returned. But on the street below, as she is turning away, Paul falls in step with her, a dapper, almost different Paul. He is in a light mood, and this seems like a fresh start. For the first time he tells Jeanne

something about his life, its sordidity and the littleness of it. In a tawdry dance-hall, its competitors locked in a tango, he woos her in his most charming manner, rude language notwithstanding. But Jeanne is only more repulsed. Her unknown hero after all is only a middle-aged drop-out, and she wants to be rid of him, even as he plies her with smiles and champagne. His awkward parody of the tango participants and the dropping of his trousers in an attempt to scandalize, seems to put the final seal to the relationship ill-starred from the start. Paul has made the fatal mistake: he falls in love with his amoral mistress. And for her the kicks are over.

When finally Paul falls down dying, shot at point-blank by a now vengeful Jeanne, he just has time to ask her name.

Emotion had become an unwanted bonus; love was the unknown quantity neither had reckoned for. Brando and Schneider emote with an intensity and unselfconsciousness leave one wondering where the actors leave off and the real people begin. And through it all Bertolucci's masterful camera captures the mood in sensuous and sympathetic terms. It is perhaps this aura of artistic reality — for bad art cannot reflect life — that lifts 'Tango' from being just another pornographic movie to an exceptional film.

NUSRAT TAYABALI

THE WEST COAST PAPER MILLS LIMITED

Manufacturers of

"Sudarshan Chakra" brand quality paper
Azorelaid, Kraft, Poster, Board,
Maplitho Printing Surface Sized

Administrative Office:

SREENIWAS HOUSE
HAZARIMAL SOMANI MARG
BOMBAY 400 001

Telephone Nos. 268241 & 260041

Registered Office & Mills at:

Dandeli
District North Kanara
MYSORE STATE

Letter

LAW AND PROTOCOL VIOLATED

While welcoming the idea that we should maintain friendly relations with all the countries, including the U.S.S.R., I just cannot understand how Mr. Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, was greeted, in breach of protocol, at the Delhi Airport, by a 21-Gun Salute and was presented with an inter-service guard-of-honour! This form of welcome is accorded only to the Head of a State, be it a President, a King, or a Queen.

What will be the reaction of our so-called "progressive" friends in India if such a welcome were accorded to the General Secretary of one of our so-called "reactionary" political parties, say, the Jan Sangh, the Muslim League or the Swatantra Party, if he paid a visit to the U.K., the U.S.A., West Asia or any other West European country? I hope some of your enlightened readers will oblige me by clarifying this point.

Another point which needs clarification is whether any agreement entered into by Mr. Brezhnev as General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, with no position in the Soviet Government, can be considered legal and valid according to International Law?

P. B. MECKONI

COSME - FARMA LABORATORIES

Manufacturers of Pharmaceuticals
and
Cosmetics

CURTI

PONDA

GOA

add
drama
to your life

Look dashing, debonaire - you can even be a dandy if you like. The aristocratic cut and feel of a Milton's shirt will make you want to step out in style. Milton's style - the style recognised the world over. Milton's shirts are exported to all the sophisticated markets including U.S.S.R., U.S.A., U.K., Sweden, West Germany and France etc.

Milton's
shirts

milton's
(private) limited
Mathuradas Mills Compound,
Lower Parel, Bombay 13.



heros - MPL-32A

WITH MANY VOICES

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

The imperfections of the capitalist system are, of course, as nothing compared with those of socialism.

—*The Economist*, October 13.

Any Arab country calling on Russian forces does not merit freedom. Better to have Israeli colonialism than Soviet troops in the area.

—Col. Gaddafi quoted in *Swiss Press Review*,
December 3

One can, of course, take the government's word for it that the worst is over for the economy. That would be entirely an act of faith, however.

—*Economic & Political Weekly*, November 17.

The charm of a distant Indira Gandhi cannot atone for the fact that, among the important organisation men of the Congress party today, there are many with whom you will not trust your grown-up daughter for even a bare five minutes.

—A M in *Economic & Political Weekly*,
November 17.

India plods along like a constipated elephant.

—Ramesh Thapar in *Economic & Political Weekly*,
November 17.

FREEDOM FIRST,

C/o Democratic Research Service
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1. (Phone: 254341)

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.

I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 5.00

He is/I am a student. I remit Rs. 3.00

Name:.....

College (for students)

Address:.....

Signature

It was thanks to the discovery of oil, and the exploitation of oil resources by the use of Western skills, that Arab rulers grew fat, and were able to exchange their camels for Cadillacs. Let them understand that if they pursue their present course they will shortly find themselves on camels again.

—Lord Boyd-Carpenter quoted
in *Times of India*, November 13.

The government has winked at the role of foreign money in the Indian press because the countries friendliest to it are the worst culprits in this regard.

—*Economic & Political Weekly*,
November 24.

If God as some now say is dead, He no doubt died of trying to find an equitable solution to the Arab-Jewish problem.

—I. F. Stone quoted in *The Illustrated Weekly of India*, December 2.

No flower can remain in full bloom for more than ten days. No one alive can last longer than ten years in power.

—Korean proverb quoted in *Time*,
December 3.

Petroleum is like bread. It must not be cut off during peace time.

—Shah of Iran in *Time*, December 3.

For a moment last week Europe went neutral.... It managed to combine the behaviour of the ostrich and the hen.

—*The Economist*, November 3.

They (Europeans) would not help the United States to do for someone else what they want it to do for them.

—*The Economist*, November 3.

The Government proposes, Parliament disposes, and outside events make suckers of them both.

—*The Economist*, November 3.