

The Report & After

by B. K. Desai

AT the conclusion of the six-day talks between the Prime Ministers of India and China, a joint communique was issued on April 25 last year announcing the decision that a team of officials would be appointed by each country to examine relevant factual material and documents on the question of the Sino-Indian border dispute and draw up a report for submission to the two Governments. The decision itself was tantamount to a frank admission of the failure of the two Prime Ministers to resolve their differences through friendly negotiations across the table. And the failure was inevitable as from the beginning there was no common ground for discussion between the two sides. The Chinese were in no mood to vacate their aggression, they only wanted to legalise their illegal occupation of Indian territory by persuading the Indian Government to accept the "present actualities" as the basis for any talks on the subject. They had also claimed, in their note to the Indian Government three weeks prior to the meeting, that the boundary line claimed by them was in conformity with the "traditional and customary border and the state of actual jurisdiction in the area". The Chinese stand was thus diametrically opposite to that of the Indian Government and left no room for compromise or negotiations. The talks therefore broke down even before they could start and the Prime Ministers in their stubborn attempt to keep the peaceful negotiations going were left with no other alternative than to entrust the problem for examination to officials from both the sides. Grave misgivings were expressed at that time by many observers about the utility of the exercise, as it was feared that it would only give China more time to consolidate its position in the occupied territory and would result in renewing the deadlock at the lower level with each side submitting its separate differing report.

As expected, the two sides have presented separate differing reports, but the exercise has proved worthwhile. The voluminous report submitted by the Indian team establishes beyond a shadow of doubt justice and validity of India's position. It proves with the help of a massive array of indisputable evidence the correctness of the traditional Sino-Indian border as shown in Indian maps and underlines the fact of China's aggression and unlawful occupation of 12,000

square miles of Indian territory. The report, besides, lays bare the intrinsic weakness of the Chinese case which the Chinese attempted to cover up during the discussion by evasive replies, imprecise and deliberately vague information and even downright insulting postures and allegations against the Government of India. This was in keeping with the usual communist practice of negotiation by intimidation and evasion; but it has in the present case convincingly demonstrated the utter hollowness of the Chinese claim. As pointed out in the Indian team's report, the Chinese evidence was not only "meagre and inconclusive in its content, there were also certain fundamental irrelevancies and contradictions in the facts and logic of the Chinese case". Thus the verdict of history is now clear and it unambiguously upholds India's stand in its entirety.

But the report reveals more than the hollowness of the Chinese claim. It also exposes Chinese duplicity and insatiable expansionist greed. The report makes it quite clear that until September 1959, China had constantly led India to believe that she accepted the traditional Indian alignment of the boundary, which she had deliberately kept undisclosed claims to about 50,000 square miles of Indian territory. It was only in September 1959, that is, five years after the India Government had raised the question of Chinese maps, that the Chinese Government, contrary to their previous assurance, justified and upheld their maps and laid claims to the parts of Indian territory. And, here again, successive Chinese maps have shown shifting Chinese positions with a bewildering variety of delineations of the alignment. The Chinese greed has thus increased continuously and China has come out every time with fresh claims to yet another part of our territory. For example, the Chinese, as pointed out by Prime Minister Nehru himself, in the early stages had claimed only a few of the villages in the middle sector; but now they linked all these villages to enclose a large area to inflate their demand for another 2,000 miles of our territory. The Chinese duplicity is exposed in all its nakedness in their stand on the question of Kashmir, Bhutan and Sikkim. The Chinese Government has for the first time come out openly on the Kashmir issue and declined to recognise the accession of Kashmir to India. In the case of Sikkim and Bhutan, Mr. Chou En-lai had categorically stated on April 25 last year that China "had absolutely no claims or border disputes with Bhutan and Sikkim and respected India's relations with these two territories." But the Chinese Government has now gone back on its assurance given hardly

ten months ago, and has questioned India's right to discuss issues pertaining to the northern boundaries of Bhutan and Sikkim.

Thus the report, besides fortifying India's case, gives for the first time a complete and over-all picture of China's sinister design against our country. It also reveals the dangerous naivete of our Panchsheel foreign policy based on the implicit faith in the essential goodness of the Chinese and other communist powers. Ironically enough, the report also unequivocally supports, though not directly, the Dalai Lama's claim that Tibet before 1950 was an independent and sovereign country with full treaty-making powers. This is the first time that an official Indian team has clearly admitted the fact in the light of historical evidence. The report, in a sense, is an admission by the Indian Government of its guilt in encouraging the Chinese communists in their imperialist ambitions, and showing scant regard for independence of the neighbouring and strategically important country. The report, in this respect, is a long and sorry catalogue of India's failure every time to understand the basically expansionist character of the Chinese communist regime. In this context, the relevant comment in the report on the Chinese behaviour makes almost a pathetic reading. "Peaceful relations", it states, "are based on the assumption of the most honourable motives and intentions. India had reason to believe that China had accepted and acquiesced in the traditional Indian alignment and was only now creating a major boundary question and not that China had sought to deceive India until September 1959." The tragic irony is that, since 1950, there was no dearth of warning voices in our country on this count, and even the Chinese communists right from 1950 onwards had never made any secret of their plans against India's territorial integrity. It was only the Government of India that had put on the Panchsheel blinkers and preferred not to heed these insistent warnings till September 1959.

By demolishing totally the Chinese case, the report has exposed the Chinese treachery and aggressive and intransigent attitude to the full view of the outside world. By its irrefutable evidence and cogent arguments, the report should convince even Sinophiles like Krishna Menon that China has, in fact, committed aggression on the Indian soil, howsoever one may try to define the word. It has already stiffened Prime Minister Nehru's attitude who quite rightly pointed out in Parliament recently that there was no "dispute" as India was concerned over the frontier with China and that "there could be no question of negotiations or horse-trading". He further asserted that

"our case in regard to the border is almost fool-proof and that the border question 'will only be set when the Chinese vacate this territory.'" This firmness of tone and attitude is in refreshing contrast to the almost wavering position adopted by the Prime Minister during the last two years. This change in attitude, though welcome, is not adequate; it needs to be translated into a positive policy calculated to serve our purpose of making China vacate the aggression. It is now abundantly clear that India cannot persuade the Chinese communists to vacate the aggression by methods of peaceful negotiations. At the same time, India cannot resort to war to throw the Chinese out of her territory. But there are many ways, military as well as diplomatic, which India can legitimately adopt to counter the Chinese danger. Military preparedness to resist any further Chinese advance, coupled with the tightening and toning up of administration in the border regions is obviously the barest minimum needed for the purpose. But it is also essential that India should take diplomatic initiative to convince her neighbours and friends of the correctness of her position and expose the Chinese deceit and greed. This requires to be done forthwith as so far we have never put forth cogently our case on the border issue before our neighbours who have been forced to cultivate friendship with the Chinese communist regime by our wavering and indecisive stand.

Already China has succeeded, to some extent, in isolating India from her neighbours by entering into border treaties with them. It is therefore of utmost importance that India should launch a diplomatic offensive and publicise her case effectively all over the world. Another step that needs to be taken is the revision of our policy in relation to Tibet, that unfortunate country whom we betrayed in 1950. The report has conclusively established the fact of the independence of Tibet before 1950. It is therefore necessary, in order at least to make amends for the wrong done by us to the Tibetan people, that India should now come out openly in support of Tibet's claim to independence and lend at least her moral support to the struggle for freedom which is still being waged by the Tibetans in their country. This would further help to expose the true imperialist character of the Chinese communist regime and counter their diplomatic offensive against India. And lastly, in accordance with this policy, India should take the lead in mobilising the world opinion at the U.N. in support of the resolution on Tibet, tabled by Malaya and others in the General Assembly. This will, of course, involve the risk of causing embarrassment to the Soviet Union. But if we succeed in mobilising the Afro-Asian opinion in the U.N. behind the resolution, Russian opposition to the resolution will only expose the Soviet anti-colonial profession for what it is. But in order to do this, our policy of non-alignment and neutrality will have to shed its one-sided bias and many of its self-imposed inhibitions. It will have also to give up its double standard of value — judgement which has vitiated its reasoning and done so much harm to our national interest.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 pP

Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor,

127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,

Bombay 1.

Notes

A Grave Challenge

ALL over the world there are emphatic protests against and fiery denunciations of the murder of Mr. Patrice Lumumba and his two associates. Murder anywhere and at any time, whosoever the victim and the assailant may be, is a crime against humanity. The murder of Mr. Lumumba and his associates is a far worse crime against humanity as it might open the flood-gates of civil war and foreign intervention which might, in their turn, lead to a world conflagration. It goes without saying that there must be a thorough investigation of the crime and the persons and authorities responsible for the dastardly act must receive the punishment that would be due to them.

All efforts must be now concentrated on the establishment of peaceful and normal conditions in the Congo which alone will enable the representatives of the various tribes and groups inhabiting the country to come together and evolve a political settlement. Without a political settlement there will be no peace in the country and its independence and integrity will always be in danger. In the world as it exists today, it is only the United Nations which can essay and accomplish this task. It should therefore be the duty of all Powers, big and small, to strengthen the hands of the United Nations and help it in all possible ways in accomplishing the task as early as possible.

Under the circumstances, the attempts that are being made by Russia and a few other Powers to weaken the United Nations and to discredit its Secretary-General are a grave disservice to the cause of peace. Whatever their professions of goodwill towards the people of the Congo, they will do incalculable harm to them if they will persist in their efforts to compel the United Nations to wind up its operation in the country. The withdrawal of the United Nations will convert the Congo into a battlefield. And the battle that will be fought there will not be restricted to the people of the country. Rival groups of Powers and their adherents will jump into it and the Congo will become the arena of an international war. Continued and more vigorous operations and presence of the United Nations is the only guarantee against the emergence of that danger.

It will be also necessary to put a stop to the interventionist activities of Belgium. Belgians must be asked to quit and, for the time being at least, all help to the Congo and its various provinces, military, technical or political, must be channeled through the United Nations. The help that the Belgians have so far rendered has only created complications and helped disruptionist and unruly elements. It should be clear that by persisting in that course Belgium is creating grave embarrassment to her allies and is also endangering world peace. The United Nations must

bring this fact home to Belgium and take effective steps to stop her meddling in the affairs of the Congo.

The difficult situation that has developed in the Congo is a challenge to the wisdom and the strength of the United Nations. The organisation as a whole and more particularly the leading and powerful nations who shape its policies are on trial. Will they have the intelligence and the patience to hammer out a mutually agreeable solution? Or have they reached a dead end and cannot do anything better than leave such issues to be decided by the age-old method of force, fraud and duplicity?

After this was written came the welcome news of the resolution adopted by the Security Council. The new resolution envisages resolute action. It deserves the support of all peace-loving elements and of all those who stand for an early solution of the Congo problem.

Tight-Rope Dancing

IT is a tortuous and deceptive resolution that the National Council of the Communist Party of India has passed on the issue of Chinese aggression. No where can one find the communists describing in the long resolution the Chinese action as aggression. As long as they do not accept that fact, they cannot be regarded as on the same side as the Indian people. They may not have openly aligned themselves with the Chinese rulers, which they could not in view of the forthcoming general election. But nor have they accepted the national point of view and cannot therefore share the national indignation against the Chinese and the desire to repulse the aggression. They are just sitting on the fence, ready any day to walk into the Chinese Camp as the Chinese pressure increases or the national pressure decreases.

There is a lot of tight-rope dancing in the resolution. At one place it says, "The material collected by the Indian side has led the Indian people to believe that India's case is strong." Fearing adverse reaction in the Chinese communist camp, it hastens to add, however, "The Chinese side has collected a mass of material to prove its case and that on the basis of this material the Chinese side rejects the soundness of India's case". An attempt is thus made to balance the two sides, the side of the Indian people and the side of the Chinese aggressors. To the communists both sides appear at the moment equal. The Indian people should be grateful to them for not, so far, placing the Chinese side higher!

Another concession to the national sentiment that they have made is the reiteration of their acceptance of the McMahon Line, their assertion that China must negotiate with India regarding the northern borders of Bhutan and Sikkim and their implied disapproval of the Chinese attempt to negotiate with Pakistan the delimitation of boundaries of some areas of Jammu and Kashmir. The country must be equally grateful to them for not towing the Chinese line on these issues!

Can a party which adopts such an ambiguous line

on a clear issue of national integrity and defence have any claim to be regarded as a national organisation? The alien roots and inspiration of the actions and policies of the Communist Party are clear to any close observer of the national and the international scene. However, some people console themselves with the idea that there is a nationalist and an internationalist group in the party and that in the last few months the former has gained predominance over the latter. If the resolution under consideration is any evidence of the success of that group, it must be said that the differences between the two relate only to questions of tactics. The nationalist group may not, for, tactical reasons, like certain things to be said or an entirely pro-China attitude to be adopted. But on essentials there are no differences between the two groups. And that is but natural as both are professedly communists and communism does not attach much importance to national boundaries. It is useful for the communists to make a show of differences in their ranks, but others should be intelligent enough not to be taken in by them.

Jabalpur Riots

COMMUNAL riots which flared up in Jabalpur and some other towns in Madhya Pradesh have the lesson for the country that the riots between linguistic groups which broke out in Assam last year had. They show that harmony and peace between communal and linguistic groups which exist in the country are not based on a sound foundation and that any untoward incident can easily disturb them. The incident which ignited the fires in Jabalpur is of a most despicable kind. The two youths who were responsible for it must receive the most severe penalty of the law. But that it could be generalised and members of one community could be made to believe that the other community was bent upon dishonouring their women folk shows the woeful state of the public mind. It is this state of the public mind which must engage the attention of the leaders of the country. For, as usual, the attempt will be made to pass on the blame to the so-called goondas, the unruly element which exists in every society. It must be remembered, however, that the goondas enter upon the scene and take advantage of disturbed conditions only after the stage is prepared

for them by the educated and respectable sections of the society. It is the latter who indulge in communal propaganda or fall an easy prey to the scare stories propagated by interested parties. It is these educated and respectable people who have to be taught the first lessons in communal harmony and insulated against the virus of communal poison. The Congress has done well by condemning in unreserved terms the shameful happenings and by demanding a high level judicial investigation into their causes. This will serve some useful purpose but what is far more essential is vigorous and sustained propaganda for removing the fear and suspicion that lurk in the public mind.

Sol Levitas

THE death of Sol Levitas, the Managing Editor of the well-known weekly journal *The New Leader*, will be mourned all over the world more particularly by groups and circles engaged in combatting totalitarian communism as the biggest present menace to freedom and democracy. Mr. Levitas had a first hand acquaintance with the methods, policies and objectives of communist rulers. He was one of those social democratic leaders of Russia who had to leave the country within a few years of the communist conquest of power. Denied the opportunity to work for the progress and welfare of the Russian people, he engaged himself in the bigger task of defending and advancing the cause of human freedom all over the world. He carried on that task through *The New Leader* which from week to week carried the message of liberty and progress and exposed the machinations of international communism. Mr. Levitas was also associated with many other agencies working for the liberation of oppressed nationalities, groups or individuals. In him the forces of freedom all over the world have lost a stout champion and an ardent advocate. We place on record our deep sense of loss and pay our respects to his memory.

Tibet Fights For Freedom

*With a Foreword by the DALAI LAMA
Edited by RAJA HUTHEESING*

Published for

**INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL
FREEDOM**

148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

by

ORIENT LONGMANS

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
NEW DELHI HYDERABAD DACCA

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

ENCOUNTER is easily available in India — and at a price (Re. 1 a copy) well within the reach of anyone's pocket. The following booksellers are among those who stock it regularly: International Book House, 9 Ash Lane, Bombay—; Central News Agency, Delhi; Foreign Publishers Agency, Grand Hotel Arcade, Calcutta; Higginbotham's, Madras. The U. K. address of ENCOUNTER is 25 Haymarket, London, S.W.1.

Annual Subscription Rs. 12

For members of the I.C.C.F. Rs. 10/-

Panchayati Raj

by Jayaprakash Narayan

IN the past few months much has been written about Panchayati Raj and there is no need to describe it in any detail. A few observations, however are called for. First, it should be noted that the initiative for Panchayati Raj originally came not from the political motive of broadening the bases of our democracy or laying the foundations of what I have called 'participating democracy', but from the anxiety to obtain full public co-operation in the execution of development programme. On account of this restricted aim with which the experiment was started, its significance has not so well been grasped even by the conscious political elements in the country, much less by the people at large. It is clear, however, that the logic of the movement is driving it forward and constantly enlarging and deepening its implications. There is still need, however, of arousing popular enthusiasm about this measure, and of making the people realize that what was intended was not a procedural reform of the administration at the lower levels, but a political revolution of the greatest significance for the people: that in effect the intention and the attempt were to bring Swaraj to the people. This understanding and enthusiasm cannot be brought about by Development Officers but by the democratic and popular leaders of the country—irrespective of party and ideology, and by social workers and intellectual and moral leaders generally.

In order that Panchayati Raj may become the base of a true participating democracy, certain conditions must be fulfilled.

First, education of the people, understood in the widest sense of the term, is an essential condition for the success of the experiment. This education can best be imparted by disinterested, non-partisan agencies, engaged in social service or tasks of rural development. Political parties may also make a great contribution in this respect, provided they addressed themselves to the task in a non-partisan spirit. Perhaps the best way for them would be to create a common agency through which to carry on this work. Government officers and agencies might also do useful work in this sphere. Schools, libraries, co-operative societies have an important role to play here. It should also be considered whether a non-party and purely educative body of the voters which might be called the 'All-India Voters' Association' should not be formed in order to render educative service to the voters. There might also be a Centre jointly set up and conducted by the Union Community Development Ministry, the All-India Panchayat Parishad, other All-India Local Self-Government Organizations, the Akhil Bharat Sarva Seva Sangh, and other All-India Rural Service Agencies. Such a Centre could help by way of producing literature, conducting of surveys, studying of problems, etc.

Second, it is well worth emphasising that the success of Panchayati Raj would depend upon the extent to which organised political parties refrained from interfering with it and trying to convert it into their hand-maiden, and use it as a jumping ground to climb to power. There is no doubt that as consciousness grows among the people at the ground level, they would be less liable to be moved about as pawns by political parties and ambitious politicians. But in the initial stages it is necessary for political parties, in the interests of the people whom they claim to be anxious to serve, to place themselves under a self-denying ordinance and keep away from either setting up party candidates or putting pressure on the elected representatives to become party members, so as to be able to control the basic institutions of democracy.

Third, there should be a real devolution of power and not a make-belief. It is possible to construct the outward structure of Panchayati Raj and to give it no substance. That would be like a body without a soul: dead from the start, a still-born child. What is needed here are sincerity, imagination and courage. The people must be trusted. There is a tendency among those of us who have received some education to distrust the ability and intelligence of the common people, and it is possible to talk of devolution of power without in reality surrendering any power. No one can learn to discharge responsibility unless responsibility was really given to one. Withholding of responsibility, either on account of lack of confidence in the people or of reluctance to surrender power, would lead naturally, as it has already done to a considerable extent, to an attitude of irresponsibility in the people who will for ever be on the look-out for heroes and miracle-makers to solve their problems. It is out of such a psychological situation that dictators are born. For democracy to be a success, it is necessary that the people are prepared, and given full opportunity to shoulder responsibility.

Fourth, it is imperative that at each level the local authority should be given its own minimum resources. If control of resources remains in the hands of the State Government, the devolution is bound to be rather nominal. 'He who pays the piper calls the tune' would be as true here as anywhere. I am afraid in this sphere the progress has been even less marked than in the case of devolution of authority and functions. In this connection, land revenue, even though it does not amount to very much, should be the first resource to be placed totally at the disposal of the Village Panchayat and the Panchayat Samiti. It should not be the prerogative of the State Government to allocate certain sums out of land revenue to these bodies. Subject to an equalization fund for the purpose of aiding the poorer villages and blocks, the entire land revenue should be left in the hands of the Panchayats and the Samitis.

Other possible sources of revenue must be found and placed at the disposal of the Panchayati Raj in order that it might function with dignity and enjoy its autonomy.

Fifth, Panchayati Raj should be able as soon as possible to exercise real authority over the civil servants under its charge, who should be held fully accountable to it. Even in the matter of recruitment, it would be advisable to associate the local authorities or their nominees. At the same time provision should be made to assure to the civil servants justice and security of service and freedom to discharge their duties without improper interference.

Sixth — and as important as any of the previous conditions — it is my emphatic view that elections to village panchayats should be held without any electoral contests. This view has been severely criticised in some quarters. In some other quarters opinion seems to have veered round to my point of view. I should like to say that the more I have thought over this question, the more convinced have I become that if Panchayati Raj is to succeed, contests in the elections to village panchayats must be avoided. The village today is a much divided house. There are caste and class differences; there are family and other factions. There is no collective will in the village. On the other hand, the task that the villages face can never be tackled unless there is united and collective effort. A community spirit must first be created before there might be a proper community development. To introduce electoral contests into the village is to throw a monkey-wrench into the works.

Several suggestions have been made as to how contests could be avoided. It should be remembered that I am speaking only of the village panchayats which, it has been generally agreed, should not be constituted of more than a thousand to two thousand souls. If the principle is accepted, it should not be difficult to find a way of putting it into practice. Unfortunately it is the view in many quarters that unless there is an electoral contest, there is no democracy. It is this static, abstract and narrow view of democracy that comes in the way of finding a solution. But I am certain that unless a solution is found, Panchayati Raj and participating democracy would never be a success.

While the attempt to establish Panchayati Raj is a step in the direction of a more stable, popular and satisfying form of democracy, a step that, when properly executed, might succeed in taking *swaraj* to the people, it is not adequate by itself. In order that the edifice of democracy might be strong and invulnerable, the top layers of it must be built into the foundational structure. But, as the situation stands at present, the foundational structure will rise only up to the district level, beyond which, i.e., at the State and Union levels, a completely different structure will continue to exist, resting on nothing more solid than a sand heap, namely, the amorphous mass of individual and disparate voters. This is a very unhappy mixture of two different principles and processes of democracy that, like water and oil, will not mix. The

differences between the two may be summed up as follows:

The system that rests on individual voters has invariably a tendency towards concentration of power at the top, while the other system tends towards dispersal of power; in the former, organised parties that are run from above by small and powerful elites play the decisive role; in the latter, communities and communal representative bodies working from below exert the decisive influence; in the former, again, the representatives elected by the unorganised voters are not and cannot be under their control, in the latter the communal bodies exercise a continuous influence over the representatives they send to the higher levels; in the former system the people's participation is limited to casting of votes, in the latter there is direct participation of the whole people through the *gram sabha* and fairly close participation through the higher communal representative bodies; in the former system elections are expensive, in the latter just the opposite; the former requires mass media of propaganda and involves unhealthy psychological and emotional excitement, in the latter these evils are reduced to the minimum; in the former most voters are more unlikely to understand the issues which are placed before them than in the latter in which the voters at each level are likely to be well acquainted with the problems that they have to deal with.

It has been observed earlier that the amorphous, or inorganic, democracy, based on individual voters, tends to concentrate power at the top and does not provide for any control over the voters' representatives. This is a very vital matter but unfortunately is not much appreciated. In this type of democracy there is hardly any force that tends to pull power down towards the people. The voters, though their number may run into millions, in the nature of things lack any organizational means to check the upward concentration of power. There are, of course, political parties and their membership too might run into millions, but the trend everywhere is, even in the democratic parties, for power to be concentrated in a caucus of leaders. There are also special interests, chiefly economic, that attempt to influence this type of democracy, but this influence too tends to be exercised over the centres of power. The growth of economic centralization which aids and abets political centralization has already been referred to. It is true that there are trade unions, co-operative societies and other similar organizations that provide a broadening structure for this democracy, but (a) they are not built-in structures of the democratic pattern concerned, and (b) they themselves are tending to become top-heavy and over-centralized.

The position is quite different in the case of participating or organic democracy. It is indeed being created in our country right now, but, quite illogically, only half-way through. Because this democracy will be built up of several tiers, beginning with the basic tier of the *gram sabha* (which should be distinguished from a mere arithmetic sum of the voters in

(Continued on page 10)

Prof. Galbraith's Social Economy

by M. A. Venkata Rao

PROF. Galbraith's book *The Affluent Society* uses the term "new frontiers" to indicate the next phase of economic development to be led by America and the other affluent societies of the West. He describes the present economic situation as one of crisis brought about by an imbalance between private affluence and public "squalor". The future lies in a correction of this imbalance by a planned guidance of the economy.

His theory of social balance forms the key to the trail that he blazes for America to follow to save herself (and the world as well) in some measure.

"The city of Los Angeles is a near classic study" he says, "in the problems of social balance. Magnificently efficient factories and oil refineries, a lavish supply of automobiles, a vast consumption of handsomely packaged products, coupled with the absence of municipal trash collection service which forced the use of home incinerators, made the air nearly unbreathable for an appreciable part of each year.... The agony of a city without breathable air was the result."

Again — "The family that takes out its mauve and cerise, air-conditioned, power-steered and power braked automobile for a tour passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards and posts for wires that should long ago have been put underground...."

Is this, indeed, the American genius?"

The contrast is due to the fact that private enterprise produces the constituents of the American standard of life in abundance. They are individually produced for profit and individually purchased. And America has discovered the secret of high production with near full employment with her economy functioning at full gear using its resources, technology and manpower to the full.

After producing the necessities of the household and comforts forming part of the new way of life compact of frills, gadgets and luxuries, American economy is obliged to maintain full and effective demand for its competitive products. This it does by high power salesmanship and advertising. It has also entered into a phase of *want creation* so as to keep up demand and keep the economy going at full blast.

In all this, it is sustained by traditional economic attitudes forming the psychology and philosophy of individualism. It is a justification of free private enterprise and the free market economy to ensure with production and the best possible allocation of the factors of production among competing industries and entrepreneurs. The objective of maximum production was reinforced by the need for full or near full employment to engage the vast reservoirs of labour and other ranks of the population.

This became the *conventional wisdom* modified by

a certain amount of Government regulation of monopolies, currency and banking through central or reserve banks. It came to accept a certain amount of social security as a necessary sop to Cerberus to tide over difficult times. But liberalism and conservatism both are committed to the goal of maximum production through private enterprise. They hold to a rigid set of economic ideas and attitudes that resist any change in economic goals and policy, any better use of the affluence they have achieved other than that of maintenance of the machinery of production at full speed irrespective of the *content* or *pattern* or *composition* of the standard of life they insist upon.

Prof. Galbraith derives the imbalance that has resulted in the neglect of public services from the fact that they are no man's business concern. Social conscience has not developed sufficiently to persuade Americans in local and state spheres to tax themselves to provide the ancillary services to support the vast new levels of consumption without social disorder.

This sphere of social life is neglected. Cars multiply faster than roads and garages. They are sold by instalment purchase and new credits. Industry creates wants and provides credit for marketing them. To sell superfluous cars, companies introduce frills like fish tail fins or bird wings and all manner of new fancies. Food is so abundant that a national tendency to obesity has appeared on the scene. Food packages have developed marvellous fancy coloured containers.

Children are neglected. Schools and supervisors of games are insufficient. Provision for children's games and amusement in comic books, television sets, eatables of all kinds, motion pictures etc. has tempted private enterprise to produce all sorts of goods, which in the absence of supervision can only breed demoralisation and juvenile delinquency. The *mores* that encourage earning by all members of the family deprives the home of the mother's care and beneficial presence among her children. New production introduces new opportunities for fraud. The provision of police services are insufficient at the local level. For local finance does not keep pace with the demand for public services.

And the old economic conventions do not permit increased taxation.

There is no one responsible for providing these ancillary public services so necessary to balance private affluence. The entire gamut of social criticism urged by satirical writers and social reformers against the weaknesses of present American civilisation is endorsed by Professor Galbraith.

Americans made a resounding success in penetrating the old frontiers on the West, crossing mountains, negotiating rivers, clearing forests, taming prairies and covering the country from coast to coast with cities, farms, railroads, etc. absorbing millions of

immigrants every year. This is wonderful pioneer work. Today America needs all these qualities of inventiveness, capacity for hard work and for taking risks, braving unknown dangers, generosity, initiative and capacity for team work. But they need to be deployed on a more difficult and more intangible frontier—viz: the abolition of the poverty still existing in pockets and the introduction of a more robust pattern of social life and individual consumption, plainer living and higher thinking.

In a word, Professor Galbraith goes all out for a Planned Way of Living hereafter replacing the unplanned growth of former times that has produced the present power of their economic system to satisfy primary as also the higher wants that do not diminish by sharing and that enhance the quality of life. Tobacco, alcohol and a number of amusements and indulgences that do not strengthen the consumer in health and wellbeing as an after-effect should not figure so largely in mass consumption. Frills and credit-induced purchases and artificial needs created by powerful advertisement and marketed by high powered salesmanship cannot count as elements of solid economic well-being.

Professor Galbraith is aware that he is calling for a *transvaluation of values* in our social and moral outlook. Today there is a vacuum in our social philosophy. We do not know what to do with our capacity to produce affluence.

America needs a new policy and outlook not only to give a healthier turn to her internal progress but to help to sustain international order.

The critical part of the book is a sustained polemic on the conventional wisdom, as he calls it, of current individualist capitalist economy shaped in the main by Ricardo, Malthus and the Mills. He shows how they are outmoded and now function only as barriers to fresh developments. Yesterday's thought is cluttering today's progress.

He shows how the remedies for the defects of current economic life (unemployment, depression, poverty of the failures who were unable to stand the competition of life) fashionable in current statesmanship such as monetary policy, social security and even the Keynesian public spending to keep up effective aggregate demand are all palliatives and are not certain. The current ways to contain inflation are also ineffective.

He points out mordantly how the rise in the standard of living of the common man in the USA and the other affluent societies has muted the demand for equality. The Marxian cry of class war is not strident in America. The milder Fabianism with its gradualism has taken its place in Britain and Scandinavian States.

But equality is a moral demand that cannot be shored up against for all time.

Professor Galbraith's remedy is an acceptance of the need for correcting the present social imbalance between private wealth and public services.

He outlines a programme that he thinks will introduce a new stability in the economy and which,

(while not emphasising mere maximisation of production irrespective of its components) will not extinguish freedom of enterprise and the free market. They will continue in the fields in which they are successful i.e. in the production of things for individual consumption under conditions of their competition. Though imbued obviously with the central ethical message of socialism, Prof. Galbraith does not suggest the Marxian remedy of centralisation of economic power and activity. His Plan is social in character. Social economy is the proper term for the ideas he is dealing with, that is, the impact of economic activities on social health, social balance and the higher aspects of progress.

He quotes Alfred Marshall to the effect that economic activity should include ethical values among its aims.

He suggests all the same a great new extension of Public Leadership in guiding economic activity.

At the federal level, he suggests a Cyclical Graduated Compensation for unemployment rising to full salary scales when unemployment exceeds a certain mark decreasing to lower levels as it falls to smaller figures.

This will keep up consumer demand during the crisis and prevent depression from gathering steam.

Public spending and long term credit at low levels of interest to industry to finance lines of production taking time to mature will also promote industrial revival after a crisis.

He has no allergy to deficit finance. In fact, he makes fun of the rigid abhorrence of fiscal and currency "profligacy", as the conventional wisdom calls it. He is not averse to high taxation all round to correct the imbalance between private and public services.

Sales taxes extended on a larger scale levied by local bodies should provide better health services, police, schools, hospitals, higher amenities like music, public galleries, drama etc.

A large permanent demand will be created in these lines for the supply of school buildings and their components, hospitals and their surgical equipment, and medicines and so on. Private demand will receive a vast new accession in many lines. So even the level of production may be favourably affected. But demand will shift to some extent to more socially useful and physically and mentally bracing lines from mere frills like fancy car tails and debilitating goods like narcotics, tobacco and the host of artificially created goods that do not leave the consumer better or stronger or healthier than before.

We will be biologically nearer life-strengthening forms of consumption than under the present unplanned craze for mere maximum production, more out of a nervous apprehension of unemployment and the social disorder that it entails.

Professor Galbraith suggests public expenditure for dealing with ease poverty brought about by individual failure and the insular poverty in certain pockets (urban and rural) not as a matter of occasional grants but as a *permanent policy*. The organisation of better schools and social facilities to the children in the

(Continued on page 10)

Some Reiterations In Democracy

by S. R. Mohan Das

THE recent visit and lectures in Bombay by Lord Morrison—"that errand boy who rose to become the Deputy Prime Minister of U.K."—serve to reiterate some thoughts, old and new, on problems and prospects of democracy in India. Lord Morrison was impressive, not in semantic profundities on democracy as it functioned in the U.K., but by his simple description of the attitudes and perspectives that have evolved over the centuries to give democracy in U.K. its rich content and tradition.

Tracing out the expansion of rights and privileges from the exclusive preserves of the monarchy more and more to the outer periphery of the feudal lords and then further on to the commoner over the centuries, Lord Morrison's enunciation imparted some interesting lessons. His detailed analysis of such questions as the evolution of the, constitutional monarchy, extent and nature of parliamentary control over state and public enterprises, the functioning of the party system and the other institutions like trade unions, co-operatives, business and industrial organisations ought to greatly enrich Indian students in formulating their concepts about democracy. In this article, it is proposed to reiterate some conceptual clarifications on democracy.

The experiences of successful democracies as in U.K., Sweden, Switzerland, U.S.A., Canada and other countries reveal one significant fact. Their success is more striking and pronounced in direct proportion to their non-doctrinaire perspectives. Democratic attitudes which derive from burning *a priori* idealism necessarily contain seeds of frustration and disintegration because these attitudes are not borne of traditions and pragmatic experiences evolved over long periods. They are essentially synthetic and abstract. The trends of democracy in France, derived from passionate idealism of the French Revolution, clearly indicate the interesting contrast with the British. This basic characteristic of democracy, viz. doctrinaire versus non-doctrinaire orientation, makes a considerable amount of difference in content, depth and future prospects of democracy.

Indian attitudes on democracy can usefully be analysed on the above background of comparison and contrasts.

Indian traditional approach to democracy is based on idealism as passionate and burning as the incentives derived from the French Revolution. There have not been much of evolving traditions of democracy in India. With all our attempts to glorify the Indian Panchayats as representing our rich democratic heritage, there is a hollowness in this claim which even the champions of this claim discern easily. Panchayats were functional organisations of the villages in the old days and if they had been allowed to thrive during the years they might have paved the way for strong

institutions as in U. K. to become sure foundations of Indian democracy. But this was not so. In the absence of such a development the present incentives for democracy in India had to be obtained from contemporary doctrinaire sources. With this doctrinaire and *a priori* idealistic visions of democracy, citing of the Indian panchayats as a proof of Indian democratic tradition amounts to the devil quoting the scripture.

Contemporary Indian attitudes on democracy place heavy emphasis on the collectivistic abstract ideals, the impersonal and the National, on revolutionary and radical precepts rather than on the less dramatic and dogmatic evolutionary trial and error methods of learning through experience. The revolution of rising expectations is actually the generation of exaggerated promises for demagogic purposes to obtain mass mobilisation to provide political motive power. When such mobilisation of the people is found impossible for constructive purpose under a free society, the logic for greater regimentation and total power becomes inevitable in the doctrinaire scheme of things. Material progress is the urgency even while the affluent societies are berated and depicted as becoming mentally depraved, vulgar, and spiritually sick.

The *a priori* ideals and doctrines, which represent neat theoretical solutions get jolted by the enormous complexities of the human factor. But having become entrenched in the ideals and doctrines with a vested interest, the doctrines will not be changed but the "masses" must be changed. The doctrinaire approach to democracy has resulted in the growth of "organisation" consciousness as distinct from the "institution" consciousness. Organisations and movements in terms of mass content and their utility as motive power alone are considered relevant. Organisations have to transcend into Institutions with richness of tradition and values if democracy has to have a sound base. The mere parliamentary form does not give content to democracy. Thus concepts of democracy in India are purely idealistic. There are, of course, variations among the idealists, but essentially they all are of one tribe. Village panchayats are paid homage not for their functional role, but as a part of Gandhian idealism which finds industrialisation and urbanisation evil.

Pandit Nehru was quoted as having said to U. S. columnist years ago "There is a difference between the Indian and Western mind. The Indian would not ask what he should *do*, but what he should *be*." This may or may not be true of an Indian, but it certainly reflects what an idealist like Mr. Nehru would ask. In this comment lies the interesting secret of prevailing attitudes to democracy in India in certain quarters. "It is not a question of what to *do*, but what to *be*," represents the passion and fervour which give

the power for drive and intense movement, but devoid of consciousness as to what to *do*, the movement often leads to a blind alley in terms of democratic values and aspirations.

On economic questions, Lord Morrison, as a stalwart of the British Labour Party which pioneered the nationalisation of steel in U.K., gave a clear exposition of the purely pragmatic approach which motivated the nationalisation programme. While ensuring the healthy aspects of production and productive efficiency, the nationalisation measure only brought about ownership changes without functional changes. Here again the emphasis was not on implementing an ideal or a doctrine just for the sake of a dogma, but on ensuring the common good. The most important part of the Labour Party's programme was the fact that every genuine and healthy vested interest was given due recognition and some were not trampled upon to serve others, in line with a doctrine.

With regard to the civil services, Lord Morrison pointed out the stages by which the present first class civil service in U.K. came about. There was nepotism and favouritism in U.K. as much as it may be existing in India, but the remedy was thought out in terms which did not call for anyone's body or gore! Fallibility was accepted as a problem to be handled and not as a weapon for vendetta demanding the rolling of heads.

(PANCHAYATI RAJ—Continued from page 6)

the village, because it is endowed with a political entity and definite collective powers and privileges) and going up to the Lok Sabha, and because the powers and functions and duties and resources of each tier are clearly defined, power cannot but be dispersed in this system. Further, because the higher tiers are constituted of the representatives of the bodies at the lower tiers, power is much more likely to be exercised from below upwards, rather than from the top downwards. For the same reason the representatives at the higher level are under the constant gaze of the bodies—they are organised, statutory bodies and not a mere collection of amorphous individuals, let it be remembered—at the lower levels, and thus subject to the control of the latter.

This little elaboration will serve to make clear the vital differences between the two types of democracy. Now if Panchayati Raj stops at the district level and above that, shall we say, Party Raj rules supreme, the people are bound to feel cheated. They will interpret this illogical situation to mean reluctance on the part of the politicians really to give up power. It would seem to them — and they would be right — that real power still remained locked up in Delhi and the State capitals and that what had been given to them was not the real stuff. This kind of disillusionment might produce disastrous results.

Therefore, Panchayati Raj must not be terminated at the district level but extended forward up to New Delhi. Although this cannot be done immediately, this should be declared to be our goal.

—Part of a paper prepared for the Seminar on "South and South-East Asia has Second Look at Democracy"

In vendettas only heads roll and fallibility continues but "under the table."

The British traditions of democracy in terms of behaviour amounted to, in simple terms, the conversion of primitive passions into more civilised form of conflict where everyone gains in some parts. Crusading has ceased to be the fashion excepting as nostalgic reminiscences of a historical epoch. British traditions of democracy obviously reject the idealistic theory popular in our midst that all conflicts must be removed and beatific harmony achieved. Conflicts could never be avoided, but could be made to manifest under conditions of fairness to all the combatants in the conflict, simply because human beings have the faculty of reasoning and culture.

In the idealistic nostalgia for removing all conflicts and bringing about harmony, the Marxists and utopians are very close.

Lord Morrison contributed much more than he could have imagined by his lectures which represent a reiteration of some simple commonsense formulations and commonsense approach to the great problems of human rights, privileges and welfare. Essentially it was a lesson in "what to *do* — if you want to *be*", an approach under which the slum-dwellers of London with their dry humour would greet their monarch with banners: "Lousy but loyal".

Indian people are not made of different material and if only the idealists would not thrust on the Indians characteristics fabricated inside the idealists' brains, there could be better prospects for democracy in India!

(PROF. GALBRAITH—Continued from page 8)

poverty-stricken areas will eliminate poverty in the next generation.

Further, private enterprise has not provided sufficient funds for scientific research. It is more interested in inventions and patents immediately productive of profit. Professor Galbraith suggests a large new line of public expenditure for research for knowledge for its own sake. Colossal production by itself does not provide security. Security depends on the amounts actually deployed for military and other research.

This is *not* socialism, for private enterprise will remain to provide for individual consumption. The State need not enter private production unnecessarily. But it should offer economic opportunities for the supply of public services such as education, public health, preventive medicine, research, higher amenities in the arts and encouragement of instructive travel etc. This is a *mixed economy* but far different from that of semi-socialism such as we have in Britain and India. Private and public provision will cooperate to guide the economy, social balance and growth in the whole range of culture. But each will serve in its own field for which it is specially qualified. But conventional wisdom inherited from classical economics is in the way. It opposes further taxation for such purposes. Its ideas must therefore be examined and shown how outdated they are for an affluent society.

Review

Britain In India

R. P. Masani, Oxford University Press, pp. 278, Rs. 15

THIS is a story of Great Britain's relations with India extending over a period of three hundred and fifty years. Englishmen came to India as traders. Out of their trade they acquired in the course of a century and a half an empire by taking advantage of internal quarrels and the disintegration of the Indian society and by utilising all possible fair and foul means for extending their hold. The new industrial civilisation which they brought to India and a number of social and political measures which they took enabled the British rulers to hold together the empire for another hundred and fifty years. But in the end a people's movement for liberation generated by economic forces and by a wide acquaintance with British political institutions and ideas faced them and they had the wisdom to quit. The end of British rule came through a peaceful transfer of power, an event unique in the history of the world. Mr. Masani has in his book highlighted many of the outstanding events in this long historical process and given an account of what Great Britain did in India during the course of those three hundred and fifty years.

Opinions are bound to differ regarding the effects and consequences of British rule. There was a school of thought consisting of liberal politicians, influential in the early years of the national movement, which regarded the establishment of English rule as an act of divine dispensation. At the other end is the school of thought which regarded it as an unmitigated evil and the source of all the misery, the poverty and the degradation of the country. While the first school of thought did not pay much attention to the economic consequences of the British rule, the other failed to take notice of its modernising influence and of the stagnation and decay which had overwhelmed Indian society in the centuries and decades preceding its advent. During the days of the British rule it was not possible to discuss this question in an objective and dispassionate manner. Now that the obstacle is no longer there, one can undertake a serious study of that unique event. To that study the facts collected together and lucidly narrated by Mr. Masani will make a useful contribution. The contribution would have been far more valuable if, while dealing with political aspects, Mr. Masani had also paid some attention to the economic aspects of the relationship.

Mr. Masani has a particular competence to write the book. "For sixty-five years he has been an eye-witness of many stirring incidents in the country's history... During the two decades preceding the declaration of independence and the country's partition he had the privilege of interpreting the best mind in the Indian National Congress to successive representatives of the

British Crown and of striving to make rough places smooth". Having drunk deep at the fountain of English history and literature, he is in a position to appreciate the better side of the British rule. Having grown in the company of many of the older leaders of the national movement he is well conversant with its aims and objectives. This happy blend has enabled Mr. Masani to avoid prejudices and give a fair account of the actions and policies of British rulers during the two centuries of their imperial rule.

V.B.K.

Germany Today

A. K. Mukerji and Ram Singh, Siddharth Publications, Delhi, pp. 104, Rs. 2.50.

WEST GERMANY is in the news both because of her phenomenal economic progress and the explosive character of the international dispute revolving around her. This book consisting of the articles written by two eminent journalists, Mr. A. K. Mukerji and Mr. Ram Singh, both Editors of the weekly journal *Thought*, after their short visit to the country, gives glimpses of the astounding progress made by her and calls attention to the issues involved in the dispute over Berlin and the unification of Germany.

Mr. Mukerji has drawn bright and illuminating pen pictures of many of the places visited by him and of the persons he met. They show how a new Germany has grown out of the ruins of the war and how that new Germany resents the division of the country imposed upon her and how she is pining for reunion and her acceptance as an equal member of the international community of nations. The new Germany is economically strong, and buoyant in spirit, and her face is turned, Mr. Mukerji assures us, towards peace and reconciliation and not towards war and revenge.

Mr. Ram Singh's contributions are a discussion of the problem that Germany has posed before the world. How long can a highly efficient, disciplined and proud people be denied the right of self-determination and kept divided against their will? Mr. Ram Singh's conclusion is: "Germany divided betokens disaster to Europe, Germany unreconciled is world peace bedevilled."

It is flattering to know from the two writers of Germany's anxiety to secure India's support. One is then painfully reminded of the ambiguous and unsatisfactory attitude that our country has adopted in the name of neutrality. It is open to us to suggest any safeguards that we may think necessary to allay the fears of Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other neighbours. But it is not open to us just to sit silent and acquiesce in what Russia is doing to perpetuate the division of Germany. It is to be hoped that the insight into the German problem that the two eminent journalists have provided through this book will help to educate public opinion on the issue.

V.B.K.

With Many Voices

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

"The deep
my friends,
—Tennyson.

Panchsheel is indeed already rescuing the world. It has brought the U.S. and the Soviet Union closer. President Kennedy and Prime Minister Khrushchev are talking the language of peace because of Panchsheel.

—Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, Kashmir Premier,
Hindustan Times, February 12.

Sooner rather than later, China will persuade herself to come to a satisfactory agreement with our country in regard to our common frontiers.

—From President's Address to the budget session of Parliament, *Times of India*, February 15.

If our Government could really believe this they should be capable of believing anything.

—*Hindustan Times*, February 15.

I feel that although the country has won freedom, we are increasingly losing individual liberty. It appears there will be very little of commerce, business, agriculture and industry left in this country outside Government services. In a country which greatly valued freedom of the individual, people are getting more and more dependent on the Government. It appears as if the country will be one of Government's servants only.

—Shri Prakash, Governor of Maharashtra State,
Swarajya, February 12.

It seems obvious that if Mr. Khrushchev goes to New York or the United Nations General Assembly next month his right hand will not be stretched out to grasp Mr. Kennedy's. It will be holding a shoe.

—Eric Stenton, *Times of India*, February 12.

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service,
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.

I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3/

Name:

Address:

Signature

Speaking to newsmen about the mission to New York undertaken on behalf of the Afro-Asian Council, Mr. Purshottam Trikamdas said that Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, the leader of the Indian delegation, did not support his suggestion that the delegation should stress the fact that Tibet had been reduced to the status of a colonial possession when the four-power draft resolution on Tibet came up for discussion. Mr. Menon's reply, according to Mr. Trikamdas, was that it was a matter of opinion.

—*Times of India*, January 24.

Mr. Nehru, who leads the nation today, is not convincing in the lip-service he pays to democracy. His concept of democracy seems to be limited by the desire not to offend the Russians.

"Dim", *Current*, February 22.

We rejoice to hear the Soviet denounce political assassination with such vehemence. We condemn any death without due process of law, whether of African politicians, Hungarian patriots, or Tibetan nationalists.

—Adlai Stevenson in the U.N. Security Council, *Time*, February 24.

The Congress leaders say that the present generation is being sacrificed for the future, but the future is already mortgaged.

—Acharya Kripalani, M.P., *Current*,
February 22.

INDIAN TRADE UNIONS A SURVEY

by V. B. Karnik

A survey of the trade union movement in India during the last forty years. It gives a graphic account of the various stages through which the movement passed. This is a book which all trade union workers should read.

pp 276+viii, demy 8 vo.

Price Rs 15.

PUBLISHERS

LABOUR EDUCATION SERVICE
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.