

the rates fixed under the money-lenders' acts or, again, of *pugree* on fiats. Where the payee wants to avoid taxes, the payer has to use black money—the black element in ownership flat prices is used to evade both the promoters' tax and the capital gains tax of the landlord. Surely, so long as black money has so many uses and honesty only the doubtful reward of moral salvation—which also can be bought by feeding Brahmins and building temples—the scales will remain unevenly balanced?

But TTK's abortive experiment has at least proved that bureaucratic gimmicks cannot make up for bureaucratic inefficiency, and that the failure of tax administration cannot be covered up by voluntary self-enforcement. The recent measures to tighten administration would need to be carried much further for the tax administration to earn the respect of tax-payers.

Racial Conflict in Mauritius

INSTABILITY and anguish have been, during the last few years the lot of thousands of people of Indian origin settled all over the globe. Mauritius is the latest in the series of trouble spots where Indian settlers either as a politically dominant majority or as an economically entrenched minority have become the object of antagonism of other communities. Even though racial strife has erupted in Mauritius after disturbances or evictions involving Indian settlers in Ceylon, Burma, Kenya, Zanzibar and British Guiana, the troubles in Mauritius have caused surprise. Before last week's clashes, which began on May 10, Mauritius was a serene island of tranquility on the fringe of the seething African continent.

Since the last general elections on October 21, 1963, Mauritius has been ruled by an all-party semi-autonomous government headed by Dr S Ramgoolam who is Chief Minister as well as leader of the predominantly Indian backed Labour Party. It is the largest political party in Mauritius and holds 19 of the 40 elected seats in a 55-member Legislative Council. The other major partner in the Government is the Parti Mauricien composed of Creoles and Negroes. The two parties are not merely racially antagonistic. Racial antipathies are accentuated by the economic roles of these communities on the island. Indians who constitute 67 per cent of the total population of 730,000 are largely labourers, small peasant proprietors and petty

shop-keepers' The Creoles who are of French or mixed French and Negro origin own the big sugar plantations, sugar mills and rum distilleries. Sugar, molasses and rum provide 94 per cent of the exports of the island and most of this trade is in the hands of the Creoles. The Negroes are not economically powerful but have been traditionally linked with the Creoles.

Last April, Anthony Greenwood, the British Colonial Secretary, visited the island to arrange for a constitutional conference to be held in September 1965 in London. The Labour Party demanded complete internal self-government leaving only defence and external affairs in British hands. The Parti Mauricien fearing Indian domination and a possible nationalisation of the sugar industry by the Labour Party is quite happy with the *status quo* but as an alternative, half-heartedly wants to be integrated as an overseas department of France as is the position of the neighbouring island of Reunion. Anthony Greenwood's visit instead of reconciling these conflicting interests only helped to crystallise them. The result was recent riots. Some 150 troops of the 2nd Battalion of the Coldstream Guards have been flown in from Aden and on May 14 a state of emergency was declared by John Rennie, the British Governor of the island. Temporary calm has been restored.

A permanent settlement can only be brought about by compromise, moderation and patience on the part of the two chief political parties. The Indian settlers must get rid of their social insularity which has been the cause of the almost complete lack of communication between Indian and other races on the island. The Creoles cannot continue to dominate the island's economy and should be made to realise that any concessions on their part will only be in their own long-term interest as well as that of all the others on the island.

Vietnam Policy Under Fire

A Correspondent writes :

PRESIDENT Johnson's policy of "escalating" the war in Vietnam by directly bombing North Vietnam has come under increasingly intense attack in the United States. Indeed, the criticism aimed at the Administration in Washington by professors, commentators, the student movement, and other groups, has been surprising to most observers in the United States. This criticism has been so volatile,

that several Administration spokesmen, including McGeorge Bundy, the President's special assistant and one of the architects of the present Vietnam-policy, have been openly debating with leading critics of present policies.

On May 15, a nation-wide series of teach-ins took place, involving more than 100,000 students and professors at colleges in all parts of the United States. A televised debate between Bundy and Professor Kahin of Cornell University was followed by thousands of local debates and discussions. At the larger universities, the programme started early in the morning and lasted all day. The government, which has tried in the past to stifle public debate on the Vietnam issue, was forced by public opinion to participate in the debates and to defend its position. It seems likely that a majority of the participants in the day-long programmes were critical of the government's policies, though public opinion polls still show that a majority of the general public support the President.

The teach-in is probably the largest manifestation of a series of protests which have taken place in the United States during the past month over the Vietnam situation. The student demonstration in Washington which brought 20,000 students to the nation's capital to protest the government's policy was one of the largest rallies concerned with foreign policy in recent years. Other, more radical, protests have also taken place. Several thousand young people have signed statements refusing to serve in the armed forces fighting in Vietnam. Others have been arrested for "sitting-in" in the State Department and other government offices. Rallies have become an everyday part of college life, and other segments of the population have also become involved. The peace movement has actively been working on religious groups, labour unions, and other organisations to arouse opinion on the Vietnam issue.

One of the crucial differences between the protests which are currently taking place and the usual dissent from governmental policy is the scope of the critics. A number of respected, and usually pro-government intellectuals such as Walter Lippman and Hans Morganthau have been quite critical of government policy in Vietnam, and more recently in the Dominican Republic. University professors usually silent on public issues have openly criticised the government on this issue. A number of highly influential jour-

nals and newspapers, such as the *New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and others have been critical, in marked contrast to their usual support for governmental policy. The liberal and left press has been particularly vociferous on this issue, and magazines like the *New Republic*, *Commentary*, and the *Nation* are quite outspoken.

Administration officials are also very much aware of the unpopularity of American Vietnam policy outside the United States. The demonstrations which have taken place in Japan, Britain, and other nations have made an impression. But perhaps more important are the indications of disapproval from the usually pro-American leaders of some of the Western and neutral nations. France's attitude toward the Vietnam problem has been particularly disliked in American governmental circles, and Lodge's tour through Asia was somewhat disappointing for the Americans, according to some observers. The recent crisis in the Dominican Republic has added further criticism, this time mainly from the Latin Americans, to the growing tide against US policy.

In all, President Johnson's policies in Vietnam are among the most unpopular foreign policy decisions in the past several decades in the United States. Certainly, there is more and louder criticism of his policy than on any other issue in memory. Most politically aware Americans, however, do not have a simplistic view of the Vietnam situation. It is generally realised that merely "abandoning Vietnam to the Chinese" is not a constructive solution to the problem, since the people would have no better chance to pick their own government than under present circumstances. Although there is a section of opinion in the United States which feels that the Vietcong constitutes a constructive force in Vietnam, many are "convinced" that the Vietcong is almost as undemocratic as the present Saigon government; even they recognize, however, that it has substantial popular support.

The whole situation is a dilemma for the United States. Because of an accumulation of foreign policy errors since 1954, there seems to be little that the U S can do to save the situation in Vietnam. This recognition has led to the widespread demand for an American withdrawal in that nation. This "realpolitical" viewpoint, based on the reality of the present situation, is coupled with a strong moral revulsion for the bombings and use of gas by Americans.

Thus far, the Administration has taken note of the widespread criticism, though no move has been made to modify American policy. It is, of course, the test of a democracy if popular opinion can succeed in bringing about a change in the attitude of the government. As of this writing, it does not seem that the government is changing its stance, though there is hope that with increased pressure from informed sections of public opinion in the United States combined with the deterioration of the situation in the war in Vietnam itself can force a modification in the American government's position.

LETTER TO EDITOR

Government and the Services

I AM considerably disappointed by reading Romesh Thapar's version of why India did not hit back in Kntch (May 15, 1965). While the information supplied by Thapar, if it is true, is interesting (although there is hardly anything new in the political capitulation before the bureaucracy, civil or military), his conclusions are hardly logical deductions from the pieces of information, or even reasonable. While sharing much of Thapar's concern for the future of the country I cannot but feel that he often allows himself to be influenced too much by certain elements. That impression grew irresistible after reading his despatch on the reasons for the military debacle in NEFA, as it has grown now after reading his present despatch.

Granting that the military bureaucrats were not behaving properly (wonder how, after all the pampering, anybody can expect the bureaucracy to behave properly), was this in itself not a political failure of the greatest magnitude? The politicians who fail to contain the bureaucracy are clearly unfit to be in positions of ministerial responsibility. No amount of political sympathy or agreement can be an adequate compensation for the loss that the nation would suffer from the support to a regime which seems to be particularly inept in maintaining discipline in service.

There is yet another danger. In a parliamentary democracy the minister is responsible for the services. With the exception of India perhaps in no other country are the services (civil and military) exposed by the political wing to so much public disapprobation. The tone was set by the late Prime Minister

and is still continuing. This tends to breed a sense of irresponsibility and recklessness (and in some cases great capacity for mischief) among the members of the services. The great majority who are honest are exasperated by this public denunciation to which they have no means of replying and gradually become indifferent to standards and propriety. There is no particular reason to suppose that the services in general (with the exception of a handful) have got any different political orientation than that of the present ruling party. If even then the political wing is unable to exercise the necessary influence over the services it only would indicate great political weakness which cannot be explained away by any denunciation of the services. After all the political wing has got unlimited powers to regulate and control the services. If they do not exercise these that is not the fault of any one else. The easiest way to create the proper impression is to punish the guilty and promote the meritorious.

SUBHASH CHANDRA SARKER

Bombay

May 17.

THE TATA IRON AND STEEL COMPANY LIMITED NOTICE

Notice is hereby given under Section 154 of the Companies Act 1956, that the Register of Members of the Company will be closed from Friday, the 9th July 1965 to Friday, the 30th July 1965, both days inclusive.

The Transfer Books of the Company will also remain closed for the aforesaid period.

Notice is also hereby given that the dividends for the year ended 31st March 1965, when sanctioned, will be made payable to those shareholders whose names stand on the Register of Members of the Company on Friday, the 30th July 1965.

Dated at Bombay this 26th day of May 1965.

By Order of the Board of
Directors,

For and on behalf of
The Tata Iron and Steel
Company Limited,
Tata Industries Private
Limited,

Managing Agents,
By their Constituted Attorney,
N K Desai

REGISTERED OFFICE :

Bombay House,
24, Bruce Street,
Fort, Bombay 1.