

## A Leap In The Dark

by V. B. Karnik

**T**HE strike of the employees of the Central Government was, no doubt, an unprecedented event. A strike of such magnitude and sweep had never before taken place. Railway workers and postal employees had organised some strikes. But they were separate and independent struggles. Never before had they come together and organised a joint struggle. And they were not alone in organising the strike. They were joined amongst others by defence workers, by workers of the civil aviation and other departments and by the clerical and other employees of administrative offices. Never before had such a combination of the employees of the Central Government come into existence and never before had a call gone forth for such a countrywide and all-embracing strike.

The strike began, as scheduled, at the stroke of twelve on the night of 11th July. Employees of the Posts and Telegraphs Department who were on duty at that hour quietly handed over their charge and walked out of their offices in a disciplined manner. It was expected that drivers and guards of trains and signallers and cabinmen and station masters would do the same and bring to a halt the working of the railway system. That did not happen and it proved the doom of the strike. For the rest of the workers the strike began in the morning of 12th July. In the administrative offices the response was on the whole satisfactory. In some offices not a soul turned up. The railway workshops remained closed and a large percentage of other railway workers also did not turn up for duty. In the defence establishments also there was a fair response. But the local and through trains on the Western and Central Railways kept running, no doubt with some difficulty and many interruptions. But the fact that they were running led to a certain amount of demoralisation in the ranks of workers.

Such a wide response to the strike was available on the first day only in a few places like Bombay, Calcutta, Lucknow and Ahmedabad. Later, when the news spread, railway and other workers in many places responded and brought about a more or less partial stoppage of work. But such places were not too many and the strike never succeeded in its objective of bringing about a countrywide paralysis of the activities of the Central Government. Large parts of the country were not at all affected by the strike and

the few places that were affected did not remain tied up too long.

It was not in the nature of such a strike to drag on indefinitely. It could continue at the most for three or four days. It had to come to a decisive conclusion one way or the other in the matter of a day or two. It was clear by the afternoon of the second day that it had failed, because it had not received the simultaneous response all over the country that was essential for its success. It spread to a few new centres in the next two days, but by that time the centres where it began on the first day had begun to waver. The trek back to work in those places began on the third day. It turned into a flood on the fourth and the fifth day. Some of the unions which were in the forefront of the struggle began to waver and some of them ended the strike as far as they were concerned by advising their members to resume work. The leaders of the strike who happened to be free were wise enough to read this writing on the wall and on the night of the 16th they issued the call for unconditional resumption of work. Having already decided the matter for themselves, the workers gladly accepted the call and the strike came to an immediate end.

The Government had made ample preparations for preventing the spread of the strike and for maintaining essential services during the period. They had armed themselves with extraordinary powers through the promulgation of the Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance. The strike was declared illegal and support to or participation in it were made penal offences involving penalties ranging from six months' to a year's rigorous imprisonment. Orders were issued banning meetings and processions. During the five days of the strike, hundreds were arrested at various places under the Ordinance or for violation of prohibitory orders. According to government figures the total number of persons arrested all over the country is well over fifteen thousand. The Preventive Detention Act was also pressed into service. In Bombay alone over thirty well-known trade union leaders, including the three leaders of the Standing Committee of the Joint Council of Action, were arrested on the eve of the strike. Similar arrests took place in several other places. There were as usual lathi charges in many places — and also some firings. The firing in Dohad, where there was a complete strike in the railway workshop, resulted in the death of five workers and injuries to several others. The whole machinery of the Government was mobilised for defeating the strike which was treated not as a trade dispute but as a challenge to the authority of the Government.

In view of this attitude of the Government, which became clear as soon as the threat of the strike became real, there could have been no doubt about the result of the strike. It was bound to end in a failure. The surprising thing is not the disastrous end of the strike, but the fact that thousands upon thousands of workers participated in it knowing full well the heavy cost that they would have to pay. They knew full well that participation in the strike would result in dismissal from service and forfeiture of provident fund and many other benefits. Many of them had long years of service to their credit. Some of them were drawing high salaries and did not belong to the category of poor, starving workers. And yet they all responded to the call of their respective unions and jumped into the struggle. It was a brave and courageous struggle that they waged. But it was like the famous Charge of the Light Brigade in the Crimean War. Lord Tennyson has immortalised that epic incident:

"Forward, the Light Brigade!  
Charge for the guns!" he said:  
Into the valley of Death  
Rode the six hundred.

'Forward, the Light Brigade!  
Was there a man dismay'd?  
Not tho' the soldier knew  
Some one had blunder'd;  
Their's not to make reply,  
Their's not to reason why,  
Their's but to do and die:  
Into the valley of Death  
Rode the six hundred.

Boldly they rode and well,  
Into the jaws of Death,  
Into the mouth of Hell  
Rode the six hundred."

The description may well apply to the employees of the Central Government who joined the strike. They may not have "rode into the valley of Death", but they did ride into the valley of unemployment and misery at the command of their leaders. Thousands of notices of termination of service and suspensions that have been served on the striking employees bear testimony to that fact.

### FREEDOM FIRST

*Published on the first of each month*

**Annual Subscription: Rs. 3**

*Single Copy: 25 nP*

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

History, it appears, has not been able to fix the responsibility for the command which resulted in the slaughter of "the noble six hundred." In the case of this strike, there is no difficulty in fixing the responsibility and it must be fixed in the interest of truth as well as the healthy development of the trade union movement. The responsibility for the command to begin the strike must be squarely placed on the shoulders of the three top leaders of the P.S.P., Mr. S. M. Joshi, Mr. Nath Pai and Mr. Peter Alvares. They were the spokesmen of the Joint Council of Action and they had the decisive voice in all negotiations that preceded the outbreak of the strike. It may not be fair to say it, but it appears that they had set their heart upon the strike and were keen on establishing their reputation as leaders who would not compromise but fight till the bitter end. Unless some such assumption is made, it is difficult to understand and appreciate their rejection of the three-clause proposal by which the Government inter alia accepted the principle of linking wages with prices and guaranteed fifty percent neutralisation with the agreement to refer the dispute, if any, regarding the balance to adjudication or similar machinery. This could have been under the circumstances a reasonable compromise which would have satisfied the workers. The strike could have been then avoided and workers spared the immense hardships that it was bound to entail. Compromise is the very essence of a trade union struggle. But Mr. Joshi and his colleagues converted it into a fight for principles. In a fight for principles there is no scope for a compromise. The three leaders were also afraid of the adverse reactions of a compromise on the workers and on the reputation of their party. They thought that any compromise which did not ensure immediate increase in emoluments would be rejected by the workers. In that respect they were the victims of their own propaganda. It was they that had put the employees in that frame of mind. But a wise and courageous leadership knows how to reason with workers and persuade them to accept a desirable course of action which may not be at the moment to their liking. It is easy to be a leader who would always follow his followers. The three leaders followed that easy course and contented themselves with swimming with the current.

Now that the strike is over, it can be stated frankly and unequivocally that it was a most ill-advised and ill-prepared strike. It was ill-advised because its failure was writ large on the face of it and it is only a blind person who could have failed to read it. If it succeeded in becoming sufficiently widespread and in continuing for a sufficiently long period, it would have resulted in incalculable harm to the nation's economy and workers, including government employees, would have been the worst sufferers. If it failed, it would give a severe set-back not only to the organisations of the employees of the Central Government but also to the trade union movement as a whole.

(Continued on Page 11)



# Reflections On The Third Five Year Plan

by C. L. Gheevala

**T**HE draft outline of the Third Five Year Plan presented by the Planning Commission to serve as a basis for public discussion has a crucial significance not only in carrying forward the economic progress achieved in the Second Plan but also in maintaining the democratic values and set-up of the constitution under which the economy is to function. The objectives, strategy and priorities and the magnitude of the national effort that can be mobilised, represented in the outline as the approach to the Third Five Year Plan, should be judged on the above basic criterion. India has ventured on the great experiment of planned development, not by any means but through a spontaneous and voluntary acceptance of the practice of democratic socialism, consistent with her tradition and growth.

The low levels of productivity, income and living, the high demographic pressure on agriculture accelerated by a rapid rate of growth in population, the existence of large-scale unemployment and disguised unemployment in the rural sector, the extreme dependence for capital equipment and technical know-how on foreign countries and the desperately low rate of economic growth that is feasible under these conditions — all these factors emphasise the need for a bold and ambitious plan in the long term perspective. If the nation has to lift itself by its boot straps from the state of present poverty and usher a period of dynamic and self-accelerating growth, there should no doubt be continuous planning with sustained effort for a long period of 25 to 30 years. The people should be prepared for sacrifices to this end. The draft outline rightly stresses this perspective.

While keeping in view this larger perspective, it is at the same time vitally necessary to have a framework of the plan that would be realistic, based on an objective appraisal of the prevailing economic trends and the lessons thrown out and the problems posed in the working of the second plan, both in the economic change envisaged and in the pattern of social advance conceived. The objectives of the Third Five Year Plan are: (1) to secure an annual increase of more than 5% in national income, (2) to achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains, (3) to expand basic industries, (4) to utilise to the fullest extent the manpower resources in the country and (5) to bring about an even distribution of income and wealth. Obviously, these objectives should be clearly reflected in the framework, in the scheme of investment and financing of the plan as well as in the technique and priorities.

The outline provides for a total investment of Rs. 10,200 crores, Rs. 6200 crores in the public sector, with an outlay of Rs. 7250 crores, and Rs. 4000 crores in the private sector. The outlay would thus total Rs. 11,250 crores. The capacity of the economy to

manage the resources of the order would alone determine the feasibility of this size of investment and measure the strain, stress and sacrifices involved. The real advance that could be made, in fulfilling the targets of increase in national income would be conditioned by the effort which the society can put forth without an excessive strain, to meet the requirements under internal resources adequate to match the order of external resources estimated as necessary for the overall investment. A firm assurance of arrangements to mobilise external resources of the magnitude assumed is also a pre-condition to the success of the plan.

The draft outline is singularly vague and uncertain in regard to the achievement of resources under the various heads. The provision for additional taxation of Rs. 1650 crores, having assumed the budgetary receipts corresponding to external assistance, at Rs. 2200 crores, has possibly failed to take note of the impact of the measures of additional taxation, direct and indirect, imposed in the Second Plan. This apart, the position in regard to the general pool of savings has not been fully appraised, to be sure of success in mobilising this quantum of resources by taxation. It is a moot point to consider whether the economy could contribute Rs. 1650 crores by way of yields under additional taxation. The performance of the States does not reassure that they could succeed in mobilising the share in additional taxation of one third, assigned to them. The achievement of the additional taxation target is considered vital to the successful implementation of the plan. Therefore, if this target is not achieved, as it is quite probable, then the lower limit fixed for deficit financing of Rs. 550 crores will have to be relaxed. Because only taxation and deficit financing are within the fiscal management of the Government and a choice will have to be made between them, having committed for an outlay. In the mobilisation of domestic resources the position thus reveals an unsteady basis and an imbalance as in the Second Plan. The criteria for a price policy for the public sector enterprises to yield adequate surpluses are not also clearly laid down, though the outline relies heavily on formulating such a policy.

The requirements of foreign exchange in the third five year plan period are estimated at Rs. 2600 crores. Including the commitments under P. L. 480 account estimated at Rs. 600 crores, the total balance of payments deficit would be Rs. 3200 crores. The prospects of securing external resources of this order are not yet assured and the plan will have to be flexible and the commitment in regard to the foreign exchange expenditure will have to be made only on the basis of external resources that are clearly in sight. This is to expose the economy to great risk by indicating an order of priorities or demands on outlay implying a

high foreign exchange component and without being sure of the supply of these external resources. This flexibility in the plan is not warranted when at the end of the second plan, we have to project in clear terms an advance in national income and physical targets in the various sectors of the economy. In the major industrial sector, particularly, in the absence of any indication as to the prospects of obtaining external resources, it would be difficult even to maintain the tempo of development reached in the economy, with the problems of repayment on the committed expenditures and the maintenance of imports, looming large. There is thus an inevitable continuation of the imbalance in the pattern of resource estimation of the second plan period, though being aware of the effects of the same. It would be a wise and prudent policy if the total outlay is conceived in two parts, the first part with a pattern of resource mobilisation based on firm realisations and the second part matched to a scheme of financing that may fructify.

The strategy of the plan and the priorities reveal the same bias in favour of heavy capital-intensive industries, though agriculture has received the top-most priority and the percentage of allocation is stepped up. The past experience has shown that in agriculture the problem is not merely one of investment but the strengthening of the sector from all sides, both by increasing the allotment as also by streamlining the organisation and administrative machinery for the purpose of effectively utilising the investment funds and achieving results in terms of a higher rate of productivity. While there is no controversy over the need for a rapid growth in basic industries like steel, fuel and power, the capacity for expansion in these industries could be logically related only to the overall resource position and the demands on them, by other sectors, in a scheme of balanced and integrated growth.

The implications of this undue emphasis on heavy capital-intensive industries have been sufficiently brought out in the second plan experience. The emphasis on producer goods industries and the neglect of the consumer goods industries tended to build-in the inflationary pressures. No less a person than Shri U. N. Dhebar, the head of the Congress party, had pointed out that in our anxiety for excessive emphasis on bringing about rapid industrialisation, we had failed to evolve a balanced plan with the result that non-fulfilment of some of the expectations led to the creation of an atmosphere of disappointment or frustration. "Inordinate emphasis on industrial bias, as we must all admit, overshadowed not only the problem of agricultural development, but also what is still to be realised the problem of expansion of work-opportunities within the framework of rural economy." The draft outline does not appear to have departed in any significant manner from the self-same strategy or technique of the Second Plan. In designing the frame-work for the third plan, this important lesson of the Second Plan should not be lost sight of. Our planning must reflect an attempt at a balanced growth, by striking a mean between

the capital-intensive heavy-industries and consumer goods industries, large, medium and small-scale, simultaneously emphasising an agro-industrial approach to meet our special conditions in the rural sector. The fascination for the spectacular and the grandiose, still evident in the draft plan, should be shed and specific attention must be focussed to initiate thousands of small projects and schemes, which, because of their direct impact on the lives of millions of people, can ensure better understanding of the implications of planning.

The draft outline does not make any significant impression in expanding employment opportunities, with additional employment opportunities for 13.5 million people only, for a size of investment of Rs. 10,200 crores. This reflects the effect of the concentration of investment in capital-intensive industries. Though it is recognised that there should be the fullest utilisation to the extent possible of the manpower resources, no specific scheme or programme of planning has been suggested. Without an effort to conceive a plan-frame for the utilisation of manpower resources the high hopes of reaching the socio-economic goals of a self-generating economy and a socialistic pattern of society may not be realised even in the span of the next 15 years. The rate of growth in the economy is affected by a rate of increase in population growth higher than that originally expected and an increase in work force; this can be tackled only by a scheme of population control and manpower utilisation which should receive top priority.

The success of the Third Plan, whatever be the size of outlay, would ultimately depend on the response of the community to the plan effort initiated by the authority. The experience of the two plans, and particularly the second plan, has not revealed a spontaneous enthusiasm on the part of the public to participate in the plan effort and contribute their maximum in agriculture or in industry. The major factor which has been impeding the mobilisation of mass enthusiasm for rapid development is the apprehension on the impact of the ideological considerations which have largely shaped the outline, on the socio-economic approach in a democratic society. The criterion laid down in the outline that "the public sector has a leading role in the development of the economy and is expected to grow both absolutely and relatively to the organised private sector" is not consistent with the concept and practice of democratic socialism nor is a necessary concomitant of the process of rapid economic growth. The expansion of the public sector as stated poses problems of a serious nature to all those who believe in democratic socialism. Such expansion is bound to result in the setting up of vast bureaucratic organisations with large accretion of powers. The growth of such bureaucratic corporations, in reality, will constitute a veritable despotism endangering the freedom of the individual. In such a system there is no freedom to experiment with ideas which have not won State

(Continued on Page 10)



# Cultural Freedom In Berlin

by T. R. Fyvel

**M**Y first impression was that the gathering of the Congress for Cultural Freedom had given the centre of West Berlin something of the atmosphere of a small and rather busy university town. As I stepped out of my hotel on arriving, I at once met three acquaintances, sitting in the pavement cafe alongside. There was the English economist, Anthony Crosland, one of the closest associates of the Labour Party leader, Mr. Gaitskell. There was Michael Young, an unorthodox English sociologist, and an outstanding campaigner for the idea that modern suburban town-planning with its rows of identical small houses is wrong and unnatural because it leaves no provision for large families. And there was Dan Jacobson, the young South African Jewish novelist, widely praised for his sensitive studies of African race problems. My three acquaintances had a lesser but immediate problem: how to get a perspiring waiter to bring their bill so that they could get to their meetings at the Berlin Congress Hall in time—I noticed that they were already so caught up in the spirit of their study groups that at all costs they did not want to be even a minute late.

We got to the newly built and beautifully designed Berlin Congress Hall just in time. At my first session I heard the distinguished French philosopher, Raymond Aron, talk about some new problems of political democracy—there were about a hundred participants in the conference in his audience, about equally divided between Afro-Asians and Europeans and Americans. M. Aron spoke first of the advanced countries, or as they are today sometimes called, the affluent countries of the West. Here, he said, both industrial production and the machinery of the Welfare State had become so vast and complex that the political Parliamentarians in their debating Chambers seemed often no longer able adequately to survey what went on, and he put this problem to his listeners. In the underdeveloped countries, on the contrary, there was the danger that Parliamentary debates held in Western style in the capital simply passed over the heads of passive villagers in the countryside and were therefore superficial. Among M. Aron's listeners I noticed Jayaprakash Narayan, the Indian Socialist leader, second in popularity in India only to Mr. Nehru, who has campaigned for building Indian democracy from the village upwards; and, in fact, in the general discussion, one of Mr. Narayan's colleagues supported M. Aron's point that political democracy was a living faith which we must now adapt to the new social problems of today, just as earlier generations of Parliamentarians had adapted it to theirs.

Immediately after this session, at six in the evening, there was a dramatic change of scene. All the participants in the conference, together with the attending

correspondents, were taken to the square in front of the Rathaus, the municipality, of the West Berlin district of Schöneberg. Here 80,000 people had gathered to commemorate the anniversary of the 17th June, the day on which in 1953 the workers of Communist East Berlin rose against their oppressors and were put down by Soviet tanks. A freedom bell was sounded, and then the multitude of quiet people listened to a restrained, dignified address by the Socialist mayor of West Berlin, Willy Brandt, who assured them that their democratic freedom would be safeguarded. It was a calm and moving occasion. As an Indian professor said to me, the divided city of Berlin was the place where the advantages of Western democracy over dictatorial communism stood out most clearly, and this impression became more vivid when the international delegates to the conference were taken on a tour of Communist East Berlin, whose drabness reflected the whole spirit of regimentation and coercion under communism. But this tour came later. As for myself, after this mass meeting I spent the evening with scholars and journalists from many countries, informally arguing about the events of the day.

The Berlin gathering of the Congress for Cultural Freedom was the largest yet held. The subject for discussion was "Progress in Freedom". The duration of the conference was a week, and the two hundred participants were divided into four study groups. The first, under the direction of the French philosopher, Raymond Aron, discussed the problems of political democracy—in fact, this became a discussion on how to adapt democratic institutions to the fast-changing society of today, whether in advanced or underdeveloped countries. For instance, one of the debates centred, inevitably, on the unexpectedly influential role of army officers in many new states.

A second group, under the direction of the American sociologist, Edward Shils, discussed the role of culture and tradition in modern society—that is, a society subject to increasing technological change. A third group, led by Nicolas Nabokov, a Russian-born composer from Paris and Secretary-General of the Congress, discussed the condition of the arts and the new problems of patronage in this society. A fourth group, meeting under the title of "Progress of Ideas" and guided by Professor Michael Polanyi, a Hungarian sociologist now a Research Fellow at Merton College, Oxford, exchanged views about the intellectual and moral passions which tend to dominate our age.

The speakers spoke in English, French and German, with simultaneous translation. Like other observers, I found it better not to dodge about too much between different study groups, but to concentrate on one, and I chose the group which talked about the problems

of culture and tradition in Western and Eastern countries. But even this one group included personalities fascinating to watch. For instance—from America, Robert Oppenheimer, the famous atomic scientist, and Professor J. K. Galbraith, author of that influential critique of American capitalism, "The Affluent Society"; from Italy, the leading novelist Ignazio Silone; from France, that handsome, veteran philosopher, Bertrand de Jouvenel; from England, half a dozen younger scholars from Oxford and Cambridge. At least in name, these Westerners were familiar to me, and I found myself most fascinated by the spokesmen from Africa and Asia. For instance, from Nigeria there was Mr. Ayo Ogunshye, for some years a familiar figure at the London School of Economics and now a chief director of studies at the University of Ibadan, in Nigeria, which as a member of the Commonwealth will this year become Africa's largest independent state. Mr. Ogunshye spoke with such impressive judgment and commonsense about the problems and prospects of Nigerian students, who in their own young lives have to assimilate several revolutions at once, that I could only feel they were in the best of hands. He was followed by Dr. B. Venkatappiah, a leading Indian authority on economics and administration, who explained, much more vividly than any Westerner could have done, how Indians today realised that Western industry, technology and outlook could not be simply imported into India without further thought, but had to be carefully built upon the realities of Indian society and traditions.

It would not be possible for me to mention all the topics touched upon even in this one study group on which I concentrated. Let me therefore rather give some of the conclusions I formed in my own mind as I watched and listened, and enumerate them one by one.

- 1) The Western spokesmen at the gathering were all in accord that, in facing the Communist challenge, the problems of the underdeveloped countries were also very intimately their own problems — part of the vital responsibility of the West.
- 2) From the point of view of giving effect to partnership with Afro-Asia, they were convinced that the Western countries must act in unison and were impatient of frontiers and divisions between them.
- 3) It was agreed that co-operation with underdeveloped countries help to provide some of that sense of purpose which critics found lacking in the affluent societies of the West. I believe that if such views are not yet held by all politicians, they were certainly the views of the Western writers and scholars assembled in Berlin.

## India, Tibet and China

by B. K. DESAI

Price Re. 1

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE  
DOMEWAY.

4) In view of all one had heard of the impact of Communist ideology on Africa and Asia, it was instructive to meet so many leading intellectuals from the new states who were determined that their countries should endeavour to combine progress with democratic freedom, though the difficulties along this road were not minimised.

5) By comparison with similar gatherings only five or six years ago, the intellectuals from Africa and Asia were far more sober and practical in evaluating the benefits and defects of our Western society and more conscious of the virtues in their own traditional life which they wanted to preserve even while learning new techniques.

6) Finally, even if there was agreement on the desirable aim of combining progress with freedom, the discussion in Berlin showed how complicated a task this was. For instance, the American historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., criticised the inability of the U.S. government to act constructively and decisively amidst all the checks and balances of American political life. He was answered by Professor Busia, formerly leader of Ghana's Opposition Party, who pointed out the disadvantages when democratic leaders let themselves be tempted to adopt authoritarian methods: what was wanted in many new states was more constitutional check against Government authority.

It was with this impression of the complex task of combining progress with freedom, and the need to continue international discussion of these problems, that I left Berlin.

## ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

THREE LETTERS

Boris Pasternak

YOGA UNEXPURGED

Arthur Koestler

HIGH, LOW AND MODERN

Irving Kristol

AUGUST 1960

83

Annual Rs. 12.

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

# Sino-Soviet Differences

(Contributed)

THE ideological, theoretical and political differences between Moscow and Peking have on the whole been recently becoming noticeably more acute and they are now being openly ventilated from party platforms and in the press of the respective countries. This unprecedented spectacle of Moscow and Peking arguing their different points of views publicly is intriguing and not without significance. Unlike the East European countries within the Soviet bloc, Red China has never regarded herself as a satellite but as a partner of Moscow. The Chinese regard Mao Tse-Tung as the foremost theoretician of the communist world today and as ideological purists, they regard with suspicion the patent opportunism of some of Khrushchev's domestic and foreign policies. Behind these divergences, of course, lies the difference in backgrounds and stages of development attained by Moscow and Peking. Soviet Russia today has reached a stage of economic development which calls for a period of consolidation. On the other hand, the Communist Chinese rulers still need external distractions in order to invigorate internal efforts.

The main point of disagreement has been Khrushchev's theory of peaceful coexistence and his stress on the establishment of friendly relations with the West. China has never endorsed Khrushchev's revision of Lenin's teaching on war and peace or on the methods by which communists should seize power. Lenin taught that wars were inevitable as long as imperialism existed, and preached revolution by violence. Khrushchev modified Lenin's doctrine by declaring at the 20th and 21st Party Congresses that owing to changed circumstances, due to the emergence of a Socialist camp and the weakening of imperialism, war was no longer inevitable and that communists could come to power by peaceful means, although violence was not excluded. Khrushchev has also repeatedly declared that modern weapons excluded war as a means of settling disputes, since a nuclear war would prove disastrous for all mankind though the more densely populated capitalist countries would correspondingly suffer more.

In a series of articles in the periodical *Red Flag*, published this year in connection with the anniversary of Lenin's birth (April 22), China challenged Soviet revision of Leninism in an uncompromising restatement of her own ideological position and of her belief in the "aggressive nature of imperialism."

The Chinese thesis, as set out in the *Red Flag* articles, was briefly as follows:

China supports peaceful coexistence, but as long as the imperialist system exists, war is by no means ruled out. Lenin was "absolutely correct" when he laid down that wars of one kind or another would exist until the imperialist system and exploiting classes came to an end. The "US imperialists" are continu-

ing to plot new wars and it would be "absolutely impermissible" to mistake tactical changes on the part of imperialism for changes in its nature. It is true that the emergence of a powerful Socialist system has weakened the position of imperialism, but imperialists have not laid down the butcher's knife or abandoned aggression.

The realisation of "peaceful coexistence" at certain periods has only been brought about through struggle. Only an alliance of the Socialist bloc and all anti-imperialist forces can maintain peaceful co-existence.

If the USA or any other imperialist power launches an atomic war, "huge sacrifices" would be imposed on the peoples. But imperialism, and not mankind in general, would be annihilated. "On the debris of a dead imperialism the people would quickly create a higher civilisation than capitalism".

Revolution means the use violence by the "oppressed class". Lenin was right when he said that no ruling class ever gave way without a struggle. China does not reject the concept of a peaceful transition to communism, but, as Lenin pointed out, "the opportunities for this are extraordinarily rare".

While the *Red Flag* articles were at variance with the Soviet view on many issues, their importance lay in the fact that they crystallised Sino-Soviet differences in interpreting peaceful coexistence: Mr. Khrushchev believes that in the period of peaceful coexistence with the West, war can and must be avoided; China believes that war is inevitable so long as imperialism exists. Khrushchev believes that offers of friendship to the West can be combined with a struggle against it; China believes in being consistently hostile to the West until she secures recognition and regains Formosa.

The conflict inherent in these views began to emerge in 1958 when China staged an exercise in brinkmanship over Formosa. The Soviet Union is believed to have counselled caution. This advice was probably resented. Subsequently Soviet propaganda maintained a complete silence on the establishment of communes in China, thus withholding Soviet approval. By mid-1959 some of the differences had been toned down, but not resolved. And when the facts of the Sino-Indian frontier dispute were revealed in August, 1959, the Soviet leaders, against all precedent, withheld full support from their ally. The Chinese leaders, for their part, continued to throw doubt on American sincerity in pursuing peace and a detente.

It was against this background that Khrushchev went to Peking for the regime's 10th anniversary celebrations in October, 1959, only a few weeks after his visit to the United States, where he publicly expressed his belief in President Eisenhower's desire for peace. Khrushchev gave a sharp warning to China



to exercise restraint. The Socialist countries must not resort to war in an attempt to "test the stability of the capitalist system" or to impose communism by force, he said; they must concentrate on peaceful construction and thus "fire the hearts of men by their example". Socialism would undoubtedly beat capitalism in peaceful competition; it had brought peace and was already so strong that it was "becoming possible to exclude war as a means of solving disputes". He thought that Eisenhower and other US leaders understood the need for a detente, and believed that the Socialist countries, "working together with some bourgeois Governments", could bring about detente by a policy of peaceful coexistence.

But Khrushchev failed to persuade his Chinese comrades as to the correctness of his policy. The failure was obvious from the fact that his talks with Mao and other Chinese communist leaders failed to produce, at the conclusion of his Peking trip, even the customary piously-worded joint communique. Annoyed at the intransigence of his Chinese ally, Khrushchev voiced his criticism of the Chinese Communist policy, shortly after his return from Peking. In his foreign policy report to the Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1959, Khrushchev, while upholding efforts towards a "mutual accommodation" between East and West, made a highly unusual reference to Trotsky's "adventurist policy" expressed in the "notorious slogan of 'neither peace nor war'", which, he said, had created serious difficulties for the new-born Soviet State. This was an implicit, yet fairly obvious, rebuke to Peking for its unwillingness to improve relations with the West and Khrushchev's pointed reference to Trotsky sharply emphasised the gravity of his charge.

Notwithstanding such Soviet pressure, Peking continued to flout Khrushchev's 'soft' line towards the West. This defiance by the Chinese was evidenced again at the meeting of Warsaw Pact signatories held in Moscow in the first week of February this year. The Chinese delegate attended the meeting only as an observer, but still the Chinese representative, Kang Sheng, an alternate member of the Chinese Party Politbureau, delivered a speech whose bellicosity was completely out of line with the relatively moderate tone of the final conference communique. He not only attacked the U.S. in uncompromising terms, sternly warning that communists must not let themselves be misled by American "peace gestures," but also implicitly rebuked the Soviet Union for its neutral stand regarding China's disputes with its non-communist South Asian neighbours. Significantly, this speech was totally suppressed in the USSR and in Satellite countries.

Conflicts in the world communist movement over relations with the West reached a climax before the Paris Summit conference in May. But a sharp shift in the communist camp in the direction of compromise between Peking and Moscow set in just before the Paris Conference. After the important plenary session of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party on May 4, the Soviet leadership made a com-

plete volte-face on the question of a detente with the West and on Khrushchev's previous foreign policy in general. It then proceeded to break up the Summit Conference in the most brutal manner.

Over the American aircraft incident, differences in the Chinese and Soviet approach on the question of the "aggressive" nature of imperialism became blurred. Mao Tse-tung used it to drive home the point that China had been right all along. Speaking at Wuhan on May 14, he said that the American Intelligence flight had "once again exposed the true colour of US imperialism... preparing for a war of aggression in the guise of a fake peace". People should now awaken from the illusion, he added, that President Eisenhower "cherished peace". On May 16, addressing the Western Heads of Government in Paris, Khrushchev attacked the United States and President Eisenhower in terms characteristic of Chinese propaganda. The orthodox views expressed in *Red Flag*, and its assessment of the "aggressive nature of American imperialism", were bound to have an impact in the Communist bloc, since China could claim to have interpreted Leninism correctly and that the Soviet Union was coming round to her view.

The Chinese communists, exploiting the Summit failure, tried to make the general line of communist foreign policy more radical. At the session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, held on June 5-9, 1960, in Peking, Lin Chang Sheng, head of the Chinese trade unions, stated that coexistence with imperialist States and disarmament were only an illusion before the complete victory of socialism throughout the world.

As a result of these persistent Chinese attacks, the Soviet Communist Party took up the issue with the Chinese Communists and rebuked the latter for their left sectarian attitude. *Pravda*, the official organ of the Soviet Communist Party, in its issue of June 12, 1960, sharply criticised Chinese Communist critics of Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence, denouncing these critics as "Left-wing extremists" and "Left-wing doctrinaires" who were prepared to run the risks of a nuclear war in the name of advancing the cause of world revolution. The aim of the article, it explained, was to refute the dogmas of present day "left-wingers" in international communism. "These dogmatists, because they have power in their hands, think they can introduce communism at once and avoid the historical phases of its developments". From this it was obvious, the article mainly referred to the Chinese Communist Party. Two days later, further criticism of the Chinese stand was published in *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, official organ of the Soviet Communist Party's Russian Bureau, of which Khrushchev is the Chairman. The article complained of criticism of Khrushchev's co-existence and of charges that it represented a retreat from Marxism-Leninism.

This debate reached its climax at the Bucharest Communist Party Congress held in the third week of June this year, which was attended by representatives of all the important communist parties all over the

(Continued on Page 12)



# Review

## *The Mind of an Assassin*

by Issac Don Levine; Published by Farrar, Straus and Cudahy of New York; Price \$ 4.50.

**P**OLITICAL assassination is not the discovery of the 20th century communists. It is as old as history and politics. But only communists can claim the distinction of having added a new dimension to it. They have reduced it into a fine art. Of course, they do this on principle — that no human sacrifice is too great to usher in the millennium, that he who is not with them is against them. And if they prefer to silence people instead of convincing, it is purely because they are anxious to meet their date with destiny in 1984 before schedule with a "big leap forward."

Leon Trotsky, who along with Lenin, precipitated and brought about the October Revolution, neglected the organizational ladder that leads to power. But the hatchet-man Stalin captured and controlled the party apparatus to catapult himself on the saddle of power. He found in Trotsky a superior rival. The book under review gives an account of how Stalin got rid of Trotsky — from Russia and then from the World, (Is it another case of bad coin driving good coin out of circulation?) and an insight into the mind of the assassin. The author has given a wealth of evidence to prove, if proof is needed, that the assassin is a Stalin-agent. The assassin has maintained the fiction that he is not a Kremlin-agent. One can only regret for the loss of a fine actor to the theatre world!

Stalin first isolated Trotsky and then exiled him in 1929. He was hunted out from Turkey, France and Norway. In Norway his meetings with the Minister of Justice, Mr. Trygve Lie, later the first General Secretary of U.N.O., were not "remarkable for excessive courtesy", as Trotsky put it, for Trotsky was asked to submit his mail to censorship and stop writing on current events. Trotsky found political asylum, at last, in Mexico with the help of Diego Rivera, the famous Mexican painter. Trotsky was denied Soviet citizenship in 1932, was excommunicated from the fold of the faithfuls and was sentenced to death for conspiring to overthrow the Soviet rule with the help of Anglo-Americans. Character assassination had to precede assassination if it was to convince at least the believers.

Trotsky lived on the outskirts of Mexico in a fortified villa. After an unsuccessful and abortive attempt by Stalin-agents to murder Trotsky, a twenty-four hour guard was posted and an alarm system was installed. This made the delicate task of the Stalin-agents more difficult. But pastmasters as they are in the fine art of murder, they had more strings to their bow to meet any such contingency and eventuality.

The assassin-designate Ramon Merceder was introduced to Sylvia Ageloff, a trusted and devoted follower of Trotsky, as "Jacques Mornard", son of a non-

existent wealthy Belgian diplomat. After some flirtation with Sylvia he followed her with a doctored passport to Mexico and there posed as a mining (or under-mining?) engineer. He got unsuspected entrance into the villa. Thus the ground was prepared, stage was set for the last act in the tragic drama of "Operation Trotsky".

"I put my raincoat on the table on purpose so that I could take out the ice-axe which I had in the pocket. I decided not to lose the brilliant opportunity which was offered to me and at the exact moment when Trotsky started to read my article, which served as my pretext, I took the piolet out of my raincoat, took it in my fist and, closing my eyes, I gave him a tremendous blow on the head...."

This is straight from the horse's mouth. It was 20th August, 1940. He could do as a friend what his friends failed to achieve as foes.

History is punctuated with many political assassins and assassinations. But Ramon Merceder is an assassin with a difference and an indifference. He is different in that he is not an idealist or a visionary. A visionary would have expressed regret, which Ramon never did, for having been forced to kill a man. An idealist would have fought ideas with ideas, not with weapons especially when the opponent is unarmed. He is indifferent in that, to him all life is matter, dust returning to dust; he is a philosophical executioner. Perhaps this is the shape of men to come—men without feelings.

The problem of means and ends has exercised and baffled the best minds of all times. But communists have cut the Gordian knot or at least they believe so. They have no patience with, in fact have contempt for, the puerile controversies over the bourgeois concept of ends and means. They know all is fair; they know all that helps them is moral. Their attitude can best be summarised as, there is nothing moral or immoral but thinking makes it so.

M. DEVADAS KINI

## *Recognition in the Law of Nations*

by S. R. Patel, LL.M., published by N. M. Tripathi Private Ltd., Price Rs. 15.

**T**HE author has made a commendable attempt to discuss the various aspects of the Doctrine of Recognition in International Law within a compass of about 125 pages. His object has been to consider the doctrine in the context of existing circumstances. As he pertinently remarks in the introduction: "To make the act of recognition obligatory without changing the conditions which necessitate its existence and continuance, would be an erring and self-righteous idealism."

Before expounding his conception of the true nature of recognition, the author gives a critical exposition of the Declaratory and the Constitutive Theories of Recognition. In the later part of the book the author

(Continued on Page 10)

## REFLECTIONS ON THE THIRD FIVE YEAR PLAN — Cont'd from p. 4

approval. Instead of leading towards the realisation of the objectives of a society of free and equals, it may create problems arising out of undue concentration of economic power in the political hands and the growing bureaucratic despotism, both of which mean a serious curtailment of democracy. R. H. S. Crossman has candidly posed the dilemma when he observes, "Yet the State bureaucracy itself is one of these concentration of powers which threatens our freedom. . . . If we increase its authority still further shall we not be endangering the liberties that we are trying to defend?"

The one lesson of the Second Plan is that the public sector cannot find the resources for financing the Plan from its own surpluses unless opportunities are created for both the sectors to enlarge the common pool of savings. The issue which one has to examine is not whether it is the public sector or the private sector that should exist or expand or the proportion in which they should function, but the real problem is one of maximisation of production and how best the public and the private sectors could be made responsible to fulfil this objective. Without a rigid demarcation of spheres on ideological grounds, the field of industrial activity must be open to both in a

fair and non-discriminatory manner. Efficiency should be the only criterion for expansion of the public and private sectors. The private sector, by its inherent right of being an integral part of the national sector in the mixed economy, should be free to undertake largescale projects wherever it finds possible to do so, being in a position to mobilise the necessary resources and technique, subject to the over-all discipline.

It is only thus that the danger of concentration of economic power in the political hands and in the bureaucratic machinery with all the harmful consequences to the democratic structure of society can be avoided. The modern socialist thought which is anxious to preserve the basic democratic structure of the society is essentially pragmatic in its approach in judging the public or the private sector, the sole test being the nett contribution each would be capable of making to the economy. The socialist thinkers recognise that: "The private sector of a socialist economy is not there merely on sufferance, to be tolerated only on the grounds of political expediency, with the Sword of Damocles hanging over it in perpetual threat. On the contrary, it has a legitimate and indeed a necessary function to perform. As long as an independent sector remains, it can act as a perpetual and very effective check on the State activities. . . . At every point the nature and the efficacy of State activity can be directly challenged". (*Twentieth Century Socialism*).

The finalisation of the outline of the Third Plan should be made with a full realisation of the growing and dynamic concept of democratic socialism and the frame-work should be so modified as to fit in with the needs and aspirations of the millions of India, groaning under conditions of poverty but surging with the hopes of moving forward, towards conditions of equality of opportunities and freedom.

(Continued from Page 9)

has given an exposition of such ancillary topics as Recognition of Belligerency, Recognition of Insurgency and Withdrawal of Recognition.

International Law is not law in the sense in which lawyers understand law, because as yet there are no effective sanctions for the enforcement of the generally accepted rules of right conduct amongst nations. However, during the last 150 years or so more and more rules of right conduct for the comity of nations have been crystallized and in numerous instances these rules have been observed with a fair degree of fidelity by various nations. Scientific advance especially in the spheres of speedy transport and dissemination of ideas between nations is making the world smaller and more compact every day and the time is, perhaps, not too distant when a democratically elected world organization, armed with effective sanctions, will be able to maintain law and order at the international level.

It is essential, however, that the principle of democracy should prevail at the international level as within the confines of a nation, if a world organization is to enforce universal peace and progress. It is in this context that the importance of the doctrine of Recognition in international law can be seen. With the lapse of time more and more nations are attaining independence and the question of recognition of the newly independent nations requires to be studied in all its aspects. Mr. Patel's book is an interesting contribution to a study of the doctrine of Recognition in International Law.

PHIROZE J. SHROFF

### A White Book Tibet Fights for Freedom

With a Foreword by the DALAI LAMA  
Edited by RAJA HUTHEESING  
Crown 4 to viii + 244 pp. 24 Photographs,  
6 cartoons, 3 maps, Rs. 15

Published for

THE INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL  
FREEDOM

148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

by

ORIENT LONGMANS

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS  
NEW DELHI HYDERABAD DACCA



## A LEAP IN THE DARK—(Cont'd from Page 2)

The general public had no sympathy for the strike, if at all their feelings were against it. The strike was declared without any preparations. It was just a leap in the dark. Individually not one of the constituents of the Joint Council of Action was prepared to take the leap. Each one of them was looking to the other to cry halt. They were all afraid of each other, of being stigmatised as the backslider, as being less brave and militant. This developed into a competition amongst them to appear more brave than others and to adopt a non-compromising attitude. Eventually, with the leaders also in the same unenviable position, they decided to take the leap together and the result was the strike for which nobody was prepared.

In all these hectic talks and negotiations and the agitation and propaganda which preceded the strike the communists in the trade union movement played a sinister role. They knew that the strike would end in a disaster. They were not, therefore, prepared to take the responsibility for calling the strike. They were content to leave it in the hands of the P.S.P. leaders who were foolish enough to imagine that they had scored a triumph over the communists by keeping in their own hands the leadership of the strike. While frontrank leaders of the Communist Party were thus sitting on the side lines and watching the fun, the rank and file workers were active amongst the employees and in local joint councils of action, building up pressures to drive the P.S.P. leaders towards the strike. The Communist Party had nothing to lose either way. If the strike succeeded, its workers were in the field to claim the credit and to use it for building up the Party. If it failed, the discredit would go to the P.S.P., while the Communist Party would gain a number of new recruits out of the ranks of the employees who would be victimised. This interplay of political rivalries was also responsible to some extent for the final plunge into the strike.

Whatever, however, the shortcomings of the leaders of employee's organisations and whatever the mistakes of policy and the assessment of the situation committed by them, the Government of India cannot escape the main responsibility for the outbreak of the strike. The principal factor which drove the employees to the desperate recourse of a strike was the constant erosion that they experienced in their real incomes as a result of the rise in prices. The Government were not able to hold the price line. On the contrary, as a result of their economic policies, it was constantly jumping up. The failure to hold the price line and the arbitrary refusal to grant relief against the rise in prices exasperated the employees and put them in a rebellious mood. The inordinate delay in implementing the recommendations of the Pay Commission and arbitrary changes that were effected in some of them added to the exasperation and made the workers desperate. The Prime Minister himself later referred to these mistakes of the Government and expressed his

concern over the dilatory procedures. The Government also failed to evolve any machinery for the settlement of disputes. The strike could have been easily avoided by agreeing to refer the issues in dispute to an impartial tribunal. The Government impose that solution upon private employers. Why should they not accept it themselves in the case of disputes with their employees? In their own case they always take shelter behind an Ordinance. That happened in 1957. It was repeated in 1960. In 1957, it did not become necessary to use the Ordinance, as there was a last-minute compromise and the strike was averted. In 1960, the Ordinance was put into operation. It did not stop the strike. Lakhs of workers responded to the call for the strike, inspite of the Ordinance. That can be regarded as the worker's verdict on the policies of the Government. In a democracy no Government can afford to ignore too long such a clearly expressed verdict of a substantial section of their employees.

The strike has now ended. A large number of employees is now facing disciplinary action which may end in the termination of their services. Many amongst them are, in addition, facing prosecutions in police courts which may on conviction earn for them varying terms of imprisonment in jails. The unions which participated in the strike are threatened with withdrawal of their recognition. Once recognition is withdrawn, the employees will have no organisation to protect their interests. In some cases the unions will have to close down as employees are not allowed to become members of an unrecognised union. It is to be hoped, however, that the employees will not be compelled to experience the full rigours of many of these measures. Mr. Asoka Mehta, the Chairman of the P.S.P. who played a noble part towards the end of the strike in bringing it to an orderly end, is trying his best to persuade the Government to adopt a generous attitude. The Home Minister, Mr. Govind Vallabh Pant has assured that the Government have no intention of being vindictive. The assurance is welcome; but if the frustration and the sullen discontent which prevail in the ranks of workers are to be removed, it will be necessary for the Government to go much further. They will have to quickly implement all recommendations of the Pay Commission and also undertake at an early date a revision of the dearness allowance in view of the rise in prices since the date of the Commission's Report. The Government cannot rest content with the defeat of the strike. They must do something positive to win the goodwill of their employees.

The strike has many lessons for the trade union movement as a whole. They have to be learnt gradually and painfully. For the time being, attention must be concentrated on repairing the damage that has been done. The movement has suffered in strength and in prestige. They must be regained through quiet, devoted work for restoring workers' confidence in themselves and in their organisations.

## With Many Voices

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

For various personal and other reasons I believe that the Soviet Union as a whole is more devoted to peace than any other country.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Times of India*, July 18.

Russia's export drive is part of Mr. Khrushchev's "trade offensive", an adjunct of Soviet Communism's war-by-other-means against "imperialism".

—*Thought*, July 23.

Draconian Ordinances have woefully been recurring in free India all too often since Independence about 13 years ago.

—"Beachcomber", *Thought*, July 23.

We must, however, be on guard against wishful thinking and self-deception. Today, there are no shortcuts to world peace, let alone to peace and freedom.

—George Harrison, AFL-CIO Vice President, *Free Trade Union News*, May.

We know that the solar cooker, produced some years ago with such fanfare and self-congratulations, is useless. That is the result of research and publicity as against useful work.

—Prof. D.D. Kosambi, *Indian Express*, July 26.

The Russians want Cuba as a bridgehead for the political penetration of Latin America.

—*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, July 21.

The underlying principle was combining unanimity of political direction with multiplicity of artistic styles . . . their task was to use the weapon of literature and art to rouse greatly the socialist and communist consciousness and communist morality of all the people.

—Mr. Chou Yang, Chinese communist leader, *Indian Express*, July 26.

The agreement signed yesterday between China and Cuba cannot be called commercial in any normal sense of the word. Since under it China takes from Cuba goods she does not want in exchange for goods she cannot spare.

—*Times*, London, July 25.

The linguistic principle we have so laboriously built in this country is a leaning Tower of Babel.

—*Link*, July 24.

People these days regard every Congressman as dishonest until the contrary is proved.

—Sanjiva Reddy, Congress President, *Times of India*, July 27.

### SINO-SOVIET DIFFERENCES — (Continued from page 8)

world. Addressing the Congress on June 23, Khrushchev, without referring to China, told the audience that something ought to be done to cure those who talk of the inevitability of war. "If Lenin could rise from his grave", he stated, "he would take such people by the ear and teach them a lesson about how one must understand the essence of the matter. . . . One cannot repeat mechanically now a days what Lenin said many decades ago about imperialism, and go on asserting that imperialist wars are inevitable."

The final communique issued at the conclusion of the seven-day Bucharest Congress was published in the name of 12 ruling Communist Parties, including the Chinese. It represented a compromise between Moscow and Peking theses but it was obvious that the differences between the two schools of thought were far from resolved. The communique reiterated the validity of the 1957 Moscow declarations which cited the belief in peaceful co-existence and possibility of preventing wars in the present era. But it failed to incorporate fully the Khrushchev line against the inevitability of war. It only envisaged "the possibility of preventing wars in the present era", but

qualified that sentiment by insisting that the "existence of imperialism retains the ground for aggressive wars". It is also interesting to note that while the Soviet press and commentators played up Khrushchev's speech at Bucharest Congress and underlined particularly his interpretation of Leninism, the Chinese press practically blacked out that particular part of his speech and dilated upon the Communique.

Soon after the issuance of the communique, the Chinese communists made it clear that they were in no mood to give up their militant line. Peking's *People's Daily* in an editorial on June 29, stressed that the "possibility of preventing imperialism from launching a new world war exists and is increasing with each passing day" because of the "progress of socialism and of the national liberation movement." But at the same time it added: "However, imperialism is after all imperialism. . . . The imperialists will under no circumstances give up of their own accord their policies of aggression and war. . . . Only when the imperialist system and the capitalist systems are eliminated on earth and only when classes are really abolished, can lasting world peace be really brought about".