

Our Non-Alignment

by V. B. Karnik

THERE is general agreement in the country that in the conditions that obtain in the world it is best that we do not get entangled in military alliances and preserve our independence to judge each issue on its merits. The doubts that are expressed and the criticism that is voiced from time to time do not question the wisdom of that course, but question the appropriateness or otherwise of the steps that we take in the light of that governing principle of our foreign policy. The complaint is that they do not bear out our claim to be non-aligned and independent.

Many things have happened during the last four weeks which lend support to that complaint. One may examine in that connection the Five Power resolution that we sponsored in the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Prime Minister and Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, the leader of our delegation, have given an elaborate defence and justification of that step. It is stated that it was an appeal addressed to both President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev and that it did not lean towards one or the other. But in view of the fact that, whatever the mistakes of the Americans, it was Khrushchev who broke the Summit Conference and used insulting language against Eisenhower and in view of his behaviour as a bully in the General Assembly was it, one may ask, fair and reasonable to adopt that attitude? If at all we thought that we could play some helpful role in lessening the tensions, was it not our duty, as an independent and non-aligned country, to express our disapproval of Khrushchev's behaviour and advise him to change it in the interest of world peace? Far from doing that, we condoned the uncivilized and provocative actions of Khrushchev and sought to help him in getting a meeting with Eisenhower without making any amends for what he had done. Can this be regarded as an evidence of our non-alignment?

Mr. Krishna Menon has in his enthusiasm for his own particular brand of politics carried the matter a step further. He appears to think that not only the two individuals, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev, but also the two Governments that they represent belong to the same category. In his latest speech in Parliament, he said, while justifying the Five Power resolution: 'Also because of the nature and character of the Governments of the United States and Soviet Union, these gentlemen re-

presented their Governments'. He did not have a word to say about the wide difference between the nature and character of the two Governments. It appears he makes no difference between the Government of a democracy and the government of a communist dictatorship. That may be non-alignment of his choice, but it is not the non-alignment that the country has accepted. The country is not non-aligned as between democracy and dictatorship; it is non-aligned only as between the two Power blocs. The Prime Minister himself stated in a recent speech: "We are non-aligned. We are uncommitted to military blocs. But we are committed to various policies, ideals and objectives—very much so."

On the issue of colonialism again we have placed ourselves in a wrong position. We are eloquent and passionate in our denunciation of the colonialism of the Western Powers. We are silent, however, on the issue of colonialism of communist Russia and China. We have condoned and acquiesced in what Russia has done to the several nationalities inhabiting the outlying portions of her vast empire and more recently to the peoples of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. We are equally complacent about what China has done in Sinkiang and in Tibet even though it vitally affects our security. Taking note of this double standard that we follow, Acharya Kripalani was regretfully constrained to observe that 'even the Prime Minister unfortunately made a distinction between one imperialism (Western) and another (communist) though the essence of both was the same—political domination and economic exploitation.' He said: "to minimise evil is to excuse it and partly to justify it". We are as a matter of fact justifying the growing evil of the colonialism of communist Powers by refusing to talk about it and to hold it up for public censure. It is not the policy of non-alignment that we are following on this issue but a policy of alignment with communist Powers.

We are, may be unknowingly, found in the same company on another controversial issue of recent weeks, the issue of the Congo. It is clear that, in the Congo, communist Powers are trying to fish in troubled waters. They have found in Mr. Lumumba a person who is amenable to their influence and are consequently keen on putting him in power. We are helping them to accomplish that purpose. In spite of our talk of independence and non-alignment, we went to the extent of aligning with them in casting our vote against the seating in the United Nations of a Congolese delegation named by Mr. Kasavubu, the legally elected President of the country. Our demand for the

re-activation of the Parliament may be legally and constitutionally correct. But we have failed to take into consideration the facts of the situation. In a country like the Congo one cannot rely too much on the results of an election. Moreover, since the election took place there has been a radical change in the entire political situation. Leaders of the various tribes and other sections of the country have risen in revolt against the unitary centralised type of government which was being imposed upon them.

The revolts may have been encouraged by the Belgians and may to some extent enjoy the support of some of the Western Powers. But it is difficult to say that they have no popular backing. And it is far more difficult to say that Mr. Lumumba and his friends in the Parliament are the only real representatives of the people and that Mr. Kasavubu, Mr. Ileo, Mr. Tshombe and others are all acting as the agents of Belgian and other Western Powers. We are right in denouncing the actions of Belgium. It is clear that she did nothing to prepare the people of the Congo for handling their own affairs and is mainly responsible for the mess that has been created. We are entitled to be angry with Belgium, but that should not land us in the other camp. That is not in keeping with our policy of non-alignment.

The position in the Congo is that these revolts will have to be crushed by military or other means or the structure of the Government will have to be suitably altered in accordance with the desire of the various parts of the country. Mr. Lumumba and the communist Powers that are backing him obviously prefer the former course. One can understand their preference, as it would deliver into their hands one more African country and enhance their power and prestige in Africa and the world. It is difficult,

however, to understand our insistence on imposing on the people of Congo a unitary centralised government under the leadership of Mr. Lumumba. The fact that he was once elected the Prime Minister is not enough to justify the blind and uncritical support that we are extending to him. We can have no sympathy for the Chief of the Staff, Col. Mobutu, who has clearly proved himself incapable of maintaining discipline even amongst his own soldiers. But he and the College of Student High Commissioners that he has set up are today the effective rulers in the major part of the country. Any solution that we may suggest will have to take that fact into consideration. We may also take into consideration the wise words of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. In the course of a statement on African affairs he said:

"I should like to emphasise that the nature of Asian and African society being what it is, it would be wrong to proceed on the basis that the mere fact of freedom from foreign rule would make modern nations out of peoples who have emerged from traditional societies. The modern nations of the world took centuries to achieve national integration. Therefore, it seems to me that if the territories that are acquiring their freedom are to hold together, it would be advisable to evolve a pattern of government that provides full scope for local and regional autonomy that is possible only in a federal or confederal structure. And imposed unitarian form of government is clearly fraught with danger."

On the issue of the Congo and on many other issues of international conflicts we are in a position to make fair and reasonable suggestions. Our suggestions are likely to receive the best consideration of both the Power blocs as well as of non-aligned Powers and fair minded people all over the world. That will happen only if we are non-aligned both in fact as well as in intent. It is regrettable, however, that our anti-imperialist sentiments and the ideological predilections of a few betray us from time to time into positions and actions which are far from non-aligned or independent.

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.

India, Tibet and China

by B. K. DESAI

Price Re. 1

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

BOMBAY.

Notes

New Moves on Algeria

THE six-year old war in Algeria is now entering its decisive and final phase. Though the Algerian rebels are still militarily weak and far from their goal, they have succeeded in winning widespread sympathy and help for their cause from many Afro-Asian and communist countries. On the other hand, war operations in Algeria are putting an unbearable strain on the man-power and material resources of France which is being increasingly isolated and weakened as a consequence of its Algerian policy. The French community is now divided over the issue and extremists on both the sides are gaining strength as a result of the failure of the French Government to solve the problem. Further, Peking and Moscow, have also decided to jump into the fray and have promised to assist the Algerian rebels in their fight against the French Government. With the threat of communist intervention thus looming large, there is no longer time for procrastination or ambivalence on the part of the French authorities. Otherwise, there is every likelihood of the war spreading and involving the great powers of the East and West, thereby making Algeria yet another arena for cold war politics. This would not only prolong the agonies of the Algerian people, it would also render the solution of the problem more difficult.

President de Gaulle, fortunately, has risen to the occasion and once again displayed his bold statesmanship. He has announced his decision to undertake decisive action in Algeria. He declared last month that an "Algerian Republic" was now inevitable and expressed his determination to move on his own "to advance the Algerian solution in a decisive manner". He hinted that he would proclaim a unilateral ceasefire in Algeria, thus opening the way to political negotiations with Algerian nationalists. By conceding the inevitability of an "Algerian Republic" the General has, for the first time, unambiguously accorded recognition to the concept of "Algerian Algeria", independent of the French Republic. This should pave the way for the peaceful solution of the problem.

President de Gaulle, to carry out his plans, has now to fight the extremists on the homefront as well as to convince the Algerian rebels of his determination to grant the Algerians their right of self-determination. Already leaders of the African French Community are trying to mediate between the French Government and the Algerian rebels. With their good offices, there should be no difficulty in finding an agreed method to end the six-year old war of attrition and make progress towards the goal of a free Algerian Republic which would be friendly towards France. The President has also taken steps to obtain a mandate from the French

people to carry out his plan. A referendum on his "Algerian Algeria" policy would be held simultaneously in France and Algeria in January next year. There is no doubt that the President will receive an overwhelming backing from his people who desire an early solution of the vexed problem. With his hands thus strengthened by the popular mandate, President de Gaulle can certainly be expected to put an end to the bitter war between the Algerians and the French Government.

India And The Congo

INDIA'S stand during the U.N. General Assembly debate on the situation in the Congo has aroused grave misgivings with regard to her professions of neutrality in the cold war between the communist countries and the West. During the Congo debate, India first supported the move by Ghana and Guinea to secure the U.N. recognition to the Congolese delegation nominated by Mr. Lumumba. Later, when the resolution recommending the seating of the Congolese delegation headed by President Kasavubu came up for discussion, India opposed the move and voted along with Ghana, Guinea and the Soviet bloc against the resolution. India thus openly adopted a partisan attitude regarding the power struggle in the Congo. She has not only expressed her preference for Mr. Lumumba, she has also taken a stand against the Head of the State of that country. This partisan attitude has naturally evoked much criticism and raised doubts about India's impartial attitude in the Congolese controversy. This is particularly unfortunate in view of the fact that an Indian, Mr. Dayal, has been appointed by the U.N. Secretary General as his special representative in the Congo.

The Congo has now been openly converted into an arena for cold war struggle, thanks to the initial flagrant intervention by the Soviet bloc in the power struggle in that country. The Soviet bloc countries not only supported Mr. Lumumba as against President Kasavubu and others, they even actively assisted him with planes and other materials to help him defeat his rivals with superior force. The result of this open Soviet intervention was the expulsion of Soviet bloc diplomats from the Congo by Col. Mobutu, who stepped in the breach created by the rift between the President and the Prime Minister. Mr. Lumumba, by openly identifying himself with the Soviet bloc, drove his rivals to the other extreme. The West has now extended its full support to President Kasavubu and Col. Mobutu who still appear to be in effective control in the country.

Under such circumstances, it would have been proper for India not to take sides in the controversy. In this connection, it is interesting to note that out of 28 African countries represented at the U.N., only six, including Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Morocco, Togo and the U.A.R., voted against the proposal to seat Kasavubu's delegation in the U.N. The rest of the African countries either supported the move or abstained from

voting. Among Asian countries, Nepal and Laos voted for the resolution, while Burma, Cambodia and Pakistan abstained. India, by unnecessarily taking sides in the controversy has thus exposed herself to the charge of being partisan in the Congolese power struggle as well as in the cold war between the Soviet bloc and the West.

UNESCO Courier

A RECENT issue of *Unesco Courier* is devoted to the evil of racism. The issue contains a number of well-written articles on racial discrimination in South Africa, in the United States of America and a few other countries. There is an article on racial discrimination experienced by African students in the Delhi university. The problem of anti-Semitism in Europe is also dealt with. But, surprisingly enough, there is no article and there is no mention in the issue of racial discrimination practised in Russia and other communist countries. Any one reading the issue will get the impression that the evil does not exist in those countries. The fact, however, is entirely different. Anti-Semitism has prevailed from time to time under the communist regime in Russia in as virulent a form as in any other country of Europe. In the latter part of Stalin's rule there was a raging and tearing campaign against the Jewish intelligentsia and a whole generation of Jewish writers was killed off without any ceremony. Even today, official agencies are fostering anti-Semitism in some parts of the country. Recently there have been cases of racial discrimination against African students in educational institutions in Moscow. Elsewhere in this issue, there is a narration by an African student of the actual experiences made by them. The last issue of *Freedom First* also contained some authentic material on the topic. Was not the *Unesco Courier* aware of these facts? And why did it choose to give an incomplete and biased picture of the evil of racialism as it exists in the world? It is hardly likely also that it had not heard of what happened in Tibet. Would it not have been to the point to give some information about the actions of the Chinese in that country?

Repression In The Punjab

ONE may or may not agree with the demand for the bifurcation of the Punjab into a Punjabi-speaking and a Hindi-speaking State. But one cannot have any sympathy for the methods used by the Congress Ministry for the suppression of the movement asking for the establishment of the Punjabi *Suba*. Over forty thousand persons have been arrested so far. A number of prominent leaders were arrested under the Preventive Detention Act and are still detained in jails without a trial. Many an arrested person was "asked to furnish security ranging from fifty thousand to a lakh of rupees" for being released on bail even in cases where the offences charged were of a petty nature. Advocates defending arrested persons were

also arrested in some cases. Newspapers were not allowed to publish true and full reports. This story of the repression in the Punjab should shock the conscience of every citizen of India. All independent observers who went there to inquire into the state of affairs have borne out the truth of the story. It is necessary that the Central Government should wake up immediately and take notice of the widespread reign of terror that has been established in the Punjab. It may be opposed to the movement for the Punjabi *Suba*, but it cannot condone such a gross suppression of civil liberties without raising doubts about its devotion to the rule of law.

Mauritania And Morocco

WITH the Islamic Republic of Mauritania becoming independent on November 28, not less than 17 African countries have achieved independence this year. Mauritania has been an autonomous republic within the French community and as such is the last of the African French Community States to emerge as independent country. It is a tribute to the French statesmanship that the transition from colonial rule to independence has been smooth and without any bitter feelings between France and the African States. The fact that most of these former French colonies have freely opted to become members of the French Community shows the fund of goodwill that exists for France in Africa.

Unfortunately, Mauritania's right to independence has been disputed by another African State, Morocco. The latter claims that Mauritania is a part of its territory on the ground that it was, in the past, a province of Morocco. Morocco has even raised the issue in the U.N., but the General Assembly has declined to take any position on the claim. The people of Mauritania last year elected, through universal adult franchise, a National Assembly which later decided to become a free member of the French Community. In the face of this freely expressed wish of the Mauritaniens, Morocco's claim to the whole of Mauritania appears rather anachronistic, especially in these days when the right to self-determination is universally accepted as a sacred right of every people. Tunisia, it is significant, has decided to support Mauritania's independence and to sponsor her admission to the U.N. The matter has caused some tension between Tunisia and Morocco, but for this only Moroccans are to be blamed.

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Contributions To Political Funds

by M. R. Masani

THE time has come now when the vexed question of corporate contributions to political funds should be regarded as a broad matter of policy where all democratic political parties are equally interested in clean politics and giving the common people of our country the freest chance to express themselves. What is the present position? The present position is that a company can, by the general body, vote away unlimited amounts of money to any political party or funds. On the other hand, clause 293 says that the directors of a company can, without sanction of the general body, vote away every year, Rs. 25,000 or five per cent of the net profits, which may go to lakhs of rupees in some big companies, to political parties or funds.

I am going to point out some weighty public reasons why I think that this particular liberty should be denied to the shareholders and I am going to make the case in a moment. It is true that you may say that the shareholders who want to give away half their money to the Congress Party may give it and "why should we stop them?" They are grown up people. I agree, but was that the basis of the contract? When I subscribe to the shares of a company and later on, when the company modifies its articles to open the door to political contributions, I may be told, "You sell out your shares and go away, now that your eyes are opened". How many shareholders do that? When a man subscribes to the shares of a company, he subscribes to the major purpose mentioned in the memorandum which is to produce certain goods or to render a certain service and thus to make a profit. In other words, he does not think that his money is going to be distributed to the coffers of any political party, whatever it may be, and I object equally strongly to whichever party it may go.

The practice in other countries varies. I am not saying that all democratic countries, all decent countries, curb corporate contributions. Let me quote two leading democracies, the United States and the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, there is no ban on corporate contributions. Companies are allowed to contribute to political funds without let or hindrance, though recently, Mr. Gaitskell, the leader of the Labour Party, has expressed the view that in his opinion that should stop. In America, on the other hand, there is a ban. There are laws that prevent any corporate enterprise from voting corporate funds to any political campaign, committee or fund. In fact, they go further and put a ceiling on individual contributions also, and no American citizen can pay more than 5,000 dollars a year to the same political party more than once a year. In the United States, joint stock enterprises are prevented notwithstanding the fact that they do not interfere in other ways with the

shareholder's autonomy, from doing this—not because of their interests but because of the interest of the community in running its business.

There are three or four very good reasons why it is bad for the country if corporate enterprises' funds are allowed to be raided or levied for this purpose. First, the purpose is that the funds are meant for production. Every rupee taken away from investment in business and given to a political party, to that extent does not help production of the goods and services for which the company was formed. If we agree that maximum production is what we want—and we all agree, from our Prime Minister downwards—then surely, anything that we do to stop money from being diverted from the purpose of production to the purpose of fighting campaigns and elections is a good thing. It is a wrong use of money which was dedicated to a particular purpose.

Secondly, if you are allowing a company to give away their money, they are not going to bear the loss. They will pass the burden on to the consumer, because the donation to the political party will become part of the cost of business. It will be like an advertisement; like a public relations campaign. It will be added to the cost of business. So, in the end, the consumer pays; the price goes up and the consumer will suffer, and the inflationary tendencies will further be aggravated. If we want the consumer to be protected, then there is no reason why a company should be allowed to add the cost of political patronage to the price that it puts to the consumer.

Then, what about the minority shareholders? For them, in other parts of the Bill, great concern has been shown. I share that concern; I am very much a champion of the minority shareholders' right to fair play. But what happens to the minority shareholders here? Suppose a majority of a company's shareholders are for party A and a minority are for party B, then, are supporters of party B to have the humiliation and the annoyance of seeing their money going not to those whom they want to help but going to their enemies whom they want to see defeated? Are they going to allow the shareholders contracting out? That proposal was made and that was not accepted by the Minister.

My friend Shri Jayaprakash Narayan speaks about a non-party democracy. Many of us agree that party democracy can run wild sometimes. We want party strife to be limited to certain spheres. Most democratic parties in India, and certainly mine, agree that we should keep party elections, party labels, etc. out of panchayat elections and elections to municipal and local bodies, and that the major political parties should only fight the battle at the Assembly and the Parliamentary level. While this happy trend of thought

is being spread by those who preach the Sarvodaya ideal, to which many of us are sympathetic—though we cannot practise all of it—what does this Bill do? It takes party strife into joint stock enterprises which have so far been relatively free from party strife. I can imagine that, if this Bill is not amended, in the next few months, you are going to get groups of shareholders in major companies campaigning on behalf of their respective political parties. The Boards of Directors will be approached by petitions and counter-petitions saying, "we want the money to be given to party A". Somebody else will come and say, "We want the money to be given to party B." So, you will make the Board of Directors and the company meetings a cockpit of political warfare between the elements who want their particular party to be supported.

We want that money power should be limited. Money power cannot be eliminated, but money power should be limited. Individual citizens should put their hands into their own pockets, whether rich or poor, to help the party which they want to support. That is necessary. Political parties do want funds. But the citizen, as a citizen, has to contribute and not put his hands into somebody else's pocket which happens to be a shareholder's. That is what we are objecting to.

Finally, I come to the actual state of affairs in which we live. We live in a controlled economy. If this was a *laissez faire* State, you may say: "What has got a company to do with Government, and they may do whatever they like". But we are living today in a State where the power of life and death is in the hands of my hon. friend's Ministry and other Ministries of the Government over the fortunes of business enterprises. If we are told that this contribution will be a voluntary gift, we have a right to suspect and to be sceptical and ask: "Will the contributions be really voluntary?" If I am a businessman, I know that by pleasing a particular Minister, I can get a licence, I can get a permit and that I can get other facilities, and then, it is asking too much of my human nature to expect me not to say: "I will go and offer him a donation to his party in the hope that I shall get a *quid pro quo*." That is exactly what is happening. This is what the people of India believe is happening. So, there is no voluntariness about corporate contributions in a controlled economy. In a controlled economy, it is viewed with suspicion and is felt that there is coercion.

I do not want to generalise, but I know businessmen who have told me that, at the time of the last general elections, they were asked by emissaries of the Congress Party to pay so many rupees per loom in a weaving mill and so many rupees per truck in the case of transport companies. I am told that if in that election this amount per truck was X thousand rupees, it has now become 3X or 4X thousand rupees per truck in the case of certain States in the South and collections are being made per truck, and looms will no doubt follow in the next few months. When we show so much suspicion about private businessmen

and try to stop them from becoming anti-social, we have a corresponding obligation to see that those in office, those in power and authority in the country, also have reasonable checks put on them so that power is not abused.

So we come to this that a company today does not subscribe because of ideological purposes. When it subscribes, it does so because it hopes to get something in return or it is coerced to do so. And this is the beginning of a very vicious kind of vested interest.

Mr. Justice Chagla pointed out with what apprehension he viewed the possibility of business houses subscribing to political funds and in his judgment he made two suggestions. One was this:

"The least that Parliament can do is to require the sanction of the court before any large amount is paid by a company to the funds of a political party."

Naturally, there is no question of going to a court of law for approval if the Bill is passed as it stands at present. The other requirement that he has suggested also is, unfortunately, not in the Bill; that is, advertising immediately the fact of the donation. It is true that the Bill provides for the balance sheet to include a reference to the grant. But that balance sheet is only read by the shareholders of the company and it is published after the end of the financial year.

The result would be that the balance sheet would be published after the election and when the people go to the polls they will not know which political party has received what contribution from which public company.

So far as the Board of Directors is concerned, the ordinary shareholder would not know what is happening there. He will know the position only after the balance sheet is received. Therefore, in the interests of the shareholders and in the interests of the public, the least that needs to be done is to give maximum publicity to that fact and I know that if day after day a man opens his newspaper and finds that only one party is receiving contributions from big business houses, then he will know which is the capitalist party of India and which is not.

The Prime Minister has, more than once, taken the liberty to suggest the party to which I belong happens to be a projection of this or that business group. If it were so, I would not be making this point. I see nothing wrong in having good industrialists and good businessmen among my associates. I am proud of such people and I think it is no slur on our party if people say that we have good industrialists or good businessmen in our ranks. I think everybody should be proud of that, because they are serving the country in their own way. But since the Prime Minister seems to think that this is a useful way of smearing political opponents, let me say this that if, unfortunately, the Bill stands as at present, then who will be able to blame any man in the street who, by the same logic, says that the capitalist stooge No. 1 is nobody but Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the leader of the only party that wants corporate funds to be used for political purposes?

—Speech delivered in Parliament on Nov. 10, 1960.

Prime Minister's Marxist Dogmas

by M. A. Venkata Rao

WHILE his Five Year Plans (and the entire gamut of his economic policies at all levels) are calculated to further the establishment of a Marxist (socialist-communist) society in this country, the Prime Minister seems to be under the illusion that he is actually free from Marxist dogmas. He apparently thinks that his socialism is an original variant of his own, transcending the limits of Marxist dogmas in their unsuitable aspects and developments. He has repeated this conviction of his several times in past years and has reiterated it in Raipur recently. He said that Marx wrote a hundred years ago and that it would be unfair to imitate him in every particular at the present time. He wishes apparently to have the advantage of Marx's socialism while discarding its drawbacks in the development of his socialist construction in India. He wishes to eat the cake and have it too.

Since the fate of the country is being determined by this dogma of the Prime Minister, while England and the continent are discarding Marxist ideas such as nationalisation in their pristine purity, it is necessary for publicists and members of parties opposing Congress (and Leftist parties and groups) to examine this position of the Prime Minister and exhibit its error.

Present Marxist policies cannot be changed without their refutation as being straight concretisations of ideology and dogma.

An examination of current policies in economic development shows that far from evincing any departure from Marxism in any essential particular they exhibit a four-fold *doctrinairism* in their constituent ideas. For the Prime Minister to claim, as he does, any freedom from doctrinairism is not convincing.

1. After Avadi, the Second Five Year Plan and the present draft of the Third Plan state the goal of socialism to be realised through the policies adumbrated therein quite explicitly. The Industrial Policy Declarations of 1948 and 1956 announce unambiguously the pattern of change whereby the country is to be led from free to socialist economy. The basic structure of key industries like steel, electricity, machine tools, transportation, communications, banking and insurance, minerals, heavy industries in general are reserved for development by public economy owned and managed by Government. Other lines that are left to private enterprise are to take their chance in the interstices of public economy and to be content with the finances left over in the hands of the people after Government needs are satisfied. The present *mixed economy* is to give place gradually to full socialist economy with the private sector vanishing altogether or surviving in small ways like the ones permitted in Lenin's New Economic Policy.

This means full centralisation of all economic power

and activity in the country. This is Marxism *par excellence* and this is the explicit goal and drive of the Five Year Plans. This entails complete nationalisation in the fullness of time.

So we do not have here the end of dogma but rather its beginning and developing along its characteristic course with the full arc appearing clearly after the policy decision taken at the Nagpur Congress session to implement the blueprint of cooperative (in effect collective) joint farming as the ultimate sole pattern of agricultural production.

The Prime Minister has inaugurated the inevitable second stage in the socialisation of industry with the hints he has let fall in the last conference of the Federation of the Chambers of Commerce and again at the Raipur session of the All India Congress Committee. He has blamed industrialists for thinking always of large and costly units and has recommended that they hereafter take to small scale concerns. He has assured them that there will always be room for such small scale organisations scattered over the country. He has also formed a committee to inquire where the bulk of the vast financial outlays of the Government, Plan and extra-Plan, are going.

In terms of Marxist dogma, this move on the part of the Prime Minister corresponds to the imposition of ceilings on land holdings in order to eliminate large peasants! This is orthodox Marxism and the first step in the socialisation of agriculture, namely, the abolition of capitalist cultivators. The country-side will then be left with small and middle peasants who are to be swept into cooperative (collective) joint farms deprived of their holdings as owners. So the large manufacturers are on *notice now* from the Prime Minister that the next stage of industrial socialisation will connote their relentless elimination! This does not look like being a case of the freedom from dogma and doctrinairism inherent in Marxism. *

Thus the centralisation of the economy with the inevitable abolition of private enterprise and economic freedom for individuals and voluntary associations (which is the characteristic differentia of socialism à la Marx) remains the core and inspiration of the Prime Minister's economic policy.

2. Karl Marx had a great faith in mechanisation and was inspired with the vision of abundance that scientific technology could bring to mankind if used in an untrammelled way undeterred by considerations of human dignity and citizenship rights. The idea of planned economy stems from this "scientific" motive which is really a dream of perfect management or rationalisation using the machine to the limit of its possibility (which can always be pushed further by fresh inventions.)

Marx instances the way in which the manufacturer uses men and materials in his factory without regard

to the preferences or susceptibilities of workers. They are only hands to be disposed in productive schedules like nuts and bolts. The skill required is not skill tending towards self-expression but only facility in getting the most of the machine.

The idea of a centrally planned economy thus arose with the Master himself though he did not sketch any particular type. The present Russian type being reproduced in the satellite countries incorporates further features stemming from the necessities of the Russian revolutionary scene *vis à vis* the rest of the world. Marx envisaged the employment of the entire manpower of the country on the entire resources of land and raw materials that could be mobilised by authority. He dismissed objections referring to human freedom as mere "bourgeois prejudice". The economic freedom that was supposed to remedy the drawbacks of political freedom thus ended in freedom only for the one-Party dictatorial State!

The central characteristic of Marxism therefore involves the acceptance of the modern Frankenstein of the machine devouring man, subordinating him, body and mind, to the possibilities of productive expansion brought by it.

In India we are not ushered into full socialisation yet but the goal is explicitly declared and all measures taken so far are clearly in furtherance of the objective. This must end in the subordination of the people to the Plan. The high prices and inflation produced by the Second Plan are a grim foretaste of the sacrifice of the present generation to the future. The dreadful fact that even after six Five Year Plans in Soviet Russia, the common man is without full satisfaction of his daily needs of consumer goods makes *no impression* on the Prime Minister! In this as well, he is a prisoner of Marxist dogma and doctrinairism. He is ignoring the competent advice of informed and experienced persons—administrators, industrialists, bankers, students of communism abroad etc. He lives in such Olympic aloofness from the distress of the people (so visible all around us), that he can have the heart and unwisdom to demand "hard labour, blood, sweat and tears", borrowing the Churchillian rhetoric unseasonably so often!

3. The Five Year Plans we have taken up at the instance of the Prime Minister are a replica of the Soviet pattern barring of course its regimentation. The central feature of the plans is the excessive weightage given in them to heavy industries that consume a disproportionate degree of capital and take long years for assimilation for prosperous use in the economy. One result is the starvation of light, consumer industries which form the stuff of the common man's standard of living. Thus production increases in certain lines without giving relief to the masses. This is planning from the wrong end.

There were reasons actuating Soviet leaders in devising such Plans. They aimed at an abnormal rate of development of military industries so as to achieve self-sufficiency and parity in them (if not superiority) with Western Powers. The motive was strengthened

by the fact that the foundation of their revolutionary State postulated class war and *war to the death with capitalism*.

We in India have no such compelling motives for self-sufficiency in economic matters, (except perhaps in food grains) justifying us in stressing heavy and intermediate goods so disproportionately. More than half the proposed 10,200 crores of rupees in the Third Plan are ear-marked for heavy industries while only a thousand crores are reserved for agriculture including half for community development projects!

We could purchase heavy goods and machinery while we are developing consumer industries and accumulating both in the hands of the people and the Government ample surpluses for later investment in steel, electricity, heavy chemicals and other heavy industries.

But the unthinking surrender to Marxist dogmas on the part of the Prime Minister precludes any such natural and reasonable development of the economy.

Moreover, the State could initiate big industries if the industrialists are unable to do so but there should be a plan to devolve them to private hands as soon as investors and entrepreneurs are forthcoming on their secure establishment as going concerns.

But the Prime Minister true to his dogmatic adherence to Marxism which swears by centralisation of the economy in the hands of the State, refuses to consider this fruitful possibility.

4. Nagpur session of the Congress marks a turning point in the current programme of socialisation inasmuch as it formulated the policy of eventual co-operativisation of agriculture in joint farms. This entails the abolition of individual holdings on the part of peasants. The very procedure (adopted in Russia and East European States and China) of smoothening the process by *salami tactics* are clearly sketched in the Nagpur Resolution on agricultural development. The large farmer is first to be liquidated by the imposition of low ceilings—a matter of 25 acres, the whole of which a landowner is not permitted to resume from tenants, if he has given any part of it to them for cultivation on share-cropping or other tenure. The small peasant then is to be inveigled into service co-operatives and accustomed to joint action. Then he is to be "persuaded" to join joint farms in stages—mutual aid projects, elementary cooperative farms and eventually "higher" cooperative farms, which are equivalent to collective farms! Special grants to cooperative farms and withdrawal of assistance to independent farmers together with official pressure and propaganda are all mentioned. Even the necessity of a little violence or deprivation to minorities if majorities agree to join cooperative farms is set down in cooperative manuals and the land reforms proposals on the anvil in State Legislatures.

How can the Prime Minister say in the face of all this barefaced imitation of communist procedures that he is *free* from Marxist dogmas and doctrinaire fads? Either he has a closed mind unaware of these parallels or he is speaking with his tongue in his cheek.

(Continued on page 11)

Racial Discrimination In Soviet Russia

(The following are extracts from an interview with Mr. S. Omor Okullo, a 26-year-old African student, published in the "U.S. News & World Report". Mr. Okullo spent two years studying at the University of Moscow on a United Nations Scholarship. He was expelled by the Soviet Government after he protested against the way Russians treated African Students.)

Q. Mr. Okullo, you have written a letter to Soviet Premier Khrushchev protesting the treatment of African students at the University of Moscow. Why? What sort of treatment were you protesting?

A. We informed the Soviet Government about a Somali student who was attacked and beaten up and left unconscious by four Russian students.

Q. Why was he beaten?

A. His crime consisted of dancing with a Russian girl.

Q. Were there other incidents of this sort?

A. Well, one day the Russian students distributed a typed circular in the Russian language saying that the African students were getting too big for their boots in Moscow. What they meant really was that we came from poor homes and were getting big in Moscow and becoming an anti-Soviet group.

And one day one of the African students was insulted and called a "monkey." He was going in a lift, and merely asked them to stop for him on a certain floor.

These are a few incidents which we brought to the notice of the authorities.

Q. What was the result of your protest?

A. By appealing to the Soviet Government, we felt that something could be done by the Government to prevent what we did not wish to call racial discrimination.

Q. How many African students were expelled from the University of Moscow?

A. I and two other students, both Africans.

Q. Why were you expelled?

A. Actually, there was no clear reason given to us. But what we understood was that we were accused of being leaders of the anti-Soviet group.

Q. Why are so many African students so unhappy in Moscow?

A. One problem is that living conditions are very unsatisfactory. Also, there is not any relationship between the Soviet students and the African students. Many times, when Russian students are discovered in the company of African students, the Russians are summoned and reprimanded by the Komsomol (Russian youth organization).

Q. Why were you accused of being a leader of the anti-Soviet group?

A. Because I have been a vice-president of the African Students Union in the U.S.S.R. for two years,

and they discovered our union was not a political one and was not prepared to be used for any political propaganda.

Q. Did you get the impression they wanted to use you for political propaganda?

A. Yes, they did. That's quite true.

Q. Did they try to indoctrinate you politically?

A. In class, the teachers of Russian language try to find out the political views of the foreign students. If they find the student is really neutral—that he is unwilling to commit himself—then he is regarded as a dangerous man and politically undesirable.

For example, they asked us about our views on the U-2 and were very unhappy when I did not immediately take Russia's side.

Q. Did you find the Soviets provided you with necessary facilities for study?

A. No; the Soviet Union deliberately violated their promise to the United Nations. Before going to the Soviet Union we were promised money for books, equipment and other supplies. But, when we brought the matter to the the Soviet Minister for Higher Education, he denied it and said the United Nations was not correct. I wrote the Secretary General, but before I got a reply the Soviet Union accused me of being as dangerous as the Americans and leader of the anti-Soviet group.

Q. Can the African students go to dances with Russian students?

A. There are dances organized by the students, but they are limited to each country. They don't mix. The authorities frighten Russian students out of mixing with foreign students. By foreign I mean those who don't come from Socialist countries.

Q. Were you African and other foreign students in class with the Russian students?

A. Yes, we were all together. But this year the Russians are starting a "friendship university" for African students, where we will be separated from Russian students.

From my point of view I disagree with that, and I tried to explain it to many Soviet authorities that, if the Russians really want African students or African people to understand the Russian way of life, it is better to invite African students to mix with the Russian students in the same universities. I explained to the Russian authorities that the "friendship university" is not different from universities in South Africa. It is different only in the ideology applied to it.

Intellectuals Vs The State

by M. Devadas Kini

WHAT is the function and role of an intellectual in a society? This is one of those questions which not all the wise men put together can answer satisfactorily. And this is so for the simple reason that there can not be a limit to the vision and imagination of the poet, reasoning of a philosopher, canvas of the artist and the characters of a dramatist or a novelist. But then we have reckoned without the communists. They know exactly where the intellectual should be or fit himself — the chariot wheel of the Communist Party and the state; intellectual should be "a small cog and a small screw" as Lenin put it.

The books* under review look at the tragedy of the Hungarian intellectuals under the communist rule through two different ends of the telescope. The *Revolt of the Mind* shows what it is to live, even for a communist writer, in a communist regime and the *Political Prisoner* shows what it is to be behind the communist bars. The situations described in the books compare favourably with those of 1984 and *Darkness at Noon*. Communists have not let down Orwell and Koestler.

Paul Ignotus narrates in witty, humorous and lively details his home coming from London after the liberation of Hungary, as a correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* and the *New Statesman*, how he was arrested after Rajk as the agent of a "Truman-Bevin Tito - Vatican - Francoist - Hitlerist - Zionist - Nationalist-Cosmopolitan - Trotskyite - Capitalist world conspiracy", how and why he confessed ("I was certainly in no laughing mood myself, yet I could hardly suppress a laugh when he suddenly turned on to my face the spotlight that I had read about in *Darkness at Noon*"), the physical and mental torture that he underwent, his release after the Thaw and his escapade to Britain after the Hungarian Revolution.

Tamas Aczel and Tibor Meray, the Kossuth Prize-winners of the Hungarian Communist regime, narrate and describe in greater detail the Hungarian literary renaissance after the war and how it was arrested, how after the Thaw the Petofi Club was formed which gave expression to the feelings of the people and led the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

At the close of the war when communists gained control over Hungary there were three types of writers in Hungary. The so-called Moscovites, these were the Hungarian writers who were exiled by the Horthy regime during the inter-war years. They were the true-blue (red?) Soviet patriots whose attitude can best be summarised in: "We Hungarian writers pledge that we shall be worthy of him (Stalin) who

has shown as the way to all knowledge," as declared by Jossef Darvas, chairman of the Hungarian Writers' Association at a solemn meeting on the death of Stalin. Then there were the Hungarian writers. "I can forgive him for saying that Rakosi created the world, for he is then only comparing Rakosi to God... But how can a poet bring himself to write that, among poets, Rakosi is a greater poet than Shakespeare or Petofi?" asks Lagos Nagy, a Hungarian poet. This shows the attitude of the Hungarian communist writers. Then there was the third class of writers, that is, those writers who did not toe the party line. They were silenced for all time to come. All they could do in communist Hungary was to translate foreign classics. This is the price that they had to pay to be true to their souls, conscience and independence. This is the price of disagreement and disobedience. "The group had included the greatest poet-philosopher of the nation, Lorinc Szabo. It had also included Sandor Weoreos, a gifted young poet in whose hands the Hungarian language attained the perfection and beauty of music."

In 1945 the Communist Party started Hungarian Writers' Association to direct the literary activities of the writers. It was invariably presided over by one of the "gods" of the party who acted as the "literary policemen" to see that the writers do not go astray.

Tibor Dery is a great novelist. He was also a communist. He wrote the great novel of his life, a trilogy entitled *The Unfinished Sentence*. He was awarded the Kossuth Prize. He wrote a bunch of short stories on how Hungary was liberated. In these stories he did not always show the Soviet soldiers as angels. He set to work on a four volume novel, *The Answer*, a story of a working class boy from the thirties to 1948 when he became the director of a nationalised factory. The party received the first volume with caution. When the second volume was published Jozsef Revai, the Minister of Culture convened a meeting of writers to discuss it. Dery's crime: he did not allow the hero, Balian to join the communist party until 1945 and facing the hero with petty-bourgeois moral problems. A father always fights for his children. Dery attempted to explain why he had written the novel as he had. At the end, unable to contain himself any longer, he broke out: "The writer is trying to defend his right to write what he wants to write." But Revai replied explicitly and with finality: "In our world, the writer does not have this right... We give no licence, no so-called freedom to the writer to distort the realities of life. We do not accept the aesthetic thesis that the writer's taste and judgement are the highest criteria of how his works should be written and what he should write about. The taste and judgement of the writer may be in conflict with the judgement and interests of the people, the state and the Party. It isn't the

* *The Revolt of the Mind* by Tamas Aczel and Tibor Meray. pp. 150. Published by: Frederic A. Praeger, Publishers, New York. *Political Prisoner* by Paul Ignotus. pp. 201. Published by: Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

people or the state, who should adapt themselves to the taste and the judgement of the writer. It is the writer who must, by work and study, become one with the interests of the building up of socialism." This is the typical communist attitude. And this is how they arrested the growth of the Hungarian literary renaissance. The intellectuals were "cribb'd, cabinn'd confin'd" and frustrated.

The frustrated intellectuals now discovered and faced the painful reality—the disappointed, people groaning under a ruthless dictatorship. Writers subjected themselves to an agonising re-appraisal. Then came the great earthquake, the death of Stalin. The Thaw that followed rehabilitated and released many persecuted communists. This was a shock, wonder and a revelation for the people, especially the literary people. People began to ask inconvenient questions. "One could of course understand the speeded-up plan, the murderous tempo of work and the exploitation of agriculture. After all, a terrific effort was needed to achieve the sublime aim: socialism. But it was completely and absolutely incomprehensible why the murder of innocent people was necessary and even expedient. Here arguments and witty definitions and clever thoughts and pleasing formulation of words were of no avail." "A great Hungarian poet, Mihaly Babits once said: 'Among the criminals, the mute is an accomplice.'"

The storm that was released and unleashed after the disappearance of Stalin put Imre Nagy in the saddle in the place of Rakosi. Nagy announced his famous new programme loosening the grip of the state on the people. But it was short-lived. When Malenkov was relieved from the premiership, Nagy was also thrown out on the same grounds. Rakosi began to tighten the screw again. But now it was too late. Now it was not possible to silence the pen with the gun. The writers presented a memorandum against the dismissal of the editors, withholding publications, introducing censorship. At this time some young gifted writers formed Petofi Circle. "They did not envisage the Circle as a valve through which accumulated steam could escape from the furnace; rather it was to be a generator of steam to provide greater speed for the engine. They were enthusiastic disciples of Imre Nagy. They established contact with the "old man" and with the rebellious writers." They organized a series of debates and thousands of people flocked to hear.

By the time Rakosi could do anything about it the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet Communist Party cut down Stalin to size and knocked the bottom out of terrorism. Mikoyan came flying from Moscow and relieved Rakosi from his post "at his own request" to patch up with Tito.

The wind of change that blew over the communist world after the death of Stalin and the 20th Party Congress set in motion whirlwinds all over the communist world. There was the Poznan revolt. The university students of Budapest demanded a new government headed by Imre Nagy, withdrawal of Soviet troops, absolute freedom of speech, of opinion and of the press. And the Hungarian Revolution was on. The tragedy of these writers spotlights the problem of the second half of the 20th century: can totalitarian state and intellectual freedom go together?

(Continued from page 8)

adopting a finished "diplomacy" to achieve socialisation of the land.

5. Marxism has such a hold on the Prime Minister's mind that he is displaying a progressive indifference to democracy. Democracy will be a casualty eventually if socialism is introduced. Marx himself spoke disparagingly of "bourgeois freedom." The Prime Minister is revealing glimpses of the hinterland of his mind occasionally which are disturbing indications of the erosion of democratic feeling in his mind.

He let fall a remark during the Government Employees' strike that he had *all along* considered that the communist practice of *denying the freedom* to strike to workers was a good thing!

He has done things to lend colour to the charge that he is prepared to damage the powers of the judiciary—in the Mundhra enquiry as well as the more recent Nanavati case. To do so is to destroy the foundations of democracy and the *rule of law* which should be inviolate and impartial and beyond interference by the executive.

If big manufacturers and independent peasants disappear, as is contemplated by the Prime Minister's plans, classes that can put up a resistance to executive encroachment will no longer remain on the scene. Labour, office clerks and servants who will remain will not have the ability and independence to put up a fight against the party and bureaucratic class who will take over full powers in a monolithic power system.

Thus democracy and socialism of this Soviet, Marxist variety run counter to each other with defeat to democracy powerfully in-built in the situation. The Prime Minister seems to be aware of the truth but is indifferent to its blighting effect.

The Prime Minister's repetition of gibes against private enterprise, captains of industry, press leaders, trade union leaders, in fact against all independent sources of work and the cynical way in which he influences independent-minded Congressmen, (as for instance Mr. Subramanyam of Madras in the matter of cooperative farming at Nagpur) *to toe the line* show unmistakably the sway of Marxism on his mind.

Tibet Fights For Freedom

With a Foreword by the DALAI LAMA

Edited by RAJA HUTHESING

Published for

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

by

ORIENT LONGMANS

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
NEW DELHI HYDERABAD DACCA

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Mr. Nehru (in his speech in the Lok Sabha) showed some reluctance to deal with the China issue, continually making reference to some "larger context" in the framework of which China's more recent violations of India's integrity become "petty" incidents. May we remind the Prime Minister of a series of incidents from 1957 onwards, so petty that it was not even considered necessary to keep the country informed about them, which were finally revealed as the occupation by China of 12,000 square miles of Ladakh? We also wonder what other conclusion is possible in Peking about Mr. Nehru's obsession with the larger context except that it can plot more "petty" violations with impunity.

—Hindustan Times, November 25.

I would not be surprised if the Central Government borrowed money for development even from China.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Times of India*,
November 28.

As more and more countries have been liberated, colonialism has become less and less a real issue and the Afro-Asian bloc in reality has become increasingly a racist bloc.

—Sal Tas, *Swarajya*, November 26.

China would not join the U.N. until Formosa was integrated with China. If this were done, China would "cool down" and vacate the Aksaichin area.

—Mr. Brijeshwar Prasad, Congress M.P.,
Indian Express, November 24.

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

The impression left on the audience is that Mr. Nehru in effect regards the Soviet bloc as the paragon of virtue on whether it is disarmament or colonialism.

—Thought, November 26

In knowledgeable circles it is believed that Formosa and the American Seventh Fleet, for whom Mr. Krishna Menon has no use, are pegging down no less than a million of communist China's troops to her Eastern border; and, but for them, the military pressure on Tibet and on our Himalayan borders, would be considerably greater today. That, at least, should be a relevant consideration, especially for our Defence Minister.

—B. Shiva Rao, *Swarajya*, November 19.

There has so far been no reason to believe that Mr. Khrushchev would prefer India to China.

—Thought, November 26.

Mr. Nehru proudly declared that the policy of the Government of India in international affairs has produced an impact on world thought. It certainly has. It has convinced a large section of opinion in the Western world and now even in Africa that, whatever the outward guise, in reality and at heart, the Government of India is with the communist powers, with tyranny as against freedom.

—A. D. Gorwala, *Janata*, November 27.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

ON HEROIC LEADERSHIP

Arthur Schlesinger Jr.

THE STRANGLED CRY

John Strachey

LABOUR, LOYALTY AND THE LEFT

Henry Fairlie

December 1960

87

Annual Rs. 12.

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

Sole Distributors:

Four Oceans Publishers Pri. Ltd.

41 Gulistan, Carmichael Road, Bombay 26