

The Party or the People?

by V. B. Karnik

DIFFERENCES and disputes between the organisational and the parliamentary wings of the Indian National Congress have now become a commonplace affair. Every day newspapers publish reports of a dispute in this or that State or of the efforts to patch it up. Ordinarily these internal disputes in the party need not have concerned others. But the Congress Party holds such a preeminent position in the country that even internal quarrels amongst its members have a vital bearing upon its interests and, more particularly, upon the growth of democratic institutions and conventions. This gives those quarrels a much broader significance and the way in which they are tackled becomes a matter of national importance.

In most cases the quarrels involve no issues of principle or programme. They usually relate to questions of power and patronage. Those who are in charge of the organisational wing find to their discomfiture that, while they had some importance during the days of the elections, after the elections and the formation of the Ministry, all power and patronage get concentrated in the hands of Ministers and they lose all their importance. Human nature being what it is, it is difficult for them to reconcile themselves to that position. In addition, there are always groups and cliques in a State. There is a variety of local and sectional interests. A Chief Minister cannot satisfy all their claims. Dissatisfaction and discontent develop and they can easily assume the form of a dispute between the organisational and the parliamentary wings and create a crisis for a Ministry.

In Uttar Pradesh the crisis appeared in its crassest form. A person disliked by the parliamentary wing was elected the President of the Pradesh Congress Committee. The Chief Minister, Dr. Sampurnanand had earlier made the election a prestige issue and had declared that he would regard the election of Mr. C. B. Gupta as a vote of no-confidence in him. There was no reason why Dr. Sampurnanand should have adopted that position. It was not proper for him to dictate to the organisational wing as it would be wrong for the organisational wing to dictate to the parliamentary wing. In the end, the dictation of the organisational

wing prevailed and Dr. Sampurnanand had to make room for Mr. C. B. Gupta as the Chief Minister.

The dictation of the organisational wing prevailed through the instrumentality of the Congress High Command. The Congress High Command decided that Dr. Sampurnanand should go and Mr. C. B. Gupta should take his place. This decision was thrust upon the unwilling Congress Parliamentary Party of the State. The Parliamentary Party wanted Dr. Sampurnanand to continue as the Chief Minister. When he did not agree, a large majority of its members decided to elect to the post another senior Minister. It was not, however, allowed that freedom. It was compelled to choose Mr. C. B. Gupta as the High Command had decided to give him the place of Dr. Sampurnanand.

To any dispassionate observer this would appear to be a gross violation of all democratic principles and practices. In a parliamentary democracy it is the persons selected by the people who should have the final voice regarding the leadership and the composition of the Ministry. They represent the people far better than the members of a party committee. They are elected by the people as a whole while a party committee is elected only by the members of the party who usually form a small percentage of the population. If it is a people's government that is aimed at, the elected representatives of the people should rank higher than the officials of a party. If the latter are allowed to dictate to the former, the ultimate result will be the rule of a party in opposition to the rule of the people.

The choice that the Indian National Congress has to face is the choice between the party and the people. What will be the aim of its policy—to assert and maintain the primacy of the party machine or to help the people rule themselves through their elected representatives? There was a time when the people as a whole were identified with the Congress. That was during the days of the national struggle when the people's will was being expressed through that organisation. The situation underwent a radical change after the attainment of national independence and the establishment of a democratic government. A Parliament and State Assemblies elected on the basis of adult franchise were established as the organs of the people's will. The Congress had then to take a back seat as one of the political parties in the country though, no doubt, the most numerous and influential amongst them. The best and most talented amongst the Congress leaders entered Parliament and State Assemblies and began to function through them rather than through the party organisation. The parliamentary wing began to gain

(Continued on page 4)

Ellen Roy

WE pay our respectful homage to Mrs. Ellen Roy who died a martyr's death in the late hours of 13th December at her residence in Dehra Dun. The circumstances surrounding her violent death are still shrouded in mystery. A person or persons entered her house after eleven in the night and murdered her in cold blood after putting a gag in her mouth and a wrap over her eyes. An attempt was also made to set the house on fire. These facts raise the suspicion that the murder was not an act of a mere thief or robber. It is known that Mrs. Roy had the suspicion that the fires which took place in the office of the Survey of India in Dehra Dun which resulted in the destruction of some valuable maps of the Himalayan border areas were not accidental, that she had communicated her suspicion to the Government of India and had suggested a searching inquiry into the affair. One wonders if this had anything to do with the heinous act. It is alleged that the murder was politically motivated. In view of this allegation and in view of the mysterious circumstances surrounding the crime, it is to be hoped that the Government will take special pains to trace the offender and to bring him to justice.

Mrs. Ellen Roy was born and brought up in Germany and France. She was an American citizen by birth as she was the daughter of an American official in the United States Embassy in Berlin. She had, however, no opportunity to visit the States until late in her life. The visit that she paid in late 'fifties was the first visit to the country of her birth.

Ellen Gottschalk, as she then was, was drawn into the communist movement early in her life. It was in the course of that work that she came to know and admire and love Mr. M. N. Roy. Mr. Roy was thrown out of the official communist movement in 1929, after the sixth World Congress of the Communist International had swung the communist movement into an ultra-left line. Ellen continued to work with Mr. Roy even after his expulsion from the Communist International. In 1930, Roy came to India. He was arrested after seven months and was sentenced to six years' rigorous imprisonment. Ellen kept contact with him and kept him supplied with books, clothes and money. She patiently waited for his release. After his release she came to India early in 1937 and was soon married to him. Since then India became her country and she devoted herself to the cause of her people's progress and prosperity.

Mrs. Roy was a close collaborator of Mr. M. N. Roy and helped him in every possible way in the work in which he was engaged. She shared all his experiences with him and towards the end of his life helped him to develop both the philosophy as well as the movement of Radical Humanism. Without the help of Ellen Roy, Mr. Roy would not have been able to accomplish even half the work that he did in the political, social, philosophical and literary fields. She

was along with him in all his trials and tribulations and shared with him all the difficulties that he had to face.

Mrs. Roy also was a thinker and writer in her own right. She was a regular contributor to the *Radical Humanist* and many other periodicals. She has also written a couple of books on the philosophy of Radical Humanism. She took a prominent part in the evolution of that philosophy and its spread in India and abroad.

After Mr. Roy's death, Mrs. Roy devoted herself to the continuance of the work that Mr. Roy had begun. She could have as well gone back to Europe or the States and lived a life of comfort and security. Her brother and other relatives were keen on her going to the States and living with them. But with the rare sense of duty that she possessed, she rejected all those tempting offers and decided to stay in India and at Dehra Dun to complete the unfinished work of her husband. She was since then engaged in the task of collecting his books and letters, and editing and preparing for publication all his unpublished writings. She assumed the editorship of the weekly journal, *Radical Humanist*. She also continued her work as the Secretary of the Indian Renaissance Institute. She was mainly responsible for the Study Camps that were organised by the Institute from time to time.

In Ellen Roy the country has lost an earnest and devoted worker dedicated to the cause of freedom, democracy and higher human values. Her death will be an irreparable loss to the Radical Humanist Movement and to all those who are working for the evolution of a free society of free and equal men. It is a pity and a disgrace that a person of her eminence had to fall a prey to the foul hands of a murderer. The echoes of the murder will be heard all over the world and our prestige will not be enhanced by the fact that we were not able to afford a selfless, dedicated worker the protection that she deserved.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

ALGERIAN TRAGEDY
Philip Williams

BERENSON'S VALUES
Meyer Schapiro

THE WIND OF CHANGE
Christopher Hollis

CHANGED ANTAGONIST
Richard Lowenthal

January 1961

88

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

Notes

Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference

THE third annual conference of the Indian Association for Afro-Asian Solidarity, which was held in the city last month, was not much of a success. It was one of the usual propaganda circuses organised by the communists under different labels and on different platforms. All the communist front organisations were geared up to popularize the Conference and give a semblance of mass support to the movement for Afro-Asian Solidarity. Communist trade unions, student organisations, women's organisations, literary groups and film stars were pressed into the service to attract a big crowd for the Conference. Names and prestige of fellow-travellers like Rameshwari Nehru, Aruna Asaf Ali, Dr. Gyan Chand and others were also exploited to conceal the real communist character of the Conference. Besides, eminent Congress leaders like S. K. Patil, Union Food Minister, V. N. Desai, Mayor of Bombay and Shri Prakasha, Governor of Bombay, were also inveigled to give the whole show respectability and non-party appearance.

But in spite of these efforts, the Conference failed to evoke popular response in any appreciable measure. The Conference, it was announced by the organisers, would be attended by two thousand delegates from all over the country. But even the inaugural session, which was addressed by the Mayor and Governor of Bombay, was attended by not more than a thousand persons. Similarly, the concluding mass rally, which was held on Sunday at one of the big meeting grounds in the city, failed to attract more than four thousand people. This was an extra-ordinarily poor performance considering the fact that even ordinary meetings at the Shivaji Park ground, where the mass rally was held, attract bigger audiences any time. The press also took a scant notice of the deliberations of the Conference.

The Conference, besides, failed to draw new recruits, and even some of the eminent persons who were scheduled to participate in it, kept themselves away at the last moment. For example, Dr. V. R. Khanolkar, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bombay, was the Chairman of the Reception Committee formed for the Conference. It was announced that he would participate in the deliberations of the Conference. But he was conspicuous by his absence throughout the Conference. There were many other similar examples and the organisers had a hard time in explaining away their absence by fake excuses.

The only aspect of the Conference which struck most of the people was the association of the Congress leaders and the Governor with this communist show. There were even critical comments in the local papers

prior to the Conference over the propriety of the Congress Mayor, Minister and the Governor openly associating themselves with the communist front organisation which was eager to denounce all sorts of crimes of the West but had no words to spare on the question of the Chinese aggression on India's territory. Not only that the Congress leaders participated in the conference, but, what is worse, they also joined in the conspiracy of silence on the issue of Chinese aggression. Or was it a reflection of the neutral foreign policy of our Prime Minister, who in his long address to the U.N. General Assembly last October referred to the Chinese aggression as a mere "controversy"?

Ex-Communists' Convention In Kerala

THE two-day all-Kerala Convention of Ex-communists, held at Ernakulam in the first week of December, was significant in more than one sense. Judging from press reports, the Convention evoked good and enthusiastic response from all sections of the people in the State. About 300 ex-communists from different walks of life participated in the Convention which was fortunate in having the guidance of Mr. Stephen Spender, well-known poet and writer, who inaugurated it, and Mr. Wolfgang Leonhard, the German ex-communist writer, who also participated in its deliberations. Kerala has the double distinction of electing and unseating the first Communist Government through peaceful democratic methods. Though communist strength in the State has been on the decline after the overthrow of their Ministry last year, it is wise to remember that communists still have a powerful mass following, especially among the Ezhvas and Harijans. The democratic forces in the State have yet to consolidate their gains and provide an effective democratic alternative convincing enough to the people still under the communist influence. The organisation of the Ex-communist Convention, was a welcome move in this direction. It was aimed at bringing together all ex-communists in Kerala with a view to devise constructive ways of countering the communist threat.

The deliberations at the Convention centred round the problem of methods of strengthening democratic elements in the state and providing an adequate answer to the ideological challenge of communism. The participants in the Convention decided not to form any separate political party for the purpose, but to co-operate with existing democratic parties. This was a wise decision, as the formation of yet another party would further divide and consequently weaken the democratic forces in the State which already suffers from too many parties and groups working at cross purposes. At the same time, the Convention has announced its decision to fight unhealthy trends like communalism creeping into politics. It would strive to "strengthen progressive elements inside political parties in the preservation of democracy and the democratic way of life". This is a welcome decision as politics in Kerala, as in the rest of the country, needs to be

purified and purged of all harmful and regressive tendencies. If the ex-communists succeed in checking these evil tendencies, it will go a long way in strengthening the roots of democracy in the State.

In a sense, the Convention was also a beginning of a new quest—quest for a new sense of purpose and direction—on the part of the ex-communists. As such, the quest was most opportune and timely. Events in the last few years have exposed the clay feet of the communist god; at the same time they have revealed the total inadequacy of other doctrines—including those of socialism. In fact, most of the old ideologies and dogmas have lost much of their validity and are in need of searching re-examination and re-evaluation in the light of the past experience and the present situation. The convention, in a resolution, has announced its decision to formulate a “progressive programme” with democratic socialism as its goal. It would have been more appropriate and fruitful, if, instead of falling a prey to the temptation of adopting current ideological labels, the Convention had subjected communist and other ideologies to a searching and fundamental re-examination, and discussed ways and means of strengthening democratic institutions in the country.

Developments In Kashmir

THE dissolution of the Democratic National Conference and the return of its leaders to the ruling National Conference are pointers to the new communist line in the strategic state of Kashmir. Mr. Sadiq, in August 1957, led his group out of the ruling National Conference after it had “exhausted all efforts to reform the party from within” to form the Democratic National Conference as a leading opposition party in the State. Though the Sadiq group had advanced ideological and other differences as the reasons for quitting the ruling party, it was well-known that the real reasons for their leaving the parent organisation were the differences which developed between Mr. Sadiq and Prime Minister Bakshi over the sharing of power after the last General Elections. Mr. Sadiq has now stated that he has no differences whatsoever with Mr. Bakshi and that he now feels that the Kashmir Prime Minister’s “efforts to give the people a clean administration deserve the fullest support”. But it is wise to remember that when quitting the Kashmir National Conference three years ago, Mr. Sadiq himself had described the latter as “the most reactionary group of self-seeking autocrats”. It is rather a sad commentary on the state of affairs in Kashmir that after levelling these charges against the ruling party, Mr. Sadiq within three years should find it necessary to rejoin the National Conference in order to strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister in combatting the evils (of which, according to Mr. Sadiq himself, the latter was the root-cause).

What is more dangerous, is the ideological character of the Sadiq group. Mr. Sadiq, himself a communist, was the leader of the communist group inside the

National Conference till 1957. He was one of the vice-presidents of the All-India Peace Council; he also presided over the Conference of the Democratic Youth League, a communist front organisation, in 1953. He never concealed his intimate association with the communists. It is well-known that when he was a Minister in the Kashmir State before the last General Elections, communist leaders of India, on visits to the State, used to be his guests. Naturally, when the Sadiq group left the National Conference and formed the rival organisation, almost all the communists of Kashmir joined the Democratic National Conference as members. It was not without reason, that out of all the Indian parties, only the Communist Party of India supported the Democratic National Conference unreservedly. Even the Kashmir Prime Minister had no doubts about the communist-lining of the Sadiq Group whom he described in 1957 as “functioning as the vanguard of the Communist Party of India” or as “rabble of communist reactionaries”. That, in spite of this knowledge, the Kashmir Prime Minister should enthusiastically welcome his erstwhile opponents back into his fold throws a flood of light on the unprincipled and dangerous political opportunism which has plagued the politics in Kashmir since Independence.

(Continued from page 1)

importance and precedence over the organisational wing. That process has begun; the organisational wing dislikes the development; but it will have to get reconciled to it, if the country is to progress on the road towards democracy.

A parliamentary party is primarily responsible to the electorate which elects it. The organisational wing of a party must accept this essential fact and adjust its actions and policies accordingly. It is only in communist countries that the organisational wing gets the primacy, for in those countries there is no parliament in the real sense of the term and the highest authority that party members have to serve is the party and not the people.

In our country we have yet to build up our democracy. The Congress has to shoulder that task as the main and the major party. It has to create healthy conventions. Conflicts between the organisational and the parliamentary wings will arise from time to time. Instead of relying on exigencies of the situation, a rule of general application will have to be evolved for their solution. The rule will have to be in conformity with the principles of democracy. Democracy demands that the elected representatives of the people must have in any conflict primacy over the managers of the party machine. As democracy develops it is the parliamentary wing which will gain predominance over the organisational wing. In U.P. the former was subordinated to the latter. That connotes the subordination of the people to the party which is the sure road towards dictatorship and totalitarianism.

Towards A New Liberalism

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE times are propitious for a new lease of life to liberalism as an economic and social philosophy, if only a fresh statement of principles could be achieved in defence of freedom while incorporating the hoped for values of socialism.

The slogans of Marxist socialism, charged with the drive towards communism as they are, have proved barren. The British Labour Party is experiencing the throes of a new orientation towards a more empirical point of view eschewing doctrinaire attachments to policies like nationalisation of industries and the centralisation of economic power in the hands of the State.

We find therefore liberalism and socialism approaching each other in Britain and elsewhere.

But the differentia of liberalism should be restated with unambiguous clarity showing how it can include the inspiration of social amelioration that has deluded socialists into Statism and the communist parlour.

The modern world has been beguiled unnecessarily by the strident and dogmatic claim of socialism that there is no alternative to its identification of economy and polity, its endowment of the political machine with sovereign economic power. This has entailed the abolition of the private class of property-owning entrepreneurs gathering all property in the means of production into the hands of the State and its bureaucracy. Property for consumption is formally left in the hands of private citizens. But in substance even this liberty of using consumption property (wages and salaries) has been allowed only within the limits determined by State plans and regulations.

Any criticism of communism today evokes a pitying smile as if the critic was a benighted capitalist survivor into the new age. It is assumed as axiomatic that to reject communism is *ipso facto* to embrace capitalism!

The new liberalism has first of all to demonstrate that there is a real and workable alternative to communism and that communism and capitalism are not mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive.

It has to free itself from the common assumption that to reject communism is to bind oneself over to *laissez faire*, i.e. the policy of according complete freedom to the private owners of capital in the work of production and distribution. The fear is that such freedom to the capitalist class would automatically result in ruthless exploitation of the proletariat who have nothing but their hands and feet to earn a living.

Such a task involves a redefinition of the roles of the State and of the economy in society.

As T. H. Green pointed out in his time, the excesses of the dismal age (1780-1830) of the early years of the Industrial Revolution in England were due not so much to capitalism as such as rather to the failure

of the State at the time to realise its obligations to maintain the minimum conditions of the good life among workers in the new factories through adequate legislation of the sort that started with the new Factory Acts after a good deal of agitation and enquiry by royal commissioners. Karl Marx draws his data from the reports of these commissioners and inspectors and pays a tribute to their impartiality and accuracy and zeal.

The enclosure of the feudal lands in previous centuries had created a large class of suffering indigent agricultural labour who were in the last stages of destitution. It was the dereliction of duty by the State towards these hordes of displaced rural population that forced them into the slums round the new factories to earn what they could to keep body and soul together. The revelation of their condition started the new relief legislation which ended in the later years of the century in socialism.

A *positive liberalism* such as that of Green, Bosanquet and Barker would make room for full regulation by the State of the conditions of work and wages in all economic activity engaged in by industrial employers and workers.

The horrors of the *laissez faire* policy were due not to capitalism as an economic function of the owners of capital but to their *usurpation of sovereignty in their sphere*. They justified in the early years the view of Karl Marx that the capitalist class inherited the powers of the monarchy and aristocracy of old and invaded the region of the State. The Government became actually for a generation or two the managing committee of the capitalist class of manufacturers, leaders of big commerce, shipowners, bankers, transport men and so on. Such a State should not be entrusted with full powers. *Laissez faire* in such hands would necessarily entail the oppression of the working class.

The flaw in orthodox capitalism was its usurpation of political sovereignty along with economic freedom. The pathway for a renewal of the valid values of liberalism (as a regime of expanding freedom to the individual and his voluntary groups) lies therefore in returning the capitalist class strictly to the economic field, leaving the State free to *regulate all economic activity*, (as every other activity in every sphere of social life) on behalf of the common good.

The State comes into existence *to make life possible*, said the wise Aristotle, but went on to add that it continues to function *to make life good*.

The province of the State is coincident with that of all life, individual and social. The experiment of excluding religion or economics or education or even culture from its orbit as suggested by early liberalism

has proved failure. J. S. Mill's theory that the State should confine itself to that part of individual activity that is self-regarding has proved impracticable. Human activities cannot be divided into self-regarding and other-regarding sections. Every action is both self-regarding and has repercussions on the life of others into which the State may have to enter to safeguard the common good and adjust rights and duties.

If places of worship are used to foster anti-social conspiracies, the State cannot stand aside out of respect for their sanctity. The anti-social activity has already *ipso facto* destroyed their sanctity. The superior sanctity of social good will have to enter the field through the policeman. So in marriage and private amusements.

The economic class of property-owning entrepreneurs should not be allowed to assume political power. But the State too should not be allowed to encroach into the sphere of individual liberty. Where can liberalism draw the line of demarcation to do justice to the two aspects of the problem?

The new liberalism is confronted with this conundrum. Its success in answering this question will determine the new lease of life it may acquire in today's world crisis.

There is no doubt that the end of State action is the promotion of the good life. But the means at its disposal is force and automatism generated by fear of punishment.

It may even be claimed that the State has the right to promote morality.

But force cannot improve the morality or religion or culture of individuals and groups. These are activities that spring from the interior motives of individuals and force cannot inspire them to activity in their true nature as spiritual or ethical experiences. The whole essence of these activities depends on their voluntary character.

This instrument of force, of punishment and reward at the disposal of the State *limits the nature of its action* (vertically). There is no area of life in which it cannot legitimately enter. But the *manner* of its interference must be such as to maintain the external conditions of the good life—law and order, justice as between man and man and so on.

As Green puts it, the State will require certain kinds of behaviour, commissions and omissions, on the part of citizens even as external acts and omissions from any motive whatever, in the interests of social order to minimise the clash of individual and allow them elbow room to pursue the good things of life in accordance with their own sense of things. State action is like the rule of the road or of the queue to board bus or railway train or enter or leave theatres. The rule will minimise clash and maximise freedom for all.

Bosanquet describes the action of this principle as one of *hindering hindrances*, removing obstacles from wilful or ignorant obstruction caused by the interference of others.

The central advantage of this view of State action is that it envisages all positive activity to reside in individuals pursuing their own life-objectives for happiness. The State impinges on their activities only to remove any obstruction caused by external conditions or by mutual clash and conflict. The State will not on this view engage directly in trade or industry, teaching or preaching, or art or engineering constructions except in special cases like irrigation works and postal services.

But it will legislate to maintain fair conditions to maximise freedom such as those necessary to promote competition and restrain monopoly.

But State *leadership* is not precluded in special circumstances. If capital is not forthcoming for essential industries like those for housing, medicine or agriculture, the State may start works on its own. But it will be ready to hand them over to private citizens as soon as ability and responsibility on their part become manifest. The State will be a nursery of talent and social responsibility. It will *not supplant* private effort for all time in any line but will rather *supplement* it in special lines as a pioneer and will *support* the autonomy of the economy and the free market. This will ensure the sovereignty of the consumer who will be enabled to choose the best products offered by different producers. State monopoly as assumed by socialism will afford no room for such freedom to producers and consumers alike.

This is common to old and new liberalism. But to meet the new situation and to cover the field exploited by socialism in sentimental appeal, the new liberalism will advance to extend the sphere of freedom from the old well-to-do entrepreneur class *to all classes alike*.

The idea of freedom that it has is more positive and does not consist merely in a barren absence of restraint. Rather it will advance to provide the conditions that make freedom *real to the many*, the poorest workers in the economy.

It will encourage the emergence of a property-owning democracy. It may advance funds to workers to purchase shares in their companies. It may advance funds to tillers to acquire new lands and agricultural equipment. It will provide social overheads such as health services, roads and other communications and education, (technical and general). Some would go a step further and say that the new liberalism may offer social security not as a gift but as assistance to voluntary savings (through insurance) in various ways without sapping individual initiative and responsibility. In a word, the modern liberal state could provide welfare for all as far as possible through encouragement of the trusteeship principle and voluntary effort and organisation.

But it will avoid direct supplantation of citizen effort, individual and social, except temporarily as a pioneer. It will provide a State *leadership* for progress without spelling the eclipse of freedom like socialist centralisation.

Whither Cuba?

by Aziz Madni

EVERY revolution, every single one without any exception whatever, started as a movement for liberation and finished as a tyranny". So exclaims a disenchanted revolutionary in Ignazio Silone's *Bread and Wine*. The Cuban revolution which began hopefully as a movement for the liberation of its people from the hated Batista regime seems unfortunately to be heading for the same tragic ending.

Before the emergence of its leader Fidel Castro on the scene, Cuba, with its handful of wealthy landowners and a mass of landless proletariat, was a dictatorship presided over by a corrupt general with the connivance, if not the blessings, of the United States government. This sordid dispensation was made all the more hateful in the eyes of the people by unscrupulous American businessmen who had turned Cuba into a happy hunting ground for themselves and their Cuban counter-parts.

The revolution put an end to all this. General Batista's dictatorship was replaced by Castro's, to be sure. But the latter rested on a broad basis of popular support. It gave land to the landless peasantry, broke the monopoly of wealth in the hands of a few and terminated American business interests that had half a century dominated Cuban economy.

But that was as far as it went towards liberation. Beyond it, the revolutionary government flattered by imitation its hated predecessor. The press was as ruthlessly throttled as before, individual freedom suppressed and the rule of law reduced to a mockery. The *New York Times*, which has a reputation for its factual, unbiased news coverage, reported in its issue of October 16, 1960: "The island prisons are full of counter-revolutionaries most of whom were former followers of Premier Fidel Castro". No one who knows how beastly life under General Batista was, will shed a tear over the execution or imprisonment of his supporters by the revolutionary regime. But when erstwhile supporters of the revolution itself are thrown behind the bars or driven into exile, there can be no intellectual doubt about the turn the revolution is taking.

From its very beginning, the revolution has had an element of anti-Americanism about it. Its origin could be traced back to the protection extended by the U.S. to Batista and American business interests. Towards the end of the year 1959, anti-American feeling among the people was positively inflamed by a series of incendiary bomb attacks launched on Cuban sugar fields from airstrips in Florida. And Washington's unconvincing declaration of its inability to control these activities on the ground that they were private aircrafts flown by soldiers of fortune did precious little to help matters.

Nevertheless, left to itself the Cuban revolution

would have run its normal course in comparative peace and even its anti-Americanism would have receded into proper perspective. But in February last year came Mikoyan to fish in the troubled waters of Cuba. He brought with him a \$100 million credit, an order for sugar and offer of oil in exchange. This was followed by trade agreements with other members of the communist bloc. Thus by a few strokes of the pen, the Kremlin had established a bridgehead for the economic penetration of the whole of Latin America. Nobody in fairness could question the revolutionary government's right to deal with any country it liked. But one wondered whether a small country like Cuba could, over a period of time, take just what it wanted from the Soviet Union and no more.

In the context of these developments, the Marxist jargon Fidel Castro and his lieutenants were mouthing in season and out of season assumed a new and threatening import. Were these leaders of the revolution communists seeking to reduce their country to the status of a Soviet satellite? Was their profession of faith in Marxist ideology after all an act of genuine conviction and not the claptrap it was generally supposed to be?

There is not enough evidence to prove that Fidel Castro is a communist. "Castro is a pragmatic individualist, and much too outspoken and emotional to fit into a communist society" wrote an English correspondent after a study tour of the Caribbean. But his henchmen appointed in key positions are either communists or fellow-travellers. For example, his brother Raul, Commander-in-Chief of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, is a latter type while Ernest "che" Guercara, who runs Cuba's finances, is most certainly an out-and-out communist. So are some others. Thus while Fidel is not a communist, in the company that he keeps he is playing the Red game so as not to make much difference.

Of this there is plenty of evidence: the fact that only communists are allowed to operate as a party, the fact that anti-communists are officially branded as counter-revolutionaries, the adoption of Marxist ideology at home and open alliance with Russia on the international plane and, of course, the appointment almost exclusively of communists and their supporters in positions of authority and importance. As a matter of fact, anti-anti-communism has become so much an official policy of the Cuban government today that opposition to communism is regarded as nothing short of treason against the revolution. It is to escape the consequences of such an attitude that eminent intellectuals in the revolutionary movement like Prof. Arango and Miguel Quevedo, editor of *Bohemia*, both of whom were underground fighters against the Batista regime, have had to flee from the Island and seek

refuge abroad. And the Cuban Committee of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which had welcomed the advent of the new regime in the belief that it would restore respect for individual and cultural liberties, was also forced to dissolve.

In the weeks and months following Mikoyan's visit to Cuba, U.S.-Cuban relations were further strained until towards the end of June last year they reached a breaking point with Cuba's seizure of Texas company's oil refinery for its refusal to refine Russian crude oil. The United States government, which had until then kept its head, retaliated with an embargo on imports of sugar, the mainstay of the island's economy. Fidel Castro in turn finished the job by expropriating the rest of the \$1 billion worth of American holdings in Cuba.

Into this fray jumped Nikita Khrushchev with his threat of rocket intervention should the U. S. attack Cuba. For the first time in history, the hemisphere was threatening to become a battleground in the global struggle between Soviet Russia and the United States. Actually, any unilateral military action by the United States to break Dr. Castro's power was most unlikely, not only for the disastrous effect it would have on world opinion but also because a repetition of another explicit intervention as in Guatemala was bound to estrange the other members of the Organization of American States who are traditionally reluctant to take sides with the U. S. against a brother Latin State and among whose people Dr. Castro's revolution is hailed as a movement for the liberation of his brethren from the economic evils that parallel their own. With such a setting for a background, it was easy for Mr. Khrushchev to pose as the defender of Cuba against a practically non-existent threat from the United States.

Failing Castro's repudiation of the Soviet threat, the U. S. called a conference of Latin American foreign ministers at San Jose in Costa Rica under the auspices of the Organization of American States. The purpose of calling it was to put Dr. Castro and his junta in the dock for encouraging, if not actually inviting, Soviet intervention in the affairs of the hemisphere. The conference terminated with a declaration known as "San Jose Declaration" which, without mentioning Cuba by name, indicted its government for jeopardising the security and solidarity of the hemisphere by its refusal to repudiate the Soviet threat of rocket intervention. The significance of this declaration lies in the fact that despite their traditional aversion to joining hands with the U.S. against one of their own kind, the Latin American states were sufficiently disconcerted by Dr. Castro's implied acceptance of a possible Soviet intervention to make a common cause with the United States.

There are two circumstances in either of which the United States might feel compelled to intervene militarily in Cuba: the establishment on the island of a Soviet military base and Cuban interference with the

American naval base of Guantanamo. Should such a contingency arise, it is unlikely that Mr. Khrushchev will rush in with his rockets and run the certain risk of touching off a nuclear war on a global scale. At least on Berlin, he showed far more foresight than to carry out his ultimatum to the Western Powers to quit.

In the meantime, what can the United States do to keep Cuba from sliding behind the Iron Curtain? There is only one thing to do: seek a reapproachment with Cuba. It must begin with the recognition of the fact of the revolution and acceptance of the concomitant social and economic changes in Cuba. It will involve the lifting of the embargo on the import of Cuban sugar which has a disturbing similarity with the withdrawal of American offer of aid for the Aswan Dam and has proved far less effectual. And it will also mean the inclusion of Cuba in the \$ 500 million programme recently initiated by the U. S. for social, educational and economic needs of Latin American countries. The United States can, of course, in turn demand dissociation of the revolutionary movement from international communism, freedom of speech and individual rights for the people of Cuba and restoration of American holdings or adequate compensation for them. Such a course of action will not be easy for the new President of the United States to undertake. But is it asking too much if thereby Cuba can be induced to stay this side of the Iron Curtain?

EVERY TUESDAY

OPINION

Edited by A. D. GORWALA

*Independent, informed views on National and
International affairs*

Rs. 2/-, the annual subscription including postage,
may be sent to **OPINION**, 40-C Ridge Road,
Bombay

Moscow Conference of Communist Parties

(Contributed)

ON December 2, 1960, the Soviet press published an "information report" on the Moscow Conference of representatives of 81 communist parties. In the same issue *Pravda* published a photograph of the 189 conference participants. Contrary to established communist tradition which only permits photographs of communist leaders showing them on the rostrum, on a congress presidium, or in the act of signing a particular document, on this occasion all the conference participants were shown seated in a particular order. This deviation from the protocol was an expression of the need to stress throughout the communist world the importance of the conference and to demonstrate the "unity" achieved in the course of the discussions. The actual placing of the most important figures in the group took place in accordance with the law governing communist hierarchy and reflects the present distribution of forces in the world communist movement. At the very center of the group are Khrushchev and Chairman of the Chinese Party Central Committee Liu Sha-chi. They occupy completely equal positions in relation to the other delegates. On either side are the French Party leader Thorez and East German Party Secretary Ulbricht. Then come the heads of the Communist parties of the satellite states and capitalist countries. The photograph was thus intended to stress the equal position of the Soviet Union and China in the world Communist movement, the political importance of the Communist Parties in the Communist-bloc and capitalist states, and to emphasize the principle of "collective leadership" throughout the world Communist movement.

The report itself contained one surprise—it did not say when the conference had taken place. The outside world was well aware that it had begun immediately after the celebrations marking the forty-third anniversary of the October Revolution and finished at the end of November. Nothing was said about the conference while it was in progress; it was officially a secret. In duration and number of delegates present, the conference can only be compared with the Comintern Congress. The latter were attended by considerably fewer delegates. The founding Congress in 1919 was attended by 53 delegates from 19 countries (8 of which are presently part of the USSR) and the final, Seventh Congress in 1935 by delegates from 65 Communist Parties. At the last conference of Communist Parties, held in Moscow in 1957 to mark the fortieth anniversary of the October Revolution and which lasted three days, there were delegates from 64 parties, including the Yugoslav. At the time a propaganda Peace Manifesto was published. The conference was preceded by a meeting of the 12 Communist-bloc Parties which issued a Declaration. It also lasted three days.

A comparison of the 1957 conference with the

present one will show that on this occasion the solution of problems of the coordination of Communist foreign and domestic policy, tactics and strategy and the analysis of differences between Moscow and Peking was extended from the narrow framework of the communist camp to a meeting of all Communist Parties. The initiative here came from the Chinese. The reason for the conference was kept as brief as possible: "The participants in the conference exchanged experience and acquainted themselves with each other's views and standpoints, discussed pressing problems of international development today in the interests of the struggle for common goals." (*Pravda*, December 2, 1960). This non-committal wording substantiates the view of the outside world that there was a struggle at the conference between Moscow and Peking over the line to be taken by future communist policy and that efforts to reconcile the conflicting standpoints on pressing problems of theory, tactics, and practical policy were unsuccessful. Normally East-bloc conferences last three or four days, the purely propaganda speeches are published immediately, and the resolutions and decisions prepared in advance by the Kremlin.

An example of the Sino-Soviet rivalry and differing approach to political events is provided by relations with Cuba. Towards the end of November, a Cuban delegation arrived in Peking and a communiqué was signed on November 30. The Soviet report concentrated on the economic aspect of the agreement. The *New China News Agency* broadcast the main, political section of the communiqué. The communiqué notes that "China and Cuba announce...their readiness to ensure support for the people's of Latin America, Asia and Africa in their righteous struggle against colonialism and imperialism." It stresses the need to form a "united world front against the aggressive imperialist forces headed by the United States." Prior to the publication of the results of the visit of the Cuban delegation the widow of Sun Yat-sen, Sung Ching-ling, had published an article which in spite of its conciliatory tone had clearly pointed to the leading role of China in Asia and to the need to form a united world front against the United States.

After the Moscow Conference both the Soviet and Chinese set about attempting to minimize the lack of agreement. The report stressed that "the discussion of all questions took place in an atmosphere of brotherly friendship." Liu Shao-chi proclaimed at meetings in Leningrad and Minsk the "indisruptable brotherly friendship of the Soviet Union and China." The Soviet press is presently full of articles on the "unanimous agreement" in the world Communist movement and efforts to convince world opinion that the contradic-

tions between the USSR and China are fabrications of "bourgeois prophets".

On December 6, 1960, the Soviet press published a "Declaration of the Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties," which can be regarded as the programme of action for future communist policy. From it one can analyze the balance of forces in the world communist movement and the nature of Sino-Soviet differences over both theory and practical policy. One can point first to the numerous repetitions, demagogic tone, and obvious attempt to conceal in a mass of verbiage the actual state of relations and struggle inside the communist camp. The most important conclusion is that the present solution is merely a temporary compromise between Moscow and Peking. The basis of this compromise is that the Soviets have been accorded the leading position in the world communist movement, while all the basic theses of international communist policy which are under dispute have been formulated in accordance with the Chinese demands. The Declaration notes that the "Soviet Union is the first country in history to lay the path to communism for all mankind. It is the brightest example and most powerful support for the peoples of the entire world." On the other hand, "the people's revolution in China has inflicted a crushing blow on the positions of the imperialists in Asia, has furthered to a considerable degree the change in the balance of world forces in favour of socialism. Having given a new impetus to the national-liberation movement, it has exerted an enormous influence on peoples, particularly on the peoples of Asia, and Latin America." We must point out here that the honors accorded Moscow do not include Khrushchev. His policy and he himself are not mentioned at all in the Declaration.

The main import of the Declaration is the constant reference to the United States as the "main prop of colonialism," "the main force of aggression and reaction," "the main support of world reaction and the international gendarme, the enemy of the peoples of the entire world." The main task of communist policy today is to create a united world front against the United States. This task is backed up by the thesis that the present period is that of the final struggle against capitalism:

Our epoch, the main feature of which is the transition from capitalism to socialism... is the epoch of socialist and national-liberation revolutions, the epoch of the destruction of imperialism, the abolition of the colonial system, the epoch of the transition to the path of socialism by all new peoples, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale. (*Pravda*, December 6, 1960)

The concept of peaceful coexistence and the possibility of averting wars, although nominally recognized in the Declaration, are nonetheless deprived of their original meaning by various counterthesis. Further, the recognition of the possibility of averting wars along with the proclamation of a united front against the United States is a piece of demagoguery without any political logic.

The main thesis of the Declaration is the revival of

the idea of revolution. Communist parties in the non-Communist countries are set the task of bringing "the masses to understand the tasks of the socialist revolution and the need to carry it out." The Declaration guarantees support for those peoples entering upon the path of revolution from "interference by the imperialist powers". It gives as the main centres for the implementation of this policy of revolution Indochina, Algeria, Cuba and Latin America as a whole, the Congo, Berlin and Germany. It also provides a definition of the concept "socialist camp"—a "social, economic, and political cooperation of free sovereign peoples" (*Ibid.*)—which is fraught with dangers for Moscow. The Declaration does not mention the communiqué of the Bucharest Conference of Communist Parties (*Pravda*, June 28, 1960), which was signed by 12 Communist Parties including China. The communiqué was regarded at the time as a *modus vivendi* for future cooperation.

Analyzing the materials of the conference one can obtain the following conclusions:

(1) The world Communist movement is presently split by the rivalry of the two centers, Moscow and Peking, which are struggling for the right to direct Communist expansion. This rivalry is likely to continue and it enables the other Communist states to maneuver more freely for their own ends.

(2) The conference Declaration represents an unstable compromise. The disagreements between Moscow and Peking are so great that the results of the Moscow conference cannot be regarded as a firm program of action for world Communism. Sino-Soviet disagreements have already spread from theory and strategy to the state interests of both countries. It must also be remembered that the programme of action is a concession to the Chinese dogmatists. It diverges from the Kremlin's standpoint and runs counter to the wishes of the Soviet people, particularly the younger generation.

(3) Nonetheless, Communist policy in the immediate future will be more aggressive in tone. The enrollment of all Communist parties means that this policy will be a clash between two fronts and become world-wide in scope.

(4) The manner in which the conference was held and the Declaration provide grounds for the assumption that there was an attempt to restore the Comintern. The Chinese Party leaders were not strong enough to have their own way at restricted conferences of 12 Communist parties, so they compelled Moscow to extend discussion of world Communist policy to a forum of all Communist parties. Any future attempt to restrict decisions to the Communist bloc alone will lead to opposition by the other Communist parties. In fact the process of the re-creation of the Comintern is under way as shown by the formation of the necessary central executive committee. This process is furthered by the recognition of the principle of "collective leadership" and the emphasis on the equal positions of Moscow and Peking.

Democracy—U. P. Style

THE U. P. Congress, aided and abetted by the High Command in Delhi, is writing chapter after chapter of a new brand of democracy for the State. The process is not yet over.

With moral issues, confidence issues, prestige issues and issues of culture and traditions thrown in at suitable intervals and in appropriate doses, new principles, precedents and conventions are being established, which other States and other parties may well copy in years to come, if only because their authors are some of the country's most eminent and respected leaders, including Mr Jawaharlal Nehru, Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant, Dr Sampurnanand, Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri and Mr Chandra Bhan Gupta.

The first chapter of this new democracy opens sometime in October, 1958, when the Gupta group, including some of the Ministers, demands the reconstitution of the PCC executive council which had earlier been nominated by Pandit Pant and Dr Sampurnanand. When the erstwhile dissident Ministers insist that they are not obliged to follow their governmental chief in Congress organizational matters unless the Ministry as a whole decides that any particular organizational issue touches the prestige of the Government, Dr Sampurnanand enunciates the principle that there are questions which have a direct or indirect bearing on the Government and on such matters members of the Government must act together. This precipitates a crisis. Dr Sampurnanand makes it a confidence issue and nine Ministers resign.

Mr Nehru upholds Dr Sampurnanand, saying that while it is not possible to lay down a rigid rule on the question of freedom of opinion to Ministers on organizational matters, it will be "rather absurd" if Ministers functioned in a way opposed to the Chief Minister under cover of "so-called organizational matters."

The crisis continues to simmer until it boils over around August, 1959, when 98 members of the erstwhile dissident group read a signed statement in the Vidhan Sabha declaring their lack of confidence in the Sampurnanand Ministry and charging the Government, among other things, with maladministration, nepotism and corruption. They get away with it by saying that it is only a "technical" breach of discipline, continue to be under the leadership of one in whom they had earlier declared their want of faith and return to the charges against him and his Government from time to time—an unheard of situation in the conventional form of democracy.

The High Command passes on these subjects a resolution which means all things to all men and leaves the matter in mid-air—open, yet closed.

The second chapter of this new democracy relates to the elections of the organizational wing of the party. These are held in an atmosphere of extreme bitterness and tension. Court injunctions are sought, sordid motives are attributed; violence in some cases is resor-

ted to; bogus membership is alleged: observers are sent by the High Command to straighten out the tangle. The process of completing the elections takes nearly a year during which factionalism mounts to a new high.

The third chapter deals with affairs connected with the election of the PCC president. Days before this momentous election is held Dr Sampurnanand enunciates another important principle of the new democracy which, in effect, amounts to this, that should his own nominee be defeated by whoever are his rivals, his Government will have forfeited the confidence of the organization as a whole and it (the whole Government) will be doing a real service to democracy if it retires from office. The matter at once becomes a moral, prestige and confidence issue for him, all rolled into one. Mr. C. B. Gupta, the candidate set up against Dr Sampurnanand's nominee, objects. He cites the very wholesome principle of the old brand of democracy, that it is his democratic right (as of anybody else's) to fight the election, little realizing that soon he will himself be a candidate again, this time for the leadership of the legislative wing of the party, and then this very principle will go by the board.

As it happens, Dr Sampurnanand's nominee is defeated in the PCC election and, in accordance with his statement, he sends in his resignation—not to the Governor or the Legislature Party as is usual in the old form of democracy, but to the High Command.

Anyway, the High Command hums and haws and finally decides to send for both Dr Sampurnanand and Mr Gupta. Mr Gupta goes in first and before even Dr Sampurnanand starts for his journey to Delhi, a High Command spokesman announces to a befuddled public that he (Mr Gupta) is the High Command's nominee for the leadership of the Legislature Party. There is little else to be decided but when Dr Sampurnanand reaches Delhi, a resolution is drawn up which again means all things to all men—an art of drafting which somebody in the High Command carries to perfection. According to this resolution, the decision to resign is left to the discretion of Dr Sampurnanand and if he decides to quit, the Legislature Party is called upon to elect a new leader.

A show is now put up that grave issues are involved, the leadership question is left wide open; feelings are worked up. Despite Mr Gupta's repeated declarations that he is the High Command's nominee, not a word comes from Delhi that he is, in fact, so placed. It is a source of considerable embarrassment to Mr Gupta.

The dispute now goes to the Raipur session of the AICC where Mr Nehru's intervention is sought. He agrees to do so but takes his own time. Meanwhile, Dr Sampurnanand is pilloried by his detractors for his doubts and hesitations, and bitterness increases. A

(Continued on Page 12)

With Many Voices

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

Our age is racked by the fanaticism of unbelievers.
—Michael Polanyi, in his presidential address
to the *Quest Seminar on the Place of Science
and Humanities in Higher Education*.

India has come to feel about China after her bitterest
experience in international relations.

—*Indian Express*, December 23.

The politics of non-politics are dangerous.
—Stephen Spender, *Indian Express*, December 2.

(Continued from page 11)

Most of us are far more concerned about our neutrality, which is dangerously under suspicion, since Mr. Krishna Menon is roundly attacking the West, while Comrade Zorin seems to be hugging the leader of our U.N. delegation to his expansive breast. The Prime Minister cannot fail to see that the feeling has become widespread that we are now almost entirely in the Congo in the Russian Camp.

—*Argus*, *Eastern Economist*, December 23.

While Indian spokesmen are expounding their country's foreign policy, criticism of the policy from within would not amount to an act of patriotism.

—V. K. Krishna Menon, *Times of India*,
December 29.

However defective may be the policies of Taiwan or South Korea or South Viet Nam, their combined forces of 1-3 million troops and 700 planes help to pin-down substantial Chinese forces in those areas.

.....So long as China remains an aggressive power, it is wise to remember that it is perhaps other's alignment that makes it possible for us to remain unaligned.

—Asoka Mehta, M.P., Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party, *Janata*, December 18.

For communists the study of the works of L. Tolstoy is a waste of time.

—Directive of the Chinese Communist Party
quoted in *Neue Zurcher Zeitung*,
November 30.

The least we can do is firmly to resolve to write off Panchshila so far as China is concerned and thereafter give China every reason to feel about India what

meeting of the Legislature Party, called to consider the resignation of the Chief Minister refuses to accept his resignation. Another meeting is fixed for the purpose 17 days later.

Taken in by the conventional connotation of the word "election," the erstwhile ministerialist group prepares for the contest. The long-awaited "advice" from Mr Nehru at last arrives. In accordance with it, Dr Sampurnanand announces his resignation from the leadership of the party and the group sets up the seniormost Harijan Minister in the Cabinet for election to the office backed by many of his ministerial colleagues, forgetting that the leader in a categorical statement had earlier declared that his Government as a whole would retire from office if a certain person is elected PCC chief.

The cry is now raised that Mr Girdhari Lal is a Harijan candidate; sectarian frenzy is openly whipped up; Mahatma Gandhi's name is trotted out in support of his candidature—altogether a new conception of fighting an election in a parliamentary democracy.

By this time it becomes fairly well known that Mr Gupta is Mr Nehru's "choice" for succeeding Dr. Sampurnanand and finding that the Prime Minister's candidate is not having plain sailing, the persuasive presence of Pandit Pant descends on the scene followed closely after by Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri. The unopposed "election" of Mr Gupta becomes a prestige issue with the Prime Minister.

More chapters of the new brand of democracy are still to be written. The Opposition has challenged the constitutional and legal validity of the appointment of a Chief Minister who is not a member of either House and who does not derive his strength from the people. It is also being questioned why the legislature remains prorogued for more than two months to enable the ruling party to put its house in order.

The trouble really is that some limbs of the traditional form of democracy still survive, such as the Constitution, the legislature and the Opposition, and and they create all the confusion. It should be the supreme task of the Congress to trim these limbs in such a fashion that they fit smoothly into the new pattern of democracy without causing any acute discomfort to itself.

Courtesy *Hindustan Times*