

Marxist Contortions in Kerala

"Atreya"

AMONG the Marxists in India, Kerala Marxists have always manifested what might be called a "one-up-manship" in relation to the others. The stalwarts of this character have been A. K. Gopalan and E. M. S. Namboodiripad. Over the years the record of these two Marxist leaders indicates their disastrous vested interests in dissent to such an extent as to make Chairman Mao blush. After managing to wreck all possibilities of parliamentary democracy from effectively functioning, both participated with their party in all general elections that serve parliamentary democracy. Not only that, they assumed power as a party with a clear-cut strategy of making use of all the facilities of power to wreck the organizational structure of all opponents. They have assiduously tried to operate the basic strategy of the United Front viz: "If you have 10 enemies, combine with the nine weaker enemies to finish the strongest 10th enemy, then with nine left, combine with eight to finish the ninth and so on, until only one enemy is left." This strategy, however presupposes that the prime strategist who devices this strategy will remain integrated, while the others are supposed to be taken care of through this opportunistic united front alliances precisely because they are vulnerable to "internal contradictions". In a very short period of time, however, the Communist Party and the entire Communist international apparatus have become subject to dissensions and squabbles that have had serious repercussions in all countries. The major initiative for the splitting up of the Communist Party of India was taken by Namboodiripad and Gopalan, and both became important leaders of the CPI (Marxists). The vested interest these two Marxist leaders had in permanent dissent naturally led them to break off from the integrated C. P. I. to split it into two parties.

Having permeated intensively among the rank-and-file in Kerala a similar passion for continuous dissent, the Marxist Communist leaders were subjected to the same medicine that they brewed for the erstwhile integrated Communist Party. Whatever accusations the Marxist Communist leaders found and packaged in their ideological jargon — "revisionists, compromisers"

— were now being made against the Marxist Communists themselves by a group which revolted against flirting with the "bourgeois parliamentary" set-up that neither provided the scope for revolutionary action, nor enhanced party strength. On the contrary, according to the ultra-revolutionaries the strategy pursued by the Marxist Communists of showing interest in parliamentary elections, had only brought about constraints to revolutionary programmes of the party, and there could not possibly be any compromise or co-existence between bourgeois parliamentary democracy and revolution. As the intensity of hostility and polemics was increasing between the Marxist Communists and CPI(R), an extremist faction was developing within the Marxist Party, both in West Bengal and in Kerala.

To a great extent, the factionalism may be attributed to personalities, but it would be an oversimplification to say that a few disgruntled elements in the Marxist Communist Party have become passionate dissenters out of personality incompatibilities. This would be

AT THE POST

This, as will be noticed, is the two-hundredth issue of *Freedom First*. It takes this opportunity to convey its grateful thanks to all those who have enabled it to reach the happy position of being able to publish the issue, the subscribers, the readers, the contributors, the advertisers, the printers, the staff and last but not the least the Democratic Research Service.

For over sixteen years *Freedom First* has held aloft the banner of freedom and democracy. It has ceaselessly tried to instil those values in the minds of the Indian people and to warn them against the forces, foreign and indigenous, which sought to undermine them. *Freedom First* has dedicated itself to that task and will be at the post to perform it always. It counts upon the continued help and cooperation of its numerous friends to be able to perform that essential task diligently and efficiently.

V. B. KARNIK
Editor

like stating that the Communist Party of India broke up into CPI(R) and CPI (Marxist) only on account of the personality factors of Dange. It would also be an over-simplification to attribute credit to "Mao's Thoughts" and the trickle of money orders from the Chinese Embassy in India to explain this phenomenon.

The behaviour of Kunnikal Narayanan, his wife Mandakini and his band of followers represents a passionate departure from the Marxist Communist Party line of united front and parliamentary democracy. The planned terrorism at Tellicherry and Pulpally came about after a clear and well-published rift within the Marxist Communist Party in which such hawks as Imbichi Bava, Kosala Ramdas and others figured prominently. The dissidents complain that there is very little to choose between the Dange-revisionists and the neo-Revisionists as represented by EMS and AKG. In a thesis issued and widely circulated among Marxist Party members, the "ultras" consisting of Imbichi Bava, Kosala Ramdas, Kunnikal Narayanan have roundly exposed the illogic of the election exercises undertaken by the Marxist Communist Party in the United Front alliance strategy, and electioneering tactics, all of which, the dissidents have characterised as completely constricting revolutionary movement. Four of the "ultras" have resigned their membership of the Kerala Legislative Assembly in consonance with their thesis that bourgeois parliamentary democracy cannot serve genuine revolutionary purposes and that they have to fabricate and forge barrels of guns to generate an outflow of power. After this resignation from the Assembly, the operative part of the "revolution" has started with a series of strikes in strategic areas such as the Idikki Power Project area where pylons were hacked and felled, disrupting power supply in large areas of the State. A similar "struggle" was going on in West Bengal, under the auspices of the Ultras in the industrial relations sphere.

After a series of such "struggles" in the industrial relations sphere as staging exercises, the planned terror in the form of armed attack on police stations is now being attempted. The extent of the terroristic attack is not so much as the dramatisation and sensationalising of the one or two that have been initiated. The purpose of these, therefore, seems to be to permeate an impact of the Ultra-revolutionaries not only in Kerala, but all over India. Another impact sought to be made is in making the Marxist Communists and "Revisionists" squirm, expose them into a compromising position of "revisionism and neo-revisionism" and of subserving the bourgeoisie.

The Ultras have really achieved quite a measure of success in their objective of making the leaders, E.M.S. and A.K.G., squirm. These two leaders of the Marxist Communist Party are now getting a much larger dose of the medicine they dished to the Right Communists after breaking away. The Ultras have

decided to light many fires to test how the Marxist Communist leadership in Kerala will deploy the instruments of the State Government it commands in dealing with the "revolutionary challenges" posed to it by its own ex-comrades using its own logic.

The pressure on the Marxist Communist Party from the Ultras is now so severe that the days of the United Front can certainly be presumed to be numbered. If the Marxist Communists soft-pedal the handling of the Ultras involved in the violence and terrorism at Tellicherry and Pulpally, the pressures from them will increase with greater terrorism to get the Marxists committed further. Simultaneously, the Marxists will be facing pressures from the Right Communists and other United Front partners over this question. An interesting debate has already started in which there has been an open fight between the Left and Right Communists in the same familiar patterns indicating the constant pressure Right Communists intend applying on the Marxist Communist leadership. Industries Minister T. V. Thomas has revealed that he has invited G. D. Birla to take over an abortive and sick textile mill with the knowledge of Marxist Communists. The Right Communists seem to be cornering the Marxist Communists into a position where the latter will not be able to get away with an ambivalent stance concerning the Ultras on the one hand, and industrial development on the other. The Birla episode generated by T. V. Thomas followed in the wake of an earlier controversy with the Marxist Communists concerning inviting Japanese collaboration for industrial development.

Thus one can see an interesting situation crystallising in Kerala in which a polarisation will be discernible. In this polarisation, the Ultras will be in the extreme of "revolutionary" terror and destruction carefully and consciously designed, and on the other extreme will be the Right Communists anxious to unleash developmental programmes in the conviction that the woes of Kerala are such that disintegration and anarchy have already reached dangerous dimensions. In between these two extremes, the Marxist Communists, now in the driver's seat of the State Government's power, are placed in a difficult position. If they opt for developmental stability and programmes, they have to completely disown and suppress the Ultras. The Centre also will demand of the Marxist Communist leadership of the Kerala Government as to what they propose to do concerning the Ultras. E.M.S. and A.K.G. are truly in a very difficult situation and the forthcoming conference of the Marxist Communist Party in Cochin will face a dilemma.

For once the Marxist Communists in Kerala are at the receiving end and the next few months will reveal whether they are able to "contain" the ultras or will be stampeded into disintegration.

Russian Doctrine Of Intervention

(Contributed)

RUSSIA'S claim to the right of intervention in any country of the "Socialist commonwealth" where a "threat to Socialism" is thought to exist, was confirmed by the Russian party's General Secretary, Brezhnev, at the Polish Communists' Fifth Congress during November, 1968. First advanced by S. Kovalev, head of *Pravda's* propaganda department, in the party newspaper on September 26—primarily as a retrospective justification for the invasion of Czechoslovakia—the thesis marks a fundamental departure from the Russian attitude to principles governing relations between Communist countries and calls in question the extent to which Russia feels bound by the recognised principles of international law.

According to *Pravda* of November 13, Brezhnev told the Polish congress:

"When internal and external forces hostile to Socialism attempt to turn the development of any Socialist country in the direction of the restoration of the capitalist system, when a threat arises to the cause of Socialism in that country, a threat to the security of the Socialist commonwealth as a whole—it already becomes not only a problem for the people of that country but also a general problem, the concern of all Socialist countries".

He also claimed, in contrast:

"Socialist States stand for strict respect for the sovereignty of all countries. We are resolutely opposed to interference in the affairs of any States, to violation of their sovereignty".

Clearly, Brezhnev gives a special and restricted definition to "Sovereignty" when applied to "Socialist" States. He is not concerned with sovereignty in the generally accepted sense of State sovereignty i.e., inviolability of frontiers, respect for legal government, but with the sovereignty of a political system. This means that once a country has declared itself "Socialist"—or has been accepted as such by the Soviet Union—it can never be allowed to modify its political system, even if the majority of its people make clear their desire to do so. In the Soviet view, it is the "sovereignty" of the Socialist system that must be preserved. Thus, although Brezhnev did not, like Kovalev, specifically refer to the "laws of class struggle" which allegedly transcend the ordinary principles of international law, his thesis was essentially the same.

Kovalev had dismissed the objections and complaints of other countries and Communist Parties to the intervention of the five Warsaw Pact States as groundless since they were based on an "abstract, non-

class approach to the question of sovereignty and the right of nations to self-determination". The legal norms and the relations between Communist countries, he argued, "must not be interpreted in a narrow, formal way, and in isolation from the general context of class struggle in the modern world."

"Those who speak about the 'illegality' of the actions of the allied Socialist countries in Czechoslovakia forget that in a class society there is not and cannot be non-class law. The laws and legal norms are subordinated to the laws of class struggle, to the laws of social development... One must not allow a class approach to the matter to be overshadowed by formal-juridical considerations. He who does this, by depriving himself of the only correct, class criterion for assessing legal norms, begins to measure events by the yardstick of bourgeois law."

"Such an approach to the question of sovereignty means that, for instance, the progressive forces of the world could not come out against the rebirth of neo-Nazism in the FGR, against the executioner's actions of Franco and Salazar, against the reactionary outrages of the "black colonels" in Greece, since this is the "domestic affair" of "sovereign States"..."

It is doubtful whether the Russians would have publicised the theory of limited sovereignty if they had been able to sustain the original excuse for intervention—that they were "invited" by certain Czechoslovak leaders. But this was so quickly disproved and widely rejected that they had to advance the present ideological thesis which they have no doubt always secretly subscribed to but which they have hitherto considered it impolitic to spell out. They could, incidentally, have invoked a statement by Lenin in February, 1918:

"No Marxist, without renouncing the principles of Marxism and of Socialism generally, can deny that the interests of Socialism are higher than the interests of the right of nations to self-determination..." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 26, 4th Ed., Moscow, 1964).

Recourse to such a drastic measure as military intervention against a fraternal "Socialist" State—no matter how "extraordinary" and "enforced" it was, according to Brezhnev at the Polish Congress—showed how little the Russian attitude has changed during the past 50 years. Other Communist countries and the Western Communist Parties now see how little room for manoeuvre they have under the concept of "different roads to Socialism", if the USSR is to set itself up as the sole arbiter of the correctness of another party's poli-

cies. Indeed, Brezhnev may have done irreparable damage to the international Communist movement, whose members are implicitly asked to support an ideological theory to which they have never wittingly subscribed.

Brezhnev's speech in Warsaw begged as many questions as it purported to answer. He spoke, for instance, of certain, undefined "general principles of Socialist construction, retreat from which could lead to a retreat from Socialism as such", but avoided the question of who was to decide when a particular country might be adjudged to have departed from them. In Czechoslovakia's case there was considerable disagreement among ruling and non-ruling Communist Parties.

And while giving increased currency to the term "Socialist commonwealth" the Russians have left it undefined—either by design or because they themselves cannot decide which countries constitute its membership. The 1961 Russian party programme appeared to identify the term with the "world system of Socialism", which was described as a "social, economic and political commonwealth of free, sovereign peoples, proceeding along the path of Socialism and Communism, united by community of interests and aims, by close bonds of international Socialist solidarity". It included Albania and China, but not apparently Yugoslavia. While Brezhnev left the term undefined, he appeared to have in mind primarily the Warsaw Pact countries:

"Let those who are inclined to forget the lessons of history and who would like once again to busy themselves redrawing the map of Europe know that the frontiers of Poland, GDR, Czechoslovakia, as of any other member-country of the Warsaw Treaty, are immovable and inviolable. These frontiers are defended by the whole armed might of the Socialist commonwealth".

Similarly, Brezhnev, spoke of the economy of the "Socialist commonwealth" purely in the context of the Moscow-led Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) (which includes only Mongolia in addition to the East European countries). His implied definition was however, at variance with the reported statement by the Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, in New York in October that the "Socialist commonwealth" had no "geographical limits".

On the subject of international law, all relevant Russian reference books and textbooks, quote with approval the United Nations Charter and subsequent General Assembly resolutions and refer to "universally recognised norms and principles" as its basis. Nor is it claimed that the special relationships, based on "Socialist internationalism", said to exist between Communist countries, supersedes the generally recognised principles of international law.

Whatever new policy may be presaged by Brezhnev,

Russian ideological experts have previously regarded any action such as the invasion of Czechoslovakia as contravening international law and the declared principles of relations between Communist countries. S. P. Sanakoyev's *The World System of Socialism*. (International Relations Publishing House, Moscow, 1968) wrote (p. 94): "In the context of the world Socialist system the method of solving issues by negotiation objectively becomes the *only* method [emphasis in the original]. Such methods as the use of force, threats, pressure etc. are contrary to the spirit of Socialist politics and diplomacy".

Eastern and Western Marxists' Protest

The following is the full text of a letter of protest signed by about 70 prominent Eastern and Western Marxist and left-wing philosophers during a symposium on Marxism held on the Yugoslav Adriatic island of Korcula from 14 to 24 August 1968. Prominent Western signatories of the letter are Ernst Bloch (Tübingen), Herbert Marcuse (USA), and Lucian Goldman (Paris), while Zador Tordai, Vilmos Sos, Agner Heller, Gyorgy Markus (all from Hungary) and Nicolae Bellu (from Bucharest) are among prominent Eastern European signatories. It was published in *Knjizevne novine*, Belgrade on 31 August 1968:

Marxist philosophers and sociologists from all over the world, gathered in Yugoslavia at the meeting of the Korcula Summer School, have just learned with horrified shock that Czechoslovakia has been occupied; the occupation, which cannot be justified at all, has been carried out, despite the resistance of the Czechoslovak people, their legal government and their Communist Party, by the armed forces of the Soviet Union, East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria.

No incident, no "provocation" could be cited as a justification of this armed intervention.

This illegal act by the Soviet government and the Soviet Communist Party have inflicted a horrible blow to all the powers of world socialism, as well as to the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence. It will render more difficult the cessation of American aggression in Vietnam and will serve as an excuse for other aggressions.

The future of the world socialist movement demands that the anti-socialist and anti-democratic character of this military occupation be unmasked most energetically. A "policy of strength" has no connection whatsoever with the security of socialist countries and with their defense.

Michael Stewart's Mission

R. Muthuswamy

MICHAEL STEWART, the British Foreign Secretary, visited India for bilateral talks as a part of the series of such talks started sometime ago between India and other countries. India had such talks in the past with Russia and U.S.A. India's differences with these countries in the approach to various problems were no less than those with Britain. However, the Indo-British talks evoked unusual interest and peculiar comments.

Stewart declared that his visit was intended "to establish, confirm and straighten but also to modernise the friendly relationship between India and the United Kingdom". While welcoming him at the Palam airport, B. R. Bhagat referred to the need for more mature relationship between the two countries and this was again reiterated by Stewart in his reply. The relationship between India and Britain is still inhibited by the hangover of the ruler-subject relationship extending over more than two centuries. The lapse of time of twenty-one years after Independence has not helped to blunt the sensibilities. Inevitably many stances have been conditioned by these inhibitions and these led to unnecessary friction and misunderstanding.

Many see a fence-mending mission in the visit of Stewart. Many in India have not yet forgotten and forgiven the attitude of the British Prime Minister during the Indo-Pakistani war in 1965. To them assuaging assurances and reassurances were necessary. In fact wherever Stewart went he was haunted by questions on this issue. Earlier he had visited Pakistan where also he must have been harassed by similar questions. In fact the oversensitivity on the Kashmir issue on the part of both Pakistan and India has made it impossible even for friendly countries to interfere. Even Russia which was an avowed partisan of India had to have rethinking after the Indo-Pakistani war. Therefore Britain cannot be an exception despite its earlier efforts to mediate on the strength of both India and Pakistan being members of the Commonwealth. Yet we in India could not be mature enough to perceive this but instead took delight in nurturing a grievance and seeking assurances and re-assurances. Even after the lapse of 3 years after the statement made by the British Prime Minister, which was perhaps made on the spur of the moment, we could not gracefully welcome the illustrious visitor without referring to this entrenched grievance. In one of the meetings addressed by

Stewart, a Jan Sangh Member of Parliament went to the extent of demanding a public apology, now that the Foreign Secretary had declared that 'Britain had neither the right nor the duty to meddle in Indo-Pakistani affairs'. Everybody remembered this incident but not the spontaneous offer of help by Her Majesty the Queen at the time of the Chinese invasion.

As a contrast, when the question of Rhodesia came, here again instead of a genuine understanding of the predicament in which Britain is placed and her bonafides concerning the problem, we took an over-zealous position as the only genuine protector of human rights. Britain has already imposed economic sanctions against Rhodesia in the belief that such pressure would bring about desired changes. Whatever may be the result, the fact remains that Britain feels as much as India and is doing whatever is possible in the prevailing circumstances. Obviously in the eyes of the Indian Government this is not enough and Bhagat informed the Parliament that it was the Indian view that the racist White minority regime of Ian Smith can be liquidated only by force. He also added that this represented the difference between the approach of Britain and India.

The advocacy by India of extremism can be justified only by a consistently non-compromising stand and record wherever human rights were trampled. Our record in this regard is not that consistent. When Russia invaded Czechoslovakia, our moral conscience did not bother us very much and on the flimsy pretext of semantic niceties about the resolution in U.N. we abstained from voting in favour of the resolution condemning the brutal Soviet invasion. Subsequently during the bilateral talks with a Soviet delegation in Delhi, India literally surrendered before the delegation and could not utter a whimper against the Russian invasion. At the same time without any qualms our policymakers took moral stances in Parliament rather extremely when censuring a well-meaning friend like Britain. There was no qualms whatsoever about creating embarrassment for our guest, who had come down with the avowed objective of developing better relationship.

We chose to remain in the Commonwealth deliberately as an equal partner and not as a subject nation but we have not yet been able to establish a free relationship as existing between two sovereign states. Even after the British quit, the institutions and systems initiated by them remained with us. Trade

between the two countries still flourishes and even today Britain is the major exporter to and importer from this country. Just as our linking for these institutions and systems remained with us, our hate for Britain also lingered behind with the result that we have developed towards Britain a peculiar love-hate relationship. The time has now come to bring out to consciousness this hate and shed it. Perhaps Stewart had this in mind when he said that "both countries had to move to a mature relationship without cutting the bands of affection and understanding as modern states behaved with one another". He added that he believed Britain and India could forge such a mature relationship and remain on good terms because of important factors common to both — the parliamentary system of democracy, the rule of law and individual freedom. These are really precious common heritages to be cherished for ever. Hate had its place only as long as Britain was the ruler and India the ruled. It has become irrelevant now that both are equal in status and it is up to India to put this into practice and make it a reality.

As regards the substantive issues discussed at the talks there was not much progress except perhaps a better understanding of the respective positions. One good thing that emerged out of the talks was the agreement of both countries to refer the India Library question to arbitration. Let us hope that his type of civilised arrangement to deal with problems will be the forerunner of solutions of other problems.

Mao Society as Russians see it

How will a society built up on Maoist recipes look like?

The theoretical organ of the Soviet Communist Party, *Kommunist*, has drawn a profile of such a society in one of its articles.

"In the sphere of economy, there would exist enforced labour organised on an army pattern, (labour battalions, regiments, and so on); consumption would be limited to the basic needs; all the resources would be concentrated on the creation of the State's military potential in the interests of the great power military policy. In the field of social relations, there would be administration-enforced levelling-off of the classes and the individual personality would be reduced to the position of a cog in the State machine. In the field of ideology, the wealth of the national and world culture would be rejected and ideas of Mao will serve as the only spiritual diet for the nation; self-denial would be idealised and natural human demands and emotions rejected."

—*Indian Express*

Marxist Terms Re-Explained

G. L. M.

Co-Existence: A transitional phase of accommodation and underground activities pending complete communist conquest of the world.

Co-Existence — Peaceful: Relationship maintained by subversion and infiltration in non-communist countries.

Counter-Revolutionary: Anyone who dissents from the zigs and zags of the Kremlin or of Mao Tse-tung.

Democracy — Bourgeois: Decadent capitalist hoax for class exploitation.

Democracy — People's: Government by a class calling itself the Communist Party for ruling without popular consent.

Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Benevolent rule by a coterie or a dictator not responsible to nor removable by the people.

Dissent with Authority: Treason.

Election: Nomination by Party bosses for automatic approval by 99 percent members.

Equality: Condition in which all men are equal but the Leaders (or the Leader) are more equal than others.

Eternal Friendship of Socialist Countries: A bond strengthened by Soviet or Chinese tanks, guns and planes and backed by spies and saboteurs.

Fascists Hyaenas: Nazi rulers of Germany with whom Molotov signed a pact.

Imperialist: Any power that stands in the way of the Soviet Union's or China's ambition of world domination. Hence Russia is "imperialist" for China, China for Russia and America for both.

Non-Alignment: Turning a blind eye to Communist aggressions while castigating Western ones.

Non-Interference: Principle which precludes any interference by other countries in the affairs of communist countries while permitting the Soviet Union and China to operate and finance communist parties in other countries for their overthrow.

Parliament: A picked assembly where silence is golden except to applaud and agree.

Respect for National Sovereignty: Submission to the Soviet Union in political, economic and cultural matters.

Revisionists: Term applied by Peking to Moscow and its satellites and by Moscow to dissidents from its own policies.

Struggle Against Imperialism: Movement to support and strengthen Soviet Russia's or China's domination of the world.

The State: A super institution to which unquestioned obedience is due until it withers away.

Student Unrest—A Point Of View

Jai Chinai

(The contribution is by a student. Reactions and comments will be welcome — EDITOR.)

ALL over the world the student community is in a cantankerous mood. There have been many analyses of the unrest and the problem has been examined *a posteriori* but it seems that while analysing or examining it certain vital facts and sad realities are being overlooked. The causes attributed to the unrest are mostly stereotype, namely, the generation gap, the general feeling of frustration among students, the lack of an ideal or leadership, the failure of religious values etc. A thoughtful scrutiny of these old jingoos may reveal a new truth.

There does not seem to be any reason to believe that the present generation is frustrated or suffers from anxiety more than any previous generation. The fact that religion is losing its hold over the youth happily indicates that there has been progress from unreason to reason. The generation gap has always been there. It cannot be called a new factor which has changed the set of circumstances. Only today, for the first time, the youth has voice. The lack of leadership is significant but it is not as if we no more have something which we had so far. It is only a new necessity.

For the first time in the history of mankind a stage has been reached where practically, "the Student" has become a synonym of "the young generation". Never before was the youth united and organised under one single banner. Today, they have a common platform, common motivation, common set of grievances and, above all, there is unity generated by better communication and a shrinking world.

The power of the youth today is far more than that of their historical counterparts. It is because the youth is better acquainted with world situation and is more knowledgeable than ever before. There has been a steady progress in human psychology whereby the animal handicap of being unable to look beyond the immediate future is being replaced by human instinct of looking farther and farther ahead to the future. That is why each succeeding generation blames the preceding one of blunders that have been committed. It is partly so because it is very easy to look back and nag than to look ahead and plan. To put it in different words: it can not be denied that the youth lacks a constructive approach. All talk of the absurdity, the uselessness and the shortcomings of the "establishment", but few can suggest any alternative or a constructive amendment to it.

Before the Indian situation is commented upon, two important points must be noted. First, that student unrest in India is not prompted by the same motives

as that in most other countries and secondly, which almost follows from the first, that it has not the same solutions. The young ones in France are giving a helping hand to the socialist movement, those in U.S.A. and U.K. are busy with "make-love-not-war campaign", those in Czechoslovakia and other Communist countries are fighting for liberalisation and those in many undeveloped and underdeveloped countries are struggling to achieve better political atmosphere; whereas Indian students are busy burning and destroying property, beating their own teachers and professors, making a mockery of education and bringing to the whole student community shame and disgrace. Yet, the majority of students are indifferent to the grievances of the minority but it will not take much time for them to actively sympathise and then it will be very difficult to check their steps.

Here, it is not sought to justify the acts of students in other countries. The emphasis is on the motives of the students in other countries. At least the ends sought to be achieved are noble, although the means may not be justifiable. Indian youth, unfortunately, has no worthy goal. Most cases of vandalism, arson and violence are just for the "heck" of it or else the grounds are flimsy and frivolous.

It is, however, unreasonable to blame the students alone for the unrest. Every section of the Indian populace has grievances. Protests are rampant—almost like epidemics. The hutment dwellers and the hawkers, labourers, clerks and officers, manufacturers, merchants, businessmen and bankers, parliamentarians and politicians, teachers and professors are all in a state of unrest. Students have more freedom of action due to the lack of responsibility and hence are singled out. The responsibility for the unrest is squarely on all the people. It is a vicious circle where no one can put a finger at a point and call it the root cause. There have been different eras in the history of the world; this is just an era of unrest. The only chance of survival of law and order is self-discipline and self-teaching.

The parents should infuse in children the concept of good citizenship, catch them young, as it is said. The child must be allowed to develop its own distinct self and should not be "shaped" according to the dreams and fancies of the parents. It is very often this "shaping" that inculcates the feeling of protest and frustration.

The teachers must be devoted to teaching and must

(Continued on page 10)

Letters to the Editor

A New Preacher

Sir,

May I invite your and your readers' attention to the preachings of a new preacher who is drawing crowds in Bombay? He is Acharya Rajnish who addressed a series of three meetings at the cross maidan last month, the subject being "India and My Anxiety". He is a powerful man in his forties with bald head and beard, wearing a Khaddar dhoti and a Khaddar-piece around his shoulders. He comes up the dias and sits cross-legged. There is pin-drop silence and all eyes and ears eagerly turn to him.

Then emerges a clear, resonant and well modulated voice and gushing forth like a powerful river, envelops the audience under its spell. The Acharya bases his speech on four main points.

1. That the Indian society has suffered due to belief in destiny and re-birth.

2. That the past is too much with us. We only look back trying to walk ahead and consequently we fall down.

3. That even though we say that soul is eternal we are very much afraid of death and we do not take any risk or make any adventure. We are content with holding on to whatever we have. We have made a philosophy of poverty.

4. That the words pleasure and joy are almost foreign to us. Gloom and sorrow reign supreme in India. We are dead for long. Dead Past is ruling us and we have no Present and much less any Future.

The Acharya believes that only by a revolution a new India can be built, that the Communist Party cannot do this because it is weak and has eliminated God. His ideology in a nutshell is Marxism plus God. He first intends to bring about a revolution in thought. Once his ideology spreads, automatically a party would be formed. To bring about revolution, if necessary, violence could be used. The revolution which he intends cannot be brought about by democratic means and hence he thinks a dictatorship for 50 years is necessary.

That is how the Acharya thinks. For that reason this former professor of philosophy wears a Khaddar dhoti and a Khaddar piece around his shoulders and grows a beard. He quotes Gita, Bible, Koran, Upnishads and Confucius and Nietzsche and others.

He firmly believes that the affairs of the nation are at present in the hands of undeserving and corrupt persons. He has faith in the youth of the country and wants to kindle the fire of revolution in their hearts. He addresses the youth very affectionately and tells them that tomorrow belongs to them.

The Acharya is an ascetic for some years now, but a new dimension he has added to his powerful per-

sonality since the inauguration of the Gandhi Centenary year celebrations by trying to expose politicians who follow Gandhian methods or in other words democratic principles.

At first sight, the Acharya and his professions sound like a paradox. But to the discerning observer, it soon becomes evident that there is a well-thoughtout plan about everything he does and speaks. Even though he denounces past history and everything that is gone he uses the past to suit his teachings.

He talks about Marxism and God. But the two are poles apart. Which will remain then, Marxism or God? Will he throw God overboard or use him only as a convenient pretext and develop as a Marxist propagandist? It is difficult to say, but that is the reason why he deserves to be watched.

Bombay, December 19.

N. B. DESAI

A Brave Journalist!

Sir,

You need to be congratulated for exposing the true facts in regard to the Karanjia Contempt of Court Case.

One fact which came out during the trial and which throws light on Shri Karanjia's character has not been touched on by Shri Abba.

The editor had written in the impugned article that a "judicial friend" of his had enquired of him whether the judgment of the Magistrate as reproduced in the *Blitz* was a genuine one or some kind of an April Fool joke. The learned Judges put a query about the identity of the "judicial friend". The editor refused to disclose the name stating that he would suffer the consequences himself. In the Supreme Court, counsel for the editor, Shri Chagla, tried to create the impression that in refusing to disclose the identity the editor was upholding the best traditions of journalism.

The question that arises is: Was this editor, in refusing to disclose the identity of the "judicial friend", upholding the best traditions of journalism?

Their Lordships' observations on this issue are as shattering as their observations on the contempt issue.

"We made a query with the learned Counsel for the respondent whether his client was willing to disclose the name of the so called 'judicial friend'. Mr. Manohar (the respondent's advocate) stated that his client would suffer the consequences himself and not disclose the name.

"We may, however, point out that in the initial affidavit filed by the respondent explaining the background of the article, it is not asserted on oath that there was in fact a 'judicial friend' who wrote the alleged letter.

(Continued on page 10)

Menon And Menonism

A. G. Noorani

WHAT is the political outlook of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon? The question is important because for a decade or so he served as Mr. Nehru's Man Friday in the external world. Mr. Menon in power sought to conceal his views. Out of office he has been less guarded in his utterances. A fine sample is available in *India and World Politics*.* The book contains the transcript of seventeen hours of taped Menoniana running into nearly three hundred pages and a jargon-ridden chapter of "analysis" of some forty pages by the ardent interlocutor, Mr. Brecher. It all adds little to one's knowledge of the man or his outlook but is useful only as a collection of his views for the curious.

Having held forth as long as he did Mr. Menon thought it prudent to prune. Writes the editor, "I regret the fact that Mr. Menon found it necessary to delete or soften some of his more forthright judgments of men and events, but this has not, in my judgment, altered the main thrusts of the dialogue or its value for persons interested in international politics."

Here we have in one volume not only the Thought of Menon but his Second Thought as well. His "View of the World" as Mr. Brecher calls it with his penchant for the high-sounding phrase.

It is clear that the questioning was gentle, as it had to be with so irascible a subject, and the latter was less than candid. For example, as late as 1964 Mr. Menon would neither confirm nor deny the authorship of the proposal Mr. T. J. S. George, his biographer, attributes to him for an exchange of a lease of Aksai Chin for a lease of the Chumbki Valley. The proposal was said to have been made by Mr. Menon to Chou En-lai in Delhi in April 1960. Asked to comment, Mr. Menon told Mr. Brecher "I am not prepared to say yes or no at this point nor am I prepared to continue talking about these issues".

Platitudes are there aplenty, predictably. "What is non-alignment? It is merely independence in external affairs". Alas, there is no such thing as complete independence in world affairs, as even the super-powers have come to realise, and certainly non-alignment is neither the guarantee nor the proof of independence. Witness India's stand on Czechoslovakia. However, more instructive are more candid Menoniana such as, for example, "to us the West meant Empire".

Indeed, the sole value of the book lies in its record of some suppressed views which Mr. Menon now expresses. Take North Korea's attack on the South which India then criticised as aggression. "In my view

neither North Korea nor South Korea committed 'aggression'; as Korea was one country they were 'aggressing' into each other. The United Nations, which at that time was the United States, caught the North Koreans at the time when these fellows went south (North Koreans crossing the 38th parallel). They were both moving into each other in the sense that neither of them regarded the other as a separate country. I believe the whole of the Korean business was an understanding—I don't use any stronger word between Trygve Lie on the one hand and the Americans on the other. Otherwise why should he call a Security Council meeting on a Sunday morning without proper notice?

"So far as we were concerned, what happened was, the Indian Observer on the pre-independence (U.N. Korean) Commission, K. P. S. Menon, sent reports about the aggression of a kind which his own colleagues didn't agree with. I was taken aback when we subscribed to this Resolution on Aggression."

So, Mr. Menon went to work. "It was one of those things on which I put my view strongly to the Prime Minister. Then we watered down India's attitude to the U.N. role in Korea". The pattern of Menon dominance was set fairly early.

"We took the view that so long as Hungary was a member of the U.N. you could not talk of her as a colony." We now know that this absurd plea Mr. Nehru often trotted out originated in the Menon mind. Mr. Menon succeeded because of Mr. Nehru and is careful not to attack his patron. Thus, he criticises Sir B. N. Rau for his stand on Korea ignoring the fact that he was merely acting on Mr. Nehru's instructions.

Mr. Menon is ever his disingenuous self. Why did he alone among neutrals vote with the Soviet bloc on Hungary and not abstain as the others did? Because "either we have a conviction or we haven't". This plea makes nonsense of India's many abstentions. Asked whether Mr. Bajpai had advised trading Indian recognition of Chinese suzerainty over Tibet with Chinese recognition of our border, Mr. Menon replied, "I don't think so. I never heard about it. I don't think Bajpai came into it at all." Actually Mr. B. Shiva Rao had revealed this as far back as February 28, 1963 in a letter to *The Hindustan Times*.

It was a peculiar relationship between Mr. Nehru and Mr. Menon and debate will ever continue as to which was the potter and which the pot. "We were not frightened of the American strength at the U.N. Nehru allowed me — in effect, he put me on — to draw their fire" (italics mine throughout). A propos the Goa operation and Mr. Nehru's hesitation asked Mr.

* *India and World Politics*. Michael Brecher, Published by Oxford University Press, Rs. 45/-.

Brecher "Was it consent or acquiescence, Mr. Menon?" The answer was "No. No. He wanted something to be done. *You see, he had a complicated temperament; he didn't like the vulgarity and the cruelty of it, but at the same time he wanted the results—the liberation of Indian territory.* He had never disapproved of frank positions at the U.N. He himself would express them, probably quite rightly, in his own way. He might even have said something slightly different over here, although not different in substance. I took it in that way—such things have to be understood". We understand.

For all that Mr. Menon was sad he did not have his way all the time, "Some time before the end, when discussing a particular matter with the Prime Minister, I told him, 'there is only one thing I reproach myself for, that I should have stood up to you more', and, generously, he agreed. I did not always contribute what I could because I preferred or thought it more appropriate not to be insistent. But Pandit Nehru often sensed these things and he reacted to them in his own way afterwards."

Would the result have been very much different? Opinions will differ. But the flow of Menoniana recorded in the book gives its own answer.

"My belief is that the Pakistani leaders looked upon Pakistan as a first instalment, thinking in terms of the English doctrine 'take what you can and fight for more'. They never seem to have accepted the Partition as final, as we did. Their main approach to the problem was that India was theirs; India was a Muslim country historically; the British had taken it away

(Continued from page 7)

sympathise with the problems of students. Two things demand great attention first, bridging the gulf between theory and practice, syllabus must be utility oriented. Secondly, the examination system requires complete reorientation. The real test of a student must be his understanding, grasping and originality and not reproduction, memory and plagiarism.

The Government must refrain from interfering in all and sundry matters of education according to its political needs. Amaturish playing with education has made it uncertain. Educational system has no stability and the policies have no permanency. The universities must be given freedom of action. The role of the Government must be to help, protect and guide them. Party politics must be severed from student activities at all costs. It is also of great necessity that the Government should not be vulnerable to violence. The present practice is to be indifferent to complaints and grievances. Sympathetic discussion is not afforded and when it takes the form of violence Government submits to it. It should rather be the other way round.

Finally, students must not forget that their primary business is to study. Patience, hope and hardwork are the sinews of success and there is no shortcut to success.

from them; now the British had gone away and it should be handed over to them.

Mr. Menon is not a man to change his views "We were a peace time army and our main enemy was Pakistan (in 1962). Even today I maintain that our main enemy is Pakistan." As for the U.S., it must simply retire from the Far East.

Mr. Brecher cautiously and ponderously analyses the answers his questioning secured and concludes. "The evidence is overwhelming: Krishna Menon equates the United States and the Soviet Union in the global power hierarchy; they are the two great powers; but he distinguishes very sharply their responsibility for the world's ills: 'American Imperialism' is unquestionably the pre-eminent evil force. In fact, criticism of the Soviets is rare and invariably mild. There is acknowledgement that Moscow, in the last years of the Stalin era, aggravated the tension but not the slightest intimation of blame for the conflict. There is a frequent expression of 'regret' at the Soviet resumption of nuclear tests at different times; and both powers are held responsible for the impasse on disarmament, though, ironically, the United Kingdom and Canada are singled out for failing to break the deadlock (ch. 16). In his United Nations speeches, too the glaring discrepancy in Menon's assessment of the role of the bloc leaders in world politics is evident, though the language is somewhat more restrained; but the thrust and content of this part of Menon's Image are unmistakable."

And Mr. Menon's Image shaped India's foreign policy to no small extent in that fateful decade from 1952 to 1962.

(Continued from page 8)

"In the absence of an assertion on oath, we have our own doubts whether there is in fact such a letter-writer or whether the reference is a fake one made to cut one more joke at the cost of the Magistrate".

While on this subject, it is interesting to record that in the Thackersey case the same editor reeled off name after name of many important officials and national leaders who had made, according to him, disparaging or damaging remarks about Shri Thackersey or his enterprises. On scrutiny it was found that all the persons named were either dead or not available for confirmation that they had in fact expressed opinions ascribed to them by the editor.

It seems that the editor has perfected to a fine art a system to avoid the consequences of damaging statements — ascribe them to imaginary persons who are dead or not available for examination, or, when pressed to reveal the identity, try and pretend to be a brave journalist who strictly honours journalistic ethics and refuses to reveal his sources!

Bombay, December 9.

Yours faithfully,
S. D. J.



Democracy is a Government of the people, by the people, for the people. True. But it can find fulfilment only if citizens have a right to own property, to produce and consume goods and services desired by them within reasonable regulations by the State. Democracy can find fulfilment only

if the initiative and enterprise of the people, whether in agriculture, business, industry or the professions, are allowed to flourish. A democracy can work only if you, an intelligent citizen, understand the economic issues and help to formulate public opinion

Join the Forum of Free Enterprise, a non-political organisation, to educate public opinion on free enterprise and to stimulate public thinking on economic issues. You will find booklets and leaflets, issued by it every month, helpful in understanding current economic problems.

Write for particulars (state whether Membership or Student Associateship):

FORUM OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Sohrab House, Dr. D. N. Road, Post Box 48-A, Bombay-1, (BR).

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

The Russian invaders have almost succeeded in "normalizing" Czechoslovakia to their satisfaction.
—*Time*, December 6.

France, the most 'planned' country of the Western world, is today reduced to a sort of economic pal-mistry.
—*Observer*, December 8.

Communism in Russia and throughout Europe is in the process of dissolving the more outdated day dreams of Karl Marx.
—*Indian Express*, December 13.

The malady afflicting the Congress has spread its malaise to all other political parties.
—*March of the Nation*, December 14.

The Communists in India may divide themselves into left, right, left extremist, adventurist, and the like. But potentially and in their ideology they are all one, all subversionists.
—C. Rajagopalachari, *Swarajya*, December 14.

The separation of religion from law would be good for both.
—K. Subba Rao, former Chief Justice of India
Times of India, December 15.

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. 5.00

Name:

Address:

Signature

America cannot, as some would wish, ignore the cold war or abandon the obligations it has undertaken.
—Professor Zbigniew Brezezinski,
U.S. News & World Report, December 16.

How could anybody vote for elements which were either pro-Russia or pro-China, never pro-India?
—Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister,
Indian Express, December 16.

The Russians will only hold fast to a satellite when it is in their own strategic area.
—*Swiss Press Review and News Report*,
December 16.

Real socialism could be seen in Japan and Germany where the people actively participated in nation building.
—Dayanand Bandodkar, Chief Minister of Goa,
—*Indian Express*, December 17.

Our politicians believe in dying in harness.
—*Indian Express*, December 17.

The Communists are engaged with foreign help in setting up a Viet Cong here.
—*Opinion*, December 17

If America withdrew from Asia, Communist China will menace India and all the other countries in the East.
—M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, *Indian Express*,
December 19.

I wrote to my government to oppose the action in Czechoslovakia. Now they say I am the enemy of the state. To whom shall I write?
—Russian Poet Evgeny Evtushenko as reported
by Frank Hardy, Australian novelist in
Time, December 20.

All revolutionary movements have two wings. A legal wing and an illegal wing. CPI (Marxist) intends to co-ordinate both wings. Legislature, Government, demonstration and deputation belongs to the first category and armed insurrection to the second.
P. Govinda Pillai, *Kerala Sabdam*—1968
Independence number.