

National Democratic Opposition

by S. Sharangpani

WITH the third General Elections less than a year hence, all political parties in the country have already begun to gear up their respective party machineries for the electoral encounter. All the parties are now busy in planning their tactics, drafting election manifestoes, and choosing their candidates for the contest. Each party, similarly, is doing its best to mobilise all possible resources by every means at its disposal in order to influence the choice of the voter in its favour. Unfortunately, the elections have tended more and more to become an expensive exercise in mobilisation of man-power and material resources. The recent elections in Orissa, wherein the ruling Congress Party has been reported to have spent about fifty lakhs and commanded a fleet of over two hundred jeeps, should serve to underline the extent to which money now plays an important role in the conduct of elections. Thus, the performance of any party in elections has now come to depend largely on its capacity to raise the necessary resources for fighting the elections. Here, the Congress, being the party in power, naturally is in an advantageous position. Its capacity in this respect can never be under-estimated, and it can be matched only by that of the Communist Party which has the advantage of being the only party that is being financed by a mighty foreign power. Thus, barring the Congress and the Communist, all other parties have mainly to rely for their success on their organisational strength and their ability to command popular support.

This leaves the Congress and the Communist as the only two parties with superior organisation machinery and material resources. The outlook is hardly promising for the healthy growth of democratic traditions and institutions in the country. Already our democracy suffers from the glaring disparity between the strength of the ruling party and that of the various opposition parties in the field. The Congress, with more than 370 seats has practically three-fourths of the total membership of Parliament while the opposition parties combined command only about a fourth of its total membership. This brute majority has helped

the ruling party to entrench itself in power and exercise it without any fear of an alternative claimant. This absence of any effective check on the governmental power has done immense harm to our parliamentary democracy and has tended to make the ruling party practically indifferent, if not impervious, to opposition from any section of the press or the public. It has only encouraged those in power to assume the mantle of infallibility and made them intolerant of criticism of their policies. The most glaring example in this respect has been the stubborn insistence of our Prime Minister on retaining Mr. Krishna Menon in charge of the country's defence, in spite of the growing opposition of the informed public opinion in the country to his continuance as the Defence Minister. Similarly, the failure of a government to protect the territorial integrity of the country would have brought about its instant downfall in any other democratic country. But in India, the ruling party, enjoying a virtual monopoly of power, even refuses to admit its failure in this regard and continues to follow its harmful policies in foreign as well as domestic affairs.

The absence of effective opposition has thus not only rendered our parliamentary democracy defective, it has even endangered our very existence as an independent and democratic country. As a result, our country today faces the twin danger of aggression from without aided and abetted by subversion from within by agents of international communism. This peril is all the more threatening as our Government externally, in the face of all the evidence, refuses to recognise the real character of the aggressor and the ideological considerations motivating its behaviour. Internally also, its attitude and policies towards the communists are characterised by the same ambivalence that has prompted it to rely on friendship with Russia as a guarantee against further Chinese encroachments on our territory. It is not, therefore, without significance that in the country today, of all the opposition parties, the Communist Party appears to be the nearest to the Congress, and more particularly to the Prime Minister, at least so far as foreign and defence policies are concerned. The communists have already extended their whole-hearted support to the Government's foreign policy and announced their decision "to defend India's foreign policy of peace and non-alignment." As Mr. Ajoy Ghosh has stated at Vijayawada: "Intense efforts would be needed on the part of all patriotic forces in the country to defend our foreign policy, to defeat those who want to change it and to strengthen this policy further". That of all the parties and groups, the com-

munists should claim to unite all "patriotic forces" in the country should sound really ironical; but they have been emboldened to do so as the policies of our Government have imparted plausibility to the communist claim.

Further, in order to defend and strengthen "all that is progressive in the Government's policies", the communists have already launched a multi-pronged attack. They have adopted the policy of "creating conditions for very broad democratic unity" with progressive Congressmen; they have also adopted the tactics of infiltrating the ruling party and dividing it from within as well as without. The Vijayawada Congress of the Communist Party has laid down a clear-cut programme of winning "allies" inside the Congress in order to bring pressure to bear upon the leadership of the Congress for bringing about a "shift to the Left" in its foreign as well as economic policies. Besides, the process of Congress-Communist alliance has already begun to gather momentum at various levels. Substantial number of communists, as recent reports have pointed out, have already joined the Congress in various States. Similarly, "the potential allies" of the communists inside the Congress have succeeded in splitting the Congress organisation into "Right" and "Left" camps, and they are being assisted by their comrades who have decided, in Mr. Ajoy Ghosh's words, "Even when opposing and fighting policies of the Congress and Government, to concentrate fire wherever possible on the rightist elements". The communists, in addition, have also succeeded in getting many Congressmen to associate with their various front organisations. "On a number of questions of

foreign policy, to quote him again, "we have been able to join hands with influential Congressmen in common organisations working for peace and against colonialism, and for friendship with Socialist countries." Thus the Congress-Communist alliance has already advanced quite far, as was evident recently in the Orissa elections where the communists openly supported the Congress and even the latter welcomed the "fraternal assistance" from the comrades without hesitation. The ultimate aim of the communists; of course, is to capture the Congress from within and convert it into a National Front on the Czech model. If they succeed in their game, we may shortly witness in India the repetition of the Czech experiment in co-existence with the communists.

The prospect thus is not very assuring and the democratic parties and groups in the country cannot afford to view it with unconcern. The country has already paid the heavy price of about 12,000 square miles of its territory, which is equal to the area of the State of Kerala, for its folly of relying exclusively on the wisdom of the Congress leadership. What is now at stake is the very survival of our democracy and independence. If the present drift of the Congress continues unchecked for long, it might perhaps be too late to arrest it. It is therefore necessary that all *democratic opposition parties*, like the Praja-Socialist, the Swatantra, the Jan Sangh and the Socialist, should come together to fight the elections on a common national platform. These parties, it is true, differ in their ideologies and approaches to the problems of economic development. But they have many basic factors in common. They are all patriotic parties and sincerely subscribe to democratic principles as a way of life. They are, therefore, fundamentally opposed to communism and any other anti-national and anti-democratic ideology. And, lastly, they are united in their determination to resist foreign aggression on our soil. They have always taken a common stand on all these issues in the past and have therefore incurred the wrath of the communists who have always branded them together as "reactionaries". If these parties combine on a common national democratic platform, they stand a good chance of emerging as a powerful national democratic opposition *bloc* which can effectively check the present trend of the Congress towards an alliance with the communists. It should be noted in this connection, that though the Congress secured absolute majority in terms of seats in the Legislatures and Parliament during the last two General Elections, the percentage of votes it secured was only 43 in 1952 and 47 in 1957. Thus the Congress Government has always been the minority government and its overwhelming success in the elections has always been due to the division of opposition votes among various parties. If, therefore, the democratic opposition parties pool their strength and resources together, they may provide a democratic alternative to the Congress and yet save the country from sliding into the communist camp.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month



Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 nP



Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor,

127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,

Bombay 1.

Notes

Prisoners Of Conscience

A MOVEMENT to work for the release of "Prisoners of Conscience" all over the world has been just launched in Great Britain. The object of the movement is (1) to work impartially for the release of those imprisoned for their opinions, (2) to seek for them a fair public trial (3) to enlarge the Right of Asylum and help political refugees to find work and (4) to urge effective international machinery to guarantee freedom of opinion. The movement is non-political and non-denominational in character. It has been launched by three lawyer members of the British Parliament belonging to the three main Parties in cooperation with a few others.

A "Prisoner of Conscience" is, according to the sponsors of the movement, "any person who is physically restrained (by imprisonment or otherwise) from expressing (in any form of words or symbols) any opinion which he honestly holds and which does not advocate or condone personal violence". Persons who conspire with a foreign government to overthrow their own are not included in the category of "Prisoners of Conscience" for whose release and relief the movement will work.

There are thousands of such "Prisoners of Conscience" in all parts of the world. They are to be found in large numbers in countries under communist or fascist dictatorships and in the colonial possessions of European Powers. But they are also to be found in other countries including some of the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. The movement will work impartially for the release of all prisoners, whatever the political character or the geographical location of the governments imprisoning them.

The movement will endeavour to mobilise public opinion in support of its demand for the release of "Prisoners of Conscience". It will collect information about the prisoners and highlight it by holding press conferences from time to time. It has set up an office in London at Mitre Court Buildings, Temple, London E.C.4. It has launched a campaign called "Appeal for Amnesty, 1961" urging governments to release the prisoners or to give them a fair trial. 1961 is, according to the sponsors of the movement, "an especially suitable year for the Amnesty Campaign". "It is the centenary of President Lincoln's inauguration, and of the beginning of the Civil War which ended with the liberation of American slaves: it is also the centenary of the decree that emancipated the Russian serfs". Mr. Peter Benenson, one of the Directors of the Amnesty Campaign, has stated in an article in *The Observer* of London: "Pressure of opinion a hundred years ago brought about the emancipation of the slaves. It is now for man to insist upon the

same freedom for his mind as he has won for his body".

There can be no two opinions that the movement and the Campaign that it has launched deserves the wholehearted support of all those who stand for the basic human right of freedom of opinion. We hope and trust that in India they will receive the enthusiastic support of all sections of public opinion.

Trading With The Devil

MR. G. D. BIRLA, one of the most prominent of Indian businessmen and industrialists, has after his recent visit to Russia pleaded strongly in favour of vigorous efforts for increasing trade between India and Russia. According to him, there is ample scope for increasing trade between the two countries, and he has appealed to Indian traders and manufacturers to take advantage of the opportunity. Growth of trade relations will, he hopes, lead to lessening of suspicions and mistrust and help the process of relaxation which, he says, has already started in Russia.

Trade is always welcome. It is ten times more welcome now when we are so anxious to expand our export market. It may be remembered, however, that our experience of trade with Russia has not been so far very happy. All the same, there will be no harm in exploring possibilities. Let us by all means try to find a market for our goods in Russia. If, as suggested by Mr. Birla, a trade delegation or a trade fair will help that effort, let them be organised as early as possible.

In our anxiety to increase trade we should not, however, forget the peculiar conditions which obtain in communist countries. A communist country uses its foreign trade as all other dealings with foreign countries as a political weapon or instrument. It is political considerations which determine its export

TRADE AND TOTALITARIANISM

"You ask me what difference is there between our getting a loan from Russia or from the United States? Imperialism in its economic form—in the movement of capital—is the same: both must be paid for. But the political consequences are different. The economic imperialism of totalitarianism brings totalitarianism with it. The economic imperialism of democracy allows us to keep democracy."

—Victor Raul Haya de la Torre, the wellknown Peruvian revolutionary.

and import trade and not ordinary business considerations. Russia has never made any secret of her determination to adhere to that policy. Indian traders and businessmen will have many an unpleasant surprise waiting for them if they will lose sight of that essential fact.

Mr. Birla has waxed eloquent in his articles about Russia's need for peace and the peaceful intentions of the Russian rulers. The desire for peace entertained by the common people is never in question. The Russian people are no exception to that rule. What is in question are the intentions of their rulers. If Mr. Khrushchev is so keen about peace, how does one explain the difficulties created by Russia in the negotiations over the banning of atomic tests, the troubles in Laos and South Vietnam, the threat to Berlin and many other explosive issues of the international situation? They do not bespeak a desire to lessen international tensions and help the cause of peace.

A shrewd observer of men and events that he is, Mr. Birla cannot be unaware of the political consequences of a policy of friendship with communist rulers. It is to be hoped that he will keep them in mind and will constantly warn his fellow traders and industrialists against them while trying, as he appears to be intent now, on establishing and expanding trade relations with them. It may be necessary, as pointed out by him, "to trade even with the devil," but let there be no illusions about the person one is trading with.

Arrests In The Punjab

THE arrests and imprisonment of a large number of Akali leaders which took place early in June expose the nervousness of the Punjab Government as well as the scant respect that it has for the civil liberties of the people. The Akali leaders have yet to decide about the steps that they will take in furtherance of their demand for Punjabi Suba. Talks and

correspondence are still in progress between the Sikh leaders on one hand and the Prime Minister and other Congress leaders on the other hand. The threatened fast unto death of Master Tara Singh is not to begin before August 15. In view of all this, there is no conceivable reason why the Punjab Government should have become so panicky and arrested such a large number of prominent Akalis long before they could even think of an agitation or a campaign. The action is arbitrary as well as reckless. Far from acting as a deterrent, it may act as a provocation and create for the Punjab Government the very situation it wants to avoid. And in any case, such gross violation of civil liberties will instead of weakening, strengthen the hold of the Akali leaders. Suppression has never succeeded in killing a movement that enjoys the support of the people.

Mr. Khasa Subba Rau

WE mourn the death of Mr. Khasa Subba Rau, one of the most independent and bold of our journalists. Mr. Subba Rau was not only a competent and effective journalist; he was also a man of convictions and courage. He was associated with Indian journalism since long and was at the time of his death the Editor of his own English weekly journal *Swarajya*. Mr. Khasa Subba Rau had to fight on many occasions lone battles for the sake of his principles. He did not shirk them and that characteristic virtue earned for him a unique place amongst journalists. Mr. Subba Rau will be remembered long for his bold and incisive writing on issues of public importance. It will be difficult to fill the void left by him.

INDIAN TRADE UNIONS

A SURVEY

by V. B. Karnik

A survey of the trade union movement in India during the last forty years.

Price Rs 15.

PUBLISHERS

LABOUR EDUCATION SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

HOW TO OVERTHROW

PARLIAMENTARY

DEMOCRACY

— A Communist Blueprint

by D. F. KARAKA



Price 25 nP.



DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

BOMBAY

Neutrality And Its Consequences

by Oskar Helmer

(Mr. Oscar Helmer, author of this article, is a distinguished Austrian Socialist elder statesman and former Interior Minister. The article analyses the meaning and consequences of Austrian neutrality and examines the historical circumstances surrounding the proclamation of that neutrality. It was published recently by "Forum", Vienna, and had a wide repercussion in the Austrian press and abroad)

WHAT we have relinquished is our open and close connection with our Western friends—the countries that helped us in our greatest need and saved us from falling under the wheels of the communist juggernaut. What we have taken in exchange is neutrality, which entails the renunciation of a full share in European integration. The exchange was made under compulsion, when we had no choice. That in itself should put us on our guard against the lure of shadows. But thanks to the optimism inherent in our national character, we are in constant danger of believing the neutrality fable rather than the stern facts of history. So I will take this opportunity of recapitulating these facts.

On 26th October 1955, the Austrian National Council adopted the following resolution, which was then promulgated as an Article of the Federal Constitution:

"With a view to the permanent assertion of its independence of the outside world and its territorial inviolability, Austria hereby voluntarily declares its intention of observing a perpetual neutrality with all the means at its disposal. To safeguard this aim, Austria will abstain in perpetuity from membership of any military coalition and will permit no foreign power to establish military bases on its territory."

The explanatory memorandum with which the Federal Government prefaced the Peace Treaty (bill introduced in the National Council on 21st May 1955) declares that:

"As early as the summer of 1953 the Federal Government sought to ascertain whether a declaration of Austria's neutrality on the part of the Austrian Parliament would facilitate the conclusion of the Peace Treaty. The result of this inquiry was negative, but the Austrian delegation to the Berlin Conference (February 1954) nevertheless gave an official assurance that Austria would in future join no military pact, and would refuse to permit any foreign military bases to be established in Austria."

What is here presented, from the legal standpoint, as "voluntary" neutrality; and from the chronological standpoint as an Austrian initiative dating from 1953, takes on a different aspect from the standpoint of historical causality. From this latter viewpoint it is seen to result from the pressure of power politics, to be a measure to which Austria submitted — which, indeed, she even suggested, though at first without success, in the hope of "facilitating" the conclusion of the Peace Treaty; or, to put it less cautiously, of buying the Treaty. The conclusion of the Treaty brought with it the long-desired sovereignty, but it was a

sovereignty conditional upon imposed neutrality. The sovereign States of democratic Europe have the right to renounce their sovereignty in order to build a united Europe; but Austria has relinquished that right, which in the present period of integration is perhaps more important than any other. We have been obliged to renounce the sovereign right of renouncing our sovereignty.

So what is represented from the legal standpoint as "voluntary" neutrality is seen, when regarded from the standpoint of practical politics, to be more in the nature of "neutralization" — in other words an enforced (in practice, though not in legal theory) restriction of sovereign rights through the acceptance of neutral status. When Molotov, speaking on 10th February 1954 at the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Berlin, mentioned neutrality for the first time, what he really meant was neutralization; and indeed he actually used the word — not, it is true, in relation to Austria, but in connection with the withdrawal of the allied forces from Germany as a preliminary to a German peace treaty. He called for measures "to ensure the neutralization of Germany in the interest of the consolidation of peace in Europe." Not until two days later did he add a demand for the neutralization of Austria, with the implication that the occupying forces would not be withdrawn from that country until the peace treaty with Germany had been concluded.

On this occasion the Federal Government felt impelled to publish the following comments (14th February 1954):

"Foreign Minister Molotov's suggestion that the Austrian Peace Treaty should include a provision by which Austria would pledge itself to abstain from joining any type of coalition or military alliance seems to require some clarification, inasmuch as, though the Federal Government has repeatedly declared its intention of abstaining from all military pacts, it cannot make any pledges which might debar it from embarking upon economic or political co-operation with a view to European consolidation."

With regard to further developments that culminated in the Austrian Treaty and the declaration of neutrality, it should be noted that even after Germany joined NATO, the Soviet Union maintained its view that Austrian neutrality was intended as an example to be followed in the case of Germany. Addressing the Soviet Presidium on 8th February 1955, Molotov again declared that "Austria must pledge itself to

join no coalitions or military alliances, and to admit no military bases." So when the Austrian delegation went to Moscow on 11th April 1955, its course was already laid down for it.

All the same, the delegation achieved a measure of success. It was conceded that the neutrality clause need not be embodied in the actual Treaty. But the members of the delegation had to give their personal promise to "see to it" that Austria would issue a declaration of neutrality immediately after the ratification of the Treaty.

In fact, though not in theory, the members of the Austrian delegation were acting under duress. There was no other way of securing the withdrawal of the occupying forces and the signature of the Treaty, except by seizing this chance of a compromise which the Russians might never again be disposed to offer. The statement in the resolution subsequently adopted by the National Council, to the effect that Austria was "voluntarily" becoming neutral, was similarly dictated by considerations of practical policy. Without "voluntary neutrality" there would be no Treaty, without the Treaty, no national sovereignty; while neutrality meant restricting our freedom of international negotiation. That is the vicious circle in which Austrian foreign policy is now spinning.

Nor are problems of foreign policy the only ones resulting from our neutrality. It tends to drive us into ideological neutralism as well. There were signs of this even before the neutrality law had been passed. On 15th October 1955, Dr. Raab, the Federal Chancellor, made the following statement in a broadcast speech:

"I want to make it perfectly clear that a mere declaration of neutrality will not settle the matter; a

certain amount of self-control will be needed as well. To be neutral means that we must try to live on friendly terms with all nations and Governments. We must not be too ready to criticize the Governments and nations with which we are henceforth to live at peace and have peaceful dealings. There is no sense in preaching to some Western State about its colonial policy one day, or in launching into propaganda against the East another day. It would be a very good thing if the Austrian press and radio would bear this in mind."

If Raab's views had been consistently followed, the right to freedom of the press and of opinion, which are fundamental freedoms laid down in the Constitution, would have become mere illusions, and all Austrians would have had to wear the muzzle of neutrality. Their silence would have led the rest of the world to suspect that they approved of Communism. A few days later, at a meeting at Laa-on-Thaya, I tried to make the rectifications that were urgently needed, pointing out that:

"The National Council's decision that Austria is to pledge itself to perpetual neutrality can and must apply only to military matters. For ten whole years, democratically-minded Austrians have been resisting attempts to deprive them of freedom of thought and impose a single will upon them. Austria belongs to the Western cultural community, which corresponds to the democratic attitude in politics. In the darkest days of the occupation, in an exposed area of the free world, Austria stood up for freedom and made great sacrifices in its cause. The decision taken by the National Council with regard to neutrality should help to maintain and consolidate that freedom. The Federal Chancellor's definition of Austrian neutrality does not tally with the views of democratically-minded Austrians. It ought to be withdrawn, for it is likely to lower Austria's political prestige in the free world."

Thereupon Raab decided to retreat — in the nick of time, before world opinion was informed of his far-reaching definition of Austrian neutrality. During the debate on the declaration of neutrality in the National Council, he said:

"The fundamental rights and freedoms of the citizen will in no way be restricted by the promulgation of this law. Neutrality lays obligations upon the State, but not on the individual citizen. The intellectual and political freedom of the individual, and more particularly the freedom of the press and of public opinion, are not affected by the perpetual neutrality of a State. Neither does that neutrality imply a pledge of ideological neutrality."

The pressure of public opinion and common sense won the day, and Austria did not kneel in homage to communism. Are we to do so now that some five years have gone by? We want to abide strictly by our pledge of neutrality, but we do not want to overdo things. The legally voluntary but actually compulsory restriction of our sovereign rights through neutrality appeared to us to be the lesser evil. We do not want to make it any greater.

Tibet Fights For Freedom

With a Foreword by the DALAI LAMA

Edited by RAJA HUTHEESING

Price Rs. 15

Published for

**INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL
FREEDOM**

148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

by

ORIENT LONGMANS

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS

NEW DELHI HYDERABAD DACCA

The Muslim Convention

by K. K. Sinha

IN a way the proceedings of the two-day Muslim Convention held recently at Delhi justified its having been convened. Although restricted in its composition, it gave an authentic idea of the feelings of a large community—as large as 50 millions in a total population of over 400 millions—after a long silence, if one may say so. Whatever one may think of their opinions, it is necessary that one should hear their genuine voice and feelings in order to form one's own judgement. This Convention certainly helped to understand their mind howsoever incompletely. The Conference was sponsored by "nationalist Muslims" and the delegates were handpicked on the basis of this criterion. Further, it did not talk about Pakistan at all—possibly purposely, although it passed resolutions on as close a neighbour as Goa or as distant one as Algeria. This speaks of calculated inhibition, an attitude of mind that does not indicate normalcy. Who knows who prevented them to talk on this subject which is vital and is also *felt* to be vital—is it they themselves or is it the unwritten directive from the High Command?

The Convention clearly indicated one fact, namely, that the Muslim community genuinely feels discriminated against in the country, in several ways, in spite of the liberal Constitution and a government under Nehru. There was no artificiality about this. When one remembers that in Northern India, and specially in Delhi, it needs some guts for a Muslim to speak out his mind, this authentic tone represented by the whole proceedings of the Convention should be carefully noted by all Indians. When a person of a background like that of Dr. Mahmud talks of scrapping State autonomy and centralising the State apparatus of the entire country, it shows how deep has been the disillusionment and frustration in the community.

Judging from what has happened in the Convention, it is obvious that it would have been totally wrong to have prohibited the holding of the Convention. The initiative was taken by the most favourable group of Muslim leadership, from a nationalist angle. If even they are gagged from voicing once and in an *ad hoc* manner their problems and feelings, and that also after Jabalpur, the disappointment would have grown more bitter and deeprooted.

Two major resolutions have been adopted in the Convention. One was a request to appoint a Commission "to enquire into the grievances of minorities". And the other asking the Prime Minister to call an all-party conference (of only those believing in socialism and secularism) to promote national integration.

These resolutions *sound* sensible. But let us see.

Enquiry? You enquire about a matter about which there is confusion or doubt. But that minorities *are* at a discount almost in every sphere of life is such a

patent fact that those who have eyes can easily see it. It is quite another matter if one *likes* to see it or not. A further major enquiry will only arouse passion on both sides. Will that be to the good? Would it not be a much better approach to consider:

- (a) How to give genuine effect to the provisions of the Constitution so that in each field *fair-play* for everybody is ensured;
- (b) How to improve relations between the two communities and how to help the minority elite to become more integrated and mixed in the social and political life of the total community.

These are concrete tasks to be concretely performed. The Congress holds power in all the States. It professes secularism and fair-play. The first immediate task is for the Congressmen at every level to practise what they preach and to do what it has the power to do.

What would be gained by having an all-party Conference? More wrangling or more hypocrisy. The stage when only words could improve matters has passed. For a Muslim, at times of tension, it is a question of life and death. These resolutions do not come to his help. All these talks can go on. But it would be sheer stupidity to expect much from that except temporary satisfaction.

Day-to-day practice in the fields of administration, education, trade, employment, etc. in terms of impartiality is the only real guarantee. Stress on that. The Congress runs the administration. If, therefore, there is today no fair-play, *the real reason is that the Congressmen who man the show have ceased to honestly believe in what they say*. Nehru may call a Conference and all will vote for whatever he says and then go about their own way. *This basic hypocrisy is the real curse*. No Conference can cure this so easily.

One more point. There appeared to be a latent trend of contradiction in the Convention proceedings. While many speakers as well as the resolutions stated that they did not seek special favour but wanted only restoration of Constitutional rights of citizenship, they again asked for many things as if they were asking for minority rights. Ultimately one has to choose. One has to be either a "citizen", as suggested in the Open Letter by the Institute of Political and Social Studies on the eve of the Convention, from where all rights flow, or seek minority "protection". The Convention, as was very natural at this first start, appeared to be in hesitant mood to choose between the two. However, there are indications that serious rethinking has indeed begun. This was most welcome and let us hope the logic of this new departure will be followed up.

Finally, it was interesting to note the active parti-

(Continued on page 11)

Laos And Containment

by James Burnham

WHAT these late events in Laos show, once more, is the impossibility of a policy of containment. Not containment's mere undesirability or inferiority relative to other conceivable policies; but quite literally its impossibility. The policy of containment has two integral elements: positively, to halt the advance of the Communist enterprise; negatively, to renounce offensive operations, of whatever sort, inside the enemy sphere. It is this combination that cannot, repeat cannot, be carried out in practice.

It is not a question of what Party is in power or what particular individual happens to be President. Containment has been the foreign policy of the United States government throughout the postwar period, and has failed, with nonpartisan inevitability. Under Truman's containment, communism took East Europe and mainland China. Under Eisenhower's containment, it was granted North Korea, took North Vietnam and Tibet, entered the Middle East, got footholds in Africa and seized a beachhead in the Caribbean. Under Kennedy's containment, Laos' departure from the Western camp (at least as far as neutralism) has already been conceded; the communists have established a "Yenan Government" in Congo's Oriental Province; Brazil has broken the solid South American diplomatic front.

The present predicament in Laos is not, certainly, of President Kennedy's making. Taken by itself, the situation in Laos is just about insoluble. Most of its area is jungle and mountain, with no railroads, few roads, and a primitive economy. Its people—Buddhists, illiterate, light-hearted and lazy—do not take naturally to warmaking. Normal American military methods are unsuited to the local environment.

By all accounts, our support programmes have been rather badly conceived. We did not aim toward the right size (smaller) and kind (adapted to guerilla, ranger, para-military tactics) of army. Our too massive civil aid seems neither to have strengthened the economy nor seduced popular psychology. However, granted the containment premise, it is doubtful that any programme could have done more than delay the Laotian slide.

After Laos came into existence through the 1954 Geneva negotiations that carved up French Indochina, the communist force (Pathet Lao) was left in being and in control of the northern provinces. Nothing was done to defeat and dissolve the Pathet Lao, which was in direct land communication with North Vietnam and Communist China, and through them with Russia. Its military units and political apparatus could be built up at leisure, at almost any desired level.

Laos could not be, and cannot be, defended exclusively from within Laos. Obviously the Laotians cannot defend themselves by their own efforts against

pressures brought by nations so overwhelmingly more powerful as China, Russia, or indeed North Vietnam. But even the Laotians plus the United States plus SEATO plus NATO cannot defend Laos indefinitely by defensive operations mounted inside Laos, short of the commitment of a force so great as to denude other theaters.

The defense of Laos is possible only if it includes operations outside of Laos; only if it comprises or at least threatens offensive operations of one sort or another against the enemy's own territory and positions. The anti-communist Chinese guerillas in the vague North Burma border areas have been such a threat, if a small one. It is interesting that a successive enemy campaign to neutralize and get rid of these guerillas (now being evacuated to Taiwan) has paralleled his advance within Laos. Free China is a threat, and without its existence on Taiwan and Quemoy, all Southeast Asia would have fallen some time ago. But the policy of containment forbids exploitation of the offensive potential of Taiwan—initially in political warfare, raids, guerilla actions, stimulations of mass resistance, etc.—which would be the best possible defense for South East Asia. And it is of further interest that the campaign to liquidate free China is also stepped up along with the renewed South East Asian thrust.

Just as Laos cannot be defended in Laos, South-East Asia, as a whole, cannot be defended indefinitely in South-East Asia, or the Congo in Africa, or Cuba in the Americas. There are not enough arms in the universe to rush all over the world plugging each and every crack that opens. The enemy can be held-contained—only if he is compelled to divert his energy from making troubles for others to meeting troubles of his own. In other words: containment is possible only through what amounts to a policy of liberation.

You cannot win by negotiation what you have lost in the field. It is unlikely that any measures so far envisaged by Mr. Kennedy can prevent Laos, already lost by us, from being taken over by the enemy (doubtless under the same face-saving neutralist formula). If we couldn't hold Laos by a policy of containment, it will be still less feasible to hold the remainder of South-East Asia, which will be much weakened by the Laotian loss. Already south Vietnam is under heavy attack, and Burma is swinging toward Peiping-Moscow.

President Kennedy should not be too much blamed for failing in Laos. But the blame for the successor debacles will be rightly on his shoulders if he fails to draw, and apply, the lesson once more taught by this first major defeat under his auspices: that U.S. World Policy—the policy of containment—is bankrupt.

—Reproduced from *National Review*.

How Not To Ban A Book

by Nissim Ezekiel

IT is not only freedom of expression that is at stake in the judgment on *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, in the Bombay Presidency Magistrate's Court, but also commonsense and intelligence. Here is a serious novel, brilliantly written, that has never been widely read. Whether it is obscene or not has hitherto been the concern of only a handful of litterateurs and lovers of literature. Even among those who have held the book to be obscene, that is, indecent by implied standards of decency, it is by no means invariably believed that such a work has no right to exist. That leaves us with a miniscule minority who would prefer it to be eliminated but are not all necessarily agreed on how this should be done. Some of them are shrewd enough to consider banning impractical and recommend the more effective method of silent censure. How many, then, actively urge its removal from circulation? Almost nobody.

Mr. M. Nasrullah, Additional Chief Presidency Magistrate of Bombay, acted on behalf of what may be called this "lunatic fringe", when he fined a bookseller and his partners for selling a copy of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and possessing another. The learned Magistrate held that "the ends of justice would be met by imposing a token sentence on the accused". Thus an act which he described as in effect assisting in the rocking of the foundations of society, in spreading "a devastating effect on all our accepted morals and ethical values concerning the institution of marriage", and in corrupting the public, particularly the young, such an act called for no more than a fine of Rs. 40/- to one partner of the offending bookshop and Rs. 20/- each to two others!

Mr. Nasrullah's judgment avoids almost completely any detailed analysis of Lawrence's book. His remarks on its theme and intentions are grotesquely inadequate. We are told, for instance, that Lawrence wrote the novel when he was a "sick and dying man between 1926 and 1928". Lawrence published *The Plumed Serpent* in 1926 and as he usually wrote very fast this must have been produced in the previous year. In 1928, he brought out a collection of short stories which included *The Woman Who Rode Away* and a volume of essays entitled *Mornings in Mexico*. Although he was tubercular for several years, it cannot be said that he was a sick and dying man, except between September 1929 and March 1930. If Mr. Nasrullah is to be believed Lawrence was nearly five years adying. Considering his voluminous output in this period, it is certain that Lawrence had more vitality in a dying state than most men, including geniuses, have displayed when living.

Mr. Nasrullah also needlessly committed himself to the view that Lawrence was obsessed with some urge, presumably morbid, "to shake the world" at any cost, "to throw a bombshell" for the sake of

which he had "obviously indulged in certain excesses ...". To Lawrence himself, the Magistrate attributed the opinion that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* "was not everybody's book, but only for the intellectuals in universities". While it is quite likely that Lawrence may have said that his book is not for everybody, it is prima facie impossible he could have said that it was for "intellectuals in universities". This injustice, at least, Lawrence should have been spared.

What follows is worse. Mr Nasrullah declared that his court was "primarily concerned with the reaction of the average man in society as distinguished from the intellectuals in universities on one hand and the libertines on the other." This baffling triple division of humanity reduces the judgment to a farcical level. Some average men are also libertines and many are to be found among "intellectuals in universities" not only in India but all over the world. Then there is the ignoramus, whose response to *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is said to be of no relevance. Presumably, Mr. Nasrullah meant that condemnations of the novel by the ignoramus did not influence his judgment. It was hardly necessary to confuse matters further by mentioning this additional category of human beings. It overlaps substantially with a dubious average and is in any case meaningful only within a specific context, unless used in a pejorative sense.

The ignoramus is as likely to be corrupted as the average man by whatever is alleged to be corruptible, and is surely as much in need of protection from it. The same is true of "intellectuals in universities" as well as "libertines". The questions that are begged are whether such protection is worth providing in an open society, whether it does not defeat its own ends, whether it does not eventually tend to extend its range without limit, whether it does not invariably become riddled with contradictions.

Mr. Nasrullah was not altogether oblivious of the fact that freedom of expression was an issue in the case before him. He resolved it by drawing the line where it is "exercised in such a way as to present a danger to society..." Here again, presumably, the danger operates through the "average" person, not the university intellectual, not the libertine, not the ignoramus. The virtual impossibility of having to take a decision on this basis, does not appear to have troubled Mr. Nasrullah. For the sake of mythical average, he glorifies "accepted morals and ethical values" and the "foundation on which society stood". No inconvenient questions need be asked about the condition of all that is "accepted".

The Bombay footnote, if it may be so called, to the history of *Lady Chatterley* case, is unfortunately an ignominious one. It does not even have the merit of serious intellectual content, and is likely to expose

(Continued on page 11)

Without Comment

Communism vs. Arab Nationalism

PRAVDA ATTACKS CAIRO JOURNALS

Moscow, May 31—The Soviet Government newspaper *Pravda* today made a violent attack on two Cairo publications and editors, including the newspaper *Al Ahram*, which frequently reflects the policies of United Arab Republic President, Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Pravda charged that *Al Ahram* and the weekly *Al Mussawar Jad* "simultaneously opened their pages for the vilest anti-Soviet slander, concocted in accordance with old recipes of the imperialist propaganda kitchen."

Pravda, singling out an article written for *Al Ahram* by Mr. Kamal Hamdi Abu Kheir, said: "The level of Abu Kheir's empty prattling about socialism, or rather against socialism, is revealed by his attempt to identify the socialist order, which triumphed on a vast part of the world, with the bloody regimes of Nazi Germany and fascist Italy."

Pravda, attacking *Al Mussawar's* editor-in-chief Fikri Abaza, said his open letter to Soviet Premier Khrushchev apparently had been written after he had heated himself up like a "Bassar Fakir."

It specially criticized Mr. Abaza's suggestion that the Soviet Union should halt activities of its communist parties in Arab countries.

"The slanderous exercise of Mr. Abaza and Mr. Kheir will never detract from the truly noble and great mission of the Soviet Union in African countries," *Pravda* added. —*Hindustan Times*, June 2.

RUSSIA PROTESTS TO UAR

Moscow, June 3—The Soviet Union protested through its Central Council of Trade Unions today against arrests and torture of Arab communist leaders by the United Arab Republic.

The official Soviet Communist Party newspaper, *Pravda*, published this first formal protest.

Other Soviet newspapers have taken up the subject recently in a less direct fashion.

The *Pravda* protest specifically mentioned the recent death of the Lebanese communist leader, Mr. Faradzalla Khel, in a Syrian prison.

It said: "On behalf of millions of members of the Soviet Trade Union, the All-Union Council of Central Trade Unions expresses a wrathful protest against the arbitrariness of the local authorities in the UAR towards the prisoners, and appeals to the UAR Government to intervene immediately and take necessary measures to stop mockery and torture and to set free

patriots, democrats and activists of the working class movement."

Pravda added: "Many Syrian patriots and democrats have been killed. The threat of physical destruction continues to hang over those who are still alive."

The protest also said that "the torture of patriots, true sons of the motherland, is a crying violation of democratic rights and liberties, and a trampling of elementary understanding of justice and humaneness."

"All this naturally evokes a feeling of disgust and indignation of all honest people."

—*Hindustan Times*, June 4.

CAIRO WINS FIRST ROUND OF WORDY WAR

Beirut, June 7—The United Arab Republic appears to have won the first round in the new verbal battle with the U.S.S.R.

U.A.R. authorities yesterday produced before journalists in Damascus, one of those the Moscow Radio had named as having died.

However, it is known many Arab communists are in prisons or under house-arrest in both Egypt and Syria, and the Soviet Union has become increasingly critical over the past months of U.A.R. domestic policy towards communism.

Hitherto the Soviet Government has been prepared to wink an eye at U.A.R.'s treatment of its communists. It evidently felt this was a small price to pay in return for Egypt's friendship on the international level and support against the West on most major issues. A friendly Egypt was vital for the Soviet's African policy. Above all no attempt was made to use Egypt's heavy economic obligations towards the U.S.S.R. to force the U.A.R. to change its attitude towards Arab communism.

But today there are signs that the U.S.S.R. is considering wielding the big stick. It is no coincidence that Soviet attacks on the U.A.R. are taking place during the preparatory neutrals' conference now attended by 22 nations in Cairo. This conference is unpopular with the Soviet Union, both because it is partly inspired by Marshal Tito and also because the President has made no secret that he wants it to be genuinely neutral of both Eastern and Western blocs.

—*Indian Express*, June 8.

MOSCOW IGNORES NEUTRAL SUMMIT

Vienna, June 7—While the Communist Radio and Press continues to comment with approval on the Vienna talks and to quote optimistic Western editorials, it is turning its attention to the quarrel that has suddenly risen between the communist world and the UAR.

As on an earlier occasion of Moscow-Cairo animosity—in the winter of 1958-59—a campaign began over the arrests of many communists in the UAR and the activities in the Soviet bloc of the exiled Syrian communist leader, Mr. Khalid Bagdash—it is Bulgaria that has been chosen to lead the attack. Both Sofia Radio and the official Communist Party news-

paper comment on the present open "wave of terror and persecution against progressive workers in the UAR."

Western observers believe that the present rift goes much deeper and is producing tougher attitudes than the previous dispute. The neutralist pre-summit meeting in Cairo is almost ignored in the Communist Press and Radio.

—*Statesman*, June 9.

KHRUSHCHEV WARNS UAR

Cairo, June 9—Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has warned the United Arab Republic Government that it is putting itself in a critical position by taking an anti-communist line.

Mr. Khrushchev made the statement to a UAR parliamentary delegation which visited Moscow last month. It was published today by the *Al Ahram*, together with the reply sent to the Russian leader by the delegation leader, National Assembly Speaker Anwar el Sadate.

Mr. Khrushchev told the delegation: "If you want socialism you should not say you are against communism. You are thus putting yourselves in a critical position and will fall into the imperialist trap. I am warning you, I speak in all honesty."

The Russian leader said that communism could give the Arabs a better life.

He said that the UAR was like a beginner in socialism.

In his reply, Mr. el Sadate said that the UAR's fight against communism was confined within their national boundaries and prompted by the attitude of local communists to their national revolution.

He added that the UAR disagreed with Mr. Khrushchev's "closed circle" division of the world systems into capitalism and communism.

—*Hindustan Times*, June 10.

ARAB STATES' WARNING

Cairo, June 11—Ministers from four Arab States, here for the Arab defence conference, on Saturday

(HOW NOT TO BAN A BOOK — Cont'd from page 9)

us to ridicule if it receives any attention outside India. That is why I started by saying that commonsense and intelligence are as much at stake, perhaps more so, in the judgment on Lawrence's novel here, as freedom of expression. Even if none in India wish to exercise that freedom to the extent implied in this case; even if none are genuinely interested in witnessing it; even if the book is truly corrupting and subversive; even if there are sound reasons for banning it; even if all these circumstances exist, the Nasrullah verdict would still be atrocious for its sheer muddle-headedness. That is the most pathetic aspect of the case as it was settled in Bombay.

strongly condemned the Soviet Union's current "propaganda campaign" against the United Arab Republic.

The Saudi Arabia Defence Minister, Emir Mohamed Ibn Seoud, stressed that the campaign was not directed solely against the U.A.R., but against all other Arabs as well.

He said that his country completely approved the U.A.R.'s attitude toward the campaign, and hoped the Soviet attacks would be halted so as to preserve Soviet-Arab friendship.

—*Indian Express*, June 12.

PEACE COUNCIL SUPPORTS RUSSIA

New Delhi, June 18—The communist-sponsored All-India Peace Council has joined the Moscow-directed campaign against the United Arab Republic for alleged ruthless suppression of Arab communists.

Following a directive from the communist world peace movement headquarters in Vienna, Indian Peace Council president Sunder Lal sent a protest letter last week to President Nasser repeating Moscow complaint that Lebanese communist leader Jafrullah Helou was brutally murdered in a UAR prison.

Mr. Sunder Lal, it is believed, prefaced his protest by praising President Nasser personally, seeking to imply that the UAR President had no hand in his Government's anti-communist actions.

—*Hindustan Times*, June 19.

(MUSLIM CONVENTION—Continued from page 7)

cipation by Dr. Z. A. Ahmed, the communist leader. How does the communist deal with minority opinion in a Communist State? How much protection does communism give to Islamic culture and religion and language? In fact what is the position of a believer in a Communist State? These questions are answered in advance for him by the practices of the Soviet, Chinese and other Communist States whom he has actively supported. He demands enforcement of the liberal Constitution of India but fully and emphatically supports the absence of all liberties in Communist States. Thus, there appears a lack of integrity in his position. He was indeed a misfit in the Convention. But he stuck on because the elections are coming and he could fully exploit the name that he bore, although he was not responsible for it.

In sum, the Convention was useful not only to the Muslims but to all thoughtful citizens. It should have a deep and pervasive effect, provided the issues raised by it are clarified in the course of further and more widespread deliberation, and provided the Congress leadership begins to wake up from the effects of its power intoxication. But will it? It is basically not a question of votes; it is one of belief in basic values of secular democracy rooted in the sanctity of the individual.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Our knees do not tremble at the world revolution.
We believe in it.

—President Kennedy, *Times of India*, May 5.

If you want Socialism, you should not say you are
against Communism. You are thus putting yourself in
a critical position and will fall into the imperialist
trap.

—Nikita Khrushchev, to UAR Parliamentary
delegation, *Indian Express*, June 10.

At present West Berlin sticks like an infuriating
bone in the Soviet throat, and Mr. Khrushchev would
be glad to get rid of it by swallowing it.

—*Examiner*, June 24.

The fox is loose, Mr. President. He's after the
chickens and you live in the chicken house.

—Vice-President Lyndon Johnson to President
Ngo Dinh Diem, *Time Magazine*, June 2.

✓ There is really no such thing as "non-intervention";
the very existence of a free society is a form of inter-
vention in the internal affairs of dictatorships.

—J. P. Roche, *New Leader*, May 15.

There is damn well not going to be another Congo
in Kenya.

—Ian Macleod quoted in *Economist*, May 20.

If Castro, Che Guevara and his other associates are
not communists, they are certainly cheating the inter-
national communist movement of its dues.

—William Henry Chamberlain, *New Leader*,
April 10.

What an umbrella-word is leftist! How many take
shelter under its shade! Is a well-known medical man
a communist? Well.....er.....he is leftist. Is an
equally well-known writer, a scientist, a communist?
You know, the apologist will say, both of them are
leftist.....Is Krishna Menon a communist? Pat
comes the answer, he's a leftist. Are journals which
persistently support the Soviet cause communist? No,
they are always leftist.

—A. D. Gorwala, *Opinion*, May 23.

.....Petty theft is widespread as any car-owner
in Moscow will tell you as he removes his hub-shields
and windscreen-wipers before parking his vehicle for
the night.

—Ralph Parker, *Thought*, May 27.

Geography has made us neighbours. History has
made us friends. Economics has made us partners.
Necessity has made us allies.

—President Kennedy to the Canadian Parliament
quoted in *Economist*, May 20.

The law may not be able to make a man love me,
but it can keep him from lynching me.

—Martin Luther King, *Time Magazine*, June 2.

There are more rajas, maharajas, capitalists, pan-
dits, and maulvis in the Congress than all the com-
munist parties put together plus the Swatantra Party.

—*Mankind*, May 1961.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

THE QUEEN AND I

Malcolm Muggeridge

DISASTER IN CUBA

Theodore Draper

AFRICA FOR BEGINNERS

Melvin J. Lasky

July 1961

94

Annual Rs. 12.

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

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service,
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST,
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3.

Name:

Address:

Signature