

JULY 1963

The Opposition And Its Task

V. B. Karnik

SINCE the Opposition victories in Amroha, Farrukhabad and Rajkot, a persistent demand has been voiced all over the country that the opposition parties should combine and present a united front to the Congress. The demand is based on the hope that, with unity in the ranks of the opposition, an effective check can be developed on the vagaries and misdeeds of the Congress and in elections a number of seats can be wrested out of its hands, the seats which it wins only because the Opposition votes are divided. Many Congressmen also are supporting the demand as they realise that all is not well with the Congress and would like a healthy and vigorous Opposition to grow in order to keep it on the proper track. The people in general will also be happy if, instead of being hostile parties and groups, the Opposition will get together and speak and act with one voice and mind.

It is regrettable, however, that the fond hope is not likely to be fulfilled. Each opposition party is so obsessed with its own importance and with the correctness of its own programme that it has no patience with other parties and groups and considers it more essential to fight against them rather than against the Congress. Each is, therefore, keen on going it alone. One amongst them, the Praja Socialist Party, has even gone to the extent of making a flamboyant declaration that it would under no circumstances cooperate with parties like the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra. Whatever the value of the declaration, it only highlights the impossibility of uniting the opposition parties and groups or of even getting them together in a long-term united front.

Ordinarily, it should not have been difficult for the Opposition to come together. The entire Opposition, from which, of course, the Communists are to be excluded as what is being discussed is a democratic Opposition, is of one mind on the issues of resistance to Chinese aggression and the defence of democracy. It is further of one mind on the issues of corruption and maladministration. These provide a sufficiently wide platform for all patriots and democrats to stand together without giving up their widely divergent views on other matters. The situation is complicated, however, by the utterly unrealistic ideas about Left and Right. Some parties regard themselves as parties of the Left and are not prepared to work with what

they regard as parties of the Right. They have a holy horror of any joint work with the so-called Rightists. They have not yet realised that the old terms Left and Right have in the latter half of the twentieth century lost all their meaning and that what is essential in this period is the united effort of all democrats and patriots for the preservation of democracy and national independence. In India both are threatened today by Chinese Communism. The first task of all democrats is to fight that danger. Opposition to the Congress has become necessary because it is not carrying on that fight as resolutely and vigorously as it should and because its corrupt and weak administration is spreading defeatism and cynicism in the country. It is regrettable that the opposition parties and groups are not realising the urgent necessity of tackling this problem, which can be done only on the basis of a wide national and not a narrow party outlook.

If unity or long-term united front is not possible, opposition parties can at least think in terms of electoral adjustments with a view to avoiding internecine quarrels which have helped the Congress in many constituencies. The next General Election is no doubt still far off. But unless the preparations are taken in hand early, the Opposition may meet with the same fate as in the three earlier elections. The Congress forces will be then well-organised and united, while the Opposition forces will be disunited and disorganised. Elections and electoral activity is, no doubt, not the only activity in a democracy; there are many other forms of activity, but electoral activity has its own unique importance as that is the main way of bringing about changes in the Government and its policies. It has also many side effects. It educates the people, it makes them conscious of their own strength, it reinforces their faith in the possibility of peaceful change and it makes them take an intelligent interest in public affairs. If opposition parties will at least decide to avoid internecine conflicts, it will give a new sense of confidence to the people. They will realise that it is no longer necessary to rely helplessly on the Congress. They will realise that it is possible for a non-Congress candidate to win against the mighty Congress as it happened in Amroha, Farrukhabad and Rajkot. They will then become more vocal, more demanding and more assertive; nobody will then be able to take them for granted and that may well become the beginning of a new era, the era of a growing and conscious democracy.

As a faithful and competent custodian of the people's interests, the Congress has not so far rendered a good account of itself. It may not be immediately possible to remove

(Continued on page 2)

U. N. Finances

Raman Desai

EIGHTEEN years ago the organisation of the United Nations came into being with the definite object of maintaining world peace through an organised force. The membership of this organisation today stands at 110. The General Assembly is composed of all members and its affairs are voted upon; important questions can be decided only by a two-third majority of members present; one of the questions considered important is recommendation on maintenance of international peace and security. The World Court in 1962 has ruled that expenditure authorised by the General Assembly for maintaining peace, expenditure for the peace machinery in the Congo and the Middle East was expenditure proper and valid and that members who failed to pay their share of these expenses for two years would lose the right to vote in the Assembly.

The United Nations Organisation faced a deficit of \$104 millions in 1962; this deficit was met by a loan for 25 years from some member states. By the end of this year another deficit of about \$140 million is in sight. These deficits have arisen because of the rejection by the Soviet Bloc, France, Belgium and others of their liability to contribute towards the cost of such operations as in Congo, Gaza etc. The costs in the Congo in 1962 alone amounted to \$120 million. It may be noted that the Soviet Union approved the initial move to send troops of the United Nations into the Congo. No doubt they hoped thus to install their creature into power in the Congo. But when they did not succeed in this venture they refused to pay their share of the costs of troops; France and Belgium followed suit.

On the 22nd May, the Soviet Union has served notice that it will not pay for several items in the budget; these included the Commission in Korea, the mission in the Middle East, the Cemetery for the troops killed in the Korean War and for the charges for the Bond issue last year. They also offered to pay some other dues only in Rubles, which meant that the goods purchased should be Russian.

The deadline for all such payments not only by the Soviet Bloc, but France and 40 other members will come at the end of the year. It is probable that these members are, as usual, bluffing. France has argued

that the enforcement of penalty for failure of dues can and should be only by a two-thirds majority vote, not simple majority vote, of the General Assembly. This is clearly wrong; expulsion of a member Nation is one thing and failure of elementary subscription dues another. Another argument raised by France is that such operations as in Congo constitute the U.N. into a World authority or government, a concept to which France does not agree. This is a curious argument negating the very fundamental concept, the basic hope and ambition of the U.N. and cannot be entertained. But the other members who have regarded the United Nations as the one and only hope of keeping peace in the world and have made sacrifices in preserving the prestige of this organisation must determine to enforce the ordinary rules of procedure of the Assembly even at the cost of a showdown. India has, in this matter, an exceptionally clean record and Mr. Nehru should in this instance shed the usual inhibitions in dealing with the tortuous ways of the Soviet Bloc and align this country with the democracies in enforcing elementary rules of conduct in the World Assembly.

(Continued from page 1)

it from that position. It is, however, urgent and important to develop a countervailing force so that the Congress may not stray too far away from the path of public good. The people have realised that necessity and that is at the bottom of their demand that the opposition forces should unite and present a common front against the Congress. The people have made clear their desire, it is now for the Opposition to respect or disregard it.

HOW TO OVERTHROW PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

— A Communist Blueprint

by D. F. KARAKA



Price 25 nP.



DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE
BOMBAY

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.

Compulsory Deposit Scheme

Yogindra Trivedi

WHILE piloting the Bill for Compulsory Deposit Scheme in Parliament the Finance Minister laid emphasis on the fact of the emergency, as also the need for Compulsory Saving, where some marginal saving was possible. It is a sad experience of many people, that taxing measures, which have come in force for a short duration, and for meeting some exceptional circumstances, have ultimately lingered on, even while those emergency conditions have disappeared. It is thus that we have got in our Income-Tax Statute provisions like Advance Payment of Tax, Capital Gains Tax etc. One can, therefore, safely assume that the Compulsory Deposit Scheme Act will be on the Statute book for a sufficiently long time unless it proves economically futile or politically injurious.

When the Bill was discussed in Parliament, there was a strong section of members who felt doubts regarding its constitutional validity, but the subsequent explanations given by the Attorney General have laid the doubts regarding its constitutionality at rest. The residuary powers, reserved to the Union under Entry 97 of List I to the Seventh Schedule are wide enough to cover all topics of legislation, which are specifically not mentioned in either the State list or the Concurrent list. The High Court at Bombay, while considering the power of the Government to reserve the monies paid voluntarily by the assessee held in "Radheshyam Makharlal vs. Union of India" that the same did not infringe the fundamental right to acquire, hold and dispose of property conferred by Article 19(1)(f) of the Constitution of India. Of course, the validity of these provisions will be surely challenged by irate citizens, but the said challenge is not very likely to meet success on this count.

Coming to the main provisions of the Act it will be seen that the Act seeks to make six categories of persons liable for the payment of Compulsory Deposit. They are: (1) persons liable to payment of land revenue (2) persons liable to Income-Tax payments (3) holders of immovable properties in urban areas (4) salaried class of people, whose salary income is Rs. 1500/- or more per year (5) persons whose turnover for the purposes of sales-tax is Rs. 15,000/- or more (6) other persons who may be specified later, whose annual income is Rs. 1500/- or more.

The above categories of persons are charged with the payment of Compulsory Deposit. The varying rates of deposit are prescribed thereafter. The facility of paying Compulsory Deposit instead of additional surcharge is also extended to advance payment of tax under sec. (4) sub-section (5) of the Act. Sub-sec (6) provides that in a few restricted cases, the liability to pay the Compulsory Deposit shall not arise if 11% of the annual income is paid on an insurance policy, or as contribution to provi-

dent fund, or in Post Office Savings Bank. Of course, this benefit, is available only to the salaried class of people. But to save 11% of the annual income by way of insurance or otherwise is considerably difficult for small wage earners. Sub-sec. (8) provides for interest at the rate of 4% per annum on the amount deposited; and sub-sec. (9) provides for repayment of deposit and interest at the end of five years after the year in which the amount is deposited. It should, however, be remembered that only the deposit and interest in respect of the year after which the five years are completed will be repaid and not the entire deposit. The minimum which the Government could have done was to allow the payment of interest at the end of every year. The proviso to sub-sec. (9) makes arrangements for earlier payment of the deposit and interest, in case the authority concerned feels that genuine hardship will be caused unless such repayment is made. Those provisions instead of being kept vague and left to the discretion of the executive authority should have been specified in the body of the Act itself. Thus cases could have been enumerated in which such earlier repayment could be made. The amount of deposit and interest will be free from attachment by any creditor for the debt of the depositor. Sec. 12 provides for penalty for failure of the deposit, which can be as much as half the amount, to be deposited. One notable omission in the Act is the absence of any appellate authority to supervise arbitrary exercise of the power under the Act by the authorities concerned. In the case of any dispute the Government's or the empowered authority's decision is final, and the same is not made subject to the appellate jurisdiction of Civil Courts. This is unfortunate, because in cases of arbitrary determination the citizen will be compelled to take the only course open i.e. to move the High Court by a high prerogative writ, under Art. 226 of the Constitution of India. If proper departmental appeals were provided for, then probably it would not have been necessary for small depositors to resort to the costly remedy of rushing to High Courts.

Another lacuna in the Act is seen in the manner in which deposit has to be made for claiming deduction from the payment of additional surcharge. Such deposit has to be made before the end of the financial year during which the assessee's previous year ends. In the case of an assessee, whose previous year ends on 31st March of the year, such deposit will have to be made before 31st March, as the previous year is the finance year. This will be extremely difficult, because the assessee may not know the rates of tax for his income, or sometimes even his total income, as the books of accounts can be closed only after a few months after the completion of the year, and it is only then, that the income is ascertained. In the case of such assessee, it is absolutely essential that

some time is given after the completion of the previous year for the deposit to be made.

Looking generally, the Compulsory Deposit Scheme Act, as a fiscal statute is of doubtful value and benefit. Its administrative problems and expenses will be enormous, because for the first time, it covers a wide range of people, who are disbursed in all walks of life. In the case of employers a complicated procedure is prescribed under the Scheme for maintaining pass books, for filling in forms and for maintenance and production of documents. There is no doubt that the number of forms will multiply with the passage of time, and even in moderately small establishments, it may become necessary to employ a full time person, just to look after the effective implementation of the Scheme.

It may be also mentioned that in the absence of proper administrative machinery to implement the said scheme on such a vast scale, there may be wide-scale evasion of the law from small income group people. The evasion by itself may not be very large, numerically, but it certainly raises a wider question. Should we make laws which we cannot effectively implement? If we have such laws, which we cannot properly enforce, people develop certain apathy towards that law, which is detrimental to the democratic fibre of our political system. It is necessary in democracy that laws should be respected by people and therefore we should only have such laws, which cannot be easily flouted.

The preamble of the Act states that the Act is meant to provide for Compulsory Deposit in the interest of national economic development. The laudable object of the Act is sought to be served by casting the net far and wide. In fact no measure of direct taxation has hitherto swept so widely. No one had ever ventured to tap persons with an annual income of Rs. 1500/- which in our country may be considered a mere subsistence annual income for a family of five. With the the spiral of cost of living index rising steadily, it is unthinkable how anyone can expect the wage earner at Rs. 125/- per month to save Rs. 45/- per year. While a measure like the Gold Control Order has some justification for the intended social reform the Deposit Scheme cannot boast of any such laudable social implication. It is idle to compare it with compulsory insurance, which it is not, for like insurance it does not cover any risk. It cannot, therefore, replace the necessity of life insurance for those, who are insurance minded, would still go in for insurance, even while undergoing the heavy burden of Compulsory Deposit. The results of the recent by-elections should be a pointer to the Congress on the mood of the electorate towards the new taxing measures.

No one can deny the need of the State for raising more revenues in a developing economy, but this purpose can better be served by checking gross and monstrous evasion of tax, rather than by resorting to flippant measures, which can only harass honest and unaffording citizens.



Now, now, don't panic Mr. Macmillan! First ask the Attorney-General, after that a judge, after that...

Courtesy: Hindustan Times



Resigned for telling a lie? Here they would have to resign if they told the truth!

Courtesy: Times of India

The Battle Of Clay's Cliches

Peter Ritner

THE State Department's release late last month of "The Scope and Distribution of United States Military and Economic Assistance Programmes"—or, as it has come to be called, the Clay Report—has evoked a flurry of catcalls from many of the most articulate "forward-looking" celebrities in American political life.

The fact is that, aside from its literary primitiveness, the Clay Report is not a bad state paper of a particular type. It is an official acknowledgement that people in the Government, and many others outside the Government, have been asking troubling questions for a long time, and it is thus at least one step towards the clarification and discussion of these questions. The Report does not answer most of its own questions. But by summarizing them we may be able to suggest some methods of getting at the answers they invite.

Although the Clay Report gives us no occasion to charge that members of the panel do not realize that modern governments must perform innumerable indispensable functions in the economic sphere, it is clear from the many references to "private productive ventures" that . . . they were intellectually persuaded that the stimulation of private entrepreneurship is the precise end at which an intelligible American aid effort must aim.

Apparently this is one of the most controversial aspects of the Report. Yet I do not see why this should be so. Surely the Clay Committee is right. Most Americans who think about the matter at all do agree that for societies to gain the relative stability, rationality and lack of frustrations needed to share the goodies of the 21st century, to avoid tripping into the trap of great wars, they must be more-or-less middle-class societies, nurturing more-or-less free individual entrepreneurs who exercise more-or-less unsupervised business initiatives—with all the multitude of dispersed power centers and intra-social associations this busy private activity implies. Are Americans mistaken to believe this? Is there proof they are wrong?

The assumption that the fostering of pluralist, "democratic capitalist" systems around the world is the proper aim of American aid policy does not rest on eschatology alone. There is solid evidence that economic pluralism and diversity possess ample economic justification. Centralized social power inevitably must be controlled by politicians, and this is not always economically fortunate.

Moreover, how many planners have there ever been who were gifted enough to draft a programme, riding roughshod over a host of private interests, and mobilizing millions of people, which takes account of every contingency? Sad to say, the effects of oversights in social planning are also multiplied by the very dimensions of the schemes.

It is not that the Clay panelists are typically Ame-

rican, parochial free-enterprisers. It is that any man can prove at least this much, that a modified diversified free-enterprise system is in many significant respects safer and more resilient than a centralized, politically controlled and directed economy. Not only politically safer but also economically—*vide* the ghastly, wasteful blotches of Stalin's regime in Russia.

To convince the politicians of backward countries to accept and anticipate their inherent fallibility is of course quite something else, again; regrettably, this point the Clay Report did not touch on at all. Basically, the vision of a middle-class entrepreneurial society, with its characteristic hum of muted conflicts-of-interests, appeals to the Nkrumahs no more than it does to the de Gaulles. Such a texture of polity ill accords with the inward mysticisms, the ideological commitments, of the party chiefs who dominate the politics of the underdeveloped countries. It seems materialist, particularist, unreliable—above all, too slow, considering the clamour of their peoples and the delicate poise of their personal careers. The one-man, one-party, one-army, one-ideology state seems much the fitter instrument for the private and public objectives of the ordinary Man of Destiny, especially when he can describe it as some form of "Socialism" and thus bemuse a few helpful Westerners.

It is this irresistible attraction of consolidated power to the underdeveloped leader, plus the comparative ease with which he can put the idea across in his new country, plus the prospect of its inevitable decay into corruption, nepotism and repression, which makes such a sensitive and sophisticated writer as Robert Heilbroner despair of American aid programmes' ever accomplishing anything toward the creation of societies we can admire. Heilbroner's pessimism may be called for. But that is not to say the Clay Report is wrong to declare that the United States has small motive to encourage governments of a form it has only too much reason to know must one day deteriorate into cruelty, instability and economic muddle.

How to get a backward society changed into a middle-class society is the next point at which discussion of economic development breaks down. I am not really so naïve as to desire or expect that one day Lagos, Nigeria, will resemble Louisville, Kentucky, or to think that appalling hazards like the population explosion do not make an optimistic view of the destinies of the under-developed countries hard to support. But neither can I believe that American economists and politicians have exhausted every resource of ingenuity in this matter.

The American West developed because capital from England, France and the East Coast was applied to a large number of specific enterprises—many of them small—some of which withered, more of which flourished. The key elements in the situation were personal supervision by the investor (people

usually watch their own money) and cost-accounting (knowing whether they were making money or losing it). Why then should American aid programmes not take primarily the form of support for thousands of small-scale, closely attended projects, instead of backing huge "infra-structure" projects like roads no one travels, artificial harbours no one uses? Why, for example, should there not be an agent of an American development bank in every large city and town of a certain backward country, lending money, giving advice, helping in marketing and distribution, servicing hundreds of private ventures simultaneously. Many of these investments would be a dead loss. But some would succeed, and from these successes one could hope for a ramification of individual entrepreneurship throughout the whole society.

Intellectually, one must comment, this piecemeal approach will not attract the all-knowing foreign-aid bureaucrat, who loves to fly from Addis Ababa to Ceylon to Vientiane in his Government airplane, planning almost on the scale of the Ford Foundation.

It is also true that for this "intimate" mode of aid to succeed a large cadre of trained Americans must live very close to the economic lives of the peoples to whom they are accredited; and good bankers are not much commoner than good surgeons. But given a bit of tactical skill, and more luck, the payoff would be such as to erase the costs of the programme, however high, and it would be a payoff that could be publicly demonstrated.

When the Clay Report says, "We cannot believe that our national interest is served by indefinitely continuing commitments at the present rate to ninety-five countries and territories," it says something every realistic man must agree to, though not perhaps for identical reasons. A few preliminary clarifications must be noted.

First, the Report rightly emphasizes that much darkness will be lifted from the whole aid area when the billions of dollars which have flowed out in military assistance to South Vietnam, South Korea and Formosa are no longer confounded with "aid." These monies were never expected to achieve the "economic development" which justifies the aid programme. If they purchase anything, it is something to the purpose of national political strategy; therefore, they should be earmarked to a separate budget and called by a different name.

Next, it is not relevant to answer the Clay Report's recommendations for pruning the aid programmes by poking fun at a country with a Gross National Product the size of America's for squirreling away its pennies. Given the national will to do it, no sensible man questions the ability of United States to engage in an aid programme three times bigger than the present one. But—and here is the point—neither Congress nor the people will support any programme at all unless they see visible results. It is the want of visible results from the programmes in backward countries—as distinguished from the success of the Marshall Plan operation which got us into the aid business in the first place—

a want which is the direct consequence of strategic sloppiness in the mounting of the programmes, that constitutes the serious menace to their future.

If the emphasis of American aid programmes were to be deflected from great Super-installations to intensive, small-scale, dynamic, man-by-man, plant-by-plant investments, the basic requirement of all strategy—overwhelming concentration of forces at the right place and the right time—would be even more necessary, and difficult to achieve, than at present. It is impossible to conceive of such a programme being carried out in anything like the number of countries which today receive U.S. aid. The United States is faced, therefore, with the compulsion to select targets in the interest of economy of force, a selection involving choices repugnant to the people for whom foreign aid has longest been an article of faith.

For one thing, as John Kenneth Galbraith has written, "It is idle to imagine that good development plans can be created or carried out without a good government to do it." To adopt this principle, and to call a spade a spade, American aid bureaucrats might just as well candidly concede that the \$671 million Indonesia has received in loans and grants from the United States is money down a rathole: This expenditure cannot be defended as serving the interests of American policy, nor in the long run as benefitting the Indonesian people.

On the other hand, as the Clay Report suggests, our aid to India (and the Report adds Pakistan) could be stepped up; not because India is going to "offset the Red Chinese colossus," but because with India there is a fair chance that the right kind of aid, in the right quantities, will enable a great nation to float the economically pluralist, progressive, relatively stable society which our strategy envisages.

To air a pet theory of my own, a very good case can be made for spending the vast bulk of American aid money in only three or four crucial countries: India in Asia, Brazil in Latin America, perhaps Nigeria in Africa. If the United States could succeed in promoting these few huge pivotal states into self-modernizing spirals, the geopolitical drift of the entire underdeveloped area into chaos and feckless totalitarianism might be checked—as nothing else would check it.

In sum, it is sensible and proper for the Clay committee, and Congress, to fret about the nature and perspectives of the American foreign-aid programme. The doctrinaire proponents of "foreign aid" are wrong to interpret every dubiety as a sign of xenophobia and isolationism. Except for aid officials worried about their departmental budgets, the problem is not the gross amount of money allocated to the programme.

Nor need Americans spend much more of their time boring themselves with the "aid as a Cold War Weapon" theme. Russia is not necessarily the beneficiary of the totalitarianization of the backward regions of the earth. China "slipped" to Russia more

(Continued on page 8)

Mr. Dange And China

M. D. Kini

WHY have the Communists supported the Government of India on its stand on Chinese aggression? Is it patriotism or just clever tactics for self-preservation? (Of course, Communists can never be accused of patriotism, nor are they famous for their patriotism). Answer to this question has been provided by Mr. S. A. Dange in his "Neither Revisionism Nor Dogmatism Is Our Guide", a reply to the *People's Daily's* editorial entitled, "A Mirror For Revisionists" — "a virulent attack on the CPI, its policies and its leadership" as Mr. Dange puts it.

Mr. Dange starts his reply by paying tributes to the Chinese Communist Party and apologising for their inability to foment and carry out a revolution. "The Communist Party of China is a great Party... Compared to their achievements, we, in India, are a small Party. We have no revolution to our credit."

The massive invasion of China, we gather from Mr. Dange's reply, on October 20, 1962 was a bolt from the blue for the CPI. It caught them napping, as it were. They had not prepared themselves for such a situation. "The Party had no idea of the gravity of the Chinese invasion for quite some time and was not prepared ideologically and politically for such a situation." But they were forced to take a decision and take sides leaving aside their non-committal, evasive, equivocal attitude. That they supported the Government of India in a resolution passed on November 1, 1962 is largely because they had no other alternative. If the CPI had not supported the Government at that crucial time on that crucial issue, it would have been extinct by now. It would have been a death sentence signed by itself. "It (the Party's united front for defence) saves the ideology of Communism and the reputation of the socialist camp as friend of the newly-liberated country, from being discredited among the masses." The cat is out of the bag.

The CPI would have supported China, if its history is any guide, but for the fact that Moscow and other Communist Parties of the world themselves disapproved the aggression for their own reasons. "They (communist parties and countries) are even afraid that Indian reaction, in league with imperialists, might try desperate measures to secure an upperhand in India and change the foreign and internal policies of India in a reactionary, pro-imperialist direction. Hence, greater is the reason why China should see reason and bring about peaceful settlement as soon as possible." These countries have disapproved it not because they do not believe in aggression or violence, not because they do not want one more addition to their bloc, but because they fear this may only drive India into the arms of the Democratic West, because it may strengthen the so-called rightists in India, and because they have differences on the strategy and tactics of world revolution with China. As a matter of fact, Togliatti, the Italian Communist leader called China not an aggressor but "stupid" and an East

German communist leader complained that his party was never consulted on this issue by China!

"It should be noted, for the sake of understanding the approach of the Chinese leadership to the India-China border problem, that they not only had differences with "bourgeois Nehru" and the Communist Party of India on this question, they had at the same time, developed sharp and fundamental differences with the world Communist movement on all the most important propositions of Marxism-Leninism in their application to the present epoch." Now we understand why Mr. Dange supports Prime Minister Nehru. Prime Minister Nehru happens to be on the right side of the World Communist movement and hence the CPI!

Mr. Dange's main argument against the Chinese aggression is that India is a non-aligned country committed to peace and socialism. In spite of all their faults, says Mr. Dange, under Congress government, the state sector is growing and "the foreign policy of the Government is basically one of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism." It will not be wrong to conclude that if our country is not non-aligned or if the ruling party is not committed to socialism, the CPI would have helped the invading China!

It is very interesting to read the remark of Mr. Dange on Prime Minister Nehru's socialism. "Our Party has never maintained nor does the message, that India under Nehru is building socialism. But there is also the fact, Nehru does speak of some ideals of socialism, though they are not scientific."

According to Mr. Dange, "the root cause of the border dispute thus would appear to be, not the maps, not past history — but political and ideological attitudes. Hence their (Chinese communists) least desire to settle it," and adds "if past history and maps conflict with Marxism-Leninism and the needs of present and future history, which of these, indeed, should have the decisive claim on our understanding and approach? Obviously, Marxism-Leninism. It is so with the Chinese leadership, according to their own light. It should be so with the Indian leadership and the world Communist leadership. When the understanding of the two biggest Parties differ or one pits itself against the other who is the arbiter? Quite obviously, a world conference of the Communist and Workers Parties." That is to say, in border conflict it is not history, facts and maps which decide the issue but "Marxism-Leninism and the needs of present and future history." If the "needs of present and future history" of World Communism demand aggression according to the evaluation by "a world conference of the Communists and Workers Parties" Mr. Dange and his Party will justify and support it! Comment is superfluous.

Mr. Dange says, "War or no war, friendship or no friendship, territorial claim on every inch or no claim, compromise and concessions or no compromise and

no concessions, offensive or stay put where you are — all these questions are questions of class politics and ideology, and ought to be so, particularly with a Socialist State", and he quotes Chinese leader who says: "To understand this (border conflict) we must examine the class nature of the Indian bourgeoisie and big landlords, represented by Nehru...". If border conflict is related to ideology and class politics, there is no meaning in holding any talks with the Chinese. One fails to understand why the CPI always demands and advocates talks with the Chinese. Is this not a case of double-talk on the part of the CPI?

Referring to the Peking Radio broadcast on October 22, 1962 inviting Indian Communists to rise in revolt, Mr. Dange says the conditions in the China of 1920's and today's India are different and so CPI cannot support China just as Chinese Communists supported Russia at that time. Elsewhere, he significantly says "The Indian National Congress has not become Kuomintang and Nehru is not Chiang Kai-shek. What

may happen in the future is not the point now." It seems Mr. Dange expects conditions of the 1920's China to appear in future after Nehru's disappearance and then China can expect CPI to do its 'duty'.

Mr. Dange makes the startling disclosure that Government of India was toying with the idea of surrendering Aksai Chin to China just before the massive invasion. "The Indian Government, before relations became bitter, was prepared to recognise the Chinese need for the Aksai Chin Road to link up with their Sinkiang Province. No one in India, except hardened war-mongers and American agents, would have quarrelled on that. A suitable formula, honourable to both sides, could have been found, and it was in the offing." If this is a fact, it is a sad reflection on our leadership.

Mr. Dange's reply is a very important document. It once again throws revealing light on the CPI and proves that CPI is not just a heresy but still a conspiracy.

(THE BATTLE OF CLAY'S CLICHES — Cont'd from page 6)

than 15 years ago; one wonders if today Khrushchev might not like to see it "slip" back again.

When Americans think about foreign aid, nothing will help so much as to be lucid about what we are trying to do, even at the risk of certain oversimplifications. To habituate huge, pauper nations to a permanent dole is worse than worthless. To provide exactly the kind of advice and assistance, at the right time, which helps four or five of the most important countries in the world to overcome the fatal handi-

caps of capital starvation and to modernize themselves into pluralist, self-sustaining economies would constitute a wondrous accomplishment of statecraft.

For these reasons, American efforts should be directed mainly at the stratum of the private entrepreneur in such key countries, and away from Brobdignagian schemes that consume so much money, which can easily go so wrong and which can so readily be perverted by half-baked politics on the make. The aid programme must whittle down its objectives to an overall operation which can be practically administered, in a close and efficient way, by an American governmental agency, no better than other agencies, surviving on the sort of appropriations it can reasonably expect to coax from an always skeptical Congress. It must recognize the need of strategic concentration, pick its targets carefully, and never mind the anguished outcries from every rejected quarter.

Each of these suggestions is prefigured somewhere in the Clay Report, though we may regret that its authors did not take the time to make their remarks more explicit and comprehensible than they did. We must always remember that success can never be guaranteed. The Industrial Revolution is by far the most disruptive force ever to strike human society. It has only begun to shake us up in the West, let alone affect the Bushman of Bechuanaland. Only the shrewdest (and luckiest) generalship, shorn of musty emotions and tired dogmas, professionally appraising the real world, testing each move forward in the cold winds of experience, opportunity and reason, will suffice to carry the United States into the 21st century surrounded by a world it can view at all comfortably. This, it seems to be, is what the Clay Report, in its bumbling way, is trying to say. It needs saying.

How Communists Destroy Democracy

A LESSON FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Price Rupee One

Available from

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road

Bombay 1

British Press Council

The Times, London, June 19, 1963, reported:

The Press Council announced after its meeting yesterday that it has adopted a revision of its constitution along the lines proposed by the Royal Commission on the Press of 1961-62, whose main recommendations have now been accepted.

These changes, said a council statement, have been made after exhaustive discussions among the members of the council and its constituent bodies, representing all sections of the press.

The shape of the new Press Council and its redrawn list of objectives were published by the council. The principal items—that there is to be a lay chairman of the reconstituted council and a lay element not exceeding 20 per cent—had already been given by Lord Halisham last month.

The objects of the reconstituted council remain the same as before: (1) To preserve the established freedom of the British press; (2) to maintain the character of the British press in accordance with the highest professional and commercial standards.

In the detailed objectives which follow these main two items, however, there is some change, and the number is reduced to five from seven.

In first place among the detailed objectives the council places the following:

Consider complaints about the conduct of the press or the conduct of persons and organisations towards the press; to deal with these complaints in whatever manner might seem practical and appropriate and record resultant action.

This clause replaces the somewhat longer Clause 4 of the old constitution, which was worded: By censuring undesirable types of journalistic conduct, and by all types of journalistic conduct, and by all other possible means, to build up a code in accordance with the highest professional standards. In this connexion it should have the right to consider any complaints which it may receive about the conduct of the press or of any person towards the press, to deal with these complaints in whatever manner may seem to it practicable and appropriate and to include in its annual report any action under this heading.

Clause 2 of the new constitution (Clause I of the old) remains the same: Keep under review developments likely to restrict the supply of information of public interest and importance.

Clause 3 on monopolies is more definite than Clause 8 of the old constitution. It reads: Report publicly on developments that may tend towards greater concentration or monopoly in the press (including changes in ownership, control and growth of press undertakings and to publish statistical information relating thereto).

The old wording was: To study developments in the press which may tend towards greater concentration or monopoly.

Clause 4 is a newcomer, although it had been recommended in somewhat similar terms by the

Royal Commission which led to the setting up of the Press Council in 1953. It reads: Make representation on appropriate occasions to the Government, organs of the United Nations and to press organisations abroad.

Clause 5 is almost identical in wording to that which it replaces: Publish periodical reports recording the council's work and to review, from time to time, developments in the press and the factors affecting them.

Dropped from the new list of objectives is that which refers to improving the methods of recruitment, education and training for the profession, and the much-ridiculed and little-understood aim "to promote a proper functional relation among all sections of the profession."

In their statement after the meeting yesterday, the Press Council—it has now abbreviated its title from the lengthier General Council of the Press—says it is intended that the chairmanship shall be offered to a man distinguished in public life who has had no previous connexion with the press. The post will be a salaried one. The lay representatives coopted to the council shall be chosen by the chairman and other members of the council in consultation.

To make way for the influx of lay members the number of journalistic and managerial representatives will be reduced from 25 to 20. These will be nominated by the Newspaper Proprietors Association Ltd., Newspaper Society, National Union of Journalists, Institute of Journalists, Scottish Daily Newspaper Society, Guild of British Newspaper Editors and Periodical Proprietors Association which is to be invited to join the council.

These, with the addition of the independent chairman and lay members, will maintain the body at its present strength, and in accordance with existing practice each consultant body will be entitled to nominate one official who may speak but not vote.

(In this connection attention is invited to Mr. S. Natarajan's article, Emergency and the Press, in the "Freedom First" of April, 1963. The editorial in the "Times", London, June 19, 1963 is reproduced below. —Ed.)

CORRECTORS OF THE PRESS

The changes in the Press Council now announced are a sop to those who want to regulate the press. A fifth of the members in future are to have nothing to do with the press and there is to be a paid, independent chairman. Exactly how this hybrid body will proceed is not clear. As the changes represent a victory for those who have not hitherto had confidence in the council because of its composition, there will, in due course, no doubt be demands to know if whatever findings are published are un-

(Continued on page 11)

Without Comment

COMMUNISTS SUPPLY ARMS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Since the end of the Second World War armaments have been needed in South Africa only for police repression by the white minority. It is not surprising therefore that in recent years there has been a growing movement for a total arms boycott of the Verwoerd government; and since South Africa resigned from the Commonwealth in 1961 rather than give assurances about her future racial practices this agitation has been extended to the people of Great Britain. It was not until the Sharpeville massacres four years ago that the British woke up to the seriousness of the situation in South Africa; until then they had all too often deceived themselves with the thought that you could not really judge if you lived safely far away in Europe, and that when it came to the point the Whites and the Blacks probably got on together quite well given their respective stations in life. Today this fallacy is fortunately a thing of the past.

A few months ago when the British Government authorised a comparatively minor arms delivery to South Africa there was for the first time a real public outcry against it. This was already sufficient to make it unlikely that further arms will be sent, although the Conservatives have to tread a tricky middle way; verbally at least, between popular disapproval of apartheid and the anxiety of a number of members of Parliament on the Conservative right-wing about the future of South African trade. Virtuous indignation by others here is not very well-founded, for Great Britain has always had a particularly large commerce with South Africa—it was after all the mother country until 1910—and undoubtedly has far more to lose than most of its critics. There is room for considerable satisfaction too in the development which has led to the new leader of the Labour Party (and very possibly Prime Minister within a twelve-month), Mr. Harold Wilson, declaring that in no circumstances will a Labour Government allow further arms deliveries to South Africa.

If we turn to the European scene we see that much the same sort of development has been taking place all over. This too is largely because of South Africa's departure from the Commonwealth, the mystique of which does not stop at the English Channel. In reply to questions from the British Labour Party, West Germany, Sweden, Denmark and Italy have all stated that they are banning arms deliveries to South Africa, and across the Atlantic Canada has given the same assurance. In addition, the United States, while not wishing to give formal promises of such depth in case they should rebound in a future showdown with the Communists, has promised to use export

licences to forbid delivery of arms which could in practice be used for internal repression.

In the last few years the boycott has also been promoted internationally, particularly in the United Nations. Understandably enough the leaders of this have been the Afro-Asian group in the General Assembly, and the more talking power has been obtained by the independent Black nations of Africa the more effect the campaign has had; and as part of their effort to whip up as much hostility as possible between the former colonial territories and the countries of Western Europe and North America, the Soviet Union and her satellites have associated themselves wholeheartedly with the campaign to establish an arms boycott of South Africa.

It is probably true that there is no room for the over-scrupulous in politics, and for this reason alone it would not be reasonable to castigate the Communists too harshly for taking up this position on the arms boycott if it were not for one extremely important fact: while in the last few months there has been a dramatic waning of arms supplies to South Africa from countries in the West, their place is being taken in this lucrative but in the last resort highly immoral trade by the Communist states of Eastern Europe. This has been revealed in some detail by the extremely well-informed African correspondent of the London Sunday newspaper 'The Observer', Mr. Colin Legum. It appears, furthermore, that the arms which are being supplied from Eastern Europe are precisely those which would be most useful for repression of unarmed Africans. So far the trade in small arms is the work of Czechoslovakia and East Germany—and in the latter case it seems, incredibly enough, that recent arms offers have been spontaneous and entirely independent of any South African request.

Although at this stage arms deliveries can only be pinned down to the two countries mentioned, there is no doubt at all that on a wider basis attempts at boycotts in the West on general trade with South Africa have been met with a significant and growing increase in trade with all European Communist countries, and in the last few months this tendency has even spread to China. Figures for Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary and Poland are available to prove this, and a representative of the South African canned fruit industry is at present on a tour of the Far East where he is to enter into negotiations with as many countries as he can and also investigate what possibilities there are for exporting canned fruit to continental China. Contacts already exist between Communist China and South Africa because of the large imports of maize which China has recently bought there.

It will probably not be regarded as astonishing that the South Africans are ready to take up with great relief whatever trade outlets with Communist countries come their way. Public morality, in either economics or politics, has never been a strong point with the apartheid government, and in any case the Verwoerd ministry already has its back to the wall—in trade at least, if not yet in any other respect.

But what is far more remarkable, particularly for those independent countries of Africa which have themselves received such effusive assurances of goodwill from the Communists over the past few years, is that countries like Czechoslovakia and East Germany should be sending arms to South Africa which, if they are not actually used against South African citizens, can only be intended to be kept in readiness for any future effort by sovereign states elsewhere in Africa to liberate their oppressed brethren in the south.

If Communist activities in the various parts of Africa are to be kept in proportion, these relations between the foreign trade administrations of Eastern Europe and the apartheid government of Dr. Verwoerd should not be left out of consideration—they should on the contrary be publicised as much as possible.

(Swiss Press Review and News Report Vol. IV No. 24. 14 June, 1963)

ONE-WAY TRIPS TO SPACE

Among the things which the Russians are anxious to hide are repeated failures of their space-flight experiments. In contrast to the candour with which American space authorities have exposed themselves to criticism and even ridicule when they have announced without concealment false starts and miscalculations, postponements and handicaps in their astronomical trials, Soviet space projects are carried on in the utmost secrecy. Even they have to admit that they have made a mistake when a rocket shot at the moon or at Venus does not achieve its goal, since the space ship is no longer in a hermetically sealed Siberia but in space where it can be tracked by many stations on earth. Nevertheless, even these near-misses are billed as successes.

Reports from various observatories and rocket tracking centres outside the Communist bloc indicate that Soviet space mishaps have cost the lives of at least ten men. In two cases, the Kremlin has quietly acknowledged that lives have been lost. In a report of the successful Popovich-Nikolaev flight, the official Soviet government newspaper, *Izvestia* of January 9, 1963 mentioned that two Russian cosmonauts had been killed. One of these space pilots, Pyotr Ivanovich Dolgov, died on October 11, 1960.

Articles published in this magazine can be reproduced without permission but with acknowledgement. It will be appreciated if two copies of the article are sent to the Editor.

Western tracking stations picked up his radio signals until they abruptly ceased thirty minutes after his blast-off. Doglov's death "in the line of duty" was officially made known in 1962, but not further details were released until the publication of the *Izvestia* article last January. The other cosmonaut whose death was admitted was named Andreyev. Other data strongly suggests that at least seven other Russian cosmonauts have died in space.

MARXIST DOCTRINE — AS MEDICAMENT

Short of medicine and doctors, China has found a new way to advise its invalids. They are prescribing Marxism. The Chinese Communist Party has called on all patients in the country not to depend on doctors and drugs, but to combat their illness with "a spirit of revolutionary optimism." The country is now trying to revive the traditional methods of treatment for want of experienced doctors and western drugs. People suffering from tuberculosis are told that even this disease could be cured within a few days if the patients displayed "subjective initiative and revolutionary optimism." "The revolutionary spirit and revolutionary optimism are the best and the quick treatment for curing all diseases in today's China." "The Communists also advised thousands of sick persons in China that "combatting diseases is a political mission and must not be treated merely as a personal question."

(Continued from page 9)

animous, how the outside members voted, and above all what was the view of the paid chairman. The more eminent he is the more likely this demand will be. The dilemma about a Press Council remains unchanged. Any such body with powers is a first step toward censorship; without powers it has to fall back upon public opinion, which in the long run, will operate whether there is a council or not.

Nor will the effectiveness of the new council be helped by its terms of reference being so widely drawn. To have to cope with the most trivial complaints (some of them from publicity hunters), with keeping an eye on the amalgamating propensities of proprietors, with preserving "the established freedom of the British press", and with making representations to United Nations' and other bodies will entail much fruitless effort. The truth is that this whole idea of some superior, authoritarian body, vested with the tasks of, on the one hand, consolidating the collective power of the press and, on the other, of curbing its individual excesses is a false one. The greatest safeguard for the public is that newspapers shall remain individual entities, subject to the law of the land (already in some respects too restrictive) and to the play of all the other forces existing in the community. Set up a body of regulators and someone will try to arm it some day.

With Many Voices

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

India will henceforward remain 'unaligned' *de jure*...but she has been forcibly aligned, *de facto*, with the West.

—Mr. John Strachey, *Hindustan Times*, June 5.

The proverb is most misleading that it takes two to make a quarrel. If one side is sufficiently blinded by ideology, the mere existence of another side suffices.

—Professor Peter Wiles, *Encounter*, June 1963.

The Right has a lesson to impart to the Left today. It did not go in for summit negotiations among its different components, but preferred *unity in action*, and that has paid it rich dividends.

—*Mainstream*, June 8.

To be a Conservative is not to have a doctrine but simply a disposition.

—Professor Michael Oakeshott, *Encounter*, June 1963.

Masani's return to Parliament is not only a vindication of his position but also an indication of the growing perceptiveness of the people.

—Jayaprakash Narayan, *New Age*, June 16.

Inflation is the mother of servitude.

—Professor Michael Oakeshott, *Encounter*, June 1963.

So many people have hung on to the Prime Minister's coat-tails for so long that they are becoming rather shiny.

—Mr. Inder Malhotra, *Statesman*, June 3.

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. 3.00

Name:

Address:

Signature

Swatantra Secretary Masani's victory in Rajkot is a more accurate measure of the collapse of Congress integrity than that of either Acharya Kripalani or Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia.

—*Link*, June 2.

Lord Russell is no Socrates, though he has been trying hard to earn his glass of hemlock.

—Mr. Arthur Koestler, *Encounter*, July 1963.

There is no motley crowd in the country comparable to that in the Congress Party itself.

—Mr. M. R. Masani, *Free Press Journal*, June 15.

What ails Britain is not the loss of Empire but the loss of incentive.

—Mr. Arthur Koestler, *Encounter*, July 1963.

The average Englishman...strikes one as a hybrid between a lion and an ostrich. In times of emergency he rises magnificently to the occasion. In between emergencies he buries his head in the sand with the tranquil conviction that Reality is a nasty word invented by foreigners.

—Mr. Arthur Koestler, *Encounter*, July 1963.

The victors make an odd-looking *trimurti*—Kripalani the creator of ideological obscurity, Masani the conserver of private enterprise and Lohia the fierce destroyer of anything within reach.

—Mr. Nandan Kagal, *Times of India*, May 30.

Mr. Minoo Masani's victory at Rajkot drives yet another nail into the Congress coffin.

—*Indian Express*, May 29.

It is in Rajkot that the Congress has suffered its worst defeat.

—Mr. Nandan Kagal, *Times of India*, May 30.

The Jan Sangh, the Communist Party and the Socialist are the only dynamic parties that do not have a fascination for stability.

—Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, *Hindustan Times*, May 30.

When prices rise, nationalism won't help.

—Mr. S. K. Patil, Union Food and Agricultural
—Minister, *Times of India*, June 25.

In these three constituencies the electorate has shown that it is *against* the Congress. But what they are *for*, remains obscure.

—Mr. Nandan Kagal, *Times of India*, May 30.