

Panchsheel And Tibet

by V. B. Karnik

PANCHSHEEL is an excellent statement of the relations that should exist between civilised nations. It was no new discovery of the Chinese or the Indian Governments. It did, however, receive an eloquent and powerful expression in the Treaty that was concluded between the two countries in 1954. Since then it has become the basis of a number of international agreements that India has entered into with other countries. As a result, the term acquired a new currency in international affairs and India came to be known all over the world as the initiator and advocate of Panchsheel.

As a statement of principles which should govern relations between States, Panchsheel is unexceptional. The five principles which it enunciates provide a useful basis for the peaceful coexistence of nations. But in actual practice it can work successfully only if both parties to the agreement accept and implement it honestly and without any reservation. It is a code of conduct which imposes mutual obligations and the failure of one party to fulfil its obligations renders it unworkable in practice.

Panchsheel was born with the agreement between India and China. It is an agreement by which India signed away the independence of Tibet. It is on the basis of this disgraceful fact that Acharya Kripalani has been all along saying that Panchsheel was born in sin. What was born in sin has come home to roost, for it is again on the issue of Tibet that Panchsheel is facing its first serious crisis and challenge.

The Prime Minister was correct in giving away the imperialist privileges that independent India had inherited from the British. But they should have been handed over to their legitimate owners, the Government and the people of Tibet. Instead of doing that, they were handed over to another imperialist Power, the Government of China. And on the top of that China's suzerainty over Tibet was also accepted merely because it had been earlier accepted by the British rulers. That was the period of our honeymoon with China. It was not then thought necessary to ascertain historical facts or to take note of the un-

ceasing struggle for retaining its independence that Tibet had waged through centuries against China.

It is not, however, necessary now to go into that old history. China has violated her 1951 agreement with Tibet guaranteeing to Tibet autonomy, non-interference with its political institutions and internal administration, religious freedom and the authority and the position of the Dalai Lama. It was on the basis of this agreement and solemn assurances to respect the autonomy of Tibet, that the Government of India accepted Chinese suzerainty over the Himalayan Kingdom. By its actions during the last few years and more, particularly during the last couple of months, China has broken the solemn pledges that it gave to Tibet and to India and thereby destroyed the very basis of our agreement with her. Is this conduct of China consistent with the canons of Panchsheel?

Respect for international agreements is the very foundation of relations between nations. Panchsheel cannot function if one of the parties treats Treaties as scraps of paper. China has treated her Treaty with Tibet and her agreement with India as a scrap of paper. The Chinese Government still talks of the autonomy which it proposes to impose on the strength of Chinese machine guns and with the help of its stooges. It is an autonomy which cannot tolerate the presence of the Dalai Lama and requires the forcible dissolution of the established Government of the country. The dissertations of Mr. Chou En-Lai on the topic will rank as a classical example of the Orwellian Newspeak in which peace means war and war means peace. Communist regimes have in general exhibited scant respect for voluntarily undertaken commitments and that makes it extremely difficult to deal with them on the basis of Panchsheel.

Non-interference in the internal affairs of another country is the pivotal principle of Panchsheel. But communist regimes interfere from day-to-day in the internal affairs of non-communist countries through Communist Parties which are always at their beck and call. A Communist Party is in each country the agency of the international communist movement. It takes its orders from the international centre located in Moscow or Peking and seeks to manipulate the internal affairs of the country so as to serve the interests of its international masters. The national revolt in Tibet has again provided the most blatant illustration of this relationship between a Communist Party and a communist regime. The statements on Tibet published by the Communist Party of India are a faithful echo of the declarations of the communist

rulers in Peking. They have repeated parrotwise Peking's denunciations of the Tibetan revolt and have even gone to the extent of publicising the Peking slander about Kalimpong being the commanding centre of that revolt. By making use of such instruments to push forward their policies, communist regimes actively interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. Communist regimes are thus inherently incapable of a faithful observance of Panchsheel. In relation to them, Panchsheel imposes only a one-sided obligation of non-interference binding on non-communist countries but having no effect on them.

But even this one-sided contract cannot stop us from speaking and publicising the truth about Tibet. We have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of China, but does that mean that when she commits an aggression we should not call it by that name? We are very eager and anxious to maintain and develop friendly relations with her, but that cannot mean that we should break off our friendly relations with the people of Tibet. Tibet is far nearer to us than China and more closely linked through ties of culture and religion and trade and social intercourse. A large number of Tibetans live in the border areas of India. Their number is estimated to be as big as the number of Tibetans living in Tibet. They have their friends and relatives spread all over the country and more particularly in Northern parts of Bengal, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. Under the circumstances it will be humanly impossible for us to remain indifferent to what happens in Tibet. Our hearts are touched by the trials and tribulations of those people and there is an irresistible urge to do whatever we can to help them and in course of time enable them to regain their autonomy and independence. There are obvious limitations to what we can do. But within those limitations, we must be prepared to act resolutely and unequivocally. The Government of China may not approve of our actions, but even on the basis of Panchsheel they have no right to tell us how we should behave towards our neighbours, and our kith and kin.

The Chinese occupation of Tibet also raises the question of the security of our North Eastern Frontier. China has not yet accepted the McMahon Line and there are rumours from time to time about her interest in some of our border areas. The three Himalayan Kingdoms of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim and the Ladakh area of Kashmir are now in the direct line of attack. The attack may or may not take place. But if it does take place at any time, Panchsheel will be of as little help as it has proved in the case of Tibet. The efficacy of Panchsheel depends not on our desire and anxiety to uphold and practise it, but on the readiness of others to bind themselves by the same obligations. What has happened in Tibet is a sad commentary on the regard that China has for those obligations.

INDEPENDENCE, ONLY SOLUTION

The Committee for Solidarity with Tibet has issued the following statement to the Press.

THE Committee is happy that after a long and hazardous travel the Dalai Lama, the spiritual and the temporal head of the people of Tibet, has found a safe abode in our country. The Government of India deserve to be complimented on their decision to grant asylum to the Dalai Lama and his party and for the arrangements that have been made for his residence. The Committee hopes that no undue restrictions will be placed on the Dalai Lama and that he will be allowed to carry on unfettered both his spiritual as well as political duties. It is further hoped that similar generous and sympathetic treatment will be accorded to all Tibetans who may be forced to come to India as refugees.

The statement that the Dalai Lama made at Tejpur is a fitting reply to the lie that China and her agents were propagating that he was abducted by the rebels and that he was acting under duress. It is surprising that even after that clear statement, the Panchen Lama and others should still continue harping on the same lie. If any further refutation were needed, the Dalai Lama has provided it by the fresh statement that he issued in Mussoorie.

The statement made by the Panchen Lama that some Indians are harbouring "expansionist ambitions" is a gross libel on our country. India gave away all privileges in Tibet that she had inherited from the British. China, on the contrary, not only did not give up her privileges but is seeking to expand them by the complete absorption of Tibet. This and other remarks of the Panchen Lama and other Chinese leaders are also a reflection on the honour and integrity of the Government of India.

Every Indian will unreservedly repudiate these gross allegations against the people and the Government of our country. But there are some, the communists, who have forgotten that they are Indians and are shamelessly acting and speaking as the agents of the Chinese communist regime. They are thoughtlessly and blindly repeating every lie that is being given currency by the Government of China. The country will never forget this treacherous and anti-national conduct of the communists.

The Dalai Lama's statement has made it crystal clear that the seventeen point Treaty of 1951 was signed by Tibet under duress and compulsion and that the pledge of autonomy made in that Treaty was never honoured by China. In view of this fact, independence is the only solution that can satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people of Tibet. Moreover a communist regime cannot by the very nature of its being tolerate local autonomy of any kind.

(Continued on page 12)

Notes

Chinese Campaign

COMMUNIST China has opened her propaganda war against India. Participating in the war are the Peking Radio, the *New China News Agency* and a number of important political leaders. In a communist country, nothing happens without the permission and blessings of the Government. There can be no doubt therefore, that this is a deliberate and planned campaign.

The Panchen Lama, the puppet ruler whom China has now put in the place of the Dalai Lama, has also joined the campaign. It is not necessary to take note of his outpourings separately as he must after all say what his Chinese masters ask him to say.

Originally the main target of the Chinese attack was the Praja Socialist Party and some other opposition groups who had raised their voice in support of Tibet. Later the attack was extended even to Congress leaders. Amongst persons who are attacked by name figure such persons as the Congress President, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, and Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit. Some Cabinet Ministers and Government officials have also come under attack.

India is being accused of interfering in the internal affairs of China. To make the accusation more plausible, of course, to their own enslaved people, some Indians, it is stated, harbour "expansionist ambitions". These "expansionist Indians" are, according to Mr. Liu, the President of China's Labour Federation, "heirs to the British imperialists" and, according to Mr. Kuo Mo-jo, Chairman of the Chinese Peace Committee, they have "inherited completely the old practice of the British imperialists". This is an accusation directed against not a few individuals but against the people and the Government of India, for both have condemned equally emphatically Chinese action in Tibet.

The communist rulers of China are angry with us because of our sympathy with the people of Tibet in their plight. They would have liked us to support their aggression against that country and approve all measures that they are taking for "communising" it. They are angry with us because of our warm welcome to the Dalai Lama. They would have liked us to refuse him asylum and hand him over to them for humiliation and subsequent liquidation. They still pretend that the Dalai Lama is not a free agent and refuse to accept the authenticity of his statements. This pose of the Chinese is highly defamatory as it is a reflection on the integrity of our Government.

The Prime Minister has reacted to this violent and libellous attacks in a highly restrained and civilised

manner. The only comment that he made was that the "statements were made in a state of high excitement". Later he said that the Chinese were using the language of cold war. But if similar attacks continue to be made even he will find it difficult to maintain the restraint. The Indian people as a whole are already angry. They are angry in the first instance at the aggression and they are getting more and more angry at the shameless and clumsy attempts to cover up the crime with false accusations against others.

The present attitude of the Chinese rulers makes it plain that old ties of friendship do not mean anything to them. They will continue to be friends only so long as we do not cross their way and shut our eyes to any crimes that they may commit. This is hardly the basis for building up an abiding friendship between nations.

Communists In Power

IN power, the communists are the worst reactionaries is the common experience all over the world. As rulers, they become the worst tyrants and bureaucrats. The communist Ministry of Kerala has just provided one more illustration of this universal rule. The Rules that they have framed under the Kerala Education Act to regulate the conduct of students and teachers place the most obnoxious restrictions on their rights and liberties. According to the Rules both students and teachers are prohibited from taking part in meetings or agitations directed against the authority of the Government. They cannot collect funds for any charitable or such other purpose without the permission of the Head Master. There are many other restrictions of a similar character. Breach of the Rules will lead to suspension or dismissal.

While in opposition the communists never fail to exploit students and teachers for their political ends. On the slightest excuse the communists draw them into meetings and processions and demonstrations and ask them to go on strike or create disturbances. The attitude changes as soon as by hook or crook they get into positions of power. Once that happens, they like the students and teachers, to be disciplined and obedient and do only those things which are approved by the communist regime.

The Kerala Rules are so patently reactionary that even the communists are now ashamed that they were framed and published. The General Secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Ajoy Ghosh has now admitted that "it was a mistake to frame such rules." He said they would be suitably amended. The General Secretary of the party organisation in Kerala has also made a similar statement. There is a hope therefore that the Rules will be improved. But whether they are improved or not, they have thrown a revealing light on the character of the communists as rulers. In Kerala they may be compelled to beat a retreat, but their character will never change. A leopard never changes its spots.

Crisis In The Communist Party

(From A Correspondent)

THE City Conference of the Bombay Committee of the Communist Party held last month once again highlighted the usual weaknesses and defects that have plagued the party for many years. The united front tactics of the communists are in full operation in the Bombay State for the last three years. The communists are the second biggest party in the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti which is a united front of various non-Congress parties and groups. But still the communists, unlike in Bengal, have not been able to exploit the situation in Maharashtra fully to their advantage and have not yet been able to increase their strength to the extent expected by them. True, it has helped them in widening their base among the masses and in recruiting new cadre for the party. But it has also created many ideological and organisational problems for the party. The new-comers are not well grounded in communist ideology while old workers are being contaminated by bourgeois ideologies and habits and have come to be afflicted more and more with inconvenient doubts on many ideological issues. The result is the growing apathy among party members and the loosening of the party discipline which has adversely affected the effectiveness of the organisation.

The political and organisational report adopted by the City Conference of the Bombay Committee emphasised this point at great length. It lamented the growing apathy of the party members for ideological discussions and stressed the need for training more full-time cadres and conducting study circles for the rank and file.

This growing indifference among party workers is reflected in the general decline in party membership. A large number of members are stated to have dropped from the "active" list of the party. It was disclosed at the Conference that the party membership which was at 2112 at the last conference, had dropped to 1960 this year. Of this again only 1660 had paid their regular membership dues. The Marathi party weekly *Yugantar* sold less than 1200 copies a week as against 1300 copies last year.

Similarly the organisational report lamented the growing neglect of party work and political campaigns by party members. "Even the public meeting organised by the party last year to celebrate the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution was an utter failure. This is disgraceful to our party"—the report added.

As expected, the secret trial and execution of Imre Nagy came up for discussion before the Conference and differences were aired by many speakers. The Bombay Committee last year had passed a resolution criticising the Hungarian Government for the secret trial and execution of Imre Nagy. The Central Exe-

cutive of the party subsequently severely criticised the Bombay Committee for its stand on the question and reminded the Committee that in openly expressing the views on the question, even before the Central Executive had laid down any line in the matter, the Bombay Committee had acted against the provisions of the party constitution. But the Bombay Committee, it was evident at the Conference, was still adamant on the question. Of course, it made it clear in its organisational report that its criticism was directed only against the procedure of secret trial and execution which, it contended, tended to undermine the popular faith in "socialist democracy". The role played by Nagy in the Hungarian uprising, it emphasised, was undoubtedly counter-revolutionary and treasonable. But even this slight trace of non-conformism was frowned upon by the Central Executive which wanted the Bombay Committee to toe the Moscow line without the slightest tinge of deviation. Several speakers at the Conference, it was reported, demanded that the CPI leadership should have condemned the secret trial and execution of Nagy and bluntly pointed out that even the Central Executive did not speak on the issue with one voice.

The organisational report also dealt with the performance of the communists in the City Municipal Corporation which it considered as none too satisfactory. It accused S. S. Mirajkar and B. S. Dhume, leaders of the communist group in the Corporation, of having failed to fulfil their responsibilities. It noted the dearth of good and able councillors in the communist group and criticised the present communist leadership in the Corporation for defying the party mandate on several occasions.

Finally, the report alleged that the "right-wing" PSP elements in the Samiti,—that is, supporters of Mr. Asoka Mehta inside the PSP—had prevented the Samiti from enforcing some of the progressive measures contained in the Samiti's election manifesto. As regards the Communist Party's stand *vis-a-vis* the PSP, the report stated:

"The most dangerous is the Ashok group in the Praja Socialist Party inside the Samiti. Unfortunately this group is strong in the Bombay PSP. This group is always in the forefront in sabotaging the unity of the Samiti, championing reactionary policies in Municipal administration, adopting disruptionist tactics on the Trade Union front and carrying on anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda everywhere.

To realise our goal of establishing a "Socialist Maharashtra in Socialist India", we have first to strengthen the Samiti as against the Congress and inside the Samiti we have to fight this Ashok group and expose its disruptionist character and policies."

Green Against Red

by M. A. Venkata Rao

A KNOWLEDGE of the revolutionary movement in Europe in the last hundred years is helpful in realising the far-reaching implications of the so-called "land reforms" proposals sponsored by the Prime Minister and his pliant party. The Nagpur resolution on the 'agricultural organisation pattern' now endorsed by Parliament imports a crucial and irreversible change in the social structure supporting land economy. It leads the country into the morass of bungling that fails to get the best out of scientific technology owing to faulty human relations stemming from a fatal commitment to collectivism in everything.

From the turn of the century a vast revolution in aspirations and concrete goals of life and work in the countryside has made itself felt in Europe. It crystallised itself especially in Central Europe and the Balkan States in a small holders' movement and overflowed into cultural life—literary, philosophical and even sociological. A veritable peasant's renaissance overspread the inner life of the area and created a spring of national revival that is yet potent in the suppressed lands behind the iron curtain.

The Czechs under Masaryk, the senior, realised their dream of national independence through a movement that used the new life for national revival. The Hungarians developed the small holders' movement which was supported by literary spokesmen whose later successors were prominent in the freedom struggle of 1956. The Yugoslavs owe their national independence to the support of the rugged and independent peasantry who supported the communist partisans under Tito. They were inspired by the literary spokesmen who developed a supporting philosophy and poetry.

In Russia too for a generation before the Revolution the *populist* movement represented this vision of a peasant paradise in the countryside—each family with a holding of its own bringing up a race of strong yeomen with love of the land and open air life. This populist movement developed sufficient self-consciousness to realise that its vision of peasant autonomy and independent national life burgeoning into all spheres of culture was contradictory to the goals of Marxist communism. Lenin and the social democrats condemned the peasant as an incorrigible capitalist and had no place for him and his "dwarf holding" (Engels) in their scheme of collectivised agriculture.

But Lenin was a practical revolutionary and knew that the revolution he had in view needed the support of the peasants and so he devised his salami tactics of outmanoeuvring them stage by stage, dividing them into landlords, rich peasants, middle peasants, poor peasants and labourers.

So too the pre-Nagpur land reforms envisaged a stage of small holders to whom land was to be transferred from rich peasants. But the Nagpur resolution

leaps over this stage of initial satisfaction of poor peasants' land hunger with actual transfer of property to them. In Hungary and other lands of South East Europe, land was actually divided among small-holders in 1945 with the Soviet troops in attendance. But in 1947 and thereabouts, the new holders were hustled, by and large into collective farms, by force and immense social and economic pressure. The coiled spring broke loose in Poland and Hungary in 1956 and the bulk of collectives disappeared overnight.

The significance of the tragedy lies in the fact that a natural revolution on the land consisting in a redistribution of large estates into viable small holdings for family cultivation with property rights was smothered by an artificial revolution based on an affront to human psychology and a false philosophy of collectivism. The first revolution was called the Green Revolution. Green is the sign of life and joy. Red on the other hand is the symbol of bloody destruction. In Southeast Europe, the red revolution smothered the green. The green revolution had become so self-conscious as the life-giving, democratic alternative to communism that it summoned a *Green International* but events did not allow its success. The Leftist, communist, trend was overwhelming and after the October Revolution of 1917, the hope of the populists was destroyed by Leninism.

In contrast, the objectives of the Green Revolution were realised at least in basic structure and possibility in West Europe in which a general movement of enabling peasants to acquire land was successfully carried through. Particularly in Denmark, the peasant ruling classes though mostly socialist in explicit orientation, brought the green revolution to signal success. The countryside was covered with small and middle farmers, homesteads and holdings assisted by a network of service cooperatives combining individual freedom with social cooperation. Capitalism was deprived of its sting and was regulated to serve the disinherited and to form the spring of development instead of the means of exploitation. The Danish movement was helped by the educational renaissance of the Folk High School under the national and religious-social inspiration of Grundvig.

A number of powerful modern aspirations and trends coalesce to support the Green Revolution and make of it the right road for rural reconstruction leading to a happy *open society* of democracy and progress in rural areas. In fact, the Irish poet A. E., (George Russell) had developed the idea of a socialist commonwealth and rural civilisation in the course of his long period of service of the cooperative movement in Ireland before her independence in 1919. Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore were attracted by his delineation of rural reconstruction under cooperative auspices combining a peasant re-

(Continued on Page 10)

A Front Conference In Calcutta

(From A Correspondent)

THE Indian Conference of Afro-Asian Solidarity held in Calcutta for four days in the first week of April had rather an awkward posture to take in view of the 'Tibetan nuisance.' This "Indian" Conference was packed with communists, known to be so or camouflaged. Romesh Chandra, the party-man in charge, who manages the front, must have worked hard at it and had there been no "Tibet", the Conference would have made an impressive impact. The foreign "comradely delegates" from China, USSR, Bulgaria, Iraq, Egypt, Cameroons, Italy were carefully chosen. The Indian delegation from outside Bengal also was packed with "Comrades" unknown to the public. Of course, the "Comradely Congressmen" like Anup Singh and Rameshwari Nehru were there as big shop-windows behind whom the Comrades could work, for the way these two "Congressmen" conducted themselves was exemplary!

Some known Congressmen, ill at ease with the ruling section in WBPPC, were keen to get this platform to boost their morale. Unfortunately, even some senior Ministers thought they should "not let the communists monopolise Africa and Asia." But as Romesh Chandra's retinue began to occupy the whole Conference, sense began to dawn and only two or three prominent Congressmen remained with them in the end. As the Conference developed its momentum, even they began to feel that they had committed a terrible mistake.

Right from the beginning the atmosphere was surcharged. The Mayor Dr. Triguna Sen as well as the President Rameshwari Nehru were obliged to refer to Tibet, although the Mayor's reference to Hungary, I understand, was deleted at the last moment. The most important part of the Conference was the meeting of the Political Commission. Apprehending conflict, the communists packed the hall with their members including those who could not understand the proceedings conducted in English. The non-communists, a bare dozen against 500, had already submitted their draft resolutions. The first battle was on the objection raised against the election of Vivekananda Mukherjee, the Editor of *Jugantar* Bengali daily, as the chairman as he was writing vile and outrageous articles against those who were supporting the Tibetans. Then objection was taken to the exhibition of a map of China which showed parts of Nepal, Bhutan, Ladakh and Nefu within Chinese borders. The Conference organisers tried their best not to allow the non-communist resolutions. There was a procedural wrangle. Ultimately the printed copies of the resolutions were officially circulated, much to the chagrin of the communists. But they were not allowed to be moved, except the one on Israel.

The official resolutions, as usual, were long and

windy. The main resolution on "Imperialism and Colonialism" expressed "wholehearted support to the valiant fighters for freedom in Algeria, Cameroons, West Africa, Tanganyika, Kenya, and other places". But Tibet was not mentioned. The non-communists moved an amendment to include in this long list one word: "Tibet". No sooner was it uttered than there was a howl and uproar ensued. But the mover did not budge. One of the Conference leaders tried to persuade him to withdraw. Speaker after speaker supported the amendment, and every time the hall was bursting to have a fight. The Chinese delegate was being hurriedly consulted, the Iraqi was uncomfortable, the Russian went outside to have tea, as the pressure in the hall was unbearable. The amendment was duly voted down and similarly other amendments were defeated. But the day went against the Comrades. They never had expected that a few courageous individuals could take hold of their platform for over threefourths of the time ramming the naked truth down their ears.

The afternoon session saw the official resolution on Tibet. The CPI had strongly objected to have any resolution on the subject. Ultimately an agreed resolution was put up. At the insistence of Rameshwari Nehru, the reference to the 1951 Sino-Tibetan Agreement was inserted. But if any amendments were moved the Comrades said they would have no resolution at all. The discussion on the resolution was extremely violent. The communists had practically no able speaker and appeared even ignorant of Tibetan affairs. One of them said that the critics of China were inspired by agents of the *Daily Express*, the *Statesman*, Chiang Kai Shek, etc. This led to a furious protest and uproar and the Conference was on the point of coming to an end in confusion. Rajani Mukherjee and some others at this stage walked out of the Conference.

Other sessions were not less noisy and troublesome. The Women's Conference was the scene of a persistent struggle by the Congress and the PSP leaders to introduce a resolution on Tibet. The communists got so nervous that they surrounded the entire session of the Women's Conference by male delegates. Similar was the scene among the students. In the public rally Dr. Nalinakshya Sanyal, one of the collaborating Congressmen, mentioned Tibet and he was howled down.

Leaflets and posters in support of Tibet greeted the Conference everywhere throughout the city. The poster read: "Express solidarity with Tibet: Down with Colonialism in Africa: Down with Soviet Interference in Egypt. Down with colonialism in Tibet."

It is needless to mention that there were several scuffles at the time of distributing the leaflets and pasting the posters.

Tibet And Indian Communists

by S. R. Mohan Das

IT took the Indian Communists quite some time before they could express their party line on Tibet developments.

The C.P.I. tarried quite a while before giving the party line for the party and fellow-travelling faithful. The entire articulate public in India spontaneously reacted to Tibetan developments. But the C. P. I. waited for what we were left conjecturing. Then there were reports from New Delhi that an "important leader" of the Communist Party was "summoned by the Communist Chinese Embassy," and within hours after this episode, the National Secretariat of the C.P.I. released its first official statement on Tibet completely endorsing the Red Chinese stand in every detail.

Not only were the press reports about Chinese Embassy "summoning" a CPI top leader not denied, but Prof. Hiren Mukherjee actually more or less confirmed this report in the Parliament by stating there was nothing wrong in this.

Although every non-communist, both in the Parliament and outside, was shocked at this performance of the CPI, those who knew the record of the CPI found nothing surprising in this, even after the so-called "democratic" and "national" facade that the party built for itself after the Amritsar Congress.

The present CPI stand on Tibet is in conformity with its past performance on a basic question, viz., the CPI is not a political party, it is an international conspiratorial movement to drag free and democratic countries into the orbit of the Communist empire.

The CPI's consistency in its actions to subserve international communist interests has been quite impressive. Their anti-national stand has been equally consistent.

During the national movement the CPI supported, on grounds of "self-determination principles," the demand of the Muslim League for Pakistan. Anything that would dismember the future strong free and united India which could be a democratic bulwark against communist expansion was welcome to the Indian proxies of international communism.

When "Quit India" movement was launched, the same standards were valid for Indian Reds.

When India became free in 1947 the Zhdanov line endorsed by Stalin was the gospel for the CPI. The independence of India was denied as a fact. This denial was supported openly and brazenly by no less a "bhai" than "Cheeni bhai" Mao Tse Tung. In a message of greetings to the Indian Communist Party General Secretary at the 1948 Congress of the CPI in Calcutta, Mao declared:

"The Indian people are one of the great Asian nationalities with a long history and vast population; the country's fate in the past and her path in the future are similar to those of China in

many respects. Like Free China, a Free India will one day emerge in the world as a member of the socialist and democratic people's family. That day will end the imperialist, reactionary era in the history of mankind."

Then came Telangana in a juvenile effort to overthrow the new Indian Government in coordination with similar attempts all over S.E. Asia with the infant republics.

On the issue of Korean War, Iran, Viet Nam, Malaya, Yugoslavia, in fact on any international issue, the C.P.I. has never found it possible to deviate even an inch from the Kremlin or Peking line no matter how different were objective conditions in India.

Whether it was Hungary, or the shooting of Imre Nagy, denigration of Stalin, shooting of Beria, removal of Malenkov, Molotov, or Bulganin or Zhukov, or the "hundred flowers turning out to be weeds", the CPI had to endorse word for word as gospel truth whatever their bosses in Moscow or Peking decided.

With such a magnificent record of consistency in toeing the line, there was nothing shocking or surprising about the CPI's latest performances on Tibet. The alibis and the arguments they use do not matter.

For instance, even the Indian communist cannot rationally believe, after their line on "muslim self-determination" line re. Pakistan in the early forties, that the same argument about Tibetans does not apply. After shouting at Western Imperialists for their alibi of "emancipating the backward natives" under colonialism by such boons as Railways, Post Offices, good roads, sanitation to justify their rule over colonies, the communists today peddle the same Chinese burden in Tibet to emancipate the "feudal" Tibetans. In fact even a non-communist, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, echoed this line. The CPI front organisations, journals and fellow-travellers have dutifully echoed this line of the party. A dramatic touch to this alibi was further provided by the veteran "American communist Anna Louise Strong, an alibi gratefully grasped by the CPI to prove why Tibet must be in Red Chinese iron grip:—

"Tibet holds the sources of China's great rivers. Chinese read the papers and know all about the poisons made in America and Britain which can kill all the world with a few ounces. They will not leave their water supply in the hands of nations like that."

We can safely rely on the CPI to faithfully echo these sentiments soon. What is really shocking is the almost total blindness of many eminent Indian leaders who not only refuse to be shocked by proved performances of the CPI, but give the CPI considerable respectability and rehabilitation consciously or unconsciously just at the crucial movement when the CPI stands bare and exposed.

Are There Political Prisoners In USSR?

by Mironenko

KHRUSHCHEV declared at the Twenty-first Congress of the all-Union Communist Party that: "In the USSR there are no instances of prosecution of political crimes in a court of law". He also said, "...we have no political prisoners." (*Pravda*, January 28, 1959). These declarations do not at all correspond to the facts, for ever since its founding there have been a large number of political prisoners in the USSR. Prosecution of political crimes in a court of law continues even today.

Since USSR criminal law does not use the expression "political crime" there can be no political criminals in the USSR. Political activity against the Soviet system is called "counter-revolutionary" and is considered much worse than a criminal offense.

In the Soviet Union, where it is maintained that the revolution has already been accomplished, there are not, and cannot be, so-called political crimes.

"The encroachment by the enemy of the people on the Workers and Peasants Socialist State are of a completely different nature and classification. These activities are the most dangerous crimes. Therefore, they are called counter-revolutionary crimes in the USSR". (BSE,—*Large Soviet Encyclopedia*, Ed. I Vol. 46, Moscow, 1940, pp. 148-49)

Now, the new criminal law for crimes against the State has substituted the phrase "especially dangerous State crimes" for the phrase "counter-revolutionary crimes". This is only to emphasise more heavily that political crimes as well as counter-revolutionary crimes directed against the communist regime do not and cannot exist.

That this is false is amply shown by the entire history of the struggle of the Soviet Union against the Communist dictatorship. If there were no political crimes in the USSR it would not have been necessary to broaden the statute "Concerning Treason" to include Soviet citizens who refused to return from abroad. All of the basic situations covered under "counter-revolutionary crimes" in the old law of 1927 are not only included but also largely expanded in the new law of December 25, 1958, under the heading "Concerning Especially Dangerous State Crimes". In 1923, if a Soviet citizen refused to return home, he was merely deprived of his Soviet citizenship. Now this is considered "treason" and is punishable by ten to fifteen years' imprisonment or by death.

Khrushchev claims there are no political prisoners in the USSR. However, recently the Soviet Press has carried articles dealing with a trial of Soviet citizens who during war time worked in the occupied territories. All of these citizens have been sentenced to death for "treason". Khrushchev's assertion is vigorously refuted by the fact that in 1957, 300 students were convicted of freely speaking with foreign students at the time of the International Youth Congress in Moscow.

In further refutation of Khrushchev's claim that

there are no political prisoners in the USSR is the fact that by March, 1953, (the time of Stalin's death), there were five million political prisoners. The total number of prisoners reached ten million. Khrushchev himself attested to "socialist legality" when he declared that it was destroyed in the hey-day of Stalin's cult of the individual and Beria's activity.

Three amnesties have been declared in the USSR since March, 1953. The first amnesty of March 27, 1953, did not cover counter-revolutionaries who were sentenced to more than five years in prison. However, the minimum term of imprisonment for this offense is five years. Hence the amnesty did not touch the political prisoners. They remained in the camps and prisons.

The second amnesty was declared on September 17, 1955. It covered only prisoners who were sentenced for counter-revolutionary crimes committed during the war years 1941-45 and under Articles 58-1, 58-3, 58-4, 58-6, 58-10, and 58-12 of the RSFSR criminal code. This amnesty granted reprieve to those who were sentenced up to ten years. Prisoners sentenced to more than ten years (although their sentences were cut off by half) and prisoners convicted of crimes committed after 1945 remained in prison.

Prisoners convicted under Articles 58-2, 58-5, 58-8, 58-9, 58-11, 58-13 and 58-14 were not covered by this amnesty. They remained in prison. On September 20, 1956, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted the resolution "concerning the Application of the September 17, 1955 Order of the Presidium, Supreme Soviet of the USSR". From this resolution it is clear that the amnesty did not apply to the prisoners convicted under Articles 58-1a, 58-1c, and 58-1d. These prisoners numbering several millions remained in confinement.

The third amnesty of November 1, 1957, did not apply to political prisoners convicted under terms of Section One of the Statute concerning State Crimes.

An analysis of all the three amnesties shows that all prisoners who were sentenced during World War II for counter-revolutionary activity, and were not included in the amnesty of September 17, 1955, in addition to those sentenced for counter-revolutionary activity committed after the war (whose sentences were not already up) remained in confinement. Fourteen years have passed since the end of the war. The majority of the articles for political offenses call for 25 years' imprisonment or the death sentence. The latter, from May 1947 until January 1950, was replaced by the 25-year sentence. Hence it is clear that the majority of political prisoners have not served out their sentences and remain in confinement.

Calculations show that the number of political prisoners, estimated at five million in 1953, has decreased, but that there are still more than one million men in prison for political reasons in the USSR.

The Other Algeria

by Sal Tás

PRESIDENT Charles de Gaulle's recent amnesty of Algerian nationalist leaders and rebels marked the beginning of a determined effort to solve the French-Algerian crisis. Foremost among those released was Messali Hadj, the father of Algerian nationalism, who has been in exile for 40 years and in French prisons for 25 years. In addition, 5-10,000 imprisoned Algerians were freed, 200 rebels condemned to death were pardoned and the prison conditions of Ahmed Ben Bella and four other National Liberation Front (FLN) leaders were eased.

It was Messali Hadj who first organized a nationalist mass movement, with strong socialist overtones. For a time he was close to the communists, but later broke with them completely. Outlawed in Algeria, he organized the Algerians who had found work in France and Belgium, and was instrumental in having them join trade unions. Many of them, working and living in the most difficult circumstances, were drawn into the communist-controlled General Confederation of Workers (CGT). When Messali Hadj organized an Algerian trade union, however, they joined it in huge numbers.

During his long absence, Messali Hadj lost touch with his associates in Algeria. One result of this was a split in the nationalist movement, which gave rise to the FLN. Organizational and personal rivalries between the FLN leaders and Messali Hadj's Algerian Nationalist Movement (MNA) rapidly became embittered. For many months the FLN conducted bloody raids and other brutal acts of terrorism against the MNA in France, and after a while the MNA began to respond in kind.

Both movements are, above all, nationalist, and it would not be correct to say that communism is behind either one. But whereas the FLN is largely influenced by the methods and ideology of the United Arab Republic, the MNA is much closer to Western Socialist movements and ideologies. This gives particular importance to a man like Messali Hadj.

He is a politician with long experience and many contacts among prominent Socialists, a man who still retains a large following among Algerian workers in France (and through them among the masses in Algeria). He could become the centre of a more realistic, less demagogic and less intolerant form of nationalism. With him de Gaulle could eventually negotiate. It is because of his potentially crucial role that I obtained an exclusive interview with him, his first after his release.

The *Hotel du Parc*, his residence in Chantilly, 45 miles from Paris, is a large and rather nice provincial hotel. Across the road, opposite the entrance, two soldiers keep watch in the most inconspicuous way. Inside, the right wing of the hotel is practically an MNA encampment. One man stands guard at a win-

dow, another at the door that leads to the street. In the hallway, a dozen young Algerians loiter about, but suddenly they come to their feet and make some effort of standing at attention.

The tall figure at whose appearance they had risen, and who now beckons me, is Messali Hadj: strongly built, gray-bearded, wearing a red fez and a fine green *djellaba*. He smiles, bows slightly and greets me with a soft, almost flute-like voice.

"I am an optimist," he began, even before I had an opportunity to pose a question. "I am an optimist, because the web of lies about Algeria which had enmeshed the French people has been ripped asunder. When we see what de Gaulle has said, what he has *not* said and especially what he has done, it is evident that progress has begun.

"Certainly the Fourth Republic had laudable intentions, but it never found the courage or the strength to move in the right direction. De Gaulle has both! His pardon of the 200 doomed rebels has made an enormous impression on the Algerians. It was no small thing to pardon them in the heat of war. I receive many hundreds of letters from Algeria, and they all tell how deeply moved the Algerian people are by this humane gesture. It is clear that France needs time to digest this step before de Gaulle can take the next step. But de Gaulle will go on. He has plan, and he will certainly execute it."

"But to succeed." I interrupted, "de Gaulle needs a partner for negotiation. What is your position on that?"

"I know what you mean. The world's attention has been focussed on the FLN because of its spectacular acts of terror. All dictatorships start with such terrorism. But real leadership knows when to stop them. The FLN is a heterogeneous group that contains people from ultra-left to ultra-right. A man like Ferhat Abbas, for example, was an opponent of Algerian nationalism when I founded the MNA. Now he tries to make up for his past, and this accounts for his extremism.

"There are, no doubt, valuable elements in the FLN, but there is no chief there. And that movement is supported by outside powers who sooner or later will present the bill for their aid. You don't believe that Cairo or Moscow does anything for nothing? This is not real independence.

"Don't forget, I am the father of Algerian nationalism. There are whole regions of the country where the *fellaga* have joined the rebellion because Messali Hadj asked them to do so. My whole life has been one long struggle against Stalin and his aides. But now I am free and can attend to the organization of my party.

"Half a million Algerians live in France and Belgium. The majority of them have remained loyal

to me; they come here in the hundreds. I am astonished at the enormous progress they have made in 40 years. Forty years ago, they were paupers; now they are an élite—modern workers with organizational experience and discipline and knowledge of trade-union affairs. Their contact with me will have immediate effects in Algeria, where thousands are being freed from prison camps—including a great many who are Messalists. They will rebuild my organization."

"And what is your program for a solution of the Algerian question?" I asked.

"When we first used the expression, national independence, we did it in order to wake up an entire people. We have learned a lot since then. A million Frenchmen live in Algeria; they were born there and have lived there all their lives. Some are rich, some poor. They represent a great reserve of culture, of organizational power and, in their own milieu, of democratic experience, which is indispensable to Algeria. And should the fighting stop, human contacts could be resumed.

"Let us be frank. We Algerians can govern a small town or community. But to govern a whole country requires much more. We must break away from revolutionary intoxication. We face tremendous economic problems, which independence alone cannot solve. Tunisia and Morocco know that now; so does President Sekou Touré of Guinea.

"The word independence is evolving and gaining broader meanings. Nations today live in larger communities. Benelux, the European Common Market,

the North Atlantic Treaty Organization members: Together they live and defend themselves.

"I propose that an independent Algeria collaborate in the closest possible way with France, within the framework of a Commonwealth along British lines. This is surely what de Gaulle, too, has in mind: a new community, France-Maghreb (France with North Africa) at the side of the French-Central African community. Once independent, we will have lost all inferiority complexes and all causes for friction with France.

"Toward this end, a round-table conference is needed, to which all representative groups will come. Let the FLN come too. And let our discussions be public, so that the Algerian people can judge who are its real defenders and who are the intransigent impossibilists. I do not represent all of Algeria; but I do represent an important part of it. And if the FLN refuses to come, we will proceed without them. Such a conference, I assure you, would be the beginning of indispensable human contacts and would have a tremendous impact. It would be a model for the future.

"I ask my Socialist friends to help me. I would like to have the opportunity of traveling abroad, to show the world that other Algeria which it does not know. Through this knowledge, through international understanding and cooperation, we could lay the groundwork for a sensible, dignified solution of the Algerian problem. Let me show that other Algeria.

Reproduced from *The New Leader*

(GREEN AGAINST RED—Continued from page 5)

naissance on the basis of a democratic redistribution of land to small holders with modern technology brought to their doors through cooperative societies. But in A.E.'s vision as in that of Gandhi and Tagore, the social order of individualist property in land was *final* and not to be superseded at any later stage. But today, the Nagpur dispensation takes the country beyond the green life-giving democratic social order into the realm of the red revolution with its defiance of the individualist side of human psychology, its harsh collectivism, coercive apparatus, overwhelming overhead costs forfeiting the full advantages of technology by yoking it to a faulty social, political and economic system.

The green revolution supports the current criticism of the excessive and ill-regulated urbanism of modern industrialisation. It suggests that man requires some elbow room and some contact with mother earth. The contact with rural life and land culture should not be denied to citizens. The Soviet attempt to destroy the village altogether in the endeavour to get full control of the peasant is ill-advised. On the contrary, the British ideal of *town and country planning* points to the right direction. What is needed is to humanise the conditions of industry so that workers may not be submerged under external compulsions.

The green revolution fosters national patriotism as a natural outgrowth of life on the soil. The folk element in culture obtains scope for natural burgeoning. The extensive literature of Southeast and Central Europe still going strong even under Red oppression is witness to this statement.

The green revolution supports democracy as a natural corollary of independent peasant life full of activity on a self-regulated basis, each householder and his family planning their own life and using cooperation for getting the benefits of large scale capital and operation.

Today India is being led beyond the green into the red dispensation of collectivist agriculture and socialist structure, wherein the individual is suppressed and a huge mechanical social order motivated by grandiose ambitions of unlimited production uses the farmers' energies without his willing cooperation.

The tragedy of Southeast and Central Europe was initiated through the presence of Soviet troops after defeat in war. But in India, we are about to enact the tragedy under the compulsion not of foreign troops but that of a voluntarily accepted ideology on the part of the supreme leader of the country.

Facts About Collective Farms in USSR

by S. Kabysch

THE so-called voluntary form of cooperative agriculture in the USSR today is generally known as the collective farm (kolkhoz) or the agricultural artel. The rules governing the organization and operation of the kolkhozes were worked out at the Second Congress of Agricultural Shock Workers and ratified by the Council of Peoples' Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) on February 17, 1935. These regulations have since undergone further additions and modifications. In a resolution of May 27, 1939, by the Central Committee and the Council of Peoples' Commissars concerning "Measures for Protecting Public Lands from Waste," it was decided that the distribution of all individual plots be carried out by the local soviets and all land in excess of the quota established by the central authorities be added to the communal lands. Moreover, the number of work-day units for the kolkhozniks was laid down as follows: a minimum of 60 days per year in the industrial regions; a minimum of 100 days per year in the cotton-growing regions; and a minimum of 80 days per year in all other areas. (*Izvestia*, May 28, 1939.)

On April 17, 1942, another resolution of the Central Committee and the Council of Peoples' Commissars raised the number of compulsory workday units to be spent on the kolkhoz communal land as follows: to 100 work-days in the industrial regions; to 150 work-days in the cotton-growing regions; to 120 work-days in all other areas; and 50 work-days for youths between twelve and sixteen years of age. (*Izvestia*, Apr 17, '42).

Another resolution of the Central Committee and the Soviet government on March 9, 1956 concerning "The Statutes of the Agricultural Artels and the Further Development of the Kolkhozniks' Initiative in Organizing Production on the Kolkhozes and the Management of the Artels," stated that "it was recommended" to the kolkhozniks that "they themselves supplement and alter the agricultural regulations in accordance with local requirements and the conditions on the kolkhoz." The decision appeared to revise those regulations pertaining to individual plots, permitting the limitation of size of such plots to be raised so that the standard of living of the kolkhozniks could be raised. In a general meeting of the collective farmers, it was agreed that the individual plots of those farmers who did not fulfill the prescribed quota of work-day units be reduced. It was also proposed that the former limitations on the number of cattle and livestock that could be owned by the collective farm household be revised. The general meeting further declared that the required minimum number of work-day units should "depend on the amount of labour that was required to fulfill the norms of the kolkhoz." (*Pravda*, March 10, 1956.)

The wage rates in the kolkhozes vary greatly and depend on the economic conditions of the kolkhoz concerned. In those kolkhozes with rich harvests, especially of industrial crops (cotton, flax, sugar cane, etc.), a work-day unit is reimbursed at a higher rate than in other kolkhozes. For example, in the Road to Communism Kolkhoz in Kimry Raion in the Kalinin Oblast, the pay for one work-day unit was 7.70 rubles plus produce, whereas in the Bolshevik Kolkhoz in the Sumy Oblast it was 7.00 rubles per work-day unit plus two kilograms of grain and one kilogram of potatoes. (*Ekonomika selskogo khozyaistva*, No. 7, 1958, p. 98.) In the Belorussian SSR, it was 4.00 rubles per work-day unit plus 1.4 kilograms of grain and 1.5 kilograms of potatoes. (*Sovetskaya Belorussiya*, January 22, 1957.)

Beginning in 1957, several so-called leading kolkhozes switched to a system of guaranteed monthly wages in place of the piece-work system. At present, the Party and government are encouraging the monetary form of payment in the kolkhozes.

In recent years, the size of the individual plots has not exceeded 0.25 hectares. The yield of these plots varies according to the climate and the soil. For instance, on the Land of the Soviets Kolkhoz in Akmo-linsk Oblast, the kolkhozniks receive about 5,000 rubles per year in the markets from their plots. (*Selskoe khozyaistvo*, August 19, 1955.) In several kolkhozes in the Georgian SSR, the individual plots average 0.40 hectares and produce yields of up to 40,000 rubles per year. (*Ekonomika selskogo khozyaistva*, No. 7, 1957, p. 94.)

Toward the end of 1957 there were 78,200 kolkhozes in the USSR. The average kolkhoz was composed of 245 households. On the average, each kolkhoz had 1,695 hectares of communal land, 374 head of cattle, of which 137 were milk cows, 255 pigs and 913 sheep and goats. The average weekly income for each kolkhoz came to about 1,338,000 rubles, while expenditures ran about 1,250,000 rubles. The total number of work-day units for the average kolkhoznik was about 335 days per year. (*The USSR in Figures: A Statistical Compilation*, Moscow, 1958, pp. 198-99.) The average area of land on one kolkhoz amounted to 7,100 hectares, of which 2,200 hectares were under cultivation, 400 hectares were used for growing hay, 1,200 hectares for pasture, and 3,300 hectares for other uses, such as buildings, forests, etc.

The statutes of the kolkhozes stipulate that when a member withdraws from the artel, he should receive only his cash shares accrued up to the end of the year. Fines and punishments "for negligence" are fixed at general meetings and assume various forms; the confiscation of the whole or part of the individual plot or confiscation of rights to private livestock.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

"Trust in Panchsheela and keep your powder dry" should be the basic tenet of our foreign policy.

—D. R. Mankekar, *Indian Express*, April 8.

India's honeymoon with China is over. It is no use pretending otherwise. What is imperative is to prevent a divorce.

—"Royjee", *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, April 8.

Let us be friends with communists by all means. But let us not get into emotional conditions by the mesmerism of peaceable words. The communists will be the last people to respect us for it.

—S. M., *Hindustan Times*, April 1.

The prevalent and wholly romantic attitude to foreign affairs has done enough harm already, and it is much better to be aware of the facts of international life than to be surprised by perfectly foreseeable events now in Hungary and then in Tibet or Cairo or Karachi.

—"Cassius", *Hindustan Standard*, March 28.

But for the implicit threat of H-bomb war, Russia and China would by now have occupied and begun the communising of India.

—*Mysindia*, April 12.

If Tibet could not co-exist with China inside China, will India and China be able to co-exist inside Asia?

—Frank Moraes, *Indian Express*, April 25.

Tibet is not another Hungary: it is more likely to become Red China's Algeria, a festering war to the knife that can be neither won nor lost.

—*Time Magazine*, April 20.

✓ I am conscious that co-existence between my country and China is only possible in so far as China is not my immediate neighbour.

—Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Prime Minister of Cambodia, *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, April 16.

Whether the Communist Party of India is patriotic or not, it is certainly not very intelligent.

—*Free Press Journal*, April 3.

Let those who took the Amritsar resolution (of the Communist Party of India) setting out a democratic constitutional path for the Indian Communists at its face value take warning (from the CPI's stand on Tibet). We may not get many more warnings.

—*Hindustan Times*, April 2.

Is it uncharitable to conclude that Nehru is more than half inclined to think that the Chinese pill must be good for Tibet, since it is administered in the name of modernisation and progress?

—Vighneshwara, *Swaraja*, April 11.

(Continued from Page 2)

The Government and the people of India must champion this demand of the Tibetan people for national independence and the right of self-determination. It is their duty and task to popularise this demand all over the world. The Asian nations must in particular be awakened to the enormity of the crime that is being perpetrated in Tibet and to demand with one voice the withdrawal of China from Tibet and the restoration of that country's independence. India should take the lead in raising the issue in the United Nations and other international forums.

The Committee appeals to the people to realise the grave implications of what has happened in Tibet to the security of the country and to the cause of the freedom of small nations. If they are sufficiently active and vigorous in their protest against the actions of China, the Government of India which has already responded nobly to the plight of the people of Tibet, will be prepared to go further and champion the cause of their independence.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

A TALK WITH VINOBA
Sidney Hook

SITTING ON A FORTUNE
Wayland Young

SHOWER A STORY
Hwang Soon Won

May 1959

68

Annual Rs. 12/-

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