

Revolt In Cuba

by V. B. Karnik

THERE are many misconceptions in the Indian mind about the revolt in Cuba. They are due to lack of information about events in that far off country. They are also due to deliberate propaganda on the part of some to paint the revolt as an invasion of the country organised and financed by the United States of America. Now that the revolt is crushed and there is no immediate danger of the situation developing into a major international crisis, it is desirable to think a little more calmly about the happening and assess the real character of the event.

The actual help that the revolt received from the Government of the United States of America will ever remain a matter of speculation. There can be no denial, however, of the obvious sympathy of the American Government. President Kennedy has made no attempt to hide the fact. It is clear, however, that there was no military intervention. Had it taken place, the revolt would not have ended so swiftly and in so tragic a manner. There will be some who may object even to an expression of sympathy — and even to private efforts to help the revolutionaries. They may remember, however, that it was only with such assistance that Castro succeeded in overthrowing the dictatorship of Batista. If it was moral and legal to help Castro in his struggle against Batista, how would it be immoral and illegal to help others against Castro when he becomes a dictator and establishes a police regime?

The revolt that took place was a revolt of a significant section of the Cuban people against the dictatorship of Castro. The section that revolted included such eminent personalities and one-time close supporters of Castro as his first President, his first Prime Minister, his first Chief Justice, the head of his own office, and a number of others who were his comrades-in-arms when he was fighting against Batista. None of these persons can be labelled as mercenaries or agents of any foreign Power. They are Cuban patriots who are in opposition to Castro because of his suppression of freedom and democracy and his alliance with international communism. They parted company with him after he strayed away from the path of revolution, and have now banded themselves together for a fight to end his dictatorship. It was they who organised the

revolt and many amongst them were in the front lines of the battle. They may have received assistance from some American agencies but it is they who fought and bore the brunt of the struggle.

Very little is known in India about the developments in Cuba after Castro seized power. He is still regarded as the revolutionary leader of the Cuban people who helped them overthrow the hated dictatorship of Batista. There is widespread support and sympathy for him and in many circles ardent admiration for the scant respect that he has paid to the threats or inducements of his country's mighty neighbour, the United States of America. Blinded by sympathy for the revolution that he led, people have forgotten to take note of the later developments. Castro seized power with the promise of liberating all political prisoners. But today under his regime there are more than 15,000 political prisoners and many more were compelled either to flee the country or to run away to the hills. There is no freedom of the press. Some newspapers were taken over by the Government — and others were suppressed. There is no civil liberty and no independence of the judiciary. The judges who refused to take orders from his officers were purged and compelled to leave the country. The independence of trade unions was destroyed and the Cuban Confederation of Workers was turned into an agency of the Government. Over 200 elected officers of trade unions were dismissed from their offices. One of them was the General Secretary of the Federation. He is today languishing in one of the jails of Castro. Cultural and educational organisations have also been brought under the strict control of the Government. One of them, the Cuban Committee for Cultural Freedom, was disbanded. Many of its office-bearers and members had to leave the country and seek refuge elsewhere. Even in the economic field, Castro was not able to fulfil his promises and there is now more of misery and starvation than ever before. Developments such as these disillusioned many and turned some of them into bitter enemies of the Castro regime. Denied opportunity for a peaceful and constitutional opposition, many of them have been fighting a guerilla war against the regime since long. The revolt that flared up was only an episode in that long and bitter struggle.

The revolt has been suppressed. The rebels could not withstand the organised might of the Government. Some of them have paid with their lives for their brave action against the dictatorship. Many have been captured and are facing trial for treason. Some

(Continued on page 6)

Communism Versus Communalism

by Saadi

COMMUNALISM as it is understood in India in the context of the recent historical background is undoubtedly bad; but to exaggerate its importance out of all proportions to the danger it constitutes in the present political framework would, indeed, be short-sighted since it is likely to divert peoples' mind from apprehending more menacing forces in our public life. The point is that our Prime Minister's condemnation of communalism — whether Hindu, Muslim or Sikh, is welcome, but his too much preoccupation with it might help to soften peoples' resistance to communism which is a far greater threat to India's security and culture than any other political alignment in the country.

Judged objectively, communalism is not such a great force in the country today as it was a couple of years ago. By and large, communalism, especially after the assassination of Gandhiji, has become a discredited political creed, and only a small number of people seriously subscribe to its ideals.

Communism on the other hand is getting stronger and stronger and eating into the vitals of our political life. It has very subtle ways of infiltrating into our institutional framework and undermining it from within. Claiming to be scientific understanding of history and of material forces and progressive social philosophy and economic doctrine, it ostensibly aims at leading a social revolution for the establishment of Utopia of common man's dream. Thus the communist ideal is apparently appealing to the generality of the people. Especially the working class and peasantry are taken in by communist professions.

Communalism is manifested in three main currents in India: Hindu communalism represented by the Hindu Mahasabha and few other parties; Muslim communalism represented by the Muslim League and Jamiat-e-Islami; Sikh communalism represented by the Akali Dal and other Sikh groups.

It is true that in certain States communalist parties have become active in the political arena. For instance, the Muslim League has been revived in Bombay and in recent elections to the Bombay Municipal Corporation it won 4 seats, defeating some prominent members of the Congress and the PSP. It is also true that the workers of the Muslim League carried on communal propaganda on an intensive scale. Likewise, during the riots in Jabalpur, Saugar and other towns in Madhya Pradesh, Hindu communalist parties took active part.

Yet it cannot be stated with certainty that communalism has become such a formidable threat to country's security and democracy. Compared to communism, communalism is weak in every respect. Communism is on the ascendance while communalism, on the whole, is on the decline. Communism is accepted on much a wider basis and at various levels

of our social and cultural life while communalism is narrowed down to certain areas and to certain political groups. In Parliament and in Legislative Assemblies, communists outnumber communalists. What is worse, communists emerge in various disguises and it is difficult for naive people to gauge their real nature.

The Communal Harmony Committee of the AICC, by a majority vote, has recommended that communal parties must be banned in India in spite of the fact that the Law Ministry of the Union Government had advised against this move on constitutional grounds. A ban on communal parties may be however possible with a suitable amendment to the Indian Constitution. But the question is whether it would be politically wise to impose a ban on communal parties.

Again, there is no guarantee that ban on communal parties will really help to root out communalism from our political and social life. Communalists may function in various disguises. They may join the national democratic parties like Congress and PSP and try to expand their influence. In fact, it would be easier for communalists to function more effectively from within the national democratic parties than on their own separate political platforms, since under disguise they would largely remain undetected. They may even work in close association with multifarious communist fronts—communists would indeed like to welcome them as they did in Kerala for the achievement of their own ends.

It must be understood that communalism is an attitude of the mind and has to be combatted on many fronts: political, economic, social and psychological. With increasing political awareness regarding peoples' rights and obligations, with expanding economic opportunities as a result of the success of the developmental plans, with the widening of social and cultural contacts between various communities consequent to educational advance and with the emergence of a spirit of mutual adjustment and tolerance, which itself is an outcome of the political, economic, social and cultural progress, communalism is bound to recede.

It is true in view of the fact that communism often thrives on poverty and misery, the same method will ensure the defeat of communism. But there is a danger that before that method comes fully into operation, communism would make a bid for power, which, if we are not vigilant, might, in all probabilities succeed. The same, however, does not hold good in the case of communalism.

Hence, there is a need of determined effort, backed by conscious will to defeat communism before it becomes too formidable. Any divergence from this task like the one which too much preoccupation with communalism is likely to lead to, will spell disaster.

Notes

De Gaulle Triumphs

THE revolt of the French Army Generals in Algeria against President de Gaulle has collapsed even before it could spread to metropolitan France. The Fifth Republic has thus survived yet another, and the most dangerous, attempt from the French extremists to bring it down. The Fourth Republic met with an ignominious end because of the impotence of the French leadership to solve the Algerian problem which has bedevilled the country's politics for the last so many years. De Gaulle came to power, no doubt, with the help of the Army which was fed up with the succession of unstable Governments, none of which could command enough popular support to solve the baffling problem of Algeria. But he had the courage and vision to see the inevitability of granting the right of self-determination to the Muslims in Algeria. He had, besides, the overwhelming support of the French people which none of his predecessors had. From the beginning, he tried to bring about a negotiated settlement of the problem, but at first he was somewhat hesitant to concede the Algerian demand for independence. But it is to his credit that, when he was convinced that the Algerian Muslims would not accept anything less than independence, he reconciled himself to the ultimate separation of Algeria from metropolitan France. The peace talks between France and the Algerian nationalist delegation were scheduled to begin last month in Geneva, but were put off indefinitely owing to last minute differences developed between the two sides over the question of the status of other minor Algerian groups. These differences are of a minor character and the talks are expected to begin in a short time.

The President's policy of granting eventual independence to Algeria was never to the liking of the French extremists who wanted Algeria to remain French at all cost. The European colons in Algeria broke out into open rebellion a few months ago, but could not succeed as the French Army in Algeria remained generally loyal to de Gaulle. But this time the President was faced with a more serious threat as the loyalty of the French Army itself was doubtful. The revolt brought France virtually to the brink of a civil war, and if it had succeeded, would have destroyed all chances of the peaceful settlement of the Algerian problem and dealt a fatal blow to French democracy. De Gaulle could succeed in crushing the revolt without any bloodshed largely because of the massive backing of the French people. He has now

emerged from the ordeal a much stronger man. Public opinion in France also has shown itself to be in favour of de Gaulle's policy of a negotiated settlement. This has strengthened immensely de Gaulle's hands and enhanced his stature in the eyes of the people all over the world. The world will certainly acclaim him as one of the great statesmen of our age, if he could now with renewed vigour hasten the peaceful solution of the Algerian problem by early resumption of negotiations with the F.L.N.

Anti-Subversion Law

THE Criminal Law Amendment Bill providing for punishment of those who question the territorial integrity of national frontiers in a manner prejudicial to the safety and security of the country has recently been passed by Parliament with the support of all the groups excepting, of course, the communists. The measure, if anything, was long overdue and no one would grudge these powers to the Government, especially after the experience of the anti-national activities of the communists in our border areas. As the Home Minister stated during the debate, the enactment of such a provision was necessitated because of the "highly treacherous and anti-national propaganda" carried on by the communists in the frontier regions. It is revealing that during the debate only the communists opposed the Bill on the ground that the purpose of the Bill was "to unleash an anti-communist hysteria in the country." That the communists should have felt impelled to oppose the measure aimed at curbing anti-national activities of individuals, clearly showed that they have indulged in such activities. And the Home Minister quoted many instances to substantiate this charge against the communists, though no such proof was necessary. There have been many reports appearing in the press in the recent months of systematic campaign of subversion by members of the Communist Party in the border regions, and even the recent session of the Communist Party Congress at Vijayawada showed that the communists have cut themselves off completely from the main current of opinion in the country.

On no count the provisions of the Bill could be termed harsh, as it provides enough opportunities for a person charged, to defend himself through the normal processes of law. The Bill, if anything, is inadequate in the sense that the borders of Jammu and Kashmir are excluded from its application. In this connection, it should be noted that the major area under the Chinese occupation is in the Ladakh region of Kashmir and the communists have always been advocating "concessions" to the Chinese communists in this sector only. It is to be hoped that the Government will plug this loophole in order to arm itself with adequate powers to counter the subversive activities in all the frontier areas.

Without Comment

WORLD PEACE COUNCIL

New Delhi, March 21—The Government of India has granted visas to 20 Chinese to enable them to attend the World Peace Council Conference being held here from March 24 to 28.

The total number of foreign delegates may exceed 250. The Soviet Union's contingent is expected to have 12 delegates.

The last time the World Peace Council tried to organise such a conference in India was in 1952. The Union Government had then refused permission.

—*Hindustan Times*, March 22.

New Delhi, March 24—The Chinese delegation to the World Peace Council tonight walked out of a cultural function organised to celebrate Tagore's centenary after the function chairman, Mr. Humayun Kabir, had done some plain speaking about Tibet.

Mr. Kabir, Union Minister for Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, declared that just as Tagore's love for Japan did not prevent him from criticising the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, the great poet would undoubtedly have regretted the suppression of Tibet by China.

Thereupon the leader of the Chinese delegation immediately took the floor to denounce not only Mr. Kabir's remarks, but also India's attitude towards the Sino-Indian boundary dispute.

Before walking out, the Chinese spokesman asserted that while a majority of the Indian people wanted settlement with China, some Indians were anxious to delay the solution and thus inherit the "seeds of British imperialism."

—*Statesman*, March 25.

New Delhi, Friday—Overshadowing the elaborate ceremonial the communists had organized at Vigyan Bhavan today for the opening of the World Peace Council's four-day meeting was an unmistakable element of irony.

Nearly 75 determined demonstrators, belonging to the newly formed "National Association of Marxists," gave the sponsors of the conference a taste of the harassing tactics the communists usually reserve for their political opponents.

Most of the demonstrators were former communists and therefore adequately trained in the technique of agitation. What they lacked in numbers, they made up in enthusiasm and militancy.

They took their former comrades by surprise and demanded—through placards, slogans and angry questions shouted across the low boundary wall—what

the World Peace Council proposed to do or say about the Chinese occupation of Indian territory.

The demonstration became particularly tumultuous when the Chinese delegation drove to the main entrance of Vigyan Bhavan renamed for the day "Juliot Curie Gate."

For once the communist leaders anxiously looked round for the police. "Why has not a police party been posted here yet?", demanded one of them, while Mr. Y. D. Sharma, Delhi's representative in the Central Executive Committee, went ahead to try persuasion with his erstwhile colleagues. But he found the demonstrators' leader, Master Chhaju Ram, more than his match in polemics.

Nobody was more relieved than Mr. Sharma when a posse of police arrived. The police officers eventually managed to ensure that the demonstrators would not try to storm the conference hall.

Inside the conference hall, the communists and fellow travellers crowding the hall cheered the Chinese speaker when he assured the "Indian people of China's resolute support in the struggle to 'restore Goa' to India."

—*Statesman*, March 25.

The World Peace Council, currently meeting in Delhi, will not discuss the Sino-Indian border dispute. The steering committee of the Council has come to this decision, since it thought that the dispute "was not an international problem as such, but was concerned with only two friendly countries."

Nine delegates from China are attending the Peace Council meeting. The head of this delegation is learnt to have told the steering committee that it would be politic to refrain from a discussion of the Sino-Indian border question, because such a discussion was likely to raise doubts on the intentions of either India or China for the observance of the principle of peaceful co-existence between them.

—*Hindustan Times*, March 25.

New Delhi, March 25—Ideological differences plagued the deliberations of the two main bodies of the World Peace Council—the Commission for National Independence and Abolition of Colonialism and the Commission for Disarmament and Peaceful Co-existence. Near pandemonium is reported to have prevailed at the secret session of the former today.

Thirty members spoke at today's meeting of the National Independence Commission. Mr. Ivor Montagu, vice-president of the British Peace Committee and Chairman of the commission, later told newsmen "each member was free to express his opinion and every member expressed his own views."

Mr. Montagu said that repression of peaceful movements in many countries by certain nations was discussed, but that the "question of Chinese oppression in Tibet was not raised."

Chinese members of the Disarmament and Peaceful Co-existence Commission threatened to walk out unless the delegate of France withdrew certain

(Continued on page 11)

The Defence Debate

by A. K. Menon

THE recent debate in Parliament on the defence estimates has spotlighted the deep disquiet that has been widely prevalent in the country about India's defences, and more particularly about the doings of the Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon. The angry speeches and heated exchanges that took place during the debate were a measure of the intensity of distrust and misgivings that Mr. Krishna Menon has aroused in the country by his temperament, character and the ideological bias which he has tried to inject into the affairs of his department. When, for instance, Acharya Kripalani at one stage accused the Defence Minister of aiming at a "military dictatorship" by his manoeuvres and manipulations in the Armed Forces, he was voicing the grave apprehension of quite a large section of the informed public opinion. Only a few days prior to the Lok Sabha debate, Dr. Kunzru had also pointedly referred in the Rajya Sabha to the dissatisfaction in high army circles caused by the arbitrary manner in which the Defence Minister was handling the issue of appointments and promotions in the armed forces. It was therefore regrettable that the Prime Minister, instead of considering these charges seriously, chose to belittle them by ridiculing the opposition Members and justifying all the deeds of his colleague by vaingloriously flaunting the support of the majority of the people to his party.

The gravamen of the charge against Mr. Krishna Menon is that he has been misusing his authority as the Defence Minister to build up his own position through devious ways. In fact, the Opposition, and even many Congressmen, doubt his *bona-fide* and question the wisdom of keeping him in such a sensitive and strategic position. Acharya Kripalani charged him with having created cliques in the Army and having lowered the morale of our armed forces at this critical time by indulging in favouritism and allowing his personal prejudices against individual officers to hinder the smooth and effective functioning of the armed forces. Acharya Kripalani gave a few concrete instances in support of his charge, though he was prevented from citing names of officers concerned. Mr. Menon in replying to these charges expatiated on the elaborate machinery provided for determining promotions and the Prime Minister gallantly volunteered to shoulder the whole responsibility for the appointments in question. But in doing so, they both singularly failed to give satisfactory reply to the main charge. No one in the debate had questioned the procedure followed, the charge was that the procedure is nowadays often rigged so that a "desirable" officer is duly recommended and the undesirable one is deliberately left out. As the opposition Members pointed out, there is a glaring inconsistency in the Defence Ministry's promotion policy; in one case, seniority becomes the main consideration and merit

is ignored, while in another, merit is claimed to be the sole criterion. As the "Military Correspondent" of *Indian Express* has pointed out: "The Defence Minister's exposition of the prevailing rules was studious and sound, but between rules and their implementation there falls a shadow. Promotion Boards and Selection Boards are impressive establishments but they can be manned by men without integrity. The institution of Defence Minister as a court of appeal is excellent. But if the Minister is himself a messy? The M.P.'s complaint is that they are badly manhandling an apparently good system".

This suspicion that the Defence Minister has been deliberately misusing his authority to pack the army posts with his own men naturally prompted the Opposition to challenge the basis of some of the recent army promotions. Mr. Menon side-tracked this issue and counter-accused the opposition leaders of bringing politics into the Army. But this does not explain why, for the first time in fourteen years, army promotions have become a subject of controversy. Besides, it is a patent fact, which neither the Defence Minister nor the Prime Minister can gloss over, that it is only since Mr. Menon became the Defence Minister that there have been so much audible rumblings of discontent in the higher army circles. General Thimayya's resignation two years ago, and the reported resignation of a Lieutenant-General three months ago, are a tangible proof of this widespread discontent which cannot be explained simply by the alleged "unorthodox" ways and reported dynamism of Mr. Menon. The fact is that there is considerable substance in the allegations made by the Opposition regarding favouritism and suppression which has undermined the efficiency of the Armed Forces and Mr. Menon's controversial and notoriously temperamental personality has only helped to aggravate the matters.

Mr. Menon in countering the charge of having lowered the morale of the Armed Forces, made much of the improved amenities, salaries and careers provided during the last few years. On the basis of these facts he boastfully claimed that the "morale of the Army was never higher." Improved material conditions, no doubt, do help to build morale of the forces, but mere improvement in material conditions cannot build morale unless there is a good leadership which could inspire the forces to make, if necessary, the highest sacrifices for the cause of the country. Mr. Menon has singularly failed to provide this spiritual leadership; his statements and acts, on the contrary, have always had the calculated effect of undermining the morale of the Army and the faith of the general public in the ability of our armed forces to defend the country against any aggression. It is not without significance that the major advance of the Chinese army into the Indian territory was made

during Mr. Menon's tenure of office. And even after the fact of the Chinese aggression was made public, Mr. Menon, it is significant, was for a long time reluctant to brand the Chinese as aggressors. During all these years he had characteristically avoided taking a firm stand on the subject; on the other hand, he has frequently made statements which could have a demoralising effect on the country's armed forces and the people in general. His statement during the defence debate that our country cannot hope to match the might of China's armed forces, or his subsequent statement in Bombay that India did not wish to fight the Chinese over the Himalayan ranges, are examples of Mr. Menon's crooked genius.

All these facts should add up to a strong indictment of any one responsible for the defence of the country. But more than this, Mr. Menon's continuance as the Defence Minister is highly undesirable from the point of view of our national interest as he is notorious for his pro-communist leanings. At this critical time when our country is faced with twin dangers of aggression from across our frontier and subversion from within by the communists, our country can ill-afford to have a known pro-communist to preside over the affairs of the Defence Department. With Mr. Krishna Menon as the Defence Minister, the communists have every chance of successfully implementing their programme of National Democratic Front. Acharya Kripalani referred to the unstinted support which the communists have always extended to Mr. Menon. No other party, including the ruling Congress party, is so united in its support to Mr. Menon. And the communists have every reason to do so: He has soft-pedalled the issue of the Chinese aggression; he has compensated the communists for their loss of prestige by going out of the way to pay undeserving tributes to the Russians for their so-called support to India as against China on the question of Chinese aggression; he has

invited the Russian pilots to fly over India's strategic northern borders; and, last but not the least, at this critical hour he has by his policies paralysed the effectiveness of the country's armed forces by causing discontent in the Army circles. These steps should result in the paralysis of the will of the people and power of the Army to resist the Chinese aggression and pave the way for the communist take-over. No one could serve the communists better in this respect than the pro-communist Defence Minister. Thanks to Prime Minister Nehru's blind loyalty to personalities and dogmas, democracy in India now faces twin great dangers—that of the presence of the Chinese in Ladakh and of Mr. Krishna Menon in the Defence Ministry.

REVOLT IN CUBA (Contd. from page 1)

others have escaped into the hills and may continue from there their fight against the regime. One more fight for freedom has met with a serious reverse. But the struggle for liberty and against tyranny is eternal and it will continue despite the reverses that it may suffer from time to time.

The revolt in Cuba failed because it did not receive any support from other countries. The Governments are bound by the doctrine of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. In spite of its obvious sympathy for the revolt, the Government of the United States could not render it any effective assistance. It has, however, served to make the Government aware of the danger of the spread of international communism. In an eloquent address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, President Kennedy has shown how the forces of international communism "steadily advance picking off vulnerable areas" through "subversion, infiltration and a host of other tactics." These situations, he was careful to add, "do not permit our own armed intervention." The danger, therefore was, he stated, that "our security may be lost, piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border." The democratic countries of the world have to gird their loins to meet this new indirect aggression and invasion. President Kennedy said: "We dare not fail to grasp the new concept, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it." This declaration of the President is reassuring, but one wonders how many more such futile revolts will be necessary before the leaders of the free world will devise concrete measures for safeguarding freedom and for advancing the cause of democracy.

Military revolt against an established authority has very little chance of success, unless it receives extensive support from outside. External assistance leads to international complications and involves the threat of a world war. No sensible person would like to tread that path. But then it is essential to find out a more effective and less dangerous way by which a people can free itself from a dictatorship and enjoy the blessings of freedom and democracy.

Tibet Fights For Freedom

*With a Foreword by the DALAI LAMA
Edited by RAJA HUTHESING*

Price Rs. 15

Published for

**INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL
FREEDOM**

148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

by

ORIENT LONGMANS

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
NEW DELHI HYDERABAD DACCA

The Sixth Congress of Indian Communists

by S. R. Mohan Das

ONE fact that should give immense satisfaction to the Indian communists is the extent of press coverage their latest Congress has been obtaining in the Indian press. Not only has there been mere reporting of the congress proceedings, but an extraordinary amount of interpretation and analysis of the proceedings have been made by special correspondents and reporters on behalf of every important Indian daily. Even the ruling party congresses never receive such an extensive attention in terms of analysis. But as in the case of most analyses, scrutiny of the decisions, pronouncements and proceedings of the CPI Congress is restricted by the subjective factor of the wishful thinking of the analysts and the objective factor of the closed nature of communist business sessions. The reporters and commentators have had to rely heavily on "leaks" from quarrelling factions within the party to get their scoops. Such scoops were the tea leaves in their cups for predictions and analyses. The importance of the latest CPI Congress at Vijayawada lies in the fact that its setting should be placed in the immediate wake of the Moscow Congress held a few months ago and where the global line and strategy for the international communist movement were laid. The importance of this point was underlined by the visit to India as fraternal delegates of a high powered Soviet delegation led by no less a luminary than Comrade Suslov.

The Vijayawada CPI congress cannot be properly evaluated unless this basic fact is recognized and interpreted. It is for the first time in the history of the CPI that the Soviet Communist Party—the vanguard of the International Communist movement—sent such a high-powered delegation. Comrade Suslov's visit certainly evoked considerable comments and interpretations. But all these comments were clouded by a theme which was of considerable importance to India nationally, viz. Chinese aggression. The Indian commentators interpreted in Comrade Suslov's visit only what they wished to interpret. This wishful interpretation dealt with the alleged gulf within the Indian Communist Party over loyalties to Peking and Moscow respectively. Comrade Suslov had arrived, it was popularly believed by the Indian analysts, "to resolve this conflict" between the factions of the Communist Party.

The dominant premise from which most Indian analyses on the Communist Party of India are derived currently is the issue of Chinese aggression against India. The CPI, cashing in on the shortness of public memory (in erudite language known as lack of a sense of history!!), has managed to rehabilitate itself considerably as a respectable political party instead of the international conspiracy that it is. With the Amritsar thesis, the CPI obtained enormous respectability from among the bourgeoisie in India which it is uncompro-

missingly committed to liquidate. With this respectability, reinforced by its running a government in Kerala for more than 2 years, and by numerous leaders in the ruling party consciously or unconsciously espousing many of its causes, the CPI has been able to present an image in the Indian mind of just a "National" political party like any other in India. The Communist Party of India has successfully assuaged Indian opinion of any fears about its extra-territorial moorings and motivations.

In this background, the CPI congress confabulations were analysed in the limited context of affairs that immediately affect India nationally and internationally. When analysed thus, the CPI policies and attitudes were found to be in closer harmony with the ruling party's policies internally and externally. The only point of sharp conflict was Chinese aggression. On this question, commentators followed the currently fashionable remedy against Chinese aggression, viz., "the good friend of India,—the USSR—will settle this problem for us." As Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon has been frequently saying; there was "considerable significance" in the fact that "the Soviet Union has not so far come out in support of China" in her aggression against India!!

Thus, the CPI confabulations were narrowly placed in the framework of Chinese aggression against India. After this, it was easy to rationalise and build up various theses about the CPI. It has been asserted that the Indian Communist Party is beset with two conflicting factions, one "nationalist" led by Comrade Dange, and the other "Internationalists" led by Comrade Ranadive. The next stage of the rationalisation was even more interesting. The "Nationalists" were pro-Moscow and the "Internationalists" were pro-Peking!! Moscow is associated with "liberalism, peaceful transition to socialism" etc., and Peking with "warmongering, extreme left-wing adventurism" etc. The obtuseness associating "Nationalist" wing with Moscow lies in the attempt to credit Moscow with willingness to recognize "national independence" of non-Communist States, which means the "Nationalists" of the CPI would not have extra-territorial loyalties, and would remain patriots. The pro-Peking "Internationalists," merely because they supported China's claims against India, were traitors. This was the very limited and whimsical perspective with which the CPI congress was being interpreted.

The reality was of course something entirely different. The factions within the CPI were nothing new, and were not the result of Chinese aggression. Factions in the CPI have existed right from the inception of the CPI, as it existed in the Soviet Union or in any Communist Party. The factions were the result of differences over the strategy and tactics to be followed at any given time or over a long period, over the interpretation

of the "objective situation" as the communists would call it.

The existing factions in the CPI have been there more or less in the same fixed positions for years. These factions are based on the passionately conflicting interpretations of the "objective situation" in India and on the basis of such interpretations, evolving the strategy and tactics for the party. The issues in India that have been evaluated and studied by the various factions in the CPI relate to:—

1. The extent and degree of class conflict obtaining in India.

2. The role of Pandit Nehru, his relationship with the ruling party. The extent of his "progressiveness" and the extent of his capacity to "compromise with reaction."

3. The role of "other progressive and reactionary forces," problems of united front with them.

4. The significance of "massive Socialist aid to India" and the extent of "Imperialist penetration" through aid.

5. The record of India in the matter of foreign policy questions. etc., etc.

These are some of the many issues over which there are dogfights within the CPI, and factions result out of such interpretations and tactics. On such factions the Chinese aggression got grafted and found expression this way or that.

The basic purposes and aims of the CPI have not changed one bit. There has never been any conflict over these basic purposes and aims. All the support which the CPI seemingly gives to "progressive policies" of the Nehru Government, just as the Soviet Union does, are like the "support a rope gives to the hung"—an appropriate phrase coined by Lenin himself.

Comrade Suslov arrived in India not to make the "Chinese faction in the CPI" to change its line to support the Soviet line. He was very much needed by the CPI, and he too needed the CPI to work out complex strategy and tactics for the CPI for the future in India. It is significant that no resolutions were passed on Chinese aggression against India, and Comrade Suslov never committed himself one bit

about this question. While he was gracious enough not to say that he supported the Chinese against India in this issue—a fact which seems to give immense gratification to Mr. V.K. Krishna Menon—he was equally careful not to appear as supporting India. On the other hand, Times or India News Service reported: "Two top leaders of the Soviet Communist Party attending the CPI Congress confessed to the Times of India News Service that the Central Committee of the Soviet CP, in conveying the 'wishes' of the Soviet Prime Minister Mr. Khrushchev, had specifically asked the CPI not to say or do anything that would further estrange Sino-Indian relations and generate 'more bitterness in China'."

With Comrade Suslov in their midst, and announcing the safe return to earth of the Soviet astronaut, the factions stopped their quarrelling and unanimously accepted the political and organizational report as presented by the Moscow-approved hierarchy within the CPI.

There were certain amusing sidelights to the convention. Taking the cue from Moscow converting the "Friendship University" into "Lumumba University," the CPI convention site was named "Lumumbanagar." Certain African delegates who were to hoist the flag at Lumumbanagar were subsequently dropped "as the party found" they belonged to other tribes than Mr. Lumumba's!! The Italian Communist fraternal delegate expressed disgust at the wrangling indulged in by the various factions. In spite of the "secrecy" enjoined to be observed by all delegates, rival factions raced with each other to get the ears of news correspondents to give them scoops discrediting their rival factions.

Coming to the serious questions, what is the future strategy of the CPI? The answer is to be found not in the party's published resolutions, but in a significant little booklet that has been published by the Czechoslovak Communist Party on "peaceful transition to Socialism." In this book, the blue print is given as to how Parliament could be utilised to sharpen the class struggle and effect a *coup d'état*. The Czechoslovak example of how this was done, with the able backing of the occupying Red Army was cited. In India that "objective condition" of a red army of occupation was not there until Tibet was conquered and Chinese invaded India. Now it is there and the Chinese armed threat will be enough of a pressure *externally* to help generation of pressures *internally*. Then in between these two pressures, the slogan of "a government of National Unity" with communists taken into coalition, will become a reality. The harping on the theme of "alliance with progressive Congressmen" in generation of "peoples' struggles" is an interesting development in the strategy of the Communist Party of India. Taking this along with the significance attached to the importance given to "Socialist massive aid to India" under rupee accounts, will give startling answers about the real moves of the CPI and should help the powers that be in understanding the real nature of International Communist threat to India through the instrumentality of the CPI.

INDIAN TRADE UNIONS

A SURVEY

by V. B. Karnik

A survey of the trade union movement in India during the last forty years. It gives a graphic account of the various stages through which the movement passed. This is a book which all trade union workers should read.

pp 276+viii, demy 8 vo.

Price Rs 15.

PUBLISHERS

LABOUR EDUCATION SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

The Odds Against Democracy

by Rita Hinden

IT seems only yesterday that many of us in Britain were obsessed by the problem of how to put an end to colonial regimes, with all their injustices. We believed, with what now seems to have been a touching faith, that if only the institutions of self-government were speedily built up and a grounding in democracy given, new independent states would be created which would carry forward the best in our own political systems. Asian and African leaders were talking our own language; they were calling for the vote, for free elections, for civil liberties, for a Parliamentary system. In the British Colonies (about which alone I am qualified to speak) they would be satisfied with nothing less than the 'Westminster model' of Parliamentary government. Only remove the obstacles to independence, and their feet would tread firmly on the path towards democracy.

Yet in a few short years things have begun to go wrong. Democracy is not working in most of these countries as we had hoped. It is too soon to speak for them all, but we have only to think of Pakistan, Ceylon and Ghana to be filled with disquiet; we have only to hear the sort of argument that is prevalent among ex-colonial politicians and intellectuals for the disquiet to deepen. For they themselves are beginning to entertain doubts about democracy. True, 'one-man one-vote' is not questioned, but almost everything else is—civil liberties, the party system, free trade unions and co-operatives operating independently of governments, even the rule of law. Their argument is that their countries are still poor and weak; what they need is strong government and national unity if they are to achieve the rapid economic development which is their most urgent need; all the 'trappings' of British democracy are out of place in their particular conditions.

Into the rather gloomy musings born of these experiences in nascent democracies, a new train of thought—equally discouraging—has been injected by a well-known American sociologist, Professor Seymour Lipset. Professor Lipset has written a book called *Political Man*, in one section of which he lays down the objective social conditions which a stable democracy demands. Democracy, he claims, demands a certain level of economic development. It is only when a degree of economic advance has been achieved, that the people as a whole can be sufficiently educated to sustain democracy. Although a high level of education is not a *sufficient* condition for democracy (think of Germany under Hitler), it comes close to being a *necessary* one; a stable modern democracy has never yet been established among an uneducated people.

According to Professor Lipset the position is particularly dangerous for democracy in countries undergoing rapid economic development. Where there is

long-standing poverty, there may be intense conservatism (those who know something of the Africa and Asia of the past know this to be true.) But once economic development gets going, new horizons open out, disturbing comparisons are made, people become aware of new possibilities and impatient to seize them; democracy seems too slow and unwieldy a tool. Communism has had its triumphs not only in low-income countries, but in rapidly-industrializing and developing ones. It is quite wrong, therefore, to pin one's hope for democracy on economic development.

What are we to say to this? Are we to give up hope in face of this seductive thesis which experience in the emergent countries seems to confirm? The difficulty about accepting it is that it is based on a form of economic determinism which entirely rules out the human element, the will of man. It assumes, in the familiar Marxist style (though I am sure that was not the author's intention) that political systems (or superstructures) are the direct products of economic conditions, and that nothing that man can do can alter this inevitable fact. But is this really the only lesson to be learnt from the variety of political systems that the world has known? Have not great political thinkers, powerful leaders, strongly idealistic movements, the differing values inherent in differing cultures, also played their part? Economic conditions may give rise to certain tendencies, but tendencies can be counteracted, or moulded in different ways, according to the ideals which are cherished by a nation and its leaders.

India gives prospect that this may be possible. There is apparently nothing in her economic or social conditions from which democracy can draw hope; in addition powerful totalitarian winds blow from across the Chinese frontier. Yet so far democracy there has not failed. Why? Surely at least part of the answer is that India is being led by men who want and value democracy, that there is a class of intellectuals, administrators, politicians, who (largely through their contact with Britain) understand the working of Parliamentary democracy, are trained in how to operate it, and who are struggling hard, against great odds, to safeguard democratic institutions. If democracy survives in India, it will be not only because the five-year economic plans succeed—as is so often and far too glibly said—but because men and women fought for it and have tried to adapt its principles, developed in quite different circumstances, to the circumstances of their own country. If this can be done in India, can it not be done elsewhere? We in Britain have made the great mistake of allowing democracy to be identified with the one-man one-vote principle, so that to many Africans this now seems the heart of the matter and all the rest unnecessary trim-

(Continued on page 10)

Review

South Africa and the Rule of Law

International Commission of Jurists. Geneva. 1960. 239 Pages. Price \$ 1.00.

WITH South Africa's expulsion, euphemistically termed by the Press as withdrawal, from the Commonwealth, this report by the International Commission of Jurists on the Rule of Law, or more precisely the absence of it, in South Africa, offers a timely justification for the castigation and ostracism of this hate-ridden country from the community of nations. The Commission defines the term, Rule of Law, as "a dynamic concept for the expansion and fulfilment of which jurists are primarily responsible and which should be employed not only to safeguard and advance the civil and political rights of the individual in a free society, but also to establish social, economic, educational and cultural conditions under which his legitimate aspirations and dignity may be realised."

It follows from this definition that what is to be upheld is not merely the adherence of the State with the formal correctness of a legislative measure but the compatibility of the social content of legislation with the basic principles of human rights. What is appalling in South Africa is not the violation of the Rule of Law in the formal sense of the term but the use of law as a potent instrument for the oppression of its people. The South African Government has woven an intricate web of legal measures to oppress its people. When the Courts have ruled some of these measures to be unconstitutional, the South African Government amended the Constitution itself. In all this the South African Government has ensured an ostensible outward adherence to the letter of the law. But justice according to the law can be nothing save injustice when the laws themselves are unjust.

The Commission viewed the South African "experiment" in the background of the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Commission holds the racial clarification of the South African Government as violative of Article I of the Declaration; its laws relating to movement and residence as infringing Article 13; its measures relating to work and trade unions as encroaching on Article 23; its repressive measures on the individual rights and freedoms as undermining the essence of Article 2; its misguided views on miscegenation as a breach of Article 16; its disregard for the concept of equality before the law as subversive of Article 7; its provisions in regard to arbitrary arrest and detention as a repudiation of Articles 9, 10 and 11; its suppression of the freedom of opinion and expression as an infringement of Article 19; its prohibition of the rights to peaceful assembly and association as a violation of Article 20; and its educational policy as a flagrant breach of Article 26.

To this long catalogue of crimes and aggravations

must be added the South African Government's blatant defiance of the authority of the United Nations in refusing to comply with the provisions of the Charter by turning South-West Africa into a trusteeship territory.

The Commonwealth of Nations is not an international organisation in the strictly legal sense of the term. Membership in the Commonwealth involves no legal rights or obligations. But not so membership in an international organisation like the United Nations. The Charter of the UN is a multilateral Convention and has the binding force of a treaty on all those States that have acceded to it. Even if it be argued that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on which the International Commission of Jurists bases its report on South Africa, has no binding force on the Member-States of the UN, there can be no question that the Charter of the UN is certainly binding on all its members; and Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter establish beyond doubt that Member-States are bound to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the UN to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

If the expulsion of South Africa from the Commonwealth, membership in which imposes no obligations, was deemed desirable, there is certainly much more force in the argument that South Africa must be expelled from the United Nations. Unfortunately, the Charter has no provision relating to expulsion of members. But notwithstanding this lacuna in the Charter, the expulsion of a member guilty of a deliberate and systematic defiance of the authority of the United Nations is the logical course to adopt. The legal community the world over owes a debt of gratitude to the International Commission of Jurists for focussing its attention on the moral depravity which lies beneath the legal system of South Africa. It is to be hoped that lawyers everywhere will seize upon this timely and valuable document to buttress their case against South Africa and attempt to enforce on the government of that country adherence to the principles of the Charter and, should they fail, seek the expulsion of that country from the UN and leave her to the consequent ostracism of the civilised community of nations.

—ANAND MOHAN

(Continued from page 9)

mings, nice perhaps as a luxury which prosperous countries can indulge in, but unnecessary and unsuitable for themselves. What we have to insist on is that a political system which does not allow for an opposition, which does not permit the freedoms of speech, of the press, of association and conscience on which an opposition and numerous voluntary associations can flourish, which does not encourage the growth of a vigilant public opinion, is not a democracy at all, but some form of authoritarianism. It is, in blunt words, a tyranny or a dictatorship.

—Condensed from *Socialist Commentary*

WITHOUT COMMENT (Contd. from page 4)

observation he had made at the meeting of the commission today.

The French delegate had said "even in this part of the world (Asia) there is a great threat to peaceful co-existence. This is because one neighbouring country has committed aggression on one of the largest democracies in the world."

The Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Lucio Lussatto, an Italian legislator, implored the French delegate to take back his words to ensure that the commission's work went on smoothly.

—*Hindustan Times*, March 26.

New Delhi, March 25—Pandit Sunder Lal, president of the Indian Peace Council, declared today that the Chinese occupation of 12,000 sq. miles of Indian territory constituted "no threat to world peace whatsoever," and that was why neither he nor any other Indian member had raised the issue at the current conference of the World Peace Council.

He also claimed "tacit understanding" between him and the Government of India that the problem should not be discussed during the conference.

This disclosure by Pandit Sunder Lal at the press briefing organised by the sponsors of the peace conference gave rise to confusion because correspondents wanted to ask more questions and the Peace Council authorities tried hard to prevent further discussion of the problem.

The confusion was heightened by Pandit Sunder Lal's further claim that the "tacit understanding" had been reached with no less a person than Mr. Nehru.

—*Statesman*, March 26.

New Delhi, March 26—Details are available today of a fierce row which developed behind closed doors between the communist delegates to the Peace Council session and other delegates who wished to raise the Sino-Indian border dispute during the current session of the World Peace Council here.

At a closed door meeting of the Indian delegation several members of the Peace Council made strong speeches attacking the Chinese aggression against India. These speakers demanded that the subject should be inscribed on the agenda of the plenary session of the Peace Council.

At this stage the President of the All-India Peace Council, Pandit Sunder Lal, got up and claimed that Mr. Nehru had asked the organisers of the conference "not to raise the Sino-Indian dispute as it will not help in the final solution of differences between the two countries."

It is reported the Indian delegation was further told that "Prime Minister Nehru believed that the border dispute is a matter which can only be negotiated by the two governments and its discussion by the Peace Council will only aggravate matters."

Delegates, who were completely taken by surprise by this advice attributed to Mr. Nehru, decided not to pursue the subject.

—*Evening News of India*, March 27.

New Delhi, March 26—The Secretary of the World Peace Council has pulled up Mr. Sunder Lal, Chair-

man of the Presidential Committee of the Indian Peace Council, for his "laxity" in making a statement at a news conference about the "tacit" understanding between him and the Prime Minister Mr. Nehru on the attitude to be adopted by the Council regarding the Sino-Indian border dispute, according to informed sources here.

—*Indian Express*, March 27.

New Delhi, March 27—Prime Minister Nehru described in the Lok Sabha today that the World Peace Council, holding its session currently in the capital, was an organisation which, despite its desire to work for peace, indulged in warlike declarations.

Replying to a stormy debate raised as a result of a short-notice question by Mr. Mahavir Tyagi, Mr. Nehru disclosed that he had told the leader of the Indian delegation, Mr. Sunder Lal, that the acid test for the council was to consider, in the right way, the Sino-Indian boundary issue, although the council was disinclined to discuss it.

The Prime Minister characterised as most objectionable certain denunciatory statements against India made by the Chinese delegation and its subsequent walkout from the meeting.

Mr. Nehru indicated that the policy of the Government of India was not to prevent any international or other organisation from holding meetings in India and exercising freedom of expression. Although there had been no basic change in the original attitude of the Government of India towards the Peace Council, Mr. Nehru observed that the council had dropped some of its objectionable features. Mr. Nehru did not dilate on what these features were. The Indian Government had given no help to the conference currently in session.

—*Indian Express*, March 28.

New Delhi, March 29—The Chinese clashed with some of the Western delegates and threatened to walk out from the World Peace Council conference last night, according to informed sources.

It appears that matters came to a head when a Western delegate suggested at a closed-door meeting of one of the commissions that a formal statement on the India-China border dispute was called for.

The Chinese delegation felt really touched on the raw when an Englishman, who was instrumental in securing the Government's permission for holding the conference here, said that China's action against India was not in conformity with the Bandung principles which the two countries had jointly sponsored.

At this stage the Chinese delegation threatened to walk out after calling in some of the familiar communist epithets for the West.

This disturbing denouement was prevented strangely enough by the siding of some of the Indians with the Chinese. The persons who are said to have interceded for the Chinese were Pandit Sunder Lal, Gen. Sokhey, a Stalin Peace Prize Winner and Prof. D. D. Kosambi, a well-known Marxist scholar from Maharashtra.

The commission's session broke up infructuously in the small hours of this morning.

—*Hindustan Times*, March 30.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

A large chunk of the forces of the right are in the Congress. At the same time the bulk of those who are our potential allies are also inside the Congress.

—Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of Communist Party of India, *Link*, April 23.

You will not wage war on the top of the Himalayas and also you will not wage war unless you are forced to do it.

—V. K. Krishna Menon, addressing the Allahabad University Student's Union, *Hindu*, March 19.

India does not wish to fight over the Himalayan ranges, but if China has any intention of coming down the Himalayan slopes and entering the plains, then we are prepared to give her warm reception, warmer than she might expect.

—V. K. Krishna Menon, *Hindustan Times*, April 24.

Still, it is a mercy Mr. Menon has not talked of fighting the Chinese on the beaches of India.

—S. M., *Hindustan Times*, April 26.

No one who has watched the course of affairs since 1957 can have any doubt that what Mr. Krishna Menon wants is not a straightforward, non-political army, but an army subservient to him, willing and anxious to carry out all his wishes.

—A. D. Gorwala, *Janata*, April 23.

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

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.

I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3|

Name:

Address:

Signature

The fact is that the reported dynamism of the Defence Minister (Mr. Krishna Menon) is merely nervous activity, which does more harm than good.

—Acharya Kripalani, M.P., *Current*, April 19.

It is difficult to say who is right and who is wrong in Cuba. We have no knowledge of the conditions there. Nor are we competent to pass a judgment.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Hindustan Times*, April 23.

Free people in all parts of the world do not accept the claim of historical inevitability for communist revolution. The great revolution in the history of man, past, present and future, is the revolution of those determined to be free.

—President Kennedy in his reply to Khrushchev, *Indian Express*, April 26.

Castro as a Cuban nationalist could count on much sympathy in neighbouring countries, but Castro as a stooge of foreign powers would invite only scorn and ridicule.

—Thought, April 22.

The Communist Party puts India and China on the same footing. It makes it appear that India is as guilty as China. The fact of the matter is that there is aggression made by China on India and the CPI wants to put India and China on the same level.

—Lal Bahadur Shastri, Home Minister, *Times of India*, April 25.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

A VISIT TO INDIA
John Wain

SIX AFRICANS
Brian Crozier

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP
C. A. R. Crosland

May 1961

92

Annual Rs. 12/-

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