

## Security And Public Services

V. B. Karnik

COMMUNISTS have taken strong exception to a circular said to have been issued by a Secretary of the Government of Bihar. The circular was on the subject of "screening of selected members of the Village Volunteer Force for rifle training." The direction in the circular which has roused the ire of Communists is as follows: "No selection for rifle training need be made in the Panchayats under communist or anti-national influence." The weekly journal of the Communist Party, *New Age*, has characterised the circular as "Anti-Communist Hysteria" and, angry at being described as "anti-national", it has appealed to the Home Ministry of the Government of India to "take action against the undemocratic and anti-national decision" embodied in the circular.

It is easy to understand the anger and resentment of Communists. If the circular is allowed to stand, it will stop their and their agents' infiltration into the Village Volunteer Force and those selected for rifle training. They may not attach much importance to the Village Volunteer Force or to rifle training. But they regard it as a thin end of the wedge. If Communists are to be denied these opportunities at the bottom, how can they be allowed similar opportunities at higher levels, in the defence service, in auxiliary and other formations, in ordnance factories and in sensitive departments and agencies of the Government? They are afraid that the policy enunciated in the Bihar circular may become the policy of the Central and all State Governments. It will then make it difficult for them to pursue their present basic aim of worming their way into positions of strategic importance in the machinery of the Government. They are moreover angry at being called "anti-national", when they are trying so much to pose as nationalists. They know that the whole game of their present tactic and strategy will be lost if they do not succeed in getting themselves accepted as nationalists. The Bihar circular defeats that objective as well as the plan of infiltration in government services.

Whatever the reaction of Communists, the Bihar circular raises the crucial issue of security in government services and the danger that the presence of Communists represents to it. The issue requires to be considered in the particular context of the war that the country has been compelled to wage against the aggression of a communist Power. The questions that

call for clear answers are: Are not Communists a grave security risk when the country is engaged in a war against communist China? Is it possible to depend upon Communists to work actively for the defeat of a communist Power? Will it not be wise and expedient to err on the safe side and to exclude Communists from all positions in government services and other activities where it may be possible for them to endanger security?

The question must be considered and answered in the light of the knowledge of communist theory and practice. According to communist theory, every Communist is a soldier bound by the discipline and acting under the instructions of the international communist movement. His first loyalty is to that movement and not to his country or any other organisation to which he may belong. The interests of a communist State rank higher in his eyes than the interests of his country. Whatever that State does advances the cause of the world revolution and must be supported irrespective of all other considerations. Communists have on many occasions acted according to these principles and betrayed the interests of their countries for the sake of the interests of a communist Power. Many have acted as spies for Soviet Russia. Some amongst them were high-spirited, dedicated men who did what they did, not for filthy lucre but out of their devotion to the cause of world revolution. This type of men, who are to be found in every Communist Party and its fellow-travellers, are far more dangerous than ordinary spies. Because of their abilities and eminence they find entry into high places and into positions of trust and responsibility and can do grave damage to the security of a country. It is necessary to take special precautions against them.

It is true that at present some differences have developed between Russia and China. It is equally true that the dominant wing in the Communist Party of India is Moscow-orientated rather than Peking-orientated. But one cannot be too sure about the extent and the depth of those differences. They may be settled any time; and as long as both remain wedded to the same goal of expansion of communist domination, they will not allow them to come in the way of one communist country's war against another non-communist country. Indian Communists still regard China as a communist Power and as long as they continue to be Communists, China will have a claim on their loyalty and devotion. How far that claim will go and what it will compel them to do — it is difficult to say. It is likely that it may not go too far. But why should one play with fire? Why should one undertake a risk, more particularly when the issue involved is national security?

The correct answer to the questions will therefore

be that Communists are a security risk and should be kept away from all those positions where it may be possible for them to do anything that may cause damage to national security. An individual Communist may be as patriotic as anybody else, but as long as he is a Communist, there is a possibility of a conflict between his duty as a Communist and his duty as a citizen or a government servant. The Government must accept this possibility and, in view of it, exclude Communists from all posts which are regarded as sensitive from the point of view of security. This will apply particularly to posts in defence services and all other posts where work of a secret character is being done. Exclusion of Communists from all such posts should be accepted as a national policy and immediate steps should be taken for its implementation all over the country.

Great Britain was recently faced with a similar problem. In that country, the Communist Party is a legal organisation and it has friendly relations with Soviet Russia and a number of other communist countries. Taking advantage of this fact, Communists found entry into public services and acquired responsible positions in a number of service unions. Ordinarily the Government might not have taken notice of this fact. But during the last few years there were some serious cases of espionage in which it was discovered that communist countries had got hold of vital secret information through sources located in the services. In some cases, the guilty persons could be detected and were later sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. It became necessary as a result of these leaks to investigate the procedures established in services for the preservation of security. A Commission of Inquiry was appointed for the purpose under the Chairmanship of Lord Radcliffe. The Commission submitted its report in April 1962. It is a thoughtful document which deserves to be studied carefully by all those who are interested in the problem of security in public services. The Commission was alarmed by the "disproportionately high" communist representation in service unions. The report states: "We inquired into the penetration by Communists of the Civil Service Staff Association and trade unions and were disturbed at the number of Communists and Communist sympathisers who are holding positions in those bodies either as permanent full-time paid officials or as unpaid officers or members of executive committees. . . . We regard this presumably deliberate massing of communist effort in the Civil Service Unions as most dangerous to security, however one defines it."

The Commission found that there was not enough awareness in the higher circles in the services of the danger to security represented by the presence of Communists. It attributed it to "the ambivalent attitude on the part of the general public and of the government towards the Communist Powers and the Communist Party generally." The difficulties created by the ambivalent attitude were described by the Commission as follows:

"In time of war there is no doubt about the enemy's identity and a slogan 'Careless talk costs lives' can strike an immediate response in people's minds. In

a state of cold war the blacks and whites of wartime merge into a more neutral grey. Although the Soviet bloc and the Western Powers are at conflict on a number of fundamental issues, we are at the same time officially in friendly relations with the Soviet Powers and the Government is seen to be working hard towards an improvement of these relations and encouraging commercial, cultural and other contacts."

Stating that "the dangers of the present situation are aggravated by the fact that very few people are aware that they exist" the Commission recommended: "without jeopardising secret sources of information, Heads of Departments and Principal Establishment Officers should be told more frankly than we believe to be the present practice the scale of communist penetration of the Civil Service unions and should be warned of the identity of individual communists with whom they are likely to have dealings." It also recommended various other measures for tightening security arrangements.

Great Britain is compelled to take these steps even when she is not at war with a communist Power. India is at war with a communist Power. There is all the more reason why we should exercise a stricter watch on Communists in our country and more particularly those who are in public services. It is a fact well known to all that many of them and their fellow travellers are in services and service unions and enjoy the same facilities as others. A clear distinction must now be made between them and others on the basis of their political convictions and sympathies.

Communists and their friends will raise a clamour against such a policy and condemn it as an exhibition of McCarthyism. They forget however, that the policy is being suggested when the country is at war against a communist Power and only in relation to those posts which are sensitive from the point of view of national security. No country can wage a war against another country and at the same time keep in such posts those who are ideologically aligned with that country. We have been so long rather indifferent to the problem of security in our services. We adopted a policy of friendship with all countries and, believing that it will be reciprocated, did not think it particularly necessary to enforce strict regulations about security and to test the reliability of all those who entered government services. Now that a fight has been forced upon us we cannot afford to continue our old policy of indifference. We have to be particularly vigilant about Communists as our enemy is a communist Power. During the last few years Communists and Communist sympathisers had a free entry into all services and, once in service, they could occupy any posts. In view of the Chinese aggression, it is not possible to continue that position any longer. There must be a strict scrutiny of the political opinions and sympathies of all government employees and those with regard to whom there is the least suspicion must be excluded from all those posts which deal with matters of national security. It is true that in our country no government employee is allowed to become a member of a political party. But it is not the formal membership of a party which is relevant

(Continued on page 3)

# Individual Liberty And The Law

S. Natarajan

IT will be recalled that in the earlier days of the emergency three persons were detained mysteriously and as mysteriously released. In fact, it was only when the question of their detention was raised in the Lok Sabha that it was disclosed that they had already been released a few days earlier. An even more curious incident has since taken place. Some politician, unnamed but vaguely indicated as a P.S.P. man, said in a speech in November that rather than see him surrender an inch of territory to the Chinese he would shoot the Prime Minister. This extravagance was reported in an Urdu newspaper in January and here it was seen by the Union Home Minister. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri checked on it through the Central Intelligence Bureau in March and drew the attention of the Chief Secretary of the State concerned that action under the Defence of India Rules should be taken. In April, he mentioned the matter casually in the Lok Sabha and involved the House in a protracted controversy over it. Finally, on the ground that it is not in the public interest to reveal more details, the Home Minister and the leader of the P.S.P. party in the Lok Sabha held private discussions and emerged with a mutual exchange of compliments.

Several points emerge from this incident. The man spoke in November when both in the Government and among opposition parties there prevailed the agony of a painful awakening. The State Government did not consider it a very serious matter; the public would seem to have dismissed it from their minds; the Urdu newspaper which published the statement two months later, presumably did it to ridicule the speaker — since it has not provoked Mr. Shastri's wrath. Two months more elapsed before Mr. Shastri stirred up matters again by prodding the State Government to act; one more month and he brings it up in the Lok Sabha and, when it attracts attention, proceeds to invoke the blanket of public interest to muffle it up. This suggests administrative ineptness and an indecent anxiety to invite trouble. No Home Minister with a modicum of political sense would

*(Continued from page 2)*

here but political convictions, sympathies and associations. It may not be always easy to decide what they are but, once the principle is accepted, it may not be too difficult to evolve some tests which will give the necessary information and will not be at the same time unjust or unfair to employees.

In any case, let the Communist Party of India know that, as long as the conflict with China lasts, it will be under a cloud of suspicion and will not be allowed to claim as a matter of right equal treatment with other patriotic and nationalist parties. Its political convictions and ideological sympathies place it in a different category. That, it should know, is not the opinion of one official in Bihar but of the whole country.

seek thus to revive a twice-dead issue; if it is not in the public interest to disclose further facts, it was certainly as much against it to act as Mr. Shastri did. Equally reprehensible is the attitude of the opposition parties who showed an unseemly eagerness to disown the politician, virtually throwing him to the administrative wolves even while winning the point that no one should be condemned on the evidence of police reports.

There is another question here affecting parliamentary responsibility which needs serious consideration — specially as the pattern seems to be becoming common: That is the trend towards settling public issues privately between a Minister and one of the leaders of the opposition parties. Mr. Shastri gets into a huddle with Mr. Dwivedi. Oil Minister K. D. Malaviya, after an exchange of heated words followed by an interchange of compliments with another M.P., offers to convince the P.S.P. leader, Mr. Nath Pai, of his incorruptibility by showing him all the relevant papers. A Minister should be responsible to Parliament — not to Mr. Dwivedi or Mr. Nath Pai or any other M. P. however important or troublesome he may be. Here are not personal issues and they cannot be settled on a personal basis. How Parliament can permit itself to be bypassed in this manner is an inexplicable mystery.

Ministerial bad manners are infectious. In the State of Maharashtra, the Home Minister invoked the Defence of India Rules to take Mr. George Fernandes and Mr. Janardhan Upadhye, President and Secretary of the Bombay Taximen's Union, into custody on April 5. This was followed by a one-day taxi strike and demonstrations for the release of the two men. All of which placed a heavy strain on an already overworked police force. In a press conference held after the houses of the State legislature had been prorogued, Mr. P. K. Savant, the State Home Minister, declared that the arrests had nothing to do with the trade union activities of the men, referred to the "unprecedented measure of industrial peace" enjoyed in the State since the emergency was declared, and concluded that "it was not in the public interest to furnish any further details." He also explained that Mr. Fernandes was guilty of trying to create disaffection among the police and had "sought to impose his own schedule of taxi fares in utter disregard of the public interest and the law" — "such activities, in the context of the present emergency, being anti-national and adversely affecting the defence effort."

Mr. Savant's reservations in the public interest again demonstrate a failure to appreciate the facts of the situation. What he has revealed only adds to the confusion, and further details would only presume, merely lead to greater clarity which is to be desired. His preventive action has precipitated the very state of affairs he wished to avoid — there are all kinds of talk about launching strikes, for one thing, and Mr.

Fernandes' supporting Socialists are indulging in wild threats which no Government, resistant to blackmail, can ignore. Had Mr. Fernandes been allowed to try out his own schedule of taxi fares, he would have been a much discredited man. Taxi-men know better than anyone that the public will not agree to pay more than the legal fares. If, again, he was trying to pervert the police, he could well have been proceeded against under the ordinary law. The effect of the present policy has been to make Mr. Fernandes into a martyr, and even leaders of the P.S.P. who are generally cynical of the Socialist leaders are cutting loose from the defence committee.

Apart from the detention of the two leaders, "there was a round-up of bad characters at various places in the city, numbering 332." These, it may be said, are not politicians but individuals whom the police

have under their eyes and whom they usually lock up temporarily in times of trouble. They are the persons whom the Police Commissioner has the authority to deport from Bombay City. There is no precise definition of "a bad character" but it conveys the meaning that the individual so designated is of known criminal tendencies and a menace to healthy civic life. It is not known why these men are not removed from the city where their opportunities for mischief are obviously maximum. It might even lead to an improvement in their conduct so that they too partake of the benefits that such a removal would effect. This is a matter which the Home Minister of Maharashtra might usefully devote some thought to. It is strange that, when in so many directions the Government has accepted the concept of purposeful functioning, it should continue to pursue a policy of inaction in this field.

## Failure Of Gold Control In Russia

Roman O. Zybenko

THE USSR is the second producer of gold in the world, after South Africa. Between 1946 and 1958 the average annual Soviet production was 15 million ounces, while the South African average for the same period was 17.7 million ounces. The averages of other gold-producing countries for the same period were considerably lower: Canada—4.4 million ounces, USA—1.7 million, Australia—1 million.

Observation of the world market shows that the Soviet government parts with its gold very unwillingly. It sells gold only when it is compelled to by domestic or foreign economic circumstances. After the heavy sale of Soviet gold on the international market in 1947 in order to rebuild the war-shattered economy, a large amount (2.1 million ounces) was sold at the end of 1953, apparently in order to assist the Soviet Zone of Germany after the Berlin uprising.

Like all other industries in the Soviet Union, gold-mining is a state monopoly. Authorized gold-mining is done in two different ways—through state undertakings using equipment of advanced design, and through prospecting "artels" or cooperative enterprises, which mine the gold by fairly primitive methods. According to Soviet law, the artels are required to keep strict accounts and to deliver their gold to the state only. But in fact the law is frequently violated, according to an article by E. Gorelov and A. Krylov in *Ekonomicheskaya gazeta* (November 24, 1962). Local authorities and state receiving centre's permit operations by private prospectors or "voluntary producers," who receive permission to mine, acquire the gold without official supervision and accordingly are able to dispose of a large part of their gold on the black market. According to the same article, gold is stolen in the artels, the state mines and the washing and concentrating mills. For instance, 50 kilograms of "unrecipitated" gold was found in the apartment of a certain Shumilin, an inspector of the Magadan mine; another 13 kilograms was found in the possession of two

passengers at Magadan airport. The article goes on:

"The theft of gold at the Ynykchan mine is a frequent occurrence. The mine foreman Dyachkov, the cashiers of the gold-receiving office Borodin and Gordievsky and an operator of the washing apparatus, Mindayeva, systematically appropriated gold and sold it to dealers. A large group of gold thieves was active in Tygda raion of Amur Oblast. Amongst the criminals were the state controller of one of the districts, Verkhoturov, the monitor Ergashev, the gold-carrier Kosach, the mine foreman Mysak and others."

"Dealers and speculators," says the same article, come to the goldfields from every part of the Soviet Union:

"These people come together from all ends of the country to the eastern areas during the summer washing season like flies after jam and often win over undependable workers to crime."

They sell the gold thus obtained to jewellers, dental technicians, makers of ornaments, and so on at exorbitant prices. In Sverdlovsk Oblast one such group fashioned more than 30 kilograms of gold into rings, ear-rings and bracelets in a short period of time. According to the same newspaper, there are underground networks of private suppliers and consumers of gold, as well as middlemen. The Black market in gold, they maintain:

"... is to a large extent favoured by the obviously imperfect system of gold prices fixed for prospectors and voluntary producers. This is a very important problem requiring the most careful study."

While the Soviet press reflects serious misgiving regarding the use of "private channels" by dentists and jewellers to obtain gold for their professional work, the fact that "gold stolen from the state leaks through other channels also" causes the Soviet government the greatest alarm. Large quantities, it is reported, are accumulated in private hands and disappear underground. In connection with the trial

of a group of large-scale currency dealers in Kharkov, the newspaper *Pravda Ukrainy* recently declared:

"About six kilograms of gold, including 330 objects of gold, platinum and silver, 48 gold watches and many diamonds were discovered in the possession of the accused and were confiscated.... They had hidden them in soap, kitchen walls, the doors of a garage, under the pavement and even in a grave." (January 5, 1963)

The Soviet press abounds in similar reports of "criminal deals" by various "hoarders and money-grubbers" whose hoards of jewels and gold had been confiscated. An article entitled "Dirty Gold," in *Izvestia* (October 3, 1962), throws light on the large scale of these operations. One group operated over the whole of the country:

"The Moscow 'currency speculators' bought gold from foreigners and it passed through the hands of a third person to Zaitov, who was also receiving gold stolen from distant mines. He forwarded it to his agents in Tashkent, Andizhan, Bukhara and Tiflis. There it was resold to local plunderers of socialist property, who had gained so much money by stealing that they did not know what to do with it."

The gold, said the article, was illegally transported throughout the country, mainly by the children of the directors of the "enterprise." One of the "couriers" is described as follows: "a modern young man... with an athletic physique and good-looking, an excellent metal craftsman and fitter, a passionate football player." Another "courier" was the daughter of one of the directors and was a graduate of the Plekhanov Institute in Moscow. It is characteristic that most of the young people in the organization had completed a higher education and in many cases were Party members. Another director of the enterprise, Makhmutov, had three children—one son, a major in the army, and two daughters, one a lawyer, the other a doctor. "These people," says the newspaper, "connected with the criminal world, wore a 'mask for going out' and 'for a long time lived a double life.' The earnings of the members of the organization were very high. One of the female members in Moscow was found to possess six kilograms of gold in coin and nuggets, pearls, some strings of which were valued at 20,000 new roubles, 50,000 roubles in cash and State Loan Bonds to the value of hundreds of thousands of roubles."

The same paper, *Izvestia* (January 27, 1963), in an article entitled "The Octopus Made Harmless," reports the case of a Leningrad currency dealer, Zuikov, director of a commercial centre, who acquired a million roubles' worth of property. It was discovered that he had a "museum-storeroom" containing pictures by the famous artists Aivazovsky and Shishkin, cans full of gold, more than one thousand tsarist coins, valuable diamonds, several thousand American dollars and, finally, an enormous medallion, the size of a large saucer, with a bas-relief of the Emperor Alexander II, also of pure gold. He did not keep his gold ingots at home, but had buried them in a cemetery, in the grave of his own daughter.

Further reports in *Izvestia* (February 3, 1963) and

*Radyanska Ukraina* (February 3, 1963) deal with the trial of two "bands" of speculators in gold, diamonds and foreign currency on an enormous scale. The members were of various nationalities and strata of the population—one member was a fighter pilot. Both these organizations also forged money and sold it. There was an electroplating workshop in Leningrad, and members of the Kharkov group manufactured gold ten-rouble pieces to look like tsarist coinage and became the suppliers of a highly profitable underground mint.

All categories of the Soviet population who have excess money—higher Party officials and economic administrators, senior officers in the armed forces and ordinary speculators—are interested in gold. Many of them, unable to use their high salaries to buy their own houses, automobiles, motor cycles, television sets, refrigerators etc., invest their money in the foreign currency and gold acquired by others through theft from the state. Ordinary Soviet citizens, however, also often buy gold to lay away "for a rainy day," even at the expense of giving up basic necessities of life. The recent introduction of the death penalty for speculation in gold and foreign currency shows the extent of this type of crime in the Soviet Union.



"Friends, voters, Muslims..."

—Courtesy: *Hindustan Times*,

# The Spirit Of Lincoln

A. B. Shah

OF the political leaders of the nineteenth century, no one perhaps has greater significance than Abraham Lincoln for the contemporary world. This is especially true for India. For, when faced with the historic choice of the twentieth century, namely, the choice between democracy and totalitarianism of one hue or another, she unreservedly opted for democracy soon after she became free. Most other nations, which gained freedom after the second World War, have either gone communist or slid back into some form of native authoritarianism. Of the very few that still remain committed to democracy in Asia and Africa, India obviously is the most important. For if democracy takes root in India, that would, of course, mean the saving of the sub-continent from communism. But it would also demonstrate to the people of other underdeveloped countries that rapid economic progress does not necessarily demand democracy as its price; that democracy, on the contrary, releases the springs of human creativity and ensures that their waters shall be equally accessible to all. This is more than what can be said for totalitarianism of any type. However, it is not enough to argue this on the basis of Western experience. It is necessary to demonstrate its validity with the example of an underdeveloped society. On the fate of democracy in India will, therefore, depend to a considerable extent the future of freedom in Asia and Africa, and, perhaps, in the rest of the world. India's struggle since 1947 to strengthen the foundations of her democratic system has to be viewed in this perspective in order to appreciate the magnitude of the stakes involved in it.

Unfortunately, however, there is no law, nor enough empirical evidence to suggest that a nation which is called upon to play a key role at a turning point of history would invariably be equipped for it. Nor is there anything very surprising in this. For in the mosaic of cultures that the world is, there is no reason to expect that the development of a particular society would of necessity be commensurate with the tasks it has to face. Often these latter would be posed by forces over which it had no control. Wisdom in such a situation would seem to lie, not in condemning the time as out of joint—which is but another way of blaming others for one's difficulties—but in developing clarity of thought and purpose as a precondition to intelligent, adequate and resolute action.

Now one characteristic of the Spirit of Lincoln, as I understand it, was precisely this. His thought was clear and his action resolute, however much it went against his own natural inclination. For example, Lincoln hated slavery, but was prepared to accept the 'argument of necessity' and allow it to continue, convinced that the inner logic of free institutions will in course of time lead to its disappearance. But he was clear that he would not permit 'the extension of a bad thing' even if preventing its extension meant a

civil war and the possible break-up of the United States of America.

Lincoln did not want war; he was basically a man of peace. He certainly did not wish that he should be called upon by Providence to preside over the disintegration of the Union, as a result of an internecine war. What then was it that gave this man of peace and unity the inner poise and the unshakable conviction that no price was too great for preventing the extension of slavery to the northern states? The answer, I submit, lies in his belief, mentioned above, in the dynamics of freedom. It may be briefly formulated thus: Liberty, if not forced to contract, will, by its own nature, go on expanding until it has swept away all the obstacles in its path. Its obvious converse would be: Slavery, if not allowed to expand, will, by its own inner stresses and strains, begin to contract and ultimately disappear. In other words, Lincoln had perceived that containment of evil would, in the long run and at a much lower cost, result in the liberation from evil. The moral for contemporary statesmen, though obvious, is apt to be partly missed. Lest there should be any misunderstanding, let me state it in brief. Containment is a better policy than liberation, but *only if one is prepared to make the necessary sacrifice for an effective containment of evil*. Containment thus has nothing in common with isolationism, appeasement, or that bane of romantic statesmen, namely, self-deception.

What was the driving force behind Lincoln's policy—in his case, one could call it the principle—of containment? Here, again, Lincoln stands out among the statesmen of his time or ours. For him containment was not, as I mentioned a moment ago, isolation, still less, appeasement. His willingness to put up with slavery where it already existed did not prevent him from condemning it as an evil. For Lincoln, the unalienable rights of man, of which the Declaration of Independence spoke and which included 'Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness', were the heritage of *all*, not only of the white men; the 'government of the people, by the people, for the people' was to be a government of all, the white and the black, the yellow and the brown. That, according to Lincoln, was the spirit of the Constitution. For, "it was not the mere matter of the separation of the Colonies from the motherland; but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of the country, but, I hope, to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time *the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men*." Lincoln would have rejected out of hand the specious arguments of those who would sacrifice freedom, even if it be of others, to secure peace or the goodwill of the enemies of freedom. To one such argument he explicitly referred with contempt in the following words:

"But, slavery is good for some people!!! As a good

thing, slavery is strikingly peculiar, in this, that it is the only good thing which no man ever seeks the good of, for himself.

Nonsense! Wolves devouring lambs, not because it is good for their own greedy maws, but because it is good for the lambs !!!

There is another aspect of the Spirit of Lincoln which needs mention in this age of self-appointed peace-makers. Lincoln believed that there could be no compromise with evil on the plane of ideas, even if one had to put up with it on the plane of action. In this he was like Gandhi. Both rebelled against ideological co-existence. Addressing an assembly of Republicans at the Cooper Institute in New York, he exhorted his countrymen thus: "Let us be diverted by none of those sophisticated contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man, . . . and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance."

To take up such an uncompromising attitude to evil requires faith in the people and in the love of liberty that resides in the heart of man, shall I say, as part of his nature. The spirit of Lincoln drew sustenance from this source. Indeed, it was the common people's love of liberty embodied in one of themselves and prepared to go, again and again, through the ordeal of fire in order to affirm its immortal life. History has stood witness to many such ordeals. Everytime, as in Lincoln's own time, the spirit of liberty has been born afresh even after crucifixion at the hands of the priests, or their easy-going instrument, the Pilate who, when confronted with evil, yielded to it, and asked "what is truth?" The people were behind Jesus of Nazareth, but their voice was not allowed to reach the ear of him who disposed of their destinies. But Lincoln was no Pilate. He believed that all authority was derived from the people and that the question which, as he put it, faced the whole family of man—the question, "whether a constitutional republic, or democracy can or cannot maintain its territorial integrity," has to be answered by the people themselves. He wanted the people to teach men that "what they cannot take by election, neither can they take by a war; teaching all the folly of being the beginners of war." And for this he relied on man's innate love of freedom, not merely on armies and battlements, as the French did in the thirties of this century. Raising the question, "what constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence?", he

replied, "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defence is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your own doors."

And that is why even in the midst of the Civil War, Lincoln was not prepared to suspend elections, let alone civil liberties. For if this were done, the rebellion "might fairly claim to have conquered and ruined us." Perhaps in Lincoln's time things were simpler; but it is difficult to imagine that a civil war could be less exacting than a phoney war of the type that the world was first to see for more than six months nearly twenty-five years ago. The difference lies, it seems to me, not so much in the demands of the war as in the degree to which the love of liberty is alive in the hearts of men.

It is the good fortune of the common people of the world that the Spirit of Lincoln is wide awake a century and half later in the land of its birth. It is the good fortune of the world that this spirit does not recognize any barriers of race or colour, but treads freely over land and sea—yea, even over the sea and in the air—to ensure that the flame of freedom, once lighted, shall not be put out again. No one, least of all a common Indian like me, who has not yet paid the price of freedom, is entitled to pay his tribute to this spirit. Or, maybe, I am. For like Lincoln, the common people all the world over, whenever they had an opportunity to choose between freedom and slavery, have expressed their choice in unambiguous language. As one of them, I consider myself Lincoln's kin, bound to him by bonds that have united lovers of freedom in different lands and climes, and inspired them to fight so that "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." And, therefore, anyone who stands for freedom and democracy, anywhere in the world, has the right to pay his tribute to Abraham Lincoln. He was not of America alone. He was not a politician, nor a statesman of the New World alone. He was a leader of mankind and he belongs to the whole world.

(Based on the speech delivered on February 12, 1963 on the occasion of the hundred-and-fifty-fourth birth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.)

## TATAR TRIOLET

Justly beloved Lives our Tsar,  
Our trust — alas, Rasputinized.  
Our peasants see his light a star,  
justly beloved.

Lives our Tsar  
dimmed by a cloud's dark cold, not far  
above, that holds him mesmerized  
justly?

Beloved lives our Tsar,  
our trust — alas, Rasputinized:

### FREEDOM FIRST

*Published on the first of each month*

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 nP

Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor,  
127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,  
Bombay 1.

# A Brave New World

M. D. Kini

**W**HAT is dogmatism? It can be defined as total commitment to a set of half-truths. The trouble with communism is, it is based on half-truths. Of course, communists claim that their faith is based on scientific knowledge. But any scientific theory is subject to alteration or revision in the light of new facts and new developments. And in communism revisionism is a great sin. This explains the repetition of such time-worn shibboleths of communist dogma like the pauperisation of the proletariat in capitalist countries and the break-down of the capitalist system, in the final text of the programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union adopted in 1961.\* The book has an excellent introduction and an illuminating commentary by Herbert Ritvo. This is the third programme of the CPSU—"a programme for the building of the Communist Society", a blueprint for a brave new world.

The programme calls Yugoslavia, revisionist. "The Yugoslav leaders by their revisionist policy contraposed Yugoslavia to the socialist camp, and the international Communist movement..." But this sounds rather hypocritical now that Khrushchev has made up with Tito and in fact called Yugoslavia a "socialist country" in his polemics with Mao. But then we have to remember that Khrushchev belongs to that school of political thought which considers anything is good and moral which serves its purpose.

The programme gloats over the so-called contradictions in and among the capitalist countries. "The contradictions between the principal imperialist powers are growing deeper. The economic rehabilitation of the imperialist countries defeated in the Second World War leads to the revival of the old and the emergence of the new knots of imperialist rivalry and conflict." Since nearly hundred years, communists are waiting for the collapse of the capitalist system under the weight of the stresses and strains of its contradictions and they have been badly disillusioned. They grossly underestimated the capacity of capitalism to change and reform itself. The programme does not refer to the contradictions and rifts in the communist bloc, may be because Marx has not predicted it.

Do the communists believe in peace and peaceful methods of change? Your guess is as good as mine, because though the programme declares: "The working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist parties—seek to accomplish the socialist revolution by peaceful means", "The issue of war and peace is the principal issue of today", "The main thing is to ward off a thermonuclear war, to prevent it from breaking out," "Peaceful co-existence of the socialist and capitalist countries is an objective necessity for

the development of human society", the programme also asserts:

"The success of the struggle which the working class wages for the victory of the revolution will depend on how well the working class and its party master the use of all forms of struggle—peaceful and non-peaceful, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary—and how well they are prepared for any swift and sudden replacement of one form of struggle by another form of struggle" and "consider it their duty to support the sacred struggle of the oppressed peoples and their just anti-imperialist wars of liberation."

To put all this in simple language, communists will support peaceful changes of democratic government into communist form of government everywhere and encourage violence, short of nuclear war, to achieve it wherever necessary. Now we know the depth of the difference between Khrushchev and Mao. It is not about the aim, not even about strategy and tactics of world revolution but only about the use of atomic weapons. Here is a warning for all democrats. The profession of peaceful and democratic method of change proclaimed by the CPI and other communist parties is just a change of tactics. Non-peaceful and extra-parliamentary methods will be used whenever and wherever necessary. The slogan of peaceful co-existence has no meaning as long as the communists do not abandon non-parliamentary methods and disband cominform.

The programme assures abundance to the Soviet citizens by 1980. "The material and technical basis of communism will be built up by the end of the second decade (1917-1980), ensuring an abundance of material and cultural values for the whole population; Soviet society will come close to a stage where it can introduce the principle of distribution according to needs..." It promises all sorts of pies in the distant sky to the Soviet people. I can only hope these promises will not be, to borrow a proverb from Lenin, like pie crusts, made only to be broken.

Marxism was born in pre-democratic and un-industrialised Europe. That is why there is so much emphasis on violence and class war. In Europe and in North America industrialisation has made a bigger cake possible and trade unionism as well as democracy have made a better, fairer distribution of the cake necessary. And so Marxist dogma has lost its appeal. But Marxism retains its appeal in non-democratic and economically under-developed countries. The three successive revolutions that took place in Europe—industrialisation, vigorous trade unionism and democracy—have to be accomplished simultaneously and concurrently by the economically under-developed countries. This is a challenge to the leadership of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. On the response to this challenge depends the future of freedom and democracy in these continents.

\* The New Soviet Society. Final text of the program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. With annotations and introduction by Herbert Ritvo. Published by The New Leader Magazine, New York.

# Ceylon Faces Communist Challenge

Rama Swarup Sabherwal

CEYLON is one country in this region where three brands of communists, often divided against themselves over personalities and leadership rather than doctrine but ever-ready to join forces against the common enemy of 'reaction', are heading for a constitutional take-over. One wonders whether Ceylon would be another Kerala in the near future!

The rural masses of the island have at no time been seriously interested in communism. They are tied to the soil, too poor to fancy anything outside their own traditions. Buddhism, the glory that was Lanka in the days of their great kings, Parakrama Bahu or Dutu Gemunu, or among the Tamils the great king Elara, these have been the only weapons that the political demagogue has been able to use where the peasantry is concerned.

That is why in a straight election, the communists fared very badly. A few leaders like Dr. N. M. Perera, the leader of the Trotskyite Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Ceylon Socialist Party) or Philip Gunawardene, leader of the Trotskyite Mahajana Eksath Persamuna (People's United Front) or Dr. S. A. Wickremesinghe (President of the Ceylon Communist Party) scraped out of successive national elections not on Marxist doctrine but rather on their personal popularity or appeal to Buddhist and national sentiments.

Both the Trotskyites and the Communists have to fall back on middle class snobbery and prejudices to attain their aims. For example when the attempted *coup d'etat* on January 27 last year became news, Comrade Philip Gunawardene was loudest in crying down that it was a rightist plot. The only basis to this allegation was that some of the suspects were rightists. So, said Comrade Philip, all rightists in key government offices must be removed. He has been echoed by the weekly newsheets of the left wing who have found in the foiled *coup* an opportune moment to strike at the inexorable enemy of communism. So today for the left wing, the plot has become a magic formula to play on the prejudices of some sections of the Buddhist population who have been piqued at the situation that rightists with their better education and efficiency are holding important positions in the island.

It is a well known fact of modern history that Hitler set fire to the Reichstag to make a scapegoat of communists. Recently all the left wing joined together to cripple the government with a general strike when over a million workers in urban areas all over the island were to down tools. The Government met the challenge and the strike was an utter failure.

Such Machiavellian tactics have reached their mark, but they have also boomeranged, resulting in honest Buddhists who have no illusions about communist strategy asking themselves: Could it be that the Communists themselves were behind the attempted *coup*?

But the Red challenge has yet to be met. The declared foreign policy of Ceylon is neutrality. But it is not a neutrality of conviction but convenience, and when a small nation adopts such a policy, it finds it next to impossible to maintain neutralism. So Ceylon has become a hot bed for international communist wire-pulling. Streets are flooded with cheap communist literature published in Moscow or Peking. Young Ceylonese are sent on scholarships or conducted tours of communist countries, and they return home with eulogies for the Marxist way of life.

During the British days, Ceylon used to be described as the "sentinel island of the British Empire". Today they quip that "Ceylon is the sentinel island of the Soviet Empire".

Though this is an exaggeration, yet there is something to it. Press is important in a free country, but Ceylon has no press as such. There are only two groups of newspapers, one echoing the other. There is a sameness in both groups, and even here even though the official policy of these papers is right wing, there are young left wing sub-editors and Red editors judiciously sprinkled about in them, and they do not hesitate to plug in stealthily a little news item against the West, or a feature lauding the Soviet way whenever they could, or blacking out news favouring the Free World thinking.

Sometimes directors of these papers turn a blind eye, fearing an overall attack, and disclosure of their private affairs.

But the more real danger since 1956 has been in the political parvenu who has found in "socialism" a lucrative business to keep him from parochial insignificance. His number is becoming legion, and he has infiltrated into trade unions, youth organizations, and others going under the name of democracy, like the Ceylon Democratic Lawyers' Association, or Ceylon Journalist Association.

Unlike in certain other countries, in Ceylon communism up to now has no military backing to bring about the revolution. The only way that communism could triumph in Ceylon is by infiltrating into Trade Unions, the Public Service and the Armed Forces, and by sponsoring Front organizations such as the Peace Council, the International Union of Students, or the International Association of Democratic Lawyers.

What about the prospects?

A communist backed military revolution is almost fantastic to think of in the present circumstances. Two past elections in 1960 have reasonably demonstrated that the chances of the electorate returning a communist government are negligible. The Communist Party itself has been able to obtain only four seats in spite of a non-contest agreement with the ruling Freedom Party of Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike.

(Continued on page 10)

# Dohad Parliamentary Bye-Election

Kamalashanker Pandya

**T**HE first parliamentary bye-election after the Chinese communist aggression and the declaration of national emergency has resulted in the defeat of the candidate of the ruling Congress Party at the hand of the opposition candidate, who happened to belong to the Swatantra Party. Why has it so happened?

Dohad is a small town in Panchmahals district of Gujarat on the Western Railway on Bombay-Delhi section and adjoining to it is a modern Western Railway Colony, Freelandgunj, by name.

This is a reserved seat and the constituency comprises of the tribal people in 4 taluquas of Panchmahals District and 4 taluquas of Baroda district. The seat was held by the Swatantra member who, in the last general election, won it by a margin of 4000 votes defeating his congress and PSP-SP rivals. This time, though the voting was only 37%, the margin has gone up to more than 14000 votes. Why this should happen in these taluquas, once the impregnable stronghold of the Congress and where the Congress has invested lakhs and lakhs of rupees so far in building up its organisation through various agencies.

The first and foremost reason is the grand alliance of all democratic forces as represented by the PSP, SP, Jana Sangh and independent social workers and intellectuals, opposed to the growing authoritarian trends in the present Congress, whose policies are indirectly taken advantage of by the Communists for undermining national unity. Though the winning candidate is a Swatantra member, the urges and the forces behind him were more dynamic and widespread. Dohad was once a centre of political consciousness, unparalleled in Gujarat, as the headquarters of the Congress Socialist Party and the Congress-controlled Bhil Seva Mandal. Democratic ideas, their conception and practice and widening horizons had well been planted among the people by the workers of the Congress Socialist Party and subsequently by the same workers who, after having abjured politics, worked in all nation-building activities. Their efforts produced huge educational institutions in Panchmahals by unifying the people of the district and the intelligentsia had thus an opening for their creative energy. This force of mature workers and democrats was a decisive ideological factor in as much as the wide ramifications were felt everywhere in this scattered constituency. The Congress, a house divided against its own self, seething with power politics at all levels could not create an urge

for democracy or unify people for nation-building activities in this backward tract.

The second and equally decisive factor was the personality of Maharaja Shree Jaideepsinhjee of Devgarh Baria of Swatantra Party who had won the Assembly seat in the last general election by scoring 90% of the votes cast. He is a young, energetic, tireless, selfless worker with a passion for democracy, civil liberties, social justice and educational work.

The third factor was the climate created in this region after the All India Central Government Employees' General Strike of 12th July, 1960, the day the Police shot down 5 workers. The Gujarat Government had created a situation to terrorise and subjugate the people and then to utilise them for partisan ends. The Gujarat Government had to concede a judicial enquiry and during those days a close link between the working class and the general public had been forged on the basis of civil liberties, social justice, and against authoritarian trends and influences. This was a turning point in this backward region which required to be purged of dark forces.

The fourth reason was the awareness created in the people about the true nature of Chinese communist aggression, who would not be ideologically swayed the other way.

The people of this region, as elsewhere, want a good, responsible and constructive opposition to express themselves on problems concerning them. The opposition here has grown from the soil, has constructive and nation-building activities and institutions as its base and is ideologically and politically mature.

In this constituency there are no well-knit political parties except the Congress. There are splinter groups, such as Lohia Socialists in Jhalod, non-party workers led by the veteran leader, Shri Ramanlal Sheth of Dohad, Shree Jaideepsinhjee's personal influence and some Swatantra Party pockets. All these forces refused to be divided on personal or ideological grounds and realised the serious situation through which the country is passing. They stood shoulder to shoulder to register their protest against the unrealistic foreign and domestic policies of the ruling party.

All these forces built up unity at all levels and this basic democratic unity had repercussions far and wide and this consciousness above all counts for the success of the opposition candidate in spite of campaigning by the Ministers of Gujarat State, who as Ministers in office are not supposed to canvass in bye-elections.

The first parliamentary bye-election in India has thus given a verdict against the political policies of the ruling party.

The people saw it to their cost that our hard-won Freedom, within 15 years of having achieved it, is under jeopardy and these common people, undeterred, placed the ideology of FREEDOM FIRST in one of the most backward regions of the Country. This ideology has reached our people.

*(Continued from page 9)*

But the danger lurks, and is becoming more and more serious. It lies in infiltration.

A competent authority on the subject recently told me that the possibility of something that happened in Czechoslovakia cannot be ruled out in Ceylon, unless the right wing remains vigilant and meets the challenge.

# Review

## Communist China and Asia

A Challenge to American Foreign Policy:  
by A. Doak Barnett.  
A Vintage Book, Third Printing, May 1962.  
Price \$ 1.85. Pp. 575

"COMMUNIST China and Asia" which first appeared in 1960 is already regarded as one of the most outstanding contributions to the study of communist China and of the problems it poses for American foreign policy. Both its analysis and its suggestions are as pertinent now as they were when the book was first published. Although recent developments in Sino-Indian relations call for revision in some respects, the central argument of the book still stands.

The volume presents a fine example of cooperative research. Doak Barnett is on the staff of the Ford Foundation and he had the assistance of the Council on Foreign Relations. This influential body set up a study group, representative of various shades of opinion. The collective contribution of this study group is wrought into the contents of this book. The author, however, assumes the entire responsibility for the views expressed. Barnett is not merely content with analysing the problems of American foreign policy; he is anxious to guide the State Department on the possible lines of future policy in relation to Communist China. It would thus appear that the author has a political axe to grind but this in no way diminishes the value of the book.

As the title indicates, the author is concerned with the analysis of the impact of Communist China on the countries of south and south-east Asia and with the implications of this impact for United States foreign policy. The volume in effect contributes to our understanding of the foreign policies of both countries. Barnett discusses the main features of the Communist regime — its totalitarian structure, its rapid economic development, its expansionist aims and its evolving tactics in foreign policy. He also discusses the implications of Sino-Soviet alliance, the problems created by the overseas Chinese in the countries in which they have settled and the consequences of America's policy of non-recognition of Communist China.

In a lucid chapter on *The Roots of Mao's Strategy*, Mr. Barnett describes the ideological basis of Chinese foreign policy. The following remarks provide an excellent background to India's present attempts to negotiate with the Chinese:

"Communist leaders visualise specific situations in a context very different from that generally accepted by leaders of status quo powers, or even by those leaders of national revolutions who think primarily in terms of national rather than world-wide aims. Peking's leaders are not fundamentally concerned with freezing the existing positions, 'stabilising' situations, or permanently 'solving' problems. Instead, they are interested in promoting change, provided each change, however small in itself, enhances their power. If they agree to 'settle' issues

by compromise it is because they have come to believe that compromise is an unavoidable necessity, or because they are confident that the situation which has been temporarily stabilised will again shift in favour of their own revolutionary forces.... As they analyze a problem, they do not ask how an issue can be solved permanently, but how they can exploit the existing situation to lay the best possible groundwork for future advances." (p. 71)

To the Chinese, neutrality has no meaning. In 1949, Mao Tse-Tung declared that "neutrality is merely a camouflage and a third road does not exist". It is now generally conceded that one of the several reasons for the massive Chinese attack on India in 1962 was their desire to demonstrate to the countries of South-East Asia that India is despite all her declarations to the contrary — aligned with the imperialistic nations of the West. Indeed, the *Peking Review* of December 28, 1962 gave full expression to this view.

American foreign policy in relation to China was in the earlier years conducted under an emotional stress; a more cautious and restrained approach is now emerging. Barnett suggests the lines on which American foreign policy could realistically develop. Recognising the dangers of over-simplification he presents and examines the following broad policy alternatives:

1. Full accommodation to Communist China, 2. A "liberation" policy involving all-out pressure against Peking, 3. A policy aimed at isolating Peking and applying limited pressure against it, 4. A "two-Chinas" policy aimed at stabilising and giving international recognition for a new status quo based on a divided China.

The advocacy of the "Two-China" policy came in for special comment and criticism when the book was first published. The main objection to this proposal was that it was not likely to be accepted. Barnett recognises these difficulties. Indeed he even suggests that these "solutions" will create new problems but he insists that by moving in this direction and thereby altering its basic posture to China, the United States would succeed in enlisting greater world support for its policies. Barnett makes a plea for a long term realistic policy calculated to build up the defences of peace in the underdeveloped countries of South-East Asia by helping them to build up more viable economic structures. "What is needed to meet the challenge of Communist China is fundamentally, not so much an effective China policy as an effective Asia policy." One notices that there is already the change coming over American foreign policy; a more positive approach is being taken now to the economic and political problems of underdeveloped countries and through these to the problem of countering the lure of communism.

S. P. Aiyar

## Tibet Fights for Freedom

An Orient Longmans Publication  
Price Rs. 15

# With Many Voices

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

Nehru is indispensable only so long as Indians believe he is. There is no real vacuum of leadership in India, only a vacuum of recognition.

—Mr. Welles Hagen, *Opinion*, March 26.

Could it be that once you had the ear of the Prime Minister you could open your mouth wide enough to put your foot into it?

—Thought, March 30.

Vigilantly guard your freedom, because the Soviet Communists are ready to go to any extreme in order to take away your independence.

—Mr. V. S. Tarasov, *Hindustan Times*, April 2.

The Defence of India Rules have been reduced to the Defence of Nehru Rules.

—Mr. Kashi Nath Misra, *Current*, March 30.

A government can successfully lie no more than once to its people. Thereafter, everything it says and does becomes suspect.....

—Mr. Gene Robb of Albany, N. Y., Vice-President of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, *U.S. News & World Report*, April 4.

The communists believe neither in non-violence nor in peace.

—Mr. C. B. Gupta, Chief Minister of U.P., *Times of India*, April 6.

Who have been the targets of Communist aggression? Not the members of SEATO. By and large it has been the unaligned nations.

—Lord Home, British Foreign Secretary, *Hindustan Times*, April 9.

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

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.  
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3.00

Name: .....

Address: .....

Signature

A born demolisher of received ideas, C. R. is a devil of a man with a monstrous gift of being right against a whole country.....

—*Eastern Economist*, March 29.

He (Mr. Khandubhai Desai, Chairman of Oil-India and INTUC leader) castigated the public sector for possessing "a feudal mind" and for being deficient in human values. Public sector enterprises were now in that stage of development out of which the private sector had emerged three generations ago.

—*Indian Express*, April 5.

Mr. Nehru said after the Chinese Communist attack that India had been living in a world of unreality of its own creation. It seems incredible that India should ever move back into that world. Yet, most observers here believe that, to a large extent, that is exactly what has happened.

—*U.S. News & World Report*, April 8.

The cows can't read directives. All they want is a just exchange: 'You give me fodder, I give you milk.'

—Mr. Khrushchev, *Time*, March 22.

We will build a wall-around Cuba — not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their freedom and sovereignty.

—President Kennedy, *Time*, March 29.

The Gandhi cap is no longer an emblem of purity.

—K. K. Shah, General Secretary, All India Congress Committee, *Times of India*, April 22.

It is dangerous for a nation to be governed by men with fixations.

—Rajaji, *Swarajya*, April 6.

The freedom of Indonesia is the freedom of China, and the life of Indonesia is the life of China.

—President Sukarno, quoted in *Times of India*, April 13.

Because men are incapable of being angels is no good reason for their being ants.

—*Opinion*, April, 9.

We talk about national unity to meet the Chinese threat and yet go around disrupting that unity by criticizing the Swatantra Party and the Jan Sangh who are more serious in fighting the Chinese than many others.

—Mr. Hanumanthayya, *Link*, April 14.