

Unjust and Unfair

V. B. Karnik

EVERY country is entitled to ask a foreigner to leave and, if he does not leave within the prescribed time limit, to arrest him and throw him out. That is the sovereign right that a country possesses. But no civilized country will ordinarily expel a foreigner unless he has indulged in some objectionable or undesirable activity. Civilized countries do not shut their doors against foreigners.

India has a proud and enviable record in this respect. Through the ages she has welcomed foreigners from many lands, as visitors, as students and even as settlers. Many have settled in this land and become part and parcel of its people. They were allowed not only to practise their religion but also to preach it. Some, no doubt, took undue advantage of the hospitality that was extended to them. But that happened when we were not free. We are now free and can stop and punish the misbehaviour of any foreigner without abandoning our age-old virtue of hospitality.

Christian missionaries have been coming to India for centuries. In the earlier period they carried on extensive proselytisation and, taking advantage of the poverty of our people and the rigidity of Hindu social customs, converted to Christianity large numbers of them. But those converted Christians are now an integral part of our nation. Since Independence, proselytisation has stopped and the missionaries are now engaged only in welfare and educational work. The work that they have done in the two fields, mostly with finances received from abroad, has been of immense benefit to the country and no sensible person would like it to come to a stop. It is this work carried on in a dedicated manner in neglected places and amongst neglected social groups that has endeared them to the people, and the people have never bothered about their nationality.

Fr. Vincent Ferrer who has been just served with a notice to leave the country is one such dedicated social worker. For over seventeen years he has carried on work of great value and importance in a part of the Nasik district in the State of Maharashtra. Manmad is his headquarters and from that central place he has spread his work in the adjoining about a dozen talukas of Nasik, Ahmednagar and Jalgaon districts. His main

work has been amongst farmers. He enabled them to dig wells, to use fertilisers and thus increase the yields from their fields. He is reported to have helped over ten thousand farmers. As a result of the spirit of self-help that he created and the financial help that he was able to secure, over a thousand wells were dug and about eight hundred pumps were set up. The farmers are thus able to get two or three crops where, owing to meagre rainfall, they were hardly able to get even one crop. In addition to this work in the agricultural field, Fr. Ferrer is running four schools, four boarding houses for boy and girl students and a small hospital. Is this the work that one can scoff at or ignore merely because the organiser happened to be a foreign Christian missionary? Is this not, on the other hand, work that should invite admiration and gratitude?

But strangely enough, the Government of Maharashtra has asked the initiator and organiser of this notable work to leave the country. The order has been passed, it seems, because some opposition parties whipped up an agitation against Fr. Ferrer. An inquiry conducted later by some government officers is also reported to have found some things against him. What are the things that were found against Fr. Ferrer is not disclosed; nor is he allowed any opportunity to disprove them. This can be hardly regarded as just and fair to a foreigner who for over seventeen years identified himself with a large group of our people and served them to the best of his ability in a painstaking and effective manner.

Some of the charges vaguely hinted against Fr. Ferrer are that he brought about conversions and that he indulged in anti-national activities. Fr. Ferrer has emphatically denied both charges. In view of this denial there should have been an inquiry and Fr. Ferrer should have been given an opportunity to disprove the charges. Mere assertion of charges by government representatives will not carry conviction to anybody.

To make charges against a person and to punish him without holding a fair inquiry is a violation of the principles of natural justice. The rule applies to nationals as well as to foreigners. A foreigner is also a human being and it is the inherent right of every human being that he should not be punished without being given a hearing. It is another matter that under the existing laws he cannot seek justice in a court of law. Fr. Ferrer's religion and nationality are irrelevant in this respect. As a human being interested in the welfare of the Indian people he should not be denied

(Continued on page 11)

Exports After UNCTAD

A Special Correspondent

THE UNCTAD was more than an exercise for trade experts. It had a political significance as well. The leaders of the less developed countries are beginning to see that their prospects for increased foreign aid and private investment are limited; they are losing confidence in the possibility of achieving developing objectives through existing trade arrangements. Many argue as a consequence that the existing trade rules are rigged against them; that they must be changed to give the less developed countries a larger share of world income as a matter of right. UNCTAD was the great opportunity to press this claim. Indeed, for the leaders of some of the less developed countries, UNCTAD was the answer to a political gap no less ominous than the trade gap: the gap between the rising demands of their growing populations at home and their ability to meet these demands through existing development efforts."

These are extracts from a book, *In Pursuit of World Order* written by Richard N. Gardner of the Columbia University who had formerly served as Deputy Assistant Secretary in the administrations of Kennedy and Johnson. This book was published in June 1964. Gardner's comments refer to the results of the first UNCTAD held four years ago. But, interestingly, his remarks seem appropriate in respect of the second UNCTAD as well.

The first UNCTAD was described as the "most important international conference since the San Francisco Conference that produced the United Nations". It was considered as "a significant step towards creating a new and just world economic order". It was attended by about 2,000 delegates from 119 countries and lasted nearly three months.

The second UNCTAD was in session only for about eight weeks. Nevertheless, it was certainly an impressive show, which was attended by 1,600 delegates from about 120 countries. It is true that its positive achievements are not many. In fact, on many vital issues, which are of great significance to the economic future of the developing countries, the second UNCTAD was unwilling or unable to take decisions. Some of the more important problems that confronted the conference were the granting of tariff preferences by the industrial countries for the exports of manufactures and semi-manufactures; agreements to stabilise the prices of primary product exports; and measures to improve the earnings from invisibles and stimulate the flow of private capital, technical assistance, and foreign aid. On all these vital issues, the Conference could not arrive at a consensus. In fact, it appears from the point of view of practical results,

that the second UNCTAD was not greatly different from the first one. "This preference issue was one of the most divisive at UNCTAD: it split the industrial countries into different camps", says Gardner. This was what happened at the second UNCTAD as well.

Some of the issues like preferences have been referred to special committees for further study. But experience shows that not much good is likely to come out of them. Gardner in his book recalls that at the Swiss National Exposition, which had opened in Lausanne in the closing weeks of the first UNCTAD, there was a large piece of machinery whose parts moved a lot and made much noise but served no purpose. This was known at the first UNCTAD as "the continuing machinery". It is unfortunate that at the second UNCTAD also, no serious attempt was made to come to grips with any of the major problems confronting world trade.

Nevertheless, it will not be correct to describe the second UNCTAD as a down-right failure. One useful service it has done is to throw light on many aspects of international trade on which little or no information was available. Although export promotion is of crucial importance to the developing countries, few of them have cared to study seriously the different aspects of this question. Take, for instance, our own country. The Commerce Ministry has no detailed information about the types of non-tariff barriers to which Indian goods are subjected in many countries. Nor does New Delhi have a clear idea of the export earnings, actual and potential, of the different States in the Indian Union. On invisible earnings, the Commerce Ministry, the Finance Ministry, the Reserve Bank, the Planning Commission or any other official or non-official body, has not made any competent and comprehensive study. This is perhaps not surprising, considering that even in a great trading nation like Britain, the data available on invisible earnings are considered to be wholly inadequate.

The UNCTAD secretariat has done well in preparing a series of papers, many of them well documented, on major aspects of world trade. But one wonders how many in the Government or the private sector will have the time, patience and inclination to read these valuable papers.

One important lesson that the developing countries should learn from the first and the second UNCTAD is that they should try to promote exports mainly by their own efforts rather than by constant appeals to rich nations for concessions of one kind or the other.

(Continued on page 76)

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

M. R. Masani, M.P.

THE draft treaty against nuclear proliferation is a big issue facing this country and it is a crucial decision, whether or not to sign that treaty. Our Government seems to be altogether without a policy on this subject. On the one hand, it has quite rightly announced—and I give them my full support, my party is with them on this—that we should not even attempt to produce nuclear weapons. Because we believe that it is neither economically nor politically feasible or desirable that we should make this attempt. Mr. Morarji Desai, our Deputy Prime Minister, has given the economic reasons in an article he wrote in March this year. He said:

“Economically it will break us if we tried to enter this nuclear race because of its fantastic cost; it will not be possible for us to spare any funds unless we are prepared to be much poorer than we are today. How will that help us? Our people will die in poverty even before destruction by a bomb thrown by China.”

For these and other reasons, we agree with our Government that no attempt should be made to make the bomb.

On the other hand there seems to be difficulty in signing the treaty and it looks as if we are going to have the worst of both worlds—neither have the bomb nor this Treaty, agreeing not to make it.

There are some arguments which are cogent against the signing of the Treaty. The first of these is that it would come in the way of peaceful development of atomic energy. From what little I have been able to study of the Treaty and find out, I do not think that there is any reasonable basis for this complaint. Article IV of the Treaty is very clear. It gives the fullest liberty for the development of peaceful uses of the atom. Article V even allows for an explosion which is very near the border line; the explosion must be done by a nuclear power on behalf of the non-nuclear powers with the permission of the world authority. So, nothing is barred so long as it is done in concert with the world authority. There cannot, therefore, be the argument that by signing it, it comes in the way of peaceful development. And if it does, let minor amendments be made to put it right.

A stronger argument is that the Treaty is unfair to the non-nuclear powers because, while leaving the nuclear powers supreme to do what they like and to advance on the path of nuclear armaments, it puts constraints and restraints on all non-nuclear countries. This is a very correct argument. It is true that under the Treaty the super powers are excluded from any

measure of interference, inspection or control. Now, I regret that the United States, which for over a decade had insisted on international inspection for themselves and for the Soviet Union, have given in on this point by accepting an utterly reactionary and out-of-date concept of her national sovereignty by the Soviet Government. It is a matter of pity. I deplore it, but deplorable as it may be, the Treaty, in article VI and, in its preamble, does hold out the aim that even nuclear powers are prepared to discuss submitting themselves to international discipline.

Another argument is that we may like to go in later for nuclear armaments and we should not tie our hands in this fashion. It again is not a very convincing argument because the Treaty under article X opens the door to any country changing its mind for good reasons and giving only 90 days' notice. In three months we can untie our hands from this obligation. Is there any one to suggest that it is so long a period for getting out of this solemn contract? That again is not a very convincing argument for not signing the Treaty.

Let us now consider the other aspect; what are the disadvantages of not signing it? The first is that we will isolate ourselves from the mainstream of the world. Today, as far as one can guess, there are only half a dozen countries who will be adamant against signing the Treaty and we should consider the kind of company in which we shall find ourselves if we take that step. These countries which are adamant are Albania, Cuba, Rumania, North Vietnam, North Korea and Communist China. I for one would not like to be found in that company either by day or by night. The record of these countries and the kind of governments they enjoy or suffer from, we need not discuss here. But I would not like to see the country of Gandhi, when the whole world advances in one direction, to join this thieves' kitchen on the other.

Then we lose the goodwill of both the Super Powers. In a righteous cause where principle is involved, I would not mind. If both the Super Powers are wrong, let us certainly take a consistent stand for world progress, peace and humanity. There will be the political disadvantage of annoying the Big Two. There will be economic hardship and handicaps. Certainly, under Article V of the Treaty, India will be denied the benefits of the cooperation from the nuclear powers in developing peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Today, the United States is giving us nuclear fuel, if we do not sign the Treaty, they will be bound to stop it. Canada has been a very friendly country to us in the nuclear field. All our advance has been made with

the full participation and friendship of the Canadians. They have given generously to us. We have agreed that we will never use this for nuclear armament purposes. It is quite possible that the Government of Canada will take the line that our refusal to sign puts our pledge to them in some doubt. So we may even lose the Canadian support we have been getting over the last decade.

Apart from the danger of annoying everyone, is it a desirable posture to take up that, when the great powers are moving in one direction, we shall come in the way?

In this case, the two super-powers are cooperating in one direction. We may not be satisfied with the rate of progress, but to cut across what they are trying to do and to thwart this effort and join the company which I mentioned earlier, I do not think would be a very desirable political posture for our country.

Finally, we lose the benefit, by not signing the Treaty, of any nuclear guarantee that is incorporated in it. There is a draft resolution attached to the Treaty which says that, with the consent of the Security Council, the nuclear deterrent will be used to protect any country that is attacked by communist China or any nuclear power. It is true that the Security Council is not a body which gives an automatic guarantee. There is Great Power veto; there are politics and there is diplomacy. I for one would have much preferred a guarantee free from the veto of the Security Council. It is not a very good guarantee; it is a very doubtful guarantee. But who is responsible for this? I say our Government is responsible. By refusing to accept the offer made as far back as 1964 by the United States for a bilateral foolproof guarantee, if we were prepared to enter into that arrangement, we threw away a bilateral foolproof guarantee. Last year when Dr Vikram Sarabhai and Mr L. K. Jha went to Moscow and Washington, came back and reported publicly that the response was very favourable and both powers were inclined to give a parallel guarantee, though not a joint one, again we threw away the initiative. As a result of this waffling and indecisiveness, we have now lost our bargaining power and we have jolly well to take the guarantee that is offered, unsatisfactory as it might be. But even now, I would urge on the Prime Minister that, in the few months that still remain before the Treaty comes up for signature, because it now goes to a Special Session of the General Assembly, during these few months, let us try for two things. Let us try to improve the terms of the Treaty to the extent that is possible in the General Assembly from our own point of view. Secondly, let us still get from the USA and the Soviet Union some *quid pro quo* for signing the Treaty. If we want conventional armaments which are not being given to us, let us get these conventional arms. If we want a particular kind

of economic assistance, let us ask for it. If we want political support and goodwill, let us get it because that is how business is done at the international level. We still have a few months. Let us not pursue this path of neither having the bomb nor the advantages of not making the bomb.

Then, it is argued that Indian public opinion is hostile to signing the Treaty. I would like to question that fact. When we talk of public opinion who do we mean? Is it really suggested that the peasants in India in our villages are greatly concerned whether we sign or do not sign the Treaty against nuclear proliferation? Does it really mean that the masses of our country are interested in this technical thing which is an abstract issue? The real thing is that it is a handful of intellectuals and the elite in this country, a certain number of chauvinists, who are really interested.

I think Government themselves are responsible for not educating public opinion. Look at the report of the Defence Ministry that was put before us a few days ago. It highlights the military threat from China. Nobody is more opposed to the posture of Communist China *vis-a-vis* India than myself. I and my Party stand for breaking off diplomatic relations with that bandit regime. But I say that the main threat from Communist China is political. It is not only military; it is a mixed one, if you like. We are stressing more and more the military threat and are neglecting the political threat which has already raised its head in Bengal and elsewhere, in Naxalbari, which was a symbol of what was coming to this country. Nothing can please Mao Tse-tung and his lot more than our entering into a mad arms race with them which will ruin our economy, bring more starvation and deprivation and drive more and more people into the arms of their Fifth Column through that economic distress.

We have got probably six months or four or five months before the Treaty will come for final signature and I would suggest to the Prime Minister, let there be a small Parliamentary Committee of serious students of this subject from all sections of the House to study the Treaty. Let them place before it as much information as they think can be safely given to us. What is highly confidential they need not disclose to us. Let us that way educate ourselves and the country to the pros and cons of this matter in a purely pragmatic spirit. Let the Government then come before us—it is their obligation—and say whether we should sign or not sign the Treaty. It is not my job or of anyone on this side, who are denied the information today to come out and say, "Yes, sign the Treaty" or "Do not sign". I am not prepared to take either position at this stage. But a day will come when this Parliament will have to express itself if it is not done now. It is the obligation of the Government to come before us, educate us, give us the information and then face us with a concrete proposal.

Based on a Speech in Lok Sabha

Fearless Warrior Of Peace

G. L. Mehta

MARTIN LUTHER KING was a rare human being who restored one's faith in human nature which is dimmed by cynicism and pessimism. In his life, work and even in death, he showed to what heights of idealism, moral fervour and fearlessness a man could rise. In an age of crass selfishness and low intrigue, he was utterly selfless and completely devoted to his cause. In an era when love of power taints even the best of us, he was one who sincerely believed in the power of love. In times when nations and peoples are rent asunder by hatred and fanaticism his was the voice of compassion and tolerance. In an epoch when the mighty ones are prepared to destroy one another and threaten the annihilation of the world for the sake of their creeds, he firmly believed in strength through peace and understanding. His deep faith was equalled only by his heroic courage.

Nearly twelve years ago, he first came into prominence when he organised a boycott of the city's bus service by negroes in Montgomery, Alabama, where a negro woman was arrested for violating a local ordinance prohibiting negroes from sitting in the white section of the bus. The boycott continued for 381 days in which nearly 50,000 negroes of the city joined by walking to work and ultimately, won their point. King insisted, however, on scrupulous observance of non-violence: "We believe in law and order", he told his followers, "do not go get your weapons—he who lives by the sword perishes by the sword". He acknowledged his debt to Gandhiji in expounding the boycott: "This is a project of passive resistance depending upon moral and spiritual forces. We will return good for evil. Christ showed us the way and Mahatma Gandhi showed us it could work".

Here is a full cycle! The leader of the negro movement in Montgomery drew his inspiration from Gandhiji's philosophy and technique of *satyagrah*. Gandhiji himself came across Thoreau's essay on *Civil Disobedience* while in prison in South Africa and was profoundly impressed by it. And Thoreau himself was a devoted student of ancient Hindu thought having imbibed the *Geeta's* teaching. Each owed a spiritual debt to the other, or rather, enriched one another's heritage. King writes in his *Stride Towards Freedom*: "Like most people, I had heard of Gandhi, but I had never studied him seriously. As I read, I became deeply fascinated by his campaigns of non-violent resistance. I was particularly moved by the Salt March to the Sea and his numerous fasts. The whole concept of *satyagrah* was profoundly significant to me. As I delved deeper into the philosophy of Gandhi my skepticism concerning the power of love gradually diminished and I

came to see for the first time its potency in the area of social reform."

Prior to this, King thought that the ethics of Jesus were effective only in individual relationship and a more "realistic" approach was necessary when racial groups and nations were in conflict. But after reading Gandhi he felt he saw new life:

"Gandhi was probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and effective social force on a large scale. Love, for Gandhi, was a potent instrument for social and collective transformation. It was in this Gandhi emphasis on love and non-violence that I discovered the method for social reform that I had been seeking for so many months. The intellectual and moral satisfaction that I failed to gain from the utilitarianism of Bentham and Mill, the revolutionary methods of Marx and Lenin, the social contract theory by Hobbes, the 'back to nature' optimism of Rousseau and the superman philosophy of Nietzsche, I found in the non-violent resistance philosophy of Gandhi. I came to feel that this was the only morally and practically sound method open to oppressed people in their struggle for freedom".

Thus, Martin Luther King became a true *Satyagrahi* who not merely imbibed the moral principles summed up in that concept but also sought to practice them every day and in every way. There was no spiritual vacuum in his life. It was ceaseless striving, endless wrestling. Nor did he permit his followers to have an attitude of equanimity. He pursued every moment and with all his energy the goal of social justice and equality for the negroes. After the U.S. Supreme Court's decision making integration of negroes in public schools mandatory, he felt that the "new negro" had acquired "a new sense of self-respect and of dignity" and he believed that after "a shock period" whites and negroes would work together without bitterness.

Unhappily, that hope was not fulfilled. The whites in the southern States were defiant and came continuously in conflict with the Federal Government in Washington which under Kennedy and Johnson has been anxious to extend civil rights to negroes and promote racial harmony. Action and reaction are equal and opposite in the social as in the physical realm. Black power, militant negroes, racial riots, strife and violence in cities have marred America's national life in the last few years and reached a peak of frenzy last summer. But Martin Luther King carried

on the fight undaunted by threats and unswerved by gusts of blind passions and mutual hatreds. He led protest marches, proclaimed the need for justice as well as harmony—all against depressing and unpropitious circumstances. He was repeatedly imprisoned, his house was bombed, he was assaulted, stabbed and wounded but he did not surrender nor did he retaliate.

At the age of 35, he was one of the youngest to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. While we have all but forgotten Gandhiji's message of social justice and communal amity and tolerance, Dr. Martin Luther King in far off America kept the torch burning. "It may be through the negroes", he once said, "that the unadulterated message of non-violence will be delivered to the world". And like the man from whom he derived his inspiration King also lived dangerously and, particularly during the last few years, he valiantly challenged, time and again, the cult of white supremacy. And in this, he defied death itself.

In his eloquent and moving speech when thousands of negroes marched to the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, Martin Luther King said, again and again "I have a dream" and it was that dream which inspired, enthused and guided him. For him, there

was no compromise between the forces of light and of darkness; once the sharp line was drawn the struggle was obligatory, unrelenting and final. His own end, therefore, seems not a tragedy but a fulfilment of the dream for which he lived and strived. The dastardly hand of an assassin has taken him away before his dream has been fulfilled. That such men as Lincoln and Gandhiji, Kennedy and King should die thus is a tribute to their heroism but a shame for our so-called civilisation. Fanaticism and hatred turn men into brutes and in such moments, there seems only one step between the divine in man and the beast in him.

Martin Luther King was described when he received the Nobel Peace Prize as "a fearless warrior of peace." He was not only one of the truly outstanding men of our times, not merely an incomparable leader with vision and passion; he was the symbol of the historic and massive struggle against injustice and tyranny, oppression and intolerance. At his tragic end when the world mourns, he seems larger like the sun at its setting.

—Courtesy, *Commerce*

LESLIE SAWHNY PROGRAMME OF TRAINING FOR DEMOCRACY

With a view to strengthen democracy and for training of political workers and others in citizenship, political organisations and in the principles of democracy and liberty, it is proposed to establish the Leslie Sawhny Programme of Training for Democracy for five years commencing April, 1968.

The programme will aim at training public workers and fulfil the long felt need of democratic political parties to have trained and disciplined cadres of workers.

The Programme will offer to local units of political parties, trade unions, volunteer organisations, co-operative societies, youth and students groups and others, training courses of various kinds in all the States in various languages. It will also endeavour to take follow up action to keep in touch with alumni.

The Programme will employ essential staff of organisers and trainees, but will for participation in the process of training draw mostly on experts in various fields such as political and trade union functionaries, academic men in the field of political science and economics, writers and journalists and management men.

The syllabus of a training course will include (a) background information on India, geography, population etc., Constitution, Government's economic, defence and foreign policies, political parties, contemporary political scene — Indian and world; (b) study of comparative political philosophies; (c) study

of organisation of a political party, its auxiliary arms, local bodies, conducting of meetings etc. These courses will be tailored to suit the needs of different categories of workers, and all the expenses of running a camp such as providing board, lodging, reading material etc. will be borne by the Programme.

The project had been discussed with Col. Leslie Sawhny during the last few months of his life. As is well known, the late Col. Sawhny had a passion for freedom and liberal values and was a Member of the Liberal International. He not only inspired this endeavour, but secured for it substantial financial assistance. As a tribute to his memory, it was decided to name the Programme after him.

The Programme will be administered by a Board of Management consisting of

Mr. N. A. Palkhivala — Chairman
 Mrs. L. Sawhny
 Mr. M. R. Masani, M.P. — Hon. Secretary & Treasurer
 Mr. Shantilal Shah, M.P.
 Mr. V. B. Karnik
 Mr. S. Mulgaokar
 Mr. M. A. Sreenivasan
 Mr. M. R. Pai

Mr. Arvind A. Deshpande has been appointed the Executive Secretary. The office is located at Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor Bell Lane 127 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

Another Year Of 'Cultural Revolution'

(Contributed)

1967 was another year of "cultural revolution" in China. It began with a militant call to isolate and destroy the enemies of Mao's thought and ended in the midst of an intensive and only partly successful campaign to end the resulting violence and disorder. Throughout the year the Chinese people were subjected to an extraordinary campaign of exhortation and pressure by Mao Tse-tung and his zealous supporters who sought through purge and propaganda to impose upon China fealty to Mao and his Thought.

Having unleashed violence against established authority from January to August, Mao and his colleagues have visibly failed in their year-end efforts to quell violence and restore order. Despite months of public appeals, and declarations, students continue to rebel against injunctions to settle down in school. Classrooms and campuses in many urban areas continue to be the scene of brawls amongst rival factions and confrontations between student and teacher. Even where vaunted revolutionary grand alliances are proclaimed to be "in preparation" or installed with much fanfare, subsequent regime broadcasts—as in Shanghai—tell of paralyzed administration resulting from bitter infighting amongst newly installed revolutionary rebel representatives and between the newly arrived and battered old guard cadres. Finally, despite all the admonitions against bourgeois self-interest, regime media confess that the railroad workers of Chengchow, as with the peasants of Honan and steelworkers of Liaoning, persist in seeking higher wages, better working conditions and bonus incentives.

In short, Peking's words are heard but not heeded, at least in the critical areas of administration, education and economic behaviour. Of the three lines of national control—bureaucracy, party, and army—only the PLA appears to remain capable of instilling the necessary discipline and respect for authority so essential to fusing China's 700 million inhabitants into a cohesive national entity, responsive to Peking's will. Certainly the magic of Mao's name no longer suffices to restore order out of chaos. Despite his vaunted tour of five provinces and Shanghai in September and his repeated appearances at rally and reception, the old Chairman's various "instructions" appear to have little effect, either on those bureaucrats and officers who still resist Mao's "strategic plan" or on the hotheads who continue to fight with posters, fists and weapons in naked contests for power or for revenge.

Yet Mao and his colleagues are understandably loath to apply literally their touted maxim that power comes out of the barrel of a gun. Empowering the

PLA to fire on fighting groups who refuse to disband is the last, irrevocable step toward admitting that the regime's will can only be exercised through the use of force. Such an admission would reveal the ideological bankruptcy of Mao's regime.

Second only to Mao in the public eye during 1967 was the Minister of National Defence Lin Piao. Lin Piao, who presumably controls the PLA, was described as "the closest comrade in arms, the best pupil and the best successor" of Mao.

A third figure constantly in the public press—indeed the most important target for criticism—was the silent Liu Shao-ch'i, President of the Chinese People's Republic. Liu was repeatedly condemned as "China's Khrushchev" and "the leading person in authority following the capitalist path." Many other persons were criticized and purged during 1967, but no self-proclaimed enemies of Mao emerged. Much of the violence of the year past can be attributed to struggles against persons who were identified with Liu as alleged supporters of capitalism and revisionism. Issues in contention, however, were not often illuminated by specific facts. Attacks on "economism", epithets such as "freaks and monsters", repeated adulation of Mao, and exhortations to combat selfishness served instead to carry the major verbal burden of the revolution. Indeed Peking's own pronouncements most often defined the Cultural Revolution as a simple struggle between supporters and opponents of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

The makers of revolution portrayed themselves as supporters of the ongoing proletarian revolution who aimed to put "politics in command" and thus avert the return of capitalism which they claimed to be the imminent result of policies which had emphasized economic considerations. The primary thrust of the Cultural Revolution accordingly was aimed at alleged supporters of Liu Shao-ch'i who were described as "those Party persons in authority taking the capitalist path." Any such simple explanation of the Cultural Revolution as a struggle between revolutionaries and would-be capitalists, however, was sustained neither by Peking's words nor by the tumultuous events of 1967.

A new stage in the Cultural Revolution became apparent early in the year as the central issue became the seizure of power from the regional party authorities. Violent struggles and considerable bloodshed occurred in remote areas as well as in the major cities. Local authorities resisted attacks by Red Guards and created local groups to oppose them. Mao's call on

the PLA in January to support "genuine proletarian revolutionaries" created a new pattern of authority by circumventing the authority of local cadres and replacing normal decision making processes with *ad hoc* actions. This break with the established pattern of management and control was further sanctioned by subsequent instructions to the PLA to ensure that agricultural and industrial production was maintained and to assume responsibility for public security until new organs of power could reflect the new order.

The new order was intended to take the form of revolutionary committees based on three way alliances of leading members of the PLA, revolutionary mass organizations and loyal cadres. But despite a massive propaganda campaign and apparent PLA support, the new order was slow in coming about. At year's end, despite persistent reiteration of the slogan "the situation is not only good, it is excellent," Peking could claim that revolutionary committees existed only in the major municipalities of Peking, Shanghai and Tientsin, and the provinces of Heilungkiang, Kweichow, Shansi, Shantung, Inner Mongolia and Tsinghai. Elsewhere, the PLA was the major representative of national power and authority.

Domestically, China this year can be most briefly summarized in three quotations from official Chinese sources:

"The great proletarian cultural revolution must go from the offices, schools and cultural circles to the factories and mines and the rural areas so that all positions are captured by Mao Tse-tung's thought."

People's Daily, Red Flag — January 1, 1967

"Do not be afraid of disorder. Disorder will make it possible to distinguish the black elements."

Lin Piao, March 3, 1967

"It is necessary to stop armed struggle and remove all defence works."

Chou En-lai, November 14, 1967

Disorder in domestic affairs extended also to China's foreign relations. The burning of the main chancery building of the British Mission in Peking on August 22 by Red Guards from the Foreign Ministry marked the highpoint of violence; but relations of the Peking regime with numerous other nations, most notably Indonesia and Burma, reached their most parlous state since 1949. The bitterness of Peking's continuing polemic with the USSR was crowned by its refusal to send a delegation to Moscow to observe the fiftieth anniversary of the Soviet revolution. Lin Piao observed in a speech in Peking that "the fact that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have restored capitalism is the most cruel

event in the fifty year history of the international Communist movement."

The most ominous aspect of Peking's new stance in foreign affairs, however, lay in indications of its declining respect for generally accepted standards of international civility and cooperation. Thus, Chou En-lai, who enunciated China's adherence to a policy of co-existence of Bandung in 1955, proclaimed in December, 1967: "The victory of China's great proletarian cultural revolution... has made it possible for China to be a more powerful base for supporting the world revolution." The Premier's words may have been more rhetorical than action-oriented, but they were consistent with a continuing propaganda campaign against the governments of Burma, Indonesia and Thailand as well as many other indications of a lessened concern for normal state to state relations with the rest of the world in 1967.

The demonstrated ineptitude of the Peking regime in managing both political and economic affairs may well have destroyed whatever remained of its claims to be a model for other developing countries. Moreover, its apparent disdain for traditional friendships and its willingness to sacrifice them for the cause of "revolution" created further doubts about its reliability as a neighbour and as a part of the international community.

(Continued from page 2)

The economic policies of many developing countries are far too much influenced by out-dated ideologies. They have failed to take advantage of the powerful contribution that private enterprise can make to export promotion. It is significant to see that only those countries have been able to achieve substantial success in exports, which have given adequate encouragement to private enterprise. In 1966, for example, the share of exports in the national income was 40 per cent in the Netherlands, 24 per cent in Canada, 23 per cent in the U.K., 16 per cent in Italy, 15 per cent in France and 13 per cent in Japan. For India this percentage was 4.5 in 1966-67. The developing countries would do well to read carefully the speech of Mr. George Woods at the second UNCTAD and find out how far their own inaction and inadequacies are responsible for their inability to obtain a larger share in world trade. Even for highly advanced countries, a continuous increase in exports is considered indispensable to enable them to maintain their present standard of living; and for developing countries, the need for a steady rise in export earnings is much more important. If the developing countries become acutely aware of the role of export promotion in their economic development and adopt energetic measures in that direction, they are likely to achieve better results, notwithstanding the unhelpful attitude of some developed countries.

Review

Mahajan Report Uncovered

A. R. Antulay, Allied Publishers, Rs. 14.

THE Mahajan Commission's report on the boundary dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore and Mysore and Kerala has come under severe criticism in both Maharashtra and Kerala. The criticism was due to a large extent by anger at the adverse recommendations made by the Commission. The Commission did not accept Maharashtra's claim to many predominantly Marathi-speaking areas included in Mysore and, on the other hand, accepted Mysore's claim to Kasargod and recommended its separation from Kerala. Naturally, there were outbursts of anger against the Commission and its report both in Maharashtra and Kerala.

But it is one thing to be angry and hurl denunciations and an entirely different thing to present a reasoned and dispassionate analysis of the document and bring to light its internal contradictions and errors of judgment. Bar. Antulay has performed that task in a painstaking and meticulous manner. It was, indeed, a formidable task, as the document he had to deal with was one prepared by a former Chief Justice of India.

It is clear from Bar. Antulay's analysis that the former Chief Justice of India has slipped at many a place. The main defect is that he did not apply the same standard to all disputed areas that he had to consider. He applies one standard to Kasargod and refuses to apply the same standard to Belgaum, Akkalkot, Bidar and other areas where Maharashtra has a dispute with Mysore. He is equally wrong in accepting and basing his recommendations on the theory of *status quo*.

The theory of *status quo* can have no place in the case of a disputed area. So far as a disputed area is concerned all factors must be properly reexamined and if the tests laid down for the inclusion of an area in an unilingual State are satisfied then the decision of the States Reorganisation Commission must be reversed. Additional requirements such as a bigger proportion of language gravity cannot be imposed on the ground of not disturbing the *status quo*. If the Commission had not worked on the basis of that theory, some at least of its recommendations would have been different. It appears to have overlooked the position that in the case of disputed areas the decisions of the States Reorganisation Commission were not final.

Bar. Antulay has brought to light many inconsistencies in the Mahajan Report. One of them may be mentioned here: "The Marathi speaking population of the city of Belgaum (51.4 per cent in the 1951 census) was slight; and 46 or 47 per cent to which it is reduced in 1961 is, in the Commission's view, unable to carry others with it. But the 12.3 per cent Kannada speaking people in Kasargod are held competent to carry with them, not only 30.9 per cent people belonging to the other linguistic groups including 2.9 per cent of Konkani and 5.3 per cent Marathi but even 55.8 per cent Malayalam speaking themselves." The Commission's recommendation regarding Kasargod may be just and proper; but then the same considerations should have weighed with it in making its other recommendations.

Bar. Antulay has charged the Commission with partiality for Mysore and animus against Maharashtra. He is not happy to make the charge, but felt compelled to make it. The language used in the report is at places open to that interpretation. But the better explanation would be Justice Mahajan's aversion to linguistic States. Being opposed to linguistic reorganisation of States, he had generally speaking no sympathy for claims to cities and other areas based on linguistic grounds. That mental outlook may be responsible for his harsh words against the linguistic agitation in Maharashtra. The mistake was that of the Government of India. They should not have appointed a person with very strong views against linguistic reorganisation to decide issues pertaining to boundary disputes between linguistic States. It was equally wrong not to lay down specific terms of reference leaving it open to the One-Man Commission to "wander" as it pleased.

Ordinarily, once a commission is appointed to settle a dispute its recommendations should be ungrudgingly accepted by both parties, as otherwise there will be no end to a dispute. The ordinary rule may have to undergo a little change in the case of the Mahajan Commission's report in view of the grave contradictions and irregularities that have been brought to light. Bar. Antulay's searching analysis has uncovered so many of them that it will not be proper to accept the report without a critical examination. The Government, it appears, is at present engaged in that task. Parliament will also have to apply its mind to it soon. Both will find Bar. Antulay's critique of the report of immense help. It will be also of help and interest to students of the Maharashtra-Mysore border dispute and generally to students of problems created by linguistic reorganisation of States.

V. B. K.

Towards Understanding Madras Politics

(Further replies have been received from the two esteemed commentators on the reply given by Mr. Kini on their comments on his article—all of which were published in the last issue. The two replies and Mr. Kini's rejoinder are published below. It will not be possible to carry the controversy any further. The commentators may rest assured, however, that "Freedom First" has no prejudice against the D.M.K. Government and that it regards the work that it has done in the course of a year as commendable, particularly when compared with the work of some other non-Congress Governments. For reasons of space the replies had to be shortened to some extent —EDITOR)

Mr. Vedamurthy writes:

IN his reply to my article under the above caption published in the April 1968 issue of *Freedom First* M. D. Kini asks me what I have to say to "Periyar Ramaswamy Naicker who has called Tamil Language as 'barbarian'". Well, I can only say that Kini who draws consolation that he is "in good company" as regards his dubbing the Second World Tamil Meet as a "big circus" or a "carnival" is certainly welcome to enjoy the "better company" of Periyar Naicker as regards his opinion of the Tamil language also! I am afraid, I am too unintelligent to appreciate the sense of humour which M. D. Kini has displayed in referring to the Tamil Meet as a "circus" or "Carnival", as I happen to subscribe to the views expressed in journals like *Swarajya*. M. D. Kini who professes a soft corner for the Orissa Swatantra Government does not seem to attach any value to what appeared in *Swarajya*—a weekly which had much to do with the founding of the Swatantra Party itself.

As for the share of the Madras Government in the expenses of the Conference I refer Kini to the report of the Madras Legislature's Proceedings which ended just six weeks ago. Kini who has taken so much pains to quote from other papers could have taken some time off to read what *Swarajya* has to say on the Tamil Conference. If popular participation to make the Meet a glorious event should go only by the name of "circus or Carnival", well I don't subscribe to that kind of culture or that type of humour. I prefer to be in the good company of *Swarajya* Columnists in this respect!

To Kini's observation "the opposition of the D.M.K. to Hindi just because it will benefit the people of North and the preference for English because it will put equal burden on all is the most pernicious argument I have ever heard", the best possible reply is from one who is really the father of the Hindi movement in the south, namely Rajaji.

V. T. Sreenivasan, the General Secretary of the Mysore State Swatantra Party tells me that India's only Nobel Laureate Scientist C. V. Raman is in cent per cent agreement with Rajaji on this issue. If M. D. Kini still wants to call it "the most pernicious argument" well, it is only more than 40-41 long-fingered

consoled by the fact that I am in the good company of Rajaji and Sir. C. V. Raman!

Mr. Sridhara Murthy writes:

MR. M. D. KINI'S reply to the clarifications about the D.M.K. Government of Madras, appears to be his further attempt to discredit D.M.K. It betrays his deep rooted contempt for D.M.K. irrespective of its achievements, economic and other.

In the fifth para of his article in *Freedom First* of March 1968, Mr. M. D. Kini quotes *The Hindu* which lists the achievements of the Orissa Government and adds, "This is quite an achievement which deserves wide publicity and creates hope about the future". But Mr. Kini also says that his criterion is how a government tackles the economic problems, quotes with approval the statement of Mr. A. V. P. Araithambi wherein he has listed the achievements of D.M.K. Government in the field of industry and agriculture, hastens to add, "I don't think this is something to rave about, gloat over and shout about". In playing down the D.M.K. with his phrases he has only displayed his D.M.K. phobia. Apart from the Central Ministers, no less a political analyst than Mr. M. R. Masani has praised the efficiency of the present Madras Government. Referring to my remark on the number of licences issued by the Madras Government, Mr. Kini, has said "In cases like this only statistics carry convic-

NOVOSTI—

NEWS AGENCY
OR
CLOAK FOR ESPIONAGE?



Price: 50 p.

Published by
DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

1, Alindur Street, Madras 1, India

tion". Again referring to the World Tamil Conference, Mr. Kini likes "to be enlightened" as to what was the contribution of the Madras Government. Let me caution Mr. Kini that on matters over which he is yet "to be enlightened" he should refrain from making comments.

At a time when there is lack of party loyalty, political stability, and economic realism in the Congress as well as non-Congress States, all enlightened political critics should put their efforts to strengthen and mobilise all non-Socialistic, morally clean and politically stable parties. It is a pity that a columnist of the *Freedom First*, makes uncharitable and prejudicial remarks on D.M.K. and persists in doing so even after facts are told and when the greatest of democrats, Rajaji is meticulously taming and training D.M.K. into a strong non-socialistic and democratic force as an alternative to the Congress and its outmoded economic dogmas.

(Continued from page 1)

the opportunity to live and work here unless, of course, it is proved after an inquiry that his continued stay in the country is undesirable or objectionable.

It is wrong to regard action against Fr. Ferrer as action against the Catholic community. Those who are giving the agitation for the cancellation of the order against Fr. Ferrer that turn are doing a grave disservice to him as well as to the Catholic community. The externment of Fr. Ferrer is not a religious issue; it is an issue of human freedom and it is only on that basis that it should be tackled.

There can be no question, therefore, of carrying conviction, as suggested by some, to the Catholic community. Liberal opinion in the country must be convinced that the action taken against Fr. Ferrer is neither arbitrary nor unreasonable. Unless liberal opinion in the country is convinced it cannot carry conviction to liberal opinion abroad. It is undesirable that to the millions of her friends abroad India should appear as having acted in an unjust and unfair manner. As things stand at present it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the action against Fr. Ferrer is unjust and unfair.

After these lines were written came the news that the Government of India has extended by two months Fr. Ferrer's permission to stay in India. This is a welcome step. This will enable the Government to hold an inquiry and find out the truth of the matter. If Fr. Ferrer is held guilty of carrying on undesirable activities nobody will object to his being asked to leave. But before that step is taken let there be an inquiry with adequate opportunities to Fr. Ferrer to refute the charges. It is not desirable that the Government should be hustled into action by the interested propaganda of some opposition parties and local groups.

Mr. M. D. Kini replies:

NO meaningful discussion can be carried on mere opinions. Facts and figures make it more scientific and rational—whether it is a question of licences issued or the contribution of the Madras Government to the World Tamil Conference.

Greatness of Tamil people and history is not at all the issue. It is obvious to every student of Indian history. The only point at issue is whether a Government in an economically underdeveloped country should spend money on other than economic purposes.

Again, in politics nothing is final. So also the official status of Hindi. It is not the opposition to Hindi which is objectionable but the way it was whipped up, and expressed itself in violence.

May I assure my friends from Bangalore, that those who disagree need not be opponents, that those who could not appreciate, need not have contempt, but have pain instead; and those who are not with them, need not be against them.

Without Comment

It is futile to attempt to treat the Communist parties as democratic political parties. Their first love and married life-partner is subversion. Political alignments are only stepping ladders. If we study their scriptures closely as they do themselves, we shall discover this unalterable fact. Marx is their *Rig Veda rishi*. His religion is, as Karl Jaspers has pointed out, to create a void, and the void will be filled automatically, destruction leading to creation by a law of material nature; this is the Communists' religion and they will not give it up whatever be their denominational differences in rituals and symbols. The C.M. of Madras and the Central Congress Government of Delhi should get rid of the halters they have put round their necks.

—Swarajya, March 30.

STRIKES IN INDIA

By V. B. KARNIK

Price: Rs. 42

Published by

P. C. MANAKTALA & SONS PVT. LTD.
6, Fairfield, Churchgate
Bombay 1

With Many Voices

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

Throughout my public career, I have followed the personal philosophy that I am a free man, an American, a public servant, and a member of my party—in that order, always and only.

—President Johnson, *The Indian Express*, April 2.

Now that the worst enormities of the Stalinist period seem to be over, I feel that the worst thing about Russian society is the lie. *Pravda* is far more untruthful than any paper published in England, which is saying quite a lot. The notion of truth as being a thing of importance and value in itself seems to be non-existent in Russia.

—Philip Toynbee, quoted in *Opinion*, April 2.

The Soviet Union, the central shrine of the Communists, has made the lie not only an abiding tenet of the Communist faith, but also a most convenient and powerful instrument for its propagation.

—*Opinion*, April 2.

A communist victory in Vietnam will pose a great danger to Thailand. The communists will go on a rampage and move southward to our country and the Indonesia.

—Malaysia's Transport Minister,
Tan Sri Sardon Jubir,
The Indian Express, April 3.

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

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

Name:

Address:

Signature:

The Negro needs the white man to free him from his fears. The white man needs the Negro to free him from his guilt.

—Dr. Martin Luther King, *The New York Times*, April 7.

I am one of the few persons who understand the Communists thoroughly and that is their grievance.

—Morarji Desai, *Hindusthan Standard*, April 8.

Our philosophy has remained at its highest and the practice at its lowest.

—Morarji Desai, *The Times of India*, April 14.

Dictatorship flourishes on emotion. The emotion may contain an element of idealism, but it is mostly group aggressiveness.

—P. Spratt, *Swarajya*, April 20.

Of late, posters have appeared on the walls of Calcutta and some mofussil areas which read "not mid-term elections not civil disobedience, but armed revolution". The slogan of the extremists is "armed revolution, here and now".

—*Weekend Review*, April 20.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA A SHORT HISTORY

BY

M. R. MASANI

Popular Edition : Crown Octavo Size Rs. 2.50

Library Edition : Demy Octavo Size Rs. 10.00

Available from

All Booksellers & Railway Bookstalls

OR

BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN

Bombay - 7