

Take-over of Press

"Atreya"

ONE of the basic concepts that is instilled in any efficient school for pickpockets is the sleight of hand trick under which the attention of an intended victim should be powerfully diverted away from the "target" area to better capture it. Predatory animals too resort to this process of diversion of the victim's attention to keep the victim off guard in order to more easily kill it.

One can clearly see such predatory techniques being assiduously planned in the blueprint now being worked in New Delhi for throttling whatever freedom that still exists in the Indian press today. The biggest monopolists in press ownership, namely, the Communist Party hatchetmen, started this hue and cry about the "Jute Press", "Monopoly Press" right from the days when many of the gaffes of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon started getting exposed in a press that was neither afraid of the capitalist owner of the paper nor communist-lining ministers, no matter how close they were to the power centre. There was no press baron born in India who could make even a second-class editor working for him to write editorials the way the "boss" wanted. The real tragedy was that in most cases the so-called "press barons" were totally apolitical and are actually paying the price for their political ignorance. Owning a paper to many of them was a "status symbol", and not even a pre-meditated profitable instrument. Specifically speaking, nobody could tell such veteran journalists as Frank Moraes, Nanporia, B. G. Verghese what they should write in their editorials, whether one agreed with their views or not.

Another interesting fact about newspapers is that key positions in editorial departments were held by "progressive journalists" who were news editors and senior sub-editors. These "progressives" have always enjoyed a free hand in the matter of any slanting they might have wished to give in terms of their ideological commitments and many used to do this without any "control" over them. There was one thing very common among all journalists and that has been the enormous pampering they have received at the hands of the State for nearly three decades. Even during the

last days of British rule in India, Indian journalists received prima donna treatment from the rulers to some extent and after Independence they were subjected to literally orgies of pampering. The objective of State policy in this matter seemed to be to generate journalists in India as a breed of court jesters. While fortunately this did not happen, something else happened. This was the sapping of the independent and radical nerve of journalists as a group, their becoming seedy in the continuous courting that was being done of them by competing embassies, governmental departments and public-relations minded parasites.

Though journalists were courted, there was a contempt in the courting arising out of a belief that the vulnerability of journalists to cocktail parties constituted the method of getting one's influence peddled in a particular paper. Allotment of priority telephones, housing plots in journalists' colonies, free trips in proving flights of airlines, visits abroad, constituted the special privileges for a journalist which were sought after.

All these factors contributed to Indian journalists not emerging as a strong professional group with healthy vested interest in professional standards. It became a rat's race of parasitism. An interesting episode in this connection is worth reporting. The Soviet Embassy used to hold frequent cocktail parties for journalists and at these parties it was found that a lot of gate crashers were there some of them journalists, others non-journalists. In order to identify the gate crashers and exploit their weakness for cocktails, the Soviet Embassy resorted to a very clever technique. It sent out invitations to the journalists on the mailing list it had. Sure enough, at the Press Club in Delhi everyone knew about the cocktail party scheduled a week hence. Just 24 hours before the scheduled party, the embassy telephoned the invited guests announcing the cancellation of the party. Yet at the scheduled time of the party, the gate crashers who had not known about the cancellation arrived and the Soviet Embassy officials politely took them to the bar and gave them the cocktails after obtaining their names and addresses in order to avoid embarrassment for them in the future!! After the gate-crashers left, the Commissars must have been laughing themselves hoarse at the "decadence of the bourgeois Indian journalists."

It is in such a background that the working journalists are finding themselves victims of their own weaknesses which have been assiduously built into them. The journalists in India can never survive on the basis

of their own organized strength. They are victims of these weaknesses necessitating State protection in such legislative enactments as the Indian Working Journalists Act. On their own they have developed very poor or no bargaining power with either their employers or the State. As a consequence they are perennially beholden to either the Government or the industrial newspaper employees.

In this situation, the Soviet-supported communist caucus in the Indira Cabinet realised that the time had now come to take over the press, in the wake of the prototype situation going on for some years in the *Times of India* group of papers. The free press in India continues to be what Khrushchev described as the "dead rat in the throat" of the socialist liberators of India. It continues to commit the unforgivable crime of publishing matter which makes the Soviet Embassy and its Indian hatchmen squirm uncomfortably.

An employee of the Press Trust of India named Vats who pleaded for and got a prolonged Moscow assignment features as the king-pin in the present attempts to muzzle Indian press. After his return from Moscow, this employee flaunted his influence with the "progressive" politicians and the Prime Minister in Delhi to such an extent that he cocked his snout at his General Manager with contempt for the organization. He was asked to take over another Bureau relieving an equally senior man who had manned the outpost for many years without any complaint, but Vats refused to accept the transfer because he was needed to create history. Barrister Kumaramangalam who day in and day out nowadays lambasts indiscipline among industrial workers, actively encouraged his protegee to cynically violate all service obligations to the P.T.I. The Communist Party caucus has managed to project Vats as the chief of the Indian Federation of Working Journalists and now the communist-controlled organizational instrument is ready to work out the *coup de etat* of the press take over.

While the smoke screen was garrulously created about the monopoly press to prepare the tenderminded and gullible journalists and public opinion about the non-existent threat from "monopolies", active prepa-

rations are going on by the Communist parasites to take over the press in the further consolidation process of "peaceful transition to Socialism". Though one Bombay weekly hopefully headlined that all these activities were being done without the knowledge of the Prime Minister, in actual fact, the Prime Minister was watching with benign interest the enterprise of her proteges. In fact, the Bombay weekly displayed its utter naivety when it brought out its story.

In the intended take-over process, the nominees of the Working Journalists and the newspaper employees federation will constitute the predominant factor. The union instrument of both these groups are controlled by right and left Communists respectively. The provision of the trustee is to reward a number of politicians for whom patronage opportunities are declining or running out.

While the "monopoly press" published the enormously large North Korean advertisements as paid advertisements, we could look forward to the spectacle of these types of despatches coming in our dailies as regular features once the take-over is done. This is what is in store in the proposed legislation to take over the ownership of all dailies having more than a circulation of 15,000. The real intention is not diffusion, but parasitical take-over of control points of newspapers by the Soviet-lining Communists. What happens to journalists under this type of arrangement has already been quite eloquently shown by Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali and her trusted boys of the *Link* publications and the *Patriot*.

Unless those journalists and editors who feel they have stakes in an open society and the real freedom of the press join together to rouse the conscience of all democrats in India and internationally, there is very little that stands in the way of the *coup de etat* which the Communists hope to stage in the take-over of one more power instrument in a modern society, namely, the press.

Raman Desai

We place on record our sense of deep grief at the sudden death of Mr. Raman Desai who for three years edited this journal with ability and distinction. Though a banker by profession, Ramanbhai was deeply interested in cultural affairs. He took keen interest in the development of painting, music and dance. For a number of years he was prominently associated with the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom. In recent years he was the Hon. Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bombay. In him we have lost a close friend and an ardent public worker.

—EDITOR

Trade Unions & Politics

BY V. B. KARNIK

Price: Rs 3.50

Published by
UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY

LABOUR EDUCATION SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

A Victory Of Reason

Hippopotamus

IN September 1944 the three victors, the USA, the UK and the USSR laid down in London their intention of jointly ruling Berlin. France was drawn into this agreement in November 1944.

In September 1971 the four powers together promised in Berlin to "promote the elimination of tension and the prevention of complications" in Berlin and agreed "that there shall be no use or threat of force in the area and that disputes shall be settled solely by peaceful means".

The road from London to Berlin was a thorny and crooked one, full of agitation and statesmanship, enriched with fear and hope, marked by wickedness and bravery.

Conquered solely by Russian troops, Berlin became the landmark of the smashed and chopped-up German Reich.

Those 27 years were never dull and boring, neither for the East nor for the West. For the West, Berlin was a "thorn in the flesh of the Soviets" (E. Reuter, late mayor of West Berlin), for the East it was a "cancerous growth" (N. Khrushchev).

The history of post-war Berlin was the history of a permanent crisis.

The year 1948 saw complete separation of the Eastern from the Western part of Berlin due to the currency-reform in the West introduced on June 20th, followed by the total blockade of land routes from West Germany to West Berlin on June 23, which lasted until May 1949. Berlin only survived through the gigantic efforts of the Western Allies and the enormous willpower of its population. We all remember quite well the abortive rising in East Berlin in June 1953 and the "Khrushchev-Ultimatum" in 1958, which was aimed at converting West Berlin into a "free city" under Soviet control. The final visible sign of Berlin's hardships was the Wall built in August 1961 and fortified ever since. Now West Berlin was indeed an isolated island in the "Red Sea".

This desperate situation of Berlin gave the Soviets permanently the opportunity to demonstrate through blockades and harassment on the land routes, the limits of the power of the Western Allies.

Something had to be changed. But this change could only be initiated after 1969, when a new coalition government of Social Democrats and Free Democrats ousted in West Germany the Christian Democrats, who had been ruling the country for twenty years, and who never abandoned Dulles' "roll-back" strategy of the Cold War years. And this desperately needed change could only come through negotiations.

"When we proposed negotiations to Moscow two

years ago," a senior official in Washington was quoted in *Newsweek* magazine on September 6, 1971, "we were in a weak position with almost no bargaining power". True, because the West had nothing to offer at all but strong words.

The situation however changed due to the efforts and achievements of Willy Brandt's and Walter Scheel's new Ostpolitik.

Within the first four months after coming into power the social-liberal coalition began talks with Moscow (January 1970), Warsaw (February 1970) and East Berlin (March 1970). Thus the soil was fertile enough to be fructified by the Big Four. Their ambassadors met for the first time on March 26, 1970 to discuss the Berlin issue and to search for a mutually acceptable solution.

Seventeen months of discussions, thirty-three sessions and more than one hundred and fifty hours of bargaining went by before everyone was satisfied with the solution found.

There was little progress at first, but the big breakthrough became possible after Bonn's negotiations with Moscow and Warsaw had led to the signing of two treaties in 1970. Willy Brandt made it quite clear to Leonid Brezhnev on August 12, 1970 that the treaties would not be presented for ratification to the German Bundestag if there was not reached a satisfactory solution for West Berlin. In addition to that the NATO countries made it a condition, that an all-European security conference and negotiations on mutual and balanced force-reductions in Europe would only come into being after Moscow would show its preparedness to make concessions on Berlin. And they came. With the Chinese on their doorsteps, the Soviets were very keen to reduce the tensions on their Western flank.

With the signature on the Berlin agreement, more than a quarter century of confrontation in the heart of Europe seems to have come to an end.

For the first time since the war the four-power responsibility for Berlin is laid down. The four governments respect "their individual and joint rights and responsibilities..." and agree "that irrespective of the differences in legal views, the situation... shall not be changed unilaterally".

But much more important than these general statements are—for practical purposes—the specific provisions in Part II of the agreement and its Annexes I-IV.

The Soviet Union promises to guarantee the unimpeded transit traffic by road, rail and waterways from the Federal Republic to West Berlin, thus abandoning her longtime stand that the German Democratic Republic alone should have jurisdiction

over access to Berlin. East German officials will be allowed to make only identification checks of travellers, and goods would be transported in sealed trucks, rail-road cars or ships. This provision alone would make the agreement worthwhile, because only a person who ever travelled by car or train to West Berlin really knows what that means.

Furthermore, the four governments agreed, that the "ties between the Western Sectors of Berlin and the FRG will be maintained and developed." The Soviet theory was herewith reversed, that West Berlin was a kind of "third German State". The Soviets for the first time not only recognized Bonn Government's right to a presence in West Berlin, but they also agreed that permanent residents of Berlin may travel and visit East Berlin, East Germany and other Eastern countries "under conditions comparable to those applying to other persons entering these areas", and that "the Federal Republic of Germany may perform consular services" for West Berliners in those countries.

A lot was gained for the people of West Berlin. What had to be given up? Not very much. The USSR will be allowed to establish a Consulate-General in Berlin with a limited staff, the Federal Government

will not perform any longer "constitutional or official acts" in West Berlin, e.g. the election of the Federal President.

Taking into account firstly the situation of West Berlin in the last twenty-seven years, and secondly the provisions of the agreement, it is safe to say, that the new development was "a giant and welcome step towards an East-West accord" (*Times of India*). The deadlock over West Berlin has been broken and one can see an open field for further peaceful cooperation in Europe and elsewhere.

It is ridiculous to say that the agreement means "the three power confirmation of the division of Germany" (West-Germany's right wing newspaper *Bild*). Germany was already divided, not the least through the Germans' own mistakes and megalomania. "The flags were not hauled down" as F. J. Strauss, ex-finance minister of the FRG saw it. What was achieved was the beginning of a better tomorrow, which could teach us all a lesson, since it demonstrated what can be achieved by patient and adroit peaceful negotiations. The Germans have to accept the division of their country and their capital. No peaceful means is in sight to reverse this historical event



Research Quality Expansion...

we are deeply dedicated to each!

Amar Dye-Chem are pioneers in the dyestuff industry in India — and have sustained the performance through the years. In meticulous quality control. In unceasing research. In consistent expansion. In mounting exports. Today, Amar Dye-Chem make dyestuffs for almost every conceivable application — in textile, paper, leather, plastic, paint, coir and many other industries.



*we believe that
Research is the life blood
of the chemical industry.*

AMAR DYE-CHEM LTD.
'Rang Udyan', Mahim, Bombay 16



Fundamental Rights In Danger

(From a Correspondent)

A ONE-DAY Seminar to consider Amendments 24 and 25 to the Constitution was held in Bombay on August 28. It was convened by the Fundamental Rights Front and was presided over by Mr. K. Subba Rao, the former Chief Justice of India and the President of the Front. The Seminar was attended by a number of prominent persons including Mr. M. R. Masani, Mr. Justice J. C. Shah, Mr. Khushwant Singh, Mr. N. A. Palkhiwala, Prof. A. B. Shah, Dr. R. C. Cooper, Dr. S. P. Aiyar and others. The Seminar adopted towards the end a Statement and also appointed a committee to draw up and develop an action-oriented programme.

The following is the text of the Statement that was adopted:

"The 24th and 25th Amendments have in them the potentiality to deprive the people of their freedoms.

Through the 24th Amendment, Parliament has usurped the constituent power of the people, enlarged the scope of the word 'amendment' to include 'repeal', abridged the Fundamental Rights by removing the limitations on its power under Article 13 of the Constitution and made it obligatory on the President to give his assent to the constitutional amendments.

The 24th Amendment passed under the pressure of the emotional slogan of "sovereignty of Parliament" changes the "constitutional democracy" which by definition is a limited Government, into "constitutional despotism".

The freedom of the country does not mean the freedom of a geographical unit, but that of the people therein. It does not make any difference if they were deprived of this freedom by a foreign Government or by an Indian Government.

By the said amendments, the freedoms of the people acquired by the sacrifices and prolonged struggle of our people and preserved for us by the Constitution, are again in jeopardy and are in the process of erosion.

It is necessary to focus the attention of all freedom-loving people on this immediate danger to their freedoms so that they may fight for their preservation by all constitutional methods before it becomes too late.

The 25th Amendment destroys whatever remains of the common people's Fundamental Right to Property. Under the 25th Amendment, the State, by law, can deprive a person of his property without compensation or without the intention of any public purpose.

By the introduction of the concept of "any amount" in the place of "compensation" in the law of acquisition and by making the question of "public purpose" for the purposes of Article 39 Clause (B) and Clause

(C) non-justiciable, it enables the State to confiscate the property of the people for a nominal amount.

The Amendment further makes the State Legislatures subordinate to the Central Executive in the area covered by the said amendment, in as much as the State can make laws in that regard virtually only after obtaining the previous sanction of the Central Executive.

The 24th and 25th Amendment Bills may well turn out to be the beginning of the end of the rule of law in our country."

A number of papers were prepared for the Seminar. The following are extracts from some of those papers:

In his paper entitled, The "Conscience of the Constitution" Dr. S. P. Aiyar stated: "What is sought to be achieved now by way of constitutional amendment is a change in the very nature of the Constitution by locating power in Parliament. Let us assume that those who have inspired these bills have the most laudable intentions in mind. But do we give to a future Parliament, differently constituted, the power to invalidate the present amendment bills and abridge fundamental rights to suit party interests? What happens to constitutional continuity if the constitution is to be changed one way or the other in the direction in which political winds blow?"

Mr. J. M. Lobo Prabhu raised the question "Which is Supreme — Parliament or People?" and answered it as follows: "In a democracy, there is no doubt of the supremacy of the People. The real question therefore is whether Parliament reflects this supremacy exclusively or whether it is not also entrenched in the Constitution, the Judiciary, clear and not self contradictory laws and above all in the real interests of the people." Continuing he stated: "If therefore other laws against Fundamental Rights are to be passed, other amendments of the Constitution, like the 25th Amendment will be necessary. What has been achieved therefore by the 24th Amendment is the open door to Constitutional amendments of other Fundamental Rights, which may make the Constitution grow like a telephone directory."

Mr. Zafar Futehally expressed his fear of the Parliament misusing its power to curtail Fundamental Rights as follows: "It is on the contrary this very fear — and indeed the certainty of misuse by political forces whose prime criteria of action has been to be on the winning side — which prompts the average, educated, non-political citizen of India to watch with apprehension the actions of the political heroes of the day. The Fundamental Rights ensure that the intelligent minority of the country can by the force of their

logic and understanding stay the hand of the majority whose decision is limited and personally motivated. If this pillar is removed it would appear that in many areas the last recourse of reason against political expediency would vanish from the Indian scene."

In his paper entitled "Supremacy of Parliament" Mr. K. Santhanam expressed the following view: "The power of amending the Constitution is undoubtedly a supreme power and this has been delegated in various ways in the Constitution. The Parliament has been empowered to amend certain articles of the Constitution by a simple majority, e.g. the reorganisation of States. Other articles can be amended by the Parliament by a double majority of each House i.e. an absolute majority together with a two-third majority of those present and voting. Other articles can be amended by the above process subject to ratification by 50 per cent of the State legislatures. In this scheme, there is nothing inconsistent if certain articles have been reserved to the people themselves and made not amendable by any of the above methods. This is exactly the judgment in the Golak Nath case and Article 13(2) is the obvious authority for it."

Dr. R. C. Cooper expressed his views that after the Amendments neither the freedom of the press nor the rights of religious minorities and backward classes would be safe. He stated: "Regarding Mrs. Gandhi's assurance that the amendment of the Constitution will not be misused to adversely affect the basic rights of the people, let me recollect a similar assurance of late Prime Minister Nehru. Exactly the same promise was made by Mr. Nehru on the floor of the Parliament at the passing of the 4th Amendment. Some years later, when the West Bengal Government took shelter under this amendment of the Constitution causing grave hardship to about 2,000 small people, the late Prime Minister personally expressed to me his helplessness while sympathising with their lot."

Other papers that were collected together for the Seminar consisted of some articles published in various journals. Prominent amongst them were articles by Mr. Frank Anthony, Mr. M. R. Masani, Mr. K. Subba Rao and Mr. V. Shankar.

In his article Mr. M. R. Masani asked: "what would be the consequences for the country if these Bills now introduced in Parliament are enacted and if the State Legislatures, the President and the Supreme Court were to succumb to these pressures?" He answered:

"The first of these results would be that the most elementary rights of the citizen, namely, the right to freedom of speech and expression; to assemble peaceably; to form associations or trade unions; to move freely throughout the territory of India; to reside and settle in any part of the territory; to practise any profession, or to carry on any occupation, trade or busi-

ness; and to profess, practise and propagate one's religion, would be placed at the mercy of those who may at any given time enjoy a temporary majority in Parliament. Mr. Gae, the Law Secretary of the Union Government, despite the fact that he is among those who wish the Supreme Court to reverse its decision in the Golak Nath Case, has described the majority judgment in so far as it held that Articles 19(1) (f) and 31(2) are not mutually exclusive as "character for the right to the freedom of speech, personal liberty and other rights guaranteed in Part III of the Constitution." That charter would now be scrapped if Parliament were to have its way.

"The second consequence would be that the rights of the minorities to freedom of worship and to establish and maintain institutions for religious and charitable purposes, to establish and administer educational and other institutions of their choice, to equality of treatment and to protection from discrimination would be similarly exposed to destruction by a majority vote.

"The third consequence would be that the freedom of the Press would be endangered.

"The fourth consequence would be that the Supreme Court would be removed from its position as the interpreter of the Constitution and the sentinel of the citizen's rights.

"The Bills to amend the Constitution now before Parliament are thus measures that would *open the door to the establishment of an authoritarian regime in this country and mark the beginning of the end of free India's democratic way of life.* These Amendments are undemocratic and ultra vires the Constitution and it is hoped they will be vetoed by the President and, if necessary, struck down by the Supreme Court."

Mr. A. D. Corwala expressed the same opinion in his article. He stated: "This Bill is truly a monument to the inherent arbitrary, autocratic tendencies of our elected Prime Minister. By its use, with complete legality, the country can be turned into an authoritarian state, all dissent silenced, and everybody brought to heel. "But trust us" says the beguiling Indira, "surely you know me, I couldn't do any such things, could I?" "Great lady," say we "if you couldn't do such things, why bring forward such a bill? The fact of its introduction is in itself ample evidence to show that you not only could, but would, do such things." *The Bill in fact presages the end of democratic government in India.* Once it is passed, a dark shadow is cast over all freedom. We become creatures of the Government's will, not free citizens, living and thinking according to our own individual consciences."

Mr. V. Shankar discussed in his article the legal effect of the decision in the Golak Nath case. He wrote: "To my mind the majority judgment in the Golak Nath case on two issues is both clear and logical,

(Continued on page 10)

Economic Reform In Russia

F. Hajenko

LONG before the economic reform began to go into operation in the USSR, Western economists were saying that the Soviet economy would only show the high rates of growth achieved during its initial period of extensive industrial development (i.e. its period of initial industrial accumulation) by administrative planning methods so long as it was in the process of reaching maturity; afterwards, these rates would inevitably begin to decrease. Soviet economists categorically denied this. The high rate of Soviet economic development, they said, resulted from the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist economy, and hence was not bound to any particular period of development.

In the late fifties, however, the Soviet and other Communist economies started to show signs of crisis; returns on capital (*fondootdacha*) and the growth rates of industrial production and labour productivity began to decline sharply.

The situation was particularly critical in Soviet agriculture, where from 1956–60 to 1961–65 the average annual increase in production slumped from 5.9 to 2.1 per cent.

In the face of these hard facts, it was officially acknowledged that the "previous system of planned management of the economy"—hitherto hailed as exceptionally progressive—had "begun to retard economic progress" and therefore was in urgent need of reform.

The first country in the Soviet bloc to embark upon an economic reform, in January 1963, was Eastern Germany, the bloc's most highly developed industrial state. The USSR followed suit in late 1965 on the basis of resolutions adopted at plenary meetings of the Party Central Committee held in March and September of that year. Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia began their reforms at about the same time, and Rumania in 1968. This sequence reflects, to some degree at least, the order in which the various countries approached economic maturity.

The essence of the economic reform in the Soviet Union was to allow enterprises broad economic initiative and enhance the economic stimulation of production. As the prominent Soviet economist L. Leontev put it in an article in the Party's theoretical mouthpiece *Kommunist* "economic initiative . . . is destined to become a powerful motive force in the development of production."

What the reform meant specifically was as follows. Economic methods of governing the national economy, based on such economic "levers" as prices, credits and profits, were to supplant purely administrative ones. Commodity output was to be given preference as a

criterion over gross production. Profitability was to be accepted as an index of an enterprise's successful operation, and market relations expanded. Emphasis was to be placed on material incentives as opposed to the moral ones previously favoured as conforming with the "new Communist attitude toward work." Bonuses were to be paid not from an enterprise's wages fund but from its profits, so that the higher the profits, the greater the bonuses. A kind of "thirteenth salary" was also to be paid out from profits.

Thus, a worker's earnings were to become directly dependent on the success of his enterprise. The idea was that it would become in the worker's own interest to work hard, observe labour discipline, seek out new "production reserves," use power and materials economically, and so on, and see that his comrades did as well. Instead of being a mere machine-minder, he was to take an active, constructive interest in his job.

According to the Soviet press, the economic reform has proved a success. Party Central Committee Secretary I. V. Kapitonov, for example, declared in a speech made in 1969 on the occasion of the ninety-ninth anniversary of Lenin's birth that the Party's and government's economic policy was "completely justifying itself in practice and proving its viability strength".

For a number of reasons of a subjective as well as an objective nature, however, the reform is so far failing to take full effect. First of all, its implementation has been taking longer than planned. Although scheduled for completion in 1968, it had still failed to encompass some economic sectors by the end of 1970. Prices for industrial products have not, as promised, been brought into line with average expenditures of social labour, so that the possibilities for operating profitably vary from enterprise to enterprise. Scientifically founded recommendations on the optimum relationship between centralized guidance and enterprises' initiative are lacking. The form of providing material incentives for workers also appears to have been poorly conceived.

The relative ineffectiveness of the reform is not surprising in view of the obstacles in the way of its implementation. Any considerable extension of the initiative of individual enterprises, for example, demanded that appropriate market relations should exist between them. Since, with few exceptions, such relations were either absent or else extremely tenuous, and since market relations were in general frowned upon in Soviet economic theory, this measure was implemented with considerable caution and with numerous reservations.

(Continued on page 11)

Without Comment

Russian and Chinese Forces

A SURVEY published recently by the International Institute for Strategic Studies provides the following information about the military might and disposition of forces of China and Russia:

Peking has 2.9 million men in its forces, but the country's real strength lies in the concept of "people's war," pioneered by Mao Tse-tung. This involves massive, popular, military mobilization for defence purpose—but limits the mobility necessary to launch offensive attacks.

Significant progress is being made in arms production. Tanks, bombers, fighter aircraft, diesel-powered submarines and fast guided missile patrol boats now are being manufactured in the country.

Ability to wage nuclear war has been markedly improved with the introduction of 30 Soviet-type TU-16 bombers, which have an operational range of about 1,500 miles. Five of these aircrafts now are being produced each month in Chinese factories.

China's military dispositions point to Russia as the main enemy in Chinese eyes. Not only is virtually all of China's nuclear force deployed defending the northern frontier with Russia, but the biggest conventional military force—33 divisions out of the country's total of 140—is reported assigned to the same border areas.

The Soviet Union, having matched the American total of offensive strategic missiles, has continued to deploy additional intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) on land, to construct additional ballistic-missile submarines, and to develop more-effective weapons for its offensive forces.

Evidence of the continuing Soviet build-up includes the fact that the U.S.S.R. now surpasses the U.S. in ICBM strength—1,510 missiles to 1,054.

In addition, the U.S. lead in Polaris type submarine continues to be whittled away. A year ago the U.S. had 656 submarine-based missiles to 280 of the Soviets. Now the ratio is 656 to 440, and equality in submarine forces may be reached by 1974.

Over all, the picture is one of a Russia which, in the past five years, has achieved tremendous military progress and today, broadly speaking, matches U.S. armed strength.

Statistics show how the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are pursuing different courses. From a peak of 3.5 million men in 1968, strength of American armed forces is declining to 2.7 million today, 2.5 million in 1972. No parallel reductions are noted in the Soviet Union.

Instead, manpower levels are showing a slow but steady increase and now are around the 3.4 million mark. Defence expenditure is declining in the U.S., while it is rising in Russia.

One reason for the escalation of Soviet spending is thought to be the Kremlin's worry over two problems—its unstable East European empire, and a hostile China. As the Chinese build forces along the border, so do the Russians. Today there are 41 divisions deployed against the Chinese.

Front Organisations

THE Communist front organisations are another important channel for the dissemination of propaganda. They were established to appeal to specialised sectors of society and their propaganda is angled accordingly. They produce 19 publications and innumerable information bulletins.

The most important of the Soviet-controlled front organisations are the World Peace Council (WPC); the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU); the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Union of Students (IUS).

The WPC appeals to pacifists, intellectuals and idealists, mainly because it has camouflaged its true purpose. The WFTU, organisationally strong, has to compete with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) to which the leading non-Communist union belong. The WFDY and IUS take a leading rôle in organising world youth festivals, the largest single propaganda event in the Communist calendar. The IUS also acts as a clearing house for applications to study in Communist countries.

Other "fronts" controlled from Moscow are: the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF), the World Federation of Teachers' Union (FISE), the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), the World Federation of Scientific Workers (WFSW), the International Organisation of Journalists (IOJ), the International Radio and Television Organisation (OIRT) and the International Federation of Resistance Fighters (FIR).

All these organisations were shaken by the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia and opinion among members and officials was so divided that the fronts were virtually at a standstill for three months. Nearly all leading officials who had criticised the invasion lost their posts between 1969 and 1970. By the end of the period the organisations had almost returned to normal but they are tending now to operate more outside Europe. The WPC is collaborating with the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO) in support of African "liberation movements" and the WFTU is working closely with the All-African Trade Union Federation (AATUF).

Reviews

Hindus and Family Planning

Sudhir Hendre, Supraja Prakashan, Bombay, Rs. 11.

THE book is written to prove that family planning will be disastrous to Hindus, as in the course of about a hundred years they will be reduced to the position of minority. The thesis is not proved though it is reiterated many a time in the book. A number of tables are given at the end, but there is not one which lends support to the thesis.

The whole argument is based on the permission given to Muslims to marry four wives at a time, while monogamy is obligatory on Hindus. How many Muslims take advantage of the permission is not found out by the author. Moreover, as the number of women is less than the number of men amongst Muslims, as amongst Hindus, the permission will not have any concrete effect on the results of family planning. The only complaint that can be legitimately made is that, owing to backwardness and ignorance, family planning has made little progress in the Muslim community. But that would only mean that more vigorous efforts should be made to carry the message to that community.

Family planning, its desirability or otherwise is, however, only a minor part of the book. The major part is a strident plea for the protection of Hindu interests which are supposed to be under attack by the secular Government, Muslims and other minorities and foreign Powers like Russia and China. In making that plea the author has made so many wild statements that it is not possible to deal with them. He is angry with the Constitution and wants it to be scrapped. He is against Marxism, Socialism and Communism, which, according to him are "basically opposed to the great Teachings of Hinduism". He suggests giving up democracy. His advice to the Hindu is: "Therefore the Hindus have to save Hinduism from the secularists led by the Nehru dynasty which has become the self-sold slaves of Russia, and mortgaged the foreign policy, economic policy and cultural heritage of Hindustan to Russia, China and Pan-Islam." The sentence can give an idea of the nature of the author's thinking.

The author has put himself forward as an advocate and defender of Hinduism. What he has written, however, cannot be said to have served the cause that he has in view.

V. B. K.

Computer and Labour Problems in India

K. R. Bhandarkar and Raja Kulkarni, United Asia Publications, Rs. 25.

AUTOMATION and computerisation have made little progress in India. According to the book under review, in 1970 there were only 116 electronic

computers in use in the country and most of them were in use in technical and research institutions and in industries in the private sector for purposes of accounting, statistics and inventory control. They have not yet made their appearance in the field of production. All the same, the book says: "Automation has come to stay." According to it, "It is not necessary for it to spread directly with its explicit known features, in each and every economic activity of the society. It is enough, even if it occupies the strategic and commanding points in the economic structure. This is exactly the role automation is destined to play in our country."

The authors of the book, one an experienced electronic engineer and the other an eminent trade union leader, are not unaware of the problems created by automation. It gives rise to unemployment; even if immediate retrenchment is avoided out of humanitarian considerations, it reduces the employment potential, thereby adding to the gravity of the problem of unemployment. They seem to have, however, come to the conclusion that automation cannot be avoided. The only thing that can be done is to regulate its pace and in that connection they have made in the book some useful suggestions.

While considering the question of automation and computerisation, the authors have discussed many social, economic and political issues, but they have not raised the crucial issue of the choice of technology. That really is the most important issue for a developing country like India with a big surplus of manpower but an acute shortage of capital. How is scarce capital to be used? Is it to be used for developing capital-intensive industries which provide little employment or for developing labour-intensive industries which possess a much larger employment potential? The answer to that question will determine the attitude to automation and computerisation. Automation and computerisation may in the long end give rise to new industries and provide employment, but nobody knows how distant that "long end" is and how the country will be able to keep intact its socialism and its democratic institutions against the rising anger of evergrowing masses of, educated and uneducated, unemployed workers.

As the Finance Minister, Mr. Y. B. Chavan has pointed out in his Foreword, "introduction of computers is not a mere investment decision but it has also some important social connotations." The social connotations are not, one must regretfully say, usually kept in mind when taking decisions about the choice of technology which is involved in the introduction of computers.

The two authors, Mr. Bhandarkar and Mr. Kulkarni, have done well to write a book to invite attention to a problem which is bound to loom large in the years to come. The printing and the general getup of the book are such as will attract readers.

S.D.

(Continued from page 6)

namely, that Article 368 does not empower Parliament to amend the Fundamental Rights with a view to abridging or taking away the rights conferred under Part III of the Constitution and that any law passed by Parliament under Article 368 in contravention of this interpretation would be void. I do not subscribe to the view that Article 368 is only procedural or that we must read into other articles, quoted by Justice Subba Rao, Parliament's authority to amend the Constitution. The title of Part XX "Amendment of the Constitution" and the fact that nowhere else does the Constitution deal with the general power to amend the Constitution make it clear that *Article 368 does clothe Parliament with the power to amend the Constitution in the manner laid down.*

"The question, therefore, arises as to the extent of such power. It is here that Article 13 of the Constitution comes into play. Justice Hidayatullah has rightly remarked that Articles 368 and 13(2) of the Constitution must be harmoniously construed. The minority judgment also agrees. The only question is which overrides which.

"To my mind the overriding nature of Part III is borne out by the definite and specific restrictions imposed not merely on Parliament but on the entire authority and limbs of the over-all "State" which has been defined under Article 12 to include "the Government and Parliament of India and the Government

and the legislature of each of the States and all local or other authorities within the territory of India or under the control of the Government of India." Surely it cannot be contended that Parliament here is included in its restricted sphere of legislation and not in its sovereign status of Constitution-maker.

"Article 13(2) says that the State (and not Parliament alone) 'shall not make any law which takes away or abridges the rights conferred by this part (Part III) and any law made in contravention of this clause shall to that extent of the contravention be void.' To my mind the sole intention underlying this Article was and could have been to declare the Fundamental Rights inviolable."

A couple of articles and papers giving the other view were also made available to the Seminar.

BOOKS RECEIVED

1. *Religion and Change in Contemporary Asia*, Edited by Robert F. Spencer, Oxford University Press, Bombay. Rs. 45/-.
2. *Mahatma Gandhi: The Man and his Mission*, by U. R. Rao, edited by G. S. Pohekar, United Asia Publications, 12, Rampart Row, Bombay 1. Rs. 15/-.
3. *France and the World* by Girija K. Mookerjee, United Asia Publications, Bombay 1. Rs. 25/-.

CANCER IS CURABLE IF DETECTED IMMEDIATELY

These are the 7 Danger Signals

1. Any sore that does not heal.
2. A lump or thickening in the breast or elsewhere
3. Unusual bleeding or discharge
4. Any change in a wart or mole
5. Persistent indigestion or difficulty in swallowing
6. Persistent hoarseness or cough
7. Any change in normal bowel habits.

If you notice any of these 7 Danger Signals--consult
doctor AT ONCE.

YOUR MONEY CAN SAVE A LIFE!

The Indian Cancer Society is in urgent need of funds with which to fight cancer. However small your donation, it can help to save a life. Post your contribution to THE INDIAN CANCER SOCIETY, Hospital Avenue, Parel, Bombay 12.

GIVE TO CONQUER CANCER

Letter to the Editor

Autonomy for States or Bharat?

Sir,

THE article in the issue of August under the heading "Autonomy for States" is interesting in various ways. It gives a summary of the Rajamannar Report. Those, who have neither time nor the inclination to read that report, are thankful to Mr. S. V. Raju for giving them its outline.

In all these thoughtless quarrels between States and the Centre and one State with another, a basic point is often forgotten by the politicians, namely, that they are all within Bharat. All these disputes are created by self-centred and selfish politicians, who often put the party's interests above those of Bharat. It is not the people who quarrel but politicians will be seen from the fact that when tens of thousands, if not lakhs gather at various religious places all over India, we never hear of any personal quarrels. They all come from distant parts of Bharat, and speak different languages, even eat different food and dress differently. Yet how cooperative they are! Even when they gather in lesser numbers, as in temples, no quarrels arise. Also when they travel in packed third class carriages, we never hear of bickerings amongst them.

I have pointed out these simple instances to show that there is a basic unity amongst the vast majority of the people, except amongst the 5000 and odd elected members, who are said to represent the majority!

Apart from this, the methods used by Gandhiji to win freedom are being misused and mis-applied every day by politicians to bring disruption and not unity in the country. They are all caricaturing those sacred methods as none of the parties have any moral or spiritual basis as Gandhiji had.

In the imaginary "conflict" between States and Centre, they forget that the Centre also is elected by the same voters and not by some special group from outside the country. The saying that the "ship is alright and the faults are in the men who run it" is becoming more and more true in our unfortunate land. Does the Centre stand in the way of removing beggars, slums, improving sanitation, creating enough of food and shelter in the various States? Does it stand against keeping the law and order situation in a decent way? Does it stand against efficient administration with no corruption? Will any politician answer these simple questions?

The real point is that the States want to have their finger in the "corruptions" which are prevalent in various ways in granting licenses for industries etc. Instead of taking steps to remove such vices the States say "allow us" i.e. the corrupt politicians in the States also, to carry on the same nefarious practices and make the vast majority suffer.

The whole difficulty is that the pre-Independence ideal of the love of Bharat, for which thousands and thousands had suffered, has vanished from the hearts of politicians. Hence this virus is infiltrating into the body politic of the country. People are more afraid of our politicians than they ever felt of the foreigners who ruled us for 200 years.

The root cause is that the politicians have all forgotten Bharat in their competition to bring more and more disruptions for this land, which were the causes for our slavery for a long 1000 year under foreign rule. The fault is neither with the States nor in the Centre but they are all in the 5000 and odd persons whom we have selected to represent us. How to reform them is the basic question.

S. R. NARAYANA AYYAR
(Camp) Bombay, 11.8.1971

(Continued from page 7)

Already, the reform has brought in its wake not only considerable changes in economic theory but major social changes as well. In particular, the need has become apparent for a democratization of labour relations, greater freedom and independence for the worker *vis-à-vis* the state, and hence toleration of a freer development of society in general. The reform has constituted such a break with a system of management for years considered the only correct one possible that, in the words of one Soviet writer, a "certain re-orientation of economic thinking" has been called for. For many, this has naturally not been easy, especially since in the light of their previous political education the reform must have appeared as a deviation from the path of Communist construction. The reform is therefore encountering the conservatism and bureaucracy hampering all innovations in the Soviet economic world: determined attempts are being made to retard its implementation and even reduce it to a dead letter.

Even though there is recognition among Soviet economists that the present level of industrial enterprises and the need to increase their efficiency "objectively demand an extension of the frontiers of workers' participation in management," there is a firm principle laid down in Soviet economic legislation which says that "the management of production remains at the given stage a function of the state." Here, the state is represented in this case by the director, who can thus legally ignore any proposal put forward by a workers' meeting, production conference, factory trade-union committee, or any similar institution. Unlike his colleague in the West, the Soviet factory director has such dictatorial powers that he can even frequently afford to flout the labour laws without too great a risk to his own position. Thus, in most cases, participation of workers in production management is in the Soviet Union either reduced to a formality or simply non-existent.

With Many Voices

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

The greatest enemies of economic wisdom are dogma and ideology.

—N. A. Palkhivala, *Indian Express*, September 2.

The sufferer will be the dissenter, independent thinker, the man who does not obligingly fall in line.

—Nayantara Sahgal, *Sunday Standard*, September 19.

The Indo-Soviet Treaty has evoked respect for India in the international world.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Swarajya*, September 18.

In the name of Socialism, the consumer has been condemned to live with shortages, queueing and the blackmarket.

—*Thought*, September 18.

India is not Czechoslovakia and Indira is no Dubcek.

—*Janata*, September 5.

With some of them on the Board as representatives of the employees and some as shareholders the Communists and their allies would have been in the happy position of dominating the newspapers and in controlling their policy.

—A Working Journalist, *The Current*, September 25.

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. 5.00

Name:

Address:

Signature

Giving advice to, or about, Vietnam has become a vocation in itself.

—*The Economist*, August 28.

Non-alignment is what India does, just as fashion is what Mala Sinha wears. In this sense, we shall always remain non-aligned.

—Sisir Gupta, *Sunday World*, August 22.

President Allende's chance of bringing off his unique double, a marxist programme carried out by democratic processes, depends on the willingness of his assorted supporters to go on believing that the two things are compatible; and that willingness seems to be wearing thinner.

—*The Economist*, August 21.

Patriotism and clarity of thought are almost always incompatible.

—A Belgian Banker, quoted in *Time*, September 20.

Our national policies are identified with individual's fads and idiosyncracies—Nehru in Foreign Affairs, Amrit Kaur in Health and Population, wild backwoods men in Economics.

—S. K. Muranjan, *Opinion* September 21.

In being neither advanced nor backward, this country really enjoys a unique position.

—*Indian Express*, September 23.

The big danger today in Indian politics is the McCarthyism of the Left.

—G. K. Reddy, *The Hindu*, September 21.

The factory and the laboratory have become major priority areas for modern Communist spies.

—*The Observer*, September 26.

In spite of protests from many parts of the world, the Soviet habit of putting potential opponents of Communism into mental homes is growing.

—*Swiss Press Review and News Report*, September 27.