

A Pie In The Sky

by V. B. Karnik

A NEW communist manifesto has just made its appearance. It is presented by the rulers of Russia. It will be considered by the Communist Party when it holds its Congress in October and, as things happen in that country, it will be adopted with acclamation without the change of a word or a comma. It will be endorsed with equal, if not greater, acclamation by Communist Parties all over the world, except possibly in China where the dictates of the communist leaders of Russia do not now enjoy that blind and unquestioned obedience which they secure in all other sectors of the international communist movement.

The programme that has been chalked out in the manifesto is primarily for Russia. But it is the claim of the Russian rulers that the Russian experience has universal validity and that the road that was followed in Russia will be the road that all other peoples will follow in their march towards socialism. Dilating upon the experiences made in Russia, the manifesto states: "The high road to socialism has been paved and it will be taken sooner or later by all peoples." Its appeal is not therefore restricted to the peoples of Russia, it extends to the peoples of all countries. It seeks to spell out for the world as a whole the broad strategy of "the socialist revolution and the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat" which alone would enable people "to achieve socialism".

Russia, it is claimed, has already built up socialism. "Socialism has triumphed in the Soviet Union completely and finally." The next task is to build up communism when "the greatest principle 'from each according to his ability to each according to his needs' will be implemented." The manifesto hopes to attain a large part of that stage in the next twenty years, that is, by 1980. Its concluding words are: "The Party solemnly proclaims: The present generation of Soviet people shall live under communism."

This distinction between socialism and communism as two different stages of social growth is an innovation in Marxism. It was invented and popularised by Stalin in order to acclimatise the people's mind to the ugly realities of the situation as it existed under his regime. The inequalities, the oppression and the cruelties that were rampant in his regime were defended on the ground that they were necessary to ensure

the development of socialism into communism. It is significant that Khrushchev and his lieutenants have still found it necessary to maintain that artificial distinction.

The draft programme has painted an alluring picture of the communist heaven in which the Russian people will find themselves landed at the end of twenty years. The period is divided into two equal stages. At the end of the first period, it is stated: "The Soviet Union... will surpass the strongest and richest capitalist country, the United States, in production per head of population; the people's standard of living and their cultural and technical standards will improve substantially; everyone will live in easy circumstances; all collective and state farms will become highly productive and profitable enterprises; the demand of Soviet people for well-appointed housing will, in the main, be satisfied; hard physical work will disappear; the USSR will become the country with the shortest working day."

At the end of the next decade "there will be an abundance of material and cultural benefits for the whole population. Soviet society will come close to a stage where it can introduce the principle of distribution according to needs" and "a communist society will on the whole be built in the USSR."

To make the picture more realistic a number of target figures of the production of various commodities are mentioned. The figures are impressive. One only hopes that they will be fulfilled. If all targets are fulfilled and if every thing goes well, the benefits that will become available to the people of Russia will be as follows: "At the end of the 20 years public consumption funds will total about half of the aggregate real income of the population. This will make it possible to provide at public expense: free maintenance of children at children's institutions and boarding schools (if parents so wish); maintenance of disabled people; free education at all educational establishments; free medical services for all citizens, including the supply of medicines and the treatment of sick persons at sanatoria; rent-free housing and also free public services; free public transport facilities; free use of some types of communal services; steady reduction of charges for, and, partially, free use of holiday homes, boarding houses and tourist camps; increasingly broad provision of the population with benefits, privileges and scholarships (grants to unmarried mothers), scholarships for students; gradual introduction of free public catering (mid-day meals) at enterprises and institutions, and for kolkhoz farmers engaged in production."

Some newspapers have prominently advertised one

more benefit, the benefit of free food. The summary of the programme circulated by *Tass*, the Soviet News Agency, does not, however, mention it. *Tass* is not likely to omit the item if it were there. But even if it is included, it will not substantially alter the picture. It will only mean one more, no doubt important, addition to the social services that would become available.

There will be many who will regard this as mere utopia. They have many weighty economic arguments to prove why Russia will not be able to maintain her present rate of economic growth. In the field of agriculture particularly, there may be many mishaps and many short-falls. One need not, however, enter into that discussion. The fact is that even if that utopia is realised, it will not prove much of a draw for people in industrially advanced countries. In some of them the people are already enjoying many of the benefits that the Russians are to enjoy after twenty years. And none of them is stagnant. Their economies are also growing and their standards are improving. They may not find any particular merit in getting the goods and services that they need free through the State. They may prefer to get better wages and pay for them as they are then able to exercise choice and secure a better satisfaction of their needs.

The picture will not also prove attractive to the less developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Many of them have drawn up their own plans of economic development and are trying to improve the lot of their people. They know of the harsh and oppressive methods adopted by communist rulers of Russia and many of them find them unworthy and obnoxious. They will not like to follow in the footsteps of Russia and, if they get sufficient help from democratic countries, they will be relieved of the necessity of looking in that direction. Their course of action will be determined not by the glowing pictures of communism that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union may draw but by the enlightened or otherwise policies that the Western nations may adopt towards them.

The long-term social and economic objectives mentioned in the document are not, however, of crucial importance. Russia may or may not succeed in establishing "the world's shortest and, concurrently, the most productive and highest paid working day" or in creating an abundance of wealth. One need not worry at the moment about things that are to happen after twenty long years. What is of far greater importance is the policy that she is going to follow and the actions that she is going to undertake in the immediate present. The draft programme does not throw much light on the matter. But it contains many a formulation which shows that the communist leaders still continue to be the prisoners of their outdated age-old dogmas.

There is the same old description of the "general crisis of capitalism" and the same old denunciation of monopoly capitalism and imperialism. The words and the phrases that have been used are the usual stock-in-trade of any communist document.

There is the same old affirmation of loyalty to and belief in Marxism-Leninism. The programme states: "Fidelity to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian inter-nationalism, their firm and unswerving implementation, and defence of these principles against opportunists and all other enemies, are imperative conditions for the victory of socialism."

There is the same old insistence on proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is stated: "But the transition from capitalism to socialism can come about only through revolution. However varied the forms of a new, people's state power in the period of socialist construction, their essence will be the same—dictatorship of the proletariat." "People's Democracy", it is pointed out, is "a variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat".

The same old vulgar abuse is heaped on other parties of the working class, more particularly, the Social Democratic Parties. "Historical experience has shown", it is asserted, "the bankruptcy of both the ideology and the policy of social democracy." "Right-wing social-democrats are the most important ideological and political props of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement."

These and various other similar propositions so pontifically advanced in the draft programme make it clear that the communist leaders have learnt nothing new in the last twenty or twenty-five years. Howsoever accursed capitalism may be, nobody can say that it has stood still. Capitalism has been changing, the whole world has been changing; the only stagnant factor appears to be the thinking of the leaders of the communist movement. They are still thinking in terms and categories of a bygone age.

The only encouraging feature of the document is its reiteration of the policy of co-existence. It is stated: "The Soviet Union has consistently pursued, and will continue to pursue, the policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems." It is further stated: "To abolish war and establish everlasting peace on earth is a historical mission of communism." It is heartening to read these words. But the practice is otherwise. In practice, the Russian rulers have been and are, not lessening, but rather intensifying the danger of war. They have been exploiting every opportunity to make things difficult for states with different social systems. That may accord well with their goal of world revolution, but it runs counter to their professed policy of peaceful co-existence. Actions are far more important than words and they leave very little ground to hope for a lessening of tensions and the growth of a climate of peace.

The draft programme does not hold out any hope of an immediate improvement in the conditions of the Russian people. The benefits that are held out as a bait are to accrue only after ten or twenty years. Until then, the only thing that they are asked to do is to toil, toil and toil like workers in the early years of capitalism for "a pie in the sky."

Even in the political field, there is going to be no relaxation of the rigours of dictatorship. It is stated

(Continued on page 12)

Notes

Yellow and Red Journalism

BLITZ, the crypto-communist tabloid published from Bombay, has been found by the Lok Sabha to be guilty of a "gross breach of privilege" and it has been decided that the Editor of the weekly be summoned to the bar of the House and reprimanded. The issue arose over a report appearing in the weekly in April this year which contained vicious attack on Acharya Kripalani, the most widely respected Member of Parliament, for his Lok Sabha speech criticising the misdeeds of the Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon. This is the first time in the history of Indian Parliament that a journalist has been called to the bar of the House and reprimanded for committing a gross breach of privilege. That this dubious distinction should go to a magazine peddling the communist line is in itself not without significance.

In this case no issue of the freedom of the press was involved. On the contrary, the weekly has been found guilty of the unbridled misuse of the freedom of the press which has been so characteristic of the type of journalism *Blitz* represents. It is an unscrupulous mixture of yellow and red journalism which thrives on sex, sensationalism and lies, pandering to the base instincts of its readers. That such a magazine should become a convenient medium of international communism for carrying on its propaganda only throws a revealing light on the unscrupulous techniques of the communists. But what is surprising is the fact that such a journal should enjoy the patronage of many eminent Congress leaders, including the Prime Minister. Prime Minister Nehru speaking on the issue in the Lok Sabha described the *Blitz* attack on Acharya Kripalani as "exceedingly vulgar, which in itself was a serious offense." But, then, the journal has specialised in this type of writing and has been indulging in it for the last many years. And, still, the Prime Minister found nothing wrong so far in lending his prestige to the journal by frequently giving long interviews to its editor and allowing the latter to claim that his weekly is the mouthpiece of "Nehruism" in India. Besides, it is no longer a secret that Mr. Krishna Menon, the Defence Minister, is a staunch supporter of the magazine. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, while moving his resolution in the Lok Sabha for the adoption of the Privilege Committee's report, described *Blitz's* report as a "scandalous, scurrilous, wilful mis-representation" and hoped that the Committee's findings will put an end to the "ego of yellow journalism in the country". But, so long as Congress leaders allow this type of journalism to trade on their name and prestige, it is difficult to see how a mere reprimand from the Lok Sabha can curb this undesirable trend.

Kenyatta's Release

THE release of Jomo Kenyatta, after eight years of imprisonment, has removed one of the major hurdles on the way of Kenya's advancement towards independence. Kenyatta was arrested in 1952 and sentenced the following year to seven years' imprisonment for managing Mau-Mau rebellion. However, by putting him behind the bars, the colonial government only helped to enhance his popularity among his people who came to worship him as a martyr in the cause of Africa's liberation. His continued detention became the chief obstacle to any major constitutional advance in Kenya. His release was therefore inevitable if constitutional progress was to be made in Kenya and if racial conflicts were to be avoided. The British Government's decision to release him was accepted by all sections of the people in Kenya, including many responsible spokesmen for the loyalist Kikuyu, who gave the Government much effective aid against the Mau-Mau rebellion. This should certainly help to create a better atmosphere and understanding between various sections of the Kenyan people.

Kenyatta, as a national leader, towers over other African leaders and all political parties in Kenya now look up to him for guidance and leadership. His release should therefore open a new chapter in Kenya's history. The political and social life of the country is already ridden with factional and racial conflicts. The racial minorities are apprehensive of their future, while the two major African parties, Kadu and Kanu, are bitterly opposed to each other. Under these circumstances, the future of Kenya depends much on the course of action Kenyatta decides to follow. It is therefore gratifying to note that he has, at the first opportunity, tried to assuage the fears of racial minorities in the country. He has also condemned racial violence, expressed his satisfaction with the pace of political progress and emphasised the urgent need for unity as a precondition for political and social progress.

But if Kenyatta is to fulfill his historic mission, it is necessary that the last restriction on his participation in the political life of the country should be removed. The present Constitution of Kenya debar anyone who has served a sentence of more than two years' imprisonment from being elected to the Legislative Assembly. This would exclude Kenyatta from all formal participation in the political life of the country, even though he is bound to exercise decisive influence on the course of developments. It is to be hoped that the colonial government will see the futility of continuing this inequitable restriction and would remove it without delay, thus enabling Kenyatta to shoulder the responsibility of leading Kenya towards independence.

Auguste Comte's Religion Of Humanity

by M. A. Venkata Rao

IT is curious that of the two parallel fruits of the scientific developments of modern times summing up the many-sided repercussions of the new stirrings from the days of the renaissance viz: a broad humanitarianism and what has been called a militant social Darwinism, it is the latter that has become dominant in the contemporary world in the shape of Marxist dialectic materialism. Auguste Comte represents the earlier humanist aspect of the historical movement in the higher culture of nineteenth century Europe. His vision of the psychological evolution of ideas in terms of the three stages — theological, metaphysical and positivistic culminated (without regard to logic perhaps but in entire harmony with the higher impulses of the human conscience) in his religion of humanity.

This was overshadowed by the stern doctrines of Marx's class war and his tocsin awakening the working classes of the world to unite to achieve communism — i.e. a society of their own founded on the grave of the capitalist class that reigned in the previous epoch of individualist property and systems of production.

The wounds inflicted on human affairs by this doctrine of division and strife can perhaps be healed by harking back to the methods suggested by Auguste Comte to universalise the sympathies of man.

Marx's way was institutional and external leaving human nature in the economic and political jungle as unregenerate as before.

Comte's way was to deal directly with the psychology of man i.e. his emotional nature.

Auguste Comte was influenced decisively by a woman disciple that came to him in later life Matilde. In her he saw a new level of nobility in human nature.

He instituted a new universal "religion" to bring out and cultivate the moral impulse, the ethical instincts which are specifically human lifting man higher than the animal stage of evolution. It was a stage which was adumbrated in the historical religions but it was muddled over in it with superstitious impurities. Comte envisaged a purer and more rational mode of worship without implying revelation and personal Godhead in the traditional way.

Comte saw that human history affords us many examples of man rising higher than his biological source, as it were, examples of *heroes*. They are heroes of thought, of beneficent emotion and charity and of magnificent deeds inspired by a breath-taking sense of adventure and devotion to causes larger than self and family.

The essence of religion consists in this devotion to causes larger and higher than normal motives familiar to us in family, friendly circles and even in national spheres. In such self-transcendence man shows a gleam of a higher nature which evokes the apprecia-

tion of all mankind. In such realms of self-sacrificing action, broad sympathies and wide horizons (*prāna ārāma, mana ānanda, shanti sammiddhi*) we get glimpses of the truly human. The workday levels at which we ordinarily live, (ringed round with selfishness and flowing in customary ruts), we move in a middle region between the biological and spiritual levels of our nature. To live from large horizons and centres in which the good of neighbour and self, of family and nation, of nation and humanity are one or in which the larger is dominant over the narrower in case of conflict between the two is the objective of all ethical advancement and moral progress. All other forms of progress are but instrumental to this consummation.

Worship is the surrender to the claim for assimilation, says Dr A. N. Whitehead. Religion is a process in which we contemplate something higher than ordinary endowed with supreme value or considered as endowed with supreme value. God is but the highest we know considered as real.

Such moments are rare if left to chance. Religions therefore organise rituals whereby believers are brought together in prescribed places to contemplate supreme value in fellowship. Comte was impressed with this use of ritual. He sketched a ritual for a Religion of Humanity with weekly meetings at which the lives of heroes who have enriched humanity are contemplated with admiration and gratitude. All spheres of human achievement and all nations were included in his new calendar of saints.

Today in India we have great need for effective means for widening the horizon of our nationals and enlarging their sympathies and hearts so as to make the *nation as a whole* come alive to their imagination. The authorities call it by the name of national integration. The transition from tribe to nation is not yet effected decisively in our country on a scale sufficient for national self-government.

While the measures of punishment by law for anti-national action on the part of people in moments of stress (motivated by casteism and parochialism and communalism) based on religion may be *necessary*, they can hardly be *sufficient*. They are negative in character and need to be supplemented by the evocation of motives of a positive quality carrying affirmative experiences of love and affection for values spontaneously appreciated by the higher feelings and conscience of man as man.

It would be a good thing therefore to institute (by those who can be persuaded of its value) *humanist associations* in as many places in the country as possible. They can organise weekly meetings for services in the spirit of the religion of humanity. Each meeting may concentrate on a great personality or hero

(Continued on page 8)

Planning For Poverty Or Plenty?

by M. R. Masani

IN considering this Plan, it is useful in the beginning to cast an eye at the situation of the picture that faces us at the end of the Second Five Year Plan. What are the main facts of life with which we are faced today? From these we must start. I suggest that these main facts are three. Firstly, there is the phenomenon of rising prices. That does not need to be established by me because the Reserve Bank's report on currency and finance for the year 1960-61 and the Economic Adviser's general index of wholesale prices show a net rise of 7.2 per cent during the past year on top of a rise of 5.8 per cent in 1959-60. The Governor of the Reserve Bank himself in a recent speech has complained that there has been a steady rise, a continuous rise, in prices at the rate of 6 per cent per year during the Second Plan period without any reduction at any point of time. The Plan itself at page 121 concedes that wholesale prices have risen by about 30 per cent.

The second important fact with which we must start is the stagnant income of the large mass of our people. In so far as the landless labourer is concerned, the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Report laid on the Table of this House on 21st December, 1960, shows a material decline in wages and an increase in unemployment and indebtedness on the part of our agricultural labourers between 1950-51 and 1956-57. That process, to those who observe, has been further accentuated during the past four or five years. In so far as the industrial worker is concerned, my hon. friend the Minister of Planning and Labour said in the House on 11th April 1960:

"Between 1939 and 1947, the standard of living of the workers had declined by 25 per cent. By 1951, they had just covered the lost ground. By 1955, the real wages had increased by 13 per cent. But, since 1956, when again price started rising, their gains have been to an extent wiped out."

So far as the lower middle classes are concerned, I would say that their standard of life has gone down during the past five years. It is not only a matter of stagnating; there has been a cut back in their standard of life.

Who then has benefited by these Plans? The answer would appear to be that it is the new ruling class who are in power and in office on the one side and their satellites, a few privileged businessmen who have been given private monopolies of a limited kind on the other. It is these classes that are the only beneficiaries of the first two Plans.

The third main fact of life is the bankruptcy of this country. Our foreign exchange reserves have gone down below the safety point. The total credits so far obtained as a result of all the agreements signed by this country are, I understand, of the order of

Rs. 1750 crores. That is the best figure I have been able to ascertain from official quarters. That is the present measure of the credits that we have agreed to take or which have been vouchsafed to us in the aggregate as a result of all the agreements signed with various countries. To this sum of Rs. 1750 crores, we now propose to add further foreign indebtedness of Rs. 2200 crores. These are figures that make one shiver. Because, it really means that in the effort to repay these amounts and to pay interest and service charges on these loans, the future of this country for many many years is mortgaged. On the other hand, exports, through which alone we can possibly pay back our foreign intake of loans, are stagnant. I shall say a little about this later. But, while we go on increasing our loans from the rest of the world, we have shown our inability to repay them. This is the Rake's Progress from which we must now desist. This is the picture.

What are the prime needs of the Third Five Year Plan? The Third Plan itself sets out these needs admirably in certain parts of that long and verbose document. These needs are set out as three: (i) more saving and investment; (ii) greater production and greater productivity — that is, efficient production at low cost; (iii) export. That is an excellent summary of the primary needs of the country which the Third Plan must carry out. I do not think any one can improve on the Plan itself in setting out its needs: more investment, more efficient production at low cost, and export.

How does the Third Plan set about carrying out these three purposes? If my hon. friend the Minister will not mind my saying so, it sets about the purposes by frustrating or denying every one of these three objectives, by sabotaging each of them, if I may use a strong word.

What are those aspects of the Plan which, in fact, defeat its purpose? I would list them under five heads.

First, persistence in increasing direct and indirect taxation which is already excessive. By that insistence, certain effects are produced. Secondly, persistence with deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 550 crores. Thirdly, insistence on or obsession with forced industrialisation irrespective of cost, a kind of recklessness — let us produce; it does not matter at what cost; so long as industrialisation takes place, it is legitimate in itself. Industrialisation for itself without the justification of efficiency; this is the third major aspect.

I would like to document this a little. There is priority for low and slow return of heavy industries, the particular high water mark of that being the needless, premature setting up of a fourth steel plant. On each of the three steel plants that have been set up already,

we have spent — on each of them — twice the entire expenditure on elementary education in our country. Just think of this. Similarly, the cost of the heavy industrial programme in the public sector exceeds the entire outlay on agriculture. In a country where 70 per cent of our people live on the land and work on the land, we are spending more than half of the total outlay on industrial enterprises in the public sector. That particular State sector of our industrial enterprises takes half of the entire cake, while 70 per cent of our people live in the villages and work on the land.

It finds particular expression in the tendency towards gigantism, to talk of big things, striking things. No where is this waste of public resources better embodied than in our fad for Atomic Energy.

Mahatma Gandhi was able to see this flaw in the hon. Prime Minister's economic thinking a long time ago. On 29th June 1939, Gandhiji wrote a letter to Rajkumari Amrit Kaur on the subject of Pandit Nehru's planning. This was what he said. This is the whole letter; it is a three-sentence letter dated 29th June 1939. This was what Gandhiji wrote:

"I have advised you about Jawaharlal's invitation. In my opinion, the whole of his planning is a waste of effort. But he cannot be satisfied with anything that is not big."

I would hesitate to make such a crushing comment as Mahatma Gandhi has done.

The fourth factor of this Third Plan is the domination of the State sector. We know that the Third Plan tries to force savings or investments away from the people's enterprise into State monopolies.

Today, the people of India, outside the State sector, produce 90 per cent of the gross national product, but the Third Plan wants to cut this down to 40 per cent, and this in spite of the fact that, while private enterprise has achieved nearly more than 40 per cent of the target set for it in the Second Plan, the public sector or the State sector fell down on its job by a ten per cent shortfall. That part of the economy that functioned better than expected in the Second Plan is to be punished, but that part of the economy that failed to deliver the goods is to be boosted — in spite of the preference of the people.

Finally, there is the persistence with the collectivisation of land mentioned on pages 209 to 211 of the Plan. If hon. Members think that that particular fad has been laid to rest by the Opposition that was voiced in this Parliament and outside, they will be making a mistake. I want to warn the House and the country against any complacency. Let this present Government win the next elections, and the peasants of India will find that a very dangerous attempt will be made to snatch their lands away from them under the deceptive slogan of "joint co-operative farming." This is necessary, because every State Capitalist plan has to collectivise the land, since there is no other known method of squeezing what is called surplus value, what Marx called "surplus value", out of the earnings of the peasantry.

If these are the four main aspects of the Plan, the

results are inevitable. If this Plan is passed, I would forecast that the following things are bound to happen. One is that there will be further inflation. The Plan itself concedes further inflation. On page 127, it says: "...it is essential to be prepared for a moderate rise in the price level..." How moderate it will be is still to be seen. At another place, on page 132, it says, in trying to justify this calamity which it is inviting on the country, that: "Price rigidity is incompatible with development and some prices cannot but rise." It all depends on what you do. If you carry out these misguided policies, the prices will rise; there is no good blaming the prices; you must blame yourselves alone.

Secondly, what will follow will be increased unemployment. The Plan concedes that also. It admits at one place that on top of the 9 million unemployed today, there will be another half a million unemployed added as a result of the Third Plan.

Thirdly, what will happen will be increasing misery for our people through the denial of the necessities of life. The Plan is full of repetition about the need to cut down the consumption of the people. This is very comparable to Mr. Khrushchev's new programme recently published, where it is said that, at the end of another twenty years, the Soviet people are going to enjoy consumer goods. 1980 is the time when taxes will disappear, and water, electricity and so many other things would be free in the Soviet Union! Pie in the sky when you die. Jam tomorrow, jam the day after, but never jam today. That is the slogan, and that is the model. And what is the result? The mighty Soviet regime can fly their rockets to all parts of space, but they cannot make the simple things of life that the people want for their daily needs.

Then again, the effect of this Plan will be a high-cost economy. Today, State and private monopolies are extorting what a professor has called "near-ransom prices" from the consumer. Just to give an idea of the gap between the price in the world market and the price in India, let us take penicillin. The import price of penicillin is 10 nP per million units. The cost of production at Pimpri, or the price of the Pimpri penicillin, is Rs. 1.25 per million units. So, when we can get penicillin at 10 nP, we have to buy Pimpri penicillin at Rs. 1.25 per million units. This is the gap. This is the price that the consumer has to pay for this kind of planning or misapplication of planning.

The result is that large-scale smuggling is going on into this country, because when you create a big gap like this between the import price and the local price, smuggling is inevitable in any part of the world. So we have a high-priced economy.

If you have a high-cost economy, how do you propose to export? Shri Somani, who spoke before me has made, and the Plan itself makes, constant reference to the need to export. But how can you export when your cost of production is so high? Look at the price of sugar. The price of Indian sugar is Rs. 700 per ton. The world price of sugar is Rs.

(Continued on Page 11)

Warning For East & West

by Willy Brandt

IN West Berlin resistance is never looked upon as a frivolous matter. Nor do the inhabitants of this city appeal for action by their countrymen before weighing carefully the responsibilities and risks involved. They know that in any European cataclysm they would be struck down first. What follows, therefore, is a warning, not a threat—a warning that all concerned would do well to heed.

Sometimes one gets the impression that there are people in both the East and the West who feel "fed up with the damned Berlin problem," who are eager to get rid of it or at least take the sting out of it. But no isolated "solution" of the Berlin problem can remove the sting. There will be tension as long as the whole city is surrounded by a Communist realm, even if Berlin itself is reunited. Not even international corridor guarantees—desirable though they, too, would be—can prevent the Soviets from exerting pressure against this city; nothing can as long as Germany remains divided. Moscow enjoys a certain tactical advantage here because of Berlin's geographic position, and there is no escaping this fact.

In these circumstances, the only relevant question is how much pressure will the Russians dare to exert? As long as our Allied friends are determined to provide a satisfactory answer to that question, the Communists will only be able to derive a limited advantage from West Berlin's position. The balance will always be unfavourable to the Soviets in the end.

Since the start of the cold war it has been demonstrated time and again that Berlin can be a source of unmatched difficulty for the Soviet Union. This is not only because Berlin contributes to the instability of an anemic East German satellite. It is because Berlin has become a rallying point for the Western democracies; here they can mobilize their moral and material resources, bury their differences and act in unison. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations have repeatedly rediscovered their solidarity in periods of crisis over Berlin, and nothing frustrates Moscow as much as this sudden closing of the free world's ranks precisely when it is banking on Allied discord. Yet the greater the crisis, the firmer the solidarity of the Western Allies is likely to be.

Thus, the Communists want people to think that nothing will happen in Berlin or in Germany if Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev signs a separate peace treaty with his East German satellite. But by pretending to "recognize" the *status quo* in Germany, such a peace treaty will actually aggravate the issue of German reunification. Indeed, it will be far more difficult to deal with this problem than it has been until now, with the four former occupation powers acknowledging that it is their responsibility to solve it. And it is a dangerous delusion to think that love of their country and the yearning for national reunifica-

tion can be torn out of the German people's hearts.

Of course, we cannot prevent Khrushchev from signing a separate peace treaty with himself in his German "colony," but we are obliged to warn what the consequences will be. Such a treaty will result in the claim that the boundary dividing Germany is inviolable, that it has become a frontier between two sovereign German states. Then, whoever demands the reunification of his fatherland will be labelled, in Communist terms, a "dangerous revisionist and chauvinist."

At that point, we Germans will truly become active revisionists where the division of our country is concerned. We cannot and must not respect a borderline dividing our people as the frontier of a foreign state. We will have to seek ways of surmounting it. To act otherwise would be to live without self-respect as democrats and without faith in our rights as Germans.

In this sense, our initiative as revisionists can decide the life or death of democracy in Germany. German democrats in my own and in younger generations do not intend to repeat past mistakes; they will never buckle under as did democrats in the Weimar Republic. Freedom-loving forces in my country have woven the demand for national reunification into the fabric of their banners and they will not let this appeal fall into the hands of undemocratic elements. The crucial national interest must never become the domain of Communists or neo-Nazi neutralists.

It is for the Soviet Union to decide what it prefers in Central Europe: a people prepared to live in peace and understanding with its neighbours, seeking conciliation, or a people left with no choice but to press for "revision." By signing a separate peace treaty, Khrushchev will not serve the peace; until my country is united, my people will know no rest.

Hence, I think it is of paramount importance for the Western Allies to insist more vigorously than ever that four-power responsibility for Germany as a whole cannot be affected by any kind of unilateral Soviet action. The national movement for German reunification must remain wedded to insistence by the Western Allies on their rights and obligations to bring about such a reunification.

By pretending to ameliorate an "abnormal" condition, recent Soviet proposals actually hope to separate the interests of West Berliners from the interests of their protectors. In other words, they aim at finally dividing this stalwart alliance.

That would begin to happen the moment Allied authorities failed to respond to Communist interference and harassment of German traffic in the very same manner that they would defend the right of Allied military forces to travel between Berlin and the

West. If Allied rights and obligations in this city do not cover the essential interests of the civilian population, the Allies will be unable to act as protectors, and they will cease to be considered reliable or adequate protectors.

While this fact is probably appreciated, what many Western leaders may not yet appreciate sufficiently is the danger of severing or weakening West Berlin's relationship to the Federal Republic in areas that do not directly involve the normal traffic of persons and goods. The key issue behind the resistance of Berliners to all "free city" and most interim-agreement proposals is the defense of our right to choose the currency-system we belong to. All the developments here since 1948 have hinged on this historic choice: The blockade broke out on this issue, and the hope that encouraged the beleaguered population to hold out was built on the introduction of hard West German currency in Berlin. During the long years of unemployment and difficult reconstruction that followed, it was again the *Deutsche Mark West* which assured Berliners that they could work their way forward to full prosperity as free men and women.

Not only the confidence of the Berliners, but also the confidence of West German and of foreign investors emanates from the fact that West Berlin is an integral part of the Federal Republic's economic system. West German currency is West Berlin's staff of life; without it no one would invest in Berlin, no one would believe in Berlin's normalcy and hard-earned stability.

Indeed, if nothing were changed in the status of West Berlin but its currency, if West Germany currency ceased to be legal tender and the city were given a currency of its own, within one year West Berlin would be depopulated and devastated both economically and morally. It would become a dead city. The Allies would not then be able to defend Berlin even if they had three divisions stationed there instead of 12,000 soldiers; there would be nothing left to defend.

The Kremlin knows this. This is what lies behind the lure of its "free city" proposal. Dependence on West Germany currency is responsible for that minimum of economic and juridical unity which binds West Berlin to the Federal Republic today. Nothing can be subtracted from the things that fasten West Berlin to West Germany without encouraging the Communists to attack the currency core of that relationship.

A final solution of the Berlin problem must wait until the great powers are ready to permit the German people to reunite their country. Meanwhile, Germans in West Berlin will set an example of reliability and self-control that should prove to any open-minded neighbour that Germans can safely be entrusted with the right to self-determination. At the same time, Berlin will remain an outstanding challenge to the alertness, the faithfulness to principle and the reliability of the West.

—Reproduced from *The New Leader*

(AUGUSTE COMTE—Continued from page 4)

who has contributed something of permanent value to humanity. The entire record of man can be taken into account for this purpose. Traditional religions confine themselves only to their own deities and saints but the religion of humanity will throw open its list of human greatness to all peoples and to all spheres of human achievement — all the arts and the sciences, religions and philosophies, prophets, pioneers, form-makers, thirthankaras, bodhisattvas, avatars, acharyas, in fact the entire roll of the liberators of man throughout the ages. The Buddha, Asoka, Mahavira, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhva, the Sikh Gurus, and so on through the long and impressive list till the recent days of Wilberforce, Abraham Lincoln and Gandhi.

The service will be brief. A portrait will be displayed of the hero selected. A talk on his contribution will be given or an essay read about him. A poem or hymn about him or by him will be recited. The audience may offer flowers and disperse. Week after week some great Human Being and his work for Man will be brought to the notice of the members when in a mood of admiring contemplation. This is a psychology of appreciation of Value and Service built up in the minds of the people to serve as a *permanent emotional predisposition towards universal sympathy*.

Religion has also another aspect namely a refuge in moments of distress and perplexity. This aspect will be subdued in this religion of humanity. No supernatural relief should be promised.

The Jains among us have this type of Religion of Man. They worship the Perfect Man, perfect as they conceive perfection—infinite knowledge, infinite joy, infinite power. They do not expect any personal response from the personality worshipped. They expect only the reflex effect of the elevating influence on the aspirant and worshipper.

Nor is necessary to personify Humanity as a Great Being like God—*Grand Etre* as even Comte did. This way we slip back to superstition. It is possible to stick to the human level only lifting attention to the high peaks of human achievement. Contemplation (*dhyan* and *japa*) will form the character in the image of the character contemplated—in this case the highest values known to us expressed in a society wherein the fundamental rights have become a reality.

INDIAN TRADE UNIONS

A SURVEY

by V. B. Karnik

A survey of the trade union movement in India during the last forty years.

Price Rs 15.

PUBLISHERS

LABOUR EDUCATION SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

The Neutral Summit

by Anand Mohan

EVER since the diplomacy of summitry has come into vogue, confrontations between heads of government have become as common as that other affliction—the common cold. The proposed neutral summit falls in with the fashion of the times. But is it likely to hold as much significance for the world as the summit meetings between East and West? One is justified in entertaining some strong reservations, not only about its prospects but also about its credentials.

The country most anxious to hold the conference is obviously Egypt, a fact that is not surprising. From the time that President Nasser came into power, he has bid often for leadership in world councils. His first attempt was to gain the leadership of the Middle East, in which he failed ignominiously. In recent times he had his eyes on the leadership of Africa, in which attempt he did not fare any better. Now comes his bid to snatch the leadership of the neutrals.

There is nothing wrong in a country endeavouring to give a proper lead to others who follow, more or less, the same foreign policy. But it is certainly reprehensible if a country aims at leadership only to use that position for furthering its own narrow ends—ends so narrow that the community of civilised nations cannot subscribe to them. It is with shock that one read only a few weeks ago the reported speech of an Egyptian Minister which sought to explain away Hitler's genocide.

Everyone who wishes well the countries of the Middle East considers the Arab-Israeli dispute unfortunate. But even the most ardent supporter of the Arab cause cannot look with equanimity on an Egyptian attitude that seeks to condone the massacre of millions of Jews. If President Nasser desires to use the proposed neutral summit as a platform for carrying on his crusade against Israel, India cannot find herself in congenial company.

In fact, the absence of Israel at the neutral summit speaks volumes about our own neutrality. We are neutral not only as between East and West but also as between the Arabs and the Israelis. But, as in the former case, in which we are neutral in favour of the East, in the latter case, too, we seem to be neutral in favour of the Arabs. Or else, how are we to explain the aberration of our non-recognition of Israel? We have not recognised Israel for the simple reason of not causing offence to the Arabs. For a country which cries itself hoarse about its vaunted secularism and decries the menace of communalism within its borders, to permit itself to be governed by religious considerations in foreign policy is, to say the least, incomprehensible. Judged by the criteria which India herself proposed for determining the neutrality of a country, Israel qualifies for an invitation to attend the conference. Why, then, did India not have the moral courage to insist on Israel's being invited?

Another country which was very much present at the preparatory conference was Cuba. Dr. Castro would no doubt wish to use the platform of the neutral summit for castigating the United States. The student of history might certainly find, in the long stretch of Cuban-American relations, some grounds for Cuba's grievance against the United States. But even so, the best of Dr. Castro's sympathisers cannot find in his statements and actions anything more than the thin veneer of neutralism designed to disguise the intention of giving the Soviet Union a foothold in the New World.

One of the elder statesmen at the summit will be President Tito of Yugoslavia who has the ear of both President Nasser and Prime Minister Nehru. Nasser is on record that it is President Tito who has tutored him in the art of making the best of both worlds—the communist and the anti-communist. Is any comment called for on statesmanship of such a high order?

As for the rest of the members of the neutral club, we find them in sad disarray and with diverse political systems enjoying various degrees of freedom and oppressed by multifarious shades of authoritarianism. Ideologically, too, they range from communist to anti-communist, although all of them experience the mystique of *Panchsheel*, if not with the same ardour or for achieving the same ends.

Will it all be a repetition of Bandoeng? One suspects so. Platitude will once again be uttered on disarmament and nuclear tests, and vitriolic vituperations on colonialism. On neo-colonialism there might be an ominous silence. They might be expected to decry anti-communism as a negative attitude, though we cannot see how anti-communism can become a positive attitude.

History will, perhaps, record that the neutrals failed in their finest hour because of their inability to find a common formulation which they could unanimously affirm. How could any such unanimous affirmation of policy emerge when they have sat on the fence for so long that the iron has entered the souls of some?

There are some things in life toward which it is necessary to be uncompromisingly unneutral, if we are to merit the description of humans. The realisation of that truth is the beginning of political wisdom, though it might mean the end of neutrality.

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Without Comment

German Militarism: Facts & Fiction

You get the idea that the U.S. and its allies are restoring German militarism, building West Germany into a great military power which one day may threaten the unprotected and helpless East Germans and all the rest of Europe.

What are the facts?

You find that no West German put on a military uniform or picked up a gun for the defense of Western Europe until "Khrushchev's Germans"—Communists of East Germany—had an army of more than 100,000 men built up over a period of eight years of training, arming and marching under Soviet guidance.

The communist dictatorship in Moscow first ordered the militarizing of East Germany in July, 1948. Only disguise: a name. The Army of East Germany was called the "People's Police."

In 1950 these "police" were organized into infantry, armour, signal and engineering units—with even a Navy called "water police."

In 1951 East German Reds organized an Air Force as "air police." By 1952 there were 85,000 "police" equipped with Soviet arms, Soviet training officers and operating in 12 infantry brigades, 4 tank regiments, 4 antiaircraft regiments.

It was November, 1955, before the first West German donned a military uniform.

In Communist East Germany today, there are 110,000 men in a force at last openly called "the People's Army"—a mere change of name—with 200,000 in reserve after careful training.

In West Germany, with three times the population of Communist East Germany, there are about 225,000 men in an Army built to operate only within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

—U.S. News & World Report

SOVIET SCIENTIST GIVEN ASYLUM CANADA GRANTS REQUEST

Ottawa, Aug. 16. The Immigration Department announced to-day it is granting political asylum to Dr. Mikhail Antonovich Klotchko, a prominent Russian scientist in the field of general and inorganic chemistry.

Professor Klotchko, 59, was attending the 18th International Congress on Theoretical and Applied Chemistry in Montreal early in August and had extended his visit to include Ottawa, the Immigration Department said.

While in Ottawa, he contacted the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and asked that his wish to stay in this country be made known to the Government.

Prof. Klotchko, winner of the Stalin Prize and the Order of Lenin, was in charge of a chemical laboratory in Moscow from 1947 to 1955. He was head of a laboratory in the N. S. Kurnakov Academy of Science.

He has been a member of several editorial boards responsible for publishing chemistry journals in the Soviet Union and is the author of several scholarly papers in the field of chemistry.

—Hindu, August 18.

ANOTHER SCIENTIST SEEKS ASYLUM

Vienna, Aug. 22.—It is learnt here today that a young Ukrainian scientist from Kiev, Mr Nikolai Ivanovitch Sereda aged 24, defected to the West while with a chosely guarded Intourist party of students here early in July. Sereda, specialist in electronics, managed to slip unobserved from his hotel early one morning and approached the nearest traffic policeman asking for political asylum in Austria and was taken by him to the nearest police station.

The Soviet Embassy demanded to see him and permission was given but the Austrian Government insisted on its representative attending the interviews for fear of undue pressure being brought to bear on Sereda. The young man refused to change his mind although his father, also a scientist, was specially flown from Kiev in an attempt to persuade him to return. Sereda gave as his reasons for defection his resentment at the heavy Moscovite pressure on Ukrainian liberty and culture. He was flown to Frankfurt and later to the USA, where, it is understood, he is at present.

—Statesman, August 24

44 STUDENTS FACE EXECUTION IN CUBA

Mexico City, Aug. 20. Forty-four students and two Roman Catholic priests are to face a Cuban firing-squad on Monday in Havana, leaders of the Mexican sections of the Revolutionary Democratic Front and directory of the Cuban university students-in-exile alleged here.

They told reporters the condemned men include Alberto Muller, head of the directory of Havana students, who entered Cuba clandestinely last November to organise the students fight against the Castro regime.

—Indian Express, August 21.

India, Tibet and China

by B. K. DESAI

Price Re. 1

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

BOMBAY 1.

PLANNING FOR POVERTY OR PLENTY? — *Cont'd from P. 6*

400 per ton. Not even the ablest Minister can persuade people to buy sugar when it is selling at so much above world prices. Therefore, the export effort, which is so important, will fail.

Now, the question may be asked: Why has the Third Plan on the one hand got such good objectives, and why, on the other, does it by its measures defeat its own purposes? There are two possible reasons. One is that it may be ignorance of the economic science, a lack of understanding of the problem. I have too much regard for the hon. Minister and the gentlemen who sit on the other side to think that they are doing something that is so self-defeating with their eyes open.

Therefore, one has to look at some other factor which must make them behave in this manner, and I cannot help saying that that factor is the factor of doctrine or dogma. I make bold to say that this Third Five Year Plan is not a plan of economic development at all because its primary interest is not in the development of the economy but in certain political and social objectives which are frankly stated in other parts of the Plan. I go so far as to say that this is not even a Socialist plan of economic development because Socialism implies two things, a rising standard of living for the common people and greater equality. I have shown earlier that far from trying to raise the standard of living of the people, the Second Plan has either depressed it or is making it stagnate and that the Third Plan gives us ample warning that, if one thing has to be cut down, it is the consumption of goods by the people.

Now, at page 26 of this document, this is what is said: "As it proceeds, economic development may widen disparities between rural and urban areas, increase differences in levels of development in different parts of the country, and accentuate the problems of economic inequality".

Therefore, I say this is not even a socialist plan of development. Then what kind of plan is it? I would say it is a plan to foist on the people of this country the Soviet pattern of State Capitalism.

Now, why do I say this? It is because this Plan is obsessed with autarchy. Autarchy is a desire to attain self-sufficiency.

Now, why this idea of self-sufficiency? Where does it come from? I suggest it comes from the Soviet Union. You will remember that the Soviet Union started its planning at a time when Soviet Russia's hand was turned against the rest of the world and the hand of the rest of the world against Soviet Russia. There are three differences between us and Soviet Russia. One is that in Russia, there were not enough people, and a great deal of land; in our case, we have too many people and not enough of land. The second big difference was that Soviet Russia started with the zeal of converting the world by force to its own doctrine, while we have no such pretensions or professions. The third is that the rest of the world was hostile to Soviet Russia while, in our case,

there is an Aid to India Club which is pouring out its wealth for our benefit. Therefore, there is nothing in common between our position and the position of the Soviet Union in 1919 and 1920. Yet we are blindly copying this obsession with heavy industrialisation which came from the desire in Soviet Russia to strengthen the nation militarily and materially against an onslaught which was expected from the rest of the world. In other words, being a peace-loving power, being the country of Gandhi, without knowing it we are following a track which may make sense for a military power out to conquer the rest of the world but which makes no sense for a power which is not able to defend even its own frontier. The idea of self-sufficiency is at the very root of this Plan.

This obsession with autarchy is completely unintelligent, because we are not in the position of the Soviet Union, because we are not opposed to the world, because every one wants to help us, and we do not want in the next ten years to turn our back on the world. We are short of capital. That is not a position that is going to change in the next ten or fifteen years with all our efforts, and I support them, to control our population. That imbalance will remain for many generations to come and, while it remains, we shall want more capital per man, and that capital not being available, we should be able to get it from abroad. Therefore this whole Plan is vitiated by this position that it desires us to become independent of the world in the next ten or fifteen years.

I therefore feel that this Plan, instead of developing our economy, places it in a strait jacket, ties it hand and foot, and then asks the Indian people to deliver the goods. No people, not even the Indian people, can deliver the goods if their hands and feet are tied in this manner. The danger is this, that by over-centralisation, the States will lose their rights, will become mere glorified municipalities and district and local boards if they do not look out. Secondly, there will be a concentration of political and economic power in a few hands. This will mean that the Fundamental Rights under the Constitution will be endangered. I do not want to say to my friends on the right who are interested in trade unions, that if they think that while other rights will be destroyed, their right to strike and the right of collective bargaining will remain sacred, they are making a mistake. One of the first curbs and blinkers will be on the working class, not to ask for higher wages and not to go on strike in pursuit of their demands.

Therefore, I say this Plan is a threat and a danger to the working class, to the peasantry whose land it wants to take away, and to the middle class who make up the bulk of the nation. The job of those who believe in the real economic development of this country is to educate the bulk of the people to this threat not only to their standard of life, but also to their way of life.

—Condensed from a speech in Parliament

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

The source of world trouble and tension is Moscow, not Berlin. And if war begins it will have begun in Moscow, not in Berlin.

—President Kennedy, *The Economist*, London, July 29.

East Germany is the only area in the world where population shows a precipitous downward trend not because the birth-rate is falling but because those who are able to walk prefer to run-away, — from it.

—Thought, August 19.

The question of the struggle for a peace treaty with Germany is not only literally for a peace treaty with Germany; because the moral and legal rights are on our side. This is a question of the struggle for the acknowledgement of our greatness.

—Nikita Khrushchev, *Statesman*, August 12.

People do not leave their hearths and homes for glamour and shop windows.

—Prime Minister Nehru, quoted in *Times of India*, August 22.

If the Soviet dictator is so drunk with power, so inflated with arrogance that he will start a war over Berlin, he will certainly, even if he is appeased on Berlin, resort to arms elsewhere.

—W. H. Chamberlin, *New Leader*, July 17.

I am optimistic because in this world you have to be optimistic.

—Dag Hammarskjöld, *New York Times*, July 30.

The East Germans have been leaving because, unlike the other Europeans under communist rule, they have had somewhere to go, and an open manifold, Berlin, through which to get there.

—*Economist*, London, August 19.

(A PIE IN THE SKY—Continued from page 2)

at one place that "the dictatorship of the proletariat has fulfilled its mission," and that the state has now become "an organ expressing the interests and will of the people as a whole". These theoretical propositions do not bring any comfort to the people. What they are interested in are personal liberty, freedom of opinion, expression and organisation, the right to criticise the Government and to change it through the exercise of their votes and such other rights and liberties that are available to the people in democratic countries. The draft programme is a lengthy document, but it does not contain a word about these people's rights and liberties.

The stranglehold of the Communist Party is also going to continue. The draft programme states that there will be "a further enhancement of the role and importance of the Communist Party as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society." Some changes are going to be introduced in the structure of the party to provide for the entry of new persons in all party organisations. But care has been taken at the same time to provide for "the continuity of leadership." The leaders will therefore continue to be as irremovable as before, though they may from time to time change the instruments of their policy.

This, in effect, is the new Bible that has been promulgated for the devout communists all over the world. The communists will no doubt swallow it and accept it as their new gospel. They have no alternative; they have to accept whatever is handed down to them from Moscow. But others are bound to be more critical. They will find in the document hardly anything that is new. It is just a weary repetition of what old Marx wrote about a hundred years back and Lenin a few decades later. There is nothing in it which he will find inspiring or invigorating. Marx had the vision and the voice of a prophet. That voice rang through the Communist Manifesto of 1848. The vision that Marx cherished became a hundred years later the grim reality of a cruel dictatorship in the hands of Stalin. The document that Khrushchev has manufactured is an embellishment of that reality. A tyranny remains a tyranny, howsoever embellished and no free man will be prepared to accept it as the price for a few crumbs that may be thrown at him at the end of ten or twenty years.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

ENCOUNTER is easily available in India—and at a price (Rs. 1/- per copy) well within the reach of anyone's pocket. The sole wholesale distributors for India (except Delhi & Calcutta) are FOUR OCEANS PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LTD., 412 Mirabelle Hotel Chambers, 33 Marine Lines, Bombay 1.

The U.K. address of ENCOUNTER is 25 Haymarket, London, S.W.1.

Annual Subscription Rs 12

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