

## The Evolution Of An Opposition

M. R. Masani

SINCE in society there are bound to be various individuals and groups pursuing ideas and having interests which are not necessarily identical or even compatible with one another, it is natural that those who do not succeed in having their point of view accepted by the Government of the day should strive to persuade others to their point of view so that there is ultimately a government which would implement their point of view. It follows that the opposition in a democracy has a role to play almost as important as that of the ruling party. Both the ruling party and the opposition represent the hopes and aspirations of living human beings and the mere difference in the numbers they represent at any given point of time does not make any difference to their importance.

Indeed, opposition is the *sine qua non* of a democracy. The British socialist author, E. F. M. Durbin, in his book on socialism and democracy makes the existence of an opposition the acid test of the genuineness of a democracy. Neither a written constitution, nor fundamental rights on paper, nor a secret ballot, he rightly points out, make a democracy genuine unless opposition parties are not only tolerated but actually function. The Soviet Union is a good example of the truth of Durbin's thesis.

The democratic process has two characteristics. First, in the absence of unanimity, it recognises that for the time being the view of the majority must prevail since obviously *some* decision has to be taken. At the same time, since human judgement is fallible, it should be open for mistakes to be rectified in the light of new facts and experience and the opportunity should be there for the minority of today to become in course of time the majority.

It is necessary then that an opposition party functions as a champion of the interest of the minority and the critic of the majority. It also functions as the watch dog of the observance of the Constitution. In discharging these functions, it helps in focusing attention on the issues with which a country is faced and provides alternative solutions.

In India, thanks to the ignoring of Mahatma Gandhi's advice that, on the achievement of national independence, the Indian National Congress should withdraw from the political scene and allow its

members to form two political parties functioning in the parliamentary sphere, the country has not been able to evolve a satisfactory two-party system. While a two-party system is not feasible so long as the Soviet dictatorship exists in Moscow and insists on having its Fifth Column in this country, a three-party system can and should be achieved. So long as this does not happen, one will have to accept the fact that, while the Constitution permits of an opposition, no opposition in fact exists in the sense of an alternative Government capable and ready to take office the moment it receives the mandate of the electorate. How is this lacuna in our democracy to be filled?

Obviously, if the democratic opposition parties in the country were to merge in one big National Democratic Party the problem could be solved overnight. Unfortunately, the realities of the situation rule it out as an immediate solution, though it should remain the objective. A second alternative is that which Acharya Kripalani has advocated, namely, that of common functioning on the basis of an agreed minimum programme. Unfortunately, the response from some of those concerned has been so negative that immediate success appears to be elusive.

A third alternative is that for democratic opposition parties to work together on specific issues on which they find themselves in agreement, while going their own ways and pursuing a policy of "live and let live" in regard to other matters. This path has in fact been followed with increasing success since 1960. It was the spontaneous working together of democratic opposition parties that enabled opposition candidates to defeat the Congress Party supported by the Communists in Dohad, Amroha, Farrukabad and Rajkot. Pursuing this path promises results. One is encouraged in this view by the fact that the opponents of a national democratic consolidation in India recognise it as the main threat to their position. *Mainstream*, a Communist journal of Delhi, said in its issue of June 8 after the Rajkot by-election: "In this respect, the Right has a lesson to impart to the Left today. It did not go in for summit negotiations among its different components but preferred *unity in action*, and that has paid it rich dividends."

As this unity in action develops, it should lead to a generalisation of the experience of the recent by-elections. Now that the people have seen at Amroha and Rajkot how the opposition can win, both the wisdom of the political parties and the pressure of public opinion should impel them towards an electoral understanding for the next General Elections designed to ensure that there is only one opposition candidate against the ruling party or the Communist Party.

# Corruption: Causes And Cure

Pheroze J. Shroff

**T**HE hydra-headed monster of corruption is stalking the land. There is hardly any sphere of public activity on which the sinister shadow of corruption has not fallen. Corruption has become so much rampant during recent years that it is being taken for granted. People have almost ceased to regard corruption as something to be ashamed of and to be abhorred. They look upon it as an inseparable incident of official activities.

Enormous sums are being filched from the public by unscrupulous elements amongst officialdom. The technique of extorting illegal gratification has been made into a fine art. The weapon of official delay is being used so adroitly that those who want to assert a right or seek redress have to grease some itching palms. Innumerable formalities laid down by legislation and notifications for the transaction of official business give ample scope for delay with the consequent opportunities for extracting bribes. The victims of corruption whether they be tradesmen or manufacturers, pass on the burden of the wrongful exactions to the public. The superior officers connive at corruption amongst the subordinate staff because they do not like any scrutiny in their own assets or expenditure. It is notorious that a number of officials live in a style which is beyond the limits of their official salaries and perquisites.

In order that the evil of corruption may be minimized, if not eradicated, it is necessary that the top-most executive body which consists of the ministers should be entirely free from the virus of corruption. Unfortunately, such is not the case. In Orissa, Kerala, U.P., Punjab, Andhra and other regions members of the ruling party have made serious allegations against some of their colleagues in the ministerial ranks. There are loud and insistent demands for judicial probes in the impugned dealings of the ministers. In Punjab a senior Congress legislator has recently prepared a 100-page charge-sheet making serious charges of bribery, corruption, nepotism and maladministration.

If the ministers indulge in corrupt practices for personal aggrandizement or for consolidating their political power, they become the grave-diggers of democracy. The surest way to destroy the tree of democracy in any country is to irrigate it with the foul and stinking waters of corruption. When a political party remains in power for an unconscionably long period it gets a vested interest in graft, corruption and nepotism. Having tasted the fruits of power, it longs to perpetuate its own dominance even by trying to corrupt the electorate in devious ways with the tax-payers' money.

Nothing has given greater fillip to corruption in our country than the totalitarian-type economy with its incidents of unrealistic taxation and inflation. The totalitarian regimentation of the economic life has armed the executive with enormous powers. Under the provisions of such legislation as the Industries

(Development and Regulation) Act, the Essential Commodities Act, the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, the Companies Act, the Banking Companies Act, the Exports Imports (Control) Act, and hundred and one similar pieces of legislation and thousands of rules and regulations passed thereunder, the Government servant has been invested with enormous powers, which in a number of cases he does not fail to exploit for his personal gain.

The highly regimented economy has brought into existence the parasitical and corrupt tribe of contact-men who specialize in the art of obtaining favours for or warding off disfavours for their clients from the officialdom for a price, which varies according to a usually accepted sliding-scale. The totalitarian regimentation not only hinders production and economic development but breeds corruption on a vast scale.

Government's reliance on inflationary finance for their various projects has also given a strong impetus to corrupt practices. History is replete with instances where a debased currency has led to the debasement of national character. A dishonest currency by robbing people of their hard-earned savings and creating economic instability destroys the morals of the people and forces them to resort to corrupt and dishonest practices. Inflation furnishes the usual excuse for indulging in corruption. When the value of the rupee keeps falling and the prices keep spiralling, Government servants say that they are forced to obtain illegal gratification to supplement their dwindling incomes. The greatest disservice which a totalitarian economy with its incident of inflation renders to the country is to deaden the conscience of the people and make them regard corruption as a way of life.

The best way to eradicate corruption from our midst is to do away with ideologically inspired policies and programmes which give facility and scope for corruption. Human nature being what it is, if Government policies breed corruption, machinery for the detection and eradication for corruption will itself tend to become corrupt. Power without character is an unmitigated evil. Laws which bring out the worst in man rather than all that is good in him should never be placed on the statute-book. A people who love sturdy independence and are vigilant in safeguarding their fundamental rights against the insidious encroachments of a self-righteous state will not become victims of corruption and extortion by the unscrupulous elements in the bureaucracy.

A healthy opposition and an alert and well-informed public opinion provide a formidable guarantee against corruption. In a democracy the people are entitled to be informed on all matters affecting the public. A Government which adopts a secretive policy on vital matters affecting the public creates opportunities for corruption and high-handedness for the bureaucracy. The ministers as the highest executive

heads must carry on the administration without fear or favour. They must scrupulously avoid a double standard: one for themselves and for those in whom they are interested and another for the general public. It is axiomatic that in matters of integrity and fair dealings the people will adopt the code of their leaders.

If the President of India is liable to be impeached under the Constitution there is no reason why the ministers should be accorded immunities against conduct which cannot bear public scrutiny. If the Prime Minister and the Chief Ministers do even one-tenth of the sermonizing to their own colleagues in the ministries as they do to the people, there may be, perhaps, some appreciable improvement in the tone of public administration.

The Commissions of Inquiry Act of 1952 empowers the Union and the State Governments to appoint a Commission of Inquiry if the Government concerned is of opinion that it is necessary to do so for the purpose of making an inquiry into any definite matter of public importance and performing such functions as may be specified in the notification. The appointment of such a Commission is made obligatory on the appropriate Government if a resolution in that behalf is passed by the House of the People or as the case may be, the Legislative Assembly of the State concerned. In the existing state of affairs there should be a greater recourse to this Act in all appropriate cases. As there are frequent complaints that persons in authority try to hush-up inquiries or whitewash individuals for political reasons, the Act should be suitably amended to empower the President as the head of the nation, who is above all parties, to

appoint the personnel of the Commission in his own discretion. The President should be also empowered to set up Vigilance Committees consisting of highly respected citizens of integrity at the Centre as well as in the States. Ministers and high officials should be required to submit to these Committees a statement of their assets at the time of their assuming office and every year thereafter till they continue in office. If the Committee is of opinion that there is a *prima facie* case for inquiry it should submit its recommendation to the President for necessary action. Even the existence of such Committees will seem as a salutary check on the depredatory proclivities of persons in power.

There should be a publicly declared code of conduct for ministers. Strict notice should be taken in cases of deviation from this code. Resignation should be demanded from persons found guilty after an impartial inquiry. In order to ensure integrity and efficiency in administrative services, members of the legislature who try to exercise back-door influence on government servants should be brought to book. Connotation of corruption should not be confined only to cases where there is receipt or demand or offer of illegal gratification. The definition of "Corrupt practices" should be wide enough to cover the innumerable forms in which corruption manifests itself. Politicians found guilty of corruption should be deprived of their political rights for a number of years. If the government is really sincere in its avowal to eradicate corruption there are already in its armoury enough weapons to achieve the object. It is for the people to choose governments which are free from the taint of corruption.

## Powers Of The President

A. G. Mulgaonkar

SINCE the Indian Constitution came into operation over a decade ago, several constitutional problems have from time to time agitated peoples' minds. One such question has been: What is the full constitutional ambit of the status, powers and functions of the President under the Indian law? Mr. K. M. Munshi, who deservedly enjoys among other things a wide reputation as an authority on Constitutional law, a little while ago, contributed an article to the Press calling attention to this matter, the importance of which is not to be minimised. Mr. Munshi, after stating the different considerations that prevailed among those who concerned themselves in the Constituent Assembly with framing the provisions dealing with the President in the Constitution, says they ultimately chose a composite form of government in which the Parliamentary form of the Executive was to function within the framework of express powers and functions as defined by the Constitution. Then follows the thesis Mr. Munshi wishes to propound. At the same time, under its provisions the President was to represent the whole country (and not the party in power at the

Centre) exercising specific powers and authority coupled with a responsibility to function as the supreme guardian of the democratic processes and forms and the Fundamental Rights guaranteed by it. He also says that we must not allow a convention, borrowed from an unwritten Constitution of a unitary State like the U. K. as regards its monarch who enjoys hereditary status derived from history and deep-rooted national sentiment be invoked to justify a disregard for express constitutional provisions. Mr. Munshi must, therefore, be understood to mean that there are express Constitutional provisions which put the President by law, in a position where, to put it bluntly, he can at least on certain occasions override the decision of his Council of Ministers.

This position if correctly stated is so directly opposed to the understanding of many others that it becomes necessary to examine the various Articles of the Constitution to ascertain which view receives the greater support from them. There is one aspect of the matter, however, which requires to be stated at the outset and it is that the only authoritative pro-

nouncement on any matter arising out of the Constitution must be the Supreme Courts and until this is available the legal position is not settled and the views expressed by anyone, however eminent, are views so held.

In considering the position of the President under the Indian Constitution regard must be paid to the words of the Article 52 (which creates the office of President) and those that follow it immediately. The two most important among these are Articles 53 and 74. Article 53 (1): the executive power of the Union shall be vested in the President and shall be exercised by him either directly or through officers subordinate to him in accordance with this Constitution. (2): without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing provision, the Supreme Command of the Defence Forces of the Union shall be vested in the President and the exercise thereof shall be regulated by law. Article 74 (1): there shall be a Council of Ministers with the Prime Minister at the head to aid and advise the President in the exercise of his functions.

It will be seen that by Article 53 (1) the executive power is vested in the President but he must exercise it in accordance with his constitution. By article 74 (1) the Constitution lays it down without option that there shall be a Council of Ministers to aid and advise the President in the exercise of his functions. The two Articles read together therefore must mean that the President, while he is the formal or titular head and the administration must be conducted in his name, must be guided in his functions by the Council of Ministers with the Prime Minister at its head.

In fact in the debate of the Constituent Assembly we find this position more amplified by some of those who concerned themselves with these provisions. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Constituent Assembly summed up in the following words: . . . . . "We have adopted more or less, the position of the British Monarch for the President. His position is that of a constitutional President." A little later this is how he describes the effect of Article 74: "The Ministers, are, of course, responsible to the Legislature and tender advice to the President who is found to act according to that advice. Although there are no specific provisions, so far as I know, in the Constitution itself making it binding on the President to accept the advice of his Ministers, it is hoped that the convention under which in England, the King acts always on the advice of his Ministers will be established in this country also and the President, not so much on account of the written word in the Constitution, but as a result of this very healthy convention, will become a constitutional President in all matters."

Mr. Munshi himself said this in the debate: ". . . . . during the last hundred years, Indian public life has largely drawn upon the traditions of British Constitutional law. Most of us have looked up to the British model as the best. . . . After this experience, why should we go back upon the tradition that has been for over a hundred years and try a novel experiment."

It will thus be seen that the efforts of those that hammered out these Articles were to conform to the

English pattern of the Constitutional King. It will be interesting, therefore, to see how the position of the English King is viewed by English Constitutional theorists. Walter Bagehot, whose work on the English Constitution has enjoyed great authority since it was published nearly a hundred years ago, has succinctly assessed the constitutional position of the English Crown as follows: The right to be informed, the right to be consulted and the right to warn. These rights alone with one or two others, to be mentioned hereafter are very real and have been exercised by the English Crown repeatedly before Bagehot's time and since as the official biographies of Queen Victoria, Edward VII and George V show. Queen Victoria not only insisted on dispatches from the Foreign Office being taken to her but her alterations or amendments being incorporated in them. Her admonition to Gladstone on the occasion of the first imposition of death duties by Harcourt in 1888 and earlier to Palmerstone over his management of the Foreign Office are well known. King Edward's contribution to the success of the foreign policy of his Liberal Ministry (if not its initiation) was genuine. The additional rights may best be illustrated by some important historical occasions when they were exercised. When Asquith asked in advance an assurance from George V that a sufficient number of additional peers would be created to ensure the passage of his budget in case the House of Lords threw it out once again, the King made it conditional upon the Liberals fighting once more another election on the specific issue of the budget although they had been returned in a large majority a few months before. The right of asking for a mid-term election is the Prime Minister's but the Crown has some discretion in granting it. The choice of Baldwin as his Prime Minister by George V when Bonar Law resigned, in preference to Curzon and other senior leaders of the Conservative, is an instance though he may not have any mandate of his party. These instances along with the dictum of Bagehot indicate the sphere of the Crown's influence under the English Constitution. This is by no means unimportant or ineffective. If by a gradual process of conventions we in India reach the same constitutional position of the President vis-a-vis Council of Ministers, we can be justly proud. Attention must be drawn to two other Articles. Under Article 78 the duty is cast upon the Prime Minister to communicate to the President decisions of the Council of Ministers proposals for legislation; generally keep him informed about the administration of affairs and if the President so desires, submit for the consideration of the Council of Ministers, any matter on which a Minister has taken decision but not the Council. It will therefore be seen that the Indian President, far from being a political figurehead or a social showpiece, is entitled to play a constitutional role. A great deal depends upon the personality of the two office-holders. If the President happens to be a mature elder statesman doubtless his influence is bound to be felt. On the other hand to clothe the President with overriding powers of interference may spark off controversies and agitation with its resulting, even dangerous,

consequences. Besides, the democratic processes to which Mr. Munshi refers will find their true fulfilment by a devolution of power to lowest level and not by its concentration at the highest level i.e. in the hands of a single individual, however eminent he may be. The dangers inherent in this concentration of power should be apparent to anybody who is conversant with the recent political history of some of India's neighbours.

An Article to which reference is frequently made to justify the view that the Indian Constitution gives certain powers of interference in the Union administration is Article 76 which deals with the appointment of the Attorney-General for India. It is suggested that the Attorney-General is an independent legal adviser both to the President and to the Council of Ministers. On a true construction of the Article, this view must be regarded as untenable. True, he is to be appointed by the President and to hold his office during the President's pleasure and he is also to refer or assign to him such work as he pleases. This wording

of the section is in pursuance of the terms of the Article 53 (1) whereby the executive power of the Union is to be exercised in the name of the President. This power really becomes nominal or formal when we look at Article 74 which creates the Council of Ministers as pointed out earlier. Now the most important aspect of the matter is that the Attorney-General is the principal law adviser to the Government, which in reality is the Council of Ministers. Can it be suggested that he should also act as law adviser to the President, particularly when the two are at loggerheads, in effect, thereby subjecting him to two conflicting loyalties. Between a client and his legal adviser a very delicate relationship subsists and nothing should be done to disturb it in this case as public interest will thereby suffer. It is better therefore that in cases of difference of opinion between the President and his Council of Ministers on constitutional matters, provided they are of a serious nature, the opinion of the Supreme Court should be sought under Article 143.

## Today's Reformation In India

M. A. Venkata Rao

WHILE some thinkers call for a "renaissance" to inspire and support the new social order in India today, others point to the new forces already at work for over a century from the days of Raja Ram Mohan Roy as constituting the "renaissance" needed.

Principal D. S. Sarma's Renaissance in Modern India and Dr. Mazumdar's Indo-British Renaissance are prominent contributions in this field which only highlight and document the work of innumerable writers in many fields.

The political and social revolution essential to help consolidate the new social order adumbrated in the democratic republic and the fundamental rights and directive principles of social policy of the Constitution is upheld by the trends compendiously called the renaissance but more appropriately to be titled the *new reformation* in India. This new reformation as it appears in the work of representative thinkers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Dayanand Saraswati, Veeresalingam Pantulu, Prarthana Samajists, BalGangadhar Tilak, Aurobindo Ghose, Gandhi—consists in a many-sided rethinking and renovation of the vital ideas lying at the base of Hindu culture—theory and practice, moral ethos and social institutions.

The inward pattern of the change effected by the movement akin to that of the reformation in Europe can be indicated briefly in terms of the Gita and its new interpretations. This will reveal at a glance how relevant the new outlook is to the new attitudes demanded by modern democracy. This will reveal the cultural basis for democratic values which can be mobilised in their day to day working.

The new ideas are already present in the Gita even as the ideas of Luther and Calvin were present

in the Bible. What is new is the emphasis and insistence on sincere adherence to them in practice.

Democracy as a way of life is charged with a keen sense of the ultimate value of the individual person from which springs the political creed of: one man, one vote. It strengthens the influence of the rule of law; one law for all, irrespective of birth and rank, wealth and poverty, that is, equality of political rights.

1. India's new reformation picks out from the scriptures utterances that stress the equal divinity immanent in all men irrespective of outer fortune.

So we have the following verse from the Gita taking a prominent place in the new dispensation:

*Vidyavinaya sampanne bramane gavi hastini  
Shunichaiva shvapakecha panditah samadarshinh.*

V-18

The learned seers see equally the same brahman in the learned brahman, in the cow, the elephant, the dog and the dog-eating outcaste!

Orthodox pandits and priests never made much of this aspect of the matter!

The Constitution has banished untouchability as illegal.

The new reformation pointing to the equal presence of the divine in all beings, human and sub-human, demands equality of opportunity for all and the development of a new *social conscience* alive to the miseries of the underdog.

2. This new realisation of the old doctrine of the indwelling brahman (antaryami) is consciously made the logical basis of the new ethic of non-injury, new in depth of realisation, in terms of social and political obligations.

The verse 28 in chapter 13 is made use of to point to this logical implication.

*Samam pashyan hisarvatra samavasthitameeswaram  
na hi nasthi atmanaatmaanam tato yati paraam  
gatim XIII-28*

Seeing Iswara or God existing equally in all beings, no one will injure others, for so doing is to injure oneself; For the same God is in the other also!

3. Another verse used for the same purpose of equalitarian ethics basing itself on the presence of an identical God in all is the following;

*Atmaupamyena sarvatra samam pashyati yo Arjuna  
Sukham va yadi va duhkham sa yogi paramo matha.*

VI-30

Whoever sees everybody everywhere like himself, that is, *treats everyone like himself*, in joy and sorrow, he is the true yogi!

4. In Orthodox emphasis, the Gita is a *moksha sastra* (science of salvation), though it treats of a war or crisis ethic. The practical aspect of war and fighting is thrust into the background and the metaphysical aspect is stressed in traditional priestly teaching making the Gita primarily a yoga sastra, an *upanishad* an art of seeking union with God. In this light, the view of the world is pessimistic. It is referred to as *mrityusamsara sagar*, ocean of worldly process charged with death. The world has no essence of value. The best thing to do is to learn how to get out of it without entailing rebirth!

The Buddhist experience (like that of *existentialism* today) of the world as essentially compact of *anguish* is the kernel of tradition. It is a world-denying philosophy.

But today we want a more robust, world-affirming view. So the new reformation seeks out those passages in the scriptures that stress the infinite value of life, the world and duty.

From this point of view, the new thinkers stress verses like the following:

*Dharmaaviruddho bhuteshu kamosmi* VII-11

I am desire *not contrary to dharma*. God Himself dwells in desire not contrary to dharma.

So desire is not evil by itself and in itself. If fulfilled in accordance with morality, the joy that results is pure and unsullied.

The essential goodness of man and his inheritance is affirmed by the new reformation.

And in the tenth chapter when speaking of the dynamic immanence of God in emergent qualities and resplendent achievements as well as in lower nature (matter and life), Krishna says that He dwells in Victory, in determination and cultivation of mind (culture) in the truth-essence of all true beings and state of things; He is the Rod of Punishment in Authority rightly used; He is in the Policy that leads the conqueror to victory! He is the Knowledge of the expert ones!

These sentiments do not look as if tradition was committed to world renunciation and the axiom of the non-essentiality of all things. The new reformation stresses the values of life—value of rightly used authority to maintain society, of victory to punish wrong-doing and to uphold the good, to push the world along on its way by supporting instinct where

it is allied to social harmony. The work of the world should be carried on.

Hence the new thinker seeks out passages that give a positive meaning to *karma* or action. Orthodoxy often and mostly narrowed it to mean *ritual* and ceremonial. But the Gita uses the term in the widest sense to mean *all action* initiated to carry on the world's work.

Verse III-20 says that Kings like Janaka who were liberated even while living (*jivanmuktas*) realised themselves by performing duties for the sake of social solidarity—*loka sangraha*. Verse III-25 asks Arjuna to perform his duty of fighting in the battle that confronted him not for his own profit or glory but for the sake of social solidarity, dharma, social morality.

This term *Lokasangraha* is very prominent in the reformers' vocabulary who have shifted the emphasis from ceremonial duty confining itself to worship to social service.

Krishna himself says in one verse that though there is nothing for him to gain by work, yet he is constantly and unweariedly at work! If he stopped his incessant energising through nature, the three worlds (today we may speak of the endless number of galaxies) would dissolve and fall apart! (III-22, 24)

Karma is no longer the process of action by which we lay up evil capital to secure a future birth nor even ritual by which we purify our mind and soul preparatory to *jnana* or saving vision.

It is now regarded as action whereby we realise the larger, social or universal aspect or level of our being.

Humanism in which is included whatever is legitimate in socialism and nationalism is the key note of the new reformation at work today as a leaven in all the dimensions of culture—art, literature, music, painting, social work, politics—which can all be indicated by the generic name of democracy.



"Wish we could catch a spy—he could tell us what's going on in this country!"

Courtesy: Hindustan Times.

# Guilt Complex At Work

S. M.

THE statement announcing the agreement on the forthcoming joint air exercises in which contingents from the United States and Britain will take part with the Indian Air Force makes odd reading.

It is far more concerned with what the agreement is not about than what it is about. One is expected almost to conclude that the air exercises plan is an unwanted imposition by the West and it took all the Government's alertness to avoid involvement in the more elaborate arrangements which were being plotted in Washington to rock our non-aligned boat and rob us of our sovereignty.

Basically, if we are to believe what it says, it is an uncomplicated arrangement for the training, with American and British help, of Indian Air Force personnel in the use of sophisticated radar equipment. The Indian Air Force has no supersonic planes, barring four or six Mig-21's. It is only at supersonic speeds that mechanical control of an aircraft's armaments becomes a necessity. Experience in radar flying therefore presupposes the availability of high performance planes which, not unreasonably, the agreement stipulates, will be supplied for the period of the training by the United States and Britain.

Instead of merely saying all this and leaving it there, the statement wanders all over the field of fundamental policies, goes to some length to show the United States and Britain their places by reminding them about who is to be in control and ends up with a triumphant hurrah for the maintenance of non-alignment on a steady, unwobbling course despite the great temptations.

What else can one make of the wholly uncalled reference to the discussions which everyone knows are currently in progress with the U.S.S.R. "regarding assistance for strengthening our air defence?" It is the well-known policy of the Government to seek military assistance where it can get it and there is no reason why the policy cannot be restated in the right context. But is a limited agreement with two countries quite the place for mentioning the high policy considerations which compel us to seek some kind of balance in the sources from which we draw our military hardware? I do not remember that the agreement to buy the Mig-21's from Russia contained a footnote to the effect that we had reserved our right to look for automatic rifles in the U.S.

Why again the melodramatic piece about "the defence of India, including its air defence, being wholly and solely the responsibility of the Government of India?" Or the disavowal of a commitment by the United States and Britain "to assist India in its defence should it be attacked?" I did not know that there was an impression anywhere that a long queue was forming up of countries pressing their unwanted help on India or clamouring to underwrite unilaterally India's defence, come Mao, come Ayub.

Or, was it necessary to point out that the joint air

exercises will be of short duration? The purpose of the exercises, of imparting training and experience to the Indian Air Force in the use of highly sophisticated radar equipment, has been precisely stated. The duration of the exercises would obviously be governed by the fulfilment of that purpose. Is it the suggestion that a short stay, say of two months, in our country by foreign armed personnel does not offend sovereignty but a stay of say, six months would?

Then there is the priceless bit about the air exercises being under "overall Indian Air Force aegis." Whatever aegis may mean, it does not amount to what the Government of India hopefully imagines it will suggest to us, which is that the Indian Air Force will be in command. It is only proper that it should not be in command since it is our personnel which is to be trained. It is hardly to be expected that they should order their teachers about. If our Air Force is to profit from the exercises, it must go along with the training plan drawn up by the United States and Britain. There is no question here of who commands but of achieving the greatest amount of co-ordination for the maximum benefit of the personnel under training. We have already made it clear by defining the scope of the exercises that the curriculum has been set by us. Do we have such a feeling of wounded self-respect that the delusion has to be spread that the teaching methods will also be dictated by us?

The fact is that the Government is bending over backwards to appease the noisy band of critics whose patriotism needs to be blazoned daily to convince themselves of its authenticity. These patriots are very sensitive about imaginary slights to independence and sovereignty in any military assistance from the West even though the occasion for inviting it is the actual and continuing violation of our sovereignty by their erstwhile friends from China.

The Government is aware that it is all its existence is worth to be caught again in the state of unpreparedness of last autumn, but its dilemma is to carry on with the preparations while keeping up the pretence that its basic attitudes are unchanged. The pretence makes it vulnerable to Communist and fellow-travelling criticism. The result is the pathetic exhibition of the Government's guilt complex in the statement on the air exercises.

I see that some of these critics are satisfied with the air exercises plan. I am afraid they are being a trifle naive about its meaning.

At the end of June, after the meeting between President Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan, there was a communique issued which referred to continuing help to India "by providing further military aid to strengthen her defences against the threat of renewed Chinese Communist attack." An official spokesman later said one of the ideas under consideration was the dispatch of Anglo-American air units for "familiarization in India."

If the meaning still eludes the "patriots" let them ask themselves what India would want with an elaborate radar screen when it is not likely to have for some years to come more than a dozen supersonic planes, the six Mig-21's which have arrived and the six more which are promised for delivery next year.

I have not the slightest objection to such questions not being answered in a straightforward manner by the Government if that will keep the critics quiet. But my fear is that the appeasement of such critics is causing hesitations which are not calculated to enable us to make the best of our resources towards the defence effort, not only in terms of help from outside but in terms of national morale.

To continue with such hesitations is to run away from the full implications of the Chinese challenge. The implications are not that the Chinese will return in strength tomorrow or the day after. The far more dangerous implications are in the longer term, of an inexorable pressure exerted against us and our northern neighbours that is far more likely to manifest itself in political subversion with consequences for us which will be no different from those of military conquest. That pressure will ease only when the Chinese are convinced that we have the will and can command the military means to contain their expansion.

A case in point. Chinese radio propaganda has a field day in the border areas in their calculated plan of the softening of the people politically. They have powerful stations in Tibet which relay Peking broadcasts in several local Indian languages. As against this, no Indian radio station is clearly audible in these areas.

To counter Chinese propaganda is an important element of the defence effort and one that ought to be given the highest priority. I am not defending the recent agreement with Voice of America as the ideal arrangement in all circumstances. But any proper sense of priorities would accept temporary compromise as a lesser risk than the continued exposure of the vulnerable border people to the poisonous potential of Peking propaganda.

Yet because of some ignorant or dishonest criticism, the agreement was up for reconsideration within ten days of its signature.

Before we convince anyone of our resolution in the fight against the Chinese, we will need to give some evidence, it seems, of a government at work which knows its own mind.

(Courtesy: *Hindustan Times* July 25)

## Why Sino-Soviet Conflict?

Aleksandr Kaznacheev

[The following extract is from "Inside a Soviet Embassy" a review of which appears on page 10. Ed.]

VERY often Western specialists offer the following explanation of the Soviet-Chinese tactical differences of their "ideological" dispute. The Chinese Communist regime, it is said, is decades behind the Soviet Communist regime not only in economic, but also in political development; the Chinese government feels less secure at home than the Soviet government. Thus, the Chinese Communists are more revolutionary, aggressive, and militant than the Soviet Communists. The Chinese are in greater need of the external factor to stabilize their position, and thus they demand that the Communist bloc stand more firmly against the West, which would, in fact, mean war, while the Soviets want to go more slowly.

The differences in development and tactics do really exist, but the question is whether they are the real reason for the Soviet-Chinese split. First of all, political and economic development nowadays is a much quicker process than it was some thirty years ago. What took the Soviets forty long years may take the Chinese only twenty, or maybe even less than that. The Chinese Communists have already achieved considerable political stability in China, built up efficient bureaucratic machinery, carried out several successful purges. There are few evidences to support belief in the Chinese Communists' alleged political immaturity. The Soviet government is also in great need of the external factor and its stand toward the

West is in no way less tough than what is desired by the Chinese. The Chinese Communists are not fanatical, compulsive, or irrational, and they understand pretty well that they are in no better position than the Soviets, but may even be in a worse one, to risk a major nuclear war.

But above everything else, the Chinese are far behind the Soviets economically, and for a long time will need Soviet economic assistance. To risk losing this economic assistance, the military alliance, and with them their very future, just for the sake of a tougher line against the West, or a more fervent revolutionary spirit, would be a great political stupidity on the part of the Chinese Communists, and stupid they definitely are not. Thus, the reasons must be really serious and compelling, not "ideological" or "tactical," to force the two Communist giants into an open split of the Communist bloc.

What are these reasons? Some people in Russia, who are in a position to know, especially those in the Diplomatic Service, often express in private talks the following theory:

The Communist dictatorship, they say, is no longer needed in the Soviet Union. The country has already passed through the transitional period from an underdeveloped to a modern state. Nowadays there is not a single vital internal problem left in the Soviet Union

which need be solved by ruthless dictatorial methods. The only thing which the Soviet ruling class can use as a justification for the continuing existence of its dictatorship is the alleged threat of aggression from abroad. Thus the stability of the Soviet Communist regime depends nowadays not only on the effectiveness of the internal police control and repressions, ideological brainwashing and indoctrination, but also depends more and more on the external factor. In the short run, this external factor consists of the mounting international tension, the cold war, and the atomic hysteria. It is coupled with successes of Soviet foreign policy and of the international Communist movement. It is based on the astounding ignorance of the majority of the Soviet people of the real reasons for and the nature of the deadly struggle between the Communists and the Free World, and of the real nature, goals and methods of Soviet foreign policy. In the short run, the existence of this external factor is the cornerstone of the Communist regime's stability in the country.

In China the picture is somewhat different. There are many tremendously difficult problems which can be handled quickly only by the ruthless power of dictatorship. Nevertheless, the Chinese Communist regime's stability to a great extent also depends on the same external factor, though in a slightly different way from their Soviet brother's. The following comparison, which may sound strange to the Western ear, is quite often made nowadays in Russia.

The position of the Communist regime in China is similar in many ways to that of Hitler's regime in Germany in the thirties. Many of the problems which face Chairman Mao were faced also by Hitler. A large part of the German population supported Hitler in spite of his curtailment of their personal rights and liberties, in spite of concentration camps, and even after the first defeats in war. Why? The answer lies mainly in economic and nationalistic factors. Germany had a large and expanding population of one solid national origin living in a relatively small, circumscribed area with no room for expansion and relatively limited natural resources. This situation, coupled with an industrious, ambitious, nationalistic people, surrounded by small and less-vigorous neighbours, combined to make Hitler a national saviour. He promised to resolve these inconsistencies in his own way, and the Germans accepted his promises and successes, however they may have felt about his methods.

In China today there is a surprisingly similar situation. There is the awesomely vast and growing population, almost entirely of one national origin, also very industrious and ambitious, its nationalism sharpened by a century or so of foreign domination and humiliation. There are memories of the early central Chinese empires which dominated much of the civilized world. China has insufficient cultivated land area and probably limited resources. She also has small and less-vigorous neighbours, except for the Communist giant to the north. The Chinese Communists are extremely confident — they promise their people not only a better life in a comparatively near future, but also a revival of Chinese grandeur. They maintain that only their regime can accomplish it —

of course, in their own Communist way. The majority of the Chinese people, as many facts show, support their regime, regardless of the horrible regimentation, the starvation, the cattlelike life in the communes, and the breaking up of the traditional Chinese family.

In the Soviet Union, there are no similar compelling drives; there is no large population crowding the country to bursting — Russians have not explored even half of their land area yet!

Besides, the Soviet Union is composed of several completely different nations and races. The Great Russian nation represents nowadays actually less than 40 per cent of all the Soviet population, although the census of 1960 put it as more than 50 per cent. So the Soviet rulers' goal is expansion, but of political control only, not territorial colonization, which is unnecessary and indeed practically impossible.

The Chinese Communist rulers actually must pursue expansion, and not only political expansion as the Soviet rulers do, but also territorial. With this expansion — territorially limited to solve China's main problem, and politically unlimited to establish Chinese world supremacy — they hope to retain forever their dictatorship in China. Extreme nationalism is the main feature of Chinese Communism and the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, Chinese style, is merely a clever device used for keeping control internally and covering Chinese nationalistic expansion externally.

Thus, the growing dependence of both the Soviet and the Chinese Communist regimes upon the external factor and, as a result, their growing aggressiveness are the keys to understanding of all Communist policies. No doubt, there is clear realization on both sides that their far-reaching interests, ambitions, and goals are irreconcilable. First, there is not enough space in the present world for two empires, and one can be established only over the corpse of the other. Second, the very existence of an independent major power would destroy the stability of any empire, especially one which is based on political control; therefore the struggle to death between them is inevitable.

It is this dependence of both Communist brothers upon the external factor and their final realization that an open conflict between them is inevitable that constitutes the real reason of the Soviet-Chinese breach, in whatever form it may appear to the world at any given moment.

Although their present rivalry is already conducted on a pretty wide front and covers such important global issues as supremacy in the Communist bloc, control over the entire world Communist movement, penetration into the Asian, African, Latin American continents, and division of strategic regions into spheres of influence, it is very improbable that they will actually break their alliance before they finish with their common and still more dangerous enemy — the Free World. Only if the West is weakened still further, or one of the "brothers" decides that the other side represents now the main threat, will they bring the breach into the open. Until then, China and the Soviet Union will keep up the appearance of unity, while subtly preparing the ground for the future struggle.

# A Look Into A Russian Embassy

V. B. Karnik

**I**N these days of peaceful co-existence and hopes of a growing convergence between the two blocs there is a tendency to believe that the various institutions and agencies of communist Russia operate in the same manner as similar institutions of the free world. Countries of both blocs establish their embassies in other countries. According to the belief mentioned above those embassies whether of the countries belonging to the free world, or to the communist bloc should behave and operate in the same manner. But in actual fact, while the embassies of the free world carry on normal diplomatic activities, those of the communist bloc function mainly as subversive agencies engaged in the task of overthrowing the Governments to which they are accredited. Information that has leaked out so far, has provided ample evidence to bear out the truth of the statement. *Inside A Soviet Embassy*<sup>\*</sup> provides for the first time evidence of a direct character, as it tells in concrete terms the subversive activities that a Russian embassy organised in one of the countries of the free world.

The writer of the book, Mr. Aleksandr Kaznacheev was born and brought up in Russia and was trained by the communist administration for a diplomatic career. Because of his knowledge of the Burmese language, he was appointed a junior officer in the Russian embassy in Rangoon. He was soon enlisted as a Political Intelligence agent and worked in that capacity for over a year until, disillusioned with Communism and disgusted with the type of work that he had to do, he defected and sought political asylum in the United States. It is only after finding freedom and security in that country that Mr. Kaznacheev has written this book, describing in details, on the basis of his personal observations and experiences, the various operations that take place in a Russian embassy.

According to Mr. Kaznacheev, the most important activity that takes place in a Russian embassy is the Intelligence activity. Intelligence in Russian parlance means not collection of information but "penetration and subversion of local regimes, direct and active participation in the struggle between different political parties." He describes as follows the tasks that the Political Intelligence with which he was connected had to perform in Burma: "The main targets were the Burmese major national political parties, Trade Unions, and youth groups. Vozny's (head of the Intelligence group) officers were assigned to penetrate each of them, to establish contacts with their rank and file, and to cultivate the most promising and important of their people to the point of recruitment. Simultaneously, attempts were made to plant trusted Soviet agents at strategic places within a party, and all these efforts taken together were expected to give the Soviet Intelligence the chance to influence the

policies of a party in the way most beneficial to the Soviet government. The other side of this political game was the relentless struggle against Burmese anti-communist forces and leaders." Similar machinery, says Mr. Kaznacheev, exists in every country with which Russia has diplomatic relations, and it "insidiously carries on activities of penetration and subversion—political, economic, cultural—thus preparing the ground for future Communist take-over."

It is the Political Intelligence group which is the most important in a Russian embassy. Members of the group enjoy privileges and facilities which are not available to others. It is only because Mr. Kaznacheev was a member of that group that he was able to establish contacts with a number of Burmans as a result of which he developed admiration and liking for the Burmese way of life which influenced in the end his decision to break away from the communist regime. Others in the embassy had no contact with the Burmese people. They were required to live "as if on board ship, cut off from everything." They could mix only amongst themselves and had in addition, as happens under any totalitarian regime, to spy on each other. The Russian diplomats lived a life in which, as Mr. Kaznacheev has aptly described it, "It's all against one and one against all." One of his friends described it more graphically as "we are captives *in camera*, prisoners in solitary." It is not surprising that Mr. Kaznacheev found this type of life in the embassy unbearable and decided to break with it.



"It's quite simple really—we've decided to be neutral between alignment and non-alignment...."

Courtesy: Hindustan Times

<sup>\*</sup> *Inside A Soviet Embassy*, Aleksandr Kaznacheev, J. P. Lippincott Company, New York, \$4.95.

Mr. Kaznacheev has given some interesting information about how the embassy fabricates reports and documents and plants them on local newspapers. As soon as the stuff is published, it is picked up by the Russian news agency *Tass* and circulated all over the world as a news item published by a responsible journal. One of the fabrications related to Mr. Morarji Desai. It was an article planted on the fellow-travelling Burmese journal, *Botataung Daily*. It accused Mr. Desai of "taking a bribe of about a million dollars during his trip to the United States." He took the bribe, it was stated, "to subvert Indian neutrality, destroy friendly relations with the Communist world, replace the Nehru government with a pro-American one, and even settle the Kashmir dispute to the advantage of Pakistan." The article was published by the journal as a dispatch from "Our Correspondent in New Delhi." This one example is enough to show the length to which communist rulers of Russia would go in their efforts to malign and isolate those whom they regard as their enemies.

There was a time when, even after India, Burma and other countries of South-East Asia attained their independence Russia regarded their independence as false and instigated local communist parties to organise revolts against the newly established national governments of those nations. According to Mr. Kaznacheev, that policy underwent a change after Stalin's death. Russia then decided to follow a policy of "friendly neutrality." An authoritative spokesman elaborated to Mr. Kaznacheev the meaning of that new policy. It was as follows: "Under this 'friendly neutrality' we mean that the local governments should support our bloc in their foreign policy and not hinder our activity and propaganda inside their countries, should allow their homegrown Communists and leftists to maintain close relations with us. In return we give them some economic help and refrain from openly undermining their prestige. Of course, we don't guarantee that we won't secretly penetrate their government apparatus and political parties in order to ensure their countries' strong adherence to the policy of 'friendly neutrality'." The friendly countries may wonder after this if the old policy of open hostility was not better than the present policy of secret opposition and insidious subversion!

The book has thrown some light on the Sino-Russian dispute which has now broken out in the open. It appears that the two "Communist Brothers" were at loggerheads since long. In Burma there was a conflict between the Chinese and the Russian policy. According to a "gentleman's agreement" Russia had conceded China primacy in Burma, regarding it more or less as a country belonging to the latter's sphere of influence. But China did not observe the gentleman's agreement and took many steps which ran counter to the interests and policies of Russia. There was, it appears, veiled hostility between the embassies of the two countries. Mr. Kaznacheev has given interesting information on the point and subsequent developments have borne out its truth.

The story of a young man who, as pointed out by Mr. Simon Wolin who has edited the book, abandons his homeland, his family and a promising career for

## Review

### *China Invades India*

Edited by V. B. Karnik. Published by Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd. Pages 309. Price Rs. 15.50.

THE fact that this book is written by four experts, in the form of five essays, should not lead anyone to believe that the book is a collection of opinions on Sino-Indian relations. Actually, the book presents a continuous theme, from a concise history of China to the latest invasion of India. It presents the logic of events, the last act but a continuation of the first; the future before us one of bleak preparedness against, not an ancient friend, but a predestined enemy obsessed today by a philosophy of war and conquest. Each author, in his own fashion, deals with his chosen aspect. Mr. Karnik, suave and polished; Mr. Kini, jerky and heavy handed but authoritative; Mr. B. K. Desai, scathingly readable and entertaining; Mrs. Indu Patel started with rhetoric, which alarmed me, but ended remarkably with up-to-date prognosis and our need for preparedness for years to come, streamlining our economy to an egalitarian welfare state within and total defence abroad. All in all, a remarkable combined effort in presentation of a case and its history.

Mr. B. K. Desai has written several monographs on Tibet and is as usual critically biting in narrating the history of our shame in Tibet. He has narrated how, in spite of China's uncalled for attack in Korea in 1950, Mr. Nehru was prepared to surrender Tibet from the very beginning. Those of us who felt that Mr. Panikkar was the evil genius behind our dealings with China over Tibet, will be surprised to know that Mr. Nehru had advised him, even before he left for Peking in 1949, that Tibet was to be handed over on a platter. Mr. Panikkar, of course, as a successful Dewan in a Native State and that too in Patiala, under a notorious Maharaja, could be no other than a johukum courtier in any walk of life assigned to him. But it is clear that if the difference between a politician and a statesman be that the former ahead but a few months and the latter to five years hence, in both the categories, Mr. Nehru can only be distinguished, taking our choice, between a politician of the second class and a statesman of a still lower division. But the fault is of each one of us, even as Dunkirk and Buchenwald lay at the door of every Frenchman and Englishman, and for the future, there remains only stern vigilance, firstly against ideological humbugs amongst us, and secondly in military alliances and equipment for many a year to come.

RAMAN DESAI

the sake of his convictions, and plunges into the darkness of an unpredictable future is always bound to be of absorbing interest. In this particular case, it is all the more so as it also reveals the inner working of a highly organised and heavily financed subversive agency passing under the name and title of a Russian embassy. It is to be hoped that the information revealed in the book will cure at least a few of their illusions and delusions about the communist regime and its diplomatic activities.

# With Many Voices

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

✓ "Let the working class of capitalist countries rise against their oppressors. Our sympathies are on the side of the working class. We can help. . . . We have the means to do so. But we will never interfere in the internal affairs of other States."

—Mr. Khrushchev, *Times of India*, July 5.

✓ "To maintain, support, instruct, direct a Communist Party in a country not ruled by the Communists, — more honestly termed by Stalin 'our Shock-Brigade' — if that is not interference, what is?"

—Mr. A. D. Gorwala, *Opinion*, July 9.

"M.I.5 (the Secret Service) is so busy looking for Communists under the bed that they don't see who's on it."

—Mr. Sydney Silverman, *Thought*, July 6.

✓ "There are many people in the world who really don't understand — or say they don't — what is the great issue between the free world and the Communist world. Let them come to Berlin."

—President Kennedy, *Time*, July 5.

"At least in Britain, ministers who tell lies in Parliament are called 'liar' by their colleagues once they are found out, and no Prime Minister protects them."

—Mrs. Taya Zinkin, *Opinion*, June 25.

"I don't like to be told that I am wrong."

—Mr. Sukarno, *Hindu*, July 14.

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

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.

I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3.00

Name: .....

Address: .....

Signature

"How does one co-exist peacefully with somebody who does not want one to exist and tries his hardest to prevent one existing?"

—Mr. A. D. Gorwala, *Opinion*, July 2.

"No British Government should be brought down by the action of two tarts."

—Mr. Macmillan, *Times of India*, July 13.

"If Nehru were more fastidious, if Macmillan were more fastidious, . . . politics in Britain, and in India, would not stink to high heaven as they do today."

—Mrs. Taya Zinkin, *Opinion*, June 25.

"The real question is not whether Europe can count on America but whether it can count on itself."

—Mr. Max Lerner, *Indian Express*, July 13.

✓ "Your liberty is our liberty; and any attack on your soil is an attack upon our own."

—President Kennedy, *Time*, July 5.

"Talking a lot does not qualify one to be a thinker."

—Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru,  
*Times of India*, July 7.

"The U.S. will risk its cities to defend yours because we need your freedom to protect ours."

—President Kennedy, *Time*, July 5.

"No nation can build its destiny alone."

—President Kennedy, *Times of India*, July 7.

✓ "The theory of Marx can be improved by throwing a piece of bacon."

—Mr. Khrushchev, *Hindu*, July 13.

✓ "The only reason to negotiate is to win something. If you're not going to win something, don't negotiate."

—Mr. Khrushchev, *U.S. News & World Report*, July 15.

"Nothing in India has given me such pleasure as the Zoo."

—Mr. Galbraith, *Century*, July 20.