frontier

Vol. 3: No. 10 JUNE 13, 1970 PRICE: 35 PAISE

On Other Pages

COMMENTS .. 2

View From Delhi

POLLS AND POLLSTERS
FROM A POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT .. 5

A Letter From France

NAXALITE INTERNATIONAL
ASHOK RUDRA .. 7

ON LENIN—VII
MONITOR .. 9

WITHOUT MATERIAL INCENTIVES
PRADHAN H. PRASAD .. 11

KEYNESISM TODAY—I
SAMIR DASGUPTA .. 12

Book Review

DRAWINGS BY FOURTEEN CONTEMPORARY ARTISTS OF BENGAL .. 15

LETTERS .. 15

Editor : Samar Sen

PRINTED AT MODERN INDIA PRESS, 7, RAJA SUBODH MULLICK SQUARE, CALCUTTA-13 AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY FOR GERMINAL PUBLICATIONS (P) LTD. BY SAMAR SEN FROM 61, MOTT LANE, CALCUTTA-13

TELEPHONE: 24-3202

NEW EUGENICS

EXPERIMENTS with the smallest units of living matter are yielding more revolutionary results than the colossal showbiz in space. Some of these experiments may initiate changes far more profound than anything expected from nuclear energy or interplanetary travel. By all accounts the first artificial synthesis of a gene is an important event, and there may be a little legitimate pride in this country in the fact that Dr Khorana was born and educated here. Of course his advanced studies were done first in Switzerland and Britain and latterly in Canada and the USA. That his achievement owed a great deal to research facilities in the USA is also obvious. But, unlike high energy physics or space technology, molecular biology does not make extravagant demands on financial and technical resources. With the right kind of organisation and research climate, similar work could perhaps be attempted in India also. The Chinese have shown what can be achieved by determined self-reliance. It is a mistake to think that they are engaged only in making atomic weapons and missiles; the first artificial synthesis of insulin by a group of Chinese scientists showed that fundamental biochemical research is by no means being neglected.

Now that a gene has been synthesized there is naturally a great deal of futuristic fancy about genetic manipulation and its consequences. What is disturbing is that the speculation may not be entirely fanciful. And it is likely to be the least fanciful in its evil aspects. How far it will be possible to cure hereditary defects or diseases by what is now called genetic engineering may be doubtful; the chances are that in trying to manipulate genetic mechanisms man will create new genetic disorders. And it is certain that techniques for doing genetic damage will become potential instruments of war. Biological warfare is already high on the priority list of the American development effort and it may not be a very long step from germ warfare to gene warfare. Vietnam is being used as a vast laboratory for the testing of a variety of life-destroying or life-distorting chemicals, possibly also of disease-carrying bacteria and viruses. The next step may well be attempts at long-term genetic damage. Nixon and his successors will surely try to improve upon Hitler's work on eugenics.

Food For Thought

Millions of Indians who live on near starvation level will never know that some three hundred delegates recently assembled in New Delhi under the banner of the National Food Congress to discuss ways of improving the nutritional standard of diets. It is as if the problem of hunger is no longer there. The authorities claim that the green revolution has changed the rural landscape—let the cynics say it is turning into red—and the success of the intensive development programme in the wheat-growing areas will be repeated in the rice-producing States. But it is for everyone to see that rice has not responded everywhere so well to the high yielding varieties programme. If there is a breakthrough in agriculture (do three successive bumper harvests amount to that?) why haven't food prices come down? The reason is not difficult to find. The Government has been deliberately maintaining the procurement prices at a high level. For the benefit of kulaks, consumers are made to suffer. In this context has to be seen why the recommendations of the Agricultural Prices Commission for a reduction in procurement prices were rejected for two consecutive years. But those indefatigable persons like Annasaheb Shinde, chairman of the National Food Congress, will still repeat the platitude that food prices will automatically decline following a rise in production. Other things remaining the same, prices will further go up when the concessional food imports are stopped after 1972-73. As long as procurement prices are kept at a high level, neither an enlargement of the food zones nor their abolition can solve the problem. Mr J. A. Dave, chairman of the National Food Conporation of India, has been candid enough to admit that as the price policy is related to socio-economic and political considerations, there is little possibility of any substantial reduction in procurement prices in the immediate future. In the present situation, the issue price to the consumer will keep spiralling, reducing to a trickle the feedback of stocks into the public distribution system. As a result, the buffer stock of foodgrains will swell beyond what is considered economically feasible. Mr Dave has suggested a way out. By subsidising the difference between the economic cost and price, consumer prices should be maintained at a lower level. But how is the consumer going to benefit from a situation when instead of being asked to pay high prices for his purchase of food, he would be subject to still higher indirect taxation?

The Chinese leadership believes that self-sufficiency in food is the sine qua non to self-reliance in other fields. India cannot think like that since her immense potential crop resources are being held down and compelled to submit to foreign dictates. Seen against this background, India's hyper-fascination for mechanization of farming on Western and Japanese lines and low emphasis on human labour investment—which in China's case forms the most important source of capital—can be easily understood. Take for instance the use of tractors in China. For the small, irregular tracts in south China and with an abundant supply of human labour, tractors were not found very useful. But in the north, with relatively low concentration of population, tractors could be fruitfully employed, especially when rains delay ploughing. The Russian model of "tractors first, then collectivization" was already there, but China's collectivization was set in a non-mechanized, labour-intensive agricultural framework. Due to oil shortage and high cost of steel and machinery, China did not go for large-scale mechanized farming from the beginning. Mechanization has, however, come, but gradually. In the use of fertilisers and soil treatment, the Chinese flexibility sets an example for all developing countries to emulate.

"Progressive" Bureaucrats

Are the bureaucrats of West Bengal stealing the leftist thunder by proposing a moratorium on the eviction of sharecroppers? The leftists will no doubt congratulate themselves and consider that the Government dared not act otherwise, because of the development of militancy among the peasantry and hence the bureaucratic path of least resistance. But the fact remains that all the propaganda and brave talk of the leftists, on the peasant front, have been geared to the protection of the peasants who had forcibly occupied benami land during the UF regimes. The proposed bill for amendment of the existing Land Acts provides an extension, by a further period of one year, of the stay of proceedings for termination of cultivation by a sharecropper. This will certainly take some wind out of the leftist sails. Not that the sharecroppers will feel relieved by the moratorium. The uncertainty of possession continues and the peasants in general will also continue to wonder over the mystery why the UF Government could not devise a scheme of conferring titledeeds on the peasants who risked their lives to occupy the land. Being thrown constantly at the mercy of bureaucrats is not a happy proposition.

The leftists cannot possibly grudge either the absence of any provision to revise the land ceilings. They discussed the matter and were keen on fixing the ceiling at 25 acres a family, but again, owing to the unresolved mystery, did not pass any legislation to that effect. If the caretaker Government now dithers on defining a family, it should be pardoned because all logicians know that definitions are a tricky subject! Even then, the West Bengal bureaucrats, who had approved of the UF-proposed ceiling but whose approval was shelved by the Centre, should be congratulated. Some of them even proposed 15 acres as a family ceiling!

On the face of it, the West Bengal bureaucrats have inbibed some of the revolutionary ardour prevailing in the State. It may not be, however, that revolutionary, if one believes that a crucial factor is emerging on the agricultural front. There has been this season a breakthrough, claimed by the West Bengal Agriculture Department, in rabi cereals—boro paddy and winter wheat. The introduction of the high yielding seeds, Formosan-Filipino paddy and Mexican wheat, it is said, has produced a million tonnes of rabi cereals and that the boro paddy, in particular, has given the jotedars 2,470 lb per acre, an aggregate which has not only almost trebled the usual per acre yields in West Bengal, i.e. 885 lbs, but also, surpassed the yield in many advanced countries! If the claim is true, the utilisation of the high-yielding-varities scheme will definitely reduce the urge of the jotedars to lean on land in volume.

In this context, the proposed revision of the sharecroppers' share of the crop, from 60 per cent to 75 per cent, will hardly affect the jotedars. In fact, when the sharecroppers are supplied seeds, fertilisers, etc by the jotedars, a procedure which is normal, the sharecroppers' share will be reduced to fifty per cent. Only in negligible cases, the sharecroppers, who are in a position to pay for the costly seeds, fertilisers and irrigation facilities, will get their 75 per cent share. The sharecroppers' right to inheritance, as proposed, is again a tricky affair, because, inevitably, the determination of the inheritance will have to be settled in courts.

The much vaunted amendment bill, the bureaucrats should know, will not satisfy the Research and Policy Division of the Union Home Ministry, which blamed the bureaucrats for not implementing land reforms. After the airing of the land-to-the-tiller slogan right after independence, in course of 20 years, 82 per cent of the tenants in eight States including West Bengal are still tilling the land without enjoying tenancy rights. Following the advice of the Division, the last conference of the Chief Ministers, the Bombay resolution of the Congress (R) and Mrs Gandhi's appeal to the State Governments had placed some radical land reform targets. The West Bengal bureaucrats have only tinkered with the problem, more concerned with the political content of it and least bothered with the long-term effects of the agrarian measures.

Beware Of Peking— I

Hardly four days after Nixon thrust his troops into Cambodia Comrade Kosygin came out with a stern warning that "the Soviet government will draw appropriate conclusions for its policy from such a line of action by the U.S. in Southeast Asia." And thanks to his revolutionary dynamism, he drew his "conclusions" with unbelievable promptness. Within 24 hours Radio Moscow launched a broadside against "fascist and chauvinist" Chairman Mao who foisted his fascist rule over China with the help of the slogan "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Radio Moscow was convinced that Hitler and his gang would have said the same thing. The broadcast was obviously intended to be of some educative value for Prince Sihanouk who unfortunately had fallen for this fascist slogan. Within 24 hours of the broadcast Soviet and American representatives found themselves eyeball-to-eyeball at the SALT session in Vienna. The Soviet delegates, now implementing the conclusions already arrived at by Comrade Kosygin, made a warm gesture and invited the American friends to lunch at the Soviet Embassy. But a recalcitrant Sihanouk neither abandoned the perilous course of protracted armed struggle nor learnt from the Soviet example how to win friends. Another round of 'appropriate conclusions.' In an editorial article *Pravda* warned communist and national liberation movements in Asia and Africa that advice from Peking could have fatal consequences. "The Peking leaders", it warned, "bear the responsibility for the fact that, having imposed their adventurist tactics on certain sections of the communist and national liberation movement in Asia and Africa, they doomed them to defeat and rout." But nobody should assume from all this Soviet effort to hold back Sihanouk from the adventurous course of people's war that Moscow is reconciled to the American invasion of Cambodia. Comrade Kosygin, notwithstanding what his professional detractors might say, has indeed called for "the struggle of Cambodian patriotic forces against American aggression". But since the Soviet leaders are not sectarian they believe that General Lon Nol and his friends would eventually join this patriotic struggle. That is why the Soviets and their pragmatic East European friends are sticking to Phnom Penh while the sectarian communist countries of Asia have let down Cambodia erroneously, denouncing the regime as fascist and calling the Lon Nol-Sirik Matak clique puppets of U.S. imperialism. The indefatigable Soviet Ambassador in Phnom Penh, Mr Sergei Kudryavtsev who has spared no pains to win over the generals, before he left Phnom Penh, called for "Cambodia's return to the road of peace and neutrality". But what if the generals refuse to become patriotic and instead join the "forces of aggression and war"? Well, the ambasador in that case threatened "to make conclusions for its (Moscow's) policy". Still more conclusions are ahead.

But Mao, chauvinist, fascist, adventurist and what not as he is, has drawn his conclusions which will only infuriate the votaries of peace and freedom both in Washington and Moscow. In a rare statement made in Peking late last month he emphasised his belief that through "persevering in a protracted people's war, the three Indochinese peoples would

certainly overcome all difficulties and win complete victory". He reiterated his adventuristic faith in the success of small nations against the big ones "if only they dare to rise in struggle, take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their countries." U.S. imperialism which looks like "a huge monster", he again said, is in fact no more than "a paper tiger now in the throes of its deathbed struggle". Mao did not brag about the kind of support China would give to the struggle of the Indochinese people but Chau Seng, Sihanouk's special adviser, said in an interview in Paris that Chinese support to Cambodian struggle would be all out including sending of Chinese volunteers if necessary. Earlier there was an agreement in Peking, second in a year, for supply of war material to Hanoi as free gift. All this was done apparently before China publicly announced the 'conclusions' it drew from Cambodian events.

Beware Of Peking—II

A correspondent writes :

Who says President Nixon's misadventure into Cambodia has eroded the last remaining goodwill in the rest of the world for the USA's Indo-China policy? The American President may have failed to convince you or me or our cussed neighbour about the nobility of his cause, a fair one-half of his own countrymen may like to flay his actions, the American youth may rise in total revolt, but, for President Nixon, there is at long last compensation for all this. There is at least one government which understands and appreciates the American move : the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Record the latest observation in the *New Times* (Moscow), and you will come to know that the real aggressors in Cambodia are not the Americans, but Mao Tse-tung's China. Nixon, poor soul, what could he do but invade Cambodia. For he was under great provocation. It was the Chinese who by their machinations in Sihanouk's country created the conditions for intervention on the part of the United States. Obviously, therefore, it is not the USA, but China, which has violated Cambodia. Although the Soviet pronouncement does not make it that explicit, the lesson to be derived from this magnificent discovery can be only one, namely, in the present critical juncture, it is the duty and obligation of all freedom-loving peoples across and around the globe to come together to crush, once for all, those heinous aggressors; it is implicit that in this great, glorious and noble mission Comrades Brezhnev and Kosygin will not forsake the magnanimous hands proferred by any true friends of the Soviet Union, including of course those preferred by Richard Milhous Nixon. And, as soon as the heat abates somewhat in New Delhi, we might now witness the heart-gladdening spectacle of Comrades Minoo Masani and Asoka Mehta and Sripad Amrit Dange all marching together to the Chinese Embassy and shouting in unison : Hands off Cambodia !

No, this is not far-fetched speculation. An alliance of this nature between the various shades of the friends of the CIA and the friends

BRINGING BEAUTY AND STURDINESS TOGETHER

RALEIGH
INDIA'S BEST LOVED BICYCLE

Raleigh is beautiful. Raleigh is sturdy. Raleigh is India's best loved bicycle.

Manufactured to rigid quality control specifications by Sen-Raleigh. Raleigh is built to go, designed to last and is the fastest moving bicycle in India.

Discover the unbeatable pleasure of Raleigh cycling for yourself.

Fastest selling fastest moving Raleigh rules the road.

®Regd. User : SEN-RALEIGH LIMITED

The most trusted name in bicycles

SRC-101

of the Soviet Union had emerged during 1962-63: the camaraderie then cemented had rusted a little in the meanwhile, but now Cambodia has once more provided a great occasion to like-minded people to come together. In another lambast, a Soviet commentator has warned Mao Tse-tung's hordes against continuing with their nefarious acts of interference with India's internal problems. The peace-loving Russians are aghast at China's blatant actions which are, to say the least, provocative in the extreme. The medium is the message, says McLuhan. Perhaps the Soviet Union is trying to tell us something. Could it be that, between them Comrades Brezhnev and Nixon have decided that, to ensure a speedy end to the hostilities in Vietnam, it would soon be necessary for the American forces to enter India—and liquidate the Naxalite sanctuaries? The Russians, and their leaders, are an understanding lot; they know beforehand that in case such a thing happens and the Americans invade and overrun Indian territory, it would all be the fault of the Chinese. China, by difinition, is the source of all trouble. If the Soviet Union gets a drubbing in the World Cup from the Brazilians, that too is on account of the Chinese. The Chinese, who are responsible for all evils under the sun, are the perpetrators of My Lai; they invaded Korea; they were behind the coup in Guatemala; maybe, retrospectively, they were responsible for Hitler, Guernica, Trotsky, Kerensky, and everything else; you name any bad episode in history and China was instrumental for it.

After such expositions, one has to lend credence to the rumour that the Communist (sic) Party of India's National Council is meeting soon in an emergency session to decide on the party's nominee as Home Minister of the country in an imminent coalition regime. The rumour has it that the running is close between the two Comrade Guptas—Bhupesh and Indrajit—with Chairman Dange contemplating to cast the deciding vote for himself.

View from Delhi

Polls And Pollsters

FROM A POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT

WHEN you see Congressmen of rival parties huddle together over scotch in New Delhi, you can be sure they are discussing just this—the imminence of fresh elections to Parliament. Mid-term election is a perverse, debased political coinage of the politically illiterate because the Constitution provides for no such thing as a "mid-term" election and Mr Harold Wilson never sought a mid-term election but only a general election. All that the Constitution says is that the life of the Lok Sabha cannot exceed five years.

In an interview given to a Turkish press delegation early in April, Mrs Indira Gandhi ruled out fresh elections to Parliament. She saw no reason why there should be any elections before the one scheduled for 1972. But now there is every reason to believe that there would be one, possibly early in 1971. The Palace spokesmen concede the possibility in private, if they do not get too sentimental under the influence of you know what, that is.

The by-election trend is largely in favour of Mrs Gandhi. So is the monsoon. Suppose she manages to get the bill on privy purses abolition and the urban ceilings through the monsoon session of Parliament. What stands in the way of her strategy of dissolving Parilament and seeking a new balance? Whether the States implement the urban property ceilings or not, the Centre would have passed the bill and that is the end of the responsibility. October-November is the ideal time to dissolve Parliament and February 1971 like any February is the ideal time for the Election Commission to hold a countrywide poll. After all the poll has to be held before the euphoria wears off.

In any case, both the Congress parties are preparing for fresh elections. Both of them are working on the implications of an electoral strategy without a public commitment on positions.

In this context, the ruling Congress party's attiude to the "friendly" opposition parties is reveailng. None of them would like to be taken for a ride and would like a clear commitment on the post-election pattern of sharing power as a pre-condition to support for the Congress-R in the elections. But Mrs Gandhi thinks that by being smart and a little patronising, she could win the support of all at the polls. For instance, in her interview to the Turkish Press delegation, she has claimed that the once secessionist DMK has integrated itself with national politics and the two communist parties are no longer echoing what someone abroad savs. The certificate of "good conduct" given to the two communist parties should flatter Comrades Dange and Sundarayya but what she means is obvious and is perhaps an implied endorsement of what the Soviets have to say about national liberation movements in general. The two communist parties are content with the crumbs from the table of the national democratic front, as it were, and have earned legitimacy in the system.

Will Mrs Gandhi decide on the bomb as a pre-election gimmick is a question being seriously debated in New Delhi these days. The Prime Minister called for a nuclear-free Indian Ocean area during her sojourn in Mauritius. Which means the Indian bomb, if made, will not be tested in the Indian Ocean. But there is reason to believe, at least on the basis of information available here, that a 650-square mile area in Rajasthan was earmarked long ago for a possible test, call it a "peaceful explosion" or anything else. Mrs Gandhi finally and firmly talked aga-

inst the bomb in Mauritius, something which she would not say so categorically in New Delhi. But nobody takes it seriously. If the decision on a bomb can win an election the ruling party will by all means reverse its own Guntur AICC resolution against the bomb. It is political survival of a party at stake and to hell with the nation.

A decision in favour of the bomb should win an election for the ruling party, whatever the outstanding issues. The princes can be got round or bought round. The urban ceilings would touch nobody but impress the have-nots just as the West Bengal land ceiling in the form decided upon after the kulak intervention would hurt nobody really.

The immediate problem of course is the Naxalites and the communalists. Mr Chavan has no differences with Mrs Gandhi on the line of action. Both of them equate Naxalite extremism with the RSS-Shiv Sena communal violence. The poor Mr Rajeswar Rao may say that communal violence is the most detestable thing and might express his sneaking sympahies for the Naxalites. But that is not the official CPI line just as Mr A. K. Gopalan's warm references to the Naxalites (and why they would not attack the CPM leaders physically) do not represent the official CPM line.

A joint exercise of the Home and Law Ministries seems to have come to the conclusion that it would be unwise to ban the RSS or the Shiv Sena because if some court holds the ban ultra vires it would be disastrous for the prestige of the Government. Even the Information and Broadcasting Ministry has betrayed its pro-Hindu prejudice. While the Jana Sangh could put out 50,000 copies of Mr A. B. Vajpayee's speech, the I and B Ministry, according to the sarkari communists, would not bring out a pamphlet containing Mrs Gandhi's speech. Well that is a technical problem to be sorted out between the CPI and its one-time fellow-traveller, Mr Inder Gujral, of the Lahore Government College fame. But "secular democracy" is about the most fashionable thing in New Delhi. Inside the ruling party, one learns, there are two categories of people—those who are not anti-Muslim but would equate all communalism together, and the other which blames only the majority communalism but would bracket minority communalism as "progressive" and "leftist".

The minority vote will be a crucial factor in the elections to come. Mrs Gandhi's advisers reckon her chances rather bleakly but hope she would get 105 seats in a House of 525 and with the help of "friendly" parties, would have a viable collection of over 240 members. But if there is an appreciable swing in her favour, she

My cup of tea

Richbru is tea that
tastes just right.
Good and rich and strong.
Cup after cup after cup
you get so many more from
every pack of Richbru.

Lipton's Richbru

LIPTON LIPTON'S MEANS GOOD TEA.

LRC-4

might win over 300 seats outright and would not have to depend on the communists, the DMK and the Muslim League. It happened in Ceylon, where Sirimavo Bandaranaike does not have to depend on the communists and Trotskyites. But it is equally not necessary for the pro-Moscow Communist Party of Ceylon to share power with the Trotskyites, whose alleged truck with the Chinese Communist Party Comrade Suslov was denouncing in the mid-sixties. For the first time, pro-Moscow communists are sharing bourgeois democratic power with the discredited Trotskyite rump (the Fourth Intertiononal daes not consider the Lanka Sama Samaj Party quite "Trotskyite" but that is of no consequence because Moscow has considered the party Trotskyite). But suppose Mrs Bandaranaike shows signs of cordiality towards China, the Soviets would certainly resent it. Mr Peter Kuenemann's withdrawal from the Cabinet would not threaten the position of Mrs Bandaranaike whose party is more amorphous than Mrs Gandhi's and has no ideology worth the name.

A *New Times* article in the wake of the Ceylon elections, charges the Chinese with promoting insurrectionary movements in Asian countries. The Soviet communists forgot revolution, insurrection and insurgency long ago and the article, if anything, is an unwitting admission that communism of the brand advocated by Moscow has no place for national liberation movements.

Lastly, Dr Vikram Sarabhai made a secret visit to Moscow recently and as head of India's atomic energy outfit, discussed India's atomic policy in the wake of the Chinese space achievement. The Indian bomb might be coming soon, if the planned 500 megawatt unit outside the hamstringing aid agreement which provides for international supervision, goes through. India's bomb policy is on the point of undergoing a change. Official spokesmen might deny everything that appears in the Press but the change is coming.

June 7, 1940

Letter from France

Naxalite International

ASHOK RUDRA

MESSRS Chavan and Dhavan may well think that they will be able to contain or eliminate the Naxalite menace or what they would like to call "nuisance" by taking certain stern police measures and setting up certain subcommittees to issue platitudes about the causes of student unrest. But they may prove wrong. What is happening in Calcutta and elsewhere in India by way of attacks on apparently trivial or meaningless targets by extremist youths is no isolated phenomenon. A wind is blowing all the world over, at least in all parts of the world outside Eastern Europe, where alone conformism reigns supreme. Everywhere else in the world increasing numbers of young people are not only rejecting the values of their elders, which include not only the institutions of the State but also the institutions of the traditional left parties, but are also paying heavier and heavier prices: ruining their studies, their careers, and clashing more and more often with the forces of law and order, resulting in deaths and injuries. This phenomenon has been there with us for the last four or five years: with West German students fighting the police over Vietnam; with American youth marching on to the White House, keeping a nervous President Nixon awake a whole night; with this anti-imperialist movement of American youth getting more and more militant by its tactical alliance with the anti-racialist struggle of the American Negroes; with students of even the staid British universities resorting to the unprecedented action of taking over universities under the leadership of extremist leaders; above all, with the revolution in France in May 1968, which started with students taking over universities and developed into young workers taking over factories, and a general strike paralysing the whole country for as many as three weeks, and which was ended by the betaryal of the revolution by the leaders of the Moscovite Communist Party and the trade unions dominated by it who sold the revolution for a few substantial crumbs of wage increases. As could have been predicted by anybody at that time, those very important victories of economism got all swamped by the inflation that resulted from it in 1969.

* *

This phenomenon has been with us for some time. But what is new in these countries is the adoption by the extremists of a tactic of what is being called urban guerillas. In France the practitioners of this form of warfare are called "les casseurs" —the breakers. The news these "breakers" have been making read exactly like those one has been reading about the Naxalite rampages in Calcutta. Sabotage of factories, bomb attacks, gheraoes, pitched battle with the police—these seem to be becoming the order of the day in this consumption society. The news the upholders of law and order are making in France also read exactly the same as in India. Those who are forging special laws for West Bengal to allow preventive detention could have learnt a few lessons by studying the type of "anti-casseur" legislation the French Government has been preparing. The French legislation made provisions for making any participant in a violent demonstration, any one picked up at random, responsible for the entire event and punishable and liable to pay for whatever losses of property could be ascribed to the demonstration. This is supposed to prevent young people from joining any demonstrations whatsoever. Liberal opinion in France was much more upset by the proposed legislation than such

opinion in India by the measures being taken against the Naxalites, which now include cold-blooded murder by the police of people arrested on suspicion. So much so that the House, even though overwhelmingly dominated by the Gaullists, passed the law only after some modification.

A recent incident, not perhaps very typical, for it did not involve any violence, has nevertheless attracted considerable attention. A group of young people raided one of the most expensive and exclusive shops selling luxury food articles, looted the wares, and distributed them among the people of a particularly depressed slum area. The action was probably not so much aimed at giving to the poor slum dwellers a taste of caviar and champagne—if these were the products looted. It did make a sensation by highlighting the indecency of such luxury in the midst of so much poverty. Anyway the course law and order has taken is as follows. A girl student who joined the expedition has been picked up, tried and sent to prison for 13 months.

* *

Looting a food shop may look like a very poor action for bringing about a revolution; just as poor as ransacking principals' rooms in colleges. But the Home Minister of France, just like his counterpart in India, must be knowing who threatens most what he is there to protect and therefore whom to punish most. There must be some reason why the police in France as in India are so much after these young kids, while the stalwarts of the communist parties, who claim zamindari rights over all revolutions, are left in complete liberty. The police do not stop at taking steps against those who actually break things. In France, as in India, as in the USA, they use provocateurs to fabricate incidents and then round up whomsoever they want to round up. Two young people who were arrested recently for placing bombs in some government offices in Besancon, admitted in the court that they did it because they wanted more police repression of those who acted like that.

The inspiration of the movement in France is largely Maoist no doubt, but it is not exclusively so. In this part of the world inspiration for armed actions against the established system comes also from Latin America where Che Guevara is more alive than ever before. It is not only the Red Book that supplies the ideas; only a few days back the French Government banned a book published in France by no less respectable a publisher than the Catholic house, Seuil. It is a book written by a Brazilian fighter, dealing with techniques of guerilla warfare in urban circumstances. Also, among the casseurs are elements of the French petit bourgeois class, the shopowners, the small traders who are resorting to violence as a last desperate gesture before getting crushed under the bulldozers of Big Capital, more powerful than ever before, thanks to the Gaullist revolution. The Black Nationalism of the United States provides a third important source of inspiration.

* *

Nobody who has known the evolution of Jean-Paul Sartre's political thought would be surprised at the latest position he has taken. He has joined hands—only tactically and only provisionally—with the casseurs—the French Naxalites. He agreed to be the editor of the weekly paper called *Le Cause du Peuple* (The Cause of the People), the official organ of a group of French Maoists, after two of its editors got arrested and the police seized all the copies of all the issues that came out of the press. Sartre's declaration was that even though he had not become a Maoist without any reservations, he did identify himself with all the articles that would be published in the journal under his editorship. He means it as a challenge to the police in an effort to expose the discriminatory character of the use of law by which it is being attempted to suppress the Maoists. He is doing no less than the others who edited before him—why is he not being arrested he asks. The French Home Minister does not obviously want to make international news by arresting one of its most famous intellectuals who refused the Nobel Prize the other year.

While Sartre joins hands with the French Naxalites, Jean Genet, the famous and controversial writer, has done so with the American Naxalites —the Black Panthers, the Negro movement given entirely to violent methods. Genet accepted an invitation from the Panthers, managed to enter the USA without a visa, and went from town to town, university to university, in a campaign for the life of a Panther leader who is being tried for murder—a case of framing, according to Genet.

* *

The man of the Left who has been most talked about recently in the French press, radio and television is Roger Garaudy, now expelled from the French Communist Party after he characterised in a thesis the Soviet Union as a military-bureaucratic dictatorship (or some such terms) practising something like colonialism vis-a-vis other socialist countries. Garaudy's rupture with the Soviet party started at the time of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia; and one of the last items in his long and bitter quarrel with other leaders of his party has been an allegation by him that the French party handed over to the Czech party, after Dubcek's removal by the Russians, a document on some secret talks Dukcek earlier had with Waldeck Rochet, which the Czech party used as an instrument for the denunciation of Dubcek.

Garaudy's exit is ironical. He was the Party's man for dealing with the intellectuals; which meant that on innumerable occasions in the past he had to be the party's spokesman to defend often indefensible positions against adversaries who were formidable and in subjects that were not easy—poetry, philosophy, science, etc. ....But c'est la vie, as one says in French!

FRONTIER is available from
CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY
23/90 Connaught Place
New Delhi-1

On Lenin—VII

MONITOR

THE workers, we have seen, can on their own, unassisted by the intelligentsia, reach at best trade union consciousness but not revolutionary (or communist) consciousness. Similarly, in the political movement the workers, as workers cannot go beyond a certain limit. "Workers are capable of displaying enormous energy and self-sacrifice in strikes and street battles with the police and troops, and are capable (in fact, are alone capable) of determining the whole outcome of our movement—but the struggle against the *political* police requires special qualities; it requires *professional revolutionaries*."[1]

In fact one of the crucial questions that the communists must satisfactorily answer is the question of the relation between an organization of professional revolutionaries and the pure and simple labour movement. The revisionists, who maintain that the political struggle is identical with the economic struggle against the employers and the government, hold, by the same token, that the organization of revolutionaries is more or less identical with the organization of workers. But it must never be forgotten that just as the political struggle carried on by the communist is far more extensive and complex than the economic struggles the workers carry on against the employers and the government, in the same way, the organization of revolutionaries must differ from the organization of the workers for the latter struggle. "A workers' organization must, in the first place, be a trade organization; secondly, it must be as wide as possible; and thirdly, it must be as public as conditions will allow...on the other hand, the organization of revolutionaries must consist first and foremost of the people whose profession is that of a revolutionary...In view of this common feature of the members of such an organization, *all distinctions as between workers and intellectuals*, and certainly distinction of trade and profession, must be obliterated. Such an organization must be of necessity not too extensive and as secret as possible".[2]

There are generally two basic charges against the views expounded above concerning the organization of revolutionaries. First, such an organization is not revolutionary but conspiratorial and the political struggle which it is supposed to lead is consequently nothing but political conspiracy. Secondly, such an organization and the views underlying it are the very negation of democracy. Let us examine them in order. As regards the first charge it can be easily replied that according to the communists (or Social Democrats) the fight for democracy and for socialism must be waged not by conspirators, but by a revolutionary party that is *based on the labour movement*. They hold that political struggle must be *waged not in the form of plots*, but by educating, disciplining and organizing the proletariat, by political agitation among *the workers*.[3]

But conspiracy must not be confused with secrecy. Under the conditions of extreme repression when no open means of political struggle exist, a revolutionary organization must be secret. Thus, "according to its *form* a strong revolutionary organization in an autocratic country may also be described as a 'conspirative' organization, because the French word '*conspiration*' is tantamount to the Russian word '*zagovor*' ('conspiracy') and we must have the utmost secrecy for an organization of that kind. Secrecy is such a necessary condition for such an organization, that all other conditions must be subordinated to it".[4]

As regards the second charge, namely that the views on organization here expounded contradict the principles of democracy, it could come only from those who had no intimate knowledge of the history of revolutionary movements and who were mechanically applying the conditions of foreign countries to a land like the Czarist autocratic Russia. The 'broad democratic principles' for an organization—as the critics uphold—presuppose two conditions: first full publicity—that is, a publicity that extends beyond the circle of the membership of the organization—and second, election to all offices. As regards the first point, a party is called a democratic organization because all it does is done publicly; even its party congresses are held in public. But when a party is forced, by nature of things, to be a secret organization and cannot thus fulfil these principles it is absolutely useless to raise the question of 'broad democratic principles'.[5]

Nor is the situation with regard to the second condition of democracy, namely, the principle of election, any better. This condition is taken for granted in countries where political liberty (in the bourgeois sense) prevails. There everyone can know the background of a political personality, the stages through which he has passed and, consequently, knowing all the facts of the case, every party member can decide for himself whether or not to elect this person for a certain party office. "Try to put this picture in the frame of our autocracy!...Is it possible for all the revolutionaries to elect one of their members to any particular office, when in the very interests of the work, he must *conceal* his identity from nine out of ten of these 'all'? ...'Broad democracy' in party organization...is nothing more than a *useless and harmful toy*. It is a use-

---

[1] *What is To Be Done?* Chapter IV, Section B, Lenin's emphasis.

[2] *Ibid.*, Chapter IV, Section C, Lenin's emphasis.

[3] *The Tasks of the Russian Social Democrats* (1898). Our emphasis.

[4] *What is To Be Done?* Chapter IV, Section E, Lenin's emphasis.

[5] *What is To Be Done? Ibid.*

less toy because, as a matter of fact, no revolutionary organization has ever practised *broad* democracy, nor could it, however much it desired to do so. It is a harmful toy because any attempt to practise the 'broad democratic principles' will simply facilitate the work of the police,...divert the thoughts of the practical workers from the serious and imperative task of training themselves to become professional revolutionaries to that of drawing up detailed 'paper' rules for election systems."[6] In fact, a serious revolutionary party must be unencumbered by these resonant but hollow phrases and must concentrate upon three essentials—strict secrecy, strict selection of members and the training of professional revolutionaries. "If we possessed these qualities something even more than 'democracy' would be guaranteed to us, namely complete comradely, mutual confidence among revolutionaries".[7]

As is well known the question of party organization was one of the main factors that divided the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party into the Bolsheviks (majoritarians) and the Mensheviks (minoritarians)—the former led by Lenin and the latter by Martov and others (1903). As regards the party rules—on which a fierce controversy arose between the two trends—Lenin formulated that one could be a member of the party provided he accepted the party programme, supported the party financially and belonged to one of its organizations. Martov, while accepting Lenin's first two points, differed sharply on the third by maintaining that one could become a party member merely by helping the party in some way without necessarily belonging to one of its organizations. Thus while Lenin regarded the party as an organized detachment whose members must submit to party discipline, Martov regarded the party as a somewhat loose organization without its members submitting to any discipline and thus throwing the party open to unstable, non-proletarian elements. The differences between Lenin and his opponents—though touching on the question of party organization went in fact much deeper. The Mensheviks attached an *absolute* value to democratic principles while Lenin objected to any such abstract interpretation of democracy. "The fundamental principle of dialectics is that there is no such thing as abstract truth, truth is always concrete".[8] The democratic principles have always a relative and not an absolute value. This is true as much for the general political life as for the internal life of the party. In the name of abstract democratic principles Lenin's opponents in fact rejected the discipline and centralism within the party, indispensable for the functioning of a revolutionary leadership. To them *democracy* and *centralism* were polar opposites. One of their leaders, Axelrod, pointed out that as the Social Democratic Party was the party of the working class, it could not be an entity separated from the working class and it could not differentiate between the workers who belonged to the party and the workers who did not. Lenin replied that the "party as the vanguard of the working class, must not be confused with the entire class".[9] One must be aware of the different degrees of consciousness and activity within the class: to hold that the Social Democratic Party is the party of the working class signifies that the party will lead the class and not the inverse and that the party must not be dissolved in the class. It is an illusion to think that under capitalism, the working class will ever attain the level of consciousness and activity of its vanguard. 'We are the party of a class", wrote Lenin, "and therefore *almost the entire class* should act under the leadership of our party.. No sensible Social-Democrat has ever yet doubted that under capitalism even the trade union organizations (which are more primitive and more comprehensible to the underdeveloped strata) are unable to embrace the entire, or almost the entire working class. To forget the distinction between the vanguard and the whole of the masses which gravitates towards it, to forget the constant duty of the vanguard *to raise* ever wider strata to this most advanced level, means merely to deceive oneself, to shut one's eyes to the immensity of our task, and to narrow down these tasks".[10]

Citing the pompous phrases about democracy and autonomy within the party in the name of the proletariat the opponents of Lenin were in fact revealing themselves as supporters of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectuals who are mortally afraid of any discipline and organization. Lenin reminded them that the proletariat is not afraid of organization and discipline and that the proletariat will do nothing to have the worthy professors and high school students, who do not want to join an organization, recognized as party members. "The proletariat is trained by its whole life for organization far more radically than many an intellectual prig...It is not the proletariat, but *certain intellectuals* in our party who lack self-training and the spirit of organization and disciplne".[11]

Thus the party, as the organized vanguard of the proletariat, must have one discipline, one leading centre; after a thorough, ample discussion and decision the lower organizations must submit to the higher organizations, the minority to the majority, as the parts submit to the whole; the same discipline is applied to all members equally—the leaders or the followers. "In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organization. Disunited by the rule of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, ground down by forced labour for capital, constantly thrust back to the 'low depths' of utter destitution, savagery and degeneration, the proletariat can become,

---

[6] *Ibid.*, Lenin's emphasis.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* (1904), Section R.

[9] *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* (1904), Section G, Sub-section 1.

[10] *Ibid.*, Lenin's emphasis.

[11] *Ibid.*, Section Q, Lenin's emphasis.

and inevilably will become, an invincible force only when its ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organization which will weld millions of toilers into an army of the working class".[12]

(*To be concluded*)

[12] *Ibid.*, end of Section R.

Without Material Incentives

PRADHAN H. PRASAD

TO the utopian socialists of the nineteenth century, dominated by Owen, Fourier, Saint-Simon and Proudhon, "socialism" was commonly used to connote the doctrine of community or cooperative ownership and community control of means of production and property in the interest of all. Marx, on the other hand, laid the foundation of what is known as "scientific socialism".

He analysed the historic character of a socialist society which would exist in the transition period between capitalism and communism. He showed a realistic awareness of class composition and pulls of forces of diverse character in a Socialist State. Defining socialist society Marx says: "What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges. Accordingly, the individual producer receives back from the society—after the deductions have been made—exactly what he gives to it."[1] Lenin also subscribed to the doctrine of 'to each according to his work" and attempted to give it a practical shape after the overthrow of capitalist society in Russia in 1917.

The doctrine, however, suffers from a serious limitation on account of a considerable measure of arbitrariness involved in its application. Those in power may exploit the arbitrariness for bestowing favours and privileges on themselves, their relations and friends. Even in situations where private ownership of property may not exist, the privileged stratum of society (aided by the institution of 'material incentives for work') may enjoy the political power and use it to the advantage of their class. "The abolition of classes", says Lenin, "requires a long, difficult and stubborn class struggle, which after the overthrow of the power of capital, after the destruction of the bourgeois State, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not disappear (as the vulgar representatives of the old Socialism and the old Social-Democracy imagine), but merely changes its forms and in many respects becomes more fierce."[2] It is precisely to counteract such a tendency that both Marx and Lenin advocated dictatorship of the proletariat (the non-privileged stratum of the society) in the political transition period between capitalist and communist society. "Between capitalist and communist society", says Marx, "lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the State can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."[3]

The history of the socialist nations relates only to the recent past. One can gather from the short historical evidence that even 'dictatorship of the proletariat' and 'economic inequality', when combined, remained unstable. The privileged stratum of the society in some of the communist nations has succeeded in wresting political control from the non-privileged one. A new class of 'haves' seems to have replaced the old ones.

Do we have an alternative? A socialist society may take the form of an institutional set-up where there is absence of private ownership of immovable property and other means of production, market of wage-goods only (which are operated by the State), a ceiling on individual holdings of wealth which would in the circumstances consist of movable consumer goods (i.e., wage-goods) only, free schooling to all up to the age of, say, fifteen years, free higher education, free medical treatment and a time scale of wages for all. One would begin to earn wages as soon as one is born and would continue to earn it till he dies. With economic development, the time scale of wages would also register an upward shift. For example, in the context of our economy (at the present level of economic development) the time scale of annual wages per person will be somewhat like Rs 300-900 (the average, however, will be less than the per capita income because investment, free medical treatment and free education etc. have to be provided for in the economy). If the system works efficiently and consequently per capita income goes up in a few years' time by say, fifty per cent, one can expect the scale to be Rs 450-1,350. The wages till persons attain the age of fifteen, will be given to their parents or guardians. After that they will be sorted out either for different jobs right away or for higher education or for training in accordance with the manpower needs of the economy, their preferences and objective assess- of their capabilities. All will have to give to the State a certain amount of labour (say 30 hours per week) till the age of retirement—be it for working in the fields or for being trained as an engineer. Since the time scale of wages as well as working

[1] Marx, K., *Critique of Gotha Programme*, Selected Works of Marx and Engels, F.L.P.H., Moscow 1962, Vol. II, p. 23.

[2] Lenin, V. I., Selected works, F.L.-. P.H., Moscow 1952, Vol. II, part 2, p. 61.

[3] Marx, K., Op. cit., pp. 32-33.

hours will be the same for all, normally people will not feel so much of deprivation (as is felt in the existing institutional set-up) when they are asked to join as sweepers instead of being sent for training or higher education. The class antagonism that characterises the existing societies will vanish for all practical purposes. It will lead to the elimination of luxury use of commodities which is a strategic requirement in the context of rapid economic development. It does not imply, however, that cars and air-conditioners etc. will not be used in the economy. A doctor may be provided with a car during his working hours. Working places of some of the scientists may even be air-conditioned. But when off duty, the doctor will use the common mode of transport. The living quarters of the scientists will not be air-conditioned if those of others are not. Conditions of work will be different but the conditions of living for all would be the same. It would also be an ideal situation for democratisation of all leading functionaries of the State.

Distinction

The only question that arises in this context is—would the system function efficiently in the absence of material incentives for work? It is often argued that since all will be treated equally, nobody would try to acquire better skills than others, for, what is it that will prompt one to exert to put in his best?

Human needs can be classified into three broad categories—need for security, need for distinction and need for self-actualisation. In a capitalist society wealth alone satisfies the need for security. That is why it is most sought for. Since it can offer security in a set-up characterised by widespread insecurity, it also satisfies the need for distinction. There are, however, other sources of distinction, too, such as hard work, acquiring of better skuls honesty, sincerity, courage etc. A skilled worker is always held in esteem by his fellow workers. Society always applauds a hard worker. A courageous person draws respect from others. But 'wealth' no doubt enjoys a vast superiority over all others which go to satisfy the need for distinction. No matter how one acquires wealth, one enjoys a status in society if one is wealthy. That is why we strive or work to acquire wealth. 'Material incentives for work', thus have a necessary place in such a situation. But if "wealth" is withdrawn (by an absence of institution providing for 'material incentives') from a system which provides reasonably adequate security, will not people try to acquire distinction by other means? Will not people still put in their best? If so, there is no reason why a system having no 'material incentives for work' will not function efficiently.

The third need—the need for self-actualisation—is generally realised when the more down-to-earth needs (such as those of security and distinction) are fairly satisfied and supportive environment is available. Thus, it does not come in conflict with the positive attitude towards work in a socialist system having no 'material incentives'. On the contrary, the chances are that the need would be widely felt and realised.

Do we have any difficulty now in choosing between a socialist form with 'material incentives for work' and the one without them? In principle both involve value judgment. But there is much less (almost negligible) of arbitrariness at the operational level in the latter than the former. The latter will be a democratic set-up while the former may not be. Moreover, the latter not only hastens the realisation of the situation : "From each according to his ability to each according to his need", but comes very near it.

NOTICE

Articles cannot be returned unless accompanied by return postage.

Business Manager
Frontier

Keynesism Today

SAMIR DAS GUPTA

LIKE many a student of my generation, I have had my share of the 'New Economics' in a more or less vicarious manner. Fortunately, of course, the market was not yet flooded with 'guides' (and 'guides to guides') and a copy of Klein's *Keynesian Revolution* or Harris's *New Economics* was rather easily available to an economics undergraduate. Because of academic qualms, however, I have had occasional shots at the *Central Theory* itself, although the experience has never been quite pleasant. I muts nevertheless say that I found my 'second hand' Keynes delightful, not much braintwisting, and a lot more in line with common sense than I thought the rest of economics was. I now suspect that the profession of economics could have kept young Mav Planck who came to study the subject but was scared away by its 'complexities' if Keynes's ideas had appeared several decades earlier, although that might well have delayed the birth of the Quantum Theory.

Some recent commentators have observed that the *General Theory* is still difficult reading even for specialists. But they all seem to agree that it lends itself to substantial simplification. Which is perhaps another way of suggesting that the major thrust and philosophical underpinnings of the *General Theory* are rather clearly comprehensible. The questions which, however, seem pertinent today are to what extent the Keynesian premises and conclusions were 'new' and how much of his contribution is likely to stand the test of time. The questions may not be such as would elicit similar answers from all students of Keynes, who might nevertheless generally agree that a fuller knowledge of the relationship between Keynes the man and his ideas should form the basis for such an answer.

Prominent in the range of contemporary literature on Keynes are

W. W. Hunt's *Keynesianism : Retrospect and Prospect*; Robert Leckachman's *The Age of Keynes*; Michael Stewart's *Keynes and After*; Sir Eric Roll's *The World after Keynes*; T. V. Hutchison's *Economics and Economic Policy*; G. L. S. Shackle's *The Years of High Theory : Invention and Tradition in Economic Thought*; and Sir John Hicks's *Critical Essays in Monetary Theory*. One of the latest additions to the literature is an interesting tract by Professor Axel Leijonhufvud, called *Keynes and the Classics*, wherein he launches a major reappraisal of Keynes's contribution to economic thought and policy, stating how far contemporary interpretations depart from the author's own views in his *General Theory*. Leijonhufvud goes on to provide a checklist of what he believes are Keynesian views. He comes up with such staggeringly unconventional interpretations as that Keynes never assumed (a) "the labour market is dominated by unions, that wages are rigid, or that workers act irrationally because they suffer from money illusions"; that (b) " investment or saving are interest-inelastic"; that (c) "there is a liquidity trap or that at no positive interest rate will savings equal investment".

Professor Leijonhufvud distils out two Keynesian causes of unemployment. There can be a departure from full employment equilibrium due to a wrong level of interest rates, the Keynesian corrective for which consists in monetary policy. The second cause of unemployment has to do with over-pessimistic entrepreneurial expectations during a deep depression, which result from the failure of the price mechanism to communicate correct information about potential full employment demands. Here, according to Leijonhufvud, Keynes's belief was that direct government expenditures, by belying the expectations, would do the trick.

Bloomsbury Set

Despite these important contributions, there remains, however, the need for a different kind of biography of Keynes which would serve as a background against which the flavour of Keynes's intellectual contributions, could be properly appreciated. The much too literate biography written by Sir Roy Harrod has rightly been criticised by Galbraith as being "somewhat undiscriminating in content, and Keynes's personality is never sharply in focus". Professor Leckachman's book seems to be aimed at this task, but basically he fails to juxtapose Keynes of the English high society with Keynes the nonconformist of the *General Theory*. One fruitful way of doing so would be to look at Keynes in his famous 'Bloomsbury set' which Professor Leckachman does, albeit by way of general description. But he does not feel it necessary to focus on the personality of Keynes in order to distinguish him from such social and intellectual snobs as Lytton Strachey, Clive Bell and the Woolfs, and to show that their influence on Keynes was less than complete.

Lord Keynes was admittedly an aristocrat. And yet it took nobody else but Keynes to write such a 'maverick' piece of literature as *Economic Consequences of the Peace* (1919), a polemic which he dedicated to the formation of the general opinion of the future. In this book Keynes was protesting against the terms prepared at Paris by the Big Four to humiliate and contain the defeated Germany. The big risk he was thus taking in expressing firm and unpopular views in no tongue-in-cheek manner, through his severe indictment of the whole hypocrisy, may only be vaguely imagined fifty years later today. And this Keynes accomplished when he was only 36. That he also stood then for European integration, in the light of the economic history of the 19th century, deserves no less attention; for ever since 1946, Europe has been striving for economic as well as political unity—if only through arrangements approved by the USA.

And what distinguished Keynes of the *General Theory*, published nearly twenty years later, from the rest of his social circle was his un-aristocratic concern about involuntary unemployment—a subject which remained unutterable in orthodox economics on which he himself had been brilliantly nurtured. Quite naturally, therefore, this unorthodox concern, coupled with his stress on governmental intervention in economic life, evoked quick suspicion that Keynes was a 'radical'. Critics even wished to consign him to the same underworld where he in turn had relegated Marx "along with such dubious characters as Silvio Gesell and Major Douglas". And one could look back today and observe that Keynes's *New Economics* has never been quite officially invoked—except, one might wish to think, during the brief Kennedy years. One recalls that Keynes had been using the text of his magnum opus for his Cambridge lectures well before it was actually published; and yet as late as only two years before his death in 1946 he was still trying to hammer his ideas on the House of Lords. 'For the last 20 years", he told the House, "sometimes almost alone, in popular articles in the press, in pamphlets, in dozens of letters to *The Times*, in text-books, in enormous and obscure treatises, I have spent my strength to persuade my countrymen and the world at large to change their traditional doctrines and, by taking better thought, to remove the curse of unemployment". I believe it was around the same time that Professor Robbins and Keynes were on the wireless, respectively advising the world to save more and to spend more. Also, Keynes's early attempts to influence the American academic community and Washington are known to have been frustrating. Franklin Roosevelt, who had upheld a balanced budget in 1932, told Frances Perkins that her friend (Keynes) "left a whole rigmorale of figures. He must be a mathematician rather than a political economist". And Keynes told her that he had "supposed the President was more literate, economically speaking".

"Tinged with Fraud"

Even when the 'New Economics' seemed to be gaining some accep-

tance, especially across the Atlantic, it was hardly because people had read or even cared for the *General Theory*. It was simply that unemployment had gradually become a dirty word and governments were made to realise that they would not be tolerated if they allowed the unemployment level to move too high. Also, in academic circles, critics gradually conceded that Keynes was not much of a 'radical' after all, and a sympathetic interpreter hastened to point out that "Marx analysed the reasons why the capitalist system did not and could not function properly". Keynes was thus not only pronounced not guilty, eventually his name began to be uttered by cunning 'moderns' here and there in the hope of earning a certain respectability for their policies which somehow checked with Keynes's strategy. But as Galbraith rightly observes : "For a long while, the public application of Keynes's policies was tinged with fraud. Officials calculated the contribution of the deficit to income and to reducing unemployment and wished it were larger. Then they wrote speeches avowing devotion to a balanced budget". He seems, however, to have overlooked the fact that in one of his earliest speeches in Congress, President Johnson was trying to play the same kind of fiscal game, although he discreetly avoided using the term 'balanced budget'.

It is rather odd that his reading of the *General Theory convinces* Leckachman that the refutation of Say's Law of Markets is Keynes's most crucial contribution. Unfortunately his claim tends to give also the impression that such a refutation was a unique contribution of Keynes. Let us not quibble over the most logical interpretation of the 'Law', but suffice it to note here that it implies the impossibility of a general glut in the market. Now, it should be remembered that Marx had analysed the subject many years ago and chided Ricardo for having accepted "the childish babbling of a Say". Then, of course, there was Malthus. And, in more recent times, it was Bernard Shaw who admonished 'the intelligent woman' that "spare money is the root of all evil." Barring Malthus, however, most critics of the 'Law' were socialists, and consequently their quarrel with Say was intimately bound up with their rejection of capitalism on the ground that it is incapable of systematically providing the workers with employment at a living wage. To be sure, therefore, Keynes's significance does not lie in his refutation of the 'Law' on the borrowed argument that intended savings are not necessarily matched by large enough injections into the income stream. Of course, if one thinks of the incredible fact that for a century and a half most major non-Marxian economists made unquestioning use of the 'Law' in its most literal sense, one will perhaps say with Sweezy that 'historians fifty years from now may record that Keynes' greatest achievement was the liberation of Anglo-American economics from a tyrannical dogma", even if they may "conclude that this was essentially a work of negation unmatched by comparable positive achievements".

(To be concluded)

The Annual Number

of

FRONTIER

is due on July 1

Price: 75 Paise

Please book your orders early

Book Review

DRAWINGS BY FOURTEEN CONTEMPORARY ARTISTS OF BENGAL

Published by Priti Mukherjee and Bhawani Mallik.

Sole distributor: Kalamandir. Price Rs 6.00 inland and $4.00 overseas.

THIS is a collection of monochrome sketches by Somnath Hore, Mohim Roodro, Nikhil Biswas, Bijan Choudhury, Rabin Mandal, Prokash Karmakar, Gopal Sanyal, Isha Mohammad, Shyamal Dutta Roy, Sanat Kar, Suhas Roy, Ganesh Pyne, Sunil Das and Bikash Bhattacharya. The sketches have been arranged according to the age of the artists.

In his introduction Nirode Mazumdar writes, "Turning the pages occasionally one encounters a surprising effect of camaieu or again a kind of vigorous empatement." Camaieu is the French term for the first stage in monochrome in building up an oil painting. All the artists on the list here are primarily painters; hence, with the exception of only three, they have very cleverly tried to give the effect of painting vignetting tones in their pen and ink drawings. The oldest, Somnath Hore, and the youngest, Bikash Bhattacharya, however, have used brushes.

Temperamentally the artists are different and the most striking is Ganesh Pyne who, though aware of the age he belongs to, gives vent to his deep respect for tradition. Prakash Karmakar, sacrificing anatomy, concentrates on depicting the coherency of lines with expressionistic formalisation. In spirit, nevertheless, his drawing is oriental. Nikhil Biswas, for whom this is a posthumus publication, with his usual intertwining lines has expressed the suffering of mankind through the crucified Jesus. Thematically Rabin Mandal is on the same track with his deceased friend but technically his execution differs. Sunil Das has been represented here with one of his facile horse drawings. Bijan Chowdhury appears to have developed an interest in Baroque art.

It is a rich collection and is more than a book. It is a permanent exhibition of a group of talented Bengali painters of today. The production is good. The price has been kept low. The uncommon feature of the book is that the artists themselves have assessed their own drawings. But artists, we know, express themselves through their works and not through words. If there had been someone else to speak for them, it would have been better, I believe.

The necessity of such a production has long been felt. The publishers therefore should be thanked for this bold venture.

A. B. M.

Letters

A Marxist's Dilemma

In view of the recent turmoil in our political life, United Front politics and Naxalite activities, it is high time a Marxist took stock of the present situation.

It is irrefutable that a large section of the petty bourgeoisie, workers etc is either antagonistic to or disinterested in the present Naxalite activities. They with their Marxist training have begun to regard the Naxalite line as a deviation (presumably left) from Marxism. They pay allegiance to the CPI(M) or the CPI line. In West Bengal the general trend is now unmistakably towards the CP-(M), in spite of the fact that the CP(M) leadership unabashedly calls elections in the present set-up a people's verdict.

But a true Marxist should not be confined to such small controversies. If the CP(M) or CPI were revisionist, he should be able to fight their ideologies out. It will not be out of place to mention that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung took great pains to expose the weakness of all other doctrines, making concrete analyses of concrete situations. They never would rest content and complacent and took the ideological struggle always to the forefront. In this respect, I quote a few lines from Stalin.

"It is not who has a larger or smaller 'mass' following today, but the essence of the doctrine that matters. If the 'doctrine' of the Anarchists expresses the truth then it goes without saying that it will certainly have a path for itself and will rally the masses around itself. If however it is unsound and built up on a false foundation it will not last long and will remain suspended in mid-air. But the unsoundness of anarchism must be proved."

The Naxalite doctrine is based on the assessment that India is semi-colonial and semi-feudal. It should be possible and is absolutely necessary to prove this assertion beyond doubt by a systematic analysis of the objective conditions of our economy. It is necessary to prove that the Indian bourgeoisie is essentially comprador; that collaboration between an imperialist country and an underdeveloped one essentially amounts to subordination of the latter by the former; that PL-480 is a noose around our neck. It is necessary to expose the hoax of the 'socialist co-operation of the USSR and the myth of the Indian state sector and to prove foreign hands in the military affairs of our country. It is equally important to make a detailed analysis of the semi-feudal structure of Indian agriculture. Some analysis has been done in this direction but it is far from complete.

On the basis of this assessment it will be easy to point out the major and focal contradictions of Indian life.

Next comes the form of struggle. It is determined by the socio-economic character of our State, the general crisis of the capitalist world economy, the experience of the struggles in other neo-colonies and the subjective preparation of the Indian people (a matter fraudulently used by revisionists of all shades). Here a fierce struggle should be waged against the CP(M) and CPI programmes and actions, against their participation

in bourgeois parliaments. More useful than a call for boycott of election is to emphasise and explain time and again that to consider the parliamentary struggle at present in our country as the main form of struggle is a kind of reformism calculated to retard the democratic revolution in the interests of the imperialists and their running dogs. Take, for instance, land acquisition in the UF regime and the economic struggles of the industrial proletariat. In the present moment, close examination of all the publications of the CP(M) leadership (e.g. stand on ideological issues—November 1969, *Ganasakti* Lenin Centenary Volume) is in order. If the CP(M) were revisionist, it is entirely possible to tear their arguments to shreds in a manner Lenin argued Kautsky and other revisionists out.

Once the ideological basis is strong and unassailable, it becomes easier for the sincere cadres (their number is not small among the ebullient Naxalite youths) to conquer the citadel of the revisionists, namely, the industrial proletariat with this ideology. and quickly raise their consciousness to the required level for an upsurge. The CP(M) and CPI leadership will be helpless against such efforts and will only be isolated.

This ideological side is neglected and the result is that practice becomes listless and irrelevant, creating vortices and eddies but no deluge. Naxalism with all its practical pitfalls is a force growing in vigour only because of its unconscious, spontaneous correspondence with the present politico-economic structure of our country and the inherent rottenness of the revisionist and opportunist doctrines. Its growth will be accelerated hundredfold only if it becomes more conscious and it takes more care to assert its scientific superiority over revisionist doctrines relentlessly at every twist and turn of the country's situation. A peoples' war will not be far off if every party cadre becomes a conscious revolutionary.

K. G.
Calcutta

Understanding Naxalism

Apropos Mr Abdul Matleb (May 16), I want to make it clear that one cannot hold the CP(ML) responsible for what I understand and explain as Naxalite politics. What I understand is as follows :

India is ready for revolution. Revolution did not take place because of the role played by the CPM and the CPI among the proletariat.

India being essentially influenced by an agrarian economy, it is better to organise the rural proletariat first. In China also, imitating the Russians, the Chinese communists tried to capture State power through city-centered workers. But they failed. Then Mao organised the rural proletariat and captured the whole of China with the help of the urban working class as a secondary force. So let us not fool ourselves about the realities. In the Chinese Revolution the urban working class played only a complementary role and not the main role as in Russia. We need not consider it a sin—in China 80 per cent of the economy was agriculture-oriented. The Indian economy is also more or less dominated by agriculture. Again, from the military point of view the rural areas are more favourable for the proletariat to capture "power". The income of the rural poor is several times lower than that of the urban working class. That is why on the whole the city worker goes in for economism rather than revolution. This economism can be fought only by throwing out the social chauvinist and social reformist leaders of the CPI and the CPM from trade union leadership . This will not happen automatically. This can be effected only by intensifying the armed struggle in the rural sector, by which the capitalist-agent nature of the CPM and the CPI will be exposed before the urban workers. Evidence is provided by the way the Jamshedpur working class is joining the CP(ML). The trade union in Jamshedpur was under the control of the CPI. But the CP(ML) could penetrate it because of its armed operations in the rural areas of Bihar. It is these armed opeartions which can rekindle the revolutionary urges of the urban working class and not vice versa.

M. N. D. Nair
Trivandrum

No Satellite

Mr Prabir Kumar Mukherjee (May 23) wants to say two things—that scientific achievement is scientific achievement whoever attains it and that China denounces the costly spectacular development of space science, yet she herself undertakes to do it and with pride although she is beset with other problems.

Scientific achievements having aggressive potential in imperialist America do not gladden the hearts of the anti-imperialists. Atom bomb in the hands of America have always been a great danger. But atom bombs in the hands of the Socialist Soviet Union then were a great counter-weight and deterrent. Along with progressive people all the world over, China welcomed the Soviet achievements. But with Kosygin and Nixon co-operating with each other for spheres of influence and against revolution and China, can China remain indifferent about the duopoly? The Chinese say that weapons, even atomic weapons, are not ultimate decisive factors in war. Rockets and sputniks do not eliminate the causes of war. Therefore one should not go gaga with them. The latest Chinese statement reaffirmed this position. The brief statement ended with a note of warning to their own countrymen lest they should become dizzy with success.

As for China's "other problems", figures of her 1969 trade and production, now available from various sources, are evidence of her determination to remain self-reliant, to produce more for the people and to be prepared for whatever may come. One wonders how in such a remarkably short period she, with no foreign assistance and domestic exploitation to depend upon, could free herself from internal and external debt and yet produce an earth satellite.

Wheat from Australia and Canada is not essential for China's current consumption but useful foreign exchange is earned by buying wheat and selling rice, at the same time creating reserves. North Vietnam understands and appreciates this policy. Her warm tribute to China on the occasion of launching her first satellite bears testmony to it.

A. MAZUMDER
Calcutta

Bad Policemen, Beware !

One does not normally take cognizance of hundreds of irrelevant letters published in newspapers and journals; but when the stupidity of some of them involves the question of faith in any journal, it calls for proper deliberation. How could you give top priority to a letter which aims at only slandering Shri Jyoti Basu on some pretext ("the reddest sun in our heart"!)? Where has it been established that the policemen were politicalised during the nine-month UF regime? You have shed enough tears for the victims of police atrocities; how can you give prominence to a letter which openly sides with "those policemen who indulge in beating" or "who have not yet abandoned their anti-people role". The myth of the bourgeois press that letters do not reflect the editorial opinion cannot go a long way, for, then the correspondence columns of your collaborator—that 'Anglo-Indian daily', which has lost no time in giving prominence to the letter published by you in their monotonous "Monday nuisance",—would have been completely different.

TARAPADA CHATTOPADHYAY
Mahesh

For FRONTIER contact
S. P. CHATTERJEE
Statesman Office
Steel Market
Durgapur-4

Other Things

It is painful to read 'Whisky and Whores' in *Frontier* (May 30) and those hackneyed views. Is it a reflection of your socio-economic cultural consciousness of the present or an ambivalence towards run-of-the-mill Bengali films? I do not know. But I am sure that in 1970, there are more living things to write on, not excluding even Bengali films. For example, you might review the recently published interview of Satyajit Ray, which I think is a very controversial one.

SURJA BANDYOPADHYAY
Ichapur, 24-Parganas

Cambodia

In his three-part analysis of events in Cambodia Subroto Sen notes that Sihanouk pursued a contradictory policy of anti-communism at home and friendly relations with socialist countries in the international sphere. Being a sincere nationalist as also a ruling prince, Sihanouk wanted to prevent his country from being reduced to a satellite of the United States. The improvisation was bound to fail; but the question remains: why should the socialist countries have obliged Sihanouk at all? How could it be that an anti-communist ruling prince was an ally of communist China? Extending the question further we may ask how China can be friendly with the ruling junta of Pakistan?

The guiding principle in the field of diplomacy, as enunciated by Lenin, is peaceful co-existence with countries with different social systems. It does not exclude in theory material and ideological help to revolutions abroad. But of course, exporting of revolution is strictly forbidden, it is unMarxist. The principle offers scope for diplomacy and manoeuvre on the part of a socialist country in a world when the bourgeois governments suffer from internal contradictions and regional clashes of interest. Taking into consideration the concrete situation in certain countries or zones, socialist diplomacy can embarrass the imperialists, break fronts and thereby weaken them. Here of course the primary imperative is that nothing must be done which impairs the revolutionary movements of the masses. In other words the test of success of socialist diplomacy is whether or not the revolutionary movement of the country in question has been encouraged and helped. In point of fact, however, a socialist country is bound to face a dilemma. Whatever little help (military or diplomatic) the ruling class of a non-socialist country gets from a socialist country, it is bound to be used by them against the people in the civil war that is bound to come. A definite risk remains. The efforts to play up one particular country to disrupt the concerted imperialist offensive may succeed or fail. Inspite of the risk a socialist country cannot afford to pursue complete non-communication with the other world. A concrete study of situations can only establish the justification or mistake of the course followed by the socialist, country.

The cases of Indonesia, Cambodia and Pakistan in relation to China and the Soviet Union are instructive. The Soviet Union and China befriended Soekarno's government in a bid to upset the American offensive in South-East Asia; and the former supplied eighty per cent of Indonesia's arms purchases. The PKI took to the parliamentary path in spite of the friendly warning of the Chinese Party in 1956. The Cambodian communists on the contrary secretly went underground in 1962 and built up bases in the peasant areas. That was an act of their own choice: to go or not to go to the jungles. Peking's relations with Soekarno or Sihanouk were not the determining factors. Now Russia has been supplying spare-parts to Suharto's army but Peking has been hostile to Djakarta since the coup of 1965. Prince Sihanouk, in the nationalist interest, restricted the attempts of the U.S. to gang up his country against China and actively

helped the liberation fighters of Vietnam and Laos by allowing trade in foodstuff between the liberation fronts and his country. For his impertinence in not ganging up Sihanouk's country was raided by the Thai and South Vietnamese pappets. Sihanouk needed Pekings 'aid' to balance the pressure of the U.S. Peking helped Cambodia to build up factories and supplied weapons of a defensive nature : mainly anti-aircraft guns, fighter planes, patrol-boats and some AK 14 rifles. Here is a case of Peking's successful diplomacy though the balance was bound to be upset by the decisive moves coming from within Cambodia. After the coup in Cambodia Peking has stopped the supply of ammunition for AK 14 rifles. Pakistan is a typical case of how even a reactionary military junta can cause a breach in an imperialist front because of its own special regional interests. Pakistan's relations with China have elevated her bargaining position vis-a-vis the U.S. to the extent that she could oppose the Vietnam war inside SEATO and refuse to participate in it. Peking in return gives qualified diplomatic and military 'aid' to Pakistan. The exact nature of military aid is not known to us. (The credibility of Indian news agency reports is low).

The class struggles in Pakistan will determine her future; Peking's diplomacy has utilised the junta to break a grand anti-China front. *Pravda* on the other hand urged the people of Pakistan to wait for the beneficial measures of the Yahya government which would be forthcoming in the new democratic set up promised by the general. Meanwhile the arms trade with the Pakistan government would go on.

The principal contradiction of this age is between Imperialism (and social-imperialism) on the one hand and the national liberation movements on the other. Peking's diplomacy to initiate and nurture breaches on the imperialist front is a part of the struggle now going on

G. MUKHERJEE
Calcutta

Gandhi

I await the weekly arrival of *Frontier* with eagerness. I differ with you about two things. One relates to Gandhiji and the other to the question of a link language. Where the basic objective is the ending of exploitation and oppression of the toiling masses, the area and range of even intellectual agreement or disagreement narrows down to the basic question of loyalty to and welfare of the exploited humanity. Gandhiji's ceaseless fight was always directed towards the emancipation of these oppressed people. It may not have been scientific in the Marxian sense but does that render it futile? Gandhi was identified with the poor and this should be enough to make him acceptable to the revolutionaries of genuine variety. Communist China has not disowned Dr Sun Yat-Sen as a friend and ally, although he only spearheaded the bourgeois democratic revolution in China and was certainly not a proletarian revolutionary. Gandhi was far more proletarian in his basic objectives than Dr Sun was. Why should revolutionaries in India throw him away and allow him to be used by the bourgeoisie against them? The sarkarwallas exploited Gandhi's name for their own selfish ends for a whole quarter of a century and this absurdity reached its highest point in the Gandhi centenary celebrations. What today's Moscow does with Lenin, Delhi did with Gandhi. This is so because they are not there to protest!

I learn from a friend who has lived in New China for ten years that Gandhi was not unacceptable to it as a man of the people. The Chinese did not destroy Gandhi's photographs in NEFA as they did Nehru's. I don't suggest that Gandhi should become friend, philosopher and guide for Marxists-Leninists. But he certainly can be accepted as a friend and ally and not totally disowned and condemned as a counter-revolutionary.

The language question is very easy. Only the intellectuals make it complicated and politicians make it worse. When the test of suitability of the link language is linked up with the basic interests and conveniences of the common mass of people, the problem will be automatically solved. There is no point in taking sides, particularly in favour of English which is the language of the privileged in India.

In all other matters I find myself in agreement with you.

RAMADHAR
New Delhi

PLACE A REGULAR ORDER

FOR YOUR

FRONTIER

Subscription Rates

INLAND

Six Months	..	Rs. 8.25
One year	..	Rs. 16.50
Five Years	..	Rs. 75.00
Seven years	..	Rs. 100.00

Foreign AIR MAIL Rates (One Year)

Europe: Rs. 120 or 15 dollars

Asia: Rs. 88 or 11 dollars

America: Rs. 168 or 21 dollars

By Surface Mail

All countries: Rs. 40 or 5 dollars

Long-term Subscriptions will help the weekly

ASSAM BENGAL RIVER SERVICE PVT. LTD.

POWER BOAT BUILDERS & ENGINEERS

26A, EZRA MANSIONS

10 GOVT. PLACE EAST,

CALCUTTA-1

Registered with the Registrar of Newspapers of India under R.N.16516/68

DEPEND ON US... YOUR SOUND COMPANION

WE ARE SOLE DISTRIBUTORS FOR EASTERN INDIA OF :

MURPHY
Radio and Transistor

AHUJA
P.A. Equipment, Hi-Fi Stereogram, Tape Recorder

PYE
Car Radio

ARCEY
Car Aerial, Suppressor, Condenser

MECOM
Intercommunication

KEL
Potentiometer, Rotary Switch

murphy radio
Delights the home!

DEBSONS PVT. LIMITED
CALCUTTA • GAUHATI • PATNA
CUTTACK • JABALPUR

DEBSONS