

frontier

Vol. 4: No. 30

NOVEMBER 6, 1971

PRICE: 35 PAISE

On Other Pages

COMMENTS	2
<i>View From Delhi</i>	
ARMS FOR THE TREATY FROM A POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT	4
"THE YEAR OF CONFUSION" C. PRASAD	5
AN ASPECT OF AN AGRARIAN PROGRAMME RANJAN SENGUPTA	7
THE RISING SUN AGAIN KALYAN CHAUDHURI	9
RABINDRANATH AND JALLIANWALLABAG ASISH KUMAR LAHIRI	14
<i>Clippings</i>	
THE PUNJAB NAXALITES	15
LETTERS	16

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: 243202

WORKER-MANAGER

SHRI Bagaram Tulpule is going to be the General Manager of the Durgapur Steel Plant. He is a trade union man, and unlike our President V. V. Giri, an active one, being the vice-president of the Hind Mazdoor Sabha. He is therefore the first trade unionist who with his fangs on has been taken by the Establishment to its bosom. Hindustan Steel Limited, the giant steel firm with international ranking, will also be ornamented with two worker directors. Bold dramatics.

The appointment of Shri Tulpule has already elicited warm felicitations from the INTUC, whom the CPI has certified as the progressive force of the bourgeoisie, and acerbity from the CPM. The DSP happens to be the arena where the CPM-controlled union, enjoying the majority of workers' support, has been fighting the INTUC ever since the plant started. So Shri Tulpule must be knowing, as everyone knows, where he stands. There would not be many either who will feel curious to know how the union man manages the DSP, even though he may have a work style different from the impossible Major Wadera's, he being a visiting lecturer in the Hyderabad Staff College and additionally having a psychology-teaching wife.

What ails Durgapur, wrote Major Wadera, a major who loved to write articles for workers and publish them every fortnight in beautiful offset covers. Major Wadera however never knew. He could not understand why the damn those 30,000 workers, given the highest wages for a worker in the country, living in a prestigious steel plant and township, should not work. The plant which has a rated capacity of 1.6 million tonnes a year and can be expanded to 3.4 million tonnes, has been producing 0.80 million. In 1970-71, 0.69 million. Why, Major Wadera used to ask. Basic raw materials like iron ore, limestone, ferrous scraps were no problem; these were available within the country in plenty. Demand for steel has been oppressive, and its non-availability has stunted the industrial growth of the country. The workers were all trained. Why then the absurdly low output? The workers, of course, wailed Major Wadera, and systematically echoed the industrial pundits all over the country. The workers, who were Bengali who, Indian sociologists including Bengali ones say, talk more than work, quarrel more than talk and quarrel more in factories and offices than in their homes.

Shri Tulpule however should know. The management had not, to start with, recognised the majority union. Later, after being forced to grant recognition, they have been seeking to break it up, by laying off and retrenching workers, killing union leaders and portraying them as saboteurs. They have kept machines idle for days, delayed repairing tools and equipment, sometimes destroyed the machines through artful devices. What can Shri Tulpule and other worker directors do? Will they be able to free the DSP from the feudal clutches of local landlord leaders and conduct it on firm capitalist lines?

The CPM-led union should not be a bar to that experiment, its political ideology at the time and for a long time to come, being no deterrent to capitalist growth. The CPM unions elsewhere are doing it fine in other industries, helping the bourgeoisie to go from strength to strength. If the DSP management can shake of its undue fear of the revolutionary glands of its workers, Shri Tulpule and his colleague directors can bring off the eighth wonder of the Indian industry, a profit-earning DSP, even if he and his directors be some Trojan horses for revolutionary workers.

where else in the country. The hill people and the tribes are suspicious of the people of the plains; they fear that they will not be able to lead their own life if they do not sever their ties with the plains people. This fear is rooted in their experience of years of economic exploitation and political domination by the people of the plains. To an extent, this is a common feeling among tribals all over the country, and that is why the tribal areas are comparatively restive. Some of the tribes in Assam have grown so bitter that they want to go out of not only the State but also the Union; the secessionist trends in Naga and Mizo lands have their origin in this feeling. The tribal areas are wide apart, and the tribals are divided amongst themselves by clan rivalries; both come in the way of the creation of a single, viable tribal State. In this baffling complex of situations, the Centre had a vital interest to safeguard. Assam's geographical position precludes fragmentation of the State; it needs a single authority in command. The recipes tried by the Centre so far have these twin aims of granting measured doses of autonomy to the linguistic and ethnic groups and of preserving the administrative unity of the region. The latest formula is no exception. Like its predecessors, it also slurs over the basic issue that the stability of the region depends upon the willing cooperation of the hill people and the tribals to earn which a lot needs to be done and also undone.

Repeating The Mixture

Once again the Government of India has decided to resort to cartographic surgery to give the north-east region a look of quiet harmony. It is difficult to say how many times the map of the area has been re-drawn since independence. The process has been interminable, and each change has raised a fresh crop of controversies and demands that have refused to be muted till another change has been promised. Obviously, New Delhi's recipes failed to satisfy the different linguistic and ethnic groups inhabiting the region, and it is unlikely that the latest proposal will succeed where its predecessors have failed. The people not only of the north-east region, but of the whole country know that the Government understands only the language of pressure, backed where necessary by varying degrees of violence, that all its resoluteness melts away if a determined body of people can become adequately noisome over a demand, however unjustifiable and absurd. They know that what passes as government policy is, in fact, an amalgam of impromptu responses to developing situations.

The latest scheme of reorganisation has been on the anvil for nearly a year. What had been proposed a few months before the mid-term parliamentary poll is likely to be given

effect to on the eve of the Assembly elections in the region. The political motivation is too glaring to be ignored, though the benefits the ruling party may reap are bound to be transitory. Between the promise and the fulfilment the original proposal has undergone drastic modifications. The Centre has yielded to the united opposition to its original proposal to convert the projected north-eastern council into a super-Cabinet and to vest the common Governor of the region with authority to enforce the council's decisions on the constituent units. The council and the common Governor are expected to ensure that the units do not pull in contrary directions and a unity of approach is maintained in matters of common concern. With their wings clipped, they are unlikely to be equal to this task. The dismal end to which the zonal councils formed after the reorganisation of States have come awaits the proposed north-east council also. Even this whittled-down scheme is not acceptable to all the units. Nagaland continues to be intransigent, but the Government seems to have decided to ignore its objections.

The basic problem of the north-east region is that more conflicting forces are at work there than any-

China And The UN

Long before the United Nations began the debate on the China question, it was clear that Peking will get its berth in the world body. But even then few could foresee the pique and passion in the final voting and its radical fall-out surprised quite a few. Washington had belatedly realised the futility of the Dullesian policy on China and the need to be in a position to communicate with Pe-

NOVEMBER 6, 1971

king, but that without compromising on the thorny question of Taiwan. The U.S. panacea was the resolution that would give Peking the permanent seat in the Security Council, but at the same time maintain one for Taiwan in the General Assembly. However, the General Assembly scotched U.S. hopes and adopted the harsher Albanian resolution that voted China in and Taiwan out.

The voting itself was interesting. None had any doubt about the minds of Britain, France and Canada who had earlier fallen out with the U.S. on the China issue; their sentiment was moved more by the mundane possibilities of a big market than a pro-red fervour. But even Portugal and Israel this time betrayed their master and voted for the Albanian resolution. Their cue was taken by many others. These powers have apparently realised that while they have no reason for not recognising China, they have many reasons for doing so and for these the nationalists in Taiwan can be dispensed with.

Peking has proved to be a consummate dialectician in its dealings with the U.S. as in other cases concerning foreign relations. It had stated frequently that it was ready to negotiate on the UN question but refused to put up with Taiwan. Naturally the UN decision will add to the Chinese confidence.

China's entry into the UN may rip apart the present concentration around the two big powers in the world body and disturb the status quo that the two have maintained so long. In the immediate aftermath of the Cultural Revolution the Chinese communists are eager to befriend as many Third World nations as possible and put paid the effort by her two principal adversaries to isolate them. And in so doing they will take advantage of the contradictions between the U.S. and its allies and, perhaps more important at the moment, the contradictions between Washington and Moscow. In this, the UN will be a very useful tool in their hands.

Japan-Taiwan

When Emperor Hirohito decided to visit some European countries, he was clearly taking some risk. In every capital tight security arrangements were made; still he could not avoid seeing that bitter memories of the Second World War had not died down. In one place the windscreen of his limousine was hit by a stone and in another a coat was flung at him.

Undeterred, the Japanese monopoly capital is again taking the country toward "co-prosperity". (See 'The Rising Sun Again' elsewhere in this issue.) The Sato Cabinet is reviving militarism and the appeal of the right with the ultimate aim of establishing control over the non-socialist countries. In the past the Chinese suffered most from Japanese imperialism; today they have taken it upon themselves to make the world aware how the zaibatsu—a combine of big industrial giants—is steadily spreading its wings to bring the developing economies under its control. The phenomenal growth of the Japanese economy during the postwar years has been made possible by the systematic prospecting and exploitation of the natural resources of other countries and selling finished goods abroad. Wages in Japan are kept at an unbelievably low level so that internal consumption accounts for an insignificant portion of total production. In the circumstances, the unusually high growth rate can be maintained by having a lion's share of the world's annual raw material extracts, dumping goods on foreign markets to the detriment of local industries and exporting capital in a big way. No less than one-third of Japanese exports go to South-East Asian countries. Tokyo estimates that the South-East Asian market will be worth \$37,400 million by 1975, but considering the protectionism in U.S. trade policy every attempt will be made to sell more in this region than the present projection.

Peking has cited quite a few instances to show how Japanese econo-

mic machinations are crippling developing economies. Thailand now owes to Japan more than its total foreign exchange reserves; Tokyo is now the prime investor in the Philippines and Thailand; and it enjoys a very favourable trade balance with all Asian countries producing raw materials. But Tokyo's operations in Taiwan and South Korea are of the greatest concern to Peking. Huge Japanese investments in these two countries cannot be explained in merely economic terms; they have also been included within Japan's defence perimeter. The Chinese have noted that the Japanese openly put forth two years ago the slogan 'with economics as the lead and the armed forces as the backing'. In energetically carrying out economic expansion in China's Taiwan province, Japanese monopoly capital aims at turning Taiwan into a Japanese colony and re-occupying it. More than any other factor, Japan's presence in Taiwan stands in the way of the province's eventual reintegration with the mainland.

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

Arms For The Treaty

FROM A POLITICAL
CORRESPONDENT

THERE does not seem to be a limit to the cynical exploitation of the Bangladesh crisis for power ends, especially the end of winning the 1972 Assembly elections. Things might be drifting compulsively towards a conflict on the sub-continent but the ruling elite finds it necessary to sustain the war psychosis until the elections are over.

It might have been technically proper to invoke Article 9 of the Indo-Soviet treaty to discuss the deteriorating border situation. It is a metaphysical situation. One does not know if the treaty was invoked to discuss the threat because the treaty was already there or whether the treaty was signed because the threat was already there. In any case, the leadership can no longer keep the pretence that the treaty had nothing to do with Bangladesh. Mr Nikolai Firiyubin who came for what were described as annual bilateral talks happens, among other things, to be the Secretary-General of the Warsaw pact set-up. The Soviet air chief who followed him was heading a military mission and there is little doubt about it now. Its objective is to assess India's defence needs. Indian military purchase teams have been visiting the Soviet Union after the treaty but the hardware that would be available as a result of the Soviet team's assessment would have nothing to do with the immediate Bangladesh crisis. More, Mr Swaran Singh has told the Parliament Consultative Committee that he did not expect the Chinese to intervene militarily in the event of an Indo-Pakistan conflict. It is not clear whether the government has at last come to the conclusion that China is not a hostile neighbour. If it has, the bogey of two hostile neighbours menacing India's silken socialist path cannot be sustained for long. It

would be well to remember that before the treaty was signed Mr Brajesh Mishra, our man in Peking, had assessed that China would not back Pakistan if there were to be a conflict. But it suited those who rushed into the treaty to believe, and make others believe, that the United States had hinted to us that China might back Pakistan and that a conflict was inevitable.

If the leadership is earnest in its public stance that it is for normalisation of relations with China, there is threat to India from only one quarter. The Press was talked into reporting that Mr Swaran Singh assured the Consultative Committee, in the wake of the Firiyubin visit, that the Soviet Union will stand by India in the event of aggression. Well, Mr Swaran Singh could not really say this to the Consultative Committee and the story was not based on any authoritative briefing to the press. If what Mr Swaran Singh said was true, the treaty becomes a defence pact, a mutual security pact and the government need not pretend that it is not.

Far from reducing our defence expenditure, the treaty will increase it. For, if the threat from Pakistan is real, as it is, the treaty has failed to deter aggression on India. The signing of the treaty might have postponed the Pakistani attack predicted in Indian quarters for August 12 but it has not eliminated the threat. The treaty will only add to the escalation of the arms race on the sub-continent revived by the Soviet Union in the name of containing China.

Before she embarked on her Odyssey of two continents, the Prime Minister called in Mr Bhupesh Gupta who seems to have a special role, next only to that of Mr D. P. Dhar, in implementing the historic treaty. The CPI had summoned a meeting of its Central Executive in the belief that it would already be war when it went into session. Something happened in Teheran on October 14 to put off the conflict. From all accounts it is clear that in the event of a conflict the Soviet Union would stall any U.N. or other intervention

to impose a ceasefire for about two weeks. Anything more would be difficult. If at least eight Bangladesh districts come under effective control of the Mukti Bahini as a by-product of a conflict, India would extend recognition to the Bangladesh government. A number of socialist countries, it is supposed, will follow India to recognise Bangladesh.

The Soviet equivocation on the issue continues. On one side they are proclaiming indirectly their support to India's public position while they are quietly working for a political settlement within the framework of Pakistan. Mr Firiyubin, it is said, has tried to make it known to the Mujibnagar leadership which looks to Soviet help that he could mediate to secure the release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman towards a political solution if the leadership agreed to a settlement within Pakistan. New Delhi cannot take exception to such mediation by Mr Firiyubin because in the case of U. Thant's offer, India has taken the position that he was welcome to mediate between the Bangladesh leadership and the rulers of Pakistan since the Bangladesh issue was not an Indo-Pakistani one.

Before it is a countdown, the Soviet leadership might make an attempt at mediation. The CPI's role in this game is far from clear. Its leadership is accusing the Khandkar Mush-taque Ahmed group of having links with the United States and the CPI-(M). It is not yet certain that the CPI has differences with the CPSU on the solution to the Bangladesh crisis. The fact that Mrs Gandhi has to invoke not only Article 9 but Mr Bhupesh Gupta in the crisis is proof that her leverage with the Soviet leadership after the treaty is not what it was but the CPI's leverage with her has grown, at least for the moment.

If and when an independent Bangladesh emerges, it would be in the interest of India's ruling classes to have in Dacca a government "compatible" with the Indo-Soviet treaty. The Mujibnagar government is just compatible if the United States is prevented from gaining influence over

it, according to the votaries of the treaty.

If not earlier, mid-November is the time a conflict might break out, according to the soothsayers who know

the details of Mr Bhupesh Gupta's talks with the Prime Minister, duly reported to the Central Committee of the CPI.

OCTOBER 31, 1971

"The Year Of Confusion"

C. PRASAD

THE year 1971 will perhaps go down in history as the "Year of Confusion". Bangladesh, Ceylon, Sudan and to cap it all the Nixon trip to Peking. What really has been happening in China? The new left in the West is puzzled, frustrated, angry. The Trotskyite fringe has lashed out at the Chinese for their "great betrayal" while the Maoist factions have come out with a defence, lukewarm and often unconvincing, of Chinese policy. Both the critique and defence have been more emotional than rational. Two recent articles in the left-wing French press, however, do not quite belong to this category.

Hamza Alavi writing in Jean-Paul Sartre's *Les Temps Modernes* has tried to view Bangladesh from a non-orthodox Marxist angle and has come out with an indictment of the Chinese policy towards Pakistan as "myopic". One of his basic premises is that in post-colonial societies like Pakistan the superstructure of the State often does not correspond to the indigenous socio-economic base. Compared to the state of the economic infrastructure and that of the national bourgeoisie, the state superstructure is "overdeveloped". And he suggests a triangular conflict between the bureaucratic-military oligarchy, the bourgeois and landlord classes of Pakistan and the petit-bourgeois nationalists of East Pakistan. "The movement for the independence of East Bengal", he says, "cannot be explained in terms of the interest of the Bengali bourgeoisie" because the Bengali nationalist movement came into existence before the Bengali bourgeoisie was born. The class basis of

the movement is essentially petit-bourgeois. But armed struggle for liberation has transformed it into a popular movement.

Alavi, however, does not have any illusion about the reactionary nature of the Awami League leadership. At the beginning, he says, the ruling classes of Pakistan were in the same dilemma as Mujib. They knew that the Awami League was the last bastion of the social system to which their interest was inextricably linked. If they did not concede the demand for regional autonomy the situation might turn revolutionary and they would stand to lose more. The Awami League too faced the dilemma of choosing between the army and the rapidly rising popular force. Americans had no such dilemma whatsoever. They overtly supported, encouraged and infiltrated the Awami League. It was clear that an independent East Bengal under Awami League rule would pass squarely under American influence. India too made significant intervention through diplomatic activity and propaganda. The Indian press and radio reacted to the Pakistani army's action by exaggerated and even erroneous statements. This hardly helped the Bangladesh cause because by the same token Pakistani propaganda according to which the trouble in East Pakistan was fomented by India and participated in by "Indian infiltrators" became credible. But there is little proof of Indian military intervention.

India, according to Alavi, aims at setting up an Awami League government in Dacca through international pressure and if this could be realised with the help of Western pressure

India could hope to develop close co-operation with Bangladesh. Such a possibility obviously raised the apprehension of the Chinese to whom geopolitically this is a most sensitive region. In the context of their conflict with the Western powers, the Soviet Union and India, the Chinese placed more importance on friendship with the ruling oligarchy in Pakistan. Chou En-lai's message to Yahya Khan and the Chinese warning against "external intervention in the internal affairs of Pakistan" have helped to mislead public opinion and strengthen the morale of those who committed one of the worst crimes in history against a people.

Maoist Left

Alavi believes that the Maoist left of East Bengal is the vanguard of the united struggle for national liberation along with other left groups and the militants of the Awami League who have preferred armed struggle to withdrawal into India. In putting accent on intrigues and Western designs and speculating on the future orientation of an Awami League government the Chinese, he thinks, have underestimated the role of the liberation fighters. Thus not only have they become politically isolated but they have also failed in their obligation to proletarian internationalism. They have equally demonstrated their extreme myopia, their incapability to understand the development of the social forces in Bangladesh and the real rapport existing between the Awami League leadership and the struggling people. The Awami League leadership were riding a mounting tide of nationalism that would not easily recede. Despite their limitations and their dependence on the West they did have no other choice but to accept the popular demand and thus reinforce direct struggle. It is the role played by the liberation forces—and not the orientation of the Awami League leadership—which will determine the course to be followed by the Bangladesh government. The Chinese reaction can only spread confusion at

NOVEMBER 6, 1971

the base and weaken the revolutionary unit. Happily, according to information available, the Maoist leadership of East Bengal has not been misled or diverted from their task in the coming struggle. They fervently hope that the Chinese will realise their mistake and correct it.

Explaining why in the final analysis the reactionary nature of the Awami League leadership would not count, Alavi says that even among the leadership there are people more inclined to the masses than to anti-people compromise with the Western powers. Moreover, an Awami League government cannot but depend on the people because in East Bengal there is no repressive apparatus. There is practically no Bengali army.

Hamza Alavi believes that without a change in the mode of production regional autonomy cannot solve any problem. But while underlining the importance of a common struggle for socialism in Pakistan he wants to accord equal importance to the struggle for the liberation of Bangladesh. Independence of Bengal is already a historic necessity. Not because by itself it will resolve the problem of regional disparities, neither because it is the only one to possess a different national identity in the whole of Pakistan. It is necessary because the bloody operation conducted by the army has rapidly created a totally new political situation. It has irretrievably snapped the political tie that existed between East Bengal and West Pakistan and dramatically crystallized the Bengali nationalist sentiment. It has also set in motion the forces for national liberation which will not allow the struggle for socialism to be stopped by the weak petit-bourgeois Awami League leadership.

Different Assessment

Kostas Mavrakis, another Marxist writing for *La Nouvelle Chine*, a Parisian monthly devoted to Chinese affairs, has made a quite different assessment of the struggle in Bangladesh and justified the Chinese position vis-à-vis Pakistan as principled Marxist-Leninist stand. Aware that the Wes-

tern press has distorted and misinterpreted the Chinese statements Mavrakis starts with an analysis of the text of Chinese messages and statements which are anyhow very few in number. The declaration of April 8 which accuses Indian reactionaries of slandering China by saying that she is helping in suppression of the "freedom loving people of East Bengal" cannot in any way be construed as Chinese support to the Pakistani Army's action. The *People's Daily* commentary on April 11 entitled "What do the Indian expansionists want?" is reaffirmation of the Chinese support to the Government and people of Pakistan against aggression and intervention from outside. So far Chou En-lai's message to Yahya Khan is concerned, it has never been published by the New China News Agency and the Chinese Embassy in Paris has declared itself unaware of the text. If it is false the absence of explicit Chinese denial could be explained by unwillingness to snub a friendly government. Assuming it to be authentic it is difficult to draw from the text conclusions the Western press has readily drawn. At a time when Yahya Khan broke off negotiations to resort to the gun Chou En-lai writes: "We believe that thanks to the wise consultations and effort of Your Excellency and leading personalities of the different political sectors of Pakistan the situation will become normal." Wasn't it an advice to seek political solution instead of military repression? At a time when the world press published reports on the massacres in Bengal Chou wrote: "It is highly important to differentiate between the large mass of people and a handful of persons who want to sabotage the unity of Pakistan." Finally it is to be noted that in the text the paragraphs stating the Chinese official position start with: "The Chinese Government considers that..." But the ones dealing with Pakistan's internal problem start with: "We believe..." and "according to our opinion..." And they are concluded by the phrase "As friends of Pakistan we submit these views for your informa-

tion." It is thus a personal and private missive and this would perhaps explain why the Chinese have refused to publish it.

From the analysis of the official Chinese position Mavrakis has drawn two conclusions. First the Chinese support to the Pakistan government is directed uniquely against Indian interference. Secondly, in the present situation the Chinese do not seem to wish the dismemberment of their sole ally in this part of the world (which would be to the greatest advantage of India).

After referring to the U.S.-Soviet attempt to encircle China and the key role India played in it, Mavrakis points out the necessity for China as a *state* to counter these moves. By having ties with Pakistan China conforms to the principle: "We should support everything that the enemy opposes". It is on the basis of this principle that Lenin concluded the Rapallo agreement with Germany. The case of Cambodia is also similar. This country found itself menaced by the territorial designs of Thailand and South Vietnam, both supported by the U.S. Prince Sihanouk also had to draw closer to China and North Vietnam. These two countries on their part knew that friendship with Cambodia helped the struggle against American intervention. Aid from China and other socialist countries to Cambodia allowed Sihanouk to break off ties with the U.S. Later events have shown how wrong it is to think that Chinese "support" to a government representing the propertied classes would be an obstacle to the development of revolutionary movement. The good relation Peking had with Prince Sihanouk did not hinder the Cambodian communists from striking root among the masses and gathering military strength. Prince Sihanouk suspected China of supporting them and did not hesitate to criticise her in his speeches. Nevertheless, thanks to Chinese assistance Sihanouk could resist American pressure which ultimately brought about the coup d'etat. Thus the skilful Chinese policy led Sihanouk into a position

where he could be of service to the people. After the coup his speeches broadcast all over Cambodia have helped to rally peasants to the revolutionary movement.

Coming to the Chinese attitude at party and people's level Mavrakīs says that by not supporting Bengali nationalists they have not violated Marxist principles. There are always exceptions to the general principle of supporting national movements depending on concrete circumstances. Marx and Engels were for the independence of Poland and Hungary but against the national movement of the Czechs and Slavs of the south. Lenin in his polemics with the partisans of Rosa Luxemburg explained that in view of the changing international situation it becomes necessary to adopt a different attitude. "In that epoch (of Marx) one had to be against Czar (and against a certain movement of small nations utilised by the Czar for anti-democratic purposes) and for great revolutionary nations of the West. Today one has to be against the front, henceforward united, of the imperialist powers and for all national movements directed against imperialism to the profit of socialist revolution." (*Oeuvres Complètes*, t.22 pp. 368-9). While calling on the oppressed nations to rise Lenin nevertheless stressed that "different democratic demands, including the right of national self-determination, are not absolute but part of the whole worldwide democratic (now socialist) movement. It is possible that in certain cases the part is in contradiction with the whole. Then it has to be rejected. It may happen that the republican movement of one country is an instrument of the clerical, financial or monarchic intrigue of other countries. Then we have the right not to support this movement." (ibid p. 367)

Some "leftists" have criticised China on the assumption that an *autonomous* people's movement has been existent in East Bengal. But citing evidence of the Western press Mavrakīs has tried to show that

the Awami League is nothing but a bunch of reactionaries tied to the apron strings of India trying to get a share of the cake. He quotes the Director of the Indian Institute of Defence Analysis as having said, "The disintegration of Pakistan is in our interest. We have thus a rare chance." Mavrakīs concludes that the Awami League is an example of a nationalist movement turned, by all evidence, into an instrument of Indian expansionist intrigue. In the absence of an *autonomous* movement the two

parties in the recent crisis are India (and her allies of the Awami League) and Pakistan. The Bengali people are a victim almost reduced to passivity. But he is certain that if the Bengali liberation movement becomes a genuinely popular, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal and *autonomous* movement the Chinese people will not fail to express their solidarity. The situation then would be different. A revolutionary Bengal would sap the established order of the whole Indian sub-continent.

An Aspect Of An Agrarian Programme

RANJAN SENGUPTA

THE rich, capitalist farmers of Punjab and Haryana are worried. They are afraid that they are producing too much.¹ On the other hand, millions of rural and urban poor are starving.² But that does not matter at all. This is the irony of the system.

The market recognizes you only if you have hard cash to pay for things, otherwise you simply do not count. What is the worth of a human being if he has no money?

The system is very cleverly balanced. A self-perpetuating elite group goes on masquerading in the name of plan, production, and development. But in fact it is this group that is the major hindrance to the full development of productive forces.

Take the case of agriculture. Only 5 per cent of rural households own about 40 per cent of the land, all in

the farm size of 20 acres or more. In fact, as much as three-fifths of the land is in the hands of 12 per cent of the households. Thus a few families have a lot of land to play with as they please.

Owners of large farms are notorious for misuse of land. The Farm Management Studies (of the late fifties and the early sixties) reveal that the bigger the farm size, the lower are the labour and other inputs, including irrigation, per acre; and so is the production per acre. The simple explanation for this perversity of land use is that so long as the acreage is vast it does not matter much to the owner if the rate of yield per acre is low. What is lost on a per acre basis is redeemed by the sheer size of the total acreage.

No wonder, multiple cropping is such a 'foreign' idea to a large tract of land in India. As column 4 of the table shows, barely 15 per cent of the net cropped area grows more than one crop per year.

The duration for which a crop is on land varies from crop to crop within the range of two to six months.³ Rabi wheat, for instance, takes five or five-and-a-half months (mid-October to mid-April), while summer rice stands

¹ M. B. Lal, "Problems of Plenty for the Farmer," *Statesman*, September 29, 1971, p. 6.

² V. M. Dandekar and N. Rath, "Poverty in India", *Economic and Political Weekly* (January 2 and 9, 1971).

³ Except cotton (7 months), tobacco (7 months) and sugar cane (10-12 months).

on land for two to three months. Let us, therefore, say that one crop needs six months at the outside.

It then follows that *eighty-five per cent of India's agricultural land remains unutilized for fifty per cent of the time per year*. What the country loses as a result in terms of potential output is anybody's guess.

Why is this tremendous waste?

Year	Net cropped area (million acres)	Net cropped area sown more than once (million acres)	Ratio of (3) to (2) (per cent)	Net area irrigated (million acres)	Ratio of (5) to (2) (per cent)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1950-51	297.9	32.9	11.1	52.1	17.5
1955-56	322.9	45.5	13.9	56.9	17.6
1960-61	333.1	48.9	14.7	61.7	18.5
1964-65	345.3	52.7	15.2	66.5	19.2
1966-67	342.6	48.8	14.2	68.7	20.2

Source : Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture, C.D. & Co-operation, Directorate of Economics & Statistics, *Indian Agriculture in Brief*, 10th ed. (January 1970), pp. 26 and 29.

Again, the rich landowners could not care less for intensive land use. They are afraid that better land utilization may incidentally benefit the poorer section of the community as well, and thereby reduce the scope of their exploitation. Who knows, even the wage rate and the employment of agricultural labour might go up substantially, and thus help the wretched masses of the Indian earth stand up on their own feet. The big landowners are getting a lion's share of the surplus anyway. Why take the risk of disturbing the status quo?

The poor peasants, on the other hand, are already up to their neck in debt. Cultivation of scattered pieces of land here and there is terribly expensive specially when more than half of the land owned by big landlords and rich peasantry is left vacant. Just to erect fences, for example, to protect crops from animals in isolated areas itself would cost a fortune. A poor peasant cannot afford that.

The net result of all this is that nearly 300 million acres, yes, *three*

hundred million acres, of land remains idle for half the year (see cols. 2 and 3 in the table). Most of this land presumably belongs to the big landowners.

If the landlords and rich peasantry are not willing, and the poor small peasants are not able at this stage, to utilize land more effectively by multiple cropping, the landless labourers

can save India from this impasse. There are about 9 million households of landless agricultural labourers. They can organize themselves into labour brigades, and cultivate the land for themselves when it is otherwise usually left idle. Once they spearhead this movement small peasants would certainly join it in due course. And that would be a big, first step forward!

The productivity of land varies depending upon soil condition, crop, irrigation facilities, and so on. It is estimated⁴ that under the existing conditions of cultivation a 15-acre holding, on an average, produces a reasonable amount of income (Rs 1200 per year) to sustain a family. The yield of the second and third crops may be a little lower. At any rate, let us take 15 acres per household as the norm. Then 9 million landless agricultural labour households would need 135 million acres.

Out of 343 million acres of cropped area as of 1966-67, 137 million acres belong to the top 5 per cent of the rural households. All this land of 137 million acres is in the farm

⁴ A. M. Khusro, *The Economics of Land Reform and Farm Size in India* (1970), pp. 72-73.

size group of 20 acres or more. Probably most of this land is used for a single crop only. If so, this land is enough for ensuring a reasonable amount of income to the families of landless agricultural labourers, provided it is distributed for cultivation to them during the time when it is otherwise usually left idle.

Use land productively, or let it be so used. Let this be the slogan. Initially the owners of farms of less than 20 acres each may be exempted; because sooner or later they themselves would use land round the year.

Of course, there are problems in implementing this programme. A major hurdle is the lack of irrigation facilities. Columns 5 and 6 in the above table show that only about one-fifth of the land is under irrigation. Even then not all of it grows multiple crops. In any case, an extensive irrigation network has to be built up. This is an essential prerequisite; and it is known to be technically feasible.

The mass poverty in India is synthetic, man-made. It can be swept away by a titanic wave. And for that you don't necessarily need 'miracle wheat' or high yielding variety seed, or any such dodge.

Here are two most exciting and thought provoking books by a Gandhian thinker

GANDHI & MAO

Price Re. 1/-

"JAI PEOPLES' BANGLA DESH"

with an introduction by

Pandit Sundar Lal

Price Rs. 1.50

by **RAMADHAR**

Giving you the proper perspective, correct conclusions and a different evaluation. Postage Extra.

Write to us for MARXIST BOOKS

Distributors

Current Book Depot,

Mahatma Gandhi Marg,

Kanpur-1, U.P.

INDIA.

The Rising Sun Again

KALYAN CHAUDHURI

SATO and Nixon have recently clarified certain points of their Agreement of 1969 on two main issues, the renewal of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, first signed in September 1951, then in a more equitable form in 1960 and renewed again in 1970, and the reversion of Okinawa islands to Japanese control in 1972.

But what Sato and Nixon really concluded at Washington during Mr Sato's visit to the USA in 1969, according to sections of the Western press, was a deal which amounts to a reorganization of the entire structure and strategy of economic and military imperialism in Asia.

A special issue of *Ampo*, published from Tokyo by the Japanese New Left, after a careful study of the Sato-Nixon summit meeting, has come to the conclusion that their programme is a reflection of two main developments. The first of these is the fact that the present structure has been thrown into a state of crisis, principally as a result of the revolutionary breakthrough made by the people of Indochina. The second is the resurgence of the power and imperial ambitions of the rulers of Japan. The *Ampo* report reveals that "the essence of this deal was that Japan should shift from a limited and generally passive role to a greatly expanded and very active role in the joint task of defending and strengthening the structure of counter-revolution in Asia.

Within this context the return of Okinawa, now a strong military base of the USA in the Pacific, symbolizes America's commitment to the task of intensifying her expansionist activities and this is why the return of Okinawa will amount to the repossession of a vital strategic base and a major thrust by Japan toward the south. Sato's plan for reversion of Okinawa in 1972, the *Ampo* report alleges, has absolutely nothing to do with removal

of U.S. bases from Okinawa or liberating the Okinawans from their bondage to the war machine. On the contrary, one of the first concrete results of the reversion will be that U.S. forces will be joined on Okinawa by the Japanese Self-Defence Force (SDF). The Japanese Defence Director has already visited the island and SDF troops have several times been sent to Okinawa for joint training exercises with the U.S. military. Immediately after reversion takes place in 1972, the SDF is reported to have a plan to send 3,300 troops, along with anti-submarines, F-104 reconnaissance planes, minesweepers and warships. These will be permanently stationed on Okinawa where people have been seeking peace since the beginning of this century. Within six months after reversion, the Japanese SDF plans to send 3000 more troops to man radar sites, ground-to-air missiles (Nike and Hawk) and other equipment. Another effect, which has already begun, is a sudden invasion of money from giant industries which want to turn what is left of the islands into smoke-spewing factory complexes. Thus with reversion Okinawa will be ruled from Tokyo by Sato's Liberal Democratic Party.

Japanese imperialism, fast extending its rule over Asia, has greatly integrated itself, through the deal over Okinawa, as a conscious and responsible pillar in the American imperialists' edifice of aggression and suppression, acting through the multilateral structure of world imperialism. Japanese imperialism is extending its network of economic domination from East to West Asia, Africa and Latin America and is increasingly assuming a role of "military police" in East Asia. Apologists for the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty have downplayed the long-standing American policy of pressuring Japan to rearm and assume a subordinate policeman's role in Asia, and its political and economic conse-

quences for Japanese society. Arguments in support of the Security Treaty and U.S.-Japan military alliance fail to recognize that Japan has already rearmed on a scale sufficient to pose a threat to her neighbours.

Military Power

A bare listing of facts about her Self-Defence Forces indicates why Japan is now rated 4th or 5th in the world in terms of actual military power. Japan's Ground Self-Defence Force (GSDF) is expected to have 180,000 men by the end of this year with a 'volunteer reserve of over 30,000. Under the present Five Year Plan the GSDF has been equipped with Japanese-made small arms, anti-tank rockets and heavy tanks. For anti-aircraft defences it has automatic, radar-guided, 35mm Swiss-designed guns and several battalions of Hawk missiles. The Maritime Self-Defence Force (MSDF) of Japan is the third most powerful navy in the Pacific after those of the U.S. and the Soviet Union. According to the latest figures, she has 10 diesel-powered submarines, 26 destroyers including one guided missile type, 16 frigates, 20 fast petrol vessels and 155 assorted warships. Japan's Air Self-Defence Force (ASDF) with 1,530 aircraft, has been recently rated by the *Air Force Magazine* as the most powerful in Asia after that of the U.S. and Russia. She has 200 F-104Js, 300 F86D and F86F fighters, Nike-Ajax missiles, 400 jet trainers and 30 large Sikorsky helicopters. The Japanese-manufactured EIKO (F-104J, presently in service, can carry a nuclear bomb anywhere within a 700-mile radius.

The huge military capability does not even begin to suggest Japan's economic potential for waging conventional war. That is to be seen in the fact that Japan has the third largest GNP (Gross National Product) in the world and she is economically and militarily a giant among nations. Compared to two of her hypothetical adversaries—North Korea and China—she is not only a giant but an increasingly ominous threat in her own right. In the late forties and fifties

China and North Korea viewed the American domination of Japan as a serious threat to their own security; today they have good reason to put increasing stress on Japan itself and not just the U.S. presence.

Chinese and Korean fears of Japan have been reinforced by the heavy growth of new Japanese military establishment. On October 1, 1962, the largely-circulated Japanese daily, *Tokyo Shimbun*, reported an alleged U.S.-Japan plan for Japanese-South Korean military cooperation. The plan called, among other things, for the permanent stationing in Seoul of a Japanese Self-Defence Force, repairing and outfitting of South Korean military aircraft and ships in Japan, linking of the Japanese air defence system with the Taiwanese and South Korean air defence systems "so that combined air action will be possible," and Japanese and South Korean naval cooperation in blockading the Tsushima Straits in the event of emergency.

Three years later, in June 1965, a Japan-South Korea "normalization" treaty was signed, marking significant Japanese involvement in the anti-communist military set-up in South Korea. During the last stages of negotiations for this treaty, opposition members of the South Korean National Assembly charged the Japanese with conducting the talks on the basis of a secret U.S.-Japan understanding that called, among other things, for equipping of South Korean forces with Japanese, rather than American-manufactured, war weapons. Since that treaty was signed, South Korean military pilots have been receiving flight training in Japan and Japanese soldiers are being taught Korean at various Self-Defence Force schools such as the one at Maizuru.

The modern defence industry of Japan was revived on a small scale as a repair industry for the Occupation Forces within a few years after the end of World War II. But for practical purposes, the origins of the Japanese military-industrial complex can be dated from the start of the Korean war, when General MacArthur reluctantly ordered the illegal rearmament

of Japan in the guise of an expansion of the National Police Reserve. At the same time, the American Government initiated a "special procurements" programme to meet the needs of its Japan-based Eighth Army and Fifth Air Force. Within one year, income from the construction of bases and the purchase of war materials had started Japan on the road to economic recovery and a more favourable balance of payments. The "special procurements" programme, however, did not end with the Korean war. Between 1951 and 1960, "special procurements" amounted to over six billion dollars, an average of 600 million dollars annually. The programme also pushed Japanese industry towards a military-industrial complex. According to a recent study of Japanese government-business relations by Yale University's Chitoshi Yanaga, by January 1951, eight months prior to the end of the Occupation and the signing of the first U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, "72 percent of Japan's production capacity was directly engaged in the manufacture of weapons."

The key agreement of the period of the first American military alliance with Japan was the U.S.-Japan Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement (MDA), signed by the Yoshida Government in 1954. The then Prime Minister of Japan, Yoshida himself, desired the rearmament of Japan to follow rather than accompany the completion of economic reconstruction, and therefore disagreed with Dulles over the speed at which rearmament should proceed.

On the basis of the MDA, Japan's modern armed forces were organized: laws were enacted setting up the Japan Defence Agency (JDA), equivalent to a ministry of war in all but name, and the Self-Defence Forces; the police system was recentralized to bolster internal security; a Defence Secrets Protection Law was enacted and other laws were passed to consolidate the defence industry. Underlying the MDA, however, was a U.S.-Japanese understanding on matters that were other than military in nature.

The MDA was time to time negotiated during a period of profound crisis and confusion in American policy toward Asia.

Left Opposition

In contrast to her economic development through trade expansion with America's help and cooperation in South-East Asia, the tempo of Japanese rearmament during this period could not proceed as fast as American policy-makers anticipated or desired. One reason for this has been the effectiveness of the left-led opposition, based on commitment to the principles of the Constitution and reflecting the genuine sentiments of a large number of Japanese people. Neither Yoshida nor his successor, Hatoyama Ichiro, responded satisfactorily to American pressure for rapid rearmament or were wholeheartedly devoted to anti-communist planning for Asia as desired by America against her help to Japan in making way for the latter's trade expansion in South-East Asia.

Hatoyama's diplomacy, consequently, was no more acceptable to the men behind rearmament and "defence production" pressure—which first emerged during the Korean war—than his overall policies were to American policy planners. By the end of 1955 the leaders of Japan's monopoly corporations, working through powerful business organizations such as the Federation of Economic Organizations, had succeeded in throwing Hatoyama out of power and creating the Liberal Democratic Party. This marked the clear ascendancy of organized monopoly capitalism over Japanese political life, as well as a trend towards even closer American-Japanese military and economic cooperation.

Not until the advent of Kishi Nobusuke, former economic Czar of Manchukuo, architect of prewar Japan's New Economic Order, Minister of Trade and Industry and Vice Munitions Minister in the Tojo Cabinet, did the U.S. find its man in Tokyo. Kishi, an uncompromising anti-communist, was Japan's Prime

Minister from 1957 until after the second military alliance was concluded with the USA and U.S.-Japan Security Treaty renewed in 1960. During his tenure, foundations were laid for the growth of a military-industrial complex tightly bound to American defence industry, closer ties with Taiwan, and the Japanese economic advance into South-East Asia. Several features of the military-industrial nexus emerged in the sixties in the regime of Kishi's successor, Ikeda, and these are more clearly witnessed in the present regime of Kishi's most trusted political disciple, Sato.

That there is always a very tight relationship between American and Japanese defence industries can be easily established after going through the production lists of Japanese companies, mainly defence contractors, including Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Tokyo Shibaura Electric, Fuji Heavy Industries, Hitachi Ltd., Nissan Motors, Mitsubishi Electric, Nippon Oil, Nippon Avionics (joint venture of Nippon Electric and Hughes Aircraft of USA), Isuzu Motor and Fujitsu. Most of these top Japanese defence contractors are tied by licensing agreements and joint ventures to the top 100 American defence contractors like General Electric, Lockheed, Boeing, IBM, Ford Motor Company, Bell, Union Carbide, Sikorsky, Standard Oil, Hughes Aircraft, Litton Industries, Collins Radio, North American Aviation, Phillips Petroleum, Honeywell and Kaiser Industries.

The General Electric, America's fourth largest manufacturer and its number two defence contractor, has now licensing agreements with about 65 Japanese companies as well as a 10 per cent position in Yokyo Shibaura Electric, Japan's number three defence contractor. General Electric, interestingly enough, is a frequent sponsor of academic gatherings and "scholarly" publications on Asia which support the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty system.

Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Japan's number one defence contrac-

tor, now devotes 10 per cent of its output to arms and 30 per cent to war vehicles. This giant and other leading defence contractors are fast tending to move into defence production. As competition increases in consumer goods markets with the influx of foreign goods and the liberalization of investment opportunities for foreign firms, many Japanese industrialists are being tempted into the military hardware market where the State is the only buyer and foreign competition is less keen. After its recent tie-up with Chrysler Motors, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries separated out its automotive operations and announced its intention to plunge more heavily into defence production. The President of the number two defence contractor, Mitsubishi Electric Company, at the time of his appointment as Chairman of the Japan Weapons Industry Association in May, 1969, stated that he wanted to see Japan's defence expenditures raised to 5 per cent of the GNP. The direction these leaders have taken is sure to be followed by the entire defence industry. One can see here how American business and Government pressure on Japan for liberalization of investment terms is being met in Japan by increased investment in defence production. In the process of nurturing the Japanese military-industrial complex, the U.S. Government has frequently acted as broker for "private" American defence contractors. In 1967, the American Ambassador to Japan, U. Alexis Johnson, is alleged to have personally called on the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ushiba, to ask for the use of General Electric engines in building the F4F Phantom fighter plane. But the more common means of facilitating line-ups between the two military-industrial complexes are governmental bilateral agreements and memoranda, such as the Data Exchange Agreement of 1962 and Memorandum on Military Research and Development in 1968, concluded between the Japan Defence Agency and the Pentagon. The U.S.-Japan Aerospace Cooperation Agreement of 1970 is another

example of this kind. Valued by a report in *Business Week* (September 13, 1970) as being worth at least 200m to 300m dollars to American defence contractors, it paves the way for American aerospace industry assistance in the seventies in the development of Japanese Q and N series launch vehicles—ICBM-type rockets which could be armed with nuclear tips rather than space research satellites.

"Research Projects"

Though direct interconnection between the military establishment and the universities has not yet significantly materialised in Japan, indirect university cooperation with the military through research projects commissioned by private industry is on the increase. Recently the Board of Audit investigated the research status of twelve leading universities and revealed that they reported to the Ministry of Education some 279 research projects, many of them military-related, having a total value of 103 million yen. An interesting sidelight on Japanese university involvement in military research and development, however indirect, is that its benefits have not been limited only to the Defence Agency of Japan. In 1959, the U.S. Army established an office in Tokyo to identify and, when possible, place under contract Japanese scientists whose work might contribute to U.S. military objectives. By 1967, when this sort of Pentagon "peace fare" activity was first disclosed by Senator Fulbright, the Army Research Office in Tokyo was monitoring contracts and grants with nine Japanese universities and a number of private research institutes.

As the Japanese military-industrial complex enters the stage of self-sustaining growth during the 1970s, it is safe to predict that retention of the Security Treaty will not be necessary for either side. What is much more difficult is whether a revived Japanese imperialism can remain integrated in the American imperial system. For the present, it should be noted that the strongest pressure for revision of

the anti-war constitution, expanded defence production, liberalization of investment terms, overseas deployment of Defence Forces, and strengthening of the Security Treaty comes from the leaders of heavy industry, finance, trade and commerce—the class of monopoly capitalists. For reasons of their own there are also a number of Japanese “realist” intellectuals who espouse these goals. Imperialism and militarism, while irrational from the standpoint of the Japanese nation as a whole, today seem increasingly rational for certain classes and groups within Japan. The views of such groups present a way of examining the rationale behind the current defence fever. What do business groups perceive to be the major benefits of defence spending and how will the anticipated higher level of defence spending in the seventies affect Japan's future relationship with the U.S. ?

Questions relating to the Japanese rearmament programme under the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, however, converge on the issue of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty which the Japanese Government has not yet signed and which many leaders of defence industries oppose. It has been estimated that by 1975 Japan, long a candidate for the nuclear club, will have generated enough Plutonium in her power reactors to produce 600 to 700 atomic bombs of 20 kiloton variety. Yet if Japan did every nation in Asia. Did acquire nuclear weapons ostensibly to deter China, it would result in an irrevocable reduction of security for every nation in Asia. China, already threatened by the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenal, would be squeezed still further by Japan ; while India, which was involved in a war with China in 1962 and has recently signed a treaty with the Soviet Union, may try to acquire nuclear weapons and all these will sure create a war condition in entire Asia.

Labour Front

General MacArthur was first seriously entrusted with the task of

weakening the Japanese labour movement and wiping out growing communist influence on the working class by the U.S. Government. MacArthur, working through the Supreme Commander Allied Powers (SCAP), put all his efforts into getting Japanese unions affiliated with the CIA-inspired anti-communist International Labour Federation that had been taking shape in the fifties in Western Europe. By 1955, SCAP could step up its anti-communist witch hunt, purging all communist leaders from the Japanese labour unions. In the early sixties, American labour leaders attempted on three significant fronts to undermine the left-wing Japanese unions. Through Harry Pollack, a “labour attache” who took up his post in the American Embassy in Tokyo in 1962, new efforts were made to strengthen the right-wing unions. Between 1962 and 1965, the labour exchange programme, conceived by Asia Foundation and funded by the State Department, brought some 880 Japanese labour leaders to the USA. On returning home they were organised into groups by the American officials and unionists to resist any proposals to struggle against the Security Treaty. These Japanese labour leaders, American friends, have today a dominating position in the labour front of Japan. Through their efforts are being allegedly made to utilise the right-wing leadership to help organise the labour movement in South-East Asia, a tactic which one Japanese student of the labour movement likened to the American military strategy of using Asians to fight Asians.

If strengthening the right-wing Japanese labour unions is the reverse side of the American policy of pressuring Japan to rearm, mention must also be made of a more subtle American effort to influence Japanese intellectuals. Since America's foreign policy is aimed at “diplomacy in depth” and a task “not merely for government, but for foundations, universities, business and unions as well,” its ingenious formula for interference in another country's internal affairs

cannot be easily conceived. In real sense American cultural activities in Japan for having a significant influence on Japanese intellectuals, students and the growing generation were well provided in 1962. The role of the Ford, Asia, and Rockefeller Foundations as “support institutions” for U.S. foreign policy was widely discussed in the pages of leading Japanese papers including the historical journal *Rekishi Hyoron*. The largely-circulated journal, *Suzuki Ryo*, and others called attention to the South-East Asia Research Centre which Kyoto University had announced was going to be set up. The idea for such a Centre had originated with J. S. Everton, a Ford Foundation official in 1958, the year before he was appointed U.S. Ambassador to Burma. *Suzuki's* analysis of the prospectus for the Centre disclosed that its purposes were remarkably congruent with U.S. foreign policy needs at that time. Finally the Centre was opened, funded chiefly by the Ford Foundation, to limit its research activities to Malaya and Burma, two areas not adequately covered by U.S. counterpart research institutes.

The pace of Japan's rearmament programme can be easily realised after going through her peacetime defence budget. The rate of increase of Japan's defence expenditure went up from 435 billion yen during the First Defence Plan (1957-60) to 1,180 billion yen during the Second. Since 1960, in fact, Japan has increased her defence spending faster than any other country in the world with the possible exception of the U.S. The spending involved by the current Third Defence Plan (1967-71) is double that of the Second Plan, while it is certain that the amount for the Fourth Plan will be more than double that of the Third. Japan's defence industry is on the threshold of an era of growth, and it is widely expected that there will be soaring progress under the Fourth and Fifth Defence Plans.

Cultural Front

That the glorification of Japanese military power and supremacy in the

NOVEMBER 6, 1971

past and militarism of today is integrated with the government policy, if not a craze of the present rulers of Japan, is reflected in the cultural front in the production of theatres, shorts, documentaries, feature films and television shows, either sponsored by the State or private units, and other mass and propaganda media.

For example, advertised as a "spectacular recording" that "closely follows the events of history", a recently-produced film of Japan, *Battle of the Japan Sea*, feverishly glorifies the history of Japanese militarist aggression in Asia. It deals with the 1904-5 war between Japan and Russia to seize Korea and China's northeast—a period of history the people of China and Korea will never forget.

The *Peking Review* of February 5, 1971 in a long article under the heading of Striking Revelation of Japanese Militarism's Ambitions For Aggression (the article has been lifted from the PR and published in a Western film journal), made an attempt to understand the reason behind the Japanese government encouragement for the production of such a "reactionary" film and criticised *Battle of the Japan Sea* bitterly. In the film the war to invade and grab Chinese and Korean territory by Emperor Meiji has been described as a "sacred war" which had "nation-wide support" and "an undertaking paid for in blood." The Japanese war supporters have let loose on the screen a horde of militarists once again waving their blood-stained butcher's knives in another "show of force" against the people of China, Korea and the rest of Asia. The *Peking Review* alleges that "this is an other iron-clad evidence that the reactionary Sato government is vainly trying to stage a come-back and take the old road of aggression again under the aegis of U.S. imperialism."

Battle of the Japan Sea opens with an imperial conference of ministers in the presence of Emperor Meiji. With lordly airs and in oratorical declamations, they discuss the formulation of the "pioneering" national policy of the "greater Japanese empire."

As is known, militarism based on the Tenno system, which regards "building up the military strength of the nation" and expansion as the supreme national policy, was adopted in the Meiji era. In a "letter in his own handwriting" and an imperial mandate, Emperor Meiji openly advocated "pioneering the vast seas" and "spreading the national prestige far and wide" by means of military expeditions, and turning Japan into a "greater empire" to rule the world. Growing strong through aggression, Japanese militarism brought catastrophe to the people of Japan and the rest of Asia for more than half a century. The *Peking Review* article lifted and published in the Western paper alleges that "the 'pioneering spirit' the Sato Government harps on today is precisely this spirit of expansion and aggression to enslave and plunder the people of Asia. Looking at the presentation of the film under review one can see along with the outbursts of wild howls by the "arch criminals" of the Meiji Dynasty, the war machine of the Japanese empire going into action. Instantly, the screen is filled with the roar of guns and palls of smoke. Japanese warships intrude into Korean and Chinese harbours, fully armed Japanese aggressor troops land at Jinnampo and Liaotung Peninsula, trampling on the soil of Korea and China..

In *Battle of the Japan Sea*, the "pioneering spirit" of Japanese reactionaries' ancestors has been given great publicity and character of chieftains of a war of aggression, Heihachiro Togo, Maresuke Nogi and Takeo Hirose described as "famous generals" in a "sacred war" and "heroes" of an "era of prosperity." They are lauded as "men who made their name in history and able commanders without peer before their time and after." Loud music of "victory" is used to eulogize the so-called "magnificent military exploits" of Togo, Nogi and company. It is believed that by showing these on the screen, Japan's present rulers' intention to revive the hegemony of "the

greater Japanese empire" by force of arms and again putting into effect the colonialist plan of the "Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere" has been well expressed.

With intensive arms expansion and preparations for war, the Sato government is perhaps getting Japanese public opinion ready for it with an avalanche of militarist books, newspapers, films, television and radio programme.

Another recently-produced Japanese film, *Gateway to Glory*, centres around the career of Ichiro Hirata who "does not fear to shed his blood in fighting, not for defence but for invasion and in a war of aggression." The main character of the film, Ichiro Hirata, is a young man from a poor family who once wanted to become a statesman in order to "solve social contradictions." But after joining a naval academy he "changes completely", wins a citation from the emperor, and is on the way to becoming a Fascist flunkey who can "subjugate self to order and render loyal service to the emperor." After conducting successful operations in the "war of aggression" he becomes the head of the naval academy. The film ends with Hirata going back to the front as a Supreme Commander with a greater vigour and lust for war.

The film openly calls on Japanese young people to follow Hirata's example and be heroes who "do not fear to shed their blood in war." This glamorous picture of a "hero" seems to have covered up the Fascist mentality bred in him by the poison of the reactionary militarist traditions of expansion and aggression against other countries. On the invasion of China, Hirata is for "controlling the air with carrier-based bombers." So completely has he given himself to Japanese militarism that he waives a leave to see his dying mother. "I am now", he says, "first of all a man of the navy and not my mother's son."

The film critic of *Peking Review*, writes that *Gateway to Glory* has been produced to deceive Japa-

nese young people into becoming cannon fodder. What Hirata preaches in the film is exactly what Sato wants to spread in real life. Behind the militarist's "loyalty and patriotism" is the aggressive ambition to rebuild the "Great Japanese Empire." The Sato government talks about "opening up Asia" and claims that "Africa's natural resources are extremely important to the Japanese economy". Before sending its navy recently on round-the-world trips, Sato boarded the warships to tell the officers and men to "take a good look at the world" and to "look at the motherland from a broad angle." Hirata repeats this in the film: "We should turn our attention abroad and the emperor's prestige spreads to the whole world." Both in the government and on the screen the militarists echo and encourage each other to "carry on the great cause of the ancestors" and "break ten thousand leagues of waves."

Sources :

1. Abuse of Power, U.S. Foreign Policy from Cuba to Vietnam, Asia. By Theodore Draper.
2. At War with Asia by Noam Chomsky.
3. Special Issue on Okinawa of AMPO, Published by the Japanese New Left, Nos. 7-8, 1970.
4. Peking Review, February 5, 1971.
5. China Reconstructs, May, 1971.
6. English Overseas edition of Asahi Shimbun, Sep. 22, 1971.
7. Japan Quarterly, July-September 1970.
8. An Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement by Donald Robinson.
9. Japan Socialist Review, January, 1969.

For FRONTIER contact

S. P. CHATTERJEE

Statesman Office

Steel Market

Durgapur-4

Rabindranath And Jallianwallabagh

ASIT KUMAR LAHIRI

WHEN in protest against the enormity of the measures taken in the Punjab for quelling some local disturbances, Rabindranath asked to be relieved of the title of Knighthood, the gesture was hailed as a tremendous rebuff to the British rulers and as renewed proof of his solidarity with the Indian people. Today every child knows and is taught to boast of this incident.

But what were the actual facts? Did the incident really prove that Rabindranath was one of the few who could take upon themselves the task of speaking for the vast multitude of the oppressed masses? Or was he merely a mediator between the wrath of the rulers and the revenge of the masses? Let us look into the facts as they were.

In his message to the first commemoration of the martyrs, Tagore in strong language and in his typical manner, condemned "the cowardliness of the powerful." And then he said:

"Brothers, when physical force, in its arrogant faith in itself, tries to crush the spirit of man, then comes the time for a man to assert that his soul is indomitable. We shall refuse to own moral defeat by cherishing in our hearts foul dreams of retaliation. The time has come for the victims to be the victors in the field of righteousness".

—The time that has been made all too familiar by M. K. Gandhi. But Rabindranath travels even farther:—

"We who have witnessed the wholesale slaughter of the innocent in our neighbourhood, let us accept God's own office, and cover the bloodstain of iniquity with our prayer.

"With Thy Graciousness, O Terrible forever save us."

Leaving aside the rhetoric, this simply amounts to the affirmation that though they have killed us, we won't do them any harm. The only point that should be mentioned is

that the victims of iniquity were not the ICS men, nor the comprador-landlord classes, but men in the street.

To continue :

"Let those who wish try to burden the minds of the future with stones, carrying the black memory of their anger, but let us bequeath to the generations to come only those memorials which we revere."

In his eagerness to conceal the monstrosity of this incident from future generations, he reveals his inherent class cohesion with the rulers. For, who but the rulers would try to smother the tremendous impact of the incident on the people? And in helping the rulers to pursue this aim, Rabindranath at once labels himself—no, not a lackey but a mediator.

The logic behind this high-sounding philosophy is, however, quite naive. In an already polluted atmosphere, 'foul dreams of retaliation' would further add to the overall pollution. But hadn't this atmosphere, in which such unwarranted mass slaughter could take place, reached the point of super-saturation with pollution? And, as the Bengalis say, what abuse beyond death? What was the fear of further deterioration? The balance which had been shaken, and which he was so anxious to see restored, was it anything other than the balance between the rulers and the ruled? Had that balance been shattered, it would have been all to the good, it would have been much better than the semblance of peace. What was required was to carry the spirit of vengeance forward to an organised extreme, to use this as the starting-point of a new phase of the peoples' struggle against imperialism; and not to smother the pain by offering philosophical prayers to the terrible. But for Rabindranath to concede this was to go against the very grain of his class outlook. So,

what he had to say to his suffering countrymen was put in plain language, that though they had killed us in the hundreds like dogs, we must in order to uphold the virtues of righteousness keep silent and not indulge in any foul dreams of retaliation. What greater service could one render to the rulers?

It is not my intention to belittle Rabindranath, to prove that he was nothing but a hypocrite. All I wish to establish is that his ideas like those of every other human being, bore the mark of their class origin. Himself belonging to the class which was created to serve the purpose of the British colonialists, he was akin to the ideas of the ruling class. It was not for him to see that what was meat for his class was poison for the whole people. Hence this role of a check-valve.

It matters little whether this role was an unconscious one or one of deliberate choice. But this very incident, far from bringing to light his oneness with the oppressed masses in their struggle against imperialism, establishes beyond doubt his actual identity—that of a mediator. Mediator—it seems to be the last word concerning Rabindranath in his relations with the British and the Indian people.

Clippings

The Punjab Naxalites

The recrudescence of terrorist activity which has been shattering the calm of the Punjab countryside for the past 14 months points to the alarming fact that the pernicious seed of Naxalism has taken root here. The shoot-to-kill approach adopted by the police against Naxalites has only scratched the surface of the problem. The regularity with which their activity continues shows that mere attritional action has been unable to contain the spread of the movement which in Punjab is purely intelligentsia-based. All that the police have so far succeeded in doing is to

bring about periodic lulls whenever they shoot a couple of extremists in an encounter. But these lulls have always been short-lived.

In Punjab the Naxalite movement came into being in 1968 when about 50 members of the Communist Party with extremist leanings separated from the party. They formed the nucleus around which the movement was built. That very year they are said to have attacked the police on two occasions at Bhikhiwind village and later at Chamkaur Sahib. The extermination of "class enemies"—a category that includes landlords, moneylenders and other such "oppressors", witnesses, detractors of Maoist ideology and police officers—began in 1969. In August last year, alleged Naxalites gunned down a Swatantra Party MLA, Mr Basant Singh, at his farm near Patiala, and this is when the politicians and the police came to take notice of the magnitude of the menace. In March this year the student son of a senior police officer was stabbed to death in his hostel room in Chandigarh. Two policemen including a Deputy Superintendent and several landlords have also fallen victim to the Naxalites in recent months.

The Naxalites are well entrenched in the Sangrur, Bhatinda, Jullundur and Hoshiarpur districts. Well over 50 murders have been committed by them since the beginning of 1970, the number of attempted murders being much larger. The police on their part have in retaliation shot dead about 40 Naxalites in encounters during the same period. According to police estimates there are approximately 100 "hard core" Naxalites in the State, all in the age group of 18 to 35 years.

The most disquieting fact of all is the deep involvement of the students, teachers and Government servants in the movement. The orders issued recently by the State Education Department asking all principals and headmasters of district schools and colleges to be on the look out for Naxalites among the students and

teachers alike, constitute a pointer to this reality.

Were it not intelligentsia-based, the presence of the Naxalite movement would seem paradoxical in this prosperous State where neither an acute land problem nor any perpetual poor-rich confrontation exists. Even the farm worker in Punjab is probably the highest paid unskilled labourer in the country getting anything from Rs 8 to Rs 12 a day. Moreover the three-crop pattern allows neither the farmer nor the labourer any time for indulgence in political activity, extremist or otherwise. It is here that the educated but unemployed school and college students come into the picture. They form the mainstay of the Naxalite terrorist force along with some disgruntled, landless persons.

The college teachers and other such Naxalites are the brains of the movement as also the authors of the considerable extremist literature produced in the State. Punjab has probably the most prolific output of Naxalite literature in the country after West Bengal; the better known clandestine publications are "Lok Yudh" and "Hem Jyoti."

All the really important Naxalite ideologues have so far succeeded in eluding the police, with the result that the movement is spreading and keeping up its terrorist momentum. By the time the police have killed a dozen Naxalite "field workers", as the active terrorists are called, another three dozen have been indoctrinated by the ideologues to carry the Maoist message further.

Some students arrested by the police revealed that the ideologues organise study circles and brain-storming sessions to convert impressionable young students to the path of violence.

These students who become Naxalites have divided the countryside into zones, each zone comprising three to four villages. There is one common leader for every zone. They never attack in groups of less than five or more than seven, their principal targets being the police stations and armouries and Government treasuries. Recently a note was received threat-

tening a raid on the rural branch of a nationalised bank, but a large police posse was stationed at the bank and the raid never materialised.

According to the police, Punjab Naxalites are known to have direct links with West Bengal. Many of them go there regularly for "intensive training".

Pockets of Naxalite influence exist in the Punjab University at Chandigarh and the Punjabi University at Patiala. An engineering college in a major Punjab town is known to be a hotbed of Naxalite activity. Chandigarh was considered to be a safe sanctuary for Naxalites until March this year when the student's murder put the police on their trail.

Last winter the walls of Gandhi Bhawan in the Punjab University campus were found plastered with Naxalite slogans and posters.

The Naxalites have also infiltrated into the Punjab Police Department as evidenced by the fact that on several occasions the terrorists were forewarned of police action against them.

Ever since the new Inspector General of Police, Mr Ashwini Kumar, took over, the police's attritional approach has intensified. In the process three printing presses, piles of Naxalite literature and huge caches of arms and ammunition have been recovered in raids on Naxalite hide-outs. From one suspect alone the police recovered as many as 95 hand grenades. Nearly 300 Naxalite sympathisers and supporters have been arrested under the Maintenance of Internal Security Act in recent weeks. That the rural population is itself opposed to such extremism was indicated by an incident in Sardulgarh, Bhatinda, on October 13, when a Naxalite was killed by some people who left anti-Naxalite posters at the spot.

The police, however, are acting as if by their disregarding the gravity of the problem, the problem itself will vanish.

(From *The Indian Express*)

Letters

Is It "A New Style?"

Your editorial "A new style" (30 October 1971) has come to me as a surprise. A "safe guess" about the PLA was not necessary. Because, Lin Piao's photograph appeared in *Peking Review* No. 27 (2.7.71) and No. 32 (6.8.71); the joint editorial commemorating Army Day wrote that the Chinese People's Liberation Army is "commanded by Vice Chairman Lin" (PR 32, 6.8.71), a message to greet the 27th anniversary of the liberation of Rumania was also signed by "Vice Chairman Lin Piao" (PR 35, 27.8.71); A message to greet the 26th anniversary of the founding of DRVN was also signed by "Vice Chairman Lin Piao" (PR 37, 10.9.71); a message to greet the 23rd anniversary of the founding of DPRK was also signed by "Vice Chairman Lin Piao" (PR 38, 17.9.71).

And now, the latest *China Pictorial*. Its cover page has brought out a photograph of both the top leaders together, under the caption: Chairman Mao Tse Tung and his close comrade-in-arms Vice Chairman Lin Piao. Earlier photographs also bore the same caption.

It is an irony rather than a coincidence that the latest *China Pictorial* and your editorial were released on the same day.

"China is now showing a new style": In what contextual meaning has the word 'style' been used?

If it has been used to mean principle, I as yet cannot trace 'a new style'. Mao Tse-tung had said "we should be firm in principle; we should also have all the flexibility permissible and necessary for carrying out our principles" (Report to the 2nd plenary session of 7th CC of the CPC). Till date I do not know of any instance wherein they have either compromised or changed their principle.

If the word 'style' has been used to mean tactics, then the CPC has always favoured flexible and varying tactics. Tactics depend on the prevalent objective condition, which

change with time. Way back in 1928, Mao Tse-tung proved that "mistakes in tactics were made solely because of failure to distinguish between two kinds of period, that in which the regime of the ruling classes is temporarily stable and that in which it is split up" (the struggle in Ching-kang-san)

If the word 'style' is supposed to mean policy, then even today the overall policy of the CPC and PRC as such, remains unchanged. That policy is "to make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and crush our enemies one by one" (on Policy). Today, the imperialists are plagued with recurring crises (the present one is seventh in a row since 1967), their contradictions have sharpened and their infigths are bursting up to the surface. So naturally it would be wise to walk right into them (The struggle in Ching kang-shan) and further spread out the wing of socialism over the world people.

Mao Tse-tung has said time and over again: "the policy we adopt is of decisive importance" (On Policy) While fighting the Japanese imperialism the "basic policy" was "to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the anti-communist diehard forces". In "Current Problems of Tactics" we read: "Steady expansion of the progressive forces is the only way to prevent the situation from deteriorating, to forestall capitulation and splitting, and to lay a firm and indestructible foundation for victory". In the same work it was pointed out that "the winning over of the middle forces is an extremely important task for us". For isolation of diehard forces once again an incisive line of distinction was drawn. Pre-1943, Japanese imperialism was distinguished from the other imperialist forces, as it was Japanese imperialism that had actually committed aggression against China. Referring to the policy Mao Tse-tung had clearly said that "we deal with imperialism in the same way".

The General Line of 1960 and Lin Piao's report at the 9th congress of the CPC (ref.: Foreign Policy) had

NOVEMBER 6, 1971

stressed on US imperialism as the enemy of the world people without of course underrating other imperialist powers and Soviet social-imperialism. But on 20th May 1970, a clear line of distinction was made. The call went out: "People of the world unite and defeat the US imperialism".

Since then the progressive forces are being actively "developed," middle forces are being "won over". Anti-communist diehards like US imperialism and its running dogs (one being the Sato government) are being severely attacked. The PRC has been extending the same policy the world over—even to the home grounds of US imperialism. It is in this perspective that the virulence of attack on Soviet social-imperialism has been toned down somewhat, without of course slackening the vigilance against it.

The policy of uniting all forces that can be united, to isolate and attack the "most stubborn enemy", is not new so far as Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought are concerned.

Mao Tse-tung had scientifically predicted long ago—"the present situation in which the United States controls a majority in the United Nations and dominates many parts of the world is a temporary one, which will eventually be changed". One-half of the prediction has come true. The second half of the above prediction no longer appears to be a very remote possibility!

"The new style" is not 'odd...to Maoists abroad'. It is 'odd' to the 'ultras only'.

Mao Tse-tung himself defined the ultras or the extremists and reflected on their policies to say: "both extremist policies (all alliance and no struggle and all struggle and no alliance) caused great losses to the party and the revolution". His concept of united front is that it "combines alliance and struggle" and that "struggle is the means to unity and unity is the aim of struggle".

If the extremists with one hand wave the red flag of Mao Tse-tung Thought and with the other continue

to commit "Left" or Right errors, then it is they who are to blame and not the Party members and cadres as a whole.

Han Suyin's statements are neither new nor do they present a surprise. China not only wants friendly relations with India and Pakistan (to name only two) but also friendly relations between India and Pakistan, without either or both of them being under the clutches of U.S. imperialism. Such friendly relations are for uniting all possible forces that can be united to fight against the principal enemy of the world people—U.S. imperialism. This is, as outlined earlier, an old policy.

To the CPC and PRC "negotiation" is nothing new. China and CPC have always advocated negotiation as the primary weapon to settle differences with other countries. Twenty-five years ago the CPC even allowed U.S. representative Patrick Hurley to fly into Yenan and mediate as a "third party" between the CPC and KMT.

The overall policy is to give the enemy 'tit for tat'. But how to give 'tit for tat' depends on the situation. If the enemy wants to fight, then he must be fought (without losing the initiative at any stage) and wiped out. If the enemy wants to negotiate then to decline on occasions would mean 'tit for tat' and on other occasions to go for negotiations can be the 'tit for tat' reply—all depends on the prevalent subjective condition and the forces that are at play.

The PRC's approach to E. Pakistan is based on the following: "The communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only; 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interest of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere

represent the interests of the movement as a whole" (*Communist Manifesto*).

Socialist China's 'style' of work is not 'new', but quite different.

One may recall the speech that Dr Norman Bethune gave to describe his personal experiences in Soviet Russia. Others who had visited the country along with him had described the happenings there as odd and quizzing. Dr Bethune referred to them and their descriptions as 'Malice in Blunderland'. He explained that Soviet Russia, being a country with a socialist social system, was quite different and even opposite to the world outside its borders—one may even have to walk on his head to recognise things in the perspective "outsiders" are used to seeing. Today, one may very well say the same about Socialist China.

That is why we do not find hourly health 'bulletins' from the 'palace' or such other kingly abodes. We do not find news of every 'tour' or even a 'sneeze'. Whether a fraternal party in a banquet toasts a particular leader is too trivial a matter to be even reckoned, specially to those who are fighting for the victory of socialism and proletarian culture.

I humbly present the above for review and criticism. I have said all this not for vilification but because I am, like many others, a keen reader of *Frontier*—a friend and admirer too. If I have said anything wrong, I shall appreciate scathing criticism for my rectification.

P. NAG
Howrah

Of Boys And Brutalities

"They chained the boys, dragged them in and locked them up in small cells where the sun never enters and wherefrom the old air never retires to make way for the new. The boys coughed, it was cold, gasped for air and cried aloud in anger and distress. The cries got muffled in the cells...

"They brought 'food' for the boys.

The boys glanced at it and said 'this is bullshit'; at which they laughed and said 'but it is good enough for you'. The boys could not and not want to eat, whereupon they said 'you will go without bullshit even'. The young ones starved and shouted. The shouts got lost in the murky cells...

"They locked them in the cells round the clock and every day. The boys cried: 'allow us out at least to answer calls of nature'. But they said 'you have a mud pot which is enough for the best of God's creation, and you are the very worst'. 'The pots are not cleaned for days' shouted the boys. Their shouts were drowned in the stench and the filth...

"And, then, a very young one in very high fever said 'My mother, I am told, is dying. Please let me see her before I die.' But they said, 'You will neither see nor be seen'. The young one cried in pain and despair. The strong cells, however, took care to silence the shriek".

You may wonder who they are and who the boys are. The boys could be the young Christians, and they, their Roman overlords or the boys could be the hapless Jews in Germany and they, their Nazi masters.

They are not. Here, the boys are the 'Naxalites' in Visakhapatnam jail and they are their jailors. And though the situation is not exactly alike, it is almost similar. Matters are heading towards an explosion. There was a clash and a hunger-strike in Hyderabad; there was a demand from prisoners in Tirupati asking for humane treatment in Visakhapatnam. The authorities are doing their very best to prod and provoke the prisoners into a revolt. Because, though the boys have all the guts, the authorities have all the guns. And the sooner the guns and the guns

meet in action, the better it is for the latter. In such an event, you see, the public can be spared the 'unseemly' trouble of witnessing a legal trial of the Naxalites.

Not that taking the boys for the trial is much trouble for the police and jailors. The boys can be taken in hooded and heavily guarded vans and by discreet routes to a court which is specially located on the extreme tip of India's eastern border, within less than a stone's throw from the sea, where the public would not gather, where the few that take interest in the trial and come to court can be marked and noted and later harassed and where the harangues, the shouts, the slogans, the slangs and the cries of the Naxalites can conveniently be contained and left to be lost in the sounding of the waves. They might as well have located the court in a ship anchored off the coast, thus 'immunising' the public from the dangerous Naxalite slogans and lectures.

Not that they cannot do it. But, you see, however small it might be, it is still a bother and a headache. The best way out is to have no boys at all, so that there need be no trouble of locating any court anywhere to try them.

R. VISWANATH SASTRY
Hyderabad

This is a piece by a well-known revolutionary writer. Mr Sastry wrote it after hearing about the treatment meted out to prisoners by the Jail Superintendent in Visakhapatnam, a notorious jailor transferred from Rajahmundry where he killed two prisoners by beating them.

Government Violence

News agencies operating in West Bengal are reporting a decline in violence. Do the figures include all the casualties, for instance, those inflicted by the State Police, the Central Reserve Police, the Centres's, Secret Service personnel and the Armed Forces' jawans engaged in combing not

'merely' "Naxalite" dens but also campuses and hostels of the Jadavpur and Visva-Bharati universities? It is a diabolical piece of omission to put the reading public in blinkers, and hide the facts of genocidal killing indulged in by the redoubtable roughnecks of the Congress(R) in Cossipore-Baranagar. How long can the establishment keep back stark, brutal facts of administrative murder, of intelligence police in plain clothes flicking off young men and students in Howrah station's IIIrd class waiting room, at the cross-roads of Cossipore-Sinthee-Baranagar area, at exit points leading to the Ganges, in Birbhum's obscure villages, on the streets of Ashokenagar, Burdwan, Calcutta, Krishnagar? Why was there no judicial inquiry held into the police-managed murders of eight innocent youths in Barasat-Basirhat?

R. P. MULLICK
Lucknow

Self-Criticism

"After devoting more than twenty years of the collection and interpretation of historical material on the 19th century Bengal renaissance, I find many lacunae in the work done." This is how the famous Benoy Ghose opens his self-criticism. (September 25). Self-criticism is always welcome.

In his works, Benoy Ghose developed a sort of mechanical parallelism between the European Renaissance and the so-called Renaissance movement in Bengal. Throughout his research career he has been a victim of reasoning by analogy. He did not try to analyse the basic class-structure from a socio-economic standpoint and never took into account the typical environment of this British colony. Thus he failed to analyse the obliquity of European influence on Bengal through the imperialist Britain and could not clearly point out the crisis of our rootless new culture. But it is heartening to note the belated signs of sanity, though he still seems to be under the spell of analogy.

SATYAJIT CHAUDHURY
Naihati

NOVEMBER 6, 1971

For Frontier contact
People's Book House
Meher House,
Cowasji Patel Street,
Fort, Bombay

Before you have another child

think

wouldn't you first
like to give this child
all the care he needs?



Help him take his first steps in learning. Make sure he gets all the things you're planning to give him. But if another child should come along too soon, this may not be easy. Wouldn't you prefer to avoid this?

Millions of couples all over the world are doing just that. They put off having another child till they are ready for it. You too can do this with NIRODH. It's the world's most popular rubber contraceptive for men. Remember, NIRODH is the safest, simplest method of Family Planning and has been used successfully for generations. So why don't you too use NIRODH.

Available everywhere at only 15 paise for 3 because it is subsidised by the Government.



Until you want another child, use

NIRODH

the rubber contraceptive millions choose

Sold by : General Merchants, Chemists and Druggists,
Provision Stores, Pan Shops, Etc.

611/11

**WE ARE SOLE DISTRIBUTORS
IN EASTERN INDIA FOR:**

DEPEND
ON
US...
YOUR
SOUND
COMPANION

MURPHY

Radio

POLYDOR

Record

AHUJA

P. A. Equipment, Stereogram,
Stereo Amplifier, Tape Recorder

PYE

Car Radio

ARCEY

Car Aerial, Condenser
Suppressor

MECOM

Intercommunication



DEBSONS PRIVATE LIMITED

CALCUTTA • PATNA • JABALPUR
CUTTACK • GAUHATI

BEV/AS/DPL/7