

janata

Vol. 73 No. 11
April 8, 2018

Kashmiri Pandits' Dilemma
Kuldip Nayar

**Rewriting of History and
Sectarian Nationalism**
Ram Puniyani

**Inequality Neither Inevitable
Nor Irreversible in 2018**

**Bhai, We Pledge To Continue
the Fight to
Fulfil Your Dreams . . .**

Editor :
G. G. Parikh

Managing Editor : Guddi

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Mumbai - 400 007.

Email : janataweekly@gmail.com
Website: www.janataweekly.org

Veteran Socialist Leader Bhai Vaidya (22 June 1928–2 April 2018) Passes Away

Qurban Ali



Bhalchandra Vaidya, popularly known as Bhai Vaidya, passed away on April 2, 2018 at Poona

Hospital in Pune, at about 8 in the evening. 89-year-old Bhai Vaidya was admitted to Poona Hospital on March 26, 2018, after he became seriously ill. He had been diagnosed with cancer in the pancreas only 18 days ago. He was cremated at Vaikuntha crematorium in Navi Peth, Pune on 3rd April, 2018. He is survived by his son Abhijit, daughter Prachi Rawal, a grandson and a grand-daughter.

According to his son Abhijit who is a cardiologist, “on March 9, Bhai Vaidya complained of heaviness in the abdomen following which he was advised a sonography test. It was indicative of cancer. The next day he underwent magnetic resonance imaging and other tests which diagnosed him with pancreatic cancer.” On March 26, he complained of breathlessness

following which he was admitted to Poona Hospital and Research Centre. “His condition slowly deteriorated,” said Abhijit. “He was conscious and had a 10-minute talk with NCP leader Sharad Pawar when he visited him in the hospital on March 28.” He led a very active and energetic life till the very end, said Abhijit.

Born on June 22, 1928, at Dapode village of Pune’s Velhe Tehsil, Bhai Vaidya did MA in Sociology and Political Science. Swept in the flush and enthusiasm of the 1942 Quit India movement, Vaidya had his first brush with political activism before he turned 15 as an Indian freedom fighter.

He joined the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) in 1946. Then played a major role in socialist movement while working in the Socialist Party, Praja Socialist Party, Samyukt Socialist Party and Janata Party. He actively participated in the Quit India Movement of 1942, the Goa Liberation Movement of 1955, the Kachch Satyagraha of 1956 and the JP movement of 1974.

Bhai Vaidya was a vocal opponent of Emergency even during his Mayor-ship, when he organised a rally of 20,000 people at Shaniwar Wada in Pune and got arrested. He was jailed during the Emergency from 1975 to 1977. As a freedom fighter and a lifelong activist who fought for the rights of Dalits, farmers and backward classes, Bhai was in jail 28 times. Bhai Vaidya was at the forefront of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti movement with his mentor Shreedhar Mahadev Joshi and other influential leaders of the time.

In his political career which spanned over 60 years, he was elected several times to the Municipal Corporation and later he became the Mayor of Pune city during 1974–75. He was the first president of the All India Mayor Association. He was elected as a Member of the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in 1978 and was Minister of State for Home in Sharad Pawar's cabinet

between 1978–80, in Maharashtra State.

He is well known for many reformative decisions during his short stint in the Home Ministry, especially changing the police uniforms from half pants to full pants and refusing huge bribes from smugglers with his honest and uncompromising attitude.

He participated in the Bharat Yatra in 1983 with former Prime Minister and then Janata Party President Chandra Shekhar. He was also the National General Secretary of Janata Party from 1986 to 1988. He took over as National General Secretary in the Samajwadi Jan Parishad (SJP) formed in 1995 and held the post till 1999. In 2011, after the re-establishment of the Socialist Party in Hyderabad, he became its first National President and guided the party till 2016.

Bhai Vaidya was an uncompromising opponent of neo-liberalism/neo-imperialism

that came with the new economic policies introduced in 1991, and led several movements against its impact on Indian society.

In an age of corruption and compromised political ideals, he stood above the squalor of petty realpolitik, maintaining his dignity through his rectitude and near-legendary honesty.

For last 10 years of his life he fought for free health and education. He is known as an honest politician and a fierce socialist leader/activist who never compromised on his morals and values during his career. He was one of the few prominent survivors of socialist movement in India.

Vaidya was among the last in a fading constellation of socialist leaders. Renowned for probity in public life, he was a staunch adherent of socialist values and ideals. RIP Bhai Vaidya.

Email: qurban100@gmail.com

Kashmiri Pandits' Dilemma

Kuldip Nayar

Chief Minister Mehbooba Mufti has said that the Kashmiri pandits should visit their place of origin, meaning thereby the valley. Her remark is like splashing salt on the wind. The pandits were forcibly ousted from Kashmir in 1993. Their fault was that they were Hindus in the 90-percent Muslim Valley.

Former state chief minister Farooq Abdullah has admitted in a public statement that no Muslim from the valley objected to their ouster. It is, indeed, true. He resigned from the position of chief minister

which led to presidential rule in J&K. It is alleged that then governor Jagmohan was primarily responsible for facilitating the exodus of Kashmiri pandits. The day he was appointed as governor, a large number of Kashmiri pandits were forced to leave the valley because of his pro-Hindu stance.

It was being alleged that security forces searched each and every house in Srinagar when hundreds of militants were found to be in possession of weapons. Most of them were arrested but during the

operation, which led to Gawkadal massacre, questions came to be raised on the role of the governor. Jagmohan, who was very close to Sanjay Gandhi, was also instrumental in forcefully destroying many slums in Delhi in the name of beautification.

The Kashmiri pandits began to leave the Valley in greater numbers in the 1990s during the eruption of militancy, following persecution and threats by radical Islamists and militants. In 2010, the Government of Jammu and Kashmir noted that

808 pandit families were still living in the Valley, and that the financial and other incentives put in place to encourage others to return there had been unsuccessful.

According to a Jammu and Kashmir Government report, 219 members of the community had been killed in the region between 1989 and 2004 but none thereafter. However, in July 2017, the Supreme Court refused to reopen 215 cases in which over 700 members of the Kashmiri pandit community were killed in Jammu and Kashmir in 1989, citing the passage of time.

The appeal now by Chief Minister Mehbooba Mufti is a step in the right direction. During her appeal, following an interaction with Kashmiri pandits in Delhi, she said that “Kashmiri Pandits should visit Kashmir (and) their younger generations should see where their roots really lie. We will make all arrangements. Whatever has happened in the past is unfortunate but now we will have to move forward,” she said.

In fact, she also urged Prime Minister Narendra Modi to take a leaf out of former Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee's book and initiate a dialogue with Pakistan. “I urge Prime Minister Modi to talk to Pakistan just like Vajpayee ji did. Neither are we nor is Pakistan in a condition to fight a war, both countries know now that if there will be a war, nothing will be spared. Both the nations will just lose everything,” she added.

I do agree with her because this is not a Hindu-Muslim question and should not be made into one. All political parties need to initiate steps which will enable the pandits to return to the Valley. Most of their

property is intact. The rest must be taken back from the people who have occupied it forcibly or otherwise.

I recall the Hurriyat leader, Syed Shah Gillani, vehemently denying that it was Hindu-Muslim question. At that time, the bug of fundamentalism had not bitten Gillani. He may not have changed his views. But he is conspicuous by his silence. He should have renounced his earlier stance: the Kashmiri pandits are part of our culture and should not be mixed with the general Hindu-Muslims question. Gillani, in fact, told me that he had wrongly stated earlier that the Kashmiri pandits' question would be settled with the overall Kashmir dispute.

But Home Minister Rajnath Singh has unnecessarily given an opening to those who argue that Kashmir is an unfinished task of partition. They want the state to be divided on religious grounds. Someday they will also try in Pakistan to re-emphasise their contention that the criterion of religion—on the basis of which India was divided—should be extended to Jammu and Kashmir.

Then chief minister Mufti Mohammad Sayyed had mooted an idea of having a separate area where the Kashmiri pandits can safely reside. At present, 30,000 of them are reportedly in Kashmir while their total number is around four lakh. As long as Sheikh Abdullah was dominant in the affairs of Kashmir, he did not allow religion to play any role in politics. He would say that he was opposed to the state's integration with Pakistan because Jammu and Kashmir was a secular state. He did not want to join an Islamic country because he preferred

pluralism to communalism.

Even during the independence struggle, the Sheikh sided with the Congress instead of the Muslim League which demanded a separate homeland for the Muslims. He paid the price for being critical of New Delhi's policy of wanting a strong Centre. After being detained for 12 years at Kodaikanal in the South, he stayed with the then Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to register that Nehru had realised his mistake of misjudging the Sheikh when he demanded that the Centre should only administer three subjects—Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications—as was offered at the time of partition.

The Sheikh's famous statement was that Kashmiris would not eat Indian wheat if it meant compromising their autonomous status. The Sheikh's faith in secularism was deep although he wondered whether India would stay pluralist in the long run.

Whether the Kashmiris realise it or not, in the expulsion of Kashmiri pandits, they have lost the services of highly trained people. The pandits have gone to other parts of India and have found jobs because of their high qualifications. They are not likely to go back even if the state offers them equivalent jobs. In fact, Kashmir has lost the cream of youth which is technically well equipped to help the state develop economically.

Yet Srinagar should make efforts to get the pandits back because that will give them the secular image which they had enjoyed for decades. Lack of efforts on this front would only alienate them from the rest of the country where the Kashmiris are gainfully employed.

Email: kuldipnayar09@gmail.com

Rewriting of History and Sectarian Nationalism

Ram Puniyani

With the Hindu nationalist BJP in the seat of power, an exercise in history writing is being undertaken on lines parallel to what was done in Pakistan. So far we did keep hearing loudly about the communal version of medieval history, where villainous foreigners, the Muslim kings, attacked India, spread Islam and destroyed Hindu temples. The latest sample of this version is seen in the glorification of Rana Pratap as a great Hindu nationalist, freedom fighter, etc. Lately it is being said that he had defeated Akbar's army in Haldighati! Another theory being propounded is that Aryans, from whom Hindus are supposed to have derived their lineage, were the ancient natives of this land and that Harappa and Mohenjo-daro were part of Aryan culture!

Now to put an official seal on "Hindu first" version of history, the Modi Government has appointed a committee, the aim of which is to work on these lines so as to prepare a report which will form the basis for making the syllabus of school books. The panel is referred to in government documents as the committee for "holistic study of origin and evolution of Indian culture since 12,000 years before present and its interface with other cultures of the world". Union Culture Minister Mahesh Sharma, while announcing the panel said that the long-taught version that people from central Asia arrived in India only some 3,000 to 4,000 years ago and transformed the population needs questioning.

In this panel, one aspect which is the major focus of study is ancient Indian history, especially the origin of Aryans. There are various versions of this. Jyoti Rao Phule attributed the coming of Aryans to be the invasion which led to the oppression of low castes here. Lokmanya Tilak went by the theory that Aryans, the people of a superior race, had come from Arctic zone. While the RSS's second Sarsanghchalak did not want to contradict Tilak, he was also aware that if Hindu superiority and exclusive ownership of this land is to be asserted, Aryans have to be presented as the 'original natives'. And so he claimed that while Tilak was right in saying that Aryans came from Arctic zone, the Arctic zone was earlier located in our Bihar and Orissa areas and later shifted to north through the movement of the land mass!

The primary source for theories about the origins of Aryans in the Indian subcontinent has been the study of Indo-Aryan languages. The major current theory is that there might have been several waves of migration, through which the Aryans came here. The remains of the Indus valley civilisation, as well as Harappan and Mohenjo-daro culture show that this was an urban culture. On the other hand, the Vedas, the major source for understanding Aryans, show that they were a village-based pastoral society. Thus, the two cultures are very different from each other, proving that there is no continuity between the people of the Indus valley culture and

the later Vedic people. However, RSS historiography has nothing to do with historical evidence; they believe in concocting evidence to prove their theories. To prove that the Indus valley civilisation was Vedic, RSS historians have tried to manipulate evidence on a computer to show that a unicorn depicted on a broken Harappan seal is actually a horse and is therefore an Aryan seal—the Indus valley people did not have horses, whereas the Vedic people had horses.

Today, there are various genetic studies too which prove the migration of Aryans into India from Central and Western Asia. Now, a committee with a prime mandate of 'Hindu First' has been asked to prepare a report. Why this wasteful exercise in the face of so many other pressing problems? Eric Hobsbawm has pointed out, 'History is to Nationalism, what poppy is to an opium addict!' Sectarian nationalism always wants to take its history as back as possible to strengthen its claim of exclusive control over the land. In Pakistan the marginalisation of Hindu minority has run parallel with the theory that Pakistan was formed with Mohammad bin Kasim winning over Sind. In their syllabi, all Hindu kings are missing, the role of Indian National Congress, Gandhi and Nehru in the freedom struggle is not mentioned. Here in India, Hindu nationalists begin with the political assertion first formulated by Savarkar that all those regarding this land as 'holy land and father land' are Hindus. So logically, the ancient

lineage has to begin with Hindus, irrespective of the fact that the word Hindu itself came into vogue in the 8th century.

It is remarkable that leaders of Indian nationalism, Gandhi (in his book *Hind Swaraj*) and Nehru (in his classic *Discovery of India*), saw the country as belonging to people of all religions, with the interaction between religions giving rise to a syncretic plural culture, giving rise to aspects of unity in diversity. The cultures interact, influence each other and change over a period of time, all the time. This is what came out in the very significant UN document 'Alliance of Civilisations'. For academic interest, genetic studies have already shown that the birth of

Man took place in South Africa, from where humans moved to all over the globe, debunking Eurasian origin theory. The interaction of cultures is not one sided, it is a process taking place over time and evolving. The UN document concludes that all the societal progress has been due to the interaction of cultures. This is the view of inclusive Indian nationalism as well.

In Hindu nationalist view, which is being espoused by Modi and company for this panel, 'Hindu first' is the starting presumption. It can be understood that all observations and results of this panel will be guided by that dictum. The construction of past for present political goals is with the aim of deriving legitimacy

to suppress and marginalise those who do not fit into their definition of Hindu, or to force everybody to adopt Hindu norms as defined by them. A deliberate attempt is being made to 'pick and choose' those aspects from the past which give foundation to Hindu sectarian nationalism. The aim of this entire exercise is to prove that Hindu lineage goes several thousand years into the past; even though the fact is, this should not matter in a democracy. The Indian Constitution correctly begins with 'We the People of India'; in contrast to this, the statement, 'We the Hindus' is being gradually made to dominate.

Email: ram.puniyani@gmail.com

Against False Conflation: JFK, MLK, and the Triple Evils

Paul Street

Two Murders

I do not pretend to know the full stories behind the assassinations or executions of either John F. Kennedy (JFK) or Martin Luther King, Jr., the latter killed in Memphis, Tennessee, exactly 50 years ago today. Were one or both them killed by lone gunmen? By the CIA? The FBI? Organized crime? The US military? Some combination of these?

There are good reasons to doubt the official stories and suspect 'deep state' conspiracies in both cases. But don't ask me for any definitive answers. I don't have any and I doubt I ever will. (Don't ask me about Bobby Kennedy either).

I can, however, definitively mark as absurd the messages I periodically get from purportedly left people telling me to see the killing of JFK

in the same light as the murder of Dr. King—as if both iconic 1960s figures were great peoples' leaders fighting heroically for racial equality, social justice and peace.

JFK Atop the Triple Evils

That, it can be definitively said, is nonsense. The super-wealthy corporate-liberal and proto-neoliberal JFK spent the lion's share of his presidency on the wrong side of each of what King called "the triple evils that are interrelated": racism, economic injustice (capitalism) and militarism. Kennedy is a false progressive idol of the highest order.

Let's start with the second of King's "triple evils"—class rule. "The role played by twentieth-century Presidents," political

scientist Bruce Miroff noted 42 years ago, "has been characteristically conservative. 'Liberal' as well as 'conservative' Presidents . . . have bent their strongest efforts, not to alter, but to preserve America's dominant institutions. Whatever their professed sympathies, their actions have served, not to redistribute wealth and power, but to perpetuate existing inequalities . . . [serving as] central figures in the maintenance of established [hierarchical] socioeconomic arrangements."

As Miroff demonstrated in his forgotten 1976 classic *Pragmatic Illusions: The Presidential Politics of John F. Kennedy*, JFK was no exception to the rule. More than a decade before neoliberal Democrats emerged to explicitly steer the Democratic Party further to the

corporate right, JFK's superficially declared sympathies for the poor and working-class took a back seat in his White House to "the real determinants of policy: political calculation and economic doctrine."

As Miroff explained, political cunning "led Kennedy to appease the corporate giants and their allies in government." Economic doctrine "told him that the key to the expansion and health of the economy was the health and expansion of those same corporate giants. The architects of Kennedy's 'New Economics' liked to portray it as the technically sophisticated and politically neutral management of a modern industrial economy. It is more accurately portrayed as a pragmatic liberalism in the service of corporate capitalism."

The regressive nature of JFK's "New Economics" was cloaked by his recurrent, much-publicised spats with certain members of the business community (the executives of US Steel above all), his repeated statements of concern for labor and the poor, and his claim to advance a purely "technical" and "pragmatic" economic agenda that elevated "practical management" and administrative expertise above the "grand warfare of ideologies."

JFK inhabited the same centrist, cautious, cunning and "pragmatic" place on the first of King's "triple evils"—racism. Kennedy might have found it politically useful to intervene on King's behalf during the latter's jailing in the election year of 1960 and, later, to wrap himself in the aura of racial progress and equality by offering some partial and belated federal protections to the civil rights movement (CRM). But the Kennedy administration worked hard to divide and dilute

the CRM, seeking to channel it into staid and narrow legal and electoral grooves. The JFK White House gave some elementary shelter to activists and Southern blacks only when the president and his practically co-presidential brother and Attorney General Bobby Kennedy calculated that rabid white Southern reaction was undermining their ability to sell the United States as a model of enlightened "democracy" in its Cold War contest with the Soviet Union for the allegiances of the nonwhite Third World.

Subsequent elitist 'Mississippi Burning' revisionism notwithstanding, the Kennedy administration was no great friend of the struggle for black equality. Its response to the black freedom movement was dominated by the tension between two competing political calculations: (1) the threat of politically alienating white Americans, above all traditionally Democratic and white Southerners; and (2) the risk of losing Third World hearts and minds in the supposed US struggle to advance 'freedom and democracy'. Kennedy and his brother bent over backward to accommodate Southern racists, leaving them feeling free to kill and maim civil rights activists in the deep South. When the federal Civil Rights Commission announced that it would investigate racist violence in Mississippi, the younger Kennedy denounced the commission as being like the House Un-American Activities Committee "investigating Communism." When NAACP leader Medgar Evers was shot down in his own driveway, Bobby Kennedy said that it was not the federal government's job to protect black activists. It was up the state of Mississippi.

The real experience and struggles of black Americans were not an especially relevant concern to the Kennedys. When Southern racist authorities managed to defeat the CRM without politically problematic and embarrassing violence (as in Albany, Ga., in 1962), the Kennedy administration was happy to withhold protection from King and his fellow activists. When racist police commissioner Bull Connor attacked black protesters in Birmingham, Ala., with high-pressure water hoses, dogs and batons in May 1963, JFK complained that the demonstrations were making the US "look bad in the world" and Bobby Kennedy claimed that 90 percent of the protesters had no idea why they were in the streets. Along the way, Kennedy appointed at least five segregationists to the federal judiciary, turning to the racist Mississippi senator, James Eastland, for advice on appointments. The Kennedy brothers were inordinately obsessed with alleged Communist connections to King and the CRM. They approved racist FBI director J. Edgar Hoover's regular and relentless police state surveillance, smearing and infiltration of the movement.

This ugly Kennedy history would be less surprising to liberals, perhaps, if they would carefully read JFK's bestselling, Pulitzer Prize-winning 1957 book *Profiles in Courage*. There, Kennedy foretold his coming weak civil rights record, purveying Southern white historical mythology by referring to the Reconstruction era after the Civil War as a "black nightmare . . . nourished by Federal bayonets."

Turning to King's third evil, JFK's foreign policy record was militantly imperial and militarist,

contrary to subsequent liberal and left hagiographers' weird determination to reinvent him as a man of the left. As Noam Chomsky noted in his 1993 study *Rethinking Camelot: JFK, the Vietnam War, and US Political Culture*, "One of the most significant legacies left by the [Kennedy] Administration was its 1962 decision to shift the mission of the [US-funded, equipped, and trained] Latin American military from 'hemispheric defense' to 'internal security'," leading, in the words of Kennedy's top Latin American counter-insurgency planner (Charles Maechling) to "direct [US] complicity" in "the methods of Heinrich Himmler's extermination squads. The shift to deadly internal repression was a natural corollary to Kennedy's "export-promoting" Alliance for Progress "development program," which benefited Latin American elites while drastically increasing Latin American unemployment.

When Kennedy was assassinated, the CIA and JFK's advisers were working with his approval to overthrow a democratically elected government and install a fascist military dictatorship in Brazil. The plan was carried out months later. "Brazil," Chomsky observed 11 years ago, "had a moderately populist-democratic government in the early 1960s. The Kennedy administration organised a military coup that imposed a neo-Nazi national security state that was the first of the plague that then spread throughout the continent to Chile, Argentina, Central America and then became one big massacre."

In Cuba, where Washington's Third World fascist allies had been overthrown and forced to flee after Fidel Castro and Che Guevara led a

popular socialist revolution in 1959, the Kennedy administration made repeated attempts to assassinate the nations' leaders and launched an ongoing campaign of terror and sabotage. After the US-run Bay of Pigs invasion operation that Kennedy inherited from Dwight Eisenhower failed spectacularly in its efforts to spark a rebellion against Castro in April 1961, Kennedy "asked his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy," writes historian Piero Gleijeses, "to lead the top-level interagency group that oversaw Operation Mongoose, a program of paramilitary operations, economic warfare, and sabotage he launched in late 1961 to visit the 'terrors of the earth' on Fidel Castro and, more prosaically, to topple him." This explicit terror campaign included the murder of 400 Cuban factory workers in early November 1962, less than two weeks after the Cuban missile crisis.

Kennedy understood the thoroughly conditional nature of "democracy" as a US foreign policy objective when he remarked that while the U.S. would prefer democratic regimes abroad, it will choose "a [pro-American dictator] Trujillo" over "a ['anti-American' dictator] Castro" if those were the only choices. "It is necessary only to add," Chomsky observed in 1991, that Kennedy's "concept of 'a Castro' was very broad," including anyone who challenged US power and global capitalism.

Then there's Vietnam. Kennedy "raised the level of [US] attack [on Indochina] from international terrorism to outright aggression in 1961-62," Chomsky said, justifying the use of US airpower to napalm social revolutionaries, defoliate Vietnamese countryside

and slaughter innocent peasants with the false claims that "we are opposed around the world by a monolithic and ruthless [Soviet-Marxist] conspiracy" and that failure to stop "Communism" in Vietnam would open the gates to Soviet world domination. After the epic failure of the CIA's Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba and the erection of the Berlin Wall in East Germany, Kennedy told *The New York Times'* James Reston in late 1961 that "[n]ow we have a problem in making our [anti-Communist Cold War] power credible, and Vietnam is the place."

Would Kennedy, as some of his liberal and left fans like Oliver Stone and James K. Galbraith (son of JFK assistant John Kenneth Galbraith) claim, have withdrawn US forces from Vietnam had he not been assassinated in late November of 1963? (Stone even made a blockbuster movie to claim that the supposed peace advocate JFK was murdered by the CIA to permit US escalation in Vietnam under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson, portrayed as an agent of the defense industry and right-wing military officers.). This has been a topic of dispute between and among left and liberal historians and researchers, including Rick Perlstein, Galbraith, Stone and Chomsky. They dispute the significance and meaning of JFK's apparent October 1963 'decision' and plan to remove US troops from Vietnam by the end of 1965. The winners in the debate are Perlstein and Chomsky, who correctly observe that that Kennedy's "withdrawal plan" was conditional on full US victory over the Vietnamese revolution and independence movement. It would not have been carried out, given harsh realities on the ground. As

Perlstein noted five years ago:

[W]hether John F. Kennedy's formal decision would be carried through in the interim between October 1963 and January 1966 was contingent on what happened in the future. One day this summer I issued a formal decision to go the beach. Then it rained. And so I did not go to the beach . . . And as anyone who knows anything about the Vietnam War knows, the people funneling intelligence to the president were alarmingly adept ('the military phase of the war can be virtually won in 1963') at claiming the sun was shining when it actually was pouring down rain. In fact, when it came to America's military prospects there, it was winter in Seattle just about all the time.

JFK's late-in-life public statements were consistent with Chomsky and Perlstein's sense that the doomed young president had no intention of pulling back from his mass-murderous assault on Vietnam until US "victory" was attained. In Fort Worth, just hours before the assassination, for example, Kennedy said that "without the United States, South Vietnam would collapse overnight." In the speech he would have delivered in Dallas, Kennedy was going to say that the US, in its role as "watchman on the walls of world freedom," had to carry out duties that were "painful, risky and costly, as is true in Southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task." In repeated public statements in the summer and early fall of 1963, Kennedy left no doubt that for him, withdrawal without "victory" was

unthinkable.

Even if Kennedy had survived and removed US forces from Vietnam, this would have meant only that JFK had decided that US-trained and US-equipped South Vietnamese troops and the US-funded regime of South Vietnam were capable of defeating the Vietnamese revolution without the further engagement of US troops—on the model, say, of the mass-murderous US-backed Suharto government in Indonesia.

The most nauseating claim made by members of the liberal Jack Kennedy cult holds that JFK heroically saved humanity from nuclear annihilation during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. I have shown in my previous writings (see my essay *The Cuban Missile Crisis vs. the Korean Missile Crisis*) that the truth is precisely the opposite. "In effect," the British journalist Joseph Richardson noted five years ago in an article properly titled *JFK's Lunatic Priorities During the Cuban Missile Crisis*, "Kennedy's government was prepared to risk a nuclear conflagration to safeguard US prestige. [Kennedy's] Secretary of State Dean Rusk jubilantly exclaimed after the first Soviet ships opted not to run the American blockade that 'we're eye ball to eye ball and I think the other fellow just blinked.'"

Had the Soviets not blinked, it is likely Rusk would not have been around to give his reaction. But for Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's determination to let humanity survive and the heroic intervention of a Soviet submarine commander named Vasili Arkhipov beneath the Western Atlantic in the early evening of October 27, 1962, it seems likely that Kennedy's reckless naval blockade and nuclear machismo

would have set off World War III. At the same time, Kennedy set the stage for the Strangelovian "one minute to midnight" moment by dramatically escalating the international arms race and with his incursions into Cuba, which provoked Castro into seeking a Soviet nuclear shield against US invasion.

Despite all this and more, JFK still maintains a strange reputation as an agent of peace and social justice among certain persistently deluded and bamboozled people of "the left." As the "Unrepentant Marxist" Louis Proyect noted in a sharp 2005 reflection on JFK's undeserved progressive standing, "the search for enlightened bourgeois leadership [past and present] seems never-ending."

MLK Against the Triple Evils

King, by contrast, really was a people's champion—never more than in his final year. You wouldn't know this from the neo-McCarthyite, and whitewashed narrative of King that is purveyed across the nation every year, especially during and around the national holiday that bears his name. This domesticated, bourgeois airbrushing portrays King as a mild liberal reformist who wanted little more than a few basic civil rights adjustments in a supposedly good and decent American System—a loyal supplicant who was grateful to the nation's leaders for finally making noble alterations.

This official Orwellian commemoration never says anything about the Dr. King who studied Marx sympathetically at a young age and who said in his last years that "if we are to achieve real equality, the United States will have to adopt a modified form of socialism." It deletes the King who wrote that

“the real issue to be faced” beyond “superficial” matters was the need for a radical social revolution. It deletes the King who went on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) in late 1967 to reflect on how little the Black freedom struggle had attained beyond some fractional changes in the South. He deplored “the arresting of the limited forward progress” Blacks and their allies had attained “by [a] white resistance [that] revealed the latent racism that was [still] deeply rooted in US society.”

“As elation and expectations died,” King explained on the CBC, “Negroes became more sharply aware that the goal of freedom was still distant and our immediate plight was substantially still an agony of deprivation. In the past decade, little has been done for Northern ghettos. All the legislation was to remedy Southern conditions—and even these were only partially improved.”

Worse than merely limited, King felt, the gains won by Black Americans during what he considered just the “first phase” of their freedom struggle (1955–1965) were dangerous in that they “brought whites a sense of completion”—a preposterous impression that the so-called “Negro problem” had been solved and that there was therefore no more basis or justification for further black activism. “When Negroes assertively moved on to ascend to the second rung of the ladder,” King noted, “a firm resistance from the white community developed . . . In some quarters it was a courteous rejection, in others it was a singing white backlash. In all quarters unmistakably, it was outright resistance.”

Explaining to his CBC listeners the remarkable wave of race riots

that washed across US cities in the summers of 1966 and 1967, King made no apologies for Black violence. He blamed “the white power structure . . . still seeking to keep the walls of segregation and inequality intact” for the disturbances. He found the leading cause of the riots in the reactionary posture of “the white society, unprepared and unwilling to accept radical structural change,” which “produc[ed] chaos” by telling Blacks (whose expectations for substantive change had been aroused) “that they must expect to remain permanently unequal and permanently poor.”

King also blamed the riots in part on Washington’s imperialist and mass-murderous war on Vietnam—the war that JFK initiated and had no intention of pulling back from short of US “victory.” Along with the misery it inflicted on Indochina, King said, the United States’ savage military aggression against Southeast Asia stole resources from Lyndon Johnson’s briefly declared and barely fought “War on Poverty.” It sent poor Blacks to the front killing lines to a disproportionate degree. It advanced the notion that violence was a reasonable response and even a solution to social and political problems.

Black Americans and others sensed what King called “the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same school. We watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village, but we realise that they would never live on the same block in Detroit,” King said on the CBC, adding that he “could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.”

Racial hypocrisy aside, King said that “a nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense [here he might better have said “military empire”] than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual doom.”

Did the rioters disrespect the law, as their liberal and conservative critics alike charged? Yes, King said, but added that the rioters’ transgressions were “derivative crimes . . . born of the greater crimes of the . . . policy-makers of the white society,” who “created discrimination . . . created slums [and] perpetuate unemployment, ignorance, and poverty . . . [T]he white man,” King elaborated, “does not abide by law in the ghetto. Day in and day out he violates welfare laws to deprive the poor of their meager allotments; he flagrantly violates building codes and regulations; his police make a mockery of law; he violates laws on equal employment and education and the provision of public services. The slums are a handiwork of a vicious system of the white society.”

Did the rioters engage in violence? Yes, King said, but noted that their aggression was “to a startling degree . . . focused against property rather than against people.” He observed that “property represents the white power structure, which [the rioters] were [quite understandably] attacking and trying to destroy.” Against those who held property “sacred,” King argued that “Property is intended to serve life, and no matter how much we surround with rights and respect, it has no personal being.”

What to do? King advanced radical changes that went against the grain of the nation’s corporate state, reflecting his agreement with

New Left militants that “only by structural change can current evils be eliminated, because the roots are in the system rather in man or faulty operations.” King advocated an emergency national program providing either decent-paying jobs for all or a guaranteed national income “at levels that sustain life in decent circumstances.” He also called for the “demolition of slums and rebuilding by the population that lives in them.”

His proposals, he said, aimed for more than racial justice alone. Seeking to abolish poverty for all, including poor whites, he felt that “the Negro revolt” was properly challenging each of what he called “the interrelated triple evils” of racism, economic injustice/poverty (capitalism) and war (militarism and imperialism). The Black struggle had thankfully “evolve[ed] into more than a quest for [racial] desegregation and equality,” King said. It had become “a challenge to a system that has created miracles of production and technology” but had failed to “create justice.”

“If humanism is locked outside the [capitalist] system,” King said on CBC five months before his assassination (or execution), “Negroes will have revealed its inner core of despotism and a far greater struggle for liberation will unfold. The United States is substantially challenged to demonstrate that it can abolish not only the evils of racism but the scourge of poverty and the horrors of war.”

There should be no doubt that King meant capitalism when he referred to “the system” and its “inner core of despotism.” This is clear from the best scholarship on King, including David Garrow’s epic, Pulitzer Prize-winning biography,

Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Council (HarperCollins, 1986).

No careful listener to King’s CBC talks could have missed the radicalism of his vision and tactics. “The dispossessed of this nation—the poor, both White and Negro—live in a cruelly unjust society,” King said. “They must organise a revolution against that injustice,” he added.

Such a revolution would require “more than a statement to the larger society,” more than “street marches” King proclaimed. “There must,” he added, “be a force that interrupts [that society’s] functioning at some key point.” That force would use “mass civil disobedience” to “transmute the deep rage of the ghetto into a constructive and creative force” by “dislocate[ing] the functioning of a society.”

“The storm is rising against the privileged minority of the earth,” King added for good measure. “The storm will not abate until [there is a] just distribution of the fruits of the earth.” The “massive, active, nonviolent resistance to the evils of the modern system” that King advocated was “international in scope”, reflecting the fact that “the poor countries are poor primarily because [rich Western nations] have exploited them through political or economic colonialism. Americans in particular must help their nation repent of her modern economic imperialism.”

King was a democratic socialist mass-disobedience-advocating and anti-imperialist world revolution advocate. The guardians of national memory don’t want you to know about that when they purvey the official, doctrinally imposed

memory of King as an at most liberal and milquetoast reformer. (In a similar vein, our ideological overlords don’t want us to know that Albert Einstein [*Time* magazine’s “Person of the 20th Century”] wrote a brilliant essay making the case for socialism in the first issue of venerable US-Marxist magazine *Monthly Review*—or that Helen Keller was a fan of the Russian Revolution.)

The threat posed to the official bourgeois memory by King’s CBC lectures—and by much more that King said and wrote in the last three years of his life—is not just that they show an officially iconic gradualist reformer to have been a democratic socialist opponent of the profits system and its empire. It is also about how clearly King analysed the incomplete and unfinished nature of the nation’s progress against racial and class injustice, around which all forward developments pretty much ceased in the 1970s, thanks to a white backlash that was already well underway in the early and mid-1960s (before the rise of the Black Panthers, who liberal historians like to blame for the nation’s rightward racial drift under Nixon and Reagan) and to a top-down corporate war on working-class Americans that started under Jimmy Carter and then went ballistic under Ronald Reagan.

Of the two martyrs JFK and King, only the latter posed radical challenges to American racism, classism, militarism and imperialism. JFK, by contrast, was an agent of each of those and other interrelated evils. If Kennedy was killed by the ‘deep state’, his murder was due to rivalries and resentments within the power elite. It had nothing to do with him posing some threat to the US domestic

and/or imperial order. If King was in fact killed by the military police state (and he may well have been), it's because he truly was an enemy of the reigning American capitalist and imperial system by the end of his life. He would have to be counted as one of many people of color who were murdered by the police state authorities during the 1960s and 1970s, alongside Malcolm X, Bobby Hutton, Fred Hampton, Mark Clark, Lawrence "Buddy" Lamont (Ogala Sioux) and Elliot Lames "LD" Barkley—to name just a handful of those liquidated by the authorities as punishment for engaging in popular resistance in those years.

**Courtesy : Counterpunch,
April 4, 2018**

Footprints of A Crusader (The Life Story of Mrunal Gore)

by
Rohini Gawankar

Published by
Kamalakar Subhedar

Secretary,
Samata Shikshan Sanstha,
Pareira Wadi,
Mohili Village,
Sakinaka, Ghatkopar (W),
Mumbai 400 072.
Mobile : 9820092255
Contribution : Rs. 300+

Bhai Vaidya was of a Different Mould

Julio Ribeiro

When I belatedly recognised the man on a bicycle on a crowded street in Pune City, I cut him a salute. I was travelling by car on one of my infrequent visits to Pune and did not expect to see my former boss on a cycle! I had forgotten that Bhai Vaidya was of a different mould than the normal politician. Using a form of transport that he could afford to pay for from his own resources was par for the course.

Bhai Vaidya was the Minister of State for Home in 1980 when I headed the Crime Branch in the Mumbai City Police. The Police Commissioner, Madhusudan Kasbekar, dealt with the Chief Minister and the Home Minister on a daily basis. As Crime Branch chief, I did interact with Bhai Vaidya but not as frequently as the Commissioner.

But Vaidya had more confidence and trust in me than he had for my chief as I found out later. I got a call from him to come and meet him at his home. He told me that he had been approached by a despicable character who wanted some work done for which he offered him a bribe of Rs 2 lakh. He wanted the man caught. I was in a fix. Obviously my boss, the Commissioner had not been informed. The Minister had warned me to not inform him about this operation. I consulted a close confidant in the police who advised me to share this information with the Anti-Corruption Bureau and entrust them with the job. By doing so, I could escape my immediate senior's

wrath. The operation was successful. The criminal was caught red-handed and later convicted.

Bhai Vaidya's wife was a working woman. If my memory serves me correctly, she was a teacher. Every day she set off to work by public transport. Some psychopathic officers tried to convince the Minister to advise his wife to travel in the government car provided to him for official use. Bhai Vaidya refused.

Bhai Vaidya is dead. He was made of different stuff from the politicians of today and even the majority of politicians of his day. I mourn his death as I would for any good man or woman. And in my imagination I will cut him another smart salute.

Courtesy: The Indian Express

The Unemployment Crisis: Reasons and Solutions

Contribution Rs. 25/-

Published by
Janata Trust & Lokayat
D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Grant Road (W),
Mumbai 400 007

Inequality Neither Inevitable Nor Irreversible in 2018

Earl Bousquet

Once upon a time it was impossible to even think of what inequality looked like around the world. Today, it's being assessed globally—and the pictures emerging are all too ugly.

The latest *World Inequality Report*, published on December 14, 2017, indicates that since 1980 the world's richest 0.1 percent (7,000,000 people) have boosted their wealth by as much as the poorest half of mankind: 3.8 billion people. Since then, the richest 1 percent have 'captured' 27 percent of the world's wealth growth; the 0.1 percent have gained 13 percent and the very top 0.01 percent (76,000 people) have 'collected' 4 percent.

Turbo-charged Inequality

The 100 researchers worldwide who contributed to the report found that inequality has worsened in both the European Union and the United States in the 40 years under review, but the situation is much worse in the United States.

The current annual income of the super-rich 1 percent in the United States has risen since 1980 by 205 percent, while for the top 0.01 percent it has ballooned by 636 percent. At the same time, the average annual wage of the bottom 50 percent (117 million adults) has stagnated at about \$16,000.

The report says the stark difference in wealth distribution in the United States is because "the tax system has become less progressive; the federal minimum wage has collapsed; unions have been weakened, and access to

higher education has become increasingly unequal." In addition, "deregulation in the finance industry and overly-protective patent laws have contributed to booms on Wall Street and in the healthcare sector, which now make up 20 percent of national income."

US President Donald Trump's highly vaunted 'Christmas gift' tax bill, the report says, will not only reinforce this trend, but "will turbocharge inequality in America" because what's presented as "a tax cut for workers and job-creating entrepreneurs" is instead "a giant cut for those with capital and inherited wealth." It will therefore "overwhelmingly benefit shareholders who can reap their additional profits without any extra work."

While inequality has also increased in Western Europe, the researchers found, it's been at a lower rate "as wage inequality has been moderated by educational and wage-setting policies relatively more favorable to low- and middle-income groups."

Hidden Hooks

Former US presidential candidate Senator Bernie Sanders has exposed the hidden hooks in Trump's fishy tax plan. He says that in order to curb a \$1.4 trillion deficit accumulated over 10 years, the Trump plan to railroad \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts through Congress will eventually amount to early and permanent payback rewards for the super-rich who backed his 2016 election campaign, eventually

condemning the middle-class and poor to eternal economic damnation.

Sanders posits that while the tax cuts for the corporations and the super-rich are permanent, benefits to working families will eventually expire after a few years, leaving as many as 83 million middle-class families paying more taxes, but Sanders is not the only critic of the loaded Trump tax bill.

Philip Alston, the United Nations special rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, was equally scathing in his condemnation of the Trump administration's policies and their effect on America's poor.

After touring six American states during a two-week period, he not only denounced growing inequality in the world's richest country, but also accused President Trump of racing to turn the United States into "the world champion of extreme inequality."

But exactly who are the world's richest and poorest: the 1 percent and the 99 percent?

Richest of the Rich

According to the *Bloomberg Billionaires Index*, the world's richest person is Jeff Bezos, the founder and chief executive of Amazon, with his \$98.8 billion fortune. In the space of the past year, his wealth has increased by a whopping \$33 billion.

The world's five richest people are Bezos, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, Berkshire Hathaway boss Warren Buffet, Zara owner Amancio Ortega and Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg, in that order. Between them, they own \$425 billion in

assets, equivalent to one-sixth of the entire GDP of the UK. And Bezos, Buffet and Gates—the top three—own as much as half the entire US population.

Across the Atlantic in the UK, the richest on record is the Hinduja family, which controls a conglomerate of businesses including car manufacturers and banks and is worth \$15.4 billion: just half of Bezos' earnings in a year.

Poorest of the Poor

In the United States, the world's richest country, there are officially 41 million poor people. Almost 13 percent of the population is living in poverty, including 13 million children, with 19 million adults (almost half the total) living in deep poverty and 9 million with no cash income at all.

Blacks comprise 13 percent of the US population, of which 23 percent are officially documented as living in poverty, comprising 39 percent of the nation's homeless. A lesser-known statistic is that the majority living in poverty across the United States—some 27 million—are white.

The UK poverty picture is hardly different. Poverty rates increased to 16 percent for pensioners and 30 percent for children last year, while one in five people (20 percent) are living in poverty.

One in eight UK workers, amounting to 3.7 million people, are not earning enough for their needs, while 40 percent of working-age adults living in poverty have no qualifications, making it even harder to earn better pay.

No Hope

The UK government is being urged by charities and trade unions to

unfreeze benefits; increase training for adult workers, and embark on a more ambitious house-building program to provide affordable homes for struggling families, but none of this seems to be even close to happening anytime soon.

Take the state of the British government's response to the plight of the victims of the west-London Grenfell Tower fire, which killed 70 people—including 18 children—and displaced 210 families in June.

A memorial mass was held at St Paul's Cathedral on December 14 to mark the six-month anniversary of the tragic inferno, attended by representatives of the British Royal Family, as well as Prime Minister Theresa May and Opposition Leader Jeremy Corbin.

The very same day, London health authorities indicated that while thousands of affected extended families and relatives are still mourning, survivors of the disaster face a new wave of post-traumatic stress, with chances of treatment hampered because so many remain homeless.

Only 45 of the more-than-200 affected families have been permanently resettled. Victims still cannot begin proper psychological treatment to address symptoms that include horrific flashbacks. In addition, 426 adults and 110 children are still in treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and other trauma-related issues.

Unhealthy Choices

It's not just in the United States and the UK that poverty is causing people to make stark choices. Almost 100 million people worldwide are pushed into extreme poverty each year because of debts accrued through healthcare expenses.

A report published by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank on December 13 found that the poorest and most vulnerable people are routinely forced to choose between healthcare and other household necessities, including food and education, subsisting on \$1.90 a day.

The report says that more than 122 million people are forced to live on \$3.10 a day—the benchmark for “moderate poverty”—due to healthcare expenditure. Since 2000, this number has increased by 1.5 percent every year.

The report says that 800 million people spend more than 10 percent of their household budgets on “out-of-pocket” health expenses. Almost 180 million spend 25 percent or more: a number increasing at a rate of almost 5 percent per year, with women among those worst affected.

In addition, only 17 percent of women in the poorest 20 percent of households around the world have adequate access to maternal and child health services, compared to 74 percent of women in the richest 20 percent of households.

Taxation Not Enough

“Progressive income-tax regimes not only reduce post-tax inequality, they shrink pre-tax inequality by discouraging top earners from capturing higher shares of growth via aggressive bargaining for higher pay,” the report's authors conclude.

They also note, however, that taxation alone is not enough to tackle the problem “as the wealthy are best placed to avoid and evade tax, as shown by the recent Panama Papers revelation that 10 percent of the world's wealth is profitably parked in tax havens.”

Taxation of the richest—commensurate with their fortunes—can always go a long way, but this is hardly ever treated with the seriousness necessary, especially when politicians depend on the super-rich for contributions in pursuit of power, as with the Trump tax bill.

Instead of trapping tax-evaders in their countries of origin, the overwhelming gubernatorial tendency in rich countries is to pursue and punish those poor countries that seek to overcome their inherited economic difficulties by offering healthy incentives for investment.

For example, the EU recently published a list of countries it's threatening to punish for not doing enough to dissuade rich tax evaders. All of them are small nations, mainly present and past European and American colonies left to fend for themselves after centuries of exploitation.

The rich, punishing nations harbor ambiguous laws assuring the super-rich that “tax avoidance is legal, but tax evasion isn't.” They also compete to attract the most profitable multinational corporations to their shores by offering over-generous tax-free incentives, allowing them to pay the lowest wages to the greatest numbers of poor workers.

Such ingrained guarantees will continue to widen existing inequality gaps everywhere, until the impoverished majority creates the mechanisms for taking full and real control of their destinies instead of investing their blood, sweat and tears in re-electing parties that promise the best and always deliver the worst.

What Can Be Done?

Across the world, the same questions arise: What's to be done?

Who's to do it? And where to begin?

There is a definite need everywhere to protect poor family households by ensuring the breadwinners not only have jobs, but that salaries ensure they can adequately take care of their families.

The authors of the *World Inequality Report* argue that never mind all these deadly facts, inequality is not inevitable. They argue that given the divergent paths documented, “it is possible for institutions and policymakers to tame the un-equalizing forces of globalization and technological change.”

“Just as the policymakers in the United States have made the distribution of income there less equal, they also have the power to make economic growth more equal again.” They also advise that “given the stagnant wages among the bottom 50 percent since the 1980s, governments should focus on how to create a fairer distribution of human capital, financial capital and bargaining power rather than limiting themselves to the redistribution of national income after taxes.”

This, the *Inequality Report* says, “will involve improving access to education; reforming labor market institutions to boost workers' bargaining power; raising the minimum wage; changing corporate governance to give workers a greater say in how profits are distributed, and making tax systems more progressive.”

The researchers conclude that “the United States has run a unique experiment since the 1980s—and the results have been uniquely disastrous. Bad policy can have a real impact on millions of lives for decades, but what government have

done, they can still undo.”

With 2018 on our doorstep, developing countries can still adopt new approaches to sustainable and sustained future development. Rather than perpetuating dependence on handouts from the super-rich to the extremely poor through the failed “trickle-down” economic formula, poor nations should devise new means of using their inherent natural and human resources to their maximum potential.

Janata

is available at

www.lohiatoday.com

**Acharya Javadekar
A Satyagrahi Socialist**



G. P. Pradhan

Price: Rs. 20/-

Janata Trust

D-15, Ganesh Prasad, Naushir
Bharucha Marg,
Grant Road (W), Mumbai 400 007.

Bhai, We Pledge To Continue the Fight to Fulfil Your Dreams . . .

Our dearest Sathi Bhai Vaidya, veteran socialist leader and ideologue and founder president of Socialist Party (India), passed away on April 2, 2018 at the age of 89. He had been diagnosed with pancreatic cancer only a few days ago, and had been hospitalised on March 26.

Bhai, as he was more popularly known and which was how we all addressed him, upheld the banner of socialism all his life. He was uncompromising in his struggle against capitalist globalisation. Whenever called to speak on the growing fascist offensive in the country, he was very clear that it was the twin brother of globalisation, and both needed to be fought together, and only fighting for democracy and secularism without talking of anti-capitalism will not lead us anywhere.

Over the past fourteen years since we established Lokayat, we had been gradually moving towards accepting the philosophy of democratic socialism. With the coming to power of the BJP in 2014 and the aggressive fascist offensive launched by it, we realised the need to not only work more closely but also politically unite with other like-minded socialist groups to fight the twin dangers of capitalist globalisation and fascism. It was mainly because of Bhai's principled stand for socialism and against capitalism and imperialism, his firm stand against opportunism and corruption in politics, his refusal to indulge in unprincipled compromises to somehow form coalitions and come to power, his fame for honesty

and uprightness, that led Lokayat to take the decision to affiliate with Socialist Party (India).

Bhai's simplicity is legendary. He would come down to our programs whenever we invited him and he would freely interact with our activists as an equal, and in all this, he never had any airs despite being such a senior national political leader. When we opened a party office in Gokhale Nagar slum, Bhai came down for its inauguration without any fuss and without bothering how many people would be there; he even offered to contribute Rs 10,000 every year from his pension towards its rent.

Bhai thoroughly enjoyed the songs of our cultural team, and would read all our booklets and give his comments. Whenever we went to his house, he would sit down with us as an equal, and would even make tea for us if the maid was not there at home! He would remember each activist's tastes, and would offer sweets and cakes to those of us fond of sweets, himself taking the pains to take them out from the fridge. There would be many magazines in the magazine rack outside his room, and he would ask us to take them for our activists.

Bhai was fully in agreement with our efforts to build a strong socialist cadre based movement. He came down to inaugurate all our Annual Meetings after we joined SPI, and gave inspiring speeches directed at the large number of youth who came down for the annual gathering. He would even sit through the entire first

session of three hours, appreciating and enjoying our presentations and cultural programmes.

Bhai was seriously concerned about the rapid growth of fascist forces in the country that were threatening the very conception of India as a sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic republic as enshrined in the Constitution of India. And so, together with Dr G.G. Parikh, he launched the platform 'We the Socialist Institutions' in an effort to bring together all socialist organisations and institutions. Lokayat has played an active role in this platform from the very beginning. Over the last two years since the founding of this platform, we have taken many initiatives, and Bhai was very appreciative of our efforts.

Bhai, we pledge to continue your efforts to bring together all the socialists as well as progressive and left forces of our country to fight the growing fascist onslaught, and build a strong cadre-based socialist movement that will advance the struggle to build a democratic and socialist India.

—Lokayat, Pune

Spectre of Fascism

Contribution Rs. 20/-

Published by

Janata Trust & Lokayat

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,

Naushir Bharucha Marg,

Grant Road (W), Mumbai 400 007



GANNON DUNKERLEY & CO., LTD.

An infrastructure company established since 1924

REGD. OFFICE

*New Excelsior Building, (3rd Floor),
A.K. Nayak Marg, Fort, Mumbai 400001.*

Tel. : 022 2205 1231

Fax : 022-2205 1232

Office :

Ahmedabad, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Mumbai & New Delhi