

Stalin: A Vindication

MARCH 5, the anniversary of Stalin's death, passed without official notice in Russia.

When, a few days after Stalin's death three years back, the Democratic Research Service attempted to hold a public meeting in North Bombay to discuss the situation opening up after Stalin's death, communist hooligans broke up the meeting by violence on the ground that the attempt to discuss Stalin's role otherwise than in terms of the hero worship current then was an insult to the dear departed demi-god's pious memory.

But now, how are the mighty fallen! We wonder whether, if in the next few weeks anyone were to attempt to hold another public meeting to protest against the current debunking of the departed Vozd and to evaluate objectively his role in history, the same communist hoodlums would attempt to disturb such a meeting in a similar manner? For now that the man to whom these stooges of the Kremlin used to offer the most venal flatteries and adulation has been denounced by their new Fuehrer of being "a mass murderer and torturer." Lesser lights abroad, like jackals attacking a dead lion, have chimed in. Sgr. Togliatti, the Italian *gauleiter*, accuses Stalin of "certain attitudes which turn out to be unjust, unacceptable and incomplete." Herr Ulbricht, his German counterpart, joins with charges of "increasing tendencies of personal despotism" and denies that Stalin was "the man who defeated German fascism." The latest to add his own little hiss is R. Palme Dutt, who has been the servile mouthpiece of the Kremlin for three decades for interpreting the ways of Moscow to India. Palme Dutt bravely adds his little kick to the dead dictator for "mistakes in judgment" and for "concentrating personal power in his own hands," and for "unjustly condemning many loyal comrades."

So far, so good. Those who have always made these criticisms of Stalin, even when he was in the heyday of his glory and power, will rejoice that at last the truth about this biggest tyrant of modern times is being admitted to the unfortunate people of the U.S.S.R. *Freedom First* has been amongst the small circle of journals which have expressed these views at a time when our Parliament and Assemblies adjourned in Stalin's honour and the Prime Minister

allowed himself to be led away so far as to describe Stalin as the beloved father of his people and a great lover of peace.

But who are these men who are now bravely tearing Stalin limb from limb? What were they doing throughout Stalin's lifetime? How clean are their own records and their own hands?

The answer is that each of these men — Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan and Molotov — was a willing and active accomplice in Stalin's reign of terror over the miserable Soviet peoples and that there is blood on the hands of each of them. They were his tools and creatures, sharing in the fruits of the ruthless exploitation of the Russian masses. Mr. Edward Crankshaw, the well-known British expert on Soviet affairs, describes these men as being in Stalin's lifetime "local tyrants". Among those "who earned a wider hatred than others," he names "Khrushchev with his brutality in the Ukraine, Malenkov brooding like a spider at the centre of the web which controlled the great purge, Bulganin the political overseer of the army."

For instance, Mr. A. Mikoyan, who was recently cooing sweet nothings into New Delhi ears, had referred to Stalin as recently as the 19th Party Congress in 1952 as the "genius-like architect of communism, our dear and beloved Comrade Stalin."

Now, in order to throw dust in the eyes of the world and to save their own skins from the hatred of the Russian people—and the riots in Georgia are only the first faint rumblings of the storm — these men are trying, in true Stalinist fashion, to make Stalin the big scapegoat for their own hated regime. Those who fall victims to this obvious dodge and see in these contemptible antics a return to normalcy are making yet another mistake of the same jejune kind they made in 1953 about Stalin's role.

These men in the Kremlin, with whom some are so ready to fraternise, are guilty men — with the blood of Soviet citizens and subject peoples in Europe and Asia on their hands. These are not the men through whom and under whom the suffering peoples of the Soviet Union will be liberated. Let us by all means rejoice in the disintegration of the Stalinist creed and the signs of its approaching doom. Truth is on the march. *Freedom First* is vindicated in its estimation of Stalin's role. History and the Russian people will in time prove us equally right in our abhorrence of what Bulganin and Khrushchev represent.

Notes

International Recognition For J.P.

BY electing Jayaprakash Narayan as one of its Honorary Chairmen in the distinguished company of Bertrand Russell, Karl Jaspers, Reinhold Niebuhr, Salvador de Madariaga and Jacques Maritain, the Congress for Cultural Freedom has honoured itself as well as Jayaprakash.

Next only to Acharya Vinoba Bhave, this former Marxist is today the leading exponent of Mahatma Gandhi's thought and way of life. Along with Vinobaji, he tends in a way to become this country's conscience. His impassioned protest against police excesses in dealing with disorderly students in Patna has now been vindicated by the findings of those appointed by Government to investigate into those unfortunate incidents. His recent appeal to the Maharashtrians to desist from pressing further their claims to Bombay and to all concerned to heal the wounds is in the best Gandhian tradition.

A founder member of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, Jayaprakash now becomes one of the doyens of this international organisation devoted to the values of freedom.

Unrest Among Warlis

THE hand of the Communist Party is evident in the disturbances among the Warlis in Dahanu Taluka. It is strange that these ignorant Adivasis should agitate for the inclusion of Bombay in Samyukta Maharashtra. Their mental horizon is totally ignorant of Maharashtra or Gujarat or the significance of Bombay city in the context of rival linguistic states. They have been led to wholesale destruction of haystacks and charcoal kilns, the pillaging of private and public property and attacks on government servants, for the greater part of February. There can be no two opinions about the communist sponsorship of this trouble among the Adivasis. Placards in Marathi were hung on trees demanding the release of Mrs. Godavari Parulekar, the communist peasant leader, who was arrested under the Preventive Detention Act in Bombay during the linguistic disturbances. Police officers said that the guerilla tactics of the Warlis prove "an intelligent network" in the area and "a master-mind" behind the disturbances generally. The arrested tribesmen confess that they were led by Lal Bavta (Red Flag) leaders for proclaiming the "workers' raj" in their area.

These events in the remote rural areas of the hill-tribes appear in strange contrast to the new policy of non-violence and co-existence proclaimed by the Soviet leaders in the recent 20th Congress of their Party held at Moscow. While their speeches (and

their interpretation by fellow-travellers and others) indicate that the communist parties throughout the world would give up their former role of legal obstructionism and illegal subversion, it is noteworthy that the communist party in India continues on the contrary to take full advantage of any difference of opinion or any occasion for strong feelings to promote disaffection and subversion against the government. The Central Committee of the Indian Communist Party seems to have endorsed such a policy of continuing the promotion of disaffection as opportunity arises in different parts of the country, even while proclaiming a policy of support to the Nehru government in matters of foreign relations and the Second Five Year Plan in general. The inner intention of the party seems to be to obtain support for themselves from the people, independently of the present leaning of the Nehru government towards Russian policies on the international stage.

Commemoration Of Masaryks

CZECHOSLOVAKS in exile celebrated last month the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, first President and Founder of Czechoslovakia. They recalled with sorrow also the death of Jan Masaryk, the son of the first President and Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time of the Sovietisation of Czechoslovakia. Jan Masaryk committed suicide in Prague rather than see his country under communist control. For some time after the communist coup d'état in February 1948, the communists honoured Thomas Masaryk and declared that if he had been alive he would have approved of their methods. But soon finding the people clinging obstinately to the memory of the Father of the Nation, they began to denounce him as an agent of Western imperialism, life-long enemy of the Soviet Union and betrayer of the Czech people!

At the meeting in Washington Dr. Peter Zenkel, former Deputy Premier of free Czechoslovakia and former Mayor of Prague, said that Czechoslovaks in exile fully realised the ordeal which the Czechs and Slovaks are experiencing behind the Iron Curtain. But he declared that they would never give up their hope for a return to the kind of free country they had under Thomas G. Masaryk. Regarding the communist regime at present in power, he said that it was trying "to kill the soul of man and to crush the spirit of Masaryk." The name of Masaryk had been removed from schools, streets, and hospitals but free Czechoslovaks believe that his name is still a symbol of freedom and that their country would some day attain freedom from the yoke of Soviet communism.

Passing Away Of "The Harijan"

MR. GEOFFREY TYSON, for long Editor of the premier commercial weekly in Calcutta viz. *Capital* comments in his newsletter on the cessation of publication of *The Harijan*, the weekly journal edited by Mahatma Gandhi till his death. Mr. Tyson

thinks that it was much more than a political organ, being Mahatma Gandhi's own "personal window on the world and as important in his scheme of things as the evening prayer meeting or the weekly day of silence." Mahatma Gandhi's whole philosophy of life appeared in the columns of *The Harijan* by way of comments, criticism or approval of innumerable contemporary public issues. Its columns held the mirror up to Mahatma Gandhi's position as the guide, friend, and philosopher of his people. Mr. Tyson remarks that the stopping of *The Harijan* was only natural and appropriate since in the new India after freedom "much of the original Gandhian philosophy has disappeared into the limbo of forgotten things. For instance, Mahatma Gandhi wanted government to be reduced to the minimum. He believed above all in the resources of the self, self-discipline, self-reliance, self-understanding. Rightly or wrongly, there is more government in the India of today than ever before. No doubt, the new community and rural extension projects would have had his blessing, but he was intensely suspicious of the complex of modern industry with its acquisitiveness in all departments of men's lives."

Perhaps few Indians would care to dispute this conclusion of Mr. Geoffrey Tyson. It is hard to believe that Mahatma Gandhi would have countenanced the main pattern of the Second Five Year Plan with its abnormal stress on heavy industry and its easy recourse to heavy deficit finance. Above all, it is difficult to believe that Mahatma Gandhi would have approved of the growing tendency for the State to encroach upon all spheres of life and to become omni-competent, a tendency which is the harbinger of dictatorship and the decay of liberty.

Soviet Russia And Korean War

THOUGH many people suspected Soviet participation in the Korean war, it is extraordinary that so far there had been no tangible evidence of it. The International Research on Communistic Techniques Inc. of New York has just released a circular giving the first direct evidence of active Soviet participation in the Korean war. It consists of the statement of one Victor Semenovich Ilyinsky who is a Soviet escapee from the Moscow circus currently touring Europe. Ilyinsky said that he was an assistant to the famous bear-trainer Valentine Ivanovitch Filatov in the Moscow circus. He was drafted into the Soviet army in 1948 at the age of 19. He served in Korea from 1951 to the end of July 1953 and rejoined the circus in November 1953. Touring in Europe with the circus he escaped from the party in West Germany. He says that the Russian mission was taken to North Korea and given Chinese uniforms. There were a hundred in his group. His Division Commander was Kozhedub, three times decorated as a hero of the Soviet Union. Slusarev was their Lieutenant-General. Their base was about 90 kilometers from the 38th parallel near the town of Aksu. Ilyinsky stated that the Soviet planes were camouflaged by

green paint and bore Chinese insignia. Planes flown by Chinese pilots were unpainted. He said further that men of the Air Corps in Korea were Soviet flyers. Those who survived were rotated every four months. The bodies of those killed were cremated and sent to Russia in a sealed box with the message "killed on a military mission." The families were never told where the mission was. Ilyinsky was in a bomber crew and served for about two years. When he was sent back on July 27, 1953, he was strongly advised not to tell anyone that he had been in Korea. If he did, he would get ten years at Slave Labour. Ilyinsky says that people were afraid to talk freely about this, especially in the cities such as Moscow. In addition to giving direct eye witness evidence of Russian participation in the Korean war, his statement also confirms recent reports of internal restlessness in Soviet Russia.

Tut, Tut!

MANY in India admire Britain for its sturdy tradition of free speech and robust respect for non-conformism. To these, the news that Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge, Editor of *Punch*, and his co-sponsors of a move to hold a public meeting to protest against the invitation extended to Bulganin and Krushchev to visit the U.K. have been denied facilities for the hiring of a big public hall for the purpose, will come as a disappointment.

A big popular demonstration had been planned at the Albert Hall, which had been booked, when—somewhat mysteriously—the management cancelled the booking. Attempts to secure the Stoll Theatre and the Empress Hall have also failed. Mr. Muggeridge and his committee have now announced that the meeting will take place in the open air of Britain which is still free.

The merits of the stand taken by the sponsors of the meeting are not here in issue, but the right in a democracy for those holding a point of view to join publicly in expressing it without let or hindrance. In that context, the action of those controlling public halls in London who denied the usual facilities has hardly been in the best traditions of British democracy. But while there is *Punch*, there is still hope for Britain!

Studies on the Plan Frame

Price Re 1

Papers on the Plan Frame by Dr. B. V. Krishnamurthy, Mr. Y. S. Pandit, Prof. Hannan Ezekiel, Mr. T. M. Desai, Mr. R. V. Murthy and Prof. G. D. Parikh.

Published by

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM
148 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1

Wait And Watch

by V. B. Karnik

THE Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has attracted world-wide attention. Some of the speeches that were delivered and some of the policies that were announced were not on the well-known set lines and, as nothing happens in the Soviet Union without a purpose, speculation is rife now to find out the exact significance and trend of the new wind that blew in the Congress.

There are in the world many trustful souls who are always on the lookout for the slightest evidence to justify their pre-conceived notions regarding the peaceful intentions and honourable behaviour of Soviet rulers. They have naturally seized upon the proceedings of the Congress and declared with their usual cocksureness that a significant change has taken place and that Soviet Russia has definitely and irrevocably turned her face away from violence and aggression. One would have liked to believe that what they were saying were true, but on so many occasions have subsequent developments cruelly falsified their declarations that one cannot but adopt a cautious and questioning attitude.

There are on the other hand others who have a closed mind on all issues pertaining to Soviet Russia. They cannot conceive of any changes for the better under the Soviet regime and would suspect a sinister plot in every action and policy of communist rulers. A rigid attitude of this type is as unhelpful for the proper assessment of Soviet moves as the naive and wishful thinking of others. What is necessary is a dispassionate analysis of each move, knowing full well that the communist rulers are neither omnipotent nor omniscient and that, in spite of all the autocratic power that they possess, even they have to adjust their policies and actions to changing conditions in the world and at home.

One of the two significant things that happened at the communist conference was the revision of the dogma on a couple of essential points. It has been now recognised, ever so belatedly, that war is not inevitable, that transition to socialism can take place through parliamentary methods and that, contrary to the dictum pronounced by Stalin in his last work, production was increasing in capitalist countries. It has also been recognised that Stalin's *Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, which had so long held the place of pride in the education of communist functionaries, was—as democrats have always asserted—full of mistakes and distortions and it has therefore been decided to write a new history as well as to prepare a new programme for the Party.

These are no doubt important revisions of the dogma as it was currently understood. But similar statements had been made earlier on more than one occasion by the oracles of the communist movement, and even at this Congress the revisions were put forward and justified on the basis of texts from the writ-

ings of Lenin. It is not therefore the words that are new but the decision to use them at the present moment and the emphasis that is placed upon them. That being the case, it may not take the communists too much time or trouble to revert to the old phraseology or to shift the emphasis to something else.

The other significant event that took place was the denunciation of "the cult of personality." This was a direct attack on Stalin and Stalinism, which has since then developed into a bitter campaign against the savage tyrant and his merciless exposure in Russia and abroad—a complete vindication of those who saw through Stalinism in the heyday of its power. The cult of personality was denounced in order to secure endorsement of the "collective leadership" that has developed since the death of the dictator. It was announced at the Congress that Russia would never again allow herself to be ruled by a dictator. The announcement is welcome as far as it goes, particularly to those who have always objected to that dictatorship. But how can one be sure that one dominant personality will not emerge as a dictator out of the collectivity and that the rule of a group of dictators will not be as oppressive as that of a single dictator?

It should be noted moreover that the Congress rejected Stalinism but accepted Leninism lock, stock and barrel. It is a historical fact that Stalinism grew out of Leninism. It is true that, faced with the concrete situation in Russia, Lenin might have modified his Marxism and charted out a different course for the development of the country, but he died before he could effect that modification. What were left to Stalin were therefore the dogmatic, intolerant and dictatorial policies and actions of Lenin. Stalin built on those foundations and established the cruellest tyranny that the world has ever witnessed. Stalin was no doubt the architect but the design and the tools with which he worked were those provided to him by his master. It is poor satisfaction for the world to know therefore that the communists have ceased to be Stalinists but that they continue to be Leninists. From that tree one may expect nothing but bitter fruit.

In spite of these reservations, however, the very fact that Khrushchev, Mikoyan and others had to denounce Stalin and Stalinism and proclaim acceptance of certain policies and theories which were so long condemned as opportunist and counterrevolutionary is a definite indication of a change. It is yet too early to say if it is a superficial change, a mere tactical manoeuvre, or a significant change affecting both the method as well as the objective of the international communist movement.

The communist rulers are not operating in a vacuum. They are ruling over a country consisting of two hundred million live human beings. For nearly forty years they have driven the Russian men

and women like dumb cattle and made them work like galley slaves at building up a huge industrial and military machine. But even the most efficient tyranny cannot permanently root out of the human breast the desire for comfort, for happiness, for relaxation and for freedom. That irrepressible human desire may now slowly be making itself felt. Under the cruel dictatorship of Stalin that desire could not find any expression. After his death it may have asserted itself, and the lesser men, who are now occupying his position, may have found it necessary to reconsider their policies in the light of the demands of that elemental force.

Moreover, industrialisation and needs of administration have created in the country a new ruling class consisting of managers and technicians and bureaucrats and party cadres. This new ruling class may be now anxious to secure for itself a little more of comfort and relaxation and a certain amount of security. Under Stalin nobody had the least security. Nobody knew if he would be alive or dead the next morning. Many a high dignitary of the State and the Party was quietly liquidated or hustled into a prison or a concentration camp. The communist rulers have had enough of this terror and insecurity. They may now be wanting a little opportunity to enjoy in peace the good things of life.

The Soviet rulers are moreover feeling the pressure of world events. They might have realised that the aggressive policies of the Stalin regime had brought them to the brink of war and deprived them of the friendship and sympathy of many nations and peoples. They found in addition that the free nations were no longer unprepared and divided. This strength and the unity of the free nations may have had a sobering influence on the communist dictators. In spite of many mistakes and many divergencies, which are inevitable amongst free countries, the non-communist world is now in a far better position to resist communist aggression than ever before. The free countries did not develop the economic crises that were predicted for them, the crises that were to pave the way for the rise of communism through internal subversion or external aggression. All this might have compelled the Russian rulers to reconsider their policies.

It is not possible, however, to be very specific about the extent of that reconsideration. One can only indulge in guesses and one guess may be as correct as any other. But one cannot lose sight of certain important factors. The Russian rulers continue to be the devoted followers of Marx and Lenin. They talk in the same grandiloquent manner about the military might and the industrial advance of their country. They continue to rule over the country in the same old tyrannical manner.

Even the changes that were announced at the Congress were brought about in the classical Stalinist style. There was no discussion in the Congress, not a word of dissent was uttered, there was not even a murmur of disapproval. The dictators proclaimed the new faith from the pulpit and the assembled

crowd of delegates accepted it with servile obedience. One can never be too sure about the character and significance of changes effected in such circumstances. Moreover, the dictators who are today proclaiming their breach from Stalinism and are vying with each other to denounce their dead Fuehrer were only until a short while ago his ardent and faithful *gauleiters*. They were parties to all his crimes and atrocities. The world is bound to be sceptical when overnight they announce their conversion to a new faith.

It is legitimate therefore to be sceptical and cautious. But it will not be proper to be altogether rigid and to exclude all possibilities of significant changes. The communist rulers of Soviet Russia are after all ordinary politicians. With all the power in their hands they cannot defy too long the human urge for happiness and security. That urge may be now developing into a force powerful enough to compel the rulers to take note of it. Moreover the spectre of the nuclear war, which they now know would destroy them along with a great part of the world, may have forced them to reconsider their relations with other countries. It is possible therefore that the change may not be altogether a tactical manoeuvre. It may be the harbinger of far-reaching modification of internal and external policies. It is yet a long, long way from a return to normalcy, but this may turn out to be the first faltering step in that direction. In any case, it is best to wait and watch rather than rush forward to pull down laboriously built up defences or shut oneself behind those defences and refuse to see what is happening beyond.

QUEST

a bi-monthly of arts & ideas

Sponsored by

the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom

EDITOR: NISSIM EZEKIEL.

"I was much impressed both by the get-up and by the contents of QUEST. It seems to be up to the highest standards, and is certainly far and above the best magazine I have ever seen produced in India."
—Mrs. R. Praver Jhabwala, Author, *To Whom She Will*.

*Poems, Articles, Short Stories, Book Reviews,
Notes on Theatre, Cinema & Dance.*

Annual subscription Rs. 6/-

Single Copy Re. 1/-

**Army & Navy Building,
148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.**

How Mao Bluffed Dulles

by Franz Borkenau

IN the following observations, which deal with the Formosa crisis, I shall try to demonstrate, that in provoking this crisis, Mao had a definite object which he fully achieved — an object of such paramount importance that this generation will never get over the results of his success. I think we succumbed tragically last spring to a crude bluff. Mao made us believe that at that moment and under these circumstances he really wanted Formosa. We have paid dearly for believing him. Our leaders got their deserts for not understanding that the *pretended* aim of any communist action never, as a matter of Communist principle, corresponds to its real aim.

True, at the time not even the greatest political genius could have seen Mao's real motives as we can see them now. We might nevertheless have avoided disaster, had we simply disbelieved Mao's threats, which in any case did not deserve credence; had we not, as we have done so many times in the last two years, panicked before the non-existent threat of global war.

Mr. Dulles tells us that he, stern defender of our interests, did *not* panic; on the contrary, where others advised meek retreat, he threatened use of the H-bomb, and Peking bowed before him. But there can be just as much panic in retorting to enemy diplomacy by threatening world war as there is in running away. When you take a feint for a serious move and in the greatest hurry hit out—and hit thin air, your adversary reaps the benefits of panic. Having diverted your attention to the wrong point he trips you swiftly and, while you are pointing an H-bomb at him, strips you of the revolver in your pocket which was his only object. Dulles' panic consisted in believing that Mao was seriously preparing a massive attack on Formosa; from that belief an unholy sequence of disasters has followed.

How are we sure Mao was not in earnest about Formosa? This has become clear since the Peking *People's Daily* published Mao's speech on the agrarian question before the Party Central Committee last July 31. That speech ought to have caused more excitement in the chancelleries of the world than any of the dozen fake crises Mao Tse-tung has created abroad in recent years, crises Mao created largely to cover up precisely what he blurted out on the last July day of last year. But Mao's speech did not create much of an impression; most major organs of the Western press devoted about as much space to it as to the latest Government reshuffle in Australia.

That speech announced the official beginning of a Second Revolution in China, aimed at bringing China's hitherto individualist economy and social structure into line with its Communist totalitarian regime. It involves more than half a billion men, women and children, and will completely transform the most populous country of the world. Mao proposes to

achieve this transformation by stages: total agrarian collectivization of about 80 million peasant holdings within roughly two years; total nationalisation of urban business within about five years; transformation of China into a great industrial power within fifteen years.

It would be foolish, after the Russian experience, to deny the very real possibility of success in such a plan. If Mao does succeed, the face of the world will be altered. Yet in view of the pending U.S. election campaign and of the constant need for Anglo-American recriminations, the world pays no real attention.

The word "revolution" is not being used figuratively. Mao has much less to build on than Stalin had in 1929. The Chinese peasant has no collectivist traditions of any kind. Private business in China was much more frequent, more successful and more respected than it ever was in Russia; the Chinese are a trading people. And China's industrial base is much smaller now than Russia's was in 1929.

For all these reasons, such a transformation, performed in such haste (its speed was the crux of an intra-Party struggle), cannot proceed without producing a most terrible economic and political crisis.

Mr. Dulles might reply that the Formosa crisis happened *before* the start of the Second Chinese Revolution. Here a little chronology is in order. The present final decision to launch a full-scale social revolution was preceded by two lesser attempts in the same direction: one in 1954, which we just mentioned, and another in 1952 (prompted by the late Kao Kang, leader of the party's left extremists). It follows that the issue of social transformation was under debate in Peking almost from the moment of the conquest of the mainland. (This, moreover, should be self-evident to students of communism).

Several factors, however, acted to delay the social transformation. The first of these, no doubt, was the Korean War.

When the Korean War was over, the issue was raised again, but the objections always raised by moderates (whom Mao now attacks violently) rose to fierce resistance when the consequences of such extreme action, even in peace time, became apparent.

In a word, the Formosa crisis was started about the time Mao decided to launch his Second Revolution. Had he started the two campaigns in earnest at the same time, one would have to regard him as madder than Hitler. Assuming, however, that the internal transformation was serious and the propaganda over Formosa a bluff, the two campaigns tally perfectly.

Why the bluff? Certainly it was not out of fear of Western determination. Mao and Khrushchev knew only too well that the West would never take the initiative for a major war (and they still know it, even if Dulles has roared like a lion, because the ultimate decisions are by no means his). The point is

that Mao was then moving into a phase where much less than a major war could jeopardize his regime.

I should say here that I am not a great admirer of Chiang Kai-shek. I think that only half the credit for communist victory in China belongs to Mao; the other half belongs to the leaders of the Kuomintang whose behaviour transformed innumerable peasants and intellectuals into communists.

However, it is almost certain that now, to protect their beloved farm plots from the greedy hands of the communist regime, to avoid being driven into the cities by the millions—in short, to avoid all the horrors now descending on them—the Chinese peasants, intellectuals and soldiers would welcome not only the much-reformed Chiang Kai-shek but the Emperor Pu-yi, the Dowager Empress of evil memory, or even all the evil spirits of Buddhist hell, if only they could rid themselves of a regime which, after having freed their land from usurers and corruptionists, is now taking it away wholesale.

In such a situation, no American bombs, no massive Kuomintang invasion, but simply a few Nationalist parachutists might have been enough to rouse whole provinces to revolt and to threaten the regime's very existence. Never could smaller forces exert a greater threat; never could one of the world's worst aggressors be maimed at a cheaper price and with less risk of major war.

That is why Mao, who had calculated these dangers in advance, had to guarantee not simply peace in the Formosa Straits but complete paralysis of the

Nationalist Government before he began to expropriate the peasants. This, presumably, had been his chief reason for accepting an Indo-China settlement which did not include communist rule in Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam; it was, certainly, his only reason for starting and then settling, the Formosa crisis.

Of course, it was important to Mao to eliminate Chiang's invasion bases, and it was a victory for him, and not for Dulles, that he got the most important of them. Yet, as in Indo-China he had settled for the time being without Saigon and Phnompenh, he now settled without Quemoy and Matsu.

Mao was in a hurry to settle because he sought not crude material advantages, but political ones. Had there been an Allied will to invade the Chinese mainland, the loss of all Chiang's coastal islands would not have been a decisive obstacle. Once such a will has been disintegrated, however, all the invasion bases in the China Sea cannot by themselves produce it.

In ten years, the Chinese Communists will be able to deal with both Russia and the West on a level of practical, if not statistical, equality of power, for what they will lack in economic development they will make up by the vastness of their country, the immensity of their population, the fanaticism of their creed. Then all we are experiencing today in Asia, Africa and Latin America will look like child's play. And we shall have only ourselves to thank, for we might have prevented it both after the war and in 1955.

(Abridged from the *New Leader*)

The Soviet Woos Franco Spain

by Richard Mowrer

UNDAUNTED by the Franco regimes much-touted anti-Communism, the Soviet Union is trying to neutralise Spain — and the American bases here. The wooing process started early in 1954; lately, it has become more intense. The signs are unmistakable:

Spring 1954: Russia releases 285 Blue Division prisoners. (The Blue Division was a Spanish contribution to Nazi Germany's war effort.)

1954-55: Commercial exchanges are developed between Spain and countries of the Soviet bloc. The Spanish trade journal *El Economista* reports conclusion of an arrangement whereby Spain is to import 200,000 tons of coal from Poland in exchange for 300,000 tons of Spanish iron ore.

The Government publication *Estadística del Comercio Exterior de España* reveals that between July and December 1954 Hungary and Czechoslovakia traded with Spain. The published figures show that the exchanges were extraordinarily favourable to Spain — irresistibly so, in fact. The Spanish exported surplus wine to Hungary to the value of 365,979 gold pesetas and imported from Hungary in exchange

exactly nothing. Spain sold to Czechoslovakia canned fish valued at 284,867 gold pesetas, but imported 30,610 gold pesetas worth of goods, mainly chemical products.

Soviet Radio broadcasts beamed to Spain dwell on the desirability of Spanish commercial interchange with the satellite countries.

"In interested circles, the belief is gaining ground that Spain's foreign trade crisis is too profound to be remedied within the framework of the world capitalist market, which is rapidly shrinking. The idea that the solution lies in access to the markets of the socialist and people's democratic countries is winning more and more adherents . . . The conditions of trade with Eastern Europe are particularly advantageous, since there are no monopolistic schemings or colonizing tendencies. . . Finland's prosperity today is due to her good trade relations with the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. Spanish exporters remember how Poland's imports alleviated Valencia's orange export crisis in the Thirties."

(Continued on page 11)

Review

Ethics by Nicolai Hartmann

(Three Volumes. English Translation by Dr. Stanton Coit. Library of Philosophy. Allen and Unwin & Co.)

IN the present crisis of culture, one of the deepest needs is for a philosophy that can rehabilitate moral values with a minimum of metaphysical or religious assumptions. The idiom of religion in all its historic types (Eastern and Western) has lost meaning to many in the modern world. The language of idealist philosophies whether Platonic, Hegelian or Vedantic has become increasingly meaningless to recent generations. But the sense of moral obligation remains, obstinately disturbing the inner consciousness of modern man who is not altogether satisfied with current trends of pragmatism and relativism. Is there no right and good intrinsic and objective in their essence like the truths of mathematics? And can we read off the binding character of right and good by a direct insight into the situations confronting us, even as we read off solutions of mathematical problems without invoking God or immanent spirit?

Nicolai Hartmann meditated on this crucial problem of ethics (common to all mankind in all ages) while fighting in the trenches on the Eastern Front in the war of 1914-18. He carried a copy of Aristotle's *Ethics* in his kit and pondered on the "mind and face" of moral duty searching for a basis of universality and necessity for them in the actual experiences in which we become aware of their demand on our mind and heart.

He reviewed the salient types of right and good crystallised in Greek experience at its best as expounded in the theory of "cardinal virtues" of Plato and of the "virtues" of Aristotle. He distilled the essence of Christian morality as adumbrated in the texts and exhortations of the Bible and the Fathers of the Medieval Schools. He next separated 'what is living from what is dead' in the wild aphorisms of Nietzsche the anti-Christ and added the notes of the Noble, the Ideal of the "Remote Infinite" and of "Radiant Experience" to the values of Greek and Christian morality. He then sketched a wide arc of values in an ordered array covering the whole field of Western Civilisation and added a philosophy that found roots for them in the actual experience of man on the analogy of mathematics. He added a new dimension of "stratification of values," their rivalry and competition with each other and their gradation in excellence and nobility. Thus we find in the three volumes of this profound and illuminating German philosopher a comprehensive realm of values common to civilised humanity grounded on insight into felt experience without any draft on the "Bank of the Transcendental Absolute."

M. A. VENKATA RAO

On the Nature of Man

by Dagobert D. Runes (Philosophical Library, New York. Price \$3.)

THIS is an essay in primitive philosophy by a well known philosopher, author and editor of

numerous books and other publications. Dr. Runes has an inimitable style of writing, which is at the same time simple and direct. The book under review is particularly important because it attempts to define the borderlines of human thinking and morality — a subject which will interest all students of human psychology, sociology and history. The author takes the reader into the intricate depths of the human mind and reveals man as a unique being almost totally different from animal. Here the reader is led to doubt the veracity of the Darwinian theory about the evolution of man. Even if evolution is a fact, Dr. Runes argues, the goal of its progress is positively not man. He says "when writers, clear thinking or otherwise, set up a whole plausible system of probabilities and likelihoods, there is a danger that some lazy-minded epoch will take cover under this comfortable philosophy and stay there like a worm that has crawled into an empty snail-shell. It is so pride-warming and satisfying to think: fish, amphibian, reptile, mammal and, finally, glorious rational man!

"But there are fish swimming the seas today whose ancestors lived millions of years ago. Some spunky paleontologist sets down the exact number of years, which he has derived with remarkable accuracy; one almost expects to be given the hour and day of birth of the '151,000,000 year' old fishbone

"These fish, after all the millions of years of evolution, are still fish, and the rats, with all their cross-breeding are still rodents, and the mosquitoes are still vermin. And the orangutan will never beget anything but another ape, no matter what.

"There are some changes within breeds, but the true answer has not been found; only a plausible hypothesis has been advanced. . . . We stand before riddle."

Dr. Runes divides mankind into three distinct types: the opportunists, the men of conscience and the many. He undoubtedly prefers the men of conscience, whom the Hebrews called "Announcers," "Teachers" (Prophets).

Being an iconoclast, Dr. Runes breaks the idols of all the false gods. But he has a burning faith in the true God — the moral God, and of Him he says "Adonai Echod! God is One, and One lives in the heart of man, and the love to God and the love to man are one and the same." A. A.

Law in Communist China

International Commission of Jurists, The Hague, Netherlands.

THIS is a small brochure published by the International Commission of Jurists. It consists of an article by Father Andre Bonnichon and of extracts of his depositions before the committees of the Commission.

Father Andre Bonnichon is a French missionary worker who was in China from 1931 to 1954. He was arrested by the communist regime in June 1953 and was expelled from the country after ten months in jail. At the time of his arrest Father Bonnichon was the Dean of the Faculty of Law, University Aurore in Shanghai. What he has written in the

brochure is based on his personal observations and actual experiences during the time that he spent in jail.

The picture that Father Bonnichon presents of the law as it exists in communist China is very strange. In communist China there is no law as we know of in free countries. There are no texts which lay down the obligations of citizens and for the breach of which they lay themselves open to punishment. The communist State does not believe in binding itself by texts.

The State is omnipotent and infallible. If a person is arrested he must have committed a crime, for the State can do no wrong. The only course open to the arrested person is to confess and give proof of the sincerity of his confession by implicating others. Father Bonnichon deposes: "You do not know who accuses you, you do not know of what you are accused, you must simply accuse yourself." There are therefore no lawyers to help the accused. As a matter of fact the idea appears to be, as stated by Father Bonnichon: "To defend oneself constitutes a veritable revolt against the established power."

The general conclusion of the former Dean of the Faculty of Law consequently is that there is no settled law in communist China and everything depends on the "omnipresent and omnipotent will of the Government." "Master today of body and soul to a degree rarely attained in history", the Government, he asserts, "wishes to preserve full mastery over tomorrow without binding itself to any set formula."

This was Father Bonnichon's experience in 1953. One wonders if since then there has been any improvement. V.B.K.

Kurukshetra *Social Welfare in India*

Published by Publications Division, Government of India, New Delhi.

ON reading the two books *Kurukshetra* and *Social Welfare in India* published by the Publication Division of the Government of India on behalf of the Community Projects Administration and the Planning Commission, one feels impressed by the earnestness of our Government to plant democracy at its grass-roots. The main aims of the National Extension Service and the Community Projects, which will be enveloping one-fourth of our rural population by the end of the First Five Year Plan, are directed to create the people's movement of self-help, local initiative, mutual aid and cooperation. Rural welfare and the creation of an urge amongst villagers to improve the standard of living through their own resources, the Government giving only a helping hand, are also amongst the other aims. It is proposed to extend the programme to the entire rural population by the end of the Second Five Year Plan. One of the incidental ideas of the programme is to bring the administration, non-official organisation and people nearer to one another. The programme of social Welfare caters to the needs of general social welfare and is mostly meant to strengthen voluntary organisations doing social welfare activities.

The efforts that the Government are making to put new life into the villages through the Community Projects and the National Extensive Service are very laudable and they deserve the co-operation of everyone desiring to advance the cause of democracy and popular welfare. A close perusal of the books, however, reveals that there is no serious attempt to analyse the causes of the malady which led to the slow erosion of our human and material wealth. It is feared that unless that is done, all the earnestness, enthusiasm and high idealism may not prove very effective.

The main industry of our country is agriculture and about 85 percent of our people depend on it for their livelihood. Our main market also comes from that population. However, though it is our biggest industry, it was the most neglected and undeveloped one and run on the most primitive lines. Unless the conditions of the agriculturists change, our economy is bound to remain unbalanced, anaemic and ineffective and, as a counter-part to that, the growth of democracy in our country is most likely to be hampered.

The causes of the malady are a wrong philosophy of life. The predominant philosophy teaches our people that earthly life is a hindrance to the salvation of the soul. That philosophy has created the other-worldly attitude and a great apathy towards the solution of our earthly problems. As its result faith has replaced reason and passivity, fatalism and cynicism have replaced creativity.

Unless a new philosophy and set of values based on reason, knowledge and scientific spirit is inculcated in our people, it is not possible to generate the will to improve their lot. Once a new outlook is created a tremendous fervour will grow amongst the people for the improvement of their lot by their own efforts. The creation of that new outlook through the spread of knowledge and education is the urgent task.

M.B.S.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has accepted the invitation of the Congress for Cultural Freedom to become one of the Honorary Chairmen of the organisation.

The Calcutta Group arranged a reception for the Japanese women writers Mesdames Tsuyako Abe, Yoshiko Shibaki, Shigeko Yuki and Ayako Sono when they visited Calcutta on 25th February. The reception was attended by a number of prominent women writers and social workers.

Prof. W. S. Woytinsky delivered a lecture under the auspices of the Committee. The subject of his lecture was "Modern Imperialism, a Case Study, the United States." Prof. M. L. Dantwala presided.

The Indian Committee accorded a reception on March 14 in Bombay to Miss Sylvia Marlowe and Prof. and Mrs. Woytinsky. Miss Marlowe is a celebrated musician while Prof. and Mrs. Woytinsky are well-known economists. All the three are from the United States.

Letter to the Editor

Dear Sir,

We, who sign this letter, are all members of the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom and have been reading *Freedom First* from the very first issue. We joined the I.C.C.F. because we believe in the basic principle of freedom which it seeks to uphold. We have also taken part in the activities of the I.C.C.F. and Democratic Research Service to the best of our abilities.

The Editorial Notes in the December and February issues of *Freedom First* on States Reorganization in general and the recent events in Bombay and Maharashtra in particular have left us surprised and puzzled.

That acts of hooliganism and incendiarism should be condemned in unequivocal terms, no one will deny. They have, in fact, been condemned by all the responsible papers in Bombay and Maharashtra. Shri. Shankarrao Deo and Shri Raosaheb Patwardhan went on fast to atone for the sins of others. Shri S. M. Joshi, at great personal risk to himself, stopped a shop from being looted and a police officer from being attacked by an angry mob.

You have not referred to these things in your notes and yet it is true that violence must be condemned and it may also be conceded that nothing will be achieved by violence. But have the Government realised that they, too, cannot achieve anything, cannot suppress a people's deeply cherished desire, by violence or by a show of it?

Your suggestion is that in a democracy such matters should be settled by sitting round a table and by a give and take of ideas and that we should proceed democratically in getting the wrong righted, if there has been any wrong.

So far as sitting round a table and giving and taking ideas is concerned, we all know that there have been several such meetings and a considerable give and take of ideas. The net result of all these conferences and exchanges of ideas appears to be that Bombay will on no account be allowed to go to Maharashtra, for some very serious reasons. The S.R.C. in its report gave us a peep into some of these reasons, into the minds of some sections of the inhabitants of Bombay, who are afraid for themselves if Bombay goes to Maharashtra. The seriousness of the implication of this suspicion and fear, the slur it casts on the whole of the Marathi speaking people is overlooked and the Maharashtrians are expected to overlook it.

The Maharashtrians are praised for the glorious past and the prospect of a still more glorious future is held out to them; they are complimented on their patriotism and self-sacrifice and at the same time they are denied what is their due. This is mocking them with praise.

Now about tackling this problem by democratic methods. The majority of the three crores of Marathi speaking people being illiterate is ignorant of the intricacies of the democratic process. Once their

wishes are stirred about anything, they take to violence, as people everywhere do. This is wrong but natural. As Shri Jayaprakash Narayan stated in a statement, this violence is only the foam on the sea. One has to look deep for the restlessness underneath.

But the Government and the High Command of the Congress certainly know what democracy is! Have they been democratic all along? Have they done the first thing that a democratic Government and party must do, viz. to understand and appreciate the mind of the people? Have they made any effort to explain their position to the people of Maharashtra? Have they, for instance, explained to them in what way the Nation's interest would be jeopardised or its unity endangered if Bombay were allowed to remain in Maharashtra where, even the Prime Minister admits, it belongs? They have referred vaguely to certain fears and suspicions entertained by certain groups and sections. But have they ever clearly stated what these fears and suspicions are, and what they are based on?

On the contrary, the Government have acted in a way in which an imperialist government would act in its colonies and not in a democratic way. They stationed extra police force in all important cities in Maharashtra a month before the S.R.C. proposals were announced and gave them the look of occupied cities. This, later on, was reinforced and not reduced. The large number of resignations of Congress members from legislatures and local bodies were an unmistakable indication of the feelings of the people. What was the reaction of the party and the Government to this gesture? They have refused to consider the resignations and have passed an ordinance (this has since been replaced by a Bill) enabling the Government to run the local bodies without the members. They have disregarded the verdict given by no less a body than the Corporation of the City of Bombay. The party has denied its members the freedom of voting and has refused permission to elected representatives of the people to express themselves freely. The party does not allow its members to organise themselves to realise the goal of Maharashtra with Bombay, nor does it give any clear indication as to what it is going to do to reassure the people.

They have left no democratic way open to the people or to the leaders. They have put a ban even on meetings, processions and demonstrations. Is it any wonder if, in these circumstances, the people of Maharashtra feel frustrated and insulted? or if they feel that they are not likely to get justice at the hands of this Government?

They are being advised by all and sundry to accept with magnanimity the verdict of the Government on this issue. They are being asked why they should bother if a piece of land is put into this or that State or kept separate. After all, they say, it would still be a part of India. Why do not these wise people address this advice to themselves? If, after all, they mean what they say, why not let Bombay go to Maharashtra? It will still be in India.

Again we are told that the reorganisation of

(THE SOVIET WOOS FRANCO SPAIN — Continued from page 7)

Spring 1955: Two representatives of the Soviet Government show up in Madrid as delegates to an international congress on standardization of ball bearings. The fact that Spain has no diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union or any other Communist country is no obstacle. The Soviet line now is co-existence with everybody, including General Franco. Always keen, for prestige reasons, to be selected as a meeting place for international gatherings, Madrid lets the two Communists in (and details two policemen to keep an eye on them).

Summer 1955: At a meeting of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the USSR

and Czechoslovakia do not oppose a motion inviting Spanish participation.

Fall 1955: Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov tells a Spanish correspondent at the UN that the Russian proposal for a European security pact naturally includes Spain, if Spain cares to join. This statement is accompanied by a beaming smile and a warm handclasp for the Spanish newspaperman, who happens to represent the bitterly anti-Soviet Falangist publication *Arriba*.

These are the facts, to date, of Russian endeavours to soften up Spain. It seems there are more to come. It is reported from Paris that Soviet diplomats there have sought to establish direct contact with the Spanish Embassy with a view to developing trade between the two countries. In the matter of offering economic inducements to Spain, the Soviet Union is in a strong position for these reasons:

1. Moscow holds \$400 million worth of gold which the Republic shipped to Odessa during the Civil War. This was four-fifths of what Spain had in 1938. Today, the country's gold reserve is down to \$116 million. Recovery of something like four times this amount would be a sensational stroke of good fortune. Less than a year ago, the Russians set a precedent regarding the handing back of gold belonging to others: they returned eleven tons of the precious metal to Persia.

2. Spain is in the grip of a textile crisis. Production costs have gone up. Japan is again a strong competitor in the world market, and large stocks of Catalan cloth are piling up in warehouses with no buyers in sight. Factories cannot drastically reduce production, because the labour laws bar dismissal of employees. There is a desperate need for foreign markets. Citrus exporters also may soon need new outlets, for the orange crop this year looks to be a record-breaker.

3. Spain is dissatisfied with the amount of U.S. economic aid it is receiving. Government officials have said so on various occasions, and the theme has been echoed in the state-controlled press. Some months ago, *Arriba* put it this way.

"If the average Spaniard sees that American aid is not followed by an improvement in his standard of living, the popularity which Americans now enjoy in Spain will evaporate like a dream, and that very quickly. If after America had squandered fabulous amounts of Marshall Plan aid in Europe without notable results, we were to be denied what is indispensable, the great programme of aid and mutual cooperation would be in grave danger."

Having incorporated Spain in their "let's be friends" campaign, the Russians can be expected to exploit fully the considerations listed above as a means to an end, to wit: to detach Spain from economic dependence on the United States and tempt the Spanish back to their traditional neutrality, thus depriving America of the Iberian bases complex now being built.

Reproduced from the *New Leader*.

(Continued from page 10)

States is governed by considerations of administrative convenience. We had all along held that, in a properly governed country, administration is adjusted to suit the convenience of the people, not that people are pushed one way or the other to suit the convenience of administration. If any adjustments are to be made for administrative convenience they should come after the States are reorganised on proper lines and not before.

It is amazing to us that you should have shut your eyes to all these aspects of the question and to the grave injustice and injury done to the people of Maharashtra.

Bombay

R. B. JOSHI
W. L. KULKARNI
G. B. GRAMOPADHYE
A. A. KANEKAR

[*Freedom First* has taken no sides in the controversy over the reorganisation of States. It has deliberately refrained from discussing the merits of the claims put forward by various protagonists, and it is out of consideration for the esteemed correspondents that it publishes with some reluctance their letter. It will not, therefore, enter into a controversy with the correspondents about what they have written in support of their demand for the inclusion of Bombay in Samyukta Maharashtra.

The main concern of *Freedom First* is the preservation and expansion of democracy and freedom. It insists that all disputes and controversies should be settled through peaceful and democratic means. The Notes referred to by the correspondents were written solely with a view to warn against the riots and other violent demonstrations that were developing out of the agitation over linguistic claims.

Freedom First holds no brief as implied by our correspondents for the Government or the Congress High Command. It will only suggest that, however highhanded and undemocratic their behaviour and actions may be felt in certain circles to be, democracy will be imperilled if undemocratic and violent measures are resorted to for securing redress against any injustice that they may consider has been done to them—Editor.]

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Modern Capitalists are not pot-bellied.

—Prime Minister Nehru, as quoted in the *Times of India*, March 5.

• None of us would wish this lovely island to become a chattel of communist tyranny.

—Mr. David Marshall, The Chief Minister of Singapore, *Times of India*, March 19.

A little too over-conscious of the recent past, the British unlike other westerners in India, suffer from some sort of a guilt complex and are always nervous about becoming "unpopular." Inevitably they plump for what they believe to be the popular line.

—*Thought*, March 17.

Even if by a miracle, America were to offer large-size aid, our Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, would not accept it.

—J. J. Singh, *Times of India*, Feb. 19.

Some years ago gallons of ink were wasted to prove that China would not and could never turn Communist, and now as many gallons are spent on demonstrating that China was naturally ripe for a Communist regime. Will the same happen about India?

—*Social Action*, January 1956.

I wish there was a tax on loose language.

—Mr. M. A. Sreenivasan in a speech on March 7.

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

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3| Rs. 2 for
members of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Name:

Address:

.....

.....

Signature

Two plain warnings publicly given by none other than Mr. Khrushchev. The first referred to those who might look forward to a Red conversion: "Those who fancy that we have abandoned Marxism, Leninism and Stalinism are like shrimps learning how to whistle." The second was quoting a Russian proverb: "One often kisses people one cannot strangle."

—*Social Action*, January 1956

A buffer State (Iran) will be buffed no longer; a player-off of great Powers has abandoned the game; by the exertion of free will (with the hope of economic benefits, to be sure) a small independent Asian nation has withdrawn from the shadowy role of a "sphere of influence."

—Middle East Correspondent, *The Times*, Jan. 11.

What India needs is responsible opposition if the Prime Minister is wrong, and responsible discussion, criticism and acceptance of his ideas if he is right. What happens is irresponsible, rowdy opposition, and irresponsible, slavish acceptance, and very little in between.

—*Mysindia*, January 22.

The address of the Power which dragoons and dominates its satellites is "The Kremlin, Moscow."

—Sir Anthony Eden, *The Times* Jan. 19.

The Prime Minister, is most exposed to corruption from power.

—Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, *Times of India*, Feb. 7.

Kerala could achieve political stability if all non-Communist organisations put up a joint front.

—Mr. Nadar, *Times of India*, March 13.

Coupland pants with a Jawahar jacket.

—Mr. H. V. Kamath on the pattern of States finally emerging after months of consideration,
Times of India, March 15.

Today Khrushchev is burying Stalin—who, one is tempted to wonder, will bury Khrushchev?

—*Problems of Communism*, March 1956.

What is needed is not nationalisation of insurance, but insurance against nationalisation.

—Mr. M. A. Sreenivasan in a speech on March 7.

If a cobra (communism) is sighted in a village, surely the manly and sensible way is to kill it, not to amputate the limbs of all the inhabitants to prevent death by snake-bite.

—Mr. M. A. Sreenivasan in a speech on March 7.