

Revolt In Tibet

A REVOLT has broken out in Tibet, a revolt against its occupation by the communist regime of China. It is no longer confined to outlying regions. It has erupted in Lhasa, the capital of the country. It is undoubtedly a people's revolt. The so-called British and American imperialists are no where near by to be conveniently accused of having fomented and organised the revolt!

The Khampas have been fighting for over two years. Let alone support, their struggle did not get even a mention in our press. It is only recently that some newspapers gave news about their fight. But the reports that they published were regarded as sensational and highly exaggerated. One foreign correspondent was threatened with expulsion from the country. The events that came to light during the last few days proved that the reports were neither fanciful nor overdrawn.

It is likely that the revolt will be crushed. It may be crushed even before these lines are published. It is an unequal struggle that the rebels are waging. They have hardly any arms, while the Chinese are equipped with modern arms and armaments. As the political correspondent of *The Statesman* has pointed out, "With roads over which rumble 10-ton trucks, airfields which are useable and vast resources, the Chinese have the power to crush the revolt." The Chinese are known to have used aerial bombing earlier. They may do that again. There is an unconfirmed rumour about aerial bombardment of Lhasa. What can the people do against such terrific weapons of destruction? The people of Hungary fought for some time with bare arms the tanks and machine guns of the Russian army. But in the end they were defeated and destroyed. The same fate may overtake the brave rebels of Tibet.

It is a thousand pities that when a brave people of a nearby friendly country are endeavouring to free themselves from foreign yoke we in India have to sit with folded hands and watch the defeat and destruction of a people's revolt. Our Parliament is denied the opportunity of discussing the developments on the ground that it will amount to interference with the internal affairs of China. On that reasoning, we shall be forever precluded from expressing our support to

and sympathy with all struggles against foreign occupation. The occupying power can in each case trot out the excuse that its dealings with the people in the occupied territory is its internal affair.

Our country has, no doubt, accepted Chinese suzerainty over Tibet; and it may not be immediately possible to repair that mistake. But the communist rulers of China had guaranteed full national and regional autonomy to Tibet. They had moreover covenanted to keep inviolate the spiritual and temporal powers of the Dalai Lama. The Chinese rulers have consistently violated these agreements. They have been attempting all along to impose communism on Tibet and to absorb it into their territory as any other region of China. It is against these attempts and in order to preserve their own way of life that the quiet and patient people of Tibet have risen in revolt.

As the Prime Minister has stated, "there is a long tradition of cultural and religious ties between India and Tibet." India has for centuries known Tibet as an independent country with whom she had the friendliest relations. His characterisation of Tibet as "the Tibet region of China" may be diplomatically correct but it jars on the ears of every Indian. To Indians, Tibet will ever remain an independent country or territory with an entity of its own and a civilisation and culture of its own. They cannot but sympathise with the brave efforts of the Tibetans to preserve their separate entity and to uphold their way of life. If any changes become necessary, the Tibetans must have the right of deciding for themselves the extent and the pace of those changes.

Our hearts go out to the Tibetans in their hour of trial. At the moment, it may not be possible for us to do anything more than to extend our moral support to their courageous struggle. But let there be no doubt as to where our sympathies lie. Let them be expressed clearly and unequivocally. That may have some effect on the communist rulers of China. We must be also clear about our attitude towards those who may be compelled to seek refuge in our country. They must receive a warm and hospitable welcome. We are friends of China; but we are equally the friends of the Tibetans. As friends, the Tibetans are entitled to claim political asylum in our country and we shall be failing in our duties of friendship and in the exercise of our rights as a sovereign independent nation if we refuse to grant it to them on the ground that it may annoy the rulers of China.

Tibetan Crisis And Indian Policy

by S. V. Raju

THE see no-evil, hear no-evil, speak no-evil attitude predominates Indian official policy on the growing pressure of Communist China on Tibet. Travellers from Tibet, mostly refugees, reaching Kalimpong were severely discouraged by officials of the Government of India from spreading "rumours" and "exaggerated reports". In Parliament Mr. Nehru, even while conceding that there had been "some trouble" hastened to explain that it was all because of the Khampas who had always been turbulent. But many discerning political analysts consider this apparent indifference of Mr. Nehru to the Tibetan revolt as a mere apologia. They point to Mr. Nehru's hurried visit to Bhutan some months back and the agreement he concluded to build, among other things, a road to connect India and Bhutan directly and thus obviate the present necessity of having to pass through a strip of Red Chinese territory with all its accompanying humiliations which even Mr. Nehru, it is reported, had to suffer. It is relevant to recall in this connection that originally Bhutan had cold-shouldered Indian offers of aid and India had to commission the services of Mr. Nehru to literally force the Bhutanese to accept it. The return visit by the Bhutanese Prime Minister to India, Mr. Jigme Dorji, is equally significant insofar as it underlines Bhutan's anxiety about the revolt in neighbouring Tibet. Mr. Dorji in the course of a press conference confirmed that "frequent conflicts" had been taking place between the Khampas and the Chinese. Mr. Dorji made it plain that the most important thing was to establish road connections between India and Bhutan. He expressed his impatience with the report of Indian engineers that the road would take two years to construct. This sudden enthusiasm for road building betrays the extent of nervousness with which both India and Bhutan view the Chinese suppression of the Tibetan people.

It is true that the Khampas have always been a turbulent race and have resented any attempt at control.

But this by itself does not explain the truly national character of the Tibetan revolt. Singling out the Khampas as the cause of all the trouble would lead to the conclusion that Tibetan revolt is just confined to a part of the country. But there are reports that many Lamas have joined the Khampas in their guerilla warfare. George N. Patterson reported: "With 200,000 guerilla fighters spread throughout an area seven times the size of Britain, three quarters of it over 15,000 feet, they are holding their own against the 300,000 strong Chinese Army...." To fight the Khampas, the Red Chinese wanted the Dalai Lama's personal bodyguards to be sent to Eastern Tibet. The Red Chinese in addition asked the Dalai Lama to proceed immediately to Peking and even Mr. Nehru has no news about the Dalai Lama. The growing pressure on the Dalai Lama sparked off the demonstrations outside the Indian Commission in Lhasa which resulted in the Chinese Foreign Bureau suggesting to the Indian Consul General that "for the better protection of himself and his staff they should move into the office of the Chinese Foreign Bureau." These incidents certainly refute Mr. Nehru's contention: Remove the Khampas and all Tibet will welcome its communist masters.

Will the revolt succeed? It would be mere wishful thinking to assert that it will succeed in driving out the Red Chinese. Winter has so far helped the Khampas to indulge in guerilla warfare. But with the advent of the summer, with superior weapons of warfare, the Red Chinese are ultimately bound to starve and bomb the Khampas into submission. Coupled with this is the report that Communist China is currently carrying out a programme of large-scale colonisation of Tibet and its bordering regions. According to the *Sining Tsinghai Jilpao*, in the past three years 35,000 Chinese youths had permanently settled in Tsinghai province. Earlier, reports from Lhasa indicated the presence in large numbers of the Han people in Tibet.

It is, therefore, obvious that through invasion, colonisation indoctrination of children in schools and other communist devices, the Chinese have indicated their determination to enforce their rule on the Tibetans. Brazenly and openly the Red Chinese have been throttling the Tibetans into submission.

In the face of such an open aggression by the Red Chinese the attitude of the Government of India has been to wish away an unpleasant reality. The Government of India has gone on record frowning on impartial correspondents who report on the struggle of the Tibetan people. For instance, Mr. George N. Patterson, an authority on Tibet, received a warning from the External Affairs Ministry that "unless he discontinued sending 'misleading' and 'exaggerated' messages about Tibet to the *Daily Telegraph*

(Continued on page 4)

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 nP

Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor.
127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

The Cudgels For Co-operative Farming

by S. R. Mohan Das

THE present controversy on cooperatives and co-operative farming has let loose some interesting by-products which a sensitive observer cannot miss.

It is quite probable that the issue of cooperative farming as such would not have evoked such a spate of critical comment had it not been part of a general and new trend in the ruling Congress party of late. While the champions of the Nagpur Resolution of the Congress on cooperative farming and ceiling on land assert that there is nothing new in the developing ideology of their party, the critics point out certain pertinent facts to prove this is not so.

For one thing, despite indignant denials, the fact remains that the initiative for the new trends in the Congress has had to come uniformly and consistently from the Prime Minister individually. To put it bluntly, the Prime Minister "laid out the line" for the Congress. Sure enough, the delegates have always "accepted" that line.

Another significant fact about the Nagpur convention is the almost total paucity of "suitable" candidates in the ruling party to succeed Mr. Dhebar. In fact this was almost becoming such a problem that the one and only person who could become the sole repository of the spirit of the "New Congress" was found to be Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

It is this background which gives the controversy a special interest.

Mr. Nehru is himself aware of this fact when he says that the "vested interests" did not react so violently to the Avadi Resolution on Socialistic Pattern, because they felt the Congress was not serious, but now after Nagpur, they realise Congress "means business."

What exactly are the main aspects of the controversy on cooperatives and cooperative farming? Some lucidity in terms is required to understand the points of controversy.

The champions of Nagpur Resolutions headed by Prime Minister Nehru would portray that the critics are opposed to cooperatives on account of their "selfish vested interests" and Mr. Nehru passionately proceeds to proclaim that "all obstacles to the advance and progress of the common man will be swept away."

A study of the points made by the critics in the controversy reveals that nobody seems to have anything against cooperatives at all. On the contrary, many of them have been associated closely with and have contributed towards the growth of the co-operative movement in India.

What they criticise is the emphasis on cooperative joint farming. What they also point with pertinence is: since when and how has this sudden fascination and passion for cooperative farming developed and from where?

Our versatile Prime Minister who has pronounced

views on almost all the questions facing mankind has developed a "precise" passion for cooperatives and cooperative farming only since a few months ago. In fact what is now an "article of faith" would not fetch more than a few column inches of space as news or views even in any mofussil weekly newspaper, a few months ago.

With this in mind, the question is asked: "Is the present passion for cooperatives and cooperative farming the result of a new awareness of India's acute economic distress? Have all the other priorities for economic development under the 1st and 2nd Plans now been achieved, to come down in a businesslike manner to cooperative farming and growth of cooperatives?"

Apparently not. What could be the stimulus for a sudden awareness about cooperative farming? Mr. Nehru provides the answer. Calling upon his party-men to accept the Nagpur Resolutions and implement them or get out of the organisation, Mr. Nehru warns that if the Congress did not do this, it will be swept away by "others."

The real reason is thus unconsciously let out. The Prime Minister, though may not be so in title, has been the dominant single force in the Congress since Independence. As a result of this, what the Congress lacked as a party organisation; it tended to make up through administrative functioning of its Governments, though all the time nostalgically envying the organisational efficiency of the Indian communists. With the loss of Kerala to the Communists, the Congress has not yet bothered to find a fundamental solution to its weakness. On the contrary, it now aims to bring about what it believes to be more reform and alleviation measures by an even more intensified administrative and bureaucratic action through its governmental machinery.

This is the unique philosophy which Mr. Nehru so passionately champions now. When the critics point out that this will only result in serious damage to not only our commitments to values but even the reforms and alleviation aimed at, Mr. Nehru indignantly lashes out at the critics, as representing "selfish vested interests."

Actually there is a more dangerous vested interest that will develop through this passion of Mr. Nehru. That is the "irate vested interest in having to establish a real failure into a mythical success" by having to alter his fundamental value commitments.

In this process he has already been thrust with, with the "cooperation" of the Indian communists, whose mentors are past-masters in the art of not only making tall claims for their methods, but making the gullible swallow such claims. Witness the recent claims of Chinese Communes producing 360 tons of paddy crop in one acre of land, and our Food and Agriculture Minister popularising this miracle all over India!!!

Not one question dealing with the specific problems of the cooperative movement in Indian conditions, the various complex problems of organisation involved having in mind our basic commitment to democracy, good government, rule of law, etc. have been answered by Mr. Nehru.

The answers of Mr. Nehru have been "violence in language" which he has so deplored in international affairs. A few weeks ago, Pandit Pant shrewdly remarked: "We are in the midst of a Revolution of Rising Expectations." Mr. Nehru has described the Nagpur resolutions as "Revolutionary." Mr. K.D. Malaviya, reportedly reflecting the thinking of the Prime Minister and the "Ginger group" dubbed the critics of cooperative farming as "Reactionaries."

The phrases and slogans are falling into patterns usually familiar only in quarters other than Congress.

When the critics point out that the "Revolution of Rising Expectations" is distinct from the democratic "Revolution of honest performance and People's conscious will," they are said to represent "reactionary vested interests."

While usually pleading for an integrated, broad and all embracing outlook on all questions, in this controversy, the Prime Minister often tends to develop a

"single-track mind" perspective over abstract formulas. The magic words "Cooperative Farming" have caught his current fancy and nothing else mattered. Those who tried to relate this beatific vision of the Prime Minister to the realities in India are "guilty" of disturbing and distorting his dreams and were "cheating you." Words like "Panchayats," the "Indian Peasant," "Indian Countryside," "the 360 million masses" have given certain idealistic images in his mind of the hard realities of India.

So we can better understand the controversy when we hear Mr. Nehru revealing so sincerely and so nostalgically:

"In the few years left to me I would like to see India of *my* dreams realised." (italics this writer's)

This is exactly the point of the controversy, in Mr. Nehru's own words. This is exactly the point the critics make in this controversy, with all their respects and affection for Mr. Nehru. All they ask is: "an India of *whose* dreams?" They believe Mr. Nehru has given the answer and do not accept it, and believe a large section of the Indian people have a will to strive for an India of their own dreams too without being called names like "reactionary" and representing "vested interests."

(TIBETAN CRISIS — Continued from page 2)

or other foreign papers, the Indian Government would be constrained to interdict his residence in the districts of Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri and Cooch-Bihar." The Government has hitherto maintained a fairly clear record with regard to the freedom of the Press. But their anger with Mr. Patterson indicates a deliberate and perhaps frightened disregard of events in the north, and acceptance of the view that what China does within "its territories" is her own business and not India's and that India resents being used as a clearing house for the world to know what is going on within unhappy Tibet. India does not want to rub Red China the wrong way. And nothing, even rebellion, across our borders will be allowed to spoil the spirit of "Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai" sentiments.

Kalimpong was the chief source of news about Tibet. But thanks to the attitude of the Government of India, the centre has shifted to Kathmandu. From the Nepalese capital news trickles almost daily about the revolt. While the Government of India has repeatedly tried to make it out that the whole trouble is due to the Khampas, no mention has been made of the Chinese bombings of villages, the large scale colonising, the looting of monasteries, defiling of religious spots and the murder of monks.

Several months ago a memorandum was drawn up by Tibetan officials and presented to the Indian Government by Lukhang, a former Prime Minister and most respected Tibetan leader. This was followed by appeals by the Dalai Lama's brother Gyalu Thondun. "The only response the appeals have evoked," wrote George Patterson, "is that Indian officials have advised the Tibetans to emulate India in her struggle for independence by resorting to Civil disobedience

campaigns and other forms of non-violent demonstrations against the Chinese. Tibetan officials who have tried to publicise what is happening have been reminded that they are only being allowed to remain in India on condition that they take no part in any political activities, China having brought strong pressure to bear on the Indian Government to have them returned."

The revolt in Tibet is now well over two years old. Over 50,000 Chinese and 15,000 Tibetans have been killed. It is reported that Tibetans are streaming in their thousands from cities, towns, villages and nomad encampments to join in the guerilla fighting. They have blown up roads, bridges and airfields so that Chinese are restricted in their movements in the mountains and are desperately short of supplies of all kinds. The Tibetans themselves are starving and have only sufficient food to last them for another two months.

Much of this the Indian public would have been unaware of and consequently the Government of India would have been saved the trouble of taking a definite stand. But the Kalimpong-Khatmandu reports force the Government either to confirm the reports or to characterise them as "exaggerated."

The events in Lhasa, however, during the middle of March, right before the premises of the Indian mission will compel Mr. Nehru to admit the existence of serious trouble in Tibet. But it would be expecting too much to believe that Mr. Nehru would react strongly to Chinese aggression. India's policy will continue to be the same viz., that the Tibetan revolt is an internal affair and in the spirit of Panchshila India will respect the "territorial integrity" of Communist China, and its "Tibetan Region."

Communism In The Arab World

by Adam Adil

THE recent break between Cairo and Baghdad on the one hand and the bitter wordy duel between Khrushchev and Colonel Nasser on the other unmistakably indicate that a clear cleavage has emerged between Arab nationalism and communism. General Kassim's increasing dependence on Iraqi communists for support, the elimination of Nasserites from political scene in Iraq, and the communist attempts to slander Col. Nasser and United Arab Republic in the Iraqi press and Moscow's open partiality for the Iraqi communists have accelerated the process of the cleavage. The mutual recriminations between Arab nationalists and communists in Iraq have assumed relentless proportions.

Colonel Nasser and Cairo Press have begun to accuse communists as the "enemies of God and Islam." For the first time since 1954, when the Nasser regime banned the fanatical Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and arrested its leaders, the appeal of religion and the influence of the ulemas are being invoked in the Arab world. A call has been given to Arabs to organise and attend special congregations in Mosques and pray for the defeat of communists in Iraq and for the souls of the "brave Iraqi martyrs" who fell in the recent Mosul mutiny. In United Arab Republic, President Nasser and other leading dignitaries have personally led such congregations. In addition, silent processions have been organised in memory of Mosul heroes. And the venerated world famous Muslim theologian, Shaikh Mohmoud Shaltout, Rector of Alhazar University, the oldest seat of Islamic learning in the world, has, in a Fatwa, (a canonical ruling) condemned the communists for "trampling the Holy Koran and enslaving the people by fire and steel." He has called for a Jihad (holy war) against "atheistic communism" by Muslims throughout the world. In Damascus, recently, throngs of people marched in a spectacular parade from the Ummayyad Mosque with copies of the Holy Koran held high over their heads to hear President Nasser denounce communists as protagonists of "slavery and atheism".

It is obvious that President Nasser's emphasis on religion in his drive against communism in the Arab world would prove a unifying factor for Arab nationalists of all shades of opinions and allegiance from Morocco to Persian Gulf. Their primary concern is to combat the rising monster of communism in the Arab world.

It would be wrong to presume that the people of Iraq are wholly behind General Kassim and his communist supporters. Apart from the inflammable Baghdad crowds, vast majority of the Iraqi people are nationalists and distrust the communists. But the communist terror has held them back, and they are deprived of all means of asserting themselves. And it has been evident from the Mosul mutiny that General Kassim

does not enjoy the confidence and support of the entire army. A formidable element in the army is anti-communist and would like Iraq to steer clear of Russian influence.

The immediate cause of the revolt of the Fifth Brigade in Mosul was a monster rally of "peace" partisans held in that city. The rally was sponsored by the communists, but was also participated by National Democrats and other Leftists. It was officially claimed that 2,50,000 people from all over Iraq had mustered in Mosul for the rally. During the gathering, clashes occurred between communists and nationalists resulting into the loss of lives of several people. The anti-nationalist rabid speeches at the rally with familiar communist cliches and slogans, were too much for the local Brigade Commander, Colonel Abdul Wahab Shawaf, to tolerate. Two days later Shawaf raised the banner of revolt. As the story goes, the coup was launched precisely at the hour when General Kassim was addressing the first conference of the Iraqi League for the Defense of Women's Rights—a gathering attended by a large number of militant ladies from communist countries.

Colonel Shawaf's eight points justifying his revolt against General Kassim, clearly indicate his anti-communist and pro-nationalist position. Briefly summarised, Shawaf's points condemn, first, despotism and the cult of personality; second, the persecution of free officers and others (this is a reference to the trial and sentence of Colonel Abdus Salarm Aref and his supporters); third, the subjection of the country to communists. In support of the sturdy Kurds, Shawaf stressed his allegiance to the constitution promulgated after July revolution which guaranteed the Kurds full rights, and in sympathy of the peasantry he expressed his approval of the land reform bill. The central point of his accusation against the Prime Minister was that he had betrayed the revolution by deviating from its basic principles.

Unfortunately for Shawaf, he received little support from his fellow commanders. Brigadier Nazim Tabakjali, Commander of the Second Division in and around Kirkuk—an anti-communist himself—whom Shawaf claimed to have consulted before launching the revolt, not only did nothing to support him but telegraphed a message of loyalty to General Kassim. Troops in Baghdad and Southern Iraq as well as the air force, which are deeply infiltrated by communists, naturally rallied to the support of the government. Yet, keen observers of the events in Iraq are of the opinion that the failure of the revolt was not due to a lack of sympathy on the part of the people for Colonel Shawaf and for his aims, but due to faulty organisation and ill-timing of the coup.

It cannot be said, however, that the spirit of hostility
(Continued on page 8)

Letter From Kerala

by Ravi Prasad

THE opposition cry of "lawlessness" and "insecurity" in Kerala, dubbed by the Government and communist leaders as mere propaganda stunts, was substantially confirmed by the official report of the working of the Police Department published in January this year. The report makes it clear beyond any shadow of doubt that during the two years under the Red regime, while there was an increase in the number of cognisable and grave crimes, including murder and dacoity, there was a tremendous fall in the percentage of detection of cognisable cases (from 41% in the previous year to about 27% this year). The report attributes the rise in crimes to "certain sections of the people" trying to "capitalise the desire of Government not to use the police power except when it was absolutely unavoidable". The fall in detection work is attributed, among other things, "to withdrawal of cases of a labour and a political nature" and "diversion of attention of the Police (from crime) due to the intense political and labour activities and agitations."

Let figures speak for themselves. In 1954 the number of murders in the state stood at 162 and in 1956 it was only 173; but in 1957—the year in which the Reds came to power in the state—it leapt up to 254 and in 1958 to 273. The number of house breaking and theft cases was only 1131 in 1955 and 1351 in 1956; but it rose to 1893 in 1957 and 1955 in 1958. Dacoity cases increased from 13 in 1956 to 19 in 1957 and 22 in 1958; robbery cases from 69 in 1956 to 89 in 1957 and 92 in 1958. It must be remembered here that these figures do not include the large number of offences not charged by the police for various reasons.

This exactly has been the essence of the Opposition criticism in the past. Their contention was that as a result of the indiscriminate remission of sentences, introduction of a new police policy, withdrawal of cases, etc. a feeling of "insecurity" and "lawlessness" had developed in people's minds and that there had been an unprecedented increase in crimes due to this policy on the part of the Government.

One of the first things done by the Communist Ministry when it assumed charge was to grant a liberal remission of sentences of prisoners in the State, as a token of mercy on the occasion of the assumption of the *first popular Ministry in Kerala*. 1366 prisoners got the benefit of this remission and of these 425 prisoners were released immediately. These included 34 political prisoners. The rest were those serving various terms of imprisonment for criminal offences.

While the opposition leaders and the non-communist Press were critical of the indiscriminate discharge of criminal offenders, the communists, intoxicated with their unexpected "victory" in Kerala, went a step further. They waited for the prison-gates to open and garlanded the first batches of prisoners released on the occasion; they were given a very warm reception and

taken round in processions. The communists all over the State "fraternised" with these persons who were "liberated" by the new "People's Government" that had come to power. Though some of these criminals and habitual offenders went back to prisons within a few days of their release others successfully remained outside. It is said that most of these who have managed to remain "outside" are now working as "handymen" of the Communist Party in "maintaining order" at communist gatherings and in many other "useful" ways. Today these "resourceful" men have become part and parcel of the Communist Party machinery.

Large scale withdrawal of cases has been a common feature in the Magistrate's Courts in Kerala during the last two years. It is said that not less than 236 cases were withdrawn in one year (1957) alone. Most of these cases were those in which communists or fellow-travellers were charged with criminal offences like trespass, assault, intimidation, obstruction of police, etc. Instances are also not rare where attempts were made to withdraw even murder cases on the plea that withdrawal was necessary "to restore" industrial or political peace.

Withdrawal of cases is only one of the many methods followed by the communist regime in Kerala for interfering with the administration of Justice. When "comrades" or "Our Men" are in trouble, the following methods are adopted: 1. The police are given "oral orders" not to charge any case; (2) if the police ignore this and charge the case against "comrades", those police officials are soon replaced and either the prosecution fails to prove the offence or the case is not pressed due to lack of proper "evidence"; (3) Cases are withdrawn on the ground that in the interests of industrial or political amity and peace, the withdrawal of the case is necessary; (4) if none of these methods succeed and if the comrades are found guilty and sentenced by court, the Government promptly remits the sentence even if it is a small fine of Rs. 10/-.

The new police policy of the Kerala Government also has played a very important role in pushing up the crimes in the State during the last two years. As soon as the "new" Government came to power, they declared that the police will not be used to suppress "working people's struggles". "The officers and men of the police force were told that the settlement of industrial and agrarian disputes was not the job of the police. . . . the job of the police was to track down and punish the perpetrators of crimes such as theft, murder, dacoities, etc. as well as to prevent actual breaches of the peace. . . ." (E.M.S. Namboodiripad in his introduction to *Kerala on the March*.)

It appears, therefore, ironical for the same Government to say that crimes such as theft, murder, dacoities, etc. leapt up to new "peaks" during the two years under its administration, because "certain sections of the

people tried to capitalise the desire of the Government not to use the police power except when it was absolutely necessary."

One of the first "reforms" attempted by the Communist Government in Kerala as soon as they came to power was that of education. The controversial Education Bill was the outcome of this desire for "reform" along with the nationalisation of text books which was immediately taken in hand. When the nationalisation was decided upon last year, the opposition parties and the independent press warned against possible attempts at indoctrination of communist ideas through text books and of other forms of corruption of "young minds". The Government and the spokesmen of the Communist Party "allayed" these fears by saying that members of text book committees were not all communists.

When the text books, produced by these committees ultimately made their appearance there arose a volume of criticism against the form and content of the books. The main charges were: there were too many howlers and mistakes; printing and production was done very carelessly; several portions were inconsistent with the normal "standards" expected for the category of students for which they were intended; passages here and there offended the feelings of certain sections of people; the achievements of India since Independence had been belittled and those of China and Russia glorified; an attempt was made through these books to instil communist ideas into the young minds of the school children. Concrete cases were collected and a State-wide campaign was launched which gathered quick momentum. To pacify the agitators—dubbed as "Catholics" and "conservatives"—the Government appointed an Expert Committee with Mr. Kuruvilla Jacob, Headmaster of the Madras Christian College High School (Madras), as Chairman to examine the allegations and report.

Some time ago the Expert Committee submitted its report and within a few days the Government issued a "brief summary" of the same in the form of a press release. According to the press release, they (the Committee) had given the finding that no "planned attempt" to indoctrinate the pupils with either communist ideology or anti-religious ideas was in evidence. It went on to say, however, that the Committee had drawn attention to a few passages in the Malayalam text books of 1958-59 which tended to offend the religious sentiment of certain sections of the people.

The press release also admitted that the Committee was of the opinion that there was "a little too much haste" in the preparation of syllabus and that as a result various discrepancies and defects had crept in. The Committee had also found errors in subject matter, which it felt, could have been avoided.

"The question whether there was any evidence of 'planned attempt' to indoctrinate communist ideology had been answered by the Committee in the negative," said the press release and quoted the Committee as saying: "The committee does not consider that there has been any concerted attempt on the part of the

authorities or the text-book writing committees at indoctrination of communist ideology."

This is the story that the Government wanted the people to believe. It must be remembered here that the full report has not been published so far and that the press release gave only an "official" summary in the hope that the bulk of the people would be satisfied with what the summary said. And the people would have believed the story and treated all criticism of text books as baseless and biased, but for the statement issued in Madras by Mr. Kuruvilla Jacob, the Chairman of the Expert Committee, two days after the publication of the "brief summary".

In his statement Mr. Jacob pointed out that "the syllabuses were revised very hastily without any reference to the schools regarding their suitability.... The subject of study which suffered most as a result of the hasty revision was social studies."

He went on to say: "No criteria for approval of the books were given to the text book writing committees. It was left to the text book writers to write the manuscripts and the conveners of the committees to judge the merits of the scripts according to their own standards. This was a very serious defect and particularly so where the schools had no choice in the matter of selection of the text books."

Mr. Jacob further said that there were several passages in the text books in Malayalam, social studies and science, which considered by the usual standards of school text books were unsuitable. "Some of them tended to offend social, religious and political sentiments." It is insignificant that the Government's official "summary" does not include the words "social" and "political".

"There are certain lessons and passages in the social studies text books and Malayalam language text books which may tend to create in the pupils impressions favourable to communist ideas", added Mr. Jacob.

Commenting on a serious error in the social studies text book, Mr. Jacob is reported to have said: "Chapters 13, 14, 15 of Book Six of the social studies text book taken by themselves do not give a fair and correct picture of the achievements of India after the attainment of Independence. This is a serious error which does give the impression of belittling the achievements of India, in comparison to China."

On this aspect of the committee's findings, all that the "brief summary" says is that the committee has found the treatment of this subject "defective"!

There is another interesting "side story" to this: Mr. Kuruvilla Jacob was appointed by the Government as its "Honorary Educational Adviser" sometime ago—when the criticism of the new "Education policy" adopted by the red regime was at its height and the Government wanted to give the impression that their education policy was the outcome of valuable advice tendered by an eminent educationist like Mr. Jacob. Now after seeing the working of the Education policy of the communists at close quarters, more especially after taking a good look at the "nationalised" text books, Mr. Jacob has resigned his position as "Honorary Adviser."

(COMMUNISM IN THE ARAB WORLD—Cont'd from p. 5) against the Kassim regime and communists is dead with Shawaf. The Mosul revolt has sowed the seeds of deep discontent against the regime and widened the gulf between Arab nationalism and communism. Communists in Iraq are calling for a renewed purge of the civil service and the army. Nine diplomats, belonging to United Arab Republic have been already expelled from Baghdad. Communists are trying to strengthen their stranglehold on every department of the government so that General Kassim has no alternative but to exclusively depend upon them for support against Arab nationalists. Communists are confident of future, for although they enjoy little support in the Arab world they have a world-power to back them. They are resorting to increasing terror to suppress the nationalists. And they know that the demonstrations in Baghdad in support of General Kassim are no indication that similar demonstrations cannot be provoked in Iraq itself by Nasser and his nationalist supporters. Hence, communists want to be on more surer grounds.

Colonel Aref and his colleagues, although under sentences of death, constitute greatest danger to Kassim's regime. Hence, communists are demanding immediate execution of the sentences. During Colonel Shawaf's revolt, communists succeeded in persuading Colonel Mahdavi, president of people's court, to add his powerful voice to the clamour in the shape of personal appeal to General Kassim to approve the sentences passed by the court. But it seems that Colonel Kassim is not sure that death sentences, if executed, would have shattering effect on the rebels. Again, his decision with regard to the sentences will be influenced by his assessment of his personal position in relation to the communists.

Communism in the Arab World is still in its infancy; but it has the capacity of growing fast. And the Soviet Union, by active moral and material support, can encourage the small coterie of Arab communists to resort to subversion and conspiracy against Arab nationalist governments with a view to bringing the oil-rich desert regions within the Soviet sphere of influence. Arab nationalists have, indeed, been wise in being conscious of the communist danger and combatting it before it is too late. The Soviet Union by its open support to the local communists has exposed itself as having political designs over West Asia. Given proper organisation and correct assessment of the position of the Soviet Union in relation to the Arab world, Arab nationalism is bound to present a formidable front against the spread of communism in West Asia.

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

SOLIDARITY WITH TIBET

A Committee for Solidarity with Tibet was formed in Bombay on March 27 at a meeting of prominent citizens held under the presidentship of Mr. Asoka Mehta, M.P. Mr. Frank Moraes, Editor of the *Indian Express*, was elected the Chairman and Mr. R. V. Murthy and Mr. Adam Adil the Secretaries of the Committee. The office of the Committee is located at Kermani Building, Pherozechah Mehta Road, Bombay 1.

The Committee issued the following statement on the events in Tibet:

The revolt that has broken out in Tibet is a genuine people's revolt against the policy of the communist rulers of China to destroy the autonomy of that country and impose an alien way of life on its people. This action of the rulers of China is in direct violation of solemn commitments made by them to guarantee the national and regional autonomy of Tibet and to keep inviolate the spiritual and temporal powers of the Dalai Lama.

As stated by the Prime Minister, there is a long tradition of cultural and religious ties between India and Tibet. As such we are deeply concerned with what is happening in Tibet and consider it our duty to express our solidarity with the people of that country in their courageous efforts to preserve their autonomy and their way of life.

Tibet has been for centuries a distinct territory with separate entity of its own and with its own civilization and culture. The attempts of China to colonise the region are indefensible and are against the interests of Tibet. The people of India are vitally interested in the preservation of the autonomy of Tibet because of their long ties with Tibet.

Looking to the way the struggle is going on, there is no chance of the Tibetan resistance being able to withstand the fully-armed Chinese troops. In that event, Tibetans would be compelled to seek asylum in foreign countries. We hope the Government of India would be hospitable enough to grant asylum to refugees coming out from Tibet.

We have formed a Committee for Solidarity with Tibet to give expression to our deep concern with the recent developments and to organise public opinion in support of Tibet. We request those who agree with us to join the Committee and help in its work.

The Democratic Alternative

BY MISS M. A. DEVIKI

Rs. 2.50

Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom,
148 Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Leon Trotsky as Diarist

by Bertram D. Wolfe

WHILE Trotsky lived on Prinkipo, it seemed to him that if he could but get to some western land, he might resume the shaping of history and man's destiny. But when Daladier granted him refuge in France (in 1935), the two years he spent there were the loneliest and saddest of his life.

At first there were at least secretaries and close disciples around him. But he had to keep out of French politics, avoid the public eye, live incognito, stay away from the big cities. The Government trembled lest there be a physical attack upon him—from the Communists who asserted that he had been invited to advise Daladier on war with Russia, from the Right for whom a Communist was a Communist and "World Revolution" worse than "Socialism in one country," from aggrieved White Russians, from the Soviet police. How then was he to sink into the landscape, yet continue the activities which were the sum and substance of his life?

He settled in an isolated villa over the Mediterranean, where the local officials were unaware of the identity of the stranger. Then Rudolf Klement, Trotsky's courier from Paris, arrived at night on a motor cycle with the lights out, bringing police, a scandal, and the need to move.

He had to dispense with secretaries and couriers, shave his beard, part his hair differently, don French "bourgeois" clothes, put on deep mourning to minimise casual conversation. Trotsky without a secretary was as unwonted a sight since 1917 as Trotsky without his beard. Accompanied only by his loyal wife, Natalia Ivanovna, he sought seclusion in a tiny mountain village in the south-eastern Alps. This was more isolated than Prinkipo, forcing him to talk to himself in diary form in order to record his analyses of what he read in the press, and leave for posterity his Marxist forecasts of its future.

The result—Harvard has just published it as *Trotsky's Diary in Exile*—is a poor and melancholy thing, melancholy in both senses of the word. Yet it is a psychological document of the highest importance, isolating as if in a laboratory the spirit of infallibility and dictatorship as it lives in one who has lost the power to dictate but not the will, nor the faith in his own infallibility.

His first word is a protest that a diary "is a literary form I am not especially fond of." We may believe, as he asserts, that he would "prefer a daily newspaper." Yet, unlike Lenin, Trotsky was one who glanced frequently at his own image in the mirror of history. He had already written an *Autobiography*, two brief wartime diaries, one of a stay in Switzerland, another in Spain, a marvellous account of being transported to Siberia and escaping ("My Round Trip"), and innumerable passages of an autobiographical character in

The Stalin School of Falsification, his *History*, his *Lenin*, and other political-polemical works.

Yet it is clear that he is writing this diary *faute de mieux*. It consists of sporadic entries in three notebooks, written with little of his usual care for form and literary skill: 12 entries for February 1935; 13 for March; 11 for April; 14 for May; 8 for June; 4 for July; 1 for September. The July and September entries were written in Norway after France had refused to renew his permit, and Norway's Labour Government had granted him asylum. All the entries smack of boredom and disgust, disgust not so much with Stalin as with the Western socialist and democratic world. The entries are often only newspaper clippings, with his interpretation of them; lists of books read, with banal social-critical remarks; oracular utterances on Marxism; touching pen portraits of his faithful wife and her sufferings at the persecution of their family; "prophetic" forecasts of the future of France and Europe; a few reminiscences, one of them (as we shall see) important, on Lenin and the days of their joint tenancy of power. To this varied and unequal assortment, the Harvard Editors have chosen to add a *Testament*, written five years later in Mexico, when Trotsky was suffering from high blood pressure and expected his life to end soon by a hæmorrhage of the brain. (The hæmorrhage came five months after the *Testament*, brought on by the alpine pick of an agent of the G.P.U.)

In more senses than one, 1935 was a turning-point for Leon Trotsky. He was alone for the first time in years in a Western land which he might have begun to study at close range, reconsidering at the same time some of his certitudes. For all he really saw or understood of the world around him, he might as well have remained on Prinkipo or in Alma Ata. Hitler had just taken over power, crushed the mightiest communist movement outside Russia. Trotsky sensed that this opened a new phase in history, but he totally misread it. France would go fascist "within the year." "Mosley, or someone like him," would make England fascist "the minute France went." After that "the Scandinavian countries would be unable to hold out." All this is noted with *Schadenfreude*: Engels "after forty years" was proving right about England; "parliamentary democracy is doomed;" the old order "will collapse with a stench.... The only question is, who will be its heir?"

He must speed up his own answer to this question. If he had already accepted Stalin's theory that the socialists were "the accomplices" of fascism, he was now prepared to add that the Stalinists were, too. He would give up his dreams of reconquering the Third International, and lay the foundations for a Fourth. This alone could save mankind. Whether the masses accepted his International and his formulæ before it was "too

late," or whether "universal barbarism" would ensue, in either case "the correctness of the Marxist prognosis is *bound* to reveal itself." It was the fact that history might choose either one of these two correct Marxist prognosis which made his work now "more important than in 1917." Without his help, Lenin would probably have succeeded in making the October Revolution and winning the Civil War. "But now my work is 'indispensable' in the full sense of the word." The collapse of the Second and Third Internationals leaves "no one except me to carry out the mission of arming a new generation.... I need at least five years more of uninterrupted work to ensure a succession." (He was to have five years and five months more before the alpine pick crashed into his skull.)

The year 1935 was also the year in which Stalin began to arrest first hundreds, then thousands of Russian communists for having "plotted with Trotsky and foreign intelligence agents the murder of Kirov." The saddest pages of the diary deal with the fate of those connected by ties of blood or allegiance to Trotsky, whom Stalin now persecuted as a means of atomising the party, disposing of potential successors, and taking vengeance on the opponent temporarily beyond his reach.

First had come the turn of Trotsky's one-time collaborators: "Glazman driven to suicide, Butov shot in a G.P.U. prison, Blumkin shot, Sermuks and Poznansky banished (they were later shot)."

Then his oldest daughter, Zinaida, broken in health, her husband in prison, had committed suicide in Berlin when Stalin revoked her citizenship along with that of all of Trotsky's family in exile. Now the diary records the exiling to Siberia of his first wife, His elder son, Lyova, is in danger from the brownshirts in Berlin. (Natalia Ivanovna succeeded in getting a visa for him to come to Paris, by a personal appeal to Herriot; in Paris he died in a hospital under suspicious circumstances in 1937.) The younger son, Sergei, an engineer who has never been interested in politics, is the subject of anxious speculations. A number of entries deal with Natalia's efforts to learn of his fate. When the diary ends he is in Siberia, where a little over a year later he would be shot by the G.P.U. His only political act had been an attempt to exercise the right of silence in a régime that denies even that to the son of a man who must be denounced.

These are the most moving pages of the diary. But even as we grieve with the old man and his devoted helpmeet at the sufferings of their flesh and blood, our sympathy is suddenly chilled by reminiscences on the death of the Tsar and all his household. Trotsky remembers with pride that it was he who first proposed that Tsar Nicholas should be "tried for his crimes and executed." But Lenin, being "wiser," said "there might not be enough time for a trial." For the first time it is put clearly on record that Lenin and Sverdlov then ordered the execution of the Tsar and all his family. The Government — of "Lenin and Trotsky" — took the lives of the Tsar and his wife, his brother and the latter's wife, his four daughters

and sickly son, an accompanying nun, the faithful servitors who had gone into exile with the Tsar, and several of his Ministers.

The decision (the Diary records) was not only expedient but necessary. The execution of the Tsar's family was needed not only to frighten, horrify, and dishearten the enemy, but also to shake up our own ranks, to show them that there was no turning back, that ahead lay either complete victory or complete ruin.... The severity of this summary justice... showed the world that we would continue to fight on mercilessly, stopping at nothing.

Stopping at nothing — is not this but a para-phrase of the nihilist slogan, "*Everything is permitted*"? But where, one pauses to wonder, is the idealism of the dedicated terrorists of 1905? — Kalyaev, telling his comrades, "I could not throw the bomb when I saw the Grand Duke's children riding with him in the carriage" — Voinarsky saying to approving co-conspirators, "If Dubassov is accompanied by his wife, I will not throw the bomb" — Savinkov holding back his bomb when he saw that 'innocent strangers' might be killed on Admiral Dubassov's train — the same Savinkov escaping from prison, revolver in hand, resolved to shoot any officer that bars his path, but to turn it on himself rather than shoot an ordinary soldier? How many words of Trotsky's "explanation" would Stalin have to change in applying them to the extermination of Leon Trotsky, all his family, and his "faithful servitors"?

Though tragedy personal and political are in the pages of the diary, not a line of it suggests that Trotsky has re-thought anything, learned anything from his own fall and exile by a régime to which everything is permitted and which "stops at nothing." Nowhere is there any new-found wisdom, any trace of humility or even a momentary doubt. Every line scornful, omniscient, cocksure, full of self-importance and certitude — and all the dogmatic pronouncements and judgments so wide of the mark!

Blum is a "has-been," his whole concern being to prevent the working class from struggling against fascism. Blum and Cachin in their "united" opposition to Trotskyism are ineptly compared to Kerensky and Tseretelli opposing Lenin in 1917. Engels' relation to Marx is absurdly and humourlessly compared to Christ's relation to Jehovah. Trotsky feels a closer kinship with Roehm than he does with Leon Blum. Macdonald is "more contemptible than Mussolini": the Webbs are closer to Stanley Baldwin, and Baldwin "closer to the Celtic Druids as intellectual types" than to Lenin and the author of the *Diary*. Spaaks is "a shoddy little man... an honest 'friend of the people'... no more than that." (One is reminded of Trotsky's last word on Stalin: "a plebeian democrat of the provincial type... such in essence he remained to the end.") Trotsky believed such epithets were the most devastating at his command, for he hated "plebeian democracy" more than the Barbarism with which he believed he would contend when "parliamentary democracy collapsed now with a stench."

(Continued on next page)

Review

Back to Life

Poems from Behind the Iron Curtain. Edited by Robert Conquest (Hutchinson. 15s.)

GOOD News — humanity is not yet finished. The instinct for freedom can live on when freedom is not even a word, not even a memory. The impulse to song can be stronger than the fear of authority, even when authority is everywhere.

In the West, where there is some sort of approach to freedom in these matters, one still meets people who think poetry needs defending. They need defend no longer. The authoritarian Governments of Eastern Europe have taken over the job and done it thoroughly. They worked by the simple method of trying to dam up the spring, to divert it to their own uses. They put the poets in a nice warm cage and said, "Sing about how good we are to you." The poets tried, because they knew what would happen to them if they didn't, but nothing would come out except a few strangled notes that weren't worth the trouble.

So, after the death of the old Prison Governor, the cage was unlocked and the poets were allowed to come out. Not very far, just into the prison courtyard, but it was enough. As soon as they saw the sky over their heads, and breathed the air outside their cage, the poets began to sing. At first the gaolers were pleased, but soon they noticed that the songs were not about them and their goodness, but about the rain, the grass, the clouds, the birds and animals. When the gaolers did hear themselves mentioned, it was in tones of sarcasm or even direct criticism. So they

(Continued from previous page)

There is yet another sad note, subdued but persistent, running through the pages of the Diary. The Diarist feels that his powers are beginning to decline. "Old age is the most unexpected of the things that happen to a man." "The worst vice is to be more than fifty-five years old" (before the Diary opened, Trotsky turned 55). "Contemporary history is running in high gear. . . . The only pity is that the organism-destroying microbes work even faster."

Deep down within him Trotsky senses that he will not return in triumph to Russia in five years, or ever, nor preside over the re-making of the world and of man in the image of his blueprint. Indeed, five years later there is his *Testament*, bearing witness once more that neither the years of unending purge, nor the Stalin-Hitler Pact, nor the Second World War, has brought a shadow of a doubt. The *Testament* stipulates no errors, revises no positions, only reaffirms "my Marxist, dialectical materialist, irreconcilable atheist . . . faith in the communist future."

"Life is beautiful," it assures those whom he expects to gather to hear the reading of the will. To "future generations" he leaves the task so ill begun "to cleanse it of all evil, oppression and violence, and enjoy it to the full" . . .

bundled the poets back into their cage, and turned off the central heating as punishment.

If any reader's teeth were set on edge by the fanciful tone of that last paragraph, I apologise. But it is the shortest way of describing the contents of this book, a collection of poems written and published in Russia and Eastern Europe during the last few years. Mr. Robert Conquest, who gathered them together, had access to no special sources, no packets of crumpled manuscripts smuggled out in boxes of soap flakes, no poems taken down by Morse on short-wave radio. He simply read the literary magazines of the countries concerned, selected a bookful of poems, and had them translated. It is our good fortune, as readers, that Mr. Conquest is not only a poet but a trained F.O. diplomat who knows intimately the political scene in the countries concerned; it means that, as well as a supremely moving book of poems, we have a masterly introduction.

Normally, the best thing a reviewer of verse can do is to quote. But, magnificently quotable as some of these poems are, I will not transcribe any bits and pieces. Neither will I try to say anything about the literary quality of the translations. They seem to me well translated, in a bald, matter-of-fact way that is exactly right. Mr. Conquest warns us that the collection "is not presented as literature, and much of its quality inevitably fails to come through." Of this, I naturally cannot speak; it seems to be probable that, whatever happens to the quality, the form, the physical shape of the poems cannot have survived translation, since their original languages are so utterly different from English. As we have them, they appear in undress, so to speak—free rhythms, no rhyme, an impression that one is reading notes for poems rather than the poems themselves.

But this is probably no great loss. The book's chief value lies in the impression it gives of desperate sincerity, of life, in all its crude urgency, forcing its way upward as if through a crust of ferro-concrete; and, for this effect to come through, one does not need to see the poems as elaborate artefacts. All the same, it is fair to add that one or two of them come through even in translation as considerable works of literary art: Adam Wazyk's "Poem for Adults", for example, or the terrible "One Sentence on Tyranny" of Gyula Illyes. Again, some of the poems are ironic epigrams, whose tone of bitter mockery comes through even without the whipcrack of the poet's own words (example: "Principles of an Experienced Canary" by Milos Macourek). But, in the end, one agrees with Mr. Conquest that translation and literary quality are not, for the moment, the points at issue.

Boris Pasternak remarked recently. "The essential thing in our age is that a new freedom is being born". This from a man who has been insulted and pestered in every possible way by the lackeys of the administration, expelled from the Writers Union, not allowed to accept the Nobel Prize and seen his greatest novel snatched out of the hands of his countrymen. He sees the growth of a new freedom. Do you want to see it too?—then get this book.

—JOHN WAIN

With Many Voices

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

Pandit Nehru tries to remain neutral even between the Congress Party and the Communist Party of India in order to keep the legend of his being a national symbol shining.

—Dr. Krishnalal Shridharani, *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, March 3.

Mr. Nehru's economic thinking is a case of arrested thinking. It belongs to Laski and the London School of Economics of the thirties, and the Prime Minister unfortunately continues to think and plan in this context despite the lapse of nearly thirty years.

—*Indian Express*, March 14.

Well, if it (cooperative joint farming) leads to that (collectivisation), let it. I am not frightened.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Thought*, March 21.

The biggest obstacle to the successful implementation of the Nagpur resolution on land reform is the farmer himself who is too individualistic to accept the basic principles of cooperation.

—*Hindustan Standard* March 17.

Planning has now become a God. It is incomprehensible, all pervading and against criticism.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Hindustan Standard*, March 20.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

HISTORY AS LITERATURE

GEORGE F. KENNAN

REVOLT AND COMMITMENT

STUART HOLROYD

THE VAN GOGH LETTERS

W. H. AUDEN

April 1959

67

Annual Rs. 12/-

For members of the I.C.C.F. Rs. 10/-

The time may soon come when unexpectedly he (Mr. Nehru) finds himself in the embrace of Mr. Namboodiripad and Mr. Ajoy Ghosh with Khrushchev grinning genially in the background.

—*Indian Express*, March 4.

Whatever be the faults of his temperament or other failings, in fairness to Mr. Krishna Menon it must be said that he is the only true socialist within the Nehru orbit.

—“Junius”, *Swarajya*, March 7.

I have not yet found a Congressman who acts according to his beliefs.

—Jaipal Singh, M.P., *Hindustan Times*, March 18.

There are Indians who sometimes talk with borrowed superiority of American innocence. Of Indian innocence of the world at large, the end has not even begun.

—“Casius”, *Hindustan Standard*, March 21.

Russia has a singular advantage of its permanent public relations office in the agency of the Communist Party of India.

—*Thought*, March 7.

Who is more vociferous in its concern for the underprivileged, more vehement against colonialism, more vocal in the plea for peace than Soviet Russia—Peace, Peace, Peace. But not everyone that says—Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

—Valerian Cardinal Gracius, Archbishop of Bombay, *Examiner*, March 14.

Looking at Baghdad, we see a bigger terror than the one in the days of Nuri el Said.

—President Nasser, *Times of India*, March 16.

Socialist and Communist Parties are more or less satellites of the ruling party.

—M. R. Masani, M.P., *Hindustan Times*, March 10.

Arab nationalism does not need western instigation or western bases to take a stand against the spread of communism in the Middle-East.

—*Economist*, London, March 21.

The “vested interests” which Mr. Nehru or his Leftist successors may have to fight will be the new landholders that they have created and the working classes in whom they have vested a large stake in industry.

—*Indian Express*, March 24.