

Emotional Integration

by V. B. Karnik

EMOTIONAL integration of the people is one of the most pressing problems facing the country. The problem cannot be solved from one day to another. The integration will be a long process requiring for its fruition decades and, may be, generations. But in the meanwhile the process will have to be actively encouraged and care will have to be taken to see that no steps are taken and no policies are pursued which hinder it.

To begin with, it is essential to accept the fact that we have yet to grow and become a nation and one common people. It hurts our pride to accept the fact but, unless it is accepted, no purposeful action will be possible to develop the bonds that will bind together the three hundred and sixty million people who inhabit the land.

During the period of the national struggle the urge to get rid of foreign rule bound the people together. The bond disappeared with the disappearance of the British rule. Since then, we have been relying on the geographical and the political factor and on the common bonds of history, culture, civilization, race and nationality. The latter bonds have not proved strong enough to hold the people together, as recent events have shown but too clearly.

The differences and disputes that flared up over the issue of the re-organisation of States came as a rude reminder of the thinness of the bond that unites the various regions of the country. The storm subsided, no doubt, after a short period, but one cannot say that a greater integration has been effected. Local and regional loyalties continue as strong as ever—and in any conflict between them and the interests of the country as a whole one cannot be too sure that the former will be subordinated to the latter.

The recent controversy over the issue of the official language of the Indian Union bears an equally painful testimony to the weakness of the national bond. There is nothing wrong in questioning the advisability of giving Hindi the status of that language or in suggesting that English should continue as the official language. But to regard the advocacy of Hindi as the imposition of the North on the South is an entirely different matter. It shows how the people of South India regard themselves as separate from those of

North India. The Dravida Kazagam agitation is only a very loud expression of that feeling of separateness, which is prevailing on a wide scale.

A similar feeling of separateness, possibly of less intensity, exists between the various linguistic groups and within those groups between the various castes and communities constituting them. Ordinarily all these castes and communities live together without conflict but, when for one reason or another, a conflict develops the wide gulf that separates them becomes evident and one realises that they can hardly be regarded as complimentary parts of an integrated whole in spite of living together for centuries. The ugly riots that took place in September last in Ramnad District of Madras State is an instance in point. Similar disturbances have taken place from time to time in other parts.

Hindus and Muslims and Christians have very little social contact with each other and Hindus themselves are divided into numerous castes and sub-castes which, except in a few industrial cities, keep themselves apart from each other. There are other sections of the people like the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes who do not yet have an assured place in the Indian society. The trouble in the Naga land which for some time degenerated into open hostilities was a particularly acute manifestation of the feeling of separateness. The Jharkhand Party and the wide popular support that it enjoys amongst the tribal people in Bihar and Orissa is also an expression of the same desire to regard themselves as a separate entity. All this proves how far away we are yet from our objective of welding the various communities inhabiting this land into a common integrated people.

Totalitarian countries have their own ways of solving the problem. Soviet Russia has solved it by establishing a dictatorial police State and by mercilessly crushing all manifestations of local or regional patriotism and loyalties. Stalin went to the extent of exterminating or uprooting a number of national groups. In totalitarian countries there is, moreover, a highly centralised and disciplined political party which can send its agents to all parts and through them control the entire social and political life of various communities. The plan in those countries is to cast the whole nation into a common mould according to a set pattern. The plan is carried through with the help of all coercive and other powers at the command of the State.

That course of action is not obviously open to us. We have in the first place deliberately chosen the path

of democracy and as such we cannot follow the ways of violence and coercion. In the next place, we have with equal deliberation decided to preserve and develop the rich variety of local and regional cultures and patterns of life. The problem that faces us is how, without resorting to dictation or violence, to develop the manifold linguistic, communal, caste and regional groups into an integrated Indian community conscious of its common destiny and of its common tasks and responsibilities.

The methods that have been tried so far are to appeal to the people in the name of religion, language or past history. The appeal is effective in the case of some sections, but it repels others, as there is no common religion, language or history which can have a uniform appeal to all. An appeal based on history usually reminds the people of a golden age in the past, and exhorts them to work together in order to secure its return. But in the case of the Indian people there is no one common golden age to which all of them can look back with pride. The golden age of one section of the people may be the dark age of another. This type of appeal has not therefore drawn the people nearer each other; it has on the contrary reinforced the division or the separateness by reviving old memories of fights and defeats or victories.

In the circumstances the appeal that will unite must be an appeal to the future rather than to the past. The appeal must tell the people that, whatever the past and whatever the old fights and quarrels and animosities, the Indian people of all communities, groups and regions are now members of one and the same society and that they can by common efforts build up a glorious future for themselves, including all and excluding none. A joint endeavour to build up that common future, proceeding simultaneously in all parts of the country and amongst all sections of the people, will bring them together and create amongst them the bonds of friendship and brotherhood.

A mere verbal acceptance of the idea or mere propaganda on that line will not, however, be enough. The

idea must find concrete expression in the day to day activities of the Government and all its agencies and in the actions and policies of all organisations which are in a position to influence national development. This must be particularly secured in the field of economic progress. People in all parts of the country must get the feeling through actual experience that attempts are being made to ensure the even development of all parts. Those parts which have been left behind so long will demand and must get special attention. This may possibly slow down the tempo of development in some parts but it is much better to secure an even all-round development, rather than spectacular progress in some and poor progress in other parts. The existing inequalities of economic development and standards of living between the various regions should not be allowed to grow wider. The prospect of uniform progress as part and parcel of a steadily developing national economy will provide the foundation for the growth of the sentiment of national unity and solidarity.

People in all parts of the country must have a say in the evolution of policies and a part in their execution. The policies to be adopted must be national in the real sense of the term. They will not be national only because they are adopted by a majority of votes. A majority may disregard the interests of a minority or of some parts of the country. The decision properly arrived at may not be very logical or neat. What is far more important is that the people as a whole must find in it the expression of their aims and aspirations. If the affairs of the nation are conducted in that spirit, national solidarity will grow and divisive forces will find no base for their operation.

Any number of appeals are being made these days to build up national unity in the name of nationalism. But it is necessary to remember, as pointed out by the Defence Minister, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, that nationalism produces sub-nationalism and that "linguistic, regional and other differences are the products of sub-nationalism." If the danger is to be avoided the appeal must shift to a different basis. The people must be asked to unite as human beings for their greater progress and welfare, as with cooperative endeavour they will be able to secure them more easily and speedily. The emphasis on popular welfare will progressively liquidate the differences between linguistic and regional groups and bring them together into a common integrated community.

The Chief Minister of Bombay, Mr. Y. B. Chavan, highlighted the obvious truth when, in the course of a message to a seminar on Education and Inter-Regional Understanding, he stated: "It will be no exaggeration to assert, I think, that as a nation we shall eventually stand or fall by the degree of genuine emotional understanding and sympathy that we are able to achieve between one part of our country and another." The unfortunate situation that has developed in Indonesia, where owing to certain policies followed by the central Government separatist tendencies are growing in various parts, has a lesson for us which we shall disregard only at the peril of our independence and integrity.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

**For members of the Indian Committee for
Cultural Freedom Rs. 2**

Single Copy: 25 nP

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

Notes

Terror In Hungary

SECRET trials and executions seem to be the order of the day in communist Hungary. Six students were recently executed for "printing protests against the Russian occupation." The act was so inhuman that it provoked three Members of the British Parliament to issue a public statement protesting against it. Immediately thereafter has come the news of a group of children, of whom the eldest is a boy of 14, being prosecuted for attempting to overthrow the regime. A regime which can seriously prefer such a charge against children can hardly call itself civilized.

The fact of the matter appears to be that the Government of Hungary is now seeking to wreak vengeance on all those who participated in the glorious revolution of October 1956. The sober and authoritative *Civil Liberties Bulletin* has described the situation as follows: "The Communist regime in Hungary seems to be engaged in a final drive to liquidate the last freedom fighters who are not already dead or who have not taken refuge abroad. The drive is marked by secret mass trials of army and police officers, priests, students, writers and particularly those who are regarded as the spiritual authors of the revolt, for discovering whom the universities are being combed. Even workers are not free from such judicial reprisals: twenty workers from the Cespal Island steel-works are on trial.... Among the military leaders of the anti-Soviet rising who are being tried in the heavily guarded Kohida prison are General Maleter, General Kovacs and Col. Kopacksy. Gen. Maleter, Minister of Defence in the short-lived Nagy Ministry, it will be recalled, held the Kilian barracks from the time of the first Soviet attack on 24th October 1956 until the temporary Russian withdrawal from Budapest a week later and was trapped in a treacherous way under the pretext of discussing the technical details of the withdrawal of the Soviet Army. Kovacs became Chief of Staff on 31st October 1956 and was arrested with General Maleter during the negotiations with the Russians. Kopacksy was appointed Budapest Chief of Police. During the rising the police refused to join with the Russians in trying to suppress it. These leaders have been in jail for fourteen months and are now being tried for treason and espionage."

Disturbed by these developments, the United Nations Special Committee on Hungary made a representation and asked for assurances that the "highest humanitarian standards would be applied." The representation was rejected, however, as "the establishment and functioning of that committee were not and are not recognised by the Hungarian Government."

The Government of Hungary has recently expressed some solicitude over the plight of Hungarian refugee children who are now alleged to be anxious to return.

Particular mention is made of one child who was forced to commit suicide in Lisbon owing to the unhelpful attitude of the Government of Portugal. The case deserves to be investigated, as everybody will agree that children should be enabled to go back to their parents if they are really anxious to do so. But who can take the Hungarian Government's solicitude over children seriously when it is indulging in such acts of repression and terror?

Kerala Communists In Trouble

KERALA'S communist Ministry seems to be in trouble from all sides. Beset with difficulties from all sides and troubled by the waning popularity, the Kerala communists are trying to evolve a new strategy which will provide them with enough scape-goats to cover up their own failure. In the beginning the communists prided in displaying certificates of good conduct given to them by the President and the Prime Minister. But now they seem to be chafing for a fight with the Centre. The decision of the President to refer the Kerala Education Bill to the Supreme Court to ascertain its opinion on certain controversial clauses has provoked the Kerala Reds to condemn, in effect, the President's action as undemocratic. They have now come forward as champions of the autonomy of States and have called on all "good democrats" inside and outside Kerala to protest against this. Not content with this they are now out to form a united front, on a governmental level, with other State governments against the Centre. The Kerala Minister for Education, for example, has called upon the southern States to form a joint front to fight the Centre to exact greater grants. Similarly another Minister has complained that Kerala's demand for flood relief did not meet with the response as did the demands from other States. Thus the pattern of the new strategy is obvious: to create ill will against the Union Government and to shift all the blame on to the Centre. Already numerous official newspapers of the Party have been criticising the Centre and blaming it all on these counts.

The tactic is too transparent to succeed and the reason for it is obvious. The communists are rapidly losing ground in Kerala and they are coming under heavy fire from the opposition parties for their failures in many fields. Even the Chief Minister had to admit that his Government was not satisfied with the progress of the working of Five-Year Plan schemes in the State. He also admitted that out of the allotment for the second year of Rs. 17.90 crores they were able to spend only Rs. 4.21 crores in the first seven months of the year. There are, besides, increasing charges of corruption and nepotism levelled against the communist leaders including Ministers. One finds visible prosperity, it is charged, among the communist dignitaries even in villages which is inexplicable by ordinary logic. It is also alleged that packing of all possible places with communists is done without regard to their capacity or claim to the jobs. Names of some Ministers are also mentioned in a few cases of corruption. All this has an adverse effect on the

popularity the communists once enjoyed. The trends in some of the recent local elections show the rising tide of the unpopularity the regime and the Party are facing. Under such circumstances, it is but natural that the communists should feel compelled to search for scapegoats. But how far they would succeed in their new tactic only the ensuing by-elections will show.

American Loan To India

THE U. S. Government's offer of a loan to the extent of \$225 million to help India tide over the current economic difficulties is most welcome. It is true that the loan does not fully come up to our expectations, but it is obvious that it will go a long way in narrowing the large foreign exchange gap which is today threatening to endanger the economic development. Further, since the loan is to come partly from the Export-Import Bank and partly from the Development Loan Fund, it will be immediately available. If it were to be an outcome of a special Bill in Congress asking for loans, it would have involved considerable delay. The immediate availability of the loan, apart from the fact of the loan, is an indication that U.S. Government are not oblivious of India's needs. It is also reported that the U.S. Government is considering measures to relieve food shortage in India by special deals, apart from assistance under P.L. 480. With the proposed offer, the U.S. assistance to this country given so far since independence, will add up to \$1,275 million, which is five times the aid Russia has given. And all this has been done without any political strings, and in the face of the pro-Soviet bias in India's foreign policy and Mr. Krishna Menon's snobbish impertinence against the West.

Out of \$225 million, \$157.5 million will come from the Export-Import Bank, which will mean that India will have to buy American goods to that extent. It is true that the American goods are priced slightly higher than their counterparts available in Europe and elsewhere. But as it is apparent from the statement of the Indian Industrial Delegation which visited U. S. recently, this price-disadvantage will be made good by the superior quality of the American goods and the saving of at least 2 per cent in interest rates.

Sheikh Abdullah

SHEIKH Abdullah's release from detention will be welcomed by all freedom loving people in India. His four year's detention without trial, however, does no credit to the Government of India, at whose connivance, the Sadre-e-Riyasat of Kashmir had dismissed him in August 1953 and appointed Bakshi Gulam Mahommed in his place. It is natural that he should come out of his detention bitter and a little frustrated. But it is expected of a leader of his calibre to be sober even in his bitterness and try to assess the situation with a sense of objectivity. He has complained that his speeches have been misreported in the Indian

press; hence we hope he is still his old self and his political moves free from communal considerations.

It is obvious that Sheikh Abdullah is still immensely popular with the Kashmir people. His meetings are unmistakable demonstrations of his popularity. This fact is a clear indication that he cannot be ignored from a permanent solution of the Kashmir problem. We would certainly urge upon New Delhi not to spurn an old friend. Sheikh Abdullah, with all his background cannot be irreconcilable. Although he has made no secret of his hostility towards Bakshi Gulam Mahommed and his government, the hand of friendship extended by India's Prime Minister is bound to have a "healing touch." Sheikh Abdullah is shrewd enough to realise that he can rely more upon his erstwhile friends than his life-long enemies who are ruling over Pakistan today. The lasting solution of Kashmir problem lies in reconciliation, between Sheikh Abdullah, Bakshi Gulam Mahommed and New Delhi.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

Prof. Abraham Kaplan, Chairman, Department of Philosophy, University of California, visited the office of the Committee on 3rd January, 1958. He met some members of the Committee and discussed with them a number of problems of social philosophy.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

THE CAPITALISM OF THE PROLETARIAT?

by Daniel Bell

THE WORLD'S CITIES — PHILADELPHIA

by J. A. Lukacs

THE COUNTRY WITH A SMILE

by George Mikes

February 1958

53

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference

by B. K. Desai

THE Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference held in Cairo in the last week of December was another indication of the growing identification between Afro-Asian nationalism and international communism. That the two could strengthen each other and form an unholy alliance was a convincing proof that nationalism, in the absence of any positive creed, is bound to degenerate into blind anti-Western hysteria and thus feed the forces of international communism. For a long time Moscow has been posing as a champion of Asian nationalism as against the West and coveting the Middle East as a convenient springboard for penetrating deep Africa. On the other hand, rulers of Egypt cherish the longstanding ambition to become the unchallenged spokesmen of "Arab renaissance" and hope to become the champions of African liberation. The separate aims of nationalist and communist leaders dovetailed perfectly at the Cairo Conference which concluded with the establishment of Afro-Asian Solidarity Council with Cairo as its headquarters, an Egyptian as the first Secretary-General, and a Russian representative as one of the Secretaries.

It is interesting to trace the origin and development of this latest communist drive. Ever since the Colombo Powers decided to convene the Bandung Conference in 1955, Russia and China have tried to exploit the resurgent Asian nationalism and the idea of Afro-Asian solidarity by identifying themselves with the common aspirations of Afro-Asian peoples. Prior to the Bandung Conference, the communist-sponsored "Asian Conference for the Relaxation of Tension" was held in New Delhi. That the Conference was held under the auspices of the All-India Peace Council in implementation of a proposal of the World Peace Council in Stockholm was a clear indication of its real nature, political colour and the main driving force. The Conference claimed that it was the preparatory meeting for Bandung itself. The claim, however, aroused much indignation all over Asia.

But while the Delhi Conference failed in its attempt to identify the international communist movement with Bandung, it succeeded in establishing the Asian Solidarity Committee in New Delhi as a new front organisation to replace the discredited "peace committees". At a meeting in Delhi in December 1956, held under cover of the Asian Writers' Conference the Committee decided to extend its activities to Africa by organising an Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Cairo, by renaming itself the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement and calling its projected quarterly, *Asia-Africa Review*.

Cairo was chosen as the venue of the Conference as, it was explained by Dr. Anup Singh, Secretary of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, Egypt was the "recognised leader and guide" of the Arab renaissance, and besides Cairo had useful links with other Arab countries. The Preparatory Committee met in Cairo

in the last week of September 1957, to settle the opening date and the agenda of the Conference. Invitations were sent out to all Bandung countries and to other countries in Asia and Africa liberated since then. The purpose of the Conference was stated by the Preparatory Committee to be to "continue the Bandung Conference policy" and to "answer imperialist plots against certain Asian and African states such as recently took place in Syria". The statement concluded by saying, "It is recalled that the Bandung Conference was attended by Governments. The Afro-Asian Conference, however, will represent the people."

The tone of deliberations at the Conference was set in advance at the Preparatory Committee meeting with statements by its members denouncing Western aid as an "instrument of imperialism". The Conference was described as a "New Bandung", thus confirming the intention of confusing popular opinion about its origin. After the Bandung Conference Soviet Russia tried to identify herself with the aspirations of resurgent Asian nationalism by invoking and supporting the Bandung spirit and profusely subscribing to the doctrine of Panchsheel every now and then. But the Soviet Union was not invited to the Bandung Conference and it was still regarded a European power. But with the Cairo manoeuvre the Soviet Union succeeded in its attempt to pose as an Asian nation together with Red China.

With the stage thus set for this anti-West circus, the organisers made every effort to ensure that there would be no opposition to their policies either in the Preparatory Committee or at the Conference. This was clear even from the composition of the delegations from different countries. About 500 hand-picked delegates from 45 countries, including teams of observers from East European countries represented none but themselves at the Conference and indulged in shouting slogans in the name of "millions of people" in Asia-Africa. The largest delegation was, of course, from the Soviet Union consisting of no less than 40 members headed by the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Uzbek Republic. Communist China also was not far behind with a delegation of 25 members led by the Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee of Chinese Deputies.

Among the "people" and Governments not represented at Cairo were such members of the Afro-Asian communities as South Koreans, Turks, Filipinos, Nationalist Chinese, Pakistanis, Iraqis, Saudi-Arabians and most of the Africans. The Government of Jordan refused to send a delegation and Jordan was represented by an exile. Lebanon was represented principally and almost exclusively by communists. The Indian delegation consisted of 10 members, all of them communists or fellow-travellers. Prominent among them were Dr. Anup Singh, Smt. Rameshwari Nehru and Mr. A. K. Gopalan. Many of the nationa-

list movements in African countries like Algeria were represented by exiles in Cairo. Most of the delegates attending the Conference were not personalities of special importance or influence at home and very few of them would be able to spread the "message" of the Conference after their return.

From the very beginning there was a general apprehension even among the protagonists of the so-called "positive neutrality" that the Conference was bound to degenerate into a forum for the communists for their propagandist diatribes against the West. Even though Egypt had agreed to play the host and to pay the entire cost of the Conference, Nasser himself was not free from this doubt. A week before the Conference opened, Dr. Anup Singh disclosed that President Nasser had expressed the wish that the Conference should not provide the occasion for an attack against any country. Besides, many of the delegates from such African countries as Tunisia, Morocco, Ghana and Ethiopia had made the trip only on the basis of assurances by a Nasser representative, Mr. Zakaria Lutfi Gama, who toured Africa only two months before the Conference. They were assured that Egypt would steer the Conference along a "neutral course" and would not permit communists to dominate the sessions.

But the policy of so-called positive neutrality was submerged and completely forgotten under the welter of cries for peaceful coexistence (of the Moscow type) between East and West. The Conference provided the impetus to the new drive by the Kremlin to convince peoples and Governments of Asia and Africa that the Soviet Union is their best friend and champion of their rights among the great Powers and that all anti-communist Governments are imperialistic and, therefore, their enemies. The discussions held and resolutions passed in different sub-committees such as economic committee, anti-imperialism committee, disarmament committee, and racial discrimination committee were in the usual style of soap box rhetoric in which all the ills to which Afro-Asia is heir were attributed to "imperialist ambitions" and U.S., Britain, and France were the main targets of attacks. In all these meetings, some of which were held behind closed doors, little was said that had not been repeated thousands of times before. But what was more important to the organisers than the deliberations were the propaganda aspects of the Conference which were in full operation throughout till the end. No wonder, then, that the Soviet Union and her henchmen stole all the thunder and completely dominated the scene at the Conference to the dismay of the Egyptian President who was conspicuously absent from all the sessions of the Conference. Even the redoubtable Dr. Anup Singh could not help saying apologetically at the conclusion of the Conference that the conference's decisions tended by implication to follow the line which "suited the communists" although, he claimed, the communists "neither financed nor dominated it."

The Soviet Union posed at the Conference as the champion of Afro-Asian Solidarity and of the rights of the Afro-Asian peoples. The Moscow propaganda drive, it was apparent, was concentrating on a few

keypoints. One was the appeal to the pride of the young nations concerned, another was to credit them with becoming a powerful force as "bastions of peace" in world affairs and the third was to stress the drive for national independence together with the boast that the friendship and cooperation of the "socialist camp" were the best guarantee the weaker nations could have against victimisation by other Powers. With this deceptive pose the Soviet delegates could blatantly play their role without fear of their claims being controverted. In the anti-imperialism committee they could support openly "the struggle of the Jordanians against the Eisenhower doctrine which has been imposed upon them by their ruler", could attack in the racial discrimination committee "American imperialism" for following racial discrimination or together with other delegates in social committee they could unashamedly condemn the "holding of hundreds of Cypriots in concentration camps" as a British atrocity. In the economic committee the Soviet delegate made an offer of "unconditional aid" to underdeveloped nations and advised his Conference colleagues to seize foreign property and capital in their countries citing the Suez Canal and recent events in Indonesia as an example.

The whole irony of the situation lay in the fact that the worst culprit was the main champion of virtues which he held in utter contempt. But this does not minimise the danger of this latest Soviet drive. From the reports of the Conference it is apparent that the Soviet delegation was the most popular and always received long and wide applause everywhere in the Conference. In the economic committee delegates refused to debate reports from Egypt, Syria and Japan until they had heard what the Soviet representative had to say. In the disarmament committee, the Soviet delegate first asked to be excluded from the group chosen to draft a resolution demanding a ban on nuclear weapons as, he said, the Soviet Union was forced, under the circumstances of the cold war, to produce nuclear weapons. However, the delegates would not hear of forming a resolution sub-committee without Soviet representation. These few instances are sufficient to demonstrate how richly Moscow was being rewarded for its latest drive. The outcome of the Conference was the decision to set up a permanent Secretariat and a Solidarity Council with a National Committee for Solidarity in each country. Many countries in the Middle East have expressed their misgivings that this new Solidarity Council with its headquarters in Cairo would prove to be a thin end of a new Comintern wedge in Afro-Asian countries.

The communists and their fellow-travellers have found a fertile ground in the genuine aspirations of Asian countries for independence, equality and happiness. To counteract this Soviet threat, the Western Powers will have to do more than simply extend military and economic aid. What is needed is a totally new approach and vision which would understand and share in the common aspirations of the Afro-Asian peoples and would channel their nationalist sentiments along friendly and constructive lines.

Guided Tourism In China

by Adam Adil

GUIDED tourism is a common rule in all communist countries. * Mao's China is no exception to this rule. The technique of guiding tourists is so subtle and nearly perfect in China that members of delegations are taken in by the communist "achievements" and go back to their countries full of praise for the regime. Yet, discerning eyes have not failed to see beyond the nose. It is clear, however, that tourists have little freedom to go round the country at will and form their own judgement.

One of the first Indians to spotlight guided tourism in China was Brajkishore Shastri, who visited China in May 1953 as a member of a labour delegation. While describing the terrible conditions of the Chinese under the communists and the regimentation of even children the Mao regime has brought about, Mr. Shastri asked "Did George Orwell have a situation like this in his mind when he wrote his 1984?"

Mr. Shastri's experience has been confirmed by later visitors. They all agree that the Chinese communists following Russia have set up an elaborate system of guiding tourists which even the discerning visitors have found it difficult to escape.

Actually, for the last three years the communist regime has stepped up political tourism. Particularly, Asian countries are encouraged to send delegations to China. Peking reported that in 1955 more than 4,700 visitors from 63 countries had come to China, and the *Peoples' Daily* of January 21, 1957 claimed that the number for 1956 had increased to over 5,200 persons from 65 countries. According to the statement made by the Japanese China Friendship Association, in 1956, 1243 Japanese visited China. The Chinese Government realise the political importance of visiting delegations. Members of the delegations are usually political figures, trade unionists, cultural personalities, authors and leaders of public opinion in their respective countries. When they return home and write books or newspaper accounts or make public speeches eulogising the regime in China, the impact on the common people is normally great. And although these visitors are usually non-communists they help the growth of communist movement in their respective countries.

Visitors to China are handled by the China International Tourist Service, which is an agency of the Chinese Peoples' Society for Cultural Relations with foreign countries (CPSCR). Its major functions are, firstly, to boost up front organisations in other countries for the distribution of Chinese communist material, and secondly, to organise and direct delegations and other visitors to places which are show-pieces of communist "achievements". The CPSCR provides interpreters, arranges interviews with leaders as well as with "common" people, and gives, in general most flattering attention and hospitality to the visitors.

Most visitors enter China through Hong Kong. They cross into Chinese territory at Shumchun, and at

this place begins the personal attention of CPSCR to the visitors. Mr. Sailakumar Mukerjee of India who visited China in 1954 records how the Vice-General Secretary of CPSCR and the Vice-Secretary of the China India Friendship Association journeyed all the way from Peking to Shumchun to greet the 35 member Indian "friendship delegation" of that year, and stayed with the delegation throughout the journey.

The authoress Han Suyin records that most visitors complete their tour of China in about 20 days. Some stay for as long as forty days to two months. The journey round the country includes a train trip from Canton to Honkow and then to Peking. If the trip is by plane, the return trip is usually by train. About one third to one-half of the visit is passed in Peking in interviews, conferences, parties, meetings, receptions, cultural functions and short trips outside the city. Then, a trip to China's industrial heart, Manchuria, is arranged. This is sometimes followed by a trip to West China, to Sian, Lanchow and sometimes to the new oil centre at Yumen. Then, some visitors are taken to Chungking where a chain of guest-houses and cultural palaces has been erected. Many tourists are taken to Mao's birthplace and made to talk to Mao's "uncle", who is not necessarily the same person at all times and, as the story goes, is replaced by others in shifts. Some visit Shanghai and Hangchow. From the reports of the visitors, it appears that the itinerary is almost the same for all visitors, of course, with minor variations from time to time.

Often visitors are taken to the Great Wall and the University Centre in the West Hills. Some are shown a model jail near Peking. James Cameron, correspondent of *London News Chronicle*, the London editor of *Ce Soir*, Adalbert de Segonzac, Robert Guillain, correspondent of *Le Monde*, G. S. Gale, a member of Attlee mission in 1954, have published accounts of visits to the same jail where they were given the same briefing by the same person on how the prisoners, of whom two-thirds are political, are enjoying their "reform through labour service".

James Cameron comments, "And then one saw the simple peasant, chosen at random, and he was so palpably well rehearsed, one's questions faded away; one asked for a village and one found oneself in a place so immaculate that its roads were tramped smooth by the feet of endless delegations that had gone before." Comparing the accounts of Dhirendranath Das Gupta and Adalbert de Segonzac with those of Cameron, it is obvious that they visited the same model factories, farms, collectives, Shanghai kindergarten and other sights. The uniformity of accounts, is in fact, startling. Cameron says further, "I found myself besides a young man who by chance spoke English, who by chance knew both my name and my mission, and who by chance was in a position to stand by me until the end of the ride. He was more than

(Continued on page 8)

Seminar On Education For Democracy

THE Bangalore Group of the ICCF organised a three-day Seminar on Education for Democracy from 22 to 24 December. The Seminar was held in the Hall of the Kannada Literary Academy. Proceedings on the first two days began with music by the orchestra of the Maharani's College for Women.

The Chief Minister of Mysore, Shri S. Nijalingappa inaugurated the Seminar on the evening of the 22nd and Shri V. Venkatappa, Minister for Education opened the symposium on the morning of the 23rd. Shri Nijalingappa made a moving speech depicting the sombre crisis confronting the world today with the two world power systems of Soviet Russia and the USA in mortal opposition. The only way out, he said, was to control politics to achieve welfare and harmony. Shri Venkatappa too dwelt on the high responsibility of educated people to preserve the free way of life and to keep it free from corruption. If democracy afforded opportunities for the unscrupulous to play mischief, he contended, it afforded opportunities by the same token to wise and good people to counteract such mischief. Wisdom had its own responsibility. He too stressed the paramount importance of freedom.

The programme of the Seminar consisted of an opening symposium on democratic values as such, two sessions on the practical aspects of education at the university and pre-university levels and a closing session on the informal aspects of the effect of literature and other arts on the growth of democratic consciousness.

The opening symposium was presided over by Vidya Vibhushana Shri M. P. L. Sastry, Member, Legislative Council, who, as befits a Sanskrit scholar and a democrat, spoke on the basis for democracy in the cultural heritage of the country. The untouchable's query to Shri Sankaracharya (who asked him to stand aside) as to what he referred to by his word *chandala*—his body or his soul?—awakened the great teacher to an overwhelming sense of identity and equality of all souls as sharing in the same universal spirit. This basic idea of the Vedanta, said Mr. Sastry, afforded an unshakable foundation for democracy.

Professors M.V. Krishna Rao, C.V. Srinivasa Murthy and M. Yamunacharya from the University of Mysore defined and described the essential components of the democratic attitude—the dignity of the individual articulated in the framework of civil liberties and fundamental rights, the spirit of freedom as the indwelling and all prevailing consciousness of democracy, the conventions of democratic government in party, cabinet and parliament, rule of law and the paramountcy of the judiciary within its own field, the habit of government by discussion, tolerance of opposition, the eschewing of all forms of violence, overt—as well as incipient, violence in thought as well as in deed, etc. They drew attention to the virtues and postulates of democracy and the need to support them by the whole of life as well as in the detail of governmental working.

The session on university education was presided

over by Rao Bahadur Prof. B. Venkatesachar who was for over a generation professor of mathematics and latterly Principal of the Central College and Director of the Indian Institute of Science. He spoke of the social value of mathematical training in developing a consciousness of truth as objective fact and law, independent of human foibles, passions and predilections and beyond self-interest. Prof M. A. Venkata Rao spoke on the teaching of history and its role in democratic education. The historian, he said, should stress the distinction between history as a series of willed actions or voluntary deeds and omissions of human beings endowed with freedom. They could have been different if leaders and men had willed differently. The mutual relation between democratic leadership and its following, in which the personality of both was affirmed on a basis of freedom and consent, he asserted, was the stuff of democratic history. The opposite was the case in totalitarian states. History could elicit and support democratic consciousness by showing the power of conscious awakening on the part of peoples. This, he said, stressed the self-determining role of human society when it functioned at a certain level of self-consciousness. Mr. Philip Spratt sketched the various ways in which totalitarian States controlled the thought of their subjects in all spheres of life—education, history and the social science as well as the arts and physical and biological sciences.

Mr. M. V. Balakrishna Rao read a paper on the need and the value of social sciences for framing sound democratic policies. He was a delegate deputed by the R. L. Foundation of Bombay. The Seminar evoked keen interest amongst the intelligentsia of Bangalore and all sessions were well attended.

(Continued from page 7)

amiable, in the end I was sorry to lose him, but some how he was always replaced.... As we groaned into Canton Station..... The new government man appeared with superlative timing precisely at my window."

Any foreigner who is desirous of visiting places and persons outside official schedule arranged for him—particularly when those places and persons are unacceptable by the regime for the purpose of guided tour—he gets the usual reply that the hosts will try to arrange the visit; but no such arrangement is ever made by the hosts. No foreign visitor has yet been permitted to visit Tibet, minority areas, border regions, the coast-line of South China, defense works, forced labour camps, and famine and flood areas. According to Robert Guillain all enquiries and inquisitive questions receive uniform official answers. The difficulty of finding truth about China is further aggravated by the absence of free newspapers. The only information a visitor can get is from official briefings and handouts, and the newspapers and magazines circulated are all officially controlled.

The Revolt Is Rising

by Leon Denpen

IT is a tragic comment on the failure of the Bolshevik revolution that even a minor novel of slight artistic merit like Dudintsev's, which has the courage to champion the creative, idealistic individual in his struggle with a sterile and corroding bureaucratic rule, should be hailed as one of the most significant documents of our nuclear age.

Why, some critics asked, all this furor, not only in Europe on both sides of the Iron Curtain but also in America and in the former colonial world? Why, indeed, did party boss Nikita Khrushchev denounce the young author as an "calumniator" who has written an "unhealthy, tendentious and obnoxious" book?

The answer, it seems to me, is clear: it is because Dudintsev, probably without realizing it, speaks with the authentic and long-muted voice of Russian humanity. It is because revolutionary history is repeating itself in the vast Russian empire and Dudintsev, like his nineteenth-century predecessors, has become, quite unconsciously, I am sure, the harbinger of the "first booming of the tidal wave that heralds many storms after a depressing lull." Whatever its aesthetic merits, *Not By Bread Alone** has made a profound impression on the Soviet public, particularly on the younger generation of Russians, and has become a central phenomenon in Russia's post-Stalinist life.

There is, indeed, a deadly parallel between the impact of *Not By Bread Alone*, forty years after the Revolution, and the spirit of revolt unleashed by Russia's novelists, poets and critics in the fertile nineteenth century. When Tsar Alexander II's Ministry of Interior authorized the publication of Dostoyevsky's *The House of the Dead* in 1860 a disappointed Russian censor, Khrushchev's spiritual ancestor, noted sadly in his brief report: "Will not uninformed readers interpret the highly humanitarian measures of the (present) government in relation to penitentiaries as a softening of the penalties for very serious crimes?"

The frightened censor was, of course, not alone in sensing in the novels of Dostoyevsky, or in the works of his predecessors, Pushkin and Gogol, the handwriting on the wall—the mighty challenge to Orthodox faith and the supremacy of the autocrat. That great rebel Alexander Herzen, who had been following developments in Russia from his London exile, was inspired by *The House of the Dead* to write in his journal, *The Bell*: "Listen! From all the course of our immense country, from the Don to the Urals, from the Volga to the Dnieper, the grumbling is increasing, the revolt is rising."

And yet, Dostoyevsky, like Gogol before him, was horrified by the suggestion that his novels contained a message of freedom—that they were, in fact, paving the way for the overthrow of the Monarchy. He considered himself a faithful servant of the Little Father,

the Tzar, and hated men like the critic Vissarion Belinsky, the prophet of "westernism," who hailed some of his novels as harbingers of revolt. He had even prepared an additional text for *The House of the Dead* to explain that the conditions under which the Siberian convicts lived robbed them of their appetite for good "patriotic" rye bread. And Gogol insisted to his dying day that his *Inspector General* and *Dead Souls*, far from being savage satires on Tzarist bureaucracy, were actually works with a "Christian" moral purpose designed to teach the great unwashed humility, obedience to the Tzar and servility.

Similarly, a century later, Vladimir Dudintsev complains bitterly in the special preface to the English edition of *Not By Bread Alone* that he has been "misunderstood." "We speak boldly and honestly about our deficiencies and our difficulties," he writes, "because they are the birth pangs of a new world in which there is no injustice, a world the principles of which are being confirmed and marching to victory in my country."

One cannot compare Dudintsev's pedestrian prose with the masterpieces of Gogol or Dostoyevsky. Nevertheless, as Edward Crankshaw puts it, there are writers whose names live for centuries, but once they have died, are scarcely read. These are the men and women who, without being great creators, mark with their work a turning point or a new beginning. Indeed, whoever reads today Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* or Chernishevsky's *What's To Be Done?* Yet both writers will be remembered as long as man yearns for freedom. This, I am convinced, is also true of Dudintsev. Whether he realizes it or not, *Not By Bread Alone* will come to stand for the awakening of the Russian people to the true nature of "proletarian dictatorship"—whether under Lenin, Stalin or Khrushchev.

To be sure, Dudintsev is not the first Soviet writer to raise his voice against the all-powerful bureaucracy. Others—Boris Pilynak, Yuri Olesha, Isaac Babel—have done it more subtly and with greater literary skill. (All three subsequently perished in Stalin's great blood purges.) Even Ilya Ehrenburg, that Stalinist charlatan and quick-change artist, on whose "evidence" a number of prominent Yiddish writers were sent to their death, jumped on the bandwagon after Stalin's death to write *The Thaw*, which is mildly critical of the dead tyrant's excesses. But Dudintsev, to my knowledge, is the first post-Stalinist novelist who indicts the fundamental Communist idea, its deadly one-party rule, and not simply the men who have become its instruments. Unlike his predecessor, he seeks to probe to the very root of the evil. Quite unconsciously, I am sure, he emerges as the spokesman of the disfranchised masses, the have-nots, the forgotten men who are in a continuous life-and-death struggle with what Milovan Djilas calls the new class.

(Continued on Page 11)

* *Not By Bread Alone*—by Vladimir Dudintsev, Hutchinson, London, price 18s. pp. 447.

The Affair Of Dr. Zhivago

(Contributed)

DR. ZHIVAGO is a new novel written by the famous Russian writer, Boris Pasternak after years of silence under the Stalin regime. Stalin has passed away and Pasternak is able to write, but he is not yet able to publish his novel in Russia. The novel was published in Italian in Milan and Collins are due to publish shortly an English translation.

The publication of *Dr. Zhivago* in Milan was a sensational event. Many efforts had been made earlier to get back from the publisher the copy of the novel on the excuse that the author wanted to revise it. The director of the League of Soviet Writers, Alexi Surkov, made a special trip to Milan to persuade the publisher to drop the plan of publication. Persuasion as well as threats were used, the consequences of the publication to the author were also mentioned, but the publisher stood firm and refused to oblige the emissaries of Moscow.

The publisher of the novel is the well known house of Giangiacomo Feltrinelli. The present proprietor of the house, Feltrinelli, is an important member of the Communist Party of Italy. He has played a prominent part in the party as well as in the public affairs of his country. There is no mystery or conspiracy about the way in which the manuscript of the novel reached his hands. When Feltrinelli entered into his contract with Pasternak and secured the rights of translation in European languages, the authorities in Moscow had planned to publish the novel through their publishing house "Gozlitizdat." One of the Soviet reviews *Znamaya* had published some poems from the book and the press and the radio had also announced its early publication. October 15 was set as the date for the publication in Russia and abroad. So it was in a perfectly legitimate manner that the manuscript and the right of publication were secured.

But later the Kremlin bosses had some second thoughts and they decided not to publish the novel. The Union of Soviet Writers, without whose authority no novel or poem can be published, decided that the novel's "cumulative effect casts doubt on the validity of the Bolshevik Revolution, which it depicts as if it were a great crime in Russian History." The verdict sealed the fate of the novel. Then began efforts to stop its publication in other countries. But the Italian publisher, Fraternali stood firm and the efforts failed.

Dr. Zhivago is a major novel about post-revolutionary Russia by one of Russia's and the world's most distinguished writers; it has 760 pages and more than 200,000 words in the Italian edition. It describes the life of a host of characters against a background of social change in Russia during the last fifty years.

The novel begins with the funeral at the turn of the century of Maria Nikolayevna, the mother of a boy named Yura Zhivago, the future Dr. Zhivago. It goes on to recount the life of Yura and his wife Tonya, and that of another couple named Pasha Antipov and his wife, Lara. The lives of these characters are closely intermingled.

After fighting in World War I and living through the Bolshevik Revolution in Moscow, Yura moves east with his wife. There he meets Lara, whose husband is a war prisoner of the Germans. Yura falls in love with Lara but is kidnapped shortly afterward by a group of civil war partisans who need a physician.

Yura spends more than two years with the partisans. On his return he finds that his wife and two children have gone to Moscow and he becomes Lara's lover. Later he learns that his wife and children have been expelled from the Soviet Union and are in Paris. Lara's husband, meanwhile, had become a leader of irregular forces opposing an anti-Bolshevik army. Upon the victory of the Soviet forces, the communists, have no further use for his services, want to shoot him and he commits suicide.

Fearing for Lara's safety, Yura prevails upon her to go to the Soviet Far East with another man. Yura returns to Moscow, where he supports himself by writing. He lives with the daughter of the janitor of a house where he had resided years before. Some time later he died of a heart attack in a street car without again seeing his wife and children.

Some of the remarks made by the principal characters of the novel have an anti-Communist flavor. They are spoken in a context describing conditions that existed in Russia a long time ago.

To a person who says that Marxism is a positive science, one of the characters replies:

"Marxism and science? Marxism is not sufficiently master of itself to be a science. Science must have equilibrium. Marxism and objectivity? I know no current of thought that is more isolated and farther from the facts than Marxism. Government men do everything possible to turn their back on truth to maintain the legend of their infallibility. I despise politics. I don't like men who don't love truth."

Another character says:

"I think that collectivization was a wrong measure and that it failed though the error could not be acknowledged. To conceal the failure by every means that terrorism can suggest, it is necessary to make people learn not to think and to judge, forcing them to see things that did not exist and proving the contrary of what every one could see."

At another point a character says:

"The worst evil and the root of future evil were a loss of confidence in the value of one's own opinion. We thought that the times when one adhered to one's moral sense were over. We thought it was necessary to sing in chorus and to live on absolute concepts imposed from above."

Further on the novel says:

"This has often happened in history. What was conceived as a noble and lofty idea has become martial and crude. Thus Greece became Rome

and Russian enlightenment has become the Russian Revolution."

The novel is now published—and the question that is now worrying writers all over the world is: What is going to happen to Pasternak? It is to be hoped that the present rulers of Russia will not do what even Stalin dared not do. Pasternak enjoys such an eminent position in world of letters that even Stalin had to tolerate him though he refused to bow down to his will. But the remarks made by Surkov, the Director of the League of Soviet Writers, are ominous. He likened the publication of *Doctor Zhivago* to the publication in 1930 of Boris Pilnyak's *Bois des Iles*. The book was banned in Russia. Later Pilnyak was arrested and after some period in jail was executed. It is to be fervently hoped that the same fate will not befall Pasternak.

The fuss that Russia has made over the publication of *Doctor Zhivago* has exposed the Russian ruler's attitude towards writers and their writings. It appears there was a thaw for some time immediately after the death of Stalin. The writers made use of comparative freedom obtained by them to question and criticise the whole body of recent Soviet literature. The communist rulers were shocked and alarmed by the violence of the pent up feelings. The process was therefore reversed and the writers were called to order. The *Literary Gazette* set the tune. It told the writers:

"At the present time when . . . the slanderers from the camp of international reaction are trying to calumniate our revolutionary traditions, to juggle with facts, your place, writer, is in the firing line. Today your anger and your hatred must resound from the pages of our newspapers and magazines; your flaming words filled with profound understanding of the class character of social phenomena."

The supreme boss of the Party, Khrushchev addressed the writers in 1957 no fewer than three times and enjoined upon them to follow the new line.

At a garden party held for the writers in May he made a very nasty personal attack on a poetess, a member of the Communist Party, called Margaret Aliger, who had been very bravely standing by her own work and also defending the young contributors to *Literary Moscow* an annual which had shared

with *Not By Bread Alone* the honour of leading the revolt.

Miss Aliger was so overwhelmed by the attack that she fainted and had to be carried home. For some time Miss Aliger resisted the pressure to recant and confess the errors. But in the end she broke down and *Literary Gazette* of October 8 published her recantation. Her recantation was in following terms:

"I have had to go through several months of bitter reflection, deep consideration, and direct and merciless argument with myself" she began; and then she went on to confess to her mistakes: "I am sometimes inclined to substitute moral-aesthetic considerations for political ones. I have lacked comprehensive political sense. . . obviously I must now be far more demanding towards my life, get rid of certain tendency to speculate, undertake a more thorough check on my views of events in my life by going to life itself, to get into direct and immediate contact with it. . . asked for, in the statements of Comrade Khrushchev . . . always keeping in mind that any work done by a Soviet writer is political work and that it can be carried out honestly only by unwaveringly observing the Party line and Party discipline."

This confession of Miss Aliger so triumphantly published by Soviet Russia throws a flood of light on the "freedom" that writers enjoy in that country and also explains the desperate efforts made by its rulers to prevent the publication of *Dr. Zhivago*.

(Continued from Page 9)

Aesthetically, as I have indicated, *Not By Bread Alone* is as dull as some of the proletarian novels that were manufactured in New York in the 1930's. It is repetitive and slow in movement. There are no shades or colours in Dudintsev's imagination except black and white. The villain of the piece, Drozdov—cynical, power-grasping and a typical Stalinist factory director—is, of course, in the true tradition of "socialist realism", all black. He is a time-server and loves his comforts. He has just divorced his old wife because he was tired of her, and has married a young girl called Nadia. Like the typical practical executive, he has no sympathy for the idealist, the stargazer Lopatkin, who believes that man cannot live by bread alone.

On the other hand, the hero, Lopatkin, though a bit eccentric like all geniuses emerges as the embodiment of proletarian virtue and "pure" Communist idealism. It is Lopatkin who voluntarily abandons the plush life of the new class to invent a machine for casting drain-pipes that would help build the "Socialist Fatherland". In the end Lopatkin pits himself against the petrified bureaucrat, Drozdov. Though framed with Drozdov's help and deported to Siberia, he refuses to give up his belief in his invention and himself. As in all "Socialist realist" novels, virtue triumphs, if not completely. Help comes to Lopatkin from an unexpected quarter—Drozdov's wife, Nadia—and the tide begins to run in his favour.

And yet, *Not By Bread Alone* is a landmark, if not in Soviet literature, certainly in the history of Bolshevism.

—condensed from *The Socialist Call*, New York.

INDIAN COMMUNIST PARTY DOCUMENTS •

Published by

The Democratic Research Service
and
The Institute of Pacific Relations

Price Rs. 10

Available from:

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

The Pope is for peace — we are also. The Pope is for banning the atomic bomb — we are also. Therefore, objectively speaking, there is a point of contact and meeting between the policy of the Soviet Union and the Vatican.

—Mr. Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister,
The Hindustan Times, January 13.

To the prophets of imminent catastrophe it may perhaps be pointed out that for the last seven years there has been no major clash between the Big Powers.

—*The Hindu*, January 16.

In its nine months of power it (the communist regime in Kerala) had set new standards in efficiency, impartiality and incorruptibility — by lowering the earlier ones. The general philosophy of the communists seems to be that refractory skulls invite resounding blows.

—Asoka Mehta, *The Statesman*, January 14.

Mr. Adlai Stevenson seemed fascinated by domestic camels and when asked whether he liked camels he said, "Yes, but my major passion is the ass."

—"Wagis", *The Statesman*, January 14.

When we say we have a socialist pattern, we mean that we hope to have what the Russians claim they have — but in a democratic way.

—Mrs. Laxmi Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, *The Times of India*, January 17.

Oil is a dangerous and slippery thing too. There is more trouble in the world because of oil.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *The Indian Express*,
January 17.

Communism has two fundamental errors. First the system actually does not work. It breaks down with logical inconsistencies and practical inabilities. Secondly the arrogance of belief is intolerable, for communism usurps for the man the right of God.

—Dr. R. Fray, *The Hindustan Times*, January 4.

India is a servant and Pakistan is a slave. While Pakistan cannot change her masters India has a choice between two masters of the Atlantic and the Soviet camps. Only to that extent India is more sovereign state.

—Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, *The Indian Express*,
January 18.

Many countries have not believed in the mortal danger of communism, and then, when the evidence became clear to them it was too late and impossible for them to come to their sense. Look at Hungary!

—Cambodia's Ex-King Norodom Sinhanouk, *Time Magazine*, January 20.

You can oust a French minister, but you cannot change his opinion of yesterday's art show. True realism cannot always be guided or motivated by politics.

—Ilya Ehrenburg, *New York Times*, December 29.

Many countries have not believed in the mortal danger of Communism, and then, when the evidence became clear to them, it was too late and impossible for them to come to their senses. Look at Hungary!

—Cambodia's Ex-King Norodom Sinhanouk,
Time Magazine, January 20.

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

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.