

The Challenge Of The Visit

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE timing was excellent. All three events took place coincidentally, within the space of less than a month. While the last *Nyet* was being uttered in Geneva and the bomb exploding near the Baikal Lake, the Bulganin-Khrushchev act was getting under way in India.

All of it was, of course, only to serve the cause of "peace and understanding" among nations. How could it be otherwise, coming from the very heart of the motherland of peace and democracy? What else could the three events have meant but "encouragement to the countries of Asia and a natural reaction," a kind of warning to the "war-mongers," the Western grave-diggers of the spirit of Geneva? The seventeen grey-bottomed *Nyets* of *compere* Molotov, the peaceful hydrogen explosion (without any fall-out of course) and above all the curious, well-rehearsed, part comic — mostly sinister "partly Laurel and Hardy, mostly Jekyll and Hyde" all-India ham-act of the other two *comperes* were all of them the three-faced aspects of the same pre-and-post Geneva Soviet policy.

When we look into a mirror it may at times be useful to imagine what the mirror thinks about our face. It is often difficult to realise how the mirror of world opinion reacts to the acts and behaviour of one's own country. Take, for example, France. How few Frenchmen realise how the mirror of public opinion outside of France sees the political anarchy which prevails in their country since the end of the World War? How much of the traditional image of France as a great nation and a great world power has been carried away by France's irrational and erratic behaviour in world affairs of the last decade?

It may perhaps be useful now for those Indians, who have kept an open mind to reflect about the appearance of their country in the eyes of their cranky cousins of the non-communist part of the world.

Despite the repeated and emphatic statements of neutrality, there arises in that part of the world the growing, and at times, a "groaning" suspicion that India willy-nilly has been manoeuvred into being a kind of urbanely polite spokesman of Soviet foreign policy and that the process of "netting" the big and trusting Indian fish into the murky waters of the long-term communist policy has been successfully initiated.

In this context it appears that the breach of the rules of international etiquette by the Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers, Marshal Bulganin, and by the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. Nikita Khrushchev, have been part and parcel of a carefully calculated plan and that the statements they made in India and Burma were not the result of a kind of uncouth and at times alcoholic exuberance of two happy-go-lucky extrovert globe-trotters (a character role which Mr. Khrushchev seems to enjoy) but were rather from the first to the last completely intentional. Should we not therefore carefully weigh the utterances of these *panchshila* loving defenders of Buddhist faith and analyse them as part and parcel of the carefully worked out process of getting neutralist India into the orbit of Communist policy?

The public fraternisation of the Russian leaders (whose regime offers perhaps the most systematic and comprehensive sort of totalitarian tyranny the world has ever known, a regime that has shed more blood than all the Timurs, Caligulas and Genghis Khans of the past) with our national hero and Prime Minister, the chosen heir of perhaps the greatest apostle of non-violence in all history, has conferred respectability and put the seal of approval of the Indian national conscience on the Russian State system. It would be very difficult hereafter to convince our people, (intelligentsia and the masses), of the essential injustice and total untruth implied in such sanction of the Russian regime by our moral consciousness.

This is no speculative question, for approval and admiration will inevitably exercise a strong pull in the direction of alignment with the object of our admiring friendship.

And indeed this is envisaged and encouraged in the proposal of economic and cultural cooperation contained in the joint communique by Mr. Nehru and the Soviet leaders on the eve of the latter's departure from India.

Such "free" collaboration between the people of the two countries will extend the scope of infiltration into our administrative, economic, technical and cultural circles, for their Russian opposite numbers are trained propagandists while our personnel are mostly ignorant of the grim realities of the Russian situation.

Thus there is room for doubting the wisdom of inviting the heads of a State with such a black record of concentration camps, forced labour, thought control, barbarous purges and liquidations into our country and holding them up to popular veneration in receptions more extravagant than any offered to Mahatma Gandhi at the height of his popularity. Indeed people were led to rank Bulganin and Khrushchev with the heroes of the Mahabharata and even the *avatars* of Rama and Krishna!

Was it right for our government to give such direct access to foreign potentates into the soul of our people and accord them such a place in the national "pantheon"?

It is no wonder that while our Prime Minister speaks scrupulously of still being outside of both camps, the Soviet and Chinese leaders refer to the *solidarity* of the masses of Russia, China and India, in the face of which, they declare, no one would dare to start a war against them!

The intimate personal relations established between Mr. Nehru and the Soviet leaders, Bulganin and Khrushchev, during the recent "festival" of the latter's visit here have confused the rank and file of the Congress Party as well as the officials of the administration. It has blurred the sharp distinction between the Congress Party of Mahatma Gandhi's creation in the image of free spiritual values and the Bolshevik State—the party of the amoralist Machiavellians, Lenin and Stalin.

It has weakened the parliamentary institutions of

the country and dwarfed the colleagues and co-workers of Nehru, in and out of Government.

Nothing could be therefore of greater disservice to the Indian nation than to conceal the bitter truth that in the eyes of the free world India has moved dangerously close to the communist "united front". The only hope we have is that the nations of the free world will show the greatest possible degree of political maturity, that they will not let themselves be taunted into the state of bitterness towards India which the communists so ardently desire and that they will continue to extend their helping hand for the preservation of India's freedom and independence.

QUEST

a bi-monthly of arts & ideas

Sponsored by

the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

EDITOR: NISSIM EZEKIEL.

"I have just now finished looking through your journal and I am very impressed with its quality. Yours is, as far as I know, the only serious rival to COMMUNITY, in South East Asia, at least!"

—C. R. Hensman, Editor, COMMUNITY.

"It presents uniformly good reading, and the editing and production show a high degree of judgment and technical excellence. What gives the magazine a certain distinction is a critical awareness of the contemporary condition that seems to inform it as a whole. One is struck by a seriousness of intellectual purpose with an evident refusal to be dogmatic or tendentious"

—THOUGHT.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the 1st of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

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

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

Annual subscription Rs. 6/-

Single Copy Re. 1/-

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

Notes

The Pot And The Kettle

NOW that the heat has died down somewhat on the Dulles-Cunha communique, it is possible to look at the matter in correct perspective. About the egregiously undiplomatic wording of the communique, in so far as it referred to Goa, there can be no question. If American diplomacy is often felt to be immature, this is yet one more evidence of the fact. That there should have been irritation in Washington with the manner in which Bulganin and Khrushchev were allowed to use Indian soil for their tendentious propaganda is understandable, and such irritation was by no means confined to Washington. If Mr. Dulles had chosen to express his pain at the fact that nothing had been done to stop Indian soil being used for such unneutral purposes, many in this country would have recognised the validity of his reproach. Joining with the Portuguese Foreign Minister in this little pin-prick was hardly a reaction worthy of the world's leading democracy.

Having said that, it is also a matter for consideration as to how many of those who were so wroth with Mr. Dulles for this gaffe were in a position to throw a stone in the direction of Washington. When Prime Minister Nehru was on his way back from Moscow, he was asked at a press conference in Europe what he had to say in regard to the captive peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other Eastern European satellites of the Soviet Union. Prime Minister Nehru's reply was that all these were free and independent sovereign States with whom India had friendly diplomatic relations. None of those who have displayed such indignation with Mr. Dulles' prevarication were noticed to have shown similar annoyance with our own Prime Minister's equally equivocal statement. Mr. Dulles, by sticking to diplomatic niceties, has in this case only followed Mr. Nehru's unfortunate example. Both statements are equally worthy of censure at the hands of those who are really opposed to imperialism and colonialism in all its forms. A condemnation of one and a guilty silence on the other are not convincing as evidence of real concern for those who, whether in the Baltic States, Eastern Europe or North Korea, or in Algeria, Morocco or Goa, are still subject to colonialism.

Moscow's Advice To C.P.I.

REFERENCES in *Time* magazine and other sections of the world press to the Shepilov letter of instructions to the Communist Party of India do not come as news to well-informed students and observers of the communist apparatus in India. The existence

of this letter has been known for some time now in such circles and its importance has not been overlooked considering that Dmitri T. Shepilov is not only one of the chief editors of *Pravda* but is also known to be a man close to Khrushchev who has pushed him forward a great deal in the hierarchy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. That, combined with his position in *Pravda*, has led to his being something of a mouthpiece of the supposedly-defunct Comintern, which functions nonetheless with great effectiveness.

The Shepilov letter to the Communist Party of India reportedly makes three main points. The first is that the Indian Communist Party should do nothing that would act as an irritant or interfere with the major diplomatic operation on which Soviet Russia and Communist China are now engaged of taking India in tow. The second is that the Indian Communists on their part need not be unduly perturbed or panicky at the ardent courting of the Indian Government by their mentors in Moscow and Peking nor take their public professions at face value.

It is the third and concluding point which brings out the real nature of current Soviet manoeuvres in this country. The letter goes on to reassure the Communist Party of India that the time must inevitably come when it will be possible for the Communist Party of India to settle scores with the present bourgeois Government of India. This part of the letter not only shows that there is no reassessment in Moscow of the true nature and character of the Indian Government but constitutes a real stab in the back, considering that the Shepilov letter arrived in New Delhi in advance of Bulganin and Khrushchev.

Indian In Soviet Camp

THE recent question in the Rajya Sabha with regard to the reported detention of an Indian in the Vorkuta Soviet Concentration Camp in Arctic Siberia represents the natural concern which every Indian would exhibit over an incident of that kind. The fact that this report has emanated from persons who have been recently released from the concentration camp is enough indication of the truth of the report. The Government of India, instead of dismissing the report as "vague", should try to collect fuller information about that unfortunate Indian. Further, not one but several of those released from the concentration camps have testified to the Indian's detention.

Actually this report had reached India about three years ago. The Indian Embassy in Bonn (West Germany) had informed the Government of India of it in 1952 on the strength of the statement of certain prisoners released from Soviet concentration camps. Some prisoners named the detained Indian as "Johnny Fault" while others identified him as "Abdul." Again, it was reported in 1954 that an Indian from the concentration camp was brought to East Germany. Whether it is the same Indian brought to East Germany last year or there is yet another Indian still detained in Soviet Union, is a matter the Government

of India should forthwith inquire into. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's assurance that "we are still making some inquiries" is not enough. What the Government of India have to do is to take immediate steps to secure the release of the Indian from the concentration camp.

The Soviet concentration camps are truly international in character. Not only Russians, but nationals of various other countries are also detained in those haunts of torture and degradation. Besides, there are thousands of German and Japanese prisoners of war.

The Courageous Two

IT is a pity that only two out of nearly six hundred members of the Lok Sabha could muster courage to protest against the impropriety of many remarks made by the Soviet rulers during the course of their stay in the country as its guests. And it is a greater pity that when the two members sought to express in very mild terms their disapproval of this action of the Soviet guests there were interruptions and shouts of protest in the Lok Sabha.

Mr. N. C. Chatterjee and Mr. H. V. Kamath, the two courageous members, were within their rights in expressing the views that they did when the Lok Sabha was discussing a supplementary demand for a grant to the External Affairs Ministry. It was just the occasion to give expression to any view that a member held of the use made by the Soviet rulers of the country's hospitality.

Surprisingly enough the interruptions and the protests were made by Congress members and not by communist members as one would have expected. The communist members did not think it necessary to intervene as they found that their work was being done by Congress members.

It is not easy to understand why Congress members were so upset by the remarks of Mr. Chatterjee and Mr. Kamath. The two members did not talk about the guests in a disrespectful or discourteous manner. What they did was only to point out that the guests did not observe the rules of good conduct and had unnecessarily compromised India's position in the eyes of the world. Even this mild protest, it seems, was too much for Congress members who, acting upon the Party's orders, were keen on showing to the world that the guests and the hosts were equally pleased with each other.

An Unhelpful Decision

THE decision of the High Court of Bombay holding that a party did not have an inherent right to demand a passport and that it was not a justiciable right will be regretted by all those who stand for the expansion of civil liberties. The Constitution has specifically guaranteed the right of free travel within the country. The Declaration of Human Rights to which India has subscribed, includes the right

to travel abroad. And as travel abroad is not possible without a passport, a citizen should have been held entitled to get a passport. The right is not, of course, absolute and is subject to reasonable restrictions, but the reasonableness of those restrictions or the grounds on which the restrictions were imposed in any particular instance should be open to the examination of a court of law.

Mr. Justice Coyajee of the Bombay High Court, however, adopted a narrow point of view and decided that the right rested entirely with the Government and that they were the sole judge of the conditions and circumstances under which a passport should or should not be granted to an applicant. This decision is in sharp contrast with a recent decision of a Federal District Court in the United States of America which held that the Department of State could not deny a passport to an American citizen without submitting the basis of its denial to judicial decision. The *raison d'être* of the decision was that the freedom of movement is part of a person's liberty and that he cannot be deprived of it without due process of law.

The same reasoning should hold good here. Passport officers should not be allowed to act arbitrarily or capriciously, which will be possible only if a right to a passport is regarded as a justiciable right. It is to be hoped that an appeal will be filed against Mr. Justice Coyajee's decision and that it will be reversed by a higher tribunal.

Need For National Unity

MR. SRI PRAKASA, Governor of Madras, in his Convocation Address to Bihar University, rightly stated that "the biggest problem facing the country at present is how to ensure the permanence of national unity."

With the publication of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission provincial feeling in many parts of India has taken an ugly turn and is threatening to disrupt the national unity. Most vocal in the field are the communists who desire to exploit every situation to create chaos and render practice of democracy and the rule of the law impossible. Unless better counsels prevail, and reason rather than emotion is relied upon in the solution of the linguistic problem, we are afraid the situation will go out of control. Language is important no doubt but to raise linguism to the position of first principle in the dynamics of social change will, indeed, be a folly. Wherever there are disputes, the best course for the disputants would be to sit around a table and resolve their disputes in a spirit of give and take rather than allow them to be settled in the streets of cities and towns.

At the present juncture national interests must precede sectional interests, and national unity must be considered a need of paramount importance. At a time when India is embarking upon a major programme of social and economic reconstruction such fissiparous tendencies as we are witnessing to-day will only lead to disaster.

China Enters Stalinism

by Asiaticus

WHEN Pietro Nenni returned some short time ago from a visit to the East, he was interviewed by a London *Times* correspondent and the report he gave was, needless to stress, a very favourable one. But, relates the interviewer: Only when I mentioned China did his eyes really shine. "China," Nenni said, "was something different: Idealism, voluntary mass support of the regime, a revolution from consent." Such reports have been received in recent years from several Western visitors, and not all of them have been communists or fellow travellers. There was no terror, no purges in China, they said. The regime simply did not need terror because it was supported by the overwhelming majority of the people. Most of these visitors did not know China before, did not master the language and were consequently separated from a real understanding of the situation by an unsurmountable barrier. Closer observers of the Chinese scene have taken a dimmer view. One of them is Michael Lindsay (Lord Lindsay of Birker), one of the early supporters of the Chinese Communists in Yenan who has violently attacked in a recent book the foreign policy of Peking *China and the Cold War*. Close observers who have followed the official Chinese publications in press and radio have been concerned in particular about the major purge which has beset the country since early summer, 1955. In view of the extent of this purge and the number of people involved it seems rather likely that Peking has now finally embarked on a policy of Stalinism with all its implications. The very terrorist excesses that were predicted to be unlikely if not impossible in China by sympathetic but over-optimistic visitors are now already taking place. Our information about them is not based on the dubious reports of some refugees. It is proudly reported at great length and detail by the Chinese Communist press and radio day by day.

There can be but little doubt that in 1947/8 the Chinese Communists had the support of a considerable part of the Chinese people. But communist policy since then, especially *vis a vis* the peasants and the intelligentsia and the many unfulfilled promises, have caused a great change in the situation. This was first realised as the result of the mass defection to the West of Chinese Communist prisoners in the Korean camps in 1952/3. Since then the great purge has assumed far bigger proportions though its climax may be months, perhaps years ahead. The new purge began with a drive against intellectuals in summer of 1955 but spread almost instantly to wider fields. It was not the first such purge. It had been preceded by several more restricted and harmless ones which have been summarised recently by a Soviet historian, Prof. N. Fedorenko *Questions of the ideological struggle in China*. In 1951 a movie

The story of U Sun was sharply criticised by the Central Committee of the Chinese C.P. for a "reactionary reformist deviation." It lasted for 4 months and was in the words of a communist critic "the first struggle waged by Marxism against bourgeois, reformist, capitalist ideology after the liberation of China and it had great educational significance for the Chinese intelligentsia. This was followed in 1952 by the so-called "drives against the three (five) evils" which was however mainly directed against inefficiency and corruption in the State apparatus and economy and was of little ideological importance.

In 1954 there was a new major drive, a "discussion" about the appreciation of a classical novel of Chinese 18th century literature. In the course of this "discussion" many Chinese literary figures were charged with a "formalist" non-Marxist approach to literature and the national cultural heritage in general—under the influence of Hu Shi, a leading contemporary Chinese philosopher and literary historian. The pretext for this "drive" was more than threadbare but the intention was obvious: to bring about the "Gleichschaltung" of the Chinese intelligentsia in whose ranks there was as yet far too much of independent thinking to the liking of the Peking rulers.

Next came the Hu Feng affair, which affected for the first time members or sympathisers of the Communist Party who had dared to demand less thought control and cultural regimentation. There was nothing secret in the whole affair for Hu Feng and his friends had made their views known to government and party institution in the winter of 1954/5 to discuss them. However, the advocates of totalitarian control prevailed and in June 1955 the campaign against "Hu Fengism" came into full swing. First he was condemned merely on ideological counts only: of having represented a dangerous anti-party, anti-state ideology. But a few weeks later the whole affair assumed far wider implications. Hu Feng had not merely been a deviationist, but an "enemy of the people", and agent of Chiang Kai-Shek and of Western Imperialism who wanted to overthrow the communist regime in China. And not only Hu Feng himself but also his many friends and accomplices. After a few days it appeared that Hu Feng had hundreds of thousands of members in his "organisation" in every province of China, in the Chinese army, police, in factories and railway stations, in villages and party headquarters. It was an astonishing performance equalled only by the inventions of the GPU during the big Soviet purges of the thirties. The style also became very similar: "Vigilance," "scum of the earth," "mad dogs", "hyenas", "shoot them", "report everything and everybody suspect". The accusations became equally fantastic. The following quotations taken from

a booklet of Lo Jui Ching, Communist minister of state security (Peking, August, 1955) should suffice: "The counter-revolutionary Wang Pi Chang and two accomplices found employment in the peoples' hospital in Hopei and caused the death of ten patients and the permanent crippling of three as the result of intentionally false treatment." (which reminds one of both the story of Gorki's death and the Jewish physician's affair in 1953). Another counter-revolutionary, Fu Chia Pang, destroyed intentionally the 5-ton steam hammer in Takjuan by letting it work too early after its installation. (It is easy to imagine that poor Fu Chia Pang would have been charged with treason if he had *not* tried out his tool at the earliest possible moment). "Chang Jun, a Kuomintang reactionary in an ammunition factory made changes in certain blue prints without permission. As a result it was not possible to use 8,400 of the rifles produced and 509 showed bad results when tried out." "Li Chien Chin intentionally caused damage to a one-ton bulldozer which could not be used for a week as the result." "The counter-revolutionary, Tung Tien Kai, an engineer filled a hole in the roof of the tunnel of the Fengtai-chatchang railway with shreds of wood instead of good timber in contravention of the building prescriptions." "The counter-revolutionary and chief engineer Li Teh Hou caused an explosion with 38 casualties as the result of intentionally false work in the pits of a coal mine in Hsiaohujuan."

Many thousand such "news items" have been published in recent weeks in the Chinese press: on poisoning cattle, the intentional murder of patients in hospitals, on sabotage in every branch of the national economy. It is an almost exact replica of what happened in the Soviet Union in 1937—but perhaps on a wider scale. The Chinese minister for national security says in the booklet already mentioned: "In our country with 600 million, there are more than a few hundred or a few thousand counter-revolutionaries." Which means presumably that several millions will fall victim to the present purge. According to Lo Jui Ching 271,074 have been arrested of late (according to incomplete figures) in the provinces of Kwantung, Hunan, Kiangsi Anwei, Kiangsu, Shanghai, Kweichow and Yunnan as members of counter-revolutionary organisations. Among those arrested were many and prominent party members such as the Shanghai chief of the political police, Yang Fan, the deputy mayor of Shanghai and others. "Chen Min Chi Pao", the Chinese *Pravda*, announced in its issue of July 16, that whole local party committees were constituted of "bandits, rascals, members of religious sects and counter-revolutionary elements who had killed revolutionaries."

In these conditions we encounter all the concomitants of an organised witch-hunt, so well known from 1936-38 in the Soviet Union, and from more recent years in the Communist bloc. There is the appeal for "Bolshevik vigilance", the call to spy and denunciate. Stakhanovik workers in the fields of denunciation are highly commended and children are lauded for regularly reporting on their parents. Radio Peking on

August 24 announced the establishment of special post boxes to make it easier for the population to report hidden counter-revolutionaries. Already on the first day, this source reports, there were 1,600 letters and postcards. The "New China News Agency" on July 14th, dedicated a special feature to Jen Fu Shu, a worker in a plywood factory in Harbin who had reported within two years 51 cases of sabotage. He has been appointed "model security agent" and his exploits have been made the subject of an exposition in Harbin. Of late, we are given to understand "Fu Shu has been given a further appointment and his efforts have increased even more." But Fu Shu's activities are dwarfed into insignificance by the exploits of Wu Te Yuan, a young graveur in Peking who has "unmasked" 281 counter-revolutionaries within one year. ("Chung Kuo Ching Nien Chi Pao", Peking August 6th, 1955). This seems to be the Chinese record at the moment, but there can be little doubt that it will be soon surpassed in view of the concerted efforts made to bring a large scale witch-hunt under way. The same issue of the Peking newspaper already mentioned relates at some length the case of Wei Kuo Chu, a pupil in a Shanghai secondary school, who helped the police to catch his father (a "well known counter-revolutionary") who had escaped from a concentration camp. On August 28, Radio Peking praised another student in Chengshow who had denounced his father. This young man received a medal for his brave behaviour together with 21 other youths who had excelled in similar actions. A young man who had *not* informed the police that his father was a counter-revolutionary, was arrested on the other hand, and given a five years' sentence. ("New China News Agency, Peking, August 27th, 1955)."

We do not profess to know whether the present attempt to whip up mass hysteria in China is "spontaneous" as far as Peking rulers are concerned. It tends to show in any case, that Peking fears to have lost its support among the masses and believes that the country has to be ruled by terror. China has reached the Stalinist stage of Communist development. As the country is far more backward than Russia was at the time of the Communist revolution, Chinese Stalinism may conceivably surpass in due time the horrors of Stalinism in the Soviet Union.

It would be wrong to accuse visitors to China of not being able to see what appears to be the main feature of China today: the gradual passage into the great purge and regime of terror. Even a seasoned observer can hardly form an authoritative opinion after a short visit in a country of six hundred million. But the news about the great purge is not kept secret at all; it is to be found daily in the Chinese press and radio; there has been no conspiracy of silence about it. It would be interesting to know for what reasons the most recent developments in China have not received the publicity they deserve. However that may be, little doubt now remains that the Chinese regime has not been able (as so many well-wishers had hoped) to evade the "mistakes" of the Soviet Union and is now on its way to its local brand of Stalinism.

I. C. C. F. Report Of General Meeting

THE Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom held its Third General Meeting in Bombay on 17th and 18th December. It was attended, besides members from Bombay, by delegates from Delhi, Calcutta, Patna and Bangalore.

The inaugural function on Saturday evening included addresses by Mr. Asoka Mehta, M.P., who presided and Mr. Nicolas Nabokov, Secretary-General of Congress for Cultural Freedom.

Mr. Nabokov's speech brought a touch of reality and intensity to the inspiration and objectives of the movement. He pointed out how Nazi and communist totalitarianism had put the clock of liberal progress back in the twentieth century. Free culture and free human activities engaged in self-expression and self-fulfilment building the free culture of humanity had become impossible today in totalitarian countries and difficult in other countries owing to a passive yielding to the cult of mechanisation and the mass man.

He said that, in travelling across the vast expanse of India, he had a feeling of familiarity, for the Indian landscape resembled the open steppes of South Russia where he was born. He recognised also a broad similarity between the Russian people and the Indian people in a certain openness of heart and mind, a generous and hospitable appreciation of human personality, if not also in a sense for the mystic imponderables of life and nature. He prayed that misfortune might not overtake the simple, trusting people of India as it had his own unfortunate compatriots in Russia.

His accents imparted a sense of urgency and peril regarding the present situation both in India and elsewhere. He said that danger is pressing upon the free peoples both from within and from without. It required a deep and wholehearted dedication on the part of intellectuals to meet the challenge of the situation and make the world safe for democracy and the higher values of human personality without which culture and progress are words without meaning. It is impossible to put in words the impression of limpid sincerity and depth of personal conviction conveyed by Mr. Nabokov in his address in the Inaugural function as also at the reception organised by the Indian Committee in his honour at the Taj Mahal Hotel on the 19th. He bore out the impression of dedication he made by the devoted manner in which he followed the long and tiring discussions at the General Meeting on Sunday when for over three hours he followed the discussions and intervened with constructive suggestions enlivened by homely proverbs, anecdotes and sallies of wit and humour.

Mr. Asoka Mehta's presidential address covered wide ground; in fact he canvassed the vital nerve of the whole problem of modern civilisation. He posed it as arising from the loss of human values consequent on the development of technological civilisation which tears the individual from his roots in nature

and society and makes natural self-expression through normal growth in healthy human relations difficult. The problem before the present age is how to recover the equilibrium of life through a re-ordering of the application of technology and a reorientation of social relationships. Socialism and all other "isms" are responses to this challenge. The key to the solution is for the intellectual to recover a sense of the potency of ideas.

Mere practical dynamism without a grasp of the long range consequences of proposed changes and without the ability to entertain and develop ideas springing from the complex situation of the age is not enough and may prove more harmful than beneficial. The problem of cultural freedom is seen in this context as the problem of enabling man to reassert his ascendancy over the environment and build a world in harmony with his higher values in which he can live and grow without self-alienation.

The Meeting decided to send a message of warm greetings and appreciation of the Sampattidan movement to the Conference of the Sarva Seva Sangh meeting the following day in Vijayawada. Appreciation was expressed of the Sampattidan movement as a new dynamic for social change and of its lead, based on ancient tradition and spiritual values, to the Indian people at a time when their minds were being confused by ideas and ideals foreign to them.

The business session of the Committee held on Sunday morning adopted three resolutions and discussed the work of the Indian Committee as also the policy and principles of the bi-monthly magazine *Quest*, the organ of the Committee.

The first resolution referred to the Draft of the Second Five Year Plan and fuller provision being made for an immediate improvement in the actual living conditions of the people as also (which is even more important) for the expansion of their rights and liberties.

The second resolution expressed disapproval of the political exploitation of children such as the mass rallies arranged to welcome Soviet rulers during their recent visit to this country.

The last resolution welcomed the resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Congress at Milan last September recognising the importance of the welfare of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries to the strength and unity of the free world as a whole. It also endorsed the Milan resolution regarding the solidarity of the intellectuals of the free world with the artists and writers of the under-developed regions. The Meeting requested its Executive to prepare concrete proposals before its next meeting.

The discussions in the delegates' meeting on the aims and methods of the Congress for Cultural Freedom and the representative character of its Indian medium *viz.* the *Quest* brought out a variety of vigorously held views.

There was the usual divergence in emphasis on the former subject between the relative roles of direct

constructive cultural activity in one's chosen vocation and of attention to the administrative, economic and political conditions that may foster or obstruct such devotion. On the subject of the Committee's journal, the discussion turned on the independence of the Editor which is essential for developing the individuality or unique "face" of the journal. But it was also felt that, through an advisory board it was possible and necessary for the Editor to keep in mind the climate of opinion prevailing in the Committee.

The Meeting then elected the new Executive. Dr. Sampurnanand, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, Mr. Jaipal Singh, M.P., Mr. R. Benipuri, Mr. M. Bhaktavatsalam, Mr. Eric da Costa, Mr. Minoo Masani, Mr. Asoka Mehta, M.P., Mr. Ram Singh, Mr. Philip Spratt, Mr. Ka. Na Subramaniam, Mr. J. B. H. Wadia, Mr. V. B. Karnik were re-elected to the Executive. The two new members elected to the Executive are Mrs. Rukmini Devi Arundale, M.P., and Tarkateerth Laxmanshastri Joshi, Editor of Encyclopedia of Hindu Religion. The new Executive met on the afternoon of the 18th and re-elected Mr. Philip Spratt, Mr. Ka. Na. Subramaniam, Mr. J. B. H. Wadia and Mr. V. B. Karnik as Secretaries.

Full opportunity was taken during the sessions to introduce the music lovers of Bombay to Mr. Nabokov through a music seminar, a public lecture by him on "the Origins of Western Music—When did East & West Separate?" and an Indian music recital.

Altogether, the session was memorable for stimulating discussion that displayed a healthy clash and contact of divergent personalities, each interested in some branch of culture.

'MUTUAL STUDY'



Low in the Manchester Guardian

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

Resolutions adopted by the Annual General Meeting held on December 17 and 18, 1955

(1) This Annual General Meeting of the ICCF sends its greetings to the Conference on Sampattidan of the Sarva Seva Sangh which meets tomorrow, December 18 in Vijayawada. While paying its tribute to those who have dedicated their life to this unique movement which provides a new dynamic for social change and holds a beacon light before the Indian people when their minds are being confused by ideas and ideals foreign to their ancient tradition and spiritual values, the Meeting wishes the Conference on Sampattidan all success.

(2) This annual General Meeting of the ICCF recognising the vital part that economic progress plays in cultural freedom, welcomes all steps taken to improve the true welfare of the Indian people.

There are risks in all planning, particularly of the centralised kind. While these risks have to be undertaken, it must be recognised that they are greatly increased when a totalitarian outlook is imported into the framing of the Plan.

In view of these likely dangers and in the interest of the preservation and expansion of individual liberty and social freedom in which the ICCF is specially interested, this Meeting urges that the Second Five-Year Plan should be so drawn up as to provide at every step for meeting the needs of the people and securing the enthusiastic cooperation of the people and their increasing participation in every phase of the Plan.

(3) This Annual General Meeting of the ICCF expresses its strong disapproval of the political exploitation of children such as took place during the receptions that were accorded to Soviet rulers when children were mobilised through educational institutions to cheer, to wave flags and to shout slogans.

It regards this as symptomatic of the undesirable tendencies that develop in a democracy such as ours when people are encouraged to glorify systems that are inimical to the free way of life.

(4) This Annual General Meeting of the ICCF welcomes the resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Milan last September, recognising the vital importance of the strength and unity of the free world of the peoples of the under-developed regions and seeking to give concrete expression to the solidarity of the intellectuals of the free world with writers and artistes of under-developed regions. The Meeting requests its Executive to prepare, in response to the request that has come in from the International Secretariat, concrete proposals and forward them to it before its next meeting.

What Would The Marshal Have Said?

THE Press Guild of India organised a reception in honour of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Krushchev at Raj Bhavan to meet the representatives of the Fourth Estate. The reception was to be held at 8 a.m. on Thursday 24th November. Late on Wednesday night news came that the reception had to be cancelled "to lessen the strain on the Soviet guests." The Reception Committee did everything it could to avert the cancellation, but the intervention of the Chief Secretary to the Bombay Government and later of Mr. Morarji Desai, proved of no avail. The Russians were determined not to face the Bombay Press. They did well—the strain would certainly have been unbearable.

Surprisingly, the Press in Bombay did not give much publicity to this peculiar event. A small note in *Current* said that the Russians feared the presence of a large number of American and other pressmen who were likely to cause embarrassment to all concerned. The Russian Embassy moreover, is reputed to be not on particularly friendly terms with the President of the Guild, Mr. Frank Moraes.

There is little doubt that if the reception had taken place, it would have followed the pattern of the meeting which took place later at Rangoon between reporters and the Russians. The wicked reporters asked: "What about Panchashila for East Germany, Latvia, Estonia, Poland (or words to that effect) at which the Russians shouted back: "You are incapable of understanding what goes on in East Germany and if you tried to write anything good about Russia you would be made to starve to death by the capitalist press lords."

The Press Guild had seen to it that no protocol nicety was violated, and much spade work had been done before hand. Advance copies of the welcome speech of the Chairman, as well as of the questions which were to be put to the visitors had been prepared. The Russians, however, were clever enough not to ask for the questions before declining to answer them. If they had done so, there would have been a much greater furore over the whole affair.

Among the twenty questions which the Press Guild had intended to ask Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Krushchev, the following could have been answered satisfactorily only by the aid of New Speak and Double-think:

- (a) To what extent does Russia permit freedom of expression to its citizens, and to the press?
- (b) You must have come across the description of our ideal: "A Socialist Pattern of Society. Would it be possible to know if there is any important difference between such a society which already exists in Russia?
- (c) It is stated that one of the reasons why Russia is able to sell its manufactures on favourable terms to Asiatic countries is that it is employing forced labour. A U.N. Committee under the Chairmanship of a distinguished Indian, Shri Ramaswamy Mudaliar, itself declared that

"forced labour used both for political and economic ends is a standard part of Government policy in the U.S.S.R., and the Soviet dominated Eastern European countries." We should like to know what the distinguished visitors have to say to this.

Answering a reporter in Delhi before his departure, Marshal Bulganin said that there was no need for two political parties in Russia, because there was basically a common approach to all problems in a State where classes had been abolished. What would the opposition be about? And he might have added, would they continue to oppose after a suitable period of probation at Vortuka!

The Soviet Rulers did not hold a single press conference during their stay of about a month. The conference with the press that they held in Delhi on the day of their departure was hardly a press conference. Journalists had been asked to send their questions beforehand and a prepared statement answering a few of them was read at the conference. No questions were allowed on the spot nor were the pressmen permitted to seek clarification of the statement that was made. This was hardly a press conference as we know of it in this or any other free country.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

"ALGERIA DOES NOT EXIST..."

Herbert Luthy

USUALLY DESTROYED:

Aldous Huxley

NO MIRACLE AT MILAN

Dwight Macdonald

PORTRAIT OF A NEW YORK LADY

Elizabeth Hardwick

DECEMBER 1955 **27** ANNUAL RS. 12/-

For members of the Indian Committee
for Cultural Freedom Rs. 10/-

Review

The Appeals of Communism

by Gabriel A. Almond (Princeton University Press, 1954.
Pp. xxii, 415. \$6)

THERE is a school of literary critics who will count through *Hamlet* to find how many times Shakespeare uses *and* at the end of a line. People who are not used to it tend to be irritated by the fussy statistics and the heavy verbiage of American sociology. This book opens ominously with a chapter-heading, "The Structure of Communist Communication", and a glance through its pages reveals a forbidding mass of figures—in fact, (using its own methods), more than a hundred statistical tables.

But a technical vocabulary has its uses, and the statistical method has its place. Irritation does not in fact survive a reading of the first chapter. Everybody knows that communists pay scarcely any attention to their ideal aims and work only to get power. This book proves it in a convincing way by a statistical analysis of some of the communist classics. The analysis brings out several points which nobody would have noticed without it. Thus the ideal communist as portrayed by *Stalin's History of the C.P.S.U. (B)* embodies "goal qualities" (devotion to the ideals of communism) as to 6 percent of the references, and tactical qualities as to 94 percent. Of these tactical qualities militancy accounts for 28 percent, rationality 23, organisation and discipline 16, of the masses 13, confidence 5, and criticism, dedication and uniqueness 3 each. The emphasis on rationality is surprising and seems more characteristic of Lenin, in whose works it is in fact more heavily underlined than militancy. In Stalin rationality is really limited to the leader: the ordinary member is left very little scope for it.

There are further differences. An analysis of *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy* and the *American Daily Worker* compared with the *History of the C.P.S.U. (B)* shows in an often amusing way the pictures of the party and the world presented to the outsider or raw recruit and to the initiate. The aims dangled before the one—freedom, peace, and so forth—become "vulgar reformism" to the other.

This section, though full of interest, is only preliminary to the main subject, which is an account of the reaction to communism of 200-odd people who have been in the party and left it after a shorter or longer stay. They include about equal numbers of workers and intellectuals, of people who joined before and after the great change of policy in 1935, of Americans, British, French and Italians, and of members who achieved high, middle and low party rank. In addition there are some psycho-analytic findings, unfortunately of a somewhat sensational and obvious type. The main theme is the response of this mixed group to the dual system of aims: the praiseworthy public aims, and the machiavellian atmosphere in the inner party.

According to this account, almost all entered the

party in a state of political innocence. That would be expected in a popular front period, but is surprising if it is true of other periods. Almond admits that many are attracted by the atmosphere of secrecy and illegality surrounding the party, and that personal considerations, often of a neurotic type, weigh considerably with those who enter.

There is interesting material on party training. A clear difference emerges between the party in the 1920s and the party in the Stalin era. In the earlier period the atmosphere was fraternal, and there was genuine intellectual life and discussion; later the party became bureaucratic, personal relations became strained and suspicious, and training ceased to be rational persuasion and became a process akin to army drill, designed to break down the personality and produce automatic obedience. This accords with the accounts of the British party by Bob Darke and Douglas Hyde. Hyde has an amusing passage on the rapid loss of sex appeal as women rise in the party hierarchy, and the concern this causes to the leaders. The specific point is not mentioned, but it fits in well with the material on personality changes.

People leave the party for many reasons. Apart from career motives, doubts are due essentially to the discrepancy between the party's propaganda and its real aims, but this appears in various forms, such as resentment at Russian domination. The question of foreign money does not seem to have arisen. Doubtless the facts are fully known to very few at the top of the party, but many members must be aware of the truth in a general way. Disillusionment is normally a prolonged process, not a sudden break. Doubts are more or less suppressed, until the proverbial last straw comes along. There is often a good deal of anxiety, and even suicidal impulses. Many who have left it become strongly hostile to the party, but contrary to the common impression few become politically conservative or take to religion.

For the purposes of this study members are divided into three groups: rank and file, low echelon and high echelon, and these differ broadly in the ways which would be expected. Another group is referred to: members who are leaders of front organisations and trade unions. These are often high up in the party, but have to maintain many contacts outside it; they are consequently pulled both ways, and as a group are less loyal to the party than the high-up members who work entirely in the apparatus. There is a group not referred to here: those like Hiss, Fuchs, Maclean, Burgess, and others we can suspect, who keep their membership secret. In the nature of the case it would be impossible to get many ex-members from this group to answer a questionnaire, but it is a pity that this quite important type is entirely overlooked.

The four parties studied differ considerably. The Italian is big but ill-trained. The French has the soundest cadre, and has succeeded best in grafting Stalinism on to its own culture. The British deviates most from type: many of its own members do not take it quite seriously, and the public treat it with

(Continued opposite)

Mr. Nabokov In India

MR. NICOLAS NABOKOV, Secretary-General, Congress for Cultural Freedom, returned to India from Japan on December 10. The first place that he visited was Madras where an elaborate programme had been drawn up for him by Mr. Ka. Na. Subramaniam and Miss S. Vijayalakshmi. The most important item of the programme was a discussion at the Music Academy. In the discussion that followed Mr. Nabokov's statement on Western music a number of musicologists like Dr. Raghavan, Mr. T. V. Subba Rau, Mr. Alan Danielou, Dr. C. Narayana Menon and others participated. After the discussion there was an exhibition of Bharata Natyam by Srimathi Bala-saraswathi, singing by Shrimathi D. K. Pattammal and a performance on the Veena by Devakottai Narayana Iyengar and Marungapuri Gopalakrishna Bhagavata.

Mr. Nabokov visited Mahabalipuram and the Kalakshetra at Adyar. At the Kalakshetra he visited Kathakali and Bharata Natyam classes. He inaugurated the Art Section of the South Madras Youths' Association, at which he narrated the moving story of a Russian poet from 1906 to 1953.

(Continued from page 10)

tolerant contempt. The American party is no more effective than the British, but its internal atmosphere is more strained and earnest. This is explained, somewhat summarily, perhaps, by the high proportion of incompletely Americanised immigrants among the members.

The Indian party, one may guess, resembles the the American in that an important cause of the alienation of its members from orthodox society is the Indian-Western culture-clash. But its situation is otherwise very different and in some ways is more like that of the French party. Nevertheless the French party has lost many members, from all levels, not only by purges for tactical deviations, but because of a loss of faith caused by perception of the essential dishonesty of communism. The Indian party has lost very few, from the higher levels at least, through rejection of its principles. This is presumably because, since the end of the "people's war" period, the party's public policy has been in broad agreement with the sentiments of the country as a whole.

There has been one brief period when this apparent agreement broke down—the Andhra election campaign, when the Congress spokesmen showed that they knew very well that communism in practice means the very opposite of its high professions. For two or three weeks they gave the Andhra public what is, in broad terms if not in detail, the truth about communism. But to reserve truth for a critical election campaign, and in the supposed interest of foreign policy to acquiesce in lies at all other times, is a queer way to treat the truth. Congress leaders should notice that point, and reflect that their diplomatic jugglery with the truth may not always turn out so fortunately.

PHILIP SPRATT

From Madras Mr. Nabokov went to Bangalore where he had an equally busy programme. He attended a music recital organised for him by the Bangalore Sangeet Sabha. The Indian Institute of Culture arranged a public lecture. Mr. Nabokov visited Mysore where he had an interview with H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore. The Maharaja is an expert musician and a great lover of Indian and European music. In Bangalore Mr. Nabokov also met Miss Shanta Rao, Miss Vishalakshi, Mr. Krishna Rao, the celebrated Kanarese writer and many others distinguished in the field of literature and music.

Mr. Nabokov was in Bombay from the 16th to 21st December. His most important engagement in Bombay was the Annual General Meeting of the Indian Committee which he inaugurated on Saturday, December 17. A music seminar was organised on the same day at which Mr. Nabokov led the discussion on problems relating to the development of music in India, both Indian and Western. A number of prominent musicologists in Bombay participated in the discussion. The next day Mr. Nabokov delivered a public lecture on the "Origin of Western Music." The lecture was jointly organised by the Bombay Madrigal Singers' Organisation, the Time and Talents Club and the Indian Committee. Mr. D. K. Mante, Speaker of the Bombay Legislative Assembly, presided over the lecture.

On Monday, December 19, Mr. Nabokov addressed a students' meeting under the auspices of the United Nations Centre of the Ruparel College. The same day the ICCF held a reception in his honour. On Wednesday, December 21, Mr. Nabokov addressed a meeting of writers organised by *Quest*. He had also a meeting with painters and other artists on Sunday, December 18. There were several other private and semi-public engagements at which Mr. Nabokov met a number of distinguished persons interested in the advancement of culture and the movement for cultural freedom.

To the Editor

Why this Silence?

Dear Sir,

Mr. Nehru raised a hue and cry when America decided to give military aid to Pakistan. Why is he now silent when Communist Czechoslovakia under the advice of Russia decides to give military aid to Egypt?

Again he raised a hue and cry when America exploded an experimental hydrogen bomb. But when Khrushchev says now that Russia has discovered a super-hydrogen bomb and admitted that Russia exploded an experimental bomb recently, Mr. Nehru has nothing to say against this!

Bangalore

S. S. BANKESHWAR

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

There is no such thing as peaceful co-existence. That is a Russian proposal and it would be a mistake for us to swallow it.

—Mr. Averell Harriman, Governor of New York,
Times of India, December 6.

It would seem that in the excessive enthusiasm with which the authorities have arranged a welcome for our visitors from Moscow, they are digging the grave of Mr. Nehru's foreign policy.

—Onlooker, *Times of India*, December 1.

Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev are doing more than sail down the broad bosom of the Ganga. They appear to be taking us for a ride on the Volga.

—Onlooker, *Times of India*, December 1.

Moscow is timing its new offensive very effectively to fit in with American inclinations to cut back in the very field the Russians now wish to exploit. Whatever meaning the Soviet visit may seem to have in Delhi, this starker meaning cannot be ignored in Washington.

—The *Christian Science Monitor*, Boston,
November 30.

They politely disregarded Neutralist Nehru's insistence that India is with neither bloc in the cold war; repeatedly the Russians described India as their 'ally' and often they talked less like salesmen than like benign senior partners down on an inspection trip.

—*Time*, New York, December 5.

The question of questions is whether we are really neutral.

—*Thought*, December 17.

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

The real danger comes from the O.P.I. — the Opportunity Party of India.

—Mr. Hem Nath Sanyal, *Times of India*,
December 19.

Some people talk about peace so loudly it sounds like war.

—Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, quoted in *Time*,
New York, December 5.

India went red ages ago. Look at the pavements, the walls of buildings, the stairways of offices.

—Mr. A.F.S. Talyarkhan, *Times of India*,
December 21.

In Seattle Mr. Truman said that the so-called Geneva spirit "didn't amount to a damn."

—*New York Times*, November 27.

Uncle Joe carried on a conservative, old-fashioned mail-order business. Personally he never stooped to put a foot in the door and pull out a prospectus the way Uncle Nikolai and Cousin Nikita do.

—*New York Times*, November 27.

If the Near East needs more trouble Russia will provide it.

—*New York Times*, November 27.

What the Russian salesmen are really selling is nothing immediately tangible but, in the words of a once familiar phrase, pie in the sky by and by.

—*New York Times*, November 27.

Do they (the Soviet leaders) really think it is a tribute to the intelligence of the Burmese, the Indians or any other peoples in that part of the world to be told they are only suffering from the delusion that they are free and independent people and are still in fact in colonial shackles?

—Lord Reading, Minister of State for Foreign
Affairs, *Times of India*, December 23.

Those who are against me call me a private sector man.

—Mr. Krishnamachari, *Times of India*,
December 3.

India and Burma are known to have strong feelings against "colonialism" and against "blocs"; and nobody in the West disputes their right to such things. But it is somewhat different when democratic Asia's statesmen are seen solemnly condemning blocs hand in hand with the builders of the mightiest power bloc in history; or joining in a denunciation of "colonialism" with the one power that still holds vast areas of Asia in an iron grip.

—*The Economist*, (London), December 17