

Mao's Flowers And Weeds

by V. B. Karnik

FOR many months there has been speculation and controversy about a secret speech delivered by Chairman Mao Tse-tung to the Chinese Supreme State Council in February 1957. Extracts from the speech were published in Poland and Hungary and later in other European countries and the United States of America. A lively controversy has raged since then in democratic as well as communist countries regarding the exact implications of the speech and the lead that it gave to the international communist movement. After a delay of about four months the *New China News Agency* has obligingly published the text of the speech. The text has, it is admitted by the Peking Radio, undergone some revision at the hands of Mao Tse-tung and includes "certain additions." Some significant deletions have also taken place.

This compares favourably with what Russia did in the case of Khrushchev's speech denouncing Stalin. In spite of all the consequences that flowed from it, such as the successful revolt in Poland and the suppressed national revolution of the Hungarian people, and the debates that developed in a number of other communist countries, Soviet Russia has not so far published the official text of the speech. So that, if it becomes necessary, Khrushchev can declare at any moment that he never made the speech and that it was all a dirty propaganda of war-mongering imperialists and fascists. No such escape will be now open to the Chinese dictator. But even he is not as frank as he ought to have been. He has not yet published the text of the equally important speech that he is reported to have delivered on March 12. Some portions of that speech have appeared in the world press, including the press of some communist countries. The second speech throws light on some points which are obscure in the first speech.

Mao Tse-tung's speeches have created a great flutter in the dovecotes of communism. Accustomed as they have been so long to the leaders of the Russian Communist Party laying down the line and telling them what to do and what not to do Communist Parties of many countries are amazed and staggered to find

the leader of the Chinese Communist Party laying down a new line and propounding new theory and tactics. This is regarded as a challenge to the primacy and supremacy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The international communist movement had so long only one centre of authority, namely, Moscow. Peking appears to have challenged this sole and sovereign authority of Moscow. Those who have in recent years shown a desire to break away from this bondage to Moscow have eagerly seized upon the speeches of Mao Tse-tung to justify their course of action. They see in those speeches powerful support for "different ways to and forms of socialism" which they have been urging and trying to initiate. This weakens the position of Moscow. The rulers of Moscow are not unaware of this grave challenge to their supremacy. It is clear that they have not been happy with the speeches, but they appear to be undecided yet about the action to be taken for reasserting their authority.

A new line of communist strategy and tactic is also being spelt out of the speeches. A distinctly new idea that Mao Tse-tung appears to have developed is about the continuation of contradictions between the people and the State and the leaders even after the establishment of socialism. He sharply distinguishes these contradictions from the "antagonistic contradictions" that exist between the State and the enemies of the people, such as, "those social forces and groups which resist the socialist revolution and are hostile to and try to wreck socialist construction." He has no objection to a ruthless suppression of the latter type of contradictions. He asserts that it is the function of his people's democracy "to suppress the reactionary classes and elements and those exploiters in the country who range themselves against the socialist revolution and for a specific period of time to deprive landlords and bureaucrat-capitalists of their right to vote and freedom of speech."

With regard to the former, namely, "non-antagonistic contradictions" amongst the people Mao Tse-tung advocates a different course of action. In the first place he severely castigates those who refuse to admit the existence of such contradictions. He points out that they are bound to remain for a long time even in a socialist society as it takes time "to grow and consolidate itself" and as the people also require some time "to get accustomed to the new system." These contradictions, he asserts, can be solved in a peaceful manner. He has laid down for their solution "democratic methods, methods of discussion, of criticism, of persuasion and education." Pointing out

the dangers of the use of other methods, Mao Tse-tung said: "If one persists in using the methods of terror in solving internal antagonisms it may lead to transformation of these antagonisms into antagonisms of a nation-enemy type as happened in Hungary" where, he pointed out, the Communist Party because it chose "repression instead of persuasion simply disappeared in the matter of a few days."

These remarks of Mao Tse-tung have been construed in many quarters as an indirect denunciation of Stalin and Stalinism and as a powerful plea for a tolerant attitude towards opponents and the people and for the use of the methods of persuasion and education. The same meaning is read into his plea for "letting a hundred flowers blossom and letting a hundred schools of thought contend." Mao Tse-tung had made this remark one year back. He repeated it in his February speech. It was motivated by a desire to conciliate the intellectuals. He said "China needs as many intellectuals as she can get to carry through the colossal task of socialist construction." His advice therefore was: "We should trust intellectuals who are really willing to serve the cause of socialism. . . . We should not be too exacting in what we expect of them. As long as they comply with the requirements of the State and engage in legitimate pursuits, we should give them opportunities for suitable work." He also disapproved of "attempts to deal with ideological matters by administrative orders or coercive measures." Mao Tse-tung's insistence on a "long-term co-existence with democratic parties" is also regarded as another evidence of the new tendency towards liberalisation.

The speech has therefore found a warm welcome in democratic quarters. One cause of the welcome has been the blow that it has struck at the authority of the Russian rulers. The *Liberal News Chronicle* of London commented that Mao Tse-tung had "shaken" the Kremlin and "driven a deep wedge into Russian empire." It is difficult, however, to be so optimistic. Mao Tse-tung concluded his speech by saying: "To strengthen our solidarity with all socia-

list countries—this is our fundamental policy, herein lies our basic interest." Earlier he had paid a glowing tribute to the help rendered by Soviet Russia in the industrialisation of China—and had pointed that, while learning from all countries, "the main thing, is still to learn from the Soviet Union." The development of rival centres of authority and inspiration may contribute to the weakening of the international communist movement, but it will be naive to read into the speech any immediate worsening of relations between Russia and China.

Another cause of welcome has been the apparent tendency towards liberalisation. But in this respect as well appearances are deceptive. Mao Tse-tung has no doubt advocated democratic and persuasive methods for solving "non-antagonistic" contradictions between the people and the State. But it is he and his party which will decide which contradictions are "non-antagonistic" and which are "antagonistic." It is he and his party that will decide who are the "enemies of the people" and deserve to be treated in a different manner. Once an individual, group or class is declared "an enemy of the people" the State will be free to liquidate it or take any other measures against it. Mao Tse-tung himself admitted that from 1949 to 1954 his Security Forces liquidated 8,00,000 persons. Other estimates put the figure much higher, between ten to fifteen millions. But whatever the figure, there can be no security and no freedom as long as a political party or its leader can call an individual an "enemy of the people" and then destroy him. This is essentially the old Stalinist method which Mao Tse-tung is not yet prepared to discard.

The slogan "Let a hundred flowers blossom and let a hundred schools of thought contend" turns out on scrutiny to be very little of a departure from the established communist practice of rigid control over thought and mind. Mao Tse-tung has talked of "fragrant flowers" and "poisonous weeds" and has laid down six criteria to distinguish one from the other. Those six criteria are as follows:

"Broadly speaking, words and actions can be judged right if they: 1. Helped to unite the people of our various nationalities and do not divide them; 2. Are beneficial, not harmful to socialist transformation and socialist construction; 3. Help to consolidate, not undermine or weaken the peoples' democratic dictatorship; 4. Help to consolidate, not undermine or weaken democratic centralism; 5. Tend to strengthen, not to cast off or weaken the leadership of the Communist Party; 6. Are beneficial, not harmful to international socialist solidarity and the solidarity of the peace-loving peoples of the world."

Words and actions which fulfill these six criteria will be regarded as "fragrant flowers" which will be allowed to blossom. The rest will be "poisonous weeds" which will be destroyed. According to Mao Tse-tung "these six political criteria are also applicable to all activities in arts or sciences." The worst part of the situation is that it is the Communist Party which will decide if a particular writing is a "fragrant flower" or a

(Continued on Page 4)

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

Algerian Deadlock

THE situation in Algeria is getting everyday uglier and out of control. It is really symptomatic of the paralysis of conscience on the part of the French that even after an intensive military campaign of over 34 months, the French government has not been able to solve the Algerian problem either militarily or politically. France has now more than 4 lac French soldiers in the Algerian campaign which is costing her more than a million pounds per day. But the campaign has succeeded only in making a negotiated settlement of the problem more difficult than ever. The mutual killing indulged in by Algerian nationalists, French *colons* and the French soldiers stationed in Algeria is assuming ghastly proportions day by day.

The root-cause of this heart-rending tragedy is the stubborn refusal on the part of France to grant independence to Algeria on the plea that it is an integral part of metropolitan France. But the fierce opposition of Algerian nationalists, who constitute more than 80% of the Algerian population, makes nonsense of the plea. The presence of 1.2 million French *colons* with their insistence on maintaining their superiority at any cost has only served to complicate the issue further.

The policies pursued by the French authorities are bringing France near the point of economic bankruptcy, and are sowing seeds of hatred against the West in the Arab world. Already the relations between Tunisia and France are strained because of the Algerian situation. There are indications that Algerian war may spread over to Tunisia and Morocco though they have as yet maintained friendly relations with France.

The only way out of the Algerian dilemma is to meet the legitimate aspirations of the Algerian people. But in the present situation the relations between Algerian nationalists and the French government are strained to such an extent that the prospects of a negotiated settlement between them are far from bright. It is, therefore, necessary for some outside Powers like the U.S. and Tunisia to take an initiative in solving the deadlock.

Report On Hungary

THE United Nations Investigating Committee on Hungary deserves to be congratulated on the excellent job it has done in bringing to light all the aspects of the recent tragic events in that unfortunate country. It has held that the Soviet Union was responsible for "massive armed intervention" in putting down "a spontaneous national uprising." The Committee's task was by no means easy especially in view of the fact that the Kadar Government refused it per-

mission to enter the Hungarian territory — a fact which alone is enough to establish that the hands of the Soviet and of the Kadar Government are not clean. The Committee had to base its findings on evidence accumulated from every available source outside Hungary. It comes to the definite conclusion that "a massive armed intervention by one Power on the territory of another with the avowed intention of interfering in its internal affairs must, by the Soviet Union's own definition of aggression, be a matter of international concern." It declares unequivocally that the Hungarian Revolution was a spontaneous mass upsurge against communist tyranny and that it was not inspired by any outside agency as is sought to be made out by the Soviet Union and its apologists.

The Committee pays a high compliment to the character of the Hungarian people when it states: "A fact reported by many credible witnesses, however, was that no looting occurred although numerous shop windows had been destroyed. Goods of value, including even jewellery, lay untouched within the reach of passersby."

Although the Radio Moscow has described the findings of the Committee as a "propaganda bomb supported by false evidence", it is apparent that the Committee in its investigations has maintained a high standard of integrity and impartiality and has checked the reliability of the evidence with meticulous care. The fact that Russian intervention was not invited by the Hungarian Government of the day, brings into bold relief the real character of the Warsaw Pact (under which the intervention was supposed to have been sought) and it is obvious that the Pact is only a smokescreen to delude the world at large with regard to the status of the Eastern European countries, and that it imposes no legal and moral bindings on Moscow.

The findings of the Committee must open the eyes of those who still look hopefully towards Moscow. The brutality and the ruthlessness with which the freedom movement of the brave Hungarian people was suppressed may become the experience of other Eastern European nations if any of them tries to raise its head or, for that matter, of any free nation of the world if Moscow is allowed to extend its influence any further.

The UNO has no alternative now but to take a serious view of Soviet tyranny in Hungary and deliberate upon the ways and means of helping the Hungarian people to liberate themselves.

Moscow Youth Festival

THE Government of India has decided to restrict the number of delegates that will be allowed to leave the country to attend the "Sixth World Festival of Youth and Students for Peace and Friendship" scheduled to take place in Moscow from July 28 to August 11, 1957. The number of delegates to be allowed to attend the Festival will be about eighty. Though the reason given by the Government for this bold stand is the paucity of foreign exchange, it is obvious that

reasons other than financial are also involved in the decision.

The organisers of this Festival, for which lavish expenditure appears to have been incurred by the USSR, have clearly been counting on large delegations from Asian countries. A thousand was mentioned earlier as the strength of the Indian delegation. But their plans will now obviously go awry on account of the Government of India's stand, which might be followed by other uncommitted Asian countries.

The youth festivals are obviously, like many other international communist circuses, designed by the Russian leaders to cast their political net far and wide, for the ardent and inexperienced youth of the entire world. Despite their lofty claims to the contrary, they are organised to spread the influence of communist propaganda throughout the world with the help of the youth of other nations and seduce them by showing them only the bright side of life in communist countries. This year the Festival has a special poignancy, as Soviet leaders are keen on washing from the minds of uncommitted youth the impressions of the struggle of the youth in Poland and Hungary.

In the USSR itself, the press and the radio are assisting the Soviet youth to prepare politically for the encounter with foreign friends. Soviet young people who will be hosts to the Festival are being told that "the nation's great electric power stations are worth any number of wondrous cigarette lighters the foreigners may possess". Soviet youths will have "decrepit" Moscow houses pointed out to them "with reproach" they have been told. Lest they may feel exposed, they are being advised to tell of what Moscow was like before the Revolution and to point to the great progress that has been made. They have been warned against considering "an ordinary foreign thing to be a wonder". This includes "excitement over women's jewellery, cigarette cases, and lighters or cuff links."

These and many other curious and defensive maxims have been issued in the columns of *Moskovsky Komsomolets*, a Moscow youth paper. They indicate the obvious nervousness of the Kremlin leaders as to the possible repercussions of the contact of the Russian youth with their well-placed counter-parts from abroad.

*MAO'S FLOWERS AND WEEDS—(Cont'd from page 2)

"poisonous weed." How can "a hundred flowers blossom" under such conditions of political censorship and threat of destruction?

The assurance of a "long-term co-existence with democratic parties" is equally deceptive. The so-called democratic parties of China are not political parties in the real sense of the term. They are just small groups of individuals who are not allowed to carry on any mass activity. They are allowed to exist and are accorded a minor share in the administration on accepting the leadership of the Communist Party and agreeing to work within strictly circumscribed

limits. The communists are not always opposed to other parties. What they are opposed to are opposition or competing parties. Other parties are allowed to exist in some communist countries, provided they accept the leadership of the Communist Party and do not compete with it in securing the support and the allegiance of the people. Mao Tse-tung's assurance does not carry the position any further.

But even this assurance is not being honoured in practice. Only a few days back came the news of the demand for resignation of two Ministers belonging to the China Democratic League, one of the non-communist organisations which have been allowed a shadowy existence. The demand is being voiced by some of the local organisations of the League. And the reason for the demand is the alleged "fantastic" speech made by the two Ministers praying for more power for non-communist parties. Another charge made against the two Ministers is that they "denied the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party." This exposes the utter hollowness of the so-called co-existence with democratic parties. The fact is that the Communist Party needs some stooges and convenient tools from time to time. And as long as a person or a group is needed to play that role, he or it is allowed the precarious position of co-existence.

Mao Tse-tung has also talked about "political freedom and democratic rights." But according to him "this freedom is freedom with leadership and this democracy is democracy under centralised guidance, not anarchy." It is to be the "the unity of democracy and centralism and the unity of freedom and discipline." Mao Tse-tung still swears by the Marxist dogma that democracy and freedom are means and not ends. After this clarification it is not necessary to point out that the freedom and democracy that will be vouchsafed to the people of China will not be real freedom or real democracy but a communist version of the two under which both freedom and democracy are nullified in the name of communist leadership and socialist discipline.

It is difficult therefore to be enthusiastic about the pronouncement of Mao Tse-tung. It does not hold out much of a prospect of liberalisation. The speech may be regarded as an indication of the growing strains in the country. Mao Tse-tung has himself referred to some of them in the course of his speech. It may be that the growing economic distress and the increasing alienation of the people and more particularly of the intellectuals have compelled the dictator to loosen the restraints and to lay more emphasis on persuasive rather than on terroristic methods. It is yet too early to say if this shift in tactics will produce any significant changes in China. But the speech has already had a disconcerting impact on the world communist movement. It has shaken the authority of Moscow. It has broken Moscow's monopoly of communist wisdom. It has set up a new authority for laying down the law for the communist faithful. All these may have far reaching effects on the future of the international communist movement. This may in the end turn out to be the real significance of the speech.

Philosophy Of Freedom

by Adam Adil

MAN in every age has craved for freedom. The ideal of freedom is his highest aspiration. He craves to be free in every sphere of life and to him no sacrifice is too great for the achievement of freedom. In fact, the ideal of freedom has invested in man an eternal spirit of self-sacrifice, and Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, in *Discovery of India* remarks rightly "because of that much may be forgiven to man, and it is impossible to lose hope for him." It is in the nature of things that man needs freedom for development of his personality and in the absence of freedom his spirit contracts and decays.

Political freedom constitutes the most important aspect of the general content of freedom. It was natural that thinkers and philosophers from Plato and Aristotle downwards to Locke, Mill, Voltaire and Laszki have thought about political authority and political obligation; and poets like Dante, Wordsworth, Byron, Tagore, Iqbal and others have not only written and sung of political freedom, but have taken part in political revolutions for realising it.

Though often in history reactionary movements constituting the very negation of freedom have risen and violently shaken the world, the advancing march of the torch of freedom has proved an eternal process and rendered the spirit of man immortal and deathless. In our times, fascism arose with menacing ambitions. It clashed against the spirit of man who held fast to the ideal of freedom, took a toll of several million lives, but was vanquished and finally vanished as an ephemeral mirage. Today, totalitarian communism has reared its head. It too must pass although it threatens to overwhelm the whole world. Perhaps humanity will once again be called upon to offer still greater sacrifice in order to bring about the annihilation of totalitarian communism. The spirit of man with its ideal of human freedom shall survive with greater resplendence.

The concept of human freedom is essentially the concept of the freedom of the individual. In the words of Spencer "there is nothing higher than the individual in the world's history." Obviously, to deny freedom to the individual is to deny the value of the individual; hence it is a crime against humanity. The freedom of the individual thus constitutes the fundamental basis of any progressive political thought, though it is generally agreed that in a complex social structure individual freedom has to be limited within certain disciplines to ensure real personal freedom and systematise the development of human personality.

The English Revolution of seventeenth century as well as the French and American Revolutions of eighteenth century were aimed at freeing the human personality of all the chains which were fettering it to the point of death. John Locke and Rousseau had prepared the philosophical background for those Revolu-

tions. Locke's was a matter of fact treatment of the political problems while Rousseau had adopted an abstract and logical approach to them. The existence of civil society, Locke thought, was a matter of convenience, and to him the stabilisation of parliamentary authority was the best method of safeguarding the liberty of the people against the onslaughts of arbitrary rule. Although, some times Rousseau appeared obtruse whenever he touched the questions about the protection of liberty from the incursions of absolutism, he set forth most clearly the thesis that only in civil society, dominated by a sense of original social contract, does man rise above the level of an instinctive life of animals.

In short, political philosophers have built the fundamental idea that the political community exists primarily for the betterment of the lives of individuals composing it; and that it must develop into people's sovereignty which is the only guarantee of the freedom of all; and that if it does not so develop it must forfeit the confidence of the people and ultimately collapse into tyranny and chaos.

Apart from some shining examples of individual freedom in ancient India and some other parts of Asia, for the first time in modern epoch the English and the Dutch took a mighty leap towards freedom from arbitrary rule. They were followed by America in 1788 and France in 1789, when the sovereignty of people in both the countries asserted itself successfully against the forces that constituted the denial of freedom. The general effect of the success of the French Revolution was overwhelming throughout the Western as well as South Eastern Europe. Not only the liberation of the individual became a bye-word, but was considered to be a reality emerging from the process of history. Such were the hopes of thinking minds in Europe at a time when the arbitrary rule was overthrown in France. And Wordsworth could sing: "Bliss was it in that dawn to live; and to be young was very heaven."

But with the advance of the nineteenth century it was realised that the dreams of the social thinkers of the time of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth century and the American and the French Revolutions of the eighteenth century had not been fulfilled completely. Hence new social theories which sought to establish that popular sovereignty, such as the representative government and the rule of the law were not themselves enough to secure the real freedom of the individual. The torch bearers of the French Revolution of 1848 and of the Chartist movement in England demanded that "the political liberty should mean something more than the freedom of those who owned the capital to exploit those who did not own it." This demand has become increasingly formidable since then. This meant that political freedom

(Continued on Page 12)

Anniversary Of East German Revolt

The following is the full text of a message sent by Mr. J. H. Oldenbroek, Secretary-General of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, to the workers of the Soviet Zone of Germany on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the East German workers' revolt against the communist regime. The uprising was not restricted to Berlin. Altogether, there were strikes and other demonstrations in 274 cities and towns in the Soviet Zone. For the next two weeks, Soviet martial law, imposed on the whole zone, exposed the flimsy pretensions of the "German Democratic Republic" as the governing authority. Of the thousands immediately arrested, 1,067 workers were sentenced to a total of 6,321 years in prison.

THE 17th of June is the fourth anniversary of the day on which the workers of the Soviet Zone of Germany rose against their oppressors. The memory of the people's revolt in Eastern Germany has not been obscured by the similar happenings in Poland and Hungary in 1956. On the contrary, these latter events showed that the populations of these countries feel just the same way as their brothers in the Soviet Zone. The Communist authorities had used Soviet methods to stifle the solidarity of the workers. Different scales of payment for the same work and arbitrary benefits accorded to individuals were intended to give rise to ill-feeling and jealousies. The differentiation between workers and salaried employees was made complete by special ration cards. A comprehensive spying system was created for the purpose of achieving the greatest possible degree of division in all groups of society.

However, the gamble of jealousy and fear proved to be false at the very time when it should have yielded its results. The great mass of working people rose up with entire unanimity, taken up by the great conviction that their situation demanded unity of action. This was a victory for trade union training and tradition. The demands, which had been modest at the outset, were superseded by definite political demands, amongst which was the call for the abolition of the government imposed by force, for free elections and for reunification of the Federal Republic. The Soviet tanks managed to break the general strike, but they could not kill the spirit of freedom.

The 17th of June was also an appeal to the responsible statesmen not to relax their efforts for the reunification of Germany. That day's happenings have become a constant reminder to freedom-loving Germans and to the whole free world. It must not be forgotten that the population of the Soviet Zone is still forcibly deprived of its freedom. The workers of the Soviet Zone, of Poznan and of Budapest have shown the Communists that, although it may be possible to crush with tanks the people's desire for freedom for a while, it can never be completely suppressed.

The clashes of the workers in the Soviet-occupied zone with their oppressors, which are a daily occurrence, show us that solidarity is the most effective weapon against Communist oppression.

The so-called trade unions of the Soviet Zone help the Communist government to exploit the workers still further. The leaders of these so-called trade unions pay no heed whatsoever to defending the

workers' interests. For this reason, we must continue to reject any attempts at fraternising, or interference made by the trade unions of the Soviet Zone, the so-called 'Free German Trade Union Federation.'

The trade unions of the free world are fighting for the national independence of all peoples and for the social progress of mankind. We are aiming at peace and the co-operation of all free nations in the interest of the well being of mankind as a whole. We consider it to be our task to galvanise into action those who are uncertain or hesitant by keeping alive the memory of June 17, 1953, and of the courage and sacrifice of those who selflessly risked everything in the cause of freedom and human dignity and social rights.

On behalf of the 55 million members of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, I wish you all success in your efforts to attain national freedom and social justice. I appeal to you to close your ranks still further in the day-to-day struggles for the achievement of your justified demands, and to oppose your solidarity to the power and arbitrary actions of your oppressors, who are trying to destroy your unity.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

WORLD CITIES: CALCUTTA

by Sudhin Datta

THE TOYNBEE MILLENNIUM

by H. R. Trevor-Roper

A TROUBLED DIALOGUE

by Anissimov—Silone

June 1957

45

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

Educational Policies In Kerala

by M. A. Venkata Rao

NO State of the Indian Union can live unto itself ignoring its integral relationship to the other States, especially as our Constitution is nearer the unitary type than the truly federal one and is acquiring more and more of the unitary spirit since the era of planning and consequent growth of the functions of the Central Government. Policies adopted in any State therefore have their inevitable repercussions in all other parts of the country. This fact, lays a special duty on publicists and statesmen to watch developments of any significance in any part of the Union. Such a duty has special poignancy in regard to the State of Kerala inasmuch as it has come to have a communist Government. Democracy entails perpetual vigilance for its health and survival even where it is represented by genuinely democratic parties and governments owing allegiance to principles of liberal self-government. But where, as in Kerala, we have a Government, albeit within the confines of the Union Constitution, whose adherence to genuine democracy (apart from the spurious type prevalent behind the Iron Curtain) is avowedly tactical and temporary, it behoves us to scrutinise its policies with special care. From this point of view, the new educational proposals announced by the Kerala State demand wide attention and close examination.

The new proposals are far reaching in scope and concern the principle of text-book nationalisation at the school stage, control of syllabi and courses of study in schools as well as improvement of the salaries of teachers in Government and private schools, the policy, in view of the secular character of the State, of the withdrawal of State grants to denominational schools run by religious organisations like the Catholic Church and the introduction of a Bill in the legislature for reorganisation of the University in the State.

The principle of nationalisation of textbook production seems to have been accepted in several States of the Union. Indeed, the Secondary Education Commission of the Central Government has recommended the establishment of a high-powered Textbook Committee in the States presided over by a High Court Judge, or a person of equal status. It will select writers of books for the several grades of school, and publish them and develop a fund of its own for this purpose. It may give some business to private publishing firms but it need not do so, it being open to it to become a monopoly in the textbook trade. The object is no doubt good, namely, to prevent cut throat competition among textbook publishers, their exploitation of needy writers, teachers and ex-teachers and to maintain quality irrespective of the profit motive.

But in spite of such good motives, it must be recognised that the socialisation of textbooks is unsound in principle in a democracy. Seeking to exclude one kind of evil influence among publishers and writers with a pull, it introduces the greater evil of party patronage into educational matters where it is least

to be tolerated. Moreover, it sins against the principle of educational autonomy which means self-government of teachers and writers and scholars and publishers. Writers and teachers and educationists by virtue of their *expertise* have the right and duty of writing and selecting textbooks and books for general reading for school children of different grades. They alone have the requisite experience and relevant knowledge to create and choose the media of education. The criteria of writing and selecting are inherent in the creative vocation of education in close and intimate contact with the child mind and no one outside this circle can have the countenance to dictate to writers and teachers what is and what is not suitable for the reading of students. Publishers have a legitimate place in this work. They can become discoverers of talent and can help writers to find themselves and obtain an economic reward for their efforts. Competition among them will help to maintain quality and encourage the emergence of fresh talent and new ideas. State bureaucracy embodied in State Text-Book Committees of the kind envisaged today in Kerala and other States come in the way of such creative freshness and threaten stagnation in the world of ideas.

Another possible evil flowing from the undue power that textbook nationalisation places in the hands of ruling groups is the temptation to influence the content of textbooks, particularly in the field of history, literature, social sciences and human values. The tendency complained of by several critics on the part of the Central Government to interfere in the interpretation of past historical events like the National Revolt of 1857 and favour a particular view, when *bona fide* scholars have divergent views about its national character is an instance in point. Also, a tone of disparagement of the heroic achievements and deeds of historical personages like Shivaji and Rana Pratap Singh on the ground of their alleged "communalism" and violence is another case in point. History should present the plain unvarnished truth in the context of the ethos of the age it refers to. Current political stereotypes and ideological values should not be allowed to retract its form and appearance to students at the present day.

Such a danger of warping the events and values of past epochs and personages is all the greater in the case of Communist Parties. Communism does not believe in objective truth. It insists on historical materialism and dialectical interpretation in the Marxist sense judging all events and persons in the light of *partiism*. We must look out therefore for attempts, sooner or later, in Kerala by ruling groups to rewrite history and social values in the light of Marxism and for the spirit of teaching under their fostering care to partake more and more of the dogmatic tone of *partiism*. This is a sin against the spirit of truth which is the soul of education.

In regard to the anxiety of the State Government to

extend primary education to all children up to 14 years of age, a duty incumbent on them according to the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution, the Kerala Minister of Education has alarmed the Catholic Church. He has declared that in accordance with the secular nature of the State contemplated in the Constitution of India, while private religious organisations are permitted to run schools of their own wherein they can teach their sectarian principles and values, they cannot expect the state to grant financial aid to them out of the general revenues. The Bishops have issued a statement that this threatened withdrawal of State aid to denominational schools contradicts Article 30 of the Constitution which says that "all minorities whether based on religion or language shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice." This is conceded to them by the Kerala Ministry. But there is more in the Article 30, para 2 of which distinctly states that the "State shall *not*, in granting aid to educational institutions, discriminate against any educational institution on the ground that it is under the management of a minority whether based on religion or language." This para of Article 30 would seem to confer a right to State aid even on denominational institutions. Of course it is subject to what is known as the *conscience clause*. The issue turns on two contrasting notions of secularism in regard to governmental action. One idea of secularism which is adopted in the USA prohibits the State from giving any financial grant from Government funds to any denominational school or college. It refuses State aid impartially to all religions. The contrasted and more inclusive idea of secularism which is more in accordance with the Mauryan or Asokan tradition in India, (which apparently has found expression in Article 30 of the Constitution) is impartial grant of State aid to *all recognised religious groups* in the land, even as Asoka gave grants to Buddhists, Hindus, Jains and others.

If the Kerala Government insist on their version of secularism, the matter would have to be settled by an appeal to the Courts and, from the standpoint of democratic values, discussion will have to probe to deeper levels than the implication of secularism for State aid to denominational schools. Democracy insists that the deeper question be raised, namely, whether there is anything in religions or social ideals and drives associated with religions or political ideologies in letter and spirit contradictory to fidelity to truth, dignity of human nature, tolerance and the right to self-expression not entailing harm to others. If there is reasonable ground to suspect that there is something analogous to these in communism or catholicism or any other religio-social system, obviously the State would be within its rights to refuse to accord financial aid to such institutions. A probe into the underlying assumption of State aid to educational institutions raises the question whether indoctrination, historical or social, is a legitimate demand on State revenues. For communism, as well as many religions, insist on indoctrinating their pupils, or the whole nation, with a set of crystallised ideas whether em-

bodied in Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism or different theologies of older religions. If democrats feel that the Congress Party and Government have no right to inculcate their own view of Indian history on scholars at school and on the reading public, they should be much more on their guard to oppose indoctrination, whether religious or political, in State-aided schools. The real issue is therefore the struggle between indoctrination and true education.

From this point of view, certain changes embodied in the proposed Kerala University Bill need careful examination, for the issue concerns the future of free education and true democracy. The Bill proposes to follow the suggestion of the University Commission and create a federal university for Kerala. In pursuit of this aim, it declares adherence to the laudable object of conferring autonomy on the university which is truly gratifying. But it soon makes the disappointing statement that it proposes to take the constituent colleges of the Travancore University under Government control. Thus it takes away by the left hand what it had given with the right hand. For by this action, the core of university teaching and its staff is taken over by the Government which is communist by conviction and alignment. What is thus left to the university to exercise its autonomy upon are only offices of the Vice Chancellor and the officials and clerks concerned with the governing body of the university for administrative and examination purposes!

With the teachers under its control the Government has patronage under its control. And this is *not* what is meant by university autonomy. To add to this, the Bill also provides that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University shall be the Minister of Education. This makes university *heteronomy* complete. It may be that this is taken from the Madras University Act. But it is contrary to the spirit of educational self-government and is fraught with the gravest consequences particularly under a communist Government.

These moves are hostile to education under any Government but are more dangerous when proposed by a communist Government. In *form*, these proposals may seem to partake of the same character as those in force or proposed in other States but in *spirit* and tendency they are sure to have results destructive of human democratic ideals instinct with genuine education.

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

The Impossible Dialogue

THE letter of Ivan Anissimov, Soviet literary historian and member of the editorial board of the review *Inostranaiia Literatura*, which is published below, along with the reply of Ignazio Silone, brings to a close an attempt at discussion that got under way six months ago.

Last September, the editors-in-chief and a few of the chief contributors to several Eastern and Western literary reviews met in Zurich. The Chairman of the meeting was the Italian writer Ignazio Silone, editor of *Tempo Presente*. It was between Silone and the members of the editorial board of the Soviet publications *Inostranaiia Literatura* and *Znamya* that a discussion took place on the true meaning of de-Stalinization. But the Russians did not answer to the point, and they were obviously embarrassed by every direct question.

To enable them to weigh their replies, and also to continue an exchange of ideas that had barely been outlined in three days of discussion, Ignazio Silone submitted to Ivan Anissimov a questionnaire, with the understanding that his questions and Anissimov's replies would appear simultaneously in *Tempo Presente* and *Les Lettres Nouvelles*. It was not until three months later that Silone received Anissimov's reply, which had been drafted after the events in Poland and Hungary.

Anissimov's reply to Silone's questions were preceded by a long preamble. "The events in Hungary", he wrote, "have demonstrated with terrifying clarity that while we were in Zurich we were a stone's throw away from the Fascist horror and that the fiercest of enemies had been in hiding behind the door near we had stopped to talk. If we fail to be aware of the truly monstrous machinations of the reactionaries, we may find ourselves in a thoroughly tragic situation. That is why Jean-Paul Sartre's article in *L'Express* on the events in Hungary creates such a sad impression. Neither his intelligence nor his literary talent can save Sartre when he rushes headlong into the mire of slander." There then follows a sentimental appeal to Silone which is worth quoting: "Mr. Silone, you who have taken part in the fight against fascism can understand what it means to resist the thrust of that regime; the Hungarian defenders of the People's Democracy and the Soviet soldiers found themselves obliged to do that very thing, and they did not hesitate. They saved the world and Hungary, above which loomed the ominous shadow of Horthy's partisans."

Silone's first question concerned Sholokov's statement at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR that Russian literature of recent decades had been "a literature of dead souls," as a result of the directives imposed upon creative writers by the State. Have the directives changed? In what way? Are directives still being issued? Anissimov replied that "Mikhail Sholokov had never adapted his criticism to State directives regarding writers" and declared that "socialist realism, with all its originality, its dis-

satisfaction and boldness, its drive toward the future, its faith in the triumph of socialist ideals, its wise understanding of life and its ability to enter into the most complex contradictions, is naturally embodied in the great achievement of Soviet literature..."

Silone then asked whether what had been officially denounced as "an abuse of the cult of the personality and a violation of socialist legality" had already been given literary or artistic expression in the USSR. Anissimov recognised that "the historical situation obliged Soviet literature, for a certain period, to live under the unfavourable conditions of the cult of Stalin." But, he added, it must be borne in mind that, for Soviet writers, Stalin was "the personification of the people and of a high ideal. That ideal saved many of them from servility and artistic failure."

Silone asked whether, given the climate of "thaw", the time was not now ripe to make known to the Soviet public, "in addition to the anti-American pamphlets and conventional accounts of certain Western writers, the work of the independent left"? Anissimov first replied that "the term 'thaw' which you use and which is very widespread in the Western European press has not caught on in our press and never will." He added that "if we print what pleases us, we have a right to do so," but "as for your wish to have us publish the 'works of independent leftists', we have, generally speaking, no objections to raise."

Silone's last question was as follows: "The changes which have taken place in your country in recent months have been very openly hailed in literary and artistic circles in Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia. Have these reactions been brought to the attention of Russian writers?"—"Polish reviews and newspapers are widely circulated in the Soviet Union," replied Anissimov. "It seems to us that our Polish friends, against which so many false charges were recently brought in Poland in the heat of the moment. The future will show who is right and who sees farthest." With regard to Hungary, "it seems to us clear," replied Anissimov, "that many writers in that country lost their bearings and were ready to reject not only the errors of Rakosi but also the socialist reorganisation of Hungary." Anissimov ended his letter with a few questions which he in turn directed at Silone. What did Silone think of literature in the contemporary world? What was his attitude "in view of the struggle between two fundamental literary currents for and against socialism?" What place did Silone assign to the "independent left" of which he spoke.

In his reply, Silone referred Anissimov to the testimony of communists—English, Italian and Polish—who had been in Budapest and who had told the truth. He challenged Anissimov's optimistic picture of Soviet literature by giving a long list of Russian and Jewish communist writers who had been murdered by the Stalinists. He declared that "your 'socialist realism' has usurped its name. It would be closer to reality to call it 'state realism'". "To my knowledge," he

added, "there is only one Russian work that, strictly speaking, could be labelled socialist realism. I refer to Khrushchev's 'secret report', but it was published by the Americans and, what is worse, it seems that the author is about to repudiate it." "I imagine", said Silone "that to be a literary historian in Russia is not very amusing. For an honest man, it must certainly be more painful than forced labour in Siberia. Yet the tone of your letter is that of an untroubled man who lives in a safe and stable society. How is that possible? Perhaps the explanation is to be found in the passage of your letter in which you deny the critical state of transition that has recently been called the 'thaw'".

The tone of Anissimov's last letter, which follows, is no longer "that of an untroubled man." This letter not only bears witness to the nature of Soviet society, but is equally interesting as a psychological document. One sees in it an exasperated reaction due to long years of forced repression in a society into which a man can integrate himself only at the price of a monstrous conformism.

The earlier letters exchanged between Anissimov and Silone appeared in the March and April issues of the French journal, *Les Lettres Nouvelles*.

ANISSIMOV: "You exceed all limits"

Dear Mr. Silone,

I have received your long letter and at first thought you had sent it to the wrong address. Literary exercises of that kind are broadcast every day by Radio Free Europe and similar broadcasting stations. But I then realized that you had quite simply lost your head and consequently the possibility of speaking any other language. In Zurich, where we began our dialogue, your attitude was different.

I wish to say to you, Mr. Silone, that your irritated letter, which deliberately falsifies the facts and destroys all perspective, and which is so violently anti-socialist and anti-Marxist, is evidence of the fact that your intentions are most reactionary and that the great social upheavals taking place in the life of contemporary man seem to you hateful and repulsive. After all that you have written, the terms "independent revolutionary" and "socialist" can only be a caricature when applied to you. From this point of view, your letter unmasks you completely.

I admit that in Zurich I did not have many illusions as to the nature of your "independent revolution." But your letter, in which an indecent casualness goes hand in hand with a feverish nervousness (caused, very obviously, by the fact that the card of the Hungarian counter-revolution on which you had bet proved to be valueless), your letter, I repeat, shows your personality in its true light, and I must say that the resulting picture is not a pretty thing to see.

Mr. Silone, you exceed all limits when you allow yourself to speak of my country in so disrespectful a tone, when you allow yourself to slander the Soviet socialist structure, which is governed by the will of a nation of two hundred million persons.

You exceed all limits, Mr. Silone, when you try to teach lessons to the representatives of Soviet literature.

Furthermore, you know very well that after a letter such as that which you have taken the liberty of sending to me a dialogue between us is no longer possible. Your letter shows that it is precisely you who do not want—and even fear—a continuation of this dialogue, because you know that, despite the furious attacks of the reactionaries, the socialist world is getting stronger and stronger and that the new wave of anti-Soviet and anti-communist slander, to the unleashing of which you make your own eager contribution, is already decreasing and must inevitably collapse. Truth is regaining its place.

That, Mr. Silone, is why you are getting so nervous. That is why insults and unseemly statements flow from your pen.

IVAN ANISSIMOV

Moscow, April 3, 1957.

SILONE: "I beg your pardon"

Dear Mr. Anissimov,

As I am somewhat used to interpreting letters from totalitarian countries, I am able to note two important admissions in yours of April 3rd.

To begin with, one can deduce from it that you listen every day to the broadcasts of Radio Free Europe and other Western stations. I am glad that you do—not, frankly speaking, because I think these stations represent the "source of truth," but because it is easier to approach the truth by a systematic comparison of conflicting opinions. If what is said is correct, if listening to foreign radios is very frequent in Russia, especially among students, this is, beyond any doubt, a positive fact. In Italy, a similar phenomenon occurred during the last years leading to the collapse of the dictatorship.

But your second admission is far more important—and, moreover, is particularly pointed up by your picturesque and truculent expressions of feigned indignation. The reason is that you are, unfortunately, not in a position to answer any of my propositions, inspired though they are by a sincere desire to improve relations between Russian and Western writers. Meanwhile—and to begin with—despite the commitment made in Zurich, you have not published my letter in your review, whereas our readers have been able to read your entire letter which, through my intermediary, was translated into several languages. How is one to judge your attitude? I should like—in your defence—at least to imagine that you have been prevented from doing so.

I am further disturbed by the fact that you have not been authorized to accept my invitation to a public confrontation of our respective information concerning the origins and character of the Hungarian insurrection of October 1956 and concerning its repression by the Russian armed forces. Why do you renounce the quest for the truth? It stands to reason that your leaders are afraid of a debate on the subject.

Your silence about the fate of a large number of your country's eminent writers, historians, critics and dramatists who disappeared during the Stalinist period without leaving any traces, casts a sinister

doubt on the official condemnation of that terrifying period. I am surprised, for example, that you are not in a position to give us the definitive version of the death of Maxim Gorki. How long shall we have to wait before you inform us whether he was poisoned in application of a sentence—which has never been revised—of one of your courts, or whether he died a natural death? And when will light be shed on the others, on the deportees, who were sentenced to death without trial?

Mr. Anissimov, the fact that you were not authorised to accept my proposal to collect from the democratic writers of all countries contributions for the setting up of a special fund for honouring the memory of the Russian intellectuals who were victims of the Stalinist terror, by the publication of their recollections and unpublished writings and the testimonies concerning their martyrdom by their surviving comrades, is very serious indeed. Are you not afraid that this effort to repair an injustice, an effort we all owe to their memory, will become more and more difficult as the years go by?

And why have you not been authorized to explain to us the reasons for the closing of the Jewish Theatre of Moscow (which remains closed) and of the banning of all publications in Yiddish? Do your superiors realize that these are shameful, unavowable acts? I beg your pardon—I was almost forgetting that you cannot reply.

Under these conditions, Mr. Anissimov, you are right: a dialogue between us is impossible and would have no meaning. The censorship constrains you to feign deafness. Therefore, we shall not renew the dialogue until you are in a position to reply fully to the questions I have asked and to those that I have in reserve, just as I have replied and am ready to continue to reply to yours.

I hope that that time is not too far off.

Sincerely yours,
IGNAZIO SILONE

JUST PUBLISHED
**INDIAN COMMUNIST PARTY
DOCUMENTS**

Published by
The Democratic Research Service
and
The Institute of Pacific Relations

Available from:

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

C. C. F. NEWS

THE changes in Soviet society since the Twentieth Party Congress—the problems of collective leadership, the strains in relation to Eastern Europe, and the discontent among intellectuals—were discussed by thirty-five scholars from seven countries, who met from June 24 to 29, 1957, at St. Antony's College, Oxford.

This international gathering, the largest of its kind in recent years, was sponsored by St. Antony's College, Oxford, and the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Among the participants were Raymond Aron of the Sorbonne; Isaiah Berlin of All Souls College, Oxford; George Bolsover, director of Slavonic Studies, University of London; Merle Fainsod, director of the Russian Research Centre, Harvard University; A. D. Gorwala, publicist, India; Professor Masamichi Inoki, Kyoto University, Japan; Dr. Werner Markert, University of Tübingen; Philip Mosely, research director, Council of Foreign Relations, New York; Minoo Masani, M.P., India; Hugh Seton-Watson, University of London; Franco Venturi, University of Turin, Italy; Bertram D. Wolfe, New York. F. W. Deakin, Warden of St. Antony's College, was general chairman of the conference.

Nine papers were prepared for the conference. Prominent amongst those who wrote the papers are Bertram D. Wolfe, author of *Three Who Made a Revolution*, Max Hayward of St. Antony's College, Oxford, Raymond Aron, author of *The Century of Total War*, Richard Pipes, author of *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, and A. D. Gorwala, prominent Indian administrator and foreign affairs commentator.

* * *

On June 14 was published *The Hungarian Revolution*, a White Book prepared for the Congress by *Der Monat* editor Melvin J. Lasky. By far the most complete and authentic history of that most dramatic political explosion in recent years, *The Hungarian Revolution* is a comprehensive documentation based on Hungarian sources, leaflets, broadcasts, the best British and American reports sent by correspondents from Budapest during the dramatic October and November days, and eye-witness accounts translated from French, Italian, Yugoslav, Polish, German, and Russian sources.

In addition to the on-the spot observations of countless witnesses, there is an historical introduction by Professor Hugh Seton-Watson (of the University of London) which comments on and interprets the course of Hungary's history since 1945. There is also an epilogue by Francois Bondy.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

The Poona Group of the ICCF organised on May 30 a lecture by Prof. D. R. Gadgil on "Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries." In the course of his lecture Professor Gadgil gave a resume of the discussions which took place in a Seminar on the subject held by the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Tokyo at which he was one of the Indian participants. Mr. S. M. Joshi, MLA, presided.

PHILOSOPHY OF FREEDOM—(Cont'd from page 5)

should be concomitant with economic freedom such as the "freedom from want" and "freedom from exploitation."

But certain leftist parties, particularly the Communists have tried to stress only the economic freedom to the exclusion of political freedom, and wherever they have come into power they have denied political freedom altogether. Even their slogan of economic freedom is a pretence. Actually, people under Communist rule are neither politically free nor economically freed.

The communist threat to political freedom has made it once again imperative to stress that political freedom constitutes a value by itself independantly of economic freedom, although both kinds of freedom should be simultaneously realised to render the lives of individuals rich and abundant.

It should be clearly understood that economic freedom is not the necessary condition of political freedom. The moment economic freedom is regarded the condition of political freedom, it sets in motion the tendency of suppressing the political freedom in the name of economic freedom as it has happened in Communist countries. Hugh Gaitskell, the leader of the British Labour Party, was right when he once stated "some of the most enthusiastic supporters of 'economic freedom' have argued that it is not merely desirable because of its economic effects but also a necessary condition of political freedom. They claim that, although the two types of freedom are conceptually different they are in practice related. I regard this doctrine as nonsense—and dangerous nonsense at that!"

Care should also be taken that human freedom expressed through democratic practice should not lead to what is generally termed "the tyranny of the majority," denying the grace of living to a minority which adheres to a particular political or economic point of view. Mill and Renon, therefore, laid greatest stress on this "grace of living" for each and all being regarded as an essential ingredient of freedom. In a democratic society political minority should always enjoy the right of growing into the majority. Then alone democracy and freedom can be full and perfect.

D. R. S. NEWS

The Democratic Research Service organised an informal group discussion on the subject "Tactics of United Front" on June 10 at the DRS office in Bombay. Mr. V. B. Karnik presided. Amongst those who participated in the discussion were Messrs. Adam Adil, Keshav Gore, Sudhir Hendre and M. R. Masani.

Publications of the D.R.S.

For A Democratic Foreign Policy	Re. 1/-
The Communist Peace Appeal—Philip Spratt	Re. 1/-
Neutralism In India—M. R. Masani	50 nP.
The Communist Culture Front—Rohit Dave	50 nP.
Why Does A Country Go Communist	25 nP.
Who Is the Imperialist?	12 nP.
Why Communism Must Fail?—Bertrand Russell And Others	50 nP.
The Peril of the Russian Steel Plant —Padamji Ginwala	25 nP.
Dangers of Physical Planning—A Discussion	25 nP.
Communist Conspiracy at Madurai	Rs. 2/-
Communist Double-Talk at Palghat	Rs. 2/-
The Truth About Stalin—N. Krushchev	Re. 1/-
Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma	Re. 1/-

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