

A People's Upsurge

by V. B. Karnik

AFTER the clear statement of the Prime Minister, there can be no doubt in the mind of dispassionate observers that what has developed in Kerala in the last couple of weeks is "essentially a people's upsurge". The Prime Minister gave that description of the developments in Kerala after a three-days on-the-spot study of the situation. He went there on the invitation of the Chief Minister, not as a prejudiced or interested observer, but as an independent person anxious to study the conditions and suggest a peaceful solution. During the three days that he was there he made a careful and exhaustive study and returned to Delhi convinced that the "present agitation was neither communal nor narrowly political but essentially a people's agitation."

This clear verdict of the Prime Minister should set at rest the doubts that were entertained in some quarters. Many well-meaning persons had been led to believe that the agitation was communal and religious. They had been misled by the communist propaganda that it was engineered by the Catholic Church and the Nair Service Society. Referring to that complaint Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan said: "The mass upsurge that the Churches and the Nair Service Society have been able to call forth has some time been described as communal. It is wise to be careful about the use of this word. When whole communities feel aggrieved and rise in protest, that is not communalism. Rightly or wrongly the Christians and Nairs feel that they have been discriminated against. The force of their protest leaves no doubt about the depth of their feeling". The two organisations support the agitation, but it is not restricted to that narrow circle. It embraces the entire people of Kerala, of many castes, communities and religions, excluding a small section of communists and their fellow-travellers. The people as a whole are ranged against the communist Ministry. The agitation against the communist Government is, as pointed out by the Prime Minister, "of a scale and magnitude not at all visualised by people from a distance." It is his visit to the State which gave the Prime Minister a correct idea of the extent and character of the upheaval.

A correct solution of the conflict has been also suggested by him. "A fresh election", he said, "is the

only democratic solution". He went to the extent of saying that, if a Congress Ministry were in office, he would have, under similar circumstances, suggested a fresh election as the obvious way out. Possibly, because it belongs to a different political party, he may not have actually made the suggestion to the Ministry. But now that it knows his views, it should accept his suggestion and give the people an opportunity to express their will in a constitutional and lawful manner.

Mr. M. R. Masani has, in a letter to the press, pointed out that the Constitution provides for such a peaceful and constitutional solution of the crisis. Under the Constitution, the Governor has the power of ordering the dissolution of a State legislature even before the expiry of the ordinary term of five years. When there is such a widespread upheaval in the State, when, according to all canons of judgement, the people appear to have lost their confidence in the Government it is the clear duty of the Governor to dissolve the legislature and give the people a fresh opportunity to express their will. The duty is all the more clear in Kerala, when it is remembered that the communists who form the Ministry had received only thirty-five per cent of votes and the rest of the parties who received sixty-five per cent of votes are today ranged against them in a solid phalanx. This fact and the popular upheaval that has now continued in the State for a fortnight should have convinced the Governor of the advisability of an immediate dissolution of the legislature.

Under the prevailing circumstances, the communist Ministry should have itself placed its resignation in the hands of the Governor and advised dissolution of the Assembly. It should have been prepared to face a fresh election. A democratic party would have readily adopted that fair and honourable course. It is futile, however, to expect from the communists fairness or adherence to democratic conventions. They will not willingly give up the power that they have acquired. They accuse others of accepting and advocating formal democracy. But who is now adopting the stand of formal democracy, the communists or their opponents? It is the communists who are now insisting on the formal rule that elected assemblies will remain in office for five years. By insisting on that formal rule they are denying to the people their sovereign right to have a government of their choice. In the name of a formal rule they are trying to destroy the spirit of democracy. One is not surprised by these tactics of the communists; to them democracy, whether formal or otherwise, is just an instrument to be utilised for advancing their cause. What is surpris-

ing is the gullibility of others who, in the name of a formal rule of procedure, are helping the communists to avoid an election and impose upon the people for another two and half years a government which they do not want and in which they have no confidence. If democracy is the rule of the people by the people, why should it not be open to them to change a Government through the exercise of their franchise even before the legislature has finished its full term? Moreover, in India legislatures are not elected for an unalterable definite term of years. They can be, under the Constitution, dissolved earlier. Under the circumstance to compel the people to submit themselves to a communist regime even after a fundamental change has taken place in their attitude towards it is surely not democratic. What the people of Kerala are demanding is a fresh opportunity to express their will. To deny them that opportunity is a gross violation of the fundamental principles of democracy.

Many newspapers and eminent individuals have severely criticised the opposition parties for starting a campaign of direct action against a democratically elected government. Ordinarily, it is wrong in a democracy to use direct action, even of a peaceful nature, to bring about a change of government. For, in a democracy the people can always use their franchise and effect a change. The ordinary rule does not, however apply to a case like in Kerala where there is a mass upsurge against the Government. Democracy must provide a remedy to the people when, as Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has stated, "they feel utterly suppressed and suffocated as a result of government's policy and when they fear that the party in office is using its power and resources to undermine democracy itself." The obvious remedy is a new election. When the Ministry blocks that remedy by refusing to resign, what can the people do but develop mass action in order to force it to resign? The action

in Kerala is disfavoured because it is apprehended that similar actions may develop in other States. Communists are holding out the threat of initiating direct action in other places. As Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has urged: "there is no cause to be chicken-hearted about that. On the contrary, it would be good to call their bluff". He has pointed out: "Ordinarily, the people are law-abiding. It is only when they are deeply and vitally touched that a mass upsurge happens. It is wrong to believe that any political party can create a mass upsurge whenever it pleases. Stirring up trouble is always possible and it has happened frequently in independent India. But a mass upsurge is difficult." It is a mass upsurge which has created different conditions in Kerala and they cannot be judged by normal rules of good behaviour and democratic propriety.

It is certainly desirable that normal conditions should be restored in Kerala as early as possible. A number of lives have been already lost, a lot of suffering has been already inflicted and a good deal of dislocation has also taken place. The situation should not be allowed to worsen any further. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, a fresh election is the only way out of the conflict. The Chief Minister has made some conciliatory moves by agreeing to discuss with the opposition parties and others their charge sheets as well as the provisions of the Education Act. It is unlikely that those moves will yield any results. For the people's feelings of distrust and dissatisfaction are very deep and there is discontent not merely against particular measures but, as Mr. Sadiq Ali, the General Secretary of the Congress, has stated, "against the entire manner of functioning of the Ministry". The people are not likely to be satisfied by anything less than the resignation of the Ministry. If the Ministry will not resign willingly the Prime Minister must force it to resign and face fresh election. To delay this decision any longer is to prolong unnecessarily the misery and the hardships of the people of Kerala.

All-India Tibet Convention

by A Special Correspondent

DURING the debate on Tibet in Parliament on May 8, Mr. Nehru, referring to the proposed All-India Tibet Convention, remarked in rather disparaging terms: "Some reference was made, I think by Shri S. A. Dange, to some Convention by a certain Majumdar. . . . I think it is a wrong approach which will do a good deal of harm if it was the approach of any responsible people in India." In short, Mr. Nehru dismissed the Convention, before it was ever held, as just another nuisance which would do more harm than good. What or who would be harmed, of course Mr. Nehru chose not to elaborate. But the tone in which he referred to Dr. R. C. Majumdar as a "certain" Majumdar shocked even Mr. Nehru's admirers. Surely Mr. Nehru must have been aware

that a few years ago the eminent historian was invited by the Government of India itself to write a history of the first struggle of Indian independence. Dr. Majumdar after prolonged research into the causes of the 1857 upheaval came to the conclusion that by no stretch of imagination could it be called a War of Independence. This was of course not to the liking of officialdom and Dr. Majumdar resigned rather than compromise his historical objectivity.

Mr. Nehru talked of the Convention as representing a "wrong approach". One would have liked to know from him what constituted a "right approach". Was expression of one's feelings of sympathy with the unfortunate Tibetans a "wrong approach"? Was

(Continued on page 11)

Co-operative Farming

by Hemalata Acharya

IT would sound rather naive to ask the question "What does co-operative farming convey" when the controversy on the subject has gone far beyond the stage of any simple explanation. Unfortunately, this is what is needed to-day. The man in the street wants to know what exactly is going on around at the time when he hears confused voices from the platform and from the Parliament. Ideas are not dangerous by themselves, unless we turn them into explosive materials. Co-operative farming does seem to be heading in that direction.

The Democratic Research Service's publication *Co-operative Farming-The Great Debate* is not only timely but also a pointer to where the wind of ideas blows. The Nagpur Resolution gave a rude shock to all those who were complacently watching the growth and spread of institutions in different fields. The Constitution of India, they thought, was a good safeguard against the hot-headed policy of the enthusiastic members of the cabinet and the ruling party. It was also taken for granted that the Parliament represented parliamentary democracy and once the election was over, one can safely revert to routine existence. But the Nagpur Resolution makes it quite clear that the price of freedom is awareness of what goes around. There is nothing desperately undemocratic in the institutions of co-operative farming or state trading or even, for that matter, in the idea of ceiling. The problem assumes a significant dimension when a few top ranking party leaders try to impose those ideas on the unwary and innocent people at the time when they are entangled in innumerable economic disabilities resulting from food shortage, rising prices, growing unemployment and mounting taxes. It is at this hour that some justification is required for a policy that may lead the country into a formidable crisis of culture.

What is suggested here is that in India freedom to a common man is nothing more than freedom from want. Poverty in India is endemic and any programme directed towards uprooting poverty may have its immediate appeal to those who have nothing to look forward to. Freedom is a vague and woolly word. It has an intellectual connotation. It can be appreciated by those who have been educated to cherish freedom. Freedom is culturally determined. But as long as the cultural tradition, if not exactly hostile, is indifferent to what freedom conveys any deliberate move on the part of the ruling party to curtail freedom may spell disaster. It may be mentioned, however, that no individual is completely free and determinism is subtly linked with freedom. But this determinism is accepted by individuals, for there is intellectual understanding of its existence. People have willingly and consciously submitted to a certain amount of check on their freedom for the cause they

thought greater than the freedom they value. But this happens in a society of developed individuals who know the meaning of 'thus far and no farther'. In an underdeveloped society, freedom is to be cultivated and deliberately inculcated. An underdeveloped society is a reflection of underdeveloped and immature individuals. Here a few and powerful can rule over many and the temptation to do so is great, for that is the easiest way and it saves the rulers from heart searching and troublesome enquiries. Every new measure is given an unusual importance to show that such a measure would surely increase production or would create new avenues of employment or would put a curb on rising prices.

It is in this context that a common man must be told of his responsibility and must be educated in what he ought to do when such occasions multiply. The government and the ruling party are bound to go the way they are going. One should not be surprised at that. Democratic institutions are not proof against idiosyncrasies of rulers. This has been said very often and no better than by David Bidney in his stimulating book *Theoretical Anthropology*. As he observes "It is important to bear in mind that no matter what the political organization may be, it is still possible to have a mode of totalitarian culture. That is why Democracy must not be upheld as if it were an absolute good not subject to the evils and diseases which afflict other political systems."

This digression is not without its purpose. Co-operative farming in India has been practised for quite some years. During last ten years, the policy of the Government has been to organize Co-operative farms wherever possible. Such co-operative farms have been organized for displaced persons or for the landless labourers on government waste land. With the concept of ceilings gaining predominance, it is also recognised that such surplus land must be formed into co-operative farming societies to accommodate landless labourers. The Bhoodan and the Gramdan movements have also been unsympathetic to the private ownership in land and, wherever possible, they have initiated joint cultivation on Bhoodan lands or in Gramdan villages. But in all these coercion is eschewed and the role of the Government is made secondary. In experimenting with co-operative farms either in Gramdan villages or outside, bottlenecks were encountered. It was also discovered that exceptions apart, two most important objectives, increase in production and rise in employment, did not materialise.

There, the question is pertinent: whether the large scale implementation of co-operative farming programme will deliver the goods? If not, whether the price is worth paying. Would it not be better,

to think of an alternative which would be more suitable to the Indian genius?

It would be apt at this stage to indicate the field of reference and to underline what we want to essay. There are two or three topics which may be given our closer scrutiny. So far definition and objectives of co-operative farming are twisted and turned to suit personal predilection. Let us see whether we can do anything to clear the mess. Further, we may try to discern the trends from the performance of the societies so far organized. Luckily Programme Evaluation Organization has brought out a brochure on Co-operative Farming Societies. In addition to this a summary report of the case study of four co-operative farms in Nasik District (c.f. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics Vol. 13, No. 1, January-March 1958) will be presented. This may assist us in assessing the total situation as the conclusion is backed by the direct observation and investigation of the writer herself.

Throughout the discussion our focus of attention would be the 'Great Debate' that has formed the subject matter of the publication referred to in the earlier paragraph.

Co-operative farming is supposed to be a panacea for two diametrically opposite problems, one that of ownership right and another that of small and uneconomic holdings. The existing small owner farmers consent to pool their pieces together, retaining their right over ownership dividend, thus enlarging the unit of cultivation, but leaving untouched the right of ownership of their plots. Logically there does not seem to be anything undemocratic in this, for as long as it is impossible to provide alternative avenues of employment these small cultivators can only be made productive through these channels. Ideally peasant proprietorship is the best form of organization but with unfavourable man-land ratio and poor soil, co-operative farming offers a better opportunity for the economic use of scarce resources. In this particular sense, co-operative farming can be defined as *that form of economic organization in which small and uneconomic holders voluntarily pool together their plots for joint cultivation*. These they do with a specific understanding that all the scarce resources (capital, implements, fertiliser, seeds, water supply) will be disbursed to them at lower costs and their produce will be marketed through co-operatives. Co-operative farming cannot succeed without a prior organization of service co-operatives. Therefore a considerable flexibility has to be introduced in the whole approach to co-operative production. Professor D. R. Gadgil, at the Seminar on Co-operative Farming held in May, 1958, under the auspices of All India Agricultural Economics Society suggested a plant and firm approach. The farms which form into one producers' co-operative are the plants while the co-operative farm as a whole would be a firm. There would be much freedom at the plant level as to the day to day operations, once an overall decision is arrived at on the firm level regarding the matter of policy. This plant and firm approach is commendable, but how far

agricultural operations lend themselves to such strait-jacket formulae has not been worked out so far.

In India, apart from co-operative Joint Farming (where ownership dividend is given due weight), there are co-operative Collective Farming and Co-operative Tenant Farming Societies. The former employs men as wage earners, vesting the management of the farm in the hands of the best among them all, who, therefore, will be virtually the manager of the farm. Most of the co-operative farms on the Government waste land organised to provide work to the landless and the backward section of the population are of these types. Co-operative Tenant Farming Societies which are prototype of what Dr. Otto Schiller calls 'individual farming on co-operative lines' have a greater attraction to individual owners, for it leaves them free to make whatever use they like of the produce of their farms. All the accessories are provided co-operatively, but beyond that no control is exercised over the members. A recalcitrant member is removable and land is redistributed every year. Such co-operative societies have been formed just to circumvent ceiling legislation and at times members of such societies own land elsewhere in the same village. Thus it is apparent that unless the Government decides to force the cultivating community to adopt a particular type of farming, co-operative farming by itself conveys all things to all men—which means it conveys nothing. As the matter stands to-day (and this conclusion is not *apriori*, but is the result of interviews and study of the problem first hand), those who own the land (even a small plot) will not willingly pool their plots together. On the contrary, their eye is on buying more land. Whether this is good or bad, is a subject of philosophical dissertation. That is how it is.

If under these circumstances, co-operative joint farming is insisted upon on the ground that that is the only way of increasing production and providing avenues of employment, there is no escape from compulsion by whatever name the authority may try to hide it.

This will become obvious if we pass on to the second point. Programme Evaluation Organization has published "Studies In Co-operative Farming" in December 1956 (P.E.O. Publication No. 18) which ostensibly is meant to highlight the topic under discussion. It is a study of 22 co-operative farming societies, selected for the purpose by the Registrars concerned.

The Evaluation of 22 societies shows that co-operative farming societies have attracted different classes of people in order to rectify what they consider their long standing complaints. The landless and the displaced wanted some means of livelihood. The absentee landlords jumped at the idea just to evade land legislation and to secure concession available to co-operative farming societies.

Hardly any society exists, where members have been imbued with co-operative spirit. The Subhash Co-operative Collective farm at Manjari (Poona) and

(Continued on page 8)

Vienna Youth Festival

(Contributed)

BY now it is fairly clear to all but a gullible few who refuse to see the light, that the communist-sponsored world youth festivals are part and parcel of the tactics of the international communist movement. Their ways of organisation and programmes have clearly shown that these festivals play an important part in the big propaganda game of the communists and are designed solely to further the cause of international communism. These festivals as a rule are stage-managed and manipulated by their communist managers whose main task in organising them is to convince the participants through uninterrupted programmes, without one free minute, of communist accomplishments, of achievements of the communist bloc and its ideology. But it appears that these aims have not been achieved to date to the satisfaction of the organisers. One of the reasons for this failure has been that all the previous six festivals were held in communist countries. In 1947, the festival was held in Prague, 1949 in Budapest, 1951 in East Berlin, 1953 in Bucharest, 1955 in Warsaw and 1957 in Moscow. These festivals failed to produce desired results. Most of the non-communist youth leaders from countries outside the communist bloc refused to attend the festivals taking place behind the Iron Curtain; and the few non-communist participants in the festivals were not converted. On the contrary, the festivals had an adverse effect on the youths in communist countries whose minds were "contaminated" by the unhealthy bourgeois thoughts as they came in contact with their counterparts from outside the communist bloc.

When, therefore, managers of the Moscow Youth Festival met in Vienna on December 18, 1957 to discuss plans for the next festival, they decided to hold the festival in Vienna, capital of neutral Austria. This meeting was strictly confidential and so secret that no one knew exactly who was invited and who took part in it. But shortly after the meeting, representatives of the International Union of Students as well as several other communist organisations started intensive activity in Vienna and declared that the latter had been selected as the venue for the 7th World Youth Festival.

A meeting of the International Preparatory Committee of the Festival was held in Stockholm on March 24 and 25, 1958 wherein Vienna was officially elected as the venue of the festival. But the technique employed in the process of issuing invitations to this meeting provided yet another insight into the working of communist organisations. Though the meeting was held in Stockholm, the host country, Sweden, was not represented by any responsible youth or student organisation and had, in fact, refused to have anything to do with the Preparatory Committee. Fifty-two countries were represented at the meeting of the

Preparatory Committee. Among them were 11 Iron Curtain countries, 12 Western European nations (of which only two were represented by national organisations, one of which—Switzerland—later withdrew) and a lot of small or fictitious splinter groups. In many instances they were private individuals, fellow travellers or front men. West Germany, for instance, was represented by a bookseller; England by an accordion player. Out of nine South American countries, only three delegates represented national youth organisations. More than half of the delegates from each country were communists. A closer investigation indicated that 78 of the 130 participants at the Stockholm meeting were confirmed communists, and 27 others were fellow travellers.

It is also worth noting in this connection that only three international organisations were represented at Stockholm: the communist International Union of Students, the communist World Federation of Democratic Youth and the communist World Federation of Trade Unions which withdrew to Prague when its offices in Vienna were closed a little while ago by the Austrian Ministry of the Interior.

Austria was represented at Stockholm by the insignificant communist youth organisation FOJ, which has only a few hundred members. All the national youth and student organisations of Austria not only refused to associate themselves with this communist show, they even energetically protested to the Committee prior to its meeting against its decision to organise the show in Vienna. Not only that; even organisations which were not present in Stockholm and which had already communicated their protest were elected to delegations and committees for the 7th Festival! As a result of this swindle, the Union of Swiss Students resigned and withdrew from the Preparatory Committee.

The President of the Swiss Union of Students, Mr. Wienmann, in a statement explaining the reasons for the withdrawal of his Union has offered interesting sidelights about the working of the Stockholm meeting. "Only 12 of the approximately 75 national unions of students in the world," he stated, "have shown any interest in the Festival. If the Festival Conference had the slightest democratic and liberal complexion, it certainly would have given consideration to the 60 negative and disinterested voices. But being a communist organisation, it does not care for the views of a majority."

"Though some non-communist organisations or individuals may take part in Festival preparations", he further warned, "control of policy and finance is in communist hands. The same individuals who organised the festivals when Stalin was alive are still active in the Preparatory Committee. A festival which would not be misused for Soviet propaganda is

impossible without a thorough house cleaning among the Secretariat staff. This fact has necessarily led the Union of Swiss Students to withdraw from further participation. It will further be our duty to tell our friends in Asia and in Africa:

1. That we have tried to make the Festival a neutral gathering but have failed because of communist resistance.
2. That we have thoroughly examined the character of the Festival and must state frankly that the communists dominate it and plan to misuse it as a propaganda platform for their ideological purpose.

But the Swiss Youth Organisation was not the only one to see through this communist game. Several national youth organisations from countries like Britain, Norway, West Germany, Sweden, Netherlands and others have since then announced their decision to boycott the Festival. Inside Austria itself, all democratic youth and student organisations have come together to protest against the abuse of hospitality of neutral Austria by the communist organisers of the Festival. All democratic student and youth organisations in Austria have prepared a Memorandum which has been sent in thousands of copies to all countries and even behind the Iron Curtain in order to clarify the standpoint of the Austrian youth to other youth organisations in the world. As a result of this, the Indian Branch of the World Assembly of Youth and several other youth organisations have recently announced their decision not to participate in the Festival in compliance with the wishes of the Austrian youth organisations.

Though the Festival is being organised in Austria, there exists no national youth committee in Austria which concerns itself with the preparatory work of the Festival. Only the F.O.J., the Austrian communist youth organisation, is taking part in these activities. But F.O.J. is so weak that it is unable to do the job. The Communist Party of Austria has had therefore to take over. All the work of the festival is now being looked after by the Central Committee of the Austrian Communist Party. The Central Committee has delegated a leading official of the communist "Democratic Women's Federation in Austria" to run the office which is in charge of preparations for the Festival. The organisation of the Festival, the arrangement of accommodations and transportation is in the experienced hands of a communist, Herbert Heller, who is the owner of a communist import-export firm in Vienna and is also manager of the travel agency "Josefstalt", which specialises in tours to Iron Curtain countries. He is assisted by a "democratic" lawyer, Heinrich Durmayer, notorious Austrian communist Police Chief in 1945. Similarly, all communist party units have geared up their organisation for the preparation of the Festival. The official party newspaper *Volksstimme* is carrying nearly everyday an article on the Festival. Propaganda for the Festival is being organised at all communist meetings including dances, sport events and film shows. Besides, the Austrian Peace Council also has extended its assistance for the

purpose. It has delegated its Secretary to assist the Festival committee in its work and has undertaken to recruit "reliable" interpreters. The Peace Council is also arranging meetings of war victims and anti-A-bomb demonstrations during the Festival.

The Soviet Union, too, is not lagging behind in assisting in various ways in the preparation of the Festival. It has undertaken to provide four million dollars to defray the expenses of the Festival. Thanks to this generous aid (without strings!) from the Soviet fatherland, communist youth leaders have been travelling around the world during recent months making expansive and expensive propaganda for the Festival and distributing free tickets for a trip to Vienna. But this is not the only contribution from the Soviet Union. The staff of the Secretariat of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna consists 85% of officials trained in Russia. The President of the Preparatory Committee is Mr. Bruno Bernini who is also president of the communist World Federation of Democratic Youth. The communist World Federation of Trade Unions has also been assisting the Committee in a "comradely" way. So also the International Union of Students—the notorious communist front organisation—has hitched its wagon to the Festival special.

The Vienna Youth Festival is thus yet another communist circus designed to attract and rope in gullibles and opportunists from different parts of the world. All Austrian youth organisations have refused to lend their name or support to the Festival. They respect the military neutrality of their country, but they have refused to remain neutral on the questions of fundamental moral principles. That is why they have openly voiced their uncompromising opposition to their land being abused by the communists to further their insidious aims. The irony of this whole episode lies in the fact that the Preparatory Committee of the Festival at its meeting in Stockholm decided to hold the Festival in Austria *only with the consent of the Austrian youth*. And still the Festival is being held in Vienna in the face of the open and near unanimous opposition of the youth of Austria.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

Single Copy Re. 1

Annual Rs. 12

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

ENCOUNTER is sold in India by all good booksellers, including International Bookhouse, 9 Ash Lane, Bombay; Central News Agency, Delhi; Foreign Publishers Agency, Grand Hotel Arcade, Calcutta; and Higginbotham's, Madras. The U.K. address of ENCOUNTER is 25 Haymarket, London S.W.1.

Press In Bondage

by B. J. Fernandes

THE visiting editor of a prominent American daily put it rather cryptically a few years ago when said that "opinion is easy, but facts are complex". He meant the same thing as his counterpart on an equally prominent English newspaper who put it more clearly: "News is sacred, comment free."

The sanctity of facts and freedom of comment are the accepted concepts by which the freedom of the press stands or falls. Among the democracies it is a much cherished freedom rich in hoary tradition. It holds its place of honour as the Fourth Estate, lauded by Carlyle as the "stupendous Fourth Estate".

Yet the respect for truth and free expression is not everywhere an accepted fact. It is an irony of fate that whereas in the democracies the press is the watchdog of the rights of the people, in many others it is a tool to hold humanity in bitter bondage.

Writing of the Czarist Government long before the much-vaunted October Revolution, Lenin had said: "The Russian Government can only survive by living in the dark, and that is why complete and truthful information about the life of the people in the whole country is so rarely collected in our country."

Burning with the ardour of revolutionary fire, Lenin did not foresee the day when the lack of "complete and truthful information about the life of the people" would serve him as well as it had served the Czars of Imperial Russia. Even today, fifty-six years after Lenin's condemnation of the Czarist Government, his words serve as an indictment of the Frankenstein he fathered and called the Communist Party.

Today communist society and government function in an aura of secrecy unknown in the history of mankind. Censorship, the suppression of the truth, police surveillance, party propaganda and the claptrap of a totalitarian regime make mockery of the values we take so much for granted in the free world today.

To those of us to whom these values are nonetheless sacred, the recent survey conducted by the International Press Institute, Zurich, and published under the title *The Press In Authoritarian Countries* will give a grim insight into the working of the controlled press. The survey which is in two parts deals first with the press in the Soviet Union, China, Yugoslavia and the East European satellites. The second half of the survey relates to the press in Spain, Portugal, the Latin American countries, Egypt and the Far East.

The International Press Institute perhaps needs an introduction. As an organisation of newspaper editors representing 500 newspapers from 38 countries, it exists for the express purpose of safeguarding the freedom of the press. This is the second exhaustive survey conducted by the Institute. The first published four years ago dealt with the pressures exerted by governments on newspapermen in the free world.

From the detailed analysis of the second IPI

survey, the Soviet Union emerges as the near-perfect model of the controlled press the world over. The tradition established by the Soviet Press is voiced eloquently by N. G. Pulgunov, Director of TASS, the official Soviet news agency. Says he: "News must be organised; otherwise it is news of mere events and happenings. . . . News should not merely be concerned with reporting such and such a fact or event: it must pursue a definite purpose. . . . News is agitation via facts. . . . News must be didactic and instructive."

There then is the basic difference: whereas the free press persuades, its controlled counterpart dictates; while the one holds facts as sacred, the other adjusts their meaning to present the communist Government in the most favourable light. To quote Khrushchev: "Just as an army cannot fight without arms, so the party cannot carry out its ideological mission without that efficient and powerful weapon, the press. . . . We cannot put the press into unreliable hands. It must be in the hands of the most faithful, most trustworthy, most political steadfast people, devoted to the cause."

These are the norms by which the Soviet press is governed, the norms enunciated by Khrushchev and the Communist Party. The reflexes of the Soviet press are conditioned by these norms rendering it an ideological weapon in the exclusive service of the regime.

The question may well be asked: why is the truth suppressed? Worded in communist jargon the answer is simple, though the communists will in no way admit that the truth is suppressed. "Bourgeois ideology" and "capitalist survivals" must be combated, that is the answer. But behind the facade of high-sounding communist terminology the truth is stark enough.

The real reasons behind the communist suppression of the press are:

To conceal from the Soviet people the truth about the mistakes made by the Communist Party in any sphere;

To conceal from the Soviet public the truth about what the Soviet public itself thinks and feels;

To conceal the truth about dissension between countries in the communist bloc, or between individual communist leaders;

To keep the people in ignorance of the true state of affairs and opinion in Western countries;

To hide from the free nations of the world the truth about internal affairs in the USSR and the way of life of the Soviet people;

To allow the Soviet people only such statements by the leaders of the non-communist world as the Communist Party thinks fit.

Over 7,500 newspapers are published all over the Soviet Union. All of them are controlled absolutely in every way. They are owned either by the State,

the Communist Party or by organisations in which the party plays a dominant role. The editors must be nominated or approved by the party. Trained extensively in politics and ideology, they are "politically literate and verified workers, unreservedly devoted to the cause of the party."

Party directives and publications such as the "agitator's manual" published every ten days, guide their day-to-day working. Editorial conferences are merely a matter of routine. Features and other advance copy must be approved by the appropriate party committee. Any original material, such as an article on foreign affairs, must conform to the party line and must obtain a clearance from the source. That is to say, an article on a particular subject must first be cleared by the Ministry that deals with that subject.

Distribution of all news is monopolised by the official news agency, TASS. TASS which is officially recognised as a department of the Soviet State is the primary censor of all news that is printed in the Soviet Union. Reports of conferences, meetings, discussions dished out by TASS must be printed without alteration.

News is also filtered by GLAVLIT, the Chief Administration for Literary and Publishing Affairs. Every printed work in the USSR is censored by GLAVLIT. All newspaper offices and printing houses—except those that come directly under the Communist Party—are supervised by a GLAVLIT agent.

GLAVLIT is responsible for prohibiting any publication with an anti-Soviet bias, vetting all writings for political or ideological content, decreeing whether publishing houses should remain open or closed, prohibiting the importation of material from abroad and the like.

The third of the screening agencies is AGITPROP, the Agitation and Propaganda Department of the Soviet Communist Party. What is left after this filtering of news is represented by the newspapers of the Soviet Union which are among the most drab in the world. Huge chunks of party propaganda, party directives, party promotions and party speeches pass for news and the reader who seeks amusement, human interest and mental stimulation in the pages of the Soviet press seeks in vain.

There is only a mute question that can be asked after all this: When will it all end? In the last few years there has been a great deal of officially sponsored criticism of the drabness of the Soviet press. Much of it has been stimulated by the "thaw" at the height of which party polemics were even permitted in the Soviet press. (The campaign for brighter papers goes on and many of the younger generation have openly voiced their dissatisfaction.) But whether party objectives and a brighter press can fit into the rigid authoritarian framework is a question that does not seem to have a ready answer in the foreseeable future.

CO-OPERATIVE FARMING—Continued from page 4

the Rasoolabad Co-operative Joint Farm at Rasoolabad (Baroda) seem to be doing well, mostly due to the competent management. The Chaurihara Cane Growers' Society is worked with hired labour and managed as a joint stock farm. Out of the 14 co-operative societies where members pooled their own land, in 10 societies members rely partly or wholly on hired labour for farm work. In 8 societies members participate in farm work. Five of these are on Government land. Some of these societies are highly capitalized and wage paid to the workers has no relation to their productivity. Inefficiency and disputes regarding the distribution are common features of these farms. In two of the societies members think of withdrawing immediately after the expiry of the five years period. Two or three societies are on the verge of dissolution. Two or three others are keen on individual farming after the initial period of joint farming. In some societies, bigger farmers have appropriated a large share of the produce leaving small farmers discontented. Their withdrawal is imminent. One society, the land of which belongs to a Rajah, is almost managed by big landowners.

The study does not throw any light on production or employment aspect of the problem. It underscores one fact, that the members of nearly five or six societies expected to be the rightful owners of the land they cultivated jointly either as displaced persons or the landless labourers, but when they found that this is not going to be the case, their enthusiasm sagged. Many Co-operative Collective Farming

Societies have inadequate finance and inexperienced management. They do not have even wherewithal to construct godowns or sink wells. Production and crop-planning leave much to be desired. Even when yields per acre are tolerably good, on no farm they have exceeded the yields on individual farms in the neighbourhood.

As to the employment aspect of the Programme no generalization is possible. However, it should be pointed out that the present co-operative farms will have to be treated as unemployment relief measures for they cannot work with an eye on increased production with an unfavourable man-land ratio. Every farm must have attached to it a cottage industry unit or a co-operative farm must be a mixed farm. This will relieve pressure. Whether we plan for individual farms or co-operative farms, the question of unemployment cannot be tackled, except through rationalizing productive forces. The problem of unemployment and under-employment is *sui generis*.

(To be continued)

The Democratic Alternative

BY MISS M. A. DEVIKI
Rs. 2.50

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

Review

Lolita

by Vladimir Nabokov; published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York; Price \$5, pp. 319.

TO those about to purchase this book seeking to titillate jaded nerves or furtive pornography, my advice is "don't". It is a novel of passion, passion with a unique theme, with unusual characters. It is the rank, self-consciously degraded obsession of a man of 37 years for precocious, perverted girls, "nymphets" as the author aptly calls them, generally, and in particular for *Lolita*, age 12. Of this species the author writes:

"And neither is she the fragile child of a feminine novel. What drives me insane is the twofold nature of this nymphet—of every nymphet, perhaps; this mixture in my *Lolita* of tender dreamy childishness and a kind of eerie vulgarity, stemming from the snubnosed cuteness of ads and magazine pictures, from the blurry pinkness of adolescent maidservants in the Old Country (smelling of crushed daisies and sweat); and from very young harlots disguised as children in provincial brothels; and then again, all this gets mixed up with the exquisite stainless seeping through the musk and the mud, through the dirt and the death, of God, oh God."

The novel purports to be a confession of the main character; tracing the origin of this obsession, the course of his adult life through one unsuccessful conventional marriage, and another with the mother of *Lolita*, a widow, a sordid marriage with the ulterior motive of being near to the real object of desire, this young and yet mature girl. By a strange coincidence this widow dies in a motor accident, just when disillusion about the motive of her spouse rocks her to fury, and disgrace should ruin the career of Humbert Humbert. This is a wholly incredible incident in a novel not distinguished by plot or story or a plausible sequence of events. Thereafter begins a journey, haphazard, motels after motels, a journey noted for its listlessness and frustration on both sides. Inevitably, the obsession of H. H. is not shared, only barely endured, by his partner and she after 3 years of hectic living is taken over by another equally grown man, more debauched than H. H. This successor is murdered by H. H. and hence the confession, during the period awaiting trial.

There is not one kindly, humane, even reasonably pleasing person in this story. There is no humour, no vivid flash of all consuming passion, no incident one can recall with pity for the tortured characters. Nothing softens the stark self-conscious monstrosity of the psychopath who is Humbert Humbert. The mere disparity of age between him and the nymphet is of little consequence. As he points out, one Church permits marriage at 12 for girls and the legal age is 16 with no upper limit for the males. (In any case,

this disparity is of no relevance in our country where the most distinguished citizens attend weddings which flout Sharda Act and indeed the writer knows of men in 30's, men of high, even foreign, education, marrying girls of 13.)

If H. H. is morally corrupt, according to his own estimation, the explanation lies in that monstrosity of passion for a helpless girl under his ward, a passion which is not responded to in any manner of esteem or affection, a passion wholly animal and uninhibited. There is no intellectual or emotional impact of one on the other. Part one of this novel ends with the incident where the girl realises that her mother is dead and "You see, she had absolutely nowhere else to go". It is this abject slavery of a girl, albeit herself tainted with perversion due to earlier experiences, to a man who was apparently healthy and sane,—he had no difficulty in other adult encounters in his own age or social group, — it is this false and bemused relationship, which rested on no stable foundations, which accounts for the neurotic, high strung, scatterbrained strain running through every sentence in this book. The conclusion he himself arrives at, that a maniac had deprived a child of her rights to childhood, and any kind of miserable family life were better for her than this infiction, should be the moral of the book. If it had stopped 40 pages earlier, the story may yet have had a kindly end where the girl marries a healthy extrovert youth, and a banal scene, with awaited baby, had rounded up the career of an exotic child now turning almost normal. If it had been cut short then, there would have been a moment of tenderness between H. H. and the nymphet, a true moment to live in the reader's mind. But the author is nothing if not brutally real; the story must go on to the murder of the seducer. The end portrayed is true to the whole tenor of the book; H. H. dies before trial, and within three months the nymphet dies in child birth. Tragedy on tragedy but in a stark psychological piece of writing, nothing of pity or compassion.

And yet, it is precisely in this horrific end as well as in the sustained nervous strain in the story, that the artistic integrity of the author is revealed. The battle scenes of Dore or Goya, as in *Guernica*, do not reveal a tightlipped well buttoned hero, galloping with flashing sword to death and immortality. A Calcutta artist assured me that he was commissioned to draw a large painting of the battle of Haldighat but the patron was shocked at the sword, oozing blood, thrust into a horse—the patron was a strict vegetarian. M. Nabokov is no vegetarian, not by any chance. Compassion, pity, sympathy would have destroyed the truly artistic creation of a realist portraying a leper and a perverted child. And how smoothly, neatly, his sentences flow, how one remembers a phrase or an adjective long after the page is read. And again, when a sentence begins to enthrall, comes a vulgar phrase, apparently to mar, but in reality to confirm the essential style. M. Nabokov is a writer's writer. The craftsman often triumphs over the story and the episode. The sensory perceptions of the "Hero" mainly obsessed by the girl in move-

ment, are portrayed in her playing tennis. "I remember the very first game I watched, being drenched with an almost painful convulsion of beauty assimilation. My Lolita had a way of raising her bent left knee at the ample and springy start of the service cycle when there would develop and hang in the sun for a second a vital web of balance between toed foot, pristine armpit, burnished arm and far back-flung racquet, as she smiled up with gleaming teeth at the small globe suspended so high in the zenith of the powerful and graceful cosmos she had created for the express purpose of falling upon it with a clean resounding crack for her golden whip."

When the book was published in 1955, it attracted very little attention. It is partly the notoriety achieved by slanging reviewers and the ban in France, that has made this a best seller. Left to itself its circulation would have rested among lovers of style and artistic presentation of words. It is unfortunate if its fate becomes similar to other books, which flourished when people sought pornography in them and then went into oblivion. It is strange how Edmund Wilson's admirable *Memoirs of Hecate Country* sold so much less than the brazen *Peyton Place* and how *The Philanderer* which gained circulation under prosecution, has now, justly, been forgotten. But perhaps there is another claim as well made for this book, if the foreword has any meaning:—it seems to appeal for a deeper attention to the problems of juvenile temperament, problems relating to an individualistic society which is apt to forget the duties of parents and educators to the coming generation. But if this be so, then this unique piece of artistic production, valid in itself, has a wider utilitarian appeal.

RAMAN DESAI

Of Matters Administrative

by A. D. Gorwala, published by Popular Book Depot, Bombay 7; Price Rs. 3/-.

THE saying that the test of the pudding is in its eating is no more true than that the strength and stability of a Government is in its administration. However good the Constitution of any state may be and however wise and well intentioned its laws and leaders, no state will flourish and deserve gratitude and loyalty of its subjects unless its administration is sound, solid, honest and efficient.

Administration is both a science and an art; science in the sense that it formulates and lays down, from the results of research, investigation and experiment, the basic principles of administration and code of conduct and behaviour to be followed and practised by those in charge of administration and art in the sense that it requires an amount of skill and dexterity of mind to put into actual practice these principles and to follow and observe the rules and standards of conduct and behaviour essential for the smooth working of government business.

Like a clever surgeon, a wise administrator removes, with expert ruthlessness seasoned with mercy

and enlightenment, the dreadful disease of inefficiency and corruption eating into the vitals of administrative organism, and keeps the administration dissociated from the deteriorating infection of nepotism, favouritism, communalism, casteism and corruption.

Efficiency, purity, impartiality are the four pillars on which stands the solid edifice of administration. In a welfare state, the responsibility of efficient and fearless administration lies heavily on the shoulders of those who wield power. If persons in power fail to discharge that responsibility with courage and impartiality, administrative affairs out-grow the size and order of a well kept garden and degenerate into a thick under-growth of brambles and bushwood providing a good hide-out for corrupt officials and unpatriotic smugglers, finally turning into a despair for the Government as well as the people.

The pit-falls in which the administration is likely to be entrapped need to be searched, investigated and discovered lest those in charge of administrative affairs are lost, beyond rescue, into the depths of inefficiency and corruption. Some one was needed to undertake that task. Mr. A. D. Gorwala whose reputation as an able and fearless administrator is universally acknowledged has, with full application of his wide experience of administration, discharged that task with the thoroughness of an expert investigator.

"Of Matters Administrative" is a collection of articles on administrative matters written by Mr. A. D. Gorwala from 1951 to 1958 and published from time to time in various daily newspapers in Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi. Those who are in power and shoulder the responsibility of administration would do well to go through these articles on subjects ranging from "Enlightened Ruthlessness" to "Hopeful Experiment", if they are sincere in their professions to build a genuine welfare state in India free from the influence of greedy politicians and power-thirsty bureaucracy. For the public at large these essays will provide a panoramic view of the thick jungle of despair into which the present-day administration in India has grown and a perspective of the heavy task of tending it into normal conditions with indomitable courage and perseverance.

M. R. DALVI

Co-operative Farming

THE GREAT DEBATE

Price Rs. 3

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

ALL INDIA TIBET CONVENTION—Continued from page 2

denunciation of communist imperialism crushing a harmless people a "wrong approach"? Did the calling of a meeting to appeal to international opinion and focuss their attention on the Chinese genocide represent a "wrong approach"? No doubt, according to Mr. Nehru all these are wrong approaches; for they look facts in the face. By implication they expose Chinese professions of Panchsheel.

But Mr. Nehru had not a word to say about the rival communist show organised in Calcutta about the same time as the Tibet Convention with the imposing and shameless title of the "West Bengal Conference in support of People's China on the Issue of Tibet". Of course this need not surprise anybody. For this "conference" echoed Mr. Nehru's views that "Panchsheel should be saved."

Equally surprising was the attitude of Congressmen. Possibly unaware of their leader's views and actually encouraged by the asylum given to the Dalai Lama and the 12,000 Tibetan refugees, the West Bengal Congressmen first came to the conclusion that associating themselves with all meetings and organisations in support of Tibet was quite within the party line. But Mr. Nehru's remarks jolted them out of that feeling. And immediately thereafter they discreetly withdrew their support to the organisers of the Convention. It was in this context that Dr. Majumdar sadly commented in his speech:

"For reasons not known to us, this Convention has been pre-judged and in a way, condemned in advance by our Prime Minister... it would be idle to deny that the Congress organisation as a whole, has thought fit to publicly dissociate itself from the Convention."

Mrs. Indira Gandhi echoing her father's fears about the Convention, remarked that the Convention would only create grave misunderstanding and aggravate the situation already difficult and tense. Shri Dhebar, too, felt the same way. Mrs. Gandhi was explicit. She said that the expression of views contrary to those held by the Government of India would create grave misunderstanding. Like Mr. Nehru's "wrong approach", Mrs. Gandhi's use of the word "contrary" was delightfully vague. What could be termed as "contrary" to the views of the Government of India? As Dr. Majumdar very pertinently observed:

"... I do not know of any policy on Tibet, publicly laid down by the Government, which this Convention is likely to oppose unless it is a directive that no one should publicly say or do anything in the matter."

Space need not be wasted to report on the attitude of the communists. Suffice it to say that they behaved in true Leninist fashion trying all the agit-prop methods, but to no avail. For this time the communists were swimming against a popular tide. Tibet, unlike Hungary, is just across the border. Added to this proximity are the traditional ties between Tibet and India cemented by Buddhism. Most important factor to impress the Indian mind of the injustice perpetrated on the Tibetans by the communist

Chinese is the presence in India of the Dalai Lama—a refugee from communist imperialist aggression.

It was, therefore, inevitable that communist attempts to hoodwink Indian public opinion on the realities of the Tibetan revolution should fail. Their own rival Convention was a miserable flop. Only the *New Age* could report of mythical crowds giving enthusiastic support to the suppression of liberty of the Tibetan people by "People's" China.

The Convention on Tibet was undoubtedly a success. While the Congress, the Lohia Socialists and a few minor groups did not participate, the Praja Socialists, the Jan Sangh, Hindu Mahasabha and a number of independent-minded people lent the convention their full support. No less than 1,700 delegates attended the Convention. Even though an entrance fee of Re. 1/- was levied, the Hall was packed to capacity on both days and many had to wait outside. Messages wishing the Convention success were received from many prominent Asian personalities. The General Secretary of the Nepali Congress regretted his party's inability to send representatives due to the assumption by them of "responsibilities necessitating presence in Khatmandu of important members". He, however, expressed his party's sympathy with the objects of the Convention and wished it success. U Ba Swe, of the Burmese A.F.P.F.L, Dato Abdul Razak Bin Hussain, Prime Minister of Malaya, Mr. Dudley Senanayake, former Prime Minister of Ceylon, Field Marshal Srisdi Dhanarajata, Prime Minister of Thailand, Koichi Ishizaka, Executive Secretary — People's Council on Tibetan Problem, Japan, and many others sent messages of goodwill. From India itself, Pandit H. N. Kunzru, Shri K. M. Munshi, Smt. Rukmini Arundale, Shri Atul Gupta, Shri S. N. Dwivedy, Master Tara Singh, Shri Farid Ansari and the Vice Chancellors of Delhi, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Banaras, Punjab and Nagpur Universities sent messages wishing the Convention success.

Two representatives from the Dalai Lama's entourage attended the Convention as observers. It was rumoured in high quarters that the Dalai Lama was discouraged by the Government of India from designating the two members of his entourage who attended the Convention as his "personal representatives." Therefore they attended the Convention as "representatives of the Tibetan People." In a frank but sober speech Sonam Gyatso recalled communist charges that the Tibetan revolution was the work of "upper strata reactionaries". "It is far, far from the truth to characterise our national movement as one limited to the "upper strata reactionaries", said Mr. Gyatso. "It is a mass movement encompassing people of all classes and communities without any distinction." Mr. Gyatso gave the lie to Chinese communist charges that the ruling group in Tibet was opposed to progressive reforms. Said Sonam Gyatso: "On January 1, 1959, our accredited leaders issued a declaration strongly advocating radical changes such as acquisition of large landed estates on payment of compen-

(Continued on page 12)

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

✓ I fear nobody. I am not religious and I do not fear even god.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Indian Express*, June 2.

✓ Does it require to be brave to say one is not afraid of God? I am reminded of two psalms of the Old Testament: "Fear of God is the beginning of Wisdom" and "Fools despise wisdom and instruction".

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Times of India*, June 6.

✓ I wish Mr. Nehru could convince us that he also does not fear Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-Lai.

—"Dim", *Current*, June 10.

Mr. Nehru is at least fifty years out of date. His economic policies today are policies adopted by Stalin years ago, but now discarded by his own successors.

—M. R. Masani, M.P., *Times of India*, June 6.

Mr. Nehru has tried to create in this country a One Man Democracy.

—D. F. Karaka, *Current*, June 10.

We say with all responsibility that in fighting Kerala Mr. Nehru is fighting himself.

—Blitz, June 20.

Panchasheela is too short a spoon to sup with the devil.

—*Indian Express*, June 15.

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]

Name:

Address:

Signature

The extreme Rightists in our country are the Communist Party, while the extreme Leftists are Acharya Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan.

—M. R. Masani, M.P., *Times of India*, June 4.

A huge crowd (at a public meeting held in Trivandrum on June 15) cheered Mr. P. Viswambharan, Praja-Socialist leader, when he said that Mr. Krishna Menon was more a Foreign Minister of China and the champion of communism than the Defence Minister of India.

—*Evening News of India*, June 16.

We agree with Mr. Nehru that the Indian Communists have committed blunders galore, yet we urge him to use his patriarchal influence to rehabilitate them rather than throw them to the dogs of communalism and reaction in Kerala.

—Blitz, June 20.

✓ Communists and constitution are contradiction in terms.

—V. P. Menon, *Indian Express*, June 27.

TIBET CONVENTION—Continued from page 11
sation, introduction of parliamentary form of government based on adult franchise and individual liberty."

Jayaprakash Narayan's speech has of course been widely reported. It is a masterpiece of eloquence and full of passion for the freedom of man. He spoke in resounding words: "Then, is Tibet lost for ever? No. A thousand times No. Tibet will not die because there is no death for the human spirit. Communism will not succeed because man will not be slave for ever. Tyrannies have come and gone and Ceasars and Czars and dictators. But the spirit of man goes on for ever. TIBET WILL BE RESURRECTED."

The significance of Calcutta being the venue of the Convention should not be missed. Hitherto Calcutta has been the breeding ground for communists graduating in agitation. Numerous conferences sponsored by communists and their bed-fellows have been organised in Calcutta. For the first time, the democrats got together and openly condemned communist tyranny. The Convention decided on the formation of an Afro-Asian Committee to focuss Asian and international attention on Tibet. It could develop into an effective counter to the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee inspired by Moscow.