

Face The Facts

by V. B. Karnik

IN the discussions relating to the Second Five-Year Plan, there is on the part of the Government a curious but stubborn refusal to face the facts. The latest example of the malady is to be seen in the decision of the National Development Council to stick to the target figure of Rs. 4800 crores of total investment in spite of all that the Planning Commission has stated about the paucity of resources and the strains and difficulties that had developed in the economy.

In a document prepared for the consideration of the Council, *Appraisal and Prospects of the Second Five Year Plan*, the Planning Commission has estimated that the resources that would be available for the purposes of the Plan would be of the order of Rs. 4360 crores. Even this figure is obviously an optimistic expectation. It takes credit for Rs. 759 crores as contribution from current revenues and Rs. 984 crores as loans and small savings. Experience of the first two years of the Plan does not really warrant placing the amounts to be derived from those two sources at those high levels.

The Commission is aware that there may be short-falls in both cases. It may be difficult therefore to reach the figure of Rs. 4260 crores. The Commission regards it inadvisable to prune the Plan to the level of the available resources, namely, Rs. 4260. It has therefore recommended the raising of additional resources of Rs. 240 crores through taxes, loans, and small savings and through economies in non-Plan expenditure. With all this, the maximum amount of resources that it could envisage was Rs. 4500 crores, and, accordingly, it recommended changes in the allotments under various heads so that the total outlay may not exceed the available resources of Rs. 4500 crores.

The National Development Council, however, ignored this assessment of the Planning Commission and blindly decided in favour of retaining the original estimate of Rs. 4800 crores. The decision is blind because the Council has no idea as to how those additional Rs. 300 crores would become available. The only precaution that has been taken is to divide the projects into two groups and to announce that projects in the second group costing Rs. 300 crores would be implemented only if additional resources become available. Nobody knows, however, which projects will be placed in the first group and which in the second group. Would it not have been more realistic and more honest to accept the disagreeable fact that not

more than Rs. 4500 crores of resources would become available and adjust the Plan accordingly?

But, it appears, it is not considered good manners to talk about pruning the Plan or to suggest the lowering of targets. Some even go to the extent of regarding any such talk or suggestion as positively unpatriotic. But economic facts do not have any consideration for the predilections or prejudices of persons. They have already forced a reconsideration of the Plan. A reappraisal of the Plan took place sometime in 1957 as a result of a number of internal and external factors which upset the cost estimates of a number of projects. What remained after the reappraisal was only the ceiling of Rs. 4800 crores in financial terms and not the physical targets as they were originally estimated. A number of allocations were changed. The allocation for Industries and Minerals was raised from Rs. 690 crores to Rs. 880 crores, while those for Irrigation and Power and for Social Services were reduced respectively from Rs. 913 crores to 813 crores and from 945 crores to 863 crores. There was also a slight reduction in the allocation to Transport and Communications. The allocations to Agriculture and Community Development and to Village and Small Industries were, however, left untouched. Then began the talk about the core or the hard core of the Plan, though the people were never told definitely what the core or the hard core was. In view of these facts it is difficult to understand the dogmatic insistence on the figure of Rs. 4800 crores. If hard economic facts can force a reappraisal, is it sinful to undertake it in the light of a sober consideration of the resources that would be available and the needs of the situation?

The Plan as it has been implemented during the first two years has imposed a heavy strain on the people. During the five years of the Plan the people will have to bear the burden of Rs. 725 crores of additional taxation imposed by the Central Government. The additional taxation in the States will be of the order of Rs. 173 crores. This will have to be supplemented, according to the *Appraisal* of the Planning Commission, by a further additional taxation of Rs. 100 crores if the gap of Rs. 240 crores between the available resources and the target figure of Rs. 4500 crores is to be filled up. If the target figure is raised to Rs. 4800 crores, as decided by the National Development Council, there will be, it is clear, a still greater burden. The people cannot be blamed if, owing to the wrong policies of the Government, a substantial part of the revenues raised through the new taxes is not utilised for the purposes of the Plan. It is entirely the responsibility of the Government. So far as the people are concerned, it cannot be denied that they have

shouldered what the *Appraisal* has characterised "a massive tax effort."

The people have also contributed to the Plan through deficit financing. During the first three years of the Plan, including the current year, deficit financing that has been resorted to is of the order of Rs. 917 crores. Deficit financing which naturally has resulted in high prices, has further lowered the people's already very low standards of living. The Finance Minister declared a few weeks back that in view of the existing situation there would be no further deficit financing. The Planning Commission is also aware at the dangers of the situation. It declared "the scope for further deficit financing is very limited." It has also recommended: "deficit financing hereafter must be reduced drastically." And yet it was compelled to provide for a further doze of Rs. 300 crores of deficit financing in order that the figure of resources may not fall below Rs. 4500 crores. The decision to raise it to Rs. 4800 crores will necessitate an additional doze. This will have, it can be easily seen, a further depressing effect on the life of the people.

It was apprehended at the beginning that, as soon as the lack of resources will begin to be felt, it will be the ameliorative aspects of the Plan that will be jettisoned. The apprehension has come true. According to the new schedule of allocations and outlay prepared by the Planning Commission, the allocation to Social Services is reduced to Rs. 810 crores. The original figure in the Plan was Rs. 945 crores. The allocation to Village and Small Industries is reduced by Rs. 40 crores, to Agriculture and Community Development by Rs. 58 crores and to Irrigation and Power by Rs. 93 crores. On the other hand, the allocation to Industries and Minerals is raised by Rs. 100 crores. If there is any further shortfall in resources, there is no doubt there will be further cuts in the expenses to be incurred on Social Services and similar activities.

The employment position is equally alarming. The Plan, as originally formulated, had promised additional employment for about 7.9 million outside agriculture and about 1.6 million in agriculture. According to the latest estimate of the Planning Commission

employment outside agriculture will be about 6.5 million. It will not be enough to absorb the annual additions to the labour force. The problem of unemployment will therefore remain as grim as ever, the colossal investments of the Plan not making any appreciable effect upon it.

The Planning Commission has in a sober appraisal drawn attention to many of these realities about the Plan. The appraisal is reinforced by some of the recent developments in the country. While we have been talking about big plans and devoting our attention to the building of steel mills and machine-manufacturing plants, many of our well-established industries are facing a crisis. A number of textile mills have closed down. A number of engineering concerns have slowed down production. Many complain of lack of raw materials. Unemployment is growing; prices are rising; and there is a general feeling of dissatisfaction and frustration. This is a mood which is hardly conducive to that "local participation and community effort" which the Planning Commission has invited for increasing agricultural production but which is also essential for the successful implementation of the Plan.

There will be no point in telling the Planning Commission or the Government today that all these difficulties and snags could have been anticipated earlier and were as a matter of fact brought to their notice by some in the initial stages of the formulation of the Plan. Those who pointed out that it would not be possible to raise such large resources and that the Plan was over-ambitious were scoffed at. Their criticism of the undue emphasis on heavy industries and the comparative neglect of agricultural and consumers' goods industries was ridiculed. Their friendly warnings against the dangers of inflation were ignored and they were castigated as men of little faith. That events have proved them right will give them no pleasure. Their only desire will be that even now the facts may be faced. There is no harm in setting high goals; but if events prove that they are unattainable one should have the courage and the wisdom to learn from facts and to adjust them according to the possibilities of the situation.

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.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

THE SICK MAN OF EUROPE IS...EUROPE
by Francois Bondy

LUNCH WITH J. B. PRIESTLEY
by John Braine

THE JEEVAN-DANI
A PROFILE OF JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN
by Herbert Passin

JUNE 1958

57

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

Notes

Mr. Nehru's Criticism

AT the last meeting of the All-India Congress Committee held in New Delhi, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru expressed himself in rather sharp terms about some of the activities of the Communist Party of India and some of the policies of the international communist movement. The sharp words took the Communists by surprise as they had never expected Mr. Nehru to be so critical and so outspoken. They are now retaliating by releasing a barrage of propaganda against him and the actions and policies of his Government.

One significant fact to which Mr. Nehru drew attention was the change affected by the Communist Party of India in its attitude towards the Communist League of Yugoslavia after the decision by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to boycott the congress of the Yugoslav League. The change was carried out by sending a new critical message to the Yugoslav congress in place of a friendly message sent earlier. The Indian Communists do not deny the change and the fact that they sent a revised message. Their only explanation is that the draft programme of the Yugoslav organisation was not available to them when they sent the first message; on getting the draft programme they found that there were many points to which they did not agree and, therefore, sent the second message; but it was sent long before they came to know of the Soviet reaction. They claim therefore that they effected the change on their own initiative and on the basis of their own judgment and not on any instructions from abroad. The Secretariat of the Party has stated in the course of a statement: "At the time of our sending our views on April 19, we had no knowledge of what other Communist Parties had said about the Draft Programme of the League of the Communists of Yugoslavia."

One could have accepted this communist explanation. But there is a little snag. It was precisely on April 19 that the Moscow Radio broadcast the Soviet decision to boycott the Yugoslav congress. The broadcast was repeated a couple of times on that day for the benefit of communist representatives abroad. It is a wellknown secret that Indian communist leaders listen attentively to Moscow Radio. It is inconceivable that they could have missed this important pronouncement that the Moscow Radio made on April 19, not once, but more than a couple of times. It is difficult therefore to believe that the Indian Communist Party acted on its own initiative when it sent its second message to Yugoslavia.

Another criticism that Mr. Nehru made was that the Indian Communists had their "thinking apparatus" outside the country. This criticism has also gone home and there have been angry rejoinders. That Indian Communists do not think for themselves, that they always look up to Moscow for advice and guid-

ance and that their policies and actions are determined abroad — these facts are so patent that they do not need any discussion or corroboration. One may, however, in this connection draw attention to the visits to Moscow that leaders of the Party are required to make before and after each Party Congress and whenever any important issue is to be decided.

On this occasion, Mr. Nehru was also critical about some of the happenings in China and Russia. After referring to Mao Tse-tung's famous slogan, "Let a hundred flowers blossom", Mr. Nehru drew pointed attention to the later development of "flowers being pulled out as weeds." He also referred to the "rigidity" and "intolerance" that had developed in Russia — and to "the cutting of heads". Alluding to the recent changes, he said, "Now fortunately, heads remain but other things follow". This was obviously a reference to the purges of Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich and others. Mr. Nehru also expressed his disapproval of the pressure tactics that are being applied against Yugoslavia. He regarded them as unjustifiable interference with the internal affairs of a country.

It was refreshing to hear Mr. Nehru speak about communism and communist activities in such a candid and forthright manner. It is to be hoped that there will be many more such occasions and that the people will be told more often the truth about this grave danger to freedom and democracy.

Lesson Of Devicolam

THE communist success in retaining the Devicolam seat in the recent by-election in Kerala has been a decisive one. The communist candidate Mrs. Pun-nose won by a majority of 7,098 votes over her Congress rival. The result has surprised even the Communist Party leaders who did not expect such a comfortable majority for their candidate. However, the margin of communist victory has been narrowed from over nine thousand in the last election to about seven thousand this time. This is rather significant.

Though the communist success restores the party's precarious majority in the State Assembly, no greater meaning should be read into it. The communists in office have not lived up to their promises and there is a distinct turn of the tide against the communists among at least a section of the Kerala electorate. But this process is obviously a slow one and requires for its acceleration concerted drive on the part of the opposition parties. The defeat can be turned into a victory if the opposition takes the Devicolam lesson to heart.

In a way the Congress has itself to thank for its reverses against communists, for these may be attributed to its failure to educate the electorate politically. It is for the Congress and other opposition party leaders to assess how far their alliances with the communists, as in the election of Delhi's or Bombay's Mayor, give a misleading idea to voters throughout the country and a dangerous respectability to the communists. Besides, the ideological ambivalence of our national leaders in holding that communist aims are good but their method is bad, "makes most Congressmen", as one of

our contemporaries pointed out, "apologetic when confronted with Communist challenge". This ideological confusion and the consequent failure to educate the voter politically, together with the failure of democratic parties to evolve a common ground and approach to fight the ever-increasing communist menace, have contributed to the communist success. Sooner the democratic parties realise this better are the chances for the success of democracy in India.

A Bad Precedent

IT is an ingenuous statement that the Governor of Orissa has issued explaining why he did not accept the resignation of the Mahtab Ministry and call upon the leader of the opposition to form the Ministry. The only reason advanced by him is the reported claim made by the Chief Minister, Mr. Mahtab that he still commanded a majority in the Assembly. The claim should not have weighed with the Governor and he should have followed the usual constitutional procedure. The usual procedure is to accept the resignation and then call upon the leader of the opposition to form the Government. If the opposition is not able to win a majority in the House, its Government may fail and it may become necessary again to find out who commanded the majority. But under the constitutional procedure the opposition must get the opportunity to form the Government. By denying that opportunity to the opposition, the Governor of Orissa has not only departed from the established conventions of parliamentary democracy but has also acted in an unfair and improper manner. The charge against the Mahtab Ministry has been that it utilised its office for securing adherents. Its actions on the eve of the crucial vote in the Assembly have thoroughly exposed the discreditable means that it adopted for remaining in office. By enabling it to continue in office, even after tendering resignation, the Governor permitted it to utilise the same method for retaining its support. Apart from being unfair to the opposition, it set a bad precedent and put a premium on political opportunism and corruption.

Exploitation Of School Children

THE Municipal Administration of Bombay deserves to be complimented on the decision to stop the practice of asking municipal school children to line up along streets for welcoming foreign dignitaries and other important visitors to the city. The practice had come into vogue during the last few years. It was to a large extent an imitation of the practice followed in communist countries of arranging for extending welcome to foreign visitors.

As a result of the practice, whenever any foreign dignitary visited the city, municipal school children used to be rounded up and made to line the streets along which the dignitary was to pass. The children had to stand in that position for hours and many a time in sun and rain. It was a torture to the children as well as to the teachers who had to shepherd them and teach them to shout the appropriate slogans. On

most occasions the children did not even know whom they were welcoming.

Some discerning persons had raised their voice against the practice characterising it as unlawful exploitation of children for political purposes. The Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom adopted over two years back a specific resolution on the topic and appealed to all political parties and organisations to abandon the harmful practice. *Freedom First* had also drawn pointed attention to the undesirable consequences of the practice.

The Samyukt Maharashtra Samiti Group in the Bombay Municipal Corporation, and more particularly its leading Praja Socialist Party members, deserve congratulations for the interest that they took in the matter and for the decision taken by the Municipal Administration on their advice and persuasion. It is to be hoped that the decision taken in Bombay will serve as a model to other municipalities and local bodies.

The Municipal Commissioner has also ordered that without obtaining his previous permission teachers and other officers of the education department should not encourage the buying of tickets by school children for any show in the city. This is a sequel to the tragedy that occurred on the occasion of the show put up by that notorious fellow-travelling organisation, the China-India Friendship Association. It is a wellknown fact that some known fellow-travelling elements in the Municipal education department were utilising their positions for securing ready audiences of school children for shows put up by communist and semi-communist organisations. Who were indulging in these practices is not, however, important. The important thing is that the practices were harmful and undesirable. The Bombay Municipal Corporation has done well to stop them.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

The Poona group of the I.C.C.F. organised a seminar on "Bureaucracy under Communist Regime" on 14th and 15th April. Prominent amongst those who participated in the seminar were Dr. Karve, Prof. Kogekar, Prof. Bedekar and Dr. Garde.

* * *

Under the auspices of the Indian Committee Dr. Raghuvira, M.P., Director of International Academy of Indian Culture, delivered a lecture on May 19 on "New Pattern of Economic Development". Mr. V. B. Karnik introduced the speaker.

INDIAN COMMUNIST PARTY DOCUMENTS

Published by
The Democratic Research Service
and
The Institute of Pacific Relations
Price Rs. 10

Available from:
POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Towards A Fuller Democracy

by Jayaprakash Narayan

IN the past few weeks I have been speaking about parliamentary democracy and there has been some controversy in which even the Prime Minister has taken part. I am a critic of parliamentary democracy and I am anxious to see it replaced by a better form of democracy. But let me clear at the outset the misunderstanding that I am an opponent of democracy because I am a critic of parliamentary democracy. It is far, far away from my mind to lend any support to any form of authoritarianism or totalitarianism.

I think that totalitarianism is a crime against man. It is an insult to man to deny him freedom and democracy. It is in the very nature of man that he should work for freedom. There is something in the human spirit that refuses to be suppressed or oppressed for all times. And therefore I am an optimist. I believe in the future of democracy, in the future of human freedom and human dignity. I should also like to make it clear that I have no doubt that of all the different forms of democracy, democratic political organisations that history has known so far, parliamentary democracy is the best in spite of its shortcomings. But that does not mean that we should shut our eyes to its defects, should not try to remove them and improve upon what we have today.

First of all, parliamentary democracy is not full democracy. It is inadequate democracy. What do I mean by the statement? There have been many definitions of democracy, some scholastic, some academic, some scientific. But I should like to take the popular definition which Abraham Lincoln gave: democracy is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Now it is possible to conceive that a parliamentary democratic government is a government for the people. It may even be a government of the people in the sense that it is elected. But I think you would agree that no example of parliamentary democracy exists today or has existed before which would satisfy the third part of the definition, namely, government by the people. It may be a government with the consent of the people, but it is not a government by the people.

There is another aspect of this system of parliamentary democracy. Under such a system political parties are formed and the parliamentary democratic system becomes inevitably a party system. Either we have a two-party system which we have more or less in the English-speaking countries, or we have a multi-party system which we have in Western Europe, particularly in France and Germany.

The idea of a one-party system is foreign to parliamentary democracy. There must be at least two parties—one in government and the other in opposition—or more than two parties. Political parties no doubt rise from the people. No doubt, they have their own following among the people, but yet they are not the people. Every political party claims to

represent the interests of the people better than every other political party. Out of this party system we get party machines which are highly organised, highly centralised—party machines which have their own funds and their own means of propaganda. The people are given the opportunity to elect their representatives but as a result of the working of the party system these choices which are given to the people become very much limited. When there are highly organised parties with funds, highly publicised leaders and so on, it is very difficult for independents to win elections and in all organised parliamentary democratic systems the number of independents fighting elections is very small. The choice of the people in the selection of their representatives is limited by the virtue of the fact that political parties which are organised set up candidates and the people merely have to select from them. As a result, elections for a poor country like ours have become very costly and everyone is conscious of it. But yet no solution is found. No doubt, there are certain fixed limits to the expenditure which a candidate might incur. But you all know that the rule is observed more in breach than in practice. When elections become so expensive is it possible for the people to exercise their choice in the selection of their representatives? Parties with large funds organise and manage elections and win the people's votes. Has a poor candidate any chance of winning an election under these conditions? Has a poor man's party any chance? These are serious defects which it is necessary for us to consider.

Let us take another aspect of this. The theory is that a voter is expected to express his opinion on the issues that are placed before him at the time of the elections. Is it possible for ordinary voters in any country to be able to express their opinion intelligently on all the complicated issues that are placed before them? And when we come to our own country with the backward electorate that we have—most of them illiterate, most of them are such that they have not travelled beyond their district—is it possible for such persons to express their opinion on international affairs? Is it possible for them to give an intelligent answer? We must take all this into consideration and find what system would suit our conditions better.

I think even in highly advanced countries every voter who is called upon to exercise his vote is not in a position to express his views intelligently. When I was studying in the U.S., an American University conducted a sample survey and it was found that 17% of the citizens did not know who their President was. I am talking of the twenties, many years ago. I am sure the Americans have advanced since then; but at that time, 17% of them, according to the sample survey, didn't know the name of the President. If you ask citizens of India who their President is, I don't know what the percentage will be. At an examination held

in Kanpur for subordinate civil service a question was asked: who is Dr. Rajendra Prasad? And you would be surprised to read the answers—some made him an eminent physician, some made him Commander-in-Chief somewhere, and so on and so forth.

The party system has other glaring defects with which you all are acquainted. You have heard of the Tamany Hall. Every country has its own Tamany Hall. I am sure that Bombay city has its own Tamany Hall, a few political bosses manipulating corruption and all kinds of nepotism. When you have this party system, you are not so much concerned with what is right and who is right; you are only concerned with what strength your own party has. I have seen it happening in the political field in our country—one political party boss is expelled from his party for defalcation of money and other political parties are waiting to embrace him with open arms because he happens to be a person of some ability.

We have a Welfare State. What do we find? We find in the world a trend towards more and more centralisation, more and more power for the State, for the Government. In the Welfare State as well as in the Socialist State or in the Communist State, the trend is the same. People are becoming irresponsible in the sense that they are not prepared to shoulder the responsibility of citizenship themselves, the responsibility of community life. They are content to cast their votes, they are content with throwing their votes to whoever they wish and then be satisfied with that. They have performed their duties as a citizen and therefore nothing remains for them to do, the rest is for the State to do.

Now I should like to ask you whether in a centralised order of society democracy has much of a chance. Pandit Nehru or Mr. Macmillan or Mr. Eisenhower may be a democrat and a good democrat at heart. But the whole of the social organisation is such that power is concentrated at a few centres. How could it be possible, in spite of their best feelings, for democrats to function as democrats or to give their people a democratic way of life? As all of you know the trend is more and more towards statism.

Apart from the welfarism, socialism or communism, it is commonly believed today that science itself is working for centralisation, i.e. the inevitable result of scientific developments would be more and more centralisation. Society would become more and more complex, technology would become more and more complex, requiring more and more centralisation and, therefore, in this scientific age the question is asked whether democracy can really function? The vital decisions in a centralised society are taken by a few people, decisions which affect the lives of millions of people. Would you call that democracy? This is called the age of planning and it is thought that planning is impossible without centralisation. Panditji talks of planning in a democratic context, or of democratic planning. What democracy do we have in the planning of our country? The Planning Commission has its committees, has its experts to prepare plans that are placed before the country, some discussions are held, some people write learned articles. In the Development Council there is some discussion, some

minor changes are made and then there is the national plan. Thus science and socialist planning, all these are taking us towards this over-centralisation of life—the trend of development which is inimical to the trend of democratic planning.

You will ask then what is to be done? I shall like all of you friends to think about it. What is to be done? There is one attitude of mind which resigns itself to the so-called forces of society. There are these social forces at work; there is no use swimming against the current, pitting ourselves against the trend of events—all these things are going to happen and let us try to save of democracy as much as possible. The other view is that there are certain objectives, certain aims and values in life which one is not prepared to compromise. Each one is prepared to fight for them in the extremest circumstances. Such an attitude of mind is a revolutionary attitude. It does not accept things, it fights against them.

Democracy is a way of life, is a habit of life, is an attitude towards life. Democracy embraces the whole of life. You cannot bring about changes in the political structure and leave the economic structure as it is and hope by those political changes to create a better democratic system. The whole of life, the whole of social life must be transformed to make it more and more democratic.

The picture of human society today is such that every man is more or less at war with every other man. We hear a lot today about the cold war, the cold war may in the end prove to be more harmful than other forms of war. But are you aware that we have in society, in our daily lives, a perpetual cold war going on? I am at war with you. You are at war with me. That is how life is organised. I do not think that socialism or communism has made much difference to it. Today the basis of our life is our own individual self-interest. Our selfish interest is the motivating force. The individual self-interest naturally embraces the interest of the family—a small family of the individual. We are trying to do all that we can for ourselves—for our little family. I do not think that as long as this cold war is going on it will be possible for us to enlarge the frontiers of democracy very much.

When man is at war with man, there has to be some institution, some force, some coercive power to keep people under reasonable control. Those who are using their coercive power may come from various classes or groups. They may have various interests. That is a different matter. A picture of full democracy can only be realised, a full democracy can only be possible when we have transformed the very basis of our lives. Instead of living for ourselves or for our little family, if we begin to live for our neighbours, for our fellow human beings, for the society at large, then and then only the fullest possible development of democracy can be possible.

I am pleading not only for an economic change, a social change or a political change, but a change in the entire outlook on life, in the fundamental values of life. You might say it is not possible, it is against human nature. Well if you say that, I can only reply that I do not accept that view, even though I may be

(Continued on page 9)

Tito And The Red Goliath

by B. K. Desai

THE wheel has turned full circle. In 1948 Tito was ex-communicated by Moscow for his unpardonable sin of standing up to the mighty God in the Kremlin and asserting his own independence. Five years thereafter, in June 1953, Stalin's orphaned heirs sent, with Yugoslav consent and with expectations of friendship and forgiveness from the latter, an Ambassador to Belgrade for the first time since the Tito-Stalin rift, thus opening a new era in the history of Moscow-Belgrade relations. And now again after five years Tito stands on the brink of a new sharp rupture with Moscow. It is curious to note in this connection how history is repeating itself even in the case of such details as the use of the same old accusations and invectives against Belgrade by the high priests in Moscow and Peking. It was not therefore without reason that the *Kommunist*, the organ of the Yugoslav Communist Party, noted rather laconically that the leaders in Moscow and Peking had done no more than to "reopen the file", on the resolution voted by the Cominform in 1948. But still, in spite of this fire and fury, it is obvious that Moscow cannot push the rupture to the extreme. It would mean for it a diplomatic and propaganda set-back in uncommitted regions, especially Asia and the Middle-East which it could ill afford. In a way the rupture was inevitable sooner or later. Though the Kremlin after Stalin introduced controlled liberalisation in its internal as well as external relations, it never gave up, in practice, its rigid insistence on adherence to Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism; and though it conceded to Tito his right to cultivate his garden after his own fashion, it was bent on maintaining the Soviet supremacy, euphemistically called ideological unity, in the world communist movement. The differences between Moscow and Belgrade came to a head with Yugoslav leaders' refusal to put their signature to the Moscow Declaration signed by the twelve ruling Communist Parties last November which emphasised the need for ideological unity and purity under Moscow's leadership. This dramatically disclosed the ever-widening rift between the two and underlined Yugoslavia's firm resolve to follow its own path to socialism. But what incensed Moscow more than Yugoslavs' stubborn refusal to fall in line was the latter's unwillingness to keep the fruits of their own experience to themselves and their audacity in openly formulating in their draft programme a coherent view of the world on the basis of the accumulated wisdom of their ten years of practical experiment and ideological exegesis.

• The draft programme, released a month before the seventh Congress of the Yugoslav Communist Party which was meeting after five years, contains nothing new, nothing that was not put forward by the Yugoslav leaders during the past few years. Many of the ideas incorporated in it, and which Moscow now denounces, were advanced by Tito and his colleagues at one time or the other. However, this time those ideas have been

systematised together and set out in a comprehensive form in the programme bearing the formal seal of approval by the Party. The programme does not look upon the 1948 break as an accident or a Stalinist aberration, but tries to relate it to what it considers as fundamental defects in the system and draws its own conclusions from the analysis. In the process it suggests a somewhat radical revision of dogmas held sacrosanct by the communist leaders and in its analysis of the world affairs it, at many places, holds up a mirror to the Kremlin to show the latter its true face. Here lies the unkindest cut of all for Moscow, as it feels thereby rather exposed.

According to the Yugoslav doctrine, the transition from capitalism to socialism can be brought about in some cases by peaceful parliamentary methods. Present-day world capitalism, according to the programme, contains a sizable proportion of socialist ingredients that are bound to dominate in the long run. "The capitalist system in its classical form," it concedes, "is increasingly becoming a thing of the past. The indispensable need to modify, through State intervention, the relationships in production and distribution of the capitalist economy leads to a qualitative increase in the role of the State in operating and developing the economic life of society." In this way the objective process of social development strengthens and expands the factors of socialism, and "objectively brings contemporary capitalist society nearer to socialism." In other words, "mankind is indomitably moving into the era of socialism through a wide variety of different roads" and, in some cases, revolution is not necessarily a precondition for this change. Naturally, it boldly asserts that communist parties do not have a "monopoly of any form of movement towards socialism." Thus it knocks the ground from under the feet of the communist leaders by depriving them of their historical mission and deals a deadly blow to the Moscow's leadership of the coming world revolution.

But the programme does not stop at this. It goes beyond this and says that the eventual triumph of socialism will not solve mankind's problem. It analyses the role of the state power in a socialist society. The state, it asserts, while indispensable for "fighting the remnants of the old society", soon becomes in a socialist society a drag on progress. A powerful bureaucracy soon entrenches itself and inevitably seeks to make itself the master rather than the servant of society as a whole. A socialist society, the programme concludes, must therefore address itself without delay to the task of cutting down the state's power and moving toward a form of "direct democracy." This is a radical departure from Moscow's totalitarian concept of the role of the State in a socialist society and implicit in this discussion is the idea that in some countries not only Communist Parties have no monopoly of ushering in of socialism, but they may, in fact, retard progress—again a heresy for Moscow.

As if this was not enough, the programme proceeds to examine the Stalinist state in Russia. "Stalin, for both objective and subjective reasons, did not fight the bureaucratic tendencies engendered by the great concentration of power in the state apparatus." On the contrary, the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat which withers away was changed into "Stalin's theory of the state which does not wither away, but keeps growing stronger in all fields of social life." What is worse, the programme states that after World War II "manifestations of this type started to make their appearance in the international sphere, as well as in certain elements of Soviet foreign policy and in the relations between socialist countries." Thus, according to this analysis, Stalinism arose not because of Stalin's personal defects but because of deformations in the Soviet system which, it is implied, have not yet been completely cured.

In dealing with the causes of tensions in international relations the programme, to the utter dismay of Soviet leaders, lumps the "socialist" and "imperialist" camps together as being equally responsible for the present tensions. Nato was established through fear of "Stalin's inflexible and menacing foreign policy." This is the only point on which the Yugoslavs shifted their position a little bit and slightly revised their draft as a result of Russian representations. They now hold that Nato was called forth into existence because of Stalin's policies but has world domination for its goal, while the Warsaw Pact is purely a defensive organisation.

In regard to the relations between Moscow and other communist countries the Yugoslavs are equally outspoken in their criticism. The programme openly suggests that there is exploitation of smaller countries within the communist camp and accuses the Soviet Union of seeking to impose its ideology on its communist allies. Even Tito in his address to the Party Congress attributed to Stalin the doctrine that socialism was an imported article and that it can develop in a standardised manner according to one precept by imposing certain forms of socialist development upon other countries. The Hungarian revolt and Polish crisis of 1956, he pointed out, were "natural consequences of Stalinist policy."

All this was bound to infuriate the Soviet leaders. Two days before the Yugoslav Congress, *Kommunist*, the theoretical journal of the Soviet Communist Party, assailed the draft as filled with "anti-scientific, non-Marxist, non-Leninist reasoning", and offered "comradely criticism." Khrushchev called the draft programme "nonsense" and Peter N. Pospelov, one of the Kremlin's leading theorists, called upon Tito to retract his "wrong statements." His main charge against the Yugoslavs was that the document "attempts to take a neutralist position on questions on which communists cannot be neutral."

But Tito was not impressed. At the Congress he accused the Soviet leaders of "short-sightedness and tactlessness" for meddling in Yugoslavia's internal affairs. "Our programme is our programme", he was firm in his tone, "we cannot permit anyone to decide it for us. There does not exist any infallible ideological judge." His chief party lieutenant, Vice Presi-

dent Rankovic was equally blunt. "Some people seem to have forgotten", he reminded Moscow, "that Yugoslav Communists do not have flexible spines," and made a very significant accusation that Soviet Union had blundered by counting on dissidents within the Yugoslav Party to force a change in the programme. Finally the revised draft was unanimously adopted by the Congress, and in his speech at the final session Tito appealed to the Kremlin not to repeat the Stalinist mistakes which "in the past proved fatal."

But the Chinese Communists were not prepared to learn from past mistakes. Peking's *People's Daily*, official organ of the party, came out on May 5 with a barrage of invectives against Tito. It charged that the Yugoslav programme was "out-and-out revisionism" and has "viciously slandered the proletarian dictatorship and maliciously slandered the socialist camp." The programme, it declared, substitutes "sophistry for revolutionary materialist dialectics" and "reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism." It went further and launched a frontal attack on Tito's regime which it described as a tool of "U.S. imperialists" and further said that "in political economy it takes up the cudgels for monopoly capital." The programme, it asserted, "fits in exactly with what imperialists — and particularly American imperialists — need." It even appraised as "basically right" the Cominform's 1948 charges against Belgrade. Further, the Chinese Communist Party openly vowed to crush Titoism and "revisionism" and declared that it will be a "holy mission" for it to safeguard the international communist movement from that danger.

Coming as it did from the Chinese communists this attack was rather significant, as many have until now cherished the fond hope that Mao will some day follow in Tito's footsteps and challenge the Kremlin's leadership. This episode has only proved that Titoism — or revisionism — is a danger equally to Moscow and Peking, both of which are bent on keeping at bay the dangerous thoughts emanating from Belgrade.

This episode has only stiffened Tito's resolve to pursue his own path to socialism. To be sure, Tito's road to socialism is equally reprehensible and his regime is as much dictatorial as that of the Kremlin leaders. He has shown equal intolerance of political opponents, as is evidenced by the treatment meted out to Djilas, Dedijer and others. That is why he was genuinely interested in bringing about a rapprochement with Moscow. But the inexorable logic of totalitarian communism has again ruthlessly come into operation as a result of which Tito once again stands rudely disillusioned, and like David hurling a defiant challenge at the Red Goliath.

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

TOWARDS A FULLER DEMOCRACY — (Continued from page 6)

in the minority of one. I do not think that there is any compulsion in human nature which makes the individual look to his own self-interest. I grant that there is a natural, biological urge of self-preservation and these various interests that we have—whether they are social interests, political interests, class interests, or whatever they are—they have their roots in that biological urge of self-preservation. I won't deny that. But I would still like to plead and like to convince everyone that the individual self-interest can be really fulfilled only in a society in which the individual has come to realise that his self-interest is identical with the larger interest.

If you win at the cost of another, the moral law is bound to catch up and wreak vengeance—and therefore you see empires falling, wealths disappearing and all sorts of things. That is the way of life today. The Americans may be at the top of the world, the Russians may be at the top of the world; but in this way of life which is organised on this particular basis there is absolute certainty that they will not be at the top for all times. Great empires have come and gone. There is complete assurance of everyone's success when everyone thinks that his success and the success of others are identical, when this cold war between man and man, between groups of men—whether they are classes, races, associations, trade unions, or nations—has ceased.

I think this age of science has made it more possible than ever before for this kind of a revolution to take place successfully; it has brought the human race together; it has brought education to a larger number of people than ever before; it has opened the minds of people to scientific truths. This age of science has made it possible for everyone of us to appreciate that if the cold war did not end, no matter what was done, some sort of shooting war is bound to emerge and that would be the destruction of the race. How it is to be stopped is for everyone of us to think about. We should begin with our own lives if we believe in democracy. We have everyone of us neighbours. We can practise this idea with our neighbours, in our neighbourhood.

This is a change in the inside of us—the inner change that is necessary for the development of democracy, for the development of a society in which coercion, outward coercion, has been reduced to the minimum. A fully democratic society is a society in which there is no outward coercion. Suppose it is an ideal dream—the State will never wither away, the stateless society is only an ideal to be worked for; suppose we do not arrive at it; but to the extent to which we are able to make progress, democracy has progressed. Therefore Gandhiji said (it was not his saying, he merely repeated it), "That Government was the best which governed the least." Today all of us want the Government to govern most, and we want freedom also—these are two inconsistent things. I shall like to place before you a view of social organisation which is very much different from the present picture.

We have the food problem in India, a very serious problem, perhaps the most important problem in the

country. The people must be fed before we have steel mills, before we have anything else. But whose task is it today? Whose job is it today to solve the problem? It is the job of Shri Rajendra Prasad and the Government of India. It is the job of Shri Yashwantrao Chavan and his Government in the Bombay State. That is the picture that we have today. The fundamental problem of life which touches each individual is to be solved at the top by a few people. We have a picture of society in which the individual is at the centre, then around him is the family. The family is the rock-bottom on which social life is based. If the family is destroyed, I don't think there will be human culture or civilisation. The individual and his family around him, and after that—what do we have today? The great society. The individual with his family is plunged into this vast ocean. The individual is frightened of this ocean. He is in search of security and in that search of security any rogue that comes along is able to win him over to his side. Any dictator comes along and promises to give him security and food, and he follows him. The frightened individual is not in a position even to look after the primary needs of his life.

We say the next group around the family should be a community. In human history ninety-nine per cent of the people have lived in small communities. Man is a small community animal. In Bombay city, we are lost and it is a jungle where in the same chawl, in the same tenement house, in the same apartment house one neighbour does not know the other. Human beings were not meant to live like this. Man is a social animal; he must have community. That community is the natural community for the human being which is small enough, in which everyone is able to know everyone, everyone is recognised by everyone else—a face-to-face direct community, as sociologists would call it. That should be the community, the next social organisation around the family. You might say, well we have these communities today. In India, eighty per cent of our people are living in villages which are small communities of this nature. But it is not enough to have this small community. Something else should go with it and that is very important. This primary community, next to the family group, must be so organised that the primary needs of the people living in those communities are satisfied within that community, satisfied as far as possible. The picture that emerges out of this social philosophy or this sociology would be a picture of agro-industrial communities. The members of the community produce their own food, their own clothing, their own shelter, are able to look after their primary education and primary health services.

It is not an immediate community in which human beings are living today, but a distant community or distant centres which are responsible for giving employment, for giving clothing, for giving food. When this kind of thing happens it is inevitably a top-heavy organisation. It is bound to lead to restriction of democracy. So the individual, then around him the family and around him this primary community—this

should be the picture. There may be certain needs of this community which cannot be fulfilled within the community itself; there will be other communities of this kind around this community—all those should form a still wider circle of communities. You might call it Taluka Community, you might call it District Community, though a District may be too large. Say, this primary community has a little rivulet flowing nearby and it wants to dam this in order to irrigate the land. The man-power that is available and the resources that are available in the primary community are not enough for the task, so a hundred communities may join together and put up the dam. There may be still other needs which even a hundred or a thousand of these primary communities cannot fulfil. For that a still wider circle of communities may be necessary. In this way from the bottom you go on building up.

Between these conceptions, between what I have placed before you and what we have today, there is a world of difference. What I have just now told is the picture of a new society as visualised by Gandhiji. He said that at the innermost circle, or at the lowest level, the people should exercise the utmost power and at the highest level the least power. As you go along, we have the primary needs—we must have food, we must have clothing, we must have shelter, these things we must have before we have the railways, the postal services, or the aeroplanes and what not—for these primary needs the primary community itself, or the members of communities around, are responsible in this system and they exercise the utmost power in that regard. As you go along upwards and reach Delhi, Delhi in this conception has very little power. It may have some powers of defence, currency and may be one or two other powers—a situation very much different from what we have today. Under the present system also we have a Parliament, a State Assembly, and then District Boards and Village Panchayats. But the whole Gandhian conception has been turned upside down. The Parliament has the utmost power and the Village Panchayat has nominal powers, farcical powers. This is a travesty of democracy.

We have a movement going on in the country today for the abolition of cold war between man and man. Bhoodan has now developed into Gramdan. Gramdan means a village collectively owns all the land of the village. Individual ownership has ceased to exist not by compulsion, force or legislation, but people have voluntarily agreed to pool their lands together, and say all this land belongs to us. And what has happened? All kinds of conflicts have disappeared. Land is the chief source of livelihood in the village and when land becomes communised, then the cold war gets completely abolished or at least ninety per cent of it is abolished.

It is possible to develop a community which is fully cooperative. And there in a village, it is possible for villagers to plan for their food, to plan for their clothing, for their employment, for the type of machines and technology that they need. It is possible for such a village to manage its affairs without the intrusion of political parties. They will follow the prin-

ciple of unanimity. In taking decisions whenever there are differences of opinion, no decisions are taken. As everyone is not working for his own interest, there is no tug of war; the idea is to think and to plan for the development of the community as a whole and, therefore, though differences of opinion are bound to exist, it is possible for those differences to be compromised. The tendency would be to find ways of agreement.

When a group of Quakers meet and if a difference of opinion occurs, they have a quiet time. For twenty minutes or thirty minutes they sit quietly and some solution is worked out. If not, they meet again a month later or six months later. You have such societies in Europe—they are not very many, they are few. But I look upon them as the outposts of Sarvodaya. They are independent, they have nothing to do with Gramdan. They grew out of the soil of Europe itself. In France they call themselves communities of work. These communities take their decisions unanimously, hold elections unanimously. When such a system is created, parties will have no place. And if in all the villages of India, if we have a partyless system working, it will bring about a revolution in the political structure of the country. The Constitution and everything will have to be changed with this building from below. Without a revolution, inner and outward revolution, it will certainly not work; but at least at the lower level it can work. Such a democracy is nearer to the people. It is like the direct democracy that was practised in Athens. All citizens gathered in the market place. Discussions were held. Decisions were taken by the people as a whole. In that way whole village assemblies can meet and take decisions, decisions not about trifles—not about levying a tax on bullock carts or about putting up a lamp here or there and things of that nature, but real vital questions about food, about clothing, shelter and education and, if you please, about employment.

It is possible for the community to try and plan for these things. It is possible for them to plan for regional cooperation and that way they can go up. You might say that, well, all those small communities will become isolationist, they will begin to think of their own interests and not the interests of others. Without that inner change, there is every fear and every danger of those communities disrupting the entire life of the nation or the life of the world. But with the inner change, when the conflict of interests goes away, there is no reason to suppose that a particular village, which has organised its life on this basis, will think of its own interests as independent from the interests of other communities. The interests of one village community and the interests of other village communities are not in conflict.

I should also like to plead for the reorganisation of our economic and political life on the basis of what may be called vertical decentralisation. Today, the State performs so many functions. The original function of the state was to look after the five per cent of the people who are non-conformists, who are law-breakers, to look after law and order. Now the conception has developed into a Welfare State, a socialist State, or a total State. There is no reason to

believe that only the State can run railways, that only the State can run post offices, that only the State can run life insurance, steel mills etc. True, they should not be run for private profit because that conflicts immediately with the fundamental idea that I have placed before you. But can't they be run by other agencies, by the people, and at the same time be independent of the State? Why can't we have autonomous bodies running our railways? Instead of one autonomous body, why can't we have six or ten? Cannot the people throw up new and different kinds of organisations to manage their business? Things have to be administered, there is no doubt. But why the Government alone should administer these? Why is it necessary for the Government to run the educational system or the health system? Why can't the people do it? After all, where does the money come from? Money comes from the people. Where do the officers, experts, teachers and doctors come from? Is there a factory in Delhi which manufactures doctors and teachers? They all come from the people. Then why must we go to one centre and have everything run from that centre? I am not pleading for the preservation of the village as it is. The village as it is must go. But the village must be preserved in one sense—in the sense that it is a small community; it must be developed not only as an agrarian community but, as I said, agro-industrial community and these primary communities should not be very large. We are all products of culture, but we are also products of nature.

The Sarvodaya order of society is not a national order of society. Nationalism has no place in the Sarvodaya picture of society. No kind of parochialism has any place in that society. They are outdated ideas. The citizen who lives in Sarvodaya society is a world citizen. But if we conceive of the world order as being maintained by the World Government functioning from, shall we say, New York, Moscow, Geneva or from wherever it is, a World Government functioning from the centre and planning for the whole world, can you imagine what kind of an oppressive world community that would be? I don't think it would be acceptable. A world order is possible only when we have this structure which I have placed before you. When the utmost of the needs are satisfied at the lower levels, and a few things are left for the top, only when the world order sits lightly on the individual, will it be possible for the individual to accept it.

Friends, I have placed before you a few tentative ideas about the development of democracy not only in the Indian context but in the context of the world. Of course, it is not given to us, it is not possible for us to think in terms of the whole world today. We may think, but as far as practising is concerned, we can do it only in our homes. I hope that all of you will give very serious thought to these ideas. I hope that all of us will be able to put our hands together to create a democratic order of society in our country which might become a model for the rest of the world.

Substance of a lecture delivered in Bombay on March 11, 1958 under the auspices of the Democratic Research Service

Letter To The Editor

Dear Sir,

It is with a sense of deep concern that I am writing this letter to draw your attention to a grave problem that has been affecting most of us from India in foreign countries.

In India perhaps there is not much awareness of the great harm the "uncalled for statements" of our national leaders on other countries' policies is doing to the prestige of India in foreign countries. Especially in a country like U.S., whose newspapers maintain news correspondents in India, every statement of our leaders finds its way into print. Particularly when our leaders try to sit in judgement on other countries' policies and problems in the name of world peace, it sounds highly ridiculous, because at the UNO we found that no other country had so many cases before the UNO as India.

No one else is more guilty of this than our Prime Minister Nehru. A striking illustration to this is provided today in U.S.A. where the question of foreign aid to underdeveloped countries has become a controversy pivoted on the question of recent U.S. aid to India.

To us from India it was most distressing to see India's case becoming a contentious issue between the two political parties of U.S.A., the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. Although everyone on both sides has expressed the great desire to champion India's cause, yet many Senators have pointed out the series of attacks Nehru has made on U.S. policies.

One of these include a statement by Nehru, wherein he has compared the presence of U.S. Army in Japan to Russian Army in Hungary. This has hurt the feelings of the Americans greatly. To those of us from India, who watched with great distress the lukewarm attitude that Krishna Menon at UNO showed towards the Hungarian question, this statement of Nehru makes us wonder if he has double standards to judge world situations.

We all share his view that India should be neutral, but why this meddling? When a small nation like Switzerland could remain neutral and yet contribute so much to the cause of World Peace in a constructive way, why cannot India which is so large?

I fervently appeal to Members of Parliament and request the press to bring awareness amongst our leaders that the first thing they should do is to restrain their talk and curtail their statements to the press. When Prime Minister U Nu can do this so effectively, could not Nehru do the same with the same grace?

The greatest humiliation we suffer is when we have to confess how we ourselves are confused about Nehru's statements. As if this is insufficient he has now Shri Menon in his group. If there was anyone more disliked for bad manners at UNO, it was Menon. He is no credit to India.

—An Indian in the U.S.

(The statement comparing the presence of Russian Army in Hungary with the presence of U.S. Army in Japan referred to by the correspondent was not actually made by the Prime Minister. He contradicted it as soon as his attention was drawn to it—Editor).

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Mr. Nehru, a good judge of principles but a poor judge of men, gives his loyalty indiscriminately to all who ask for it. It is at this point the compromise begins. The rot and indiscipline follow.

—B. G. Verghese, *Times of India*, May 7.

I was really thinking not so much of the Congress but of what was happening in the country as a whole, a deterioration of our standards, a certain coarseness into our public life, a certain vulgarity coming into it.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Times of India*, May 4.

Mr. Nehru may bemoan the deterioration of the moral standards in the country and the vulgarisation of our public life, but he is more responsible for this than the Congress Party itself.

—Raja Hutheesing, *Times of India*, May 7.

He (Nehru) often indulges in that kind of criticism —Nehru the agitator castigating the misdeeds of Nehru the Prime Minister and his Government, and the people who bear him applaud him, and go away with the impression that Panditji is a real "Jawahar" (Jewel) and gladly dissociate him from his "bad" government.

—H. V. Kamath, *Current*, May 21.

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service,
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3 | Rs. 2 for
members of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Name:

Address:

Signature

The Congress organisation has become something like a *mutt* which attracts and supports people who have no calling of their own and who obtain power over the affairs of the *mutt* itself. Need we wonder at the deterioration we deplore?

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Swarajya* May 10.

We in India suffer from a split personality—a real split personality.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Times of India*, May 4.

But when the split personality is sheathed in robes of power the danger of damage is far greater.

—Ashoka Mehta, *Statesman*, May 8.

I do not suffer from a split personality.

—V.K. Krishna Menon, *Bombay Chronicle*, May 8.

✓ Khrushchev is in fact a smiling Stalin.

—Mohamad Busheer, leading short story writer in Malayalam, *Weekly Kerala*, May 4.

I am a Muslim too.

—Khrushchev, *Times of India*, May 15.

The opinion of the Indian communists with regard to domestic problems is also influenced from outside. This becomes internal interference due to external causes.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Times of India*, May 13.

A neutralist policy as advocated by the Socialists must necessarily become a pro-communist policy.

—Mr. Nobusuke Kishi, Prime Minister of Japan,
Times of India, May 25.

No "summit conference" was required to liquidate the Berlin blockade, the Korean war and the Suez adventure; but it was from Munich that Neville Chamberlain brought "peace in our time," followed by the rape of Czechoslovakia and the invasion of Poland, and Roosevelt wrote letters to the Mikado upto the minute of Pearl Harbour.

—Henry Pachter, *Dissent*, Spring 1958.

Wars, both hot and cold, come suddenly like thieves in the night. Sometimes professions of peace provide the night.

—C. L. Sulzberger, *New York Times*, May 7.

Normally we should have opposed a Ganatant Parishad Ministry but for the fact that the leader the Communist Party supports it.

—Blitz, *Ma*