

JUNE 1960

End Of An Illusion

by B. K. Desai

THE Summit Conference in Paris ended in dismal fiasco even before it could get off to a start. Even before the Big Four assembled in Paris for the Conference, its failure was proclaimed by the hysterical outbursts and rocket-rattling threats emanating from the Kremlin. The utterances of Khrushchev the whole week before coming to Paris had given ample indications that Moscow, in advance, had written off the summit as futile and decided to convert it into a public forum for its propaganda diatribes against the U.S. The spectacle of Khrushchev in Paris hurling dreadful ultimatums with calculated savagery over the spy plane incident, which was obviously a minor issue, was hardly calculated to promote peaceful coexistence or a detente with the West. If anything, it demolished the false image of Khrushchev as a genial and smiling leader anxious for peace and destroyed the illusion, assiduously built up by the communists and their friends, of the peaceful professions of the world communist leaders. That the hopes of the whole world, which were pinned on the successful outcome of the summit conference, should have been dashed through the irresponsible behaviour of a single dictator is a tragedy of the first magnitude. But this tragedy is not without its moral and it is inherent and inevitable in the present power structure in the international field.

The timing of the plane incident and the clumsiness with which the whole episode was handled by the U.S. authorities played into the Russian hands which exploited it to the hilt for their propaganda purposes by blowing it up into a major issue. Khrushchev feigned righteous indignation at the aircraft incident and called for the intensification of the struggle against the "war plots of the imperialist bloc headed by the United States". In Paris he struck all along a pose of injured innocence and put all the blame for wrecking the summit on the U.S. But it was obvious that he protested too much and for ulterior motives. Khrushchev, in any case, should have been the last person to accuse anyone of espionage or aggressive designs. The whole record, during the last four decades, of the world communist movement spearheaded by the Kremlin is nothing less than that of treachery, espionage and aggression. The Soviet Empire owes much of its strength and missile leadership to this brutal fact. Even while Khrushchev was

thundering against the U.S. for its espionage activity, the neutral Swiss Government was constrained to arrest and expel two top-ranking Soviet diplomats from Switzerland on charges of espionage activity directed against their country. Similarly, the disclosure by the U. S. Government of the arrest of two Russian diplomats for espionage during Khrushchev's visit to the U.S. and the revelation by the Pakistan and West German Governments that their air space was frequently violated by Russian spy planes exposed the blatant hypocrisy of the Russian dictator. Of course, the Russians do not need to send frequently reconnaissance aircrafts over Western territory to gather military information, as it is abundantly supplied by the press and parliament or congress in democratic countries. But the veil of secrecy raised by Russia's closed system and its avowed intention of establishing its totalitarian domination over the entire globe by aggression and subversion makes it vital for the West to gather information about the military plans and preparedness of the communist bloc even by having recourse to extensive aerial surveillance. To obviate this distasteful necessity, the U.S. Government had suggested open-skies plan at the summit conference at Geneva in 1955, but it was repeatedly and emphatically turned down by Russia.

From his performance it was obvious that Khrushchev came to Paris only to scuttle the summit meeting for which he had professed keenness for over a year in the past. It is futile to conjecture about the possible reasons for this abrupt change in his mood and to relate it to the intra-party struggle for power in the Kremlin. Whatever faction dominates deliberations in the Kremlin, the basic and major conflict between the communist bloc and the democratic world varies little. It does not depend on the changes in the Kremlin hierarchy or its moods. The communist system of absolute power has its own impersonal mechanism and logic which operate relentlessly irrespective of the person or persons occupying the supreme position. Mr. Khrushchev is the product of a system which, inspite of violent and frequent changes, has remained basically unchanged. There is no reason, for example, to think that the objectives, concepts and methods of Soviet diplomacy are different in the Khrushchev era from those in Stalin's time. The Soviet leaders still continue to see the world as divided into two opposing forces or camps—those of socialism and capitalism. The communist bloc and its allies constitute the camp of "socialism and peace" while the democratic countries constitute the camp of "imperialists and reactionaries" which is doomed to destruction. Between

the two camps there may be temporary armistice with the talk of coexistence, but in the end one or the other must triumph and the victor is bound to be the socialist camp. This is the key formulation of Soviet policy which cannot be overlooked in any consideration of East-West relations and this is the main cause of the cold war between the two systems.

Thus the cold war and its consequent tensions are bound to continue—they cannot do otherwise. The "soft" and "hard" trends in Soviet diplomacy have no real significance, as both are used to further certain basic and strategic ends in Soviet foreign policy. The "soft" policy followed by the Soviet Union after Stalin chiefly consisted in its attitude of seeming mildness towards the non-communist world and it was adopted mainly to weaken the West's will to organise and to resist. It has not affected the basic issues on which the communist bloc and the non-communist world are opposed. For example, the problem of German reunification has been with us for the last fifteen years; but the attitude of Khrushchev on the issue is as uncompromising and obstinate as was Stalin's. It is also no surprise that, in spite of his talk of a detente, Khrushchev, like Stalin, has tried to precipitate the Berlin crisis in spite of the risks involved in the attempt. No amount of summit gloss can hide the intransigent bellicosity of the Soviet leaders over these and similar other basic issues affecting world peace.

Summit diplomacy, which is the climax of this "soft" line, is only a Soviet expedient to attain by smiles and methods of diplomacy and propaganda what it has all along sought to achieve by war or covert

threats of local wars. Its aim is to persuade certain sections of world opinion of its peaceful intent and thus divide the non-communist world and undermine its collective resistance to communism's further advance. The Geneva summit conference in July 1955 did not help to solve a single major issue between the Soviet Union and the West. It only created an illusion of the peaceful intentions of the new Soviet rulers. The illusion persisted in spite of the aftermath of the Geneva summit in the Middle-East and in Eastern Europe in 1956. Summit diplomacy was sought to be revived a year ago by Khrushchev but he was stalled by Peking which was in no mood to smile. It was again scheduled this year in Paris and was laboriously built up by the organs of propaganda in the West as well as the communist bloc. But the Paris summit proved still born. Khrushchev admittedly was one of the chief architects of the summit, though circumstances forced him to disrupt it in an inexplicable manner. Whether a villain or a victim of this tragedy, Khrushchev has also helped to dispel at least part of the summit illusion. What now remains of the summit and detente is the understanding that neither power dare strike the other down and both the sides have perforce to coexist and live with their tensions in this divided world. If future negotiations between the communist bloc and the free world prove fruitful, they will do so not because of the summit spirit, but because of this realisation of the balance of terror between the two systems and the awareness on the part of the Soviet leaders of the futility of the bellicose postures in this age of nuclear weapons.

Nazis In Office In East Germany

SO much is said and written about ex-Nazis holding high office in the Federal Republic of Germany that little thought is given to the other side of the picture—the presence of ex-Nazis in high office in the East German Republic. The Committee of Free Jurists, which collects information about Eastern Germany, has just published a third edition of its booklet "Former Nazis in the service of Pankow", which shows that the East German pot has little right to call the West German kettle names.

Thus, two East German Cabinet Ministers are former members of the Nazi party. They are Herr Hans Reichelt, Minister of Agriculture, and Herr Curt Merkel, Minister of Supply. Two ex-Ministers, who held office until little more than a year ago, are also ex-Nazis—Herr Luitpold Steidle, Minister of Health and Professor Werner Winkler, Minister for the Chemical Industry. The latter post has been abolished, and Professor Winkler continues to hold high office in the State Planning Commission.

While the question of ex-Nazis in the West German judiciary has been the subject of violent East German propaganda, ex-Nazis hold plenty of legal posts in Eastern Germany too. They include Dr. Kurt Schumann, the president of the East German High

Court, and Herr Siefried Dallmann, the chairman of the Judicial Affairs Committee of the East German Volkshammer. Major-General Arno Von Lenski, who has played a leading part in building up the East German armed forces, served on the infamous Nazi "People's Court".

A note of comedy was provided when the Communist Party of Western Germany was banned as an illegal organisation by the Federal High Court in Karlsruhe. The chief defence counsel for the Communist Party was hired from Eastern Germany. He was Professor Herbert Kroeger, a former member of the Nazi party and the S.S.

The present rectors of the universities of East Berlin and Greifswald are ex-Nazis. So is the rector of the Teacher Training College in Potsdam. Herr Max Hartwig, deputy Secretary of State for Church Affairs, was trained with the S.S. "Death'shead" Brigade in Buchenwald. Other prominent ex-Nazis are Herr Heinrich Homann, who is deputy president of the Volkskammer, and Herr Gerhard Kegel, who was official spokesman for the East German delegation at last year's Geneva Conferences.

(Continued on Page 8)

Notes

Warning From Calcutta

THE election of the communist candidate, Mr. Indrajit Gupta to the Lok Sabha last month from the Calcutta south-west constituency has grave political significance. In this politically significant by-election, the communist candidate defeated his Congress rival by a margin of 13,313 votes, while his other opponent, a P.S.P. candidate, polled only about 5,000 votes and even lost his deposit.

The election reveals the ominous fact that despite the exposure of the anti-national role played by them with regard to the Sino-Indian dispute, the communists have been able to strengthen their hold among the middle class in the city. The Chinese aggression against India was used as the main issue in the election campaign by the Congress as well as the P.S.P. and the Communist Party was subjected to bitter criticism for its abetment of the Chinese aggression. But in spite of the fresh memories of the fifth column activities of the communists, the majority of the voters elected the communist candidate to represent them in Parliament. This highlights the frustration of the people and the failure of the Congress rule to alleviate their lot.

The communists, of course, based their campaign on the Government's failure to solve the food and the unemployment problems and the prevailing corruption in the administration. It had an immediate and direct bearing on the people's daily life. On the other hand, the soft-peddling of the Chinese communist aggression by our national leaders helped the communists to pose as true supporters of the Government's peaceful stand on the issue and dub their opponents as war mongers. The communist victory highlights the failure of our national leaders to rouse the people on the vital issue affecting our territorial integrity.

There are, of course, other causes for the Congress defeat. The choice of the Congress candidate, the failure of the Congress Party to gear its organisation effectively to the election campaign, the indifference of fifty per cent of the voters who did not cast their votes and the disenfranchisement of about thirty percent owing to the new system of photo-affixed identity cards which could not cover all eligible voters—all these contributed to the defeat of the Congress candidate. But they only show that the Congress Party must remove its organisational shortcomings and put its house in order if it has to counter effectively the Red challenge.

United Front Politics In Maharashtra

THE resignation of Mr. S. M. Joshi, the P.S.P. leader, from the General Secretaryship of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti virtually marks the end of the

Praja-Socialists' association with the communist-cum-leftist united front in Maharashtra. The Samiti was formed about four years ago as a united front of non-Congress parties, groups and individuals in Maharashtra with a view to achieving the unilingual State of the Marathi speaking people with Bombay as its capital. Now that the popular demand has been conceded by the bifurcation of the Bombay State into two unilingual States of Gujarat and Maharashtra, the Samiti has been deprived of its *raison d'être*. It was, therefore, logical for the P.S.P. to quit the Samiti after the objective had been fulfilled. True, the border dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore still remains to be settled, but it is relatively a minor issue and all parties, including the ruling Congress Party, are united over this demand.

The P.S.P., therefore, wanted the Samiti to confine its activity to the solution of the Bombay-Mysore border dispute only. But such a course of action was not to the liking of the communists who have found a convenient cloak of respectability in the Samiti in these embarrassing days of Chinese aggression. Besides, the communists have derived the maximum advantage from the united front against the Congress in the 1957 elections and have been exploiting it to strengthen their hold in the labour and other field. By manoeuvring virtually to oust the P.S.P. from the Samiti, they have now practically converted the latter into a full-fledged communist organisation. Other splinter groups and parties in the Samiti, like the the Peasant and Workers' Party, basically subscribe to the orthodox Marxian dogma and are thoroughly infiltrated by the communists.

How far the communists will be able to exploit the name and legacy of the Samiti remains to be seen. Meanwhile, the Praja Socialist leaders are already taking steps to mobilise democratic and nationalist elements and parties in Maharashtra on a common platform with a view to forging a democratic opposition to the ruling Congress Party. This is a move in the right direction. But to be successful, the Praja Socialists should follow a consistent policy in politics as well as in the labour field. They should free themselves of all the entanglements with the communists in the trade union field where the alliance is still being continued. Surely, the communists cannot be democratic in their trade union activity and otherwise in the political field. Sooner the Praja-Socialists rectify this harmful inconsistency, the better will it be for democratic forces in Maharashtra and for the P.S.P. itself.

Khrushchev's Outbursts

IN Paris last month, Khrushchev made great fuss over the U.S. spy plane incident and used it to wreck the summit conference even before it could commence. Khrushchev denounced the incident as "treachery" and an act of "aggression" by the U. S. "imperialists" and "militarist circles". He expressed horror and indignation at the fact that the U.S. authori-

ties should have openly admitted aerial reconnaissance as part of their policy. It was obvious that Khrushchev's temper tantrum in Paris was motivated by reasons other than those of the reconnaissance flights. In part, the intensity of his reaction reflected the fact that the aircraft incident had thrown into question the efficiency of Soviet defenses. The U.S. reconnaissance flights over the Soviet territory have been going on for the last four years and Khrushchev himself admitted that he first came to know of the flights as far back as in 1956. Thus other U.S. planes had flown over Russia without interference. Even with regard to Power's plane, there have been reports to the effect that it was not shot down, but it descended first because of some engine trouble and was shot down by the Russians at an approximate altitude of forty-thousand feet.

Apart from this, Khrushchev certainly strained the credulity of the people to the utmost, when he put on an air of outraged innocence at the U.S. espionage activity. International espionage is not new, and Russians are known to have espionage agents throughout the world. More than 350 Soviet spies, for example, have been arrested in various countries since Stalin's death and in the U.S. alone more than a dozen spies have been unmasked in recent years. Many of these agents were individuals employed in Soviet Embassies. Only last month, the neutral Swiss Government ordered two members of the Soviet Embassy to leave their country for engaging in espionage. In addition to these undercover agents, there is a vast network of communist parties and front organisations in most of the countries of the world, members of which unashamedly spy on their own countries for the Soviet Union. It is no exaggeration to say that international communism, spear-headed by the Soviet Union, thrives mainly on this insidious technique. For the communists all over the world, espionage on behalf of the Soviet Union is not only a matter of policy, it is one of the cardinal principles of their philosophy. Under such circumstances, Khrushchev's violent outbursts against the U.S. for teaching the Russians a lesson in their own technique were, it is clear, out of place.

Indo-U.S. Foodgrains Agreement

THE 17-million food grains agreement signed in Washington last month is unprecedented in its scope and character; it is also a shining symbol of the friendly interest of the U.S. Government in India's planned development. No Government has ever been more generous in its dealings with an underdeveloped country than the U.S. Government in concluding this agreement. Under the agreement, India will receive 10 million tons of wheat, which is equal to half the annual U.S. wheat crop, and one million tons of rice from America over the next four years. The agreement, beginning July next, is due to be completed in 1964; it would thus help India save during the third plan period the sizeable drain on her foreign exchange resources which would have been otherwise required

to secure food grains from abroad to cover the annual food deficit. Out of this huge quantity, the Indian Government will be able to build a buffer stock of five million tons for grave emergencies and also utilise three million tons annually to meet the normal deficit. Thus the agreement will enable the planners to stabilise food prices and to keep the threat of massive inflation during the third plan in check.

Of the total value of food grains of nearly Rs. 500 crores, 85 per cent will be returned to India in rupees — half as grant and half as loan, which should make a valuable contribution to India's development expenditure. Besides, the U.S. Government will pay half of the transport cost and utilise the other half, which India will have to bear, for expenses on its programmes here.

The agreement in all its aspects is thus a clear proof of the sympathetic and genuine interest of the U.S. in the economic progress of India. But it does not solve the food problem which, inspite of nine years of planning, remains as acute as ever. The agreement only gives us a breathing spell and dispels the shadow of anxiety which hung over the next plan prospects. The food problem can be solved only if, instead of running after illusory and dogmatic slogans, the Indian Government adopts a pragmatic policy and gives agriculture a high priority in the third plan.

Developments In Punjab

THE recent arrest of Master Tara Singh and other Akali leaders under the Preventive Detention Act by the Punjab Government is fraught with grave implications. The Akali leaders were arrested for their agitation to achieve their demand of the Punjabi Suba. Irrespective of the merits of the demand, the attitude of the Punjab Government has certainly been deplorable. The law and order situation in the State was quite normal at the time of the arrest and the Akali leaders themselves had repeatedly emphasized that their agitation would be completely peaceful. The Punjab Government's action, therefore, was certainly unwarranted and ill-considered. The arrest of the Akali leaders is now bound to increase tension in the State which might necessitate further drastic steps by the Government. Besides, in using the provisions of the Preventive Detention Act to suppress the constitutional opposition, the Punjab Government has shown scant regard for civil liberties of the citizens. Such an intolerant attitude on the part of the Government, instead of solving the crisis, is bound to aggravate the situation further in the border State.

India, Tibet and China

by B. K. DESAI

Price Re. 1

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE
BOMBAY.

Maharashtra Seminar

(From A Correspondent)

IT was a distinguished gathering of the intellectuals of Maharashtra that came together in Bombay in the middle of May. The occasion was provided by a seminar organized by the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, the Asian Office, Congress for Cultural Freedom and the wellknown Marathi weekly, *Sadhana*. The object of the seminar was to discuss the problems before the new State of Maharashtra.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan, the Chief Minister of the State of Maharashtra, inaugurated the seminar. Justice P. B. Gajendragadkar of the Supreme Court of India presided over the inaugural meeting. Dr. C. D. Deshmukh, the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, spoke at the inaugural meeting and also presided over the general sessions of the seminar. Prominent amongst others who participated in the seminar were Dr. V. R. Khanolkar, Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University, Dr. S. K. Muranjan, Chairman of the Tariff Commission, Dr. D. R. Gadgil, Director of the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Shri S. T. Bharde, Minister for Cooperation of the Maharashtra State, Shri S. R. Dongerkery, Vice-Chancellor of the Marathwada University, Shri Bhavanishankar Niyogi, former Chief Justice of the Nagpur High Court, Shri K. T. Mangalmurti, former Judge of the Nagpur High Court, Shri A. D. Gorwala, retired I.C.S. Tarkateerth Laxmanshastri Joshi, Shri W. R. Natu, Chairman, Forward Markets Commission, Prof. G. D. Parikh, the Rector of the Bombay University, and Shri Raosaheb Patwardhan, the Editor of *Bhoothan Weekly*. Amongst leaders of political parties who participated in the seminar were Shri S. M. Joshi M.L.A., the leader of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti, Shri Asoka Mehta M.P. Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party, Shri N. G. Gore M.P., its General Secretary and Shri R. K. Khadilkar M.P., the General Secretary of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. A number of academicians, journalists and educationists also took a prominent part in the seminar.

The seminar began with an inaugural meeting on Friday May 13. It ended on Sunday, May 15, with a public meeting at which a gist was given to the general public of the deliberations which took place in the seminar. Dr. C. D. Deshmukh presided over the meeting and the speakers were Shri P. Y. Deshpande, Shri M. Harris M.L.C. Tarkateerth Laxmanshastri Joshi and Shri S. M. Joshi M.L.A.

The inaugural address of the Chief Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan set the tone for the discussions which took place at the seminar. He congratulated the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom and other bodies "for their enterprise in organising this seminar to discuss the economic, social and other problems of the new state of Maharashtra." The formation of the new State, he said, was "a challenge to all classes and sections of the people". Appealing for the adop-

tion of a non-partisan and non-sectional outlook, he said: "In the big tasks that lie ahead of us I think all of us ought to play down and minimise to the maximum possible extent a partisan or sectional approach. The objective of development, of social integration, or securing social justice are a ground common to all parties and sections of political opinion." "There ought to be", he said "an understanding between political parties and schools of thought to co-operate in the work of national reconstruction, at any rate to the extent to which this work is non-controversial." He concluded by expressing his hope that "this effort will have the result of bringing into the main stream of national progress the intellectual classes who have hitherto, if I may say so, somewhat stood apart, isolated and self-sufficient unto themselves."

The presidential address of Justice P. B. Gajendragadkar was a powerful plea for a discussion of social problems "in a spirit of enquiry and on a plane of objective investigation." The seminar, he said, was "an earnest endeavour on the part of the intellectuals of Maharashtra to join in a constructive and cooperative effort to formulate the urgent problems which face Maharashtra and consider their solutions." After dealing with a number of problems and suggesting some solutions, he concluded: "In conclusion may I pray that the cooperative effort of the progressive intellectuals of Maharashtra which the present seminar envisages will help to give Maharashtra its true interest, its chief strength and its real power in its enlightened, cultured and progressive citizens."

Dr. C. D. Deshmukh was the last speaker at the inaugural meeting. The main object of the seminar should be, he said, not to duplicate the work of the planners, but to review institutional or social conditions and discuss ways in which the economic plans undertaken by the Government could have the maximum chance of implementation. Intellectuals and their organisations could have, he asserted, a significant place in the implementation of the Plan. On the one hand, they could take upon themselves the work of offering an objective and constructive criticism on its implementation. On the other hand, they could address themselves to the task of bringing about a change in social conditions, as there were large sectors even in a socialistic pattern of society where the Government was powerless. In the end he suggested the establishment of a standing machinery for reviewing the administration and redressing public grievances.

The problems that were discussed at the seminar were grouped under four heads: (1) problems of economic development (2) problems of integration (3) problems of education and culture and (4) problems of politics and political organisation. The

first three sets of problems were discussed by the seminar in three separate groups. Dr. S. K. Muranjan was the Chairman of the first group, Justice P. B. Gajendragadkar of the second and Dr. C. D. Deshmukh of the third group. Dr. Deshmukh also presided over the general session.

The seminar found that it had too many problems to discuss and too little time to discuss them, though one whole day was set apart for the group discussions. Discussions in Group II which discussed the problems of integration were very lively. The administrative and other difficulties experienced by Vidharbha and Marathwada, the two newly integrated regions of Maharashtra, were explained with some vigour by the participants from those regions. There was general agreement that special efforts should be made for removing those difficulties and for securing the emotional integration of those regions.

The group decided to recommend to the Government to set up an Administrative Reform Committee in order that useful administrative practices developed in each region might be preserved and not destroyed in the name of uniformity.

The problems of caste and communal differences and of abolishing the disabilities inflicted upon the untouchables were also discussed by the Group. It was recommended that the social reform movement should be revitalised and that educational tours and camps and exhibitions should be organised in order to bring people of various regions in greater contact with one another. The Group further recommended that the seminar should become a permanent body and hold similar seminars from year to year. All these recommendations of the Group were later accepted by the general session of the participants.

The President of the inaugural meeting, Justice P. B. Gajendragadkar had drawn attention to many of these problems in his presidential address. Referring to caste and communal differences, he said: "The problem of social equality still remains to be tackled and social inequality continues to be the root cause of communal tensions and conflicts and the undemocratic display of loyalty to castes." Continuing he said: "it is of utmost importance that the intellectuals who do not belong to any political party as well as members of all political parties should come on a common platform and attack this problem with all their force."

Dealing with the problems of emotional integration, he put forward a strong plea for the preservation of the cosmopolitan character of the city of Bombay and for its integration with the rest of Maharashtra. He appealed to the intellectuals to interpret Bombay to Maharashtra and Maharashtra to Bombay. He also appealed to them to "continuously place before the public of Maharashtra the need to integrate their regional loyalty with the loyalty for the country as a whole." Referring to the problems of the emotional integration of the various regions of Maharashtra, he made the valuable suggestion: "It is not so much what you do that matters as how you do. Zest for uniformity

in the administration, whether in its executive or judicial branch, must recognise the need to respect the traditions of the different regions and the modes and methods of work evolved by them in the past."

The discussions in Group I were equally lively and interesting. The whole problem of economic development in the industrial and agricultural sectors including the question of the pattern of development to be adopted was for discussion before the group. Varied points of view were expressed and naturally there was no unanimity. However, the area of agreement was surprisingly large. Allocation of developmental expenditure to be allotted to Maharashtra in the Third Five Year Plan was subjected to a thorough examination. It was agreed that the allocation as between the various regions of the State should be such as would redress the existing imbalance and quicken the pace of development in underdeveloped areas. The role of the private sector was discussed and the general opinion was that the Government should encourage it by offering various incentives and through the expansion of power, transport and other facilities. One view expressed, however, stated that Maharashtra was well-conditioned for development along socialist lines and no special efforts need be made for attracting private capital.

The Group as a whole favoured the development of cooperative enterprises, more particularly, for processing agricultural commodities. It was also of the opinion that some big public enterprises should be located in rural areas. They would, it was thought, operate as an urbanising influence and create a spiral of development. There was considerable controversy on some issues relating to agricultural development. Opinion was sharply divided on the utility of ceilings on holdings and of cooperative farming. There was some discussion also on the problems of the development of Adivasis. Some asserted that the cooperative social habits of Adivasis would be useful for developing a modern socialist society. The assertion was challenged by some others.

The discussions in Group III covered a very wide area. They ranged from a consideration of the improvements to be effected in university education to steps to be taken for discouraging yellow journalism. The Group desired that there should be greater coordination between the various universities in the State and suggested for the purpose the setting up of a joint board of Vice-Chancellors and some others from each university. The general opinion in the Group was that the medium of instruction in the universities should in course of time be Marathi; the change-over from English to Marathi should, however, be a phased one. Many other points relating to university, secondary and primary education also came in for discussion. In the course of the discussion on journalism, the Group bemoaned the retreat of idealism in the field of journalism. It was accepted, however, that commercial proprietorship of newspapers was inevitable. The suggestion that cooperatives or trusts should

(Continued on Page 11)

Universities Behind The Iron Curtain

by Gabriel Gersh

THE ancient ideal of a university as a *universitas litterarum* has not always been perfectly realized in the western countries that gave it birth. But the concept was for centuries at least not abandoned, and many shortcomings of university education were eventually remedied. Yet all of this has now changed in those European countries which, though still geographically western, are under the political and cultural domination of the Eastern European communist bloc. In Europe east of the Elbe the process has been virtually completed of turning universities that for centuries nurtured the common civilization of the west into factories which mass produce the State functionaries and technicians required by the "peoples' democracies."

Most of the countries concerned are too far behind the Iron Curtain for the "new type" universities, as they are officially called, to be studied in detail by Western observers. But through the open window of Berlin it is still possible to see at relatively close range what is happening in Eastern Germany. The changes that have been introduced in the universities of Leipzig, Dresden, Halle and the rest are based on Soviet ideology and practice and are everywhere evident—in the social class and character of the staff and students, in the studies authorized or imposed and in the methods of teaching.

The sons and daughters of the old titled or landed or property-owning classes have disappeared from the universities. University education in the German Democratic Republic is now the prerogative of the sons and daughters of peasants, miners and factory workers—of the "progressive-working classes." But as currently applied to the universities, this phrase also includes others besides the agricultural and industrial proletariat to whom it was originally limited.

The fact is that the children of the peasants and workers show no great desire to leave the occupations of their parents and obey the party summons to study their way into the ranks of the "working intelligentsia." To maintain their target output of functionaries—they are budgeted for in the five year plan like pig iron or potatoes—a decree was therefore issued last year permitting an extension of the "working class" qualification to selected members of the bourgeois class. Those who had worked for at least two years in mines or factories might be accepted. Thus the state has been able to save face by admitting students who are "working class" in practice if not by birth. Defined in this way, the "working classes" make up some seventy per cent of the student body of the east German universities.

The State's modification of its original standards brings a double advantage to the pseudo-worker students. Besides permitting them to enter the uni-

versity, it enables them to qualify for the "basic state scholarship" of 180 marks a month without which none of them could live. Even so, they have to pass strict intelligence tests, and are therefore less privileged than the "workers by birth" for whom the only qualification is class origin and political reliability. If one is genuinely proletarian and "progressive" (meaning that the candidate is an active member of the communist youth movement) then academic qualifications are entirely disregarded.

That the remaining thirty per cent of the students are undisguised members of the middle classes is further proof that eastern Germany is not in a position to push the "sovietization" of its universities to the planned extreme. But middle class origin disqualifies a student from receiving the "basic state scholarship", and leaves open only the possibility of earning one of the 130 mark scholarships awarded for outstanding academic achievement.

A middle class student who was one of my principal sources of information is able to meet his expenses only by working at night in a steel mill. Even so, he can rarely afford an adequate meal. The rent of his furnished room (with bed, table and chair) takes thirty marks a month, and a pound of butter would—if he bought it at fourteen marks—cost over ten per cent of his monthly scholarship. He described his daily routine in some detail. He spends between six and eight hours at compulsory lectures and seminars, eats a meal and does some private reading and then goes to his heavy labouring job in the steel mill until four in the morning. From about five to nine he sleeps—"I had to learn to manage with very little sleep"—and then the day begins again.

This programme began last September, and he expects to keep up the pace without a break except for a few scattered holidays until June. This unbroken ten month term is the newest communist device for "bringing the norms of intellectual workers into line with those of industries." But the new system was planned with little knowledge of academic work and there is some speculation about whether it will survive. Obedient as they are to the orders of the party, the teaching staff of the university of Rostock has nevertheless addressed a letter to the authorities complaining that "since the introduction of the new system signs of fatigue and lassitude have multiplied and the number of students reporting sick is rising rapidly."

"Sovietization" of the east German universities has meant the compulsory addition to the syllabus of every faculty of what the communists call—with their genius for exploiting the natural tendency of their language to evolve long words—*gesellschaftswissenschaftliche* studies. The massive adjective is poorly translated by the English term "social-scientific," but

its meaning is made clear by explanatory notes in the university regulations. *Gesellschaftswissenschaftliche* studies are described as "Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism." This turns out to mean in practice, as east German students report, the study of the life of Lenin and the history of the Bolshevik Party. Extracts from the works of Marx and Engels are included, but they are selected and edited in accordance with the needs and purposes of the present regime. The pure doctrine of the fathers has ceased to be considered suitable for general consumption.

Dialectical materialism is usually regarded in the West as a subject of considerable complexity, but east German students who have completed the *gesellschaftswissenschaftliche* preliminary to their other work say it is reduced to such simple terms, and presented with such skill and cogency, that it is irresistible in its appeal to minds that have never been allowed any contact with the outside world. East German universities have been "cleansed" of idealist philosophy, and idealists from Plato to Kant have been condemned as decadent and bourgeois. And so it is in every faculty. If western thought cannot be dispensed with—as in the natural sciences—then it is attributed to Lomonosov or some other suitable Russian. An east German student of biology need never have heard of Lamarck by name, nor a young physicist of Faraday, nor a budding doctor of Lister. To further this dependence on Soviet sources, the Russian language has been made compulsory in every faculty except theology—a subject in which the Russians are less interested in demonstrating their supremacy.

To complete the process of "sovietization" a dose of *gesellschaftswissenschaftliche* teaching is included in every lecture on every subject. The first ten minutes are always spent discussing and interpreting the news of the day. This means in practice that the lecturer lays down the party line on anything from the latest Russian or Allied Note to the crisis in Viet Nam. And the lecture itself will also be given a political twist. For instance, if the subject is the architecture of

ancient Greece, a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the Greek social system will be included.

It is hard to say what proportion of those students who are western, or at least open-minded, when they enter the universities retain their outlook to the end of three or four years of this intensive indoctrination. On being asked for an estimate of the situation, one student replied: "No one who was not a communist would dare to say so outside the smallest circle of trusted friends, and most of the time we avoid the subject altogether." The students have good reason for their reticence. The West Berlin "Committee on East German Universities" has drawn up a list of 1,000 east German students and professors who have disappeared without a trace since the end of the war. An extract taken at random from the list reads as follows:

"Bail, Franz. Born 1929. Student of classical philology at the University of Rostock. Arrested October 2, 1959. Sentenced to 25 years. Member, Christian Democratic Party."

The subsequent fate of many of the missing students (of both sexes) is uncertain, but the majority are known to have been arrested by either the Russian or east German security police and sentenced up to twenty-five years' imprisonment for "sabotage against democratic reconstruction." The elastic term "permitting action against anyone displeasing to the party" was used until 1959 without any kind of legal justification, but last year it was incorporated into the notorious "law for the protection of peace." Under this statute any of the students who described to westerners the true state of affairs in their universities could be given long sentences, but a handful of them still refuse to be intimidated. One of them said rather proudly: "Active resistance is impossible at present, but by talking outside I manage to keep straight with my conscience."

(Continued from Page 2)

The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* has an interesting footnote to add to the investigations by the Free Jurists. This is that the Chairman of the East German Socialist Unity Party, Herr Ulbricht—who can, admittedly, never be accused of being an ex-Nazi, was one of the foremost protagonists of the 1939 Hitler-Stalin pact which led to the outbreak of the Second World War.

Herr Ulbricht praised the Hitler-Stalin pact for bringing the workers of Germany and the Soviet Union together. He coolly accepted the Nazis' conquests of Czechoslovakia and Poland, on the grounds that they were thus brought into the "Soviet-German block" which would prevent "the English capitalists" from waging a second world war and instigating a second treaty of Versailles. The Hitler-Stalin pact also gave Herr Ulbricht the excuse for liquidating the old guard members of the German Communist Party who disapproved of it, and whom he regarded as political rivals. —Courtesy, *Manchester Guardian Weekly*

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

A NEW YEAR'S FABLE

Vladimir Dudintsev

LETTER TO AN ENGLISH FRIEND

Raymond Aron

MAO TSE-TUNG

Richard Walker

June 1960

81

Annual Rs. 12.

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

A Tribute To Stalin!

PREOCCUPATION with the summit and with the resurgence of international tension has distracted attention from a Soviet literary event full of political significance. On April 29th, *Pravda* devoted a page to extracts from a poem by A. Tvardovsky. Mr. Tvardovsky, a recent visitor to London, is no obscure rebel, but a Stalin-prize winner and a major figure in the Soviet literary establishment. *Pravda* is not in the habit of devoting so much space to verse. What is striking is that parts of the poem to which it has opened its columns read like a literary equivalent of Mr. Khrushchev's "secret" indictment of Stalin. And this time the indictment is combined with a cry of conscience, the sad confession of a generation which did not dare to speak out so long as the "cult of personality" had not been officially condemned.

The most striking passages are contained in the part entitled "So It Was" Stalin dominates the stage from the very first:

When alive, yet from life separated
By the Kremlin walls,
He was above us like a terrible ghost
We did not know any other names

The author then addresses a childhood friend, a man of his own generation, whom he warns that "we cannot hide anything from our adult memory..... Days gone by are not strangers, We know these and previous years, And belong to them equally". The complaint continues:

So it was: for quarter of a century
The name of a man
Resounded together with the name of our country
As a call to struggle and work.
And it seemed a natural thing
That through the smoke of his pipe
He saw personally everything in the world
And ruled over all, like God;
That these hands reached out
To all most important matters in the world
To all productions, to all sciences
To sea depths and celestial bodies
And even his posthumous glory
A hero owed to him

Dr. Tvardovsky turns his attention to the purges, to Stalin's vanished companions:

Those who had been with him from the
beginning,
Who knew the underground and prisons....
They went back into shadow, one after another.
Some into shadow, some into sleep — the list is
long....
And those completely banned,
They have gone long ago;

For centuries in advance it was decided
Which portraits are to hang and where.

The poet shows sympathy for Stalin's companions who, like Mr. Khrushchev, have survived. It was not easy to stand in Stalin's way:

Thus in the world he lived and ruled,
Keeping the helm in his tough hand,
And he who standing by his side would not praise
him,
Would not glorify him, find me one like that....

The guilt is collective: "Who among us is fit for the part of a judge, to decide who is guilty or not guilty. We are talking about men and don't men create gods"? Indeed, who can claim innocence? Certainly not the writers of panegyrics, who can merely reveal "that he himself put into our mouths poems about his own person." Nor

Those who in official halls
Before he even had time to open his mouth
Already would stand up and shout:
Hurrah! He will be right again

For the collective guilt the author tries to find an explanation in Stalin's complex figure:

A son of the East, not for nothing,
Until the very end he showed signs,
Of his violent
Unreason
And reason.

The confession is later followed by a justification. It was under Stalin's banner that great economic achievements were carried out; Soviet soldiers fought heroically in the war; and so on. Finally, things are brighter now that the day of truth has come: "Men, and not Gods, will decide in future."

For all this balancing note, the poem created a tremendous stir in Soviet intellectual circles. It should not be forgotten that Mr. Khrushchev's posthumous attack on Stalin before the party congress, though it was made more than four years ago, has still not been published in Russia; and that criticism of "the cult of personality" has in recent years been toned down. To Russian readers, therefore, this piece of iconoclasm in verse is something of an event. It may not have been a pure coincidence that *Pravda* should have published the poem at the close of April, during those tense days when Soviet leaders were probably arguing about their country's relationship with the outside world, and by implication about the future of their society.

—Reproduced from *Economist*, London.

A Message From Berlin

MOST people know about Berlin today as a brutally divided city in a divided country. Far less is known about the Soviet-occupied zone which surrounds Berlin or about the regime which calls itself the "German Democratic Republic".

Berliners know the misery, oppression and despair that the communists—assisted by the Soviet occupation power—have caused by imposing an alien system on German territory by force and terrorism. Many of our countrymen, seeking freedom from this system, have escaped to West Berlin. Many others have died under it. But over one million of our fellow Berliners—in the East sector of our city—and 16 million Germans in the Soviet-occupied zone must live under communist tyranny.

These people are our neighbours, our friends and relatives. The dividing line within our city is the last one which they can still cross fairly easily without running too great a risk. So we are still able to welcome them in our homes, chat with them, help them a little and listen to them. Their story is not pleasant. If we were less fortunate, it would be our own. West Berlin is a hearth of freedom to them, a place of spirit-

ual and moral nourishment that gives them the strength to endure the grey world of compulsion and sullen oppression in the Soviet zone.

That is why West Berlin is called a "cancer" by those who support and represent the totalitarian system. The "poison" we spread is ideas... of freedom, of lawfulness, of human dignity and of a decent standard of living. Those are our "weapons" and our "threats". They are the reason why the communists are out to destroy West Berlin as a haven of freedom.

The attack on West Berlin is not only directed against this city; primarily it seeks to sever our human ties with our 16 million fellow-countrymen in the Zone around us and to destroy their hopes of a change for the better.

The Berlin Crisis has been provoked arbitrarily. It affects all who have at heart the cause of human freedom and of international peace. The present status of the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany, this communist-ruled portion of our country, not only infringes on a nation's rights to self-determination and survival. It is also a real source of new discord in the heart of Europe.

WILLY BRANDT
Governing Mayor of Berlin

DR. JOHANN GRADL
M.P. (Bundestag) for Berlin

ALFRED HENZE
Chairman of the Works
Council, AFG Berlin

ANNEDORE LEBER
Publisher

ERNASI LEMMER
M.P. (Bundestag) for Berlin
Minister of the Federal Republic

PAUL LOBE
Former Reichstag President
(Weimar Republic)

KURT MATTICK
M.P. (Bundestag) for Berlin

DR. MARIE ELISABETH
LUDERS
M.P. for Berlin
Hon. President of the Bundestag

We, the undersigned, who come from all walks of life and belong to different schools of political and religious thought in the free part of Germany, fully endorse this message from Berlin. Should the light of freedom be extinguished in Berlin, darkness would soon descend all over Europe.

WILHELMINE LUBKE DR. H. C. HERMANN J. ABS
Banker

DR. MARGA ANDERS
President of the German Women
Graduates' Association

FRITZ BERG
President of the Federal
German Industrial Association

WERNER BOCKELMANN
Mayor of Frankfurt/Main

MAX BRAUER
Mayor of Hamburg

COUNTESS MARION
DONHOFF
Editor

ERNST FRIEDLAENDER
Columnist

WERNER FRIEDMANN
Editor in Chief and Publisher

OTTO A. FRIEDRICH
Industrialist

DR. ERNST FROMM
President of the German Medical
Association, Treasurer of the
World Medical Association

DR. RUPERT GIESSLER
Chairman of the German
Journalists' League, Spokesman
of the Press-Council of Germany

KARL MARX
Publisher and Editor in Chief
of the Jewish weekly newspaper,
"Allgemeine Wochenzeitung
der Juden in Deutschland"

HEINRICH MEINS
Chairman, Wholesale
Purchasing Co-operative

BERTHA MIDDELHAUVE
President of the German
Women's League

ALWIN MUNCHMEYER
President of the Association
of German Chambers of
Commerce and Industry

PROF. DR. HEINZ
NORDHOFF
Industrialist

H. OEHMIG
President of the Union of
German Teachers' Associations

DR. HANS C. PAULBEN
President of the Federation
of German Employers'
Organizations

WILLI RICHTER
Chairman of the German
Federation of Trade Unions

LUDWIG ROENBERG
Deputy Chairman of the
German Federation of Trade
Unions

AXEL SPRINGER
Publisher

RUDOLF ULLSTEIN
Publisher

DR. W. W. SCHUTZ
Chairman of "Germany
Indivisible"

HARALD H. SCHALDT
President of the German
Shipowners' Association

DR. HEGO STENZEL
President of the Federal
German Association of News-
paper Publishers

PROF. KARL SCHILLER
Director of the Institute for
External Trade and Social
Economy at Hamburg
University

BERNHARD TACKE
Deputy Chairman of the
German Federation of Trade
Unions

[This is printed not as an advertisement but as an expression of solidarity with the heroic struggle of the people of Berlin—EDITOR]

MAHARASHTRA SEMINAR — (Continued from Page 6)

be formed for managing newspapers was considered but the consensus of opinion was that it would not remove the difficulties. There was a good deal of discussion about yellow journalism. The Group, however, felt that it was essentially a problem of education and culture and that self-discipline was better than imposed discipline. The discussion on problems of culture was of a perfunctory character. The general feeling, however, was that cultural values were in danger, that the process of raising the standards of life was not being followed by the process of endowing the common citizen with the ability to enrich himself spiritually. The Chairman, Dr. Deshmukh drew attention to what was being done in that respect in Japan. The Group suggested that, following that example, public halls might be established in villages for carrying on cultural activities.

The problem of politics and political institutions was discussed by the general session of the participants on Sunday morning. Dr. C. D. Deshmukh presided over the session.* The discussion took place on the basis of a paper written by Dr. N.R. Deshpande, Reader of Politics in the Nagpur university. A number of persons participated in it. Prominent amongst them were Shri P.Y. Deshpande, Shri P.N. Karekar, Shri S.M. Joshi, Prof. D.R. Gadgil, Prof. Ram Joshi and Shri Raosaheb Patwardhan. The consensus of opinion at the session was that the emergence of Samyukta Maharashtra was a triumph of cultural forces and that the revival of cultural values should be harnessed for building up the new State.

There was criticism at the session of the wooden character of the present administration. The real evil, it was thought, was the structure of the services which had become almost authoritarian. There was a demand for the overhauling of the administration and for devolution and delegation of powers. The need for a strong and healthy opposition was stressed by some, while others emphasised the broadening of democratic understanding and consciousness. One speaker pointed out how difficult it was to build up an opposition when, in the interest of rapid planned development, it was necessary to seek and emphasise the areas of agreement. The Chairman, Dr. Deshmukh pointed out that in the period of a take-off which the Indian economy had entered there should be as little friction as possible and that the Government should be broadbased and should receive a wide measure of popular support. There was some discussion towards the end of the role of intellectuals. It was pointed out that in order to be effective an intellectual should participate in the institutional life of the society and that he should not merely preach but give an actual demonstration in his life and work of the values which he accepted.

Later in the afternoon the general session received the reports of the three Groups and adopted them with slight modifications. Before dispersing, the session decided to set up a small committee to explore the possibility of establishing a permanent organisation to hold such seminars from year to year and to develop

a non-party platform for intellectuals. Dr. C. D. Deshmukh was elected the Chairman of the subcommittee. Apart from the Chairman, it will consist of Justice P. B. Gajendragadkar and Dr. S. K. Muranjan; Prof. G. G. Gadgil, Prof. Vasant Bapat and Shri P. N. Karekar, Bar-at-law of Nagpur were elected the Secretaries of the subcommittee.

In the evening there was a very largely attended public meeting on the grounds of the Amar Hind Mandal at Dadar. Dr. C. D. Deshmukh presided over the meeting. He made a fervent appeal to the intelligentsia of Maharashtra to take an active interest in the affairs of the new State. He said that, following the adoption of a planned economy as the means to achieve national objectives, ideological conflicts among political parties had almost disappeared. In the situation it was the duty of intellectuals, he asserted, to meet together from time to time and review the progress made in the task of solving political, social, economic and cultural problems.

The seminar was a modest attempt of the three sponsoring organisations to bring together on a common platform the intellectuals of the State for a discussion of some of its problems. The attempt succeeded beyond all expectations as it took place at an opportune moment. A seminar such as this is not expected to provide readymade solutions. Its importance lies in the fact that it gets together the intellectuals who usually keep away from politics and social affairs and persuades them to abandon their aloofness and indifference. It is to be hoped that some at least of the intellectuals who had gathered together in the seminar will begin to take active interest in the social and political life of Maharashtra. There was at the seminar a happy mixture and intermingling of political and social leaders and academicians and others. It is likely that both learnt from each other and what they learnt would enrich the public life of the new State.

A report of the seminar will not be complete without a mention of the kind and generous hospitality that the participants received from many public institutions of Bombay. On the 13th a dinner was arranged in their honour by the Bombay Regional Congress Committee. The next day the Maharashtra Chamber of Commerce entertained them to a dinner on the terrace of their own premises. The same day there was a lunch in their honour by the Indian Merchants Chamber. The next day lunch was provided by the Birla Brothers. Tea and snacks during the group meetings of the seminar were provided by a member of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, Shri Sudhir Hendre. The Directorate of Publicity of the Government of Maharashtra invited the participants to the Maharashtra State Exhibition and entertained them. A word of gratitude must also be said about the work of the volunteers of the Rashtra Seva Dal who were always at the service of the participants at the public as well as the private sessions of the seminar.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

India now is not what it was when Mr. Nehru took over. It is 12,000 square miles less in extent.

—"Saka," *Swarajya*, May 21.

We may not retain our territories under Chinese occupation, but we shall be retaining the Defence Minister.

—*Hindustan Times*, May 1.

Those who indulge in such attacks (against me) should realise that they are attacking the Prime Minister, his policies and the country as a whole.

—V.K. Krishna Menon, *Tide*, May 21.

Every convinced communist worth his salt anywhere in the world will spy on his own country for the Soviet camp as a matter of principle, honour and privilege.

—*Radical Humanist*, May 22.

The communist party in each non-communist country is like a U-2 plane infinitely multiplied in scope and range for the purpose of espionage.

—*Swarajya*, May 28.

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 cold war has never ceased and Khrushchev certainly has no intention of ceasing to wage it. All he wants is that his enemies should cease to oppose him.

—*Mysindia*, May 22.

Mr. Khrushchev has wrecked the Summit Conference because he wanted to wreck it, not because of his indignation against American spying.

—*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, May 19.

Khrushchev is shouting loud to cover up deficiencies that he hopes the Russian people will not guess.

—*Newsweek*, May 23.

We cannot survive as a nation today if we are not a democracy, and we cannot survive as a democracy if we do not go socialist.

—V.K. Krishna Menon, *Tide*, May 21.

Under cover of defending the Indian model of socialist society, the Indian National Congress Party is actually opposed to real socialism.

—*Reformation, Revisionism and Problems of Contemporary Capitalism*, published by the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Recently the London *Times* collected some statistics on "What Happens to Communists"?

These are the Statistics:

9 out of 11 Russian Cabinet Ministers who have held office since 1936 have been shot.

5 out of 7 Presidents of the last Central Executive Committees died likewise.

43 out of 53 Secretaries of the Communist Party Central Organisation have been executed.

15 out of 27 top Communists who drafted the 1936 Constitution faced the firing squad.

70 out of 80 of the Soviet War Council were executed.

Since 1917, 3 out of every 5 Marshals of the Soviet Army were shot as spies or traitors.

No record was kept of the dissident small fry.

—*Current*, May 25.