

A Tactic Or A New Policy?

by V. B. Karnik

THE free world is puzzled by the recent new trend in Soviet foreign policy. Is it a new trend or just a tactical manoeuvre? Is it a real "thaw" presaging the advance of the Spring of friendly collaboration or is it a mask worn for the time being to deceive the unwary? Political observers have been discussing these questions for quite some time now but have not so far been able to find a definite answer.

There is no dispute that there is a change in Soviet policy. Without such a change it would not have been possible to conclude satisfactorily the long-drawn out negotiations over the Austrian Treaty. The climb down in the case of Yugoslavia, the conciliatory attitude at the "summit" talks in Geneva, the relaxation of some of the heavy restraints on travel are some of the other indications of the change. The question in issue is if the change is a mere shift in tactics or is the expression of a new orientation in policy.

A shift in tactics is not a new thing for Soviet Russia. During the last thirtyeight years there have been many a change in her tactics. Many a time the change has taken place with bewildering suddenness. Fiery advocates of world revolution change with astonishing rapidity into calm protagonists of collective security and, after using a man like Litvinov and his talk of collective security for years, they one day stagger the world by entering into a pact with the aggressor, as happened in the case of the Stalin-Hitler Pact. As that astute observer of world events, Mr. Richard Lowenthal, has pointed out in *Encounter*: "Thus, periods of revolution and local aggression have alternated with periods of 'peaceful coexistence' in Soviet foreign policy from Lenin's time to this day." It is likely that the new spirit of friendliness and adjustment that has suddenly

made its appearance is a manifestation of that old communist practice of changing the tactic to suit the occasion.

On the other hand, a number of new factors have emerged in the international situation—and the leaders of Soviet Russia could not have failed to notice them. The most important amongst them is the grave danger to all of a thermonuclear war. The full realisation of the dangers of that type of war may have persuaded the Soviet leaders to drop their bellicose attitude. In the words of Mr. Winston Churchill, "safety will be the sturdy child of terror." The terror of an atomic war may hereafter determine the relations between the Big Powers and may persuade them to seek the ways and means of living together rather than those of perishing together.

Soviet Russia may have also realised that her bellicose policy was no longer yielding dividends. It was on the other hand uniting the free nations into a solid phalanx against the totalitarian camp. Moreover, a stage had been reached in the international balance of power where any further aggression on the part of the communist group of nations would have precipitated a third world war ending in the destruction of all. It therefore became necessary to reconsider the tactic as well as the strategy.

Internal conditions also demand a reconsideration of the attitude. The Soviets are now face to face with the grim reality that the feverish race to pile up armaments precludes the possibility of developing other sectors of their economy. For a time those sectors could be neglected and the consequent discontent of the people could be put down mercilessly. But the process cannot be continued indefinitely. Already there are grave shortages in the production of agricultural and other consumers' goods. The State may be in peril if early steps are not taken to remedy that imbalance of the economy. A bellicose foreign policy will not permit those steps being taken—and that may have compelled its substitution by a policy of "peace" and "friendship".

Another significant factor is the natural desire of the new ruling class for a measure of relaxation. It

is about four decades now that the unfortunate country has been passing through violent convulsions and has been driven headlong without a moment's rest by a dictatorial party. Now that a stable government has been established and there is no real danger of a foreign invasion, it becomes possible to settle down and take things easy. The desire is stronger amongst the new rulers who have secured for themselves a much higher standard of living. They would like to relax and enjoy the good things of life. The desire had been growing since long. The iron dictatorship of Stalin had suppressed it. With the disappearance of the tyrant and with the failure so far of any one man to step into his shoes, the desire is asserting itself and may in course of time materially influence the national and the international policies of Soviet Russia.

Those who argue along these lines hold that the present change is a new long-term trend of Soviet policy and urge that it should be accepted as such. If Soviet Russia is thus abandoning her war-like intentions of expanding her empire and her sphere of influence and is settling down in peaceful co-existence with others, the free nations must also drop their suspicions and fears and develop a new outlook towards her. If the outlook is thus changed on both sides, the dread spectre of a third world war will disappear and the world will be able to march forward along the new lines of progress opened out by the discovery of atomic power.

There are many equally keen and competent observers who regard the line of thinking described above as naïve and dangerous. According to them the communists are as incapable of changing their objectives as a leopard his spots. They regard the present smiles and soothing words of the leaders of Soviet Russia as a mere change of tactics. Having failed to achieve their objectives through the mailed fist and harsh words, they are replacing them by gentle words and charming manners. But their objective remains the same. It will be suicidal, those observers think, if the free nations are taken in by these deceitful manoeuvres and pull down the military, political and spiritual defences against aggression that they have built up after years of patient effort.

This point of view finds its best support in a remark of M. Khrushchev, the first secretary of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia. The remark was widely reported in the world press and has not been so far contradicted. M. Khrushchev said: "Anyone who mistakes our smile for a withdrawal from the policies of Marx and Lenin is making a mistake." Thus, according to M. Khrushchev, the leaders of Soviet Russia remain wedded as before to the policies of Marx and Lenin, the policies of international civil war and of world conquest and domination by communists. It cannot be forgotten, however, that many a time men effect significant changes in the teachings of old masters while continuing to pay lip homage to them.

More important perhaps are some of the recent actions which furnish a better guide to the intentions of Soviet leaders. The intentions thus disclosed are, to say the least, disturbing. The cordial reception accorded to the governmental delegation from East

Germany immediately after the departure of Dr. Adenauer and his colleagues and the new arrangements entered into with that regime indicate that the battle over the unification of Germany is going to be hard and long. Another factor of graver import is the new arms aid to countries of West Asia. It appears as if, checkmated in Europe, Soviet Russia and her satellites are turning their attention to the Arab countries which are full of any amount of explosive material. This new enterprise of communist countries will hardly help relaxation of world tensions.

The real test will, however, come in the Foreign Ministers' Conference which is meeting towards the end of October. It is at this conference that the various concrete issues such as the unification of Germany, European security and lowering of barriers against trade and travel will come up for discussion. The attitude that Soviet Russia adopts on these questions will provide a clue to her real intentions. It will make clear if she intends to follow the policy of peaceful and friendly coexistence or if the smile and the gentle words are only a trick to divide, beguile and enslave.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

Mr. Nicolas Nabokov, the Secretary General of the Congress for Cultural Freedom and a noted musician and composer, will pay a three weeks' visit to India at the invitation of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom. He will be in Delhi from November 8 to 11. From there he will go to Lucknow on the 11th and to Calcutta on the 13th. Mr. Nabokov will be in Calcutta until the 16th, the day on which he leaves for Burma and various countries of East Asia.

Mr. Nabokov will return to India again on December 9. The first city that he will visit will be Madras. From there he will go to Trivandrum and Bangalore and will reach Bombay on December 16. He will be in Bombay until the 22nd when he leaves for Europe.

*

The Annual General Meeting of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom will take place in Bombay on December 17 and 18. Mr. Nicolas Nabokov, the Secretary General of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, will attend the meeting and give it the benefit of his advice and guidance.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the 1st of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

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

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

Notes

A New Asian Republic

EVENTS in Viet Nam will give cause for satisfaction to all lovers of freedom who understand the vital importance of the independence of the Viet Nameese people in the larger strategy of Asian freedom. So long as Bao Dai remained the Head of the State of South Viet Nam, it was possible for the enemies of Viet Nam independence to point a finger at the symbolic link that still survived with subjection to French rule.

It cannot be denied that, in the last year or two, Bao Dai had in fact become the facade behind which French colonialism was seeking to perpetuate a foothold in that country. The decisive vote in the referendum of October 23 cast by the people of South Viet Nam in favour of their patriotic Prime Minister and against the effete Head of State loitering in France has shown a sound instinct. It is also heartening that, faced with this demonstration of popular will, Paris has thrown in its hand and recognised the new Republic of South Viet Nam which now joins Cambodia and Laos in full sovereignty. From now on, the defence of the three free States of Indo-China against the totalitarian threat from the North becomes an obligation of the free countries of Asia and of the free world in general.

President Diem, who now emerges as one of the powerful personalities of Asia, has done well to declare that the next step to ascertain democratically the wishes of the Viet Nameese people will be the holding of elections for a Constituent Assembly which will frame the Constitution of the new Republic. This is the correct path of democratic advance for the Viet Nameese people, and not the dubious elections contemplated by the Geneva Conference of 1954 in which the majority of alleged participants would be under the yoke of a totalitarian dictatorship which can hardly be expected to tolerate genuinely free elections.

Incidentally, the oft repeated argument that the French Government and the South Viet Nameese Government as its successor are bound to participate in such elections turns out on closer analysis to be unfounded. An examination of the documents of the Geneva Conference shows that there are two relevant texts. The first is the Cease-Fire Agreement between the High Commands of the French Union and the Viet Minh armies. This is a binding document duly signed by accredited representatives of both sides. There is no reference to joint elections in this document.

The other document is the final declaration of the Conference, which alone refers to elections throughout Viet Nam in July 1956 and states that "consultations will be held on this subject between the authorities of the two zones from July 20, 1955, onwards."

None of the participating nations, however, signed this declaration, which thus lacks binding force. Technicalities apart, however, what is important is the sovereign right of self-determination of the people of South Viet Nam and not the terms of what a few years ago would have been rightly denounced as "an imperialist treaty."

North East Tribal Problem

SINCE India attained independence, the North-East Frontier Area has become a constant trouble spot. To say the least the Indian administration has failed to inspire the tribal people with confidence and to make them feel one with the rest of India. In view of this fact, Mr. Nehru's Note, prepared by him in 1952 after his tour of the North-East-Frontier, for the guidance of officers of the External Affairs Ministry who deal with the tribal people, a copy of which was recently placed on the table of the Lok Sabha, is indeed relevant, though a little belated. Mr. Nehru has tried to view the problems of the tribal people with understanding and sympathy. If Mr. Nehru's suggestions are implemented, it is certain that they will go a long way in easing the tension. The problems of the tribal people are not merely economic, but cultural, and they require a careful and sympathetic handling and not a bureaucratic approach as has been the case so far. Therefore, Mr. Nehru rightly insisted: "India to them (tribal people) should signify not only a protecting force, but a liberating force. Any conception that India is ruling them and that they are the ruled or that the customs and habits with which they are unfamiliar are going to be imposed upon them will alienate them and make our frontier problems more difficult."

Mr. Nehru's Note, however, has brought to light a fact of grave concern, and we hope Mr. Nehru himself is aware of its gravity. He says: "In some other areas bordering on Tibet, I was told that comparison is being made with conditions on the Chinese side and that this was not always to our advantage. Many of our people go across the border to work on the other side and get good wages. They say that the Chinese are building roads and schools etc. In fact, it appeared that the Chinese treated our people somewhat better than they treated the Tibetans".

This means that there is full scope for the Chinese communists to infiltrate amongst the tribal people. It will not be surprising if the Chinese communists supply arms to Nagas to fight the Indian administration. If this happens, this area will prove a potential danger to Indian democracy. And if once the Chinese communists succeed in infiltrating into this area, there will be no end to their machinations.

We, therefore, hope that the Indian Government would not only take steps to befriend the tribal people in the North East Frontier by a sympathetic and non-bureaucratic approach towards them, but would seriously think of resisting Chinese communist infiltration. This can be done while bettering the economic and social conditions of the tribal peoples.

Essentials of Democracy

DR. Harekrishna Mahtab, the Governor of Bombay, gave a thoughtful definition of democracy when he defined it as rule of the majority with the consent of the minority. Dr. Mehtab gave the definition in a speech that he delivered in Ahmedabad at the Harold Laski Institute of Political Science.

Democracy is regarded in many quarters as the rule of the majority, irrespective of the opinions and wishes of the minority. Democracy, thus conceived, inevitably degenerates into tyranny. The minority is then suppressed and is required to resort to acts of rebellion for the defence of its interests.

In a country which has just begun its democratic experiment it is essential to state and restate these obvious truths about democracy. Dr. Mahtab did well also to emphasise that democracy meant administration by discussion and the tolerance of opposing or differing views. It is to be hoped that the leaders and workers of the ruling party will keep these essentials in mind so that the experiment may succeed and democracy may strike deep roots in the soil of the country.

A Commendable Lead

THE statement adopted by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions disapproving the use of the forces and equipment of regional defence organisations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, in support of colonialism is highly commendable.

The statement says inter alia: "We would disapprove of any activities by regional defence organisations in support of colonialism, be it by the supply of arms or other means, which we consider a violation of their proper functions."

This forthright statement adopted on the suggestion of Mr. K. P. Tripathi, the General Secretary of the Indian National Trade Union Congress, is very opportune in view of the crisis that has developed in North Africa where, it was feared, that France might use the equipment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation for the suppression of the nationalist movements. The international organisation having given the lead, it is now for the national centres of the trade union movement in countries associated with NATO to see that the disapproval expressed by the statement matures into strict prohibition.

National Book Trust

FACED with the problem of the production of good but low-priced books in the national and the regional languages, the Government of India have jumped to the conclusion that the Government alone can handle it and have announced their decision to set up a national book trust for the preparation and publication of "healthy literature for the masses." The trust is to have an initial capital of Rs. 30 lakhs.

In the course of his tour of South India the Prime Minister also referred to the problem and declared at one place that mass production of cheap books would

be possible only if the Government took over the publication of books.

With public revenues to finance the publication the Government may be in a position to produce vast quantities of books at cheap prices. But what will be the type of books that they will produce? Will not political considerations and patronage and favouritism enter into the selection of books and authors? Will not the Government try to mould the thought of the people in the manner they consider best? Will there not be a suppression of independent authors and their books?

The Prime Minister is himself aware of this danger. He admitted that the procedure "restricted thought in a limited sense." Why should it be necessary then to try the dangerous experiment? Many other countries have solved the problem without entrusting the work to the Government. Private publishers, authors or learned societies can be given the necessary encouragement. If such encouragement is provided and if people's incomes are increased, a large market for books will develop, and cheap and good books will be produced in large quantities.

The Government should try this straightforward course of encouraging the book trade rather than take upon themselves the responsibility of publication, which is bound to act as a fetter on the development of free thought.

D. R. S. Vindicated

THE Privileges Committee of the Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly upheld the Chief Minister, Mr. P. Govinda Menon, and came to the conclusion that the document containing the Madura thesis adopted by the Communist Party of India was "not a false and fabricated" document as contended by the communist group in the Assembly. The conclusion was later endorsed by the Assembly by a large majority despite communist opposition.

The document in question is in the book *The Communist Conspiracy at Madurai* published by the Democratic Research Service. The book published for the first time a secret document of the Communist Party revealing that, whatever its present tactics may be, its real objective is the overthrow of the existing Indian State.

There were loud protests by leaders of the party when the document was published that it was false. But when challenged they dared not take the matter to a court of law. The General Secretary of the Indian National Congress, Mr. Shriman Narayan, had made that suggestion, but the leaders of the party did not think it wise to accept it.

The verdict has once again gone against the communists in the Travancore-Cochin Assembly. The only thing that they can do now is to shower abuses on the Democratic Research Service which had the courage and boldness to secure the document and to publish it. The spokesman of the communist group in the Assembly called the Democratic Research Service "a well-known American agency serving American imperialist interests in India." The abuse is so patently vile and false that it will not deceive anybody.

The Milan Conference—A Report

by M. R. Masani

I Understand that hardly anything about the Milan conference appeared in the newspapers and I am not surprised at that. There is the old saying that when a dog bites a man it isn't news, but when a man bites a dog it is. Well, at Milan no man bit a dog. The discussions were friendly, and the gathering was in the nature of a happy family.

From the point of view of personalities, the Milan Conference was very rich. Of those who were actually there, perhaps the best known throughout the world were Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, former Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer and possible leader of the Labour Party, Mr. George Kennan, former American Ambassador in Moscow, and Prof. F. von Hayek, the well known leader of the individualist school of economics, and author of the *Road to Serfdom*. There were three others who took a very keen and active part in the Conference throughout and gave form and shape to its deliberations. These were Prof. Sydney Hook, Professor of Philosophy in New York University, Prof. Michael Polanyi of Manchester University and Monsieur Raymond Aron of the *Figaro*, Paris.

Among others who were there and who took an active part in the discussions were R. H. S. Crossman and Denis Healey, both MPs of the Labour Party, Mr. Geoffrey Hudson of the *Economist*, a well known authority on the Far East; Prof. Arthur Lewis, Professor of Economics at Manchester; Signor Herman Santa Cruz; Arthur Slazenger, Jr., author of the *Vital Centre*; Prof. Hugh Seton Watson, scholar and expert on Eastern European countries; Prof. Edward Shils, whom we know in Bombay; Signor Ignazio Silone, the Italian novelist; Peter Viereck, the well known American writer and poet; and Bertram Wolfe, the author of *Three Who Made A Revolution*. There were many others of the same calibre whom I have no space to mention.

Asia and Africa were not unrepresented, although the lion's share of representation went to Europe. Among those from other parts of the world, there were several people from Latin America. From Asia there was Mr. Brohi, former Advocate-General and Cabinet Minister of Pakistan; from the Lebanon, there was the socialist leader Kamal Djumblat; there was Kukrit Pramoj from Thailand, the Editor of an independent newspaper; there was Ungku Abdul Aziz from Malaya. Finally, there were two Africans, both from the West Coast of Africa.

The Indian team consisted of Mr. Patanjali Shastri, former Chief Justice of our Supreme Court; Mr. A. D. Gorwala, whose speech at the final session (published on the front page of *Freedom First* last month) was considered by most people among the best speeches at the concluding session; Mr. Eric da Costa of the *Eastern Economist*; and Prof. Amlan Datta of Calcutta University. In Prof. G. D.

Parikh's absence, I presented his paper, which I was very happy to do, because I found that it was one of the best papers of the Conference. The paper made a great impression. The Conference arrangements, in so far as delegates were concerned, were first class. We were looked after extremely well. Every possible contingency had been thought of, and I wish more of us were there to see how a Conference should be run.

I felt that perhaps we had asked too many people. Perhaps we should have asked a fair number of junior people, who would have benefitted more from association with the senior people, and if we *did* ask so many celebrities all at once, we should have then broken up the Conference into smaller seminars. That, I think, was the major defect of the Conference and it meant that we could not make as much of this wonderful opportunity as was desired. However, we supplemented at lunches and dinners and teas as much as could be done the need for this informal contact. Even so, many people expressed the view, and I shared it myself, that one had not met even half the people one wanted to meet.

I shall mention four or five topics on which there was an interesting debate.

The first and most obvious one was whether planning and freedom could be reconciled. Most people present were of the view that freedom and planning were reconcilable, that there was nothing inherently undemocratic or totalitarian about planning. Some people might explain that by saying that this was natural, considering the large number of Socialists present. This is partly true, for the Congress for Cultural Freedom is a grouping of anti-totalitarians of the Left.

That does not mean, on the other hand, that the Conference was "planning mad." Most of the papers had a great deal of caution to provide on the subject of economic planning. In fact, everyone rejected the idea that there were any absolutes in this matter—that one had to be for planning or against planning. Many speakers said that to argue that socialism *versus* capitalism was the issue of the time was carrying on an archaic debate. It was no longer the issue in the world at all, it was a dead issue and anyone who went on arguing either against capitalism or against socialism was flogging a dead horse. The old capitalism had been transmuted; the old socialism had been purged, as a result of Soviet failure, of much of its dross. The issue was a little more or a little less of state control.

The second debate was on the extent of economic progress in the U.S.S.R. This turned out to be the most pin-pointed, sharply-argued session—I happened to be in the chair—and we really spent an exciting morning on the subject. Thanks for that go to Mr. Peter Wiles, a young economist from Oxford, who

faced us with some shattering propositions. He said first of all that Soviet economic development was not only successful but was so successful that it was faster than any economic development in any part of the world, including America, at any stage of history. Secondly, that if this continued, as it must, then soon Soviet Russia would overtake America and the rest of the world in productivity.

The answer to Peter Wiles' thesis was presented by Colin Clarke, whose article has appeared in *Encounter*. Colin Clark had to go to Stockholm for another conference, so Amlan Datta presented his paper and generally supported it. The majority of the speakers rejected Peter Wiles' premises and his conclusions. Among them were George Kennan, who spoke from his own experience of Russia when he was Ambassador there, Professor Woytinsky, the American economist, and Bertram D. Wolfe, the well-known student of Soviet affairs and a member of the First Executive Committee of the Communist International. Their arguments briefly were that Soviet statistics are dishonest and selective, that anyone who accepts Soviet statistics is bound to mislead himself and his readers and give a false picture. Soviet statistics are mostly based on heavy capital goods industries where undoubtedly they have made most progress. Agriculture and consumer goods are ignored and, when the picture is viewed as a whole, it is not as striking or as alarming as Peter Wiles makes out. Then again, they said that economic advantage must be measured against human cost. In any case even if Soviet expansion in iron and steel and similar goods has been startling, it can't go on. A fact that came out in the discussion was that much of the gilt would be taken off the gingerbread of these statistics if it was borne in mind that, in the twenty or twenty-five years concerned, huge masses of people were transplanted from the countryside into urban industry, and, therefore, when you compare American and other expansion with Soviet, in the American case more or less the same number of people are there and they are producing more, while in the case of Soviet Russia, you double or triple the industrial population and naturally the indices are bound to go up much faster. How long can this be kept up?

The third debate was on the Thaw—the so-called “new look” in Russia. How far is this thaw genuine? How far is it just a manoeuvre to mislead the free world? Now, this is the common topic of dinner table conversation in all of Europe, wherever you go. From London to Belgrade, intellectuals are discussing how genuinely the present Russian Government has changed. How different is it from Stalin? Will they go back to Stalin? What does it all amount to? And what do we do about it? Now this was not a set question for discussion, but it came up inevitably in many discussions. Not confining myself to Milan, I shall mention two points of view which one comes across in Milan, in Yugoslavia and in Europe generally.

There is the optimistic or the positive point of view, which believes that there is the beginning of a real change, and that the whole thing cannot be

written off as one of the typical ultra-right deviations. This school says that Stalin was the apotheosis of all the evil in the Soviet system who had kept all those around him in a state of perpetual terror. They were all waiting for the old man to die, and indeed they might have contrived to hasten his departure. As soon as the tyrant was removed everyone breathed a sigh of relief. Put more impersonally, every revolution has its period of ebb; you can't go on with the terror indefinitely. Thirty-eight years have passed, and some time or other this thing in its fanatical form had to end. The class that wants relaxation is the new ruling class, the State Capitalist *bourgeoisie*, the class that owns the instruments of production not individually as elsewhere, but collectively. The new rulers of the Soviet economy, who are enjoying the fruits of privilege and exploitation of the peasants and workers, now want to have an easy time.

Now, the answer to this thesis was given by Bertram D. Wolfe. Wolfe said that, as a student of history, he wanted to go on the record that this was likely to prove just one more right deviation, that it was reversible, that the Soviet regime could easily go back to the tough Stalinist line both at home and abroad, and that anyone who got taken in by their present smiles was going to have a very sad time later when he would be caught unprepared by the next Soviet surge forward. Wolfe argued effectively that this had all happened before. He took as examples the NEP period of Lenin and the Litvinov period of Disarmament, League of Nations, Front-Populaire and the Peoples' Front against Fascism from 1935 to 1939. Wolfe also pointed to the war-time alliance between Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill, when everyone talked of how wonderful Stalin was.

Now, it is impossible for people like us to express any clear view on this vital issue. There is undoubtedly a great deal of plausibility on both sides, and I frankly feel that one must wait longer before one decides whether one or the other side is correct. The problem, however, arises: What does one do meanwhile, assuming that we agree with one or the other school? Assuming that we agree with Bertram Wolfe that this phase is only a Soviet dodge, do we modify our own strategy and tactics? Does the Congress for Cultural Freedom, for example, have anything to say in this connection?

Two more debates before I finish. One was on the role of the intelligentsia, which topic kept on coming up from time to time. For a gathering of intellectuals, the intelligentsia was not let off too lightly. The opening shot was fired by Michael Polyani in his opening address when he called them “reluctant Columbuses.” He gave the analogy of Christopher Columbus who, having discovered a new continent now known as America, insisted that he had only found the route to India and refused to accept the criticism that this was really a new Continent that he had found. He was so conservative that he could not face the New World on which he had stumbled. Similarly, Polyani finds the intelligentsia too conservative. Whether it is conservatism of the

left or the right, he finds that the intellectual class is not keeping up with the new worlds that are being unfolded before it by technological and other developments.

Finally, there was a longish discussion on the underdeveloped countries. There were two discussions on this subject. The first was on a Tuesday afternoon, when the subject was on economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

All the people who spoke drew attention to the fact that the under-developed countries of Asia and Africa were perhaps the most important battlefields of freedom today, because they are in most danger from the communists. Now, as the debate developed, one felt a little disappointed at the tenor of the discussion. For one thing, none of the leading figures of the West took part in this discussion. And altogether the feeling left on the people from the underdeveloped countries was that the people from Europe, and perhaps from North America, had not really bothered enough about the subject.

On Thursday morning, after a day's gap, there was a discussion on colonialism, racialism and nationalism, when these problems came up again. On that day, I asked for the floor and opened the discussion. I made it clear I was speaking more for a group mind than for my own, and I said that this group mind had felt a sense of disquiet at listening to the Tuesday afternoon debate.

I put three questions to which I asked for an answer from our comrades in the West. First, was there in their view an adequate awareness in the West of the prime importance of these regions and of these peoples?

Secondly, I asked if there was a willingness to share material prosperity. Do the peoples of the West now feel that there is a world community where the more advanced people have to put their hands into their pockets and share at least some of the extra comforts that they have in order to create a healthy world community?

Thirdly, are they in a mood to enter into a fellowship of freedom to which lovers of freedom everywhere can belong? Communism, which has a material philosophy, has, I pointed out, a spiritual appeal because it gives people something to join and be part of, while democracy, which is a spiritual concept offers today nothing but material help.

My remarks were echoed by an African from Nigeria, Mr. Akhintola.

The response was in part both encouraging and disappointing. The encouraging response came from two persons. One was Mr. Bertrand de Jouvenel, the French publicist and economist. He said that he shared the disquiet to which I had given expression, that he also was dissatisfied with the response made by those from the West, and that to meet this need, there should be some kind of a declaration before the Conference finished which would embody the serious concern of the free world with the problems of the underdeveloped countries.

Then Professor Sydney Hook from America tried to answer my questions. He admitted that there was not

adequate awareness in the West, that it was the duty of the people like him to create such awareness among their peoples, which was not there by reason of distance and the many barriers to understanding.

Mr. Hugh Gaitskill in his speech agreed with us to a large extent. He agreed that the problem of the underdeveloped countries was vitally important. These are the most in danger and the free world must attend to them more than it has done. Secondly, we must share.

On the third issue, however, of fellowship, he said that any fellowship or communion or something to belong to tends to be fascist or communist. The free world cannot give this sense of belonging. Mr. George Kennan expressed the same idea in his speech on the following day.

On the day after the Conference finished, the General Assembly of the Congress for Cultural Freedom met. That was an organisational meeting. I was voted to the Chair.

Three resolutions were passed. One referred to the previous discussion on underdeveloped countries: "Taking note of the strength of sentiment at the Conference on the Future of Freedom in regard to the vital importance to the strength and unity of the peoples of the underdeveloped regions, this General Assembly of the Congress for Cultural Freedom recommends to the Executive Committee the desirability of considering ways and means, through the organisation of the Congress and otherwise, of giving concrete expression to the solidarity of the intellectuals of the free world with the writers and artists of the underdeveloped regions, such as research in common problems, assistance in translation and publication of books, exhibitions of paintings and other artistic activities." This may be described as our own little Point Four Programme. Suggestions have been invited from the Indian Committee and all other national groups for the next Executive Committee meeting, which will be held early next year.

The second resolution was one about the persecution of Hu Feng and Chinese writers who were had so far been fellow-travellers of the Chinese communists, but had now fallen from grace and been liquidated. A tribute was paid to writers, poets, thinkers, artists and scientists who in China as elsewhere maintain in the face of tyranny the independence of the creative spirit and the dignity of man.

The third resolution was a protest against the suppression of *El Tiempo*, the leading Liberal paper of Bogota, Colombia, by the government of that country.

Finally, the General Assembly elected the Executive Committee of the Congress. The members of the retiring Executive Committee were re-elected. Four seats were reserved for the countries of Asia and Africa and these will be filled up by cooption as and when groups come into existence in these countries.

Commenting generally on the Milan Conference, the *Manchester Guardian* representative wrote: "If anyone is leaving the Conference no wiser than when he came, he is a Solomon or he has been lulled to sleep by the excellence of the Milan menus."

Indonesia; A Confused Picture

THE results of the first general elections in Indonesia disclose a somewhat confused picture. The Nationalist Party (which had hitherto been in coalition with the communists) and the liberal Masjumi Party have each got over 7½ million votes and it is not yet certain which will end up with the larger number of seats in Parliament. Next to these two major parties comes the conservative Nahdatul Ulama, with about 6½ million votes. The fourth biggest vote goes to the Communist Party, which receives just 6 million votes.

The results given above are not final. There is a big dispute about the elections in Central Java, where owing to corruption and other irregularities a new poll has been ordered. A few thousand more votes are still to be counted. These may make some difference in the number of votes secured by each party, but the general picture is not likely to be substantially modified.

No single party has been able to win the allegiance of a substantial majority of voters. The three big parties, the Nationalists, the Masjumi and the Nahdatul Ulama, are more or less evenly balanced, and the Communist Party is not too far behind. The Government will have to be a coalition government formed of an alliance of two or more parties. That will result in instability, a position of grave danger to any country, and more particularly to a country in the position in which Indonesia finds herself at present.

Another disturbing factor of the situation is the disappearance of the Socialist Party as a major political factor. The Socialist Party contains some of the best political elements in the country. It has a programme which can be regarded as a fair answer to the crying needs of the country. It appears, however, it was not possible to combine an effective mass appeal with a sound politico-economic programme. The result was a poor showing at the elections.

A peculiar feature of the elections was the machinery that was set up to conduct them. The machinery consisted of the Central Election Committee. This body, which was formed by the Sastroamrdjojo government, was responsible for conducting the elections. The Committee was of "strange composition", as was pointed out by an able Indonesian, Mr Hasan Muhammad Tiro, a few months back in an article in *Freedom First*. The Nationalist Party, the Communist Party and other smaller pro-government parties and organisations were granted representation on the Committee, but the Masjumi and the Socialist Party were specifically excluded from it.

There have been already many complaints about the way in which the Central Election Committee carried on its work. In Central Java its conduct of the elections was so scandalous that the Government had to order a fresh poll. The composition of the Committee has influenced the result of the elections to a considerable extent. It was possibly unwise on the part of the new government of Burhanudin Harahap

to have jumped into the elections without first cleansing the election machinery. His party, the Masjumi, was, it seems, rather too sure of itself. It did not realise that a loaded election machinery can play havoc with the elections. And it is clear that the machinery was heavily loaded with nationalists and communists who were then working together in the government of the day.

The prestige and popularity of Dr. Soekarno, who was a hero of the old national revolutionary struggle, also helped the Nationalist Party. Its anti-Dutch, anti-West programme had also a large mass appeal. The success of the Communist Party was due to its organisation, its infiltration of the election machinery and its demagogic programme. In a backward Asian country, clever racial propaganda can still sway the minds of the people.

What will happen in the country after the elections is still an open question. A coalition is inevitable, but what will be the composition of the coalition and who will lead it? The Communist Party has already made a bid to join the government. Its General Secretary, Mr. D. N. Aditi, has called for a "national coalition" to be led by the Nationalist Party and the Nahdatul Ulama and to be joined by the Masjumi, the communists and the rest. It is unlikely that the Masjumi will agree to join a coalition of this type. If it stays out and the Nationalist Party and the rest form a coalition with the Communist Party, the government that will be formed will be led ostensibly by the nationalists, but will do the will of the communists. The way will be then open for a "people's democracy" of the type prevalent in the satellite States of Eastern Europe. The communists know it and that is why they are so eagerly asking for the coalition.

But there can be other forms of coalition. There can be a coalition between the Hatta tendency in the Nationalist Party and the Masjumi or between the Masjumi and the Nahdatul Ulama or between Nahdatul Ulama and the Nationalist Party. None of these coalitions may be an ideal solution of the present anomalous position brought about by the elections. But they may at least preserve the independence and the integrity of Indonesia, which will be in grave peril if the so-called national coalition suggested by the communists comes to be accepted.

India is happy to welcome on its soil Dr. Mohamed Hatta, the Indonesian Vice-President, who saved his country for democracy during the recent crisis. It is heartening to learn of his conviction that the communists will be kept out of the Government.

Indonesia is just taking her first steps in the direction of democracy and freedom. The first step that she took in the last elections has not been very firm. It is to be hoped that the weakness of that step will not involve her in insoluble difficulties and that she will continue to march in step with other free and democratic nations of Asia.

History In The Making In Soviet Russia

WE are all familiar with Soviet methods of writing un-history, to denigrate or obliterate the purged and the dead. The *Economist*, London, gave last year the following information about the treatment accorded to the late Mr. Lavrenti Beria: "Recipients of the latest volume of the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia have found enclosed in it a discreet printed slip, on which the Moscow State publishers recommend readers 'to remove pages 21 to 24 from Volume 5, and also the portrait between pages 22 and 23, in exchange for which pages with new text are sent to you.'" It is not a recommendation to be treated lightly by anybody within the reach of the MVD, for the entry which is thus deleted for all time from the knowledge of Soviet man is the long and laudatory biography of the late Lavrenti Beria, and the portrait that must now be piously burnt is his. The nightmares of George Orwell's 1984 have become a reality thirty years ahead of time in the vast area between Saxony and Shanghai, and Beria is already an "unperson" and the record of his career "unfacts."

Current press treatment of Malenkov offers interesting instance of these techniques applied to the living. Although the second volume of the Soviet *Encyclopedic Dictionary* had been sent to the press only in April 1954, in February, 1955, after Malenkov's resignation, a second impression was made in which 'corrections' are introduced on certain pages. The only major change is in the biography of Malenkov, which was cut from 108 to 53 lines. The full texts of the original and revised version on Malenkov are reproduced below. It will be observed that the figure of Malenkov has been arbitrarily and brutally reduced from an outstanding personality, performing responsible work, to one of relative mediocrity.

VERSION OF APRIL 6, 1954.

MALENKOV, Georgy Maksimilianovich (born Jan. 8, 1902), *outstanding* personality of the Communist Party and Soviet State, a true pupil of V. I. Lenin and comrade-in-arms of I. V. Stalin. Member of the Presidium of the CC CPSU.

Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR; Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. G. M. Malenkov was born in Orenburg (now Chkalov) in the family of an employee. During the Civil War he volunteered for the Red Army. In April 1920 G. M. Malenkov entered the Communist Party.

From 1919 until 1921 he was political worker in a squadron, regiment, brigade and the Political Administration of the Eastern and Turkestan Fronts.

After demobilisation in 1921-25 he studied in the Moscow technical college. From 1925 to 1930 G. M. Malenkov *performed responsible* work in the apparatus of the CC of the Communist Party. From 1930 to 1934 he did *directing* work in the Moscow Committee of the Party. From 1934-39 he was Head of the Department of Leading Party Organs of the CC CPSU (b). In December 1937, during the first election to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, G. M. Malenkov was elected a Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and from that time on he has been elected regularly as a Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and RSFSR. At the XVIIIth Congress of the CPSU (b) in March 1939, G. M. Malenkov was elected to the Central Committee and at the Plenum of the Central Committee in March

VERSION OF FEBRUARY, 1955.

MALENKOV, Georgy Maksimilianovich (born 1902), important personality of the Communist Party and Soviet State.

Member of the CPSU since 1920. Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Born in Orenburg (now Chkalov) in the family of a petty employee. In 1919 he volunteered for the Red Army.

From 1919 until 1921 he was political worker on the Eastern and Turkestan Fronts.

In 1921-1925 he studied in the Moscow technical college. From 1925 to 1930 worked in the apparatus of the CC CPSU (b). From 1930-1934 at work in the Moscow Committee of the CPSU (b), in 1934-39 he was Head of the Department of Leading Party Organs of the CC CPSU (b). At the XVIIIth Congress of the CPSU (b) (1939) was elected to the CC CPSU (b) and at the Plenum of the CC CPSU (b) a Secretary of the CC CPSU (b), a member of the Orgburo of the CC CPSU (b) and appointed Chief of the Administration for Cadres of the CC CPSU(b).

1939 was elected Secretary of the CC CPSU (b), a member of the Orgburo of the CC CPSU (b) and appointed Chief of the Administration for Cadres of the CC CPSU (b). At the XVIIIth All-Union Conference of the CPSU (b) in February 1941 G. M. Malenkov made a speech on the tasks of Party organisations in the sphere of industry and transport. In February 1941 at a plenum of the CC CPSU (b) G. M. Malenkov was elected a candidate member of the Politburo of the CC CPSU (b).

In February 1941, at a plenum of the CC CPSU (b) G. M. Malenkov was elected a candidate member of the Politburo of the CC CPSU (b).

During the Great Patriotic War from June 30, 1941, to September 4, 1945, G. M. Malenkov was a member of the State Committee. In August 1941 G. M. Malenkov was on the Leningrad Front; in the autumn and winter of 1941 he took an active part in the organisation of operations for the destruction of German fascist troops near Moscow; in March 1942 he went to the Volkhov Front; in July and then in August to September to the Stalingrad and Don fronts; in March 1943 he was on the Central Front, carrying on everywhere great work in organising forces for the struggle against the German fascist aggressors. As a member of the State Defence Committee G. M. Malenkov directed work for equipping the Soviet Army with new fighting equipment and Soviet aviation with aircraft and engines. For special services in the sphere of increasing production of aircraft and motors in difficult wartime conditions G. M. Malenkov was awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour on September 30, 1943.

During the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945, was a member of the State Defence Committee.

For services in the sphere of increasing production of aircraft and motors G. M. Malenkov was awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour in 1943.

In November 1945 the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR awarded the Order of Lenin to G. M. Malenkov for successful work in carrying out the tasks of the Communist Party and Soviet Government.

In March 1946, at a Plenum of the CC of the Party, G. M. Malenkov was elected a member of the Politburo of the CC CPSU (b); he performed at this time work as Secretary of the CC of the Party and Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. In January 1952, in connection with his 50th birthday, G. M. Malenkov was awarded an Order of Lenin for outstanding services to the Communist Party and Soviet people. In October 1952, at the XIXth Congress of the CPSU, G. M. Malenkov gave the report on the work of the CC CPSU (b) G. M. Malenkov was elected a member of the CC CPSU by the XIXth Congress of the Party and at the plenum of the CC CPSU.

In March 1946 he was elected a member of the Politburo of the CC CPSU (b) he performed at this time work as Secretary of the CC of the Party and Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. He was elected a member of the CC CPSU by the XIXth Congress of the Party.

Until March 1953 he was a Secretary of the CC CPSU. On March 15, 1953, the fourth session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR confirmed the appointment of G. M. Malenkov as Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

From March 1953 until February 1955 he was Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. From February 1955 Minister of Electric Power stations and Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. Has been awarded 3 Orders of Lenin.

Review

Blowing Up India

by Philip Spratt, Praphi Prakashan, Calcutta, Price Rs. 2/-

TO the Indian reader, Philip Spratt hardly needs an introduction. He came to India way back in 1926 as a secret agent of the Comintern but soon made a dramatic debut on the Indian political stage as the central figure in the Meerut Conspiracy case. He has never been totally out of the lime-light since. But today he is better known through his writings in *Mysindia*, to which he regularly contributes, and his brilliantly written pamphlets.

Blowing Up India is his latest. In it he describes his excursion into Communism. Explaining the intellectual appeal of Marxism for him, he writes: "Those who have discussed the Marxian theory and its charm for the young have not stressed sufficiently the sense of superiority it gives its devotees.... The convert to Marx felt that he was in the vanguard of intellectual progress". But that was not all. Marxism gave him a purpose in life and the ostensible purpose was nothing less than the very salvation of humanity. No wonder, therefore, that fired with this missionary zeal, Spratt should have set out for India at the behest of the Comintern.

Before long he was imprisoned on a charge of conspiring to overthrow British rule in India. It was while he was serving time in prison that his faith in the amoral creed was assailed by scepticism. For, in jail he had an opportunity to read widely on Communism and began to see through its pretensions. The impact of world events at the time culminating in the Russian invasion of Finland ("There is something clear-cut and irrevocable like murder about such despatch of one's army across a neighbour's frontier") hastened the process of disillusionment, driving him inexorably to a position of hostile opposition to Communism. "It was at one time, perhaps, progressive", he writes, "It was certainly idealistic. But that phase is past. It is now a conspiracy using for ulterior ends the progressive ideas it has inherited from the old Communists". The chapter on "Communism in Practice" is a testimony to it.

In the subsequent chapters he turns from the personal to the general and critically discusses India's foreign policy in the context of the cold war. The discussion is like the Curate's egg, to use a hackneyed expression, good in parts only. It would not be easy for instance, to answer his matter-of-fact, if heretical, criticism that in Korea and Indo-China mediation has served the paradoxical purpose of helping piecemeal aggression. And yet one is amused when he naively tries to put the blame for corruption in Chiang Kai-Shek's regime at the door of Mao by suggesting that it was "due mainly to bankruptcy, brought about largely by Mao's twenty-years-long campaign of sabotage." Finally, his appeal to Hindu sentiments in contrast with his earlier derogatory references to Islam and Christianity is likely to expose him, rightly or wrongly, to the charge of tendentious writing. Be-

sides, in the perspective of history, Prophet Mohamed and Jesus Christ appear to be revolutionaries of greater stature than Lenin, for whom Spratt still retains a lingering admiration.

By and large, *Blowing up India* is a provocative little booklet that makes the reader sit up and think!

—Aziz Madni

The Soviet Impact on Society

by Dr. Dagobert D. Runes, Published by philosophical Library, New York, Price, \$3.75.

WITH the present policy of peaceful co-existence and the consequent slackening of the cold-war, it is likely that the democratic world opinion may underrate the sinister threats of totalitarian communism as an ideology and of Soviet imperialism as a world-force directed against the existence of free and democratic nations.

It needs reminding the free world that Soviet imperialism has not renounced its faith in Marxist philosophy, in communism or in the programme of "liberating" the free democratic world. The change of strategy and tactics should not delude the free world and soften its resistance to the onrush of Soviet imperialism.

The fundamental issues dividing the world in our times are sharp, distinct, mutually incompatible and uncompromising. They are, such as, freedom versus slavery, democracy versus totalitarianism and progress versus retrogression.

The book, though written about 17 years ago, has a special significance to-day and serves the purpose of focussing our attention on the aforesaid fundamental issues by exposing the pretentious professions of communism and their negations in practice. It further shows how communism is a perennial threat to and conspiracy against all cherished values of mankind.

It is the contention of the author that communism as an ideology arose as a revolt against the unjust practices of capitalism; but, when communism is put into practice in a society, it is also found wanting. Not only that, the author has also shown that the practice of communism has brought into being the worst features of capitalism and has totally enslaved the Soviet people.

The conclusion of the author therefore is that the Soviet impact on society is not for the good of mankind.

The book is a concise, sharp and fine critique of the Soviet society which should prove useful to the Indian public in the present atmosphere of credulity and gullibility.

M.B.S.

COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY AT MADURAI

Price Rs. 1/12

Available at

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Mr. Molotov: "I have never been talked to like that in my life." Mr. Truman: "Carry out your agreements, and you won't get talked to like that."

—Mr. Truman in his Memoirs, *The Times*,
London, September 22, 1955.

Those who understand economics also share Mr. Nanda's misgivings, that the bag of tricks out of which Prof. Mahalanobis has pulled out several attractive rabbits is a magician's hat and not a portfolio for a serious planner committed to traversing the democratic way.... Resources unfortunately are not chocolates one buys at a confectioner's.

—Beachcomber, *Thought*,
September 17, 1955.

The problem of refugee rehabilitation in West Germany is much more complicated and acute than in India.... In that country every fourth man is a refugee.

—Dr. Meghnad Saha,
Thought, September 24, 1955.

✓ I have never seen a good Soviet painting. They are all ugly, dreary and monotonous and full of generals with medals.

—Mr. Pablo Picasso, France's famous modern artist, *New York Herald Tribune*,
Paris, September 24, 1955.

The fear of conquest by infiltration and subversion from within and without still hangs over many a small nation.

—Dr. Mojamed Fadhil-al-Jamali, Iraqi delegate to the United Nations, *New York Times*,
September 27, 1955.

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

One instance of the "outdatedness" of Marx was that in America today there is no proletariat because there is so much wealth in America that the problem before them is what to do with that wealth.

—Prime Minister Mr. Nehru, *New Age*, Oct. 23,

✓ Damage to a worker's health is not serious as economic damage in production.

—Czechoslovak Prime Minister, Zapotocky,
Thought, October 1, 1955.

A Boss is a man who clings to office and does all things so that he remains there.

—Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru,
Times of India, October 12, 1955.

✓ By neutrality the Soviets mean each nation should have the weakness which is inevitable when each depends on itself alone.

—Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State,
Times of India, October 11, 1955.

Mr. Nehru has done a great service in pin-pointing the fact that we Indians talk in terms of high ideals and act in a completely opposite way.

—Mr. R. C. Satarawala, *Times of India*,
October 14, 1955.

The "spirit of Geneva" is as catching as the measles.

—Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, *New Leader*,
October 3, 1955.

It is not for American statesmen to reproach Adenauer for following in Moscow the methods which they popularized at Geneva.

—Mr. William Henry Chamberlin,
New Leader, October 3, 1955.

The Communists evidently desire a detente very fervently, but they are trying to purchase it at a very cheap price.

—Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr,
New Leader, October 3, 1955.

Panchshila is a political stunt to hide war economy.

—Dr. J. C. Kumarappa, *Times of India*,
October 8, 1955.

Neutrality has never saved Iran from foreign aggression.

—The Shah of Iran,
Times of India, October 9, 1955.

I am a paralysed socialist—so paralysed that I can not even join the Congress.

—Acharya Kripalani, *Times of India*,
October 19, 1955.