

Failure At The U.N.

by B. K. Desai

THE fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly opened in the third week of September on a note of high optimism and inflated hopes and passed into history without achieving anything constructive or of lasting significance. It was historic only in the sense that it brought together for the first time so many key world figures from different parts of the world under one roof and that for the first time the uncommitted group of Afro-Asian nations commanded a near majority in the Assembly. But, beyond this, the session hardly fulfilled any of the hopes or expectations which were roused on its eve. It was fondly hoped that the session would "pave the way for easing tension" between the East and West; but, if anything, it only hardened the respective attitudes of the two sides with the result that the freeze, instead of thawing, only deepened further. The historic gathering thus proved merely another propaganda encounter in the cold war and in the prevailing circumstances, thanks to the Soviet policies, it could not have been otherwise.

It was Khrushchev who converted the 15th session of the General Assembly into a world-wide propaganda circus by proposing that the delegations to the session should be led by their heads of Government. The ostensible Soviet purpose in inviting heads of Governments to the session was to consider the problem of "universal and complete disarmament." That this move was obviously inspired by propaganda motives was clear from the fact that only a few months back the Soviet delegation had walked out of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee and that the "basic provisions of the treaty on general and complete disarmament", submitted by Khrushchev in his speech in the Assembly, did not differ materially from those which the USSR had submitted to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee in June last. The real Soviet aim in ensuring the presence of the key world figures at this Assembly, it was obvious, was to utilise the change in the balance of power in the U.N., reflected in the increased strength of Afro-Asian members, to secure the control of the U.N. by winning over the sympathies of the Afro-Asian members. Khrushchev's sweeping attacks on colonialism and the West in general were aimed at making a blatant appeal for the support of Afro-Asian opinion. But in doing this he underestimated the intelligence of uncommitted

leaders. The reforms he proposed in the structure and personnel of the U.N. were intended in fact to paralyse the United Nations action — this also was against the interests of uncommitted nations who see the U.N. as the only bulwark of their newly won independence. Besides, Khrushchev by his bullying tactics and vituperative outbursts against all those who differed from him, only succeeded in alienating most of the small nations whose support he was counting upon to secure the control of the U.N. The image he projected before the world forum was that of a bully and a gangster who wanted to cow other nations into submission by his threats and intemperate harangues. "In the Soviet Union", he declared in his speech, "rockets are manufactured like sausages" and stated that whoever might become victim of the future atomic war, the Soviet Union was not afraid of such a war and would certainly emerge the victor. "If you want war", he said in his last speech before the Assembly, "continue to ask for it and you will have it". In the same speech he threatened that if the General Assembly did not accept his proposals for re-organising the U.N. Secretariat, and for universal disarmament, the Soviet Union would boycott the United Nations. He also made it quite clear that the Soviet Union would oppose any measures taken by the U.N. which conflicted with Soviet interests and expansionist aims. "Even if the decision had been adopted (by the U.N.) by a majority of 99 per cent," he stated in his speech, "we should nevertheless not agree with such a decision. . . . You have adopted this decision and you must make the best of it, but we shall continue to live with our socialist system as we have done so far. Whoever interferes — please excuse such an indelicate but rather expressive phrase — we will sock him in the jaw."

These statements and postures were hardly calculated to inspire confidence in the peaceful intentions of the Soviet authorities, and they naturally antagonised neutral leaders of the young Afro-Asian nations. On the last day of Khrushchev's presence at the U.N., Nepalese delegate, Rishikesh Shah, openly expressed his concern over "all this sound and fury, all these ugly gestures" and warned that Asia and Africa would not be "bullied by gestures of superiority" which were "insulting to our intelligence". Not only that, Khrushchev's wild antics impelled even Sekou Toure, President of Guinea, who has helped the Soviet bloc in gaining a foothold in Africa, to remind the Soviet boss, that the U.N. ideal is "freedom, the right of every people to self-determination" and to criticise him for smothering the debate "with propaganda".

Khrushchev thus failed to sway the delegations of uncommitted nations. All his proposals, with the exception of the resolution on colonialism, were rejected by a large majority of votes in the Assembly. Even in the case of his resolution on colonialism, the obscene fraud of Moscow's anti-colonial profession was demolished when the Philippine delegate sought to extend the resolution to cover the peoples of Eastern Europe. Khrushchev could reply only by removing his shoe and brandishing it at the Chairman of the Assembly while hurling insulting epithets at the Philippine delegate. Khrushchev's performance, to say the least, violated all the rules of elementary courtesy and revealed his intentions more openly than ever.

If Khrushchev failed to tilt the balance of power in the U.N. in his favour, Western nations failed to show constructive statesmanship to meet the challenge of the changing times. The West only contented itself with resisting the Soviet demands for a change in the U.N. structure while admitting that some U.N. institutions were out of date and did not sufficiently reflect the realities of the power positions in the present day world. No one could deny that the Afro-Asian nations should be given adequate representation in various U.N. Committees and Councils; but the Western nations failed to take the initiative in this regard and thereby left it to Khrushchev to champion the cause of the uncommitted nations. Similarly, the Western insistence to keep Red China out of the U.N. also showed their blindness to the shift in the world wide balance of power. In any case, these changes are bound to take place sooner or later in the U.N. organisation. By failing to take the initiative, the West only evinced lack of imagination and statesmanship on its part.

But far more serious was the failure of the non-aligned nations, headed by India, Indonesia, Ghana, Yugoslavia and the United Arab Republic, to practise their profession of non-alignment. They tried to play the role of the peace-maker by indulging in pious platitudes and meaningless generalities having no relevance to the actual realities of the world situation. Instead of facing the facts squarely, they assumed moral postures which were inconsistent with the individual roles each one of them was playing in their respective spheres. The much publicised 5-power resolution introduced by them was a case in point. Mr. Nehru, while defending the resolution, said that it contained "moral force" and was intended to "pave the way for easing tension" between the two sides. The resolution urged the "renewal of contacts" between Eisenhower and Khrushchev so that it would create the proper atmosphere for the solution of world problems. The proposed meeting, or renewal of contacts, was, first of all, pointless in the last days of Eisenhower's presidency and, besides, it showed the utter lack of appreciation of the American stand on the subject as well as imperviousness to American sensitiveness to such a move after Khrushchev's insulting outbursts against American leaders and the President. The stand was therefore as unrealistic as it was ridiculous. Besides, the political climate could

not have been improved by mere renewal of contacts between Eisenhower and Khrushchev as it had been deliberately corrupted by Khrushchev and the communist bloc by their calculated policies and postures during the last few months. In fact, the whole series of crises since last May have been precipitated by the Soviet Union as was evident from the Soviet threat to Berlin, sudden Soviet walk-out of the Geneva disarmament conference and Khrushchev's vituperative attack on the U.N. Secretary-General. The root cause of the world tension lay in the expansionist policies of the communist bloc and the violent and insulting behaviour of the Soviet boss.

But, instead of tackling this root cause, the non-aligned leaders assumed the role of apologists for Khrushchev. They were not prepared to criticise publicly the Soviet policies, nor would they express their disapproval of Khrushchev's indecent behaviour at the U.N. Instead, Prime Minister Nehru laid the whole blame at the door of the West saying, in an interview in the U.S., that the Western nations did not want to end cold war. At the same time, he testified to the peaceful intentions of Khrushchev. Nehru's regard for Soviet susceptibilities was not confined only to the sphere of east-west relations. He not only refused to admit the fact of Soviet colonialism in East Europe, he was even careful in his reference, in his U.N. speech, to China's aggression on India's territory which he described only as a "controversy". In contrast to this restrained attitude, Krishna Menon's subsequent speech in the General Assembly fiercely advocating China's right to admission to the U.N. was very revealing.

Judging from Nehru's statements after his return to New Delhi from New York, it is apparent that Nehru has come back from the U.N. not only with sad memories but also with bitter feelings against the Western nations. He has objected to the attitude of "basic contempt for the neutrals" shown by American representatives at the U.N. This attitude on the part of the American representatives is certainly to be deplored. But it is pertinent to ask whether the Soviet bloc, for which Prime Minister Nehru has so much affection to shower, has not shown worse attitude in their treatment of neutral nations and leaders. At present, Khrushchev apparently shows much regard for the opinions of these neutral leaders because he hopes to use them to further Soviet aims. But it is useful to remember that the whole communist philosophy is based on nothing but contempt for neutralism. Only recently Khrushchev said in *Pravda*: "In the present day world, there is a fierce struggle of two ideologies, the socialist and the bourgeois, and in this struggle there can be no neutrals". Thus the Soviet attitude of contempt stems from the basic premises of their philosophy, while democracy, to which the U.S. basically subscribes, has an innate respect for opposing views. And lastly, another pertinent question that should be raised is: Is Prime Minister Nehru's policy, as expounded at the General Assembly by himself and by Krishna Menon, really neutral or non-aligned?

Notes

Echoes Of Algerian War

OPPPOSITION to the continuance of the war in Algeria is rapidly growing in France. A number of young recruits conscripted into the Army for operations in Algeria are refusing to join or are deserting. There are many who give various types of assistance to the Algerian nationalists. A trial is proceeding at the moment at the Cherche-Midi court in Paris against twenty-five young Frenchmen. The charge against them is that they smuggled money out of France to buy arms and munitions for the F.L.N. columns fighting against the French in Algeria. The accused are not at all ashamed of what they did. They are proud of the help that they were able to render to the Algerians. It is clear that they acted against the policies of the Government, but not for any selfish reasons; they were actuated by the noble motive of helping a people's struggle for liberation.

The Government could have easily ignored these twenty-five persons. But they cannot equally easily ignore a hundred and twenty-one prominent writers and intellectuals who have rallied to their support and declared in a signed statement that it is right for those Frenchmen, who choose to do so, to refuse to serve in the Army or to render help to the Algerians. Prominent amongst the signatories to the statement are: Jean Paul Sartre, the well-known philosopher and writer; Simone de Beauvoir, the young writer and dramatist; Andre Breton, the founder of surrealism; Simone Signoret, the famous actress; and Florence Malraux, the young daughter of the Minister for Culture, Andre Malraux.

The statement asserts that the "absurd and criminal conflict" in Algeria "is principally kept alive by the wishes of the Army." It accuses French militarism of resorting to torture and raises the question: "Are there not cases where the refusal to serve is a sacred duty, where 'reason' means a brave respect for what is true?" It declares in the end:

"We respect and consider justified the refusal to take up arms against the Algerian people.

The Algerian people's cause, contributing in decisive fashion to the ruin of the colonial system, is the cause of all free men."

The Government of France retaliated by forbidding to the signatories of the statement all activity in the State-supported theatre, cinema, radio and television. Teachers amongst the signatories are also deprived of their right to exercise their profession. This action raises the issue of the freedom of creative artists and the restrictions that a Government can impose upon them. The Congress for Cultural Freedom has taken up the issue and registered its strong protest against the action of the French Government. A statement issued in that connection states: "The Congress feels

that these measures cannot but lead to the regimentation of art and thought. To consent to their implementation would be to place in jeopardy all public liberties."

It is to be hoped that the French Government will reconsider the matter and revoke the ill-conceived action. It is further to be hoped that the voice that the prominent intellectuals of the country have raised will persuade it to revise its Algerian policy.

Freedom Of Press In Ceylon

IT is regrettable that not much attention has been paid in the country to the proposed move of the Government of Ceylon to take over the established papers in the country and to entrust their management to a corporation to be set up for the purpose. The device of setting up a corporation will not hide the real fact that in essence it will be the Government which will control the press. When the share capital is widely dispersed, as is proposed to be done in the case of the corporation, it is the agency which sets it up that controls all its operations. In this particular case the agency is going to be the Government of Ceylon. The explanations given by the Prime Minister and others are not therefore convincing.

The press, it is true, should not be under the control of monopolists. The obvious remedy would be to establish and run other newspapers. Shree Lanka Freedom Party which is now the ruling party should have moved in that direction and the Government could have legitimately given it encouragement and facilities. The argument put forward by the Prime Minister, Mrs. Sirimavo Bandarnaike that, even, after the existing papers are taken over and entrusted to a corporation, new papers can be started and a free press can be developed is disingenuous in the extreme. She forgets that the new papers will have to compete against a state-backed and state-managed monopoly. No new venture can survive such a competition.

The Government of Ceylon, it appears, has not yet finally made up its mind on the issue. Constructive and well-informed criticism and discussion may well have some effect upon its thinking. It was, therefore, a wise move on the part of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom and the Press Guild of India to hold a meeting in Bombay to discuss the issue. The knowledge that its contemplated move is regarded by friendly democratic circles as an attack on the valued right of freedom of the press may persuade the Government of Ceylon to abandon it.

Reconstruction Of U.N.O.

THERE is no doubt that in course of time, and sooner rather than later, the structure of the United Nations Organisation will have to undergo a change. The structure was built up fifteen years ago when most of the countries of Asia and Africa were not free. With their emergence as sovereign inde-

pendent nations, a new situation has been created and the structure of the U.N.O. must reflect that new relation of forces in the world. The Security Council and all other organs will have to be reconstructed in conformity with that situation. It is to be hoped that this problem of structural re-construction will be soon taken into consideration and solved satisfactorily with the cooperation of the nations which today enjoy a predominant voice in the organisation. It may be pertinent to remark here that it was Soviet Russia which blocked the discussion of the revision of the Charter when it was last taken up for consideration and that, on that occasion, our country also did not support the move.

It is, however, one thing to suggest such a structural change and an entirely different thing to demand, as Soviet Russia has done, the abolition of the office of the Secretary General and its replacement by the setting up of a triumvirate of Secretaries. According to the proposal made by Mr. Khrushchev, each Secretary in the triumvirate will represent each of the three groups in the United Nations, namely, according to him, 'the Western world, the communist bloc and the neutral nations'. Mr. Khrushchev's suggestion of making the three Secretaries the representatives of the three nation-groups strikes at the very root of the idea of an independent international service representing the interests not of any nation or group of nations but of the international organisation as a whole. No international organisation can function effectively if its officers are to represent their respective nations or groups of nations and to take orders from them.

Mr. Khrushchev is understandably angry with the Secretary General, Mr. Hammarskjöld over the Congo affair. Mr. Hammarskjöld's firm handling of the Congo situation according to the directives of the Security Council and the General Assembly frustrated his attempts to fish in troubled waters and bring that territory under communist influence. Checkmated in this manner, he retaliated by hurling the choicest abuses on the Secretary General. One can understand his chagrin and his rage, but they need not have carried him to the length of making a proposal which will practically destroy the United Nations.

Mr. Diefenbaker, the Prime Minister of Canada, was right when he stated in the course of his speech to the General Assembly that the United Nations would be destroyed by Mr. Khrushchev's proposal for a triumvirate. Our Prime Minister did not also support it. One would have, however, liked his reaction to be stronger and sharper.

Friendship University

THE Friendship University in Moscow began functioning from 1st October. There is so far no Indian student in the University. Originally the authorities of the University proposed recruiting students from India without consulting the Government. This was in clear breach of the Cultural Agreement signed between the Government of India and the Government of Russia. The Indian Government protested against

this action of the University and refused to grant passports to the students that had been selected. Later, the University realised its mistake and has, it is reported, agreed to the selection of students in collaboration with the Government of India.

These are, however, formalities. What is important is to find out the real character of the Friendship University. It was launched as a big propaganda drive by the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. Khrushchev. For some time everybody was taken in by the idea and was disposed to regard it as a genuine effort on the part of Russian rulers to impart education and training to young men from the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Later, however, there have been some second thoughts.

If imparting of education and training is the main objective, why is it not being imparted in the existing institutions for higher training? Why is it necessary to establish for the purpose a separate university? Will not a separate university for foreign students segregate them from Russian students and the latter from the former? Is such a segregation desirable? What will be the type of education that will be imparted? Will it not be of an inferior character when even the passing of a higher school examination is not regarded necessary for admission in the university? Need students go all the way to Moscow for getting such elementary education? Such and other questions are being asked and they have not yet received a satisfactory answer.

Meanwhile a few African students residing in Moscow have thrown some new light on the institution. They regard it as an attempt to propagandise and indoctrinate young men from the backward countries of Asia and Africa. They regard it also as an attempt to segregate foreign students from Russian students. This information given by the African students should be of value in assessing the significance of this new Soviet venture.

Ill-Tempered Abuse

MR. Nehru was neither wise nor considerate when he expressed his disapproval of certain comments of *The Times of India* on Mr. Khrushchev's behaviour at the United Nations and advised the journal to "stew in its own juice". It was a graceless and ill-mannered remark that he made against one of the most respectable newspapers in the country and, we are sure, that in his calmer moments he will regret this departure from good manners.

It is not, however, merely a question of good manners. What is in issue is the far more important question of the rights of a free press in a free country. Mr. Nehru had the opportunity of telling the correspondent of *Pravda* something about them and of asserting that, however much he might personally disagree with the comments of *The Times of India*, the journal had the right of making them, as the press in the country was free. Far from adopting that stand, which he, as a democrat, should have instinctively adopted, he practically accepted his questioner's point

(Continued on page 11)

African Students And Soviet Russia

(An open letter addressed to all African Governments by three African students after leaving Moscow University throws a flood of light on the treatment accorded to African students. The open letter is signed on behalf of the Executive Committee of the African Students Union in Moscow by three African students: Mr. Andrew R. Amar of Uganda, Mr. Theophilus Okonkwo of Nigeria and Mr. Michael Ayih of Togo. Below are published some excerpts from the document.)

IN the name of all loyal Africans, the Executive Committee of the African Students Union in Moscow wishes respectfully to call the attention of all African Governments to the deceits, the threats, the pressures, the brutality and the discrimination with which the Soviet administrators and strategists have so often handled African and other foreign students in the USSR. We further wish to stress the great danger communism is to true Africanism. We hate colonialism and racial discrimination in any form, wherever it may appear. New and dangerous forms of colonialism and discrimination are being fostered by the communist system and by Soviet strategists and are a grave threat to the future of Africa.

The decision to present the case against communism to African and world opinion was taken in secret executive session in Moscow by representatives from Algeria, the Cameroons, the Congo, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, the UAR, and Uganda. Members of the Executive Committee were given the duty of presenting the case when they got out of the Soviet Union.

Our accusations are directed against the communist rulers, not against the friendly Russian people we met and some of whom we came to love. No, we accuse the disastrous ambition of communist dictatorship and its bureaucrats that have brought terror and fear to much of the world. The cases that follow show the true nature of communist "friendship" for African peoples.

The story of Mr. S. Omor Okullo of Uganda has been written in some detail by his friends who remained behind in the Soviet Union and who saw the great lengths to which the Soviet administrators would go to vilify anyone who tried to tell the truth about the Soviet Union. In the first place, Mr. Okullo and other African students have made statements to the Western press not because "they had joined the imperialist camp", as the Soviet propagandists claim, but instead because free opinion is muzzled in the Soviet Union, because the servile Soviet press cannot publish any dissenting point of view, and because the mockery of democracy that operates in this totalitarian dictatorship does not recognize the individual.

When Mr. Okullo was "expelled" from the Soviet Union, African students who remained behind demanded an explanation from Soviet authorities who claimed that Mr. Okullo was expelled for stubbornness, reaction, spying, and for association with Western diplomats. The Soviet authorities could not substan-

tiate these charges; nevertheless they wanted Mr. Okullo out of their country. Mr. Okullo left the Soviet Union and told the world what he saw there.

The Soviet press then came up with the fantasy that Mr. Okullo was expelled for failing in his exams and for immorality. The charge of immorality in whiskey drinking is simply not true. As all of Mr. Okullo's friends know, he never drinks anything but an occasional glass of beer. Furthermore, Mr. Okullo passed all exams he took last year, and this year he had no exams before he was expelled.

The Soviet propaganda machinery followed up their false charges against Mr. Okullo with several letters to African leaders and organizations in an effort to cover up the truth. Moscow Radio officials came to the University offering large sums of money to buy the consciences of African students against Okullo. These officials were angrily rebuffed by students from the Congo, Kenya, the Sudan, Mali, Togo, Uganda, Guinea, Ghana, the Cameroons, the UAR, and Nigeria who knew the truth, and who accused the propagandists of wanting to broadcast more falsehoods to the African peoples to cause still more divisions in their ranks.

Mr. Benjamin Omburo from Kenya, who is still in the Soviet Union, has courageously asked us to tell his story to the outside world. He wrote a letter of complaint on August 19 to the Soviet authorities, but they showed callous indifference.

Mr. Omburo was at a bus stop with a Russian girl when, in Mr. Omburo's words written in the above letter, "a policeman approached us and asked the girl to give him her address. Being astonished at this, I demanded that the police ask me the right to speak to the girl. I explained that I am a student at the Moscow University. I gave him my address and telephone number to check, but I refused (to let) him put questions to the girl unnecessarily. After all, the girl had committed no crime. The girl is a student. The police used force to drag us to the telephone room, took the girl's address and called for more police. The police who came were hostile, primitive, and completely inhuman."

Mr. Omburo's is not an isolated case of Soviet brutality. There was, for example, the case of the Somali student who got into an argument with a communist student at a party. The student mobilized the help of three friends, who made friendly gestures to the Somali student and at the end of the party invited him to their rooms. Unsuspecting, he follow-

ed. They led him downstairs where there was no light, and beat him unconscious.

On arrival, many of us were lavishly welcomed and feted, as a result of which some of us were impressed and made statements and broadcasts favourable to the Soviet Union that we came to rue. Initially a number of us, embittered by the ignoble aspects of colonial rule, had looked upon communism, before we knew it face to face, as a panacea for all our ills. Under such conditions, the so-called Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee extracted promises from African students and took so many of the photographs which were sent to African peoples to sway their sympathies. But the scales gradually fell from our eyes. We saw how the attitudes of the Soviet administration changed toward us if we said "no" to anything, or suggested that everything in the land of Marxism-Leninism was not perfect.

More important to Africa, we saw many and deep forms of discrimination under the Soviet system. Foreign students, especially Afro-Asians, have encountered shocking humiliations. Hundreds of fine Soviet students have been punished for their association with foreigners. At Moscow University Chemistry Faculty, Irina Alexandrevna told Soviet students they should be ashamed of themselves for their intimacy with African people who are "low down in the West" and who had been brought to the Soviet Union to be impressed with the Soviet way of life. It was unthinkable that the Soviet students should allow themselves to be influenced by such people.

There is hardly any foreign student who has not come to grips with the intrasigence of the Soviet administration, especially in his relations toward Soviet citizens. Soviet women married to foreigners are often not allowed to return to their country again. Afro-Asians married to Soviets remain in the Soviet Union. An African student and a Soviet girl in love applied for a marriage license; the Ministry of Higher Education ordered him to leave the Soviet Union within three days and the girl disappeared.

Students from Ghana and the Cameroons received threatening and insulting letters from Russian students. When consulted, the University authorities did nothing about it. Another Ghana student was so ridiculed and disgraced by student hooligans belonging to the communist youth organization, Komsomol, that he lodged an official complaint with the Ghana Embassy in Moscow.

Soviet writers on Africa paint false pictures of the African situation to the Soviet people in an attempt to strengthen their faith in their system. Professor Potechin, the so-called Soviet Africanist, in his book on Ghana, written after a fortnight's visit, painted such a false picture of Ghana and displayed such ignorance of the African situation that West African students came to Moscow from Britain to correct him. Neither the Soviet press nor Mr. Potechin himself took notice of their comments. The same Soviet correspondents freely toured in Senegal, and Mr. Volovinski, in *Vechernaya Moskva* of August 10, compared Senegalese Africans to chimpanzees he saw

at the zoo park in Dakar and described the masses as poor and diseased. Yet the Soviet authorities do not allow visitors into the stinking slums in their country where poverty, disease, and ignorance are rampant. They prepare show cases for visitors who go home without seeing the Soviet Union as it really is. The Soviets export propaganda sheets to every country in the world but refuse free import of foreign literature... "Co-existence" indeed!

The height of discrimination was reached when the Soviet authorities announced their "Friendship University" plans. To build a separate university for Africans, Asians and Latin Americans is an insult to these people; it violates the traditional concept of a university as an open institution for learning, irrespective of race, religion, or origin. We not only see this as an attempt to segregate these students and offer them lower standards of education, but we also see in this further attempt to insulate Soviet people from contact with foreigners.

Look around the world today—wherever communist guns have thundered, they have stayed and exploited. Communism has never been voted freely into office in a single country. The new communist brand of "colonialism" is well-marked in its European satellites. East German and Hungarian courage against Soviet tanks is well remembered. The communist hand in the Congo chaos, and exploitation of it, have been clear.

We consider it our duty to warn African leaders against communism and its dangers. Communism is subtly trying to penetrate Africa; the infiltration is going on vigorously, and it must be countered now. It must be admitted that for long Africa had few encounters with the communists—it is only natural, therefore, that before we deal with them we must study their history, know their methods, read their language, and be prepared to match them. We have had glaring examples of what dangers there could be in dealing with the communists on the basis of their propaganda rather than on the basis of what they really are and what their motives are.

There is little doubt that the communists cherish the disastrous ambition of world conquest. The questions then arise—shall we allow another partition and domination of Africa by foreign ideologies and interests? For the confidence we need to rebuild Africa, must we be led by philosophies inspired from outside Africa? Once this is clear—we do not want communism in Africa; we cannot be loyal to any organization that would pervert Africanism. We require the support of peoples of good will everywhere in our struggle for freedom, for respect, and for happiness. We want support for the justness of our cause, however, and not in exchange for subservience.

We are committed to the fight against imperialism and colonialism, but are we going to do it by allowing the communists to confuse the issue, create more trouble, and cause us more bloodshed? Are we winning our freedom to sell it to the strategists in the Kremlin? God forbid.

A Frightening Fantasy

by V. B. Karnik

IT is a frightening fantasy that Mr. Constantine Fitz Gibbon has evolved in his latest novel *When The Kissing Had To Stop*.^{*} Ordinarily a fantasy is an entertaining flight of imagination. However, when imagination plays with contemporary events and paints a picture which has many elements of probability and the picture that is painted is grim and dark, the fantasy can also have a frightening effect. The fantasy of Mr. Fitz Gibbon cannot be dismissed as a mere flight of imagination. It has such a large element of probability and plausibility that it makes one sit up and think about the current trend of events. The prospect would have been far more alarming but for the fact that some changes are taking place in the Soviet Union and that international communism is no longer as united and as uni-centred as it used to be.

When The Kissing Had To Stop portrays events in the England of middle or late 1960's. The events culminate in the take-over of England by the communist rulers of Russia with the use of a little force but mainly as a result of the wrong policies and bungling and self-seeking of persons who happened to be in charge of her government. One Rupert Page Gorman, who is the Foreign Secretary in a government of the Labour Party which was returned to power in the election, turns out to be the main instrument of the Russian design. He is not a communist and has no desire to be a guileful of the Russian communists. He is nothing better or worse than an opportunist. He thinks he can use the Russians for his own purpose of climbing to the position of highest power. But he is outwitted by his Russian advisers and ends as a prisoner in a labour camp in northern Siberia after handing over his country into the hands of Russian communists.

The story begins with a rally at Trafalgar Square against atom bombs and other nuclear weapons. It is also directed against American bases and the presence of American military personnel in the United Kingdom. An old popular leader of the Labour Party presides over the rally which is addressed amongst others by a scientist, a clergyman and the demagogue Page Gorman. The rally ends in a clash with the police occasioned by Page Gorman's insistence on leading a march to the American Embassy. Seated on the dais at the rally are some prominent figures from the cultural world, writer and an actress.

A few weeks later, the Conservative government is defeated in Parliament and an election is held. The election results in a thumping victory for the Labour Party. There was a wave of popular feeling against nuclear bombs and American bases. Candidates

supporting the banning of nuclear weapons, unilateral disarmament and closing down of American bases were returned with large majorities from many constituencies. The Conservative government resigned and the Labour Party was called upon to form the government. There was, however, a crisis in the leadership of the Labour Party. The leader of the party was opposed to unilateral disarmament and the liquidation of American bases as, he thought, those steps would leave Great Britain defenceless against Russian aggression. He was outvoted and forced to resign his leadership, and the leader of the anti-nuclear bomb movement, Leonard Braithwaite, became the new Prime Minister.

In the government of Braithwaite, Page Gorman becomes the Foreign Secretary. He establishes his relations with the Russians and starts giving them one facility after another. A team of Russian investigators, supposed to be scientists but, in fact, military experts and technicians, is allowed to station itself in London. In the meanwhile, the government has proclaimed its policy of neutrality and has ordered the closing down of American bases and the dismantling of rocket and bomber defences on the seas. This is done against the advice of the Chiefs of Staff and leads to the resignation of the Air Chief Marshal. Later, Braithwaite visits Russia on a goodwill mission and dies in Moscow towards the end of a banquet at which Vodka, which his medical advisers had prohibited, was mixed without his knowledge with the water that he was drinking. Page Gorman then becomes the Prime Minister. He proclaims an emergency on the basis of an obviously cooked up news of outbreak of war between China and America. That gives him an opportunity to arrest all those who might have opposed his policies and his rise to power. Page Gorman is, however, no longer needed by the Russians. He is quietly arrested and whisked off to Moscow to be later sent to a labour camp. His place is then given to one O'Mahony, a British communist of Irish extraction who has all along worked as the agent of the Russians.

The United States of America watches this process of Great Britain opting out of all solemn commitments undertaken under various treaties and agreements and is conscious of its disastrous effects on her own defences. And yet, wedded as she is to non-interference in the internal affairs of another country, she is unable to do anything to stop it. Asked about the possibility of American intervention to save Great Britain from falling into Russian hands, Kormoloff, the successor of Khrushchev says: "They won't. After all they have their own I.C.B.M.'s for their hemisphere defence. Just because the British have chosen to commit suicide, why should they do likewise? No, they will not start a world war for Britain any more".

^{*} *When The Kissing Had To Stop* published by Cassell, London.

The King, the Sovereign of the country, is also aware of the dangerous situation but, owing to the constitutional limitations on his power, he is helpless and has in the end to run away to Canada. The industrialists, the bankers, the trade union leaders, the journalists and others are not in the first instance disposed to regard the situation as serious and, by the time they wake up, the game is already in the hands of the Russians. There is only a small group of earnest and conscious men who can foresee the shape that things were taking. They try to put up some resistance. But it is wiped out and one of them, an aristocratic landlord, a Jew turned Roman Catholic, takes in the end to the hills to continue the fight against the Russian-controlled satellite government.

This take-over of the once powerful British nation is painted on the background of alround social disintegration that precedes it. A number of characters that flit through the novel lay bare the disintegration that has corroded all sectors of social life. There is a complete loss of will. As the author has remarked: "It was this declension of will that had long ago nauseated Page Gorman with political Britain. They talked, and satisfied their appetites, and left others to make the decisions. And the result of this was that they ceased to be subjects and became objects, that they found themselves, inevitably, in false positions, performing actions that were out of character for interests that either did not exist or were irrelevant. Nor was it only in politics that this declension of will had become more and more apparent through the 1950's and into the '60s. It was evident in the private lives of almost everyone he knew—adulterers who not only talked about but actually believed in the sanctity of marriage: pacifists quite prepared to use violence to attain their personal ends: atheistical clergymen not even aware that they had no God: millionaire socialists: semi-illiterate corner-boys accepted as leaders of culture by highly literate critics: drunken teetotallers: expatriate patriots. Foreigners might regard it as hypocrisy, but Page Gorman had long ago recognised this malady for what it was: loss of will". A minor character in the novel cries out in anguish: "We're both lost. Little children lost in this cruel, cruel world". That could as well be said of the British people at that imaginary moment of history.

Another character, the British communist O'Mahony, who eventually takes, on behalf of the Russian rulers, the reins of power in his hands, says in the course of his conversation with the representative of the Russian power, General Nikitin: "You were no doubt brought up to believe that this city of London was lost in a perpetual fog. That is no longer true. But the fog persists in their minds. Foggy minds have led them this far. Let the fog thicken. We can only gain by it. History is on our side, and our task is in reality only to give it a helping hand. The more confused the situation here, the better for us. Because, after all, we are the only people who know exactly what we are after".

That really is the crux of the situation. There is a

welter of confusion in all sections of society in Great Britain as well as in the United States of America. In that welter of confusion there is only one power which is sure of itself and knows what it wants to be done. It is the power of international communism. Its aim in the novel is the conquest of Great Britain. It isolates her from the European continent. It persuades her to distrust the Americans and in course of time to dislike and hate them. It fans the popular feeling against nuclear weapons. It plants its own men in popular movements and guides them from behind. It picks out men who will subserve its interests and helps them to acquire power. It plays on the vanity of men like Braithwaite and Page Gorman and makes them into its willing instruments. It is prepared to take risks and follow unorthodox methods. Having a mind of its own, it easily succeeds in its objective, matched as it is against people who have lost their will. That is the essence of the fantasy that Mr. Fitz Gibbon has created through his novel.

The fantasy may never come to pass. It is to be hoped that it will ever remain nothing more than a fantasy. But it has a lesson and also a warning; not merely for Great Britain but for many other countries. Great Britain has many reservoirs of strength and many built-in defences for the protection of her freedom and democracy. Many other countries of the world, more particularly the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa, do not enjoy those advantages. In their case the fantasy may acquire many more elements of probability.

It is not difficult to conjure up similar fantasies with regard to many countries. To conjure it with regard to India will not require much effort of imagination. The soil for the rise of dictatorship is much more congenial here than in Great Britain. The venture can begin with economic policies. Without much trouble, a plan on the Soviet model can be imposed upon the country. Difficulties in the way of its implementation can be attributed to the manoeuvres of Anglo-American imperialists and politicians and economists and businessmen of other ways of thinking. Popular opinion can be thus inflamed against democratic countries and India can be brought more and more under the influence of Soviet Russia and her allies. Popular opinion can be built up against all those who do not whole-heartedly accept the economic policies. Ministers and others who may hold different opinions will be edged out of office. Soviet Russia may at this stage make clear its preference for certain Ministers and officers by offering various concessions through them and not through others. This will lead to their advance in the hierarchy. Skillful use of patronage can at the same time secure the rise of similar elements in the various sectors of the public life. Pressure can be then built up on the frontiers and utilised for persuading the country to move closer to the Soviet camp. By this time, all avenues of public information will be under the control of a congenial Minister and it can be easily represented

(Continued on page 10)

Free Enterprise And Democracy

by "Aristides"

IN the previous article, (which appeared in the 100th issue of *Freedom First*) the challenge faced by Free Enterprise in India as a result of introduction of the "socialistic pattern of society" was discussed. On the one hand, by exclusion, by displacement and through controls, free enterprise is being squeezed out. On the other, politicians have converted politics into an industry, a means of livelihood, and are building up a "perquisitive society."

The challenge faced by free enterprise, at the same time, provides it with an excellent opportunity. In meeting that challenge, in utilising that opportunity free enterprise can do a great service to the nation. How is this possible?

The primary problem before the country today is rapid and large-scale economic development in order to ensure decent standard of living for all people; equality of opportunity; and gradual reduction in wide disparities of income and wealth.

Economic development requires initiative and enterprise on the part of many individuals in order to meet the needs of the people for goods and services. This initiative and enterprise have been sufficiently displayed by Indians. Otherwise in the last 60 to 70 years, India, in spite of the handicaps of a foreign rule, would not have been developed into the eighth leading industrial nation of the world. Even today, the enterprising Indian entrepreneur has forged ahead in several fields of endeavour despite many obstacles. In the organised sector of industries, during the First Plan, the target of new investment of Rs. 233 crores was overfulfilled. In the Second Plan, by the end of the fourth year, the target of new investment has been met by private enterprise. Scores of new enterprises have been started. In relatively new fields like manufacture of bicycles, within a brief span of about 15 years, the indigenous industry has established itself on a sound footing. Today, practically all components are manufactured in the country itself. Production targets have been exceeded and valuable foreign exchange is being earned by export of the Indian product. A recent report stated that the bicycle industry has achieved its target for the Second Plan well ahead of the schedule and about 20 per cent overfulfilment was expected by the end of the Plan period.

All these facts and trends point out the inherent capacity and willingness of private enterprise to deliver the goods. Can anything more be desirable at this stage of our economic development when maximum production is the aim? Private enterprise, however, cannot be satisfied with the achievements so far. It cannot be complacent with regard to its record. It has to observe its social obligations in a more dynamic fashion. A little clarification is necessary here. Generally it is assumed that the Code of Conduct is some-

thing akin to the Ten Commandments. This is not so. While the basic ethical values in a society are very essential to achieve the cohesion, progress and harmony of society, values like observance of truthfulness, non-violence, etc., can be implemented only by the individuals in their personal life and thus spread by example. But they can not be forced on others even by legislative coercion or the heavy hand of a monolithic totalitarian state.

There are, however, some social obligations whose observance is essential in the context of the changing environment. Such values can be said to comprise a Code of Conduct. For instance, in a city it is essential to stand in a queue for a bus or for obtaining a railway ticket. Unless that is done, everyone would suffer.

The obligations of private enterprise in this sense can be said to be five-fold. Nowhere have these been more aptly summarised than in the Code of Conduct enunciated by the Forum of Free Enterprise in January 1957. These five-fold obligations are towards the consumers, employees, investors, the State and the Community at large. The following portions of the Code of Conduct of the Forum of Free Enterprise bear repetition here:

"Producers and distributors owe it to the consumers of their products that they shall always be of the highest quality and available at reasonable cost. They shall maintain fair measure and guard against adulteration. Customers are entitled to courtesy, promptness and good service and every endeavour shall be made to see that they receive them.

"Employers owe it to labour to recognise that welfare is not conceived in terms of philanthropy, but as a social obligation. Men and women engaged in production shall do so with dignity, honour and a sense of security. Fair wages should be paid for work done. Working conditions shall be as pleasant as possible. Opportunities should be made available for the worker to gain technical skills and better his economic prospects and social status. Procedures should be instituted for the removal of legitimate grievances so that the employee is satisfied that he gets a fair deal. The employers should welcome the existence of stable and democratic trade unions. They should recognise that in the sphere of employee-management relations, as in other spheres, checks and balances are essential for the working out of rational and democratic solutions. They should accept the role of labour as one of creative co-operation and recognise the need for providing increasing opportunities for consultation of employees and their progressive association with Management to help in the promotion of increased productivity from which all will benefit.

"Management owes it to those who invest in their enterprise that they receive a fair return on their

investments, commensurate with the risk they take. At the same time, reserves must be created for expansion and modernisation of the plant and machinery and in their utilisation the Management remains accountable to the investor. Money must also be provided for research. The earning by the shareholder of a fair return or profit by the entrepreneur under competitive conditions and after payment of fair wages must be regarded as a legitimate reward for the risk and the work of promotion and development which the community urgently needs. Certain malpractices have crept into the system of company management. They are to be condemned and should be removed. Hoarding, black-marketing and profiteering are anti-social and evil. Honest business practices can be promoted and encouraged by an honest and efficient administration in a democratic State.

"Professional Men—lawyers, teachers, doctors, auditors, or writers—owe it to those who avail themselves of their services to maintain the highest standards and traditions. They should discharge their duties truly and faithfully, and should always subordinate considerations of personal gain to the larger objective of service.

"We all owe it to the community that we accept our obligations as good citizens. We shall bear our share of taxation honestly. We condemn unequivocally any attempt at tax evasion. We shall actively participate in the promotion of social, cultural and civic improvements. Wealth and power shall not be a justification for vainglory or ostentatious display, but an opportunity for rendering service to the community."

The spreading of an awareness of this Code will result in improving the managerial skill and production in all industries and services. It would, moreover, win for private enterprise its greatest potential ally, viz., the consumer.

In discharging its obligations towards the community, private enterprise will have to undertake social service and promotion of socially desirable activities. At present the political parties in the country get funds from private enterprise, do some social service for sake of votes and for building up the party and the individuals who comprise it. It is high time that private enterprise thought of expending the money through its own representative organisations and take the credit instead of letting it go to the politicians.

This will have a dual effect. In the first place, voluntary activities in society would increase and social life would be more and more outside the pale of the State. It is worth recalling here the words of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan as interpreting the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi:

"More voluntary activity there is, the more real democracy and true democracy it is. And more the people depend on the State, or the Government, the more there is denial or restriction of democracy. This aspect of democracy is what Vinobaji has been placing before the country."

"Ultimately, whatever problem you take up

whether it is a problem of education, or industry, or commerce or science, you reach the rockbottom of ethics. On what kind of ethical values is the whole system raised? What are the values which the individuals in society profess and believe and try to implement in their lives? Vinoba's Sarvodaya movement tackles this basic problem. And that is what Gandhiji also tried to do. He pictured an ideal India in which there would be *sarvodaya*, the welfare of all."

Thus private enterprise would strengthen the base of democracy. There will be another important effect. Today the biggest crisis which every Democracy faces is the crisis of leadership. Political parties, including the monolithic parties of communist countries, have failed to solve the problem of leadership in a multi-central, pluralistic society. This failure arises because of the basic misconception of the need of leadership in the pluralistic society. That need cannot be satisfied by a monolithic party or the State. What is essential is leadership at different levels of society. By its community service, private enterprise will be developing this leadership at various levels and in different facets of society so as to satisfy the requirements of a pluralistic society. Thus, the crisis of leadership in a democracy will be solved.

This is how the challenge to free enterprise can be converted into an opportunity for serving the country and the cause of democracy. There can be no doubt that free enterprise in India will rise up to the occasion, and while making India a prosperous country, will free her from the grip of politics which thrives on self-seeking.

(Continued from page 8)

to the people that the old imperialist powers were plotting against the freedom of the country. In the din of this propaganda nobody will listen to the few voices of reason that may be still articulate. Very soon, the engine of repression will be perfected and they will be silenced. There may be more and more of economic difficulties. They will be blamed on the incompetence or treachery of inconvenient Ministers and officers. When all such discordant elements are removed from the scene, the time will come for removing the hitherto applauded and widely advertised leader of the people from his supreme position. By that time he will have lost all his reliable friends and colleagues and will fall to the ground without any resistance. A man of their confidence will then take his place and India will disappear behind the Iron Curtain. All this may happen and nobody may know of the machiavellian tactics which were used for bringing it about.

At the moment, it is no doubt a fantasy, a mere flight of imagination. The very fact that one can indulge in such an intellectual activity is an indication of the comparative health of the body politic. One cannot ignore, however, the germs of the disease which may in the end subvert the body to alien influence and control. Mr. Fitz Gibbon deserves thanks for inviting pointed attention to that danger through the interesting fantasy that he has created through his novel.

Two Questions To Mr. Khrushchev

(The following is an open letter to Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, Premier of Soviet Russia. It was published in the New York Times. It is signed by a number of eminent Americans, prominent amongst whom were, Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe, author of *Three Who Made a Revolution* and many other books; Prof. Sidney Hook, Professor of Philosophy, New York University; Prof. Daniel Bell of Roosevelt College, Chicago; Dr. William E. Bohn, Editor of the *New Leader*; Arthur Goldberg, Counsel for the American Federation of Labour-Congress of Industrial Organisations and Prof. Richard Walker, author and educationist.)

Dear Mr. Khrushchev:

The Soviet Union has consistently advocated the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. In your address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 23, 1960, you indicated again the Soviet Government's position on this issue. Further, you expressed the desire and willingness of the communist countries to live in peace and harmony with other nations regardless of their political system. Finally, you proposed a broad and far-reaching plan for global disarmament and urged that this plan be accepted by all nations.

As leader of the Soviet delegation to the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations and as chief of state of one of the major world powers which has subscribed to the Charter of the United Nations, you are aware of the following provisions of that Charter:

Its members have expressed their determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war... and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person...."

Its members have obligated themselves "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to ensure... that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest...."

The purposes enjoined upon its members include the necessity of bringing about by "peaceful means... adjustment or settlement of international dispute or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace...."

Its membership is open to "peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the... Charter."

Its principles include that "all members shall refrain... from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state...."

Official publications from Communist China, including *Red Flag* and the *People's Daily*, have repeatedly stated that as long as different political systems exist "war is inevitable". In recent months high-ranking Chinese Communist authorities have been making such assertions as:

"The facts in the past 10 years have powerfully proved that man, and not materials, is the decisive factor in war, that war cannot destroy people, and that the awakened people, through war, win victory as well as progress. This is the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism". (General Li Chin-Min, NCNA

release, June 24, 1960, on the 10th anniversary of the Korean war.)

"Marxism-Leninism must not sink into the mire of bourgeois pacifism... since the armed forces of the socialist countries fight for justice. When these forces have to go beyond their borders to counter-attack a foreign enemy, it is only natural that they should exert an influence and have an effect wherever they go." (*Red Flag*, April 15, 1960.)

Chinese Communist aggressive actions against its neighbours indicate that the quoted statements are firm guides to Chinese Communist foreign policy.

In view of your representations in the General Assembly of the United Nations for the admission of Communist China and the establishment of world order through peace and disarmament we, the undersigned, believe that the whole world and particularly the assembled delegates of the United Nations to whom you have made those representations have a right to know your answers to the following questions:

1. Do you support or disavow these official statements of Chinese Communist policy?

2. If you repudiate these statements, how can you justify your advocacy of seating the Chinese Communists in the United Nations?

(Continued from page 4)

of view. As *The Times of India* has pointed out, "Implicit in it (Mr. Nehru's answer) was the assumption firstly that our comment was 'harmful to Indo-Soviet relations' and that, therefore the Government should do something about it".

If this is Mr. Nehru's position it will logically follow that no newspaper in the country can criticise the actions and policies of Soviet Russia or of Mr. Khrushchev, as any such criticism will harm Indo-Soviet relations. No newspaper in the country will be prepared to accept this position and to forfeit the right of freely expressing its views on the actions and policies of Russia and her rulers, irrespective of the approval or disapproval of Soviet authorities. As *The Times of India* has asserted: "The press must, if it is to function as it should in a democracy, reserve to itself the right to support or oppose on the basis of the specific merit of the question concerned".

It is a spirited and dignified reply that *The Times of India* has given to the ill-tempered abuse of Mr. Nehru. The journal deserves the support of all democratic forces in the courageous stand that it has adopted on the issue of the rights and liberties of a free press in a free country.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

To be realistic he (Khrushchev) remains the man with the instincts of Palmerston, the background of the Inquisition and the training of Al Capone.

—Desmond Donnelly, M.P., *The Spectator*, September 2.

Khrushchev does seem to believe that the Soviet empire which he leads has no equal, that as lord of Sputniks and Luniks he is able to control the fate of the world, and that Soviet defenses are capable at any time of nullifying the West's retaliatory weapons.

—*Swiss Review of World Affairs*, July.

It was to Mr. Khrushchev's piping that Nehru, Tito, Nasser, Nkrumah wended their way to the U.N. Why did they have to wait for Mr. Khrushchev?

—D. F. Karaka, *Current*, October 10

The Prime Minister returned (from New York) to Delhi on Tuesday after what must have been his saddest trip abroad.

—*Eastern Economist*, October 14.

The U.N. Session has cut every one to his size. No nation or individual has risen in stature and many have shrunk.

—Durga Das, as quoted in *New Age*, October 23.

Mr. Nehru has no guts to oppose Mr. Khrushchev.

—D. F. Karaka, *Current*, October 10.

He (Nehru) referred to Mr. Robert Menzies as he would to a member of the Congress Party in Parliament.

—Prem Bhatia, *Times of India*, October 11.

I believe our support to China's candidature has been overdone.....under the influence of Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev.

—"Argus", *Eastern Economist*, October 7.

The U.S. delegate's speech turned him "red" in anger, and the crypto-communist Krishna Menon could not conceal his colour.

—*Radical Humanist*, October 16.

But for the United States' presence in Europe, following the war, Europe by now would have been overrun by the communists.

—Earl of Home, British Foreign Secretary, *Indian Express*, October 14.

The difference between Western colonialism, on whose visibly rapid disappearance none need shed a tear, and proletarian internationalism is the difference between the fate of a Nehru and that of an Imre Nagy.

—R. S., *Hindustan Times*, October 14.

The people who stand for democratic freedom have reasons to feel concerned over the country's defense from external aggression as well as subversion from within, so long as Mr. Menon is in the government.

—*Radical Humanist*, October 16.

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

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

THE STRANGLED CRY
John Strachey

THE UNCOMMITTED GENERATION
David Riesman

HOW I DRIFTED TO SOHO
Anthony Carson

November 1960

86

Annual Rs. 12

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