

From Amritsar To Kerala

by B. K. Desai

FROM Amritsar to Kerala is a long way, but the communists have covered that distance, both politically and geographically, within a short period of four months. At Amritsar the communists were in a mood of aggressive self-confidence and were planning to gear up the party organisation with a view to casting it into the role of the opposition to the Congress. But when the 25-man Central Executive of the Party met at Trivandrum on August 7, the party leaders were in an apprehensive mood and on the defensive. Police firing, political murders and the growing spurt of lawlessness were indicative of the loosening of the party's hold in Kerala. The situation was so alarming that within a few hours of his arrival, together with A. K. Gopalan, from Moscow on July 31, Ajoy Ghosh held hurried consultations with his colleagues in Delhi over the latest developments in Kerala and quickly decided to shift the meeting of the Central Executive from Hyderabad to Trivandrum. The main purpose behind the shifting of the venue was to boost the sagging morale of the Kerala party and to demonstrate effectively party's solidarity in supporting the Kerala Communist Government. The main concern of the communist leadership at the meeting was to devise ways and means to counter what they called "the Congress campaign to vilify the Communist Ministry." This was just a ruse to sidetrack the main issue. The prime cause for their concern was effects of the situation in Kerala on the people and the possibility of the Centre intervening in Kerala to check the growing tide of lawlessness and anarchy let loose by the communists. How to ward off the Central intervention and what should be the party's future strategy in case the President's rule was introduced in Kerala — these were the two questions which were facing the party leaders assembled at Trivandrum.

There were also other questions which were no less important and had equal bearing on the Kerala experiment. Effects of the Kerala situation on non-communist parties all over the country were far from satisfactory. Instead of endearing the communists to other left parties, the Kerala experiment was driving them away from the communists and making them get

together in a united front against communists themselves. Even in Bengal and Maharashtra, where the United Front tactics are in full operation, Kerala has served as an eye-opener to other opposition parties. In Maharashtra the relations between the communists and their allies in the Samiti have been visibly strained and in West Bengal the united front formed at the time of the last general election appears to be braking down primarily because of the disillusionment of the PSP and other parties about the Communists caused by the developments in Kerala. The Bengal PSP has even decided not to launch any joint movement with the Communist Party and has now dissociated itself from the Price Increase and Famine Resistance Committee comprising various leftist parties of the State. Besides, the Kerala police firing and the Kerala-Birla pact have adversely affected communist prestige in the State and many leftist parties have openly attacked the Communist Party for its "anti-people policies". It was not, therefore, for nothing that the weekly *New Age*, in its special August 15 issue, bemoaned the fact that "the Communist Party stands for a united front of all Left forces but the Left parties reject it. It stands for unity in the Trade Union movement and works for it, but they oppose it and work against it. The Communist Party works for a united front on every vital issue concerning the people and the plan. Here again, it is the Socialists, PSP and other parties that prevent mobilisation of the people in a common front."

Besides, the erosion of party discipline and the lack of unity among party leaders has also been causing serious concern to the party bosses. The ghost of Nagy has still been haunting the party leadership in unexpected quarters and the serious ideological controversy provoked by the execution has not yet been stilled and continues to erupt in the most embarrassing manner. The Maharashtra Committee of the Party, at its meeting at Aurangabad, has been reported to have "disapproved" of the secret trial and the execution of the Hungarian leaders. A few active party members — full-timers — in Bombay city, it is learnt, have written to the Central Executive criticising the execution and asking for a firm stand against it and have even threatened to resign from the party on this issue. Similarly, 23 members from West Bengal have circulated an anonymous letter to the members of the Central Executive criticising the party's role in Yugoslav affair and Nagy episode and accusing the party of being "a satellite of the Soviet Union." A prominent member of the party from Bengal, Mr. A. K.

Ganguli, MLA, has resigned his membership of the party as well as of the State Legislature because of differences on policy issues including that of Nagy execution; and one more communist MLA from West Bengal, it is learnt, has been outspokenly critical of the party's policy on that issue.

Leading lights of the party have also added to this confusion and disunity by their incorrigible habit of issuing contradictory statements on various issues. "Above all, individualism is rampant, discipline is slack, the worst offenders in several cases being leading comrades who hold responsible position" — this was observed by the Central Committee in its Organisational Report presented to the Party Congress at Amritsar. The events in the past few months have only testified to its veracity. Nagy execution, Kerala police firing, coalition government in Kerala, invitation to the Congress President to visit Kerala, discussion on Kerala in Parliament and, above all, the notorious Kerala-Birla pact — on all these issues party leaders have been found to speak with different voices. The worst offender has been Dange whose instinctive habit of playing to the gallery and indulging in demagogic pronouncements has very often placed the party in an embarrassing position. It was, however, later reported that Dange was censured by the Party Executive for his indiscretions.

But this lack of unity in the higher party echelon is only a manifestation of the ideological confusion which has plagued the party during the last few years. After their victory at the polls in Kerala, the communists donned the garb of constitutional and parliamentary politicians and at Amritsar they officially endorsed the new thesis of peaceful parliamentary road to socialism. Though this was no more than a shift in their tactics, and yet another attempt to delude the masses by fake professions, there is some evidence for believing that party members were also among the first to be confused. Some members evidently took the professions seriously which has only served to increase the already existing confusion in the party! "After the general elections, the Kerala State Committee adopted a resolution trying to link our successes in Kerala and the formation of a communist government there with the broader issue of peaceful transition. Some Central Committee members

thought the document to be wrong. Some agreed with it. But the Central Committee did not even discuss it." This statement in the Organisational Report coupled with Bhupesh Gupta's strong plea (in the *Monthly New Age*, July 1958) to "fight parliamentary illusions" clearly show how these new tactics have worked both ways and sown more confusion among party members. Similarly there has been a "steady infiltration of alien ideas and ways" and "growing indifference towards the basic ideological issues" prevailing in the party with the result that "some comrades even dispute such basic concepts of Marxism-Leninism as dictatorship of the proletariat being essential for building of Socialism" (Organisational Report). Besides, there is the penetration of "right-wing revisionist opportunism" which has lately become an anathema to the party. The result of all this is the growing tendency among party leaders to "by-pass ideological struggles even when it is necessary." This naturally has left the rank and file in an ideological doldrum and only accelerated the fissiparous tendencies inside the party. Added to this is the large influx of members who have been recently enrolled as a result of the membership drive of the party to transform itself into a mass party but "most of these newcomers remain, more or less, strangers to the fundamentals of Marxism and Leninism." (Bhupesh Gupta, *monthly New Age*, July 1958). The cumulative effect of all these factors is "the growing political and ideological squabbles among the party leadership, which are fast infiltrating the rank and file and have created a situation of stagnancy and suspicion." (*Blitz*, July 26, 1958).

However one should not exaggerate the differences and fissures inside the party. Howsoever much the CPI may be faction-ridden, these wrangles have rarely come out in the open and have never detracted from the effectiveness of the party machine or the organisation. It should be remembered that the party was most faction-ridden at the time of the Palghat Conference in April 1956, but in spite of these inner-party squabbles the party was able to mobilise effectively all its resources during the last general elections. The group rivalries inside the party, centered round a few eminent leaders, have really very limited bearing on the party's policies or programme because, in the larger context of the communist movement, ultimately it is the bosses in Moscow who lay down the strategy and tactics for the party. As such these factions have very little independence to assert themselves and in all major respects ultimately Moscow has the final say.

The "new line" brought back from Moscow by Ghosh and Gopalan was heralded by Dange before their arrival on July 25 at the time of the general strike in Bombay called in sympathy for the Premier Automobile Workers, when addressing a public meeting he announced that the strike was "only a rehearsal of things to come." At the same time the leader of the Communist group in the U.P. Legislative Assembly warned the Government against the "growing unrest of the people facing starvation" and said

(Continued on page 6)

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

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

Single Copy: 25 nP

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

Notes

"Bullies" And Appeasement

IS the Government of India being "bullied" by the Communist Party into opposing any discussion in Parliament of the situation in Kerala? Acharya Kripalani expressed that apprehension the other day in Parliament and as things have turned out, nobody can say that there is no justification for entertaining that suspicion.

When the Kerala issue was first raised in this session of Parliament, the Prime Minister intervened, expressed his strong disapproval of many things that had happened in Kerala and agreed that there should be a debate on the situation. The leader of the Communist Party also expressed his agreement to a debate. It is another matter that the agreement is now being explained away as an agreement to debate the general issue of relations between the Centre and the States and not the specific issue of Kerala. However, that may be, it appeared as if there was a tacit agreement on all sides to debate the Kerala situation in Parliament.

However, when Dr. K. B. Menon actually tabled a motion to secure the debate the Speaker on the advice of the Home Minister decided to send the materials collected by Dr. Menon to the Chief Minister of Kerala through the Home Minister in order to get his version of the facts before giving his ruling. This was done because the Chief Minister of Kerala sent a telegram to the Home Minister and requested an opportunity to place the State Government's views before the house. The net result has been that the discussion on the Kerala situation which was promised on the opening day of the Session could not take place this Session.

This could have been easily avoided if the Government of India had been a little more cooperative. The Home Minister admitted that 'the Central Government had some information about some matters that had occurred in Kerala.' Why was not that information made available to Parliament? On the basis of that information, the Speaker could have easily given his ruling and Dr. Menon's motion need not have been kept pending.

Similar dilatory and evasive tactics were adopted when Mr. Masani's motion over a breach of Privilege of the House came for consideration. Mr. Masani's contention was that Mr. Namboodiripad, the Chief Minister of Kerala, had committed a breach of privilege and contempt of the House by stating in a telegram to the Home Minister that some Members of Parliament had tried to slander the Government of Kerala. Mr. Masani based his charge on a news agency report of the telegram. It could have been easily proved or disproved by placing the telegram before the House. There were demands that the

telegram, which the Home Minister had actually in his hands, should be read to the House. It had been earlier shown to the Speaker and thereby lost its claim to secrecy as a communication from a State Government to the Central Government. And yet the Home Minister hesitated and hesitated and in the end declined to read it on the ground that it was a secret document. It is only because of this attitude of the Home Minister that a clear case of a breach of privilege could not be established that day against the Chief Minister of Kerala.

In view of these happenings, can anybody be blamed if he is led to think that the Government of India is inclined to shield the Communist Ministry of Kerala. In reply to Acharya Kripalani's charge, the Home Minister, Pandit Pant said: "Acharya Kripalani seemed to think that we are in league with the communists and that we and the communists have reached some sort of an understanding in this matter. That is not so." This denial is welcome but a mere verbal denial will not satisfy anybody. What is far more important is action, and that undeniably leans heavily on the side of an attempt at avoiding a discussion of communist misdeeds in Kerala. Can it be that those who start by appeasing international communism find it difficult not to end up by appeasing its Fifth Column within the country?

Dr. Charles Malik

IN electing Dr. Charles Malik, Foreign Minister of Lebanon, to the Presidency of the 13th session of the U. N. General Assembly, that august body has shown its appreciation of the services of that great liberal diplomat to the cause of international peace and amity. Dr. Malik was elected with a convincing majority and had the support of Latin American and a substantial number of West European and Asian nations. He has been a great U. N. figure ever since the birth of that organisation and has always spoken up on behalf of those in Asia who adhere to liberal values in the midst of chauvinism and racialism. A great scholar and professor at the American University of Beirut, Dr. Malik turned to active politics after Lebanon achieved its independence. In the strife-torn Middle East, Dr. Malik has always been the staunch champion of democratic values and East-West cooperation and as such had even to incur the wrath of leaders of some of the Middle-Eastern countries. By his election the World Assembly has recognised the values for which Dr. Malik has always stood.

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Revolt In Occupied Tibet

By S. V. Raju

THE Chinese Communists have always vehemently denounced the "reactionary" Chiang Kai-Shek. Yet unlike Lenin who gave up Tsarist Russian Territorial claims, they enthusiastically inherited Chiang's claim to suzerainty over Tibet. The only difference was that while the Kuomintang government did not attempt to assert its claim over Tibet, the Communists set about to transform this formal claim into hard reality. Tibet, the land of chanting Buddhists, which had never seen an automobile let alone a jet aircraft, whose weapons of war still consists of primitive bows and arrows, was suddenly, in October of 1950, invaded by the marching horades of the Communist "Liberation Army."

While India's parliamentarians debated on the semantic niceties of "suzerainty" and "sovereignty", the Chinese Communists in their classic tradition of suppressing national rights rained bombs and shells at resisting Tibetans. India, at the insistence (it was reported) of Sardar Patel, sent a mild note of protest to Peking, but got snubbed in the process. Finally India's acquiescence to the Red Chinese occupation of the land of the Lamas gave birth to the "Panch-shila" agreement which ensured, with tragic irony, respect for the territorial integrity of the Panchashila signatories even while Tibet's territorial autonomy had been conveniently written off.

• Soon after Mao's legions occupied Tibet, the conquerors expressed pious professions respecting Tibet's autonomy and its own peculiar way of life. As late as 1956 the *Times of India* (Jan. 15, 1956) reported a P.T.I. interview with Dheta Chiting, Communist Governor of Kutyaye, south-east frontier province of Tibet, and himself a Lama. Said the Lama "Mao Tse Tung on his full official authority has... assured the Dalai Lama a unique position with full provincial autonomy and unrestricted religious freedom in the new Chinese administrative set-up."

"Dhela Chiting said that the Indian Prime Minister Mr. Nehru was present when Mao Tse Tung assured the Dalai Lama at Peking (in 1954) that Tibet would enjoy autonomy which no other Chinese province enjoyed in the People's Republic."

But the Chinese communists, as their comrades elsewhere, have never been addicted to the "bourgeois" vice of keeping their promises or remembering their assurances. For them, like truth, assurances are also relative. With cynical disregard of Tibetan sentiments and public opinion outside the bamboo curtain, the Chinese have been ruling Tibet with an iron hand.

All-weather motorable roads have been built connecting Peking to Lhasa. Airfields have been built near Lake Mansarovar. Strategically Tibet is a first class base for the Chinese from which to operate their offensive air attacks in case of future hostilities.

It was perhaps only to gain time that Mao's China was not impetuous enough to shove Marxism-Lenin-

ism-Maoism down the throats of the Tibetan people. But eight years after their occupation the Chinese Communists still find the Tibetans in a defiant mood, whom perhaps they grossly underestimated in terms of the latter's capacity to put up resistance.

A "Work Report of the People's Council of the Tibetan Autonomous Chou of Kanze" covering the period from December 1955 through March 1958 and published in a recent issue of the *Kangtung Kanze Pao*, admitted that on the eastern border of Tibet in the province of Szechwan the people had been in constant rebellion since 1956. This confirms recent dispatches from Nepal and North India that rebellion within Tibet had intensified.

The "Work Report" in the *Kanze Pao* indicated that the rebellion erupted into major revolt at least on two occasions when the Chinese Communist Army was "compelled to wage armed struggle to put down the revolts."

The Communist journal went on to say that it was the Party's decision in December 1955 to introduce land reform in the Tibetan area that sparked the open rebellion.

According to this "Work Report," "They (Tibetans) besieged the Government, burnt government stores and warehouses, disrupted communications, robbed the masses, killed cadres, attacked the People's Liberation Army, and cruelly mutilated those activists,... causing losses to the people in life and property."

Significantly enough, the "Work Report" also recorded that "the rebels have described the class struggle as a 'national struggle' and a 'struggle to defend religion'."

The Tibetan Chairman of the Communist-sponsored Chinese Buddhist Association, Hsi Jao Chia Tso, explained to the National People's Congress in Peking that the rebellions that were taking place in the Tibetan area of Szechwan were the result of dissatisfaction with Communist policies. Comrade Hsi Jao pleaded: "...the Tibetan people are highly conservative towards their native customs, it is therefore not surprising that they are also conservative in their attitude towards new events and systems. Any impetuous and eager attempt for change under unripe conditions only lead to unfavourable results."

A group of Tibetans headed by a brother of the Dalai Lama addressed a petition to the Indian Prime Minister in which they charged that the Chinese Communists had bombed the village of Litang, in the Kanze Chou, killing more than 4,000 Tibetans, practically the whole village. The New China News Agency (official Chinese Communist news agency) in a dispatch on August 7, 1956 admitted that "military measures" had been taken against "the rebels."

That there is unrest in Tibet can no longer be doubted. The very fact that for no obvious reason

(Continued on page 8)

Khrushchev—Mao Tse-tung Meeting

By Roderick Macfarquhar

THE meeting between Nikita Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung in Peking from July 31 to August 3 is one of the major events in world affairs since the end of the last world war. It ranks, I think, with the explosion of the first Russian atom bomb and the beginning of the Korean war.

It marks the entry of Communist China into the international arena as a major policy on all East-West disputes. Hitherto Chinese actions, such as the promise of *five times as many* volunteers as the Soviet Union at the time of Suez were of purely academic interest. But if the undisputed leader of Russia has to go to Peking (the analogy with Selwyn Lloyd's journey to Washington is not completely unapposite) to "sell" his policy towards the West before the summit meeting—then it is clear that recognition or no recognition, with or without a United Nations seat, China is a decisive factor at that meeting.

It thus raises for the Americans a major issue of policy — is it better to deal directly with China or is it better to allow Khrushchev to come to the conference table alone, knowing that any agreement he may conclude will be subject to Peking's veto. But for the moment, that problem is in the background. China has agreed to a summit on Khrushchev's terms and is not attempting to force herself in on the act. That, surely, will come later.

The prime question at the moment is — why did Khrushchev have to go to Peking? The short answer is, I submit, that the divergences between Chinese and Russian policy towards the present crisis had become so serious that Khrushchev had to ensure that whatever he negotiated at the summit was not immediately sabotaged by China.

This divergence becomes clear when one looks at the course of events over the past weeks. Both countries reacted strongly immediately after America moved into the Lebanon and Britain into Jordan. The Soviet Government called on the Security Council to take action against America on July 15, and protested officially against the British landings on July 18. The equivalent Chinese protests were issued on July 16 and July 19, the delay being caused presumably by the vagaries of longitude. The Soviet Union pointedly announced the beginning of military exercises on its southern borders. But then on July 19, Mr. Khrushchev issued his extraordinary call for immediate summit talks — extraordinary not for the move itself, which might be and was dismissed as a brilliant diplomatic ploy, but for its *language*.

In marked contrast to the bellicose language of the previous day's protest on Jordan, Mr. Khrushchev's wording was reasonable and cogent. But above all, his letter was impregnated with urgency, almost panic.

The guns had started firing, he said. The world was "on the brink of a military catastrophe". He might well have been trying merely to put the fear of God

into the West; but subsequent events indicate otherwise.

For while the tone of Soviet propaganda *softened* as it became clear that the Western powers were not going to invade Iraq, that of China steadily *increased* in intensity. While Soviet demonstrations were dying down, the Chinese announced that daily increasing numbers of people were protesting all over China at the Western action. The figure of 64 million was mentioned, and Reuter's Peking correspondent was rebuked for underestimating the number of demonstrators in the capital. Needless to say such demonstrations give no indication of actual public opinion. But they are a conventional Communist measuring-rod for the importance attached to a crisis. Mr. Khrushchev undoubtedly realized their significance. If he had any doubts, Peking's total failure to comment on, let alone approve, his summit proposal would have convinced him that China's attitude was completely different from his own. Indeed his proposal may have been a swift answer to a message from the Chinese capital suggesting strong action.

Certainly the phrasing of the *People's Daily* editorial on July 20, indicated that the Chinese were arguing with a more pacific Khrushchev. It clearly revealed that China considered summit talks unnecessary and weak-kneed. It said that the West had many political and military weaknesses. It had a long war front which could not be defended and which had numerous loopholes. The "imperialists" were outwardly ferocious, but in reality were "paper tigers". Most significantly of all, it added that there was a Chinese proverb that stated that concessions would not yield peace and lenience would encourage evil. Appeasement, Mao was telling Khrushchev, was the wrong policy.

Presumably at this point, Khrushchev, called on Mao not to subvert his policy in this manner; for, on July 25, the *People's Daily* did volunteer approval of Khrushchev's proposal for a United Nations summit on July 28, made two days earlier. But while the gradual easing of the Middle East crisis probably strengthened his hand, Khrushchev's failure to get to the summit presumably enabled Mao to say "I told you so".

Thus, it became imperative for Khrushchev to go to Peking to secure his rear.

The communique indicates that he won his argument, though not without concessions. In it, for the first time, China comes out firmly for a summit conference. She comes out too, in favour of disarmament, ending of atomic tests and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

This appears to be a Chinese concession for there have been a number of indications that China was not too happy about Khrushchev's unilateral renunciation

of nuclear tests; obviously it tended to cut China's chances of joining the nuclear club.

For his part Khrushchev has agreed to adopt a tougher line if his policy should fail. The communique states that the success of a peaceful policy cannot depend on one side alone, and accuses the West of bringing the world to "the brink of a war catastrophe".

It threatens, in the strongest language of the communique, that if the Western "war maniacs" make war, "all the countries and people who love peace and freedom will unite closely to wipe out clean the imperialist aggressors and so establish an everlasting world peace." This is part and parcel of the Chinese doctrine that greater numbers will ensure Communism's, and in particular China's survival in the event of nuclear war.

That the two powers do contemplate stronger measures which would increase the risk of war is indicated by the presence at the talks of the two Defence Ministers.

A further concession Khrushchev apparently made was that appeasement would *not* apply to Tito. The two parties resolved to safeguard the "purity of Marxism-Leninism" and wage "an uncompromising struggle against revisionism, the chief danger in the Communist movement which is clearly manifested in the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia ..."

The strange spectacle of a reluctant Khrushchev following a virulent Mao in the attack on Tito would appear to be over.

If this was the bargain, the problem remains: why does Khrushchev favour a "soft" and Mao a "hard" line? And why does Khrushchev have to take Mao into account anyway?

The answer to the latter question is that during the present crisis and indeed at any time of crisis, Mao might quite easily involve Russia in a major war if he chose. China's bellicose propaganda over Formosa during the current crisis indicated the area where trouble might quickly be started and, with tension in the Middle East at its height, such a spark could lead to a further explosion there, followed by the initiation of a nuclear war.

Such a war would, it seems clear, be a far greater disaster for industrialised, urbanised Russia than for agricultural China. Khrushchev could have no pleasure at such a prospect. His policy of wooing the neutrals has not been unsuccessful; indeed, in the Middle East, he is at last in sight of sapping the whole Western position. Why abandon this policy, especially when summit talks might wring further concessions from the West?

Mao, on the other hand, sees the present Communist position as one of great strength—the "East wind is prevailing over the West wind" — from which Khrushchev should demand the maximum. Wooing the neutrals is all very well; but China's marathon talks with America have brought no concessions. The "imperialists" only understand toughness — let the Communists use it. If war results, Communism will survive, not capitalism...

How then did Khrushchev secure Mao's agreement

to play it his way first? Possibly promises of more economic aid (though there is no indication of it in the communique). Possibly a guarantee to supply China with nuclear weapons in the event of a failure to secure agreement with the West on disarmament.

But the most likely reason is that Khrushchev on this issue just refused to give in — with Mao doing so in the interests of "Communist solidarity". His past utterances indicate he considers this the most important factor in defeating the West. If Khrushchev needed an ultimate threat, it was presumably that in the event of a Chinese-engineered war, Russia would immediately declare her neutrality.

FROM AMRITSAR TO KERALA—(Continued from page 2)

that "the prevailing dissatisfaction would one day flare up into a bloody revolution, engulf the entire state and overthrow the present regime." (*Indian Express*, July 24, 1958). These were not the spontaneous outbursts but behind them lay the new policy of fomenting mass struggles in J.P., Bihar, Bengal and Delhi. In Maharashtra the party has decided (at its Aurangabad meeting in the third week of July) to link struggles for day-to-day urgent issues of the people to the state-wide struggle for Samyukta Maharashtra and thus widen the scope of united front activities in the State. The party's present line has best been summed up by the weekly *New Age* in its August 15 issue: "United mass struggle, mass resistance and concrete action giving immediate relief to the people through every avenue that is possible is essential to win the confidence of the masses and seek their intervention to change the course of Congress policies." Thus the main planks of the party programme are: (1) to counter the so-called Congress campaign to vilify the Communist Government in Kerala (thus depicting the charges against the Kerala Government as framed up by the Congress Party alone) and to launch the campaign against the suggestion for a probe into the Kerala situation. (2) To forge united fronts against Congress regimes in all states by exploiting various grievances of the people and whipping up the anti-Congress sentiment among the masses to isolate the Congress from the other parties thus sabotaging any possibility of non-communist parties coming together in rest of the states and (3) ultimately to link up (1) and (2) by converting the issue of Centre-Kerala relations into that of Congress-non-Congress party relations by popularising the false belief that Kerala is a "new outpost of democratic forces in the country." (*New Age*, August 15). Or as stated in the Central Executive resolution adopted at Trivandrum: "the issue before the people is whether non-Congress popular Government representing first and foremost the interests of workers, peasants, middle class and other sections of the working people will be allowed to function under the Constitution." Thus the communist party has travelled a long way from Amritsar to Kerala. But Kerala is very near Andhra—or, to be precise, Telangana. Will, then, Telangana be repeated? That depends.

The Impact Of Science

By Michael Polanyi

THERE is a small book called *A History of Freedom of Thought* by the Cambridge historian J. B. Bury to which I often turn with a melancholy, affectionate smile. For it evokes in me the times when I believed what Bury believed when he wrote this book in 1913. He was convinced that the age-old struggle of reason against the oppressive darkness of religious authority had now secured, at last, an unshakeable bastion by the establishment of modern science. The book reminds me how at the turn of the century a brilliant group of young Hungarians founded a Sociological Society which was intended to shed the light of science on the structure of political and social life. Science would guide them in the radical renewal of society. They launched a journal with the title: *The Twentieth Century*. I recall the thrill of these magic words which defied the powers of darkness to enter the great age that was at hand for us.

It is curious that these ideas should have evoked such excitement, for they had actually caused the same exhilaration already in our grandparents, and had stirred the imagination of young intellectuals right back to the 18th century. In 1848 the Communist Manifesto had proclaimed the application of science to social action. Jeremy Bentham had taught the same doctrine in his own way before the time of the French Revolution. Though these ideas did not pass altogether uncontradicted, they kept reviving with unfading freshness and they remain, indeed, widely unto this day. Bury's little book has been reprinted many times.

Yet looking round at the political scene presented by this planet today, one may feel tempted to laugh at these great hopes set on science. We hear the modern revolutionary powers appealing to science for the justification of their soul-killing oppression of man. And we may watch with even deeper dismay how millions of people the world over still respond spontaneously to the leadership of these tyrannies and lend moral support to their actions. Modern political fanaticism menaces the whole of mankind by appealing to a superior scientific insight into the affairs of man.

To understand this strange outcome of the hopes set on science for the guidance of human affairs, we must view the role of science within the historical perspective as outlined for example by Bury. We must set aside the practical applications of science to industry, medicine and warfare, which are relatively recent. The tremendous impact of modern science, from Copernicus to Newton, and from Newton to Darwin, was not practical but theoretical. Science shed new light on the universe and on man's position in the universe: this was its liberating force. It endowed the modern mind with a new self-confidence, far beyond the level reached before by the Renaissance and the Reformation. This was the lasting feat of science;

this was the impact which evoked and ever renewed throughout the past two centuries the expectation that science might also put right the affairs of men.

From this glance at the origins of the scientific movement in public affairs, we may glean our first clue for the explanation of its eventual failure. The scientific movement started from the study of inanimate nature and the methods developed for this purpose were not suited to other matters. The ideal of science, as derived from the study of dead matter, is to achieve complete exactitude and conclusiveness. But living things obviously cannot be defined exactly nor be represented in precisely conclusive statements. This discrepancy obscures some important issues even in the study of primitive forms of life, though the damage is usually negligible here. When, however, we proceed to apply the ideals of inanimate science to the study of man, we reduce the representation of man to the lowest possible terms. We miss out then all that deserves respect in man and deprive him of any grounds for respecting his fellow men. Science, representing man thus as a creature governed by greed and fear, may well be taken to suggest that men should behave like animals and that governments should treat their subjects as if they were animals.

This criticism is indeed widespread. We hear voices from all sides deploring the destruction of moral values by the naturalistic interpretation of man. But this can be only part of the truth. For the conception of man as a creature governed by pleasure and pain, first developed in the 18th century, has served as a guide to the great era of reforms which has radically humanized Western society. In England and America Bentham's utilitarianism, based on the calculus of pleasure and pain, has been interpreted for almost two centuries as a philanthropic maxim, directing governments to eliminate unnecessary cruelty and to exert themselves in alleviating poverty, ignorance, disease and humiliation.

No, a materialistic conception of man need not be ruinous and can in fact be beneficent. But it can develop in a very different manner, as it did at the hands of Marx. Morality, Marx taught, was imposed upon society by its rulers in the service of class interests. Bourgeois morality was merely a screen for the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalists. Capitalism was doomed to be superseded by socialism, releasing new productive forces under the rule of the proletariat which would establish a new morality of its own. For all morality was class morality.

Another major offshoot of a naturalistic conception of man was the fierce nihilism of Nietzsche. In his obscure preachings, he exalted ruthless self-love and claimed that the superior individual was a law unto himself. His influence evoked the cult of brute force by which Hitler and Mussolini rose to power.

Here, then, we have our real problem. Why did

the beneficent materialism of the great reformers eventually produce these malignant offshoots which turned the twentieth century into a scene of unending cruelties and tyrannies? The answer is hinted at by a word I have used before in describing these disasters of our time. The word was "fanaticism." The nihilists of the twentieth century were ridden by a passion far more intense than the desire of the reformist to give less pain and more pleasure to their fellow men. They rebelled against every tenet of a society for which they had nothing but contempt. It is ridiculous to identify—as so many writers do—this modern materialism with selfishness and love of comfort. Modern nihilism, modern cynicism, are a venomous protest against the complacency and happiness of bourgeois moral practices. The Bolshevik scorns all established moral rules from an overweening sense of his own moral superiority. And he scorns humanitarian reform likewise because its aims fall far short of his own unlimited moral demands.

And strange to say, Nazism has a similar structure. Hitler's frenzy was pure evil, but his followers' response was moral. Like Marx, they believed that in public affairs power alone was real, and therefore accepted savagery as their patriotic duty.

The question is then why this sudden tide of moral demands on society originated at this particular period of history. The first wave of these passionate cravings was released when religious hopes were blighted by the scientific interpretation of the universe. Social reform could offer this tide of moral passions a beneficent outlet, but the situation was unstable. For a further sharpening of scientific analysis denied the very existence of genuine moral motives, particularly in public life. Appeals to conscience and humanity were now scorned as deceptive clap-trap or as utopian sentimentalism. This is when our modern scientific fanaticism was born. The process was favoured in countries where the absence of a civic tradition allowed people to put their theories literally into action. In such circumstances modern man's moral passions rushed wholly into the remaining, scientifically accredited channels of action: they became embodied in a machinery of violence.

This is indeed what the famous transformation of Socialism from a utopia into a science actually amounts to. It does not change the moving force of Marxian Communism, which continues to lie in its utopian fervour. But this moral passion now operates through supposed scientific predictions, the execution of which is entrusted to a mechanical monster; to a party, a police and an army welded into a single machine. Hidden inside this machinery, the great humanitarian passions of the movement are no longer accessible to argument. Immune against reason and morality, they are made blind, fanatical, inhuman.

The gradual humanization of the Soviet regime that has occurred since Stalin's death may be regarded as a leaking out of the generous passions buried alive under the scientific armoury of Bolshevik violence. Insurgent Communists in Hungary appealed to these original aspirations of Communism by crying for truth and justice.

They died for these ideals and in doing so have opened for us a door to their hopes. The rescue of humanity from the menace of scientific enslavement will depend on such men as they were.

Reproduced from *Quest*

I. C. C. F. NEWS

The Indian Committee and the P.E.N. All India Centre jointly organised a Seminar on Trends in Post-Independence Literature in Marathi, Hindi, Gujarati and Urdu from 2nd September to 5th September. One day was devoted to the discussion of the trends in each language. Mr. Vitthalrao Ghatge presided over the discussion on Marathi literature which took place on 2nd September, Dr. Motichandra on discussion on Hindi literature on the 3rd, Mr. Gulabdas Broker on discussion on Gujarati literature on the 4th and Principal Gurubachan Singh Talib on discussion on Urdu literature on the 5th.

The discussions took place on the basis of papers specially written for the purpose. Papers on trends in Marathi, Hindi, Gujarati and Urdu literatures were written by Mr. Shrikrishna Khadilkar, Mr. Mahendra Kulshreshtha, Mr. Harindra Dave and Prof. N. S. Gorekar respectively.

Prof. G. D. Parikh, Rector of the Bombay University, inaugurated the Seminar on the 2nd and Prof. Mansukhlal Jhaveri, Hon. Secretary of the P.E.N. All India Centre concluded the Seminar on the 5th. Prominent writers of all the four languages took keen interest in the Seminar and many of them attended it on all the four days and participated in the discussions.

Prof. Gangadhar Gadgil, who has just returned after his tour of Europe and United States of America on a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, delivered a lecture on 25th September at the office of the Indian Committee on "My impressions of American Culture". Mr. Chunilal Madia, the noted Gujarati writer, presided.

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan delivered a public lecture on 28th September at the Indian Merchant's Chamber Hall on his impressions of his recent foreign tour. The lecture was organised under the joint auspices of Bhodan Seva Karyalaya and the Indian Committee.

The Indian Committee accorded a reception to Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan on 29th September. It was attended by a number of prominent persons in the city of Bombay.

(Continued from page 4)

Prime Minister Nehru's scheduled visit to Tibet was postponed was significant in the light of reports of rebellion. But when the Communists themselves admit such disorders, then we can be sure that they are in real trouble. Like the Soviet's performance in Hungary the Chinese will handle firmly Tibetan "revisionism;" but the ferment in enslaved men's minds, whether Tibetan or Hungarian, cannot remain inside the mind forever.

Review

Liberal Democracy

by Massimo Salvador (Pall Mall Press, London, Price 15sh.

IN a world where totalitarian ideas have become a dominating factor, a book of this kind brings into bold relief the hope and the conviction of the free world that the cause of democracy and freedom has not been lost. The book is a refreshing and brilliant exposition of a thesis—at a time when it is a fashion to think otherwise—that the ideas of liberal democracy are not only not outdated or relics of ‘decadent bourgeois’ culture, but the only silver lining on the dark horizons of the present and the future. With remarkable clarity of thought and expression, Professor Salvador, not merely restates but derives new meanings from the basic values of democracy and freedom.

Professor Salvador is, however, conscious of the confusion, the immense multiplicity of the interpretations of words “democracy” and “liberty” has created; he is also aware of the inadequacies of parliamentary democracy in practice to which men like M. N. Roy and Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan have made pointed reference. In order to clear the confusion, he undertakes to discuss the various interpretations and tries to find and refocus the basic and common ideas that have dominated the minds of democratic political thinkers since times immemorial. For a correct interpretation of the terms “liberty” and “democracy”, he goes back to the fountainheads of the concepts of liberalism and rationalism. The ideas of Bacon, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Jafferson, Paine, Pestalossi, John Stuart Mill and others receive sympathetic handling from his pen and although all these thinkers have differed from one another in many details, they have served the cause of liberalism and democracy well. According to him, liberty emerges essentially as a method and not as a goal, and democracy as a set of institutions which the method of liberty gives rise to. Liberty as a method is, undoubtedly, a new concept. Though one feels inclined to believe that liberty can be safeguarded as a method, it cannot be overlooked also as a goal since it constitutes a basic human value—a value which can be both, a method and a goal.

To Professor Salvador, the absence of liberty is tyranny, autocracy, dictatorship, authoritarianism, and totalitarianism; hence liberty cannot coexist with any of these. He cautions that a “dictatorship is . . . established not when there is an imposing armed force supporting the dictator, but when the citizens are conditioned to accept the dictator’s will as theirs—when they no longer use their critical faculties.” Therefore, he is apprehensive of thought control of any kind.

With regard to the inadequacies of the parliamentary democracy, the author is sure that these would be eliminated with the progressive broadening of democracy at its grass-roots.

The author assigns a special role to the intellectual.

According to him, the intellectual is not merely a thinker or a “doer”, but above everything else, he is a leader. As a leader, the intellectual is expected to lead the people into right directions, to safeguard the interests of the people against the incursions of the state. It is too often forgotten, he points out, that whatever the function and influences of economic, military and other groups, the dynamic element in human affairs is represented by the intellectual. “Intellectuals do not often do things, but they provide the ideas which give direction to the doers. It may be true that the mental level of the individual in the mass is not higher than that of children who have not yet reached puberty, but even that individual will go in the direction the intellectual has indicated to him.” In order to substantiate his argument, the author marshals forth innumerable examples from history—from the rise of Christianity to the rise of communism.

The author suggests that in order to be effective the concept of liberty must be a dynamic one; it must broaden with the unfolding of times. “The *idea* which moves liberalism is the same now as it was in the past, but the formulation that was satisfactory to Jafferson, Mirabeau, or Humboldt, is unclear now or unsatisfactory.” Hence the need of a progressive change on its part.

According to the author, liberty and freedom cannot continue to exist without a definite act of will, not only on the part of the intellectuals, but also on the part of the broad masses of common men and women.

ADAM ADIL

QUEST

A quarterly of Inquiry, Criticism and Ideas

EDITORS:

ABU SAYEED AYYUB AND AMLAN DATTA

Oct. — Dec. 1958 Issue

FEARLESSNESS AND CIVILIZATION

by C. Rajagopalachari

GANDHI AND MARX

by Leon Emery

STATE PATRONAGE OF ARTISTS

by Tulsinarayan Singh

Annual Subscription Rs. 5 Single copy Rs. 1.25

Army & Navy Bldg.,
148, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Kerala Under Communism

THE Kerala Pradesh Congress Committee, at its meeting on September 9, expressed its "grave concern" at the "rapidly deteriorating situation in the State." A resolution adopted at the meeting said: "there is absolutely no safety for life or property in the State" and "unless there is a basic change in the policies of the State Government and the Communist Party, greater danger lies ahead for the people of Kerala and a complete disruption of society and negation of those values of life that India had always stood for are bound to follow." The Congress Working Committee also, after hearing the Congress President's account of his recent visit to the State, expressed "great concern" over the state of insecurity in Kerala. This view is shared by all non-communist parties in Kerala and newspaper reports of events in the past few months have only served to emphasise the gravity of the situation in that State.

The Revolutionary Socialist Party, which has considerable following among Kerala workers, especially in cashewnut industry, can in no way be accused of being anti-communist. As a Marxian party, it hailed the Communist Ministry as a Government of the Left and offered its cooperation in the beginning. But by bitter experience it has now come to realise that the Communist Ministry instead of serving the cause of the underdog, has only exposed the anti-democratic and anti-people character of the communists. The following are excerpts from an open letter addressed to the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party which was written by N. Sreekantan Nair, Secretary, Kerala Committee of the Revolutionary Socialist Party at the time of the Central Executive Meeting in Trivandrum in last August:

"I am addressing you across the newly-cremated bodies of the two martyrs shot down at Chandanathope. The exact figures of the casualties due to the firing have not been correctly assessed. But six others with bullet injuries are under treatment. Com. T. M. Prabha, Quilon District Secretary of the RSP and Com. Ayyan, RSP member of the local Panchayat — are also in the hospital due to brutal and inhuman manhandling in the lock-up by the police. The condition of the Com. Prabha is indeed very serious and the others will carry the marks of the police raj under the communist regime all through the rest of their lives. A criminal case has been filed against all these injured comrades and another two thousand unidentified persons. The male members of all the houses at and around Chandanathope have taken refuge in far-off places and the helpless women and children are being harassed by the communist police every night. Arrests continue, while the judicial enquiry has been ordered. Any impartial witness who might appear before this court would naturally be incriminated as one among two thousand unidentified rioters and would be beaten up in the lock-up. This is the horrible picture of the culmination of an ordinary industrial dispute in which the employer

changed the name of the concern to deny maternity benefits to women workers, cards to the male yard workers and full work to the grading workers.

"The history of the dispute is really strange. The employer refused to meet the statutory rights of the workers. Even conceding the fact that the concern is a new one, it is the successor of the old company and as such is liable to take into consideration the service and other claims of the workers under the Industrial Disputes Act. He was not prepared to meet out justice to the workmen. He refused to attend five conciliation conferences convened by the Asst. Labour Officer, Kundara. Fed up with shouting of slogans and other forms of protest the Joint Secretary of the Union, after several months of agitation, went on hunger-strike at the factory gate to get those grievances redressed.

"Perhaps, you may be aware of the fact that 95% of the employees in every cashew factory are women. It was a working day and the other factories were functioning normally. So the front rank workers from among the 700 employees of this factory were alone present on the spot and most of them were women. When they picketted, the employer sought governmental aid. A pose of Reserve Constables and the Revenue Divisional Officer were deputed to the spot. They came and laid hands on the women picketeers. The police did not arrest the women, they only attempted to forcibly remove them by dragging them by the hair and by pulling them out by their aprons. This molestation of the women was resisted by a worker and it is said that he was stabbed to death. There was pelting of stones by a few onlookers and they were also fired at.

"There was no lathi-charge prior to the firing and there has not been a single casualty from the lathi-charge.

"The violent mob of two thousand is a myth as only one police officer was admitted to the hospital and he was an I.D. Constable in mufti. A dozen others in uniform had only slight aberrations of the skin.

"Com. Damodaran Pillai, the man on hunger-strike, was lying in front of the gates and he received no injury. Hence, only those policemen who advanced on the small batch of male workers were hurt.

"Even in matters outside the trade union front the communist government has been showing brazen-faced partisanship. The Communist alone were permitted to occupy the Government waste lands all over the State. When about sixty fishermen in Chavara occupied 6 acres of land left over after mining operations, the Reserve Police force was called in to eject them. Their huts were demolished and sold out in auction. They were charged for a Petty case and fined Rs. 10/- each and about 33 of them were proceeded under Security Proceedings (Section 109).

"That the Communist Government would prefer to

put up with the claims of the Congressmen and anti-communists rather than tolerate the demands of another left wing party like the RSP, is evident from their attitude towards the RSP-led Mineral Workers' Co-operative Society. That Society had taken up a shipping contract in F. X. Periera Minerals now under Government control. The Government cancelled the contract and called for fresh tenders. When no outsider came to bid for the job, they entrusted that work to the American Company, "The National Lead Ltd.," on exactly the same terms as was in force when the Cooperative was executing the contract.

"The American Company was more acceptable to the Communist Government than the workers' Society!

"By withdrawing the boat concessions granted to the students of Kuttanad the Government-sponsored Water Transport Corporation stirred up a students struggle. What was a murmur of protest was fanned up by the intransigence of the Government into a country-wide flare-up which led to the declaration of Section 144 in several Taluks and to brutal lathi-charges at 16 centres! Some student leaders were mercilessly manhandled on the public road and in the police lock-up. The arrest of more than 6000 students and the street clashes and stabbing between the communists and the supporters of the student-struggle at half a dozen centres, compelled the communist government to convene all-party conference to settle this dispute. The unanimous recommendation of the conference was rejected by the Government. Later on, the communist government ignominiously agreed to the self-same terms which they rejected earlier.

"They concede nothing without being floored and humbled by mass action!!

"It was in the background of the student agitation and the intervention of the RSP in the students' struggle at Alleppy that the events in Chandanathope assumed political significance in the eyes of the communist government. Because the Revolutionary Socialists could not stand by as idle spectators when the courageous student leaders were being trampled under the booted foot of the Reserve Police, we stepped in to break the prohibitory order under Section 144. This was the last straw that broke the camel's back. The long standing grudge and animosity of the Communist Ministers towards the RSP found an outlet in the complaints of the crooked employer of the Hindustan Cashew Corporation (the erstwhile Swastic Cashew Industries). They directed the officers to take strong action including firing and the police opened fire at the earliest opportunity."

The following specific instances taken from the booklet, *Interference with Justice in Kerala*, published by the Institute of Political and Social Studies, Calcutta, are a few typical examples of lawlessness and insecurity prevailing in the State.

"About the middle of last year, there was a strike in certain tea-estates in Wynad in the Malabar area. When the strikers at the house of the Superintendent of the estate threatened him with violence, he managed to escape at dead of night to Calicut to represent mat-

ters to the Collector and the D.S.P. But these officers did not do anything in the matter. Meanwhile, the leaders of the strike forcibly entered the premises and occupied the house, driving the inmates of the house to the back yard. When the newspapers of Kerala raised a hue and cry and published joint reports of their representatives, the police charged a case against nine of the strikers. The judicial Sub-Magistrate, Vythiri, found the accused guilty and sentenced them to fine. The strikers went in appeal, but the appeal was dismissed by the District Magistrate, Calicut, who confirmed the sentence. But the Government remitted the sentence and paid back the fine!!

"About the same time at Chalakudy a group of nineteen communists illegally trespassed upon the land of a Christian landlord within the jurisdiction of the First Class Magistrate, Chalakudy. When a case was charged, the government applied for its withdrawal. The magistrate, however, refused permission for withdrawal.

"A group of Communists were accused of beating up a Congress worker following the declaration of the electoral victory of Sri Atchuta Menon, the Finance Minister. The case was withdrawn by the Government from the Court on the pretense that withdrawal was necessary for restoring amity between political parties. Nine communist labourers stood charged with dacoity in the Court of the Judicial First Class Magistrate, Trivandrum. During the course of the strike, these labourers way-laid a lorry belonging to the brother of their employer, beat-up three labourers in the lorry, took the lorry to Attingal and locked up the three persons in the office of the Communist Party from 3 p.m. to 10 a.m. the next day. The government sought to withdraw the case on the plea that it was their policy to withdraw cases arising out of labour disputes and that this particular case came within that category. The court refused permission to withdraw the case. The law minister thereupon declared that government had other measures in store to help their comrades. Evidently, he had in mind the remission of the sentence after it was passed by the court of sessions.

"Innumerable other cases against communists and communist-led labourers have been withdrawn by the government throughout the State. Innumerable sentences have been remitted. Most of these cases were for criminal offences, often inhuman acts of violence, theft, intimidation and trespass. The Government has established a tradition of withdrawing cases and remitting convictions against communists. This has created the impression that they (the communists) have nothing to fear, whatever offence they commit.

"During the recent students' agitation, Sri Koruthu, revenue divisional officer of Trichur, ordered the arrest of some communists for criminal conduct. A noted communist leader (brother-in-law of the State Finance Minister) threatened him in the presence of several people that his transfer would be effected within 24 hours if the arrested men were not released. True to this threat Sri Koruthu was transferred as Treasury Officer, Quilon, within the time specified by the communist leader."

With Many Voices

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

Foreign policy these days is not a matter merely of political or diplomatic relations, it is and must be linked to economic relations.

—Finance Minister Morarji Desai,
Free Press Journal, September 13.

The Chinese Communist Government have revised many things since they took over power from Marshal Chiang Kai-Shek. But they have not revised Chiang's map of China yet.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Hindu*, September 5.

If the west intended to kiss Poland, it might do so in the dark.

—Advice given to Adlai Stevenson by a leading Polish official, *Hindustan Times*, Sept. 14.

In our concept of Socialism the attack is on poverty, not on wealth.

—Finance Minister Morarji Desai, *Current*, September 17.

We (communists) get funds from sons of Ministers, but we do not publish them lest the Ministers get into trouble.

—Bhupesh Gupta, M. P., *Hindustan Times*, September 13.

We, in India, know what the communists do. It is high time we learned what communism is.

—Frank Moraes, *Current*, September 19.

The cold war atmosphere and *Jehad* politics exist in Kerala today.

—V. R. Krishna Aiyar, Kerala Minister for Law, *Hindu*, September 9.

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

After all we never had any illusion that all the people are democrats.

—Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, *Times of India*, August 7.

Our worst trait is that we talk against our colleague.

—Finance Minister Morarji Desai, *Indian Express*, September 13.

The Congress in Kerala is now forced to play a new kind of politics by owning up all dead bodies in the State.

—Joseph Mundassery, Kerala Education Minister, *Indian Express*, September 22.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors:

STEPHEN SPENDER

IRVING KRISTOL

THE RISE OF THE MERITOCRACY

by Michael Young

CONVERSATION IN MOSCOW

by Gerd Ruge

THE LAST LOVER

by Lionel Trilling

October 1958

61

Annual Rs. 12/-

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