

The Belgrade Conference

by Adam Adil

THE Conference of non-aligned nations at Belgrade in last month was, indeed an event of great international importance. It was a welcome move in so far as it offered an opportunity to many nations of the world, particularly of Asia and Africa, to come together and deliberate upon the problems facing this tiny planet. Technically it was a conference of those nations who have not formally entered into defense treaties with either of the power-blocs. But, the characterisation of them as "non-aligned" or "neutralist" was rather misleading, since they included also such nations as have made no secret of their sympathies with the Soviet Union and China in the context of the cold war and would actively work against the West in the event of a shooting war. Although there were genuine neutralist countries like India, UAR, Ceylon, Burma, the general character of the participating nations was anti-West; thanks to French atrocities in Bizerte, even Tunisia, the staunchest pro-west country in North Africa, was driven into a position of compromise with anti-Western fanaticism.

From the very beginning, great significance was attached to the Belgrade Conference both by Western nations and communist countries. In view of the general character of the participating nations, the Western press was rather sceptical of the Belgrade verdict on such explosive issues as those of Berlin, Laos and disarmament. But the presence of Mr. Nehru in the Conference was held out to be a promise of moderation, sobriety and objectivity in its deliberations. For instance, Bonn hoped that Mr. Nehru would restrain the anti-Western extremists participating in the Conference. The influential German newspaper "Deutsche Zeitung", expressed a sigh of relief at Mr. Nehru's belated decision to attend the Belgrade Conference and stated: "One can now consider the Conference with less anxiety than was possible before." The newspaper described Mr. Nehru as a "sobering politician" and affirmed that "those who remember the quite and resolute manner in which Mr. Nehru received Mr. Khrushchev's outbursts in the United Nations last year, can rest assured that Mr. Nehru will remain equally resolute with such

different personalities as Mr. Nasser, Mr. Sukarno and Mr. Castro." And also, when on the eve of the Belgrade Conference, Mr. Khrushchev announced Soviet Union's decision to resume nuclear tests, Mr. Nehru's expression of strong opposition to all nuclear tests added to the general hope that Mr. Nehru would give correct lead and appropriate direction to the Conference.

Before making an assessment of the achievements or the failure of the Belgrade Conference, it would be fruitful to understand the mental attitudes or complexes with which the representatives of the participating nations gathered at Belgrade. It must be noted that not many participants identified themselves with the aspirations of the free world. As stated earlier, some of them, particularly Yugoslavia, one of the sponsoring nations who played the host, and Cuba, were positively hostile to the West and, in fact, shared the communist world view and felt politically and emotionally attached to world communism, and agreed with Soviet Union or China on a whole range of theoretical and practical questions. For them non-alignment meant subtly, yet consistently, playing a role which ultimately toed the Russian line. Others saw the world divided into three blocs: the Western bloc, the Communist bloc and the neutral bloc — to them, neutral bloc consisted of those nations which did not side either with the Western nations or with communist countries on questions of cold war, which received aid from both the West and East and which believed in criticising one power-bloc or the other depending more upon the demands of the time than on the legality or morality of the questions involved. To them freedom was not an absolute value to be defended at all times and at all places whether it be in Algeria or Angola or in Tibet or Hungary. In other words, to them, neutralism suggested a sort of double morality, the shades or nuances of which changed alternately like the colours of the chameleon, to suit the moment and the country to deal with, thus making consistency in political attitudes or of principles a fool's prerogative. Yet, other participants at Belgrade adhered to parliamentary forms of government in their own home countries, and would not speak out boldly that similar forms of government should be established in the totalitarian countries.

In view of the mental attitudes or complexes of the participants, the general tone of the Conference, as feared by Western observers before it began, was anti-west. Even Mr. Nehru's sobering influence did not have much effect on fanatical extremism of some of the delegates. From the very beginning, the Conference lacked the sense of priorities. While ignor-

ing the major issues facing the world (and in final analysis, facing them too), certain nations began to sponsor their individual claims: for instance, Morocco pressed its claim on Mauritania, Afghanistan over the Pakistani territory called Pakhtoonistan, Iraq over Kuwait, Indonesia over West Irian. The Arabs proposed outright condemnation of Israel as the imperialist tool and the declaration of all Palestine as Arab territory. All these claims or proposals might have their own justifications; but they led to a lack of sense of direction and unanimity over priorities with the result delegates talked differently. The only issues that drew a measure of unanimity from the delegates was those of the freedom of Algeria, Angola and Mozambique, of the evacuation of Bizerte by French troops, and of the apartheid in South Africa. Exploiting these issues certain delegates began to indulge in general tirade against the West and to magnify the danger of Western colonialism out of all proportions. Mr. Nehru's attempt to remind them that Western colonialism was soon becoming a thing of the past and that they had to deal with the issues of war and peace which might drive the world to a nuclear war, resulting into a total destruction of civilisation, did not have much effect on them. What is surprising that these delegates, while condemning Western colonialism — which, of course, should be condemned — exhibited complete silence over the more atrocious and dangerous colonialism of the Soviet Union and China. Not a single word was spoken on the issue of freedom of the peoples of Eastern European countries or Tibet. They seemed to overlook the fact, quite consciously, that Soviet Russia and China since the termination of the Second World War, have enslaved as many people as the Western countries have freed, and that while communist totalitarian colonialism is extending its frontiers, the Western colonialism is voluntarily liquidating itself.

Again, the participants in the Belgrade Conference could not have failed to realise that the announcement of Mr. Khrushchev on the eve of their meeting that Russia would resume her nuclear tests, was suggestive of Russia's scant respect for them and, in fact, constituted an affront to non-aligned and neutral nations. Yet, they maintained a studied silence over the Russian announcement. One can imagine what attitude they would have adopted, had the United States of America, instead of Russia, had taken initiative in resuming the nuclear tests! Their reluctance to condemn Russia and China for their denial of freedom to millions of people in Eastern Europe and Tibet and the Russian resumption of nuclear tests was a proof that these nations parade their neutralism only to entice handsome economic aid from the West, but are basically anti-West and pro-Russian and pro-Chinese. Or does it mean that the neutral nations mistake Western courtesy and decorous behaviour as Western weakness and Russian crudity and uncouth demeanour, including Mr. Khrushchev's dangling of a shoe in the United Nations, as Russian strength demanding neutralist respect! If this is so, one will have poor notion of

the capacity of the neutral nations to make a rational assessment of the alignment of power in the world.

Even on Berlin question over which hangs the fate of the world, the Belgrade Conference did not offer any constructive solution. Not many delegates upheld the tenability of the legal and moral position of the West on the question of West Berlin and the inalienable right of over two million West Berliners to freedom and security. Even the brute fact of the sealing off Eastern Berlin by an impregnable wall was generally glossed over. On the contrary, certain delegates, notably Tito of Yugoslavia, Nkrumah of Ghana and Seku Tour of Guinea, Sukarno of Indonesia, seemed to justify the Russian stand on Berlin, while few delegates openly advocated the Western stand. In other words, the delegates, by and large, were prepared to sell West Berlin and the freedom of West Berliners to communist dictatorship without any compunction.

The final declaration adopted by the Conference, which urged upon President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev to meet and save the world from nuclear holocaust, was not, in fact, a constructive contribution to the solution of the problem of war. The Russian role in the failure of the last Summit is enough evidence of the futility of another Summit unless ground is prepared through diplomatic channels for a fair measure of agreement on outstanding issues between the West and Soviet Union — which, again, is a remote possibility in view of Mr. Khrushchev's bullying tactics and his ill-mannered threats of nuclear destruction of the West.

It must be, however, admitted that along with its many glaring failures, the Conference has had some achievements to its credit although of a pure negative character. Pressure from Tito and Nkrumah and others for the reorganisation of U.N. Secretariat on lines similar to the Troika proposal of the Soviet Russia was defeated partly due to Mr. Nehru's opposition to it and partly due to statesmanlike evaluation of U.N. role in Congo by her Premier Cyrille Adoula. And also pressure from some quarters for declaration for the recognition of the division of Germany into two sovereign States 'as a fact of life' did not find favour. These negative victories meant, in a way, that the West was not wholly at a disadvantage at the Belgrade Conference.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

Sole Distributors for India:

Four Oceans Publishers Private Ltd.,
33 Marine Lines, Bombay 1

Annual Subscription Rs 12

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

The Mind Of The Electorate

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THERE is no one Mind of the electorate in India even as there is no public mind proper yet in the sense of a system of ideas, attitudes and predispositions in regard to matters of public importance pervading more or less practically all people in the country.

Yet democracy requires such a public mind, at least in regard to matters of paramount public importance like defence, national unity and the major lines of economic interests and policies.

A few suggestions as regards the directions in which the electorate has to be informed (if not educated in a deeper sense) if democracy is to work better stand out as a result of the present writer's experience as a candidate for Lok Sabha for Bangalore City during the last general elections (which may be of general interest).

The first impression that he derived as he contacted voters from different parts of the city and different ranks in life was one of widespread *cynicism*. The voters educated and uneducated seemed to feel a deep sense of futility with the democratic process. They said directly or by implication: "What does it matter to us and to daily life and work and to our burdens in taxes and laws which party or which individual succeeds in being returned to Parliament or the local legislatures? It is all the same. What will be, will be. Things take the usual course as with all governments."

"All governments have to impose taxes and other burdens, direct and indirect. All parties make alluring promises—free schools, cheap food, low cost housing, medicine, social security services for all—in fact, all the glittering promises of the welfare State. Whether the State policy is socialist or not, welfare is promised. And welfare costs money and that means more taxes and the proliferation of the bureaucracy—more and more officers and public servants. In fact public services are expanded to provide jobs to party supporters and the dependents of successful members of legislatures and governments at the Centre and at the provincial State capitals. The greater the benevolence, the greater the burden of officialdom and of taxes!"

The standards of administration have gone down with democracy even as those of schools and colleges have deteriorated!

It is surprising how widespread this feeling was. It was the source of the indifference to the franchise and for such poor voting records in so many places. The holiday given for going to the polling booth is used for an afternoon siesta or playing cards or for visiting relatives and friends in distant parts of the city! Unless a conveyance is provided on the sly, it is difficult for candidates to get the voters to go to the polling booth, as a general rule. The ignorant working classes

are better in this respect. They form lines and queues and follow their leader to the booth—in most cases they are communist- or trade union-led.

This cynicism was reinforced by a sense of *isolation* that caused a sense of frustration and futility. The individual voter felt that his particular vote did not matter, could not influence the decision one way or the other and that the decision lay with big Party bosses moulded by influential charismatic leaders from the days of the national liberation movement with a sacred aura around their heads. The only thing that could influence the decision was big money which too seemed to have been captured by the charismatic leadership—Nehru and his lieutenants from the days of Gandhian glory.

So the average voter, illiterate and educated, preferred to keep aloof from the hustlings on polling day.

Some of them boasted of their superior wisdom in being able to see through the hypocrisy of party leaders and party policies.

When the present writer began to expound the programme of his party, his friend of school days cut him short with the curt and cynical statement that all parties are unreliable and that no party puts its programmes into practice in full. Party declarations are one thing: actual deeds and actual programmes are another.

In addition to these, there is the possibility that the party in power will have less temptations to misuse its power as its principal members would have made their pile and could now in their second term of office concentrate on good administration. The feeling is also expressed by the saying that the devil we know is better than the devil we don't know! The new men if elected will have to first satisfy themselves, particularly as many of them would have spent huge sums on election expenses!

Another line of cynical remark that was heard frequently was— "Why should we vote for you to make you a Big Man flying to and from Delhi? You will then forget us and not see us again till the next elections!" No elected person has visited his constituents and explained to them current policies on the anvil and in the offing. The voter seems isolated and neglected and unimportant in the democratic set-up. The election-season-importance vanishes leaving him lonely and woebegone with no real place in the governmental set-up. And he has a real feeling of grievance. He feels cheated and exploited nullifying the value of his vote.

He feels that all members of all parties are corrupt or will become corrupt when in office and that there is nothing to choose between them on this score.

Though the word "socialism" might have had some

appeal in the beginning after the Avadi session of Congress, today most voters go by the word *welfare* or *lok kallayan*. As for equal opportunity or equal salaries or incomes, no one believes it is possible. They will be satisfied by *betterment* all round, betterment in some tangible degree from one's present position whatever the *'ism* under which it can be secured.

As for the voters being caste-ridden, the present writer found it to be largely true but *not irrefragably so*.

Even the ignorant voter could be led to vote against caste lines if he trusted his candidate. This contravention of caste fellowship was rendered easier where the same caste men competed with each other, one standing for the ruling party and another as independent and a third as candidate of an opposition party. Sometimes even money has served a useful purpose by inducing people to vote against caste feelings!

In this matter, the present writer had an unpleasant experience of seeing educated and moneyed candidates setting a bad example of trying to secure *bloc votes* by purchasing or attempting to purchase the influence of leaders of groups viz: employers, philanthropists, donors to caste charities and religious communal leaders. The voter is set a bad example by educated candidates. His communal sympathies of which he may not be proud get respectability when appealed to by social high-ups!

This reminded the present writer of the scathing condemnation of intellectuals by the French Writer *Julius Benda* in his *Treason of the Clerks* translated into English under the title of *The Great Betrayal*.

The elector should no doubt be educated for democracy. We should now educate our masters, as Mr. Low said in England after the 1870 Reform Act. The elector should no doubt have *information* about the constitution and its fundamental rights and the duties of the citizen. He should be induced to think of the vote as a *sacred obligation*. The democratic system should be made to come home to him as a *sacred mystique*, as a sort of profound religion or human *raith* necessary to improve society and individual opportunities.

Those able to go deeper into social thought should lay bare the shallowness and danger of current Marxism and help to put into circulation deeper and more positive ideals and social goals and help to invest fundamental rights with ethical force and majesty in the eyes of the common voter.

The habit of discussing principles and policies and not mere personalities should also be recommended by example and precept by educated men and candidates.

The ideas necessary to educate the educators should be elicited from the classics of thought and given currency through press and platform and study circle. This way the intellectual will prove faithful to his salt.

Public opinion and a public mind will thus come into being through decades of conscious and devoted

DAG HAMMERSKJOELD

MR. DAG HAMMERSKJOELD has died a martyr's death. He has died a martyr to the cause of the unity and freedom of the Congo and to the cause of the intervention of an international agency for the avoidance of a civil war in a country and its exploitation for their own ends by interested parties. It is the United Nations which has saved the Congo from getting involved in a disastrous civil war and from being the arena of a fight between the two Power blocs. The credit for this arduous task performed by the United Nations must go to its brave and devoted Secretary General, Mr. Dag Hammerskjöld. It was not a pleasant task that he had to perform. He had to stand the criticism of both sides for being firm at one time and for not being firm at another time. These criticisms of interested parties did not deter him and he went ahead doing his job according to the mandate that had been given to him. His fearlessness, his impartiality and his integrity won for him the respect and admiration of all those who were connected with the United Nations and more particularly of the new nations of Asia and Africa. In his hands and under his supervision the United Nations became a more effective instrument of international action for avoiding conflicts and for helping the development of underdeveloped countries.

His death is a great blow to the United Nations and more particularly to its operations in the Congo. It is to be hoped that even after his death the international organisation will resolutely pursue the line of action that he was pursuing and thus secure the freedom and integrity of that unfortunate country. It is further to be hoped that the nations of the world will rally round the organisation and not allow Russia and her satellites to weaken it by imposing upon it the vicious "troika". The United Nations must, if it is to survive and grow, speak with one clear voice as it would not if the Russian proposal is enforced.

Mr. Hammerskjöld's death is tragic beyond all words. Mystery surrounds the circumstances in which the tragedy took place. It is to be hoped that the investigations which have begun will clear the mystery. If it was sabotage, it was a sabotage of a dastardly kind. If it were an accident it was the most unfortunate of accidents. The Secretary-General has died when he was most needed for the preservation of world peace. We pay him our respectful homage and hope that the tragedy will unite men of good will all over the world to preserve and strengthen the international organisation which he served so well and with such devotion.

work on the part of thinkers and voters and candidates. Building a national democratic society is a long term business.

Hungary — The Missed Opportunity

by Thomas J. Dodd

THE Hungarian Revolution presented the Free World with an opportunity—an unparalleled opportunity—to restore the frontiers of freedom to their pre-war limits. Our failure to react to this opportunity was, in my opinion, one of our gravest policy failures of the post-war period.

If we are to reverse the trend of recent years, if we are to force the communist world back on the defensive, if we are to set our sights on the victory of freedom over tyranny, we must first of all restudy the strategy and tactics of world communism and we must draw all the hard, bitter lessons of the post-war era. We must decide where we have erred and where we have failed and what we might have done to avoid this failure. We must conduct this reappraisal without partisan rancour. We must all be brutally frank with ourselves—nothing less than this will suffice.

In particular, I believe that we must examine the lessons of the Hungarian Revolution, that we must try to determine what we did that we should not have done and what we might have done that we did not do. It is imperative that we make this examination because—with or without an active liberation policy—there will be more Hungarian Revolutions.

Who can deny this, after East Germany, Poznan, Budapest and Tibet?

Whether these revolutions culminate in disaster or in the triumphant restoration of freedom to the captive peoples, may very well depend on how well we learn our lesson.

Before the Hungarian revolution, there were many who scoffed at all talk of liberation. Not very surprisingly, those who had lost all hope were inclined to favor some form of military disengagement, combined with a guarantee of the *status quo* in Europe.

The chief accomplishment of the Hungarian Revolution was that it proved that liberation is possible, given a favourable conjuncture of circumstances. Such a conjuncture occurred in the months preceding the Revolution. The Kremlin had been wracked by a series of power struggles; the entire Communist world had been thrown into further disarray by Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's crimes at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party; the weakening at the centre had resulted in a weakening of control in the satellites and the growing evidences of discontent in each of the captive nations communicated themselves like electric impulses to the other captive nations. It is not inconceivable that a similarly favourable conjuncture of circumstances will arise within the next several years.

There are those who read a different meaning into the Hungarian Revolution—who see in it conclusive proof that liberation is impossible and that the West has no alternative but to accept the *status quo*. To them I say that the Revolution was neither a

completely foredoomed undertaking nor a tragic defeat.

The Hungarian Revolution might have been successful if the United States and the United Nations had taken a few affirmative measures. It might have been successful if the Western alliance had not been rent asunder by the Suez crisis.

And, even without moral support from the UN and the West, it might still have been successful. At the time of the Hungarian Revolution, Poland and East Germany stood on the brink. Had either one gone over the brink, the chances are that the entire satellite empire would have erupted in the flames of a super-revolution. The Soviet Army would not have been able to cope with such a situation.

The Hungarian Revolution was a completely spontaneous national uprising. But even if it had been organized and calculated, it would have been a justifiable risk from a military and political standpoint. If we weigh the consequences, the Hungarian Revolution, in defeat, ranks as the most significant victory for the forces of freedom since the end of World War II.

From their own history, the Russians know something of the concept of victory in defeat. Napoleon won the Battle of Borodino. But General Kutuzov, as Tolstoy recounts in *War and Peace*, insisted that the battle, in terms of its ultimate consequences, was a decisive victory for Russia. The outcome was Napoleon's disastrous retreat from Moscow.

Khrushchev was able to crush the Hungarian Revolution by massing his armoured divisions against the people of Budapest. But the revolution, in defeat, exposed the lie of Communism for all peoples to see. Overnight, it converted the Warsaw Pact from a diplomatic asset into a military and diplomatic liability.

The Revolution destroyed for all time the myth that Communist regimes can enjoy at least a measure of popular support. Until several months before the Revolution, the people of Hungary, like the other peoples in the Soviet empire, gave the impression of passive acceptance of their regime. But underneath this appearance of passive acceptance there lay a smouldering hatred. When the volcano of this hatred erupted, one had to look around and ask: "Where are the Communists?"

Most significant of all, the younger generation, the students and workers who had known no other world and who had been indoctrinated since childhood in Marxist dogma—these were in the forefront of the fight against the regime. The Hungarian Revolution has demonstrated, if this needed any further demonstration, that neither one generation nor three generations nor 10 generations can produce a breed of men who will accept as natural and proper the complete

abrogation of human freedom. There is, in short, no such thing as a Communist generation.

Even in defeat, therefore, the Hungarian Revolution was a many-sided victory for the cause of freedom. But the Revolution need not have failed. I am convinced that we had it in our power to assure its success. The trouble was that we were completely unprepared. And there was no excuse for this lack of preparation because there had been ample warning.

Throughout the spring and summer of 1956 there had been rumblings in the satellite countries. In June, the Poznan revolt brought radical changes in the Polish government and resulted in the removal of Marshal Rokossovsky as Commander-in-Chief of the Polish forces. But when the Hungarian Revolution erupted four months later, we had prepared no policy to deal with such a contingency. In consequence, our response to this historic opportunity was laggard, unimaginative, and timid.

Let me suggest some of the things that might have been done with just a bit more foresight, a bit more preparation and a bit more courage.

The Hungarian revolution began on October 23, 1956, with a student demonstration in Budapest in front of the statue of the Polish hero, General Bem. Later the students surrounded the Radio Building, demanding the broadcasting of their points. When the police opened fire on the crowd, what had been a peaceful demonstration turned into an armed insurrection. Fighting against Soviet tanks with small arms and Molotov cocktails, the Freedom Fighters, in several days of fierce fighting, forced the withdrawal of Soviet military units from Budapest and other major centers.

On October 27, the formation of a new government headed by Imre Nagy was announced. On October 30, Prime Minister Nagy proclaimed the abolition of the one-party system and publicly recalled the Hungarian representative to the UN, Peter Kos.

On November 1, Prime Minister Nagy announced Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact, proclaimed Hungarian neutrality and urgently appealed to the United Nations to put the question of Hungary on the agenda.

His message to the United Nations read: "Reliable reports have reached the government of the Hungarian People's Republic that further Soviet units are entering into Hungary... therefore, I request your Excellency promptly to put on the agenda of the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations the question of Hungary's neutrality and the defense of this neutrality by the Four Great Powers."

Nagy's appeal reached the UN at 12.27 p.m., Thursday, November 1. Note this time well. Fifty-eight hours remained between the moment the message arrived and the hour on the early morning of November 4 when the Red Army treacherously struck. But so absorbed was the UN in the debate on Suez, so unprepared were we, so determined to avoid "provocation" of the Soviet regime, that no action was taken on Prime Minister Nagy's urgent appeal.

The text of the Nagy cable was circulated to the

UN delegates at 2.30 p.m. But it was simply one mimeographed document among numerous mimeographed documents, and many delegates did not read it until late that night.

I believe that it was a great misfortune for the Free World that John Foster Dulles suffered his first collapse at this critical juncture. In the early morning of November 2, after an all-night session on Suez, Dulles interrupted the debate to say that he hoped the UN would "not be preoccupied with the Middle East to the exclusion of assisting the state of Hungary to regain its independence." Hours later, John Foster Dulles was on a surgeon's table, undergoing an emergency operation for cancer.

On the afternoon of Saturday, November 3, the Security Council met again to consider the matter of Hungary. It met, to our eternal shame, not at the request of the United States, but at the urgent insistence of Dr. Emilio Portuondo of Cuba. At this meeting, the Yugoslav delegate, Dr. Brilej, stated that negotiations between the Hungarian and Russian governments seemed to be proceeding in a satisfactory manner, that it would therefore be unwise to intervene. He moved for adjournment.

Ambassador Lodge supported the proposal. "We believe," he said, "that adjournment for a day or two would give a real opportunity to the Hungarian government to carry out its announced desire to arrange for an orderly and immediate evacuation of all the Soviet troops."

I shall never be able to understand what motivated Ambassador Lodge to make this statement. For this, let me emphasize, was 48 hours after the receipt of Premier Nagy's appeal in which he made it clear that, far from making progress on the withdrawal of Soviet troops, new Soviet units were pouring into the country.

Just before midnight of November 3, when the tragic dawn of November 4 had already arrived in Hungary, the UN received the text of Prime Minister Nagy's final dramatic message, informing the world of the Soviet attack on Budapest. The Security Council approved a U.S. resolution calling upon the government of the USSR to desist forthwith from intervention in Hungary, and affirming the right of the Hungarian people to a government of their choice. This resolution was promptly vetoed by the Soviet Union. But for the people of Hungary, in any case, the hour was already too late.

Let me suggest some of the things that might have been done—and should have been done.

First, without waiting for the formal communication from Prime Minister Nagy, we should have made it demonstratively clear that we recognized the Nagy government as the legitimate government of Hungary. Among other things, we should have established contact with his government the moment it took office and suggested an immediate appeal to the UN.

Second, between the time of the establishment of the Nagy government on October 28 and the receipt of Prime Minister Nagy's appeal on November 1, we should have lined up support for a motion urging the

(Continued on page 12)

Afro-Asian Council

THE Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Council met in New Delhi for three days from 26th to 28th August under the chairmanship of the President of the Council, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. Apart from India, the countries that were represented at the meeting were: Ceylon, Eastern Turkisland, Japan, Jordan, Labanon, Malaya, Philippines, Republic of Congo (Brazzaville), South Vietnam, Thailand and Tibet.

The meeting adopted the constitution of the Council. The following were accepted as the objectives of the Council:

- 1) The promotion of social, economic, cultural, and political cooperation among the countries forming the Council;
- 2) The eradication of Colonialism, in whatever form it might exist, particularly the eradication of discrimination based on race, colour, vocation, belief, religion or sex;
- 3) Upholding and promoting the fundamental human rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and for self-determination of all people under colonial or foreign domination.

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan was reelected the President and Mr. Yoji Hirota of Japan, Mr. Nusseibeh of Jordan and Senator Tan of Malaya were elected the Vice-Presidents. Mrs. Leela P. Trikamdas was elected the Hon. Secretary General.

The following are some of the important resolutions adopted at the meeting:

ASA

The Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Council welcomes the formation of ASA (Association of South-East Asia) as a step in the right direction to seek close economic and cultural cooperation among Malaya, Thailand and Philippines. The Executive Committee confidently believing that ASA can develop into a force for world peace and stability hopes that other countries in Asia would be persuaded to cooperate with and strengthen the ASA. The Executive Committee also expresses the hope that the ASA will contribute to a closer co-operation between Asian States in the region in matters not only economic, social and cultural, but in other directions also.

ALGERIA

The Executive Committee regrets the breakdown of the Evian negotiations between the Provisional Government of Algeria and the French Government and:

a) deplores the French Government's attempts to partition Algeria and to introduce factors and issues which serve only to deflect the negotiations from

their goal — namely the independence and sovereignty of Algeria including the Sahara;

b) urges that the United Nations and its members expedite the recognition of the Algerian Provisional Government and its speedy admission into the community of independent nations;

c) lauds the humanist approach and policy of the Algerian Provisional Government which guarantees the human rights of all Algerians irrespective of race, colour or creed;

d) reiterates its full support for the legitimate objectives of the Algerian valiant struggle for independence;

e) hopes that negotiations between the parties concerned would be soon resumed and brought to an early and successful conclusion.

BERLIN

The Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Council takes note of the threat to international peace which is posed by the crisis on the issue of Berlin. West Berlin is a city of free men. Its institutions have been freely chosen by its people and there has been peace and prosperity in Berlin for 12 years now.

The action of the East German Communist regime in sealing off their sector of the city from West Berlin and, unlike the West Berlin authorities who permit their citizens to move freely into East Berlin, denying the citizens of East Berlin and East Germany the right of freedom of movement and the choice of employment in West Berlin is a violation of basic human rights, thereby aggravating the crisis. The Committee expresses the hope that the parties concerned will resolve their differences by negotiation thereby averting a threat to world peace.

The Four Power Agreement concerning Berlin signed on the 12th September 1944 and reaffirmed in June 1949, guaranteeing the freedom of movement between West Berlin on the one hand and West Germany and the rest of the world on the other can only be modified by the willing consent of the people of Germany, including the people of Berlin.

The problem of Berlin stems from a denial of the right to self-determination of the German people. The Committee urges the people of the Afro-Asian countries to express their solidarity with the people of Germany and thus assert the indivisibility of human freedom.

QUESTION OF TIBET IN THE U.N.

1. The Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Council expresses its gratitude and thanks to the Federation of Malaya, Thailand, Ireland and El Salvador for their efforts in the 15th Session of the U.N. to bring the plight of Tibet before the U.N.

(Continued on page 11)

A Reply To Mayor Willy Brandt

EVEN in a world which has become hardened to the spectacle of inhumanity, the news and pictures from Berlin have shocked men and women everywhere. Oppression and discontent exist on many continents, and the tragedy, of exile, is a fate suffered by many peoples and races. Yet the events on the frontiers of your city profoundly trouble the conscience of the world. It is one thing for a social order to force its citizens, by the millions, to seek asylum elsewhere. It is still more reprehensible to cut off their escape by means of walls and barbed wire across city streets, to threaten them at the point of bayonets, to shoot at them in flight as if they were runaway slaves.

This is not a matter of politics or ideology or of social philosophy. It is a matter of the most elementary respect for a human right — and one which all the nations of the civilised world are on record as having recognised. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, states this right unequivocally (Clause 12, para. 2):

"Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own..."

We know with what emotion you and your fellow-Berliners have, over the years, watched so many of your countrymen abandon their homes, their livelihoods, and, often, their families, in the East, in order to establish a new and more human existence elsewhere. You have often explained to us how mixed the motives have been. The refugees have not always been running from persecution and hunger: some-

times the motivation was a mixture of fear and hope and confusion. But this fact surely demonstrates that what is involved is a *human* right, transcending all narrowly political and economic considerations. Human beings, no less than nations, have a right to self-determination. Men and women want to have a share in determining where and how they should work, and what they may believe; fathers and mothers want to determine for themselves how their children should be brought up and what their lives should be like; citizens want to share in determining who their rulers and public representatives should be.

Deprived of the right to be able thus to shape their own lives, some men become rebels, others become refugees. Both recourses are understandable human responses to an intolerable situation, whether in the heart of Africa or in the heart of Europe.

As we follow the news of what has been happening at the Brandenburg Gate, along the East-West frontier of your city, we cannot help being reminded of the lines in Pushkin's "Boris Godunov" where the Czar gives instructions to "take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced by barriers... that not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow fly..." For this reactionary and unnatural command is being re-echoed today, and grotesquely enough by men who pretend to speak in the name of the universal liberation of mankind.

Barbed wire and bayonets are not the decor of any new and higher freedom. We shall not cease to insist that all pretensions of all governments and powers be measured against the right of all human beings to a life of freedom and dignity.

RAYMOND ARON (France)
Professor of Sociology at Sorbonne, author, publicist.
JORGE LUIS BORGES (Argentina)
Novelist and Essayist
A. K. BROHI (Pakistan)
Former Pakistan High Commissioner in India
VICTOR RAUL HAYA DE LA TORRE (Peru)
Founder of APRA party, Latin American political leader
SIDNEY HOOK (U. S.)
Professor of Philosophy at New York University
FRODE JAKOBSEN, M. P. (Denmark)
Leader of Danish Resistance in World War II
W. ARTHUR LEWIS (West Indies)
Principal of University College of W. Indies
VICTORIA OCAMPO (Argentina)
Poet and editor of "Sur"
J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER (U. S.)
Head of Institute of Advanced Studies,
Princeton; atomic physicist.
DENIS DE ROUCEMONT (Switzerland)
Essayist, Scholar, Chairman of Congress for Cultural Freedom
LUIS-ALBERTO SANCHEZ (Peru)
Former rector of Lima University
HUGH SETON-WATSON (Britain)
Professor at London University
IGNAZIO SILONE (Italy)
Novelist, editor "Tempo Presente"
MANES SPERBER (France)
Novelist, psychologist, essayist
SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA (Spain)
U. K.)

RAUL MANGLAPUS (Philippines)
Former Foreign Minister
MINOO MASANI, M.P. (India)
MAUNG MAUNG (Burma)
Former Assistant Attorney-General
ASOKA MEHTA, M.P. (India)
Secretary General of Praja Socialist Party
EZEKIEL MPHAHLELE (South African living
in Nigeria) novelist and teacher
JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN (India)
Founder of Indian Socialist Party and now leader of Bhodan
Land Gift movement
DAVIDSON NICOL (Sierra Leone)
Principal of Fourah Bay College
EUGENE V. ROSTOW (U. S.)
Dean of Yale University Law School
MICHAEL POLANYI (Britain)
Philosopher, Scientist, Sociologist, Fellow of Merton College,
Oxford
YOSHIHIKO SEKI (Japan)
Professor at Tokyo Metropolitan University, socialist leader
EDUARDO SANTOS (Colombia)
Former President of Republic of Colombia
EDWARD SHILS (U.S.)
Professor of Sociology at Chicago University
STEPHEN SPENDER (Britain)
Poet, co-editor of "Encounter"
MICHIO TAKEYAMA (Japan)
Editor and writer
ERICO VERISSIMO (Brazil)
Professor of Literature, Writer.

Review

Algeria, the Realities

by Germaine Tillion, Eyre and Spottis-woode. 10s.6d.

MADAME GERMAINE TILLION is a well known French sociologist who has made a special study of the social and economic problems of Algeria. She was in Algeria on various scientific missions from 1934 to 1940 and was there again in 1954. She has written extensively on the problems of Algeria. The book under notice, though a thin volume of ninety-three pages, contains her germinal thoughts on the problems. It is translated into English from the original in French.

Madame Tillion does not discuss in the book the political or the military aspects of the situation. Her attention is concentrated on the social and economic aspects. She has attempted to show what happens to an "archaic" society when it comes in contact with an industrial society by examining in detail the consequences of the contact in Algeria. The contact with France led to the impoverishment of Algeria—and to the decay of the primitive culture which existed there without substituting it by a higher culture. In such a situation, according to the author, half-measures, however well-meant, are not only useless but are harmful. She pleads for a full-scale and vigorous effort to help Algeria grow into a modern industrial community. She thinks France alone can undertake this effort and, therefore, she is for the continuation of the relationship between Algeria and France no doubt on a new and mutually beneficial basis.

It appears to be the opinion of Madame Tillion that the main problem to be faced in dependent territories is the problem of the adaptation of an archaic community to a technological civilization. She is disposed to regard colonialism as a mere scapegoat. She forgets, however, that it is colonialism which establishes the contact between the two and then prevents the natural process of adaptation. The adaptation cannot take place because of the presence of colonialism. That is why dependent peoples all over the world are so keen about the end of colonialism. And the same holds true about Algeria.

Everybody will agree with Madame Tillion that it will be best if a new relationship of cooperation is established between France and Algeria. But it is France which is obstructing that development by insisting upon her outdated privileges as the colonial overlord. Independence, when it comes, will not be a bed of roses. It will bring with it a number of baffling and difficult problems. But the people would readily face them rather than tolerate foreign rule. This is a fact of life which even sociologists should not ignore.

Political controversies often tend to ignore the people. That has happened many a time when nationalists carry on their shrill propaganda in support of their nationalistic demands. Madame Tillion's book

tells us a lot about the people of Algeria, the problems of their daily life—and the dangers that face them. The difficulties that face them are also the difficulties of many other dependent and newly liberated peoples. The book will be of interest therefore not only to students of Algerian affairs but to all those who are concerned with the sociological problems created by the impact of technical civilization on primitive and backward communities.

Satyam Eva Jayate

by C. Rajagopalachari, Bharathan Publications Madras 10, Rs. 6.

This is a collection of short articles written by Mr. Rajagopalachari from time to time from 1956 to 1961. Most of them were written for the weekly journal *Swarajya*. It is proposed to bring them together in two volumes. This is the first of those two volumes.

Mr. Rajagopalachari has written on a variety of current problems. The topics covered by him range from religion and philosophy to land problems and the official language. The articles are arranged according to the dates of their publication, but there is at the beginning the "Contents" which groups them together topicwise so that persons desiring to know the author's views on particular subjects can easily get at them.

As Mr. Rajagopalachari has himself stated in the "Preface", this is not a book "intended for reading from beginning to end". It is a book into which a reader may dip from time to time to pick up the gems of wisdom that the writer has thrown around all over 550 pages of the volume.

There can be no two opinions about the wisdom and foresight of Mr. Rajagopalachari. But along with those two virtues, he also possesses the much rarer virtue of courage of conviction. He has spoken out the truth, as he sees it,—and in saying it he has not cared for the displeasure of persons in authority.

The articles that are collected here are, as the author has stated, "protests against errors—strongly felt protests against great errors". They are the voices of "revolt against the policy of increasing regimentation to which the Congress Party which now rules India has pledged itself". The errors and the wrong policies compelled Mr. Rajagopalachari to take upon himself, at the advanced age that he has reached, the task of building up the Swatantra Party as the party of opposition to those errors and wrong policies. There are many articles in the volume which explain why he "plunged into this unpleasant task of forming a new political party" and describe the principles and policies which it will follow.

In a collection of this type there is bound to be repetition. In stray articles written from time to time for a weekly journal a writer is likely to say some things again and again. But in spite of repetitions, there is in the volume a lot of solid common sense and a number of homely truths told in a bold and frank manner. That makes it a valuable addition to the literature on current problems.

V.B.K.

Without Comment

HITLER & ULBRICHT

IN fact, the similarity between Hitler and Ulbricht is both noteworthy and significant. Disregarding a few minor figures in Albania, Bulgaria and Austria, Ulbricht is the sole survivor of the Stalin era in Central and Eastern Europe: an ungifted, unloved organisation-man, a coolly calculating intriguer, careerist and executioner. We have not forgotten that it was he who, in 1939, after the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, circularised the illicit German Communist Party with an injunction to German workers groaning under the Hitlerite yoke to be friendly towards their Fascist executioners because they were now "friends" of the Russian people, and to "unmask", the Social Democrats who opposed this "friendship" as saboteurs—i.e. to denounce them to the Gestapo without delay. That was Walter Ulbricht then, and so he has remained.

As the man most responsible for all the recent increases in tension, he has threaded Berlin with barbed wire and walls and transformed a once peaceful frontier into a scene of mortal danger and daily incident. He has made life in East Germany more and more like life in an immense forced labour camp, with higher production norms in the factories—"voluntarily" demanded by the workers, needless to say—and the official reintroduction of forced labour, particularly for those who, despite everything, attempt to leave Ulbricht's paradise. As we have already said, it is only in the worst Fascist and communist totalitarian States that travelling abroad—or in Ulbricht's terminology "desertion of the Republic"—counts as a crime. And now it has been explicitly decreed that the penalty for such an attempt to escape should include, after imprisonment, a further unspecified term of forced labour to be served in "detention labour camps". So the Communist Hitler from Pankow has brought back the genuine old Hitlerite concentration camp!

It was at the end of the "forties" that the world was shaken by the news that communist East Germany has reopened the Nazis' old concentration camps and had even established some new ones. At that time we, the workers' paper, published an article which sent the Russians (then still stationed in Austria) and the communists into a white-hot frenzy. It was entitled: "They are dying in Buchenwald again!" Well, the East German concentration camps were later converted and some of them completely abandoned. Now they are back again. Under Ulbricht, people are going to concentration camps once more.

That is the most shocking feature of the disquieting events of the past few weeks. We are not only afraid. We are not only moving even closer to unspeakable changes. Scarcely sixteen years after the destruction of Hitler's concentration camps, we are forced to re-

cognise that there are concentration camps in Germany once more.

Why does Khrushchev tolerate Ulbricht's policies, since they are apparently in direct conflict with his own—or at least with his own avowels? The reason—and this goes for the majority of satellite countries—is that he obviously thinks there is no other way of keeping people subservient and 'friendly' towards Russia. No other methods could prevent the population of Eastern Germany from deserting whenever possible and throwing themselves into the arms of the West German "militarists and revanchists". For Khrushchev, Ulbricht is simply an insurance against Germany and against the German people.

But this is a miscalculation. The tens of thousands of East Germans who defected in the last few weeks before the bar came down were fleeing from threats. They were fleeing from something which later became reality. They would have stayed if they had been less afraid of Ulbricht's regime, and Russia would have derived great safety from a pacified Germany and disarmed, demilitarized zone in Central Europe than from Ulbricht's concentration camps.

—*Arbeiter Zeitung*, Austrian Socialist daily, September 12.

KHRUSHCHEV ON NUCLEAR TESTS

"We shall do everything in our power to make general and complete disarmament a reality, to rid humanity of the arms race and the threat of a new war of annihilation."

—(Speech at the U.N. General Assembly, September 23, 1960)

"The Soviet government is prepared to do everything in order that nuclear-weapons tests be prohibited this very day, that these means of mass destruction be banned and destroyed."

—(Speech at the U.N. General Assembly, September 23, 1960)

"Should any of the states, in the present-day conditions, resume nuclear-weapons tests, it is not difficult to imagine the consequences of this act. Other states possessing the same weapons would be forced to take the same road. An impulse would be given to resume nuclear-arms testing of any capacity, under any conditions, and unlimited by anything. The government which would be the first to begin the nuclear-weapons tests would take upon itself a heavy responsibility before the peoples."

—(Speech before the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, January 4, 1960)

"Should any side violate the obligations (to refrain from testing) to which it has committed itself, the instigators of such violations will cover themselves with shame, and they will be condemned by the peoples of the world."

—(Speech before the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, January 14, 1960)

"The Soviet government stands firmly for the complete and unconditional cessation of atomic and nuclear-weapons tests. Three years ago the Soviet Union was the first of the great powers to propose an agreement to end these tests and in that way take the first step toward the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and their elimination from national armament."

— (Reply to the Twickenham Council for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, in *International Life*, February 15, 1958)

NOT ALL RUSSIANS ARE HEROES

What happened on Monday 4th Sept. night in London may be a small episode in times pregnant with big events and even bigger bangs. Yet there is a deep moral in it, so it is worthwhile to dwell on it in the search for details. The occasion was the first showing of the Soviet film *With Gagarin to the Stars*, which provided for a quick retreat from the limelight, sans glory, of the Soviet Ambassador in London, Mr. Soldatov. It was a strange contrast to the heroism of the celebrated spaceman.

A press release of the Associated British Picture Corporation announced that Mr. Soldatov, supported by no less than 10 of his highest officials, was to attend a public performance at the Regal Cinema, London. Great preparations were made on the spot and the ABPC Board was to greet the visitors in full strength, headed by its directors, Dr Eric Fletcher M.P. and Mr. MacGregor Scott. A mere three hours before the event a new announcement came from the ABPC which stated, "that the visit was cancelled by mutual agreement."

Driven Underground: When first the news of the Ambassadors impending visit became known, an anti-Communist organisation calling itself "Friends of Free Russia" and giving its address in Glasgow, Scotland, had the following leaflet printed which disclosed the names of six Soviet spacemen who had died during Soviet attempts to conquer outer space:

In Memoriam

Lest we forget. On the occasion of this first showing of the epic film "With Gagarin to the Stars" by the British capitalists of the Associated British Picture Corporation to selected members of the Soviet Union's 334-strong London Embassy, we wish to remember those space pioneers who went before:

The late *Alexis Ledovsky* 1957.

The late *Serentyi Schiborin* Feb. 1958.

The late *Andrei Mitkov* Jan. 1959.

The late *Alexis Belokonev*, *Ivan Kachur*, and *Alexis Grachev* May-Sept. 1960

Like Major Gagarin's four uncles, shot in 1917, these men are not Heroes of the Soviet Union. Without their glorious sacrifice the U.S.S.R. could not have achieved by 1961 manned sputniks capable of carry-

ing military payloads so impressive as ten megatons.

They gave their to-morrow that we might have our to-day.

Friends of Free Russia
210 Holme Street, Glasgow

How the news of the enlightening hand bill campaign reached the Soviet Embassy nobody knows, but the effect was electrifying. The Ambassador's appointment at the Regal Cinema was cancelled and, instead, he went with his entourage to a small private cinema with only 34 seats somewhere in the cellars of Dean Street...

— *FCI Bulletin*, London

(AFRO-ASIAN COUNCIL—Continued from page 7)

The Executive Committee also desires to express its appreciation of the initiative taken by the Federation of Malaya along with Thailand and Philippines to have the question of Tibet placed on the agenda of the 16th Session of the U.N. and expresses the hope that other countries will give the sponsors their positive support when the resolution on Tibet comes up for discussion.

2. The Executive Committee is of opinion that in view of the resolution of the U.N. on the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the question of self-determination for Tibet should be raised in the U.N. The Council requests the sponsors to use their best endeavours to include this aspect of the question in the resolution they propose.

A resolution on Sino-Indian Border Dispute was also passed. It was proposed by Malaya, Philippines, South Vietnam and Thailand. It reads as follows:

The Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Council considers the incursions of Communist China into the territories traditionally belonging to India as a matter of grave concern not only to India but also to all the neighbouring Asian countries. These incursions reveal the expansionist and aggressive nature of the Communist Chinese designs which poses a real threat to the security and integrity of Asian nations.

The Committee recognizes and upholds the natural, historical and legal validity of India's position on the issue and hopes that the two countries concerned will negotiate and solve the dispute amicably.

The incidents on the Indian frontiers underscore the need for the countries of South and South East Asia to take concerted measures to face the common threat.

The Executive Committee decided to send Mr. Purshottam Trikamdas to New York so that he could be present during the 16th Session of the U.N. Assembly and help members when questions like those of Tibet and Algeria came up for discussion.

The Committee also decided to send a cable to Marshal Tito requesting the Neutral Nations Summit Conference to take up for consideration the right to self-determination of the people of Tibet. A cable was accordingly sent by the President of the Council, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan.

(HUNGARY - Continued from page 6)

immediate dispatch of a corps of UN observers to Hungary, and this resolution should have been introduced in the General Assembly within hours of the receipt of Premier Nagy's communication.

Third, until the arrival of these observers, the ambassadors of the UN countries in Budapest should have been asked to serve as *pro tem* observers.

Fourth, Secretary-General Hammarskjöld should have been notified in advance that any communication received from the Nagy government was to be marked "urgent" and instantaneously transmitted to the members of the Security Council.

Fifth, reacting to the repeated report of Soviet troop movements, we should have let it be known that any attempt by the Red Army to reinstate Hungary and depose the lawfully elected government of Premier Nagy would be looked upon with the gravest concern by the United States government; that the State Department would immediately respond to such aggression by demanding the imposition of the most stringent economic and diplomatic sanctions; that, beyond this, the consequences, including the military consequences, were completely unpredictable.

Sixth, as a routine defensive precaution at a time of crisis, we should have placed the United States Forces in Europe on alert and asked for an emergency session of the NATO Council.

How different the world situation would be today if we had pursued the course of courage in Hungary!

The liberation of Hungary would, of course, have made the liberation of the other satellite countries unavoidable. There are many who say that Khrushchev would have risked war rather than accept this prospect.

I challenge this assertion. The Kremlin has always backed down from a showdown. At the time of Hungary, it would have shunned a general war like the plague. It would have been impossible to conceive of circumstances more disadvantageous from its own point of view.

There is clear evidence that, when the Red Army withdrew its forces after the first round of battle in Budapest, the Kremlin was divided and uncertain about the course to be followed. In his speech in Budapest on December 2, 1959, Premier Khrushchev admitted frankly that some of his Kremlin cronies had opposed his decision to use the Red Army to crush the revolution. They opposed it because they feared both Western reaction to intervention and the potential impact of intervention on their own Empire. Emboldened by Western assurances, however, Khrushchev and the interventionists won the day in the councils of the Politbureau.

For a period of four years, from the death of Stalin until the events in Hungary, the Free World had with- in its grasp an unparalleled opportunity to seize the political offensive, to force communism back with measures short of war, to recreate the political equilibrium in Europe which is essential to a stable peace. But we did nothing. We played the Cold War according to the communist rules.

I have said there will be more Hungaries. Of this I am certain. In the evolution of the hatred of tyranny, there is a point where it becomes a blind and all-possessing passion. And no regime in history has been so outstandingly successful in fostering this special breed of hatred as has the communist regime in Russia and its satellite regimes in other countries.

There will be more Hungaries because of this hatred, because of the eternal will to freedom, because totalitarian societies do undergo crises, and also because any crisis in a totalitarian society tends to be a major crisis.

We must ask ourselves "What will we do next time?" But we must ask ourselves another question: "What practical measures can we take to encourage the spirit of resistance among the captive peoples, and to keep alive the hope of liberation and faith in the Free World?"

There are some who say that the development of nuclear weapons makes it necessary for the Free World, as a matter of self-preservation, to abandon "liberation" as a reckless pipe-dream. The converse is true.

The emergence of a nuclear stalemate means that we do not now possess, or will not possess in the near future, the deterrent of nuclear superiority. Given the massive superiority of the Soviet Union in conventional forces, this creates a highly dangerous situation. In this critical period upon which we are now entering, there is only one serious deterrent available to us—the continuing spirit of resistance of the captive people. It becomes more necessary than ever before, therefore, that we encourage the will to liberation and support it by every practical means.

The crimes of Soviet imperialism must be spread on the record at every appropriate opportunity. Our propaganda must be sharpened. Our diplomacy must seek to raise the issue of the captive nations at every session of the UN and at every major diplomatic conference. NATO's ground forces in Europe must be strengthened. A Freedom Academy must be created, where representatives of the Free World receive concentrated training in the science of counteraction to Soviet aggression—yes, and in the science of liberation. But above all we must persuade the captive peoples of Europe, by our actions, that we shall never reconcile ourselves to their subjugation.

And it would be enormously helpful if we could also persuade them that we have learned the lessons of the Hungarian revolution.

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.