

Significance Of Berlin

by B. K. Desai

Mr. Desai has just returned after a three-week tour of West Germany in the company of three other prominent journalists of Bombay. The tour was organised by the Government of West Germany.

A WEEK before our arrival in West Berlin, the city was convulsed by the sudden explosion of an orgy of riots in which, for four days, thousands of West Berliners hurled rocks at East Berlin border guards, stoned Russian soldiers and shouted insults at American troops. The cause of this sudden outburst of violence was the tragic death of an eighteen-year-old East Berliner, Peter Fechter, who, while trying to cross the Wall, was shot by East Berlin border guards. Wounded by the bullets, he fell down from the Wall and was allowed slowly to bleed to death in full view of the crowd gathered on the Western side of the Wall who could do nothing but hopelessly watch his slow untended death from his wounds. Fechter was the fiftieth East German known to have been killed while trying to escape across the Wall. But the horrifying manner of his death suddenly spotlighted, for the West Berliners, the inhuman misery in which their 16 million countrymen were living behind the Wall, and the utter hopelessness of their own situation in the face of the brute power that was determined to retain its stranglehold over their countrymen in the Eastern zone.

Fechter's death also exposed the flabbiness of the Western position in Berlin. The American troops at the Checkpoint Charlie could have, if permitted, given medical aid to Fechter who was moaning helplessly for about half an hour before he succumbed to his injuries. But the fear of possible consequences of such an act rendered the American military authorities on the spot powerless. They refused, in spite of repeated requests from West Berliners, to extend the dying boy any medical assistance. This exaggerated fear of provoking the Soviet authorities into retaliatory measures has always paralysed the Western powers at critical times and put them on the defensive. This has forced them to reduce their commitments in Berlin to the barest minimum and given the Soviets a free hand to accomplish their designs of piecemeal annexation of Berlin into the Soviet bloc.

The erection of the Wall by the East German authorities was a blatantly illegal act violating the international agreements that govern Berlin—both East and West—as a single city and guarantee freedom of movement within Berlin and between Berlin and the rest of Germany. There were indications, in the middle of August last year, when the Wall was erected, that the East German Government was afraid of counter-action from the West and was not sure that it would be allowed to put up the Wall. But nothing whatsoever happened, the Western powers silently watched the Wall going up and later on being enforced by Ulbricht's soldiers.

It was the considered view of many knowledgeable persons in West Germany that if the West had firmly resisted the communist attempt to erect the Wall on the 13th August, last year, the East Germans would not have proceeded with their plan to seal off the Eastern sector of the city. By this refusal to act, the West lost the final chance to treat Berlin as a single entity and produced a crisis of confidence among the West Germans, which was reflected in the results of the last General Elections in which the ruling Christian Democratic Party lost its majority.

The West, no doubt, is firmly committed to preserve the present status of West Berlin undisturbed and no one doubts that it would go to any extent to resist any direct attempt to destroy freedom of West Berlin if it comes to a showdown. But it singularly lacks any plan or strategy calculated to thwart the salami tactics of the communists—tactics of attaining their objective slice by slice and not in one massive crunch. It has failed to provide any answer to the Soviet tactics of making piecemeal unilateral changes in the status of Berlin. Consequently, the Soviets have succeeded in outmanoeuvring the West in Berlin and, as a result, the position of the West in Berlin today remains firm, but diminishing.

The Soviets, of course, do not aim at squeezing the West out of Berlin so soon. Their immediate objective is the removal of East Berlin from four power control and its total annexation into the Soviet zone and the complete severance of all channels of communications between the two sectors of the city. Another Soviet objective is, after establishing unilateral control over East Berlin, to assert their rights in West Berlin. The erection of the Wall was a major step in that direction. Today the East Berliners cannot enter the Western sector, and from the Western sector only those who are still working in the other sector are allowed to visit East Berlin. Though West Germans and foreigners still have free access to both the parts of the city. When they sign a peace treaty with

Ulbricht, (and many in West Germany believe this to be likely very soon), the Soviets would, at least for some time, leave the Western access routes to West Berlin undisturbed. But they would use this new opportunity to seal off East Berlin from the West, and thereafter proceed to assert their rights in West Berlin.

To say this is neither to underrate the contribution of the West to the political stability of West Berlin, nor to underestimate their difficulties in defending their position in an extremely vulnerable geographical situation. It is true that under no circumstances will the West consider the question of allied troops in Berlin, freedom of West Berlin and free access to the city as negotiable. But, still, the West, it must be said, has failed to show sufficient daring and imagination in facing the essence of the Berlin problem. For the Germans on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Berlin is not only the capital city, it is the symbol of the basic unity of the German people and their only hope of the eventual reunification of their divided land. By destroying this symbolic character of Berlin, the Soviets hope to perpetuate the division of Germany and thereby secure recognition for their puppet regime from the West.

II

The Berlin wall, at first sight, appears to be a crude and ugly pile of concrete road blocks erected to obstruct the traffic between two parts of the city. It is six to seven feet high and runs along the 27 mile long border between East and West Berlin. But it is evil and all-pervasive in its influence and casts its cruel shadow not only over the whole city which it divides but also over the whole of Germany.

The Wall has brought tears, misery and suffering to all Berliners. Before the Wall, Berlin was open practically to all despite numerous restrictions imposed by the communists. The city was not only a sanctuary for thousands of refugees from the East, it was also a meeting place for the people in both parts of Germany. Thus, because of its unique role as an island of freedom in the Red sea, Berlin had made the sufferings of the people in the Eastern Zone somewhat bearable. But the Wall has now sundered thousands of human bonds, separated friends and torn families apart. More than 50 per cent of the people in West Germany have relatives in the Eastern Zone. The percentage is much higher in West Berlin itself. In Bernauerstrasse, in West Berlin, we could see many West Berliners standing on the pavement and, with tears in their eyes, silently staring at windows of buildings across the Wall in the Eastern sector hoping to see their relatives or friends. The Wall has thus deprived the Germans of even their elementary human right to meet their relatives in the other sector. There is no direct telephone or teleprint communication between the two parts of the city. To speak from West Berlin to anyone in the Eastern sector on the phone — (a distance of a few hundred yards across the Wall) — one has to get the connection via Frankfurt (in West Germany) and Leipzig (in the Eastern Zone)!

Such is the human absurdity of the situation

created by the Wall which the West Berliners call the Wall of Shame, and which according to Ulbricht's dialectical reasoning is the "Democratic Anti-Fascist Protection Wall." Khrushchev has referred to it simply as a "remarkable achievement", thus indicating that perhaps he was not much sure about the nature of this achievement. Howsoever one may characterise it, the Wall has shown political bankruptcy and crass stupidity of the system which finds it necessary to erect a cordon of barbed wire, concrete walls, watch towers and bayonets in order to prevent its own people from escaping abroad. The Berlin Wall, besides, is not the only barrier put up by the East German Government along its frontier with West Germany. It has established, before 1954, a closed area along 859 mile long frontier between the Soviet zone and the Federal Republic of Germany. This area comprises an 11 yard wide control strip, a 548 yard wide barrier strip and a 3-mile wide closed zone. The life in the closed zone is subjected to numerous restrictions requiring for a citizen a special permit to visit it. To visit the barrier strip, one requires, in addition, permission from local border police command post. And it is forbidden to set foot on the control strip which has been cleared of trees and ploughed over. In addition to this, a closed area has also been established along the 68-mile long border between West Berlin and East Germany. Thus, even before the Wall, the communists had converted their zone into a virtual prison. But Berlin still served as an escape hatch for the East Germans. It was mainly through this escape hatch that the majority of the 4 million East Germans — that is, one-fourth of the total population of the Eastern zone — fled to the West.

The Wall, of course, has not stopped completely the human exodus from the Eastern zone. Still people do risk their lives and try to breach the Wall by their ingenuity. For example, more than 10,000 people escaped to West Berlin since January this year. When we visited the refugee rehabilitation camp in West Berlin, the screening committee was examining the case of a teen-ager East Berliner who had made good his escape only a week before. He was working as a motor mechanic on the railways in East Berlin and had escaped to the West by travelling on the roof of a train unnoticed. He decided to seek asylum in the West as, he told us, he wanted to avoid conscription. To be a soldier in East Berlin was to be ready to fire on your own countrymen fleeing to the West, he added. He therefore decided to make an attempt to escape by train. Had he been caught by the East German border guards, he would have been sentenced to prison for a few years. "They don't shoot you if you are arrested while escaping", he argued. The expression of joy and happiness on his face was unforgettable; it was more eloquent than his whole testimony which was naturally a tale of suffering and full of hatred against the communist regime.

Anyone who visits West Berlin is deeply impressed by the determination of its people to remain free and their cool confidence in their ability to survive any

(Continued on page 8)

Notes

Russia and China

PRIME MINISTER NEHRU is reported to have stated in Paris in the course of a radio and television interview that "Russia sincerely desired peace and did not have any policy of expansion". He contrasted this peaceful and non-expansionist policy of Russia with the aggressive and expansionist policy of China. China, he said, "was expansionist in the past and was so now at the cost of India."

It is all to the good that the Prime Minister has in the last few months come to realise the aggressive and expansionist policies of China. But there was a time, which is not too far off, when he was holding and expressing the same opinion about China that he is now holding and expressing about Russia. The aggression against our borders gave him that new insight into the actions and policies of China.

In view of this fact, would it not have been better if, before expressing himself so categorically about the policies of Russia, the Prime Minister had given some thought to the feelings and reactions of the peoples who have had the misfortune of being the victims of Russian aggression? Apart from the peoples forcibly absorbed in the so-called Soviet Union, there are any number of peoples in Eastern Europe who know to their cost how aggressive and expansionist Russia has been even during the last ten or fifteen years. They have a better right and greater authority to express an opinion on the issue than Prime Minister Nehru who, it appears, can recognise expansion and aggression only when they touch his own country.

If "Russia sincerely desired peace" as Mr. Nehru believes, why does she not agree to a mutually acceptable solution of the Berlin problem? Why does she not allow the Germans to reunite in peace and freedom? Why does she not withdraw her armies of occupation from the countries of Eastern Europe? Why does she foment trouble in Cuba at one end and Indo-China at the other? And why does she not accept a practicable plan of total disarmament under international supervision and control? It will be useful if Mr. Nehru will ask himself these questions and try to find out a more satisfactory answer than the usual hackneyed theory of the aggressive intentions of the Western powers.

It is true that the balance of terror provided by the nuclear arms has at present stopped Russia from embarking upon aggression and expansion through military measures. But she is pursuing the same aims through other means like local wars, internal subversion and political and economic penetration. It is the ideology of communism which makes it obli-

gatory upon communist Russia to follow a policy of expansion and aggression. Communism cannot rest on its oars unless and until it conquers the world. It is an absolutist doctrine which cannot tolerate the existence and growth of other ways of thinking and living.

There is a school of thought which naively believes that Russia has now ceased to be a communist state and that, having consolidated her power and acquired a large territory, she will now settle down and behave as any other national state. Mr. Nehru, it appears, has come to hold that view. The advocates of the view ignore the crucial fact that Russia is still ruled by a totalitarian communist party, and its world-view and social, economic and political ideas govern her actions and policies. Besides, she can retain her control over the subjugated peoples and territories of her vast empire only by denying them the basic human rights. The continuance of the dictatorial police regime, therefore, becomes a necessity and that by its own logic leads to aggression and expansion. This is amply borne out by the history of Russia during the last forty years.

There may be some differences of tactics and emphasis between Russia and China. It will be unwise, however, to believe, as Mr. Nehru seems to believe, that there is any fundamental divergence between their aims and policies. Both are communist states and will always follow, in general terms, the same line of action. If one is aggressive and expansionist, the other cannot be peaceful and non-expansionist. They may adopt from time to time different postures, but it will be suicidal to be misled by them.

Firm Policy

WE are still without a firm China policy. While China is slowly and consistently pushing ahead with her aggression we are still wondering if and how far the Chinese have penetrated into our territory and if and to what extent our soldiers should act in defence of the borders. The information that was vouchsafed to the people was halting, contradictory and confusing. The *Indian Express* has in a recent editorial article described the queer situation as follows:

"At first it was affirmed that the aggression simply didn't exist except in the deluded and inflamed imagination of a few vocal communist-baiters. When the fact of the aggression could no longer be concealed its proportions were cut down to a size where the bubble of Hindi-Chini bhai bhai could still be precariously preserved and sustained. When even this was no longer possible, the bubble having burst, various balloons were sent up from time to time calculated to lull, distract, soothe, excite, depress or activate public opinion as the occasion seemed to demand to the authorities."

Even after the latest aggression in the eastern sector of the northern border, we have not been able

to make up our mind. Even the skirmishes that took place in the last few days have not convinced us that the Chinese are on the move. We are still waiting for them to begin military operations. But why should they resort to force, if they are able to push in and occupy our territory without any resistance? It is we who shall have to decide to resort to military measures to throw out the aggressors. But we are waiting and waiting hoping that the Chinese would realise their mistake and graciously withdraw from our territory. While we are waiting in this manner, the Chinese are consolidating their position and building up their strength.

It is not only in the border regions that the Chinese are active. They are also active amongst our neighbours. We have already lost many of our traditional friends. Nepal is suspicious about us. Sikkim and Bhutan are none too friendly. Burma has settled her problem. Other countries of South East Asia have no desire to antagonise their big northern neighbour. Pakistan has found it convenient to develop a new relationship of friendship with China. We are thus being progressively isolated and, when the critical time arrives, we may find that we have no friends amongst our neighbours.

We are losing friends because of our weakness and our inability to protect our territory. Our neighbours are losing their respect for us. We shall not regain that respect unless we are able to show them by positive action that we are strong enough and alert enough to protect our interests. There is no reason why our neighbours should be with China and against us. A democratic and peaceful India will be a better friend to them than a communist and aggressive China. But they must have the confidence that India has the strength and the determination to resist the expansionist tendencies and activities of

China. Once they get that confidence a polarisation will begin and we shall get back our friends.

What is essential is therefore a firm policy in our dealings with China. We must make it clear to her that we are determined to regain our territory and to resist every single attempt to commit any further aggression. And words must be followed by immediate appropriate action.

Djakarta Affair

WHAT happened in Djakarta has a salutary lesson for us. It exposed how communist China is ceaselessly working against us and trying to incite public opinion and agitation against us. China's hand was clearly visible, as the Prime Minister stated in Parliament, in the march on the Embassy and the demonstration against our players. It also showed how thin is the friendship of some on whom we are accustomed to rely.

The attitude that Mr. Sondhi adopted was correct and impartial. It is accepted on all hands that politics should have no place in sports. It is that principle which he was upholding and for doing it so boldly and courageously he should receive the support of all lovers of sports. The treatment that was meted out to him and the intimidation to which he was subjected were highly objectionable.

But, in any case, the Government of India were in no way responsible for the attitudes and actions of Mr. Sondhi. The ease with which the anger against him was turned into anger against the Government and the people of India shows that the atmosphere was already full of suspicion and resentment. That is a fact which is of far more importance than the throwing of a few stones and the shouting of a few slogans. Our attention and efforts should be now directed towards bringing about a favourable change in that situation.

How Communists Destroy Democracy

A LESSON FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Price Rupee One

Available from

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road

Bombay 1



Courtesy: Hindustan Times

The Voice Of World Liberalism

THE Council of the Liberal International, which is a world union of Liberal Parties and groups, met at the Hague from September 11 to 15. Among those present were Mr. G. Malagodi, leader of the Liberal Opposition in the Italian Parliament, who presided, Don Salvador de Madariaga, Mr. M. R. Masani from India, Mr. Rene Mayer, former Prime Minister of France, Count Raczynski, former Foreign Minister of Poland, Professor Massimo Salvadori and leaders of the Liberal Parties in Germany, U.K., Holland, Denmark, Israel, Belgium, Canada, Norway, and Switzerland.

The two themes of the Conference were the attitude of Liberals towards the European Community and the Common Market and that towards the Cold War. The following resolutions were among those adopted on the occasion:

I. The EEC in a Wider World

The Council of the Liberal International

RECALLING the leading part Liberals have played in the realisation of the European idea;

RECOGNISING that the EEC is only a step towards an ever-widening political and economic community of free nations throughout the world which are endowed with democratic institutions;

WELCOMING the views expressed by the President of the United States on interdependence and the proposals for trade expansion arising therefrom;

STRESSES the need for political development of the Community to evolve parallel with its economic development;

EMPHASISES the importance of pursuing the democratic development of the European institutions;

URGES the governments of the EEC to consult with other governments negotiating membership and in particular Great Britain in their discussions on the development of the political community;

URGES that in economic arrangements between the EEC and countries which for valid reasons do not become full or associated members, fullest consideration should be given to their special economic problems which arise for them from the creation of the Common Market;

EXPRESSES the conviction that neither the existence of the EEC nor association with it will in any way prejudice the independence and complete freedom of the newly independent countries.

II. South Africa

The Council of the Liberal International

CONDEMNS the oppressive ideology and policies of the South African Government;

RECOGNISES the importance for the future of Africa of the South African Liberal Party's efforts to

secure and maintain the rule of law and fundamental freedoms for the people of South Africa and

DECLARES its full support for all who are engaged in winning these freedoms.

III. Freedom For All

The Council of the Liberal International

PROCLAIMS its belief that only by liberal principles and methods can freedom and independence for both individuals and peoples be established and maintained;

REAFFIRMS that liberal policies are the prerequisites for a free, prosperous and classless society;

WELCOMES the striving of African and Asian peoples for independence as a manifestation of the permanent liberal demand for self-government and equal rights for all men;

ASSERTS that totalitarianism whether of the Left or the Right is the enemy of all these aspirations and achievements;

CONDEMNS even the tacit acceptance of Soviet domination of countries behind the Iron Curtain;

REJECTS any appeasement of communism as an invitation to aggression;

WARNS against the mental attitude which in the name of neutralism condones violations of liberty;

EMPHASISES that military defence is no more than a necessary basis upon which we can effectively meet the totalitarian challenge in all fields;

REALISES at the same time the need for a strong military defence system to which each country must bring its fair contribution as long as a general and controlled disarmament has not been put into practice;

RECOGNISES that the conflict will be protracted and that time will work for the free world only so long as it develops constructive ideas and more energy, and has the courage of its own convictions.

The text of a memorandum entitled "Winning the Cold War" presented to the Council by Mr. Richard Moore, Secretary-General of the Liberal International, on which the last resolution was based will be published in full in the next issue of *Freedom First*.

M. N. ROY

and

RADICAL HUMANISM

by

G. P. BHATTACHARYA

Available at

Strand Book Shop,

Pheroazshah Mehta Road,

Bombay 1.

Arab Politics At Crossroads

by Adam Adil

ARAB politics are obviously in a mess. On one side Algeria, which achieved its freedom recently, has failed to unite its forces and consolidate its hard-won freedom and, on the other, the 17-year old Arab League is faced with serious prospects of disintegration. This happened in spite of the strong sentiments about Arab nation or Arab brotherhood prevailing amongst Arabs everywhere. Fortunately, Algeria shows signs of improvement. Although nothing substantial has been done in the direction of bringing together the warring factions in Algeria, Ben Bella, the leader of the Political Bureau, has managed to bring at least a semblance of peace and unity to the country. Yet, it would be too optimistic a view to believe that everything is settled in Algeria.

In the recent meeting of the Arab League held at the resort town of Shtura in Lebanon one saw a spectacle of complete disunity in the ranks of the Arabs. It was, in fact, an abject exhibition of mutual recrimination, invective and abuse characterising the relationship between Arab nations. It is obvious that the mutual relations between Arab countries are at the lowest ebb. For instance, Mr. Khalil Kallas, Syria's Ambassador stated on the eve of the Arab League meeting that they would try to "cut off Nasser's head and end his reptile tactics". Egypt hit back in the same coin by calling Syrians as "barking dogs". Similar abusive terms were used by other politicians against one another.

The very fact that Syria had requested a special session of the Arab League to consider about "Nasser's aggression and open interference in its internal affairs" indicated that the Arab League meeting was not to be a peaceful affair. This was fully borne out by developments.

However, since President Nasser commands a large following amongst the younger generation of Arabs throughout the Arab countries, no Arab nation was prepared to condemn him and the United Arab Republic strongly on the floor of the Arab League. Yet, it was obvious that most of the Arab leaders who participated in the League session felt sympathetic towards Syria and took the Syrian charges against UAR understandingly. The UAR walked out of the League Session and, as a result, the Syrian charge of Nasser's subversion in internal affairs of its one-time partner will not be taken up until the UAR returns to the conference table to reply to it. In the meanwhile, the Arab League has been postponed indefinitely. President Nasser has also hinted at the possibility of UAR quitting the Arab League to start a new organisation of Arabs who believe in Revolutionary Socialism. In short, Arab unity lies shattered.

Against the background of this dismal picture, however, an Arab alliance of great import is emerg-

ing into existence. The Saudi-Arabian ruler and the King of Jordan met recently and decided to form a sort of a semi-union of the two countries. Both the potentates have buried their past family quarrels and are on the threshold of a new Arab unity. The semi-Union will be based on the integration of their armed forces and their economic policies and on the dissolution of all barriers of trade and travel. Although both these leaders have been denounced by Cairo Radio as "reactionaries, feudal, degeneraters, corrupt monarchs bleeding the Arab people", their unity holds out hope for the opening of a new chapter of better relationship between the Arab countries. Both the partners of the new union have invited other Arab countries to join in the grand Arab alliance.

Whether other Arab leaders will respond to the call of Saud and Hussain or not, it is clear that the Arab unity or the sense of brotherhood of Arab nations cannot be forged without an understanding and meeting of hearts between the various Arab countries and their leaders.

This understanding or meeting of hearts can only be generated by deciding upon a code of conduct, which will guide the diverse nuances of mutual relationships between the Arabs. The code of conduct will obviously lay down that Arabs will give up their characteristic habit of recrimination and calling of names against one another, that one Arab nation would not attack another Arab nation, verbally or militarily, or indulge in insinuation against it, that no government or a group of Arabs in one country will try to overthrow the established regime in another Arab country, that there will be no interference in the internal affairs of an Arab state by agencies outside its territory; that any dispute between two Arab states will be mutually settled through a spirit of give and take and that, in case no agreement is arrived at, the dispute will be submitted to an arbitration of impartial Arab nations, whose decision will be binding on disputing parties.

In addition to such a code of conduct, certain further steps will contribute to better understanding between the Arabs. For instance, exchange of students between various Arab countries, and frequent meetings of politicians of one Arab country with those of another for exchange of ideas and discussions of problems of mutual interest, will go a long way in exerting sobering effect on mutual relations between the Arabs.

There may, however, be some problems, which apparently may seem to defy solution. For instance, the problem created by Iraq's claim over Kuwait. But a realistic attitude on the part of Iraq will help to ease the situation. If only President Abdul Karim Kassem could realise that march of history in re-

(Continued on page 7)

Tradition And Socialism

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE official philosophy of our Government on which its economic and other programmes are ostensibly based is democratic socialism. The socialist part of the "ideology" built into policy is less clear and enlightening than democracy to the bulk of the people, even to the lettered part of it.

Neither in official circles nor intellectual spheres is there any clear and unambiguous system of beliefs announced under the fabric of democratic socialism. It is a matter of great importance to estimate the import of socialism (such as it is) in its operative force on the public, since democracy is still officially retained and democracy demands the intelligent assent of the people, at least in their more representative and sophisticated levels.

Socialism in a vague ethical sense as purporting to stand for the common good of the people in general, for equality of rights and for universal uplift or *sarvodaya* may be said to be benefitting by its vagueness and "all-things-to-all-men" blanket coverage. One sometimes comes across even educated persons with some knowledge of traditional ideas saying that after all, the theory is nothing new, that we have had it from times immemorial. They refer to popular sayings like, "let all people be happy" quoted as part of rituals together with a sort of Amen. They refer to the idea of *dharma* which calls upon all people to serve others, which asks the people to offer all work as a sacrifice to God and eschew all selfishness, which enjoins not only *svadharama*, the duties of one's own station in life but also *lokasangraha* or whatever promotes social solidarity or unification.

If socialism were simply an ethical doctrine inculcating moral values in general and social service in particular, all religious traditions—Hindu, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Jain, Confucian, Taoist, Japanese, Zen Buddhist, etc., are in harmony with it.

But socialism is more than such a general moral

doctrine. It carries a specific programme of social action in which historical and dialectical materialism, class war, dictatorship of the proletariat, one-party dictatorship, the totalitarian claim to determine the mental life of all citizens etc. is explicitly made and built into a policy.

The general public including the bulk of educated people and of course representatives of traditional authority like the heads of mutts and the pandits of the older learning and of course many fellow travellers are not aware of this grimmer side of current Marxist socialism.

Some of them are beginning to be disturbed and puzzled by the readiness of the Government to liquidate property with scant compensation shown in the recent land legislation and in the readiness to extend state invasion of industries as in the Five-Year Plans. They are beginning to feel vaguely that socialism is more than a set of ethical exhortations and social service policies. They are beginning to sense that it involves an ever-expanding encroachment of State power into private life.

Even the code of Marx says that self-employment through free action conduces for happiness whereas employment under others makes for misery in the end.

The idea of *dharma* that covers most aspects of life, individual and social, has a *pluralist* emphasis built into it that comes into frontal conflict with Marxist socialism. For it says that society is pluralist in nature. In fact, every considerable civilised society is a society of sub-societies. Each group has its own vocation, (hereditary for the most part but heredity is not essential to it.) The set of regulations necessary for coordinating the functions of participants in group life, each in his station, are evolved by experience. They constitute the *varna dharma* of the group which is approved by the law of the state—*raja sasana*, at least such of them as are of universal import and countrywide application.

Social unity of course is necessary but it need not be expressed in a single law for all. In addition to universal laws (*sadharana dharma*s) applicable to man as man. Society evolves group laws applicable to different vocations in freedom and in and through actual experience.

Marxist socialism goes contrary to this wholesome principle of pluralism embedded in Indian law and custom through the centuries, if not ages.

New occupations demand new codes like political parties, trade union leadership, democratic representation, democratic leadership and so on. What is the *dharma* of the politician? Is he to be simply a mouth-piece of his constituency—a mere delegate? Or is he a leader entitled to think independently about social

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 6)

lation to Kuwait as much as with any other country in the world cannot be resisted or checked and that the emergence of Kuwait as an independent nation is an established fact of history which cannot be reversed, Iraq would be in a position to build up a fund of goodwill for herself not only in the Arab world but also in the rest of the world. It is not yet too late for Iraq to revise her attitude towards Kuwait.

Similar such problems between Arab countries could be settled through a sense of realism, and it is hoped, that the Arab countries with their long and momentous history are mature enough to understand the significance of this simple fact in the context of contemporary history.

(SIGNIFICANCE OF BERLIN—from page 2)

Soviet attempt to squeeze them out. They are proud of their role of being in the front line of the world-wide struggle between totalitarianism and democracy, and their pride is quite justified. If West Berlin, 110 miles deep inside the Soviet zone, still remains the outpost of the free world, it is mainly because of the strong will of the West Berliners to resist any Soviet encroachment on their liberties. Geographically and from the military point of view, West Berlin is utterly indefensible. The Russians have, their half million men in uniform in East Germany in addition to their tanks, rockets and other weapons. West Berlin, on the other hand, is protected by only 15,000 Western troops and is totally dependant for its survival on its access routes remaining free. In spite of its vulnerable position, West Berlin has still remained the citadel of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

West Berlin is a very much live, prosperous, gay and bustling city. Its economy is fully sharing in the economic boom of West Germany. Compared to it, East Berlin appears dead and dilapidated. To enter East Berlin, we had to cross three barriers and show our passports at two checkpoints. The border guards, in addition, thoroughly searched our car, even removed its seats to make sure that we carried no subversive literature or weapons into their sector. The streets were comparatively deserted, though it was 5 p.m. and people were returning home from their offices. Their faces were expressionless and though they were curious to see us strangers in their midst, they avoided speaking to us. The contrast between the two sectors was, to say the least, shocking. Mr. P. K. Atre, one of the fellow-journalists from Bombay who accompanied us on our tour, and who can, by no stretch of imagination, be called anti-communist, described, in an interview to a German paper, the difference between West and East Berlin as the one between heaven and hell. The exaggeration apart, his statement describes more or less accurately the impression one gathers after visiting both the parts of Berlin. Nowhere does the difference between freedom and servitude become so starkly obvious as it does in this divided city.

The Berlin problem, in the last analysis, is essentially a human and moral problem which brooks no compromise. If it were only a political problem in the cold-war game of power, there could have been evolved a compromise solution by some sort of mutual exchange of territory and population between the two parts of Germany. West Berlin today is a bone in the Soviet throat not because of the anomaly of its location in the heart of the Soviet zone, but primarily because it is the only free city behind the Iron Curtain. Because of its free way of life, it has become the only beacon of hope for the captive people in East Europe. It is, in the eyes of these enslaved people, the only place where democracies are firmly committed to defend the rights of free men whatever be the cost. That is why Khrushchev is trying to stir up crisis every now and then in Berlin in the hope of destroy-

ing the West's will to resist. So long as the West remains firm in West Berlin, the captive people in communist countries will refuse to accept their present state of servitude as permanent or final and Khrushchev cannot hope to consolidate his power in these countries. But if West Berlin falls, nothing can halt the forces of totalitarianism from engulfing the whole world. In its significance, Berlin thus transcends the national boundaries of Germany and the Berlin problem vitally affects the future of the people all over the world. Everyone, who is politically conscious, has therefore to choose his side of the Berlin Wall.

(TRADITION AND SOCIALISM—from page 7)

good as a whole and contribute to policy-making without being tied to party discipline or voter's demands? These questions have no answer in tradition but tradition gives a clue in its pluralist customs for the discovery of suitable answers. But this is possible in an *organic*, real democracy but not in a Marxist society which will have to shed its democratic facade at some stage in its evolution.

The pluralist tradition has the further value of tolerance of the ways of different vocational and other groups. The sphere of tolerance concerns not merely ways of worship and ritual but all *mores* or customs or ways of life in work, recreation, costumes, social organisation like marriage laws and family life.

It's this inherited ethos of toleration of differences that is reinforcing day-to-day democratic procedure in India after the advent of freedom.

But the monolithic social organisation of Marxism means a return to an earlier mode of social organisation—a return to a state before social differentiation—a return to the womb, in Freudian language! Progress demands advance in differentiation and variety to make richness of life possible but it must be matched by increasing co-ordination.

In tradition, the Raja has to be class-less in the sense of looking upon all classes as equal in the eyes of the law and as claimants for his solicitude. The State and its bureaucracy and the military have to share his classlessness and be devoted to common good. They should not take sides with any class or group or caste or varna.

Hegel, the master of Karl Marx, has this notion clearly developed. But Marx has the mechanical idea of classlessness in the impossible sense of abolishing all classes and of arriving at a one-class society, which is sociologically and psychologically impossible.

A caste-less society is possible and *necessary* but not a classless society.

In this direction also, there is need for much thinking as to the implications of socialism.

The objection to socialism is not that it is alien but that it is being applied in policy without intellectual and moral assimilation after a period of thought and discussion, storm and stress or "enlightenment". Thought now should overtake policy and social change and obtain its rightful hold on the steering wheel of society.

Djilas, A Unique Personality

by Raman Desai

WHEN the Nazis overran most of Europe by the end of 1941, local resistance groups formed themselves in various countries to assist the Allies, including Russia, in the war against Hitler. Once Russia was attacked, the communists in these countries placed their well-knit secret organisations at the disposal of revolutionary governments. The Allies actively aided these partisans with equipment, supplies and espionage technique. The importance and status of the communist cells differed from country to country. In France the communists, although they played a prominent role, never obtained ascendancy over the De Gaulle group, with the result that the end of the war saw the rise of a democratic government instead of the Communist Polit Bureau with its Commissars, one party rule and the equivalent of Gestapo. In the Eastern countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia, neither the existing governments, Royalists or democrats, nor the people had any option or choice; communist regime, directly under Soviet control, was enforced on them.

In Yugoslavia the Royalist government could not survive the war. There the communists were the dominant party of resistance and their avowed intention was not merely to overthrow the Nazis but establish a government and a society which may be termed the communist pattern of society and government. These partisans received material help from the Western Allies but grew to prefer Russian guidance in planning the future. Russia to these idealists was the home of their faith, the Russian leaders their priests. There were two things in which the Yugoslav partisans differed from their French confederates; in a rocky terrain the Yugoslavs became a strong military guerrilla force and the Yugoslavs had no leader other than Tito, Djilas being number two, both devout communists. In due course, one would imagine, Yugoslavia would follow the pattern of other Eastern countries in a regime guided and controlled by Moscow. But it happened that Tito had ideas of adapting not adopting, communist principles; and Djilas* was a University man with philosophical appreciation of communism as leading to a brotherhood of man, enhancement of the status of the individual in a society of equals, a regime of social justice. And fatally to the total control by Russia, the Yugoslav leaders were patriots.

During the course of four years 1944-48, Djilas travelled to Moscow three times, the stay each time extending over several days. The conversations extend to every topic political and here are admirable sketches of the then Russian leader, in every situation of formality and informality in the course of night-

long suppers of hard, coarse drinking and talk. The first visit was intended to secure from Russia the recognition of the Yugoslav Communist Party as the country's true representative after the war and to secure military equipment. It was not a mission so much as a pilgrimage. It was a visit to the homeland, a visit to the priests and the prophets, who could not do wrong, even if they ravaged tiny Finland and mutually slaughtered one another in purges. But to see the high priests in the exercise of their power and magic was another story. Here is a description of a Roman orgy at the crudest, in a village at a Marshal's field headquarters, replete with loose women, choicest food where all came to "gorge and to guzzle" and the shock with which the sensitive fine aesthetic Djilas perceives it. These visitors soon learn that it is Russian domination over the new budding communist states that was obsessing the minds of the prophets and they had scant sympathy for future independent communist states unless they were subservient to Russian interests. The second and third encounters were remarkable for they started with a tiny remark of Djilas where he had deprecated the violence and rape committed by the Russian army within Yugoslavia in contrast to the correct behaviour of British officers; a casual comment coming from a deeply sensitive soul perturbed by inhumanities to women, but which vitiated the tone of all subsequent meetings with Russians, Stalin in particular. For, the tale of this remark was carried to Stalin and he felt the Russian soldiers deserved sympathy and a few murders and rapes just did not matter. The tone, the temper, the atmosphere in which the Russian leaders dwelt is reminiscent of the Moghul Court, the only parallel of some of the doings there one can come across in the diaries of the Courts of Shah Jehan and Aurangzeb.

At a time when Western Europe, even Asia and Africa are agitated over the Economic Common Market, when in perfect freedom the nations of the West debate their differences, political and economic, in order to arrive at a generally acceptable solution, it is interesting to read in Djilas' pages the manner in which the Russians dealt with an impending rapprochement between Yugoslavia and Albania. Trade, as Russia understood it, between such countries *inter se* and between them and Russia, could only be based on special arrangements by which Russia bought at lower and sold at higher than world prices. The Russians gleefully misunderstood the attempts of Yugoslavia and Albania for some form of political and economic unity. Stalin had no use for niceties: "we agree with you; you ought to swallow Albania—the sooner the better"—was his coarse reaction. When, however, Yugoslavia and

(Continued on page 10)

* Conversations with Stalin: by Milovan Djilas. Rupert Hart Davis, sh. 16.

Review

The Trials of Nehru

by Ram Gopal, The Book Centre Private Ltd. Bombay 28.

The Trials of Nehru is yet another feather in the cap of its author, Mr. Ram Gopal, who already has a string of ably written books to his credit. Among the better known of his works are *Lokamanya Tilak* (a biography) and *Indian Muslims*, both of which received a good press in England as well as in our own country. His latest book should also get a similar reception.

It contains proceedings in courts of nine trials with statements made by Nehru in the course of them and detailed background material by the author on each one of the trials in the context of which the cause of action arose. In the very first trial, Nehru emerges as a young, fearless rebel in the cause of his country's freedom hurling defiance at those who would crush the freedom movement. "I do not recognise the British Government in India, and I do not regard this as a court", declares Nehru in the course of it. "I regard these proceedings as farce or show. This court carries out what has already been decided".

This sums up not only the spirit of defiance in the man which was to run like a thread through all his subsequent trials but also the absence of judicial independence and impartiality in the courts that tried him. As the author points out in the preface to the book: "The trying magistrates went through the proceedings mechanically, and convictions were, almost always, forgone conclusions. Prosecutions were not always justifiable, and the prosecutors did not care to make them so, being certain that the accused would offer no defence".

There is sometimes a touch of unconscious humour about the proceedings as the irrepressible rebel seeks to turn the court of law into a public platform for his cause. For instance, in one of the trials, a Public Prosecutor, sensing what Nehru is up to, interrupts him to ask the magistrate: "Is the accused entitled to make another seditious speech here, Sir?" In another one, the trying magistrate would not hear Nehru until he had cleared the court-room of all visitors. One suspects an imp lurking behind the rebel!

These snippets from the book are only earnest of what the reader may expect from the book.

Nehru trials were essentially political. It is in the fitness of things, therefore, that the author of the book should have got the foreword to it written by Dr. Rafiq Zakaria who has a triple reputation as a lawyer, politician and journalist. (He is now a Dy. Minister in the Maharashtra Cabinet). In the foreword, Dr. Zakaria makes two very interesting points: that "none of them (the trials) was conducted before any Judge of stature or eminence nor did any one of them decide any point of law" and that "if Gandhi gave

it (the freedom movement) the moral tone it was Nehru who gave it the intellectual bias". He makes the first point not to detract from the value of the book but to show up the poor stuff that the trying magistrates were made of. Their judicial pronouncements—if indeed these can be so described!—were far removed from the best traditions of British Justice.

The Trials of Nehru has a lot to be said for it, not the least of which is that it is a reflection of the times when we were still struggling to free ourselves from the heavy, degrading yoke of a foreign rule. For this reason alone, if for no other, it is well worth reading.

AZIZ MADNI

(Continued from page 9)

Bulgaria signed a treaty of alliance, the Russians reacted with sternness. A proposal of Dimitrov for a sort of East European Federation, a customs union between Rumania and Bulgaria, met with the sternest condemnation. Molotov said, "What is a Customs Union but the creation of a State?" So it turns out that the "peoples democracies" mean not a thing if they do not serve the interests and do not act in compliance of Russian will.

So the dream of Djilas, as he states, was snuffed out under the weight of reality. He wonders whether the dream was at fault or the reality. He agrees that Stalin was the greatest criminal in history and wonders how he ruled a powerful state for 30 years. He does not consider that essentially things have altered in the communist world. He thinks that in such a world as Stalin created one must fight for one's life. He doubts if one can be a communist and remain a free man. There are so many profound suggestions in this book that I would particularly ask the reader not to miss the last para of page 49 where following from a stray comment of a Red Army Commander, to the effect that bitterest war would be the one following the complete triumph of communism in the world, Djilas argues, "when all men came to be subject to the same social system, the system would not stand by itself and various sects would undertake the reckless destruction of the human race for the sake of its greater 'happiness'".

It is remarkable how a completely brain-washed communist finally comes to see the truth of liberal, radical, humanist approach to human problems. Obviously such a man as Djilas has within himself a deeper strain of the free spirit of man than others who acquired by rote the clichés of democratic thought. I trust no one will read this book of about a couple of hundred pages in an abridged form because it is so closely argued that every word and nuance of feeling is valuable. Here is a unique personality, deeply moving in his endeavour to pursue the grim truth, never mind the cost to himself. And it is the final indictment of even the pink pattern of Tito's communism that men like Djilas must fight for their lives in the state they created with vast sacrifices.

Trade Unions In China

by Humphrey Evans

THE leaders of Communist China are extraordinarily interested in the world labour movement. They make great efforts to increase contacts with organized labour groups in other countries. Foreign trade union representatives are constantly being invited to the China mainland where they are lavishly entertained; and in addition the top officials of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions travel abroad extensively. In fact because these officials show so little concern for domestic trade union affairs, their real function must be to deal with foreign unionists.

In dealing with foreign trade unionists the Chinese Communists appear sympathetic with labour's aspirations. By every possible means they attempt to project the idea that international trade unionism can progress only by profiting from their experiences and adhering to the principles they advocate. They reinforce their arguments with extravagant claims of achievement.

As a result they have won considerable influence within the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). Yet this influence is not based on what the Chinese trade unions have done for the working class in their own country. Rather it is the result of the immense man-power strength of China as a whole.

China's workers form a small minority group in a predominantly agricultural society. Out of an estimated total labour force of 325 million, probably less than ten per cent can be classed as wage and salary earners (the definition used by the regime to identify workers eligible for trade union membership). Of this class about half may actually be active as trade union members. Thus only about five per cent of Communist China's total labour force is represented in the All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU). This compares with roughly 15 per cent of the labour force unionized in Japan, 18 per cent in Yugoslavia, 25 per cent in Italy and West Germany, 35 to 38 per cent in Britain and the USSR, and 40 per cent in Austria.

Furthermore, the unionized wage and salary earners in Communist China include government bureaucrats, teachers, administrative staffs in factories and businesses and many professional. Industrial workers are actually a small minority within the small unionized minority. In 1955, for example, the regime claimed a "working class" of 15 million (in a country of 650 million), of which less than two million were industrial workers. If the industrial force has increased four-fold since then—a generous allowance—the industrial workers would still constitute only one-third of the union membership.

Abroad Chinese unions agitate for the workers, but at home their interests are in no way connected with the Chinese workers' well-being. Their actions in

China directly contradict what they say in other countries.

Chinese Communists claim they have led the country's trade union movement from the beginning. It is true that modern Chinese labour organizations (as opposed to traditional craft guilds) first emerged in the early 1920s at about the same time that Chinese Communists became active. Upon instructions from Moscow the communists cooperated with the Kuomintang and began to infiltrate the new labour organizations in the larger cities.

The communists were trained and disciplined, and they promised they would bring rich rewards to the workers. By 1925, therefore, they had achieved leadership positions in most of the new and still weak unions. Fifty-three per cent of the Communist Party membership was said to be workers.

The communists under Mao Tse-tung came to power in 1948-1949 owing nothing to the labouring class. Li Li-san in a speech on November 21, 1949 pointed out that "the special characteristic of the Chinese revolution is that the cities were not occupied by any revolt of the urban workers, but by the armed forces of the People's Liberation Army". Yet because this conflicted with communist dogma, the facts were ignored. The Communist Chinese leaders claimed—and they still do—that they had always led the urban workers and that their seizure of political power was "the victory of the proletariat".

In keeping with the official slogans, benefits for the workers were written into the Common Programme of the People's Republic, which was adopted in 1949 as a guide to national policy. In it the communists advocated worker participation in management, minimum wages, labour insurance, an eight to ten-hour work day, and improvement of safety and health regulations.

The meaning of these paper "benefits" was soon made clear. In November 1949 representatives of the China Federation of Labour were called to Peking and told that their organization was dissolved. Henceforth all unions would be "guided" by the Communist Party through a new organization called the All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU). Russian experts were on hand to set up the new federation. "Free unions" no longer would be permitted. Only unions authorized by the government and organized according to government orders would be allowed to join the ACFTU.

Eight years later the *Peking Workers Daily* (October 31, 1957) referred to this as "the beginning of our trade union work". But actually it was the end of Chinese trade unions: through the ACFTU trade unions were to become mere agents of the Party leaders—means by which the workers could be forced to produce more and expect less.

With Many Voices

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

The reasons for the Soviet reluctance to publicise its failures (in space) are obvious. Not so obvious is why the United States refused to disclose the failures, if the Soviets won't.

—John W. Finny, *The New York Times*,
September 9.

As study of the India-China relations during the past decade or so will reveal, the Chinese have always pursued a policy planned well in advance and usually deviously keeping before them objectives which are not immediately visible to the Indian eye.

—Krishna Bhatia, *The Statesman*, September 21.

Just 17 months ago, President Kennedy had a real chance to blast Castro out of power; but at the crucial moment of the U.S. sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion, Kennedy called off the promised U.S. air cover. Today, Castro's Cuba, propped up by Soviet economic and military support, is far more dangerous than it was then. The time is gone when it might be possible for Cuban exiles, no matter how much U.S. support they might get, to reclaim their homeland.

—Time, September 21.

✓ Our approach should not be dogmatic. It should be humane. The Communist approach helped to divide the world into two, and it is its main defect, and I hold that it is an antithesis and not a synthesis.

—Acharya Vinoba Bhave, *Indian Express*,
September 20.

If (the United States) wants foreign territory, why has it failed to encroach, for a single inch, on the rich, defenseless territory of Canada immediately beside it? Better than any other people, we Canadians know the Americans and we have no reason to fear their aggression. From a Canadian point of view, the Americans are a folk perhaps almost too devoted to the ease and comforts of peace and prosperity.

—Bruce Hutchison in *Winnipeg Free Press*

We have seen recently as well as early in the days since World War II, how difficult it is to reject a communist regime once it gets its police power and controls a country.

—President Kennedy in a television programme,
September 21.

The doctrinal quarrel between Moscow and Peking has been much discussed but the basic causes of the rift are of the kind that often arise between two large nations who happen to have different national interests.

—The Hindu, September 23.

The latest Chinese incursions into NEFA are part of a grand strategy affecting not only our northern border but the whole of Asia. This grand strategy is now tactically expressed by stealthy infiltration into our territory and open nibbling at our frontiers.

—Indian Express, September 24.

A Soviet Manual defines World War as follows:

1. It would be a total war in which conventional and nuclear weapons would be used, a war waged on earth and in space; (2) it would be an ideological and military struggle between two opposing and political systems; (3) it would be a "lightning war". Its outcome would be determined in the first few minutes or hours after it breaks out.

—Hindustan Times, September 24.

It is time to take a look once again at our 5% annual growth in national income and less than 2% growth in per capita income during the last decade, which were not only discouraging but also indicate the tremendous job ahead for improving the lot of our millions of underfed people.

—A. Sitaramiah, *The Hindu*, September 25.

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service,
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.

I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3/-

Name:

Address:

Signature