

SEPTEMBER 1957

Ten Years Of Freedom

by Adam Adil

ON 15th August, we completed ten years of freedom. It is a fit occasion to take stock of our achievements, our successes and failures, our strength and weaknesses in all important fields of our national life.

Politically, we are wedded to democracy and the democratic way of life and peaceful and constitutional methods of development. We are undoubtedly the largest democracy in Asia; and twice, during these ten years of freedom, many more people than in any other country of the world exercised their franchise and elected a government of their choice. Yet, a detached view of the political situation will convince anyone that we are still far from developing the necessary healthy democratic traditions. Our political life is vitiated by opportunism and corruption, favouritism and intrigue. As a result, men of ability, honesty and sincerity have begun to develop a kind of abhorrence towards political life and are drifting away from politics.

Slowly and imperceptibly, a personality cult is developing. Recently, the Films Division of the Information Department of the Government of India has itself taken the initiative in idolising national leaders. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, who is a confirmed democrat has firmly and consistently discouraged such adoration of leaders. But curiously enough the Films Division has just produced a documentary film on the life of the Prime Minister with the obvious object of idolising him beyond limits. Such idolisation will create a psychological climate in which unthinking obedience to the Prime Minister's dictates will become the criterion of one's loyalty to the nation. It would be, therefore, a healthy practice if government agencies refrain from such idolisation. The cult of personality is dangerous to democracy and it should be discouraged in most unequivocal terms.

In the wake of independence, although the Indian National Congress was the most powerful party, there were signs of the emergence of a strong democratic opposition and it was hoped that in due course there would follow a clear crystallisation of the two party-system. But that hope now appears to be

belied, for, though the Congress has lost some of its strength in the last General Election, the democratic opposition stands completely disorganised. The P.S.P. which showed signs of speedy growth in view of the large measure of popularity it enjoyed has lost its former ground. The Jana Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha, the Socialist Party, and the Revolutionary Socialist Party, still remain as splinter groups and enjoy little support. The only party that seems to grow at the moment is the Communist Party, which has increased its strength to the extent of being able to form its government in one of the States.

The leaders of the Congress do not like even intellectual opposition; hence their anxiety to keep independent intellectuals of even outstanding merit away from positions of responsibility and power. They also discourage criticism in the ranks of their own party; no man can survive in any responsible capacity if he dares to criticise the "great ones" of his organisation. This is undoubtedly a very unfortunate tendency; it is bound to constitute a great hindrance to the growth of healthy democratic traditions. In the interests of democracy, the Congress leaders, particularly Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, should have considered sympathetically the suggestion of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan that national leaders of his stature should have themselves created opportunities for the emergence of a democratic opposition. The dangerous trend of regarding the Communist Party as the only alternative to the Congress has also emerged. The leaders cannot afford to remain unconcerned about such a trend, which is becoming evident in the country due to the acts of commission and omission of the Congress on one hand and the failure of the democratic opposition to crystallise itself on the other.

Economically, we have taken to the road of planned development. We completed with considerable success the First Five Year Plan which was conceived in modest terms. We are now implementing the Second Five Year Plan which is much more ambitiously conceived. Although it is accepted on all hands that democratic planning is necessary to put India on a par with industrially advanced countries of the world, it is feared by many influential persons that the targets of Second Five Year Plan are too ambitious. The fear has been largely borne out by the fact that our planners now find it difficult to attain their targets within the outlay as originally fixed. This has necessitated additional taxation from time to time. Again it is feared that such additional imposts will cripple the industrial life of the country.

Additional taxation combined with large doses of deficit financing has set in motion the spiral of inflation. The Government has so far failed to cope with it. Further, the Second Five Year Plan has laid undue emphasis on heavy industries while ignoring the need of equal development of agriculture and consumer goods industries. This is likely to lead to a lop-sided and unbalanced development. There is considerable confusion of thought with regard to agricultural development. The talk about cooperative farming is becoming a fashion in higher circles. They forget the totalitarian implications of such a move, which can be clearly seen from the experience of China and other Communist countries. Cooperative farming, as it is being suggested, is another name for collective farming of the Soviet pattern.

In the sphere of village and cottage industries no effort is being made to discourage the outworn and primitive tools and techniques and replace them by modern efficient ones. As a consequence these industries threaten to stultify themselves all the more in their age-old lassitude. In view of this conglomeration of conflicting trends, the pace of economic development of the country has been slower than what could have been reasonably expected in a recently freed country. Our development schemes like the Community Projects and National Extension Schemes have touched only the surface of our economic problem. Unemployment and underemployment show no sign of abatement. The situation, on the other hand, is getting all the more aggravated by the fast increasing population.

Socially, we find that our diverse linguistic, ethnic and racial groups have not yet been emotionally integrated. It was expected that after freedom there would be greater cohesion between the various social groups constituting the Indian society. But that expectation is yet to be fulfilled. Our social behaviour is still largely dominated by communal and caste considerations. Recently, we had reorganisation of States on linguistic basis. But the reorganisation, instead of bringing greater unity and better understanding between various linguistic groups, has actually given rise to greater conflicts and keener suspicions. In some States linguistic fanatics did not hesitate to indulge in violence to force the acceptance of their particular linguistic claims. There have been fights between linguistic groups over small towns and strips of lands. This demonstrates that we not only lack in emotional integration but also in the sense of national unity.

There is considerable corruption in the administration. Crime is on the increase. Nepotism and favouritism have become the order of the day. Hoarding and profiteering have increased. There is no strong public opinion against these social evils with the result that the evil-doers are accepted as honourable members of the society. No worthwhile effort is made to correct and improve the criminal and give him a chance to lead a healthy and responsible life as a useful member of the society. Child-

delinquency is yet a common phenomenon and hundreds of small children have become victims of it. It is obvious that all these social evils should be checked. But these evils cannot be checked effectively unless there is cooperation between the Government and the people.

Culturally, we have not yet made any significant advance. It is true that efforts are made to increase educational facilities but, in the absence of a consistent national educational policy, these efforts have failed to persuade the people to take to literacy and education with enthusiasm and earnestness. The place of English has not yet been determined on an all-India basis and Hindi-fanatics have made a fetish of the national language and are attempting to foist it even at the expense of regional languages.

Although there is an urge to encourage literary creations in Indian languages, no effort is being made by writers in one language to study and understand literature and literary trends in other languages, with the result that writers of one region remain strangers to those of another region. North Indian writers know little of South Indian writers and vice versa. This state of affairs needs to be changed. There should be greater contact and understanding between the writers of various Indian languages.

This bird's eye view of the political, economic, social and cultural trends is indicative of one major fact, namely, that people are inclined to depend more on the Government for the advancement of the country than on themselves. It is therefore feared that "statism" will grow, and the State will begin to interfere in every aspect of individual and social life. If that happens, it will mark the beginning of the end of democracy. This is not to suggest that the State should have nothing to do with development programmes, but only to emphasise the fact that the State should have its own limits beyond which it should not be allowed to go in the interests of democracy.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

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

Single Copy: 25 nP

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

Notes

A Sigh Of Relief

THE whole country heaved a sigh of relief when the leaders of the Federation of Post and Telegraph Employees announced their eleventh hour decision to call off the threatened strike. There is no doubt that but for that decision the general strike would have materialised causing immense harm to the trade and industry of the country and grave inconvenience to the general public. The leaders of the employees deserve compliments on the wise decision that they took.

As a result of the threatened strike the Government has been persuaded to appoint a Pay Commission to inquire into the pay scales and other service conditions of government employees and also to refer to the Commission the employees' demand for interim relief. These are distinct gains for the workers of which they can be legitimately proud.

The Government cannot be, however, complimented on their behaviour throughout the episode of the threatened strike. The departmental grievances of the employees which should have been looked into and settled expeditiously were allowed to accumulate for months and years and were taken in hand for decision only under the threat of strike. The demand for a Pay Commission and for interim relief was in the first instance unceremoniously rejected. When the pressure developed a weak inquiry committee was offered. When that would not satisfy the workers, the Government in the end agreed to the appointment of the Pay Commission. There was hesitation then on the issue of referring the question of interim relief to the Commission. The hesitation was overcome only at the last minute. This course of conduct has not added to the prestige of the Government.

The final act of the Government in hastily passing through the Lok Sabha the Essential Services Maintenance Bill and promulgating an Ordinance to give effect to its provisions was a panicky measure. The Bill outlaws strikes in "essential services", without giving the workers concerned the opportunity of getting their disputes considered by an impartial tribunal. This is an unjustified and unwarranted encroachment on the civil and trade union rights of workers employed in "essential services". With the withdrawal of the strike the Ordinance has been cancelled. It is to be hoped that similar good sense will prevail and the Bill also will be allowed to lapse.

Need For Re-thinking

IT is high time the Government does some rethinking about its attitude towards its employees. With the socialist pattern of society that we have adopted, the number of government employees is bound to increase enormously. This ever-growing mass of

workers cannot be kept in a separate water-tight compartment and deprived of many of the rights and privileges enjoyed by workers in private employment.

The Government professes to be a model employer. It must live up to that profession. It must accord its employees scales of pay and conditions of service which can serve as a model to private employers. There must be also a machinery for the settlement of disputes as and when they arise. It is unrealistic to presume that there will be no disputes in government employment because of the absence of the element of private profit. In both these respects, as things stand at present, there is nothing to prove that the Government treats its employees better than private employers. On the other hand, a number of enlightened private employers provide their workers with better scales of pay as well as better conditions of service.

In the matter of the settlement of disputes also, the Government do not have a better record to show. A number of government establishments fall in the category of public utilities where an additional obligation is placed upon the workers by the Industrial Disputes Act of not resorting to a strike without giving a fourteen days' notice. The workers have as a rule scrupulously observed this provision. But the Government has not been always willing to fulfil the corresponding obligation placed upon them of referring the dispute to adjudication. This was clearly seen in the case of the dispute of postal employees. The workers were demanding the reference of the dispute to adjudication, but the Government was all along unwilling to face an independent tribunal.

In any industrial concern disputes are bound to arise. Nobody suggests that they should be always settled by a trial of strength. But a machinery must be provided for settlement through negotiations or arbitration. The recent remarks of the Prime Minister hold out the hope that the Government may evolve some method of arbitration for settling disputes with its employees. Unless some such machinery is evolved there will be always the danger of a dispute degenerating into a harmful strike.

Another matter requiring consideration is the desirability of making a distinction between industrial employees and other employees engaged in the performance of the essential functions of government. With the growth of the public sector the number of industrial employees is growing enormously. There is no reason why they should be treated differently from other industrial workers. One of the disabilities from which they suffer is that, under the rules as they stand, they are prevented from participating in political activities, a right which should belong to them as citizens. Socialism will reduce itself to a farce if a larger and larger number of citizens is deprived of their elementary political rights only because they have to find employment in the ever-growing public sector. This is an anomaly which requires to be rectified immediately. The onerous restrictions at present imposed upon government servants of all categories will have some meaning only if they are restricted in their scope to that small

number of government employees who are directly concerned with the running of the government as such.

A Counsel Of Despair

ONE of the dignitaries of the Congress, Mr. K. K. Shah, the President of the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee, has advocated that government servants should not be allowed to form trade unions. There are already a number of severe restrictions on the trade union activity of government servants. Mr. Shah is not satisfied with those restrictions. He would like government servants to be deprived of their right to form trade unions. It is reported that a number of other Congress leaders are of the same view. It is to be hoped that the Government is wiser than the ordinary run of Congress leaders. To prevent government employees from forming unions will be a violation of the fundamental right of freedom of association. Apart from this legal difficulty, considerations of practical wisdom should stop the Government from thinking of any such course of action. If legal organisations are not permitted, underground illegal organisations will spring up as long as discontent and dissatisfaction are rife. It will be ten times more difficult to deal with the latter type of organisations. It should be remembered moreover that in the democratic system of government that we have deliberately adopted no section of the people, including government servants, can be coerced too long. Willing co-operation of the people, including that of government servants, is the first condition of a democratic government. The better course, therefore, will be to inquire into the grievances of the employees and to settle them as expeditiously as possible. It will be a counsel of despair to reject that straightforward course and to think in terms of outlawing workers' organisations.

Rise In Prices

THE main cause of the mounting discontent in the ranks of workers, including those employed in Government service, is the steep rise in prices which has been continuously taking place for the last few months. When the prices rise, the workers have a legitimate right to ask for a proportionate increase in their wages. Very few workers have their dearness allowance linked with the cost of living. In the case of government employees the dearness allowance that they get at present has no relation with the existing level of prices, the Government having refused to implement the recommendation of the first Pay Commission in that behalf. The rise in prices has hit heavily all persons with fixed incomes, more particularly those belonging to the lower income group. They and the members of their families are required to undergo serious hardships. In this situation, the Government must either control and reduce prices or compensate workers for the fall in their real earnings. This may create some difficulties for the Plan as it is drawn up. But the Plan should not be made into a new god. It must be open to modification and correction. Nothing will be gained by insisting upon its

fulfilment if the country will have to pay for it by adding to the misery and starvation of the people. Welfare of the people must receive the first consideration and that consideration demands that some relief must be provided to the workers in the miserable plight in which they have been landed through pursuit of wrong economic policies. The earlier the Government recognises this the sooner will it be possible to think realistically about the fulfilment of the Plan.

With Padded Feet

MR. K. M. MUNSHI, the veteran Congress leader and former Governor of U.P., has done well to sound a forthright warning against the approach of totalitarianism. He said, in the course of a speech in Bombay, that if the ordinary citizen failed to appreciate and safeguard the three aspects of democracy, namely, the rule of law, parliamentary government and democratic decentralisation, totalitarianism would enter with "padded feet" if it had not already done so. Mr. Munshi was referring in particular to the proposal mooted by the Finance Minister of the Government of India to set up administrative tribunals on the French model to decide expeditiously disputes regarding assessment of tax and other matters. Ordinary courts of law will be precluded from taking cognizance of such matters and will have no powers of revision over the decisions of administrative tribunals. Mr. Munshi characterised the proposal as a "step away from Democracy." Law's delays are no doubt annoying and inconvenient. But the proper remedy against those delays is to investigate their causes and to remove them. The people will willingly support any action that the Government may take in that behalf. The proposal to set up a new machinery devoid of the control of ordinary courts of law is however, another matter. It is a departure from the principle of the rule of law which is the basic foundation of the democratic system of government. It is such departures which help the entry of totalitarianism, may be, with "padded feet."

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Edited by

STEPHEN SPENDER and IRVING KRISTOL
Annual Rs. 12/- Single Copy Re. 1/-
Panton House, 25 Haymarket, LONDON S.W.1.

ENCOUNTER is a monthly review, generous in its scope varied in its contents, ambitious in its pretensions. It is edited for the general reader with an intelligent interest in a good many things and it represents an exchange among British, Asian, and American views. It is indeed a world magazine.....the only one of its kind.

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

The Meaning Of Communism

(The following are excerpts from a new book, "The New Class" by Mr. Milovan Djilas just published in the United States of America. The typescript of the book was smuggled out of Yugoslavia just before the second arrest of Mr. Djilas in November 1956. Mr. Djilas is now under-going in a jail in Yugoslavia his sentence of three years' imprisonment. Mr. Djilas had sent special instructions to his publisher to publish the book regardless of what might happen to the writer. The book is one of the most devastating anti-communist documents written by a communist).

EARLIER revolutions, particularly the so-called bourgeois ones, attached considerable significance to the establishment of individual freedoms immediately following cessation of the revolution terror. Even the revolutionaries considered it important to assure the legal status of the citizenry. Independent administration of justice was an inevitable final result of all these revolutions. The Communist regime in the U.S.S.R. is still remote from independent administration of justice after forty years of tenure. The final results of earlier revolutions were often greater legal security and greater civil rights. This cannot be said of the Communist revolution.

There is another vast difference between the earlier revolutions and contemporary communist ones. Earlier revolutions, especially the greater ones, were a product of the struggles of the working classes, but their ultimate results fell to another class under whose intellectual and often organizational leadership the revolutions were accomplished. The bourgeoisie, in whose name the revolution was carried out, to a considerable extent, harvested the fruits of the struggles of the peasants and sans-culottes. The masses of a nation also participated in a Communist revolution; however, the fruits of revolution do not fall to them, but to the bureaucracy. For the bureaucracy is nothing else but the party which carried out the revolution. In communist revolutions, the revolutionary movements which carried out the revolutions are not liquidated.

The communist revolution is the first in which the revolutionaries and their allies, particularly the authority-wielding group, survived the revolution is the first to be carried out to the advantage of the revolutionaries. They, and the bureaucracy which forms around them, harvest its fruits. This creates in them, and in the broader echelons of the party, the illusion that theirs is the first revolution that remained true to the slogans on its banners.

LEON TROTSKY

(P. 28)

Trotsky, an excellent speaker, brilliant stylist, and skilled polemicist, a man cultured and of excellent intelligence, was deficient in only one quality: a sense of reality. He wanted to be a revolutionary in a period when life imposed the common-place. He wished to revive a revolutionary party which was being transformed into something completely different, into a new class unconcerned with great ideals and interested only in the everyday pleasures of life. He expected action from a mass already tired

by war, hunger, and death, at a time when the new class already strongly held the reins and had begun to experience the sweetness of privilege. Trotsky's fireworks lit up the distant heavens; but he could not rekindle fires in weary men. He sharply noted the sorry aspect of the new phenomena but he did not grasp their meaning. In addition, he had never been a Bolshevik. This was his vice and his virtue. Attacking the party bureaucracy in the name of the revolution, he attacked the cult of the party and, although he was not conscious of it, the new class.... Trotsky was a man of the revolution of the past; Stalin was a man of today and, thus, of the future.

(P. 50, 51)

LENIN, STALIN, TITO

Lenin's revolutionary communism was replaced by Stalin's dogmatic communism, which in turn was replaced by non-dogmatic communism, a so-called collective leadership or a group of oligarchs.

The fate of Yugoslav Communism was to unify these three phases in the single personality of Tito, along with national and personal characteristics. Tito is a great revolutionary, but without original ideas; he has attained personal power, but without Stalin's distrustfulness and dogmatism. Like Khrushchev, Tito is a representative of the people, that is, of the middle-party strata. The road which Yugoslav Communism has travelled—attaining a revolution, copying Stalinism, then renouncing Stalinism and seeking its own form—is seen most fully in the personality of Tito. Yugoslav Communism has been more consistent than other parties in preserving the substance of communism, yet never renouncing any form which could be of value to it.... The heroic era of communism is past. The epoch of its great leaders has ended. The epoch of practical men has set in. The new class has been created. It is at the height of its power and wealth, but it is without new ideas. The only thing that remains is for it to justify itself.

(P. 52, 53, 54)

RESISTANCE AND DISCONTENT

The most important reason why there was no organized resistance to communism lies in the all-inclusiveness of totalitarianism of Communist state. It had penetrated into all the pores of society and of the personality—into the vision of scientists, the inspiration of poets, and the dreams of lovers. To rise against it meant not only to die the death of a desperate individual, but to be branded and excommuni-

cated from society. There is no air or light under the communist government's iron fist.

Neither of the two main types of opposition groups—that stemming from the elder classes and that stemming from original Communism itself found ways and means of combatting this encroachment on their liberty. The first group was tugging backward, while the second group carried on a pointless and thoughtless revolutionary activity, and engaged in quibbling about dogma with the regime. Conditions were not yet ripe for the finding of new roads.

Meanwhile, the people were instinctively suspicious of the new road and resisted every step and small detail. Today, this resistance is the greatest, the most real threat to communist regimes. The communist oligarchs no longer know what the masses think or feel. The regimes feel insecure in a sea of deep and dark discontent.

Though history has no record of any other system so successful in *checking* its opposition as the Communist dictatorship, none ever has provoked such profound and far-reaching discontent.

(P. 99)

UNEMPLOYMENT UNDER COMMUNISM

The great boast that there is full employment in communist systems cannot hide the wounds which become evident as one looks more closely. As soon as all material goods are controlled by one body, these goods, like manpower needs, must become the subject of planning. Political necessities play an important rôle in planning and this unavoidably results in the retention of a number of branches of industry, which survive at the expense of others. Thus planning hides actual unemployment. As soon as sectors of the economy can engage in freer play, or as soon as it becomes unnecessary for the regime to sustain and strengthen one branch at the expense of another, unemployment will recur. More extensive ties with the world market can also cause this trend.

Consequently, full employment is not the result of communist "socialism" but of an economic policy carried out by command; in the final analysis, full employment is the result of disharmony and production inefficiency. Yugoslavia was short of workers until it achieved a satisfactory degree of production efficiency. As soon as it did, there was unemployment. Unemployment would be even higher if Yugoslavia attained maximum production efficiency.

In communist economies full employment conceals unemployment. The poverty of all conceals the unemployment of some, just as the phenomenal progress of some sectors of the economy conceals the backwardness of others.

(P. 112, 113)

WASTE AND THEFT

In communist systems, thefts and misappropriations are inevitable. It is not just poverty that motivates people to steal the "national property"; but the fact that the property does not seem to belong to anyone.

All valuables are somehow rendered valueless, thus creating a favourable atmosphere for theft and waste. In 1954, in Yugoslavia alone, over 20,000 cases of theft of "socialist property" were discovered. The communist leaders handle national property as their own, but at the same time they waste it as if it were somebody else's.

The greatest waste is not even visible. This is the waste of manpower. The slow, unproductive work of disinterested millions, together with the prevention of all work not considered "socialist" is the calculable, invisible, and gigantic waste which no communist regime has been able to avoid. Even though they are adherents of Smith's theory that labour creates value, a theory which Marx adopted, these power-wielders pay the least attention to labour and manpower, regarding them as something of very little value which can be readily replaced.

Lenin was largely right when he stated that politics is a "concentrated economy". This has been reversed in the communist system; economy has become concentrated politics; that is, politics play an almost decisive role in the economy.

(P. 120, 122)

BETWEEN STRENGTH AND BANKRUPTCY

Moral downgrading in the eyes of other men does not yet mean that communism is weak. The various purges and "Moscow trials" strengthened the communist system and Stalin. In all events, certain strata—the intellectuals with Gide as the most famous example—renounced communism because of this and doubted that communism as it is today could realize the ideas and ideals they believed in. However, communism, such as it is, has not become weaker: the new class has become stronger, more secure, freeing itself from moral considerations, wading in the blood of every adherent of the communist idea. Although it has been morally downgraded in the eyes of others communism has actually been strengthened in the eyes of its own class and in its domination over society.

Other conditions would be necessary for contemporary communism to be lowered in the estimation of the ranks of its own class. It is necessary for the revolution not only to devour its own children, but—one might say—devour itself. It is necessary for its greatest minds to perceive that it is the exploiting class and that its reign is unjustified.

(P. 159)

NATIONAL COMMUNISM

In the communist parties that are not in power it is evident that national communism—despite its intent to stimulate communism and strengthen its nature—is simultaneously the heresy that nibbles at communism as such. National Communism per se is contradictory. Its nature is the same as that of Soviet Communism, but it aspires to detach itself into something of its own, nationally. In reality, national communism is communism in decline.

(P. 190)

The Split In The Kremlin?

by V. N. Rudin

ALL signposts have pointed toward the current climactic and fatal split in the headquarters of the world Communist conspiracy. But in our highspeed civilization such signposts are too frequently unheeded, and news of the recent purge of Communist Party leaders exploded on July 4 with a shock to many international observers. Behind the Khrushchev victory in purging such prominent figures as Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, and less irrevocably Shepilov, lie basic reasons. This event holds enormous consequences for the future of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), the Soviet system and the entire Communist world.

A split within the top leadership of the CPSU, which is desperately holding onto its world CP leadership, was an inevitable result of the status of the Communist regime at the death of Stalin. It was a headless pyramid. The structure of the regime was designed for a dictator—but there was no single successor to Stalin. Without this head, the pyramidal Soviet system has proceeded logically and inevitably toward disintegration.

The struggle among the “collective leaders”, or among groups within the Presidium, began immediately after Stalin’s death. The liquidation of Beria on July 10, 1953, the forced abdication of Malenkov on Feb. 8, 1955, the fall of Molotov which began in Oct. 1955 and was followed by his resignation on June 2, 1956—all were mere stepping-stones leading toward the spectacular climax of July 1957. The internal struggle during the 20th CP Congress, which did not become apparent to the West until much later, actually began the alignment of forces that have recently come into open conflict.

The fight among Soviet leaders and factions cannot be evaluated on a basis similar to that among conflicting groups in a normal democratic state, nor even among Latin American power groups. Although it is a struggle for power, the personal aspect is the least significant.

It must be realized that all factions of the Soviet leadership are aware of the present vulnerability of the Soviet system itself—and of the fact that their own survival depends upon the survival of the system. Therefore the primary concern of all the “collective leaders” since the death of Stalin has been to save the Communist system—and thus themselves. Their prime motivation is the fear of internal revolution. The East German Revolt of June 1953 and the first open revolts in the Soviet concentration camps in June-Oct. 1953 sounded an alarm that has been ringing the ears of top Soviet leaders ever since.

The basic cause of conflict in the Kremlin, therefore, is the difference of opinion among the various factions as to the tactics necessary to save the Communist system.

Out of the many accusations heaped on the Molotov faction, we can crystallize the following as the essence of the current situation:

“They (the Molotov group) set themselves the goal of returning the party to the false methods of leadership which were condemned by the 20th Communist Party Congress.”

In these few words the Central Committee confirmed the acceptance of the tactics advocated by the Khrushchev faction. In brief, these are:

The Communist regime of the USSR can no longer govern the people according to the so-called Stalinist methods (actually the methods of the Communist system itself), because this would lead to imminent or immediate revolution. Therefore, there must be a change in tactics, allowing for some concessions to the demands of the people.

This more flexible policy, proposed by one Stalinist faction headed by Khrushchev at the 20th CP Congress, was opposed by another Stalinist faction headed by Molotov.

By a similar process of logic, motivated by the same desire to save the system and the same sincere devotion to the goal of international Communism, the Molotov faction believed that any relaxation of “iron grip” tactics would bring about the same internal revolutionary upheaval. This conviction was strengthened by subsequent events in Poland and Hungary, which Molotov considered a direct result of Khrushchev’s policy of relaxation and denunciation of Stalin. The Molotov group therefore urged a retraction of the small liberties that the regime was forced grudgingly to give the people after the 20th CP Congress. This has proved impossible, especially among the Soviet intelligentsia.

The line-up of forces in this phase of the struggle was defined by the end of Feb. 1957. On Feb. 27, Mao Tse-tung delivered the key speech at the Chinese CP Congress, delineating the ideological theory which gave de facto support to Khrushchev’s tactics. At variance with basic Marxist theory, Mao stated that there can be and are contradictions between the governing Communist elite and the non-Communist masses. He confirmed Khrushchev’s premise that the Communist Party must satisfy demands of the people, or else the differences between the party and the people will intensify toward the final point of open popular revolt against the regime—citing the Hungarian Revolution as an example. Mao also supported Khrushchev’s line of “many roads towards socialism” by stating that the “road to socialism” (i.e., communism) must take into account national characteristics.

The close resemblance in content and terminology of Mao’s speech to Khrushchev’s utterances of the preceding year point up the obvious coordination between the two, which was no doubt established at the

time of K & B's trip to Red China in 1955. Mao was the first to send a congratulatory telegram to the CPSU Central Committee on its July victory over the Molotov group.

It is significant that Mao's speech was not published in *Pravda* until June 19, when Khrushchev's support was sufficiently strong to meet openly the challenge of the Molotov faction.

This challenge, indicative of a strengthening of forces, appeared in Feb. almost simultaneously with the delivery of Mao's speech in Red China. Issue No. 3, 1957, of the influential party magazine KOMMUNIST carried an unsigned editorial, which ably defended the classical Marxist-Communist theory of a centralized and uniform communist empire. The anonymous author was Shepilov.

The alignment of Khrushchev's bright young man Shepilov with the Molotov faction has caused much speculation. I believe that the explanation lies in a genuine change of conviction on Shepilov's part in regard to policy.

Appointed by Khrushchev to replace Molotov as Foreign Minister after the latter's forced resignation, Shepilov fell heir to a Ministry of Foreign Affairs that had been ably built up by Molotov during the past 20 years. He was surrounded by a staff of experts who had been selected and trained by Molotov to implement his policies. Molotov's own "iron logic", plus the daily influence of his unpurged staff, in my opinion, finally convinced Shepilov that Molotov's policies offered the best chance for survival of the Communist system.

Kaganovich, long considered the "power behind the throne," in the Communist hierarchy, became a powerful ally of Molotov also on the basis of conviction.

The struggle for personal power, which holds third place as a cause of the Kremlin split, influenced Malenkov to align himself with Molotov and Kaganovich against Khrushchev and Bulganin, in an ill-fated effort to recuperate his position. He is now being shipped out by the same route as Trotsky.

The personal power motive also temporarily aligned the third major faction, Mikoyan and Suslov, on the side of K & B,—but this is by no means a permanent alliance. Just after the purge announcement, Mikoyan was conspicuously absent from several important functions. Recently he has been conspicuously present—an indication of the mounting pressure of the Mikoyan faction on Khrushchev, which first became evident during the 20th CP Congress.

A special role is being played by Marshal Zhukov. Being a good Communist but not an experienced "aparatchik" ("apparatus man"), and remembering very well his own earlier purge by so-called Stalinist methods, Zhukov has behaved as a regular party member of the Central Committee, staying with the new tactics of Khrushchev. Rewarded becoming the first military man to be elevated to membership in the Presidium, Zhukov might be said to have been motivated by a desire for personal power.

The Presidium, however, has emerged from the current conflict with less power than before. Being too weak to win within this top closed circle, Khrushchev

had no alternative but to break the established rules of Communist dictatorship by transferring the power of the highest policy decision into the hands of the Central Committee. It was not CP Secretary Nikita Khrushchev and Premier Nikolai Bulganin, nor the top men of the CP and Soviet govt. in the Presidium, but the 318 members and alternates of the Central Committee of the CPSU who conducted the official purge.

It will now be extremely difficult—and I believe impossible—to retract this controlling power from the Central Committee and return it to the Presidium.

This means that Khrushchev and his faction, although they are now in the saddle, have a much weaker grip on their own party than before the recent split. Indicative of the new trend is the fact that Khrushchev's speeches in Prague, printed in the western press, were censored by someone before publication in the Soviet press—in all probability by the Secretariat of the Central Committee.

Although the entire membership of the Central Committee will work together to retain the CC's new power, different groups within this large body will also seek to strengthen themselves. Characteristics of these various factions are already noticeable, and will be discussed in a later report.

As each faction tends to enlarge its circle of support, the central power becomes diluted. This has already happened in the Presidium, which was the only governing body after the death of Stalin. At that time the Presidium consisted of 10 regular members and 4 alternates, a total of 14. After the 20th CP Congress, it was enlarged to 11 regular members and 7 alternates, or a total of 18. Since the recent purge, the Presidium has been increased to 15 regular members and 9 alternates, for a total of 24, and has actually relinquished its controlling power to the Central Committee composed of 318 members and alternates.

The result of this process can only be the continued dilution of power and inevitable disintegration within the CPSU itself. In an effort to stabilize itself, the CP and the Soviet govt. (which are one and the same), will be forced to make more and more concessions to the demands of the peoples of Russia. A major concession was announced the next day after the purge—to abolish as of Jan. 1, the compulsory delivery to the state of assigned quotas of farm, dairy and meat products from the peasants' own small "backyard" plots of land. The fight for these individual plots has been a bitter one between the farmers and the regime, and this concession marks a significant victory for the peasants.

The present Communist rulers of Russia are in the position of being "damned if they do and damned if they don't." With their power and control continually weakening, they must compromise with the people in an attempt to avert revolution—and yet the very concessions that they make produce new and greater demands on the part of the people, and hasten the disintegration of the Communist system.

—Reported from *Research Report* of International Research on Communist Techniques, Inc.

Malaya: On the Eve Of Independence

by R. S. Panday

ALL Asia will join the people of Malaya in the celebration of the independence of their country which became an established fact on 31st August.

A territory of 50,690 square miles, constituting the Federation of Malaya, passed under the domination of the British about hundred years ago. It was a country rich in raw-materials and naturally it proved a veritable gold mine to the British entrepreneurs.

Yet, the British brought political stability and economic prosperity to the country. They gave Malaya law, order and stable government and a long era of internal peace. They established a framework of communications by the construction of roads, railways, ports and harbours, aerodromes and telecommunications. They initiated irrigation and drainage schemes, provision of electricity supply and many other public utility services. All this has resulted in the rapid economic development of the territory. British technicians and scientists brought to Malaya organisational skill and technical knowledge which was necessary for the development of its resources, its commerce and industries. It is claimed that Malaya enjoyed higher standards of living and more developed modern social services than anywhere else in South-East Asia.

The economy of the Federation of Malaya is based on agriculture with rubber as the source of its prosperity. Tin occupies second place in its contribution to economy. These two commodities, together in 1955 accounted for 85% of the territory's total export earnings and contributed in export duties alone, almost 29% of the total Federal revenue.

Rubber plants, from South American seeds, were introduced into the Malayan peninsula in 1877 from the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew (United Kingdom) and the development of rubber production on commercial scale went ahead rapidly as soon as it was found that the soil and climate of Malaya were suitable for the purpose. Over 3.5 million acres of land (more than half of the total agricultural area) are now planted.

The production and export of tin, about 75 years ago, mainly from Chinese-owned mines, were limited by the prevailing anarchic conditions and the lack of modern communications. By 1900, however, 54% of the world's output of tin, some 40,000 tons, was produced in Malaya. During 1940-41, stimulated by war-time demand the annual average output was raised to 80,000 tons. But during Japanese occupation production declined steeply. It was only 8,42 tons in 1946. But since then the production has gone up again and in 1956 it was 62,295 tons.

Agricultural products in Malaya, apart from rubber, include rice (for local consumption), cocoanuts, pine-apples, palm kernels and palm oil. Products from fisheries and forests are also important. Minerals produced, apart from tin, include iron-ore, bauxite and

gold. There are a number of secondary industries based on main products such as rubber and tin.

Formerly, education in Malaya was imparted only by a few Muslim schools, which, in addition, offered Arabic instruction in Koran. To-day, educational services in the Federation provide school education for over 870,000 children, technical, and vocational training for teachers, farmers, nurses and mechanics, university education at home and overseas and both vocational and non-vocational education for adults. The University of Malaya was established in 1949, which has since then produced a number of graduates and other well-qualified people.

The Federation of Malaya has developed a network of social welfare services which are rendering yoemen service to children and young persons as well as to the destitute, the aged, the blind and the crippled. Labour welfare has become an important plank of social legislation, which has regulated hours of work in factories, mines and plantations, holidays and the days for rest, the methods of the payment of wages, the employment of women and children, workmen's compensation for injury in employment, workers' housing, medical treatment etc. There is also the Employees Provident Fund. By 1956, there were 950,334 registered contributors to the Fund and 14,055 registered employers. There are also strong Trade Unions and Cooperative Movements. By 1955 there were 228 registered trade unions with a total membership of over 150,000 and 1,964 registered cooperative societies with a total membership of 222,548.

The population of Malaya is computed to be 6,252,000 people out of which 2,967,223 are Malaysians, 2,286,883 are Chinese, 713,810, are Indians and Pakistanis and 90,391 are others.

The political struggle for independence, however, was not as strongly developed in Malaya as in India. It was due to the fact that traditional Rulers of Malaya, the Sultans, had more or less accepted British sovereignty, and the people in general held their native rulers in high respect. Yet the educated Malaysians felt the urge for independence, and slowly and steadily political consciousness grew amongst the people, particularly after the Second World War when many other Asian nations like India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan and Indonesia became independent. The Malayan demand for independence grew insistently. In 1956 a conference was held in London to consider the question of granting independence to Malaya, which was attended by the Representatives of the Federation of Malaya. The Conference decided in favour of independence to be established by the end of August 1957.

We Indians, heartily welcome the Independence of Malaya. We welcome the people of Malaya in the comity of free nations.

KERALA EDUCATION BILL — A DISCUSSION

The Democratic Research Service organised an informal discussion on the Kerala Education Bill on August 21. It was held in the office of the D.R.S. Among those who participated in the discussion were Prof. P. T. Joseph of St. Xavier's College; Mr. S. Abraham, Principal, Sir David Sassoon High School; Mr. Monsignor Henry Remedious, an educationist; Mr. Adam Adil and Dr. A. J. Shellat. Mr. V. B. Karnik presided over the meeting.

Mr. Karnik initiated the discussion by giving a brief outline of the Bill, and presenting its salient features. Referring to the provisions included in the Bill for an educational agency being required to appoint, with the approval of the Government, a Manager, he remarked that the Bill reduces the Manager to the status of a business manager. The Manager has simply to collect fees, hand the money over to the Government and again to disburse salaries to teachers when he receives money from the Government for the same.

With regard to the panel of teachers to be compiled by the Government or the Public Service Commission, he questioned the desirability of having a register of teachers. Is it desirable that management should be left with no choice but to select teachers from the prepared list and the Government should pay directly to teachers their salaries? This might, he said, affect adversely the control of management over teachers and also the general discipline in an educational institution. The Bill, he said, attempts to give the Government a monopoly in the educational field which might lead to abuses. This attempt to nationalise education from the back-door, he warned, might lead to communist indoctrination.

Prof. P. T. Joseph gave background information of the political situation in Kerala. Kerala, he stated, had been in quest of stable government since 1947. Commenting on the Bill he said that the State was a land of political surprises where lost causes are often revived. He pointed out that Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer, former Dewan of Travancore, had tried to introduce a similar Bill.

Mr. Abraham contended that the Government should not be placed above law. He pointed out the injustice done to the Manager of a school in the Bill where he is held solely responsible for the conduct of the school whereas actually the school would be run by a society or a managing committee. Referring to the provision for Government paying salaries directly to teachers, he pointed out that the present system of payment of salaries to teachers in Kerala was the same as the one envisaged in the Bill. This system is preferable, he claimed, as it would eliminate some of the malpractices prevailing in private schools run for profit.

Father Remedious contended that the Bill sought to model education on a totalitarian pattern, where Government would be the final arbiter of what is good for a pupil's mind. The Government inspired by the communist ideology would surely use it for in-

doctrination. The conception of Manager, envisaged in the Bill, he said, is different from what is generally held. The Manager, according to the Bill, becomes just a go-between. Every school, he opined, has got a certain concept and a pattern behind it, to build up the school. The Bill attempts to destroy those concepts and bring about rigid uniformity in the educational field.

Mr. Adam Adil questioned the propriety of giving grants to mission schools when the schools see to it that children of a particular community are given preference. He also objected to the Kerala Government's proposal to make the Education Minister Pro-Chancellor of the University. This, he feared, would give a convenient handle to the party in power to bring its political influence to bear on university affairs. He also expressed his misgiving that the Bill sought to transform teachers into government servants, thus depriving them of their freedom of opinion and conscience.

Dr. Shellat said that the Bill, if enforced, would smash the whole structure of education in Kerala and would introduce evils of bureaucracy into the field of education. The Bill empowers the Government to take over even those educational institutions which do not receive monetary help from the Government. Thus, he said, the Bill sought to put an end to freedom to experiment which was so vital for democracy.

Mr. V. B. Karnik, winding up the discussion, remarked that though the Bill did not propose to abolish private schools, the wide powers conferred on Government by the Bill would ultimately reduce all schools to the status of government institutions. If the Government becomes the sole authority to determine the quality of education it will definitely use its power for the purpose of indoctrination.

The discussion was attended by over fifty persons interested in the problem of education.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

A reception was held in honour of artists participating in the Young Asian Painters' Exhibition to be held in Tokyo, in the office of the Committee on July 31. Apart from the artists who had sent their paintings for the Exhibition in Tokyo the reception was attended by a number of senior artists and art critics of Bombay. Mr. Nissim Ezekiel, the Editor of *Quest*, welcomed the guests. There was also a display of the exhibits which was highly appreciated by all.

Mr. Takachiyo Uemura, the celebrated art critic of Japan, who was in Bombay for three days, was accorded a reception in the office of the Committee on August 12. A number of prominent artists attended the reception. Mr. J. B. H. Wadia welcomed the guest on behalf of the Committee. Arrangements had also been made to take Mr. Uemura round to the studios of a few prominent artists in Bombay.

The Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom collected and sent to the Young Asian Painters' Exhibition in Tokyo 56 paintings of 40 artists. They were selected out of over 125 exhibits by a panel of judges consisting of some senior artists and art critics.

Review

The Bridge At Andau

James A Michener, Secker & Warburg—15s.

The Hungarian Revolution

George Mikes, Andre Deutsch—12s.6d.

A Handful Of Ashes

Noel Barber, Allan Wingate—12s.6d.

THE three books tell the same story, the glorious story of the Hungarian revolution of October 1956. They tell of the spontaneous outburst of the people against a long-hated and long-detested communist regime, of the heroic struggle of Hungarians of all classes and ages and of both sexes for the defence of their rights and liberties and of its brutal suppression by the communist rulers of Soviet Russia. The story is now known all over the world and yet there will always be a keen desire to know more about the struggle and about the thousands of unknown freedom fighters whose noble heroism invested the revolution with such grandeur.

Though the theme is the same each has its own way of telling the story. *The Bridge at Andau* written by James A. Michener is based on the information collected from hundreds of refugees who passed over the bridge into the world of freedom. Many of those who were interviewed had taken active part in the revolution. Out of the information so collected the author has concocted composite figures of a youth, an intellectual, a mechanic, and a worker from red Csepel, the industrial centre of Budapest and told the story in terms of the experiences made by each one of them during the days of the revolution and the earlier period. This has made the story very interesting as well as very impressive.

Gruesome details are given in a chapter of the brutalities practised by A.V.O. the secret police of the communist regime. Nobody was safe from the long arm of A.V.O. and anything could happen to anybody once he fell under its suspicion. By its insistence on making its victims betray their nearest and dearest, enforced through terror and torture, A.V.O. had, it appears, broken down "the fabric of normal society". This explains why freedom fighters were so bitter against A.V.O. men and why in some cases in the first few days of the revolution terrific revenge was wreaked upon some of A.V.O. men who fell in their hands.

The events that took place in Csepel, the industrial showpiece of the communist regime, are vividly described in another chapter. The workers, who according to communist doctrine and the professions of communist leaders ought to have stood by the regime, fought as one man against the communist party and its rule. Many of the valiant fighters were at one time ardent and devoted members of the party. Csepel is remarkable not merely for its brave fight during the days of the revolution but also for its courageous and dogged general strike after its defeat. "That was a rejection of communism which

was irrefutable." Even the sceptics of New Delhi were moved by it and had to admit thereafter that what took place in Hungary was a genuine national struggle.

The author of *The Hungarian Revolution*, George Mikes is a Hungarian by birth. He was in Hungary during the days of the revolution as a correspondent of the British Broadcasting Corporation. He has written his story on the basis of what he saw and on the basis of information collected in Vienna from refugees and others. His justification for writing the story is in his own words: "A story of human greatness, courage and self-sacrifice has always moved me, and it seemed to me that this one should be chronicled and set down as a wreath, a memory and a reproach." The Hungarian revolution is, according to him, "most glorious revolt of this century." The story that is unfolded in the pages fully corroborates this characterisation made at the beginning of the book. Apart from the story of the revolution the book also gives an interesting account of the developments that took place in Hungary in the period between the two wars. It is a tragic tale of one dictatorship following another and imposing upon the country its own brand of terror and torture.

The third book, *A Handful of Ashes* is written by Noel Barker, the correspondent of *Daily Mail* of London. He rushed to Budapest immediately on hearing of the outbreak of the revolution. By a chance he became involved in the fighting which was taking place in the city within minutes of reaching the place. He has also shed his blood for the revolution. On October 28, when the Russians pulled out of Budapest there was wide-spread joy, but there was also suspicion about their real intention. When he went out along with another correspondent to find out what was actually happening he was shot by a Russian soldier. After a couple of days in a hospital he had to leave the country in that wounded condition as he would not be safe if the Russians had found him after their return on November 4.

This is indeed an eyewitness's account, to a large extent a personal story. The author has explained the purpose of his writing: "I will write of what happened day by day, night by night, of the people who died and how they died. I lost so many friends and they were the humble people of the earth. For this was not war, this was murder; murder against children who should have been at school. This was the battle of little people, fired with the spark of greatness against unsurmountable odds. There were no captains in fine raiment to direct the operations. There were only boys and girls in clotted bandages roaming the smashed-up streets of Budapest, dying by the thousands with smiles on their lips. There were the men and boys of field and factory, the women and girls of home and school. Though most of them are dead, it is of them that I shall write."

There is one passage in the book which will be of particular interest to Indian readers. The author was then in hospital suffering from the wound that a Russian bullet had inflicted upon him. A friend of his, Denes, a resident of Budapest who had helped as

a translator, was talking to him about the events in city and the country. "I remember that when Denes had finished talking, I thought and then told him that one man and one man alone could, by words alone, have saved Hungary at the moment of victory. That man, who professes to hold the freedom of subject peoples as the most important thing on earth, chose through all the desperate time deliberately to keep his mouth closed. That man is Nehru, who despite his glib tongue will never live down the fact that at this moment in the crossroads of history he was a moral coward. . . . I believe that the Russian decision to reopen the fight in Hungary was touch and go, and I believe that if Nehru had condemned such a measure, as he had every right to do, he would have altered the course of history in the Soviet satellite empire. But during all this tragic time, when the flower of Hungary was being crushed by the Soviet tanks, this man never practised, even with a five-minute speech, the theories he has for so long so fervently preached."

These are no doubt strong words. One would have liked the author to use less harsh language. But it cannot be denied that in those fateful days, when Soviet tanks and guns were mowing down men, women and children in the streets of Budapest, many in India had similar thoughts. The Prime Minister may not have possibly succeeded in stopping the carnage, but he should have at least made the attempt by condemning in unequivocal terms the Soviet use of its military might to crush the revolutionary struggle of the Hungarian people.

Louis Kossuth, the central figure of the 1848 Hungarian revolution, said about the heroic struggle waged under his leadership: "It has hardly ever happened in the history of the world that a nation's fight for freedom excited greater sympathy than ours. We fought by ourselves, cut off from the world." These words are equally true of the struggle waged a hundred years later. The books under review are an expression of the worldwide sympathy with Hungary's fight for freedom, and they are also a testimony how, as before, the people of Hungary fought "by themselves, cut off from the world."

V.B. K.

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

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3/Rs. 2 for
members of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Name:

Address:

Signature

ICCF SEMINAR IN POONA

THE Poona Branch of the ICCF organised a seminar on Saturday and Sunday the 27th and 28th of July at Patwardhan Hall of the Maharashtra Sahitya Parishad. The subject of the seminar was "Indian Cultural Renaissance and Marathi Belles Letters."

Those who attended the Seminar included Messers. V. D. Ghatge, V. S. Khandekar, Y. D. Pendharkar, K. Narayan Kale, D. V. Gokhale, D. V. Deshpande, Arvind Gokhale, Nissim Ezekiel, Vyankatesh Madgulkar, K. N. Phadke, and D. G. Nadkarni and Professors G. B. Sardar, D. K. Bedekar, S. P. Bhagwat, A. K. Bhagwat, Achyut Barve, P. G. Sahastrabudhe, S. K. Ksheersagar and G. P. Pradhan. Tarkateerth Laxmanshastri Joshi, who presided over Saturday's discussion, and Mr. Prabhakar Padhye, who presided over Sunday's discussion specially came down from Wai and New Delhi to attend the seminar.

The subject for discussion was divided into seven parts covering the whole range of social, political and cultural currents of the period since 1874, the year which marked the inception of *Nibandhamala*, a magazine founded and edited by Vishnushastri Chiplunkar, one of the leading pioneers of resurgent nationalism in Maharashtra. Among the chief topics that were discussed were: the reflections of the struggle for national freedom and movements for social reform in Maharashtra in Marathi literature, the effects of Marxism and the new trends in psychology; influence of modern English literature and Marathi literature in the post-independence period. The whole discussion revolved round the central questions of relation between the artist and social, political and cultural conditions of his time and that of literature, as an art, having its own aesthetic value-judgements. Mr. Prabhakar Padhye, in his concluding speech on the second day, sounded a note of warning against harmful effects of the growing State patronage on literature and suggested that the Poona Branch should take up the question of State patronage of art and its effects on the freedom of the artist for discussion at the next seminar.

INDIAN COMMUNIST PARTY DOCUMENTS

Published by

The Democratic Research Service
and
The Institute of Pacific Relations

Price Rs. 10

Available from:

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.