

An Invitation To Autocracy

Raman Desai

MR. Nehru's action in asking six Central Ministers and six Chief Ministers of States to vacate their posts has been welcomed generally by the Press as a bold measure intended to revitalise the Congress by circulating eminent Congressmen among the people, presumably to listen to their woes and rectify them. With the powers of the Government daily increasing, it is difficult to see what role well-meaning, non-official Congressmen can play, in remedying administrative failures. Mr. Sri Prakash, for example, has been writing very sensible articles about waste and corruption and he pleads his helplessness now, as much as he was presumably helpless when in office. As regards corruption in high places, time and again, competent senior Congressmen have brought instances to Mr. Nehru's notice and not even an impartial enquiry has been undertaken by him. Surely, if the officials are interrogated and a strict code of conduct expected of them, there is no reason why the same or almost similar code and procedure could not have been framed for Ministers long ago. The truth is that as long as Chief Ministers of States could procure necessary votes for winning elections, their methods of administration were winked at. Is there any hope that if Mr. Shastri, who is a man of high integrity could do nothing as Home Minister, with all his powers of investigation will succeed as a commoner, when out of office? Of course, if all that the Kamaraj Plan intended was to oil the castors of mere administrative machinery of the Congress, without radical change in the methods, the departure of senior men from office would be in the party's interest but certainly not to the country's benefit.

But Mr. Nehru's action on the offer of resignation made by his colleagues is neither in the interests of the party nor in the interests of the country. How the Congress will utilise Mr. Desai, for instance, in the Gujarat imbroglio, where he is hardly likely to receive a welcome warmer than he did, is not understood. His presence at international conferences next month was of more vital and more urgent importance than the services needed by his party. How is a new Finance Minister going to brief himself and take up the reins from the point where Mr. Desai has left the discussions? Indeed in terms of foreign aid and the need for foreign understanding of our precarious

financial position the presence of Mr. Desai in the Cabinet was essential—but on no public account could Mr. Desai be considered dispensable at this stage in our financial stringency.

It is true that Mr. Desai's departure may be welcomed in short-sighted circles and the new Minister has ready popularity assured to him by removing the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, which is hopeless administratively and uneconomic from any business point of view. Mr. Desai's obstinacy should not obscure the fact that he was courageous in his other measures such as Super Profits Tax, with which common people should have no grievance; as regards, Gold Control Order, no one has suggested an alternate measure to attempt to prevent smuggling.

It is precisely this illustration of Mr. Desai's sudden departure which raises certain doubts regarding the object and motives behind Mr. Nehru's interpretation of the Kamaraj Plan. Undoubtedly, the powers the Congressmen chose to give rendered possible a dictatorship for Mr. Nehru. Constitutionally, he could always choose his colleagues at the Centre, as he wills. The selection of Chief Ministers has been left in the past in the hands of the High Command and in fact such Ministers were selected even before the elections, quite contrary to any principle of constitutional propriety. But today Mr. Nehru has dictatorship thrust on him. And the first exercise of such dictatorial powers is disquieting. Was Mr. Nehru not aware of the interpretation one could legitimately place on his removal of Mr. Desai and Mr. Patil within hours of the specific demands for their removal by communists? To remove Mr. Desai at this particular stage must raise fears in the minds of democratic people, fears of an impending insurge of fellow-travellers in Government, as indeed hopes of such very thing happening have spouted in communist circles. Mr. Nanda is a sincere, earnest worker but his experience does not warrant holding a post which Vallabhbhai Patel filled; his Plans have been impractical although ideologically akin to Soviet experience in planning. While it is altogether wrong for a democratic party to surrender its judgement to the hands of one man, it looks pre-eminently hazardous to allow Mr. Nehru absolute powers at this juncture in our history.

But our first concern is defence; and our policy of appeasement, of perpetual note-writing even after a war has started resembles accurately the policy of Chamberlain and Halifax even after the War against Germany was officially declared. Mr. Nehru still hopes for talks, for foreign help in persuading our enemy, in hopes of compromise. One is entitled to be alarmed lest, in the near future, a galaxy of second rate yesmen and fellow-travellers adorn the front benches in Government all over the country. [CONTINUED ON PAGE 2]

The Berlin Wall

Raman Desai

JUST two years ago, the 13th August 1961, the Berlin Wall started building; a wall, not to repel invaders or barbarians, but a wall to prevent a free brother accosting a bonded slave.

There is hardly any explanation, other than that Roosevelt was a sick man wearied to death, for the extraordinary decisions of the Allies at the end of the war, with regard to occupation of German territory. The Allies could have marched up to occupy Prague, thus repaying the dastardly deed by which Czechoslovakia had been handed over to Hitler at Munich and preventing Stalin taking over where Hitler left. The Allies could have occupied the whole of Germany. The Allies could have occupied Germany upto Berlin. But what they did was to divide Germany into four parts, and further divided Berlin itself into four parts but at the same time permitting a long solid belt of Soviet occupation round Berlin with the result that Berliners in the Allied zone seemed to live in a constant state of insecurity and alarm. It seemed clear that sooner or later Russia would encroach on the other zone and otherwise make the economic life of the rest of Berlin impossible. Roosevelt failed to see that while Stalin kept his word when the War lasted, after all his country was doomed if the Allies failed him, Stalin after the war and always, owed greater and more lasting loyalty to the tenets of communist imperialism.

After all, communists would soon find that the Allied Sectors of Berlin, with their free living, prosperity occasioned by free enterprise and democratic rule, must act as a challenge, an eyesore and an object of envy to the rest of the Germans. The glaring light of publicity would reveal the poverty, the frustration, the abject surrender of the rest of Germany. It was not long before the Joint Control of Berlin was sabotaged by the Soviet Command. The Soviet declined to accept the free elections of Berlin Municipal Assembly; they withdrew from the Control Council shortly after. In accordance with plan, in June 1948, Russia completed the blockade of West Berlin. The Airlift began by which the citizens of West Berlin were fed and reassured and for the first time, a determined set of Western Powers frustrated the designs of Russia in Germany. Thereafter, the former allies have separately governed their respective zones with different constitutions for their zones.

(Continued from page 1)

The Congressmen who surrendered powers to one man, however eminent his past services, may ponder before it is too late what the consequences of such a galaxy would be to the future of democracy in this country. Frankly, the possibility of a sort of coalition, hidden or obvious, between such fellow-travellers cannot be ruled out altogether and even Mr. Nehru can be helpless once the avalanche starts, as Benes and Masaryk found themselves, after the War, under Communist pressure.

The Constitution of the Soviet zone can be imagined; behind high sounding phrases about the right of the citizens to hold and express opinions freely and to hold peaceful assemblies, in practice the various laws promulgated deny the elements of justice as understood in any other country. The Constitution even guarantees "Every citizen is entitled to emigrate" when, as we know, a huge wall physically prevents even a short journey to meet a relative. With a hypocrisy characteristic of a Government which somehow seeks recognition among the comity of nations, this guarantee still forms part of the Constitution, perhaps because the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations, states unequivocally "everyone has a right to leave any country including his own."

The Allied sectors of Berlin acted as a window by which Germans could escape into a world where their cultural traditions would find scope and a freer life ensured. The border between the two Germanys extended over 859 miles; the border around West Berlin is 97 miles long; but here in Berlin it was a question of crossing a street into a different world. The Soviet had to face this challenge. And they did it in their own fashion. The border between the Germanys was sealed; the border around West Berlin is fortified by walls, and barbed wire. The length of this wire is estimated at 6000 miles. In 1953, identity cards were issued in East Berlin. In 1954, passports and Visas were introduced for any crossing and in 1957 a new offence entailing 15 years imprisonment was created to prevent "suborning into leaving" the Eastern zone. These measures did not suffice. Besides, there were legitimate transient visitors in the zones, such as over 50,000 workers who resided in East Berlin but worked for their living in West Berlin.

As far as can be gathered, there are about 17 million East Germans and 55 million West Germans. A stream of refugees has steadily poured one way into West Germany from the Eastern sector. Upto August 13, 1961 when the Wall physically barred East Berlin from West Berlin, an estimated 3.7 to 4 million inhabitants left Soviet Germany for West Germany. The population of Soviet Germany, alone in the world, declined during the decade 1950-59 from 18.4 million to 17.3 millions. Half the refugees were young persons below 25 years of age and a large majority are persons engaged in trade, commerce, agriculture. A large exodus of members of the professions and scientific pursuits occurred. It is probably that in a few years, East Germany would have left within it very few Germans.

It is in these circumstances, that the final step, of physically barricading the East Berliners from crossing, even for a temporary reason, or to gain a lawful wage, the erection of the Berlin Wall was undertaken on 13th August 1961. The Wall stretches right across

(Continued on page 10)

Socialism Or State Capitalism?

M. R. Masani

(Extracts from the speech delivered in the course of the discussion on the motion of No Confidence in the Union Government, in the Lok Sabha on August 19, 1963)

THE Government's policy broadly, is one of socialism at home and non-alignment abroad. Let us examine dispassionately to what extent the first of these objectives have succeeded during the last fifteen years. Socialism means moving towards a more prosperous, a more free and a more equal society, an objective with which I am hundred per cent in agreement. But to what extent has this objective been furthered during the last fifteen years?

Let us consider different classes of society. Let us consider the landless labourer. Has anyone got the courage to say that the lot of the landless labourer, in terms of real income, has improved? The reports of Government committees do not show anything of the kind. I think it would be right to say that even the small peasant with a small holding has not materially improved his lot. The industrial workers have certainly been compensated by dearness allowance and you may say, therefore, that their real wages today are what they were when Independence was achieved. The Labour Minister, Shri Nanda, has conceded that there has been no real rise in the standard of living of the Indian working class.

Then we come to the backbone of the nation, the middle class. Is it not patent to all of us — because we all belong to that class — that that class today finds itself ground between the two millstones of constantly rising prices on the one side and of rising taxes on the other?

Industry and business complain that they are being cribbed, cabined and confined by endless regulations and, finally, by the super profits tax.

Then I ask, who has benefited? Who is better off today than before Independence? There is only one class that has improved its lot. That class is the class of some politicians in office, some officials and a few businessmen who work hand-in-glove with these politicians and these officials. The combination of Malaviya and Serajuddin is the only vested interest in this country. It is this class which Dijas, the Yugoslav communist, has described as the *New Class*, which talks of socialism in Russia and Yugoslavia and feathers its own nest. It is this New Class that is the only beneficiary of fifteen years of so-called socialism in our country.

Are people more free or equal? I would venture to say not. People are tied up in a mass of red-tape. All classes are subject to bureaucratic exploitation. Businessmen have to make trips to Delhi in aeroplanes, while the poor peasants has to walk or go by bus to the taluka headquarters to get some wretched form filled or completed.

Why has the socialist pattern failed to create more prosperity, equality or freedom? I venture to say that while the objective was noble while the objective

is acceptable to all of us, the method was hopelessly wrong — the method of Statism, of State Capitalism, of believing that the people could do nothing, that Government must do everything for them, the carrying on of that *ma-baap sarcar* mentality of the British raj which has been the bane of this country during the past fifteen years. We never gave the people the feeling of freedom, of saying 'do it for yourself', the feeling of faith that made West Germany great when, under Erhard, they said: 'Let the men and the money loose and they will make the country strong.' We trust neither men nor money. We only trust Government.

With what result? Take agriculture. Our productivity is among the lowest in the world. Official figures show that we raise it by 1.5 per cent every year, a very miserable ratio, because the Food Minister has admitted that we can triple our productivity, given the resources. Then why is it not done? Not because of the wickedness of one Minister or another but because as two or three Food Ministers have complained, the Planning Commission and its false order of priorities have neglected agriculture, because the money that is needed to put irrigation, water, seed, implements, fertiliser into the soil is going into top-heavy, wasteful projects where the return is very much lower.

Instead of producing more food, giving money and sinking capital into the land, we spend endless time on discussing distribution, controls, zones and cordons. That is not going to make food. If the object is to produce more food, the Government has signally failed to create a prosperous agricultural base on which our whole industry may be based. No planning will succeed if the very foundation of economic life, which is land, is neglected and weak, as it is in India today.

Turn to industry. The same picture of false priorities, a wrong order of priorities. The State sector, for doctrinaire reasons which have nothing to do with reality, is being forced upon against the interests of the country. In the First Plan, investment in State enterprises was 46 per cent. In the Second Plan it was 54 per cent. In the Third Plan, it is estimated to be 61 per cent and, if our planners have their way, which God forbid, they will raise the State sector to 65 per cent by the end of 1970-71 and 68 to 70 per cent by 1975-76. Who is to decide how the balance of the sectors will go? Is it not the people of India who, by their consumer preference, by deciding what they want to buy and what not to buy, have the right to decide? Do you want to have economic democracy in this country, or do you want six or eight people sitting in Delhi like the Gosplanners in Moscow, to dictate to the people what they should produce and what they

should not produce, what they shall buy and what they shall not buy?

It is not true that some of us do not believe in State enterprises. We stand for a mixed economy. We stand for a mixed economy of private and State enterprise working side by side to serve the needs of the community, but this must be on a basis of free and equal competition, of allowing the consumer to decide whether he wants to buy these goods or those goods, and not State monopoly Capitalism which is becoming increasingly the pattern of our socialist economy here.

Instead of creating a climate for incentives, savings and production, exactly the reverse is being done. Our vital productive forces have been crippled in the last fifteen years. It is a tribute to the vitality of the Indian people that our agriculture and industry have not died by now under the burdens and restrictions imposed on them.

Look at our taxes. They have far exceeded the point of diminishing returns. We have gone to the point where we tax more and more and get less and less, because, as you know, 50 per cent of Rs. 10 is much less than 10 per cent of a hundred rupees. We are trying to get more and more out of the people with the result that we are getting less than we should.

Stable prices and an honest rupee, a rupee that means today what it will mean ten years from now, should be the basic foundation of our economic policy. What is our record in preserving the stability of the rupee? Our Government has almost consistently gone in for inflationary policies—deficit financing, customs and excise duties on the necessities of life and above all, investment in expensive, low-return enterprises like steel, where the money supply is inflated but the goods and services that should come out of the factory do not come out. Inflation is the result of too much money chasing too few goods and services. The way to check inflation is to invest money where the return is quick and ample, and that is agriculture first of all. Then there are fertiliser, road transport and a hundred other things where, if you sow a rupee, you can reap a rupee back, but we go and dump that rupee in a steel plant which does not give even four annas for many years to come. This is the basic fault.

Then we come to controls—the main bane of our economy. It is said we should stop prices rising by putting on controls. If I may say so, that is flying in the face of the laws of economics. Nothing can stop prices rising if the supply and demand position warrants it. A British economist has said that to try to stop prices by control is like a lady going to a surgeon to remove her double chin, and the thing comes out at the back of her neck in a bump! In other words, you treat a symptom, you do not treat the disease. The disease of inflation is because of the policies of the Government. Until these are changed, no amount of controls are going to succeed.

You cannot defeat the law of supply and demand. Prices, like water, will find their own level, and no amount of juggling will stop the laws of hydrodynamics or the laws of economics from having play. And that is why the team of the World Bank which visited India in February or March this year — let

me remind the House that the World Bank is our biggest foreign benefactor today, generous, friendly and helpful — singled out for particular castigation Government's present policies, which in its opinion make for inefficiency and high costs, and controls which hamper industry at every turn.

Controls involve bureaucracy. Let me give you a few findings of the studies made by the Organisation and Methods Division of the Government itself. Official files in the Union Ministries increase at an annual rate of three lakhs; 21 lakhs of files are awaiting screening and destruction; 22 to 45 per cent of the working space allotted to the staff on an austerity basis is occupied by undisposed files. In the Central Public Works Department, 18 to 25 months are needed for a proposal to reach the stage of execution. And in that particular Ministry the study cites the case of the Land and Development Office where the allotment of a piece of land involves no less than 370 steps from the beginning till the end. This is the controlled economy.

Let us take another index — employment. Employment is a crying need. We have heard a great deal of what the Government is doing, but no results. In fact, there is a definite deterioration in the situation in regard to employment. After ten years of planning, industries in India only employed 4.6 per cent of the population in 1960-61.

Instead of creating employment, this Government has created more unemployment. I refer to the Gold Control Order. It has thrown lakhs of capable, decent people in this country out of a job and on to the streets. Nothing in my month of campaigning in Rajkot was as sad as going into a shop and finding a man looking utterly desolate, with nothing in the shop. I would ask him what was wrong, and he said: *Hu soni chhu, Barbad thai gaya*. He was in utter despair and helpless. This is a new proletariat you have created in this country. Lakhs and lakhs of good people with nowhere to go. You are crucifying them on a cross of gold. And for what purpose? Because Shri Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister, says that hoarding of gold must be stopped, smuggling of gold must be stopped. This is not the way to stop it. It is a meaningless and perverse measure. So long as your rupee is debased, so long as the rupee note in your pocket is worth 20 nP., you cannot stop people hoarding gold, land or anything spoiling the money of this country and debasing it into a false coin that makes gold sell at a premium. It has nothing to do with social habits and being reactionary. In any part of the world, destroy the currency and you will get people hoarding gold or land or anything which they think to be a better standard of value. If people in India hoard gold today, they are being good economic animals. They are patriotic and decent people who know that their money is worthless and that gold has worth today and will have worth in 25 years.

So, one comes to the conclusion that all this talk of socialism, however well-intentioned it may have been, has been a cover for setting up State Capitalism and bureaucracy, benefiting a new class and exploiting the mass of people.

Bombay Civic Strike - An Evaluation

V. B. Karnik

STRIKES are not unusual to the city of Bombay. They take place from time to time though in recent years their number as well as their intensity have decreased considerably. The strike of the municipal workers which has just ended was not, however, of the usual type. It was a strike out of the ordinary both because of the way in which it was organised and conducted and the way in which it was combated and also because of the interest that was evinced in it and the publicity that it received.

The strike was organised in order to secure an increase in dearness allowance. The demand was for a twentyfive per cent increase, but the union leaders made it clear on many occasions that the actual amount of the increase was open to negotiation. The demand was made on the basis of the steep rise in prices. Everybody knows that the prices have risen. But the rise is not being reflected in the Consumers Price Index prepared by the Government. Hence arose the demand for the revision of the Index. Unless the Index is revised, the municipal workers and other workers cannot substantiate their claim to a higher dearness allowance. The Government have, in principle, accepted the need for revision. A committee was appointed a few days back to consider the matter.

The demand for higher dearness allowance and for a revision of the Index concerned the entire working class of Bombay and not merely the municipal workers. That is why, when the strike took place, it enjoyed the general and, in some cases, the active support and sympathy of all workers. The questions that arise then are: Was it proper for the municipal workers to take upon themselves the burden of fighting for all workers? Was it wise on the part of the union leaders to place that burden on their shoulders? Was the ambition to make a mark and capture the leadership of the working class movement the main reason behind the strike? Were there any other political motives? The questions must be asked and squarely answered in order to understand the reasoning behind the strike.

The demand, which was of a far-reaching character, was raised for the first time in June. In view of the wide repercussions that it was likely to have, was it not necessary to give the Corporation sufficient time to consider it? Can one say that six or seven weeks that were granted was sufficient time to consider a demand which was not based either on any previous decision of the Corporation or the Government or any authoritative compilation of data? The Corporation is a statutory local authority and could have been relied upon to pay the higher dearness allowance with back effect as soon as it was found to be due. The union ignored all these factors and hastily launched the strike on the night of the 11th of August. In view of this, the conclusion appears to be inevitable that the union was keen on taking

advantage of the rains which were then very much in evidence. A union is entitled to choose for its direct action the time which would make it most effective; but, if in choosing the time it altogether disregards public convenience and interest, it must be prepared to forfeit public support and sympathy.

As the employees of a popularly elected non-profit-making local authority charged with a number of vital functions in the sphere of public health and sanitation, municipal workers have some obligations towards the society. Some of them are legal, while some others are of a moral character. A responsible union of such employees will think a hundred times before launching a strike at a time when it is likely to prove most injurious to public health. The Municipal Mazdoor Union paid no attention to this duty that it owed to the people.

A strike, it is now generally agreed, is the last weapon in the armoury of workers. It should be used only after exhausting all other remedies. It is pertinent to enquire if in this particular strike the union had made any honest attempt to seek redress through other means. It is true that it submitted its demands. It is also true that the Municipal Commissioner behaved in a foolish manner by laying down some pre-conditions for opening negotiations. (After the strike took place, it was explained that they were not pre-conditions but some proposals. The Municipal Commissioner deserves to be blamed for withholding the explanation until it was too late). All the same, it cannot be said that the union made all efforts that could have been made for avoiding the strike. There were other authorities such as the Mayor, and the Standing Committee and the Corporation itself which could have been approached. The union made no efforts to approach them. It did not also make use of the conciliation machinery set up by the Government. It is true that the machinery moves slowly. But it is not impossible to make it move quickly. Nor did the union offer to accept arbitration of the dispute. All these ways were open to the union, but it disdained to use them.

The only course that it adopted was to seek the intervention of the Government of Maharashtra. Union leaders met one Minister after the other and insisted upon them to persuade the Corporation to consider and grant the demand. They forgot for the time being that the Corporation was an independent autonomous organisation and assumed that the Government could take decisions for that body. They might have been misled by what happened in the strike of 1962 when the Chief Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan intervened and brought about a settlement. But what happened once need not happen again and again. Forgetting that, the union leaders were all for a political settlement of the dispute, rather than for its settlement through negotiations with employers or through resort to the established machinery of the

Labour Department. This attitude of the union gave the dispute the political colour which was responsible for its ultimate failure.

The Government, the Corporation and the Congress Party in the Corporation had, it appears, already made up their mind that the threat of strike held out by the union was a political manoeuvre and had decided to defeat the strike if it was organised. They wanted to teach a lesson to the union and stop it once and for all from organising strikes during the monsoon when they caused the most inconvenience to the city and its lakhs of citizens. There was a feeling moreover that the union was taking undue advantage of its hold over workers and utilising it for furthering the political aims of the Socialist Party. Whatever the provocation, it was wrong to adopt such an attitude as it prevented a dispassionate consideration on merits of the demand of the workers. It seems that long before the strike was actually launched, the Government had taken a political decision to defeat it. There were many straws in the wind which indicated it. With this knowledge of the Government's attitude, wise trade union leaders would have tried their best to avoid a head-on collision. But the Socialist leadership of the union also was spoiling for a fight.

The strike, when it took place, therefore, became a direct confrontation between the union and the Government. No union, howsoever strong it may be, is in a position to face such a confrontation successfully. Its power and resources are bound to be far inferior to those of the Government. And on this occasion, the Government brought into operation all their ordinary and extra-ordinary powers and resources. They made use of the Defence of India Rules. They mobilised the Home Guards not merely for protection but also for doing the day to day work of municipal employees. They drafted for the same purpose municipal workers from other places. They recruited new workers to act as strike breakers. They resorted to large scale intimidation and coercion. They arrested a large number of leading workers and put them in jails. They prohibited meetings and assemblies and demonstrations and processions. Some of these steps were taken by the Government and some others by the Corporation. During the days of the strike there was hardly any difference between the two. Both were of the same mind and were working in complete concert with each other. The complete identification of the Government with the employer which was evident during this strike should receive the serious consideration of all trade-unionists. If it becomes the general policy of the Government, workers will have to give up all hopes of ever being able to organise successful strikes. The use of the Defence of India Rules for dealing with an industrial dispute also calls for vigorous protest.

With all the might and resources of the Government arrayed against it, the strike was bound to fail. That it was failing became evident even on the second or the third day when some sections of workers began drifting back to work. Moreover the essential services of the municipality were not paralysed and, as long as that did not happen, there

was no hope of the success of the strike. Realising this, the union leaders ought to have called off the strike immediately thereafter. It is possible that in that event they might have at least secured the reference of the dispute to arbitration. But, instead of adopting that realistic course, they decided to enlarge the arena of the struggle. They issued a call to bus and tram workers to organise a sympathetic strike. There was a good response to the call. Later, the taximen and the dock workers joined. And then on 20th August, there was a one-day token strike of all workers in Bombay. It expressed their full support to the strike of the municipal workers. Strictly speaking, the token strike had nothing to do with the municipal strike. The decision to organise it was taken long before in order to register workers' protest against rise in prices and the Compulsory Deposit Scheme. But that massive demonstration, taking place as it did during the days of the municipal strike was also calculated to lend strength to it. But none of these supports could save it and it collapsed in the early hours of 21st August. The leaders of the union accepted the inevitable a few hours later and passed a resolution calling off the strike.

The strike was conducted in a remarkably peaceful and disciplined manner for which credit must be given to the union and its leaders. But some credit is also due to the police and the Government. They took pretty good care to see that there was no cause for provocations. The citizens of Bombay equally deserve credit for behaving in a calm and orderly manner and for bravely putting up with the inconvenience that was caused to them. The strike received wide publicity in the city and also in other places. There were many expressions of support and solidarity. The matter was raised in Parliament and brought to the notice of the Central Government. But none of these efforts could save the strike.

The strike has ended and ended as a colossal failure. It is to be hoped that the Government and the Corporation will not utilise the defeat for penalising workers or for destroying the union. It is gratifying to note that the Government have already withdrawn prosecutions and released most of those who were arrested. The corporation is adopting a stiffer attitude and is not still allowing all workmen to resume their jobs. This is an attitude which will hinder the early restoration of normal relations. The Government and the Corporation may note the fact that even defeated workers do not necessarily lose confidence in their union or its leaders. It is also to be hoped that now at least the workers' demand for compensation against rise in prices will receive the sympathetic consideration it deserves. There can be no two opinions about the justice of the demand. The Government will have to do something to hold the price line or to give adequate compensation against rise in prices. The municipal workers voiced this general demand of workers and that is why their strike received the wide support that it did. The defeat of the strike will not silence the demand. It will be voiced again and again until it is satisfied. The Government will be well-advised to take early measures to satisfy it.

The strike has also some salutary lessons for the trade union movement. It must not, in the first place, invite or get involved in a direct conflict with the State. With the State as such there cannot be any industrial dispute. Disputes with the State are of a political nature. Trade unions are neither equipped nor competent to conduct them. The State must also realise this fact, for trade unions will lose the very basis of their existence if industrial disputes will be regarded and treated as political struggles. The trade union movement must not, in the second place, be too ready to make use of the weapon of strike. It is in its own interests to make the best possible use of

other methods. Even a cent per cent organisation and the justness of a demand are not sure guarantee of a success in a strike. It depends on a variety of factors and it is impolitic to ignore any one of them. A trade unionist is entitled to be proud of the strength and organisation that he may have succeeded in building up; but he will be injuring himself and his union if he allows a suspicion to grow that he is putting them to improper uses. The failure of the municipal strike is mainly due to this suspicion that had grown over the years in the mind of the Government, the Corporation and large sections of the people.

The Kamaraj Plan

S. R. Mohan Das

MR. K. KAMARAJA NADAR, the Chief Minister of Madras, has proposed that senior Ministers of the Congress Party both at the States and the Centre should resign their posts and devote their talents for reviving the party's organizational strength. The logic of the proposals was that needs of running the Government at the States and the Centre had heavily drawn on all the talents, leadership and competence existing in the party, creating a complete void of such talents and leadership for organizational purposes. In other words, Kamaraj plan calls for an equal deployment of available party talent and leadership between running the government and the party organization.

It has been suggested that this plan was put forth more than two months ago. It came up for discussion at the recent requisitioned meeting of the All India Congress Committee — a meeting requisitioned for the purpose of conducting a post-mortem on the Amroha-Farrukhabad-Rajkot defeats of the Congress Party. The main issue for which the AICC meeting was requisitioned got side-tracked by the novelty of the Kamaraj proposals. Stretching oneself slightly into a contortion, a case might be made that the Kamaraj proposals in effect were the possible remedies for the aftermath of Amroha-Farrukhabad-Rajkot debacles.

In actual fact, the Kamaraj proposals are not new in terms of their basic content. Mr. Dhebar, when he was the President of the Congress, often thought aloud on similar lines, and Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. Sanjiva Reddy had suggested a similar "10-year Rule" which did not survive as many days. Under the "10-year rule", the proposal was that all ministers, State and Central, who had functioned as Ministers for 10 years or more should resign and make place for others. There was not the slightest ripple of reaction among Congressmen about such a proposal earlier. In fact when Mr. Morarji Desai in his characteristic manner tried to impose the "ten-year rule" for reconstituting the Gujarat Cabinet, a serious party crisis threatened to develop in Gujarat which was averted by the defeat in general elections of the leaders of the faction who wanted to dislodge the present Chief Minister. The interesting question

is: Why has the Kamaraj Plan evoked what is seemingly a more earnest consideration in Congress quarters? How did Kamaraj succeed where Mr. Dhebar and Mr. Morarji Desai failed with similar proposals.

The aftermath of Amroha-Farrukhabad-Rajkot had certainly a lot to do with what seems to be greater earnestness in Congress ranks for any proposal that would retrieve the Party from the "Slough of Squabbles" into healthier environments. For it is a fact that the debacle of the Congress in these three elections set up a chain-reaction of internal dissensions that amounted to a minor convulsion of the Party. Much of the dissensions in the various states was engineered in that their manifestations in such acute forms as evidenced during the past weeks was very much out of proportion to the normal differences that always exist in any democratic party. The so-called "Progressive wing" of the Congress led by Mr. Krishna Menon, Mr. K. D. Malaviya and Mr. Patnaik of Orissa, found their positions of vantage in the Government suddenly lost or made gravely vulnerable after the by-election debacles. Having managed to obtain a base among the existing minority groups in the State Congress Parties of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra and Kerala and enjoying the support of the majority group in Punjab, and Orissa as well as the Congress Party Secretariat and the Prime Minister's good sentiments, they decided to "avenge" the damage caused to them in the exit of Krishna Menon, K. D. Malaviya and Hafiz Ibrahim. The first shot was fired in Uttar Pradesh in retaliation for Amroha and Farrukhabad. The U.P. cabinet crisis could only be solved by means of an open show-down even if it meant an unseemly brawl publicly. In Kerala the P.C.C. Chief, Mr. Govindan Nair, projected as an "intimate friend" of Mr. Krishna Menon, was doing a much more effective and successful job of terminating his own party's ministry than the Communist opposition ever hope to do. For a while, until Mr. Nehru's own views on the Kerala problem were available, Congress President Sanjivayya miscalculated developments and tended to support the

P.C.C. President against the Chief Minister. When Mr. Nehru found in the Chief Minister's favour as against Mr. Govindan Nair, the Congress President hurriedly shifted his own position to approximate Mr. Nehru's. In Andhra, the Congress President is directly involved in the State squabbles in processing which his group obtain support from the "progressives" to bring about the downfall of Mr. Sanjiva Reddy.

In Punjab and Orissa, rival factions in the party are ruthlessly crushed. In Bihar to avoid serious rift within the party, a hurried deal had to be put through with Mr. Jaipal Singh, leader of the Jarkhand Party.

All these developments took their acute forms only after the by-election defeats of the party. Prior to these defeats the dissensions did exist, but never reached the flash-points of an open showdown.

The only states which enjoyed stability from the point of view of harmony between the organizational and Ministerial wing were Tamilnad, Mysore, Maharashtra and West Bengal. It is also not accidental that it is in these states that the rate of constructive development is higher, administrative functioning relatively better and stability more dependable than the others. This is the first aspect of the existing situation to be taken note of.

The second important question to be understood is the nature of organizational concepts and activities in India, among all political groups. The Congress Party was essentially a mass movement and whatever organizational structure it was able to forge out of the movement was with very simple mandates relevant to those times. In the post-independent period, the Congress has not bothered to work out an organizational apparatus attuned to the new and very complex mandates it had taken up for Independent India. The fact that the other political parties are even less equipped organizationally for the tasks to be performed in India is a poor consolation for the Congress Party. The fact however remains in the absence of any organized apparatus and yet having become the inheritor of power, the Congress found only two institutions in India that could be termed effective organizations, viz., the Civil Service and the Defence Service. Lacking its own organizational apparatus to ensure effective popular action, the party had to rely solely on Governmental organizations for obtaining its party mandates implemented. Having had to graft itself on the civil services, certain ugly by-products of this process were inevitable. We see them in the form of corruption in civil services, extensive controls and regulations. As all meaningful activities could be possible only through governmental apparatus, we have seen the terrifying stampede in Congress ranks towards power-centres, even if they be the smallest like the Panchayat Board Presidentship or a Deputy Ministership in a State Government. When Mr. Sanjivayya bewailed recently that Congressmen who were paupers a few years ago now have become millionaires, owning cinema theatres, fleet of lorries, bungalows etc., he was bewailing only symptoms without being even aware of the root causes. It has become really a critical situation for the Congress Party when it finds a stampede

for the smallest posts of power and absolutely no takers for the highest executive and elected post for the Party, viz., the Presidentship of the Congress.

The Prime Minister reigns supreme over both the Government and the Party, a position which might be gratifying to any political boss, but not to Mr. Nehru who is attributed with strong democratic and statesmanlike impulses. Yet Mr. Nehru must accept a major share of the blame for the present state of affairs in his party. It will be recalled that he was mainly responsible for the injection of his personality as the determining factor in Congress party when he decisively intervened in favour of Acharya Kripalani against Babu Purshottamdas Tandon. After that, he could not get along with his own choice as the President of the Congress, viz., Acharya Kripalani when the latter raised the issue of the respective importance of the party wing in relation to the Ministerial wing. Acharya Kripalani's was the last heroic but futile assertion of the importance of the party organizational wing. He lost and had to quit the Congress more than 12 years ago. Since his exit, the era of strong Congress Presidents came to an end. The obvious lesson was only too well learnt by the rank-and-file of the Congress, including the "High Command", viz., the Prime Minister did not suffer colleagues gladly, but felt happy only among followers and supporters.

These are the two important factors that should be borne in mind in evaluating the Kamaraj Plan. The acceptance of the Kamaraj Plan would have been represented a radical measure of revitalising the party only if Mr. Nehru had insisted on his own resignation being accepted by the party as a compulsive training for them to learn the art of self-help and incidentally treat him as a man, statesman etc., by all means, but not as a god. He did go through the motions of giving his resignation, but like the good patriarch, readily and hastily withdrew it when all the Congressmen around him wailed about becoming political orphans. By insisting on his resignation, he could have lifted a docile and politically benumbed rank-and-file by their bootstraps and made better men out of them. He gave in too easily to their anxious inertia and now he is to determine which of the Ministers should be relieved to do party work and which of them should remain in the Government.

While this development robs the Kamaraj proposals of practically any potential merit it might have possessed, there is one residual fact that must be welcomed by all democrats. That is the fact that even in the midst of the present baneful political climate, it is possible to develop genuinely strong and indigenously-developed bargaining power through sound organization. The architects of this process in India are two striking individuals, K. Kamaraj and S. K. Patil. Both these men do not owe their present positions to patronage rendered to them from any power centres. Both have earned their positions by their own merits and bargaining power. This is precisely the reason Mr. S. K. Patil was not found vulnerable at all when the "Progressives" in alliance with the Communists, demanded at least Mr. Patil's

(Continued on page 11)

Split In The Communist Church

M. D. Kini

THE communist church is on the verge of a split. The break when it comes will be as momentous as the one which occurred 500 years ago in the Christian church. The recent events, the way the polemics and controversies are carried on by them, make the rupture inevitable.

It all started with the denigration of Stalin in the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956. Mr. Khrushchev officially unmasked the tyranny of the whole era and blamed Stalin for the "cult of personality." Mao and the Chinese Communist Party did not agree with this evaluation. They said Stalin's achievements are greater than his errors.

With the passage of years, the differences between the two "fraternal" parties have widened in area and sharpened in intensity. The international communist meetings held in 1957 and 1960 have not been able to bring the two parties together.

The differences came to a head during the Cuban crisis and the Chinese aggression against India. When the Soviet Union withdrew the missiles and the rockets from Cuban territory, the Communist Party of China accused the Soviet Union of "first committing the error of adventurism and then of capitulation." From then on a wordy battle is raging between the two parties.

The Mōshi Conference in Africa and the Journalists' Meet in Djakarta where the Chinese successfully kept the Soviet Union out and the Congress of the Italian, East German and other East European Communist Parties held last year, where the Chinese communists were booed and ridiculed only point out the growing differences between the two parties. For the first time China officially voted against the Soviet resolution on peaceful co-existence at the Women's Conference at Moscow.

In the recent meeting at Moscow the Chinese delegation was headed by Mr. Teng Hsiang-Ping, the veteran of ideological battles and the Soviet delegation by Mr. Mikhail Suslov, the "grey eminence" of the Soviet Party. The meeting started and was held under inauspicious circumstances. The Soviet Union expelled three Chinese diplomats and two Chinese students on the ground that they had distributed in Russia the now famous June 14 letter of the Communist Party of China to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Chinese accused the Soviet Union of denying a right which the Soviet Union enjoys in China. It accused the Soviet Union of "allowing the magistrate to burn down houses while forbidding the common people even to light lamps" and carrying "the ideological differences between the two parties of China and the Soviet Union to the sphere of state relations." The meeting has ended quietly and unceremoniously. A communique issued after the talks simply says talks will be resumed later. Perhaps both the parties want the other party to break the talks and relations.

The main point of difference between the two parties is the strategy and the tactics of world revolution. According to Moscow, existence of powerful communist states make Imperialist War impossible and atomic weapons make it disastrous. Moscow believes that there can be peaceful transition to communism. On the other hand, China says that as long as capitalist states are there, there are bound to be wars and Communist states need not fear atomic weapons since it is the people and not weapons which is decisive in any war. China says that there is no precedent for peaceful change. For them, capitalist countries are just paper tigers and they believe that there is no third road possible.

The dialogue between Moscow and Peking can be put in their own words:

Moscow: "The atomic bomb does not distinguish between imperialist and the working people; it hits big areas and therefore millions of workers would be destroyed per each monopolist."

Peking: "In the final analysis, atomic weapons . . . cannot decide the final outcome of war, cannot save imperialism from doom or prevent the proletariat and peoples of all countries and oppressed nations winning victories in their revolutions." China declared in 1957 "even if 300 million of us die in a nuclear war, 300 million of us will still live and the whole world will be Chinese." "The first World War was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union, the second World War was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million . . . (after) a third World War, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism."

Moscow: "Whoever denies the principle of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems, the principle of peaceful competition, shows a lack of faith in the revolutionary force of the working class, in the potent force of Marxist-Leninist ideas."

China: "The general line is a line of boldly arousing the masses, and not one of peaceful co-existence . . . Lenin spoke of the possibility of a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism but up to now there is no precedent for such a transition. The prophets who pin all their hopes on peaceful transition proceed from historical idealism and repudiate the Marxist-Leninist teachings of class struggle Similarly, those who talked about peaceful co-existence being the only alternative . . . were precisely teaching peaceful co-existence between the oppressors and the oppressed. There can be no alternative to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dreams of some third way are reactionary petty-bourgeois lamentations."

We may be tempted to support Moscow in this controversy. But then we have to remember that

Moscow still believes in what are called just wars in communist jargon. It still continues to support and guide all communist parties in subverting non-communist states. This is what Mr. Khrushchev said recently, "Let the working class of capitalist countries rise against their oppressors. Our sympathies are on the side of the working class. We can help. We have the means to do so." Mr. Khrushchev is against only atomic wars.

The dispute reminds us of the religious controversies of the Middle Ages. The differences between the two states are deeper than ideological. Though the polemics are carried on in ideological terms, undertones and overtones of personal and even racial differences can be detected. They have entered the trade and aid policies of the two countries. These can even be interpreted as differences between have and have-not countries.

According to the *Peoples Daily*, the Soviet Union suddenly notified on July 16, 1960 its decision to withdraw all the 1,300 Soviet experts from China within a month, to scrap hundreds of agreements and contracts which it had signed and to discontinue supply of many important items of equipment and material. But this has been refuted by the Soviet Union. "On the Chinese government's initiative, the volume of trade between the USSR and China has been cut by almost two-thirds in the past three years and the supply of essential equipment reduced to one-fortieth of the previous amount." But the fact remains that the trade between the Soviet Union and China has declined by about 50 per cent since

1959. It was valued at 1,749,000,000 roubles in 1959 and in 1961 it is 827,000,000 roubles.

The Chinese embassy in East Berlin has recently distributed 100,000 copies of a 125-page long anti-Khrushchev pamphlet called, "Nikita Khrushchev—A Revisionist." It denounces him as a "criminal" and demands his "liquidation to purify Marxism-Leninism." In the June 14 letter, Chinese have even asked the Soviet people to overthrow Mr. Khrushchev. "If the leading group in any party adopts a non-revolutionary line and converts it into a reformist party, then the Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the party will replace it and lead the people in making revolution."

The differences and the disputes between the two "brotherly" parties have reached a decisive stage. They have reached a point of no return. The momentous break may come off at any time now. It will be a great divide, a watershed not only in the history of the communist world but in the world as a whole.

What is the meaning and significance of this schism in the communist church to the world? Does it prove the prediction of Charles de Gaulle that Russia will join Europe against China? Does it indicate, as Arnold Toynbee has maintained, that one day communist and democratic states will resign themselves to the inevitable co-existence just as Christianity and Islam have done after a bitter fight? Or does this mean the developed Communist states may throw away their dictatorship and state monopoly in favour of democracy? Only future can tell.

THE BERLIN WALL — Continued from page 2

Berlin, for 27 miles. It is seven feet high and six feet wide. There are 129 watch towers, 231 fortified bunkers and guard posts and 54 board fences have been erected to prevent West Berliners even peeping into the Eastern sector. 11,000 armed guards are on duty. There are trenches, tank obstacles, police dogs, floodlights and every device to prevent refugees crossing over. Those who used to work in West Berlin and resided in East Berlin have been deprived of their livelihood. In the lanes and rivers around Berlin underwater barriers have been erected. 65 people have been killed, 589 wounded, 1500 arrested at the border in the last two years. Thousands are in prison in East Berlin for some offence or the other connected with the desire to escape over the Wall. To bisect a city of 3.5 million inhabitants is to cut across a living community.

There is no avenue to redress. The elections in East Berlin in 1946 showed a victory at the polls of Social Democratic Party with a 48% vote and the communists mustered only 19%. But the vote has never counted with the Soviet empire. The highest power resides in the Communist Party and its organs. The Courts are only organs just outside the Party, intended, like other

organisations such as trade unions, co-operatives, etc., to serve a given purpose and according to Section 15 in the Judiciary Act 1959, "a judge must strive unreservedly for the triumph of Socialism in the Republic and must loyally support the power of the worker and the peasants." Where a defendant deliberately broke a radio set it was held that the plaintiff, by playing West Berlin programme, had caused a danger for our republic" and thus the plaintiff was really "guilty of spreading subversive propaganda against our State." Where a housewife bragged that she had been in West Berlin for three days and had a fill of bananas and apricots she was sentenced to a year's imprisonment for speaking "in the most shameless manner against the workers and peasants' power" and for attacking the fundamental social structure of the Republic "thereby agitating in a manner hostile to the State."

The International Commission of Jurists, which comprises some of the most eminent jurists in the free world, has published recently a report on "The Berlin Wall, a defence of Human Rights", a statement which should be read as widely as its integrity and objective analysis deserves.

THE KAMARAJ PLAN — Continued from page 8

head as a symbolic sacrifice to compensate for their heavy casualty in Mr. Menon and Mr. Malaviya's exit from the Cabinet. They could not succeed because unlike their proteges, Mr. Patil did not obtain his political position, nor his ministerial position as a parasite living and thriving on the strength and vitality of Mr. Nehru. Mr. Patil and Kamaraj are two persons who will not have the slightest qualms about quitting their Ministerial positions happily to take over party work.

The Kamaraj proposals thus at least contribute to an explicit recognition of this interesting situation, viz., the recognition of the bargaining power inherent in organizational competence. Today there is no organizational activity in the Congress ranks excepting lobbying for permits and obtaining share of the funds from the Government allotted for various "Welfare" or "Development" schemes. All the activities of Congressmen are concentrated around the corridors of Secretariats, and Ministerial ante-chambers. When popular discontents are articulated, the Congressman of today gets extremely frightened and scuttles away to his safe drawing room, in the contentment of the fact that his party's civil service apparatus like the Police, Secretariat departments etc., would be handling such discontent. When election time comes, Mr. Nehru is always there to be projected as a vote-getter.

The question that remains is: Will the Kamaraj Proposals result in the transference of all activities away from the civil service to the non-official institutional levels? Will the Ministers who have resigned to take up party work regain their pre-ministerial perspectives, and even if they do, could they succeed in wresting the initiative away from the bureaucracy towards popular institutional levels for self-help tendencies? In short will there be less government and more of popular constructive action? Or will Chief Ministers of States still have to resolve even the smallest labour unrest, or hospital admission for a needy individual? The answers to these basic questions remain, and how far the Kamaraj proposals will go to give proper answers remains to be seen.

Mr. Nehru has just announced that the following Central Cabinet Ministers and State Chief Ministers are being relieved of their posts:

Central Cabinet: Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. S. K. Patil, Mr. Jagjiwan Ram, Mr. Gopala Reddy and Dr. Shrimali.

State Chief Ministers: Mr. Bakshi Ghulam Mohamed, Mr. Binodananda Jha, Mr. Patnaik, Mr. Mandloi, Mr. C. B. Gupta and Mr. K. Kamaraj.

The personalities whose political future will be seriously affected by this process are Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Jagjiwan Ram, Mr. Gopala Reddy and Dr. Shrimali from the Central Cabinet and Mr. Binodananda Jha and Mr. Mandloi from the States. As for the rest, they have their own indigenously-created organizational base in their respective states excepting for Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri who has attained national eminence by his statesmanship and competence.

The vacancies caused in the Central Cabinet as a result of implementing the Kamaraj Plan has generated frenzied activities in the ranks of the so-called "Leftists and Progressives" within the Congress. Intense lobbying has already started in Delhi to explore the possibilities of packing the Cabinet with Krishna Menon and such "progressives". The "Progressives" are happy that the two "rightists" in the Cabinet whom the Communists and they sought to remove to compensate the exit of Menon and Malaviya — Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. S. K. Patil — are now out of the Cabinet. Intense lobbying is going on to have Mr. Nanda take over the Finance portfolio to give Finance Ministry a more "socialistic" content. The mouthpieces of the "Progressives" have suggested that Mr. Nehru should replace the resigned ministers with those believing in "Democratic Socialism", even if they are outside the Congress Party ranks. It has been suggested that if only Mr. Nehru would outline such "Democratic Socialism" clearly and presumably in line with the Vijayawada Thesis of the Communist Party, why, even, Mr. Dange might be willing to join the Congress Party and condescend to work with Mr. Nehru in the cabinet.

Perhaps Mr. N. V. Gadgil is right when he observed that the Kamaraj Plan has, in effect, resulted in making a dictator of the Prime Minister, albeit unintentionally. The manner in which the Prime Minister handles the situation arising out of the present resignations will answer many of the disturbing questions that have been raised.



"I hereby announce I am ready to resign my ministerial seat and devote myself to ministerial work."

Courtesy: Hindustan Times.

With Many Voices

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

The workers' councils are very good when they are propped up by American grain and meat.
—Mr. Khrushchev, *Time*, August 30.

.....a Chief Minister had attained his position by spending a few lakhs.....if one could spend a few crores one could even become the Prime Minister.
—Mr. Hanumanthaiya, *Hindustan Times*, August 11.

I would rather soon be dead than broadcast through VOA.
—Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, *Current*, August 17.

If I tell my Foreign Minister to sit on a block of ice and stay there for months, he will do it without back talk.
—Mr. Khrushchev, *Hindu*, August 11.

Law is never better than the men who administer and apply it. An expression of faith in the rule of law is, ultimately, an expression of faith in the potentialities of mankind.
—Prof. Harry W. Jones, *American Reporter*, August 9.

The banner of ideology is only a cover for ambitions.
—Charles de Gaulle, *Swarajya*, August 10.

In the Soviet Union, the truth is what *Tass* says it is.
—Mr. David Rees, *Opinion*, August 6.

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. 3.00

Name:

Address:

Signature

There is no socialism in India at present but only selfishism.
—Dr. R. M. Lohia, *Patriot*, August, 14.

Information must pursue a definite goal.....
Information is agitation by facts.....
—Mr. Palgunov, ex-director of *Tass*, *Opinion*, Aug. 6.

Freedom should be the rule and control the exception. The position is now reversed.
—Rajaji, *March of the Nation*, August 17.

I find no difference in Khrushchev from Stalin in terms of determination to communise the world.
—Mr. Averell Harriman, *Indian Express*, August 2.

53 agreements have been entered into with Russians since World War II, of which the Russians have violated 50.
—*U. S. News & World Report*, July 22.

Believe me, it is not easy to resist the temptation to power.
—Premier Ben Bella of Algeria, *Time*, August 16.

When a ruler takes a pinch of salt without payment then the officers will loot the whole country.
—Acharya Kripalani, *Times of India*, August 20.

Non-alignment is being used as a cloak for appeasement of communism.
—Mr. M. R. Masani, the *Times of India*, August 20.

Non-alignment is a creed with us.
—Mr. A. P. Jain, *Hindu*, August 21.

Concession for concession, yes; but concession for aggression, no.
—R. S., *Hindustan Times*, August 23.

If a citizen does not demand his rights, he is no longer a citizen. He becomes a slave.
—Cardinal Wyszynski of Poland, *Time*, August 23.

✓ All centralized planning and administration inevitably lead to a closed society.
—Prof. Karl Popper, *Thought*, August 24.

With the top Minister going out of the Cabinet, Mr. Nehru would be automatically vested with dictatorial powers and the country had to look forward to a complete dictatorial regime.
—Mr. N. V. Gadgil, *Statesman*, August 26.