

felt for a proper balance between those doing some job, with some authority, and those affected, by proper means of consultation (*e.g.* in industry and in local government), by the same token learning at any level has to be a balance between teacher and those taught. The only difference is that the relationship is a more direct one, but the importance of feed-back and criticism is no less valid, and if the role of a university can ever be summed up in a brief phrase it is surely that it is to encourage informed criticism of any aspect of life. Rules, roles, and relations must constantly be subject to criticism. Their acceptability has to be earned and kept just as much as the respect a teacher or anyone in authority needs to really do his job.

Spontaneity is the extreme argument against entrenched inflexibility. Freedom of choice should not be viewed as a luxury paid for by habit and discipline. It is an inevitable concomitant of a flexible and open society at all levels, which is neither without order or appreciation of inherited knowledge, nor dominated by tradition or arbitrary decision-making, and which has to be constantly learning and adapting.

R. BALL

Wadham College,
Oxford

I DON'T RECOLLECT having defended any particular role as sacrosanct or necessarily inflexible. My point was that unless there is structure of some kind nothing is possible including creativity and flexibility.

DAVID MARTIN

London

Malaysia Misaid

THE SITUATION in *Malaysia* is complex enough without Peter Schmid [ENCOUNTER, August] confusing us with his eccentric terminology. Let us forget "Malaya" (except as the name of a hotel) and try to get "Malaysia" and "Malay" clear in our minds. The former is the name of a country, the latter is the name of a race. All citizens of Malaysia are Malaysians, whether Malay or Chinese or Indian or Eurasian or European, but only Malays are Malay—though some of these may be, by birth, Indonesian Malays rather than Malaysian Malays.

Mr Schmid tells us that in the centre of Kuala Lumpur, in the evening, "I don't see a single Malaysian face among the milling throng (at most, perhaps, an Indian woman's sari) . . ." One would suppose that by "Malaysian", here, he means "Malay"; but no, "an Indian woman's sari" is placed, rather oddly, in the same category as "a Malaysian face." So by "Malaysian" he must mean on this occasion Malay and/or Indian: *i.e.*, brown faces as distinct from yellow faces (Chinese) . . . European (pinko-grey) and Eurasian (variegated shades) being neither here nor there. The Chinese of Malaysia can perfectly well be "natives" of that country, so it will hardly do for Mr Schmid to talk about "the brown natives of the country . . . dreaming away their time" when by this he presumably means the Malays. Unless, of course, the word "brown" is intended as an adjective differ-

entiating the Malay natives from the Chinese natives: in which case it is an unsound distinction since by this time the Chinese of South-east Asia are often themselves quite brown. Nor will the eating of "no end of heavily-spiced middle-eastern food stuffs" serve as a definitively distinguishing factor—what does "middle-eastern" signify? Moslem? Pork-free? Not-quite-Far-Eastern?—since the Chinese are fond of eating too. In *bumi-putra* Mr Schmid has a less ambiguous term, perhaps: it is a Malay word and can be fairly safely taken as referring exclusively to the Malays, with the sense of "indigenous" ("belonging naturally") as distinct from "native" or "possessing citizenship."

On p. 55 Mr Schmid writes, "Malaya—or rather Malaysia, as it has been re-christened since the exclusion of Singapore and the incorporation of Borneo." What a curious distortion of the facts, which (as far as they went) were simple enough! Malaysia was formed in September 1963 by the

Sakharov

In an "Open Letter" from Moscow, Professor Andrei Sakharov has made the following comments on the text of the interview which he recently gave and which was published in ENCOUNTER last month ("Andrei Sakharov Reconsiders" September pp. 59-63).

"I have noticed with satisfaction the publication of the text of the interview I gave to the Swedish Radio. Nevertheless, a number of embarrassing slips appear to have occurred in my oral replies to various questions. In the passages which deal with the privileged positions of Party members, there may be the incorrect impression that a Party member always has greater privileges than those outside the Party, especially when both occupy the same job. This is not so, and I should like to correct that inaccuracy. Otherwise I should like to stand by all the other points which I made in connection with the influence of Party membership in the advancement of careers in the hierarchy and with the real privileges of the ruling Party and Governmental caste. On the subject of the Chinese problem I tried to reformulate my views on Sino-Soviet relations, but I did not intend to leave the impression that the Chinese variant of socialism, with its Red Guards and Re-education through Work and its Quotation Liturgy, appeared to me harmless or attractive.

"The final inaccuracy which I should like to mention concerns my own personal situation. I remarked that my own position remained one of special privilege, not in relation to that of my other colleagues but in contrast to the average living standard of the country. This needs to be qualified. Earlier on I did have, according to Soviet standards, considerable funds. In the year 1969, after I published my Memorandum, I returned to the Soviet State a major portion of these funds (all in all some 139,000 rubles) because it seemed to me to be undeserved. This decision now appears to me to have been altogether mistaken."



Read The Guardian. Where there's still some sanity left.

To the Guardian that which is insane *is* insane, no matter how experts or politicians may pass it off as rational.

Like the way we close down railway lines then open up village streets to juggernauts.

The pace of change is such that the insanity is sometimes hard to detect. Or you wonder whether you are the only one who has noticed.

But this is the link between you and the people who write the Guardian. They notice and they say so. They are a collection of individuals who are given the

freedom to assess the world as they find it.

For example, they unearthed the way government departments were divulging confidential information on private citizens to commercial companies. More recently Adam Raphael overthrew British complacency about the way we treat and pay employees in South Africa.

Whether Guardian writers use a long patient process of research or a few quick strokes of satire, their common aim is to discover a way through to something saner.

If that attitude is right for you then it's right for you every day of the week.

federation of Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore: Singapore left (or, rather, was asked to leave) two years later. On p. 58 "the still-ossified Malaysian feudal structure" leaves us wondering whether Mr Schmid means "Malay" rather than "Malaysian." The proximity of the adjective "historic" suggests that he intends "Malay" since the word is hardly applicable, except in some very subtle sense, to something which is only ten years old. Similarly, on p. 56 the "Malaysians" for whom jobs are being created are presumably Malays. And presumably "the Malayansed Hilton Hotel" should read "Malayised", since it is unlikely that Mr Schmid is telling us that jobs in this hotel are reserved for people of whatever race belonging to "Malaya", i.e., that part of Malaysia which is not Sabah or Sarawak. The last accepted use of the word "Malayanised" described the transfer of governmental posts from British expatriates to citizens of Malaya or Singapore in the late 1950s.

Confusion is bad enough in itself. What is worse is that by his inadvertent but repeated identification of "Malaysian" with "Malay"—along with his tendentious allusion to "Chinese residents", for he must know that "resident" is something of a dirty word, verging on "foreign parasite"—Mr Schmid may seem to lend support to the racialists, and specifically to those who would like to establish a firm and final distinction between "Malaysian" and "Chinese" by throwing their fellow citizens who happen to be of Chinese race into the sea.

D. J. ENRIGHT

London

ED. NOTE—How we wish that Dennis Enright had been at his old desk, bringing his Malay—sorry, Malaysian—knowledge to bear on our faulty translation of Peter Schmid's impeccable report! We regret the unintentional offence given.

Kafka & Felice Bauer

NOT HAVING READ *Briefe an Felice* I am not sure how pertinent it is to wonder what Felice made of this strange lover as your columnist "R" does in the June issue.

Nevertheless, Kafka fans might be interested to learn that Felice Bauer, whom I repeatedly saw in 1935 when she was a refugee living in Florence, spoke of this "love affair" very often. Miss Bauer was by that time a middle-aged spinster. She seemed to draw most of her satisfactions from memories although she had an intense emotional attachment to a very young, very handsome fellow-refugee whom she obviously enjoyed mothering in a possessive fashion. She lived in an apartment cluttered with objects of her Berlin past, without giving any particular direction to her existence.

When I returned to Florence after the War I was told that Miss Bauer had been rounded up as so many others, and had not been heard of again. I hardly think I would remember her today had she not been weaving the "adoring" Kafka into her conversation and shown her pride in this fact without ever expressing a reciprocal feeling for the great writer.

ELLEN B. HILL

University of Rome

AUTHORS

William Trevor's new novel, *Elizabeth Alone*, is due from Bodley Head in October. His short story, "Going Home", appeared in the May 1972 ENCOUNTER. . . .

Richard Crossman was Minister of Housing and Local Government and then Secretary of State for Social Services in the 1964–70 Labour government. He was Editor of the *New Statesman* from 1970–72. . . .

Joachim Fest is a young German historian, author of *The Faces of the Third Reich* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970), who has just completed a new biography of Adolf Hitler. He lives in Hamburg, and edits the "Essay" department for *Der Spiegel*. He is shortly to join the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* as a senior editor.

Arthur Koestler's article is based on a recent lecture to the British Academy (in the "Thank-offering to Britain" series), and will be published as a pamphlet by Oxford University Press in October. . . .

John Weightman is Professor of French Language and Literature at Westfield College in the University of London, and the author of *The Concept of the Avant-Garde* (Alcove Press). . . .

Melvin J. Lasky's *Utopia and Revolution* will be published by the University of Chicago Press and Macmillan (London) in 1974. . . .

Sidney Hook is Professor of Philosophy at New York University. His most recent book was *Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy* (1970). . . .

Max Beloff is Gladstone Professor of Government and Public Administration, University of Oxford, and a Fellow of All Souls. . . .

Kingsley Amis's article will appear in *G. K. Chesterton: A Centenary Appraisal*, edited by John Sullivan, which Paul Elek will publish in May 1974. . . .

Peter Porter's latest collections of poems are *Preaching to the Converted* and *After Martial* (Oxford University Press). . . .

Alan Brownjohn is a lecturer at the Battersea College of Education in London. His most recent volume of poems was *Warrior's Career* (Macmillan). . . .

Douglas Dunn is the author of *Terry Street* and *The Happier Life* (Faber). . . .

The drawing of Hitler on p. 18 is by **Jaroslav Bradáč**. . . . Cover design by **Colin Banks** and **John Miles**.

ENCOUNTER Magazine is published in London by Encounter Ltd., 59 St Martin's Lane, London WC2N 4JS.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY WATMOUGHS LIMITED, IDLE, BRADFORD; AND LONDON