

Whither Bhoodan?

by V. B. Karnik

BHOODAN has in recent months developed into Gramdan. As a result of this shift Bhoodan workers will be engaged hereafter not merely in collecting land gifts from individual landowners but in collecting gifts of entire villages from the village community as such. In a sense this is a natural evolution of Bhoodan. The progress of the movement towards the attainment of the target of five crore acres of land will be quicker if entire villages can be secured as gifts. The distribution of land will also be rendered easier if all the land in the village is available for distribution.

If this were the only intent, there would be no cause for concern. The original objective of securing land to the landless will still be preserved. The original purpose of the movement requires to be emphasised. It was to give land to the landless in villages so that they can have an honourable existence in village communities as owners of land. It was hoped that with the ownership of land secured to them, the poor in the villages would be able to stand on their own legs, take more interest in cultivation and increase the produce of the land to their own benefit as well as to the benefit of the society as a whole. This did not exclude the possibility of the new owners of land coming together and forming cooperative organisations for joint cultivation or for the sale and purchase of produce, seeds, manure and other requirements. The gift of a village would, it was expected, facilitate this process.

When gifts of villages started coming in, it was originally intended to distribute lands equitably amongst all villagers, reserving a small portion as the collective property of the village. It was on this basis that the distribution of lands took place in a number of Gramdan villages in Orissa. This method of distribution, which was in accordance with the original purpose of the movement, did not find favour in certain quarters. They were of the opinion that the village lands acquired through Gramdan should be utilised for establishing collective farms. The leaders of the Bhoodan movement did not approve of that idea. They did not favour collectivisation of agriculture. But the view that was rejected then appears to have gained ascendancy during the last few months.

Is the Bhoodan movement turning in the direction of collectivisation of agriculture? The question requires

to be raised and posed for answer before the leaders of the movement. Collectivisation demands the abolition of the rights of ownership in land. Land becomes the property of the State or the village and the peasant becomes a mere worker on the land. The system was forcibly imposed upon the peasants in Soviet Russia and other communist countries. It did not help the growth of agriculture, but helped the communist regimes to destroy the independence of the peasants and to make them helpless tools in the hands of the State.

Nobody will suggest that it is the intention of the Bhoodan movement to follow in the footsteps of the communist rulers. Their aims and ideals and their philosophy of life are entirely different and they have nothing in common with the communist advocates of collectivisation of agriculture. Vinobaji and other leaders of the movement stand for decentralisation of political and economic power. Their aim is to raise on the basis of Gramdan the structure of Gramrajya, to convert the donated villages into village republics. However, many a time the logic of events is far stronger than the intentions of men. It is possible therefore that in spite of the noble intentions of the leaders of the movement, the abolition of the rights of ownership, which is inherent in Gramdan, may pave the way for the establishment of a servile society.

Self-reliant and sturdy village republics require for their existence and development sturdy and independent villagers, each one of them able to stand on his own legs and confident of his own position. Ownership of land or any other means of production will give them a sense of independence and confidence. The curse of the existing system is that ownership is concentrated in the hands of a few, making the rest of the villagers helpless and entirely dependent on those few. The Bhoodan movement, it was expected, would secure a wide dispersal of that ownership and create in the villages a large mass of sturdy and independent farmers who could look after their own interests as well as manage the affairs of the village. These independent farmers would of their own accord come together in cooperative organisations of various kinds for better cultivation of their lands as well as more effective management of the affairs of their village. It is certainly necessary and highly desirable to explain to the farmers the virtues and advantages of cooperation and to help them to build up and manage appropriate cooperative organisations. That is one of the tasks of the Bhoodan movement.

Collectivisation begins with the abolition of the

rights of ownership. If ownership of land is abolished there is no logical reason why ownership of all other forms of property should not be abolished. Under communism, a peasant, after collectivisation becomes a helpless pawn in the hands of a *Kolkhoz* run by a bureaucrat under orders from the central government. In the Gramrajya of Vinobaji's conception he may become a pawn in the hands of the village community. The authority holding control over him may not be far removed from him and may be more amenable to his desires and demands. But in either case he loses his individuality, a large part of his freedom and becomes absorbed in a collectivity. The Gramrajya of Vinobaji may not become a *Kolkhoz* of the communist variety. But it may revive the medieval Indian system of self-contained and self-satisfied villages which were not known either for the freedom of the individual members of the village community or for their capacity to resist foreign invasions or the extortionate demands of native rulers.

The germs of this shift in the Bhoodan movement can be detected in the philosophical outlook of its founder and leader. According to Vinobaji, property is theft. Abolition of property rights in land is a natural corollary of that basic conviction. He has said on several occasions, सब भूमी गोपालकी (All land belongs to God). Village ownership and management of land is the concrete form of that idea. But there are others in the movement who do not subscribe to that characterisation of property. They do not regard property as the root of the evil but its concentration in the hands of a few. They advocate the widest possible dispersal of property rights in land as well as in all other means of production and distribution. A full-fledged democracy can arise only on the basis of such a wide dispersal of property rights. The Bhoodan movement was expected to aid that process. It is a matter for serious and anxious consideration whether after the present shift it will play that role.

Another trend that has appeared also requires to

be considered. Mr. Maganbhai Desai, one of the prominent disciples of Mahatma Gandhi, has drawn pointed attention to that new trend. He has referred to the remarks recently made by Vinobaji to the effect that "if the land problem could not be solved through non-violence and love he would be compelled to believe in the communist way and that he would, in that case, be left with no other alternative". Mr. Desai pointed out that there was the alternative of "democratic or representative Government". He is afraid, however, that Vinobaji has rejected it. It is likely that Vinobaji is not properly reported by the press and his disciples. It is inconceivable that he will choose "the communist way" in case he fails to achieve before the end of the year the target that he has placed before the movement. Vinobaji has said on several occasions that the Bhoodan movement which is a movement for the transformation of the entire social structure cannot have annual or periodic targets. It is a continuous process which may be rapid in some periods, slow at other times. Recent utterances contradict these earlier declarations.

The discussions that took place in a seminar of Bhoodan workers held in Sevagram early in July also indicate a shift from the original purpose of the movement. A report published in *The Times of India* stated that it was decided to develop the Bhoodan movement with "the ultimate aim of achieving the abolition of private property". All this is raising serious doubts in the minds of many about the future course of the movement. These doubts are assailing the minds not merely of critics but also of the admirers of the movement who have been struck more particularly by its moral significance and its contribution to the development of a democratic society. They are worried by the new shift and wonder if it is really a move in the right direction.

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.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

ENGAGED IN WRITING

A Short Novel

by Stephen Spender

ENGLISH CRIMINALS

by Peter Wildeblood

MEN AND IDEAS: LEON BLUM

by James Joll

July 1957

46

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

Notes

For The Record

IT has been the settled policy of the Democratic Research Service not to take notice of the malicious and scurrilous attacks that *Blitz* and other communist and crypto-communist journals make against it from time to time. It has all along regarded those attacks as an acknowledgement of the effectiveness of its work.

In recent weeks *Blitz* has resorted to another strategem. Finding probably that stories manufactured in its own office do not have any weight with its readers, it has got hold of an obscure daily newspaper in Paris, *Liberation* to repeat the old libels against the Democratic Research Service and Mr. M. R. Masani, M.P.

Writing about the General Elections, *Liberation* has brought in the Democratic Research Service and mentioned that its last budget was made of Rs. 500,000 "in which the Embassy for the United States contributed greatly." Mr. Masani is dragged in as the controller of the organisation whose activities, it is stated "are directed against the Congress Party, neutralism, socialism and for private enterprise in economy." All these activities, it is implied, are "the efforts of American propaganda." Mention is also made of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom which, according to *Liberation*, "attacks all the Indian personalities who visit the socialist countries."

It is clear from the story as it is published that *Liberation* is not particularly well-informed about conditions in India and Indian organisations. The journal, we understand, belongs to the same category as *Blitz* in India and indulges in similar propaganda against democrats and socialists who do not toe the Soviet line. Stories which emanate from such a source deserve as little attention as stories circulated by *Blitz* itself.

In order to put the record straight, it may be stated over again that the Democratic Research Service receives no financial assistance from any foreign source. Every rupee of its income is raised in India and from public-spirited Indian citizens devoted to the cause of freedom and democracy. Its accounts are maintained by a gentleman of the highest probity and are audited by a wellknown firm of auditors. Its activities are directed towards the propagation of the values of democracy and the exposure of the tactics and machinations of totalitarian communism. It cannot and does not carry on any activities against the Congress Party or socialism; it counts several prominent Congress leaders and socialists amongst its friends and patrons.

In republishing the infamous libel published by *Liberation*, *Blitz* has attempted to pose as the defender of the good name of our Parliament. It has tried

to assume an attitude of righteous indignation at a foreign journal attacking the honour of a Member of Parliament. There is no point, however, in the pose. One can easily see through it. The article which expresses this righteous indignation is itself an example of deception. It is published as written by "A Member of the Lok Sabha." But in the middle of the article the mask is off and the Editor of *Blitz* appears on the scene as the real writer. If the Editor can assume such a false garb and publish an article written by himself as an article written by a Member of the Lok Sabha, may it not be possible that the libel was supplied to *Liberation* and is now being republished as a story published in a Paris journal? Whatever the source, however, the libel has been repeated too often to acquire any additional weight because it is published by a foreign journal. It deserves the same treatment—contempt.

Order Of Priorities

THE Second Five Year Plan is obviously encountering many difficulties. The estimates have gone up from Rs. 4000 to Rs. 6000 crores. The foreign exchange position has become precarious, as a result of which imports had to be severely cut down. Internally prices are rising at a rapid rate giving rise to a growing demand for higher wages. If the prices cannot be checked and reduced it will not be possible to resist the demand. If it is resisted, there will be strikes which will render the fulfilment of the Plan still more difficult. The Government are already faced by a strike notice of the employees of the Posts and Telegraph Department. They may be followed by others.

These difficulties have, it appears, forced the Government to reconsider their attitude towards the Plan. The former Finance Minister, Mr. C. D. Deshmukh hinted at it when in a speech in Madras he stated there was now an insistence on the fulfilment not of the whole Plan but of its hard core. There are other indications to the same effect. This might, however, make things far more difficult. Projects of immediate benefit to the people may be quietly shelved and all available resources may be monopolised for building steel mills and plants for manufacturing machines. If the Government adopts that course it will lead to the further impoverishment of the people.

What is necessary therefore is not a mere dropping of a few projects but a revision of the order of priorities. Nobody is against the building up of heavy industries, the only quarrel is about the place to be assigned to them in the order of priorities. The Government must adopt a realistic attitude towards the Plan. As Mr. Masani has pointed out in his article in *Yojana*: "Planning is essentially a field where we should proceed through a process of trial and error. We should be ready to modify and even abandon parts of our Plan if we find they do not stand the test of experiment and experience. There is nothing sacrosanct about a plan. Nor is it a shrine at which we should worship. A plan is merely a means to an end, and

the end is the happiness and the freedom of the people." The elder statesman, Mr. Rajagopalachari has also advised the Government in similar terms. It is to be hoped that these suggestions will receive the consideration that they deserve.

Lawlessness in Kerala

COMPLAINTS are growing regarding the lawlessness that is developing in Kerala under the communist Ministry. Complaints are being voiced both by trade union as well as political workers. In both the cases the sufferers are the non-communist organisations and their workers.

The General Secretary of the Congress, Mr. Shriman Narayan found, after an extensive tour of the State, that the picture of the law and order situation was "dark and disquieting." He found that factory owners and other employers were being threatened with violence by communist labour unions. His general conclusion was that "the services, especially the police, are demoralised and feel helpless."

Plantations, it appears, have been the worst sufferers. A note prepared by the United Planters' Association of Southern India states that a "wave of violence and hooliganism is fast engulfing Kerala's organised plantations." The note narrates the various acts of disorder and violence perpetrated against managers and other supervisory staff.

The Chief Minister of the State, Mr. Namboodiripad dismisses the complaints as untrue and unfounded. But even he had to admit that there were "incidents in which the peaceful life and property of the 'owning classes' had been endangered." He listed cases in which "Satyagraha had gone to the extent of surrounding the houses of the employer and his staff, preventing them and even their family-members from moving into or out of their houses for their normal daily life." These admissions of the Chief Minister corroborate the statements made in Planters' Association's note.

The Chief Minister has promised to put down such practices which, according to him, "obviously go beyond the limits of peaceful direct action." He has also assured that "police efficiency would not be weakened but strengthened." These assurances are welcome, but one wonders if the politics of communism will allow the Chief Minister to fulfil them.

Mr. Namboodiripad was all praise for the role that the police play in Great Britain. He said, "Great Britain is our model country in this particular case." He narrated how in Great Britain for decades there has been no firing on strikers, no issuing of prohibitory orders and no security proceedings against persons participating in strikes. All this praise of the British system from a communist is very surprising. It falsifies all the propaganda that Moscow has been carrying on for years. However, let not Mr. Namboodiripad forget that the British police can behave in the way they do only because strikers and the general public accept their democratic responsibility of behaving in a peaceful and lawful manner. If the same practice is adopted in Kerala there will be no occa-

sion for people to complain of lawlessness. At the moment, however, communist trade unionists and politicians are using different methods and, if the Ministry tolerates them, it will amount to encouragement to lawlessness.

D. R. S. Publication

THE D.R.S. has just published a new book, *Indian Communist Party Documents*. The book has been published by the Democratic Research Service in collaboration with the Institute of Pacific Relations, New York. The Institute of Pacific Relations is an unofficial and non-partisan organisation founded in 1925 to facilitate the scientific study of the peoples of the Pacific area. It is composed of autonomous national councils in the principal countries which have important interests in the Pacific area, together with the international secretariat.

The book contains secret documents of the Communist Party of India relating to its early period of the thirties and the third and fourth congress of the Party, held at Madurai and Palghat respectively. It also includes, in addition to these, a few more documents of the Party relating to the period 1954-55.

The secret documents included in this book were first brought to light by the DRS. The Communists first tried to denounce them as forgeries but when challenged to take action against the organisation, they failed to go to the court of law. The question of authenticity of these documents was even raised in former Madras and Travancore-Cochin legislative assemblies and Privileges Committees were set up there to study the question. In both the cases, the Committees gave their verdict in favour of their authenticity.

These documents have a special bearing on the present political conditions in India as now the communists are posing as having accepted parliamentary and constitutional methods as their creed. These documents, however, reveal a different story.

JUST PUBLISHED

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.

U. N. Report On Hungary

The following are the conclusions of the unanimous report submitted by the United Nations Committee on Hungary. The Committee was appointed by the General Assembly and consisted of the representatives of Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia and Uruguay.

THE terms of reference of the special committee covered a broad field, namely to report to the General Assembly of the United Nations, after full and objective investigation, its findings on all aspects of the question of Soviet intervention in Hungary by armed force and by other means and the effects of such intervention on the political development of Hungary. The committee's investigation, as has been explained, involved the study of copious documentation from various sources and in several languages, as well as the questioning of more than a hundred witnesses, whose testimony fills 2,000 pages in the verbatim record. The committee regrets that the attitude of the Hungarian Government has prevented it from basing its investigation on direct observation in Hungary, as required by the General Assembly resolution.

The committee's findings relate to many aspects of the events in Hungary and are concerned with numerous points of detail that have a bearing on the origin and nature of those events. The report itself embodies the conclusions of the committee, and these conclusions cannot be readily dissociated from the evidence which is there assembled. To the best of the committee's belief, these conclusions represent the essential facts about the Hungarian uprising which are necessary to an understanding of its nature and outcome. They are as follows:

What took place in Hungary in October and November, 1956, was a spontaneous national uprising, due to longstanding grievances which had caused resentment among the people. One of these grievances was the inferior status of Hungary with regard to the U.S.S.R. The system of government was in part maintained by the weapon of terror, wielded by the A.V.H., or political police, whose influence was exercised, at least until the end of 1955, through a complex network of agents and informers permeating the whole of Hungarian society. In other respects also, Soviet pressure was resented. From the stifling of free speech to the adoption of a Soviet-style uniform for the Hungarian Army, an alien influence existed in all walks of life. Hungarians felt no personal animosity towards the individual Soviet soldiers on Hungarian soil, but these armed forces were symbols of something which annoyed a proud people and fed the desire to be free.

The thesis that the uprising was fomented by reactionary circles in Hungary and that it drew its strength from such circles and from western "imperialists" failed to survive the committee's examination. From start to finish, the uprising was led by students, workers, soldiers and intellectuals, many of whom were Communists or former Communists. The majority of political demands put forward during the re-

volution included a stipulation that democratic socialism should be the basis of the Hungarian political structure and that such social achievements as the land reform should be safeguarded. At no time was any proposal made for the return to power, or to the government, of any figure associated with pre-war days. "Fascists" and "saboteurs," heavily armed, could not have succeeded in landing on Hungarian airfields which were under Soviet supervision, or in crossing the Austrian frontier, where a closed zone was shown by the Austrian authorities to the military attaches of France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.

The uprising was not planned in advance. It was the universal testimony of witnesses examined by the committee that events took participants by surprise. No single explanation can determine exactly why the outbreak occurred just when it did. Communist spokesmen, including Mr. Kadar and the members of his present Government, have recognised the bitter grievances of the Hungarian people before 23 October. They have spoken of a "broad, popular movement" caused by the "bitterness and indignation" of the masses. Two factors would seem to have brought this resentment to a head. The first of these was the news received on 19 October of a successful move by Poland for greater independence from the U.S.S.R. This news was largely instrumental in bringing the Hungarian students together in the meetings of 22 October. The second factor was the acute disappointment felt by the people when Erno Gero, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Working People's (Communist) Party, in his speech on the evening of 23 October failed to meet any of the popular demands and adopted what was considered a truculent tone towards his hearers.

Although no evidence exists of advance planning, and although the whole course of the uprising bears the hallmark of continuous improvisation, it would appear that the Soviet authorities had taken steps as early as 20 October to make armed intervention in Hungary possible. Evidence exists of troop movements, or projected troop movements, from that date on. It would appear that plans for action had therefore been laid some time before the students met to discuss their demands. The committee is not in a position to say whether the Soviet authorities anticipated that the grievances of the Hungarian people, stimulated by events in Poland, could no longer be contained. Signs of opposition were evident before the 23rd: the Hungarian Government had reason to foresee that trouble was brewing. While the evidence shows that Soviet troops from outside Hungary were used even in the first intervention, no clause of the Warsaw Treaty provides for intervention by

armed forces of the Soviet Union to dictate political developments within any signatory's frontiers.

The demonstrations on 23 October were at first entirely peaceable. None of the demonstrators appear to have carried arms, and no evidence has been discovered that any of those who voiced the political demands or joined the demonstrators had any intention to resort to force. While disappointment at Mr. Gero's speech may have angered the crowds, it would hardly of itself have sufficed to turn the demonstration into an armed uprising. That this happened was due to the action of the A. V. H. in opening fire on the people outside the radio building. Within a few hours Soviet tanks were in action against the Hungarians. This appearance of Russian soldiers in their midst, not as friendly allies, but as enemies in combat, had the effect of still further uniting the people.

Obscurity surrounds the invitation alleged to have been issued by the Hungarian Government to the Soviet authorities to assist in quelling the uprising by force. Mr. Nagy has denied, with every appearance of truth, that he issued this invitation or was even aware of it. Since Soviet tanks appeared on the streets of Budapest at about 2 A.M. on 24 October, it would have been impossible for him to have addressed any official message to the Soviet authorities, since he held no Government post at the time when the tanks must have received their orders. An invitation may have been made privately by Mr. Gero, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist party, or Mr. (Andras) Hegedus, the Prime Minister. The committee, however, has had no opportunity of seeing a text of such an invitation, or of considering the exact circumstances in which it may have been issued. Until further information comes to light, it would be wise to suspend judgement as to whether such an invitation was issued at all.

Similar considerations apply to the invitation which is alleged to have been addressed to the Soviet authorities before the second intervention on 4 November. Mr. Kadar had remained a member of Mr. Nagy's Government when the latter was reconstituted on 3 November and the committee is unaware of his having given any recorded indication of his disapproval of Mr. Nagy's policies. Mr. Kadar's movements at this time are not fully known, and he cannot be considered to have substantiated his own claim to have called, in the name of the Government, for Soviet help. In any event, there is abundant evidence that Soviet preparations for a further intervention, including the movement of troops and armour from abroad, had been under way since the last days of October. Mr. Kadar and his ministers were absent from Budapest during the first few days after he formed his Government, and administrative instructions to the people of Hungary were issued by the commanders of the Soviet troops.

When Mr. Nagy became Prime Minister, he was not at first able to exercise the full powers of that office. Only when the grip of the A.V.H. was loosened by the victory of the insurgents was he able to take an independent stand. By this time, the real power in Hungary lay with the revolutionary

and workers' councils, which had sprung up spontaneously in different parts of the country and had replaced the collapsing structure of the Communist Party. Mr. Nagy, though himself a Communist of long standing who had lived for many years in the U.S.S.R., invited non-Communists into his new Government, and listened to the demands of various revolutionary and workers' councils. It would appear that Mr. Nagy himself, like the country at large, was somewhat taken aback by the pace of developments. However, seeing that his countrymen were united in their desire for other forms of Government and the departure of Soviet troops, he threw in his lot with the insurgents. By this action, he obliterated the impression which he had created while still under the domination of the A.V.H., and he became a symbolic figure in the uprising, although he had not instigated it, and was never its actual leader.

The few days of freedom enjoyed by the Hungarian people provided abundant evidence of the popular nature of the uprising. A free press and radio came to life all over Hungary, and the disbanding of the A.V.H. was the signal for general rejoicing, which revealed the degree of unity achieved by the people, once the burden of fear had been lifted from them.

There were a number of lynchings and beatings by the crowds. These were, in almost all cases, confined to members of the A. V. H. or those who were believed to have cooperated with them.

Steps were taken by the workers' councils during this period to give the workers real control of nationalized industrial undertakings and to abolish unpopular institutions, such as the production norms. These were widely resented as being unfair to workers and also a reflection of popularly suspected secret trade agreements with the U.S.S.R., which were said to make heavy demands on the Hungarian economy for the benefit of the Soviet Union. During the days of freedom, while negotiations continued with the Soviet authorities for the withdrawal of Russian troops, attempts were made to clear up the streets of Budapest, and life was beginning to return to normal. The insurgents had agreed to amalgamate, while maintaining their identity, in a National Guard, which would have been responsible, with the Army and police, for maintaining order.

In contrast to the demands for the re-establishment of political rights put forward during the uprising is the fact that basic human rights of the Hungarian people were violated by the Hungarian Government prior to 23 October, especially up to the autumn of 1955, and that such violations have been resumed since 4 November. The committee is convinced that the numerous accounts of inhuman treatment and torture by the A.V.H. are to be accepted as true. On the evidence, it is also convinced that numbers of Hungarians, including, some women, were deported to the Soviet Union and that some may not have been returned to their homes. These deportations were designed to break the back of the revolution. Action taken by the Hungarian people in their spontaneous uprising succeeded in

(Continued on Page 8)

The Hungarian Revolution

by Paul Ignotus

The following is the message that the writer sent to the April 1957 issue of the Bulletin of the Committee on Science and Freedom which is devoted to the October, 1956 revolution in Hungary. Mr. Paul Ignotus is a leading Hungarian writer and played a prominent part in the revolution.

THE Hungarian revolution was no less surprising to us Hungarians than it was for others. Our country's record over the last few decades had not been very encouraging. In spite of outstanding achievements in the intellectual and moral spheres, our recent political history was on the whole more conspicuous for subservience to totalitarian dictatorships and inability to resist the epidemics of modern and reactionary obscurantism than for any sustained adherence to the liberal traditions of 1848. There was, in particular, one factor in our national life that represented a dangerous unknown quantity, even for those of us who claimed to be its objective students. That was the youth, educated, indoctrinated and regimented under Communism, and taught to believe in Russian superiority, on the Stalinist pattern. We feared that these young people would never rise against our foreign oppressors. We feared even more that if ever they did rebel, they might follow the paths of their elders in clamouring for the return of a near-Hitlerite or at least a near-Horthyite system.

These fears proved to be unfounded. Our youth fought the foreign invaders and their Quislings with admirable courage and determination. Russification and indoctrination only induced them to react all the more violently against everything connected with Stalin's rule. Nevertheless, far from showing any sympathy for those Fascist or retrograde tendencies which had been inspired by a wish to counteract Bolshevism, they emerged from the years of Bolshevik rule completely free from conventional 'anti-Bolshevik' prejudice; free, in fact, of the superstitious characteristic of our former squirearchy and even more of our would-be squirearchy, the Hitlerite lower middle-classes. They showed a free and receptive spirit, not clearly crystallised as yet, but all the more willing to study sympathetically any thought and idea coming from the West.

A very curious feature of our revolution, and especially of the efforts of our youth, was the decisive role which writers and scholars were able to play in them. There was, and is, a passionate interest in highbrow writers and poets and their works amongst the Hungarian masses. One of the main reasons for this is the sensibility shown by Hungarian men of letters—and, I should add, particularly by some who were members of the Communist Party—for the problems, sufferings and wishes of the common people.

This involvement with the issues of their time, has earned for the Hungarian writers a special place among those who are now being persecuted by the Soviet invaders and their agents. The Writers' Asso-

ciation and the Union of Journalists in Hungary have been placed under Government tutelage, and dissolved as independent entities. It is hard to tell, at the moment, what has become of the individual members of these associations. Some leading writers, such as Dery, Hay, Benjaamin, and Lajos Tamasi, were apparently arrested but released after some days' time; while some of the younger and less well-known writers and journalists, such as Gali and Obersovszky whose arrest was announced officially, are still in prison. A number of prominent persons in this field have disappeared (probably to Rumania) among them Professor Lukacs, the former Minister of Education in the Imre Nagy Government and the journalists Geza Lozonozy and Sandor Haraszti. As dissenting Communists these men of letters are in the most hated category of the enemies of the regime, for the successors of Stalin are in no way second to him in their zeal for heresy hunting. But broadly the same fate threatens all who raise their voices against the Russian oppressors.

Writers and scholars abroad should use every opportunity to show their solidarity with their colleagues in Hungary. In the atmosphere of heightened awareness of the role of intellectuals in public affairs, which has emerged from the recent events, they can be sure that their words will impress the Hungarian people.

An Impossible Dialogue

BETWEEN

IVAN ANISSIMOV

Soviet Literary Historian and Editor, *Inostrannaia Literature*, Moscow

AND

IGNAZIO SILONE

Italian Novelist and Editor, *Tempo Presente*, Rome

Price 38 n.p.

INSTITUTE OF POLITICAL & SOCIAL STUDIES

211, Park Street, Calcutta 17.

Education Or Indoctrination?

The communist Ministry of Kerala has introduced a proposal to nationalise education and to take over schools "badly run" by the management. The move has aroused a storm of protest in the State where it is regarded as a thin end of the wedge to convert education into indoctrination. The following extracts from a statement issued by the Private Schools' Rights' Defense Committee—(Kerala State) give in a nutshell the argument against the proposed move of the Ministry.

Although the Private Schools' Rights' Defense Committee has been constituted by the Education Committee of the Kerala Catholic Bishops' Conference, this Committee stands for the rights of all private schools within the State, irrespective of any religious or sectional differences.

We have to point out that it is a well-known fact that the schools conducted by private agencies are far better managed and more efficiently run than Government schools. Students coming out of private schools are better disciplined and better equipped than those turned out by the Government schools. Not only there is no necessity to convert private schools into the pattern of Government schools but the procedure would be positively injurious to the cause of education and the progress and prestige of the country.

We are definitely of opinion that the statement of the Education Minister at the Kottayam Conference that the "contents of education will have to be changed," strikes at the very root of the fundamental right of the parents to educate their own children in the manner they choose without sacrificing the standards adopted by the civilized world. The attempt of the present Kerala Government seems to be to substitute for certain unchangeable principles of religion and the moral code of *Bharata Dharma*, the atheistic and subversive shibboleths of Marxian Communism by the new methods which will be adopted by the present Government. Freedom of individuals and democratic principles will be sabotaged by instilling into the minds of the children the Marxian principles that men are mere pawns on the chess board of the totalitarian State.

The attempt to force upon the managers of private schools a list of teachers prepared by the regional authority, to be constituted by Government, is opposed by us. From the experience gathered from the practice of the present Government during the short period of two months of their functioning, anybody can realise that the local body as well as the regional authority constituted by the Government will be dominated by well-trained members of the Communist Party. It is clear that the plan is to fill the private schools with teachers of Communistic persuasion.

We are at one with the Government in enhancing the remuneration of teachers and placing their services on as firm a basis as possible. But, we wish to make it clear that we cannot accede to the proposal of the Government to disburse the teachers' salary by the Government direct. The proposal is also open

to objection on the ground that it is another step in the road to nationalisation.

On a review of the provisions proposed, we have no doubt that just like Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy and Communist Governments in general, the present Government of Kerala are striking at the vital part of the Indian national life with a view to regimentalise the individual to accept a set pattern and frustrate the object of the Constitution which establishes a democratic regime.

UN REPORT ON HUNGARY—(Continued from Page 6)

terror. This democratic achievement of a united people was indeed threatened by a form of "counter-revolution" and it was to this that it succumbed. However, the "counter-revolution" consisted in the setting up by Soviet armed forces of Mr. Kadar and his colleagues in opposition to a government which enjoyed the overwhelming support of the people of Hungary.

Following the second Soviet intervention on 4 November, there has been no evidence of popular support for Mr. Kadar's Government. Mr. Kadar has successively abandoned most of the points from the revolutionary programme which he had at first promised to the Hungarian people. On the central question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops, he has moved from complete acceptance of the nation's wishes to a refusal to discuss the subject in present circumstances. Against the workers, he has proceeded step by step to destroy their power and that of the workers' councils. Capital punishment is applicable to strike activities. The processes of justice have been distorted by the institution of special police and special courts and by the ignoring of the rights of the accused. The Social Democratic Party has again been forcibly liquidated. General elections have been postponed for two years. Writers and intellectuals are subjected to repressive measures. The Hungarian workers have shown no sign of support for Mr. Kadar's Government or for the prospects of continuous Soviet occupation. Only a small fraction of the 190,000 Hungarians, mostly young people, who fled the country have accepted his invitation to return. The peasants have reason to be grateful to Mr. Nagy for his attitude towards collectivization of agriculture and forced deliveries of farm produce.

In the light of the extent of foreign intervention, consideration of the Hungarian question by the United Nations was legally proper and, moreover, it was requested by a legal government of Hungary. In the matter of human rights, Hungary has accepted specific international obligations in the treaty of peace. Accordingly, the committee does not regard objections based on Paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter (prohibiting intervention in domestic affairs) as having validity in the present case. A massive armed intervention by one power on the territory of another, with the avowed intention of interfering with the affairs of the country must, by the Soviet's own definition of aggression, be a matter of international concern.

On The Chinese Road!

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE mystery of the short shrift that the Government is giving to reliable evidence on the failure of the experiment of cooperative farming in many lands, Soviet and capitalist, in their summary decision to increase the number of cooperative farms with a view to total cooperativisation in due time, will stand resolved with startling clarity if we glance at the official pronouncements and policies of Red China since about 1952 when the first stage of land reforms was completed and the first five year plan was in the making. For after the adoption of the socialist pattern of society in the country, we are being led rapidly on the Chinese road.

Agricultural production in China reached a crisis in 1953 on account of the resistance of the peasants to cooperativisation and natural disasters like floods and frosts. But the Soviet Union at the same time offered to set up ninety additional industrial projects to make 156 units in all concerned with metallurgy, hydraulics, mining, automobiles, tractors and oil refineries. In return for this promise, People's China undertook to export vast quantities of agricultural products (in addition to her traditional goods) such as cereals, vegetable oils, oil seeds and mining products. This burden of industrialisation had of course to be borne by peasants. Communist leaders resumed, therefore, at this stage the intensification and acceleration of the preparatory forms of cooperativisation such as mutual aid teams and "low grade" cooperatives which allow nominal retention of the ownership of his holding by the peasant while he joins the cooperative and shares in planned work on the united farm. The general line of policy adopted in October 1953 mentions the parallel development of socialist industry and socialist agriculture.

The need to buy industrial equipment from Soviet Russia on the grandiose scale contemplated by the five year plan accounts for the decision to step up the speed of cooperativisation in spite of the set back in previous years occasioned by the resistance of the peasants. The Government proceeded to get *complete control of the harvest* at the same time through the promulgation of orders for the monopoly purchase of all grains and cash crops (19 November 1953 published on February 25, 1954—Hsiu Hua Agency). This order says that all peasants should sell their grains to the State at the rates determined by the latter and forbids all dealers to pursue their trade except as public agents of distribution appointed by the State. The deprivation of the peasant of all control over his own harvest is to be completed by rapid collectivisation which transfers the ownership of agricultural products to the hands of the collective farms which are totally under the control of the State. The peasant will no longer be able to call any part of the harvest his own and cannot therefore retain any grains. The farm will have the control of the harvest and the

peasant will be paid according to the labour put in by him as measured by "work norms" and "labour days." Jen Min Ji Pao sums up the position succinctly in the following words: "The State must coordinate and plan the purchase and distribution of foodstuffs, so that it may build up sufficient stocks and thus ensure the normal progress of economic construction. The planned purchase and distribution of foodstuffs is of vital importance to the industrialisation of China and its advance towards socialism."

The motive of collectivisation of farms is thus to transfer the ownership and control of foodstuffs and industrial raw materials from the hands of the peasant proprietor to those of the State, which is accomplished in combination with State monopoly, of trade. This enables the State to pay for industrial assistance from Russia and the satellite countries with its agricultural surplus without having to coax the peasant and trader and paying them higher prices than need be.

Private property in land and the right to engage in private commerce in grains assure freedom to peasants and traders and competitive prices to consumers. But it is not the object of communism to assure freedom to them or to any other class. Its primary aim is to concentrate all freedom and the consequent power over the lives of the people in the hands of the State. Whether the State is democratic or totalitarian makes little difference to the outcome except perhaps in the matter of harshness and violence. "We have to export our surplus agricultural produce in exchange for the industrial equipment which is essential in order to speed up the development of our industry. That is why during the process of industrialisation of our country, we must continuously expand our agricultural production and constantly increase the socialist transformation of agriculture."

But human nature is against this policy of freedom for the State and unfreedom for the producer whether industrial, commercial or agricultural. Chinese human nature is no different but it is being forcibly "cribbed, cabined and confined" in collectives by Mao Tse-Tung in the ruthless manner of Stalin in Soviet Russia. Mao's declaration of the July 31, 1955 delineates this goal and policy. In that speech, Mao points out the example of Russia which socialised her agriculture in eighteen years. He proposes to do it in China in seventeen years in three more five year plans. He shows the parallelism between socialisation in industry and in agriculture and the role of agriculture as the basis of industrialisation. Socialisation is the only way by which the State could plan and control agricultural production and obtain control of it without the shackling mediation of peasants and traders. This surplus is to be traded for industrial equipment from abroad. Mechanisation of agri-

(Continued on Page 10)

Review

Freedom in Contemporary Society

by Samuel Eliot Morison (Little, Brown, & Company Canada Ltd.,) \$3.50.

ADMIRAL Morison's book is a brilliant analysis of the situation of freedom in the contemporary society. He traces the history of the evolution of the concept of freedom in its three aspects, political, economic and academic. He regards political freedom as "most important and inclusive," economic freedom as "more subject to erosion than any other in the last half century," and academic freedom as "youngest of the family, still struggling for general recognition." He never indulges in abstractions and states his arguments in clear terms. Often he deals with specific cases and discusses specific issues such as the New Deal, big business, trade unions, McCarthyism, fair trade laws, educational theories, Fifth Amendment to the American Constitution and methods of dealing with communism—all from the point of view of freedom. He exhibits a progressive outlook on economic issues; and with regard to education, he warns that lower standards of "degree mill" universities can be quite as dangerous to academic freedom as faculty "witch-hunts" and loyalty oaths which had become common in America in the day of McCarthy.

Admiral Morison is frank to a surprising degree. He seems to take the position of the French Revolutionaries who had declared "No freedom to the enemies of freedom." Hence he advocates strictest measures against communists who threaten freedom in the contemporary society. "I cannot agree with my idealist friends" he says "... who say that communists should be treated like everyone else, in the hope that they may be weaned away from their doctrine by sweet reasonableness. It is certain from events of the past twenty years that sweet reasonableness does not work on communists."

Referring to the communist infiltration in the American administrative set up, he points out: "A small but prominent group of American intellectuals appear to have decided during the Great Depression that democracy and capitalism were finished, that the world would go either fascist or communist; and they chose communism. They made a point of infiltrating key departments of the government, such as Treasury, State and Defence, where they could 'take over' in the event of expected collapse and in the meantime did everything within their power to ingratiate the Soviet government. So long as the United States and Russia were fighting on the same side, this infiltration went largely unnoticed." He wants all such communists to be weeded out in the interest of freedom.

But Admiral Morison however condemns "a doctrine new to the common law . . . that of guilt by association" due to which several American intellectuals have suffered in recent years. He states "In the eyes of the red-baiters, a man is a security risk if he subscribes to a red-infiltrated charity fund, no matter

how innocent he is of knowledge as to its real nature, or how charitable his intent, or if he has attended cocktail parties where communists are present or had a communist friend, or belonged to a communist club twenty years ago when he was in college. Of all these trends, this is perhaps the most dangerous to liberty, because it permits publicity-mad inquisitors to blacken the good names of good citizens almost at will. Hardly any civic minded, public spirited individual who goes in for good causes and contributes to charities can have avoided some innocent association with communist, at some time or other."

Originally the essays contained in the book, were the Chancellor Dunning Trust lectures, delivered by the author at Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario, Admiral Morison is a noted historian. He won the Pulitzer Prize for his "Admiral of the Ocean Sea."

ADAM ADIL

ON THE CHINESE ROAD!—(Continued from page 9)
culture may come later but meanwhile control over it by the State is essential. Hence the collective farms programme.

It is to be noted that this policy solves the foreign exchange problem through barter, a solution that is obviously exercising a fatal fascination on our authorities in India! Success in cooperativisation will help solve this trouble definitively, it is hoped, rendering third and fourth five year plans easier of realisation.

But the question arises from the democratic point of view whether in this path we are not sacrificing man for production? The query that has plagued so many in recent months whether the Plan is for the people or the people for the Plan assumes greater poignancy in view of this light from Chinese mentors and pioneers.

The Prime Minister visited cooperative societies and cooperating societies and *cooperating farmers* in Denmark where the peasants, small and middle, have retained their freedom through retention of ownership of their lands. They have secured the advantages of easy credit, large scale purchase and sale, technical advice and improved implements through "service" or "betterment" cooperatives. It is to be hoped that on return he will initiate a re-examination and reassessment of the potentiality of this kind of Rochdale cooperatives (with which we are already familiar), *vis-a-vis* the disastrous type put through in Russia and China at the cost of so much inhumanity without even the consolation of success by way of significant increases in production.

Freedom to the State to trade agricultural surplus for foreign industrial equipment through barter is not tantamount to freedom to the individual citizen. The State is not an entity with moral and spiritual ends of its own. It is but a means. Satisfaction and happiness dwell only in the individuals. Moreover, freedom is not a superfluous good. It is the indispensable condition and atmosphere of all values. The only kind of State Plan that has any final value is the Plan that enables *individuals to plan their own lives* on the basis of an equal opportunity of possessing and using private property.

Letter To The Editor

Dear Sir,

In an otherwise well written article in the July issue on the above subject, Mr. M. A. Venkata Rao raises a misleading "if" which seems to lump the Catholics and Communists in Kerala together on the subject of indoctrination. This is an old accusation; but inasmuch as Mr. Rao introduces a line of thought which seeks to deprive religious minorities of their constitutional guarantees to have aided schools of their own choice, it behoves us to refute this insinuation.

The article does try to disengage education from the attempted nationalisation in Kerala. He dislikes the moves of the present Government to nationalise textbooks, appoint teachers, take over the University, etc. The dislike, in the name of education, democracy and freedom to arrive at the truth, moves on naturally to the fear of "indoctrination" at the hands of the Communists. Then suddenly Mr. Rao drags in the Catholics and religious bodies in general, who are placed under the same suspicion of "indoctrinating" as the Communists, with a view to question their eligibility to the State aid guaranteed by the Constitution.

As the controversy is waging in Kerala where the Communists are in power and the Catholics together with the Muslims, Nayars and other religious bodies are fighting for the very existence of their schools, how, it may be asked, does the above "pot calling the kettle black" help at all. It is not a free secular government which is in power, and is expressing a dislike to "indoctrination." Such a free State—the Indian Union—has granted the minorities the right to run their own schools, and moreover, in the time-honoured tradition of our land from the days of Asoka, it has even given the right to claim grant-in-aid. The Government in Kerala is itself the ace "indoctrinator," as are all Communists, and the very expression takes its rise and particular meaning from the Communists.

To lump together the Communists with their "indoctrination" with religious bodies who "have a doctrine to teach" is like saying that "man belongs to the animal kingdom" and therefore is an animal like a horse or a dog. There is a root word in common, viz. "doctrine." It is one of those lines of argument where you get trapped by words.

If Communist indoctrination followed the old-world religious meaning, then the Communists should have opened their own private schools, as do the religious bodies; they should then have subscribed to the prescribed textbooks and curricula, without attempting to frame them in the Communist mould; and then conducted some classes on Communism outside school hours, for the benefit of the children of their own party members without compulsion on any others to attend. But this is not what one understands by "indoctrination" which, in its pejorative sense, is connected with the attempt of Communists to introduce their own dialectic materialistic view into every walk of life. Nay, the moment they have the power to

do so, they try to make it *compulsory on everybody else*, whether it be in education, economics, the running of the state or the interpretation of history, culture, religion and ethics.

Everybody knows that while the Catholics have an exact doctrine in religious matters and a well-knit discipline, they make no attempts in their schools to impose it on others. They do live their own religious doctrine and observe their own discipline, and have no hesitation in proclaiming the excellence of what they believe and observe. But they make no attempt to coerce others. In their schools in particular, they follow the prescribed books and curricula and keep the cosmopolitan tone as befits their "catholic" appellation and spirit. That is precisely why their institutions are not "denominational" in the narrow sense, so that parents of all persuasions and beliefs send their children to these schools without a tremor as to their own beliefs, customs and traditions.

As regards a view of history, culture, ethics, science, politics, economics, etc., the Catholics bank on their centuries of experience, research and prudence. Catholic scholars and scientists do not take refuge behind dogma, but follow the rules of investigation and results along with their fellow scientists, historians, theoreticians, etc. The same rules hold good both for Catholics and non-Catholics. The Catholics ask for nothing less than absolute freedom to arrive at the objective Truth. But if Catholics, while asking for liberty, also profit from the past, and if their religion does have a rich past to help them on, it is not their misfortune. In every progressive field there is the work of those who have gone before to set one well ahead on the journey of life. And if one ignores what has been built up so far, one remains an ignoramus.

Therefore, we face squarely the "if" of Mr. Rao without the least fear of failing the test of Truth or objectivity, Universal Brotherhood or tolerance, Justice or what is legitimate to one's freedom and dignity.

Bombay 17th July 1957

(Rev.) T. MASCARENHAS

I. C. C. F. NEWS

"What is Happening in Soviet Russia?" was the subject of a very interesting talk delivered to a packed hall by Mr. A. D. Gorwala on July 10. Mr. M. R. Masani, M.P., presided. Mr. Gorwala and Mr. Masani referred to the Seminar on "Changes in Soviet Society" held in Oxford under the auspices of the Congress for Cultural Freedom and gave information about the discussions that took place there.

* * *

Dr. Frank Snowden of Harvard University, U.S.A. delivered a lecture on "The Role of the Negro in the United States" under the auspices of the Committee on July 15. Mr. Purshottam Tricumdas, Bar-at-Law, presided over the lecture.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

The following are some of the interesting remarks heard at a Seminar on "Changes in Soviet Society" held in Oxford under the joint auspices of St. Anthony's College and the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

✓ Chengis Khan with a telegraph and a telephone.
—Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe

Russia is at no date in terms of the French Revolution.
—Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe

Bertram Wolfe is the last great doctrinaire of Soviet Society.

—Mr. Raymond Aron

'Toiling Intelligentsia' means everyone who is not a worker or a peasant.

—Prof. H. Seton-Watson

The Soviet regime is constantly stirring the scrambled eggs in an attempt to atomise society, but ultimately the eggs solidify.

—Prof. H. Seton-Watson

✓ The ruling class of Russia is the 'Privilegentsia'.
—Prof. Leonard Schapiro

Wishful thinking would appear to be the occupational disease of political analysts.

—Mr. A. D. Gorwala

✓ Demosthenes asked long ago: How can you co-exist with someone who does not wish you to exist at all?

—Mr. A. D. Gorwala

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

There is no longer a Communist Catholic Church, but only a Communist World Council of Christian Churches.

—Mr. Walter Kolarz

The Kremlin has no answer to the question: Where is your Nkrumah?

—Mrs. Holdsworth

Learning Self-Government is like learning to swim—it can come by practice alone.

—Mr. A. D. Gorwala

But sometimes one drowns.

—Prof. Max Beloff

We have let the Soviet Union be more of an island than it need have been.

—Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe

In the USSR there are no Communists. In Eastern Europe there are some.

—Mr. G. Paloczi-Horvath

✓ Le plus c'est la meme chose le plus ca change.

—Prof. Merle Fainsod

If we have to have Marxism, let us keep it dialectic.

—Mr. Richard Lowenthal

✓ You can tell the governors in Soviet Russia from the governed by the clothing they wear.

—Sir Isaiah Berlin

The Soviet regime is creating a 'pariah leadership' among the young intellectuals.

—Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe

In Hungary the writer had only the choice to be a blood stain or a louse.

—Mr. G. Paloczi-Horvath

We must not mistake the second month of gestation for the ninth.

—Prof. Barghoorn

But let's not ignore a spark which may turn into a flame.

—Prof. H. Seton-Watson

We know very little and must not pretend to teach more than we know.

—Prof. Merle Fainsod