

Boris Pasternak

By J. B. H. Wadia

WE who believe in the preservation and promotion of cultural freedom can never say enough in our protest against this latest act of crass infamy on the part of the Russian communists. But then, saying alone will not be of avail, especially when we have to deal with a worldwide clique of those who sail under the false colours of progressiveness, invoke democratic slogans to serve their ends and at the same time openly subscribe to an inhuman totalitarian ideology which is a complete denial of democracy and freedom. Innumerable past experiences over a period of thirty five years, of which the Hungarian betrayal is a revealing episode on a colossal scale, have shown to us the futility of relying on the promises held out by the communists or hoping for their willy nilly reformation.

I do admit that "hope springs eternal in the human breast." Hope, certainly, is of the essence of life. But merely living on pious hopes can also become an apology for human inertia and as such sort of an inverted crime against free society and real democracy. In the case of Boris Pasternak, let not hope become a blind spot in our attempt to face the facts. Let hope not be a hindrance in our assessment of an evil which exists in all its ugly reality.

As many, who had long before been thoroughly disillusioned had anticipated, the so-called thaw in the wake of Stalin's natural or unnatural death soon turned out to be a mirage. It was during that passing phase in April 1954, that *Dr. Zivago* was first mentioned in the Soviet press. Ten beautiful poems were published in *Znamya*, the official journal of the Union of Soviet Writers, along with a note that they were to be included in Pasternak's novel which was to be published in due course. The announcement was received with great enthusiasm. Perhaps, greater than necessary. Why? Because for twenty years previous to that publication, Pasternak, acknowledged as the greatest creative genius in modern Russian poetry, had maintained an ominous silence. He had published practically nothing which could be called "the off-spring of the mind", and had remained contented with doing magnificent translations of classics in non-Russian languages, notably the plays of Shakespeare and Schiller. These translations, according to the Russians themselves, were of such a high order that

they had earned for Pasternak a coveted place in the galaxy of the immortals in the firmament of Russian literature, leave aside his earlier and superb poetry which had already made an indelible influence on the course of modern Russian poetry.

But soon something happened which sent Pasternak back to his studied silence. The poems, which had been erstwhile hailed as masterpieces, began to be criticised as unworthy of the Communist ideal.

Alas! The much trumpeted thaw had not resulted in the cool melting of the waters of life—waters of life which had been sinisterly kept congealed by the rulers of Russia whose hearts cannot but be icy-cold ever.

True to the nature of communist tactics of opportune volte face, the process of refreezing had begun with a vengeance and at an accelerated tempo. The self-styled defenders of the Russian people did not even care to wait for the spring, allow a hundred flowers to bloom and then cut off their heads as was to happen in the neighbouring country of their prototypes. Pasternak's works suddenly became mediocre, then poor and lastly unworthy. Why so? "Failing to answer the call of the day" was the reason given in official quarters. And in the "progressive" realm of socialist realism it is only the officials who are invested with the right to pronounce the verdict on the merits or demerits of a given work of art.

In communist countries there is nothing more ephemeral than the call of the day. It varies from day to day. And all that you are expected to do as a loyal communist citizen is not to question if the call of the day happens to differ violently from the call of yesterday.

It is an irony of history that the communists, who never tire of shouting from the housetops their ubiquitous theory of inherent contradictions rising on the surface in non-communist countries, seem to be, nay prefer to be, blissfully unaware of the deeper implication and greater application of their favourite method of dialectics to themselves.

Be that as it may, the case of Boris Pasternak is one more proof—if more proofs are at all needed—of the failure of the concerted efforts of communism to quell the human spirit and regiment human thought.

While not underestimating the potentiality of communism dragging the world toward a new dark age, I would make bold to say that in the final show-down to come, communism is doomed to an ignoble defeat, not only because there is an ever-increasing number of ex-communists in the free world but also because there will always be more anti-communists in communist countries themselves than outside.

That is all well and good. But what about the immediate fate of Boris Pasternak? I appeal to all associations and societies of poets and writers in our country not to fail Boris Pasternak in the hour of his ordeal which is also their ordeal, our ordeal, the ordeal of all who believe in the inseparable place of cultural freedom in human society. I appeal to them all, including the near-communist organisations, to hold meetings, attend them in large number, denounce the re-actionary policy of the followers of so-called socialist realism to instal barbed-wire concentration camps around the minds of creative artistes, pass forth-right resolutions and bring to the notice of governments and countries their protest against what I have called an act of crass infamy.

As to the personal safety of Pasternak: We can never be sure of it so long as he chooses to remain in Russia in his Promethean aloofness or so long as he is made to remain there by undiscovered treachery. Because on the chessboard of totalitarian politics, the moves are always predetermined. The pieces are made to move from vilification to victimisation and from victimisation to alas! liquidation. That is why we dread to think of Pasternak's fate.

But this much is certain that now there is no power on earth which can efface the impact of his sublime thoughts.

When *Dr. Zivago* comes into conflict with Antipov, the intellectual of the party, Pasternak makes him say: "Let me go if I am, indeed, free; and if I am not free, dispose of me. I do not have to justify my actions to you." What a noble thought! What a terrible premonition!

Again toward the end of the book, Pasternak makes a statement which has already passed into history. It is an epitome of the philosophy of life of a man who loves liberty: "A man who is not free will always idealise his bondage."

Come what may, no matter what we hear from interested quarters, we know that Boris Pasternak is made of much stronger stuff. He will never idealise bondage.

He is a free spirit, the eternal sky-lark of Russian literature. He knows that creative art and liberty go hand in hand. He knows that deprived of the ethereal support of liberty, art becomes debased, a mere tool to serve the ends of the powers-that-be. He knows

that for the emancipation of man in a free society, thoughts must fly from mind to mind, from country to country, from age to age. He knows that the course of cultural freedom is like that of a river—ever-flowing, ever-free, ever steadfast and ultimately pouring itself in effulsion into the sea of humanity.

I have called Boris Pasternak the skylark of Russian literature. I cannot do better than end with a small quotation from another free soul, an earlier fervent devotee of freedom, Shelley. It is from his "Ode To The Sky Lark."

"Higher and higher still
From the earth thou springest
Like a cloud of fire
The blue deep thou wingest
And singing still doth soar and soaring
ever singest."

Sure as the sun shines, the soaring, singing voice of Boris Pasternak will be heard through the ages.

Publications of the D.R.S.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| For A Democratic Foreign Policy | Re. 1/- |
| The Communist Peace Appeal—Philip Spratt | Re. 1/- |
| Neutralism In India—M. R. Masani | 50 nP. |
| The Communist Culture Front—Rohit Dave | 50 nP. |
| Why Does A Country Go Communist? | 25 nP. |
| Who Is the Imperialist? | 12 nP. |
| Why Communism Must Fail?—Bertrand Russell
And Others | 50 nP. |
| The Peril of the Russian Steel Plant
—Padamji Ginwala | 25 nP. |
| Dangers of Physical Planning—A Discussion | 25 nP. |
| Communist Conspiracy at Madurai | Rs. 2/- |
| Communist Double-Talk at Palghat | Rs. 2/- |
| Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma | Re. 1/- |

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 nP

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

Notes

Disease Of Giganticism

IT was pleasant to hear the Prime Minister denounce "the disease of giganticism" the other day in a speech that he delivered in Bhopal while inaugurating the twenty-ninth annual session of the Central Board of Irrigation and Power. The disease, he said, had afflicted development planning. He advised that "this imbalance in our thinking" should be redressed.

Giving his arguments against large projects, he said: "Not only did large projects take a long time to come to fruition, but also failed to reach down to the people or to elicit their understanding or cooperation. On the other hand, they frequently resulted in the uprooting of hundreds of families and thus alienated their sympathies."

As against large projects he recommended small projects. These projects, which could be easily taken in hand, would, he said, secure better cooperation of the people and would, in course of time, change the face of the country.

These observations of the Prime Minister are extremely welcome. They indicate a radical change in the trend of his thinking. It is to be hoped that this new thinking will influence the formulation of the Third Five-Year Plan. There was a time when nothing but gigantic schemes would appeal to the Prime Minister. The emphasis will now shift, it seems, to small projects which do not require big outlays and give quicker returns. The country will heave a sigh of relief if the Prime Minister's denunciation of the "disease of giganticism" will effect that reorientation in the thinking of our planners.

Story Of Bungling

THE debate on the report of the Hindustan Steel (Private) Limited which took place in Parliament in the last week of November throws some light on one aspect of "the disease of giganticism". The decision to build simultaneously three 'mammoth' steel plants was a product of that disease. It is no longer useful to talk about it as the decision has been already implemented and the work at all the three places has now reached an advance stage.

But the Government could have easily established three separate organisations for building and looking after the three plants. The disease of giganticism again affected the thinking and one giant organisation was created instead of three separate organisations. This affected supervision, gave rise to delays and killed local initiative. A demand was made in Parliament that even at this stage the Government could reconsider the matter and set up three independent boards for looking after the three projects.

Other complaints that were vigorously voiced were

about wrong estimates, long delays, inefficient management and waste. The estimate, it was pointed out, had gone up by over fortyfive per cent. The time schedule was not kept. There was no proper supervision and in some cases contracts were given to undeserving persons. Mr. Nath Pai, M.P. went to the extent of saying that "the way the plants were being set up was a story of bungling, lack of vision, vigour, and good and sound planning." The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel, Sardar Swaran Singh, tried to gloss over the complaints by pointing to the magnitude of the task. The task is no doubt big, but that is the very reason why it should be tackled carefully and efficiently.

Defence Controversy

A LOT of criticism has appeared in the press about some of the recent transactions of the Defence Ministry. The criticism has been construed by some as "a conspiracy against Mr. Menon" and some of them, more particularly some fellow-travelling journals, have rushed to his help by making wild allegations against other Ministers and Ministries.

It is difficult to make categorical assertions about the transactions without knowing all relevant facts which have not yet been made public. Some of the facts made public by a journal of the standing of the *Hindustan Times* make disturbing reading. They make out a cogent case for a high level inquiry into the facts of the transactions and their desirability or otherwise from the point of view of national interests.

A couple of important questions can also be considered. Is it not desirable to separate supply from defence and place it under a separate Ministry? The two things are essentially different and it is not necessary that the Defence Ministry should itself manufacture all the equipments that it needs. Another question that will have to be considered is the desirability of utilising scarce national resources for building new factories when the installed capacity of already established factories is not being fully utilised. A high level committee can inquire into all these questions and advise the Government on the policy to be adopted.

The personality of the Defence Minister will not be an issue in any such inquiry. But his personality should not also block the inquiry when so many conflicting statements have been made and when the matter involved is of such national importance.

Democracy In Asia

THE Sudan military coup once more highlights the general trend towards military dictatorship growing in Asia and Africa. Next to Lebanon, the Sudan was the only country in West Asia with a democratic form of Government. But, democratic institutions there have been swept away by the rising tide of military dictatorship now surging in those parts. Though there had been no immediate cause for this political upheaval, such as political crisis or breakdown of constitutional machinery, it is obvious that

the change was motivated more by internal than external considerations. In this, it has repeated the pattern which has been unfolded in Pakistan, Iraq and other countries. The Sudanese Commander-in-Chief, has roundly denounced the situation of "chaos and corruption in the country due to the exploitation of politicians and political parties, the misuse of Press and contact with foreign embassies," which impelled the armed forces to step in and stem the rot. Accordingly, politicians and political parties have been forcibly removed from the scene, Parliament has been dissolved and the Constitution abolished. Thus one more country in Asia and Africa has slipped into the grip of a military dictatorship.

The extinction of democracies one by one in this region should impel democrats to ponder deeply over the significance of this trend. Internal instability, a worsening economy and the general incompetence and immobilism of politicians in the face of clamour for reforms have created a climate of impatience with the existing political system. This has naturally resulted in this growing trend away from democracy. The newly forged democratic institutions need an inner dynamism to sustain themselves in this new soil. In the absence of the spirit which should permeate these institutions to make them a success, the institutional set up fails to generate enough internal strength and falls apart. This again raises the question of the form of the democratic government suitable to the existing socio-economic conditions in Asia and Africa. The latest military coup in Sudan has once again underlined the need for serious re-thinking on the problem.

And Now Economic Bandung!

IT is in keeping with communist tactics of setting up front organisations one after another for carrying on their activities under cover of respectability, that another Afro-Asian Conference has been planned this month. An Afro-Asian Economic Congress is scheduled to meet in Cairo from December 8 to 11. It has already been given a lavish build-up by the Communist Powers and the United Arab Republic. It should be by now obvious that this is yet another link in the communist chain of front organisations which have been established ostensibly to promote friendship and solidarity among Afro-Asian countries.

In January this year, there was the "People's Bandung" in the form of Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference; then came the "Writers' Bandung" at Tashkent last month, and now this new conference is being hailed as "Economic Bandung". Thus there is a consistent political thread running through all these seemingly innocuous attempts at fostering so-called solidarity among Afro-Asians.

The conference has been convened by the Egyptian Chamber of Commerce. It has also, somehow, found funds to offer delegates all expenses and air passage to and from Cairo. The purpose of the Conference is "to regulate economic cooperation among the member states of both the continents." It has been announced

that invitations have been issued to Chambers of Commerce in nearly 50 Afro-Asian countries and about 40 nations are expected to participate. The Conference is said to be non-governmental but, then, one fails to understand how communist countries like Russia, China and others, where non-governmental Chambers are non-existent, came to be invited to participate in the conference.

One of the items on the agenda concerns the question of establishing a permanent regional organisation. This, again, is a typical feature of recent communist activities—the proliferating net work of such organisations designed to serve the communist ends. The conference is expected to help remove harmful competition among member states and pave the way for better coordination of economic policies. But will any of the delegates attending the conference gather enough courage to get up and raise the question of the recent dumping by the Russians of tin to the grave detriment of Indonesia, Malaya and Thailand or the cancellation of credits, on political grounds, promised to Yugoslavia? Or, for that matter, Red China's recent unfair drive for export by under-selling and cutting into the traditional Indian markets for textiles, coal, and oilseeds by subsidising its export to the extent of Rs. 110 crores annually at the cost of home consumption, was also not an example of friendly co-operation. Will any one of the delegates dare to raise these questions?

63

• DECEMBER 1958

LITERATURE

ARTS AND POLITICS

THE SLEEPWALKER

by Arthur Koestler

FROM A DIARY

by Stephen Spender

AFTER NOTTING HILL

by Dan Jacobson

Annual Subscription Rs. 12.00

For Members of the Indian Committee for
Cultural Freedom Rs. 10.00

ENCOUNTER

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & IRVING KRISTOL

The Tashkent Writers' Conference

By "Atreya"

FROM the various reports now available on preparations in India for the Tashkent Conference of Afro-Asian Writers, and the Conference proceedings at the Soviet "Asian" capital, Tashkent, it is possible to assess some interesting developments about the conference.

An Indian Preparatory Committee was formed in August with Dr. Mulk Raj Anand, Mr. Tarashanker Banerjee and Mr. Jainendra Kumar Jain as conveners. The Preparatory Committee was to ensure participation of an impressive Indian delegation in the Conference. Within a few days of the formation of this Preparatory Committee, one of the Conveners, Mr. Jainendra Kumar Jain, dissociated himself from the Committee along with two other writers, Mr. R.S. Dinkar and Mr. V.R. Narala.

The three dissenters issued a public statement accusing the Preparatory Committee of "partisanship" in its functioning and revealed how the Preparatory Committee was packed with communist and pro-communist writers to ensure their majority to enable subservience to Soviet plans. As a part of this process, it was further revealed, the choice of Mr. Tarashanker Banerjee as the leader of the Indian Delegation was made by the Communist-packed committee to bypass Mr. Humayun Kabir, Union Minister for Cultural Affairs, who, by a convention agreed to, ought to have been invited to lead the Indian delegation. It was accepted generally that the leader of the Indian Delegation to the last Asian Writers Conference held in New Delhi in 1956 should be the leader of the Indian delegation to Tashkent.

The Communist "Aktivists" in the present Preparatory Committee—such as Comrade Sajjad Zaheer and the pro-Soviet "progressive" writer, Dr. Mulk Raj Anand, found in this situation the ideal opportunity to bypass Mr. Kabir, as they probably felt Mr. Kabir could not be relied upon to be so pliable as Mr. Tarashanker Banerjee. Moreover, Mr. Humayun Kabir had an "undesirable" record according to Communist standards. According to the correspondent of *Times of India* of 23rd September:

"...It is feared here that the Tashkent Conference might decide to form an organization of Afro-Asian writers with national committees to implement its decisions. This organization may be patterned after the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee. *The proposal to form such an organization was resisted, among others, by Mr. Kabir, at the Asian Writers' Conference in 1956. It is no secret that the opponents of the proposal feared that such an organization would come to be dominated by writers from communist countries in view of the fact that they would enjoy the support of their governments and that individual writers would not be able to resist such domination.* (Emphasis added.)

It was thus clear to the "Anand-Zaheer" group in

the Preparatory Committee, that Mr. Humayun Kabir just would not do as the leader of the Indian delegation. It was of course no fault of theirs that Mr. Tarashanker Banerjee too refused to be their tool at Tashkent as the subsequent events at Tashkent proved.

When the dissenters accused the communist group of having sent invitations to writers whose names were not even considered at the meetings of the Preparatory Committee and thus presenting a *fait accompli* in respect of selection of members of the delegation, Dr. Mulk Raj Anand developed righteous indignation. The P.E.N. in its official bulletin had made similar charges and Dr. Anand called these charges "slanders" and conveyed through a letter in the *Times of India* that Dr. Radhakrishnan, Vice-President of India, "had promised to take up the matter (of P.E.N.'s slander) with the Indian P.E.N. Executive".

Confirmation of the deliberately shoddy manner of inviting delegates at random, as accused by the dissenters, came from Prof. Jogesh Das of Assam, who in a letter to the Editor of *Times of India* of 17th November commented as follows:

"...That there was some mismanagement in the Committee's preparations' will be evident from the following incident:

"I was invited to attend the conference as a delegate from Assam. The first intimation I received was in the form of a telegram which told me that some 'Indian Preparatory Committee' had selected me for some 'Tashkent Conference' and that the Convenor wanted me to wire acceptance and that a letter would follow ... I was puzzled. I waited for the promised letter. But the letter never arrived..."

The proceedings at Tashkent, as reported by various sources, revealed further the nature of the conference. Some of these sources could by no means be termed as anti-Soviet. These reports are worth quoting.

Ralph Parker, writing in the *Times of India* of 17th October, reported that the Indian delegation found itself isolated when it voiced objections to the manner in which the original agenda for the Tashkent Conference had been altered "in a way that threatened to throw cultural considerations into the background."

The weekly magazine "Link", noted for its pro-Soviet views, commented as follows:

"...For the 26 members of the India's delegation to the .. (Tashkent) Conference, the proceedings were a series of shocks...The original agenda which seemed to promise considerable latitude to those who maintain that writers' conferences should be concerned exclusively with literary questions, had been given a sharp political flavour... Mulk Raj Anand and Tara Shankar Bannerji made strenuous efforts to shift the focus of the confer-

ence back on cultural questions... India found herself isolated...

"The next serious shock was the total rejection of India's draft of the conference's final appeal and its replacement by a document drawn by the extreme left wing of French-African groups couched in the language of political journalism. ... That was not the end of India's trials. During the work of the commissions, a consensus of opinion had emerged in favour of the establishment of a permanent bureau of secretariat to represent Asian and African writers, to set up a publishing house, publish a magazine, assist indigent writers etc.... A spokesman for the openly political Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee in Cairo offered to take over the work, but most delegates found the suggestion distasteful. Finally a resolution was adopted to create bureau in Colombo.

"...Tara Shankar Bannerji, came to the conclusion that he could not commit the Indian delegation to this proposal to set up a permanent organization. It was a bewildered and shocked Indian delegation that heard from the stage... an announcement that India would not be among the Nine countries represented in the Colombo Bureau... pending an approach to the Sahitya Akademi. Tempers ran high and within an hour of the close of the conference, the majority of the Indian delegation had voted into existence a national committee of Indian writers, initiated by the Tashkent group with powers to co-opt representatives of those language groups not present at the conference. The feeling was strongly expressed that this committee should be represented in the Colombo Bureau." (Link, October 26, 1958).

Dr. Rafiq Zakaria commenting on the Tashkent Conference in his column "Asian Notebook" in the *Times of India*, said:

"...I do not know how our Prime Minister, with his concern for writers and free expression, is going to view this development; but I am sure our Minister for Cultural Affairs, Mr. Humayun Kabir, is bound to react sharply. He was sceptical about this conference from the very beginning and the results seem to have more than justified his fears." (*Times of India*, 2nd Nov. 1958).

Dr. Krishnalal Shridharani, a delegate to the conference reported:

"...There were a few Indian delegates who also got the special treatment that a bridegroom gets in a fond father-in-law's house—Communists and 'progressive' writers... whose writings are... more known in the Soviet Union than in the land of their birth... "I regret the decision of some of the Indian writers not to go to Tashkent on the ground that the Indian delegation was being packed with Communists and cronies; by their sit-down strike they merely provided more berths to Communists and cronies..."

"...As it was the delegation was weighted with men better known for their 'socialist realism' than for the excellence of their writings... One could not fail to see the predominance of writers and 'cultu-

ral workers' with Party or 'peace committee' or 'Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee' connections.

"The discussions seldom rose above applause-catching platitudes and slogans... A number of delegates, it was apparent, knew more about colonialism than about literature..."

"...The two Indian members (Gopal Haldar and Sant Singh Sekhon) both known Party men, had no business cooperating in the revision of the agenda behind the collective back of the Indian delegation. Dr. Mulk Raj Anand had assured the Indian writers again and again in Delhi that the Conference would be non-political (his words) and that the 'Russian writers are sincere in their desire to keep it non-political.' Both he and Tarashankar Banerjee informed us that they had given this undertaking to Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru on the basis of which the latter gave his 'blessings' to the unofficial delegation..." (*Amrit Bazar Patrika*, November 9, 1958).

After the conference, according to a Tass release, the Indian writer-delegates to the Tashkent conference, Dr. Mulk Raj Anand, Com. Sajjad Zaheer, poetess Prabhjot Kaur, poet and publisher Rabbani Taban and 'others' were given a reception in Moscow by the "Soviet-Indian Cultural Society." They were welcomed by the Soviet "authority on India" Com. V. Balabushevich, who in his works on India had characterised Mahatma Gandhi as a bourgeois reactionary and Pandit Nehru as an instrument of Western Imperialism.

In the light of the above reports, it is worthwhile recalling the "slanders" of the P.E.N. on this conference indignantly referred to by Dr. Mulk Raj Anand at that time. It would also be worthwhile knowing what Dr. Radhakrishnan feels about the attitude of P.E.N.

Finally, one can only wonder why the organizer and the leader of the Indian delegation have had so little to say about Boris Pasternak, a Soviet writer whose name ought to have some relevance even to the writers who met at Tashkent, along with such relevant subjects as colonialism and Afro-Asian solidarity with the Soviet Union!!!

The Truth About Stalin

BY N. KHRUSHCHEV

Price Rupee One



Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Report From Vienna

By Daniel Bell

The following is a report on an international seminar on Workers' Participation in Management which the Congress for Cultural Freedom organised in Vienna. The Seminar brought together a host of experts representing not only various nations but widely differing points of view. The writer, Mr. Daniel Bell is a well-known American labour journalist who has just been appointed Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, New York.

AN international public opinion poll recently conducted by Elmo Wilson showed that a majority of workers in Europe favored some form of "workers' participation in management." That such interest is high should be less surprising if one considers the fact that in the last fifteen years a remarkable set of experiments in industrial democracy has been taking place in Europe and elsewhere; I am thinking of the "Workers' Councils" in Yugoslavia and Poland; "co-determination" in Germany and Austria; trade-union-owned enterprises in Israel; "joint consultation" in nationalized industries in Britain; *Comites d'Enterprises* in France; also private experiments in worker communal arrangements in Italy (the Olivetti plants in Ivrea) and in India (the Tata enterprises).

To assess these experiments, the Congress for Cultural Freedom, in association with several Austrian colleges, recently held an International Seminar in Vienna, (from September 19th to 25th) which drew scholars, union officials, management people and journalists from twenty countries. The interest of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in a subject, which at first blush might seem to be far removed from "cultural freedom", was simple: In an increasingly bureaucratized world can we develop autonomous social forms which can give individuals a greater say over the control of their lives? Do not the experiments in industrial democracy represent one such effort?

However high the expectations regarding "workers' control" in the past, the divisions at the Seminar regarding the viability of this idea were sharp. Those countries where Trade Unions are *strongest*, such as England, the U.S. and Scandinavia, tended to *reject* the idea of worker participation in management. The British position was stated forcefully by Hugh Clegg (of Nuffield College, Oxford). Clegg, perhaps the foremost student of British unionism, drew a distinction between "democracy through participation", and "democracy by consent." The historic ideology of Left intellectuals, he pointed out, has been to favour participation. But in practice, the participation simply creates a confusion of roles; it assumes that workers' interests can be identical with those of management, but are not. The British unions in the nationalised industries, he said, prefer to maintain their *independent status* in order to act as a *check* on management. This is not less democratic, Clegg argued, since it is democracy by consent.

In Germany and Austria, where autocratic employer-power has traditionally been high (and strengthened

by cartel organisation), the Unions have sought, through law, to compel worker participation in management. Under the Co-determination Law, the labour director is appointed through the unions, and has a co-equal voice with other directors on plant decisions. But the situation is an anomaly. In Germany, the Unions have no roots in the plants, but simply bargain with employers on a national, regional or industry-wide basis. The works councils in the plants are independent of the unions. In effect, then, the union man acts as personnel director in the plant and faces shop committees as a *representative of management*. In practice, the system tends to humanize shop relations, and the presence of a union man as a director of the enterprise may act as a control on the political use of company funds—which was one of the motives of the unions and socialists in pressing for co-determination—but many delegates voiced scepticism that co-determination actually gives a worker a sense of *participation* in a firm, or of *control* of its policies.

The Workers' Councils in Yugoslavia and Poland represent, in origin, special circumstances, and the question was raised whether those forms of participation could be adopted by other countries, particularly the newly industrialising nations.

In the Yugoslav system the delegates from the workers' councils have a voice in all decisions of the enterprise, including setting of prices (although government turnover taxes may more than quadruple prices), the rates of wages, and the allocation of profits if any (a firm that fails goes into "socialist bankruptcy"). In all this, the role of the *trade union*—which is distinct from the workers' councils—is a difficult one. Seemingly it has no function. In fact some party ideologists have gone so far to assert that trade unions ought to be eliminated entirely.

In Yugoslavia, the workers' councils were created "from above" by the Tito regime. They were created for political reason, to emphasise the ideological differences between the "Yugoslav road to socialism" and the Russian. The representatives from Yugoslavia—who included A. Deleon, the secretary of the National Union Federation, and Dr. Pasich, the head of the new social Research Institute at Belgrade—admitted various imperfections in the system but denied the contentions of Professor Adolf Sturmthal (of Roosevelt College), who had spent the summer in Yugoslavia, that on key decisions the councils had *no* real authority if the Communist Party opposed a policy.

In Poland, the workers' councils that arose in October 1956 were not, as in Hungary, the spontaneous reaction of workers in plants. Here they were a deliberate movement, initiated by young intellectuals to create autonomous centers free of party control. (In many factories, members of the Communist Party are ineligible for office in the workers' councils.) Such councils obviously can become a threat to a regime; and in the last six months the Gomulka government has begun to absorb the council into the government-dominated unions.

The differences in approach of the different union movements has arisen, obviously, out of the varying experiences of these movements. In the West (except for those with avowedly revolutionary aims), the trade unions historically have been defensive and restrictive organisations, seeking not only to limit the arbitrary and capricious power of management, but to limit output ("don't work yourself out of a job"), and to enforce job scarcity. But today unions are being called on to *increase* output. And the unions are finding it difficult to accept the new role. Even the argument in socialist countries that "the factories belong to the workers" remains unconvincing, especially when workers feel that the surplus goes either to new privileged classes or to build up heavy industry for a "future" that they will not see. The lesson of Hungary and Poland—as earlier in the shop stewards' movement in Britain during World War I—is that when unions function *not to protect* but to *control* workers, workers will seek substitute forms of expressions.

As against the negativism of the British Unions and the total participation of the Yugoslav councils, a third approach to a role for workers' control was suggested, independently, in papers by Dr. Eric Trist (of the Tavistock Institute in London), by Paul Barton of Paris and by this writer. This was the argument that the real function of workers' participation and control was *on the job itself*—in the formation of autonomous work groups, in the control of pace and rhythm, in the determination of production standards, and the like. In the past, the slogan of "workers' control" has been confused with political issues. In its most naive form, the syndicates sought to run plants by a committee of workers and by the taking of decisions by mass vote. But in large and complex organisations, questions of span of control, scheduling, pricing, allocation, etc., are clearly managerial functions and cannot be decided by mass vote; the policy issues implied could be subject to union challenge (democracy by consent), but the actual operating decisions have to be made by the trained managerial group. The area of the job itself—the area that affects the worker—is one that should be subject to direct worker control. The paper by this writer, reviewing the history of the themes of "exploitation" and "alienation" in socialist literature, argued that the question of alienation in work would be resolved not by change in formal property relations as Marxist theory once held, but through the reorganisation of the work process itself.

And Dr. Trist, a clinical psychologist, presented some fascinating experiments in the creation of autonomous work groups in British coal mines and Indian textile mills, as evidence of the viability of the group-decision process.

A conference which heard reports and discussed the diverse experiences of fifteen countries is difficult to summarize adequately. But what was heartening was *the lack of dogmatism* (strikingly so among the Poles and Yugoslavs), and the awareness that the complex problems of large-scale organisation and individual identity would not be solved by *old shibboleths*.

It has been argued, by Raymond Aron among others, that this is "the End of Age of Ideology." That where there is a willingness to confront intellectual issues squarely, the old political dogmas and classifications have little merit in providing answers of understanding of contemporary issues.

This was the experience of the Congress of Cultural Freedom in previous seminars and conferences at Milan, Hamburg, Tokyo and Oxford; and it was shown once again at Vienna.

Visitors To India

Three eminent persons are visiting India in the month of December. The first to arrive will be Mr. Frode Jacobsen, the wellknown Social Democrat from Denmark. Mr. Jacobsen was the leader of the anti-Hitler resistance movement in his country and was a member of the first Government that was formed after liberation. He will visit a number of places and is particularly anxious to see villages and study village life. He will be in Bombay from December 10 to December 18 and will then spend a week in Delhi before going to Karachi on his way back to Europe.

The famous American philosopher and political scientist, Prof. Sidney Hook will be in India from December 1 to January 15. He will visit Calcutta, Banaras, Lucknow, Delhi, Ahmedabad, Aurangabad, Poona and Madras. He will be in Bombay from December 27. Prof. Hook has been invited to deliver lectures by a couple of Universities. He is attending the Philosophical Conference to be held in Ahmedabad as a distinguished guest. Prof. Hook is visiting India and other Asian countries on a fellowship grant of the Ford Foundation to study oriental religions and philosophy.

The last to arrive will be Mr. Arthur Koestler, the author of the celebrated novel *Darkness at Noon* and other books. He will arrive in Bombay on 30th December and will go to Kerala for about ten days, after a day or two in Bombay. He will return to Bombay in the middle of January and will then be available for public engagements. From Bombay he will go to Delhi and then to Calcutta.

Revolutions And Foreign Money

By Philip Spratt

FOR some years after the Russian Revolution there was a widespread belief that the Bolsheviks were in the pay of Imperial Germany. This belief added considerably to the hostility of the western countries to Soviet Russia and gave support to the intervention in the civil war in the next three years.

What first gave rise to this idea was, no doubt, Lenin's journey from Switzerland to Russia across Germany in a sealed carriage. Then a few months later the Provisional Government accused Lenin of receiving money from Germany, and some years later no less a person than Edouard Bernstein revived the accusation, saying that he had seen material in the German Foreign Office. However, little concrete evidence was ever produced.

At the end of the second World War a large volume of papers from the German official archives were captured and taken to the West, and now a selection from these papers bearing on the relations between Imperial Germany and the Bolshevik party has been published in London (*Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 1915-1918*, ed. by Z.A.B. Zeman, Oxford University Press). The review in the *Times Literary Supplement* (August 8) and the discussion in subsequent issues of that journal show that the papers yield important new information.

Mainly at the instance of Parvus, the former revolutionary socialist and Trotzky's guru, the German Treasury in 1915 appropriated two million marks, later raised to five million, for revolutionary work in Russia. Parvus received his first million marks in December, 1915. His job was to transmit it to the Bolsheviks, and he claimed to have done so. Kuhlmann, the Foreign Minister, in a statement intended for the Kaiser in December, 1917, said: "It was not until the Bolsheviks had received from us a steady flow of funds through various channels and under different labels that they were able to build up their main organ *Pravda*, to conduct energetic propaganda and appreciably to extend the original narrow basis of their party."

However, the reviewer does not believe this. He dismisses Kuhlmann as vain and unreliable, and concludes that the German money had no serious influence on the course of events. But in the issue of the *Times Literary Supplement* of August 22 Prof. L. Schapiro of London reviews all the evidence available and comes to a quite different conclusion.

He quotes intercepted telegrams published in 1917 by the Russian Provisional Government, and letters published in the Soviet press in 1923, which prove that Lenin received small sums, running to thousands of rubles, from people who are known to have been German agents. Lenin denied this in 1917, after

going underground, but his denials themselves contain statements which Schapiro proves to be false. Such transactions were naturally conducted in secrecy. If it is proved that some money passed, it is legitimate to infer that more may have passed without leaving traces.

Schapiro next shows that in the early years of the war the Bolsheviks constantly complained of lack of funds. Their old sources had all dried up, and there is evidence that their revenue from party members' dues was negligible, as can well be believed.

Yet after May, 1917, they had plenty of money, and their expenses for running their printing and other activities must have been very great; in fact their letters from that period say so. Whence this sudden affluence?

The inference is quite clear. It is proved that the German government allocated large sums specifically for the Bolsheviks, and it is proved that Lenin received small amounts from German agents. Then immediately after the revolution Kuhlmann made the statement quoted above, (and, shortly before, another statement to the same effect to the Chief of the General Staff, Ludendorff).

The allusions of the reviewer and of Schapiro suggest that there were two allocations of five million marks each, one in 1915 and one in April, 1917. It is certain that at least five million marks were allocated. This may not seem much, but five million 1917 marks amount to much more than a crore of 1958 rupees. In the chaos of Russia in 1917, such a sum in the hands of a man like Lenin could do a great deal.

It is thus almost certain that in the vital six months before November, 1917, the Bolshevik party was run mainly on German money. We can say that very probably, but for this money, the revolution would never have taken place.

Schapiro goes on to say that the newly published papers provide evidence that even larger sums passed from Germany to the Bolshevik party in the year after the revolution. This has never been suspected before. He remarks that it may help to explain why Lenin abandoned the policy of "revolutionary war" against Germany at that time.

This is of great historical interest, but of minor concern to us. What should claim attention in India is the fact (or probability) that foreign money enabled the Russian communists to take power. There is every reason to believe that they remember the lesson, and act on it. In particular, they subsidise the Indian party to a substantial extent. The public should be more alive to the danger of tolerating this flow of money from abroad.

Light On The Communist Scene

By Raymond Postgate

HOW Messrs W.Z. Laqueur and G. Lichtheim can have borne to wade through the morass of conceit, ignorance and abuse needed to compile *The Soviet Cultural Scene 1956-1957* (Atlantic Books, 27/6) I cannot understand. The book consists of selected studies published originally in the journal *Soviet Survey*, and deals with Soviet output on literature and the arts, history and philosophy, the social sciences and the social scene, and certain foreign questions, in the order I have given. The period concerned is that in which de-Stalinisation was in full spate, and the subsequent period in which it was checked after the Hungarian repression.

The learning and industry that have gone into this survey deserve the highest praise, but the conclusion to be drawn is discouraging. In utter darkness a small candle seems bright; for a similar reason, most of us, it seems, overestimated the extent and quality of the ephemeral Russian renaissance. The candle was very small. There seems, indeed, to have been little real change except the ending of Stalin worship, and some of the grosser falsifications of history that went with it. It is no longer claimed, for example, that someone called Mozhaisky invented the aeroplane in 1882. But the mass of the stuff poured out officially (and unofficially, so far as anything can be unofficial in the USSR) is the same verbose, meaningless, ill-written abuse.

"The reactionary nature of Freudism is fully exposed by its ludicrous attempts to explain social phenomena... Freudism and neo-Freudism are now in the service of imperialism, which utilises these 'teachings' on the subjection of consciousness to the subconscious for the purpose of justifying and developing the basest and most repellent instinctual tendencies" (*Short Philosophical Dictionary*). "Among our young people it is particularly easy to exploit the (alleged) self-sustaining significance of artistic content in painting. First, one makes the return to the Russian impressionists; then, by way of awakening a fascination with Renoir and Degas (although Serov, Repin and Surikov are greater painters) one leads them to Cezanne, and thus the basic aim (of corrupting the young) is achieved" (Vice-President of the Academy of Arts, Mr. Ioganson).

Sociology, one reads with still a little surprise, does not exist. There are no social surveys, no participant observation, no investigations of social stratification no breakdown of such things as census figures. There are only studies of the "deterioration of British working-class conditions up to 1953", etc. So the book goes on, for 300 pages; but in one place the small candle of hope still burns. One thing is clear; youth is disgusted with what it is offered, and particularly student youth. Soviet youth is far more ignorant than are Polish and Hungarian youth, and far more timid with less cause. But it knows that what it is told to learn and admire is rubbish; although it does not know what

truth is, it seeks for it. The Khrushchevs try to freeze thought again into stillness; *eppur si muove*.

Beyond the reach of the Secret Police it should move more quickly; it is disappointing when it does not. Professor Hymen Levy is one of the intellectuals of the British Communist Party whose faith has been shaken by recent events, and in *Jews and the National Question* (Hillway, 4/6) he gives his considered reflections. It is depressing to find them so weak and so ignorant, for the writer (though sociologically ill-educated and personally dogmatic) is not by nature unintelligent; at least, he holds many degrees.

The book is worth examining as a specimen of the mental results of a long diet of nothing but Stalinist works. Professor Levy brings out the most naive statements as accepted facts. "History text-books always depict the Holy Crusades as a pure Christian mission". It would be hard to find a present-day one that did. The Jewish problem, being an excrescence of capitalist society, should have disappeared in Soviet Russia (he seems to think.) But his own rather shallow account of Jewish history shows the problem as having existed in the Middle Ages. He assumes as a matter of course that "there are two hostile camps, Socialist and capitalist" meaning by "Socialist" those States where Socialist political writing and membership of the Social Democratic Parties are forbidden and Socialists themselves imprisoned and killed.

Fed on this stuff, he manages to construct for himself an imaginary secret history which shows that Stalin's persecution of the Jews was the natural result of American "provocation" immediately after the war. Still, persecution there was, and he is troubled that it existed and has not yet been reversed. There are still no Yiddish newspapers or Yiddish theatres, and Madame "Furteseva" (the Professor spells even common words like "Bruges" wrongly) has defended the *numerus clausus* principle in the Civil Service. He even recognises in a hurried sentence that what Mr. Khrushchev admitted at the 20th Party Congress was "more akin to barbarism than Socialism". But the reader suspects that the licensing of a couple of Yiddish newspapers would make him forget this and return to the flock.

He apologises for daring to speak, in his preface; an apology is indeed needed, but not for the reason he thinks. The apology is due for publishing a book devoid of thought and intellectual honesty, in an atmosphere where no force compels it to be so. Silence and a period of contemplation, as Earl Attlee once told the late Professor Laski, are what the workers' movement at present requires of Professor Levy.

In an atmosphere in which it was courageous to publish at all, a professional writer has produced a story very little longer than Professor Levy's, but the

(Continued on page 12)

Indian Writers On Boris Pasternak

The following statement was issued by Tarasankar Banerjee, Buddha Deva Bose, Nihar Ranjan Ray, Kazi Abdul Wadud, Manoj Basu, Narendra Dev, Badhurani Devi, Promotho Bisi, Probhat Sarbadhikary, Abu Sayeed Ayyub, Smt. Leela Ray, Protiva Bose, Santosh Kumar Ghosh, Sibnarain Ray, Bimal Kar.

The treatment which Boris Pasternak has received from the Soviet authorities is the most convincing and painful proof that the brief thaw after the 20th Party Congress is over, and another bleak winter has set in over the cultural landscape of the Communist world. Pasternak's expulsion from the Soviet Writers Union as a penalty for having been offered the Nobel prize for Literature means much more than mere dishonour or withdrawal of official patronage. It certainly means his complete black-out from the literary scene of his country, and in all probability, the loss of his house and means of livelihood. While *Dr. Zhivago* cannot be read by anyone in the Soviet Union, it is being abused and decried from that country's radio, platform and press day in and day out.

Some of the foremost critics and writers of our time have acclaimed *Dr. Zhivago* as one of the great literary masterpieces of all times. Perhaps it is only "a sincere account of life in contemporary Russia written by a sincere and great writer", as the Communist publisher of the book, Signor Feltrinelli, says. Soviet official opinion asserts that it is literary trash with an anti-social and counter-revolutionary import. What the artistic merit or the larger significance of *Dr. Zhivago* is, for each reader to judge and decide for himself. No verdict on a work of art by one person can be final or binding on another. That is why all books, and this book in particular, must be accessible to all—first and foremost to those in whose mother tongue the book is written.

On the one hand, Boris Pasternak is not a writer whose stature is in doubt—within the Soviet Union or outside. Everywhere he is accepted as a man of genius and as one of the greatest poets of our time. He of all persons can demand that no barrier be placed by any political or even literary bodies between himself and the public for whom he writes. The Soviet people are no longer in the throes of revolution, civil war or external aggression. Moreover, they have now benefits of an advanced economy and a high standard of education. It is tragically unbelievable that their own Government, while loudly claiming to be the most genuinely democratic in the world, holds them in such contempt that it will not let them read and judge for themselves whether a new book by an author of whom they are so justly proud is artistically a masterpiece or a failure, politically truthful or a distorted vision in reality.

Apparently Pasternak is free today to leave his country, though it is doubtful whether he would, in that case, be free to return. He has friends and admirers abroad and if he went out, his life would be, beyond doubt, materially comfortable. He has chosen

The following statement on the treatment meted out to Boris Pasternak was issued by MADAME SOPHIA WADIA, M. R. MASANI, A. A. KANEKAR, K. P. KULKARNI, GULABDAS BROKER, RAMANAND SAGAR, RATANLAL JOSHI and J. B. H. WADIA.

We are grieved by the treatment that is now being meted out by the Russian authorities to Boris Pasternak, the celebrated author who has just won the Nobel Prize for literature. A campaign of vilification has been started by *Pravda* and other newspapers and the Writers' Union, the official organisation of Russian writers, has just expelled him from membership. This expulsion will make it impossible for Pasternak to carry on his literary work and may make it difficult for him to earn even a livelihood.

The Nobel Prize is one of the highest distinctions that a writer can win and Russia should have been proud that the distinction was conferred on one of her writers. Boris Pasternak ought to have been complimented and congratulated for winning that highly prized distinction for the Russian language. We are distressed to find that the reaction of the communist rulers has been entirely different and that Pasternak is being treated as a national enemy. Under that pressure he has been compelled to refuse the award, "because of the meaning attributed to the award in the society I live in", as stated by him in his cable to the Royal Swedish Academy. The reason given by Pasternak throws a flood of light on the conditions of writers in Soviet Russia.

No political motives can be attributed to the award of the Nobel Prize to Pasternak, for the same organisation has awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics to three Russian scientists and that award has been hailed by the Russian rulers. It is clear therefore that it is the communist rulers who are imparting political considerations into a purely literary affair. Literary men all over the world will disapprove of this tendency of mixing politics with literature. We hope the Russian Government will have some consideration for the opinion of writers and will in deference to that stop their present ill-treatment of that great Russian writer, Boris Pasternak.

to stay back, with full knowledge of the hazards of this decision. He would rather suffer official disfavour and vilification and all that these imply than moral annihilation of his great work in Russia. Faced with the persecution of an intolerant bureaucracy, Pasternak's decision displays a quality of rare courage.

We feel that we must raise our voice of protest on behalf of a great writer and a great people against all petty officials, however, absolute their power may be today. We are aware that protest will be futile; but we are even more convinced that silence will be worse.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray adds: I do not however agree that he is a "great" writer or a man of "genius". With the rest of the letter I am in agreement. 'To me the issue is simply 'freedom of the writer and artist.'

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Our Welfare State is fast becoming, if it has not already become, what may be called a Stalemate State.
—"Parasara", *Indian Express*, October 30.

We are suffering from the disease of gigantism—showing off and doing things that way. It is a dangerous outlook.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Hindustan Times*, November 18.

The friendship between India and the USSR is of an emotional nature and cannot be described in words.

—Giani Zail Singh, M.P., *Hindustan Times*, November 18.

Russia not being directly interested in military objectives, but indirectly in political objectives, she can give aid without strings.

—Prof. Mahalanobis, *Bombay Chronicle*, November 23.

If there is any politician of world stature who has given positive moral support to military dictators in the past few years, he is Mr. Nehru.

—M.P. Vazifdar, *Times of India*, November 20.

Most of the Indian Communists tolerate Nehru because of his foreign policy, but they can't forget that not long ago they were obliged to dub him "a running dog of imperialism," and in any case, they don't like his accepting American aid or harping so much on democracy.

—K. A. Abbas, *Blitz*, November 14.

Private enterprise in India is run on Government loans.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Anrit Bazar Patrika*, November 8.

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

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3]

Name:

Address:

Signature

The systematic slander campaign against the Kerala Government is the greatest single danger to Indian democracy today.

—P. C. Joshi, *New Age*, November 23.

I expect to live to see the U.S. give lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union against China, and my actuarial life expectancy is thirty-odd years.

—John Scott, *New Leader*, October 6.

(Continued from page 10)

quality of which is so much higher that it is almost offensive to review the two together.

Tibor Dery is an elderly Hungarian whose style and sensitivity recalls De Maupassant. His book *Niki* (Secker & Warburg, 10/6) is the story of a stray dog adopted in a Budapest suburb by a middle-aged couple, the Ancsas. Mr. Ancsa was a mining engineer, an ardent supporter of the new regime, and an idealist. He was broken in the usual way by the Communist dictatorship.

There is nothing new about the story, except that Dery has given it a relatively happy ending. What is unusual is that the story is about the dog itself—or rather, herself. Her behaviour, her play, her gaiety, her moroseness, her amusements make the book. The variations of her master's and mistress's fortunes are the background. The delicacy of the observation and of the writing make the book a small masterpiece to entrance all literary critics and animal lovers. Its deeper content and its philosophy make it a minor treasure for anyone who loves freedom. No wonder that the Kadar Government, restored to power by the Russians, sentenced Mr. Dery to a term of imprisonment equivalent to a life sentence.

So widespread were the protests abroad, however, that the sentence was modified but it is unlikely that Dery will be able to write, or be allowed to publish, anything so good again. The Tsars drove their writers abroad; Napoleon III and Louis Philippe stopped only their open political attacks; even the Hapsburgs did not destroy literature altogether. But the Communist leaders have learned from them. No Victor Hugos, Heines, or Herzens can grow to maturity in the USSR and the satellites, and circulate their writings secretly or escape abroad to publish them openly. The circles in which they could be trained are not allowed to exist; they are dissipated before they can form an entity. Budapest, it is clear from Dery's book, was a centre of civilization where such circles did exist. But Budapest is no more; nothing is to be left but deadly monotonous Russian "work-towns" where isolated and ignorant students must continue to wonder unhappily why it is that they are repelled by the "masterpieces of Socialist realism".