

General Election

by V. B. Karnik

IN a parliamentary democracy a general election provides the people with an opportunity to exercise their sovereign rights to determine the shape and character of the country's government. In well established democracies the people make effective use of the opportunity to throw out of office a government which may not have fulfilled their expectations and to place the responsibility in other hands. Thus one government yields place to another and the country passes through a peaceful political revolution. A general election is a device invented by civilised societies to effect, when they so choose, revolutionary changes without dragging the country through the mire of a revolution.

Our country is now facing a general election. Having run their normal course of five years Parliament and State Assemblies have been dissolved and the people have been called upon to elect a new Parliament and new State Assemblies in all parts of the country except a portion of the State of Andhra. The entire adult population is entitled to vote. The number of registered voters is over 190 millions. These millions of voters will in the course of the last week of February and the first half of March elect the representatives who will in their name rule the country for the next five years.

It is futile to expect the general election to effect any significant change in the policies or composition of the Government at the Centre or in the States. In the conditions that obtain at present the general election is likely to be a mere formality, a formal renewal of confidence in the Indian National Congress. The people will be again overwhelmed by vociferous propaganda about the greatness of their national leaders and the tremendous services rendered by the Congress in the struggle for national independence and stamped into voting for Congress nominees. The magic names of Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Nehru will be used to bemuse the electorate and to collect votes for the Congress.

All those who are interested in the development of democracy will regret this inability of our people to make proper use of the general election, the most ignorance and backwardness, of their habit of hero worship and their surrender before authority. For

centuries the Indian people have lived in a state of utter indifference to what happens beyond the village, meekly accepting whatever was decided for them by the officers of the Government or the leaders of the village. This state of indifference and torpor cannot be shaken off in a day. It will take some time to awaken their interest in the affairs of their country and to create in their minds the democratic urge to reshape them according to their will. The task cannot be accomplished in a short while, but unless it is accomplished a general election will not acquire the meaningful significance that it possesses in a democratic country.

None of the political parties seem to be interested in the political education of the people and in stimulating their democratic awareness. The Congress is understandably not keen about the job, for it depends for its support mostly on the unthinking admiration and adulation of the people. But the opposition parties are not also enthusiastic about it. They are after quick results. It is easier to defeat a Congress candidate through agitation about some immediate issue than through the political education of the voters which takes a longer time and more patient work. The task will therefore have to be handled by others who are more interested in abiding political developments than in success at the polls.

Congress have creditable achievements to their credit and the opposition parties are very weak. The most prominent amongst the opposition parties, the Praja Socialist Party, has suffered a serious decline through internal split and lack of effective leadership. It has moreover compromised itself by opportunist stand on some issues and unprincipled alliance with the communists in some places just for defeating the Congress. It is not likely to make any strong appeal to the electorate.

The other opposition party is the Communist Party. It is hardly an indigenous party. It is in intent and action an agency of a foreign power. The Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, said in his speech opening the Congress election campaign in Bombay that the communists had "no opinions of their own" and that they were being guided by "outside forces." He questioned the propriety of their contesting elections in view of the fact that they did not believe in parliamentary democracy. That is really a moot point which deserves to be considered more seriously. The Communists have lost much of their following since the "revelations" of Khrushchev and the brutal suppression by the Soviet Russia of the Revolutionary Hungary. No democrat will be sorry at these reverses

of the communists, for any communist who may get elected is not a force for but against democracy, freedom and peace.

That leaves the Congress party with very little of opposition of an all-India character, though there might be in a State some divergent forces working against it. It is difficult to assess their exact impact on the elections in various States. But on the whole it is not likely to be much. The political picture of the country is not likely to undergo any significant change.

• This continuation of the Congress in power for an unbroken period of over fifteen years is likely to strengthen totalitarian tendencies. Opposition will get demoralised and the Congress will come to believe that it is the only power in the country. The Government will become more and more intolerant and the will of the Congress leaders will become the law of the land. Parliament and State legislatures will become packed assemblies and there will be no scope for criticism and expression of divergent views. The institutions of democracy may continue, but they will lose their vitality owing to the absence of an interplay of divergent opinions, programmes and policies.

This danger to democracy can be minimised to some extent if at least a few disinterested and independent-minded public men get elected to Parliament and State legislatures. They may not be many, but the influence they will be able to exercise will be considerable. They will judge each issue on its merits and represent in the legislatures the enlightened conscience of the community as a whole. It is the duty of eminent public men of this type to offer themselves for election. An election is not a simple matter. It imposes a terrible strain on the mind, body and purse. Disinterested public men of talent and ability are not usually inclined to face the turmoils of an election. But public duty must weigh more with them than private comfort. The country needs at least a few such men in the legislatures. They must be found out and prevailed upon to offer themselves for election and the electorates must be persuaded to cast their votes in their favour. If a few at least of such men are elected they will be an effective check on the party in power and prevent it from sliding into totalitarian attitudes and outlook.

The Prime Minister has accepted the necessity of an opposition in a democracy. He said that the Congress wanted a healthy opposition to develop in India. That places a heavy responsibility upon the Congress of sustaining and developing the democratic processes. It has so far failed to discharge that responsibility. Nobody expects the Congress to secure the return of opposition or independent candidates. But it may so conduct its propaganda as will enable the voters to use their powers of discrimination. If the voters will act discriminately they may no doubt return a majority of Congress candidates but they will also return a good number of others. That will be the test of the success of the general election as a step in the direction of democracy.

C. C. F. NEWS

The International Executive Committee of the Congress for Cultural Freedom assembled in Paris on January 12 and 13, reviewed its various activities and the activities of its national affiliates during the past year and set its tasks for 1957. Among the honorary guests present at the meeting was Paul Ignotus, Hungarian poet and journalist, and member of the Hungarian Writers' Association.

In the course of its deliberations, the Executive Committee reasserted the opposition of the Congress for Cultural Freedom to every form of aggression and took note of the fact that the aggressions in West Asia and in Eastern Europe have weakened and continue to endanger the foundations of international morality which are among the guarantees of international peace and order. The Committee noted that, while the French and British governments have obeyed the decisions taken by the United Nations and withdrawn their troops from Egyptian territory, the Soviet government has defied the decisions of the international organisation and remains guilty of continued aggression and naked imperialism. The Congress for Cultural Freedom shares in the widespread feeling of sorrow and shame evoked by the incapacity of the free world to prevent this aggression and to protect the independence of the Hungarian people.

The Congress for Cultural Freedom paid its tribute to the intellectuals of Hungary and of Poland on their continuing struggle for the right to discover and affirm the truth. The fight for freedom and independence in Hungary has, in the opinion of the Executive Committee, opened up new historical perspectives, and new possibilities for the extension of freedom in those countries of the world where it has hitherto been denied. The fact that the writers and students of Hungary and Poland are in the vanguard of this fight bears testimony to the validity of the Berlin Manifesto of 1950 on which the Congress is founded. The basis of the Manifesto is that cultural freedom has become in the face of the totalitarian system of tyranny, a precondition to the gaining of other liberties.

The Congress for Cultural Freedom has always endeavoured to aid intellectuals wherever their freedom has been threatened, and will continue to do so. The Executive Committee therefore welcomed the initiative taken by the editorial staff of FORUM, the Congress's magazine in Vienna, in coming to the assistance of large numbers of intellectuals among the Hungarian refugees.

The Executive Committee believes that, in the conditions that prevail, it is a function of the Congress for Cultural Freedom to continue the contacts and discussions which commenced during 1956 with writers and scholars living in countries where totalitarian forms of government prevail.

The Congress for Cultural Freedom also supports the intellectuals in various Latin-American countries who are engaged in the struggle for the broadening of intellectual liberty and democratic freedoms and records with satisfaction the progress that has been

Notes

Socialism And Democracy

IN his speeches at the Indore session of the Indian National Congress, the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, has spoken very clearly and firmly about the deliberate choice made by India in favour of democracy. The Congress redefined its goal at the session as the attainment of "socialist cooperative commonwealth." But Mr. Nehru made it clear that India's socialism would not be "any carbon copy of doctrinaire socialism of the socialist or communistic kind" and that it will "have deep roots in the soil and be suited to Indian conditions."

"Socialism in India", said Mr. Nehru, "will rest on the fundamental principles of democracy and peaceful methods of work." He emphasised the point in another speech and said: "We have definitely accepted the democratic processes. We have accepted it for a variety of reasons, because we think in the final analysis it promotes the growth of human beings and of society, because, as we have said in the preamble to our Constitution, we attach great value to individual freedom, because in the final analysis we want the creative and adventurous spirit of man to grow."

Mr. Nehru is aware that India's progress along the democratic path may not be as rapid as the progress of totalitarian countries. But he is not prepared to sacrifice the higher values of life for a more rapid pace of industrialisation. He said: "We want to produce the material goods of the world and to have a high standard of living, but not at the expense of the spirit of man, not at the expense of his creative energy, not at the expense of his adventurous spirit,

C.C.F. NEWS—Continued from page 2

made in this direction in some of these countries, in particular the Argentine, Peru and Cuba.

Mr. M. R. Masani attended the meeting and took a prominent part in all its discussions.

* * *

The Congress for Cultural Freedom has called on the United Nations to intervene officially in order to stop the reign of terror in Hungary.

Cabled protests were sent to Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld and United States Delegate Henry Cabot Lodge Jr. following the suspension last week of the Hungarian Writers Federation and the National Association of Hungarian Journalists.

Mr. Hammarskjöld was requested to "go at once to Budapest.....and.....exact.....the immediate cessation of all forms of repression."

"Nothing less than this", the cable added, "can assure a revival of confidence in the United Nations, which so far has not shown itself able to protect the legitimate aspirations of the Hungarian people to live in freedom."

not at the expense of all those fine things of life which have ennobled man throughout the ages."

Therefore, Mr. Nehru declared, "I am not willing at any price to leave the democratic path. I think that by following democratic principles a country can strengthen the roots of socialism in its soil in a much stronger manner." Mr. Nehru has also refused to be bound down by any rigid definition of socialism. He said "I do not see why I should be asked to define socialism in precise, rigid terms when it is something which should not be rigid."

Mr. Nehru has by these emphatic and authoritative declarations given a clear and fine lead. *Freedom First* is happy to welcome those declarations as they highlight some of the points that it has been trying to place before the country.

Unbalanced Plans

RECENT events in Poland and Hungary have drawn pointed attention to the dangerous consequences of an over-emphasis on the building of heavy industries in any national plan. The imbalance of the economy and the utter neglect of the needs of the people were primarily responsible for the social upheavals that shook these countries. Influenced by communist experts drawn from a number of Iron Curtain countries India was on the point of blindly following in their footsteps. *Freedom First* and a few others, who sensed the danger, were quick to warn the authorities against that ill-advised step. The warning was not then appreciated, but subsequent events have proved that it was a timely and correct warning.

It is gratifying to note that even the Prime Minister is now convinced that the plans of East European countries, drawn on the Soviet model, were "unbalanced plans." In a speech at the Indore session of the Indian National Congress he said referring to the plans of East European countries: "Their economy was not a balanced one. Too much stress was laid on a very rapid development of industry, especially heavy industry, with the result that agriculture suffered and the whole economy suffered." The Prime Minister advised the country against the adoption of such an unbalanced plan.

The Prime Minister is convinced that the Second Five Year Plan, as finally drawn up, is a balanced plan. Opinions may differ on the point. But it is good to know that he is now conscious of the dangerous consequences of an over-emphasis on heavy industries, always to be found in communist plans. It is to be hoped that this consciousness will assert itself wherever there is any tendency to impose that communist doctrine on the economic policies of the Government.

Situation In South Africa

A MONSTROUS, inhuman tragedy is being enacted in South Africa. The Ghetto Act is being enforced with most unscrupulous violence. Indian and African communities are being uprooted from agricultural and urban settlements and driven into isolated

areas where they have no opportunity of earning even a bare living. From Johannesburg alone, people of Indian origin are being forced out to the small township of Lenasia, twenty miles away and off the Railway mainline, in spite of the fact that these people owned property valued at £10 million at Johannesburg. Further, under the Group Areas (Ghetto) Act, mass trials and prosecutions are taking place. Many Indians and Africans are being dubbed as communists, and are tried under the Suppression of Communism Act *en masse*. They are subjected to most humiliating treatment. They are brought into the courts "huddled in cages" as if they were wild animals. The prosecutions are conducted in a language which the defendants do not understand. Not satisfied with this, the Strijdom Government has not only taken steps to separate the coloured voters from the electoral rolls, but also to deprive thousands of Indians and Africans of their right to vote. This disenfranchisement is effected on the fantastic charge of treason.

This apartheid policy of the South African Government deserves to be condemned in most unequivocal terms by all freedom loving and decent-minded people of the world. It is, in fact, condemned by many South African Europeans themselves.

More than once the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation has discussed the South African question. But no firm action has been so far taken against the South African Government. We hope that the pressure of the free world would be brought upon the South African Government to give up its apartheid policy and to treat the Indians and Africans with decency and humanity.

Military Regime In Hungary

IN spite of the directives repeatedly issued by the United Nations the Soviet army is still in occupation of Hungary. Having suppressed the Revolution with Soviet tanks and guns, the puppet Kadar Government has now started its offensive against the people. Early in the month of January the Workers' Councils, which had arisen spontaneously during the course of the revolution, were disbanded and many of their leaders were arrested and some executed.

Later the Kadar Government turned its attention

to the Writers' and Journalists' Federations. It is reported that both have been suspended. It is further reported that two of the most prominent Hungarian authors, Gyulla Hay and Zoltan Zelk have been arrested along with five other authors and journalists.

Reports also pour in of the execution of workers and others. The most distressing is the report of the execution of General Pal Maleter, the hero of the Hungarian revolution. It will be recalled that the Soviet Army commander invited him for a discussion about the withdrawal of Soviet troops and then treacherously arrested him.

A ruthless military regime has been imposed upon the people of Hungary. But that has not killed their spirit of resistance, as can be clearly seen from the reports of strikes and other acts of defiance that appear from time to time.

Ahmedabad Arrests

EVERY right thinking person will protest against the arrest of about twentyfive Praja Socialist workers and others in Ahmedabad under the Preventive Detention Act. It is reported that the arrests were made by the police after inviting the persons to a conference at the police headquarters. If the report is true, the action becomes all the more reprehensible.

During the linguistic agitation a number of untoward things had happened. If any of the arrested persons were involved in any one of those incidents they should have been prosecuted and placed for trial before a court of law. The use of the Preventive Detention Act after the event in such cases is most undesirable.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

TEN DAYS IN CAIRO

by Dwight Macdonald

TWO WANDERING SATELLITES

by Peter Wiles

ST. GUY AND MERRY RUSSIA

by Malcolm Muggeridge

JANUARY 1957

40

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

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: As. 4

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

The West Has Lost The Right To Weep

by Manes Sperber

A STONY silence was the West's only response to the revolutionaries perishing in the battle for Hungary. They had hurled themselves into the unequal battle hoping for our aid. They are dying bereft of all faith in this free world which was ready to share their triumph but not their struggle.

Having come to the aid of the Hungarian people with nothing but words, the West now does not have even the right to weep. Western statesmen, preoccupied with rescuing the dictator of Egypt, did not perceive the vast disaster that was looming up until it was too late. Mediocrity does not even need to be cowardly; its very nature protects it against the temptation to rise boldly to the challenges of history. The Warsaw ghetto fighters of 1943 perished in the same vast, cold solitude. So, one year later, did the insurgents of the Polish Home Army. For long years, this was the fate of countless victims of Mussolini, Franco, Hitler, Stalin and their accomplices. Our generation will remain branded by this recurring experience: without the power to change anything, we have seen men who were sacrificing themselves for all of us delivered to their exterminators, who drew courage from our cowardice and our indifference.

There is no question of it: For these betrayals the West deserves to disappear; it will be saved only because the consequences of their crimes will cause the totalitarian regimes to collapse before their time. For the end of these regimes has begun; the Russian divisions in Hungary may postpone it, but they also make it inevitable. The battle from which a tyrannical power emerges victorious is never its last battle; the Soviet tanks are restoring the Kremlin empire for a time, but they cannot restore the Communist myth. Everywhere in Europe, the last glimmerings of hope connected with Communist promises are being extinguished forever. Soviet weapons can kill men, but they cannot revive the arrogant lie which provided an "ideological" foundation for the regime that has now been laid bare by an entire nation, especially its workers, as well as its younger generation, its peasants and its intellectuals.

Armored divisions, backed by artillery and air power, were hurled against the people at the very moment when the men in the Kremlin were pretending to seek a negotiated agreement. All this violence and treachery was needed, for Moscow was faced with the most authentic, the most popular revolution this century has yet seen. The only resources available in Hungary to oppose it were the hangmen, the agents and the spies of the secret police and those whose crimes committed in the service of tyranny had alienated them forever from their fellow-countrymen. They were supported from the very start by the Soviet occupation troops; thus began the first massacres in Budapest.

And what of the 800,000 members of the Communist

Party? They took the most active part in the insurrection, alongside the youth and the intelligentsia, itself for the most part Communist. In all the cities and industrial areas, the factory workers took their places in the forefront of the battle, supporting their political and social demands with strikes and with arms.

Yet, the revolution soon encountered a danger which was all the more formidable because it was difficult to recognize: the absence of any internal obstacle to its success. The regime, abandoned by the forces whose backing it had proudly claimed, collapsed with the suddenness of nightmare images as the sleeper awakes. The fiction of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" dissolved the moment the real proletariat raised its voice and its fists.

This very absence of all resistance had the effect of dangerously accelerating events. What had seemed a distant goal in the morning was surpassed by evening. Indeed, every revolution, when it reaches the point of greatest ardor, transcends the boundaries set by circumstances, whether permanent or temporary. The Hungarians, like other European nations, had experienced this in 1848, and they had been tragically punished then, particularly by the Tsar's armies. It was clearly impossible for the nation which rose up in 1956 to accept continued submission to the foreign regime of oppression.

A Russia that was truly socialist and democratic would have abandoned the mad idea of maintaining nations like Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia in a state of colonial dependence. But the "collective leadership" which succeeded Stalin trembles before the peoples of the USSR. It is not killing the Hungarian rebels because it feels that Russia's security would be compromised by the abandonment of Hungary. For all Khrushchev's noisy mediocrity, these gentlemen are well aware of the uselessness of buffer states in the era of nuclear weapons and guided missiles, and they know that they have nothing to fear from the West. No, their aim in Hungary was to demonstrate that any insurrection against the regime established by Stalin was foredoomed to failure, thanks to Russian military superiority plus the strict non-intervention of the free world. Their aim was to intimidate first of all the Poles, then the other satellites, but finally and above all the peoples of the Soviet Union itself.

The Communist chiefs have just learned in Poland and Hungary a truth which was horrifying to them and utterly astonishing to most of the world: There exists in each human beings an inalienable part which is immune to enslavement and invulnerable to the most frantic propaganda. It is never really conquered by the most humiliating terror. In it the sense of liberty and the need for truth find a refuge. We have just seen the youth of Hungary, subjected since childhood to the monopolistic propaganda of the tota-

litarian regime, rise up against their oppressors with an ardor which inflamed the entire nation to the point of making it forget all fear of death. And this youth fought for the rights of man, against all lies, against all forms of dictatorship. Let the Communists and their accomplices slander them and call them fascists; the Khrushchevs know that, wherever they hold power, they are protected only by guns and tanks against the revolt of truth, which, when it takes hold of the masses, becomes the immense force of which Marx spoke.

• It was the spontaneity with which the masses acted, in Hungary even more than in Poland, that produced the indomitable force and vigor of the uprising. But, at the same time, it made difficult, if not impossible, the political measures necessary for the establishment of a revolutionary order and even provisional institutions. The Social Democratic party, which would unquestionably have been the one best fitted to guide the people toward consolidation of its political and social conquests, had long since been brutally liquidated by the Communists. Its finest leaders, scarred by years of persecution and imprisonment, waited too long after the Hungarian revolt had begun; clearly, they distrusted the Janos Kadars and other Communists who were attempting to maintain themselves at the head of the popular movement while at the same time denouncing all they had stood for in the past.

It has always been the conviction of the Bolshevik party, in effect, that power should win the masses rather than the masses win power. Rosa Luxemburg broke with Bolshevism in her insistence on the spontaneous role of the masses in any true revolution. We know now, after the workers' uprisings in East Berlin, Poznan, Poland and Hungary, how right she was. But how could she have foreseen a situation in which the insurgent masses were totally without any form of political or trade-union organization? For the machine of terror known as the Communist party had, throughout its period of dictatorial rule, deprived the working class of any authentic representative organ. In the totalitarian countries, where

everyone is subject to organization by compulsion, the population is effectively atomized. When it rebels, it starts at the very point where things were at the beginning of the last century, before the workers had won the right of free association. (Hence the startling resemblance between the recent insurrections and those of a hundred years ago. Indeed, the merciless exploitation of the working class by the totalitarian states recalls in its consequences the phase of "primitive accumulation of capital" in the West.)

The absence of any social class opposed to the insurrection, the spontaneity of the masses—unorganized and distrustful of leadership in any form—produced a dizzying acceleration of the pace of the revolution, telescoping its course. Later on, it would unquestionably have encountered serious political obstacles and dissension among the forces that impelled it. But it would have surmounted these difficulties and given the world an example of social democracy. In murdering Hungary's revolution, the Kremlin hoped to intimidate the peoples who might one day rise up in Russia itself.

Yet, the Russian revolution is approaching. How will it succeed against tanks and airplanes? The answer is that those who drive the tanks, fire the guns and drop the bombs are also men. On the day when they are ordered to fire upon their own brothers, they will lose the habit of automatic obedience. They will make a choice: Instead of attacking the insurgent population, they will lead it in the assault against the tyranny whose fall will mean the liberation of Russia and the nations degraded in its name.

I write these words of hope amid an abysmal sadness. The young men and women of Budapest, whose eager faces we have come to love from the photographs in newspapers, have since dawn on November 4 been condemned to death. Since that morning we have felt their presence everywhere.

It is they who will inspire and will be avenged by the youth of the Soviet Union on the day that Moscow and Leningrad respond fraternally to Budapest.

—The New Leader

"We Are All Stalinists"

by Saadi

AFTER having denounced Stalin as a murderer of innocents and a despot not amenable to reason and decency at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, the Communist boss of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev recently claimed "we are all Stalinists, so far as our fight with imperialists is concerned" and again a few days later, at a Banquet held in honour of the Chinese Premier, he praised Stalin as a "model communist in his fight for the working class."

To superficial observers it may appear that Mr. Khrushchev has contradicted himself. Actually it is no self-contradiction on Mr. Khrushchev's part. Com-

munists, whether they personally like Stalin or dislike him, are always at all times Stalinists—Stalinists in their intentions, in their behaviour, in their methods, ruthless, unscrupulous and totalitarian. To Communists Stalin is not merely a person—the person they have disowned at least apparently—he is essentially an institution, a system, a tradition, designated as Stalinism, and to this Stalin emerging as Stalinism they hold fast as the only anchor of their survival, a "model" for all communists to follow. Hence, Mr. Khrushchev's sudden effulgence of love and admiration for Stalin lately should not surprise any one. Again, Khrushchev's latest performance gives the lie

to the widely prevalent belief, consequent on his previous denunciation of Stalin, that forces of liberalisation have been set free in the Soviet Union. Russia is the same old State, dark and terrible, where human life is cheap, where the sense of human dignity is taboo, where human personality is crushed under the jackboot of party discipline and where the stirring of free spirit is suppressed with ruthlessness the kind of which history has never known. As recently as a month back, a group of a hundred students of Moscow university who dared to demonstrate their discontent against the communist regime were severely dealt with and most probably liquidated or banished to Siberian forced labour camps. For the reports of these students stirrings suddenly ceased. It is, therefore, pure wishful thinking to imagine that forces of liberalisation have been set in motion in Russia. The Soviet Union so long as it remains communist, will be Stalinist.

It is true that after Khrushchev's speech at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party, it appeared—that too for a brief period—that some communist circles outside Russia were indulging in heart searching and rethinking about Stalinism and communist methods, strategy and tactics. But it soon became obvious that these "heart searchings and rethinking" were nothing but an eye-wash and that the Communist Parties in various parts of the world were still the tools of the Russian Communist Party. When the smoke-screen which Khrushchev's speech had created cleared, it could be seen that communists and the Communist Parties all over the world were the same old ones. For them Stalin died but Stalinism continued.

One is led to believe that when Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan addressed his open letter to "my communist friends" he was a victim of the mirage. At least Ajoy Ghosh's reply to Jayaprakash has proved that it was a mirage. Jayaprakash wrote "I hope every communist realises the tremendous significance of Khrushchev's speech and the events that have followed. Many interpretations have been given of the true motives behind Khrushchev's revelations. The motives are not important however, for whatever they might be, there is no doubt that they were political. The more important thing is that an official admission has been made of the staggering crimes committed by a leadership that had been apatheised for a generation and in a country that had been held up as an ideal to be followed by the whole world. The people everywhere are bound to turn and ask the communists, Is this the hideous thing you have been wanting to tell us?"

"The first question then the communists must answer for themselves is: How could it be possible that they were kept in the dark so long about the facts that Khrushchev has revealed? Was not the whole non-Communist world talking about these facts for nearly three decades? The revelations of Khrushchev were indeed no revelations at all. It is impossible that the communists—at least their leadership—did not know these facts. Why did they remain silent so long? No satisfactory answer has been given so far to this question. Another question arises: Are

Communists going to stop where Khrushchev has led them? Are they not going further in search of the truth? Is the truth not of any service to communism? Can communism be built on a foundation of lies? Has Khrushchev revealed everything? Has he denounced all the crimes committed in the name of communism? Has he confessed his own crimes? If Kirov's murder was a crime, what about the murders of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin and the rest? If "enemies of the people" was a vulgar and fraudulent charge trumped up by Stalin to destroy political opponents and rivals, did the same charge when applied to Beria and his "gang" become honest and consistent with "socialist legality"? Will the Communists again put on blinkers made for them in Moscow and refuse to see anything beyond? Will again a new set of lies guide the world communist movement? Will not the communists, instead, proclaim and assert their Marxian objectivity and the revolutionary freedom of the human mind?"

Another important question asked by Jayaprakash is: How could the Russian Communist Party and the Russian people allow for thirty years and more the crimes listed by Khrushchev to be committed in their name? To advance the "cult of the individual" as an answer is to insult the meanest human intelligence and to make nonsense of Marxism. To isolate Stalin from the system and to condemn the one without even questioning the other is surely not a Marxian analysis of a historical phenomenon. Mere denunciation of Stalin and the cult of the individual cannot reform or change that system. And, as long as that system is held up as a communist heaven, communism stands self-condemned.

Stating that Khrushchev's performance, therefore, should be an occasion for serious re-examination of current communist faith, Jayaprakash asks: "What is it that the Communists want? What are they fighting for? For theories or for men? For a system or for certain values of life? Are the means the desideratum or the ends? Is power in itself the sole objective? Is nationalisation or collectivisation a means to an end, or is it the end itself? Is man, the human being, an end in himself, a being of supreme significance or just a tool in a social engineering operation?"

Particularly with regard to Indian Communists, Jayaprakash asks, "Have Indian Communists spirit enough to declare their independence of Moscow and to choose their own road to socialism?" and says "My communist friends might reply that they have in fact been always independent. It would be a pity if they said so, because they know that would be a lie and no one would believe them any way."

Jayaprakash further asks certain basic questions: "Will the communists continue to base their philosophy and practice on untruth and violence? Will they continue to call dictatorship democracy, "bureaucratic degeneration" (to use Togliatti's phrase), or in other words, state capitalism, socialism, colonialism, revolution? Will they not discard the appearance for the reality? Will they not pursue truth?"

Mr. Ajoy Ghosh's reply to Jayaprakash Narayan instead of being a proof of heart-searching and rethinking

Mr. Milovan Djilas

THE following cable was sent under the signatures of a number of world renowned personalities to President Josip Broz Tito in connection with the arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Milovan Djilas.

"The arrest and imprisonment of Milovan Djilas for his advocacy of democratic freedoms in Eastern Europe is a grave violation of the principles of intellectual freedom. At a time when the Polish and Hungarian peoples are rising against oppression and totalitarianism, free men everywhere cannot but be shocked at your silencing of Djilas's voice.

Imprisonment of Djilas hardly accords with your government's denunciations of Stalinism and must act as a continuing indictment of your regime, which you offer as a model to the countries of Eastern Europe. Djilas's fate will be a test of the sincerity of your professions of liberalisation and of your repudiation of tyranny.

We urge you to free Djilas at once and to permit the people of Yugoslavia to hear and judge his views."

The cable was signed by the following:-

UNITED STATES

Cass Canfield
Leo Cherne
Senator Joseph S. Clark Jr.,
Senator Paul H. Douglas
Harry D. Gideonse
Sidney Hook
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Elia Kazan
Alfred A. Knopf
S. M. Levitas
Archibald MacLeish
Lewis Mumford
Senator Richard L. Neuberger
Reinhold Niebuhr
J. Robert Oppenheimer
Walter P. Reuther
George N. Shuster
Senator Maragret Chase Smith
Norman Thomas
Diana Trilling
Bertram D. Wolfe

FRANCE

Raymond Aron
Albert Camus
Andre Philip

GERMANY

Max Brauer
Karl Jaspers

INDIA

Sudhin Datta
Asoka Mehta
M. R. Masani
Jayaprakash Narayan
B. R. Shenoy

ISRAEL

Moshe Sharett

ITALY

Giancarlo Matteotti
Ignazio Silone

JAPAN

Taiko Hirabayashi
Takeo Naoi
Taku Komai
Konzo Takayanagi

SPAIN

Pablo Casals

BRITAIN

Norman Angell
T. S. Eliot
Malcolm Muggeridge

The Congress for Cultural Freedom also sent a cable under the signature of the Chairman of its Executive Committee, Mr. Denis de Rougemont. The following is the text of the cable:

"The Congress for Cultural Freedom is deeply dis-

tressed that Milovan Djilas is still in prison for his advocacy of democratic freedoms in Eastern Europe. We wish to associate ourselves wholeheartedly with the protest made by a number of political and cultural figures in a telegram sent to you last week and published in the *New Leader* of January 14. We emphatically repeat their request for the release of Djilas and that the people of Yugoslavia be allowed to hear and judge his views."

"WE ARE ALL STALINISTS"—Continued from page 7

ing on the part of the communists is in the form of a political "rejoinder" with the deliberate object of "scoring points" against Jayaprakash as he had himself anticipated and warned against. Although that reply admits of some mistakes "on the part of the communists," it indulges in complete justification of the Moscow line. Mr. Ghosh even justifies the role of Soviet Russia in the ruthless suppression of the great Hungarian Revolution. Referring to Jayaprakash's criticism of the Communist Parties of the World, Mr. Ghosh says "Your appraisal of the work of the communist parties suffers from the same defects of one-sidedness as your appraisal of the USSR. Communist parties all over the world, if one is to believe you, are nothing but "puppets of Moscow". If that were so, how do you explain the triumph of revolution in China? How do you explain the fact that in France and Italy, the Communist Parties have greater mass following than any other party? How do you explain even the position which the Communist Party of India has attained as a major force in our own country? If the Communist Parties have been what you imagine then they could never have grown into the mass force which they are today." It is clear that Mr. Ghosh is the victim of a serious fallacy! Mr. Ghosh ought to know that it is possible to instigate the masses on some emotional, even irrational issue, and thus claim "mass following". This is precisely what the Communist Parties have been doing throughout the world; and this is precisely what the Communist Party of India does. The so-called "mass following" is no proof of the independence of the Communist Parties of the world from the hegemony of Moscow.

This fact is all the more firmly established by a secret circular dated 2nd November, 1956 which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has sent to all Communist Parties on the Hungarian question. The circular was, in fact, in the form of a directive, and it orders: "The Communist Parties should... courageously come out in defence of the Soviet Union's action in relation to Hungary and mobilise the broad democratic masses..... Such is the urgent task today before each national party."

Any comment is superfluous. It is not, therefore, surprising that Mr. Ajoy Ghosh should defend in his reply to Jayaprakash Narayan, Soviet action in Hungary. He was only carrying out the Moscow directive.

Religion & Freedom-A Seminar in Karachi

by A. B. Shah

THE Pakistan Committee for Cultural Freedom organized in the last week of December a seminar on *Religion and Freedom*. The seminar was attended by about thirty intellectuals from Pakistan and observers from India, Indonesia and Lebanon. The purpose of the seminar was "to find out how far the political and cultural freedom of the individual can be guaranteed by Islam or indeed by any other form of religion."

Inaugurating the seminar, A. K. Brohi, Chairman of the Pakistan Committee and a leading member of the Pakistani Bar, posed the dilemma of the free society: how much freedom should it permit to those who attempt to undermine its institutions and subvert its democratic order? Brohi himself did not answer this question, but Beshara Ghorayeb from Lebanon suggested that ideas should be countered only with ideas, not by resort to force. Brohi's inaugural address was followed by a paper by Q. M. Aslam, Professor of Psychology in Karachi University. Aslam's thesis, which was very well documented, was that no major religion, least of all Islam, was opposed to the democratic ideals of freedom, justice and equality.

The morning session on the next day was devoted to *Religion and Freedom*. In his paper Brohi maintained that the concept of duty was "the foundation of every other moral value", and that religion was "the ultimate sanction of all moral conduct". Real freedom, he concluded, is possible only within the framework of religious values.

Brohi's formulation, though not acceptable to all, set the pattern of subsequent discussions. Syed Ali Ashraf, the young and brilliant Chairman of the Department of English in Karachi University, in his paper on *Religion and Education* made a powerful plea for giving a religious orientation to education. That alone, he asserted, could safeguard freedom from the twin evils of extreme individualism and totalitarian collectivism.

Ashraf was supported by Hasan Zaman, Lecturer in Political Science in Dacca University, who in a later session read a paper on *Religion and Political Freedom*. Agreeing with Brohi and Ashraf, Zaman suggested that freedom could be ensured only by re-organizing society according to the religion of the majority. He made it clear that by religion he meant its "universal principles" as contra-distinguished from the practice and 'local' precepts of institutionalized religion. Dr. Mohamad Ahmad, Professor of Philosophy in Karachi University, gave a lucid analysis of philosophical method, and showed how metaphysics could not be constructed without the experimental—he even called it the *experimental*—basis of religious experience. He, too, made ethics dependent on religious faith.

The discussions were given a historical perspective and a touch of the concrete by Dr. Mazharul Huq,

Reader in Economics in Dacca University, who read a paper on *Religion and Political Freedom* in the morning session on the 26th. He agreed that religion could check "the infection of the deceptive communist philosophy". He was, however, convinced that "the present civilisation can survive only by a rational approach to the problem of want". He pointed out that religion was backward-looking, and not much could be expected from it "except perhaps a vague idea of justice". In his opinion, the greater religious freedom now in evidence was due to religious indifference. "Reason has taken the place of religion."

Among those who participated in the discussions on the papers, mention must be made of Jyotirmal Guha, Lecturer in English in Dacca University; Takdir Alisjabano, Vice-Chairman of National University of Jakarta, Indonesia; and Beshara Ghorayeb, Middle East Representative of the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Guha pointed out that being the product of a law-governed universe, man was endowed with reason and could, therefore, be moral without needing any supernatural sanction for his morality. Alisjabano pleaded for a comparative approach in assessing the significance of religion, while Beshara Ghorayeb went further and asserted that democracy was a-religious. He warned against the use of religion as a secular ideology, for "ideology implies rigidity and a negation of freedom to change and to evolve."

The discussions in the seminar were completely free, though some of the important problems that emerged out of the papers could not be discussed satisfactorily for lack of time. What, for example, is to be the intellectual content of a religious education? How is the 'local' to be distinguished from the 'universal' in the teaching of a religion? How, in consonance with modern science and epistemology, are we to accept the claims to divine guidance made in behalf of the prophets of different religions? And if, as Hasan Zaman so rightly observed, institutionalization makes religion trivial, how can we prevent it without at the same time rendering religion socially irrelevant? How, if the method of discursive reason is not to be applied to religion, can we decide between the claims to truth made by science and by religion? By *credo ut intelligam*, as Ali Ashraf suggested? In that case, why should man surrender his reason, the most powerful weapon that nature has given him, to an agency that is admittedly not open to argument and hence prone to authoritarianism? Indeed, as Alisjabano pointed out, is not the argument against reason itself based on reason?

There was no time to do more than raise these questions at Karachi. Perhaps the ICCF can pick up the threads where the Pakistan Committee left them for want of time. That can well be the beginning of a closer cultural co-operation between the intellectuals of the two countries.

Review

The Torment Of Secrecy

by Edward A. Shils (The Background and Consequences of American Security Policies) Published by The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, USA, 1956. Pages 238.

There is nothing like putting current controversies into the larger context of principle and historical perspective to loosen the hold of narrow emotional complexes that so often bedevil public discussion and governmental attitudes. Such enlargement of the horizon of public discussion serves to release alternative courses of action and policy tending in the long run to the permanent solution of vexed political and social tangles.

Professor Shils has attempted in this thoughtful book to set out the background and consequences of American security policies chiefly influenced in the last few post-war years by Senator McCarthy's activities in ferreting out communist influences in the Administration. Professor Shils is of the opinion (widely shared in all countries) that Senator McCarthy has done nothing but bring disgrace to the good name of America as an enlightened leader of the free world dedicated to the cause of democracy. He thinks that the danger to American security brought by the American Communist Party and its fellow travellers was too insignificant to justify the furore that McCarthyism created which came to have such demoralising effects on wide sectors of American life—administration, education, religion, journalism and diplomacy.

Starting from this phenomenon of McCarthyism, Professor Shils is led to reflect on the factors in American life that have served to feed the fears of the public and encourage the baiting of innocent citizens in so many walks of life. He gives an interesting summary of the state of imperfect assimilation of the heterogeneous elements from the nations of Europe into an integral nationalism serving as the stable and unconscious background of social life. Integral nationalism is a dominant factor in the formation of the "consciousness of kind" that sociologists speak of that seems to be so necessary for social and political life. The successive layers of immigrants from different cultural strata and ethnic stocks of Europe have not been sufficiently fused. This state of affairs develops fears of disloyalty on the part of fewer groups in the minds of the older strata. Ideals of hundred per cent patriotism and Americanism tend to get exaggerated importance in times of war and insecurity.

The reader gets the impression that Professor Shils does less than justice to the genuine element of danger to American security that developed with the cold war. The American Communist Party made capital use of the vast amount of sympathy for Russia released during the war when she grappled manfully with the Nazi hordes and made good the hopes of America and the West that timely and effective

assistance given by them to Russia in her hour of extreme need would not go in vain. Pro-Russian sentiment of the war against Hitler shielded much pro-communist activity on the part of fellow travellers in high places. The author makes light of the extent and peril of this diversion of war sentiment into assistance to Russia as the leader of world communism manifested by so many men in high places like Alger Hiss. The basic sentiment of national unity was weakened in the minds of these abettors of communist infiltration.

But granting the danger, what is the remedy? Professor Shils travels far into the fields of political thought and sociological speculation. In constitutional law, Congress should not interfere too much with the Executive as it did under the lead of MacCarthy. The Executive should not truckle to the Congress on matters within its own sphere—in this case, the conduct and discipline of officialdom under

Indians who have read "Animal Farm" may wonder whether, if they could get a fresh look at the document on which the Five Principles were first inscribed two years ago, they might not find that a sixth had been mysteriously added—with some such wording as: "for some people these principles are more binding than for others."

—Article entitled "Mr. Chou's Sixth Principle" in *The Economist*, London
December 8, 1956.

its care. This question is not discussed in all its bearings. The American Constitution is an equilibrium of powers, a system of checks and balances. If there is reason to think that the Executive has harboured traitors within its ranks, even unwittingly, the Congress has every right to institute probes into the situation. The gravamen of the charge against Senator McCarthy was not interference with the Executive but interference beyond legitimate limits overflowing into unjust intimidation and victimisation.

Professor Shils offers in the last section of his book a glimpse into a pluralist theory of social life. A realisation of the sentiments and attitudes of such a pluralist view of society will develop tolerance, he thinks, with regard to the norms and judgements of different sections and groups of society in regard to each other. On the background of a consciousness of affinity shared by all members of society, respect for the different functional values of different professions and circles should be encouraged and developed, if fanaticism is to be controlled. This reminds us of the value of the Indian ethos of differential *dharma* governing, in its heydays, the different vocational groups of Indian society.

M. A. VENKATA RAO

Officialising The Cooperatives?

by M. A. Venkata Rao

IT is time to officialise the cooperative movement" said a Union Minister (K. D. Malaviya) recently. It is a startling slogan, for it contradicts blithely the very spirit of cooperation which consists in voluntary association. It is another instance of the immanent logic of the "socialistic pattern of society" that is driving towards the displacement of social by state power in sphere after sphere of our life. The logical culmination of this move towards the 'officialisation' of everything can only be a 'communist order of society' in which the inner life of thought, feeling and will as well as external behaviour is controlled by the State, leaving no iota of scope for individual freedom.

Indian Agricultural Policy envisages a greatly extended socialisation of agriculture under the specious name of cooperative farming, with disastrous consequences for democratic values. From this angle, the critical reflections on this subject published by the Indian Cooperative Union, Delhi, are of crucial importance.

The monograph on Cooperative Farming submitted by the Indian Cooperative Union of Delhi to Government and the Planning Commission (and available in mimeographed copies) offers an appraisal of the working of cooperative farming both at home and abroad in the light of its own experience in forming and guiding several resettlement cooperatives of refugee peasants in the villages of Delhi State from 1948. Last year with the help of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, the Union initiated evaluation studies of these cooperatives. In this monograph three of its research associates, Prof. Raj Krishna, Mr. L. C. Jain, Secretary of the Union and Mr. Gopi Krishan formulate the general views and conclusions to which the Union has come on the basis of their comparative studies and experience.

Though the Government and the Planning Commission seem to be committed to a policy of rapid and large-scale expansion of agricultural cooperatives in the coming years, it is essential from the standpoint of long-term goals of policy that public opinion should be focussed on the *kind* of cooperative farming that it is proposed to introduce in India. The issue involves basic democratic values and needs to be fully realised by public opinion. It concerns the kind of society the leaders in power wish to develop in the country-side and implies questions of social philosophy as well as of the economics and technology of progress in agriculture.

As the authors of the monograph point out, the long-term policy envisaged by the Planners is one of collectivisation though the term used is cooperativisation. For the kind of cooperative they have in view entails the pooling of land under common management. The peasant loses his individual hold-

ing and becomes a labourer under the village or farm management with a nominal share in its management. The monograph draws a clear distinction between farmer's cooperatives in the generally accepted sense which help the peasant proprietor to obtain the advantages of large scale operations through pooled resources in financial credit and the purchase and sale of his requirements and products. The latest advances of technology in the different branches of agriculture—better seeds, improved implements, veterinary and poultry breeding and better dairy practices are made available to farmers through their cooperatives without involving any surrender of their rights as proprietors and operators of their land. These cooperatives have been called "service" or "betterment cooperatives."

India seems now facing a crisis in ideals in agriculture as well as in industry and is confronted by crossroads leading to divergent ways of life.

For if the long term goal of the Planning Commission is accepted and cooperatives of the kind known in Russia and China (which are really *collective farms*) are sought to be established as the universal or predominant and characteristic pattern of socialist agriculture in this country, we shall have travelled the Moscow road and departed from the climate and practice of democratic society. This will entail inevitably the destruction of humanist and democratic values in the long run in spite of the democratic professions and intentions of the leaders in power.

For the inescapable result of the sort of pooling of land and management the Planners have in view will be the destruction of the character of farmer's cooperatives as aids to the better farming of farmers who manage their own farming operations according to their own judgement and plan of life. The class of peasant proprietors will vanish from the scene of Indian agriculture and will be replaced by agricultural labourers with varying degrees of influence on management, with the stream of tendency set in the direction of setting up a cadre of bureaucratic managers, representatives of party and Government with final power in their hands.

The monograph of the Union describes very clearly the radical difference between the two types of cooperatives and their social and political implication as regards the survival of the class of independent peasant proprietors. It points out the economic consequences as well. It offers a brief survey of the experiences of cooperative or collective farming of this kind in the various countries of Europe and America where it has been tried over the years and quotes the reports of leading authorities on the subject in a luminous and orderly fashion. The nett result of the investigation is that nowhere in the world can the experiment be said to have been a success. In Russia, the large scale introduction of collective farming by

Stalin (through main force entailing the liquidation of millions of farmers) has not succeeded in raising agricultural output from pre-revolution levels. In China, though it is too soon to estimate the success of the new drive towards collectivisation (cooperatives of the High Grade with pooled land and management), the improvement in production so far has been due more to State assistance in the matter of credit and seeds, implements and manure than to the introduction of cooperatives. The phenomenal speed with which "cooperativisation" is going on in China today has been due to force, intimidation and discrimination against farmers who prefer to remain outside.

Even in East European States where collectives have been forcibly introduced as a measure of socialist policy, results are not satisfactory. It is only in Bulgaria that collectivisation has proceeded furthest with 51% of the land covered by collective farms. Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Hungary follow with around 20%; Poland, Rumania and East Germany have only 11% under collectives. Everywhere the peasants are straining at the leash. In Russia, during the war with Hitler, areas under the invader went back to individual holdings. Today in Hungary collectives were dissolved in many areas during the brief weeks of the democratic revolution.

The Union Report gives illuminating glimpses into the conditions of the cooperative farms functioning in different parts of India—the Ganga-Khadar settlement, Darauna and Nanwara societies in Jhansi district, and land colonies in Madras and in Delhi State. Most of these are societies formed by refugees or settlers on Government or gift land. They are not societies formed by voluntary surrender of individual holdings.

The writers of the monograph point out the stubborn attachment of the peasant everywhere to land and show that he can be persuaded to enter collectives only by force, threat of force or administrative discrimination against him.

They adduce valuable evidence in support of the significant fact that mere expansion of the unit of

operation does not *ipso facto* mean any decisive increase in production. The essential core of farming cannot be mechanised. Individual attention seems irreplaceable.

It is good to see the standpoint of the monograph supported by the Federation of Rural People's organizations which at a recent meeting in New Delhi presided over by Mr. N. G. Ranga passed a resolution warning the Government against hasty campaigns in favour of collective cultivation. The resolution took note of the almost total failure in pooling land and collective cultivation in several countries and stressed the need for experiments on Government and Bhoodan lands to assess the peasant's reaction before decisions are taken in favour of large scale expansion of co-operative farming.

There is the final question of policy and social values. Collectives lead inevitably, (as communists know very well) to the conversion of farmers into proletariat *i.e.* workers with no stake in the land. Under Marxism-Leninism this is supposed to be *progress*. But what is certain to follow is only the removal of the economic basis of democracy. Collectivisation binds the farmer hand and foot and converts him into a serf. The State will have the advantage of extracting the utmost benefit out of his labour on terms determined by itself—mostly on subsistence terms. This policy obviously goes against fundamental human instincts and can be maintained only by the continuous pressure of military and police might. The type of society resulting from this policy is totally different from a democracy governed by humanist ideals.

Nor does it fulfil the claim made for it by way of decisive increments in scale of production. It is the signal merit of this earnest publication, that it marshalls the evidence against "Cooperative Farming" of the kind contemplated by our planners.

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR SOLIDARITY WITH HUNGARY

THE Indian Committee for Solidarity with Hungary has decided to collect funds for inviting a couple of Hungarian refugee students to India and arranging for their training and education. An appeal calling for funds has been issued under the signatures of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, the Chairman, and Mr. R. V. Murthy and Mr. S. A. Sabavala the Secretaries of the Committee. The appeal has been sent to a number of educational trusts, endowments, colleges and other institutions.

The Committee held a public meeting in Bombay on the Chowpatty sands on January 13. Mr. A. G. Mulgaonkar presided over the meeting and the speakers included Mr. H. R. Pardiwala and Mr. M. A. Harris. The meeting disapproved of the invitation extended by the Government of India to Marshal Zhukov who, as the Defence Minister of Soviet Russia, was mainly responsible for the suppression of the Hungarian revolution.

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