

The Beginning Of The End

by V. B. Karnik

RUSSIAN tanks and troops have drowned in blood the heroic revolution of the people of Hungary. The revolution is crushed but resistance of the people to the Soviet occupation forces and the puppet regime set up by them has not ceased. It is still crying aloud to the free people and nations of the world for help and cooperation.

The world has admired the bravery and the courage of the Hungarians but has done precious little to help them in their hour of need. The United Nations passed a number of resolutions, but not one of them could be implemented owing to the cynical and callous refusal of the Soviet Government and of its puppet, the so-called Government of Janos Kadar, to pay heed to them. In connection with their aggression against Egypt the British and the French Governments accepted the directives of the United Nations. The Soviet Government, on the contrary, still continues to defy the near-unanimous mandate of the world organisation.

The Soviet army continues to occupy the country and to impose upon the people a hated military regime. The Secretary General of the United Nations and its observers are still being denied entry into Hungary. In the meanwhile, Workers' Councils have been dissolved and martial law has been proclaimed. Deportation of the youths is continuing and sealed cattle trains containing the flower of the youth of Hungary are still on the move eastward. "Thus are my people decimated, subjugated, finally driven to despair," cries aloud Miss Anna Kethly the only member of the Nagy Government and a veteran Social Democrat, who succeeded in crossing over to the free world.

In the face of this grave disaster overtaking a brave people, one may legitimately ask if the free world could not have done something more effective to save them. The major responsibility falls, of course, on the most powerful amongst the free nations—the United States of America. Could it not have spoken to the Soviet Government in more effective terms? Could it not have responded to Premier Imre Nagy's call for help to protect the neutrality of his country

and served notice on the Soviet Union that a breach of that neutrality would be treated as an aggression against the comity of free nations? Possibly, a stern warning given at that moment might have saved the situation.

It is a matter of deep regret that the free peoples of the world have to stand helpless and watch with folded hands the destruction of a brave struggle for freedom. On this occasion, owing to the strange silence and later equivocation of our country even the force of public opinion all over the world could not be fully mobilised against the aggressor. Even now, there is a disinclination to join hands with others to exercise the maximum amount of pressure. Hope was expressed that gentle words and diplomatic handling might secure quicker results. The hope was disappointed on more than one occasion and yet there is no change in the course of action. This disunity in the ranks of the free nations and the earlier crime of Great Britain and France helped Soviet Russia in getting away with what she did in Hungary.

In a speech at the United Nations the Prime Minister stated referring to the tragedy in Egypt and Hungary: "The one big thing that has emerged is that world opinion is today a strong enough factor not to tolerate what it considers wrong." The fact, however, is that world opinion has tolerated the incredible oppression practised by Soviet Russia in Hungary. World opinion has not been able to exercise any influence upon the rulers of Soviet Russia. In spite of all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the advice tendered by friendly leaders of world opinion like the Prime Minister, the Soviet Union is still busy in suppressing the Hungarian people.

The battle in Hungary may be temporarily lost, but the war for freedom has just begun. In a remarkable article published in the American weekly, *New Leader*, Mr. Milovan Djilas, that intrepid thinker from Yugoslavia has drawn pointed attention to this fact. According to Mr. Djilas: "With the Hungarian peoples' revolution, a new chapter began in the history of humanity." He writes: "Human history is changing in Eastern Europe.... It is no longer possible to stop the struggle of the people of Eastern Europe for independence. The Hungarian revolution blazed a path which sooner or later other Communist countries must follow."

Mr. Djilas has paid a handsome tribute to the heroism and courage of the Hungarian people which will bear repetition. "The world has rarely witnessed such unprecedented unity of the popular masses and such heroism. The unity of the popular masses was

so strong that it appeared as though there had been no civil strife, as though a ruling class had not been wiped out overnight as if it never existed. And the heroic intoxication was so high that bare-handed boys and girls were stopping the tanks of the interventionists who, like the Cossacks of Nicholas I in 1848, tried to suppress their liberty and enslave their country."

Characterising the Hungarian revolution as "a new phenomenon perhaps no less meaningful than the French or Russian revolution", Mr. Djilas states: "The Hungarian Revolution made a gigantic leap and placed on the agenda the problem of freedom in Communism, that is to say, the replacement of the Communist system itself by a new social system." He is convinced by his experience of national communism in Yugoslavia that it "is incapable of transcending the boundaries of Communism as such" and that even after its break from Moscow it can "construct essentially the identical communist system."

But the communist system cannot be maintained, points out Mr. Djilas, without the support of Moscow as the people as a whole, as evidenced in Hungary, are rebelling against it. Moscow may for the time being resort to the expedient of national communism, but it is bound to fail as there is an inherent contradiction between the communist monopoly of power and the national urge for independence from Moscow. Mr. Djilas therefore concludes: "The Revolution in Hungary means the beginning of the end of Communism generally."

This is the significance of the great national uprising which took place in Hungary. It was a struggle of the people as a whole not only against Russian domination but also against the communist system that had been imposed upon them. It is this revolt against communism which frightened the Russian rulers and forced them to resort to desperate measures to crush it. If it had succeeded, the whole Soviet empire would have been shaken to its foundations. With its suppression the immediate danger of collapse has been averted, but the damage done to the foundations is irreparable.

Hungary has proved that, even after ten long years of indoctrination and repression, the people did not develop any liking for communism. That is the most significant failure of communism, which even Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru could not fail to notice. Evidence

from other countries of Eastern Europe also points in the same direction. Communism as a system has to be imposed by force upon the people and can be sustained only through force. Force may operate for some time, but cannot permanently stifle the spirit of man.

That is another very encouraging lesson of the Hungarian revolution. Man's quest for freedom is indestructible. Whatever the repression and the indoctrination, man will not give up his struggle for freedom. The human spirit will always rebel against inequitable restrictions upon its free activity. The Hungarian revolution bears eloquent testimony to the truth of this proposition. Communist dictators may well pay heed to it and prepare for the inevitable destruction of their odious tyranny.

The events in Hungary and Poland have exposed the myth sedulously preached by the communists of the prosperity that communism had brought Russia and the countries of Eastern Europe. Many in our country, even amongst those who ought to have known better, had fallen for that propaganda. They had accepted at their face value the communist claims and some were even so blind as to hold up that example as a model for our country to copy. The thinking of some of our planners was also influenced by that propaganda of the communists. It is now clear that, far from improving the living standards of the people, communism depressed them and intensified the people's poverty and misery. It is the growing poverty, misery and exploitation which in the end provoked the people to rise in revolt against the communist regime and Russian domination. Hungary has provided one more irrefutable proof of the incompatibility of communism with the welfare and the freedom of the people.

Having realised that incompatibility by the bitter experience of the last ten years the people of Hungary revolted against communism. The revolt has been suppressed but it may prove, as predicted by Mr. Djilas, the beginning of the end of the communist system.

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.

E N C O U N T E R

Literature • Arts • Politics

NOTES FROM SOUTH AFRICA

by William Plomer

THE MAGIC OF MARXISM

by Michael Polanyi

MEN AND IDEAS: JOHN LOCKE

by Maurice Cranston

DECEMBER 1956

39

ANNUAL Rs. 12/-

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

Notes

'Straws In The Wind

THE events in Hungary are having repercussions even in Soviet Russia. All the terror of the communist regime has not succeeded in preventing some outburst of anger and resentment against the butchery practised in Hungary.

Over a hundred students have been, it is reported, expelled from the Moscow university as a result of some demonstrations organised by them to express their solidarity with the people of Hungary. There are reports also of student unrest in Leningrad and the Baltic States.

An editorial in the Leningrad *Pravda* said students disrupted classes at Leningrad university by demanding "re-evaluation of values." A separate article in the same paper charged that students in other Leningrad institutes had been insisting on "discussing problems that are not to be discussed."

Soviet Lithuania an organ of the Lithuanian Communist Party, quoted a top communist as saying that student unrest in that Baltic State reached proportions "bordering on hooliganism."

Similar reports of student unrest have been received from the Soviet Baltic Republics of Latvia and Estonia.

In Poland there was an anti-Soviet riot in Stettin in which a number of students from technical schools were involved. There was even an attack on the Soviet Consulate.

These may be at the moment stray incidents. But they may as well be straws in the wind.

Tell-Tale Observations

RUSSIAN aggression against Hungary, condemned all over the world, finds a stout defender in the communist rulers of China. It is common knowledge that, even after his long talks with the Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier, did not find anything wrong in the Russian action and in the end the two had to agree to disagree on the issue.

In India the Chinese Premier had to keep quiet on the issue. But at home there is no such obligation. The kept press of the country has enthusiastically applauded the Russian action.

The official organ of the communist regime, *People's Daily* wrote on November 4: "The Chinese people is determined to stand with the socialist group led by the Soviet Union. The friendship of the People's Republic of China with the Soviet Union is eternal and unshakeable."

Pointing out that the "heroic people of Russia are ready now, as in the past, to shed their blood," the journal sent its "respectful greetings to the Soviet

people and the Soviet army which have liberated the Hungarian people twice." The journal concluded: "The importance of the friendship of the great Soviet Union for every socialist country was, once again, gloriously proved in this Hungarian incident."

These observations tell their own tale, which should shatter the illusions entertained by many about the communist regime in China.

Front Organisations

THE various international front organisations controlled by communists have been badly shaken by Russia's aggression against Hungary. The Soviet manipulators of the fronts tried to persuade them to concentrate exclusively on Egypt but the efforts were not successful. When the Hungarian crisis broke out all the fronts lapsed into silence waiting for the new line.

The World Federation of Trade Unions could not, however, remain completely silent as workers and their trade unions were playing an important part in the revolution. In the beginning it expressed support to Nagy Government but lapsed into silence after the Red Army ousted it. Since then it has been trying to concentrate only on Egypt.

The World Federation of Democratic Youth which has its headquarters in Budapest could not also ignore the happenings in Hungary. There was an open split in its executive. In the end it declared that "among youth and its organisations there are different appraisals" of the "Hungarian tragedy" and the only conclusion that it could reach was that Russia and Hungary should be able to agree about the withdrawal of the Red Army.

There was a similar split in the World Peace Council. It held a meeting in Helsinki in the third week of November and the only statement that it could publish was that "opposing views have made it impossible to formulate the agreed verdict" on the "painful events in Hungary." It agreed, however, that the events were caused by the cold war, the policy of military blocs and the mistake of the previous government.

The front organisations are rapidly losing whatever little popular support they had been able to mobilise. As a result it may not be long before the communists alone are left in the organisations.

State Control Of Films

THERE is so much of talk these days in official and other circles about the virtues of State control and regulation that it was very refreshing to hear Mr. Shantilal Shah, Minister for Education of the Government of Bombay, disapproving of "State interference in or control of the Indian film industry." Speaking on "Films and the Nation" at a meeting organised by Film Journalists' Association, Mr. Shah observed that "ultimately State control of the industry would result in regimentation." He said: "Once the State decides to control the film industry then films of a particular

pattern will be screened; again such control will stifle the growth of the industry and come in the way of our cherished principle—freedom of expression.”

These weighty words of Mr. Shah should serve as a warning against the dangers of State control and intervention. The State is already possessed of numerous powers. Let it not also have the power of deciding for the people the entertainment that they should have. If the State is given that power, the State, which means a bureaucrat in charge of the particular matter, will lay down the law and all, including producers, directors, writers and actors, will have to conform to it. This, as pointed out by Mr. Shah, will stifle the growth of the industry as well as the creative powers of all persons connected with it.

Dr. Ambedkar

IN Dr. Ambedkar's death, India has lost an outstanding scholar, politician and administrator. As one of the principal architects of India's Constitution, Dr. Ambedkar's name will forever adorn the pages of India's political history. He was not merely a

scholar or administrator, but, as Mr. Nehru rightly pointed out in the Lok Sabha, he was a “symbol of revolt against all the oppressive features of Hindu society. He rebelled against something against which we all should rebel.”

Dr. Ambedkar was a man of strong convictions, which he pursued with great intensity and persistence. In many ways he was a controversial figure, but no one could ever doubt his abilities and scholarship. He was a tower of strength to the Harijans. The deep emotion with which they reacted to their loss bore testimony to it. Although he could not bring the depressed classes on a par with the advanced ones, there is no doubt that he put them on the road to economic and social recovery. Although he demanded special treatment and reservations of seats in legislatures and social, economic and educational opportunities for the depressed classes, he was convinced that ultimately these classes will have to stand on their own legs and was preparing them for that eventuality. Dr. Ambedkar was comparatively young when he died — he was only 63. Indeed he died in harness.

The Difference

We reproduce below the Editorial which appeared in December 18 issue of the Times of India. It admirably sums up the point of view that Freedom First and the Democratic Research Service have been trying to place before the Indian public over the years.

MR. Nehru's statement that all foreign troops should pull out of the countries where they are now stationed has, according to our special correspondent covering the Prime Minister's trip, puzzled American opinion. To our policy of non-alignment, opinion in the United States, both governmental and public, is now largely reconciled. Indeed informed opinion recognises that a non-aligned country such as India, constituting as it does the largest democracy in Asia, is peculiarly well-positioned to play a useful and positive role whenever a crisis or a collision threatens between East and West. What American opinion finds difficult to understand is the habit of India, a democracy, of equating totalitarian with democratic systems and of placing America or Britain on a par with Russia or China. Here, argues the U. S., is both a difference and a distinction. If a totalitarian country is to rate equal with a democratic country, then the difference and distinction lose all meaning and are valueless.

It is a point of view which merits more consideration than it has hitherto received in and from our country. Some might argue that non-alignment presupposes that the scales should be held even as between the totalitarian and democratic countries, and indeed this erroneous view infects and clouds the thinking of not a few in the higher echelons of our External Affairs department. Yet this is far removed from what should be the right and ethical interpretation of our foreign policy for it is not India's claim that as between the functions and operations of totalitarianism and demo-

cracy she sees and makes no difference. To do so would be to mortgage the democratic values of our people and hold them to totalitarian ransom.

There is a difference and distinction between totalitarian and democratic values, and it is high time we recognised this more positively in our foreign thinking. If, as is sometimes suggested, we cannot go the whole way, because of our non-alignment policy, either with the democracies or the totalitarian bloc, how can we convincingly explain our performance in going the whole hog on Egypt and in desperately striving to hold our horses on Hungary? The truth is that there is no convincing explanation, and that our clouded, confused thinking has led us into positions from which we now find considerable difficulty in extricating ourselves. There is nothing intrinsically wrong in our policy of non-alignment which indeed is eminently suited to India's interests and to the cause of world peace. But we would be indulging in a dangerous form of self-delusion if while implementing this policy we leaned invariably in favour of the totalitarian bloc against democratic countries, and thereby helped to undermine the very foundations of our own ideals and values. At the very least, let us when it comes to giving the benefit of the doubt give it to the democracies with whom we are ideologically linked than to the totalitarian countries whose avowed aim it is to disrupt and destroy the things we cherish and would like to preserve. What we are now doing is to use the totalitarian knife to cut our democratic throat.

Copyright Bill

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE Joint Select Committee have reported to Parliament and have modified several of the original clauses of Copyright Bill in response to public opinion as represented by several organisations of authors, publishers and manufacturers of gramophone records. The only organisations of authors from India to present their evidence and urge their suggestions for improvement were the Indian P.E.N., the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom and the Indian Institute for Educational and Cultural Co-operation on whose behalf Mr. M. R. Masani, Mr. Purshottam Trikamdas and Mr. Vatsyayan gave evidence before the Select Committee. The profession of writing has yet to develop an effective consciousness of rights to protect its interests in an organised fashion through authors' societies and the like. The evidence led by Mr. Whale representing the Performing Right Society and the British Joint Copyright Council of London is an indication of the leeway writers have to make up in this country in this regard.

The Report of the Joint Select Committee registers a distinct response to the representations made by these organisations and the evidence led by their spokesmen which brings the modified clauses closer to international Conventions with the result that the rights of creative writers now receive better recognition than in the original Bill.

The chief change in response to public opinion lies in restoring the original term of copyright to fifty years after the death of the author from the reduced period of twenty-five years proposed in the draft bill. Related to this is the acceptance by the Committee of the suggestion that, in the case of joint authorship, the term should be counted from the death of the surviving author and not from that of the owner of copyright who dies first.

The examination of the evidence (led by authors' representatives) by Ministers and Members of Parliament serving on the Committee shows the effect of the general acceptance of the socialist pattern of society as the goal of State policy in the habit of deducing conclusions to the detriment of the individual's rights. The discussions in the Committee stage highlight the need for vigilance on the part of citizens in all walks of life to defend democratic institutions from the incessant and insidious inroads of bureaucracy. It is gratifying however that official circles are yet responsive to informed public opinion in some measure when properly led and expressed. For the Report bears the signs of such response and has embodied many vital recommendations urged by the organisations mentioned above, though it must be said that there are still some unacceptable clauses left substantially unmodified. It is to be hoped that they

will be altered in the final consideration by Parliament before the Bill is passed into law.

One of these clauses needing modification at the final stage relates to the rights of translation. The Select Committee have been unable to accept the suggestion that the author's right of translation should be co-eval with that inhering in the original work, namely fifty years after the author's death. They retain the original period of ten years after first publication that prevailed under the old law before Independence. The argument that seems to have prevailed is that in the coming period of expanding activity in the field of translation from among the many languages in the country, the public should have the maximum access to the total production in the literary field accruing from the shorter period of author's copyright. While the motive is unexceptionable, there is no reason to expect that such a curtailment of authors' rights will promote the end in view. It will only favour the tribe of publishers at the cost of creative writers. Mr. R. D. Sinha "Dinkar" has urged cogent reasons in his Minute of Dissent for the grant of full rights in respect of translation co-eval with that of original works. He cites the example of Bengali literature and even the case of Gurudev Tagore himself in support of the more generous view. This is a point that calls for renewed effort on the part of authors with a view to urge their point of view before Parliament when the Bill is taken up for consideration.

Messrs. Rajendra Pratap Sinha, Raghuvira and M. S. Gurupadaswamy in their Dissenting Minute have upheld the Berne and Universal Copyright Conventions in demanding the rights of translation would be co-eval with those of original works.

Another matter of grave importance that needs revision relates to the rights of writers in regard to commissioned work. The Select Committee have made some minor modifications in the original clause making a distinction between the fields of periodical literature, of photographs, paintings, portraits, engravings, cinematograph-films and literary works. In the case of magazines, the commissioning agency, namely the proprietor of the paper, should have only the right of first publication but in the case of photographs and paintings and portraits, it is held on the contrary that the right of copyright should vest in the party that commissions the work. And in the case of literary writings, too, executed on commission by Government or a private party, (whether an individual or an organisation), the Select Committee have taken the unusual and untenable view that copyright should vest *not* in the *author* but in the *party* that commissions the work. It does not seem far-fetched to see in this retrograde clause the influence of the

socialist pattern of society on the minds of legislators in favouring the aggrandisement of the State at the expense of the citizen. This is a matter in which authors should bestir themselves and make their case heard in Parliament at the stage of final discussion.

Copyright is a natural right inherent in the act of creation or composition. The argument that the clause provides for "contracting out" by the author by way of a stipulation in the contract loads the dice against the weaker party. The law should defend the interest of the weaker party to a bargain and should not, as is proposed here, give the advantage to the employing or commissioning organisation, whether governmental or private.

As was pointed out by the representatives of writers in their evidence before the Select Committee, the Government itself is likely in the new dispensation to develop into an ever-expanding agency of employment, making it more and more difficult for the individual writer or other creative worker to assert his rights against it. It is necessary therefore for writers to get this clause altered and secure the inherent right of copyright as flowing from composition, with of course a provision for parting with the right in return for adequate consideration. But the natural presumption in the absence of an explicit stipulation should be that copyright rests with the creator of the work in question.

The Select Committee have acceded to the point of view of critics and have omitted the clause in the Bill providing for the resumption of copyright by owners between 7 and 10 years after assignment in cases of insufficiency of payment. While the motive underlying this clause was laudable, namely, to safeguard the writer from undue exploitation by publishers, in actual practice however, (as was pointed out to the Committee) it was more likely to work to their disadvantage. For publishers will be chary of offering substantial terms to writers if the Damocles' sword of resumption were held over their heads, with the result that it is the writers that would eventually suffer.

Another matter calling for renewed consideration concerns the setting up of a Copyright Board. Some alterations in its constitution have been made, but the whole idea needs to be challenged from the demo-

cratic point of view. The Registrar is shorn of his power as an official by relegating him to the position of Secretary of the Board and the quasi-judicial character of the board is enhanced by stipulating for the appointment of High Court Judges (or persons qualified to be appointed Judges) for chairmanship. The concession is also made that the assertion of Copyright in a Court of Law is not to be conditional on registration, which will now be optional. Copyright will accrue by the act of creation but registration may be useful for taking action in case of infringement. This is an improvement.

On the whole, the Select Committee have been largely responsive to informed representation. It is now for the authors to press the advantage home and secure full recognition of their rights in the final stage when the Bill comes before Parliament.

C. C. F. NEWS

The Pakistan Committee for Cultural Freedom organised a Seminar on Religion and Freedom in Karachi from December 23 to 26. Prof. Shah of Poona attended the Seminar as an observer on behalf of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

The Delhi Group of the Committee was reconstituted at a meeting of members of the Committee in Delhi held on December 10 under the chairmanship of Mr. Asoka Mehta, M.P. The meeting elected a local Managing Committee consisting of the following 10 members: Mr. Purshottam Tricumdas, Mrs. Purshottam Tricumdas, Dr. M. K. Haldar, Mr. Satyadeo Sharma, Mr. Farid Ansari, Mr. Ishwardas Khera, Mr. V. M. Pillay, Mr. Gopal Mittal, Mr. S. P. Chopra and Mr. M. S. Gurupadaswamy, M.P. Members of the National Executive staying in Delhi will be ex-officio members of the Managing Committee. Mrs. Leela P. Tricumdas was elected the Secretary of the Delhi Group. Mr. V. B. Karnik, one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Indian Committee, was in Delhi for a few days and assisted in the reconstitution of the Group.

The Truth About Stalin

BY N. KHRUSHCHEV

Price Rupee One

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One



Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Communist Double Talk • at Palghat

A probe into the private proceedings of the Fourth Congress of the Indian Communist Party at Palghat held in April 1956 with texts of some Secret Documents.

Price Rs. 2/-

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Mr. Djilas And Marshal Tito

THE treatment that has been meted out to Mr. Milovan Djilas throws a flood of light on the character of the present regime in Yugoslavia. Mr. Djilas was arrested in the early hours of Monday, November 19. The charge against him was that he had carried on hostile propaganda against Yugoslavia. Particular mention was made in the indictment of his recent article on the revolution in Hungary published in the American socialist weekly, *New Leader*. Mr. Djilas was later sentenced, at a secret trial, to three years' imprisonment at hard labour. Despite vigorous protests by Djilas and his attorneys the press and the public were barred from the trial.

This is not the first time that Mr. Djilas has been arrested. It was in December 1953 that Mr. Djilas, who was then the Vice-President of the country and had been just elected the President of the Yugoslav Parliament, was dismissed from all his posts, deprived of all his privileges and expelled from the Communist Party. In December 1954, he was prosecuted before a Tribunal. The Tribunal sentenced him but the sentence was later suspended by the Government.

Since then Mr. Djilas had been allowed to stay as a free man, but there were many restrictions upon his activities. He was deprived of all political activities but was allowed to resume his literary pursuits. Later on, however, even that opportunity was denied to him. In a letter published in the *New York Times*, Mr. Djilas stated: "In February 1954, Marshal Tito told foreign correspondents that I would be permitted to continue my literary activities; but by measures like these, I am prevented from earning a living and supporting my family in the only way that I am able." The measures referred to by Mr. Djilas are the return, on political grounds, by the publishers of his manuscripts without even reading them.

In June 1956 a representative of the *New York Times* succeeded in contacting Mr. Djilas in Belgrade. He secured from him four articles on the leaders of the Kremlin and their new tactics. They were published in this country in the *Bombay Chronicle*.

There were no sensational revelations about the men of the Kremlin in these articles, but there were some frank and unvarnished statements about them and about the economic conditions in Soviet Russia. In one article Mr. Djilas stated: "All these leaders of the Kremlin are men who have not gone very far with their studies. The best that one can say about them is that they are 'professional Communists'. These characteristics, which are common to all of them, mean that we must not expect to find a new ideology bursting forth. That means, in turn, that we have reached a period of decadence in Communism."

With reference to the de-Stalinisation, which was so widely and noisily proclaimed in the USSR, Djilas said: "Actually, it is bureaucracy which exercised the dictatorship in the USSR, and the members of

this bureaucracy have agreed among themselves that they cannot afford to have a new Stalinist era at the present time... All of which does not mean, however, that a form of personal dictatorship could not arise again."

Djilas' opinion of the Soviet economy is not much more flattering: "During the last few years, the output of the Soviet economy has been so weak that the results obtained are far below even the most pessimistic estimates." On the subject of the dissolution of the Cominform, he wrote at the end of these articles: "It is not the system that counts, but the bonds which link the Communist system. And nothing has changed these bonds."

These articles of Djilas were published at the moment when Marshal Tito was making his triumphal tour through the Soviet Union. They immediately brought upon Djilas savage attacks in *Borba*. It honoured Djilas with the following compliments: "a petty failure of a politician", "morally irresponsible", "filthy", "an insignificant hireling of foreigners", "a man of degraded morals who drags about in the mud of foreign bosses".

Mr. Djilas' arrest and imprisonment have aroused indignation in democratic circles all over the world. The American Committee for Cultural Freedom took the lead in organising protest against the trial and imprisonment of Mr. Djilas. Immediately on hearing of the arrest it sent the following cable to Marshal Tito under the signatures of Mr. Norman Thomas, Prof. Sydney Hook, Mr. Reinhold Niebuhr and a few others:

"On behalf of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, an organisation of leading American writers, scientists and scholars, we demand the immediate freeing of Milovan Djilas, arrested for his authorship of a recent article on Hungary in the *New Leader*, an American periodical of the highest repute and probity. The arrest of Djilas by your Government not only violates every principle of freedom and decency cherished by the American people but is also a total contravention of your own highly publicised protestations against the tyrannies of Stalinism."

The arrest of Mr. Djilas has provoked Mr. Vladimir Dedijer, the author of the official biography of Marshal Tito, to address an open letter to the Marshal. Mr. Dedijer is also a co-sufferer with Mr. Djilas. In 1954 he was stripped of all his positions and expelled from the Yugoslav Communist Party for his support to Mr. Djilas. In his open letter Dedijer points out how the arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Djilas runs counter to all the principles accepted by the country and Marshal Tito. He wrote the letter following the voice of his conscience and in order to "defend my integrity as an intellectual". This is a bold act on the part of Mr. Dedijer and in the conditions which obtain at present in Yugoslavia he may have to suffer heavily for his courage.

Truth And Propaganda

by Saadi

THE relation between truth and propaganda has assumed topical importance in view of the fact that in his reply to the debate on foreign policy in the Rajya Sabha on December 4, the Prime Minister asserted that the purpose of the Democratic Research Service, the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom and similar organisations "appeared to be propaganda rather than search for truth." Stating that he had not in his earlier reference in the Lok Sabha meant to impute any motives, Mr. Nehru observed: "I referred to certain organisations and I mentioned that there are in India a number of organisations often going under attractive names of freedom and democracy, but whose purpose appears to be propagandist rather than a search for truth, rather than, I would say, a passion for freedom and democracy. Now, it is open to any organisation to do propaganda or pursue any line of action. There is freedom in this country for that to be done. I cannot object to that, although I may disagree with them. But it is necessary for us to be reminded that some of these are organisations whose membership contains many estimable persons some Ministers, Congress members, Members of Parliament and others, and estimable members of the Socialist Party. It is true that they are there. I am not quite sure that all of them often realise or have realised in the past that perhaps the basic purpose is rather propaganda and not so much a search for truth or democracy or freedom. We know also that there are organisations going by the name of, well, literary or artistic or cultural organisations, which essentially want to do propaganda under the guise of literature or culture or dancing or singing."

Now the Oxford Dictionary defines "propaganda" as "means for propagating a doctrine or practice." All religions, all scientific truths, all theories and ideologies have spread by means of propaganda. It will be thus obvious that no torch-bearer of truth can do without propaganda if he is anxious to make a success of his mission. Even to write a book or an article propounding a doctrine or ideas is also propaganda. Without the wings provided by propaganda, truth cannot travel. It will die before it is born. True, propaganda is done as much for evil as for good; for instance, propaganda on behalf of communism is generally more virulent than on behalf of democracy. But the only way to counteract the propaganda on behalf of evil is to intensify the propaganda on behalf of good.

Mr. H. R. Pardiwala, an active member of the Democratic Research Service, has therefore done well in raising his voice of protest against the Prime Minister's efforts to play on the words "truth" and "propaganda", in a letter widely published (though not without truncating) in the press.

As Mr. Pardiwala has explained, the D.R.S. has, since its inception in 1950, taken by and large the line that in an infant democracy such as ours it is necessary to combat the furtive infiltration of mendacious

ideas propagated by the international communist movement and its local agents. Throughout its existence, it has struggled to repel the utterly false information that these bodies have been spreading about the workers' paradise in Stalin's regime. It has all along attempted to tell our people that in fact Stalin's regime was one of brutal tyranny marked by wholesale purges of those who dared to question his dictates and the liquidation of millions of innocent men and women who did not fit in with his scheme of things. It also tried to bring to light the existence in countries behind the Iron Curtain of forced labour camps where conditions of utter slavery existed. The D.R.S. also tried to tell our people that the Eastern European countries were victims of a new imperialism more dangerous than the old, because it advances under the cover of 'liberation'.

Mr. Pardiwala then makes a telling comparison between Mr. Nehru's own record as a propagandist and that of the D.R.S.: "When the Report of the ILO-UN Commission finding that forced labour was a normal feature of the Soviet regime was published, the Indian Government and its representatives in the UN repudiated that report despite the fact that a distinguished Indian like Sir A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar was its Chairman. When Stalin died, our Prime Minister got the Indian Parliament adjourned in breach of all precedent and made a feeling speech in the course of which he held up Stalin as a man of peace and the beloved father of his people. When a year or so ago, Mr. Nehru was questioned at a Press Conference in Europe about the Eastern European 'satellites', he queried the use of that word and expressed the view that Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and such like countries were sovereign independent nations and that India was proud to maintain friendly diplomatic relations with them."

In conclusion Mr. Pardiwala writes:

"In the light of Khrushchev's indictment of Stalin as a brutal tyrant and his admission of forced labour camps, as also of the heroic manner in which the entire Hungarian people have shown their understanding of the colonial status to which they have been reduced during the past ten years, the historian of our time is more than likely to come to the conclusion that what the DRS had been saying for the past five years have turned out to be the truth and that, if its publications have been in the nature of a propaganda, then it was propaganda for the dissemination of the truth which was not otherwise available to the Indian people. On the other hand, could the historian be blamed if he were sadly to come to the conclusion that Mr. Nehru, whose attitude on all these issues has now been proved by historical developments to be incorrect, was himself the victim of tendentious propaganda on the part of those in whom he reposed confidence?" Any disinterested person will find it difficult to disagree with Mr. Pardiwala.

Asian Writers' Conference

(From Our Correspondent)

THERE were enough differences of opinion among the members of the Indian Steering Committee to wreck the Asian Writers' Conference. In fact it was all the time threatening to be wrecked. It was all but wrecked when the Indian Writers' Convention met on the 22nd December. Pandemonium prevailed at the meeting. The communists were naturally chagrined when they found Prof. Humayun Kabir in the Chair. There were objections and objections to objections. Ironically enough, the differences were ironed out and the Conference was assured a fairly smooth sailing because of the able stewardship of Prof. Humayun Kabir. He inspired confidence by his clear thinking, liberal views and tactful management of the meeting. This can be clearly seen from the fact that, when the Indian delegation met later to elect a leader, he was unanimously elected to that position in spite of the fact that he was leaving Delhi the next day. He was also given authority to nominate the person who was to take his place after he left.

The Conference proper was inaugurated on the 23rd December. It would have been in the fitness of things that somebody holding a high government office had inaugurated this international Conference. The Conference was inaugurated by Prof. Humayun Kabir with a very able and impressive speech. It is rather an interesting fact that Ministers of the Government, and high Government officials, who are usually present at any conference of some importance, have kept studiously aloof from this one.

The delegations at the Conference reveal that it was meant to be a communist show. South Korea is not represented. Japan is not represented by its leading writers, but by a pro-communist writer. Dr. Lin Yu Tang was not allowed to be invited. The communist countries have sent large delegations. It is only little South Viet Nam that has sent a non-communist delegation. As regards the large Indian delegation it is a mixed group consisting of both pro-communist and anti-communist writers. It has proved impossible to keep out anti-communists in spite of the efforts of some of the organisers. On the whole, there is quite a sprinkling of non-communists at the Conference and they are making their presence very much felt.

The highlight of the proceedings of the Conference on the 24th December was a speech by Rajaji. For a politician, he showed a remarkable understanding of the nature and purpose of creative activity. He very clearly stated that the purpose of a work of art is not to carry propaganda but to create beauty. He said that a work of art no doubt has a subtle moral colouring. But that, he said, ought not be confused

with propaganda. He made a strong plea for the freedom of the writer. He strongly opposed regimentation of writers and appealed that they should write objectively and with an independent spirit. He pointed out that the Conference ought not to be used as an arena for carrying on the cold war. Nor, he said, is it desirable to convert it into a trade union of writers. It should be used, he suggested, as a meeting ground of minds, where authors exchange ideas and discuss common problems.

Before Rajaji spoke, the Conference was addressed by Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar. He referred to the rich cultural heritage of India and to the spiritual values which India has always cherished. He expressed the hope that this rich tradition would be continued.

After these two speeches were made, leaders of various delegations read reports on the literatures of their countries. The reports read by the delegates of communist countries had a uniform colouring. They were more concerned with colonialism in Asia and the Suez issue rather than with literature proper. On behalf of India, fourteen reports have been submitted! Most of the reports are unendurably long and full of self-glorification. Delegations representing some languages insisted on submitting and reading two reports. All these reports could not be read on 24th December in spite of an extra sitting of one hour. Some more were therefore read on 25th and still more on 26th morning. We Indians must really learn a certain sense of proportion and must avoid making such a sorry exhibition of ourselves at least at international Conferences.

The discussion on various items on the agenda was initiated on 24th and 25th of December. 'Freedom and the Writer' was the issue that attracted most attention. There were sharp differences of opinion on this issue and these were naturally expressed in the course of the discussion. There was nothing wrong in this. What was wrong was the way the discussion was conducted both in general session and at the meeting of commissions. There was too much woolliness, too many clichés and too much cheap propaganda. There was no real thinking and discussion. Some delegates like Mr. Padhye, Prof. Gadgil and Prof. Jagirdar tried to lift the discussion to a serious level but with no effect.

The Conference will go on for another three or four days. If one judges it by the publicity it has evoked, it has no doubt been a success so far and will be a success later on. But it has contributed pretty little so far to the understanding of the problem of the writer and his place in society.

Echoes Of The Hungarian Revolution

Denis de Rougemont, Chairman of the International Executive Committee of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, issued the following statement:

"To the last words from the revolution set in motion by the students and writers of the Petofi Circle there has been no response. We could not reply, and they knew it. In spite of this they appealed to us, and we understand their message. They want their fight to outlive their defeat.

This appeal must be heard and made known to the entire world. Each of us must now reply. Each of us must take action.

Those who in any way support the monstrous crime of Budapest are beyond the realm of humanity. This is the first thing that must be said. But practical conclusions must also be drawn. For our part, we are thinking of what must follow.

Henceforth, to shake the hand of one who 'justifies' the crime of Budapest is to salute an accomplice in that crime. To publish the writings of a Communist apologist is to aid the type of intellectual propaganda which leads to the crime of Budapest. To continue cultural exchange with the Soviet Union under the false banner of the 'thaw' which has just shown its true colour at Budapest is to walk into a trap. To receive and to fete troops of pretty artists and subservient intellectuals sent to us by the Moscow regime, and at the same time to forget the choice of the martyred writers who appealed from Budapest, is to betray their testament.

Let each one search his heart and determine freely what action he intends to take in his personal or public sphere of influence against those who applaud the crime, who will try to make us forget it, or who will look for excuses.

Let all free men who want to associate themselves with the international action of the Congress for Cultural Freedom know that they will find men here who do not forget the appeal of the writers of Budapest, who will not allow it to be forgotten and whose entire efforts are directed toward responding to this appeal."

Testimony From Poland

Mr. Jerzy Zaleski, wellknown Polish writer, wrote in the course of an article published in "Rejsy" of Gdynia:

"The rebels. Do not for one instant suspect these people of being counter-revolutionaries. Let no one among you dare call them fascists, or bourgeois agents. Arms in the hands of Budapest workers does not mean a counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Neither is it diversion on the part of foreign or domestic reaction. It is the desperate struggle of the Hungarian people for democracy and national sovereignty. It is the reply to the attitude of the leaders of the Hungarian Communist Party corrupted by Stalinism, and

of its secretary Erne Geroe who, on the occasion of a peaceful friendly meeting of students to show their community of spirit with the reforms undertaken in Poland and calling for similar reforms in their own country, has dared to call them reactionaries."

Aid Programme Of "Forum"

Forum, a monthly intellectual review of Vienna, sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom, has organised a rehabilitation programme for the refugee students and intellectual leaders of the Hungarian insurrection.

Over 1,000 refugee academicians, writers, students, artists and journalists are being served by *Forum's* expanding aid programme.

The operation is small and intimate, but this permits individual, sympathetic help to be rendered to every applicant. Editors Friedrich Torberg and Tassilo Merhal have purposely limited its scope to intellectuals and students since the magazine is uniquely equipped to satisfy their special needs.

A primary aim of the programme is to enable students to continue their education in the West. It has outfitted student camps at Siezenheim, Strobel and Ried with instructors, textbooks, radios and office machines.

The magazine's staff seeks out private families in and near Vienna willing to house refugees on the theory that large common dwellings make refugees feel like a strange group in a strange land.

A Voice From Australia

Mr. W. C. Wentworth, M. P. (Australia) wrote in the course of a statement:

"It is intolerable that the Secretary General of the United Nations, acting upon the instructions of the General Assembly, should be refused access to Hungary, and thus prevented from seeing what is happening there and reporting the facts to the world.

The time has surely come when the General Assembly itself has both the right and the duty to convene in Budapest, and to rebuke by its physical presence those who deny life and liberty to their fellow men.

Therefore let the delegates to the United Nations General Assembly gather in order at the Hungarian frontier, and march peacefully across it, giving thereby a moral lead to the world in deeds as well as in words.

If they should be subject to opposition, indignity or murder, then at least the whole world would know

the nature of the threat which faces it, and the Hungarian people know that they do not suffer alone. The delegates are the accredited representatives of humanity, and, in the present crisis, must be prepared to discharge their duties without thought of personal risk, like any soldier in the firing line or any citizen in Budapest streets.

If some of the religious leaders of the world would walk across the frontier together with the Assembly, they would be acting in conformity with the traditions which they guard.

Since nobody should suggest a venture unless he himself is prepared to share in it, I would add that I would be willing to accept appointment as Australian delegate to the United Nations for this purpose."

Scientists' And Scholars' Declaration

A strong call for the restoration of intellectual freedom in Hungary was made in a declaration delivered in December to the Soviet Embassy and the Hungarian Legation by a delegation of the Committee on Science and Freedom, an affiliate of the Congress for Cultural Freedom. The declaration had been signed by more than a thousand scholars from universities and colleges in 23 different countries. The declaration said that there was 'deep concern at the fate of our colleagues in Hungary,' and appealed for the restoration of their intellectual and cultural freedoms.

It ended with a suggestion that the Soviet Government should answer 'in the most practical manner' by permitting at once a free exchange of visits between scholars outside Hungary and those in Hungarian universities.

The statement was delivered at the embassies by a delegation led by Professor C. D. Darlington (Oxford), and including Sir David Lindsay Keir (Master of Balliol, Oxford), Professor Pulleybank (Cambridge), Professor H. J. Fleure (London), and Professor Kathleen Lonsdale (London).

The declaration has been signed by some prominent Indian scholars.

Hungarian students in Oxford have appealed to all universities to join the movement called 'The Universities Stand by Hungary's Freedom.' Among those signing the appeal are officially appointed delegates of the Hungarian Revolutionary Students Committee.

"Wounding The U.N."

In the course of a letter addressed to a friend protesting against the Indian vote at the United Nations on the Hungarian issue, the Socialist leader of the United States of America, Mr. Norman Thomas writes:

"I find it impossible to discuss calmly Krishna Menon's vote with the Soviet bloc on the Hungarian issue at the UN. This seemed to me a repudiation

of India's attempt to stand for moral principle as opposed to power politics in international relations. If Krishna Menon, in behalf of India, had merely abstained from voting, I should have tried to understand it. India has reason to fear Russia and I suppose might feel reluctant to vote with Britain and France, since they also were aggressors in Egypt. I cannot possibly understand or condone Menon's positive vote with the Soviet bloc. Although it was a somewhat different action, in my mind it ranks with what Eden did in wounding the UN in the house of its friends."

Meeting In Bombay

The Indian Committee for Solidarity with Hungary held a public meeting in Bombay on December 13. The spacious Sunderbai Hall, where the meeting was held, was packed to capacity. Mr. Asoka Mehta, M.P., presided over the meeting. Other speakers were Mr. A. D. Gorwala, Mr. Raja Hutheesingh, Prof. Correa Afonso, Mr. N. Vakeel, Mr. M. A. Harris and Mr. M. R. Dandawate. Demand was voiced at the meeting that the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, should on his way to the United States of America visit Budapest, see things for himself and then take the necessary steps to secure the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary.

QUEST

a bi-monthly of arts & ideas

Sponsored by the

Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom

EDITOR: NISSIM EZEKIEL.

QUEST is indeed an outstanding journal, ably edited.

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

*Poems, Articles, Short Stories, Book Reviews,
Notes on Theatre, Cinema & Dance.*

Annual subscription Rs. 6/- Single Copy Re. 1-

**Army & Navy Building,
148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.**

A Moment In Budapest

by Francois Bondy

ON the day I left Budapest — the 2nd of November — most of the foreign journalists crowding the lobby of the Hotel Duna were keenly aware of impending tragedy and disaster. The spokesman for the revolutionary military committee had already forecast, the evening before, the eventuality of “a fight to the death.” But on that Friday morning the atmosphere at the office of the Hungarian Writers’ Association, next door to the Soviet Embassy, had been entirely different. There, everything was intense and hopeful: a moving and strange air of exhilaration pervaded the rooms. Most of Hungary’s distinguished writers were there, working and conferring, for their literary centre was functioning as a kind of brain-trust for Prime Minister Nagy.

Through an interpreter (for he does not speak any foreign languages) I talked with Peter Veres, Chairman of the Writers’ Association, a famous peasant writer and political leader, who stood there with his old-fashioned heavy boots and handle-bar moustache like some Hungarian Gorki. “We have learned that an author must have the right to keep his silence on political issues, as well as the freedom to speak out on behalf of his community...”

On this last morning, I met again the playwright Julius Hay, in whose house I had spent the previous

afternoon. I asked Hay how it was that he and other “old Bolsheviks” were now openly fighting the Party leadership. He replied: “There were many reasons for the break. The first, I confess, was my instinctive disgust with Stalinism’s utter lack of taste and its insensibility in every field of art and letters. As writers, we were all sharply aware of that. Secondly, there was the experience of deep social injustice in our society. A third motive was the glaring failure, even bankruptcy, of our type of economic system. There was finally—and it may have been the most important element—the pressure of our youth...”

He went on: “Have we been building in this country a socialist society, marred only by some ugly distortions, or was this not a horrible regime for which I have no name and which was all distortions and no socialism? Even now, I long for the Party which once had our love and loyalty. But its leadership has destroyed it. It is difficult to love a thing which does not exist. I would still support a new and pure Marxist movement. But I would not want to become a Party member ever again... was I courageous in speaking for truth, even under Rakosi? The pressure of the young on us all was so great that I can only say, in the words of one of our poets, “I was too much of a coward to remain dishonest!...”

I talked too, with Tibor Dery, an inspirer of the Petofi circle of Hungarian intellectual dissidents and a Communist of long standing.

Many of the talks I had with Hungarian writers were recorded on tape by a Swiss radio reporter who travelled with me. In the safety of Vienna, while Budapest is still burning and armoured violence has taken command, while thousands of refugees are pouring across the Western frontier into Austria, I have listened again to these calm cultured voices, speaking to me in Hungarian, French, German and Italian. And I am trying helplessly to relate these talks, held in a mood of revolutionary confidence, with the final SOS broadcast three days later from Radio Kossuth in Budapest, that desperate and pathetic appeal for help by the same Hungarian Writers’ Association:

“Attention, attention, dear listeners! You will hear now the appeal of the Federation of Hungarian writers. This is the appeal of the Federation of Hungarian writers to every writer in the world, to all scientists, to all writers’ federations, to all scientific associations, to the intellectual elite of the world, we ask you all for help and support. There is but little time. You know the facts. There is no need to give you a special report. Help Hungary. Help the Hungarian people. Help the Hungarian writers. Help! Help!! Help!!!”

They had the first and the last word in the brief, agonising moment of Hungarian freedom.

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