

The Death Of Imre Nagy

by Stephen Spender

WE are told that the death of Imre Nagy and four of his colleagues shows that the neo-Stalinist world of Chinese and Russian communism is stepping up its new cold war against Tito's Yugoslavia.

That we are told this, that editors in newspapers where there is free discussion should be necessarily obliged to deduce it, seems an outrage against human reason everywhere, especially coming as it does at the time when Khrushchev has sent a note to the heads of the Western states asking whether they are sincere in their desire for Summit Talks. Talks, we are reminded, when they are conducted on the terms laid down by the Kremlin, consist of fragments of lead being driven through the brain cells of one of the discutants by the other. Or, when these ideal conditions cannot be arranged, they consist of the murder of a third party (the Hungarians) by a first party (the Russians) in order to illustrate a point made to a second party (the Yugoslavs).

Yet editors are probably right. A point has been made in blood for the benefit of Yugoslavs, and perhaps also for the Poles, and many others.

We are obliged to ask ourselves what advance there has been in civilization since the death of Stalin. And we can take what comfort we are able from two things: that apparently Imre Nagy made no, or at most only a partial confession—from which one might deduce that the methods of forcing and reporting confessions are less automatic than in the time of Stalin. And from the fact that the trial—secret and horrible as it was, and accompanied by the torture to death of one of those tried—has happened so long after the events of the Hungarian Revolution.

In truth, one can only consider the second of these things a real cause for solace. It may be that "confessions" are no longer extorted because they are no longer considered convincing. To say that "the victim did not confess" adds a macabre note of sincerity to the new methods of assassination.

In the free non-totalitarian world, as in the Communist, a terrible reappraisal of policy is going on: and the ideological conflicts in the East are matched by the conflicts over Algeria and Cyprus in the West. We cannot be complacent about these issues—for they are the transformation of imperialism in the West

into some different system, at the same time as there is a tightening of the chains of the satellite empires in the East. And the outcries of conscience in the West are not only against what happens in the communist world; they are also against torture and censorship in the West.

Today, superimposed on the debates about what we should do in the West, there is a more fundamental long-term discussion going on about what we should do if the free world is attacked in a nuclear war. Many people say that it is better to surrender freedom than retaliate in a way which might bring life to an end on this earth.

Whatever one may think about these things, it is extremely important that the debate about the "H-Bomb" and its consequences should be conducted in the light of *truth*, and not in a fog of wishful thinking. For this reason, one can consider that the agony of Hungary during and since the revolution, and the deaths of the Hungarian leaders now are not wasted. These events have, more than any others, prevented us from having illusions. They have put us into the centre of truth. Hungary is a microcosm of a world under dictatorship. And the Hungarian leaders who have now died are warnings of what happens to leaders who resist the Kremlin—warnings not only to communists who may be in danger of harbouring dangerous thoughts, but also to non-communists whose minds are free to range over the advantages and disadvantages of abandoning their freedoms.

In the very difficult times in which we live, we have to be grateful to everyone who tells, or who points to us, the truth. And for this reason, besides feeling the horror of the death of Imre Nagy and his colleagues, and the horror of our refusal or inability to save them, we also have to thank them. They have shed a very bright light indeed on the minds of the rulers of the neo-Stalinist regimes.

Salute To Nagy And Maleter

BY this deed, international communism once again reveals its real nature. The myth of liberalisation and of the acceptance of peaceful methods is destroyed, and the world's hopes of peaceful co-existence between various ideologies are scuttled.

Freedom is indivisible. The bell does not toll for Nagy and Maleter alone; it tolls for each one of us who does not resist the advance of communism in our own country.

—from a statement issued by the Indian Committee for Solidarity with Hungary.

Murder of Imre Nagy

Statement issued by the Congress for Cultural Freedom

MOSCOW has reported that Budapest has announced that Imre Nagy is dead. The Premier of Hungary and leader of his people during the heroic days of October 1956 has been executed in the last act of the bloody repression of the Hungarian Revolution. This deed violates the conscience of mankind and cynically breaks specific reassurances as to the safety and well-being of this courageous European statesman. The original agreement with the Yugoslavs over asylum was disregarded on the streets of Budapest where Nagy was kidnapped and deported; now in the continuing political quarrel with Belgrade, Moscow has reinforced ideology with murder.

Throughout Hungary, Eastern Europe, and doubtless even within Russia itself he will be mourned. His murder, and that of Paul Maleter and his associates, will nowhere be forgotten. Imre Nagy had proved himself a brave and an honest man and a true patriot, qualities all too rare among leading communists. He will have his honourable place in the history of his country and of Europe. More than that, this crime seals his tragic place in the history of man's struggle for freedom and human rights.

This brutal action is a revival of the old theory—a futile and hopeless one, as the Russians must know from their own history—that the ideals of revolutionary freedom can be suppressed by the firing squad. We hope that the governments of the world, and their representatives in the United Nations will speak out the true feelings of civilized conscience. We hope that the intellectuals of the world, so concerned in these days with grave crisis of large proportions, will, in the face of the death of this man, join with us in our cry of shock and outrage.

Return To Stalinism

The Patna group of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom held a meeting on 20th June and passed the following resolution:

The Patna group expresses its horror at the execution of Imre Nagy, ex-Prime Minister of Hungary and his colleagues, who led their country in its fight for freedom from the imperialist stranglehold of Soviet Russia.

The cowardly manner in which he and his colleagues have been done to death demonstrates once again the depths of degradation to which Russian imperialism has descended. These murders have been committed obviously with a view to breaking the dauntless spirit and unflagging resistance of the brave people of the satellite countries.

At a time when the world needed an assurance of peace for the preservation of civilisation and perhaps of the human race itself, this act on the part of the imperialists of Russia has come to weary mankind as a severe blow and has very much weakened the cause of peace. It indeed heralds the return of Stalinism in the communist world and holds out a threat to the future of freedom and civilisation.

Homage To Hungarian Patriots

The following statement on the executions of Imre Nagy, Paul Maleter and other Hungarian patriots was issued by a number of prominent citizens of Bombay.

WE are deeply shocked at the news of the executions of former Premier Imre Nagy, former defence minister General Paul Maleter and two other leaders of the Hungarian Revolution. These executions have followed a secret trial, and that makes the consummation both tragic and terrible.

The executions are all the more reprehensible because it was through acts of treachery that the Russian Army got hold of these eminent patriots. General Paul Maleter was arrested at a conference to which he was invited by the Soviet commander under a solemn guaranty of safe return. Imre Nagy and others were arrested and kidnapped when they were under a guaranty of safe conduct given by the Kadar Government to the Government of Yugoslavia.

The executioners and their mentors are, as usual, denouncing their latest victims, Imre Nagy and his colleagues, as counter-revolutionaries and agents of foreign imperialism. People the world over, however, know that Imre Nagy and his colleagues were valiant fighters for the political independence and the social freedom of the Hungarian people and will cherish and honour them as such.

The executions prove that, though Stalin may have been denigrated and his crimes exposed, Stalinism in all its horror is being restored in the Soviet Union. This rude reminder we can ignore only at our peril.

We pay our homage to the memory of the martyred patriots. Executions and tortures have never stilled the urge for freedom, and the martyrdom of Imre Nagy and Paul Maleter will not go in vain. The people of Hungary will again be free.

Asoka Mehta M.P.

Nath Pai M.P.

M. R. Masani M.P.

N. G. Gore M.P.

A. R. Wadia M.P.

R. V. Murthy.

Amul Desai.

M. Harris.

P. K. Atre.

Peter Alvares.

Madhu Dandawate.

Maniber. Kara.

V. B. Karnik.

B. K. Desai.

Ram Joshi.

Bagaram Tulpule.

Sofia Natarajan.

D. P. Sethna.

Anant Kanekar.

M. B. Shah.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

For members of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom Rs. 2

Single Copy: 25 nP

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

Notes

Rift In Burma

THOUGH unfortunate, the rift in the AFPFL, Burma's ruling party, which resulted last month in one section of the party moving a vote of no confidence against the other in Parliament was in a way inevitable. The AFPFL is the coalition of political groups that won independence for Burma from British rule. The League was founded as a united front of all sections of the Burmese people to fight Japanese fascism. It was thus a national movement and not a political party. After the defeat of fascism, the League was able to maintain its tenuous unity first by its fight against the British and later by the revolt of the communists and the Karens and the Shans against the Government. Since 1948, the communists have been expelled from it for their anti-national policies, the extreme Socialists left it in 1950 and joined the Workers and Peasants Party and the Muslim Congress was asked to leave in 1956. Even so the AFPFL still remains a heterogeneous movement with groups like the Federation of Trade Unions, Burma Peasants Organisation and the Socialist Party holding to their own ideologies and programmes. This prevented it from transforming itself into a full-fledged political party. Last January U Nu created a sensation at the party Congress by refuting orthodox Marxism and pleading for a kind of democratic socialism with mixed economy as the League's ideology. In view of the sharp differences on this issue between U Nu's group and the Socialists, it was decided to dissolve the League in 1960, on the eve of the next general elections. But the present crisis simply accelerated the pace of the development with the result that the no-confidence motion moved by U Ba Swe, former Deputy Prime Minister and for a time the Prime Minister, against U Nu was defeated by 127 to 118 votes in the House of 250.

It is tempting to see in this rift an evolution of a sound democratic two-party system. But in a country like Burma with too many political parties and groups and the danger of anarchy and disruption still ever-present, this split is fraught with grave perils. In such a situation only the communists would be the major beneficiary. U Nu could secure in Parliament majority of 8 only with the support of Arakan M.Ps in return for four seats in the Cabinet and the support of 44-member National United Front, which is known for its pro-Communist leanings. Thus, in spite of U Nu's assurance that he would not tolerate the treasonable activities of the communists, it is obvious that they will be able to make the most of this opportunity to entrench themselves in the social and political field. Besides, in a country where the authority of the Government has continued to be defied by communist guerillas, the dependence of the Government for its survival on the communists would be

disastrous. The Burmese communists have already started their usual diabolical game of flandering the Socialists as "American agents" and praising U Nu as a great national leader—thus seeking to widen the rift and sow the seeds of implacable hostility between the two powerful groups. Thus the present crisis may be historically inevitable, nonetheless it is unfortunate in the present situation in Burma.

The "Only Road" For Yugoslavia

MARSHAL TITO must indeed be grateful his country did not have the blessing of being 'liberated' by the Red Army. This fortunate accident of history has smoked out some hard truths of our times.

As *Times of India* of 17th June editorialised: in 1955 when he went to woo Tito, Khrushchev "publicly beat his breast and said Yugoslavia had been expelled from the Cominform on the basis of documents forged by Beria and other contemptible agents of imperialism."

Now Mr. Khrushchev has bared his fangs. The honeymoon is over. There will be no more holidaying for Soviet leaders in Yugoslav resorts.

Marshal Tito cannot be accused of not trying hard enough to please the Soviet bosses. He swallowed without a whimper the abduction by Soviet troops of Imre Nagy who banked on the immunity of Yugoslav Embassy. He wooed the Chinese Reds too quite assiduously, but did not go far enough to become a satellite. He was even willing to endorse Janos Kadar and the present Hungarian regime. In his home grounds he had as good a record as Khrushchev in dealing with "revisionists" like Djilas and Dedijer. Yet with all that, he tried to place himself on par with Khrushchev and that could never be forgiven.

Mr. Khrushchev said that Stalin threatened Tito. "If I shake my little finger, there will be no Tito." Khrushchev sneered that Stalin shook his whole body and nothing happened to Tito. Now Khrushchev contorts himself with rage and nothing happens to Tito!

To "uncommitted" and "non-aligned" leaders like Nehru and Nasser, the present Yugoslav-Soviet relations ought to be of great interest.

According to *Hindustan Times* of 11th June, Nasser is reported to have reacted strongly to Soviet withdrawal of economic aid to Yugoslavia. The passports administration in Cairo has been instructed not to allow Egyptian nationals, except Government officials on official missions, to visit Iron Curtain countries. He has also banned travel to Sweden where the Communist-inspired peace convention is to be held shortly.

At his recent press conference, Mr. Nehru was quite clear where he stood in the present tussle between Tito and Khrushchev: "Who am I to pass judgement on a conflict between two countries?" Nehru is reported to have said, "It is obvious that so far as the ideological conflict is concerned, I am not a pundit of that subject. It would not be right for me to criticise either." Mr. Nehru declined to comment on the suspension of credits to Yugoslavia by the Soviet Union, but went on to say: "We in India are grateful to

countries which give us aid. But suppose they do not give aid, we have no business to go about shouting and blaming them. It will be silly and highly improper and undignified for us to blame somebody because he has not helped us..."

This was the strange way Mr. Nehru "declined" to comment on stoppage of the Soviet aid to Yugoslavia. Mr. Nehru has given the unmistakable impression by his subsequent comments that he is more angry with Tito than Khrushchev in the present Yugoslav-USSR rift.

According to Khrushchev, there can only be one road to socialism and be it Tito, Nasser or Mr. Nehru, that road must lead to Khrushchev! If Tito dares to deviate, aid will be stopped. If Mr. Nehru deviates, beware of India's great problems, particularly Kashmir and Kerala!

Another Communist Front

ANOTHER world conference is being planned by the communists obviously with the intention of netting in a few more writers, scientists and others to act as the dupes of the communist organisation. It is necessary for the communists to organise such conferences under one name or the other from time to time. For the persons netted do not stay too long in the net and new recruits must be secured to take the place of those who left.

The conference that is being organised now will take place in Stockholm in the month of July. It will be called Congress for Disarmament and International Co-operation. It will take the place of the Peace Congress which appears to have outlived its utility and is therefore being liquidated. The object will remain the same, but the instrument will be given a different name.

As usual, preparatory conferences are being held in some places in India to pick up the delegates to be sent to Stockholm. The usual crowd of fellow-travellers and other gullible persons are found on the platforms and amongst the speakers.

The conference in Madras was addressed amongst others by Mr. Rajagopalachari. Sharing the platform with him were communist stalwarts like Mr. E. M. S. Namboodiripad, the Chief Minister of Kerala, Mr. P. Ramamurthy and others. It was a sight seeing Mr. Rajagopalachari lionising his erstwhile enemies. Not many years ago Mr. Rajagopalachari had, as Chief Minister of Madras, declared in the State Assembly: "I am your enemy Number One. May I say you are my enemy Number One? That is my policy from A to Z." It is a long distance that Mr. Rajagopalachari has travelled since then. Given his intelligence and his subtlety no one can be sure how long and how far he will travel in the direction. In the meanwhile, however, the communists are utilising him as a convenient tool for their publicity and propaganda.

Rule Of Party Caucus

BOMBAY municipal workers' strike is now happily settled and one need not at this stage discuss the

advisability or otherwise of the strike and the methods that were adopted for conducting it. One feature of the negotiations that were carried on for settling it deserves, however, the close attention of all those interested in developing healthy democratic traditions. The negotiations were throughout carried on between the union on the one hand and the Policy Committee of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti on the other. The party directly concerned with the strike, namely, the Corporation administration and the Mayor and the leader of the ruling group in the Corporation were severely left alone. A party caucus entered on the scene as soon as the crisis developed and dictated terms to the local authority and elected representatives of the people who constituted it. Corporators elected on the ticket of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti might have meekly submitted to this dictation of the party caucus, but it is an affront to the Corporation and raises the larger issue of the autonomy of local authorities and the rights and responsibilities of elected representatives. One is entitled to ask why the members of the Corporation abdicated their functions and left the fate of the city in the hands of a political caucus. The result of the intervention on this occasion may have been the happy end of a strike, but the practice is objectionable and will, if allowed to grow, result in the rule of a party caucus instead of the rule of the elected representatives of the people. Communist leaders of the Samiti may not find anything objectionable in the rule of a party caucus, but others should be wise enough to realise that the course that was adopted will defeat the ends of democracy.

Attacks On Journalists

ATTACKS on Editors and other journalists for opinions expressed by them in their journals are a mean and cowardly way of dealing with political opponents. Sometime back it was Mr. Natarajan, the Editor of *Tribune* of Ambala who was attacked in this fashion. The latest victim is Mr. M. S. M. Sharma, the Editor of *Searchlight* of Patna. The attack on Mr. Sharma was so severe that it might have cost him his life.

There is no doubt that the attack on Mr. Sharma was actuated by political motives. The actual perpetrators of the crime may have been goondas. But goondas are not known to be readers of political journals and to take strong exception to the expression of views on political matters. An adjournment motion was moved in the Bihar legislature to discuss the incident and to protest against the Government's failure to maintain law and order. The motion was talked out, but it was an indication of the public concern over the dastardly attack.

Freedom of press and of expression will be reduced to a nullity if those who dare to give expression to their opinions will have to face the danger of physical assaults. It is the duty of the Government to exercise strict vigilance in this matter and to put down with a strong hand this type of interference with the freedom of press.

An Alternative To The Congress

by V. B. Karnik

THE sixtyfour dollar question which engaged the attention of the national conference of the Praja Socialist Party held in Poona in the last week of May was how to fill the vacuum that is developing in the country as a result of the growing disintegration of the Congress. All were agreed at the conference that the Congress was disintegrating and that, if democracy and freedom were to survive and advance, the P.S.P. must gear itself to the task of providing an alternative to the Congress. The consciousness of this high role that they have to play and the urgency of equipping themselves to play it creditably gave a new awareness of their mission to the delegates and visitors who attended the conference, and the party experienced a feeling of solidarity which was woefully absent during the last few years. This is a commendable development which will be heartily welcomed by all those who desire the growth of democratic forces.

It will be generally agreed that amongst the various oppositional forces the P.S.P. is the most competent to fill the political vacuum and to grow as an alternative to the Congress. It is a party with deep roots in the country. It has grown with the growth of the political and social consciousness of the people. It has in its ranks, as stated by the Chairman, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha, "some of the finest young men and women." It is equally true that "a large number of thinking people in the country look to us (the P.S.P.) for providing an alternative to Congress rule." Moreover, it has no monopolistic ambitions. It has no desire to grow and exist as the only party in the country. Mr. Asoka Mehta sounded the correct note when he stated that "as a democrat he wanted the Congress to survive," as in a parliamentary democracy there should be at least two democratic parties. No democrat can view with favour the claim of any political party to be the sole custodian of the political interests of the people. One is happy to note that the P.S.P. advances no such claim.

Apart from the P.S.P., the only other party which can challenge the Congress and develop as the alternative is the Communist Party. The Communist Party has already convinced itself that it is the only alternative and is busy seeking the polarisation of the people in two groups, the Congress and the Communist Party. Such a polarisation, if it comes about, will be disastrous to democracy. There can be no two opinions, even after the decisions taken and professions made at Amritsar, that the Communist Party is a totalitarian organisation pledged to the establishment of a dictatorship. If all oppositional elements are to get polarised into such an anti-democratic party, the Congress would find itself compelled to resort to dictatorial methods to fight back the challenge of the totalitarian party. In the interest of democracy it is essential to avoid that eventuality. More-

over, the Communist Party is hardly an indigenous organisation. It draws its inspiration and guidance from an external agency and is tied to the apron strings of the international communist organisation. The rise of such a party as an alternative to the Congress will be fraught with the gravest danger to Indian democracy.

There can be no doubt that the people need and are looking for an alternative to the Congress. Many of them are dissatisfied and disgusted with it and yet they have to support and vote for it because there is no other alternative organisation to which they can turn. They would be glad to transfer their support to another party provided they can find one which places before them a different programme and shows them a different and better way to administer the affairs of the country. The alternative must not only be a distinct organisation but also have a distinct programme and policy on the basis of which it can appeal to the people.

There was a time when the acceptance of a socialist programme was the distinguishing feature. During the period of the national struggle, the Congress was not prepared to adopt a socialist programme as that might have affected its national character and alienated certain sections. However, even in those days the word socialism had become such debased coin that there were many who professed socialism without having the ghost of an idea of what it meant. After the attainment of national independence, the old inhibiting factors disappeared and, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, the Congress began moving more and more in the direction of socialism. At Awadi, a socialist pattern became the declared goal of the Congress. The pattern soon gave place to structure and now, so far as declarations are concerned, the Congress is a full-fledged socialist party. The socialism that the Congress professes may be of a different variety, its implementation of the socialist programme may be half-hearted and defective, but it will be difficult to deny that it has accepted the goal of socialism.

In view of this fact, it should be clear that socialism can no longer be regarded as the distinguishing feature. Now a days, all parties profess socialism. The traditional socialist programme of nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange has now become a part of the creed of every party. If that is the only thing that the P.S.P. has to offer, why should the people choose it in preference to the Congress and the Communists when both are equally committed to the same? If the rate at which nationalisation is effected is in issue, will not the people rather turn towards the Communist Party which is known to have brought it about in other countries by a stroke of pen immediately on the capture of power? If socialism were the issue, the P.S.P. would obviously

have very little to recommend itself as against the Congress on the one hand and the Communist Party on the other. Entrenched in power as it is, the Congress is in a better position to give effect to the socialist programme. The Communist Party, having no democratic scruples to bother about, can claim to impose it upon the people more speedily. The P.S.P. can in that respect prove no match for either. The claim that members of the P.S.P. are better socialists, more earnest and more devoted, will not carry any weight, as that is a claim which is advanced by all parties and there is no reliable instrument to test the sincerity and earnestness of any person. A claim of this character only leads to mutual recrimination and does not help the people to make a choice.

The real problem is, however, far more fundamental. Is socialism the issue of the hour? A socialist programme of nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange may be implemented in full; but does it ensure to the worker in the field or the factory a higher standard of life, greater individual liberty or more effective social equality? A socialist state may be established; but does it give the citizen more freedom, better rights and greater opportunity for self-development? A socialist party may capture or acquire power; but does it entrust more power into the hands of the people or give them a larger voice in administering the affairs of the state? Experience all over the world has been that a socialist state, with the concentration of political and economic power in its hands, becomes a Leviathan which by its sheer weight destroys all the rights and liberties of the people. It also becomes a totalitarian police state, as without assuming that character, it cannot control the manifold social, economic and political activities of society. The police states established in Russia and other communist countries provide an object lesson of the process. It is not the aberrations or the malignant designs of tyrants like Stalin which created those states. They are the inevitable consequence of the ruthless implementation of a "socialist" programme.

This experience of the contemporary world persuaded many eminent thinkers to re-examine the basic concepts of socialism and to question if socialism was the issue of the moment in the second half of the twentieth century. Thinking on those lines, the late Mr. M. N. Roy came to the conclusion: "The conflict of our age is between totalitarianism and democracy, between the all-devouring collective ego-nation or class and the individual struggling for freedom." Starting from a slightly different point of departure but basing himself essentially on the same experience, one of the founders and for a long time the General Secretary of the P.S.P., Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has also arrived at the same conclusion. In the letter that he wrote to the party explaining the reasons why he could not continue as a member and describing his journey from socialism to Sarvodaya, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan states: "It became clear to me that socialism as we understand it today cannot take mankind to the sublime goals of freedom, equality, brotherhood and peace." Pointing his finger unerringly on the main evil of the day, the trend toward statism,

he writes: "Democratic socialists, communists, as well as welfarists, (not to speak of the fascists) are all statist. They all hope to bring about their own variety of the millenium by first mastering and then adding to the powers and functions of the state. The bourgeois state had monopoly of political power. The socialist state threatens to add to that the monopoly of economic power. The democratic socialist state remains a Leviathan that will sit heavily on the freedoms of the people."

It will be too much to expect the P.S.P. to accept in its entirety the line of thinking or course of action suggested by the late Mr. M. N. Roy, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and several others. It will be enough if it will accept the core of their thought, namely, that the issue of the moment is not socialism but democracy and individual freedom. That issue affects very vitally not merely the industrial workers, the peasants in the fields or the exploited masses, but society as a whole. Democracy and individual freedom are not merely a sectarian or a class demand, it is the demand of the whole of society. They are today in peril at the hands of those who desire to concentrate more and more power into the hands of a centralised state in the name of rapid industrialisation or planned utilisation of all resources or greater welfare of the people.

The Congress is committed to that programme and in its name Congress Governments at the Centre and in the States are concentrating more and more power into their hands. There is no dispute now about social justice. But one need not be a statist in order to fight for social justice. It is this drive towards statism which has to be checked and resisted. Popular welfare and social justice are no longer in issue. The issue is between centralisation and decentralisation, between a powerful centralised state and direct government by the people, between a collectivist and cooperative way of living, between the authority of the state and the rights of citizens, between total power and the freedom and the dignity of the individual. In spite of its Gandhian tradition, the Congress has in each case chosen the former as against the latter. A party which proposes to develop itself as an alternative to the Congress must champion the latter and bring under its banner all those who accept those values and desire them to be the basis of the new Indian society.

If the programme of the P.S.P. is critically examined, it will be found that there is in it very little of traditional socialism. The resolution on "Task Before Us" adopted at the Poona conference enumerates *inter alia* the following tasks to be performed by the party: land reform, resuscitation of community solidarity in villages, provision of rural credit and other facilities to villagers, improving the production of artisans through cooperatives and other agencies, activity in trade unions, work amongst women, and work for intellectual and cultural renaissance. These tasks are not limited to socialists. All democratic elements can work together for performing these tasks.

It appears that there is some realisation in the P.S.P. itself of the big task that it has to perform. In the resolution on the "National Situation," it talks

(Continued on page 8)

Communists On War-path

by S. Sharangpani

THE Indian people have been warned once again by communist leaders about their true intentions. If the communists fail in their attempts at capturing power by the parliamentary road, there shall be a civil war. If non-communist parties, instead of co-operating or aligning themselves with the communists, forge a united democratic front against them, India will have no other alternative but to repeat the history of China; there will be a fratricidal civil war of mutual annihilation. In short, if Indian democracy is not prepared to let itself be liberated peacefully by Moscow's shock brigade, the Reds will be constrained to go back to their usual violent and insurrectionary methods and enact another Telangana. By opposing communism democratic elements would simply invite disaster. Let there be no mistake about it. Let no one complain afterwards that he or she had not been sufficiently forewarned.

This is a grim warning and not just the bravado of a scaremonger. It has been uttered in dead earnest by no less a person than E. M. S. Namboodiripad, the Kerala Chief Minister, and the choice of the Indian communists for Nehru's successor. ("After Nehru, Namboodiripad", was the communist slogan at Amritsar.) This threat has always been implicit in the communist theory and practice. It had been even uttered by prominent communist leaders like Sunderayya last year at the time of their assuming power in Kerala. But what is important these ominous words were uttered by Namboodiripad, and repeated immediately thereafter by M. N. Govindan Nair, General Secretary of the Kerala Communist Party, within two months of adopting the Amritsar thesis and in the wake of the much-boasted Devicolum victory of the communists.

The logic and reasoning behind this threat is as simple and brutally obvious as that of Khrushchev in executing Imre Nagy and his associates in Hungary. The Communist Party alone is the guardian of national unity. It alone truly represents the aspirations and urges of the Indian people for progress and well-being. To oppose communism is, therefore, anti-national and counter-revolutionary. It is against "the declared objective of the nation, namely socialism," as Namboodiripad put it. Thus the concept of socialism has been monopolised and the party has been equated with the nation. The rest follows automatically from these premises. But there is a snag. There are other political parties which are opposing the monopolist party in power. Those parties are contending for power and hence posing a threat to the Kerala Communist Ministry. Here lies the rub.

Evidently, the communist leaders dislike the efforts of other parties to come together in a united front against them. The continuance of their alliance, the communists fear, might spoil their chances of victory in the next election. They are, therefore, out to break this alliance in good time. Besides, the communists

have come to power with a minority vote. The percentage of votes polled by the Congress party alone in the last elections was greater than their own. This makes the alliance more dangerous. They are now, therefore, using specious arguments and dreadful threats. "The so-called unity of democratic forces against the Communist Party," warned the Kerala Chief Minister addressing a meeting at Coimbatore on June 1, "would divide the people into two camps and create disruption and disunity in the country." A few days later he elaborated this point and distorted the issues still further. The attitude inherent in the policy of the opposition in Kerala, he said, was one of "destroying" communism instead of an attitude of mutual criticism with a view to mutual correction in the interest of the nation as a whole. It was this, he added, which led to civil war in China.

It is clear that Namboodiripad wants to counter the opposition move to form a united democratic front with the threat of civil war. Besides intolerance, it betrays a lack of understanding and appreciation of the ordinary working of democratic institutions which provide for a peaceful and orderly change of government. It is precisely in this that the communists see a threat to the realisation of their aims. Hence this dreadful language of civil war to bully the opposition into submission to the Communist Party.

Namboodiripad also tried to draw a distinction between the united front which the Communist Party sought to build and the front now proposed to be forged by the opposition in Kerala. The united front visualised by the communists, according to him, was based on a common programme. There is no such jointly accepted programme for this united democratic front, he charged, except their common hatred for communism. To be sure, there has been always a basic difference between the united front communists seek to build and united fronts of other democratic parties. But the difference is far more fundamental than Namboodiripad sought to make out. It is of intentions and bonafides of the parties concerned. The communist technique of united front is old and somewhat hackneyed and those who cared to study it know well its sinister purpose and its no less sinister ways. The essence of the communist united front is "to divide our enemies and neutralise them, if possible," as stated by Matyas Rakosi, the Hungarian communist leader. By cutting out in slices democratic elements in other parties in the united front, the communists seek to infiltrate and destroy those parties. Besides, as Pattom Thanu Pillai, the Kerala PSP leader, rightly pointed out, resistance to communism is a clear and specific programme for democratic unity. This is the most important and urgent issue for Kerala, as on the success of it depends the survival of democracy in Kerala and perhaps in India.

No one would have taken exception to Namboodiripad's outpourings against the democratic unity be-

cause that was to be expected. But he went further and, like Satan quoting scriptures, expatiated on the virtues of national unity and democratic tradition. This policy of anti-communism, he asserted, stood in sharp contrast to the policy of national unity, "which we have inherited as a tradition over decades of national democratic movement." It was such a policy of national unity, he further said, that enabled our country to carry out its struggle successfully against imperialism and finally force the British to quit India in 1947. It is amusing to see Namboodiripad invoking the spirit of national unity and the tradition of national democratic movement which culminated in India becoming independent in 1947. Public memory may be proverbially short, but not so short as Namboodiripad imagines it to be, so as to forget the anti-national past and present record of the communists. They are perhaps the only party in India which has no right to speak of the tradition of the national democratic movement and unity. When the Indian people were fighting for freedom, the communists were busy denouncing nationalist leaders like Gandhiji and Nehru as "saboteurs of independence and agents of imperialism." They even carried their extra-territorial loyalty to Moscow to the extreme of siding with the British regime, during Quit India movement in suppressing the national struggle for freedom. They condemned the underground resistance leaders as fifth columnists and even served as informers of the British Government against the nationalist leaders. It

ALTERNATIVE TO CONGRESS — (Cont'd from p. 6) of "national efforts" to meet and overcome the crisis, it calls its members "crusaders for democracy" and welcomes "the closest cooperation and unity with like-minded forces that are scattered in various groups and parties." The resolution further states: "Only a resurgence of national spirit and endeavour, rooted in a revival of moral and spiritual values in our national life, can beat back the centrifugal forces and the feelings of apathy and frustration." "All those who share this vision" are in the end invited to cooperate with the P.S.P.

This immediate programme and plan of action will appeal to all democratic forces. The task of the moment should be to bring them all together in one common organisation. The irrelevant talk about socialism and the insistence on a misleading label are coming in the way of this unity of democratic forces. The P.S.P. should seriously ponder over this grave impediment in the way of democratic unity. It is regrettable that no thought was given to this aspect of the situation at the Poona conference. Everybody is agreed about the necessity of an alternative to the Congress, but it must be realised that that alternative will not be a socialist party but a broad-based movement of the people pledged to democracy and individual freedom and determined to fight for the progress and welfare of the people. The P.S.P. is in a position to develop such a movement provided it will do some serious thinking and not allow itself to be overawed by the dogmas of a bygone age and separated from its natural allies by the socialist label.

took them five years after 1947 to recognise the fact that India was after all fully independent and that too not before the Soviet Union could see light and instruct them to switch over to the current soft line. A party with such a sordid record of betrayal and treachery can ill afford to speak of national unity or democratic tradition. As for the "supreme need of so developing our economic, social and political life as to go forward rapidly towards the cherished goal of socialism through peaceful and democratic life," the Communist Party is the main obstacle in the path to this cherished goal. A party with a record of Telangana and Jamshedpur and its leaders uttering threats of civil war every now and then is least suited to take the country towards the goal.

Namboodiripad's utterances clearly show that the communists have not changed their spots and that the Amritsar thesis was just an eyewash to lull other parties into a false belief that the Reds have taken to the democratic and peaceful road. But this episode is not without its moral. Once the Communist Party is installed in power, even if by democratic means, democratic forces can oust it only at the risk of facing a civil war. This has now been publicly announced by the Kerala Chief Minister. Those parties that are helping the communists by naively aligning with them can ignore this warning only at their own peril.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

Glowing tributes were paid to the memory of late Dr. Jadunath Sarkar, the eminent scholar and historian at a public meeting held in Bombay on Monday June 9th. The meeting was organised by the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom in co-operation with the P.E.N., All India Centre, and the Asiatic Society of Bombay. Prof. D. V. Potdar presided and Prof. G. M. Moraes and Y. G. Naik addressed the meeting. Mr. V. B. Karnik introduced the president and the speakers and Prof. R. G. Sardesai proposed the vote of thanks.

On the occasion of the meeting a folder was published giving the names of Dr. Jadunath Sarkar's books and chronology of important events of his life. An exhibition of his books was also held at the place of the meeting.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

OUR BOMB AND THEIRS

by R. H. S. Crossman and Peregrine Worsthorne

THE THEATRE ON TRIAL

by Richard Roud

IMPASSE IN THE HOLY LAND

by Erskine B. Childers

JULY 1958

58

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

General de Gaulle, France And Algeria

by Adam Adil

GENERAL de Gaulle's rise to power and his plan for integration of Algeria with France have been received with mixed feelings in North Africa. The Arabs—Tunisians, Moroccans and even Algerians including the rebellious nationalists—are hopeful of peace and settlement in North Africa. If recent reports are to be believed, independent Tunisia and Morocco feel that a new era of good-will with France has begun with the advent of General de Gaulle. Even the Algerian nationalists, it is said, who have been fighting the French imperialists for four years and now holding off a force of 500,000 French troops, have softened their tough line and postponed the formation of an Algerian government in exile, which could create considerable problems for France and the West. Again, Mr. Ferhat Abbas, who holds a commanding position in the Nationalist High Command, said, in an interview to a Tunis newspaper, *L'Action*, that General de Gaulle "is well placed to settle the Algerian problem."

But the extremist French settlers in Algeria, on the other hand, seem disappointed. This feeling of disappointment is shared by French military leaders in Algeria. It is reported that at a public meeting held in Algeria, the settlers raised more cheers for M. Soustelle than for General de Gaulle. By the time the General ended his visit the rebel army leaders were in serious doubt whether they had not placed a wrong man into power. These rebel army leaders and the extremist French settlers in Algeria do not desire any association with that North African country other than that of complete imperialist domination.

General de Gaulle's plan for Algeria is not an adequate solution for that strife-torn country, but it may prove a step in the right direction. It does not envisage independence for Algeria, but it does propose to put the North African country on par with the metropolitan France, with all the Algerians, settlers as well as the Arabs, enjoying equal benefits and political rights with the Frenchmen in France. The Algerians will be also elected to the French Parliament.

If General de Gaulle's plan can ultimately lead to a grant of autonomy to Algeria within the French Union—two countries constituting equal partners in a Federation—it merits serious and sympathetic consideration.

By a century of association, the Frenchmen and the Algerians have become completely dependent on each other. There are, at present, 4,000,000 Algerian workers in France, who directly or indirectly, support one-third of the Arab population in the country districts of Algeria. In Algeria itself, French investments provide livelihood for more than 1,00,000 Arab workers. Further, there are thousands of French technicians and engineers who man various developmental projects in Algeria. If the Arab workers employed in various French enterprises, both in France and

Algeria, were to lose their jobs, the economic position of the Algerians will be greatly jeopardised. It is estimated that 1,500,000 million francs would be required if Algeria is to be further developed so as to provide employment and livelihood to the majority of the Arabs. This enormous amount could be obtained only if France remains friendly.

Likewise, the dependence of France on Algeria results from the fact that political and economic stability of France is closely bound up with the possibilities of developments in Sahara; and an unfriendly Algeria can any day smash the French hopes with regard to that vast land mass of the African desert. Further, France has to protect over a million French settlers in Algeria, whose lives are always in danger if that country is hostile.

It is thus obvious that the interest of both the countries—France and Algeria—lies in remaining together. If the plan for integration ultimately results into some sort of federation with France and Algeria as free and equal partners it will be an inducement also to Tunisia and Morocco to join. The final picture will be something like a French Commonwealth of Nations. It will be imaginative and ingenious combination of nations for sharing the hitherto unsuspected resources of the Sahara, whose vastness is just now beginning to be explored.

The federation of the North African countries with France will constitute a foundation for a permanent peace in that part of the world. The population of Algeria is far more numerous than Tunisia and Morocco joined together. The Algerian Nationalist Army is today about 40,000 while the Tunisian army numbers only 3,000. Again about 7,000 men of the Algerian Nationalist Army are on the Tunisian soil. It is possible that this glaring difference in the comparative military strength of Nationalist Algeria and Tunisia may induce former to resort to military and political pressures against the latter. Similar situation may develop in relations between Algeria and Morocco. To-day, President Bourguiba of Tunisia and King Mohammed V of Morocco are the greatest champions of Algerian freedom. The Nationalist Algerians are prepared to accept the good offices of the Tunisian President and Moroccan King in the settlement of their dispute with France. It is imperative that the present friendly relations between Nationalist Algeria and its North African neighbours should be maintained if economic stability of the entire area is to be achieved by the exploitation of the resources of Sahara with the French know-how and technical experience. The discovery that the Sahara contains important mineral and oil deposits which today's techniques are capable of removing from its inhospitable soil has brought forth many claimants to that desert land, which so far no body wanted. The French now claim that Sahara is theirs, while the Algerian

(Continued on page 12)

Review

The Naked God

by Howard Fast (Fredrick A. Prager, New York, Price not mentioned)

It has always remained incomprehensible why many conscientious and well-meaning communists could not lead themselves to believe the weighty evidence regarding the barbaric character of Stalinist regime in Soviet Russia till they found themselves all of a sudden confronted with Khrushchev's secret report to the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party indicting Stalin for his monstrous misdeeds. What Khrushchev revealed has been a matter of common knowledge for well over twenty years. Yet, these well-meaning communists denouncing this evidence as vile anti-communist propaganda regarded Stalin's those very atrocities as great steps towards man's happiness and peace, towards socialism and human brotherhood! Relevant, therefore, is the question of an old man in this book whose young communist son sacrificed his life in Spain, fighting for Spanish Republic twenty years ago, to the author "why did my son die? That I, a plain man did not comprehend this is no wonder; but you, Howard Fast, spoke and wrote and pleaded this cause—and why? Can you tell me why?" For twenty years the old man had the satisfaction that his son had died for a great cause—the cause of human brotherhood and freedom, till "a man called Khrushchev" deprived him of that satisfaction and made his life miserable at the thought that what his son died for was nothing but a worthless mirage! Apology by these conscientious and well-meaning, but now disillusioned, communists for deceiving themselves and the world around them is not enough. In view of the fact, that millions have paid dearly at the altar of communism, the 'final' understanding of men of Mr. Fast's calibre is too late in the day. Their apology may be sincere in its content but it does not exonerate them from the charge of wilful deception of themselves and of many other innocents around them.

Mr. Fast's book, however, is welcome because it is an honest confession of a disillusioned communist. It is likely to carry conviction with the communists—at least with some of them—who have not yet seen the light. The book has other merits. It gives a clear picture of the operation of the communist apparatus the world over, it also gives an idea how active is the Communist Party in a country like the United States of America, and how deep the communists there have succeeded in infiltrating the administration and trade unions and the ranks of intellectuals, students and various types of professionals. Mr. Fast makes it obvious that although in the United States the Communist Party is numerically insignificant, it constitutes a potential danger to the safety and security of the country and that the communist leadership there is as fanatical, bureaucratic, ruthless, cold and calculating as anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Fast points out that in June 1956, four months after Khrushchev delivered his secret speech to the

Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a situation had developed wherein the proposal for self-liquidation of the Communist Party of the United States was most practical. "Hundreds of influential American communists came to this conclusion, with plain heartbreak and great sincerity. Many of them gave public voice to this desire. Others raised and discussed the proposition only in inner circles." Mr. Fast believes that only by honestly stating the situation to the American people and to the world could the Communist Party of the United States have retained its honour. He is sure that had the Party convention been held in June 1956, the Party would have been dissolved. But, "by every stratagem and trick at their disposal, the leadership postponed the convention until the inevitable resignations of people of conscience assured them of victory." In Mr. Fast's opinion, the Communist Party of the United States has, thus, lost whatever claim it had to honour and integrity, it has "lost step with history." The same can be said of the Communist Party in every other country of the world.

Mr. Fast had been honoured by the Soviet Union with a Stalin Prize. Millions of copies of his books had been printed and sold in Russia. One book alone, *The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti*, had an initial printing of half a million copies. Two of his plays had been produced there, two other plays had been dramatised from his books and another book of his had become the basis for a Soviet opera. Dozens of critical articles had been written about his work as well as two book-length critical studies. As a result of this, Mr. Fast had developed a copious correspondence with the Soviet people. "...never a week went by when I did not receive three, five or a dozen letters from Soviet students, children, teachers, workers, critics, engineers, scientists and so forth; telling me what they had liked or not liked in my writing."

But all this stopped as soon as Mr. Fast announced his break with the Communist Party, which was published on the morning of February 1, 1957. On February 4, he received his last mail from the Soviet Union. "In other words", says Mr. Fast, "a gate had closed; a curtain the very existence of which I had so hotly denied in the past had been drawn. . . . On February 1, I simply ceased to exist on one-sixth of the earth's surface. All reference in retrospect also ceased, so I not only was not but never had been. . . . within Russia, no anger, no attack, no argumentation, no refutation, no criticism,—but simply a negation. I was not." To be sure, this has been the experience of many other writers who were, at first, admirers of the Soviet Union, but later became its critics. It is only in the Soviet world that it is possible for a very much living person not only to cease to exist but to never have been. Only Mr. Fast realised it very late.

However, Mr. Fast's book is stimulating not because it is a confession of one more votary of the God that failed, but because it gives an idea what an ordeal it is for one to be an ex-communist, to break away from one's dreams, hopes and aspirations and to face the disintegration of one's inner world and personality based on those dreams, hopes and aspirations. —SADI

P. S. P. Convention — A Report

By "Atreya"

THE Praja-Socialist Party continues to represent the only alternative democratic national party to the ruling Congress Party.

The recent Fourth Annual Convention of the Praja-Socialist Party held in the last week of May obtains a special significance in view of the following political developments in India.

The ruling Congress Party has had serious reverses both politically and organisationally. There has been a greater and greater polarisation of political forces between a declining democratic party on the one hand and a growing monolithic Communist Party on the other. Success of the Communist Party in taking over power in Kerala and the growing points of agreement between the ruling party and the Communist Party on such issues as foreign policy, the Five-Year Plan and highly centralised party organisation, bring about challenges to democrats of both an ideological and organisational nature.

In this atmosphere the Praja Socialist Party has been beset with difficulties. It suffered a major blow by the defection of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and his followers to form a rival Socialist Party. The retirement of its eminent leader Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan from party politics to join the Bhoodan and Sarvodaya movements was another blow.

It was in such a situation that the Convention met. And it is in this context that the Praja-Socialist Party has still to be reckoned with as a continuing democratic force in Indian politics. If one were to compare the panic that was let loose in an apparently powerful ruling party, the Indian National Congress, at the very mention of Nehru's temporary retirement, the Praja Socialist Party shines as a citadel of democratic force in that, inspite of heavy loss in the leadership and splits, the Praja-Socialist Party does not face a leadership crisis as that threatens the Congress Party.

In its deliberations the rank and file in the Praja-Socialist Party showed themselves as a virile and lively force that has kept the party going inspite of serious set-backs. There is a growing awareness in the party that the present crisis in the ruling party is not merely a crisis of organisation but a crisis for the future of democracy itself. There is anxious awareness amongst the rank and file delegates of the party that the result of the crisis in the Congress Party would be the irresistible march of the Communist Party. This realisation was probably the reason why considerable anxiety was displayed about the growing communist threat.

Hitherto the strength of the ruling Congress Party has been the momentum it derived from nationalism and the democratic content in the Congress party has only been of a secondary influence as an organisational impetus. To that extent, instead of seeking democratic remedies for its organisational set-backs as a result of the dilution of nationalistic incentives, the Con-

gress Party finds itself in a panic to preserve its organisational machine intact somehow and, in this process, finds more and more meeting points with the Communists in its futile efforts to steal the Communist thunder by emulation.

The Praja Socialist Party, though aware of this process, has shown considerable weakness and vacillation in resolving it. Like the Congress Party, it too has an organisational weakness and its leaders get into frenzy about maintaining the organisational structure somehow. Thus the party also has been in a crisis on account of the failure of the leadership to understand this question with a clarity of mind.

The rank and file of the party however were more conscious of this crisis. Almost all the delegates who spoke brought out the inconsistencies in the party's association with the Communist Party in united fronts in the States of Bombay, West Bengal and Assam on the one hand, and on the other, association with the Congress in the communist-run state of Kerala, and association with Ganatantra Parishad in Orissa.

The attempts of the party leaders to explain these alliances by the simple formula that "the Praja Socialist Party combines with any opposition whenever and wherever the ruling party becomes undemocratic," did not have the distinction befitting a genuine democratic profession of asserting that "we combine with any *democratic* opposition party, to fight anti-democratic trends."

To this extent the party too faces similar ideological and organisational crisis as the Congress Party though it is more competent to resolve this because of the more lively, more sophisticated and certainly more democratic and individualistic rank and file than the Congress.

The following represents the general state-wide trends in the party:

Kerala: Uncompromisingly anti-communist; willing to enter into alliance with any democratic political group in Kerala that is opposed to the Communist Government and Party. Strongly supports close collaboration with the Congress Party in the interests of primarily preserving the democratic framework of the country in which alone they feel a democratic socialist party and Government could be possible. To this extent, it is willing to concede that the Congress Party is democratic, had made it possible for the Praja-Socialist Party not only to exist, but to thrive and build itself.

Tamil Nad: Uncompromisingly anti-congress. Lukewarm in attitude towards communists. Party unit is very weak. National Executive members from Tamil Nad readily cooperate with communists in local united fronts and trade unions and are losing their trade union membership to communists.

Andhra: To a man the Andhra delegation attacked the party policy in strong terms for its alliances with the communists in some States. The Andhra Party completely and enthusiastically supported the ideological line of the Kerala party comrades. They attacked the Maharashtra party unit for its united front with the communists in the linguistic movement and for cooperation with the communists in electing a communist Mayor for the Bombay city, which would not have been possible without the support of the Praja Socialist Party.

Maharashtra: For the first time, the party units like the Maharashtra having united fronts with the communists found themselves on the defensive before the delegates of the Convention.

Gujarat: Generally reflected the attitude of Kerala and Andhra units.

Orissa: The Orissa unit seems to have two groups both of which have a strong antagonism towards the Congress Party on account of the political situation in the State.

West Bengal: The leadership is strongly anti-Congress and psychologically like the Maharashtra unit with regard to alliance with communists, favoured having such an alliance. Most of the rank and file members however criticised the State party leaders for their united front. There was an incident at the time of the Hungarian Revolution when the West Bengal Praja Socialist Party rank and file took out a big procession to the Soviet Consulate to protest and demonstrate against the Russian suppression, but party leader Dr. P. C. Ghose frantically rush-

ed over and insisted on his party workers dispersing and not creating any trouble lest their demonstration should offend the communists in their united front.

Uttar Pradesh: The Uttar Pradesh unit is the strongest party unit and would have been even stronger had it not been for the split created by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. The party has great hopes for its expansion in Uttar Pradesh.

This is generally the outlook of the various units of the Party. In view of Kerala and powerful growth of the Communist Party and its cocksureness of success, the dominating sentiment during the present party Convention was one of strong anti-communism and less of anti-Congress sentiment. To that extent in the National Executive the position of leaders like Asoka Mehta, Ganga Saran Sinha, Prem Bhasin, Dr. K. B. Menon have been vindicated. The brilliant speech made by Asoka Mehta had a powerful impact. Asoka Mehta who had always been dubbed as pro-Congress and hysterically anti-communist within the party was ideologically no longer on the defensive and strongly committed himself to a position that the party was reaching a stage when it has to reckon with certain basic challenges where socialism might only have a secondary priority.

He clearly outlined the need for priorities in orientation and stressed that the party can no longer afford to ignore the need for formulating priorities in the present condition in India. Chastising those who gloated over the crisis besetting the Congress Party, he had the ideological courage to state categorically that the downfall of the Congress need not necessarily be a victory for democratic socialism.

The greatest weakness the party faces is organisational. The ideological vacillation of the party can get resolved in view of the calibre of the rank and file, but almost universally there is complete lack of know-how on the technique of the organisation and how to solve the organisational problems. This is the real crisis which the Praja-Socialist Party has to solve.

ALGERIA AND FRANCE — (Continued from page 9)

Nationalists assert that it belongs to their country only. Moroccans have also filed their claim to at least a part of Sahara. Although Tunisia has so far kept quiet, it may most likely want to have a share in Saharan riches. If the exclusive claims are pressed forward, it is obvious that the peace of North Africa will be disturbed and the vast resources of Sahara will remain unexploited. Considering the fact that none of these countries will renounce its claim, the interest of all lies in joining together in happy partnership in order to exploit the Saharan riches and share them equitably. This is possible only if France and Algeria form a union and invite Tunisia and Morocco to join, which they most certainly would do. It is to be hoped that General de Gaulle's policy towards Algeria would lead to that end.

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