

Verdict On China

by V. B. Karnik

SLAVE Labour Camps are one of the most odious features of communist regimes. They exist in communist countries all over the world. Soviet Russia set the pattern which has been dutifully copied by countries of Eastern Europe and China.

A Special Committee on Forced Labour set up jointly by the Economic and Social Council and the International Labour Organisation under the Chairmanship of that distinguished Indian, Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar has already established the fact of the existence of Slave Labour Camps in Soviet Russia and some East European countries. Soviet Russia was so long denying their existence and characterising any talk of Slave Labour Camps in Russia as a malicious slander against the communist regime. But while announcing recently some ameliorative measures, she has admitted their existence and announced a policy of gradual disbandment.

Communist China has been also denying the existence of Slave Labour Camps within its territory. An international commission has, however, after exhaustive inquiry, come to the conclusion that Slave Labour Camps exist on the Mainland of China and that the laws and regulations of the communist regime expressly provide for the system of forced labour.

The international commission called a Special Investigation Commission on Political Repression in Continental China was set up by the International Commission against Concentration Camp Practices. It was set up after complaints were received from the Chinese Federation of Labour and the Hong Kong and Kowloon Trade Unions Council regarding the existence of Slave Labour Camps in the Mainland of China. The Commission was set up only after exhaustive inquiries made by Mr. David Rousset and other officers of the International Commission against Concentration Camp Practices had proved that there was a *prima facie* case against the communist regime. Notice of all the evidence collected was given to the

communist rulers of China and they were requested to provide opportunities for making on-the-spot investigations. There was, however, no response. The Government of China was also informed of the setting up of the special commission and it was invited to send its representatives to participate in its work. To this also there was no response from the communist rulers of China.

Confirming the charges brought by the Chinese Trade Unions there was also an appeal by 89 Catholic missionaries released from Chinese prisons calling for an investigation into conditions in Chinese prisons and labour camps. The appeal was signed by seven

IN FIVE YEARS IT MAY BE AS DANGEROUS TO PRAISE STALIN AS IT WAS TO ATTACK HIM TWO YEARS AGO. BUT I SHOULD NOT REGARD THIS AS AN ADVANCE. NOTHING IS GAINED BY TEACHING THE PARROT A NEW WORD.

GEORGE ORWELL
September, 1946

Bishops, one Papal prefect, two Papal administrators, 53 missionaries and 26 nuns, all of whom had personal knowledge and experience of the horrors they were denouncing.

The Special Investigation Commission was presided over by Mr. Maitre Van Rij of the Netherlands. Mr. Rij is a famous lawyer of Amsterdam with a brilliant record during the War of work in the Resistance Movement. Other members of the Commission were Dr. Georges Andre of Belgium, Mr. Franz Ballhorn of Germany, Prof. S. Balachowsky of France, Mr. Jose Calmarza of Republican Spain and Mrs. Lise Borsun of Norway. Five other members of the Commission were eminent representatives of the Asian Trade Union Movement nominated by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. They were Mr. A. H. Mirza of the All Pakistan Confederation of Labour, Mr. Padej Sivadat of the Thai National Trade Union Congress, Mr. Ignacio P. Laesina of Philippines Trade Unions Council, Mr. Meliton Salazar of the Federation of Free Workers of the

Philippines and Mr. Zouhaier Chelli of the trade union movement of Tunisia.

The Special Investigating Commission met in Brussels from April 20 to 30, 1956. The Commission examined documents, legal texts, regulations and administrative measures of the Peking Government. It also examined a number of witnesses and read the written testimony of many others who were not able to attend. After giving close consideration to all this material the commission arrived at the following conclusions:

1. That the penal system of the People's Republic of China, by defining the political offender in the broadest possible way and by depriving him of any effective guarantee of the right to defence, delivers the citizen to the arbitrary action of the government. The new measures that were adopted when the 1954 Constitution came into force, though they seem not to have been respected in actual fact, would be insufficient to constitute an effective guarantee of individual freedom.
2. That the forced labour to which prisoners are subjected in great number in the prisons and camps and which constitutes a large part of the national economy, is carried out under material conditions that are incompatible with modern penal principles.
3. That the reform of thought, combined with reform through labour, far from bringing about a regeneration of the prisoner, actually constitutes a degrading and debasing moral torture and leads to the worst possible form of dehumanisation, the loss of personality.
4. That these characteristics are indeed those of a true concentrationary system.

In the course of the judgment the Commission has recorded its conclusion that "reform through labour" is provided as a penalty in various texts, particularly in the law of March 8, 1952. The Commission has also found that "regulations of reform through labour" were, as Mr. Lo Jui-ching, Minister of Public Security has declared, modelled on the "Soviet Corrective Labour Code", forced labour appearing as a penal instrument universally applied for the purpose of political coercion.

The Commission also found that in prison and concentration camps the prisoner man-power is organised into reform-through-labour camps, that units are set up in military-fashion and placed under the direction of the troops of the Peoples' Police. It was also found that the prisoner man-power is employed in public works for the benefit of the State in fundamental sectors such as hydraulic works, strategic works, agriculture (State farms), communication, mining and lumbering.

It was not possible for the Commission, on the basis of the information available to it to establish the number of prisoners. It has stated, however, as its conclusion: "owing to the role of forced labour in national economy, of the administrative scope and number of the camps, of the number and extent of the campaigns of repression, it is nonetheless possible to assert that these prisoners number several millions."

The "reformed thought" within the framework of re-education through labour is, the Commission has said, one of the most prominent and probably most original features of the system of political repression applied in China. According to the Commission "the aim of this system is to efface the personality of the individual subjected to it and to substitute new personality which is in conformity with the ideology and interest of the Government." The Commission found that the system is "part of a repressive and punitive educational system organised and applied throughout the territory of Communist China." The following is the Commission's verdict on the system: "In short, morally broken by degrading confessions and odious denunciations that extend even to members of his family, the prisoner reached the point of losing his own personality and convincing himself that he has committed imaginary crimes which he has been led to confess. Plunged into a state of permanent terror, subject to veritable emotional torture, he becomes, not a new man, but a sub-man, a man who has been humiliated and crushed."

These findings of the Special Investigation Commission are borne out by the information collected in the recent publication *China Under Communism* by Richard L. Walker. The book quotes a statement of November 21, 1951 of Mr. Teng Tzu-hui, who was in charge of the Central-South Region. According to the statement "from the winter of 1949-1950 until November 1951 more than 1,150,000 'native bandits' had been inactivated and 28% of these or 3,22,000 had been executed." These figures are only for one of the six major administrative areas of China and are for a period "before the drive to eliminate counter-revolutionaries got under way in earnest." Most of the "counter-revolutionaries" not executed by the communists, says the book, were required to undergo "reform through labour services" or, more bluntly, slave labour. Chinese communist officials do not make any secret of their policy of reform through labour. The same Mr. Teng Tzu-hui has stated "the policy through labour service is the People's Government's most enlightened policy of dealing with criminals, and only a Peoples' Government could have decided on this new policy." Mr. Teng has given some

(Continued on page 4)

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the 1st of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

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

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

Notes

The Right To Strike

SOME strange words were heard at the recent conference of the Indian National Trade Union Congress held in Surat. The conference threw out by an overwhelming majority an amendment insisting upon the reiteration of the workers' right to strike. During the discussion there were a number of speeches by leaders, including the Labour Minister of the Government of India, advising the workers to give up their right to strike.

The argument appeared to be that, as the State has accepted the establishment of socialism as its objective and as the nation is embarking on the Second Five Year Plan, workers should give up their right to strike. The argument is very similar to the one that is heard so often in Soviet Russia and other communist countries.

There is no dispute that strikes and lockouts should be avoided. But they can be avoided best by encouraging the processes of collective bargaining. Enlightened employers as well as strong and responsible trade unions never allow disputes to reach the stage of lockouts or strikes. The I. N. T. U. C. should work towards that end rather than think of giving up the right to strike. The right to strike is one of the sacred rights that a democracy guarantees to workers.

Danger Of Infiltration

ON another issue the I.N.T.U.C. adopted a correct attitude for which it should be complimented by all who stand for freedom and democracy. In keeping with their new tactic the communists had proposed collaboration between the I.N.T.U.C. and their organisation, the All India Trade Union Congress. The I.N.T.U.C. rejected the proposal on the ground, as stated by its new President, Mr. Vasavada, that "the past record of the Communist Party has been unpatriotic and of a disruptive nature".

The rejection of the proposal for a united front does not, however, end the danger. The communists may now try the tactic of infiltration, which it is reported they have already begun in some parts. In order to be successful in pursuing that tactic they may even go to the extent of putting in cold storage their organisation, the A.I.T.U.C., as their masters in Moscow may decide upon winding up the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions as they have already liquidated the Cominform. The infiltration tactic of the communists is likely to prove far more dangerous. The danger can be met only through the unity or common working of all democratic forces. It is encouraging to learn in this connection of the proposals for an accord with the Hind Mazdoor Sabha. It is to be hoped that the proposals will be vigorously pursued

and that an understanding will be soon reached between these two great democratic organisations of Indian workers.

Fascist Dictatorship?

MANY have fallen for the communist propaganda that Dr. Syngman Rhee's regime in South Korea is a fascist dictatorship which does not tolerate any opposition. To them must have come as a surprise the recent news of the defeat of the Vice-Presidential nominee of Dr. Rhee by Mr. Chang Myun, a member of an opposition party.

The Democratic Party to which Mr. Chang Myun belongs has been in opposition to Dr. Rhee's Liberal Party for over eight years. It has not only been able to exist as a political organisation, but was able to contest and win the election to such an important office as that of the Vice-President.

Dr. Syngman Rhee, who was in the same election elected the President for a third term, has accepted this verdict of the electorate and has agreed to work with a Vice-President who belongs to an opposition party. Such a contest between two political parties, one in power and the other in opposition, and the success of a candidate of an opposition party in such a contest would not have been possible if Dr. Rhee's regime were a fascist dictatorship. This concrete evidence should serve as a warning to democrats who many a time fall an easy prey to communist propaganda.

Writers And Bhoodan

ACHARYA Vinoba Bhave has called upon writers and journalists to devote at least one-sixth of their knowledge and talents to the service of the Bhoodan movement. The Acharya has been collecting land and wealth from others, but from literary men, who he knows have hardly any land or wealth, he expects only a little use of their talents for the propagation of the great movement initiated by him.

This is indeed a very modest demand and it is to be hoped that literary men will respond to it. In this connection, it is gratifying to note that the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom has already decided to make its modest contribution. It persuaded Sir Rustom Masani to write an authoritative book on the Bhoodan movement. The book, it is understood, is already in the press and will be published by Collins in London in the autumn of this year. This is a very commendable effort which should set an example to others, both individual writers as well as literary and cultural organisations.

Ban On Films

THE recent order of the Government of India banning the public exhibition of eight foreign films with an African background cannot be justified on any ground. The films are banned, it is stated, because they "fail to portray the people of Africa in the proper perspective".

The order would have had some justification if the

complaint had been that the films in question had portrayed the people of Africa in an offensive or derogatory manner. The Indian people would not like to see a film which holds the African people to contempt or ridicule.

But the complaint against the films is that they did not portray the people of Africa in the proper perspective. This is too vague a charge which can be easily made against any film with respect to one community or the other. On that score, many an Indian film will have to be banned because it does not portray the people of a particular province, community, trade or profession in the proper perspective.

If the Government and the Board of Film Censors are allowed to ban films on such flimsy grounds, a stage will be reached when no films will be safe. This is indeed a serious encroachment on the rights of the film industry and the liberties of the people. In this particular instance, the Government may have acted thoughtlessly and out of their mistaken zeal to placate some unduly sensitive African students. If there is no protest against the action, one cannot be sure, however, that this arbitrary power arrogated by the Government will not be used in a more flagrant manner and for more selfish purposes another time.

Mire Of Technicalities

IT is deeply to be regretted that the prolonged talks held in London between the representatives of Singapore and the British Colonial Office ended in failure. It is clear from the reports that Mr. David Marshall, the Chief Minister of Singapore and the leader of the delegation, had adopted during the talks a very reasonable and accommodating attitude. The failure of the talks is mainly due to the unimaginative and wooden attitude of the Colonial Office.

Lord Attlee, the former Labour Prime Minister, stated after the failure that the British Government was "drowning the friendship of the people of Singapore in a mire of technicalities". The British Government should know by now that they will lose rather than hold places like Singapore by such insistence on technicalities.

The only party to profit from the failure will be the communists. Mr. Marshall has already predicted that there would be now a "strong accentuation of communist strength". The growth of communist influence in a place of such strategic importance as Singapore will imperil the safety and integrity of the countries of South East Asia. India and other countries of the region cannot therefore remain indifferent to this grave political blunder of the British Government.

How Long?

HOW long are members of the Indian Government and Congress Party going to patronise communist party fronts which are part of the apparatus for subverting India's democratic Constitution?

The question becomes pertinent once again as a result of the action of Dr. Syed Mahmood, Minister

in the Ministry of External Affairs, in inaugurating in Delhi on May 20 a conference of the "Indian National Preparatory Committee" formed to canvas support for a communist-inspired International Conference of Journalists scheduled to meet in Helsinki from June 10 to June 15. Among other participants in this move are Rana Jung Bahadur Singh and Mr. Chalapathi Rao, both of whom are well-known for their fellow-travelling proclivities.

It is altogether likely that Dr. Syed Mahmood, who is a simple soul, was unaware of the real character of the Helsinki gathering and thus walked into the trap laid for him. But this is not the first time this particular Minister has been found to grace the proceedings of a communist front organisation. Nor, in fairness to Dr. Mahmood, has he been the only member of the Government to be guilty of behaving in a manner that makes nonsense of the professed policy of non-alignment in the cold war.

Is it not time that the Home Ministry and its efficient Intelligence Bureau educated members of the Government about the facts of life in the world of communist conspiracy?

(Continued from page 2)

figures about the criminals arrested in the Central-South Region and of persons made to undergo reform through labour services. According to these figures the author of the book, Mr. Walker, states that in November 1951 there were a minimum of 575,000 slave labourers in the Central-South Region.

China Under Communism also corroborates from communist sources the conclusion reached by the Special Investigation Commission that the prisoners are used on a very large scale for a number of economic activities. The book has quoted a statement of Mr. Fu Tso-yi, the Minister for Water Conservancy, made in October 1952 that "in the past two years, 10,370,000 conscript workers participated in water conservancy work throughout China under the supervision of 320,000 armed police." It has also quoted another admission of the Peking regime of having used more than two million conscript labourers on the Chunking-Chengtou railway line. On the basis of all these facts Mr. Walker says: "In China everyone knows of the conditions of Slave Labour either first hand or from the lips of friends; everyone is aware of the regime's ability to liquidate people, remembering the year of violence; and everyone has heard of the methods of torture and punishment in communist prisons."

This is, indeed, a revealing picture of the conditions as they exist in communist China. Should it not warn us of the grave peril involved in following in the footsteps of that unfortunate country? Should it not open our eyes to the reality behind the deceptive promises of communism? Communism has established in China a regime of terror and slave labour camps. The verdict of an international commission composed of eminent individuals drawn from a number of countries has established the fact.

Neogy Upsets The Apple Cart

by M. A. Venkata Rao

PARADOXICALLY enough, the final Report on the Second Five-Year Plan as submitted to Parliament by the Planning Commission contains a summary of the radical criticism that one of its own members, Mr. K. C. Neogy, has felt obliged to get recorded as a warning to Government and public. Many lines of criticism have been directed against the Plan, (its swollen size and lop-sided pattern, its proposals regarding taxation and deficit finance, its attitude to organised industry in the hands of free enterprise, its stepmotherly attitudes to consumer goods, its over-optimism in respect of revenue surplus, public loans and small savings, its estimate of employment opportunities) by informed students of economics and public affairs of the highest standing in the country. Mr. Neogy has endorsed this body of instructed opinion in the criticism he has circulated among his colleagues and it is now embodied in the Report.

Mr. Neogy has characterised the caculation of financial resources in the public sector as "wishful thinking" and has expressed the apprehension that consequently deficit financing of the order of Rs. 1200 crores might turn out to be only a minimum. This would generate inflation which would not only hit people in the fixed income groups hard but also reduce the Plan fulfilment in real terms by increasing the cost of projects. Mr. Neogy is also apprehensive of the large uncovered gap and of the possibility of short-falls in the anticipated revenue surpluses. He is sceptical in a measure of the capacity of the States to fulfil their quota of additional taxation and says that tax efforts at the Centre as well will have to recognise certain limitations.

The targets are too high for the actual (and mobilisable) resources of the country, even by "abnormal" measures and new modes of taxation. Mr. Neogy, as a member of the Commission, is aware of the full facts of the situation collected and presented in ordered form by the economic staff of the Commission. He is aware of all the new sources of taxation suggested in recent months — of capital gains tax, excess profits tax, tax on total wealth, tax on expenditure and so on. But the prospects leave him unconvinced that the administration is in a position to realise the objective of the Plan without too great an unsettlement of the economy. "Inflation, progressively heavy taxation and the rigid controls that appear to be inevitable", he fears, "set in motion *forces of reaction and demoralisation at different levels of society*. This may be too dear a price for economic progress, even if real progress is possible under these conditions." (Italics ours -Ed.) Mr. Neogy's conclusion is that the Plan as a five-year programme lacks definiteness, is unrealistic and over-ambitious and that its massive super-structure is raised on precarious foundations.

These weighty observations of Mr. Neogy, coming

as they do from a member of the Planning Commission, offer welcome confirmation to the studies and conclusions of outside students. The very first of these was Prof. Shenoy, a member of the Panel of Economists who submitted a Minute of Dissent to the Panel's Memorandum on the Plan-frame of Dr. Mahalanobis. While the Panel endorsed, subject to certain precautions, the figure of Rs. 1000 crores of deficit finance proposed by the Plan-frame, Prof. Shenoy calculated that the country in its present state of under-development could not absorb more than about Rs. 200 crores in the Plan-period without setting up inflationary forces. He cautioned that if the cost of living of the common man went up beyond a certain limit, the country might be faced with "explosive forces" beyond its capacity to cope with. He asked the authorities to keep in mind the income of the constable in the police force and, that of the *jawan* in the Army in this context. This is an administrative and sociological angle as important to keep in mind as the explosive potential of the educated unemployed.

The ranks of the critics have been augmented recently by a member of the Panel of Economists, Prof. C. N. Vakil who had signed the Memorandum with the majority that had approved broadly all the main features of the Plan-frame. The *Times of India* (16th & 17th April) has published extracts from a forthcoming work by Prof. Vakil and a colleague of his, in which the authors argue learnedly that deficit financing of the order proposed in the Plan together with the other financial proposals is likely to generate an inflationary pressure forcing up the general level of prices from *three to four times* in the middle of the Plan period.

Another warning voice drawing attention to the difficulties and perils created needlessly for the administration and the country by the present Plan proposals is that of Dr. John Matthai. Dr. Matthai was mainly concerned in his address to the Bombay Rotary Club on the 19th May with the heavy and needless strain imposed upon the administration by the Governments' policy of "indiscriminate nationalisation of industries". While conceding that a certain quantum of deficit finance was necessary for financing the Plan, Dr. Matthai was concerned to point out that the Plan was too vast and comprehensive for the administrative resources of the Government. The addition of important categories of industry to the burden of administration already strained by the problems of inter-adjustment of the different parts of the economy, (such as employment and output of consumer goods, heavy and light industries, state enterprise and free enterprise, production on the one hand and transport and social services on the other, and the effect of inflation and high prices on people of fixed and variable incomes) would be an unwise proceeding inviting needless complication and even

disorganisation and demoralisation. Apart from the special approach of Dr. Matthai to the policy of indiscriminate nationalisation, students of the Plan welcome his judgment that the Plan is too big for the administrative and personal resources of the country, and that types of socialism other than that of Marxism are possible, practicable and more desirable.

These weighty utterances of men of intellectual standing and practical experience occupying positions of authority and influence in the country are a clear vindication of the line that *Freedom First* and The Democratic Research Service took from the very inception of the Plan-frame of Dr. Mahalanobis.

In its issues of May, June, and July, 1955, *Freedom First* raised far-reaching questions affecting the basic ideas and pattern of the Plan-frame. It laid bare the totalitarian inspiration of the Mahalanobis group with its Russian and Polish members and the needless economic hurdles it proposed to the country. Prof. Hannan Ezekiel stressed the dangers of physical planning that figured so prominently in the Plan-frame. The editorial article of May 1955 drew attention to the communist pattern of the Plan-frame and mentioned the names of the communist associates working in The Statistical Institute at Calcutta under Dr. Mahalanobis. It quoted Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's statement in an interview in Lucknow to the effect that the "seven authors of Pandit Nehru's plan are all men from behind the Iron Curtain." He expressed his deep concern over the highly centralised totalitarian kind of planning which Prime Minister Nehru was getting done by the experts of communist countries in the name of a socialist pattern of society.

Freedom First of July 1955 focussed the views of a number of newspapers and publicists on the unsound financial proposals of the Plan-frame. It quoted Dr. B. C. Roy, Chief Minister of West Bengal, who laid his finger on the vital defect of the Plan-frame, viz: the inability of the economy to bear the strain of the demands made by the unduly high targets proposed.

For convenience of reference, the Democratic Research Service published articles by Dr. Shriram Narayan (which were defensive of the Plan), together with critical articles by Prof. Hannan Ezekiel, and "Onlooker" of *The Times of India*, in the form of a folder called *The Dangers of Physical Planning*. They refer to the trends expressing themselves in the Plan and elsewhere in authoritative circles which, if not checked in time, might undermine the very basis of the free way of life envisaged by democrats of all persuasions—those who believe in democratic socialism as well as free enterprise, in mixed economy as well as *Sarvodaya*.

The high targets necessitate an all-out effort of propaganda to raise funds by market loans and small savings. The authorities already speak of reaching every family in the country. The panel of Economists had already suggested an amendment to the Constitution to enable the imposition of sales taxes even on "essential commodities" like food grains and salt. The proposals of the Taxation Enquiry Commission are rendered inadequate to cope with the demands of the unconsciously high level of the targets proposed.

Taxes on capital gains, on total wealth and on expenditure as well are thought of to raise the funds required.

Prof. Gadgil has suggested the enlargement of the public sector for more direct earnings without the necessity of having to collect them through taxation. This has since been accepted in the New Industrial Policy Declaration made on 30th April. Thus will the area of independent self-reliant vocations diminish under the regime of the socialist pattern. This will undermine the psychological foundations of democratic society.

The undue prominence given to heavy, or producer goods industries out of all proportion to the development of industries producing consumer goods is another feature drawn from Communist Planning. This introduces a distortion in the economy hard to overcome even in decades of planned development. It is pointed out by competent students of Soviet economy that the chronic deficiency in consumer goods in Russia even after 5 Five-Year Plans is due to this excessive allocation to heavy industries. Soviet authorities themselves admit and deplore the failure of their successive Plans to correct the distortion and to provide a sufficiency of food grains, textiles, footwear and other essential goods of household use for the common man. Khrushchev and Malenkov admitted this failure of their economy after the death of Stalin.

Khrushchev and Bulganin in their Reports to the 20th Congress of the Communist party of the USSR (vide *New Times* 16th and 23rd, April 1956) admit the deplorable failure in agriculture and consumer goods industries even after the "successful" completion of five Five-Year plans! The brochure "*Soviet Planning*" published by the Employers' Association of Calcutta (1954) furnishes impressive evidence that Soviet Planning has not been able to get rid of the sort of "crises" brought on by internal contradictions, which according to communist theory, are the monopoly of capitalist economics! "Planning crises are self-perpetuating; they set up disturbing reactions which persist over a long period." "The absence of crisis in the Soviet economy is more propaganda than fact." (*Soviet Planning*—pages 132-138).

If this is the sorry state of affairs after five successive and "successful" Five-Year Plans with their strident and mendacious propaganda, the procedure of our planners seems to be a totally uncalled for and unintelligent imitation of the Soviet pattern of planning. Even such measure of success as the Soviets have achieved has been attained at the unconscionable cost of the freedom and happiness of the vast majority of their people.

Further, when Yugoslavia is moving in the direction of decentralisation and satisfaction of consumer needs, the sort of extreme centralisation and preoccupation with heavy industry built into the Indian Second Five-Year Plan seems to lack all justification. Kipling said of politicians that they had a penchant for "creating unnecessary hells." Let us hope that with the promise of an earthly paradise on their lips, those responsible for planned development will not lead the country to an unnecessary hell.

James T. Farrell

MR. JAMES T. Farrell, the eminent American literary man, whom the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom welcomes as its guest, is a unique figure in contemporary literature in the English language. In a generation dominated by Freud, Joyce, Heidegger, Satre and Kafka, Mr. Farrell has maintained his independence of passing styles and fancies. The great tradition of American naturalism which stems from Stephen Crane, Frank Norris, Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair of *The Jungle* and Sinclair Lewis who wrote *Main Street* lives on in Mr. Farrell's work. When other writers have been swept from their moorings by the exciting anxieties of a popularised Freudianism and the vision of squalor as the natural condition of man, Mr. Farrell has stuck to the masters of his youth.

In the tradition of which Mr. Farrell is the living embodiment—a tradition in which the sober evocation of infinite detail was the instrument of an earnest criticism of life—there has always been an element of vigorous social awareness and social protest. Its European founder, Emile Zola, still claims our reverence for his courageous role in the Dreyfus Affair. There was a vague affinity between naturalism and socialism and even the most pessimistic of the American naturalists and perhaps their greatest representative, Theodore Dreiser could not resist the inherent tendencies of the tradition.

Mr. Farrell too is a critic of society. He has studied Marxism but it has not overcome his obstinate refusal to go only where his own light will lead him. He has, despite his intimacy with Trotskyite circles, never renounced his dogged individualism and his determination to make up his own mind in his own way, regardless of the pressures of society and the public opinion of the intelligentsia. Thus Mr. Farrell's naturalism, which like its founder Zola's, often achieves a lyrical quality, flourishes because it is not merely a relic of a tradition which its bearer could not throw off. Mr. Farrell's naturalism is not the result of his ignorance of other literary modes or of his inability to incorporate new styles and points of view. Mr. Farrell's naturalism is rooted in his own experience of Irish American life in Chicago and New York. It does not derive from books or from formulae. It is impelled by a genuinely human sympathy and fellow-feeling for the *l'homme moyen sensuel*, and it is this which has preserved him from doctrinarism in politics.

Mr. Farrell's great teachers are Voltaire, Marx and the American pragmatists, Mead and Dewey. From Voltaire, he draws his skepticism about the wisdom and justice of authority, from Marx his aspiration towards equality and from the American pragmatists his appreciation of the value of experience and his distrust of dogma. From Voltaire comes his affection for the late H. L. Mencken, the great liberator of intellectual America of the second and third decades of the present century, from Marx and Dewey



his friendship with Prof. Sydney Hook, his liberal socialist outlook and his attachment to the American Committee for Cultural Freedom of which he is one of the founder-members.

But neither the variety of the intellectual's influences he has undergone—he is an omnivorous reader of books on all subjects—nor the belief which he expresses in his novels that man is a creature of social circumstances can belie the tremendous fact of Mr. Farrell's own individuality arising out of the reflection and mastery of his own rich experience in many spheres of life in Europe and America. Nothing can overshadow his sense of each man's responsibility for his own intellectual and moral decisions and his own irrepressible tendency to make up his own mind and to see life through his own eyes.

Mr. Farrell's Programme

Mr. James T. Farrell, the celebrated American novelist and Chairman of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, arrives in Bombay on Saturday, June 2.

Mr. Farrell will deliver a public lecture under the joint auspices of P.E.N. All India Centre and the Indian Committee at the Durbar Hall, Town Hall, on Monday, June 4, at 6-15 p.m. The subject of his address is "Some Observations on the 20th Century American Novel." Prof. G. C. Banerjee will preside. On Tuesday, June 5, Mr. Farrell will attend and speak at a meeting of writers to be held in the Office of the Indian Committee.

Operation Lullaby

THE Fourth Congress of the CPI at Palghat from April 19 to 29 had a difficult situation to face. The new outlook and policy put forth at the 20th Communist Party Congress of the USSR had startled the world. It posed a problem no less baffling and bewildering to the leaders and rank and file of the Communist Party throughout the world than to the observers in the free world. The all-enveloping cult of personality and worship of Stalin was debunked unceremoniously by his closest henchmen who had succeeded to his authority. Stalin was denounced as a mass murderer and a maniac untrue to Marxism-Leninism. Everything he had been saying all these years, the rank-and-file member of the party was told, had been dictated by one of the worst monsters in history. The corner-stone of the sacred edifice of communist dogma, namely, the doctrine of class war, received a new and more innocent shape. The dissolution of the Cominform had followed. The way of united front on the parliamentary plane was definitely recommended.

At home in India too the emphatic endorsement of Indian foreign policy by Soviet leaders as identical, by and large, with that of their own made it necessary for the leaders of the CPI to fall into line and express similar approval of India's attitude to international problems. And in domestic affairs as well, the Second Five-Year Plan seemed to have been framed on the Soviet pattern which they were bound to approve as leading the country in the direction of their aspirations. To add to the embarrassment, the Government of India had accepted the goal of a socialist society at the instance of the ruling Congress Party.

The Palghat Congress therefore had to abjure open class war ideas and to pay court to peaceful democratic methods.

How is the CPI then to guide itself in the coming period *vis a vis* the Government and the Congress?

While appreciating the approach of the Indian Government towards the "camp of peace", it criticises the Government for not going the whole hog and severing connection with the Commonwealth. The CPI reasserts its thesis that British imperialism has not reconciled itself to the loss of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon and that it seeks to return to power in these colonial areas. It sums up its programme in the foreign field under seven heads: for peace and against atomic weapons, against military pacts and for strengthening Asian solidarity, for the recognition of Red China by the principal nations of the free world and for her entry into the UNO, for support to anti-colonialism, for the liberation of Goa, for the settlement of the Indo-Pakistan dispute regarding Kashmir and other matters by mutual discussion and for a break with the British Commonwealth. It is clear that this policy has nothing Indian about it. It is just a mechanical echo of Soviet Policies in international affairs.

The Resolution notes that some members of the

Congress Party and government do not seem to approve of the official policy and some do not express themselves wholeheartedly on its behalf in public. This section of the Political Resolution is a clue to the basic tactics that the leaders of the Party have adopted at the Congress in formulating their programme. The leadership wish now to direct their main blow at the solidarity of the Congress Party and its large following. It consists in trying to separate the "progressive" from the "reactionary" wing of the Party and Government. It will encourage the progressive elements, i.e., the pro-communist, fellow-travelling members of the Congress party and concentrate its fire of propaganda and smear campaign on the "reactionary" members, i.e., independent people with a staunch adherence to liberal and freedom-loving notions in economics and politics.

In the sixth part of the Resolution, it is stated that democratic forces in India stand divided. This section of the Resolution lists the Communist Party, the PSP and the Socialist Party as belonging to the democratic *bloc* while the un-named communal parties are said to belong to the reactionary *bloc*. The Communist Party will seek to co-operate with the former as (for example) they did in the struggles for linguistic States and in the campaigns against the US-Pak Aid Pact and the Bengal-Bihar merger proposals. But it will have no truck with the communal parties in the sense of a united front with them. A new feature of the policy statement this time however, is that the masses behind the communal parties will be sought to be weaned from their communal leadership by drawing them into common struggles. The Party will also defend and campaign for the legitimate demands of the minorities.

Thus the directive of the Fourth Congress is that they should aim at separating the sheep from the goats in all the sections of the masses, organised and unorganised. The communists should aim at rallying the progressive and democratic elements in their sense from the reactionary and feudal elements in the political parties as well as among the common people. It will seek "to build the broadest united front of all patriotic and democratic forces."

There is nothing new or original in all this. It has all happened before during the period of the *Front Populaire* that followed on the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in Moscow in 1935. A comparison of the language of the Palghat resolutions with that of CP documents of 1939 like the Palme Dutt-Bradley Thesis and the Central Committee leaflet entitled, "Down with Compromisers, Forward to the United Front" quoted in Mr. M. R. Masani's *Short History of the Communist Party* will prove that the good old Trojan Horse has been taken out of the wraps and mothballs. We are back again to 1936-38 and the days of treachery of which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has lived to tell the tale.

This does not mean that the CPI is necessarily

disheartened by the popularity of the rival Congress Party and of its Government. It only means that the Communist Party is adopting the tactics laid down for it by the strategy of its leaders in their international conspiracy. This is an era for "united fronts" and "co-existence" to disarm the suspicions of powerful leaders and nations and to make use of their innocence and trustfulness to destroy their power and Iago—like to hoist them with their own petard.

The Resolution seeks to balance this strategy with the call that it must come forward as an "*independent national force*." It is not enough for the C.P.I. that right policies are adopted by the country in international relations and domestic affairs. It is all important that the C.P.I. should obtain credit with the people for everything good and beneficial in the activities of the Government and the ruling party.

To this end, *struggle* should be maintained on as many fronts as possible. Every grievance of the people, minor or major, should be exploited and championed to the discomfiture of the ruling party. The means of becoming an "independent national force" is to champion sections of people in all their grievances. In the whole range of public questions on which opinion is agitated in all spheres of life, industry and agriculture, the party will keep up agitations on behalf of the people and against the bourgeoisie.

The clear line of division in ideology between Congress and communism is becoming indistinct and some Congress leaders have even begun to accord a more important role to the Communist Party than before. It is becoming even respectable, as evidenced by the government's taking the largest stall at the Palghat exhibition and getting the sessions filmed for public show in the country. This is something new. It is one thing to permit the functioning of the Communist Party as a political party in the democratic system of the country. But it is quite another to recognise it as a genuine democratic political party bound by democratic conventions and sharing in the national allegiance to the exclusion of extra-territorial loyalties. As anticipated by *Freedom First* and other journals and publicists the neutralism of our country is becoming more and more Pickwickian.

It would appear that Operation Lullaby is already yielding results. The statement of Mr. Khandubhai Desai at the INTUC Congress at Surat that if the CPI eschews violence it can even function as an opposition party is a pointer to the new winds favourable to the communists blowing in Congress circles.

Whatever may be the inner conflicts among Communist Party leaders, the country as a whole should be prepared for an unrelenting and comprehensive strategy of conflict to be waged by the Party, a genuine policy of "co-existence," of "peaceful co-operation" and "united front" to all outward appearance but concealing the real strategic motive of destroying all reserves of opposition on the part of freedom-loving classes and groups to preserve an open, free society.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

A dance and music recital was arranged by the Committee and *Quest* on April 27 in honour of a Japanese Cultural delegation. Mr. Nissim Ezekiel, Editor, *Quest*, welcomed the delegation on behalf of the Committee and *Quest*. Prof. Tetsuzo Tanigawa, leader of the delegation, made a suitable reply. The performance was highly appreciated by the Japanese delegation consisting of writers, sculptors, dancers, painters and art critics.

* * *

The Patna Group organised on April 30 a lecture by Mr. G. Pavey on "Appreciation of Western Music." The lecture was accompanied by the playing of records. The programme was arranged with the kind co-operation of Mr. Van Rhijn, Managing Director, Philips Electrical Co., Ltd. Calcutta.

* * *

Mr. Irving Brown, a member of the International Executive of the Congress for Cultural Freedom and the representative of the AFL - CIO, delivered a lecture under the auspices of the Committee on May 8 on "What is Happening in Soviet Russia?" Mr. V. B. Karnik presided.

QUEST

a bi-monthly of arts & ideas

Sponsored by

the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom

EDITOR: NISSIM EZEKIEL.

"The quality of the material shows QUEST as a worthy addition to the existing intellectual periodicals in India. There is not a sufficient number of them at present which makes the new magazine all the more welcome."

The Eastern World, London.

*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.**

Review

The Philippine Answer to Communism

by Alwin H. Scaff, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, U.S.A. \$ 4.

THERE are many books which tell the harrowing tale of triumphs scored by communism either through aggression or internal subversion. Here is a book which tells of a triumph scored against communism through the adoption of the dual method of friendship and force.

The end of the Second World War had left the Philippines the legacy of the rebellion of the Huks. The rebellion had its birth in the resistance to the Japanese occupation which took place when Japan joined the Axis Powers and declared war against the United States in a surprise attack on the Pearl Harbour.

The resistance movement was, however, never a merely national revolutionary or agrarian movement as it was sought to be made out. It was from the very beginning organised and directed by communists. After the end of the war, taking advantage of the devastation and disorganisation wrought by the war, the communists developed the rebellion with the object of establishing themselves in power. The Government of Philippines were therefore face to face not with a mere movement of agrarian discontent but with a determined armed struggle to capture power according to the plan and programme of the international communist movement.

The rebellion developed on the background of the many evils which existed in the Philippine society—a rapacious class of landlords and moneylenders, a weak and corrupt government, an army which indulged in many acts of cruelty, and an indigent and starving peasantry. By skilfully exploiting these weaknesses of the society and the Government the communists were able at one time to secure for the rebellion a large mass basis.

The Philippine Answer to Communism tells the graphic story of how the eight year old rebellion was in the end defeated under the inspired leadership of President Magsaysay, who as the Secretary of Defence initiated the new policy which led to the eventual rout of the communists. The new policy was the policy, as he put it, “of all-out force and all-out friendship.”

Stern and effective military measures were taken against those Huks who insisted upon continuing the fight. But care was taken to see that the military units who carried on these operations were inspired by “social consciousness”, so that they carried on their duties without alienating the local population and in many cases with their support and sympathy. The Huks who surrendered and those who after capture expressed a desire to settle down as lawful citizens were provided with opportunities to acquire land and live as independent, self-supporting farmers. That was the programme of the EDCOR, the Eco-

nomic Development Corps, which acquired lands for ex-Huks on the island of Mindanao and with generous State help enabled them to develop new democratic communities.

The book gives detailed information of this fascinating effort to win over the disaffected and misguided peasants and artisans. There were many difficulties in the way, but they appear to have been overcome and the EDCOR has come to play a big role in isolating the communists and reintegrating the ex-Huks into the democratic community.

The Philippines have succeeded in defeating the communist rebellion. The author highlights the four important aspects of the successful campaign. They are, according to him; “First, a vigorous and effective military action; second, the winning of the people to the Governments’ side; third, an expose of communist ideas and the propagation of democratic principles; and fourth, attrition against the hard core of communism”. “Winning the people away from their communist leaders and leaving the hard core isolated and hard pressed” has been the main plank of the Philippine programme against communism.

With the defeat of the armed rebellion the communists are now busy changing their colour and adopting different tactics. The Philippine leaders are not unaware of this danger. Major General Jesus Vargas, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, referred to it in following words:

“They will seek to associate with worthy causes. They will adopt misleading party names and alliances. They will maintain the ‘hard core’ of membership. They will enhance hatred and promote strikes and violence. They will resort to sabotage. They will seek to divide us. Above all, they will infiltrate into the government, universities, civic organisations, even churches. That is the usual Communist pattern. With the Communist leaders back with us and the masses, that is the problem we are up against.” It is to be hoped that the Philippines will be able to deal with this danger as successfully as it dealt with the earlier one.

The Philippines is not the only country in Asia which had to face during the post-war years this challenge of an armed communist revolt. Malaya is still facing that challenge. Burma experienced it on a much larger scale. Even India had a taste of it. We had our Telangana and similar attempts in a couple of other places. This story of how the Philippines faced the problem and solved it will therefore be of interest to all Asian countries.

The author, Mr. Scaff, is particularly competent to tell the story. He was in the Philippines as a teacher from 1940 to 1945. The last couple of years he had to spend in a prisoners-of-war camp during the days of Japanese occupation. He was in the country again in 1953. He has based the major part of his book on the information collected from ex-Huks. It is therefore a reliable story of an important struggle won against the communists in Asia.

V.B.K.

I. C. C. F. Seminar In Poona

(From A Correspondent)

THE Poona Branch of the I.C.C.F. organized a seminar on Saturday and Sunday, the 5th and 6th of May, at the Patwardhan Hall of the Maharashtra Sahitya Parishad in Poona. The subjects for the seminar were (1) the pattern of development in Maharashtra, with special reference to Casteism, the integration of the three Marathi-speaking parts coming together for the first time, and the role of the middle class in this process of integration and (2) the Liberal heritage in Maharashtra, especially its bearing on the growth of democracy. The seminar was very well attended on both days. It is a happy sign that about seventy intellectuals sat together for seven hours on each day to thrash out two of the most vital problems of their region—and that too in a political climate which is not particularly conducive to a calm exchange of thoughts and opinions.

Those who attended the seminar included: Dr. R. P. Paranjpye, Mr. Shankerrao Deo, Professors D. R. Gadgil and T. S. Shejwalkar, Messrs P. H. Patwardhan, V. D. Ghate, P. N. Rajbhoj, M. P., K. Narayan Kale, R. K. Khadilkar and K. N. Padke; Professors N. V. Sovani, S. V. Kogekar, D. D. Wadekar, N. R. Deshpande, D. K. Bedekar, A. K. Bhagwat and G. P. Pradhan and a number of younger teachers from Poona colleges. Tarkateerth Laxman Shastri Joshi and Mr. V. B. Karnik specially came down from Wai and Bombay to attend the discussions. Mr. M. R. Masani was also present at one session. Professor D. A. Dabholkar, who could not attend, had sent a paper on "Casteism in Maharashtra".

Tarkateerth Joshi presided over Saturday's discussion. The seminar began with Prof. Dabholkar's paper. He pointed out that the mere transfer of power from one caste to another, unaccompanied by its diffusion among the large mass of people, will be a poor substitute for a democratic solution of this chronic problem. The discussion which followed mostly confined itself to the historical aspect of the question. In this context Professor Shejwalkar's analysis, though perhaps a little long for the seminar, was the most studied and illuminating.

Almost everyone agreed that the desire of the non-Brahmin, culturally backward, majority to share in the good things of life was natural and welcome; everyone advised the Brahmins to accept with good grace the inevitable shift in the centre of power from one community to another, and devote themselves to the role of friendly, tolerant and benevolent advisers of the new ruling class. It was also agreed that casteism had assumed a more acute form since Independence. As Dr. Deshpande pointed out, this was probably the result of two related causes. In our struggle for freedom, the presence of the foreign enemy kept beneath the surface the consciousness of caste among those who participated in the national movement; secondly, the nationalist sentiment in the pre-Independence days was essentially a negative one, without any ideological content which could act as

a cementing force against the disintegrating action of casteism.

Speaking about intellectuals, more generally the middle class in Maharashtra, Professor Bedekar asserted that while one section of it looked forward the other derived its inspiration from the past. Its future, therefore, was not very certain. Professor Gadgil pointed out that the very term 'middle class' would be a misnomer in a classless society that we were visualising in our developmental effort. He, however, refused to try and look into the distant future and said that five or ten years ahead was enough for him. He made a powerful plea for tolerance and belief in the *bona fides* of those who differ.

In his concluding remarks, Laxman Shastri Joshi held out a ray of hope against the depressing background of middle-class orthodoxy in Maharashtra. He pointed out that the new middle class which is springing up out of the non-Brahmin communities did not have any moorings in Brahmanical orthodoxy and hence was secular in its outlook. When this new class, he said, obtained definite place in the society it would be easier to eradicate caste-consciousness.

It was unfortunate that there was practically no discussion of the baffling problem of integrating Vidarbha and Marathawada with central Maharashtra. Only Mr. Karnik referred to it and pleaded for a sympathetic attitude to their demands by leaders of the more advanced region.

Prof. S. V. Kogekar presided over the Sunday session. It opened with a paper by Mr. Sudarshan Desai on Liberalism—Definition, Experience and Expectations. He defined liberalism as consisting in "an unself-consciously tolerant attitude of one individual or group toward another, particularly having different status, opinions or cultural and educational backgrounds." Discussing the Liberals as a social force in Maharashtra, he said that since "they were neither a source of political education nor a force for liberation, it would be difficult to expect a heritage from them, say, in the nature of a cadre of politicians well-versed in the practice of liberal democracy.

Rao Saheb Patwardhan, a former Congress leader and now closely associated with the Bhoodan movement and Rashtra Seva Dal in Maharashtra, described the liberal heritage left by Maharashtrian saints. He pointed out that the liberalism of the saints was religiously oriented but suggested that it could be used for secular ends. Professor Pradhan joined Mr. Desai in criticising Maharashtrian Liberals as having remained aloof from the urges and aspirations of the people and thus condemned themselves to stultification.

Prof. M. P. Mangudkar described the humanist inspiration of the Liberals in Maharashtra, and expressed the confidence that if this humanist inspiration were given a scientific foundation it would serve as the nucleus around which a renaissance movement could grow in the country. Subsequent speakers mostly dealt with the historical aspect of the question,

in the course of which some speakers took the position that Liberalism was dead and gone. Vigorously controverting this Mr. Masani pointed out that Liberalism was a living force which was operating in Europe through Social Democratic Parties, trade unions and other cultural and educational institutions. Tarkateerth Laxman Shastri Joshi described the philosophical basis of Liberalism and pointed out that liberal values had yet to take root in our soil.

In his summing up Professor Kogekar wished that more thought were given to the future than to the past of Liberalism. Professor Kogekar also raised two important questions. First, since Liberalism believed in rational persuasion as the only means of bringing about social accord, what was to be done in a situation in which an individual or a group refused to see the social good? Secondly, how should a Liberal behave when he is confronted with an illiberal force in society? He admitted that he had no cut and dried answers to the questions.

The discussions on the first day of the seminar were followed by a public lecture by Mr. V. B. Karnik on the same subject. He pointed out how it was essential for the linguistically reunited Maharashtra to be always alive to the fact that it was just a part of the bigger Indian nation and to follow the path of rationalism and democracy in order that reactionary and parochial tendencies may not get the upper hand. Tarkateerth Laxman Shastri Joshi presided over the lecture. On the second day the discussions were followed by a public lecture by Mr. M. R. Masani organised jointly by the Vasant Vyakhyan Mala and the Indian Committee. The subject of Mr. Masani's talk was "Some Impressions of Yugoslavia and Western Germany." Mr. R. K. Khadilkar presided.

The seminar brought together, perhaps for the first time in many years, politicians and intellectuals in Maharashtra. Its success lies not so much in the solutions it found or failed to find as in the recognition of the need to end the nearly forty-year old divorce between men of wisdom and men of action. The I.C.C.F. can play a leading role in bringing about this reconciliation. Indeed, at present no other institution even seems to be aware of this need.

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

To The Editor

INEQUALITY IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Sir,

In your article "The End of Equality in the U.S.S.R." you quote Mikoyan as revealing in Delhi that the disparity in income between a leading scientist and an average worker was as high in the Soviet Union as 62 to 1. While this is a valuable confession to record from a spokesman of the Communist Party which professes, tongue in cheek, to work for an equalitarian society in India and elsewhere, it still understates the shocking inequalities that the Soviet system creates, in flat contradiction to its cynical claims.

In the Soviet army, a private soldier gets only the equivalent of £2-2-0 per month, while the monthly pay of a Major-General is round about £ 570—more than that of his American counterpart. This gives a wage-spread of 1 to 271. This detail, as well as many other significant facts, can be found in a recent book *How Russia Makes War* by Raymond L. Garthoff (Allen & Unwin) and has been quoted by no less a military expert than Lieut-General Sir Brian Horrocks in *Why I Oppose Communism*, that excellent symposium you reviewed in your last issue.

A SOLDIER.

May 21, 1956

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

MORE ON THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Edmund Wilson

THE REPUDIATION OF STALINISM

Richard Lowenthal

A MARVELLOUS DECADE

Isaiah Berlin

MAY 1956

32

Annual Rs. 12/-

For members of the Indian Committee
for Cultural Freedom Rs. 10/-.

Social Democrats In Communist Jails

The List That Enraged Khrushchev

THE following is a letter addressed to the Russian rulers, Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin, by some prominent Socialist and Trade Union leaders of Germany, Italy, Greece, British West Africa and the United States enclosing a list of over 350 outstanding Socialists and members of Trade Unions, Cooperatives and Peasant Parties imprisoned or detained in concentration camps in the Soviet Union and some other East European countries, and demanding their immediate release.

It will be recalled that Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, the leader of the British Labour Party, presented a similar list to the Russian dictators at the time of the dinner arranged in their honour. Mr. Khrushchev the real ruler of Russia, flew into a rage at the presentation of the list and lost his temper and abused the leader of the Labour Party for his bold championship of the political prisoners in Soviet Russia. *Pravda*, the organ of the Soviet Communist Party, still continues to be furious over the incident.

The letter and the list are being published here to aid the campaign that has been started by the Socialist and the Trade Union Movement of the world to secure the release of political prisoners rotting in the jails and concentration camps of the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

N. S. Khrushchev, First Secretary
Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
and

N. A. Bulganin, Chairman
Council of Ministers of the USSR

Sirs:

In view of the fact that some of the admitted crimes of the Stalin regime are now being exposed, and that some persons have been rehabilitated posthumously or released from unjust imprisonment, we want to remind you of the fate of those labour and socialist leaders and outstanding members of trade unions, cooperatives, and other workers' organizations who are still imprisoned without cause in the Soviet Union, the countries of Eastern Europe, and China.

Attached to this letter is a list of such outstanding leaders who are still in prison or, to the best of our knowledge, have been murdered or have perished in concentration camps and prisons. The list, which is by no means complete, will be supplemented.

Countless less prominent workers of the labour movement, many of whose names are in our possession, are still deprived of freedom. Still others, killed without cause, have not been exonerated nor has restitution been made to their families.

We believe the time has come to right these wrongs. Justice to the dead demands the clearing of their names. Justice to the survivors demands their immediate release.

In writing to you, we, the undersigned, speak in the name of the conscience of the world. Be certain that we shall not rest until full justice has been done.

Partial Listing of Leaders of Russian Socialist Parties and Free Trade-Unions Arrested and Vanished without Trace

Socialist Revolutionaries

1. Agapov, Vladimir
2. Altovskii, Aleksander
3. Artemov, Nikolai
4. Dobrovolskaya, P. P.
5. Dobrovolskii, S.
6. Donskoi, Dmitrii
7. Federovich, Fyodor
8. Feldman, M.
9. Filipovskii, V. M.
10. Flegontov, A. S.
11. Furman, A. M.
12. Gelfgot, G.
13. Gendelman, Mikhail
14. Gershtein, Lev
15. Gisetti, Aleksander
16. Gots, Abram
17. Ivanov, Nikolai
18. Ivanova, Elena
19. Kastakin, L. L.
20. Kolosov, Evgenii
21. Leontieva, M.
22. Liberov, Aleksander
23. Likhach, Mikhail
24. Morozov, Sergei
25. Nadezhin, G.
26. Panfilov, F.
27. Rakitniekov, Nikolai
28. Rakov, Dmitrii
29. Ratner, Evgeniya
30. Rudkov, P. A.
31. Ryumin, A. I.
32. Shestakov, V. P.
33. Sizykh, K.
34. Svirskaya, M. L.
35. Timofeev, Evgenii
36. Tseitlin, Miokhail
37. Utgov, V.
38. Valchanskii, S. I.
39. Vasilenko, Ya, E.

Social Democrats

1. Bazarov-Rudnev, Vladimir
2. Bogdanov, Boris
3. Broido, Eva
4. Bronshtein, Mikhail
5. Cherevanin-Lipkin, Fyodor
6. Deich, Sofiya
7. Dnevnikskii-Tsederbaum, Fyodor
8. Drabkin, Wulf
9. Elman, Roza
10. Ezhov-Tsederbaum, Sergei
11. Fin-Enotayevskii, A.
12. Frolov, V. E.
13. Gordon, Polina
14. Grigoriev, Rafail
15. Groman, Ekaterina
16. Groman, Vladimir
17. Guberman, O. Y.
18. Gurevich-Ber, Naum
19. Ikov-Mirov, V.
20. Kantorovich, Emil
21. Katin-Yartsev, V.
22. Kishin, Ivan
23. Kolokolnikov, Pavel
24. Kranikhsfeld, Andrei
25. Krasnyanskaya, Anna
26. Krichevskii, A. G.
27. Kuchin-Oranskii, Georgii
28. Kupriyanova, Kseniya
29. Levinson-Benskii, B.
30. Levit, Roza
31. Levitskii-Tsederbaum, Vladimir

Fotis Makris, Chairman
Greek General Confederation of Labour
E. Lloyd Evans, Vice-Chairman
Gambia Labour Union
British West Africa
Julius Braunthal, Secretary
Socialist International
London, England
Franz Neumann, Chairman
Berlin Social Democratic Party
Germany
Stefan Thomas, Chairman
Ostburo German Social Democratic
Party
Giulio Pastore, General Secretary
Confederazione Italiana dei
Sindacati dei Lavoratori

•
Adolph Heald, Chairman
Jewish Labour Committee
James B. Carey, President
Int'l Union of Electrical
Radio & Machine Workers
Emil Mazey, Secretary-Treasurer
International Union
United Auto Workers
David J. McDonald, President
United Steel Workers of America
Norman Thomas
A. Philip Randolph,
International President
Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters

32. Liber-Goldman, Mikhail
33. Lokerman, Aleksander
34. Osovskii, Vladislav
35. Petrenko, Pyotr

Free-Trade Union Leaders

1. Baksin, Ilia
2. Belovskii, Frants
3. Berg, Evgenii
4. Breido, Grigori
5. Danilin, Pyotr
6. Devyatkin, Aleksander
7. Gvozdev, Kuzma
8. Konstantinovskii, Aleksander
9. Kuzovlev, Aleksei
10. Malkin, Aleksei
11. Malkin, Boris
12. Poplyak, F.
13. Romanov, A. V.
14. Shtilman, R.
15. Shlionskii, N.
16. Smirnov, Aleksander
17. Trakhtenberg, Khaim
18. Treiger, Nikolai
19. Voronin, Ivan
20. Yudin, Filip
21. Yudov, A.
22. Zimin, Aleksander

Left Socialist-Revolutionaries

1. Batashev, I.
2. Bilima-Pasternak, P. A.
3. Derzhavin, P. V.
4. Eliseev, I. E.
5. Filatov, E. F.
6. Izmailovich, Ekaterina
7. Kakhovskaya, I. K.
8. Kamkov-Kats, Boris
9. Karelin, A.
10. Krayevskaya, G. V.
11. Leibovich, B. G.
12. Maioro V, Ivan
13. Melnikov, G. K.
14. Mirokhov, A. M.
15. Novikov, N.
16. Oganovskii, V. M.
17. Osokin, V. M.
18. Poluboyarinov, F. I.
19. Popov, A. I.
20. Samokhvalov, T. D.
21. Soloviev, S. F.
22. Spiridonova, Mariya
23. Surkova, L.
24. Trutovskii, V. E.
25. Zhukov, M. S.

List of Leaders of the Jewish Socialist Bund Arrested by the Soviets in Eastern Europe in 1939-1941

1. Adier, Szmul, from Warsaw, Poland, editor of the Warsaw *Folkscajtung*, arrested in Lida in 1940.
2. Anachowicz, Ch., of Bialystok, arrested in 1939.
3. Antman, Ryfka, of Brest-Litovsk, arrested in 1939.
4. Aronowicz, Jozef, of Wilno, arrested in 1939.
5. Dernsztajn, Sz., of Vladimir-Volinsk, arrested in 1939.
6. Dolinka, Berl, of Pinsk, arrested in 1939.
7. Flaumenbaum, Benjamin, of Bialystok, arrested in 1939.
8. Glojberman, Szmul, of Pinsk, arrested in 1939.

9. Goldman, Saul, member of the Central Committee of the Bund in Poland, arrested in 1939.
10. Kaswan, Markus, of Czernowitz, member of the Central Committee of the Bund in Rumania, arrested in 1941.
11. Lew, Hersch, of Brest-Litovsk, arrested in 1939.
12. Majzil, Dr. Noah, of Riga, Latvia, member of the Latvian Parliament, arrested in 1941.
13. Rabinowicz, Izak, of Riga, Latvia, arrested in 1941.
14. Rosenthal, Anna, member of the Central Committee of the Bund in Poland, arrested in 1939.
15. Szifris, Leib, of Grodno, Poland, arrested in 1939.
16. Sziakman, Aron Judel of Pinsk, member of the City Council, arrested in 1939.
17. Sznajder, Dawid, of Brest-Litovsk, arrested in 1939.
18. Szopfisiz, L., Bialystok, arrested in 1939.

Partial Listing of Bulgarian Labour, Peasant and Political Leaders Imprisoned or Vanished without Trace in Bulgaria

1. Bojkov, Eng. St. Agrarian Party
2. Bratkov, Petur, Socialist Party.
3. Bronzov, N., Agrarian Party.
4. Dandarevski, Mincho, Agrarian Party.
5. Derjanski, Angel, Agrarian Party.
6. Dertliev, Petur, Socialist Party.
7. Drenski, B. Sp., Agrarian Party.
8. Gichev, Dimiter, Agrarian Party.
9. Girginov, Alexander, Leader, Democratic Party.
10. Gorov, V., Agrarian Party.
11. Iordanov, Georgi, Agrarian Party.
12. Ivanov, Tsveti, Trade Union Leader and Member, Social Democratic Party.
13. Koev, Petur, Agrarian Party.
14. Koprinkov, Ivan, Socialist Party.
15. Kovachev, Iordan, Agrarian Party.
16. Kulchev, Kosta, Leader, Social Democratic Party and Teachers' Union.
17. Kunev, Trifun, Leader, Agrarian Party.
18. Mouraviev, Konstantin, Agrarian Party.
19. Pachaourov, Dr. N., Agrarian Party.
20. Peshev, Al., Agrarian Party.
21. Popov, Ch. G., Agrarian Party.
22. Siavov, Krum, Socialist Party.
23. Stambolov, St. D., Agrarian Party.
24. Turpanov, Petko, Socialist Party.
25. Vassilev, Dr. G. Agrarian Party.

Partial Listing of Czechoslovak Labour, Peasant and Political Leaders Imprisoned or Vanished without Trace in Czechoslovakia

1. Cepeciak, K., Trade Union Leader.
2. Drtina, Dr. Prokop, Former Minister of Justice.
3. Dundr, Vojtech, Social Democratic Leader, Gen. Secy, Metal Workers' Union.

4. Goerner, Viadimir, Leader, Social Democratic Party.
5. Henzlik, A., Trade Union Leader.
6. Jarolim, C. Trade Union Leader.
7. Kajer, J., Trade Union Leader.
8. Kluzak, Vaciav, Former Vice-President, Czechoslovak Teachers' Union.
9. Lichner, Jan, Former Deputy Minister of Defence.
10. Samek, J., Trade Union Leader.
11. Trzicki, Frantisek, Former State Prosecutor General.
12. Ursiny, Jan., Deputy Prime Minister.
13. Volf, — Trade Union Leader.
14. Volkova, D., Trade Union Leader.
15. Vrba, — Trade Union Leader.
16. Zuzek, F., Trade Union Leader.

Partial Listing of German Social Democrats Imprisoned or Vanished without Trace in Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany

1. Arnold, Wilfried, Member.
2. Bley, Arthur, District Secretary.
3. Beckmann, Otto, Vice-Chairman.
4. Bonkas, Hans, District Chief.
5. Beese, Heinrich, Secretary.
6. Behnisch, Bernhard, Member.
7. Christiansen, Berthold, Member.
8. Donath, Horst, Member.
9. Eckhard, Kurt, Chairman.
10. Fischer, Dorothea, Member.
11. Georgi, Max, City Council.
12. Gast, Willi, Member.
13. Hoffmann, Erich, Member.
14. Handler, Gustav, Member.
15. Hameyer, Walter, Member.
16. Hameyer, Charlotte, Member.
17. Hartmann, Gustav, Bürgermeister.
18. Hiller, Helmuth, Member.
19. Hubner, Erich, Member.
20. Hesse, Willi, Country Chief.
21. Heft, Hans, Member.
22. Irmeler, Willi, Organizational Leader.
23. Janicke, Ernest, Member.
24. Kewald, Adolf, Member.
25. Korbecher, Karl Dr. Member.
26. Kruger, Erich, Member.
27. Kreutzer, Hermann, Member.
28. Kreutzer, Paul, Kreisleader.
29. Kade, Heinz, Member.
30. Liebeck, Paul, Chairman.

Partial Listing of Hungarian Labour, Peasant and Social, Democratic Party Leaders Imprisoned or Vanished without Trace in Hungary

1. Arany, Balint, Small Holders Party.
2. Barrei, Jyulia, Former Social Democratic Mayor of Kispest (District of Budapest).
3. Bechtler, Peter, Member, Woodworkers Union, Former Deputy Mayor of Budapest.
4. Borbely, Janos, Former Member of Miners' Union Council, Former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
5. Buchler, Jozsef, Former District Secretary of Social Democratic Party.
6. Csaplar, Peter, Former Secretary, SZOT (Hungarian Trade Union Council).

7. Dabi, Lajos, Member Council, Iron and Metal Workers' Union; Former Secretary, County of Aszod.
8. Filler, Laszlo, Member of Parliament; Member, Small Holders party.
9. Gesztesy, Jenoe, Chairman, Union of Industrial Organization; Former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
10. Hegyi, Imri, Member, Council, Iron and Metal Workers' Union, Former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
11. Hubai, Janos, Former Secretary General Hungarian Leather Workers' Union.
12. Ivanics, Istvan, Former President, Steel Trade Union.
13. Jacko, Pal, Member, Small Holders Party; Deputy to Parliament.
14. Jancse, Imre, Member, Supreme Body of SZOT.
15. Juhasz, Vilmos, Former Social Democratic Representative in Parliament.
16. Jyorki, Dr. Imre, Director, Consumers' Union; Legal Advisor of SZOT and Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
17. Kallai, Sandor, Member, Council of Construction Workers' Union; former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
18. Kapocs, Ferenc, Member, Small Holders Party; Deputy to Parliament.
19. Kelemen, Jyulia, Member, Supreme Body of SZOT.
20. Kertesz, Miklos, Former Secretary, Union of Self-Employed; Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
21. Kishazi, Odon, Former President, SZOT.
22. Komuves, Jossef, Former President, SZOT.
23. Kovacs, Bela, Secretary General of the Small Holders Party.
24. Laborcz, Istvan, Member of Council, Iron, and Metal Workers' Union.
25. Mateovics, Ferenc, Member of Parliament; Member, Christian Party.
26. Menyhart, Istvan, Chairman, Union of Transport employees.
27. Mero, Ignac, Former Member, Council, Union of Self-Employed; Social Democratic Party Member.
28. Nagy, Jenoe Pal, Social Democratic Party Secretary of Ujpest (District of Budapest).
29. Papt, Iyula, Member, Council Construction Workers' Union.
30. Pavlovski, Mrs. Ferenc, Member, Women's State Council.
31. Pavlovski, Ferenc, Former Council Member, Printers' Union; Former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
32. Piller, Jyula, Former Editor, Ujpest Trade Union Paper (Budapest).
33. Pozsgay, Jyula, Member Council, Printers' Union; Former Deputy Minister, Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
34. Revesz, Undras, Secretary, Budapest Union of employees.
35. Sipeki, Dr. Geza, Legal Advisor, Council (SZOT) of Trade Union.

36. Steinherz, Simon, Former Member Council, Iron and Metal Workers' Union.
37. Szabo, Janos, Former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
38. Szeder, Ferenc, Former Chairman, Agricultural Workers' Union, Former Secretary General, Social Democratic Party;
39. Takacs, Ferencz, Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
40. Takacs, Jozsef, Former Member, Council of Agricultural Workers Union; Former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.
41. Takacs, Tivadar, Council Member, Transportation Workers' Union.
42. Turi, Istvan, Council Member, Agricultural Workers' Union, Former Social Democratic Representative to Parliament.

**Partial Listing of Latvian Labour,
Peasant and Political Leaders
Imprisoned or Vanished without
Trace**

1. Apinis, Davis, Member of Parliament, Member of the Central Board of the New Farmers and Small-Holder Agrarian Party, deported to Siberia in June 1941.
2. Bumeister, K., Member of Parliament. Social Democrat.
3. Dukurs, Roberts, Editor, Social Democrat, Member of Parliament.
4. Erhards, Ernst, Member of Parliament, Member of the Central Board of the New Farmers and Agrarian Party, deported to Siberia in June 1941.
5. Irbe, Karlis, Member of Parliament, Member of Christian Union and Workers' Party.
6. Irbuls, Stanislavs, Vice-Minister of Agriculture, Member of Parliament, Member of the Christian Peasant and Catholic Party.
7. Ivanovs, Roberts, Member of Parliament, Social Democrat.
8. Kalnins, Nikolajs, Member of Parliament, Social Democrat.
9. Kaulins, Janis, Member of Parliament, Member of the Central Board of the New Farmers and Small-Holder Agrarian Party, deported to Siberia in June 1941.
10. Kindzulis, Jezups, Editor, Member of Parliament, Member of the Progressive Peasants Union.
11. Lindins, Rudolfs, Editor, Social Democrat, Member of Parliament.
12. Meikuls, Augusts, Member of the Central Board of the New Farmers and Small-Holders Agrarian Party.
13. Milbergs, Gotfrids, Member of Parliament.
14. Pastors, Alfons, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Christian Peasant and Catholic Party, Editor, Member of Parliament.
15. Pipina, Berta, Member of Parliament, Chairman of the Center of International Union of Women.

16. Rudzis, J., Member of Parliament, Social Democrat.
17. Rudzitis, Peteris, Editor, Member of the Christian Peasant and Catholic Party.
18. Rancans, Antons, Physician, Minister of Social Welfare.
19. Seile, Valerija, Teacher, Member of Parliament, editor of several periodicals.
20. Trasuns, Jezups, Member of Parliament, Leader of Progressive Peasant Union.
21. Veckalns, A., Member of Parliament, Social Democrat, Trade Union leader.
22. Vesmanis, Berta, Social Democrat, Member of Parliament.
23. Vesmanis, Fricis, Social Democrat Speaker of the Parliament.
24. Visna, J., Member of Parliament Social Democrat.
25. Volonts, Janis, Mayor of Daugavpils City, Member of Christian Peasant and Catholic Party.
26. Ziemelis, Edmund, Professor, Member of Parliament, deported to Siberia in June 1941.

**Partial Listing of Lithuanian
Labour and Peasant Leaders
Imprisoned or Vanished without
Trace in Lithuania**

1. Aleksa, Jonas, Leader of the Lithuanian Farmers Party, Professor of University; arrested July 11, 1940.
2. Bistras, Leonas, Prime Minister; President of the Parliament, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Defence, Leader of the Christian Democratic Party, University Professor, Journalist; arrested July 11, 1940.
3. Bizaubhas, Kazys, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Education, Member of Parliament, Member of the Central Committee of the Christian Democratic Party; arrested in December 1940, sentenced to 20 years slave labour (fate unknown).
4. Buozius, Juozas Member of the Central Committee of the Catholic Farmers Party; deported to Siberia June 16, 1941 (fate unknown).
5. Carneckis, Valdemaras, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Leader of the Christian Democratic Party; arrested and deported to Siberia June 14, 1941.
6. Dagelis, Jonas, Secretary General of the Catholic Farmer Party, Member of Parliament; arrested July 11, 1940, sentenced to 10 years slave labor (fate unknown).
7. Dagilis, Rev. Juozas, Former Member of the Parliament, Member of the Central Committee of the Christian Democratic Party; arrested in 1947.
8. Dielininkaitis, Pranas, Vice President of Lithuanian, Labour Federation (Christian Labour Movement), University Professor, Journalist; arrested July 11, 1940, sentenced to 25 years forced labour.

9. Dovydaitis, Pranas, Prime Minister, President of Lithuanian Labour Federation (Christian Labour Movement), Editor of several Catholic journals, University Professor, Co-editor of Lithuanian Encyclopedia; June 14, 1941 and deported to slave labour camp.
10. Jankevicius, Juozas, Former Minister of Communication, leader of Lithuanian Farmer Party; arrested November 1940, sentenced to 8 years slave labour.
11. Jokantas, Dr. Kazys, Former Minister of Education, Member of Parliament, Leader of Catholic Farmers Party; arrested June 14 1941, deported to Siberia.
12. Kalnenas, Jonas, Former Secretary of the Populist Peasant Party; arrested June 14, 1941 and deported to Siberia (fate unknown).
13. Leonaitis, Miss Ona, Leader of Social-Democratic Party; arrested in 1949 and deported to Siberia (fate unknown).
14. Lipcius, Mykolas, Leader of Christian Democratic Party; arrested July 11, 1940, sentenced to 12 years slave labour camp.
15. Masiliunas, Jonas, Leader of Christian Democratic Party, former Minister of Communications, former Member of Parliament; arrested June 14, 1941 and deported to Siberia.
16. Miksys, Feliksas, Former President of the Catholic Farmers Party, Member of Parliament; arrested in 1945, and deported to Siberia (fate unknown).
17. Petrulis, Vytautas, Leader of Catholic Farmers Party, former Prime Minister, former Minister of Finance, Member of Parliament; arrested July 11, 1940 and sentenced to 20 years slave labour (fate unknown).
18. Rackauskas, Vytautas, Leader of Populist Peasant Party, former Member of Parliament; arrested June 14, 1941 and deported to Siberia.
19. Skrupskelis, Ignas, Editor of the Catholic Daily, "XX Amzius", Leader of Catholic Youth Movement, Professor of University, leading journalist; arrested July 11, 1940, sentenced to 20 years slave labour camp.
20. Starkus, Zigmantas, Leader of Christian Democratic Party, Member of Parliament; arrested July 11, 1940 and sentenced to 12 years slave labour camp.
21. Stulginskis, Aleksandras, Formerly President of Lithuania, Leader of Catholic Farmers Party, Member of Parliament; arrested July 11, 1940, sentenced to 12 years slave labour (fate unknown).
22. Stays, Konstantinas, Christian Democrat, Mayor of Vilnius; arrested for the first time in 1939, released and rearrested again July 11, 1940, sentenced to 10 or 12 years of forced labour camp.

23. Tamosaitis, Antanas, Leader of Populist Peasant Party, the last Minister of Justice of Lithuania, University Professor; arrested July 11, 1940, sentenced to 12 years slave labour (fate unknown).
24. Toliushis, Juozas, Leader of Populist Peasant Party; arrested August 10, 1940.
25. Tomkus, Juozas, Leader of Nationalist Party, leading Journalist; arrested July 11, 1940.
26. Velykis, Mykolas, Leader of Populist Peasant Party; arrested in 1945, sentenced to 12 years slave labour.
27. Zygelis, Balys, Leader of Populist Peasant Party, former Member of Parliament; arrested June 14, 1941, deported to Siberia (fate unknown).
28. Zvironas, Antanas, Leader of Social Democratic Party, University Professor; arrested in 1945 and sentenced to 20 years slave labour.

Partial Listing of Polish Labour, Peasant and Political Leaders Imprisoned or Vanished without Trace in Poland

1. Anski, Augusty, Editor, Peasant Party Newspaper *Gazeta Ludowa*.
2. Antczak, Antoni, Leader, Christian Labour Party (CLP).
3. Bryja, Wincenty, Leader, Peasant Party.
4. Bukowski, Stanislaw, Leader, Christian Labour Party.
5. Chacinski, Josef, Leader, Christian Labour Party.
6. Hausner, Artur, Member, Social Democratic Party. (Pre-war Member of Polish Parliament).
7. Hoppe, Jan, leader, Christian Labour Party.
8. Jankowski, Jan, Vice-Premier, Polish Government in Exile and Underground.
9. Kaczynski, Zygmunt, Former Minister of Education; Leader, Christian Democratic Party.
10. Kaminski, Col. Franciszek, Commander-in-Chief, Peasant Battalions of anti-Nazi Underground Home Army.
11. Kwasiebski, Jozesf, Leader, Christian Labour Party.
12. Nadobnik,— Deputy to Parliament, Leader Polish Peasant Party.
13. Okulicki, Leopold, Commander-in-Chief, Underground Home Army.
14. Osiejowa, Genowefa, Deputy to Parliament, Chairman, Peasant Women's League.
15. Ostrowski, Wladyslaw, Leader, Polish Peasant Party and Leader of anti-Nazi Underground.
16. Pajdak, Antoni, Member, Polish Underground Home Council of Minister, Leader, Polish Socialist Party.
17. Piotrowski, Zygmunt, Member, Social Democratic Party, pre-war Member, Polish Parliament.
18. Puzak, Kazimierz, Chairman, Council of National Unity, Member, Polish Underground and Polish Socialist Party.

19. Sonta,—Colonel, Peasant Battalions of the anti-Nazi Underground Home Army.
20. Studentowicz,—Leader, Christian Labour Party.
21. Urbanski, Franciszek, Leader, Christian Democratic Party.
22. Weker, Cecylia, Leader, Christian Labour Party.
23. Zdanowski,— Leading Socialist and Trade Unionist.

Partial Listing of Leading Rumanian Labour, Peasant and Political Leaders Imprisoned or Vanished without Trace in Rumania

1. Anghel, N., Member, National Peasant Party.
2. Bozdoc, I., Member, National Peasant Party.
3. Capeteanu, I., Member, National Peasant Party.
4. Cercega, Traion, Prominent, leader, Rumanian Metal Workers' Union.
5. Constantinescu, Cheorghe, Member, National Peasant Party.
6. Coslovschi, Orest, Member, National Peasant Party.
7. Gristescu, Gh., Member, National Peasant Party.
8. Damian, Titus, Member, National Peasant Party.
9. Danciu, C., Member, National Peasant Party.
10. Dobrescu, Aurel, Member, National Peasant Party.
11. Dragos, Ghita, Member, National Peasant Party.
12. Fluera, Ion, President, Central Labour Confederation.
13. Fotino, George, Member, Liberal Party.
14. Grigorovici,—Member, National Peasant Party.
15. Grosu, Virgiu, Member, National Peasant Party.
16. Halipa, Pan, Member, National Peasant Party.
17. Hromatka, George, Prominent leader, Rumanian Metal Workers' Union.
18. Hudita, Prof. Ion, Member, National Peasant Party.
19. Ilie, Ion, Member, National Peasant Party.
20. Jumanca, Iosif, Former Vice President, General Labour Confederation.
21. Leon, Ion, Member,, National Peasant Party.
22. Leucutia, Aurel, Member, National Peasant Party.
23. Lupescu, Ion, Member, National Peasant Party.
24. Macarascu, Gica, Member, National Peasant Party.
25. Maglasu,—Secretary, Transport Workers' Union.
26. Marinache,—Member, National Peasant Party.
27. Melinte, Vasile, Member, National Peasant Party.
28. Micsunesti, Polizu, Member, National Peasant Party.
29. Mihalache, Ion, Vice President, National Peasant Party.