

Party, Government And The People

by V. B. Karnik

IN a speech delivered at a private meeting of Presidents and Secretaries of Pradesh Congress Committees the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru made some thought-provoking remarks on the relations between a political party, the government and the people. *The A.I.C.C. Economic Review* has published an extensive report of the speech. According to the report Mr. Nehru said: "It is a difficult question because we are somewhere between two stools, if I may say so. In Communist countries there is no difference between administration and organisation. They are identical. That is not our position; neither does our Constitution give it, nor do we want it. In other countries it is the government that is everything, and the organisation only comes vaguely into the picture about some very basic policies."

Mr. Nehru then referred to the conditions as they obtained in England and, after pointing out how the Conservative Party and the Labour Party functioned, gave it as his opinion that in that country "it is the government that is everything and not the organisation". Obviously Mr. Nehru was referring when he made that statement to the relations between the government and political parties. His broad conclusion regarding the position in India was: "Now, therefore, we come somewhere between the Communist system and the normal working of the countries where there is parliamentary democracy. That is the essential difference of the situation."

The problem raised by Mr. Nehru is of vital importance. He was discussing it only in its relation with the Congress Party and in the context of its growing weakness as evidenced by the results of the General Election. The problem is, however, related to the prospects of democracy in the country. Mr. Nehru's own ideas on the subject do not appear to be very clear and specific. For, though he talks of our occupying somewhat of a middle position between communist regimes and parliamentary democracies, he has at the same time talked of the administration as the "Executive Branch of the Congress", a position not far different from what exists in communist

countries. It is likely that he is not correctly reported or that he used the terms in a loose manner, without intending to give them their usual significance. Whatever the fact, it emphasises the need for a thorough and dispassionate discussion of the problem.

According to the classical definition, a democracy is a government of the people by the people and for the people. Profound political thinkers like the late Mr. M. N. Roy have objected to the last part of the definition, namely, the clause "for the people", on the ground that it keeps the door open for ideas of dictatorship to creep in. The validity of the objection will be clear when one examines critically the claims of political parties to govern in the name of the people. Political parties are always a big or a small part of the people, but howsoever big a party may be it cannot be coterminous with the people. Even in Soviet Russia where the Communist Party is a huge mass organisation and where other political parties are not allowed to function the membership of the Communist Party constitutes only a small part of the country's population. In democratic countries a much smaller part of the population joins political parties.

The party system developed in a number of democratic countries with the advent of representative government. The party which obtains a majority in the representative assembly consisting of the elected representatives of the people forms the government. But the government that is formed is not a party government but a government of the people. In England the Conservative or the Labour Party forms, on winning a majority in the elections, a His or Her Majesty's Government. A clear distinction is always maintained between the administration or the government machinery and the party machinery and the latter is never allowed to utilise or manipulate the former. Parliament is the sovereign authority. It is the elected representatives of the people who as Members of Parliament determine the policies of the government. They may form themselves into Conservative or Labour Parliamentary Parties, but it is they and not the extra-parliamentary political caucus which decide upon the policies to be followed or the course of action to be adopted. In a democracy a parliament or any other assembly of the elected representatives of the people has a far higher right to speak in the name of the people than a congress or a conference of a political party. That is why in a country like England more attention is paid to what happens in Parliament than to what happens in the meetings and conferences of political parties. A Parliament may not be an

adequate expression of popular will but it is far more adequate than a political party.

The situation is entirely different in communist countries. There the party and the government are identical and, as there cannot be two governments in a country, in a communist country there cannot be any other party than the Communist Party. The Communist Party controls and administers the entire governmental apparatus. It also controls all economic activity. All power is concentrated in the hands of the Party, that is, ultimately in the hands of a small group of leaders. It is this group of leaders who make all the policies of the country. The representative assembly is called into session from time to time only to laud and endorse those policies. The government executes and implements the policies. It is merely the "Executive Branch" of the Communist Party. In communist countries the people as such have no place of importance. The Communist Party constitutes itself the sole custodian and defender of the interests of the people. It knows what the people want and what is in their interests and what requires to be done to ensure them. It cannot brook any challenge to its authority nor can it tolerate any discussion of the merits or demerits of its policies. Its word, its directives must be unhesitatingly accepted as the supreme law and the final wisdom. Any hesitation or failure is regarded as an offence against the State and the entire machinery of the government is brought into play to enforce obedience. This leads to the establishment of a police State and a regime of oppression and terror as obtained under Stalin.

What has happened in Soviet Russia and other communist countries is the logical outcome of the identification between the party and the government. In these countries it is the Communist Party which is the government and naturally there is no scope for the existence of other parties. Having accepted parliamentary democracy and recognised the need for more than one political party, India cannot surely imitate the communist model. By virtue of its success

at the polls the Congress Party may form the government, but it cannot become the government as a Communist Party becomes the government in a communist country. The Government of India will maintain its separate, non-party identity. An identification with the Congress Party will be a step in the direction of totalitarianism. It cannot obviously become the "Executive Branch of the Congress." In that capacity its main task will be the perpetuation of the rule of the Congress Party. A government engaged in that task will find democracy and democratic institutions an inconvenient and irksome burden and naturally it will try to rid itself of the burden.

Mr. Nehru and other leaders are worried by the decline in the fortunes of the Congress. The Congress which was once a national movement and the sole embodiment of the hopes and aspirations of the people no longer enjoys that pre-eminent position. That was bound to happen after the attainment of national independence. The Congress is now one of the political parties in the country, though it still continues to be the most numerous and the best organised. But in course of time other parties may come up and challenge the position of the Congress. This prospect may alarm Congress leaders and some of them may feel tempted to follow the communist path for strengthening their organisation. But eminent national leaders like Mr. Nehru and others may not take such a tragic view of the situation. The fate of Indian democracy is not necessarily linked with the Congress or any particular party. It may survive and prosper even after the decline of the Congress. What is far more important is therefore to awaken and strengthen the democratic consciousness of the people.

In a democracy the people are far more important than political parties. It is only under communism that a political party is assigned the highest place and is allowed to dominate the entire political, economic and social life of a country. The inevitable result is the enslavement of the people. If that tragedy is to be avoided there must be a clear understanding of the relationship that must subsist in a democratic set-up between a party and the government and nothing should be done which will enable a party to arrogate to itself the functions and the rights which belong to the people.

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.

TO BE OUT SHORTLY

INDIAN COMMUNIST PARTY DOCUMENTS

Published by

The Democratic Research Service
and
The Institute of Pacific Relations

Available from:

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Notes

Fresh Burdens

THE Budget proposals of the Finance Minister have imposed on various sections of the people new tax burdens to the tune of Rs. 92.85 crores. Even after this new taxation there will be in the revenue and capital budgets an overall deficit of Rs. 275 crores which will be met by the expansion of treasury bills. This will in effect mean expansion of currency which will throw an additional burden upon the people.

It is true that in his efforts to increase the revenues the Finance Minister has cast his net far and wide. No section has escaped his notice. All the same it must be stated that the burdens imposed on the common man have increased disproportionately. The higher excise duties imposed upon the many necessities of life will hit the common man very heavily. There is in addition the increase in postal rates, a tax on railway fares and the lowering of the income-tax limit. All these together will add considerably to the difficulties that the common man is already facing.

The fresh burdens are being imposed in the name of the success of the Second Five Year Plan. It is urged that the people must pay the price for industrialisation and development. There is no dispute with that proposition, nor with "the ultimate goal of uplifting the country's poverty-ridden masses through planned development." The urgency of planned development is accepted on all sides. But the price of the plan must not be too heavy and must not lead to the impoverishment of the very masses whose uplift it is proposed to secure. The Second Five Year Plan may need reconsideration and reassessment in the light of this consideration. A number of difficulties have already developed and the estimates of expenses on various projects are mounting up. In view of this it will be necessary to adopt a more flexible attitude towards the various targets of production and other achievements which were accepted in the beginning.

In this connection it is necessary to keep in mind the following warning sounded by an eminent economist, Mr. P. C. Jain. In the course of an article in the *Times of India* he wrote: "Higher prices, and as a result of this, higher costs of the second Plan lead to higher taxation, and this in its turn leads to higher prices and demand for higher wages and higher costs, and, therefore, still higher taxation. If we are engulfed in this vicious circle, the financial cost of the Plan would become much too high without any real improvement and there could be a very great danger of breakdown of our economy."

It is also necessary to keep in mind the alarming situation that is developing on the food front. In some parts there is already a scarcity of food and prices of foodstuffs have gone up considerably all over the country. There is also a steep rise in the cost of living which will be accentuated further by the new taxation.

All these are an indication of the strains that are developing in the economy. It will be most unwise on the part of the Government to ignore them. On the basis of the formidable majority that they possess, the Government may succeed in securing parliamentary approval to their taxation proposals, but anger and resentment will grow in the country. They are helpful neither to economic progress nor to democratic development.

Liquidation of Savings

THE recent decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. freezing for 20 years the Soviet state bonds of the staggering value of 260,000 million rubles exposes the severe financial crisis which the country is undergoing at present. The main points of the decree are: (1) Beginning in 1958 the issuance of state loans is to be discontinued, with the exception of the three percent convertibles; (2) The state is suspending for a period of 20 years the repayment of 260 billion rubles extracted from the population in the form of loans; and (3) In 1957 the last loan, payable in five years, will be floated to the value of twelve billion rubles, or one-third the figure for 1956. Subscriptions to this loan are not to exceed two weeks' pay, and the low-paid groups will not have to subscribe.

The decree is noteworthy because it amounts, in practice, to confiscation of the enormous sum of 260 billion rubles, since repayment after 20 years or later is purely academic. To understand the implications of the decree it is necessary to remember that the loans were in essence a tax. Prior to the recent decree every worker in the Soviet Union was obliged to subscribe to the loan usually at least one month's pay every year. Though nominally voluntary, bond sales were effected compulsorily through payroll deductions.

This decree is tantamount to a default on government obligation. The State bonds were sold to the people on the assurance that they were the safest investment and with the lure of the chance of winning as much as a hundred thousand rubles in the lottery. But under the new decree the people will get neither the money they have invested nor the prizes that they have won.

The loans were an important part of the income of the Soviet Union. For instance, during the period 1941-45, about 15 % of the Soviet Union's total military expenditures were covered by loans. But the loans ceased to be an asset. In view of the enormous sums that have accumulated the state have had to pay out to meet old obligations almost as much as it would have taken in by new loans. Scheduled 1957 repayment of loans amounted to about \$ 400 crores. In a decade this annual charge would have doubled. In addition to this the State would have had to make lottery payments of 16 billion rubles in 1957, 18 billion in 1957, 25 billion in 1967, and so on. Now with a simple stroke of pen some three-fourths of the entire internal debt has been officially written off.

The present step seems to have been designed to ward off the inflationary pressures being felt by the Soviet rulers. And this is not the first time that the

Kremlin has resorted to such a drastic measure. In December 1947, by a sweeping monetary reform, the Kremlin wiped out the liquid savings of the bulk of the Soviet population and made possible the liquidation of the extreme inflation that had grown during and after World War II. Thus this ignominious step is not without a precedent in the Soviet history.

Whatever may be the reasons behind the recent decree the moral is quite obvious. In the absence of democratic rights, the Soviet leaders can, by the stroke of a pen, deprive the masses of their hard-earned savings. The only hope that is held out is that after 1957 no new loans for economic development will be forced on the people. But who can guarantee that after a few years the Government will not again deem it necessary to proclaim it as a patriotic duty to subscribe "voluntarily" to state loans and insist upon the due performance of the duty?

Writer And The State

IN their paternalistic zeal for improving the taste and the standard of the common reader and bettering the lot of the writer our Central and State Governments are already making heavy inroads in the field of literature. The Central Government has established the Sahitya Akademi and National Book Trust with a view to encouraging the production of good literature and making it available at moderate prices to the general public. It has entered the field of publishing and has started awarding prizes to books adjudged best. Various State Governments also, encouraged by the Central Government's example, have come forward to help the cause of good literature by instituting annual prizes for best books in their regional languages. Besides, there are many other institutions and committees, like All India Radio, through which the State is trying assiduously to improve the lot of writers and artists in general.

Though all these attempts are commendable for their zeal, they raise far-reaching questions of the freedom of the artist to pursue his own calling without any outside interference and pressure. The increasing interference by the State in the literary field may lead gradually to the increasing State control over and bureaucratisation of literature. Some State Governments, like Rajasthan, have already taken to producing and publishing school text-books. In the case of a State Government publishing books and offering rewards to writers, it takes upon itself the responsibility of assessing the relative merits of literary works. Here precisely lies the danger of men in power misusing their authority and writers blindly yielding to temptations offered them by the party in power.

The duty of an artist is to be true to his own personal vision. His supreme loyalty is to his own creative spirit. By misusing the power, the State can transform its patronage and authority into instruments of indirect coercion and tempt the writer to compromise his integrity or surrender his conscience to the immediate aims of the almighty State. It is therefore heartening to note that at the Writers' Seminar and Conference convened by "Parimal", a literary group in Allahabad, many eminent writers from different

parts of the country, expressed their keen awareness of this growing danger arising out of the State's intrusion in the field of literature.

Repression In Indonesia

AS we go to the press we get the news of the arrest by the Government of Indonesia of Mr. Takdir Alisjahbana, the celebrated author. Apart from being a wellknown writer, Mr. Alisjahbana is the Vice-President of the University of Indonesia and the Chairman of the Indonesian P. E. N. Club. A few days back Mr. Mochtar Lubis, Editor of the independent journal, *Indonesia Raya*, was also arrested under similar circumstances. In both the cases neither reasons are given nor are the arrested persons being put up for trial. We protest against these arbitrary arrests and demand either a public trial or the immediate release of these distinguished men of letters and leaders of public opinion.

The "Literary Gazette" of the Hungarian Revolution

The "Literary Gazette" (*Irodalmi Ujsag*), official organ of the Hungarian Writers Association and spearhead of the Hungarian revolution, was published for the last time on the 2nd November, 1956. After the second Soviet onslaught the weekly was suppressed and the puppet government banned the Hungarian Writers Association. Some of the leading writers of Hungary are now in the Budapest security police jail awaiting trial, some others have escaped to the West. The latter have formed with other emigre Hungarian writers, the Hungarian Writers Association Abroad and have begun publication of the "Literary Gazette" as a fortnightly. The first issue, which is identical in format with the suppressed *Irodalmi Ujsag*, was published in London on May 16.

The title-page of the first issue quotes an 1852 official announcement according to which Louis Kossuth and his associates by their escape forfeited their right to be called Hungarians. The Soviet puppets in Hungary, who do not seem to know history, have made a declaration to precisely the same effect about the 1956 escapees, which is likewise quoted.

From secretary to type setters, from printers to proof readers, the paper is produced by revolutionary exiles. The editors and main contributors of the present issue represent among them several decades of Hungarian prison life.

The "Literary Gazette" publishes for the first time a well-known poem written by George Faludy in jail and clandestinely circulated for years but never printed before. The poem—"Wild Goose"—is an ode to the unconquerable human spirit which transforms the bleak cellar-cubicle of solitary confinement into a wonderful pageant of beauty. The emaciated convict, the lowest of the low, is rich with all human history, with all the beauties of art and nature.

The "Literary Gazette"—*Irodalmi Ujsag*—is an international fortnightly for Hungarians at home and abroad and is published at 25, Haymarket, London.

What Is Socialism?

by Leszek Kolakowski

Mr. Kolakowski, a prominent young philosopher of Poland, wrote this article for the official student newspaper Po Prostu. The publication of the article was forbidden because of its anti-Soviet character. It was however, circulated privately and created a profound impression upon the students of the country. It fell in the hands of an American journalist and was published recently in the New Leader of New York.

WE will tell you what socialism is. But first we must tell you what socialism is not. It is a matter about which we once had a quite different opinion than we have today.

Well, then, socialism is not:

A society in which a person who has committed no crime sits at home waiting for the police.

A society in which it is a crime to be the brother, sister, son or wife of a criminal.

A society in which one person is unhappy because he says what he thinks, and another happy because he does not say what is in his mind.

A society in which a person lives better because he does not think at all.

A society in which a person is unhappy because he is a Jew and another feels better for not being a Jew.

A state whose soldiers move into the territory of another country first.

A state where anyone who praises the national leaders is better off.

A state in which one can be condemned without trial.

A society whose leaders appoint themselves to their posts.

A society in which ten people live in one room.

A society which has illiterates and smallpox epidemics.

A state which does not permit travel abroad.

A state which has more spies than nurses and more people in prison than in hospitals.

A state in which the number of officials increases faster than that of workers.

A state in which one is forced to resort to lies.

A state in which one is compelled to be a thief.

A state in which one is forced to resort to crime.

A state which possesses colonies.

A state whose neighbours curse geography.

A state which produces excellent jet planes and bad shoes.

A state in which cowards live better than the valiant.

A state in which the lawyers in most cases agree with the state prosecutor.

Empire, tyranny, oligarchy, bureaucracy.

A state in which the majority of people seek God in order to find solace in their misery.

A state which awards prizes to pseudo-authors and knows more about painting than the painters.

A nation which oppresses other nations.

A nation which is oppressed by another nation.

A state which wants all its citizens to have the same opinions in philosophy, foreign policy, economics, literature and ethics.

A state whose government defines its citizen's rights, but whose citizens do not define the government's rights.

A state in which one is responsible for one's ancestors.

A state in which one part of the population receives salaries 40 times higher than those of the remainder.

Any system of government toward which most of the governed are hostile.

A single, isolated state.

A group of backward countries.

A state which utilizes nationalistic slogans.

A state whose governments believe that nothing is more important than their power.

A state which makes a pact with crime and then adapts its ideology to this pact.

A state which would like to see its Foreign Ministry determine the political opinion of all mankind.

A state which finds it difficult to distinguish between enslavement and liberation.

A state in which racist agitators enjoy full freedom.

A state in which there is private ownership of the means of production.

A state which considers itself solidly socialist because it has liquidated private ownership of the means of production.

A state which has difficulty differentiating between social revolution and armed assault.

A state which does not believe that people must be happier under socialism than elsewhere.

A society which is very melancholy.

A caste system.

A state which always knows the will of the people before it asks them.

A state which can mistreat the people with impunity.

A state in which a view of history is important.

A state in which the philosophers and writers always say the same as the generals and ministers, but always after them.

A state in which street maps of cities are state secrets.

A state in which the returns of parliamentary elections are always predictable.

A state in which there is slave labour.

A state in which feudal fetters exist.

A state which has a world monopoly on scientific progress.

A state in which an entire people, through no desire of its own, is moved to a new location.

A state in which the workers have no influence on the government.

(Continued on page 10)

Review

Ghana:

An autobiography of Dr. Kwame Nkruma, Prime Minister, Published by Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd. London. 1957. Price Sh. 21/- Pages 310.

ON the 6th March this year, the former British colony of the Gold Coast in West Africa (together with the British Trust Territory adjoining it to the East known as the Togoland) entered upon its career of independence as a sovereign State within the Commonwealth with full Dominion Status under the Statute of Westminster. The new Dominion includes Togoland as an integral part as the result of a plebiscite held under UN auspices a short while ago. This is an event of "world historic importance", (to use the language of Spengler), which was not considered within the horizon of practical politics before the second world war and which is bound to accelerate the liberation of the remaining parts of the African continent. This new entrant into the comity of nations has chosen, under the leadership of its supreme leader Dr. Kwame Nkruma, the name of *Ghana* reviving the ancient name under which West Africa was known in the days of its independence and greatness till the 11th century, when it fell before the Moors. Ghana

(Continued from page 9)

A state which believes that it alone can redeem humanity.

A state which considers itself to be always in the right.

A state in which history is a servant of policy.

A state whose citizens may not read the greatest works of contemporary literature, not see the greatest works of contemporary painting and not hear the greatest works of modern music.

A state which is always well pleased with itself.

A state which asserts that the world is very complicated but actually believes it to be extremely simple.

A state in which one must suffer long before one can get a doctor.

A society that has beggars.

A state which believes everyone to be enamoured of it, whereas in truth it is the opposite.

A state which is convinced that nobody in the world can conceive anything better.

A state which does not mind being hated as long as it is feared.

A state which determines who may criticize it and how.

A state in which one must each day refute what one affirmed the day before and always believe it to be the same.

A state which one does not like to see its citizens read back numbers of newspapers.

A state in which many ignore muses rank as scholars.

That was the first part. But now, listen attentively, we will tell you what socialism is: Well, then, socialism is a good thing.

now joins Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Sudan and Abyssinia among the free nations of Africa. But there are still vast areas in the Centre and South of the continent the problem of whose freedom will tax the moral and intellectual resources of the rulers of the modern world.

This autobiography reveals in a vigorous and straight-forward narrative the latest phase of the freedom fight. It also shows the background and early life and education of Nkruma and his preparation for his mission as a student in the USA and England. Nkruma was born in 1909 in the Western province of the Gold Coast. His father was a goldsmith and his mother came of a chieftain stock. After an early education in a Catholic school till matriculation standard, Nkruma went to the USA for higher studies with the assistance of a relative in 1934. He studied at Lincoln College (a Negro institution) and at Pennsylvania University supplementing his scholarships with earnings from odd jobs in the campus and outside. He graduated in economics, sociology and theology and took Master's Degrees in education and philosophy.

Nkruma soon drifted to New York and Harlem to be in closer touch with political life and organisations. In addition to the major Republican and Democratic party groups, he came into contact with communist and Trotskyist centres. He watched street corner agitations, attended Negro churches and preached from their pulpits. He studied in particular the technique of organisation of the revolutionary parties. As he said later, a middle class elite is ineffective without the assistance of the *battering ram* of mass support.

Nkruma went to London after the close of the war in 1945. In London, his political interests led him to help the organisations of African students and sailors. He worked with George Padmore and became secretary to the Pan African Congress which met in Manchester and gathered 200 delegates from all over the world. He organised the West African National Secretariat on a permanent basis. He started a journal called the *New African* to voice the new aspiration of the African.

Nkruma was invited to the Gold Coast in 1947 to work for the United Gold Coast Convention as its organising secretary. He worked for it with immense energy and enthusiasm. But, owing to differences of opinion, he had to form a new popular party of his own under the name of the Convention People's Party.

Dr. Nkruma, like Indian leaders, is entirely free from all bitterness regarding the past heritage of colonial oppression. He has laid down the ideal of equal partnership and friendship with all races and nations as the policy of his country. His thought and language are an amalgam of Marxist specialism and Mazzinian nationalism. His narrative shows however a remarkable freedom from fanatic adherence to any ideology. He has asked for the assistance of the free world in the first instance by way of technical know-how and capital. He hints that if they fail, he will turn elsewhere. Nkruma has made history and this autobiography helps us to understand the New Africa emerging under his leadership.

M. A. VENKATA RAO.

An Interview With Dedijer

by Hans Edward Teglers

The writer secured this interview with Dedijer when he was in Copenhagen on a lecture tour. It was published in Berlingske Tidende.

IF Karl Marx had lived today he would, undoubtedly, have written "Das Kapital" against the exploitation of the people which takes place in the Soviet Union. In this way, Dr. Vladimir Dedijer, the well-known Yugoslav politician, characterised the results of forty years of Communist rule in Russia.

Dedijer joined Tito in 1939. He was a member of the Central Committee of the Yugoslav Communist Party. When the leading theoretician, Milovan Djilas, fell into "disgrace" in January 1954, because he sympathized with western socialist ideas, Dedijer was the only one who took up his defence. When an investigation was set up against Dedijer, the Party refused him the right to defend himself publicly. He wrote a letter to the Editor of *The New York Times*, and, as a consequence of this, was sentenced to six-months imprisonment for "dissemination of enemy propaganda". The years from 1954-1956 were employed by Dedijer for comprehensive studies; in May 1956 he became a Doctor of Law.

In a conversation with this writer, he expounded his views about the development in the Soviet Union. "The old apparatus of the State was destroyed in 1917, the means of production nationalized. But the new State apparatus did not become the servant of the society but its master. The functions of such a highly centralized State depend first and foremost on the means of suppression available."

Vladimir Dedijer added:

"If such an apparatus is to be maintained, the people in it require high salaries as an incentive. In this way, they obtain a social status and become the exploiters of society. The direct producers, for example the workers, do not form part of this process. They do not have anything to say. The gap between the highest and lowest wages in the Soviet Union is greater than in many capitalist countries. Those employed by the apparatus of suppression earn particularly high salaries. Thus the main aim of socialism, which is to stimulate the individual effort in production, has not been achieved. Life in the Soviet Union illustrates that nationalization does not end exploitation. Real socialism only begins after nationalization."

Speaking about the development in the western democracies, he admitted:

"The middle classes have grown. The working classes in the Welfare State have improved their position considerably in every way. In such a state, the difference between rich and poor is not so great. The State is no longer an organ for suppressing one class by another."

Nevertheless, he maintained that socialism was necessary for freedom and democracy, just as freedom

and democracy were necessary pre-conditions for socialism. He offered us this definition:

"Socialism is a society in which one man is not exploited by another, in which the individual will be released from the chains of the State, in which man can fully enjoy every economic, social and political freedom."

On events in Hungary, he emphasized that the Soviets had forcefully prevented Hungary from choosing her own road to socialism; but they did not succeed in crushing the spirit of resistance.

Dedijer said with regard to his own country that it found itself in a new conflict with the Soviet Union which wished to force it into the so-called "socialist camp."

"In this new conflict, the Soviets are pursuing the same methods as under Stalin. One feels the hand of Molotov in this, and he has not invented anything new. Yugoslavia is being exposed to economic pressure. Thus, the Soviets have 'postponed' the promised construction of a big aluminium works in Montenegro. At the same time, the Soviet leaders are trying to play various leading circles of the Yugoslav communist party against each other."

Dr. Vladimir Dedijer expressed his belief in "the forces of history", saying: "All ways lead to socialism. One cannot turn back the wheel of history. Evolution is preferable, but revolution might in some cases be necessary. That was what happened in Yugoslavia during the war. It is, however, decisive, that revolution is only a *means* and not an *end* in itself. Any revolution which violates this principle prepares its own fall. The experiment in the Soviet Union has taught all of us one very essential thing: 'How not to do it'".

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

THE INDIAN MUTINY—May, 1957
by Celin Welch

THE WORLD'S CITIES (IV)—LONDON
by William Sansom

FRANCE IN PERSON?
by Herbert Luthy

MAY 1957

44

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

C. C. F. NEWS

AN East-West Music Festival to be held in Tokyo in the Spring of 1959 under the auspices of the Japan Broadcasting Corporation was planned last week in New York at the initiative of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, Paris.

The planning committee consisted of Nicolas Nabokov, William Schuman and Virgil Thomson, composers; Mario Labroca, director of music and television of the Italian National Radio; Ravi Shankar, Indian instrumental soloist and former programme director of the All-India Radio; Morio Tateno, New York representative of the Japan Broadcasting Corporation; Pierre Crenesse, local representative of the French National Radio-Television; Marcel Cuvelier, director of the Palais des Beaux-Arts, Brussels, and president-founder of Les Jeunesses Musicales; Alain Danielou, professor at the French Institute of Indian Studies, Pondichery; Jose Maceda, pianist and professor at the Philippine Women's University, Manila; Herbert Passin, anthropologist of Ohio State University and Tokyo; and Ian Hunter, London impresario, formerly director of the Edinburgh Festival.

The Festival committee plans to invite composers, musicologists, soloists and performing organisations from all over the world to take part in the programmes. These will include jazz, Spanish guitar music, Balinese gamelangs, Siamese dancers, Chinese opera, Japanese Noh and Kabuki theater, Indian music, and dancing and solo music from the Middle East, as well as Western symphonic music, chamber music, opera and ballet.

There will also be lectures by eminent experts from the East and the West, forum discussions, and laboratory demonstrations of instrumental, vocal and electronic techniques.

Mr. Nicolas Nabokov, Secretary-General of the Congress for Cultural Freedom is coordinator of the project.

* * *

The Congress for Cultural Freedom has followed

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

with increasing concern the steady diminution of freedom in Indonesia. The recent arrests by the Indonesian government of scholars and writers, brave enough to speak out against what they regard as a dangerous trend towards a totalitarian form of government, indicate plainly that intellectual freedom is gravely threatened.

Several months ago the International Press Institute protested against the arrest and retention of Mochtar Lubis, Editor-in-Chief of the independent Indonesian newspaper *Indonesia Raya* and well-known Indonesian novelist, on vague and unsubstantiated charges, but Mr. Lubis has still not been brought to trial. Now Mr. S. Takdir Alisjahbana, Vice-President of the University of Indonesia and Chairman of the Indonesian P.E.N. Club, has been arrested under similar circumstances. In neither case have formal charges been preferred, and the legal rights of these prominent Indonesian men of letters to a speedy and public trial seems to have been arbitrarily set aside in the interests of effective state censorship. Apparently the right to dissent is not one of the guarantees of "guided democracy."

CO-OPERATIVE FARMING IN INDIA—Cont'd from p. 7

tive farming, we are told, the Government of India are planning the establishment of pilot co-operative farming societies with a view to trying out whether in India too they would provide a solution to our land problems—the presumption being that in China they have provided such a solution. Actually in China, the agricultural co-operatives have provided no solution to land problems. It is true that after the success of the communists in China, lands were redistributed among the tillers, but those lands have been now taken over by the Government to facilitate the introduction of collective farms, euphemistically called agricultural co-operatives, with the result that all peasants have been rendered landless. The collective farms are more interested in the quantity of production in a mechanical way than in the welfare of the peasants in a human way.

Co-operative farming, therefore, should not be equated with farmers' co-operatives of our conception. The one is totalitarian and the other is democratic. Does the Government of India propose to replace democratic methods in agricultural production by totalitarian ones? The Indian Co-operative Union which has been promoting farmers' co-operatives for the last eight years has rightly warned the Government of India and the Planning Commission against the introduction of co-operative farming. They have characterised the solicitude for co-operative farming as "unthinking enthusiasm for agricultural co-operativisation."

Let us hope the Government of India will be wise before it is too late. India cannot, in the interest of her democratic way of life, afford to undertake totalitarian measures in any sphere of her economic and social life.