

Back To Stalinism?

by V. B. Karnik

ARE the Russian rulers reverting back to Stalinism which they made such a show of discarding only a year back? — is a question that is being asked in many quarters. The question presumes that the Russian rulers had made a genuine break with Stalinism—and that they had embarked upon a new policy of liberalisation and democratisation. Regret is expressed that recent developments in Eastern Europe should have checked that process and some even go to the extent of disapproving on that account the heroic struggle of the people of Hungary.

It is true that the developments in Hungary had a profound effect on the policies of Russian dictators. It is only after the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution in the orthodox Stalinist style that Khrushchev uttered those notorious words: "We are all Stalinists". Khrushchev who had only a few months back exposed Stalin as a murderer, an oppressor and a cruel tyrant began to speak about him in different terms.

In a speech delivered on 31st December, Khrushchev said: "Stalin was a great fighter against imperialism. He was a great Marxist." A few days later at a reception held in honour of the visiting Prime Minister of communist China he reverted to the same topic and heaped more praise upon the dead dictator whom he had indicted only a year back. He said: "I am a Stalinist, but I do not separate Stalinism and Stalin from Communism." While admitting that Stalin had a few bad points he exclaimed: "But in the things that counted, that is, the interests of the working class, God grant that every Communist should fight for the interest of the working class as Stalin did."

These statements of Khrushchev, which could not have been made without consulting his colleagues, indicate a reappraisal by Kremlin of its campaign against Stalin. The campaign which began with Khrushchev's secret report to the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had produced some most unexpected results. The upheaval in Poland and the revolution in Hungary were events which were least expected by the Kremlin rulers. They were the direct consequences of the

desanctification of Stalin which, in some parts of the communist empire, encouraged the people to give expression to their long pent-up feelings against their communist rulers. A process of questioning began—questioning the correctness of political and economic policies, questioning the wisdom of communist rulers, questioning the validity of the fundamental principles of communism. This process of questioning, if allowed to grow, might have shaken the very foundations of the communist system. This represented a grave danger to the very existence of Khrushchev and his colleagues as the masters of a totalitarian communist empire. A totalitarian system cannot exist except on the basis of an unquestioned acceptance of the will of a dictator or of a group of dictators.

The desanctification of Stalin which Khrushchev began was not with a view to liberalise or democratise the communist system. There is no scope in the communist system for democracy or liberalisation. It is a system of totalitarian rule by a police State. The system owes its origin not to Stalin but to Marx and Lenin and the basic principles of communism. In that sense Khrushchev was stating an elementary truth when he said: "We are all Stalinists." A present day communist must be as much a Stalinist as he must be a Marxist or a Leninist. Stalinism is but a practical application of the doctrines of Leninism and Marxism. Khrushchev highlighted the fact when he stated: "I do not separate Stalinism and Stalin from Communism."

It was wishful thinking on the part of many in the free world when they imagined that Khrushchev and his colleagues were set on a course of liberalising and democratising the communist regime when they began their campaign against Stalin. The fact is that Stalin had become too much of a liability and that the new rulers of Russia were discarding Stalin not out of any love for democracy or decency but in order to save the communist system. This was clear from the way in which the blame for all the misdeeds and crimes of the regime was placed on the head of Stalin. Not a word was uttered against the system, and the personality of Stalin was held responsible for all perversions and distortions. The new rulers had hoped that by making a scapegoat of Stalin they would secure for themselves a rule of servile obedience and unquestioned authority. Their hopes were, however, disappointed. The denunciation of a personality that they started turned into a turbulent revolt against the system. Appalled by this development

they are now, like King Canute, ordering the ocean to hold back its tides.

De-Stalinisation is a process which was not voluntarily started by the Russian dictators. It was forced upon them. As Mr. Ignazio Silone, the eminent Italian thinker, has pointed out in an illuminating analysis of the situation created by the revolution in Hungary, "De-Stalinisation corresponded to an urgent need of Russian society. It was not something which the present collegial directorate invented, but rather something they submitted to." Explaining the position he writes: "Let us not forget that the new era of Russian life by no means began with the 20th Congress of the Party, but with the strikes of the forced labourers at Vorkuta." . . . Continuing he advises: "One should not overlook the pressure of the new social strata in Russian society that are longing for peace and comfort." It is these factors coupled with the compulsions of the international situation which obliged Khrushchev and his friends to move in the direction of de-Stalinisation.

Mr. Silone has also drawn attention to the new stirring which is visible in Russia. He writes: "I have been noticing symptoms which prove that Russia can no longer avoid the awakening that is now shaking all of Eastern Europe" and "For the first time, the entire country is being stirred to its depths, particularly the younger generation." Referring to the defection of Russian soldiers which took place during the days of the Hungarian revolution he writes hopefully: "It may be the harbinger of the unhopd for springtime." Mr. Silone then concludes: "The Russians whom we have always loved are thus beginning to awaken: the grandsons of Herzen, Tolstoy, Bakunin, Vera Figner, the students who have in their blood the tradition of underground activity, the

peasants who shelter and feed runaway prisoners."

If these facts of the Russian scene as well as many things that are happening in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe are borne in mind it will be realised that the rulers of Kremlin are not the masters of the situation as they pretend to be or as is naively presumed by many in the free world. If they had that power they would have mercilessly stamped out all opposition, actual or potential, and safeguarded themselves against all possibilities of revolt. They have proved by what they did in Hungary the ruthlessness and the brutality they are capable of when their position is threatened. But the Russian dictators are powerless before the social forces that are developing in their own country and in Eastern Europe—and before man's eternal quest for freedom which displayed itself in such a magnificent fashion on the streets and barricades of Budapest and many other towns and villages of Hungary. It is these factors which will determine the course of history and not the whims and fancies of the dictators, whatever they may choose to call themselves. Whether as Leninists or Stalinists, the people know them as the directors of an oppressive communist police State. Vorkuta and Poznan and Budapest have pronounced a doom on police States. The Russian dictators will not be able to avert that doom by donning again the discarded clothes of Stalinism. It will be a futile gesture which will only expose them to the ridicule of history.

C. C. F. NEWS

The Congress for Cultural Freedom has received a grant of 80,000 dollars from the Ford Foundation to aid displaced Hungarian intellectuals and artists.

The Hungarian Intellectual Aid Fund would be disbursed in the form of fellowships and stipends to Hungarian intellectuals and scholars, to give them training in foreign languages, and to allow them to complete books and projects on which they are engaged. Hungarian artists, painters and musicians would receive grants to enable them to continue working until they have established permanent residences. The grants will be distributed through the *Forum-Hilfe*, a project of *Forum* magazine, which is published by the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Vienna, and through the offices of the Congress in Paris.

The Ford Foundation grant to the Congress for Cultural Freedom is part of a general grant made to educational and cultural institutions in Europe to aid Hungarian scholars and students.

This Ford grant is the fourth it has made to the Congress for Cultural Freedom in the last six months. Included in these, are grants for two international conferences, one on *Economic Growth*, to be held in April 1957 at International House in Tokyo, the other on *Changes in Soviet Society* to be held at Oxford in June 1957 with the joint sponsorship of St. Antony's College, Oxford.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

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

Single Copy: As. 4

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

Notes

Belated Wisdom

RECENTLY it has been reported in the press that the Government of India has issued a directive to all State governments asking them that the State Ministers should not extend their patronage to the communist sponsored cultural and social organisations in India. Union Ministers, the report adds, also have been asked not to patronise such international organisations. The organisations mentioned in this directive are the All India Peace Council, Indo-Soviet and Indo-China Cultural Society, All India Progressive Writers' Association, Indian People's Theatre Association, All India Kisan Sabha and the various other innocent-looking organisations and fronts put up by the communists to carry on their insidious activities.

All students of communist activities know very well the aims and objects of these so-called "democratic" and "cultural" societies. They are no more than so many instruments of communist propaganda. By exploiting the popular desire for peace and friendship, the communists try to rope in eminent and innocent people from all walks of life and misuse their support in the interest of Soviet policy. But the cloven hoof of support for Soviet and communist world policy has always been clearly visible beneath this camouflage. It was therefore really distressing to see many eminent leaders naively walking into the trap and falling prey to communist designs. Moreover, the government patronage, seemingly enjoyed by these associations, invested them with respectability and the foreign policy of the Indian Government, leaning more to the Red side, made it easier for the communists to further their aims under the attractive garb of pompous names. It is therefore heartening to note that the Government of India has, at long last, woke up to the reality of the communist tactics. The Indian Government certainly deserves our hearty congratulations for being able to see through the activities of these organisations.

A similar announcement was made by the Austrian Government on February 2, that the World Peace Council which established itself in Vienna in 1954 had been banned from Austria and its offices closed down. The reasons given for this courageous step were that the World Peace Council "interfered in the internal affairs of countries with which Austria has good and friendly relations", and "its activities were directed against the interests of the Austrian State". It should be remembered that Austria is a neutral country whose neutral status has been guaranteed by the big Powers including the Soviet Union. This clearly shows the scant respect the communists pay to the policy of non-alignment and neutrality followed by States outside their orbit.

The World Peace Council had been previously

expelled by the French Government in 1951, when its headquarter was shifted from Paris to Prague. This is the second time that it has been expelled with ignominy from a non-communist country.

Academic Freedom

DR. John Matthai, while speaking at a meeting of the Senate of the Bombay University, is reported to have remarked that from his experience of the working of the universities throughout the country, he had come to believe that the system of appointing Governors as Chancellors must come to an end. The Governor as constitutional head, Dr. Matthai observed, had to accept the Minister's advice in most matters. He therefore felt that the system in Indian universities, where the Governor functioned as Chancellor, provided a channel for political influences to be exercised.

Democracy to be real must have people possessing the capacity and boldness to think for themselves. Therefore in a democracy, universities as torch-bearers of the spirit of freedom, have to educate students in democracy by inculcating in them the spirit of free thinking. But for this universities and educational institutions have to be free from the encroachment of the State and especially from the intrusion of political forces from outside. For the healthy growth of universities and educational institutions what is required is to promote an atmosphere of freedom in them and to preserve their dignity and honour. This can happen only if universities themselves assert their rights against such intrusions. Dr. Matthai's suggestion, therefore, should engage the serious attention of all thinking persons in the country.

Similar observations were also made by Acharya Vinoba Bhave while addressing a mass meeting at Kumbhakonam a few days ago. Acharya Bhave observed: "All products of Government-controlled educational machinery are fashioned to think in a pre-determined manner." He further said, "Independent thinking would be there when there was independent education without government control". The Acharya therefore warned against the ubiquitous encroachment of the State on the lives of the people in a welfare state. In a welfare state it may not be possible to make educational institutions completely free from outside control. What is necessary is the promotion of the sturdy tradition of freedom in educational institutions. In a nascent democracy like ours, it is particularly the responsibility of the State to see that the proper traditions are evolved and maintained in the educational field.

Government Servants And Politics

IT will be readily agreed that government servants should be precluded from indulging in politics and influencing votes in any election. The Government Service Conduct Rules prohibit government servants from canvassing or otherwise interfering or using their influence in connection with or taking

part in an election except casting their votes. A number of ministries of the Government of India have issued notifications drawing the attention of their employees to these rules and warning them against infringement.

Nobody will object to these notifications so far as the civil servants are concerned. They are in a position to influence elections and are many a time reported to have made improper use of the positions of authority and influence held by them. It is to be hoped that the Government will strictly enforce the rules and prevent any such abuse of authority by the civil servants.

But should the same restrictions apply to the industrial employees of the Government? As the public sector expands the number of such employees is bound to increase and all of them, including the members of their families, will be deprived of their right to participate in elections and other political activities if the present rules remain in force. The larger the participation of the Government in industry or trade, the greater will be the number of citizens deprived of one of their most important rights in a democracy.

The position is obviously absurd. But that absurd position obtains today in our democracy owing to the literal interpretation that is placed on the term 'government servant'. As a result of that interpretation lakhs of ordinary workers employed in Railways, Post Offices, and other State enterprises are deprived of their right to participate in the political life of the country. This is unjust and unfair to them and is also a loss to the political movement. There is no justification for depriving lakhs of these ordinary

employees of the right which they should possess in a democracy.

It is therefore necessary to revise the definition of a government servant. It should be restricted only to those higher categories of government employees who enjoy certain measure of executive or administrative power. The rest of them who do routine, manual or clerical work should be freed from the restrictions and allowed to enjoy all the rights of citizenship.

The Republic Of Ghana

ON March 6, 1957 the British Colony of the Gold Coast will flower forth as the new and free Republic of Ghana and will be recognised from that day as a member of the Commonwealth. This event is of historic significance in so far as the Gold Coast is the first colonial possession in Africa with a predominantly negro population to achieve independence and also it is the first 'black' nation to be admitted to the Commonwealth. The day is not far off when the Republic of Ghana will find its due place in the UN organisation.

The emergence of the free Republic of Ghana is certainly a tribute to the democratic instinct of the British people and British statesmanship, as well as to the political maturity of the people of the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast, as Prime Minister Nehru once remarked, is the only bright spot in the dark continent of Africa. The situation in Africa is charged with tremendous explosive possibilities. It is therefore to be hoped that the emergence to freedom of the Gold Coast will pave the way to freedom and democracy for other African colonies along peaceful lines.

The Paradox Of Jawaharlal Nehru

by G. F. Hudson

THE events in Egypt and Hungary have brought into focus as an issue in Indian politics the "double standard" which Nehru has long maintained in his judgments on world affairs as between the Western powers and the states of the Sino-Soviet bloc. After the Indian delegation to the United Nations had abstained from voting on the resolution passed by the Assembly (November 4) calling for a cessation of Soviet military intervention in Hungary, and the executive of the Congress party under Nehru's direction had adopted a resolution strongly condemning the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt but referring to the Soviet action with only the mildest expression of regret, Jayaprakash Narayan, the former Socialist leader who has now retired from active politics but remains a highly respected and influential personality in Indian affairs, directed against the Prime Minister what was perhaps the most damaging attack made on him since India became independent.

Narayan was particularly scathing about the statement reported to have been made to a corres-

pondent by Krishna Menon, that the events in Hungary were a "domestic affair" of that country. It is as yet too early to gauge how much effect such criticism may have, but there is evidence of serious dissatisfaction in Indian political circles with the strange foreign policy partnership of Nehru and Krishna Menon which has kept "neutral" and "uncommitted" India leaning so persistently to the Communist side through a series of international conflicts.

How does this state of affairs arise in a country which is governed by a powerful non-Communist party which is in no way dependent on local Communist support in domestic politics, and has no obvious reason to align itself with the Soviet bloc in world affairs? The answer cannot be a simple one; indeed, so complex are the political phenomena of contemporary India, and so important are factors which seem to operate in a direction contrary to the pro-Communist trend that many observers deny that any such trend really exists.

In India there is no continuity between the diplomacy of the Indian kingdoms which existed before

the supremacy of the British Raj and the foreign policy of the new nation which began in 1947. Everything has had to be improvised and worked out from the beginning; in this respect India could benefit far less from the British heritage than in the sphere of internal civil administration, for the Indian civil service was an organization adapted to Indian conditions, whereas the "External Affairs Department" of the Government of India could hardly be more than a branch of the Foreign Office in London. In these circumstances it is hardly surprising that Indian foreign policy in the first nine years of its existence should be characterized by a certain doctrinaire quality, an addiction to abstract principles not yet modified by experience and knowledge of the outer world.

The somewhat callow idealism to be expected of a new state engaging in international diplomacy for the first time has, however, in the case of India been complicated by the influence of Gandhi and his faith on all the thinking and feeling of India's present leaders. Participation in the non-violent movement of resistance to British rule which Gandhi inspired and led was a great spiritual experience that has left its mark on all the Congress leaders of Nehru's generation.

In one of his talks with the French journalist Tibor Mende which have recently been published under the title of *Conversations with Mr. Nehru*, Nehru said in recollection of his own conversion by Gandhi:

"... I was simply bowled over by Gandhi, straight off ... It was a new revolutionary force in action. All this, of course, had an overpowering effect on us. We saw this great movement, were part of it, were swept by it and we pushed it ahead. At that time there were no doubts in our minds about its complete efficacy; the doubts arose later and we resolved or left them unresolved from time to time."

Looking back on the history of India's struggle for national independence, we can appreciate today how fortunate it was both for India and for Britain that it developed under the leadership of such a man as Gandhi, who evoked a self-sacrificing fervour which could never have been attained by a merely constitutional nationalist party and yet kept it within the bounds of peaceful, non-violent action. To him in the first place is due the credit for the fact that the final dissolution of the British Raj was achieved without a great armed insurrection.

But the particular course of events in India has certainly contributed to a certain unawareness in Indian public opinion of the more extreme realities of power politics in the contemporary world.

A basic inability to comprehend the nature of Communist power is evident in Nehru's benevolently tolerant attitude toward Communist regimes in contrast to the severity of his criticisms of Western nations. Thus in one of his conversations with Mende he is recorded as saying:

"I do not like the techniques adopted by the Communist party. That again means I would not like to have it in my country. But who am I to say what—in a particular set of circumstances—another country

does? I am not competent, and anyhow I cannot interfere. So I put up with it . . . my objecting to what they do necessarily would lead to their objecting to what I do. Now I do not want their interference and I do not wish to interfere with them, or with any other country for that matter."

This line of non-interference, even by criticism, in the affairs of the Communist world does not apply, however, to the colonial or semi-colonial regimes of Western powers. In this sphere India claims rights of interference over the whole area from New Guinea to Morocco.

Nehru does not, of course, exaggerate in emphasizing the strength of Asian feeling on the subject. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of his own anti-colonial conviction. But here again, why the double standard as between the Western nations and the Soviet Union? At Bandung India was conspicuously in the endeavour to keep any reference to Russian imperialism out of the proceedings of the conference. But why is the future of Algeria, Aden, or Iran the concern of all Asian and African nations, while that of Georgia, Azerbaijan, or Uzbekistan is deemed entirely an internal affair of the Soviet Union?

We know, indeed, that Communism maintains the fiction that the constituent national republics of the Soviet Union are voluntary members of a federation in which they have proportional representation at the center as well as their own elected state governments, and that there is in the Soviet Union no ground for any movement for separate national sovereignty such as there is in the empires of capitalist countries. But why should a man of Nehru's intelligence swallow all this without asking himself what freedom of choice the non-Russian nationalities of the Soviet Union have ever had in the matter of their federation, and without considering the abundant evidence which exists with regard to the struggles of these peoples for national independence over the last forty years? Is Nehru not aware that in the mass deportations of the Chechens, Crimean Tartars, Kalmucks, and other recalcitrant peoples during the Stalin era the Soviet government dealt with nationalist resistance by methods more ruthless than have ever been used by the British, French, or Dutch in the annals of their colonial rule in Asia? But if he is aware of it, why does he continually give the world the impression that he endorses the Communist thesis that imperial domination is essentially an outcome of Western capitalist expansion and can never be attributed to a Communist state?

There is another case, too, affecting India more closely, which illustrates the double standard of Nehruite thinking. There is no people in the world which has more strongly marked characteristics as a distinct national entity than the Tibetans, nor one which has a more clearly defined territory. This people, moreover, has been independent of foreign control for most of its history and was independent *de facto* for four decades from 1912. Yet India, after first protesting against, finally acquiesced in the Chinese reconquest of Tibet, and has recently concluded with Peking a treaty which refers to "the

Tibet region of China." There were no doubt weighty reasons for India to avoid incurring the enmity of China and involving Indian resources in support of a weak and backward buffer state. But if political realism thus leads India to connive at the subjugation of a formerly independent people on its own borders, what is left morally of the lofty idealism which so uncompromisingly upholds the rights of nationality in distant lands? If a "Tibet region" of China, why not an "Algeria region" of France, or a "Kenya region" of Britain?

In trying to understand how Nehru's mind works in relation to these questions, one must return to the all-important fact of India's lack of a diplomatic tradition and concentration until a few years ago on the country's internal affairs and the struggle for independence from the British Raj. Suddenly confronted with the need to conduct a foreign policy in a world of extremely complex international relations, the Indian nationalist leaders looked around for information and advice, for a simple set of rules to enable them to interpret the bewildering phenomena of world affairs. They were naturally unwilling to be instructed by their British ex-rulers, for they suspected that the latter would try to give them a view of the world which it was convenient for British interests that they should have, and they were resolved to break away entirely from British tutelage. Herein lay the opportunity for crypto-Communists and fellow-travellers entering the new officialdom from the ranks of the intelligentsia to fill the vacuum and give shape to the thinking of minds which, familiar as they were with the internal problems of India, were lacking in knowledge and experience of the field of foreign affairs.

In this way Communism gained a subtle influence over the making of Indian foreign policy quite out of proportion to its importance as a factor in Indian internal politics. It offered a complete, ready-made, and clear-cut version of world affairs which seemed to explain in simple fashion the most baffling complexities of the world situation. And this could be done without undue emphasis on the Marxist-Leninist basis of the interpretation—in such a way that Communism and an anti-colonial nationalism with overtones of socialism appeared to be natural allies in a fight against forces of reaction and exploitation identified with the imperialist West.

The strongest motive of India's Middle Eastern policy has been to counteract the prestige and influence which Pakistan, as a Moslem power established in the Indian sub-continent, naturally possesses throughout the Islamic world. India has been able to do this particularly by playing on the antagonism between Egypt and Iraq, and by taking advantage of the Egyptian opposition to the Baghdad Pact.

India opposes the Baghdad Pact because it conflicts with the principle of neutralism—which India apparently claims not only to adopt for herself, but also to impose on her neighbours; she also opposes the Pact because it perpetuates Western influence in Asia by including a Western power in an Asian regional alliance; and above all, she opposes the Pact

because it strengthens Pakistan. Egypt detests the Pact primarily because it is the symbol of Iraq's rejection of Egyptian leadership of the Arab world. Further, since the Pact is a defensive alliance for resisting Soviet expansion in the Middle East, all Communist influences both in India and in the Arab countries are directed toward an incessant agitation against it.

In any case there has been a profound ignorance in India of the facts of the Palestine situation, if only because India has diplomatic relations with Arab countries, but not with Israel, so that until Sharet's recent visit to Delhi and Bombay, Arab propaganda had a clear field and the case for Israel went unheard. The Arab influences have been reinforced by those of Communist anti-Zionism, and "neutral" India is thus brought into line with the Soviet-Nasserite objective of crushing Israel by building a coalition of Arab states led by Egypt and equipped with Russian arms.

In spite of all that has been said above about the bias of the leadership of Congress India in favour of the Soviet bloc and of anti-Western nationalist dictatorships of the Nasser type, it should be by no means a hopeless task for Western diplomacy and publicity—or rather American, since Britain is now in such extreme disfavour in Delhi on account of Eden's Egyptian adventure—to win Nehru himself and Indian educated opinion to a more just and balanced view of world affairs. When everything has been said on the other side, the fact remains that India is the great hope of democracy and liberal values in Asia, and that its political practice stands out in the strongest contrast both to the totalitarian regime of Communist China and to the more or less dictatorial governments of the Middle East.

Irritation at Indian foreign policy should not blind the West to the great virtues of Nehru's India—the combination of strong and stable administration with a genuine political liberty, the free elections, the independence of the judiciary, the active policies of economic development and social reform carried on without the coercion, the tyranny, and the persecutions supposed to be necessary for any transformation of Eastern societies. Nehru's basic devotion to liberal principles is brought out very clearly by the record of the conversations with Tibor Mende.

In order to have a proper perspective on Indian affairs it is essential always to keep in mind this real democratic faith of Nehru and the greater part of the Congress leadership. This is something which cannot be taken for granted and, under Indian conditions, can only be maintained in the face of strong temptations to resort to dictatorial authority. It needs all the moral support and encouragement that the West can give if India is indeed to provide Asia with a convincing alternative to the Chinese example. The West must continually emphasize its common ground of belief and purpose with India and be prepared to give generous economic aid to India not on condition of any international diplomatic alignment, but as from one democratic nation to another in the fraternity of the free world.

—Condensed from *Commentary*, New York.

The Truth About Poland

THE developments which took place in Poland in October 1956 were thrown into background by the far more revolutionary events which took place in Hungary about the same time. In Hungary the People's movement broke the bounds of communism and sought to destroy Russian domination as well as the rule of the local communists. In Poland the movement took the much milder form of national communism, an attempt to improve the communist regime and to lessen the rigours of Russian domination. In Hungary Soviet Russia intervened with all her brute strength and destroyed in cold blood the heroic struggle of the Hungarian people. In Poland she made a number of concessions and was able to arrive at an understanding with the new leaders of the Polish Communist Party. As a result a new communist regime under the leadership of Wladyslaw Gomulka has been established in the country.

• The new regime has effected a number of significant changes in the economic and political policies. It is too early yet to say if they will meet the legitimate aspirations of the people and give them the relief that they have been clamouring for. Extracts from an article of Prof. Oscar Lange, the top economist, published on another page, prove how the successive communist five and six year plans impoverished the people and brought about a "disintegration of the national economy." A number of reforms suggested by him have now been put into effect.

A report made by Gomulka to the Central Committee of the Communist Party in October 1956 throws a flood of light on the conditions that existed in Poland on the eve of the change over. In his report Gomulka stated the following about the economic situation:

"Generally speaking, after the conclusion of the Six Year Plan, which according to its premises was meant to raise the standard of living of the working class and of the entire nation, we are faced today in the first year of the Five Year Plan with immense economic difficulties which are growing from day to day. We contracted important investment credits for the expansion of industry and when the time came for the payment of the first instalments we found ourselves in the situation of an insolvent bankrupt. We had to ask our creditors for a moratorium. In the meantime a considerable part of these credits in the shape of machines and installations has so far found no application in production and will not find any such application for long years to come; a part of these funds has to be considered irrevocably lost. Such facts can in no way be passed over in silence. For it should be said clearly that the whole nation has to pay for the bad economic policy, and the working class is more affected than others."

Dealing with the experiment of collectivisation of agriculture, the pet communist method for the solution of the agricultural problem, Gomulka said:

"In 1955, 78.8% of farmland was in individual farms;

kolkhozes owned 8.6% and State farms 12.6% of total area owned by these three types of farm. The percentage produced by these three types was: individual farms—83.9%, kolkhozes including household plots—7.7%, and State farms including auxiliary holdings of agricultural workers—8.4%. When estimating the value of overall production per hectare of arable land we arrive at the following figures: individual farms, 621.1 zloty; kolkhozes, 517.3 zloty; State farms, 393.7 zloty at constant prices. This is, in brief outline, the economic picture of collective farms. It is a sad picture. In spite of great outlays they had smaller results and greater production costs."

Gomulka had the following to say about the Poznan riots, which communists of all countries have been attributing to foreign incitement:

"The working class recently gave a painful lesson to the Party leadership and the government, when it seized the weapon of strike and went out to demonstrate in the streets on Black Thursday, last June. The Poznan workers shouted in a powerful voice: Enough! This cannot go on any longer! Turn back from the wrong road! The Poznan workers did not protest against People's Poland, against Socialism. . . . They protested against the evil which was widespread in our social system. . . . against the distortion of the fundamental principles of Socialism. . . . The clumsy attempt to present the painful Poznan tragedy as the work of imperialist agents and provocateurs was politically naive. The causes of the Poznan tragedy and of the profound dissatisfaction of the entire working class are to be found in ourselves, in the leadership of the Party, in the government. . . . The juggling with figures which showed a 27 percent rise in living standard during the Six Year Plan proved a failure. It only exasperated people more. . . ."

Trying to find an explanation for these grave distortions Gomulka blames them on the slavish imitation of the Soviet model. He said:

"How did it happen that our Party. . . . permitted the many distortions of the recent past to arise? We shall look for a long time to find the answer. It is contained in the problem of the roads leading to the construction of Socialism, as well as in the shaping of a model for Socialism. What is constant in Socialism boils down to the abolition of the exploitation of man by man. The roads of achieving this goal can be and are different. . . . The model of Socialism can also vary. It can be like that of the Soviet Union. It can be shaped in a manner seen in Yugoslavia. It can be different still."

Gomulka then turned his attention to the "cult of the individual" and pointing out how it existed in all communist parties he described its working as follows:

"The cult of the individual was not confined solely to Stalin. It is a certain system which prevailed in the Soviet Union and which was grafted on to probably all Communist Parties, as well as to a number

of countries of the Socialist camp, including Poland. The essence of the system was the creation of an individual hierarchic ladder of cults. . . . In the block of Socialist States Stalin stood at the top of this hierarchic ladder. All those who stood on lower rungs of the ladder bowed their heads before him. Those who bowed their heads were not only the other leaders of the CPSU and the leaders of the Soviet Union, but also the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the countries of the Socialist camp. The latter, that is, the First Secretaries of the Central Committees of the Parties of the various countries, who sat on the second rung of the ladder of the cult of the individual, donned in turn the robes of infallibility and wisdom.

The bearer of the cult of the individual was omniscient, knew how to do everything, solved everything, directed everything and decided everything within the sphere of his activity. He was the most intelligent man, regardless of his personal knowledge, capacity, or other personal qualities. . . .

Under the system of the cult of the individual the Party as a whole could act independently only within the framework of subordination to the chief cult.

If someone attempted to transgress these limits he was threatened with excommunication by his comrades. If the matter concerned a whole Party, it was excommunicated by the remaining Communist Parties."

He then referred to the tragic situation that prevailed in Poland and said:

"In Poland, too, tragedy occurred when innocent people were sent to their deaths. Many others, including Communists, were imprisoned, often for many years, despite their innocence. Many people were submitted to bestial tortures. Terror and demoralization were widespread. On the soil of the cult of the individual phenomena arose which violated and even nullified the most profound meaning of the people's power."

This is a graphic account of the tragedy that befell Poland as a result of the communist regime. There can be no dispute about its authenticity as it is an account given by no less a person than Gomulka himself. It should serve as a warning to all those in our country who are tempted to find a model in the communist regimes imposed upon the countries of Eastern Europe.

Confession Of A Communist Economist

by Oscar Lange

The following are extracts from an article by Prof. Oscar Lange, the eminent Polish economist published in Zycie Gospodarcze of Warsaw. Prof. Lange has from time to time held various high positions in the Government of Poland. It will be remembered that he was one of the advisers from Iron Curtain countries invited by Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis to help him prepare the Plan Frame of the Second Five Year Plan. The devastating criticism that Prof. Lange has now published of the communist plan that was imposed upon his country with his help and that of other economists will prove of great interest to Indian economists and others.

IN the period of the Six Year Plan, a thorough reconstruction of the Polish socio-economic structure took place, and the productive forces of our country were greatly extended. We built a powerful industry, especially heavy industry, we succeeded in discarding the century-long inheritance of economic and social backwardness.

However, in the course of these socio-economic transformations, there have appeared serious disproportions which hamper the further development of the national economy. These disproportions are generally known: disproportions between the development of agriculture and industry, between the production capability of industry and the supply of materials, between the quantitative development of industrial production and its quality and overhead costs, between the investment and production programmes and the out-dated technical equipment of many factories.

On the basis of all these disproportions, another disproportion, most important of all, has appeared: the disproportion between the powerful increase of productive forces and the small increase of the people's standard of living.

These disproportions have grown to such an extent that now they lead to the disintegration of the national economy. In these conditions, immediate action is necessary in order to stop and avert the growing process of disintegration of the national economy, an emergency programme to introduce good order into our national economy is needed.

Such a programme of putting good order into our national economy is indispensable for restoring the soundness of our economic and social relations. It is also a political requirement for restoring the people's confidence, and particularly that of the working class, for overcoming the present difficulties.

The basic tasks of the programme may be formulated in the following way:

1. Immediate mobilisation of the existing reserves aimed at the improvement of the supply system and at raising the standard of living of the working class. This mobilisation must include all the material reserves throughout the country, all means of rapid increase of the standard of living through foreign trade, all means of rapid increase of production of mass consumption articles.

2. Introduction of conditions leading to a steady

increase of industrial production. We must renounce the pursuit of purely quantitative indices attained at the expense of low quality and high overhead costs.

At the present time, considerable production forces, highly qualified technical labour cadres, as well as considerable demand for raw materials, are frozen in the armament industry. The present international situation makes it possible, and the internal economic situation calls for, the turning of a considerable part of that industry to purposes directly or indirectly connected with supplying the needs of the population.

3. Restoration of incentives promoting the development of agricultural production. The increase of agricultural production requires an increased supply of the means of production to agriculture, particularly of fertilizers. An increase in the production and import of fertilizers is a basic condition for the increase of crops. However, the decisive factor hampering the development of agricultural production and its increase on the market is the lack of adequate incentives in both the individual and collective peasant economy.

• The development of agricultural collectives should be based on the strengthening of those already in operation, and on creating stronger economic incentives. The basic condition for making collectives more attractive to peasants is full abundance by—and in many cases the restoration of—their genuine cooperative character, the restoration of real self-government, and the creation of those conditions in which the peasants would really feel that they are co-owners of the collectives...

• 4. Reconstruction and raising the efficiency of handicrafts and services. The basic condition of the development of handicrafts is a change in tax policy, the policy which very often has had a discriminatory character and which treated the individual handicrafts as a dangerous form of capitalism.

5. Raising the efficiency of the distribution system. In order to abolish bureaucracy within the distribution apparatus, we should continue our efforts aimed at its decentralisation and at binding its distributive units directly to the producers.

6. Systematic programme on foreign trade policy. The overcoming of the present economic difficulties, and particularly the raising of the standard of living, also calls for the regulation of foreign trade.

7. Adaptation of the investment structure. The means of putting our national economy in order which have been mentioned here require the adaptation of the investment structure. In the field of industry we should shift the emphasis from investment in new means of production, especially industrial equipment, to investment aimed at the increase of production of raw materials for industry and fertilizers for agriculture. Special attention should be paid to investments which yield quick results in increasing the effectiveness of foreign trade. It will also be necessary to have some investments, though not very large investments, for the transformation of a part of the armaments industry into industry producing goods needed by the people.

8. Restoration of workers' interest in the results of

their work. This question is partly connected with the question of the wage and premium system, with the question of workers' participation in the profits of the working establishments. However, the question of the attitude towards work must not be limited to matters of direct material incentives. They are connected with many matters of general nature such as the standard of living, conditions of advancement, the question of participation in the enterprise administration, and confidence in the reasonableness of State economic policy.

The nihilistic attitude of a great number of workers comes both from the low standard of living and from a lack of faith that the economic policy, requiring such great sacrifices on the workers' part, is just and well-founded.

A further means of raising workers' interest in the results of their work should be the extension of workers' participation in the administration of enterprises. This participation should concern not only the conditions of work, but all activities of working establishments, including their personnel policy.

9. Further democratization of the political and social life. The disintegration of the national economy which has taken place in the course of the last years could have occurred only because the working masses lacked control. The lack of democratic control within the Party, trade unions, workers' meetings, and within the administrative apparatus prevented the timely revelation of the growing process of disintegration of the nation and economy.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

RUSSIA'S YOUNG INTELLECTUALS

by Kathryn Feuer

THE SHADOW OF THE MARQUIS

by Irving Kristol

MEN AND IDEAS: H. G. WELLS

by Antony West

FEBRUARY 1957

41

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

Review

Hungarian Tragedy

by Peter Fryer. Published by Dobson Books Ltd., London, W.8, 1956, pp. 96.

MR. FRYER, the author, was a member of the British Communist Party for nearly fourteen years and served for nine years on the staff of the *Daily Worker* before he proceeded to Hungary as its special correspondent. Incidentally, he was the first communist journalist from abroad to visit Hungary since the revolution broke out there and also Hungary was the first foreign country Fryer ever visited. It was a part and parcel of his Promised Land, "a country where all my private symbols for the past fourteen years, most of all the red star of the Soviet Union, were the official insignia." He crossed the frontier into Hungary on October 27, four days after the revolution. What he saw there during his two weeks' stay was a bitter awakening for him regarding the reality of the communist regime. He witnessed the people rising in an elemental fury against the tyrannical puppet regime which tried to make "a revolution from above" by foisting communism upon the people against their will and in the process established "eleven years of terror and stupidity." When the people rose up in arms against the inhuman stupidity, he saw their heroic resistance being ruthlessly suppressed by the Soviet army which intervened for the second time "invoking a non-existent clause of the Warsaw treaty", and perpetrated an abominable mass murder of the Hungarian patriots. Thus for Fryer it was a two-fold tragedy—a tragedy of the Hungarian revolution being ruthlessly suppressed by the leaders of his fatherland and also a tragedy of the absolute failure and impotence of the Hungarian Communist Party after eight years of dictatorship to give the people "either happiness or security, either freedom from want or freedom from fear."

Mr. Fryer poignantly describes the tragedy and tries to fathom its meaning. He rebuts convincingly all charges by communists and their apologists that it was a counter-revolutionary *coup* engineered from outside with the help of capitalist reactionaries. "It was" according to Fryer, "a real people's revolution which clearly embraced over 90 per cent of the Hungarian people." As to the "mystery" of how the people were armed, Mr. Fryer replies, it is no mystery at all. "No one has yet been able to produce a single weapon manufactured in the West."

He traces the origin of the mass revolt to the regime of "poverty, drabness and fear" that had been established by Rakosi, Farkas and Gero, the leaders of the Hungarian Communist Party who indulged in Moscow's boot-licking and blindly imitating the Soviet methods generated the atmosphere of suspicion and fear. The whole communist regime was based upon the detestable security apparatus, that is why the Hungarian citizens rose in passionate fury, especially against the security force.

The Hungarians did not want to restore capitalism

nor did they want to bring back fascist reactionaries into power. The people wanted to put an end to "the eight years of hell" of the corrupt rule of "a tiny handful of Stalinists" who had no mass support but "only a foot-hold in the state-machine, an infinite capacity for political duplicity and dishonesty and Soviet tanks in the background." The same Soviet tanks came to the rescue of these leaders when the people revolted. It was the battle of "tanks versus men" as Fryer characterises it. Despite the utter futility the Hungarian citizens put up a "desperate, gallant but doomed resistance" to the Soviet onslaught and by their "bare-handed heroism" laid bare the tyrannical nature of the Soviet regime.

Fryer poignantly describes how "three and a half days of freedom" released the tremendous energy of the people and how Budapest began to throb with new life and vigour during the interregnum.

But this interregnum was destined to be a short one because of the very nature of the Hungarian tragedy which from the very beginning "had moved inexorably to its climax." The revolt was crushed and "Stalinism vengeful, cruel and remorseless returned to Budapest" to destroy the new-born freedom of Hungary. But though the Soviet armed might could drown the revolution in blood, the indomitable spirit of the Hungarian people remains invincible even to this day. "This is a people" concludes Mr. Fryer, "whose spirit is hard to break."

This is then an indictment of an immoral and brutal system which, under the garb of people's democracy had thrived on deceit, treachery and terror. But even after the most disturbing and shattering experience, the author is not able to cure himself of his illusion regarding the communist utopia. He draws up an indictment of Stalinism and believes that it was Stalinism which was the root cause of this "monstrous perversion of Marxism." "Stalinism," according to him, "is Marxism with heart cut out, dehumanised, dried, frozen, petrified, rigid, barren." But Stalinism was not an adventitious growth on Marxism. It was the logical extension of the Marxist-Leninist line. The immorality of Soviet policy is rooted deep in the moral nihilism and collectivism which is the bed-rock of the communist philosophy. Mr. Fryer fails to grasp this and therefore the result of this agonising confession is not the total renunciation of faith. On the contrary he clings more desperately to his faith in the vain hope of purifying it by removing the Stalinist impurities. He indicts the British Communist Party which suppressed his report and suspended him from party membership. He further talks of reforming the Party by ousting the hard Stalinist core who control the Party. He has even recently announced his intention to re-join the Party "to reform it from within." But Stalinism was only the symptom and not the cause of this whole malady which lies deeper into the basic tenets of the communist philosophy. This is really a tragedy of communism—of the God that failed. But Fryer attempts to redeem and rehabilitate his God by shifting the blame on to its votaries.

B. K. DESAI

What Might Have Happened In Hungary

by Franklin A. Lindsay

NOVEMBER 1, VIENNA—Hungary's Premier Imre Nagy last night demanded the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from his country.

NOVEMBER 2, BUDAPEST—Premier Nagy proclaimed Hungary's neutrality, renounced the Warsaw Pact and again demanded Soviet Army withdrawal. He also sent a cable to UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld asking for the protection of the United Nations.

NOVEMBER 2, UNITED NATIONS—Early this morning Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., chief United States delegate to the UN, requested an emergency session of the General Assembly to consider Hungary's request. It was revealed that the U.S. delegation had decided to bypass the Security Council, where the Soviet Union could exercise its veto power.

• **NOVEMBER 2, UNITED NATIONS**—By a vote of 54 to 7, an emergency meeting of the General Assembly this afternoon passed a resolution, sponsored by the United States and 22 other nations, establishing a UN Hungarian Observation Commission. The Commission will be composed of India, Yugoslavia, Poland, Canada, Brazil, Indonesia and Sweden. The resolution directs the Secretary-General and the Observation Commission to proceed at once to Budapest.

The vote came after a stormy session highlighted by the Soviet bloc's unsuccessful attempts to frustrate the proceedings. Fifteen nations, including several Arab-Asian bloc countries, abstained. The Assembly President announced that an advance Observation Commission party, to be drawn from the Vienna embassies and legations of the Commission's members, would leave immediately for Budapest.

NOVEMBER 3, BUDAPEST—The UN's swift action has electrified the people here. They are solidly behind the Nagy Government's resolve to free itself from Kremlin domination.

At noon today, the Observation Commission's advance party reached Budapest in helicopters provided by France, Britain and the United States. It was feared that if the commission had attempted to reach Budapest by auto, they might have been blocked by Soviet troops ringing the city.

Meanwhile, reports of heavy Soviet troop movements into Hungary continue. This has led to speculation here on whether the Soviets would strike before Hammarskjöld and other UN observers arrive. The presence of the advance party, however, is considered a major deterrent to immediate Soviet action.

NOVEMBER 3, NEW YORK—Secretary General Hammarskjöld and members of the Observation Commission left International Airport at noon today in a chartered Swiss Airlines DC-6. The plane is scheduled to refuel in England and continue directly to Budapest. The Secretary General has advised Moscow

of the flight plan and informed the Kremlin that he does not expect interference, although it has been reported that Budapest airfield is surrounded by Soviet forces.

NOVEMBER 4, BUDAPEST—The UN Commission landed here today at 3 p.m. Veteran news reporters commented that not since Lindbergh's landing in Paris has there been such a demonstration at an airport. Cheering crowds made the roads almost impassable as the group was being driven to its meeting with Premier Nagy and members of his coalition Cabinet. After a two-hour session, Nagy issued a statement which re-affirmed that the UN Commission was in Hungary at the Government's request, and declared that the Commission had been granted complete freedom of movement to carry out its mission.

NOVEMBER 5, BUDAPEST—Hungary was in the midst of a new crisis last night after Soviet armoured units began to move into the capital from their encircling positions. The climax was reached when one Soviet unit encountered a three-man UN observation team in a jeep flying the UN flag. The UN team, composed of an Indian, a Pole and Swede, was taken into custody by a junior Soviet officer but almost immediately released by a Soviet colonel who quickly arrived on the spot. Elsewhere in the capital, Hungarian troops and students manned hastily thrown-up barricades across the routes of Soviet advance. Fighting was reported from the southern and eastern parts of the city.

At 4 a.m., however, Soviet units began to withdraw without having reached the Parliament Building or other Government offices. It is reported that the telephoned order to pull back was given personally by Khrushchev, who realised the grave risks to the Soviet Union in pressing the attack in full view of the UN representatives.

Later this morning, Premier Nagy again demanded complete Soviet withdrawal from Hungary and

Communist Double Talk at Palghat

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

Price Rs. 2/-

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

requested Western shipments of food, medical supplies and weapons.

NOVEMBER 5, UNITED NATIONS — Anna Kethly, newly-appointed permanent Hungarian representative to the UN, made her first appearance in the General Assembly to voice the thanks of the Hungarian people for the immediate and decisive intervention voted by the Assembly. The United States and 13 other North Atlantic Treaty Organisation nations then jointly introduced a resolution calling for Soviet withdrawal from Hungary within 72 hours. It was informally learned that more serious steps, including sanctions, would be proposed if the Soviets failed to meet the deadline.

NOVEMBER 6, WASHINGTON — President Eisenhower announced today at his press conference that emergency medical aid and food had been authorised for Hungary. Initial shipments from Army stocks in Germany will reach the Hungarian border tomorrow. Shipments of arms, now being prepared, will be immediately available if needed. President Eisenhower stated that the United States would fully support any UN decision calling for member nations to assist Hungary.

The President reaffirmed unequivocal U.S. support of Hungarian neutrality on the Austrian model. In response to a question, he stated his belief that any UN police force to support Hungary should not contain U.S. troops, at least initially, in order to emphasise our acceptance of her neutrality. He concluded by saying that no nation, after exhausting all peaceful avenues, could in good conscience capitulate to naked and unprovoked aggression. History had demonstrated that such a policy of retreat from principle leads in the long run to moral bankruptcy and disaster which can only be retrieved by much greater efforts than would have originally been required.

NOVEMBER 8, BALTIMORE—A flight of eight B-52's completed a 17,000-mile non-stop flight encompassing the United States, Canada and the North Pole. This was widely interpreted as notice to the Soviet Union of United States' strategic capabilities.

NOVEMBER 9, BUDAPEST—Soviet armies at 9 a.m. this morning began to move out of Hungary at several points. This city is in the grip of indescribable rejoicing...

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

Such an outcome of the Hungarian Revolution was within the realm of possibility, had we seized the opportunity which lay open to us and to the United Nations in the three days between Premier Nagy's request for UN intervention and the Soviet attack on the city and government on November 4. Because of Nagy's request, UN action would have been possible through the General Assembly without being subject to Soviet veto.

Even if the presence of a UN Commission had failed to stop the Soviet attack of November 4, its presence would have exposed even more profoundly, for all the world to see, the vileness of the new Soviet regime. Further, it would have given the 9 million people of Hungary a support that went beyond the absorption of 125,000 refugees.

Having failed to act until the Kadar puppet regime was proclaimed, and having chosen to recognise that regime's representatives, the UN found itself blocked from taking effective action in the Security Council by the threat of a Soviet veto, and in the Assembly by Kadar's refusal to accept UN observers. But, even after having missed these main chances, we had other, more limited opportunities for action. Anna Kethly might have been heard and, had this proved impossible, her message certainly could have been read from the UN rostrum by some other delegate. Certainly, we should have not acquiesced in the seating of the Kadar representative until the full processes of the credentials committee had been completed.

—Reproduced from *Free Spirit*, Sydney.

Q U E S T

a bi-monthly of arts & ideas

Sponsored by the

Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom

EDITOR: NISSIM EZEKIEL.

QUEST is indeed an outstanding journal, ably
edited. JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

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

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

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