

Double-Talk at Amritsar

by B. K. Desai

THIRTY-FOUR years after the party was founded, communist leaders and workers assembled at Amritsar to address themselves to the task of donning a new garb and to caste their party in the role of an alternative to the Indian National Congress. Among the leaders and workers present there was an evidence of much self-satisfaction and even aggressive self-confidence. Among the factors which contributed to this buoyant mood were the increase in the party-membership within the last two years, the Party's emergence as the main opposition at the Centre and in West Bengal and Andhra, assumption of office in Kerala, the recent election of a communist Mayor in Bombay, improvement in its position among coal and steel labourers and the substantial increase in its vote in the last general election where it increased its Legislative Assembly vote from 45.5 lakhs to 127.8 lakhs and its Parliament vote from 53 lakhs to 119.7 lakhs.

In addition to these factors the communists had one more reason to feel jubilant. That was the rapidly declining health of the Congress Party. The set-back in Delhi municipal elections, the trouble over Rajya Sabha elections in Orissa and some other States, the signature campaign in Mysore, the frustrating PCC elections in the Punjab and the one-man revolt in West Bengal—all these were the outward symptoms of a deep-seated malaise that is eating into the vitals of the only political party which could give the country a modicum of stability so essential if democracy is to take root. They portended disintegration and the resulting chaos in the country that would only benefit the party out to destroy democracy. "The Congress is in a state of political and moral decline, in a state of chronic crisis", so the CPI resolution describes the Congress. But what was more depressing than these recurring symptoms was the deep-seated melancholic mood prevalent in the Congress and the evident disenchantment experienced by the people in general.

The communists appeared confident to capitalise on this growing demoralisation in the camp of their enemy. Most of the leaders were exuding optimism and confidence. The CPI is the party of the future — this was the dominant note of their deliberations and press conferences in Amritsar. "Today the unity of India can be maintained only by a further strengthen-

ing of the Communist Party and of the democratic forces in the country"—asserted the General Secretary at a press conference. The Congress was no longer able to hold the country together. It was now the historic task of C.P.I. The ruling Party, the communists were sure, was riddled with corruption and other evils and was beyond redemption. "Somewhat grudgingly he (Jyoti Basu—West Bengal Communist leader) admitted that the Congress Party still contained honest elements but said he was confident that they would soon walk over to the Communist Party" (*Statesman*, April 7). If the country is to progress the people must follow the communist lead, was his argument. "It is essential that the people strengthen the Communist Party if the establishment of real socialism is to be guaranteed"—thus spoke Dange, the leader of the communist group in Parliament. The communists did not stop at this. According to newspaper reports, they freely discussed at the session the question centering round Mr. Nehru's successor and even found an answer. The successor, according to them, was E. M. S. Namboodiripad, the Kerala Chief Minister. Judging from the high pressure build-up given to Namboodiripad in their official organs (for instance, pictures of Namboodiripad were more numerous and prominently printed than that of any other communist leader in the *Weekly New Age*) it is not unlikely that he has come to be looked upon by them as the would-be successor to Prime Minister Nehru. A year ago all this brag and bluster would have sounded ridiculous, but at Amritsar it assumed ominous significance.

Alarmed at the increasing strength of the communists, most of the national dailies, unlike previously, tended to take note of the proceedings and resolutions adopted at Amritsar rather seriously. "Prudence lies," warned the *Times of India* in its leaderette, "in over-estimating, not underestimating, the enemy's strength." Of course, no one, was taken in by the changes made in the constitution of the Party and the fact that the Party still retains its totalitarian and anti-democratic core was stressed by most of them. "If the communists were honest about their democratic professions," wrote the *Hindustan Times*, "they should have dissolved the Communist Party of India and either joined one of the existing political parties with a socialist creed or formed a new party with democratic socialism as its aim." The reasons compelling the party to change its constitution were also obvious to most newspapers. Their belief in force and the principle of dictatorship was a hindrance and not a help in competing with other parties for the vote of the people who still cherish moral and spiritual values and generally

abhor violence. If the cult of violence is put aside, it was pointed out, then the chances of the principal parties at the polls become more or less equal and here the communists stand to gain more because of their superior organisation and resources than other opposition parties. As the *Indian Express* editorially noted: "The readiness of the Indian Communist Party to accept the ideal of socialism by peaceful means and to vouchsafe freedom of organisation even to the opposition is not a measure of its confidence in its ability to achieve its object through peaceful means, but of its belief that the disabilities of its rivals are bound to increase." "It has therefore," as a columnist in the *Times of India* put it, "temporarily accepted the part of parliamentary democracy but only *en route* to people's democracy."

But, surprisingly, no one detected the obvious connection between the tactical shifts effected in the international communist movement during the past two years, which were embodied in an articulate form in the Moscow Declaration signed by the twelve ruling Communist Parties in last November, and the major policy changes made at Amritsar. The preamble to the party constitution is admittedly the most important part of the constitution inasmuch as it is a re-statement of fundamentals and an enunciation of the policy to be followed hereafter. But most of the statements in the preamble embodying major tactical shifts are literally borrowed from the Moscow Declaration — they have been either paraphrased or important phrases in the Moscow Declaration have been just taken over in the preamble. This can be seen from the following comparison:

Moscow Declaration: The Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist countries should firmly adhere to the principle of combining the universal Marxist-Leninist truth with the specific revolutionary practice in their countries, creatively apply the general laws governing the socialist revolution and socialist construction in accordance with the concrete conditions of their countries, learn from each other and share

experience.....

Preamble: In the struggle for its immediate as well as ultimate objectives, the CPI is guided by the philosophy and the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism.....

Working out its policies on the basis of concrete Indian conditions, the C.P. draws on the rich experience of the International Working Class Movement....., on the experience of the Soviet Union, China and all countries of People's Democracy as well as of all Communist and Workers' Parties.

Moscow Declaration: The meeting underlines the necessity of resolutely overcoming revisionism and dogmatism in the ranks of the Communist Parties and Workers' Parties.....Dogmatism and sectarianism hinder the development of Marxist-Leninist theory.....

Preamble: It (CPI) combats tendencies of revisionism, dogmatism and Sectarianism in all their manifestations.

Moscow Declaration: Stronger fraternal relations and friendship between the Socialist countries call for a determined effort to overcome the survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism.

Preamble: The CP fights against chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism.

Moscow Declaration: At the bedrock of the relations between the countries of the world socialist system and all the Communist and Workers' Parties lie.....the principle of proletarian internationalism.....

Preamble: It (CP) bases itself on the principle of proletarian internationalism.

Moscow Declaration: In the present situation the strengthening of the unity and fraternal cooperation of the socialist countries, the Communist and Workers' Parties and the solidarity of the international working class, national liberation and democratic movements acquire special significance.

Preamble: It stands for fraternal relations and cooperation among the workers and peoples of the world, for the unity of the organised communist movement in the common struggle.....for the liberation of the subject peoples from the yoke of imperialism, for the establishment of democracy and socialism all over the world.

Moscow Declaration: The working class and its vanguard — the Marxist-Leninist Party — seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means.

Preamble: The CPI strives to achieve full democracy and socialism by peaceful means.

Moscow Declaration: Relying on the majority of the people.....the working class can defeat reactionary anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeois into an instrument serving the working people, launch a non-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realisation of the socialist revolution.

Preamble: It (C.P.) considers that by developing a powerful mass movement, by winning a majority in
(Continued on page 9)

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.

A Hungarian Writer's Story

By Istvan Vizinczei

Mr. Vizinczei, who is barely twenty-five, is a prominent young writer of Hungary. Having escaped from Hungary after the Revolution he is now settled in Canada.

I KNOW it can hardly add to the prestige of a young writer if he talks a lot about himself: a writer should be known primarily by his work. If I break this rule, it is because I believe that my own experience—as a young artist whose literary development took place entirely under Communism—might be of interest to persons in the Free World who saw our Revolt sparked and inspired by young intellectuals.

I must admit that the Communist Party was generous to the young people it intended to train as the new "Socialist intelligentsia." Ever since the bloody freedom fight of October 1956, the regime has grown less prodigal—for the Revolt made it plain that youth could not be bribed; but until October 1956, very few university students had to pay tuition. Most of them received State scholarships so that they could study without financial worries. Such scholarships were not high (about \$55 per month), but a student could get along on them.

In 1950, Radio Budapest broadcast a long narrative poem of mine. The literary monthly for youth, *Uj Hang*, planned to issue it, and the manuscript was already at the printer's when the Party Center banned it because of its "bourgeois sentiments". The poem happened to deal with an unhappy adolescent love. "Unhappiness is not a Socialist feeling," the director of the publishing firm explained—not too convincingly, I may add, because only a few weeks before he had been enthusiastic and had himself sent the poem to the printer. Suddenly all avenues to publication were closed to me.

At the same time, however, the Literary Fund granted me a monthly stipend of five hundred forint. All this might seem contradictory, but since I was not the only one treated this way, I realized that this was a carefully-considered policy. Young people were to feel simultaneously the Party's chastising fist and its caressing hand, and to choose which they preferred. This strategy, I hear, works, well in animal training, but with human beings it failed completely. Or shall I say that it did indeed prove effective: it made us hate dictatorship.

A source of constant humiliation was the sanctity and inviolability of Soviet culture. In 1952, one of my classmates was barred from all schools in the country (despite faculty protests) because during a debate he happened to have said that Sholokhov was "the only Soviet writer." When, in the same year, the young poet Istvan Eorsi declared at a meeting of the Writer's Union that he considered Attila Jozef a greater poet than Mayakovsky, the presses printing his book of poems were stopped immediately.

Our political indoctrinators were so stupid and base that the character of these apostles alone would have

been enough to make us detest the system. I might mention, for example, the man the Party elected to train writers. Gyorgy Mate, the Secretary of the Writers' Union, was, before 1945, a news reporter who, by his own admission, had lived off blackmail. He would summon young writers two or three times weekly for ideological discussions. At such times, he often referred to his former occupation. "Yes, boys," he'd say, "under capitalism, the only way you could make a living was by such filth." (Now he writes articles for Budapest papers on the counterrevolutionary nature of the Revolt.)

Let me say a few words about the Young Writers' Workshop, to which I and my colleagues owed a great deal. This workshop was the first independent organisation of young intellectuals and played a key role in the formation of the Petofi Club. The workshop came into being in the spring of 1951 as an appendage of the Writers' Union and, naturally enough, was sponsored and controlled by the latter's Party Committee and the DISZ (the Communist youth union). Still, it was the first youth organisation to escape the Party's controlling influence. Istvan Eorsi, Jozsef Gali and I asked the directors of the Writers' Union whether we could establish this workshop. After much hemming and hawing (why wasn't DISZ enough for us) they finally gave their permission and assigned us three rooms in the Writers' Union.

Who were we? We were all under twenty, young titans dizzy with praise (meant chiefly as encouragement) and trembling at the thought of the punishments (great and small) that the Party might have in store for us. Though filled with confidence and feeling equipped to act the part of the world's redeemers, we were also insecure, for there was always the threat that we might wake up the next morning in an internment camp as the result of a whim of Gyorgy Mate or some other bigwig.

Returning to the Young Writers' Workshop, I should like to mention two young men who were characteristic of the membership. My verses appeared with those of Istvan Eorsi in the columns of *Irodalmi Ujsag* in 1950, and this marked the beginning of our friendship. Perhaps I can describe him best by his last act. On November 4, 1956, (the day the Soviet crushed the Revolt), he wrote a poem entitled, "Menjen Hazal!" (Go Home!), which he courageously had printed on handbills with his signature. He waited for his arrest at home. Kadar's courts sentenced him to five years for this splendid poem.

The other writer is Jozef Gali, a Jewish boy who after 1945 returned alone from Auschwitz, where his parents, brothers and sisters had perished. He him-

self had escaped that hell of Fascist insanity with a body irreparably damaged—a weak heart, bad lungs and eyes that barely saw. Later he wrote a very brave and true play about the Rajk trial, which was presented on October 6, 1956. During the Revolt he helped the Red Cross, loath to fire a gun even for freedom. After November 4, he wrote a handbill protesting the Soviet invasion. For that, the Kadar Government branded him a Fascist and sentenced him first to three years imprisonment and then to death. In the end he got fifteen years.

* Istvan Eorsi and Jozsef Gali were the leaders of the workshop; we considered them the most talented. At first, the Party did not have our meetings watched and we could talk freely to one another. We were of course still green and did not know what we really wanted. We wanted to be “men of culture”—that much was certain. Eorsi spoke enthusiastically about T. S. Eliot’s poetry and recommended that we read it. Not without fear did he bring up the forbidden name, for Communist literary criticism had tersely dismissed the great poet as an “imperialist inciter.” In those days this term was applied to all writers who did not sing Moscow’s praises. Hemingway, too, we half-fearfully recommended to each other, because until he was awarded the Nobel Prize (and even Moscow had published his *The Old Man and the Sea*), Communist journals referred to him only as the “clownish protagonist of the capitalist world’s rotten individualism who seeks popularity by hunting escapades.”

In view of the official attitude, it obviously meant a great deal to us to discuss our “discoveries” in Western literature and to know whom we could trust, for this was a time when even parents were afraid to speak before their children, who might inadvertently repeat in the wrong place “what Daddy said last night.”

Another outcome of the workshop was that young people active in all branches of art could get to know each other. The poets brought their musician friends, the musicians the painters, the painters the sculptors; then came the actors and all sorts of students with a yearning for art and freedom—different forms of the same flight of the human spirit. By now there were several hundred of us at each meeting, talking enthusiastically about works that could not appear and names that were banned.

I must confess that however much my friends and I detested the Communist system, we could not think outside Communism. Communism was the reality, the hopelessly unalterable reality. And since we did not have even the faintest hope of overthrowing it, we dreamed of changing it, much as Polish youth did in recent times.

And why did we want to improve the system or indeed do anything at all? Why couldn’t we concern ourselves only with verse feet and drama? The question might well occur to a Western reader who regards politics as outside the legitimate province of an artist’s activities. As a matter of fact, I do dislike politics and consider it a waste of time for the growing young artist who has yet to learn his craft. John

Steinbeck was right when he said at the recent PEN Congress in Tokyo, “Let the writer write, not talk.” But Mr. Steinbeck lives in a free world, whereas we faced a dictatorship. And one cannot avoid politics in a land where a sad love poem is considered a “glorification of bourgeois sentiments” and a sign of imperialism. One cannot avoid politics in a land where a man—even my enemy—may suddenly disappear without my being permitted to ask what his crime was. One cannot avoid politics in a land where two times two equals three, tomorrow five, and then again three—but never four. In a Communist land a writer like Mr. Steinbeck would have to talk if he wanted the world to know what he thought—for certainly they wouldn’t publish what he wrote. One cannot avoid politics in a dictatorship; and even on free soil one cannot escape politics after escaping from an internment camp that includes half the globe.

In the whole course of its history, Hungarian literature has always been produced in an atmosphere of close “family life.” Only by this word, it is possible to express the bond, perhaps stronger than kinship, that linked the writers of all generations. No Hungarian writer was ever too busy or poor to help with good advice, criticism and even money. There exists many a tale of how Vorosmarty and, in this century, Babits and Gyula Illyes helped young writers. This traditional life of the literary clan was smashed by Fascism, and the Communist dictatorship prohibited its revival. The older writers voluntarily exiled themselves to their homes, lived off new editions of their former works, and avoided social contacts. But once we young writers found each other, we found the “hermits” too.

Before 1953, when Imre Nagy became Premier, the publication of anything that could truly be called literature was unthinkable. That this did not completely dishearten us or work towards our corruption was due to the existence of our literary “family.” We were, after all, now writing for those who knew most about literature.

In this instance, the dictatorship unintentionally did us a good turn. By barring us from public life, it increased our dependence on each other, and this led to an unusual rebirth of Hungarian literature. Nowadays the Kadar regime blames the writers for sparking the Revolt. At that time, however, many of us often felt hopeless and kept saying, “It’s no use.” But fortunately there was always some one to encourage us—not only about literary matters but also about our country’s plight. We were also aided in our personal affairs and minor troubles, for these men considered themselves our spiritual fathers and felt responsible for us.

Since, in any case, my chief interest was in the drama and films, I enrolled in 1951 for courses on playwriting and criticism at the College of Film and Theater Arts. The school had about two hundred students (actors, directors, cameramen, playwrights) and the Communist Party found it difficult to keep close check on the small classes in these highly technical fields.

(Continued on page 6)

Another Communist Affair

THE celebration of the sixtieth birthday of the great Negro singer, Paul Robeson turned out to be the usual communist affair. The decision to organise the celebration was taken abroad, obviously, in the higher circles of the international communist movement. Otherwise, it is not possible to explain how the celebrations were organised simultaneously in twenty-six countries, most of whom belonged to the communist camp or were uncommitted nations and how the communists in each country played a prominent part in organising them.

In India the communists got busy as soon as they received the instruction. Immediately the usual fellow-travellers were roped in and with their help a number of high ranking individuals were inveigled into joining the preparatory committees that were set up in a number of cities. On this occasion the task was not very difficult. Paul Robeson is well-known as a singer and there are thousands of persons who love and admire his songs. Who would not like to join the celebration of the sixtieth birthday of this favourite singer? The communists therefore easily succeeded in securing the blessings of the Prime Minister and in persuading a number of Judges and other high officers to join the committees. The association of these prominent persons threw the people off their guard and a communist stunt for propaganda and publicity acquired the colour of a *bonafide* cultural event.

It was the eminent public commentator, Mr. A. D. Gorwala who first drew attention to and exposed the real character of the celebrations. He pointed out that the celebrations were being organised not because Paul Robeson was a great singer but because he was a communist or a fellow traveller and always helped all communist activities. Mr. H. R. Pardivala, the well-known lawyer, followed him. In the course of a letter published in the *Times of India*, Mr. Pardivala wrote:

"Paul Robeson is undoubtedly a great musician. All lovers of music will, therefore, rejoice on his attaining that age. There are however many musicians and other artists living all over the world who have attained equal, if not higher fame and age. Our fellow-travelling friends have of course seen no reason to rejoice over their birthdays.

"The sponsors of this move have sought to beguile the unwary by representing Paul Robeson as a great humanist. The world has yet to know of the humanistic activities of Paul Robeson. The sudden outburst of zeal on the part of the communists to celebrate the birthday of Paul Robeson, the great artiste, should not surprise anybody. It is only a part of their larger game to seek any excuse to further the interests of their party.

"It is common knowledge that to the communists no art is real and no culture worthwhile which does not serve and advance the cause of their party. It is also common knowledge that functions such as this are organised and utilised by them only as snares for indoctrinating the innocent and duping the unwary."

Other letters followed which threw more light on the personality and actions of Paul Robeson. In the course of a letter published in *Indian Express* Mr. Mohan Das pricked the bubble of Paul Robeson's martyrdom. It had been represented by some correspondents that Robeson had been denied in his native country, the United States; "the right to even earn his living". Mr. Mohan Das nailed the lie to the counter by pointing out that Robeson owned an extensive country house in Connecticut, had unlisted telephone numbers, was free to sing whenever and wherever he chose to, earned a minimum of \$2000 for every concert and had amassed a fortune from his programmes on the radio and the screen.

Some light was also thrown on the alleged championship by Robeson of the cause of Negro emancipation. It was pointed out that the premier organisation of the Negroes, the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured Peoples, had repudiated him. A quotation from an article in *The Crisis*, the official organ of the Association, will be of interest in this connection. "A few short years ago Negro Americans were proud to point to Paul Robeson as another example of the fallacy of the 'white supremacy' myth. The Paul Robeson whom Moscow today parades before the world is not the same man. . . . They (Negroes) see no similarity between Paul Robeson, American, who overcame the obstacles of discrimination to win world acclaim for his artistic accomplishment and Paul Robeson, Moscow's No. 1 Negro, who spouts Communist propaganda as widely as Vishinsky. . . . Those closest to Paul Robeson in the years through which he rose from obscurity to world fame and respect, are perhaps most shocked about the change he has undergone. To them Paul Robeson of today is a tragic figure."

Robeson is also being applauded as a "great humanist." Mr. Pardivala has questioned that claim and has also thrown light on Robeson's close association with all communist front organisations. He writes:

"Let us next examine his 'humanism'. Far from upholding the cause of human dignity, he has always justified the inhuman tyranny imposed by the Kremlin on the people of Russia and the satellite countries. He has been affiliated with nearly sixty Communist-front organisations. In 1948 he went on record saying 'I want to destroy fascism, and to do it I am prepared to accept the opposite form of dictatorship.' Even a tyro in politics will detect the familiar communist line in this declaration. In the same year, in a press interview which he gave in Paris, he publicly defended concentration camps in Soviet Russia. Paul Robeson seems to be able to take the dictates of the Kremlin without hesitation. To him the attack by the Chinese Communists and North Koreans on South Korea was not aggression. The vagaries of the Communist political theory and practice during recent years appear to be to Robeson as immutable as the Ten Commandments. His vehement insistence at the London Conference of the World Peace Committee in 1949 that

the non-Cominform delegates from Yugoslavia be ousted, was a stand only an out-and-out party-liner would have insisted on. By following the Stalin line in this inner party squabble, he demonstrated the atrophy of his critical faculty. Only recently he repeated without any compunction the total Khrushchev line and deplored the Hungarian revolt as a movement of "fascists" against "workers."

The celebrations were organised on a big scale in Bombay, New Delhi and other places. There could be, however, no doubt about their political implications. Mr. M. C. Chagla, the Chief Justice of Bombay, who presided over the celebration in Bombay, himself admitted that the celebrations were being organised because Robeson "was more than a mere artist". This was in answer to the question why, when many other artists had reached the age of sixty, Robeson alone was being honoured with the celebration of his sixtieth birthday. Other advocates and defenders of the celebration have been more explicit. They have all along emphasised the political activities and attitudes of Robeson rather than his artistic talents. It is clear therefore that the celebrations were a political affair.

In his reply to the correspondents who joined issues with him, Mr. Pardivala has in an able manner summed up all these arguments and made some pertinent observations about Mr. Chagla's remark. He writes:

"In his inaugural speech at the C. J. Hall, Mr. Chagla said that it was "a fantastic and malicious lie" to call these celebrations a communist show. This highly "judicial" language was hardly called for. Nobody called Mr. Chagla a Communist, and he need not have protested so much. He would have been more to the point if he had told us where this move originated from. A mere glance at the committee will show that it is largely composed of known fellow-travellers and sympathisers of the Communist Party. As usual they have inveigled a few persons well placed in public life like Mr. Chagla, to join it with the object of giving it respectability and a non-political appearance. Even the posters pasted all over the city betray that they were printed at the Communist Party press where even job work printing of a non-political nature is seldom undertaken."

"It is surprising that persons so well acquainted with the affairs of the world as Mr. Chagla should allow themselves to be exploited by political partisans for their political ends. Simple and unsuspecting people are induced to attend such functions by the belief that there could be no harm in doing so, if persons like Mr. Chagla can preside over them."

"Of all persons in public life those occupying judicial positions must keep themselves above suspicion of sympathising with any political creed. If they do not do so, they will only drag themselves into the arena of public debate, much to the prejudice not only of their personal dignity but also of the prestige of the high office they occupy."

Turning his attention to the communist organisers of the celebrations Mr. Pardivala writes:

"To those comrades and others like them, I would only ask if they know the work done in the cause of Negro emancipation and human dignity by Roland Hayes, Ralph Bunche, Walter White, Max Yergen, Joe

Louis, Jackie Robinson, Marion Anderson, Dorothy Maynor and a host of other Negro leaders and artists. And what about the eminent artists and writers behind the iron curtain who have dedicated not only their art but also their lives to the noble cause of human freedom and dignity? The number of Russian writers and artists who were shot or consigned to the concentration camp in Russia only because they sought to uphold human dignity and individual freedom is legion. Even today eminent Russian writers like Boris Pasternak find themselves unable to reach the people through their work, because they would not toe the party line. Great writers in Hungary and other satellite countries like Tibor Dery and others are rotting in prisons because they refuse to accept Russian tutelage and betray their conscience and their country. What about celebrating their birthday? It is time these comrades realised that in underestimating the intelligence of others, they are not doing much credit to their own."

HUNGARIAN WRITER'S STORY—Continued from page 4

Yet even at this school we felt ill-at-ease. For instance, let me describe what happened with my one act comedy. The play was about an ugly Party Secretary who uses her power to catch men. The story was taken from life. The Party's shock troops contained a number of such women who—for want of something better—"lived for the movement" and broke more than one man for purely personal reasons. Since at the end of each year we had to hand in a play, scenario or a critical study, I submitted this comedy as part of my final examination. Result: they wouldn't let me go on with the exam. I was hauled on the carpet and temporarily deprived of my scholarship.

Not wanting to cry over spilt milk, I wrote another play: *Mama*. They banned that too. The radio had accepted it (no theater manager dared speak to me) and had already taped it, when a telephone order—this time from the Party Center—prohibited the broadcast. This time I was not so hurt; I had hardened. Besides, *Mama* brought me some rewards. I submitted it for my diploma and was graduated as top man in my class. The College wanted to send me to the film festival in Venice, but the Ministry forbade this: they said I was not reliable enough and were afraid I might not return. Instead I went to the Karlovy festival in Czechoslovakia as an alternate in the Hungarian delegation; there I was allowed "to revel" in the masterpieces of Socialist film production.

I took part in the Revolt because I hoped that we were not fighting in vain and that Hungary would be free. When tanks smashed our dreams, I decided to escape. I asked Jozsef Gali to come with me. What was the point, I said, of our rotting in jail?

"If you go, you're a coward," he said. "We have to show them that they can't drive us out of our own country. It is we who belong here."

"We can do more for Hungary abroad."

"You're a coward," he repeated. "To flee is cowardly."

I left all the same. Which of us was right, I cannot judge.

—Condensed from *Eastern Europe*

Freedom First, Mr. Lodge & Mr. Menon

A NOTE appearing in the March issue of *Freedom First* has created an uproar in the United States of America. The note was about Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge's visit to India and how he allowed himself to be used for building up Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. The note stated inter alia: "His (Mr. Lodge's) hugging handshakes with Mr. Krishna Menon (a performance which recalled his earlier refusal to shake hands with the Soviet representative Vyshinsky), his visits to Leftist rendezvous where he was fawned upon by comrades of right views and right (political) fashions, his sticking his neck out for garlands which came mostly from Leftists (which reminds one of Lenin's classic dictum of supporting an enemy with a rope to ultimately hang him with it) and in general making his official visit to India into an almost personal visit to Krishna Menon were all actions that shocked many men of sensibility in India and made them wish that the U.S. would faithfully follow a policy of non-alignment in our domestic affairs... Surely it was none of Lodge's business to lend his own support to this suspended structure (Nehru is strong enough to take care of that.) In doing so he gave a wrong impression to the Americans of Menon's popularity in India and a wrong impression to the Indians of Menon's popularity in America. He served neither India nor America by this behaviour."

It appears, the note received wide attention in the American press. The *New York Times* published a special dispatch about it from its New Delhi correspondent Mr. A. M. Rosenthal. The following extracts from Mr. Simon Morley's dispatch published in *Indian Express* will give an idea of the reactions of the American press and public men:

"The denunciation of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge by an Indian publication, *Freedom First*, which is the mouthpiece of the Democratic Research Service, has created quite a stir in U.S. diplomatic circles particularly because of the wide coverage which the accusations received in the American Press."

The publication charged that Mr. Lodge had given an insincere picture of Indo-U.S. cooperation at the United Nations and that he helped to build up the reputation of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, whom it considers a "dangerous leftist."

Although Mr. Lodge was reported somewhat troubled by the manner in which the American press reproduced the article of *Freedom First*, he told this reporter that the charges of this (Indian) publication are ridiculous.

"I still maintain the views I expressed in India and in the U.S. regarding my trip and my pleasant association with my Indian hosts, including the Defence Minister, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. I do not subscribe to the views expressed by this publication in this particular case...."

But what seems to have created an uproar in the circles close to the U.S. delegation is the impression that such an article may create in the minds of the

American average reader who has been used for many years to hear strong attacks against Mr. Menon. American politicians, and Mr. Lodge counts himself among this group, are very sensitive about any accusation charging them with the so-called softness towards Communism.

Thus when the *New York Times* correspondent in New Delhi spoke of the Democratic Research Service as one of India's leading anti-Communist organisation which has conducted propaganda against communism for eight years, it is easy to understand why its accusations received wide coverage in the American newspapers, radio and television. The fact that Mr. Nehru had attacked this organisation and implied that it is dominated by big business and the West made it even more appealing to many Republican political circles.

The initial coverage of the article of *Freedom First* appeared in the *New York Times* but was soon quoted by a great number of newspapers and radio stations.

Before Mr. Lodge arrived in India, some of the political enemies of Mr. Menon feared that the Defence Minister would use the visit to try to discredit reports that he was disliked in the U.S. These reports did not hurt his standing with Mr. Nehru but could be a handicap to Mr. Menon as a national leader.

The editorial in *Freedom First* said Mr. Lodge's "hugging handshakes with Mr. Krishna Menon, his visits to Leftist rendezvous where he was fawned upon by comrades" and his "making his official visit to India into almost a personal visit to Krishna Menon" had shocked Indians of sensibility."

Freedom First welcomes the attention that was paid to its note. Admittedly, it does not claim to speak on behalf of any large section of the Indian people. It speaks only for a small minority of men of thinking and sensibility. The opinions and reactions of such men may not be shouted from each street corner, but they deserve attention as, in the long run, it is they who mould the public opinion.

Freedom First has no desire to continue the controversy. It hopes, however, that the point that it made will be kept in mind, namely, that visiting diplomats should see that their words and actions do not give a wrong idea of their country's policies and that their visits are not utilised for building up this or that politician of the country that may be visited.

—EDITOR

Chinese "Panchsheela" in Burma

BY GIRILAL JAIN

Price Rupee One

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Nazi-Stalinist Alliance, A Polish Example

THE Communists and the Nazis are usually at loggerheads. Many a time they fight against each other even to the point of mutual destruction. But, on occasions, they have also collaborated with each other. Who can forget the Nazi-Soviet Pact which opened the flood gates of the World War of 1939-1945? And who can forget the strange reluctance of Stalin to believe that Hitler had actually invaded Soviet Russia, a fact attested to by his successor, Khrushchev in his famous indictment? This collaboration is possible only because of the ideological kinship that exists between the two apparently divergent movements of Communism and Nazism. The Communists have always denied the kinship. But there have been in recent years many instances which prove the fact of kinship beyond any reasonable doubt.

Poland provides at present a striking example of this kinship which exists between the two. The central figure of the story is one Boleslaw Piasecki, a well known Falangist of the pre-war years who has, since the war, turned into an active supporter of Communism and more particularly of its Stalinist variety. Piasecki is opposed to Gomulka and is working in his own way to secure the return of the Stalinists to power.

Born in a family of the old Polish aristocracy, Piasecki was still a young law student at the University of Warsaw when he began his political activity in ONR, the youth organisation affiliated with the conservative Polish National Democratic Party. His thinking bore the strong imprint of the new totalitarian political philosophies gripping Germany and Italy, and in 1934, at the age of 20, he led a rebellion in the ONR which resulted in the secession of his fascist-minded group to form the "National Democratic Falanga".

After the Nazi invasion, Piasecki tried to secure an understanding with Hitler. When the attempt did not succeed, he entered the resistance movement. The name of the Falanga was changed to the "National Confederation" and its partisan groups began fighting against the Germans. But they also fought against the Russians. Eventually in the spring of 1945, Piasecki was arrested by the Russian Secret Police. But after his arrest something happened and instead of being hanged Piasecki was released by the Soviet authorities. One version of the story is that a prominent member of the Polish Communist Party persuaded the Soviet Secret Police that Piasecki would be valuable to the party for influencing the Polish Catholics.

Piasecki not only endorsed all the political, social and economic attributes of Stalinism, but affirmed that it was the sacred duty of Polish Catholics to uphold this triumphant ideology of the modern era. Piasecki's new line naturally brought him into serious conflict with the Polish Church hierarchy and with the Vatican, which placed his writings and *Dzis i Jutro* on the Index. The communist regime, on the other hand, gave him its full support.

In the decisive intra-party struggle which gathered momentum in Poland following the Twentieth CPSU Congress, Piasecki ranged himself unequivocally on the side of his Stalinist protectors. He acted in close cooperation with the leading members of the Natolin group and gave the fullest support to their efforts to block Gomulka's return to power.

Stalinist Communism has thus found an ally in a professed Fascist. The two together are trying to arrest the process of liberalisation which began in October 1956. Whether or not they succeed, their working together has provided one more proof of the ideological kinship that exists between the two movements.

"HUNGARY FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM"— AN EXHIBITION

HUNGARY Fights for Freedom Exhibition organised by Girgaum Khetwadi Branch of the Bombay Praja Socialist Party from the 10th to the 16th April undoubtedly served its purpose. It attracted a fairly representative cross-section of people not only of the locality, but the whole city. The pictures and the posters covered all aspects of the Hungarian Revolution and established beyond any shadow of doubt the terrible fact of Russian tyranny in satellite countries.

Jayaprakash Narayan who inaugurated the Exhibition said that while Asian countries like India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and Malaya have seen the end of capitalist imperialism,—the countries of Eastern Europe have experienced a more sinister type of imperialism, that of totalitarian Communist Russia. This new type of imperialism exhibited itself in an unashamed and naked form in Hungary in October 1956. Although Russia's show of force achieved its immediate objective of suppression of the Hungarian people's fight for freedom, it exposed to the whole world the Russian tyranny over neighbouring Eastern European countries. Mr. Narayan congratulated the Hungarian people on their heroic battle, and said that though in the end they were overcome by the superior physical power of the Soviet Union, they, by dint of their unsurpassed courage and heroism, had unmistakably demonstrated to the world that man's urge for freedom was undying and that revolt against even the most powerful tyrant was possible.

Along with the Exhibition, a lecture series was organised on Hungarian revolution and related topics including one of French imperialism in Algeria. Those who spoke included Messrs. A. D. Gorwala, V. B. Karnik, Sushil Kavalekar, Ram Joshi, M. Harris, and M. R. Dandavate.

The Democratic Research Service and the Congress for Cultural Freedom helped the Girgaum Khetwadi Branch of the Bombay PSP in organising the Exhibition.

DOUBLE-TALK AT AMRITSAR Continued from page 2

Parliament and by backing it with mass sanctions, the working class and its allies can overcome the resistance of the forces of reaction and ensure that Parliament becomes an instrument of people's will for effecting fundamental changes in the economic, social and State structure.

To be sure, the Moscow Declaration was mainly concerned with the re-integration of the international communist movement under the CPSU control and the countering of the policentric, or the revisionist, tendencies prevalent in East European communist parties. Nevertheless, it seeks to guide communist movements in non-communist countries and especially those in under-developed areas. This can be seen even from the political resolution adopted at the Amritsar Congress which merely echoes the Moscow line.

Among the important changes which give the CPI a new look are: (1) the emphasis on its national character (2) the avowal of its peaceful intentions and (3) of its democratic professions including its pledge to allow opposition parties to function freely so long as they abide by the Constitution. These changes need to be scrutinised closely.

The first is the emphasis on its national character. Here a few events prior to the Amritsar Congress require to be noted to realise the CPI's so-called independence from Moscow.

The extraordinary Congress of the CPI was first scheduled to take place at Amritsar between Jan. 23 and Jan. 30. But it was postponed until April 6 to 13. Reporting this on December 17, 1957, the *Statesman* recalled that many senior CPI leaders, including the General Secretary, had recently been in Moscow helping to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The postponement, the daily noted, would give these pilgrims more time to work out ideas and plans acquired in Moscow.

Again on the eve of the Amritsar Congress, the *New Age*, official organ of the CPI, in its March 9 issue informed its readers that Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary, left for Prague on March 4 to discuss the question of starting an international journal "which could help the exchange of experience among fraternal Communist Parties."

This was again a significant event. Every time the Congress of the CPI is in the offing, some of the high dignitaries of the Party deem it obligatory to visit their Mecca under one pretext or the other. It may be recalled here that Ajoy Ghosh was in Moscow just before the Fourth Congress of the CPI was held at Palghat in April 1956. This time he went to Prague to receive instructions regarding the party line to be adopted. It was not, therefore, without reason, that a columnist in the *Hindustan Times* remarked: "Mr. Ghosh's 'Line', it is said, enjoys the 'blessings' of the Kremlin which does not want at present, to do anything to annoy Mr. Nehru, but at the same time wants to exploit the national sentiments of India's people and the ambitions of its bourgeoisie to further its own ends."

Unlike constitutions of other communist parties, the preamble to the new constitution of the CPI does not include the usual clause that the Party is an integral part of the international communist movement. This is a concession to the "national peculiarities" which the Party has to face. Of course, it openly declares that it stands for the "unity of the organised communist movement." But as the immediate task of the CPI is to "unite and lead all patriotic and democratic elements in the country in the defence and consolidation of national freedom", such a blatant assertion of its subservience to the Moscow mentors would only defeat its own purpose. It does not, therefore, state this explicitly in so many words. It only vows to fight "bourgeois nationalism" and to "draw on the rich experience of the Soviet Union, China and all countries of People's Democracy," and swears by the "principle of proletarian internationalism." Further in Article XII, the constitution enjoins every party members "to behave in the spirit of proletarian internationalism."

The phrase "proletarian internationalism" is rather significant. The Moscow Declaration too lays great emphasis on that. The decisive test for "proletarian internationalism" was laid down by Stalin in 1927. "He is an internationalist," said Stalin then, "who unreservedly, unhesitatingly and unconditionally is prepared to defend the USSR, because the USSR is the base of the world revolutionary movement." This reasoning was further elaborated by him during the period of the cold war in 1948 as follows: "At the present time the sole decisive criterion of proletarian revolutionary internationalism is: for or against the USSR, the fatherland of the international proletariat. Only he is a genuine internationalist who carries his sympathy, respect, recognition to the point of practical and maximum aid, support and defence of the USSR by every means and in various forms."

Who can say that the CPI has not strictly adhered to the principle of proletarian internationalism throughout its chequered career? Why then this all of a sudden emphasis on its national character and the "concrete Indian conditions"? Ajoy Ghose gives the reason: "This authoritative declaration will aid patriotic Indians in realising the baselessness of the slander that the Communist Party is not an Indian party...." (*Monthly New Age*, April '58).

Another innovation introduced in the new constitution is the avowal that "the CPI strives to achieve full democracy and socialism by peaceful means." This is also a case of borrowed wisdom on the part of the CPI. The 20th Congress of the CPSU had proclaimed the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism. Even the Moscow Declaration states glibly that the "working class and its vanguard" seek to achieve "socialist revolution by peaceful means." The CPI, scrupulously omitting the word "revolution," so as not to frighten the intelligentsia, speaks of bringing about "fundamental changes in economic, social and state structures" by peaceful means.

But here the Moscow leaders as well as their Indian disciples are speaking with their tongues in cheek. The Moscow Declaration openly states: "The possibility of one or another way to socialism depends on the concrete conditions in each country. . . . In the event of the ruling classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind."

The CPI leaders too have followed the same technique. Though the preamble does not repeat this condition for obvious reasons, the General Secretary of the Party has at many places frankly stated that the Indian Communists never meant to renounce violence as a matter of principle, and that this peaceful road would only be traversed so long as the CPI does not encounter resistance from its enemies. In the monthly journal of the party, *New Age*, (April '58, Party Congress Special), he writes on this point: "Of course this (peaceful transition) is by no means a certainty, because the bourgeoisie may resort to resistance to thwart the people's will but then the responsibility for violence will be on them. . . . The possibility (of peaceful transition) exists and we try to realise this possibility."

Thus, like the Moscow Declaration, the CPI also looks upon peaceful methods as just a "possibility". Ghosh is frank in explaining the reason for this tactical shift: "This would," he writes in the same article, "help to extend the influence of the Party. . . ."

* * *

Too much, perhaps, has been made of the CPI's guarantee of the right to form opposition parties when it comes to power at the Centre. This has been construed as an indication of the liberal approach on the part of the CPI and it has been pointed out that no other communist party in the world, excepting the British Communist Party, has permitted such rights to the opposition.

It may be recalled here that in the earlier stages the CPSU also had allowed opposition parties to function though with unhappy results. Similarly in Red China there are a few non-communist parties which are no more than so many satellites of the Chinese Communist Party. Thus this written guarantee by the CPI is not without precedent in the history of communism.

Besides, the term "communist" carries a definite connotation and it cannot be obliterated by the verbal changes made in the constitution. Communism is an exclusive creed and is founded on the principle of dictatorship of the proletariat, (or the "proletarian hegemony", as Ghosh puts it in his article.) This principle precludes the existence of other parties which do not strictly conform to the line laid down by the Communist Party.

The preamble guarantees the right to function to the opposition so long as "they abide by the constitution". But, as the *Hindustan Times* has pointed out, what is there to prevent the communists from changing the constitution and establishing one-party dictatorship? Already Kerala Communists are openly voicing their demand that the Constitution should be amended at "flexible points." Besides, the aim of the

CPI is to establish People's Democracy in India and all the communist parties in the people's democracies of East Europe have, in the past, resorted to this method of changing their country's constitutions to suit their totalitarian policies. Here also, again, Ajoy Ghosh has made this point clear in his article referred to above. He quite frankly says: "The CPI, moreover, holds that the existence of opposition parties, agreeing to abide by a *socialist constitution*, is quite probable in a future socialist India. . . . It (CPI) has no hesitation in stating that it will guarantee these and other rights to all those who will not violate the *socialist constitution* or subvert the *socialist state* through unconstitutional methods." (emphasis added.) Here the term "socialist" is significant which indicates that the CPI is going to travel along the same road traversed by the People's democracies in East Europe.

One of the problems the CPI faces in its efforts to become a truly nation-wide force is that its influence, which has grown in the last few years, is uneven as between different States. The party is weak in almost all Hindi-speaking States and its influence is generally limited in rural areas. The nature of the problem can best be illustrated by its position in West Bengal. In that State the party commands considerable influence in industrial areas, in particular, and in urban areas in general. But it has very little influence among peasants.

The Party has considerable influence among the peasantry only in the States of Kerala and Andhra and some parts of U.P. and the Punjab. In the Punjab, curiously, it enjoys the support of small land-owners but the Harijan landless labour, which should normally be close to it, is positively opposed to the party. Thus the party's composition varies a great deal from State to State creating difficult organisational problems.

The class composition of the delegates attending the Amritsar Congress is also interesting. The analysis was released to the press by the CPI office. Among the delegates totalling 475, as many as 31 were landlords, 276 middle class (or bourgeois) representatives, 45 workers, 101 peasants, 13 landless labourers and 8 small businessmen. Thus the CPI stands self-confessed as mainly non-proletarian in character.

* * *

Within a week of the conclusion of the Amritsar Congress, reports of what really transpired at the Amritsar Congress started trickling out. As usual, they reveal factional quarrels and ever-increasing struggle for power within the CPI. The CPI politics is bedevilled by these inner-party wranglings since its birth, but it appears this time at the Amritsar Congress unity, discipline, and solidarity were conspicuously absent. According to press reports, Ajoy Ghosh, who has been re-elected the Party General Secretary, no more enjoys a majority in the Party and could secure re-election only because the "Right reformist" group led by P. C. Joshi and the "Left sectarian" group led by Bhupesh Gupta, being evenly matched could not capture the office for themselves.

(Continued on page 11)

I. C. C. F. NEWS

Mr. Melvin Lasky, Editor of *Der Monat*, the well-known German monthly magazine and Chairman of the Editorial Board of the magazines published by the Congress for Cultural Freedom was in India in the month of April. He spent a week each in Bombay, Delhi and Calcutta and a couple of days in Madras. He then went to Colombo and from there returned to Paris.

In Bombay the I.C.C.F. accorded a reception to Mr. Lasky on 28th March. The reception was attended by a number of members of the Committee with whom he discussed the intellectual ferment that was growing in Eastern Europe.

He was also accorded reception by the Press Guild. Mr. R. V. Murthy presided over the function which took place on 1st April. Mr. Lasky spoke at the function about the role of writers in social movements.

As Editor of *Forum Service* Mr. Lasky met a number of Editors and other journalists in Bombay, and discussed with them the possibilities of developing the *Forum Service* in India. In Delhi and Calcutta also he met several Editors and journalists with the same object in view.

In Delhi Mr. Lasky addressed a meeting held under the auspices of the P.E.N. Club. During his short stay he had interviews with the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister and a number of other prominent officials and non-officials. The Asian Office organised a reception in his honour.

Mr. Lasky was in Calcutta from April 13 to 17. He delivered two lectures, one under the auspices of the Department of International Affairs at the Jadavpur University, and the other under the auspices of the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture. The topic of his first lecture was "Problem of Germany" and of the second lecture "Problems of Culture Freedom in East Europe". He met the wellknown painter Mr. Jamini Roy and the talented Film Director Mr. Satyajit Roy. He also met a number of other intellectuals including Prof. A. S. Ayyub and Prof. Amlan Dutta, Editors of *Quest*.

In the course of his short stay in Madras Mr. Lasky had a long interview with Mr. C. Rajagopalachari. He also met several journalists and other public men.

* * *

The Indian Committee accorded a reception to Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan on April 11 on the eve of his foreign tour. The reception was largely attended. Prominent amongst those who attended were Mr. Y. B. Chavan, Chief Minister of Bombay, Sir Rustum Masani, Justice V. M. Tarkunde, Justice B. N. Gokhale, Mr. N. V. Gadgil, Mr. D. K. Kunte and Dr. T. R. Naravane. Mr. J.B.H. Wadia welcomed Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan made a suitable reply in the course of which he explained the purpose of his tour.

D. R. S. NEWS

Mr. Norman Thomas, editor *Louisville Times*, spoke on "India in the American Press" on Monday, March 10.* The speech was followed by a lively discussion on the subject of Indo-American relations. Mr. Adam Adil was in the chair.

"Recent Changes in the Communist World" was the subject of an interesting talk delivered by Mr. Melvin J. Lasky, editor of *Der Monat*, and the editor of the well-known *White Book on Hungarian Revolution*, under the auspices of the DRS on Thursday, April 3. Mr. H. R. Pardivala, Bar-at-Law, presided.

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan delivered a public lecture on "Parliamentary Democracy" under the auspices of the DRS at the Indian Merchants Chamber Hall on Wednesday, April 9. The Hall was packed to capacity. Mr. R. P. Masani presided over the lecture.

DOUBLE-TALK AT AMRITSAR—Continued from page 10

Ajoy Ghosh was in such a precarious position that under the pressure of the "Left sectarian" group he expressed his desire to move an amendment to the political resolution which he himself had presented earlier. But he was not allowed to amend his resolution because the "Right" group was opposed to it. Unable to face the music, Ajoy Ghosh "fell ill" at the time of replying to the debate and it was left to B. T. Randive now a "centrist", to defend Ghosh's resolution.

Moreover Ghosh's panel of 25 names for the new Central Executive was also not accepted by the delegates who suggested 15 more names. The results of the elections show that the Left, the Right and the Centre have won 13, 7, and 5 seats respectively on the Central Executive.

Besides, Ghosh's proposal to have "young blood" in the nine-man secretariat was also rejected. It was suspected that Ghosh wanted to pack the secretariat with his own "henchmen". The old leaders like Randive, Joshi, Dange and others, who have been known in the past to spend more time in factional wrangling, have managed to get into the nine-man secretariat.

As a result of this wonderful display of "inner-party democracy", Ajoy Ghosh and A. K. Gopalan, it is learnt, are shortly leaving for Moscow. "Ostensibly", as the *Hindustan Times* commented, "they are visiting Russia for "medical treatment" but, in fact, to report the proceedings of the Amritsar session to their principals in the Kremlin and to seek their advice for the solution of the new crisis facing the Party."

INDIAN COMMUNIST PARTY DOCUMENTS

Published by
The Democratic Research Service
and
The Institute of Pacific Relations
Price Rs. 10

Available from:
POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

With Many Voices

Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world."

—Tennyson.

You must be together—so tough, indeed, that the enemy will always know the Hungarian working class will not waver. You should not think that if a counter-revolution comes to Hungary you can depend on help from the Soviet Union. You must help yourselves.

•—Khrushchev, addressing Hungarian workers at Sztalinvaros, April 5.

The Soviet Union has always supported us, repelling imperialist attempts to interfere in our internal affairs . . . and if the need arose and we asked for it, it would lend us also the support of its military forces to defend our national independence and the people's power.

—Janos Kadar, Hungarian Communist Party Secretary, April 4.

I must say that you Hungarians should not stand like fools with your mouths open . . . you slept soundly with your fists clenched like children, and when the counter-revolution came, Russia had to help.

—Khrushchev, April 21.

Judging by what I have seen so far, I think that in a communist society, Sarvodaya workers will find themselves behind the bars.

—Jayaprakash Narayan, *Hindustan Times*, April 11.

Under a democratic set-up the people have to make a choice (for a Government) between "two evils" as political philosophers put it. But in our country at the present moment they have to choose between "an evil" and "a devil."

—Current, April 23.

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

The communists too have become a democratic party—at least on paper. It has become a fashion these days to swear by democracy, but murder it whenever an opportunity presents itself.

—Jayaprakash Narayan, *Indian Express*, April 14.

For all practical purposes it appears as if there is an unwritten understanding between the Congress and the CPI.

—Current, April 23.

✓ We may be pardoned if we suspect that there is a good deal of sneaking "co-existence" between the Congress and the Communists.

—Blitz, April 26.

If the Amritsar resolution (of the Communist Party) were implemented probably the Communists might cease to exist as such.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Indian Express*, April 25.

India is the second greatest country in the world because she has the second largest population in the world.

—V. K. Krishna Menon, *Times of India*,
March 18.

The Communist decision to eschew violence and abolish conspiratorial "cells" as the basic unit of the Party organisation will only increase their capacity to infiltrate other political parties.

—Hindustan Times, April 27.

Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon thrives on indignation, he is always at the epicentre of self-directed earthquakes.

—Vighneshwara, *Swarajya*, April 26.

The Plan is fast becoming a totem. And the slogan is: up the totem pole, come what may.

—"Periscope" *Thought*, March 22.

We have to prefer co-operation with the West in order to shut the gates of hell.

—President Bourguiba of Tunisia, *Times of India*,
March 21.

We Viet Namese do not share the neutralist idea. We cannot, since the communists are not neutral.

—President Diem of Viet Nam, *Times of India*,
March 24.

Temperamentally he (Nehru) is like Mr. S. A. Dange (Communist-Bombay) in believing that the solution lies in sloganising "progress" in "nationalisation and more nationalisation", in tilting only at the windmill all the time.

—"Periscope" *Thought*, March 22