

AUGUST 1953

Freedom's Opportunity

THE fall of Beria, kept secret for about a fortnight, was the biggest news to come from Moscow since the death of Stalin. Following Stalin's death, commentators in the free world adopted one of two positions. Realistic students of communist theory and practice forecast that, since the Fuehrer principle was an essential part of the Soviet dictatorship, a violent struggle for the succession to Stalin would break out between the various aspirants to power. There was a more optimistic school of thought which took the view that, with Stalin's death, power which had thus been atomised could never be controlled by a single pair of hands again and that the rule by triumvirate or directorate would become a normal part of Soviet practice, leading, in course of time, to a gradual relaxation of the totalitarian system itself. This school of thought, of which Sir Winston Churchill has become the most outstanding protagonist, proceeded to suggest a long term accommodation between the Democracies and the Kremlin by means of a Big Four meeting. The heroic workers' rising in East Germany and Malenkov's liquidation of Beria in true Stalinist fashion are the beginnings of a chain of events which will smash their illusions and force the world once again to face the brute facts of life about the Soviet dictatorship.

But first, what is the meaning of these world-shaking events? It is known to observers of developments behind the Iron Curtain that Lavrentii Beria appeared to be on his way out on the eve of Stalin's death.

On January 13, 1953, the lightning had struck near its target. After careful preparation of the ground by Stalin and Malenkov, it was announced that top Kremlin doctors were "poisoners" and that the deaths of Zhdanov and Shcherbakov, which had occurred while Beria was in charge of the secret police, had

been brought on by the doctor poisoners. About the same time Stalin and Malenkov set afloat a rumour that Beria, who is in reality a Georgian by birth, was "half Jewish," as part of the general drive against him on the one hand and the frame-up of the "Jewish doctor poisoners" on the other.

Then death intervened to save Beria and, within a few hours after Stalin's death, almost all his earlier rulings were annulled. Among these sudden reversals was that Beria got the Home Ministry and the secret police back in his hands. Another was the re-establishment of the old Politbureau abolished last October by Stalin. Yet others were the release of the Jewish Doctors and the proclamation of an amnesty. The reversal of the measures devised by Stalin and the re-allocation of power was evidently the result of a deal concluded behind the scenes between Malenkov, Beria and their associates. It was Beria who proposed Malenkov as Premier and Beria's own name appeared first among the four "First Deputy Premiers." There were, however, two obstacles to Beria's rise to absolute power. One, that he is a Georgian, and Great Russian nationalism would not allow one Georgian to succeed another. For another, he had the handicap of having been too long the police chief. "More than any other aspirant," writes Bertram D. Wolfe in his prophetic article *The Soviet Struggle for the Succession* in the July issue of *Foreign Affairs*, "he (Beria) needs for a time the protective shield of 'collective leadership' and anonymous 'collegial bodies'."

History records that a triumvirate is among the least stable forms of government. The first triumvirate in Rome had ended with a civil war between Caesar and Pompey; the second with the destruction of Mark Anthony and the seizure of power by Octavius. The directorate in France was destroyed by Napoleon Buonaparte's *coup d'état*. Despite the optimists, the post-Stalin settlement was a mere stop-gap and could not be expected to last. Now the gangsters have fallen out again and Malenkov has struck the first blow and is on his way to donning the mantle of "the Great and Beloved Leader." The fight for the succession must go on till

Malenkov, or perhaps some General, emerges as the unquestioned leader.

What does Beria's removal portend for the Russian people and the rest of the world? Is it, as Lord Mayor Reuter of Berlin has described it, "the beginning of the end"? It would be reckless to be dogmatic, but indications are not lacking that the concentration of power in Malenkov's hands may entail, *in time*, a reversal of the "liberal" trends discerned in recent weeks. Those who released the Jewish doctors are now themselves being liquidated. Malenkov's antipathy for the Jews has been well-known and a revival of the pogroms cannot therefore be ruled out.

Similarly, Malenkov is known to be a Great Russian chauvinist with ill-disguised contempt for "the lesser breeds without the law" who inhabit the Soviet domains, while on the other hand, according to Mr. Harry Schwartz of the *New York Times*, in the Soviet press during recent weeks "credit was directly or indirectly given to M. Beria as the one who had prevented injustice to members of non-Russian nationalities in the Soviet Union."

Not once, but repeatedly is the charge now advanced against Beria that he was giving aid and comfort to the nationalist urges of the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. Thus, in the editorial article in *Pravda* of July 10, one reads: "By various crafty schemes, Beria strove... to disseminate hostility among the U.S.S.R. peoples and to activate bourgeois national elements in the Union Republics." The subject peoples of the Soviet Empire therefore know what to expect.

From a global viewpoint, the removal of Beria and the upsetting of the balance of power in the Kremlin may entail in all probability a return in course of time to the Stalin policy of rigidity, though the current tactical line may continue for a while. Among the crimes with which Beria and his adherents are charged is "perversion of the Lenin-Stalin policy." The opponents of reform and of concessions, the tough men who lost ground on Stalin's death, now appear to be hitting back. Even the *Times* (London) is forced to concede that "parts of the *Pravda* article against Beria seem to blame him for some of the consequences of the experiment in 'loosening'." The valiant rise of the East Germany workers, accompanied by similar outbursts in Czechoslovakia and Poland, will probably be used by Malenkov as an argument against a "soft" policy. Malenkov's dilemma is that East Europe wants freedom; and that the Soviet monolith cannot give—and yet continue to exist.

For the free world too there is a choice to make. "Totalitarianism's difficulty," writes Bertram Wolfe, "is freedom's opportunity." But how is this opportunity to be utilised? Judging by preliminary comments, the appeasers will continue, despite this blow, to repeat *ad nauseam* their nostrum of a Big Four meeting. They do not pause to consider with whom they will negotiate. Last month it might have been Beria; this month it is Malenkov; next month, it might be yet somebody else. The fact is that there is in Russia today no stable government with whom a

lasting and binding agreement can be reached, but a set of gangsters engaged in destroying one another.

The logic of Sir Winston Churchill and those who would seek to effect a partition of the world between the Great Powers is one of selling out the captive peoples of Eastern Europe, North Korea, China and Tibet. "I do not believe," said Sir Winston in a speech, much applauded in *Pravda*, "that the problem of combining the security of Russia with the freedom and security of Western Europe is insoluble." Commenting on this statement, Prof. Salvador de Madariaga writes: "This would mean that if Moscow is ready to guarantee not to attack the freedom and security of Western Europe, nothing will be said about the status of Eastern Europe which is today under the Russian boot."

Opening the meeting of the Big-Three Foreign Ministers in Washington, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles described the occasion as "the time of opportunity."

The question is how the right of the captive peoples to free elections and self-determination is to be established. Meantime, the "Liberation Station" run by Russians in exile has urged the Russian army to rise against the Soviet regime "before Malenkov has time to establish his absolute rule." That is indeed the crux of the matter. Shall he be given the time?

The workers of East Germany and the captive peoples elsewhere yearn for words of comradeship and acts of solidarity from free men and women outside the Iron Curtain. Next time they rise, they will expect more than words of praise and offers of food—however welcome these may be—from those who talk of freedom. The downfall of Beria, like the death of Stalin, provides yet one more opportunity for acts of Liberation which the free world will miss at its peril, for the alternative is the path of appeasement and of World War III.

FREEDOM FIRST

is the Monthly Bulletin of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, which is affiliated to the World Movement for Cultural Freedom.

Material published in this Bulletin may be reproduced and copyright is not reserved.

Annual Subscription Post-free (Inland) Rs. 3/-
" " " (Foreign) \$1 or 7 sh.
Single Copy 3 annas

Articles and letters for publication and all enquiries may please be addressed to

THE INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM
127 MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD
BOMBAY 1.

Notes

A Light Snuffed Out

FRIENDS of freedom will grieve that the voice of *Vivek* has been silenced. Suddenly and without any explanation, the contributions of the country's undoubted leader among columnists have stopped appearing. We have it on good authority that *Vivek* was no party to this deed. The considerations by which the management were moved have not been made known.

Freedom First is informed that several readers of the *Times of India* wrote to the editor letters for publication asking for an explanation, but none of these have seen the light of day. Meanwhile, Iqbal Singh and *Adib* are allowed with impunity to carry on their Agitprop activities in the paper's columns.

Vivek is the second anti-totalitarian publicist to be victimised in recent weeks and the incident recalls the case of Mr. Prabhakar Padhye, formerly editor of *Navashakti*. Perhaps those who complain loudest about McCarthyism in distant America—about which all democrats feel strongly—would consider turning their attention nearer home to what looks like becoming a good imitation of the real thing in reverse in our own country?

Meanwhile, no better exhortation to writers and publicists to preserve their integrity in the face of such pressure can be found than the words of Mr. A. D. Gorwala in the *Statesman* of July 8: "The urge towards conformity, the pressure for turning all thought into the same mould, the resentment against *bona fide* criticism, more especially if valid and difficult to refute, is often strongly present. In these circumstances, on the publicist, speaker or writer, a grave responsibility rests. He must tell the truth as he sees it. It is not for him to endeavour to win the confidence of statesmen by altering the truth and suiting his words to the aims of their policy. Nor must he allow the power and influence of owners of great wealth and mighty institutions to affect his task, whatever the good or harm they can do him. His primary and only duty is to the people. Them he must serve, whether or not they sustain him."

Malan and Malenkov

ON June 23 was issued a 621-page report by a Committee set up jointly by the United Nations and the I.L.O. which will, as time passes, make an increasingly deep impression on world opinion. This is the report of the Committee headed by Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, distinguished Indian statesman, and two others, to investigate into the existence of forced labour in various parts of the world.

Till now, while well informed people have been painfully aware of the existence of slave labour as a normal part of the Soviet system, there are many others

who have remained unconvinced and preferred to regard this as part of "cold war" propaganda. The findings of the U. N. Committee are, however, simple and unvarnished. Forced labour, according to the report, is found to exist in its fullest form in the Soviet Union and in the form which most endangers human rights. "Such a system is by its very nature and attributes a violation of the fundamental rights of the human person as guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations and proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.....As a result of this system, the Soviet economy had come to depend to a considerable degree on forced labour." The report also finds proven the existence of similar systems in captive countries of the Soviet Empire like Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Rumania. The other main violator of elementary human liberty to keep company with the Soviet Union is the Republic of South Africa, which is indicted for permitting the continuance of laws "which would lead to forced labour."

The International Labour Organisation, meeting in Geneva a few days later, endorsed the report and made an appeal to the Governments concerned "to re-examine their law and administrative practices in the light of present conditions." It is doubtful, however, whether either Malan or Malenkov can be expected to pay much attention to this call.

Justice For Korea

WHEN on July 1 we asked our readers for an understanding of President Syngman Rhee's action in cutting the Gordian Knot of the Korean prisoners of war problem and urged that the balance of justice rested on his side, we had imagined that ours would be a lone voice in the wilderness. We are heartened, therefore, to find that even in our own country, a few other voices have been heard asking for an understanding of Dr. Rhee's position.

In the world abroad, public opinion has recovered from the initial surprise and more and more voices have been speaking up in support of the Republic of Korea. Acting Senate Republican leader William F. Knowland said on July 5 that he owed it to "frankness" to blame his own Republican administration for not sufficiently consulting the Korean leader. He went on to say that, if he were Syngman Rhee, he himself would not settle the Korean war without a united Korea and he called for U.S. logistical support to the R.O.K.—the strongest anti-communist force in all Asia—in case the Korean Government decided to continue the war against the communists. Senator Ralph E. Flanders on his part declared: "We have retrograded politically and morally in our relations with the heroic Korean people." Equally impressive support has come from the neighbouring Republic of the Philippines where both President Quirino and General Romulo have expressed their understanding of President Rhee's opposition to the armistice on the present terms and his action in releasing the Korean prisoners of war. The Australian Army Minister said on July 22 that a period of truce in Korea "could

be extremely dangerous" and warned: "To be realistic, we must be prepared for a new outbreak of fighting." Mr. Adlai Stevenson who recently interviewed President Rhee in Korea has described him as a "dedicated man," while ex-President Truman has gone out of his way to break his political silence by declaring his liking for President Rhee whom he has described as a patriot.

Why then, despite the superficial accord reached in Seoul, does a gulf persist between the Korean and the Western points of view? The answer is undoubtedly to be found in President Eisenhower's remark that "the question of unifying Korea by warfare had to be weighed against the future of the United Nations." This is, obviously a reference to the weak-kneed attitude of appeasement which other nations in the U.N., led by Britain, have been pressing on the United States and the United Nations. Their keenness to buy off the communist aggressors in Korea is so intense that they are quite prepared to go back on the resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the U.N. on October 7, 1950, by 47 votes to 5. This resolution asserted that the United Nations objective continued to be "the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government of Korea" and it gave the U.N. Commander the authority to cross the 38th parallel and liberate North Korea. The present deceptive truce means the surrender of this objective and will be understood throughout Asia as a defeat for the United Nations.

"It has remained for the 'Syngman Rhee clique' to exhibit what little honesty, consistency and courage we have recently seen in Korea," writes the *New Leader*, New York's Social Democratic weekly. And it goes on to suggest that "perhaps, instead of condemning Syngman Rhee, we can learn something from him."

Reactionary China

THE Reuter report that the communist dictatorship in China has imposed a total ban on the import of contraceptives brings out once again the reactionary communist attitude to the question of population control. China, like India, is grossly overpopulated and the pressure on land continually increases. The communist solution of this problem is not, however, the civilized one of planning its population and helping the people to space their families, but to use the surplus man-power as cannon fodder for the imperialist wars they wage in Korea and Indo-China, and for deportation to slave labour camps in the eastern zones of the U.S.S.R. Those who talk of the "progressive" nature of the Chinese communist regime might consider the implications of their action in Indian terms.

Dr. Ralph Bunche

ON the strength of a Reuter message from U.N. Headquarters on April 2 which secured wide publication in the Indian press and which remained uncontradicted, *Freedom First* carried an editorial note entitled "Ignorance Is Bliss" in its May issue. The report had quoted Dr. Bunche as saying that "he saw nothing during his tour of Indian Universities last January to justify the statement that they were communist influenced."

The Editor has now received a letter from Dr. Bunche stating that he has not at any time said that he saw no signs of communist influence in the Universities of India. We are happy to know of this and regret that we should have been misled by the news agency report to comment critically on Dr. Bunche's alleged statement. Reuter-PTI might well look into this matter.

The Essence Of Democracy

"PERHAPS it is a mistake to always imagine that in a democracy there should be a ruling party and an opposition party. There should be some other way. . . . They (political parties) do propaganda and set up their own candidates in elections. People have to select from amongst them. This is not correct democracy. People may not be able this way to select the best worker." Such were the disconcerting sentiments expressed by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, the PSP leader, in the course of his whirlwind tour of Gujerat in support of Vinoba's Bhoodan Movement. Were it not for the fact that our infant democracy is already denounced as a sham and a fraud by those who would forcibly overthrow it in favour of "a dictatorship of the proletariat," we might have taken the criticism in good part as that of a friendly critic who, moved by the misery and suffering of his people, is impatient with the slow and inefficient functioning of an imperfect democratic machinery. As it is, the criticism is liable to be mis-

construed by interested parties as a repudiation of the democratic system by one of democracy's best friends. Let us, therefore, examine Jayaprakash's pronouncements dispassionately to see how far they are justified.

Jayaprakash begins by questioning the validity of the unstated assumption in the Western concept of parliamentary democracy that there should be an Opposition to the party in power. In reply, we cannot do better than quote E.F.M. Durbin in his excellent book *The Politics of Democratic Socialism*. Says Durbin, "If liberty is to exist, if the dependence of government upon the will of the people is to be real, there must always be a real choice before the people. This implies the steady maintenance of a critical and essential institution—that of freedom to oppose the Government of the day. Unless the electorate has more than one possible government before it; unless there is more than one party able to place its view before the country; unless, that is to say, the opposition is free

to prepare itself to take over power, and the government to surrender it peacefully after an electoral decision against it; there is no choice before it." So there! This is not to say that the duty of the opposition is to oppose everything and propose nothing. But it does unmistakably mean that opposition to the government of the day is of the very essence of democracy.

And yet Jayaprakash thinks there should be some other system. As to what that system should be like, he is delightfully vague. And so we are left none the wiser for all his criticism of what to him is an outdated concept of democracy. In his philosophical peregrination, however, Jayaprakash is not altogether unconscious of the dangerous grounds he is treading. For he hastens to add: "I do not mean that there should be one party administration in the country. This will be suicidal. What I mean is that there should be no party at all. The constitution could be run without any party." Thanks for the tender mercy!

But without previous agreement on fundamentals how is a non-party administration to set about its work? Will it stand for free enterprise, mixed economy or nationalisation? And what will be its foreign policy? We have no quarrel with the ideal of a non-party administration as our ultimate goal. But in the context of the present realities it is a "consummation devoutly to be wished" but not attainable in the foreseeable future.

Jayaprakash is, however, on surer ground when he says that the restricted choice the electorate is offered in voting for the candidates put up by political parties is not correct democracy, as the voters may not then be able to select the best worker. But here

again the fault lies not with the system of democracy but with party politics. Intent upon enforcing rigid party discipline, leaders of political parties prefer docile men who can be relied upon to toe the party line and vote for the party regardless of the issues at stake. Independence of mind is not among the qualities they admire. As a consequence, the sins of party politics visit upon the machinery of democracy, defeating the very purpose of a democratic election which is to put at the helm of affairs the best men with whose general outlook the voters find themselves in sympathy. It is for the party leaders, therefore, to choose as their candidates men of outstanding ability and character so that people may have a chance to vote for them.

To sum up, we believe that the existence of a responsible opposition to the party in power is of the very essence of democracy and that the election of people's representatives by a vote of the people themselves is the best method of selecting an aristocracy of the ablest and the most outstanding men in the state. So vitally important in any democratic society is this freedom of the people to choose that to deprive it of the freedom would be to drain away its very life-blood. It is precisely because Jayaprakash's criticism of democracy impinges upon the freedom to choose that we are provoked to join issues with him. For if a cat may look on a king, so may in a democracy the editor of a small bulletin cross swords with a leader of Jayaprakash's stature. And if the leader wishes to attempt a riposte the columns of this bulletin are open to him. For the editor is a great admirer of Voltaire when he says: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Protests And Problems

by Michael Polanyi

(The University of Hamburg and the Congress for Cultural Freedom organised an International Conference on "Science and Freedom" in Hamburg from July 23rd to July 26th.)

FROM the assault on Liege on 5th August 1914 to the bombing of Nagasaki on 9th August 1945, millions of people were killed by war, revolution and persecution. Another million succumbed since to the riots following the partition of India and again a million to the communist regime in China. When this carnage first started it shocked the people of the West, nurtured on the assurances of the 19th century, into feelings of horror which made pacifism into a dominant political influence among them. Later, when pacifism led to Munich many people realised that it was a selfish and treacherous policy. So that on the fall of France, after only slight hesitation, the West turned against Petain and followed Churchill instead.

Yet a second "Munich" had to follow at Yalta, with years of bitter remorse in its sequel, before pacifism was finally discarded in favour of a different purpose. Today this purpose is established: It is liberty.

We do not know yet clearly what we mean by liberty today. We cannot know it, since only in the last few years have we begun to understand the new type of tyranny which has re-awakened our passion for liberty.

This passion overcame individual consciences in their several ways — on their several roads to Damascus. Some heard the call in Bucharin's last speech, others in the reports on Katyn or in the suicide of Masaryk. The cumulative stirring of their remorse became effective in different people at different stages, and each realised then in his turn that by his blindness or complacency he had made himself an accessory, even though only passively, to a mass destruction of minds that was menacing to engulf mankind. So each in his turn raised the call for liberty—the name of which had become quite unfamiliar during the preceding decades in which liberty had fallen into contempt.

Several distinguished scientists are still indifferent to the systematic dragooning of their colleagues in Soviet Russia. Some because they are communists, others perhaps in the hope of mitigating the savagery of despotism by passing by in silence the spectacle of its victims. Some scholars still seem to keep aloof from ignorance or deliberate unconcern.

The primary impulse for convening the Hamburg Conference on "Science and Freedom" has been the desire to rouse academic opinion more widely against the treatment of scholars and of scholarship under totalitarianism. But the Conference will find a more substantial justification in the fact that a denunciation of totalitarian obscurantism is ineffectual without much clearer principles of intellectual liberty than we possess today.

Totalitarianism is the supreme threat to cultural freedom today. But from the very struggle against totalitarianism have flown other dangers. Communist infiltration has fostered in some quarters a fundamental suspicion against universities as seedbeds of intellectual insubordination. The demand has arisen that universities should sanction all existing economic and social institutions.

The status of universities has been diminished also by the fact that their ever growing financial requirements were covered to an increasing proportion by the State. Science and scholarship have come increasingly to be regarded by governments as justifying themselves by their contribution to national security or social welfare and the subsidies granted to universities tended to foster preferentially those developments which had a practical or popular appeal. This coincided unfortunately with a serious decline in the weight of academic tradition, rooted in the old European universities; many of these universities having been suppressed or corrupted by totalitarian governments or reduced to insignificance by the ravages of war.

These changes have tended to weaken the sense of obligation among the public to cultivate the advancement of knowledge for its own sake and to respect its progress whatever it may lead to. It has become rare nowadays to hear the head of a university appealing for funds for the advancement of knowledge as an end in itself.

All the problems of academic freedom are part of a single fabric. To oppose Marxism by liberalism is so difficult precisely because the conflict of the two is but a malignant growth of the internal contradictions in the grounds of liberalism itself. Liberalism proclaims the sanctity of the individual and his right to live by his own best lights. This doctrine may well be invoked by the private scholar to investigate what he pleases and to publish his results at his own expense, but could not justify the right of academic employees paid by the taxpayer to decide for themselves what research to undertake and what to teach their students.

According to the principle prevailing in a liberal democracy the taxpayer should determine the way public money is to be spent. Therefore, if it transpired that the taxpayer was interested in academic

studies only or mainly as a means of promoting the public welfare, we could hardly resist the Marxist doctrine that the conduct of academic research and teaching should be directed by the State, as the authority ultimately responsible for the public welfare. On these grounds any freely elected government could appear rightly to exercise powers which deny all academic freedom.

We were horrified at the action of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union imposing the authority of Michurin and Lysenko on the Soviet Academy and impelling it to repudiate unanimously in its meeting of 7th August 1948 the laws of heredity established by Mendel and the whole conception of biology related to these laws. But are we quite clear against what principles of ours such an action offends? For we must admit that previously the publications of the Anti-Mendelists and of the whole school of Michurin and Lysenko were excluded from the leading scientific journals of Soviet Russia and their teachings were unrepresented in Russian university curricula; as they still continue to be in the West. Our universities and academic publications operate under a strict censorship exercised by prevailing scholarship opinion and they would promptly degenerate into confusion if this discipline were abandoned. In this sense the existing body of science, or at any rate its fundamental conceptions are imposed as an orthodoxy in the West. Millions are spent annually on the cultivation and dissemination of science by the public authorities who would not give a penny for the advancement of astrology or cabalistic studies. Our civilization is deeply committed to certain beliefs about the nature of things, and it is for the cultivation of these particular beliefs—and these alone—that academic freedom is granted to the West. We may demand a measure of tolerance for almost any nonsense in a free society, but that is not what we mean by academic freedom.

There exists, therefore, also in the West an authority, closely intertwined with political power, which sets the framework within which academic scholarship may operate, and yet this fact does not offend against academic freedom. On the contrary, it would seem that it is precisely the defence of this political power that can alone safeguard academic freedom.

Liberty of thought was born from a rationalism radically opposed to authority. "Nullius in verba"—"We recognise no authority"—was the motto under which the Royal Society was founded. It would seem that opposition to authority can no longer guide the ideal of liberty so safely today.

Most of the themes of the Hamburg conference will touch on this problem which has never been fully faced by the lovers of liberty. For it seems impossible to say anything about the proper organisation of scholarship in a free society or even to protest at the abuse of political power against scholarship under totalitarianism without invoking the power of a different authority to protect the free society and the pursuit of free scholarship within it.

Meherally, Gandhi & The C.S.P.

by Bertram D. Wolfe

DURING the early 30's after Hitler came to power, Stalin made several vain attempts to come to an understanding with Hitler. When these failed and the Anti-Comintern Axis developed, Stalin became alarmed and made one of his sudden turns to seek support in the League of Nations (till then called by him "The League of Bandits"). At the same time, he made an alliance with France in the Stalin-Laval Pact, and the great drive for a popular front with Socialist and Democratic Parties. Up till then, the socialists had been called "Social Fascists" and democracy and socialism were "the main enemies." Now the Communist Parties offered the "hand of brotherhood" to all progressive liberal, democratic and socialist parties. Many of these were deceived, infiltrated and later disrupted by this manoeuvre, which lasted until Stalin betrayed his democratic allies by signing his pact with Hitler.

The Congress Socialist Party of India was also taken in by the fair words of friendship and not only accepted the communists into its ranks but helped the Communist Party to enter into the Indian National Congress. The Indian communists were under secret instructions to penetrate and try to capture the Congress Socialist Party and above all to discredit and destroy Mahatma Gandhi. The Indian socialists, Meherally among them, were as candid and unsuspecting as the socialists of other lands. Yet they proved to possess an antitoxin which saved them from destruction.

The only person, according to Meherally, who sounded a note of warning that the communists were not morally fit to enter the Socialist Party or the Indian National Congress was Minoo Masani.

"We spent long hours and days and nights trying to convince him but we did not succeed. He insisted upon resigning from the Congress Socialist Party if it continued to accept the communists into its ranks. When we failed to convince him, we decided to help him with his letter of resignation so that he would make it a really worthy document. All of us had a hand in helping him with an explanation of his reason for breaking with us."

Again I realised that Indian Socialism had some strange quality missing from political life in other countries for I had never heard of a factional controversy in which members of one faction tried to help the spokesmen of another faction to put their position as clearly and worthily as possible. I was mystified as I listened and pondered what this strange ingredient in the Indian spirit could be.

"Minoo was right, of course, although we did not know it then," Yusuf continued. "Some time later I discovered that the Communist Party was guilty of double dealing and had constituted itself as a hostile conspiracy within our movement. They kept up a faction of their own, slandered our movement and its leaders, secretly worked for the defeat of some of our

candidates in the elections, made undercover alliances with opponents of socialism against us. Finally someone brought me copies of a secret communist circular which they had sent out to their members, giving instructions to support reactionaries against Congress Socialist candidates in certain districts. I called a number of top leaders of the Communist Party faction within our ranks to come to visit me and I accused them of moral duplicity. Their answer was a bare-faced denial. Thereupon I took out a copy of their circular and said: "How do you explain this?"

I was alone with their leaders; they snatched the circular out of my hand by force. "Are you such fools?" I asked, "that you think that you can undo a moral crime by destroying a document? Do you think I am such a fool as to trust you after this has come into my possession? Naturally I have other copies in a safe place. You have proved unworthy of membership in a socialist movement. You have proved unworthy of membership in the Congress Party and you have proved unworthy of the moral principles of Gandhiji. What you aim at is power for your Moscow masters. What we aim at is the freedom, the well-being and the regeneration of our people. You and we cannot travel together for our roads diverge. I give you one week to withdraw all your members from our Party or we will expel every one of them.

"We will not give up the Congress Socialist Party," they answered. "It is our Party now. We belong to it and we will have control of it in a showdown."

"I give you one week to withdraw," I responded, "or we will expel every last one of you. It will be more honourable if you resign, for your continued membership in a party you do not agree with dishonours you and us. But if necessary we will expel you."

Once more I realized that it was some strange principle at work in the Indian Socialist Party which saved them from the deadly vacillation of other socialists and liberals in other lands.

"Our National Committee," Yusuf continued, "sent circulars to all our branches and locals and provincial committees throughout India, exposing the whole affair and directing the immediate expulsion of all known communists and all those who had sympathized with them, voted with them, fellow travelled with them, or joined in any way in their conspiracy."

"Do not be afraid to commit an injustice," we wrote. "If anyone is wrongly expelled, he will find it easy to prove his good faith and can be reinstated, but if any morally corrupting element remains, it will corrupt our party."

"Within the time limit set by us, our Party was purified."

"How many sections, branches, locals and provincial committees did you lose as a result?" I asked,

remembering how many parties were wrecked by such splits.

"We had no serious losses," he replied, "because the moral principles on which we acted were clear to our membership."

Suddenly I knew the answer. It was the influence of Gandhi within the Congress Socialist Party which had immunized it against the moral corruption of the communists. No other party anywhere in the world suffered such insignificant losses as the result of this unhappy experiment of working together with the communists.

As Yusuf talked to me about Gandhi, I began to realize that there was a warm bond of affection and good-humoured intimacy that bound Yusuf to him in a relationship that was compounded of father and son, master and disciple, friend and friend, in unequal parts. They had obviously argued much, too, for Yusuf told me of Gandhi's reservations about the class struggle aspect of Yusuf's socialism, and the socialist habit of treating some classes as virtue incarnate and others as incarnate evil. The dogmatic violent amoral side of Yusuf's socialist creed had been tempered by Gandhi's philosophy. And Yusuf had his reservations on the "home-spun" aspects of Gandhi's economics. But these were superficial differences while in their hearts there was a tie of common moral principle, deep affection, and the warm bond that links a devoted disciple to a great teacher.

During World War I, I began to befriend the various Indian independence fighters that I met in New York, San Francisco, and later in Mexico. In keeping with our American tradition (we are ourselves a rebellious British colony that won freedom through revolution), I supported all Indian efforts to secure independence through revolutionary action. Nor was I alienated by the fact that some Indians sought support from our World War I enemy, Germany, for had not we ourselves received help from England's enemy, France, in our struggle for freedom?

Suddenly, I became aware of the existence of Mahatma Gandhi, as the movement he headed, or rather inspired, began to dwarf and absorb all other independence efforts. But then, as suddenly, in the

early twenties, as Gandhi's movement seemed to be gaining irresistably in numbers and power, I learned that he had called off the non-cooperation and resistance movement because he feared that it was getting out of hand. Living as we did more than half way around the world, we got no real explanation of this suspension. I formed the opinion that Gandhi had become a British puppet or a traitor to India's cause, and I so wrote in our press.

But as the years passed and I watched the ebb and flow and long range growth of the movement for Indian independence and regeneration under Gandhi's leadership I came to realize that I had been wrong about him. He knew his people with a profound knowledge of their spirit, their weaknesses and their possibilities. His conception of resistance to evil included the evil latent in his own people. He not only wanted to help them to be free but to help them to be worthy to be free. I became absorbed in his masterful sense of timing, and of the strategy and tactics of the double struggle for freedom and regeneration in which he was engaged. Gestures which at first has seemed silly to me—the home spinning and the march to the sea to scoop up a ladle of sea water and evaporate out the salt—I soon realized were profoundly symbolic and brilliantly conceived to mobilize his people, stir their spirits, and dramatize the struggle for freedom. I now saw that he was creating a ritual for his struggle and was striving to convert his people's belief in him into a belief in themselves. Thus he sought to prepare them for independence, unify them, chide and restrain them when they were attracted to means unworthy of the ends they sought. How badly they needed this type of leadership was demonstrated by the terrible eruption of communal struggles at the moment that freedom was attained. I made acknowledgement in my writings that I had been wrong about Gandhi and that he was one of the few truly great men of our time. When he was assassinated, I wired to Yusuf Meherally: "My heart joins yours in grieving for the loss of the greatest man of our time." I am convinced that Gandhi was the greatest man of the first half of our century and that the historian of the future will recognize him as such.

Hands Across The Iron Curtain

The International Conference on "Science and Freedom" organised in Hamburg by the Congress for Cultural Freedom has sent the following message to scientists behind the Iron Curtain:

"At the conclusion of this International Conference in Hamburg on "Science and Freedom," in which more than a hundred scientists and scholars from nineteen countries have discussed the theoretical and practical problems of scientific research today, we should like to convey our fraternal greetings to our fellow scientists separated from us by political power. We are convinced that these, our unhappy colleagues,

have never ceased to feel a profound loyalty to those ideals of free inquiry without which science itself would never have arisen. We look forward to the day when they can sit down with us as free men at such a conference as this, to discuss our common problems in a spirit of sincerity and objectivity that they must surely cherish under the most difficult circumstances."

The Need To Identify

A READER writes in remonstrance against two articles in earlier issues of *Freedom First*. Others may perhaps share his perplexity. We think he raises an issue which calls for an answer. Nothing in the note that follows the letter has any reference to the individuals who were referred to in the earlier articles. It is a general discussion of the issue of a broad principle raised by 'V. N.,' whose letter runs as follows:

I am a regular reader of FREEDOM FIRST and have always appreciated its general policy and tone, and the high level of its polemics.

But unfortunately in the June and July issues I found the articles 'The Scientist's Responsibility' and 'Is Krishna Menon Pro-Communist?' of different tone and was somewhat shocked at the labelling of eminent persons. Is this not a case of following the example of McCarthy? It should be least expected from the organ of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Will you please explain your action in publishing such writing?

Making accusations in the press against named persons is distasteful. It is necessary because of communist methods of concealment. The Communist Party is dedicated to the destruction of the established state and the free, democratic social order, without regard to the wishes of the public. It is a formidable force throughout the world, and in India, in particular, must be taken seriously. A considerable part of its activities are secret.

Among the secret means by which it works is the group of "fellow-travellers". This term and the cognate "crypto-communist" are used to designate both more or less close sympathisers, such as gather round any party, and also those who are secret members, or if not *de jure* members are so *de facto*, and act habitually under party direction. Many people who are well known in non-political walks of life, and some even in politics, are fellow-travellers of the latter kind, and they are systematically used for covert propaganda designed to attract unwitting support to communist policies, and also for other secret work. It is not easy to distinguish the two classes of fellow-travellers, and sometimes, no doubt, members of the one are accused of being members of the other.

The Communist Party makes use of distinguished secret sympathisers for apparently humble duties, such as conveying messages and funds, and the like. Their social status is a great advantage in this sort of work.

Once such secret adherents and sympathisers are labelled, the authorities of the state, business firms, etc., are (we hope) less likely to appoint them to positions in which they can do important mischief. The Communist Party is also less likely to employ them to do its work. And the public will be less easily misled by their propaganda. It is therefore a public duty to identify them by name.

We believe that communists should be free to earn their living, and to discuss, advocate and publish their ideas. We think it doubtful whether they should be allowed to organise in pursuance of their ideas, since any organisation they may form is bound, under discipline, to become a secret conspiracy against the state and the social system. They cannot claim any immunity from labelling.

Communists nevertheless habitually protest when they are labelled. Since they are proud of being communists, they cannot feel insulted by it. If they suffer materially, as by loss of employment, that is part of the risk which they are well aware is involved (in most countries) in joining the communist movement. They raise protests, not against insult or injury, but because exposure endangers their secret work.

Others, however, have the right to protest on their behalf if communists are subjected to excessive penalties, or if accusations of communism are made against innocent persons.

It is such faults as these which are rightly condemned in the activities of Senator McCarthy. He has made reckless accusations against innocent persons; and the atmosphere in America now seems to be such that even those subjected to unsubstantiated charges of communism are in some danger of losing their employment, public or private, and of suffering in other ways. It is further suspected that McCarthy is not disinterested, but is making a career by means of his communist-hunting.

Our accusations cannot be justly compared to McCarthy's. We claim to be disinterested. Most important of all, the atmosphere in India is such that even fully substantiated charges of communism against public servants or private employees will in general lead to no victimisation or even loss of reputation. It is not too much to say that the profession of pro-communist views is now an asset in a public or official career.

There is, on the other hand, some disadvantage in professing hostility to communism. There is in operation what can be called an inverted McCarthyism, which condemns those hostile to communism as "Washington patriots" and "American agents". This will be familiar to any reader of *Blitz*, *Crossroads*, the *National Herald* and *Shankar's Weekly*. In March of this year, Mr. P. Padhye, now Secretary of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, was discharged from his position as editor of *Navashakti* by Mr. S. Sadanand, proprietor of the paper, because he had participated in a meeting to discuss the subject "The World after Stalin", organised by the Democratic Research Service. The lack of effective public protest against this act of victimisation was disturbing. Liberals who are concerned to maintain fair play and defend democratic freedom can find plenty to do in combating this kind of labelling and victimisation.

—Editor

Review

Arrow in the Blue

by Arthur Koestler (Collins, London, 18 sh.)

ONE of the books by Mr. Koestler is called *Promise and Fulfilment*. This book may well be called *Promise and Disappointment*. Mr. Koestler had indeed an exciting story to tell, for his early life, which is covered in this volume, was full of prodigal adventures and achievements. But Mr. Koestler soon forgot that he was telling a story and entered into the realm of psychoanalysis.

Psychoanalysing a person is often an exciting adventure, but when the process is turned on one's own self it often becomes a pathetic misadventure. Something of the kind has happened to this autobiography. At many places it stinks of the clinical laboratory.

Mr. Koestler has a chapter in this book called "The Pitfalls of Autobiography." He possibly did not realise that he was presenting an excellent illustration of this chapter in what followed. Several pages of this book seem to have been inspired by what he calls the *Ecce Homo* motive, in its rather tortuous form.

Even so, the book has become compelling at many places because of the sheer appeal of the story, especially after the beginning of his pilgrimage in Palestine. The best part of the book is the one devoted to his conversion to Marxism. His account of the psychology of communist conversion is perhaps the best of its kind. This promises that the second volume of the story, which I guess would be devoted to his journey in and out of Marxland, would be an experience in fulfilment.

'POLEMICUS.'

The Feast of Unreason

by Hector Hawton (Watts & Co., London, 1952. pp. 236 sh. 15/-.)

STRICTLY speaking, Existentialism is not a philosophy but a painful technique for obtaining certain experiences. After a period of intense anxiety and despair, induced by tearing ourselves from the adhesive social environment, we realize our isolation, our estrangement from man and the universe, our nothingness and our freedom to re-create ourselves. We then choose a *weltanschauung*, and, as Dilthey stressed, this act must make no pretence of partiality. There can be no turning back committed as we are so passionately that we cannot change our main position without self-distintegration. When we have taken this step we are said to be "authentic," which is the Existentialist equivalent of "saved." Just as in psycho-analysis a patient needs to relive the early experiences responsible for his plight, and not merely recall them, so Existentialist man is the product of a convulsive crisis.

From what is essentially a humanist point of view, Mr. Hector Hawton runs through the gamut of irra-

tionalist philosophies that brought about so much unhealthy influence among the post-war youth, which he likens to one of Goya's famous etchings where we see the painter sleeping at his desk, with bats and owls flying and baleful cats watching. The Dream of Reason produces monsters.

In a critical exposition of the thought of Sartre, Heidegger, Jaspers and Nietzsche, *The Feast of Unreason* lays bare the repercussions of this important movement which challenges the main stream of European thought.

That Existentialism is only one element in the recoil from reason and the formation of what may almost be called an anti scientific front — Berdyaev, for example, speaks of "Scientism" — is the moot point which Mr. Hawton never allows his readers to forget.

As an aside, the technical language of Sartre, Jaspers and Heidegger, reminds us irresistibly of Mr. Flosky's pronouncements in Peacock's *Nightmare Abbey*: "It is the vulgar error of the reading public that an unusual collocation of words, involving juxtaposition of antiperistatistical ideas, immediately suggests the notion of hyperoxysophistical paradoxology." Mr. Hawton, however, has moments to reflect: "I may be accused of distorting Sartre's views by unfair reflection," which reminds us of Mr. H. J. Blackham's note of warning in his *Six Existentialist Thinkers*, one of the best studies of Existentialism that this reviewer is aware of, "It is easy, too easy, to satirize: it guys itself." One is tempted to subscribe to Mr. Blackham's contention that despite its alterations, Existentialism at least deserves to be taken seriously. "It is a hard doctrine," he maintains, "a challenge to everybody and to everything, a call to heroism: hence the strain and stress in existentialist writings, the anguish, the 'extreme situations.' Hence the exaggerations and the derision it excites."

R. H.

To The Editor

Is Einstein Right?

Sir,—One wonders what the American Committee for Cultural Freedom is doing when the *New York Times* deems it fit to declare editorially: "Among the enemies of democracy are not only those who plot against it; there are those who make it ridiculous."

In light of the above, it is indeed very refreshing to find Dr. A. Einstein publicly posing the problem: "The reactionary politicians have managed to instill suspicion of all intellectual efforts into the public by dangling before their eyes a danger from without. Having succeeded so far they are now proceeding to suppress the freedom of teaching and to deprive of their positions all those who do not prove submissive, i.e., to starve them."

In an obvious effort to rise to the situation, Dr. Einstein declares: "Frankly, I can see only the

revolutionary way of non-cooperation in the sense of Gandhi's. Every intellectual who is called before one of the committees ought to refuse to testify, i.e., he must be prepared for jail and economic ruin, in short, for the sacrifice of his personal welfare in the interest of the cultural welfare of his country."

RATIONALIST

In answer to RATIONALIST's question about what the American Committee for Cultural Freedom is doing, it may be mentioned that the NEW YORK TIMES of June 13 carries excerpts from a statement issued by Dr. George Counts, Professor of Education at Columbia Teachers' College and Chairman of the Committee, and Dr. Sidney Hook, Professor of Philosophy at New York University. In that statement the American Committee, while reiterating their distaste of McCarthyism and all it stands for, describe Dr. Einstein's counsel to intellectuals to refuse to testify before congressional committees as "illconsidered and irresponsible" and one which "only aids the camouflage of the communists." According to the Committee, Dr. Einstein's counsel, if followed, "would accomplish what both reactionaries and communists want—to split the intellectual community from the rest of society." The statement urges instead a "policy of 'clean hands' and 'speaking out' as the only choice possible for non-communists who seek to preserve the climate of political freedom."

Dr. Einstein's misuse of Gandhiji's name needs to be challenged as the sheerest perversion of Gandhism. Gandhi challenged the imposition of tyranny from without; Einstein is questioning the right to combat the Fifth Column activities of precisely such a tyranny. Gandhi advocated choosing with care unjust laws for disobedience; Einstein urges the flouting of a democratic Constitution.

When RATIONALIST in the last sentence of his letter quotes Dr. Einstein with approval, is he suggesting that economists should refuse to respond to a call from Congress for a discussion of methods to prevent a depression and that educationists should decline to be questioned about their views on educational reform?

The fact that congressional committees in the U.S., as elsewhere, sometimes exceed their powers, and that innocent persons might sometimes get hurt in the process is no justification for destroying the system of congressional enquiry. Dr. Einstein might just as well ask citizens to disobey the summons of Courts of Justice on the ground that corrupt or biased judges are not altogether unheard of.

The best answer to Dr. Einstein has come from the Association of American Universities which has spent six months studying the matter. Under the guidance of Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, President of Yale University, and Dr. Harold Dodds, President of Princetown University, the Association has issued a report which inter alia makes the following points: (1) communists are not free and independant thinkers and so cannot fulfill their functions as teachers and cannot hold university posts; (2) teachers who invoke the Fifth

Amendment bring upon themselves the onus to prove their fitness to continue teaching.

—Editor

FREEDOM OF TRAVEL

Sir,—The right of an individual to leave his country and to re-enter it freely is a very valuable right which is not interfered with in the majority of countries in the free world except on the following grounds: Allegiance to a foreign State; extended domicile in a foreign country; acceptance of office under a foreign government; insurrectionary movements against a friendly foreign government; seeking refuge from justice; treason against the state; and generally acts inconsistent with allegiance to the state.

International law has deprecated governmental interference in the exercise of this right except on the grounds set out above, and it has even been held that the continued denial of a passport has the effect of rendering the person partially stateless. This view has been accepted by the United Nations which, in Article 13 (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, endorsed by this country, states: "Everyone has the right to leave any country including his own, and to return to his country."

The opinion of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom has been invited on the issue raised in an article appearing in *Current* of July 1 concerning the cancellation of Mr. D. F. Karaka's passport. The Committee is not concerned with the individual nor is it to be understood to endorse all the views expressed in the article in question. The Committee does, however, feel that an important issue has been raised and the principle involved needs to be clearly affirmed.

It is true that there has been a criminal prosecution pending against Mr. Karaka. If the Bombay Government had seriously apprehended that Mr. Karaka would abscond, the remedy lay within the scope of the Criminal Procedure Code and Mr. Karaka could have been required to furnish a heavy bail and/or security to safeguard against such an eventuality. The fact that Mr. Karaka has been offered an interim passport to leave the country would indicate that the apprehension is no longer entertained. The Committee therefore feels that a cherished Human and Nationality Right, namely, the right to travel freely, is being unjustifiably interfered with in this case.

J. C. DARUVALA
Hon. Secretary,

Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.
Bombay, July 3.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF I.C.C.F.

The Annual General Meeting of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom is scheduled to take place in Madras City on September 12 and 13, 1953. Mr. Sampurnanand, the Home and Labour Minister of Uttar Pradesh, has kindly consented to preside.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

"News in the true sense of the word is almost non-existent in China." (Mr. N. Srikantan Nair)

—*Evening News of India*, June 26, 1953.

"I am gravely concerned at the complacency of our statesmen and of our innumerable apostles of peace without strength or of peace at any price and their blindness to the perils to which our frontiers are exposed. The intentions of our neighbours are to be judged not by their hollow protestations, but by their deeds within and without their own territories." (Sir Padamji Ginwalla.)

—*Times of India*, June 27, 1953.

Shri Goray (General Secretary of the Praja Socialist Party) said, in a statement: "The whole of Eastern Europe is being governed by a system where the many have to slave for the few."

—*Free Press Journal*, July 4, 1953.

"We don't want appeasement, even if it is accompanied by a long cigar instead of an umbrella." (George Meany, President of the American Federation of Labour.)

—*The Indian Express*, July 4, 1953.

"Freedom is the by-product of economic surplus."

—Aneurin Bevan quoted in the *New Leader*, New York, June 29, 1953.

When Napoleon's special envoy to England, Fouchet, came to London and was received by the Prime Minister, he said: "The Emperor wants Peace."

"No doubt," was Pitt's answer, "but what for?"

—*Free Press Bulletin*, July 3, 1953.

Vaikom (Travancore-Cochin), July 4: Guests at a marriage party here walked out 'en masse' as a communist M.L.A., an invitee, arrived.

—*Times of India*, July 5, 1953.

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
BOMBAY 1.

Please enrol me as a member of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom. I remit the annual membership fee of Rs. 3/- by.....

Name :

Address :

Signature

"The communists in India act in accordance with what goes on in Russia. If the line changes in Russia, their line also undergoes a change. They have no independent wisdom of their own. And since they have no independent mind, we can't call them either good or bad. We can offer an opinion only about those who have any opinion of their own." (Acharya Vinoba Bhave).

—*Bombay Chronicle*, July 21, 1953.

"Russian tanks charging unarmed workers in East Berlin is a symbol of the changes which have taken place in Soviet social relations since the October revolution in 1917." (Mr. Edward Kardelj writing in *Borba*.)

—*Free Press Journal*, June 29, 1953.

"No other political system seems to have produced in history such a crop of traitors (as communism)." (Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan).

—*Times of India*, July 15, 1953.

Lloyds will insure almost anything but not Mr. Beria's life. (Sir Stanley Reed in "A Letter from London.")

—*Times of India*, July 18, 1953.

Kashmir is famous for "unanimous elections."

—Kashmir Newsletter in the *Times of India*, July 23, 1953.

The National Herald (Lucknow), which has been an unabashed apologist of the communist world ever since its editor returned from his visit to China, is the only newspaper to attempt an ideological white-washing of Beria's downfall and disgrace.

—*Thought*, July 18, 1953.

Stalin has said: "Communism fits a German no better than a saddle fits a cow."

—*The Organiser*, July 20, 1953.

"To those who are at a safe distance it may not appear to be very significant to have a million enemy troops entrenched just forty miles from your capital city."

—President Syngman Rhee in the *Hindustan Times*, July 23, 1953.

"...In cold war the appearance of victory can be as important as victory itself."

—President Syngman Rhee in the *Hindustan Times*, July 23, 1953.