

DECEMBER 1953

Has Art A Purpose?

by Narie Oliaji

PROUDHON believed that the purpose of art is to uplift humanity. By thus denying that art is an end in itself, Proudhon, by the implications of this belief, has done a great deal of mischief to the freedom of the artist. The artist who begins upon this road is immediately beset with problems which he has neither the aptitude nor the training to face. Once the artist chooses to have a purpose, he is immediately forced to decide: what is this purpose? The upliftment of humanity, true. But what way lies this upliftment—by perpetuating the system of private property, or by ushering in the dictatorship of the proletariat? By the return to a direct man-to-man relationship of the supposed-to-be discredited feudal system, or by the man-machine-man relationship of capitalist society? By uncompromising individualism or by dragging collectivists?

It is seen from the history of art that it is precisely in the objectivity of the artist that his greatness lies. The artist is a man who creates simply for the sake of the happiness in the act of creation. He cannot help it. And once he has created a work of art, he begins to create one more, without bothering about what social, political or moral effects it might have. Shakespeare is the greatest artist of all because he never took sides.

On the other hand, Zola defined art as a corner of the universe seen through a powerful temperament. It is one of life's little ironies that Proudhon, whom Marx despised, should be nearer to the communist concept of art, than Zola, the champion of the proletariat. Zola's profound observation at once explains the nature of art. We immediately perceive that the peculiar thrill of art consists in the fact that it is not an imitation of nature but a transformation of it. We seldom look at the tree in our garden, but we would like to look for ever at the cypresses of Van Gogh. We read history books and

learn of Cleopatra, Elizabeth and Mary Stuart, and forget all about them once we have passed the examination. But a beautiful vision of the Egyptian queen haunts us for the rest of our lives, once we have read that

"The barge she sat in, like a burnish'd throne,
Burn'd on the water: the poop was beaten gold;"

We now see that, though art does not have a purpose in the sense of Proudhon, it does have an effect, and this effect is to make us aware of beauty where we had not been aware of it before.

It is this hunger for beauty, this search for aesthetic fulfilment, this capture of a moment, a glimpse, a sound for all time, that has differentiated art from all other human activity and the artist from all other men. It is this pure, selfless, creative urge in mankind that has given us the soliloquies of Hamlet, the wheatfields of Van Gogh, the mind-hushing mystery of the Fifth Symphony. And, after all,

"Do you come from the deep sky or the abysm,
O Beauty? Your gaze, infernal and divine,
pours forth both crime and kindness in confusion,
and one for this might like you to wine.

You keep in your eyes the sunset and the aurora;
your perfumes spread as when the night-storm
rages;

your kisses are philtres, your mouth an amphora,
which makes the hero weak, the child courageous.

Do you come from the black gulf or from the stars?
Charmed, fate follows your petticoats like a hound;
you sow haphazard blessings and disasters,
and, governing all, by nothing will be bound.

You walk upon the dead, at whom you jeer;
not least among your jewels Horror glances;
and Murder, of your trinkets the most dear,
on your proud belly amorously dances.

Towards you, candle, flies the dazzled moth,
Crackles, burns, and says: Blest be the flame!
The lover, panting on his sweetheart's mouth,
has the air of a dying man caressing his tomb.

What matter whether you come from heaven or hell,
O Beauty, monstrous, dread, ingenuous one!

if you open the door with your foot, your eye, your smile,
to an infinite which I love and have never known?

Angel or Siren, from Satan or God, what matter
whence, if you can make—O dove-eyed fairy,
with rhythm, perfume, light, my one queen!—better
the hideous world, and time not quite so dreary?
—Baudelaire.

Notes

The Assam Incident

THE recent incident between the Dafla tribesmen and the Assam Rifles serves to emphasise the resolution on tribal peoples passed by the Madras conference of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom. This resolution while stating that the tribal people cannot be maintained as quaint museum pieces for the entertainment of tourists also suggested the need for the preservation of their distinct culture and way of life and the need for a gradual and sympathetic approach to the question of integrating them into the diverse unity of India.

While no one can condone the ambushing of our troops or the taking of hostages, it must not be forgotten that punitive expeditions ill become a democracy in which the tribal peoples are as much citizens as are others. The causes of this incident must be thoroughly investigated and whatever genuine grievances there are must be redressed. Persistence of these and the consequent resentment among the tribal people can only help enemies of our country, to whom a grievance is only a means towards their end of enslaving us all. Pacification and convincing the tribesmen of the good intentions of the government must be given first priority. We trust that in all future dealings with tribal peoples the government will keep in mind the prime necessity of approaching them with sympathy and understanding which alone can get the results desired by us all.

Philippines Election

THE election of Mr. Ramon Magsaysay as President of the Philippines is perhaps the most encouraging recent development in the Far East. In terms of the world struggle between democracy and the forces of communism it can well rank alongside the election of Dr. Konrad Adenauer in Germany.

Mr. Magsaysay has an impressive record of fearless patriotism and honesty, on which alone he has obtained a mandate from his people at the young age of fortysix. During the war he led the guerilla fighters against the Japanese and afterwards he was successively Police Chief, Mayor and Defence Minister. In all these three capacities he displayed outstanding abilities combined with complete integrity and so became a legendary figure in the politics

of his country. As defence minister, he reorganised the army and raised its morale so that the Huk bandits who were almost at the gates of Manila were driven into hiding in the jungles. His policy towards the communists was a very realistic one: inflexible opposition towards the hard core and sympathy and a chance of rehabilitation for the people who had been fooled by them. The policy paid big dividends and the Philippines which due to communist banditry and internal corruption was fast becoming a sick man of Asia, acquired a new stability and inspired confidence in its friends. Mr. Ramon Magsaysay, having proved his patriotism against the Japanese occupation, did so again. This time the enemy was international communism.

As President, a lot is expected of him both by the world and by his own people. It will be his task not only to completely rid the country of the communist Huks, but also to give it an honest and efficient administration so that the Philippines can progress in the free atmosphere of democracy, and provide leadership to the liberal and anti-totalitarian forces in Asia.

Bread And Circuses

ONLY last month *Freedom First* deplored the Government of Bombay's decision to award prizes for plays. Now films too, we understand, will be considered as great art or otherwise on the mere say-so of the bureaucrat. Not that there was no room for improvement, or no need of some incentive to our film producers to turn out less matter and more art. With the best patriotic will in the world it cannot be denied that Indian films are mostly about morons, by morons and for morons. Nevertheless, they serve a useful purpose inasmuch as the constant example of the Western way of life

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 2 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.

help to break down the barriers of caste, untouchability, communalism, and the many evils that have retarded the progress of this country.

It may be possible to improve the quality of films by offering prizes, if one merely takes the film as a vehicle for instruction. But the cinema is also a form of art, and art cannot be subservient to social aims; does not require State patronage, quite the contrary; it is its own justification. Therefore, to one who makes good films, as to all who make good paintings, or books, or poetry, the making itself is sufficient, and a government prize dangled before one's eyes is not likely to help one improve, and may very possibly drag one back.

War Crimes

COMMUNIST allegations of germ warfare as well as their loud protestations of adherence to the Geneva convention are seen in their proper perspective on reading the U.S. Army's War Crimes Division's report. This eighty-seven page interim document based on screening of enemy prisoners, reports of survivors and field investigation, complete with names dates and photographs is a grim record of communist savagery and sadism which rival any known in the history of modern warfare. Coupled with the testimony of returned U.S. airmen, from whom germ warfare confessions were extracted, as well as the evidence of the eminent surgeon Dr. Charles Mayo, it should serve to amply illustrate the fact that the communists can outdo the Nazis when it comes to atrocities against prisoners and other defenceless people.

The U.S. Army report lists a total of 29,815 persons against whom acts of barbarity were carried out. Of these 6,113 were Americans, 5,509 South Koreans and other U.N. soldiers, 17,354 Korean civilians and 839 unknown others. The bodies of 511 U.S. and 1,004 ROK soldiers were recovered while there are 216 eyewitness survivors whose evidence is also recorded. Of the Taejon massacre where the casualties totalled 5,000 to 7,500 the report states: "For murderous barbarism, the Taejon massacre will be recorded in the annals of history along with the rape of Nanking, the Warsaw ghetto and other similar mass exterminations.

We trust this report will get the fullest possible publicity both in and out of the U.N. But mere publicity is not enough; like the perpetrators of Belsen and Buchenwald, those responsible must be "brought to judgment before the tribunal of civilized peoples."

Liberty Of The Press

THE report of Mr. Justice F. B. Mukharji's investigation into the Calcutta incident between newspapermen and the police makes interesting reading. Apart from going into the causes of the incident, it also touches upon the fundamental question of the rights and responsibilities of the press in a democratic country.

Serious allegations of deliberate assault and infringement of the liberty of the press were made against the police and Justice Mukharji has gone into all the available evidence before passing his judgment. The cause of the incident was that the pressmen formed an illegal assembly when Section 144 was in force and that one of them forcibly resisted arrest. Significant also are the facts that no editors or owners of newspapers came forward to give evidence before the commission and that no representative of four of the more important newspapers complained of closure of any source of news. There was no evidence to support the contention that this was a deliberate assault on representatives of the press.

On the more fundamental question of the freedom of the press, Justice Mukharji says: "I wish the Calcutta press did not put forward under the liberty of the press the claim to breach the order under Section 144 or the claim to interrogate, interfere with or resist a policeman on duty. In claiming to do so, it has misconceived the liberty of the press and made a bid for tyranny and privilege. No responsible democracy will tolerate a bid for tyranny or privilege for any one institution including the press." No one can disagree with the learned judge in this conclusion.

Liberty of the press implies a free access to news, freedom to publish the news without precensorship and freedom to comment on the news. But it does not end there; it also implies responsibility on the part of the press. If some newspapermen resort to printing unchecked information and indulge in sensationalism, then they must be prepared to suffer the inevitable consequences of not discharging their duty to the public in a manner befitting the press of a free country.

Their Song For Us

THE Calypso is the national entertainment of the West Indies; its catching rhythm and skillful improvisation have spread its fame far beyond the Caribbean and today Calypso singers, with exotic names like Lord Beginner, perform in the capitals of the world. Recently two gentlemen, Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham left the shores of British Guiana to sing their "anti-imperialist" Calypso abroad. Travelling by luxury airliners and immaculately dressed, after the American fashion, they do not quite look the part of innocent victims of a rapacious imperialism. Having played unsuccessfully, even before the more volatile section of the British Labour Party, they have now decided to come down our way. Perhaps they hope that in our sunnier climate they might do better than in the Atlantic fog and drizzle of London.

Their audience here may lack the phlegmatic scepticism of the Britons, and it is sure to be more varied. Between the well rehearsed, lachrymose huzzahs of the professional bobbysoxers and the raised eyebrows of the better informed, there is bound to be a large number of people who might feel that perhaps this particular calypso lacks either novelty or genuineness and that it might more naturally be sung as a chorus to the accompaniment of balalaikas.

The Limits Of A United Front

From A Contributor

THE decision of the National Executive of the Praja Socialist Party to permit its branch in Travancore-Cochin to have an electoral arrangement with the communists will be regretted by all those who are dedicated to the democratic way of life and regard the Communist Party as a totalitarian threat to democracy and freedom.

It is true that the Executive has directed the Party to avoid joint campaigns and joint manifestoes. Nevertheless, it allows the Party to sit with the communists, divide the seats and thereby ensure the defeat of the Congress at the polls.

The Party system is an essential attribute of parliamentary democracy, and it is vital that there is complete freedom for democratic parties based on diverse social, economic and political programmes to compete with each other for the electors' favour. If the PSP should seek to defeat the Congress Party democratically, i.e. without entering into alliances with the communists, it would be a perfectly legitimate thing for it to do. Similarly, the Congress would be welcome to beat the PSP in an electoral contest. Also, should the two parties think it necessary to co-operate with each other in furtherance of the country's economic development and preservation of national integrity, they can very well do so. It is for these parties themselves to choose any of these alternatives. But when democratic parties seek arrangements with totalitarian and anti-democratic elements for eliminating their democratic rivals they can be said to have stepped beyond the legitimate frontiers of democratic politics.

The practice of democracy is not a one-way affair. It means that all those who swear by democracy undertake certain obligations and accept certain norms of political conduct. It may be possible for those who seek to justify the PSP decision to argue that the ruling party has not so far made any effort to set up such high standards of democratic behaviour. It is understandable if democratic parties in opposition such as the PSP express resentment at the methods of the ruling party, to which they object, but when they allow their resentment to direct them into a course of collaboration with the enemies of democracy, no matter how limited that collaboration may be, it cannot but cause concern to those who want the democratic pattern to be firmly established in this country.

It might be said by apologists of such a policy of expediency that the ruling party also resorts to such tactics, so why should the opposition deny itself the advantages that such arrangements may bring? In Kashmir, for instance, the Congress rulers are encouraging elements who are known to hold pronounced communist views and who deliberately and consciously are promoting the communist policy of

disruption in this country. The latest manifestation of this is the inclusion of the already powerful Red chief G. M. Sadiq in the cabinet. Now, for these opportunistic moves the Congress Party and the country will have to pay a heavy price. But can the shortsighted policy of one democratic party be an excuse for another? This would lead to a strange situation where democratic parties vie with each other for the destruction of democracy. Just as it is unpardonable for a democratic party in power to indulge in these tactics, it is also impermissible for democratic parties in opposition to cite such acts as an excuse for their pursuing a similar course of action.

It has been the settled policy of the socialists not to have anything to do with the communists ever since Jayaprakash Narayan wrote his memorable obituary on Communist-Socialist cooperation in the thirties, *Socialist Unity and the CSP*. "Never again," was Jayaprakash's unconditional assurance. For nearly a dozen years now, the Socialists have been the foremost critics of the communist ideology and its policy of duplicity and deception. They have also played a crucial part in preventing the communist united front movement from becoming a powerful force in India's national life.

No matter how it may be sought to explain away this decision to have a limited arrangement with the communists over the distribution of seats, the enemies of freedom are bound to regard it as the thin end of the wedge, and will be glad that after twelve long years they have finally succeeded in making a dent in the socialist armour and in getting the approval of the highest executive body of the PSP for a step that might very well force it logically, step by step, to a full-scale alliance with the communists.

The Communist Party has always maintained that it constitutes the only alternative to the Congress Party. Out of narrow partisan considerations some Congressmen also echo the same idea and seek to create an impression that other parties do not matter, that there is no democratic alternative to the Congress Party and that the people have to choose between them and the Communist Party. This theory of polarisation is fraught with disaster, and democrats would therefore wish that the socialists did not do anything that would strengthen it.

The PSP Executive reasons that avoidance of triangular contests will make for the healthy development of political life. This argument will not bear close examination. Triangular contests are certainly to be deplored, and no one can deny that the existence of too many parties has a baleful effect on the growth of democratic institutions. But two-cornered fights are desirable only when both the contestants are pledged to democratic principles. When such fights mean a straight contest between a

democratic party and a totalitarian party, the results must—as in Kuomintang China—prove ruinous for democracy, for the voters are faced with the ugly fact of polarisation of political forces, a situation which has everywhere preceded the triumph of communist totalitarianism. This should not be taken to mean that it is obligatory on the part of the Praja Socialist Party to fight each and every seat irrespective of whether it has got support or not. What it does mean is that a clash with communism is not avoided merely to defeat another democratic party. Further, it means that in constituencies where the party has no nominees of its own, it would not canvass for communist candidates.

The socialist policy of complete non-cooperation with the communists was not a product of dogmatism and narrow-mindedness. It was based on a well-considered and mature conclusion of the socialist and democratic movements, not only in India but the world over, reached after a long experience of collaboration with the communists, that between communist totalitarianism on the one hand and democracy and freedom on the other there can be no common ground whatsoever and that any attempts of socialists and democrats to cooperate with communists, even in limited spheres, could only result

in preparing the ground for subversion of the democratic foundations of social life. By getting mixed up with totalitarianism, it is democracy that suffers and not the other way round. That is why it is essential to rouse the people's revulsion against communism which denies all the moral and human values on which democracy rests.

No democratic organisation can defend its integrity from communist infiltration unless it rouses the moral fervour of its adherents against communist theory and practice. When it gets entangled with communist groups, this moral fervour goes and an impression is created that between communists and democrats there is no fundamental difference. When the sharp distinctions between democracy and communism get blurred, a favourable climate is created for the eventual overthrow of democracy. That is the reason why democratic parties should not play with fire in order to achieve certain immediate and temporary gains. It is to be hoped the forthcoming Convention of the PSP will ensure that the socialists, who have played such a significant part in the development of democratic consciousness against the communist menace, will not endorse a course of action the implications of which are so far-reaching and dangerous.

The Saga Of Wang Ti-chiu

by Bruno Shaw

WANG Ti-chiu is a 24 year old Chinese peasant soldier from the province of Honan. He looks older by Western reckoning, for tilling the soil on the few *mow* of family land is a hard life, and soldiering for the past five years has been even harder. His childhood name was Chi'io Tzu, given him by his grandmother because he laughed aloud when he was a baby. But he has not laughed much in the last few years.

Six years ago, the Chinese communists came to Ti-chiu's village. Many landlords were killed. Some were bad, and for them he had no pity. Some, like his parents, had only an acre-and-a-half of land from which to dig their sustenance. First, the people were told that they had been liberated, then that their burden was the fault of those who had governed them. The new rulers set up new rules. So much of the crop must be contributed in order to provide food for the liberators. So many young men from the village must join the Army to fight for liberation, not only against their own oppressors but against the foreign tigers who wished to devour their nation, the foremost of which, *Mei Kuo* (America), wanted to make the Chinese people its slaves.

Ti-chiu learned many things — about obedience to Father Mao, about Brother Stalin who had the welfare of the Chinese people at heart, about the need to report unpatriotic acts of parents. He learned that ancestors were dead people and nothing else,

that the only loyalty was to the state and not to the family, that only what was taught by the new party could be believed. All these things he learned well, for they were taught him day after day for five years.

In the war against the foreign tigers, the long-nosed *ta pitzu* who had come to their sister country of Korea, Ti-chiu saw killing and devastation that he never would have believed possible if he had not seen it with his own eyes. But he was uplifted because he was part of the forces of liberation of these people, who were much like himself.

Yet, how much soldiering, even in a good cause, can any man take? It is easy to die. It is difficult to live while all around you men are sick and dying, unattended when they are wounded, when your own feet are frozen and the food for days on end is only raw grain without even a cup of hot tea, when you are weary of the pounding of the great guns upon your ears, and when this war—which you were told would be won in a month—is in the midst of its second year and still no end in sight.

One day, leaflets from airplanes of the *ta pitzu* came fluttering out of the sky. In the army of the liberators, Ti-chiu had been taught to read almost a hundred characters of the simple *pei wha* written language. While it was forbidden for the troops to read these messages from the enemy, Ti-chiu picked one up and stuffed it into his blouse—to read later when there was no danger of being seen. Even

picking up the paper was a daring thing to do, but he had dared much in the past few years.

The leaflet was small and easily read. It said that any Chinese soldier who gave himself into the hands of the enemy would receive many things—warm clothing, food, rest, comforts, protection against any harm, and freedom when the war was over. It said that many Chinese patriots had already done so, that they had been fooled by their communist leaders, who were the enemies of the people and not their liberators. And it asked them to think clearly in their own minds how things had been in their own native village before, and how they were now. All these things it said. But who could believe them?

Now there were battles every day, and at night, and very little sleep or rest. Up the hill and down. Shooting and being shot at. Bombs from airplanes overhead and huge bursts of flame and iron that seemed to come from under the ground, from the heavy artillery of *ta pitzu*. There were more men on Ti-chiu's side, but the fighting was very bitter. So much so that the leaflet he had kept in his blouse began to take on meaning, even though he was sure it was a lie. For, after all, what could be worse than this?

So the time came when he made his decision. This is not something to be done lightly, either. One has to tell those about him, for one cannot be altogether without comrades. It was then that he got the greatest surprise of all. For the others with him felt the same way. Some had found leaflets as he had. Some were just unutterably weary. Some, he learned, had never wanted to join the side of the liberators and hated them for what they had done in their family village. These had long looked for a chance to escape—even into the hands of the enemy. Foreign tigers though the enemy might be, it had been known in times before the liberation in their village that

missionaries and traders from *Mei Kuo* had done kind things for their people. In any case, these comrades were ready to take the chance.

Thus, early in the morning while it was still dark, the dozen or so who had agreed on the plan began their march into the hands of the enemy. They carried the leaflets which guaranteed them safe conduct past the sentries into the camp of the other side. And there they found, to their utter astonishment, that everything the leaflet had promised them was true.....

Wang Ti-chiu is one of 16,000 Chinese soldiers in Korea who either surrendered or were captured by the United Nations forces and are now in the hands of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission made up of representatives of Czechoslovakia, Poland, India, Sweden and Switzerland.

Thousands of these Chinese soldiers have a deep and abiding hatred of the Chinese communists. They have tattooed on their bodies drawings of the Chinese Nationalist flag. They have tattooed on their chests and backs words which express their determination to help the Nationalist Government on Formosa destroy the Reds.

These 16,000 Chinese soldiers are those who have elected, of their own free will, to reject repatriation into the hands of the Chinese Reds—either because they have a better understanding now of what communism means to their country, or because they were forced into the Red armies against their will in the first place.

Wang Ti-chiu is typical of the 16,000 Chinese and 6,300 Korean war prisoners in the hands of the "neutral" repatriation commission. What citizen of any country outside the Iron Curtain can deny him his right to freedom? If, by chance, that right is denied him, no man will ever be safe.

From the *New leader*

The New Humanism: A Plea

by J. B. H. Wadia

AS one of the sponsors of the first conference of the I.C.C.F., I had shared with others the satisfaction of feeling that we had founded an association of serious-minded persons who believed in the need to create a new society of moral men. We equated freedom with the emancipation of the spirit of man and not with restraints. I, therefore, naturally expected the second conference to rise higher on the steps of the staircase to cultural freedom. But the speeches of the two stalwarts of the second conference, the beloved Rajaji and the respected Sampurnanandji, belied my hopes.

Lest I might be accused of one-sidedness, I hasten to make it clear that I gratefully cherish the lead of these doyens of Indian nationalism on the anti-communist front and sincerely welcome their participation in our uphill task.

Now, the tenor of these speeches enables one to divide them into two broad categories. *One*: A forthright attack on the philosophy and practice of communism as the greatest single danger to democratic civilisation. *Two*: The remedy proposed by the speakers to meet the malaise prevailing in the Indian society.

Re. *One*: There cannot be two opinions about the straight-from-the-shoulder denunciation of communism by both speakers; and with persons like Rajaji and Sampurnanandji in our midst, our hands are all the more strengthened in the successful prosecution of our task on the anti-communist front.

But "My heart aches, and a drowsy numbness pains my sense" when I come to the second category, not because like the poet John Keats I am rapt in divine ecstasy by the song of our nightingale; but because

I feel despaired to find the roving wings of the bird of freedom clipped and its beautiful feathers singed in a tragic manner.

Now, I am not at all versed in Sanskrit or any other ancient language. My study of world philosophy is based on my knowledge of English—the language, which by history has become one of the most splendid repositories of world knowledge. And, for the world of me, I fail to understand as to how the highly-honoured Chackravarthi of a state and how the highly erudite doctor-politician can ever come to equate freedom with restraints. Or how they can expect one devoted to the cause of cultural freedom to find “joy and pride” in the acceptance of restraints! How one can be against state-regulation and also subscribe to Varnashrama Dharma with its bone of caste system as an ideal solution of the intellectual malaise in Indian Society! Is it not most recently that we have begun to come out of the mal-effects of the system of untouchability, which found its ultimate sanction in Varnashrama Dharma?

And what shall we say when we are asked to accept the antiquated idea of the existence of the soul as the ultima thule of human happiness? Leave aside the science of biology, it is long since that the idea of the soul has been done away with as an untenable hypothesis even in the field of psychology. Too, too long has man taken a lurid joy and perverted pleasure in the restraints imposed on him in the name of the divinity of the soul in his perishable body. And now we are asked once again to accept outmoded concepts.... While the protagonists of cultural freedom do not discard *all* restraints, they certainly do not take “joy and pride” in them. They do not sing hymns in glorification of restraints. On the contrary, they have dedicated themselves to the removal of restraints one by one since restraints only help to perpetuate a given social order.

Only a philosophy which allows the legitimate breaking-up of restraints can be conducive to the growth of cultural freedom. No amount of intellectual acrobatics, be it Marxist or Hegelian, be it Manuistic or Sankaracharyaistic can hide the patent fact that the spirit of man never gets a chance to be free once it is chained on the iron rock of a theological order.

I submit that the slogan for the lovers of cultural freedom should not be a negative self-control only. Let it be something like what has been said in one of the Brahmanas itself: “Charaivetti, Charaivetti,” which means “From here, O traveller, march on.”

And then, if you want to quote the scriptures, you should not swear by only those portions which go to support your thesis. Why forget the Vedic hymn called “The Song of Creation” in which it is said that the world was created before the gods, hence no one knows whence they came and how? Why not also quote from the Shanti Parva in Mahabharata wherein is given an indication of the materialistic way of life? Why not rely on the materialistic Charvaka and the atheistic Kapila? Why not follow the original Buddha much of whose teaching is thrown

overboard in Vedantism? Why not listen to the sage Brahaspati and the Lokayatta? Do they and so many like great minds also not belong to India? Do they also not represent the glory that was Ind? This method of supporting one's point of view by quotations has done more harm than good to humanity. One's opponent can also give counter-quotations. But it is an unfruitful pastime. We are not in a court of law to act as advocates for our clients and win a suit on the mere strength of citations and precedents.

Suffice it to say here that in Indian philosophy there are six Schools. Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Samkhya, Yoga, Mimamsa and Vedanta. The last three are what may be called the accepted schools of philosophy which, by dint of circumstances and the machinations of vested interests, political and theological, became successful and have remained powerful for centuries. The disastrous results of the acceptance of a mode of life which would find its sanction in a given religious order, such as Varnashrama Dharma, are facts of history. And let us not allow our patriotism or religious fervour to influence an objective assessment of facts of history. If we are not prepared to evaluate, criticise and accept the concept of cultural freedom from a scientific point of view, we shall be sailing under false colours and in trying to fight the devil of communism we shall be giving a new lease of life to the demon of reaction.

Be it noted that a scientific assessment of cultural freedom does not preclude an appreciation of the abiding values in our heritage and make a fruitful use of them in the resurgence of our noble country. But the process of sifting will have to be made in the light of our accumulated knowledge. We will have to take stock of all that is best and cherished not only in our own heritage but also in our democratic civilization. Such an approach will prevent us from indulging in a blind idolatry of geography and the paralysing influence of a stagnant social order—the breeding-ground of communism and fascism.

We are fighting the communists on many fronts and because of many things. One accusation which we always level against them is that they are masterful opportunists. Let us not subscribe to the time-serving dictum of “the enemy of my enemy is my friend” at the cost of our principles. There is always the danger of our erstwhile friend turning out to be our worse enemy. Anti-communism is one of the planks of cultural freedom. But the platform of cultural freedom is something much more than one of its planks. As members of the I.C.C.F., we are as much anti-communists as anti-fascists. We are as much anti-reaction on the social as on the political front. Above all, we are anti-totalitarian. And our task is to fight authoritarian and totalitarian tendencies wherever we confront them.

If I have said all these things harshly, it is because I have had a feeling that in the second conference this all-important aspect was sadly neglected. I am afraid, this one-sided directive to find “joy and pride” in restraints, this unscientific suggestion to put faith

in the miracle-mongering power of the soul, this anti-secular advice to accept the fiat of a religious system as the answer to the intellectual malaise in Indian society and all these suggestions fortified with imposing and mystifying quotations from the holy scriptures, however well-meaning and well-meant, are likely to make us forgetful of the positive content of the concept of cultural freedom. Whereas cultural freedom certainly does not mean licence, an undue emphasis on restraints would end in defeating its very purpose. In the second conference we won a battle on the anti-communist front. But let us not lose our equilibrium in the flush of that success lest we lose the war on the cultural freedom front.

This brings us at once to the important question: By what means and how can we attain our goal? This would form another paper in itself. But if I were to stop short, I would be justifiably misunderstood as having been only negative in my outlook. Hence I will be as brief as possible.

My answer lies in suggesting the adoption of a programme based on new humanism — the philosophy of the 20th century, the result of the accumulated knowledge of centuries and millenia of world civilisation — man's glorious heritage.

It is a movement which rises above the squabbles of politics and discards power-politics as the bane of our democratic civilisation. The most cherished values of a democratic way of living are to be found in the philosophy of this new humanism the road to which has been shown to us by Mr. M. N. Roy. This philosophy does not subscribe to any vain-glorious assertion of the spiritual excellence of the heritage of India: and it does not turn its face from the positive contributions of the ancient land in the realm of pure thought just because they happen to be materialistic or atheistic. New humanism maintains that since man by nature is rational, he can also be moral. That it is possible for him to deduce a social and moral philosophy of life from a general philosophy of nature because this general philosophy of nature includes the world of matter and the world of mind. To establish its validity, new humanism does not need to take recourse to religion, be it Vedantic or not. Because religion in the final analysis will always maintain a mystic and mysterious attitude about the essence of man and because religion will find sanction for man's moral perfection in the scientifically untenable fiat of an unproven and unprovable godhead — the supreme of supremes, whom we are supposed to understand by not comprehending him.

According to new humanism, the truest method, even if it be the hardest, for man to reach the goal of social emancipation lies in upholding the sanctity of the individual, which in turn can best be done by keeping away from being mal-influenced by all kinds of frontiers, geographical or national, religious or metaphysical. Such an approach alone will ultimately help man to create a society of spiritually free and voluntarily moral men. Therein lies the solution to overcome the malaise prevailing in the Indian society of today. Therein lies the secret of cultural freedom. "Charaivetti. . . . Charaivetti."

ENCOUNTER

Literature — Arts — Politics

Edited from London by

STEPHEN SPENDER and IRVING KRISTOL

and sponsored by

**THE CONGRESS FOR CULTURAL
FREEDOM**

Encounter will draw on the best European, Asian and American writing. It will contain about 80 double-columned pages or 50,000 words of reading matter, with four pages of illustrations.

The first two numbers of

ENCOUNTER

feature hitherto unpublished excerpts from

VIRGINIA WOOLF'S JOURNALS

and contain contributions from:

W. H. Auden
Albert Camus
Eric da Costa
Leslie Fiedler
Christopher Isherwood
Arthur Koestler
Melvin Lasky

Malcolm Muggeridge
Nicolas Nabokov
Raja Rao
Denis de Rougemont
Bertrand Russell
Arthur Schlesinger Jr.

**ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION in India Rs 10/-
for 12 issues.**

Please send your Subscription to:

**ALLIED PUBLISHERS
& STATIONERY MFRS. LTD.,**

15 Graham Road	17 Chittaranjan	Munshi Niketan
Ballard Estate	Avenue	Near Kamala
Bombay 1	Calcutta 13	New Delhi

Nothing Left For Communists To Destroy?

by Faiz Noorani

HERE are some ominous words from a friend. He writes: "In spite of my intense hatred for communism, I feel, I would vote for this satanic party in our country at the next election if only to destroy the present heartless and satanic regime in our country. Nothing is left for the communists to destroy even if they come to power."

It is understandable that a man so hopelessly aggrieved with one *Indian* political party, might decide to transfer his allegiance to another *Indian* party. But wanting to vote communist, just to spite the present regime, in the full knowledge that even so cynical a vote would strengthen a *foreign-controlled* conspiracy to enslave our people—that can only be due to utter despair. It is this spreading despair, this anguish of frustration by no means confined to the writer of this letter that our whole country must fight to survive. For who lives if freedom dies?

Has anything so dreadful happened since independence to make patriots think that communists—the collaborators of 1952 and the saboteurs of yesterday—can ever be supported? Is our society so sick that killing it is the only cure? Have we Indians, the inheritors of a great civilisation and a great country, really nothing to lose if communism triumphs? These are questions that press for an answer if hope is to be rekindled where today there is so much of the darkness of despair.

Be it not forgotten that our independence, when achieved was not a gradual achievement. It almost burst in upon us like a sunrise without the dawn. The foreign regime that ended was never over-anxious for our welfare but it was undoubtedly efficient, being composed of men well-versed in the art of government. Their successors were necessarily the valiant agitators of yesterday; many of them knew all about jail life in British India but little about the administration of a vast problematic country like India. With the passing of time they and all of us have realised that to understand and solve our problems enthusiasm alone is not enough. There have been mistakes and disappointments and much still remains to be done. But a lot has been achieved by way of multi-purpose projects, more industrialisation and greater production. Above all there is the solid and substantial achievement of a democratic constitution with the rights of all citizens equally guaranteed by law. A process of democracy has been launched. It can only go forward with the people.

Let those who, in frustration, would accept communism remember that a modern dictatorship is an almost irrevocable change. It cannot be voted out of office, and freedom once lost to it can only be regained by forcible liberation from without. Our friend would vote communist in order to get rid of the present regime, for he knows that under the Constitution of our Republic it is possible by the suffrages of the people to throw out a government.

But does he not equally well know that, once the communists establish their reign of terror, it will be impossible for him to exercise any of the rights he takes for granted today? His complaint appears to be that of quite a few people in any democracy. To them democracy is slow and cumbersome; it is open to abuse; it often takes too long to do the obvious; and somehow it does not seem to deliver the goods. The result is often a frustration which is understandable.

Several things go to make a democracy; of these, national independence, the rule of law administered by a freely elected government and buttressed by an independent judiciary, the rights of free expression, information and organisation are the most important. But above all, there must be an electorate conscious of its rights, responsibilities and freedom of choice. Our short-comings as a democracy are due to the facts of illiteracy and inexperience. We had the first general election of our history in 1951. To expect that Indian democracy should become equal to that of the more advanced nations merely because we have a vote, a constitution, an independent judiciary, a free press and opposition parties is to expect the impossible. We lack an informed public opinion which must exist in order that democracy become real—and this must inevitably take time. Nowhere has it come about in six years.

An Oxford University survey of the British General Election of 1950 said that "the results of a universal franchise were just beginning to be felt." "Just beginning to be felt" in one of the oldest and best democracies in the world! This only proves that the people have to learn by experience and that a democracy gives them the opportunity and the means to use that experience. Our people likewise must be given time to be able to participate effectively in the business of government, for there are no short cuts to an ideal. Progress in a democracy is not a percentage of a percentage of some remote quantity but something real that the people must feel and then express through a process of free elections.

Revolution, carnage, violence—that is not the way to progress and better things; for a free society advances by becoming mature in the exercise of its rights and responsibilities. If one compares the noble ideals in the name of which revolutions were started and the sorry end to which they come one realises the truth of this. An absolutism which thrives on human sacrifice can only lead to a state of affairs infinitely worse than the one that exists. A government may be bad, but so long as we have the right to change it, we cannot let in the communists who would take away from us for all time the right to live our own lives, to choose our government and to mould our destiny with our own hands in keeping with our traditions.

(Continued on page 12)

Review

Soviet Science

A symposium presented on December 27, 1951, at the Philadelphia meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Arranged by Conway Zirkle and Horvard A. Meyerhoff and Edited by Ruth C. Christman, Published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1952. pp.108.

SCIENCE to-day has advanced from an age when it was tabooed and those who made scientific discoveries did so at the risk of their lives. The position is now reversed and it is the politicians who are afraid of the scientific developments. But in spite of so much scientific advancement within the last century, the position of the scientist *vis-a-vis* the politician has remained in essence the same, and often he is forced to shape his discoveries to suit the ends of the State.

It is this sorry state to which some scientists have been reduced in the world that prompted a number of them to organise a Congress of "Science and Freedom" which was held some months back in Hamburg.

The same spirit also prompted the American Association for the Advancement of Science to hold on December 27, 1951 the present symposium on "Soviet Science" which was finally published in 1952.

The book comprises of nine sections on widely differing subjects, beginning with Russian Genetics and ending with the appraisal of Science in the U. S. S. R.

Research in the U.S.S.R. is directed by the State and not done under conditions of freedom, which would probably evoke greater response from Russian scientists. The most amazing part that is played by the Soviet State in modern times is in Genetics, which is so altered to suit the political ideology of the communists. It is too well known a subject to further dwell upon, and many a famous Soviet biologist has been liquidated. This position is in no way better with other subjects though perhaps not so emphasized by the communists.

However, recent happenings in America like the wholesale screening of its top-ranking atomic scientists likens the U.S.A. to the U.S.S.R. All the same, it may be said in fairness to the U.S.A. and other democratic countries that except in the case of atomic research, there is full freedom for other scientists and except for National Research Projects, there is complete freedom for basic research.

F. R. BHARUCHA

The Third Force in China

By Carsun Chang (Bookman Associates, New York, 1952, pp. 345.)

WAS there no alternative for the Chinese people between the Kuomintang and the communists? Many have asked that question. Elder Statesman,

leader of a group of democratic parties and author of a Chinese constitution, Dr. Carsun Chang attempts an answer in *The Third Force in China*. Knowing the history of his country and having been an eye-witness to the major events leading to the spread of darkness over China, he is certainly eminently qualified to do so.

The result is a scholarly volume rich in facts presented in the unbiased and impartial manner of a historian of integrity. His analysis of American policy in China is indeed masterly and it successfully dispels the notion that the policy was either sinister or just plain naive. His revealing pen portrait of Chiang Kai-Shek is bound to strike a familiar chord in Indian readers of the book. The feeling of demoralisation and frustration leading up to the communist conquest of China is set out in a very graphic manner indeed. The chapter on India and China successfully counters both the glib over-simplification of Sardar Panikkar as well as the scholarly legal arguments of Sir Benegal Rau. It deserves to be widely read in the country.

But in this first-rate chronicle of the immediate past, the record of the third force emerges as a sorry tale of men who were too good to be true. These middle parties consisted of eminent and well-meaning individuals who had little following, and spent their time trying to effect a compromise with the communists. Their faith in the good intentions of the communists makes pathetic reading. Since communism's triumph, so many of the third force men have become automatons echoing the stereotyped phrases of communists, others have sought the self-respect of voluntary exile. Their fate should serve as a warning to all those who believe that either compromise or co-existence is possible with the communists.

F. S. N.

Tragedy Is Not Enough

By Karl Jaspers

Tr. By Herald A. T. Reiche, Harry T. Moore and Karl W. Deutsch
Gollancz, 1953. Sh 8/6.

KNOWLEDGE of the tragic is the basic feature of tragic reality. But the systematic unfolding of a tragic interpretation of the world, "a tragic metaphysics," is an intellectual construction that is attempted only in the contemplation of the poetic work, and thus indirectly of reality. Such reflections, Jaspers believes, of tragic drama upon its own meaning can be systematically arranged and made coherent. Thus they can be made to yield several basic interpretations of tragedy, either in terms of myth or philosophical concepts.

One interpretation, according to Jaspers, locates the tragic in Being as such: "whatever exists, exists as self-negation, in the dialectic of Being."

Through negation it moves and becomes tragic. The tragedy of this world then follows from a fundamental tragic predicament. Being itself has a crack running through it. However, to say that the ground of all Being is tragic is absurd, of which Jaspers is only too conscious.

Instead of actually transcending our world, this narrow pseudo-insight merely absolutizes one of its aspects. Tragedy resides only in the phenomena of this world. For through the tragic, something different speaks, something that is no longer tragic.

Comprising only a section of his long work *Von der Wahrheit (On Truth)* Jaspers' *Tragedy Is Not Enough* is well translated and edited and is perhaps the best example of his thinking made available to the English speaking world.

Karl Jaspers began as a psychiatrist, and philosophy for him is not so much a matter of logical argument as an attempt at deepening consciousness. His thought is always at close grips with reality and not involved or relaxed in abstraction. Next to Heidegger, Karl Jaspers probably ranks highest among Existentialist thinkers. However, actually, the word 'existential' occurs only once in this book and the tragedy which is its theme is that inescapable human experience of which great poets like Baudelaire have come nearest to distilling the ultimately inexpressible reality. In the degree that man faces the truth, he sees the ultimate disharmony of existence in the world of sense and time. In Jaspers' own words: "because unity fails in our temporal existence, it appears to us in the guise of the tragic."

Jaspers' interpretation of tragic knowledge is based upon various historical expressions of it in Indian or Greek drama or in Shakespeare. His analysis of *Oedipus* and *Hamlet* is central to his exposition and his contention that Hamlet, far from being paralysed by indecision, is always, in action, is typically penetrating. For him to pursue tragedy as an end is fatal to that liberation from bondage to suffering through profound acceptance of it, which gives to the tragic its unfathomable meaning.

R. H.

The Pacific Spectator—Summer 1953.

(Managing Editor Robert North, Stanford University Press, California, 1953, \$1.00)

THE sub-title of this quarterly is 'A Journal of Interpretation,' and it is heartening for readers of this country to note that in this issue the editors have tried to interpret India to the other countries of Asia where the *Pacific Spectator* is widely read. In fact, this journal holds a special place in the reading of all English speaking people of Asia.

India is represented by three items: an article on Tamil life and letters, and two short stories by Tamil

writers. The article on life and letters is fairly comprehensive and well written; it would be evident even to a non-Tamil that it is written by one having some grasp of the subject. One cannot be so enthusiastic about the short stories. *The Motherless Child* by 'Andal' sustains the reader's interest no doubt, but appeals rather to some of the more mawkish sentiments than to aesthetic taste. *The Golden City* by Pudumaippittan is a mixture of reportage and sociology, and though social criticism may be a by-product of literature, it has always been a moot point whether it can be the end of literature. Nevertheless, all honour to the editors of the *Pacific Spectator* for having published three Indians out of a total of ten items in this issue.

Henry R. Luce contributes an able article on the responsibility of the press, there is a very thought-provoking essay on the role of power-myths in Soviet society, but perhaps the most interesting item is an article on Gogol's centenary by Edmond Masson. Mr. Masson brings a fresh light to bear on the subject, gives one plenty of facts, some of them not known before, but one cannot agree with all his interpretations of these facts.

N. D. O.

C. C. F. NEWS

Raymond Aron

During November we had the pleasure of welcoming M. Raymond Aron, the noted French academician and author, and member of the International Executive of the Congress for Cultural Freedom. In a whirlwind tour which included Calcutta, Nagpur, Madras, Bangalore, Bombay and Delhi, M. Aron met numerous people in all walks of life and addressed several meetings, on subjects varying from "Contemporary Trends in French Literature" to "Marxism from Marx to Malenkov." It was indeed a stimulating experience to meet and listen to him and we hope that his next visit to us will be a longer one.

Madras Proceedings Published

The Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, recently held in Madras, containing the addresses of Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, of Dr. Sampurnanand, and of Mr. M. Bhaktavatsalam; four Seminar Reports; texts of the Resolutions and Rules adopted at the Annual General Meeting; Messages of greetings and goodwill, and much other material connected with the Conference, has been published in book form and is available at the office of the Indian Committee. Price: Rs. 2/8 each, post free in India.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

A Briton just back from a tour of Germany recently remarked to the Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill: "Really, the abundant aid a defeated country received nowadays makes me wonder whether we should solve our own economic difficulties by declaring war on America."

"There is one point you have overlooked," the Prime Minister was reported to have replied. "After a long and sanguinary struggle, we might win."

—*Times of India*, November 14, 1953.

In terms of America's national interest, the patent conclusion would seem to be that America should 'go it alone,' especially in the Pacific theatre.

—Prof. George Catlin in the *New Leader*, November 2, 1953.

"If they want to stage a hartal or strike in good faith, let them do so by all means. But if in the process there is violence or threats of violence or if they adopted unlawful methods to gain their ends, then I will teach them what revolution means."

—Sir John Kotelawala, in *Indian Express*, November 10, 1953.

"Abroad we shall be firmly committed to a policy of collective security among the nations of the world against communist aggression."

—President Elect Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines, in *Times of India*, November 13, 1953.

Every quarelling Congressman is an "unpaid agent of the Communist Party."

—Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyengar, in *Bombay Chronicle*, November 2, 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 :

Date : Signature

Pan Mun Jon. November 4: In four explanations to date, only 59 of 1,872 prisoners hearing communist explanations have accepted repatriation results by session:

Oct. 15: 500 Chinese heard explanations; 10 repatriation. Oct. 17: 430 Chinese heard explanations; nine chose repatriation. Oct. 31: 459 Korean heard explanations; 21 chose repatriation. Nov. 3: 483 North Koreans heard explanation chose repatriation.

—*Free Press Bulletin*, November 4,

One student of the Mahatma Gandhi College, Trivandrum, was arrested yesterday for of satyagraha in the University office.

—*Evening News of India*, November 17,

Asked if Britain recognised Mr. Nehru as the leader of non-communist Asia, he (Lord Swinton) said the U.K. only recognised Nehru as the Premier of India.

—*Bombay Chronicle* November 21,

"With communism, as with pregnancy, there is such thing as 'partly'."

—Quoted from the *Times* (London) in the *Statesman*, August 13,

(NOORANI: Continued from page 9.)

In the India of Buddha, Vivekananda, Gandhi Bhava an abhorance of totalitarianism is as second nature to the people. We above all others must reject communism for what it is and know that an enslaved mind in a shackled society can produce nothing of value to the human race.

Unlike communism, democracy is not a dogma resplendant with dogma, it has no holy book for reference nor a gallery of saints whose teachings only be challenged at one's peril, it has no mysticism and it does not claim to know all the answers to problems for all time. Like the human beings posing it a society is fallible but only in a democracy is this recognised, and that is its strength. Because of this, the right to choose or reject a policy, a principle or a government is implicit in a democracy. It starts with the knowledge that humanity in its history has evolved a sense of values and a code of ethics and its task is to make these values and code true for all mankind. A democracy recognises that man is not a mere "nothing but" determined by economics and that ends can never justify means in a civilised society. The road to progress is long and difficult. Let those who would turn away in despair remember that there is neither progress nor spirituality outside democracy; for that alone is the citizens' government.