

FEBRUARY 1953

Tito And Stalin-I

by Bertram D. Wolfe

THE open break between Tito and Stalin is as significant for our understanding of the Communist International or the Cominform, as that famous unhealing fistula was for gastro-intestinal observation. You remember there was a doctor who once tried to operate and heal a fistula in the stomach of a living man. He failed, so he finally put in a window, took advantage of that open porthole, and continued to examine the functioning of the stomach and the intestines through it. Thus modern gastro-intestinal science developed. In the same sense the break between Tito and Stalin opened a window into the deeply secret processes that go on inside the Cominform. In the early days of the Comintern there were public debates, rival proposals, and thus we could get some notion of what went on. But, increasingly, the Comintern became monolithic, and with it came unanimity and overwhelming blanket secrecy. Were it not for this break we would have very little notion indeed of how the Cominform functions.

How shall we interpret the break between Tito and Stalin? We can interpret it first in emotional terms and say that Stalinism underrates the everlasting determination of peoples to be themselves. The 20th Century's chief lesson thus far, I should say, is that national independence is one of the few things for which men are willing to fight and die.

Secondly, we can interpret it in historical terms—people with different experiences, different traditions, inevitably have differing values. Even a World State would never be able to bleach out all the varied national colours from life.

Third, we can interpret it in terms of national interests and national traditions. The Yugoslavs have a tradition of resistance to outside tyrants—a tradition formed in the struggle against the Turks, strengthened

in the struggle against Hitler, and now given fresh life and meaning in the struggle against Stalin.

Fourth, we can interpret it in terms of a special Balkan political tradition. Every Balkan Communist, every Balkan Socialist, every Balkan Democrat, every Balkan Liberal, has been brought up in the tradition of the need for a Federation of Balkan Republics.

When we speak of "The Balkanization of Europe" we have in mind the same thing which has been the curse of life in the Balkans. The Balkan peninsula has been the playground of Great Powers—France, Austria, Hungary, Germany, Russia—and Balkan patriots long felt that the only way their lands could cease to be a playground of the Great Powers was if they were to federate and form a genuine Federated Power of their own.

So it was almost automatic for Communists in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Rumania, as it would have been automatic for Socialists or for Republicans and Democrats, the moment they came to power in all those countries and felt a kinship with each other—it was automatic to propose a Balkan Federation. But, at that moment there was only one great power that was still to be kept out of the Balkans by a Balkan Federation: namely, the Soviet Union. And Stalin reacted angrily to the proposal of a powerful Balkan Federation which might have stood up against him.

Fifth, we can interpret the Tito break in terms of personal conflict, and this is the more instructive because Tito is a kind of "pocket" Stalin. Of all the disciples of Stalin, the one that learned most from him and was closest to him was Joseph Broz, known as Tito. Now Stalinism is a jealous "ism." It is a kind of ersatz religion in which Stalin has become the infallible, the omniscient, the omnipotent leader and father of the peoples. The *vozhd* is a jealous *vozhd* and beside him there is no other *vozhd*. He may have disciples—twelve, or twelve times twelve, or any number—but he may not have partners, associates, or second-string leaders. The disciple who challenges this becomes by definition a "Judas Iscariot."

Sixth, we might interpret Titoism in ideological terms. We might bear in mind that orthodoxies tend to breed heresies; dogmas—challenge; commands—disobedience. Then the heresies, in turn, will claim to be orthodoxies, even as so many heresies in the Christian churches appeal to “primitive Christianity.” So Titoism has appealed to “primitive Leninism,” against Stalin’s modifications or “betrayals” of what Tito claims to be orthodox Leninism. It is within this closed circle that Titoism has developed, and only now—reluctantly, hesitatingly, dubiously—some of Tito’s ideologies are beginning to question certain tenets of Leninism itself.

Having made this multiple interpretation of the development of Titoism I want to suggest something of the multiple appeal of Titoism. It appeals to national patriotism against treason to one’s country; yes, and even to the class that a Communist professes to represent. Wherever you have to put the interests of the Soviet government above the interests of your own country, your own people, and against your own working class—then you are faced with the problem of treason. Reluctance to commit these forms of treason is one of the appeals that Titoism makes to the Communists in other countries.

Second, it appeals to “primitive Leninism” as a return to purity of doctrine and true equalitarian internationalism.

Third, it appeals to fellow travellers “out on a limb” and anxious to climb down without any loss of revolutionary posture. The cold war having created an intolerable situation for people out on that limb, the problem was how they could climb down, yet still appear faithful to some kind of revolutionary doctrine. Tito gave the answer, which I think helps to explain why a Ziliakus or a Rogge becomes so ardent a Titoist.

Fourth, Titoism has an appeal to his neighbours still needing Balkan Federation to defend themselves—to Italy and to Greece.

Fifth, it is of especial interest to the Atlantic Pact Nations, for it represents the crack in the armour, the breach in the walls. I have every sympathy for the plight of the Yugoslav people who are still under the heel of a totalitarian dictatorship and from their standpoint it would certainly be much better if Tito were a Democrat and not a totalitarian Communist dictator. But from the standpoint of the present phase of the cold war, I can’t help thinking that Tito is more useful as a Communist than he would be as a Democrat.

Now I turn to the genesis of the Tito break. The first aspect that we must consider is the special circumstances under which Titoist Yugoslavia was born. Like Poland, Yugoslavia resisted German invasion from the outset. There is this difference, however, that Poland resisted both Hitler and Stalin while Titoist Yugoslavia resisted Hitler only when Stalin and Hitler broke.

Second, Yugoslavia is an ideal terrain for guerrilla warfare and although its main armies were easily smashed by the Wehrmacht, yet in the mountains of Yugoslavia guerrilla warfare was never abandoned.

Third, the Tito forces participated in the final liberation of Yugoslavia and functioned as a kind of junior ally to the Soviet Army.

Fourth, their mountains were never fully occupied by Hitler as their country was never occupied by Stalin. It was the only East European state to escape Red Army occupation, therefore theoretically self-liberated.

Fifth, geographically, Yugoslavia is farthest from Russia of the so-called “People’s Democracies.” It has no contiguous border with the Soviet Union. It has direct contact with the non-Communist world—with Italy, with Greece and with the open sea along the shores of the Adriatic. These, then, are the special circumstances which made possible the rise of Titoism.

Next, it is well to remember that the party which Tito now leads is truly a Titoist Party. A bit of biography will help. Tito was born Joseph Broz in 1892 in Hapsburg Croatia. He was a war prisoner of the Russians in World War I. There he was indoctrinated by the Bolsheviks, joined the Red Army, and got his first military training in the civil war that followed in Russia after World War I. Sent back to Yugoslavia, he became Secretary of the Metalworkers’ Union of Zagreb. In 1928 he did a tour of duty of five years in jail. When he got out of jail, he got a postgraduate course in the Lenin School in Moscow.

From the Lenin School he was sent to Paris to carry on some important Comintern duties in connection with the Spanish Civil War. In Paris he steeped his hands in the blood of “The Purges” when the Blood Purges were carried into Spain and served to demoralize the Republican side in the Spanish Civil War. By this participation in the Purge, Tito rose from an obscure second rank figure in the Yugoslav Communist Party to the chief of that party. For, those earlier leaders who had stood in his way and were his superiors largely disappeared in “The Purges.”

In 1941 the Yugoslav Party numbered 12,000 members. Less than 3,000 of them survived at the end of the Second World War, but by 1948 those 3,000 had swelled to 470,000—most of whom never knew any leader but Tito.

(To be continued)

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/-
Single Copy ” ” (Foreign) \$1 or 7 sh.
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

The Centre of Gravity

FRRIENDS of democracy and socialism in Asia have reason to be grateful to Mr. Clement Attlee for most of his prescient pronouncements in Delhi, Calcutta and Rangoon. There is one statement of his, however, with which issue must be joined and that is the one in Calcutta on January 6, which he repeated in Rangoon on January 12, in which he expressed agreement with Mr. Churchill's view that the centre of gravity in the world today was not in Asia but in Europe. According to Mr. Attlee, the major international difficulties were in Europe and not the East, and there was a general aggressiveness on the part of Russia in Europe.

Now, while this might be a useful bit of special pleading to influence President Eisenhower, it is a view that is hardly sustainable in the face of facts. With the failure of the Berlin blockade and Tito's defiance, Stalinist expansion in Europe came to a standstill. Since June 1950, when communist aggression against Korea took place, the Kremlin has quite obviously decided on expansion from its new base in China, while holding on to its considerable gains in Eastern Europe and consolidating them administratively. Korea, Tibet and Indo-China are today the primary zones of conquest. Burma and Malaya are the fields of civil war. India, Pakistan, Iran and Indonesia are meanwhile being softened up ideologically. If Soviet policies obviously indicate Asia as the zone of immediate expansion, the unpreparedness of the free countries of this region also contributes to the imminence of the peril. In Europe, democratic traditions and political maturity provide an ideological barrier, while NATO is the military shield. What has Asia today to show that is comparable in the way of ideological opposition and military collective security?

It is perhaps forgivable for Western European statesmen faced with the menace of Moscow, to wish to draw attention to their plight and thus press their claims for military and economic assistance from the U.S.A., but anyone in Asia who is misled by such self-interested claims on the part of Europeans will only be co-operating in sacrificing Asia's overriding needs and claims. From that point of view, it is reassuring that Mr. John Foster Dulles, the new U.S. Secretary of State, has shown a much more realistic appreciation of the peril in Asia than Mr. Attlee's remark reveals.

Much Ado

IT is not yet known whether there was any substance in a New Delhi press report that Pakistan is considering joining the proposed Middle East Defence Organisation. Judging by the statements made by the Pakistan Prime Minister, it would be premature at this stage to consider the possible implications,

favourable or otherwise, of such a development in so far as India's national interests are concerned. What must cause concern to those who believe in free and detached discussion in the country's press of such matters is the tendency to hysteria revealed in the comments published in certain sections of the Indian press on what was, after all, a piece of political gossip put out by a news agency without attributing it to any responsible source.

What was interesting was that the moment the story was put out, it made the headlines and, as if at a given signal, angry editorials cropped up like mushrooms all over the country. One would have thought from reading these diatribes that some dangerous enemy had suddenly appeared at our gates when, foresooth, all that was alleged was that a neighbouring member of the Commonwealth was considering joining in measures of collective security against totalitarian aggression, just as the countries of the Atlantic have joined forces in NATO, those of Latin America in the Organisation of American States, and yet other countries in a Pacific Pact!

Rarely has anything so fatuous been said in recent times as the complaint that Pakistan adhesion to the proposed Middle East Defence Organisation would "bring the cold war to India's frontiers." As if the conquest of Tibet and the concentration of Chinese Communist troops on our Himalayan frontiers had not already done so! As if the Communist Fifth Column *within* our frontiers was not waging the cold war in every city and town and village of India!

It is also noteworthy that, when our peaceful neighbours in Tibet were brutally and treacherously attacked by the Chinese Communists a little more than a year back and there was a legitimate cause for alarm about the implications for India's security, some of those at present agog with concern for India's interest were left singularly unmoved or were actually engaged in concocting apologies for the communist aggressors. There is grave danger, of which the Indian people should beware, of the ballyhoo over this incident being used by interested parties to propel India in the direction of the Moscow-Peking axis.

Against this background, it is difficult to quarrel with the suspicion voiced by the London *Times* that "the campaign in the Indian press to deter Pakistan from associating with the proposed Middle East Defence Organisation is too well synchronised to be anything but officially inspired." The London paper would also appear to be on firm ground when it says: "The Government of India is rightly proud of independence. It will not brook admonition — let alone pressure — from other countries on management of its affairs. Yet it does not seem to recognise that other countries feel and are entitled to feel the same. This is a real weakness in Indian diplomacy."

Why the Secrecy ?

THE judgment in the Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case and the conviction of the accused, including arch-conspirator Sajjad Zaheer, Secretary of the Pakistan Communist Party, and Faiz Ahmed Faiz, editor

of the crypto-Communist *Pakistan Times* of Lahore, prove the existence of a nefarious conspiracy to set up a Soviet-dominated dictatorship in our neighbouring country. It is now clear that the communists in this sub-continent attempt not mass revolutions from below but seizure of power by intrigue at the top.

The trial has come in for severe criticism by the Indian press and public. The essence of the criticism is not that the Special Tribunal appointed to try the case was not impartial. Nor that the sentences passed on them were unduly harsh. Indeed, most of the critics are agreed that the judicial integrity and independence of the Tribunal were above suspicion and that the sentences comparatively mild for the gravity of the charges against the accused. What the critics demurred at was that the Government of Pakistan should have rushed through the Constituent Assembly a bill providing for a trial *in camera* which deprived the accused of the time-honoured safeguards to which they were entitled.

The criticism is, in the main, unanswerable. Any interference by the executive with the due processes of law deserves to be condemned in no uncertain terms. The reasons motivating the conduct of the Pakistani Government, however, are not far to seek. The conspirators were accused by the late Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan not only of subverting the loyalty of the defence forces and attempting to assume control of the state by a *coup d'état* but also planning to invite "economic and constitution making missions from a certain foreign country." For reasons of State security, therefore, the Pakistani Government was reluctant to reveal the extent of communist infiltration in its armed forces. Then again, there was conceivably an anxiety on its part not to offend the Soviet Government. For have not the governments of the two sister States of India and Pakistan been living in constant fear of treading on the toes of their powerful neighbour?

Justice — Two kinds

THE Bombay Bar Association has always shown itself to be the champion of the privileges of its members and of all those seeking justice. If, despite this, the Association is reported in the *Bombay Chronicle* of January 14, to have declined to adopt a resolution congratulating Mr. D. N. Pritt on the failure of an attempt to hold him guilty of contempt of Court, it must have had strong reasons for doing so.

The Association indeed deserves to be felicitated on its understanding of the real nature of the propaganda move to which it was sought to be committed by Mr. Daniel Latifi, who is associated with the Federation of Democratic Lawyers, which is a notorious Comintern front. As those who opposed the resolution are reported to have pointed out, if any congratulations were due, they should be directed to the Supreme Court of Kenya for exercising great detachment and restraint in dealing with that well-known fellow-traveller at the Bar who goes round the world reviling the "capitalist" justice under which he shelters and boosting the butchery that masquerades

as "Soviet Justice," the most recent example of which has been the atrocious spectacle of the Prague "trials."

The communist, lawyer as well as layman, has no respect for justice or for the Courts where it is dispensed. The Pritts of all lands are out to destroy the due process of law and replace it with "people's" justice and "people's" courts, whose procedures are now well known. The Magistrate trying the Mau Mau case in Kenya has evidently arrived at a realisation of this, judging by his remark made on January 15: "I am beginning to think the object of the defence now is to drive me from the Court."

Anyone who follows carefully the conduct of Communists — accused as well as lawyers — in cases in which adherents of the Communist Party are involved, commencing with the Meerut Conspiracy Case and ending with processes which are at present pending before the Courts in this country, will recognise the same pattern of seeking to turn the judicial tribunal into a propaganda forum and endeavouring to destroy respect for courts and for the law they administer.

Gandhian Seminar

EARLY in January, a Seminar on the contribution of Gandhian outlook and technique to the solution of national and international tensions was inaugurated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, who hoped that the Seminar would "light a torch in a world torn by conflict, fear and hatred and hold up an alternative to war."

It was quite obvious from the objectives of the Seminar that the communist countries would be least interested in it in spite of the invitations to them. Pandit Nehru spoke the apparent truth when he said at the Seminar that those who shouted for peace were not genuinely honest about it, and "were manoeuvring for a position in a world heading towards disaster." Undoubtedly Pandit Nehru had in mind the communist countries, whose absence from the Seminar almost amounted to a boycott of it. The regret expressed by Maulana Azad, who presided over the Seminar, at the absence of the Soviet and Chinese delegates was surprising, for it is sheer *naïveté* on the part of any one to hope for Soviet and Chinese co-operation in seminars of this nature. Maulana Azad, an experienced and shrewd politician, should have understood the basic character of totalitarian communism and the real intentions of the communist countries.

Gandhiji may have been an apostle of peace to Indians and to the world at large, but to Soviet, Chinese (and Indian) communists, he was merely a bourgeois politician and an agent of British imperialism. With their unconcealed disregard and even contempt for Gandhiji, it is ridiculous for any one to expect the Soviet or their satellites to participate in a seminar called specially to discuss Gandhian ideas of peace.

It is high time those self-styled Gandhians and others who take the communist countries at their words realised that these totalitarian States are not at all interested in the Gandhian solution to

the world problems and their tall talk of peace is mere moonshine.

Requiescat

DR. Saifuddin Kitchlew, President of All-India Peace Council, has won the International Stalin Prize for peace. Lost in the scramble for power within a Congress party that was torn with dissensions, Dr. Kitchlew chose to tread the path of the Communist fellow-traveller. The award of the prize marks his arrival. But where? To this frustrated politician that does not matter. He has won recognition of a sort and wreaked his vengeance on his former political rivals in the bargain. With the winning of the peace prize may his soul now rest in peace!

Not quite so easily understandable, however, is the attitude of our Ambassador to Russia, Mr. K. P. S. Menon, who not only attended the prize-distribution ceremony in the Kremlin but also gave a reception in honour of Dr. Kitchlew. The Soviet Peace Campaign has by now been sufficiently exposed as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy which cynically exploits humanity's desire for peace to weaken the resistance of the free world against Russian expansionist moves. Why should the ambassador of an avowedly neutral State give his blessings to a patently partisan movement like the Soviet Peace Campaign? If this is a concrete expression of our much-vaunted neutrality, for the love of our country let us not be "neutral."

About Blocs

AN amusing example of the way in which history overtakes a false slogan is provided by Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit's recent complaint to pressmen in Cairo that the word *bloc* was so ugly that she did not "like to use it in relation to the Asian-African group."

It has since 1947 been an axiom of the Indian Government's foreign policy that there are two power blocs in the U.N. and that India's position is one of moral superiority in that she belongs to neither. Now, the functioning of the Asian-African group has knocked the bottom out of this claim. Mrs. Pandit's laboured attempt at the distinction that "the Asian-African group is not a *bloc* in the sense of the Eastern or Western *bloc* whose members must follow a rigid policy" is unlikely to impress anyone who has the faintest knowledge of how the U.N. organs actually function. The so-called Western *bloc*, like the Asian-Arabian grouping, lacks rigidity and discipline. The history of the U.N. is replete with examples of wide differences and downright opposition within its ranks and even within such sub-grouping as the Commonwealth or Latin-American delegations.

There is, in fact, only one real power bloc in the U.N. and the world today, and that is the Soviet dictatorship and its satellites. When will India's spokesmen feel free to accord public recognition to this patent fact instead of making a pathetic attempt at splitting hairs?

The Tasks Of Our Leadership

by Sampurnanand

In this article, vital issues are raised by Mr. Sampurnanand who, apart from being Minister for Home and Labour in Uttar Pradesh, is an outstanding writer who wields a vigorous pen. We hope that this article, originally contributed to the Congress Supplement of the HINDUSTAN TIMES, will stimulate a discussion of the issues raised in future issues of FREEDOM FIRST. Mr. Sampurnanand is a member of the Executive Committee of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

IF some of our leaders are to be believed, we are passing through a moral crisis more acute and more dangerous than the floods which, ages ago, chased Manu to the foot-hills of Mount Sumeru.

Like a hydra-headed monster, corruption and the spirit of violence is attacking us on a hundred fronts; its poison is eating into the vitals of the nation and we are tossed about like straws on its surging waves. My words read like a wild medley of mixed metaphors but that is about the only way in which I can describe the impression created on the average citizen by reading the statements and hearing the orations of those leaders who sometimes descend from Mount Olympus to lecture to us on our sins of commission and omission. All that can be done in the circumstances, they seem to tell us, is to retire from the field in impotent rage.

The malady appears to have reserved its most virulent attack for Congressmen and the Congress organization. The Congress President and the Congress Working Committee, as well as many lesser men, are constantly drawing our attention to our shortcomings in forceful language which is not infrequently reinforced by dramatic gestures. Kings, runs a popular proverb, have no eyes: they have only ears and some of our leaders are kings to the manner born. They give credence to whatever their faithful followers tell them and denounce whatever happens to displease the fortunate men who have their ears. Today, the cry is against bogus membership. Nobody pauses to ask why those good men who now run up to the city of the gods in holy horror at this evil discovered its existence so late, after having actually contested the elections on the basis of those fictitious rolls and, incidentally, suffered defeat.

Corruption in Body Politic

There is corruption in the body politic in all conscience. Our standards of conduct are poor. Everywhere one notices inefficiency, slovenliness, endeavour to escape hard work, avoidance of responsibility and untruth. But the picture will not gain anything by exaggeration. Neither hypocrisy and crocodile tears nor escapist behaviour solves any problems. And an attitude of self-righteousness is equally futile. At the same time it offends. A leader who says, or acts as if he would like to say, 'you are all either fools or knaves, if not both; I am the only good and intelligent man here' should not expect to be seriously taken by any but blind devotees or unthinking morons. A man has no doubt the right to go into sack-cloth and ashes but he cannot expect others to follow his example. Nor can sermonizing from a pedestal of self-assumed intellectual and moral superiority serve any useful purpose. The people may listen in silence or applaud the speaker's linguistic fire-works but that is about all. Histrionic imitation of the minor prophets of the Old Testament is not the way to raise society's morale or morals. Nor will appeals for putting in hard work with a view to add to the country's prosperity go very far. This kind of appeal and the goal placed before the people are common-places and can be made by individuals and groups which are neither interested in the incorruptibility of Congressmen nor in the abstract principles of truth and non-violence.

The fact of the matter is that we have taken to heart, with much interpretation to suit our own selfish propensities, the dictum that the progress of society lies in a struggle for existence in which the fittest survive. Every one has to beat down every possible competitor. It is all very well to speak of a Welfare State, but the question of supreme importance to everyone is how much happiness he can extract out of life. The future welfare of that amorphous object, society, which seems to care very little for any one of us, is too distant an object to have much of a meaning. Probably no one puts the matter to himself in such crude terms: a thin veneer of altruism is sought to be put on all our actions. But the reality is there and asserts itself whenever personal interests appear to be seriously threatened. There can be no real morality in such an atmosphere.

But what is the remedy for this state of affairs? A leadership which goes about condemning its followers in public condemns itself. It does not add to its prestige by proclaiming that its writ runs only among the servile and the wicked. Spiritual isolation between society and its leaders is harmful to both. The leader must step down among those whom he essays to lead, with a sympathetic understanding of their minds. Then alone he can lead. If he is not prepared to proceed thus, the march of events will simply leave him behind.

Nervous Strain all round

If a man sees face to face something that is beyond him and yet not wholly unattainable, if he catches a

glimpse of something that calls him to itself by its majesty and beauty, if, in other words, he finds himself on the trail of an ideal, he is lifted above his petty self. Otherwise, he lives for himself alone. To expect a man to sublimate his lower psyche for an earthly good is to ask him to raise himself by his shoe-strings. If the Indian people today appear to be straying from the strait path of virtue, it is because our leadership has grossly failed to take into account the existing spiritual climate. Foreign rule has disappeared and we have adopted a democratic form of government. But this democracy has come in one jump, as it were. It has not had time to grow and evolve conventions. Methods of voting and election have been copied straight from the West without much reference to Indian conditions. The feudal structure has been abolished at one stroke but the hierarchy of caste still remains. It is assailed on all sides but it survives because its innate strength does not lie entirely in concrete and tangible institutions. Moreover, it reflects real cultural differences to some extent. We talk Socialist but have adopted what is euphemistically called a mixed economy. No one knows the future of this system. It may develop into pure capitalism, State capitalism or Socialism. The old religious and social sanctions have lost their force. They are falling into desuetude and the State will not recognize them. And there is an acute shortage of employment and of the necessities of life. All this naturally gives rise to great disequilibrium of mind. There is tremendous nervous strain all round. Under such conditions, there is a tendency for inhibitions, acquired for behaviour in stable circumstances, to break down and elemental urges to come to the surface. Everyone tries to make hay while the sun shines. This is at the root of all the corruption which we see around us.

Need of New Values

It will not be exorcised by pronouncing pontifical anathemas. Apart from improvements in the economic situation which is a factor of great importance and social adjustments which are of no less importance, an approach, and a direct one, will have to be made on the spiritual plane. A new sense of values will have to be developed. Truth and non-violence are no doubt eternal verities but a parrot-like repetition of aphorisms praising these virtues will not bring about the vertical conversion of anyone's character. They will have to be re-interpreted and their implications brought out in terms of present-day life.

But this is possible only if there is a concept, a vision, of a new world. We have no such concept, no such vision. Our constitution is a collection of beads which have no philosophic string running through them. Marxism has a philosophy, even Capitalism has one, though it is anonymous and, comparatively, less explicit. But we have no name for our way of life and no definite idea of what it is and where it is leading. It will not do to call it Gandhism because, when we use this term, we try to empty it of all positive content. For Gandhiji, for instance, politics without religion was a sham; for many of us religion is the

biggest sham devised by the fertile brain of Satan. It is best not to mention it in respectable society.

Needless Confusion

The word culture might perhaps have provided an anchorage but it means different things to different minds, everyone of which believes itself to be in exclusive possession of the right meaning and, consequently, of the right to use the word. The Indian Muslim has a recognized culture because the Constitution guarantees the culture of the minorities. The Hindu, being in the majority, becomes a communalist the moment he speaks of Hindu culture. I suppose he would acquire a culture in Pakistan, if the future Constitution of that State also decides to guarantee protection of cultural minorities. Let us speak of Indian culture, by all means. A clear understanding of the meaning of the term would be of immense help to us in visualizing our goal. But there is no such understanding. A culture is an approach to the problems of life, an angle of vision, a light which colours all the emotions, the activities, the urges, the hopes and aspirations, of those who owe it fealty. Music, painting, literature, religion, these are its external vestments, the forms through which it expresses itself. We patronize the forms today but the soul is not there. Our Art, therefore, becomes an imitation with nothing to inspire it. And all mastery of technique notwithstanding, it will be as difficult for us to create an Ajanta or a Gomateshwar as it is for modern Europe to create a Madonna of Raphael or a Cathedral of Rheims.

India has passed through many vicissitudes of fortune during her long and chequered history; empires have risen and fallen; conquerors have come and gone, but there has been a continuity of basic principles in our cultural life all through. It has not been static; it has gathered sustenance and richness of context from a hundred streams but these have all been assimilated into, and become indistinguishable components of, the main current.

It is still there and the weeds that retard its flow can be removed. It can still inspire us because our whole spiritual make-up is attuned to it. It can provide the basis for that philosophy of life which we so badly need. But we have tied ourselves up badly in a tangle of words which are driving us like slaves. 'Secular' is perhaps the greatest tyrant, in this respect.

It is not a bad word, as words go and in so far as it expresses our determination not to show any preference to the followers of any particular religion, or to be guided in public affairs by the religious beliefs or injunctions held by any group of men to be binding upon themselves in addition or opposition to the laws made or recognized and, therefore, nullifiable, by the State, it is quite a good word. But it is essentially negative in its connotation. A society can be inspired by religion without its government ceasing to be secular.

The Root of all evil

This is not the place to elaborate this theme but I should like to repeat that the utter absence of any ideal that compels sacrifice and self-imposed restraint, our failure to evolve a new set of values to suit changed times, the non-existence of a philosophy linking individual lives to something higher and more inclusive than themselves is at the root of all evil. The concept of a Welfare State which cannot be stated in any but purely material terms, bread and coats and houses, hospitals and schools and roads, cannot whip up sufficient enthusiasm of a lasting character. There is a sub-conscious feeling that it is the business of the Government to provide all this and demands for tightening the belt begin to appear as unjustified encroachments upon the liberty of the individual. Such a manner of thinking, and the action to which it leads, are what anyone conversant with human nature can easily conceive. And if Congressmen are found to err, we should remember that they also are human.

Let us fight corruption where it manifests itself by all means but let us also with much greater vigour remove the soil from which it springs. Let us place before our people the vision of a new world of which they are to be the architects, a world satisfying not only to the flesh but to the spirit, in which there shall be a place for reverence and self-surrender. One could train the younger generations for citizenship of this world. That our educational system today is not based on anything of this kind is obvious and significant. We teach neutral subjects which cannot fall foul of our secularism. Some souls in torment every now and then raise the cry of moral education but every sensible man knows that moral education to be effective, must have a basis and that basis can only be religion or a philosophic substitute for it. That is where the task of our leaders lies.

An Unrepentant Spy

Dr. Alan Nunn May

FROM time to time, people who are not steeped in the communist doctrine are shocked into realising how different from their own is the approach of the communist towards the traditional concepts of loyalty to one's country and to one's fellow beings. One of the strangest cases is that of Dr. Alan Nunn May, a British scientist, who in 1946 pleaded guilty

to the charge of communicating information contrary to the provisions of the British Official Secrets Act. He has just concluded his term of imprisonment and on being released he said: "I myself think I acted rightly, and I believe many others think so too."

It is not easy to comprehend the workings of a

mind that is involved with the tremendous responsibility of developing Atomic projects but it is still more difficult to accept the statement at its face value, that in giving away vital secrets to a foreign country "he was wholeheartedly concerned in securing victory over Germany and Japan, with the furtherance of the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in this country."

The case of Dr. May will bear scrutiny. About 1945 he was drawn into the Soviet spy net which was thrown over Canada, authentic information about which was received from the Russian, Gouzenko. The military espionage work in Canada under Colonel Zabotin was directed from Moscow. By their well co-ordinated and subtle methods Dr. May was induced to give information about his work to the Soviets and he was considered to be a very valuable "agent" according to reports which finally came before the Royal Commission.

Sometime in 1945, it became known that "Alec" (May's cover name) would be leaving Canada for the U.K. and this gave rise to a series of telegrams between Moscow and the Soviet attaché in Ottawa. The Soviets were anxious to get information from him about the progress of research on Uranium and a meeting was arranged between him and the Soviet agent in London opposite the British Museum. "Alec" was to proceed from Tottenham Court Road carrying a copy of the *Times* under his left arm and the agent was to arrive from the direction of Southampton Road carrying the magazine *Picture Post*.

It is not known whether the proposed meeting between him and the Soviet agent materialised or not. In his written statement he said: "Whilst in Canada I was contacted by an individual whose identity I decline to divulge. He called on me at my private apartment in Swail Avenue, Montreal. He apparently knew I was employed by the Montreal laboratory and he sought information from me

concerning atomic research. I took the very painful decision that it was necessary to convey general information on atomic energy and make sure it was taken seriously. For this reason I decided to entertain the proposition made to me by the individual who called on me."

The Royal Commission which was appointed to investigate the facts regarding the communication of secret information by officials to a foreign power found that Dr. May was in constant touch with the Soviets. On 9th August 1945, a telegram was sent to Moscow containing the following information given by "Alec": The test of the Atomic bomb was conducted in New Mexico; the bomb dropped in Japan was made of Uranium 235; and the output of Uranium 235 amounted to 400 grams daily at the magnetic separation plant at Clinton. "Alec" handed over a small sample of Uranium 233. These samples were considered so important by the Russians that upon their receipt they were flown to Moscow.

Mr. Justice Oliver passing judgment at the end of the hearing said, "I have listened with some surprise to some of the things which your learned counsel has said he is entitled to put before me: How any man in your position could have had the crass conceit, let alone the wickedness to arrogate to himself the decision of a matter of this sort, when you yourself had given your written undertaking not to do it, and knew it was one of the country's most precious secrets, when you yourself had drawn and were drawing pay for years to keep your own bargain with your country — that you could have done this is a dreadful thing."

It is a dreadful thought that communists in all parts of the world should be so keen on keeping Moscow abreast of developments everywhere. No wonder in the United States and even in the U.N. communists and fellow-travellers are being systematically removed from all key positions.

ZAFAR FUTEHALLY.

Geneva Convention And U. N. Stand

by Prof. Edwin D. Dickinson

(Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, a member of the Advisory Commission of the Annual Digest of Public International Law Cases and Chairman of the Alien Enemy Repatriation Hearing Board (Japanese), 1945-46).

SOME of the recent discussions on the question of repatriation of prisoners of war seem to me to be based on certain false notions about international law which should be corrected.

In the absence of treaty, the competence of states to grant asylum to political refugees is unlimited. Even Andrei Vishinsky in *The Law of the Soviet State* acknowledges the validity of this principle.

This is no mere moral exhortation. It is a very meaningful and jealously guarded legal power. It is imbedded in the vast network of modern extradition treaties, in the written Constitutions of upward of a score of states, and in the domestic law and practice of the rest. The matter is approvingly and succinctly

put in Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948:

"Everyone has the right to seek and may be granted, in other countries, asylum from persecution."

States have the power to grant asylum. Everyone has the right to seek it. But there is no generalized obligation to give it — each state must decide on the basis of each request whether or not it will accord it, whether or not under its domestic law it can or should accord it.

Is it nevertheless to be believed that Article 118 of the Geneva Convention was intended to, and did, deprive parties to a conflict of the power to grant

asylum? To deprive the very prisoners the convention sought to protect of the right to seek asylum? To deprive the states involved of the power to propose, or agree to, a plan of repatriation under which some prisoners might opt not to go home? The history of the law relating to prisoners of war and the records of the Geneva Conferences of 1947 and 1949 supply the answer to these questions. It is an emphatic "no."

As early as the Revolutionary War the option of the prisoner of war not to return was respected by the United States under the Treaty of Paris of 1783, when many Hessian soldiers remained in the United States and became valued citizens of the new Republic. More recent precedents are the Treaties of Versailles, Trianon and St. Germain and the agreements entered into by the Soviets at the close of the First World War with a large number of states. Still more recently there were the Soviet ultimatums at Stalingrad and Budapest and the Anglo-French Accord regarding hostilities in Syria and Lebanon in 1941.

An opinion of the Judge Advocate General of the United States Army in 1945 reflected established law and custom in stating that a detaining Power was not obliged under international law and the Geneva Convention of 1929 to return a prisoner of war who had strong reason for not wishing to return. The General Assembly itself, in Resolution 427 (V) of December 14, 1950, expressly construed the Geneva Convention and the recognized standards of international conduct as calling not for unconditional return of every prisoner but for an "unrestricted opportunity of repatriation."

The Conference of Government Experts at Geneva in 1947, called in order to consider the proposals of the International Committee of the Red Cross for what became the 1949 Convention, was made aware of the fact that some capturing states had refused to repatriate prisoners against their will, and that in other cases they had repatriated them anyway. The conference decided to make no provision concerning this problem, preferring to leave room for discretion in formulating agreements or plans of release and repatriation, while assuring the principle that the benefits should be accorded promptly.

At the Diplomatic Conference in 1949, there was never any question but that a state might permit an individual who, in its opinion, had valid reasons for not wanting to go home, to benefit from asylum. The only point considered was whether it would be wise to require a state to respect a prisoner's wish. This came up in connection with two articles, 109 and 118. In 109 it was decided to require a state to retain seriously sick and wounded prisoners during hostilities if the person did not wish to be repatriated.

Great Britain and France objected to this requirement on the ground that a state had discretion to retain them anyway, and should be left to itself to exercise this discretion in a proper fashion. The winning side, led by Belgium, did not challenge the existence of this discretion, but felt that certain states

could not be trusted to exercise it in the appropriate case, and therefore insisted on the requirement.

Article 118 was adopted the same day the conference had made clear its recognition of the power to grant asylum. Previously an Austrian amendment, under which a detaining power would have been required to respect the prisoner's wish, had been rejected in committee and never reached the floor of the full conference. An objection to it was offered by General Sklyarov of the U.S.S.R., who said he feared that any expression of will might not be entirely free on the part of a prisoner, so that the question of repatriation ought not to turn entirely on his wishes.

Objections based on immigration law and national policy had been made to similar suggestions in 1947. The most that can be made of this is that it was thought desirable to leave room for the prisoner's state of origin to demand some sort of guarantees that the prisoner's interests would actually be protected. The convention, of course, forbids forcible detention against the prisoner's will and the position of the United Nations command is precisely to afford unequivocal and impartial guarantees that no force will be exerted to make a prisoner stay or to make him return.

The result reached at Geneva, then, was to preserve the right of a detaining Power to afford asylum, in any case where the prisoner genuinely claimed it; to prevent a detaining Power from forcing a prisoner not to return, and to require a detaining Power to respect the wish of a sick or wounded prisoner who did not want to return as long as hostilities continued.

Finally, from the record at Geneva, at Panmunjom and recently at the General Assembly, as also from what has been said above, it is perfectly clear that the position of the United Nations Command and of the United States is not that a detaining Power at the end of hostilities must admit to its territory all prisoners of war seeking asylum. Neither the position supported by the United States, nor the Geneva Convention, nor the precedent which would be set in Korea would require the United States or any other detaining Power in any future conflict to permit prisoners of war to remain indefinitely in its territory.

THE XXTH CENTURY MUSIC AWARD

AS a follow-up to the varied programme of "Masterpieces of the XXth Century," the *Congress for Cultural Freedom*, in co-operation with the *European Cultural Centre* in Geneva, and thanks to the generosity of Mr. Julius Fleischman, has instituted a music award to be made annually to young composers for works written therefor. The purpose of this award is to acquaint the public at large with modern works apt to increase the repertory of contemporary music.

A suitable procedure for awarding this "Twentieth Century Award" is under consideration at present.

Reviews

Witness

By Whittaker Chambers (Random House, New York, pp. 808. \$5.)

WITNESS is a testament of Mr. Chambers' personal faith which led him to give evidence against Hiss — to expose the Communist Conspiracy against the world.

There is a shade of difference, which ultimately becomes glaringly clear, between Judas who betrayed his Master, and Whittaker Chambers who suffered the tortures of self-crucifixion in revealing the truth about his old comrades. In this triumph of truth lies the vindication, not only of his testament, but also of the right to speak, freedom to tell and testify against the tyranny of a system — communism.

The first part of the book is autobiographical, where Whittaker deals with his formative years. The influence and horrors of World War I followed by extreme privations and sufferings created in him a condition of mind to receive this new faith which promised peace and employment for all, a solution of "Crises in History". The magic was in the new mysticism expressed by the word intellectual. It was in the spirit of a neophyte, that one had to be grounded into the doctrine of communism to be accepted as an intellectual, and in the degree of such an acceptance, both by comrades and the party lay the charm. It was, therefore, incumbent upon every aspirant to follow the dictates of the party. There were other, graver reasons created under the atmosphere of such intellectualism which drew one towards the party. In the words of Chambers, "some intellectuals are primarily moved by the problem of War. Others are moved by the economic problem. Both crises are aspects of a greater crisis of history, for which communism offers a plausible explanation, which had promise to end." Whittaker testifies that one became a communist, not for reasons of material gain. "There is always a certain number of 'Rice Christians' in any movement that has anything at all to offer them . . . In the days when I joined the Communist Party, it could offer those who joined it only the certainty of being poor and pariahs . . ." This is the most baffling aspect of the problem, and yet there are some talented people who are fanatical communists "in the party's most hazardous and criminal activities." Mr. Chambers has no answer to the question "Why did he become a communist?" but he knows the answer to "What does it mean to be a communist?" In his words, "When I was a communist, I had three heroes. One was a Russian. One was a Pole. One was a German Jew."

"The Pole was Felix Djerjinsky. He was ascetic, highly sensitive, intelligent. He was a communist. After the Russian Revolution, he became head of the

Tcheka and organiser of the Red Terror. As a young man, Djerjinsky had been a political prisoner in the Paviak Prison in Warsaw. There he insisted on being given the task of cleaning the latrines of the other prisoners. For he held that the most developed member of any community must take upon himself the lowliest tasks as an example to those are less developed. That is one thing that is meant to be a communist.

"The German Jew was Eugen Levine. He was a communist. During the Bavarian Soviet Republic in 1919, Levine was the organiser of the Workers and Soldiers Soviets. When the Bavarian Republic was crushed, Levine was captured and court-martialed. The court-martial told him: You are under sentence of death! Levine answered: "We communists are always under sentence of death." That is another thing that is meant to be a communist.

"The Russian was not a communist. He was a pre-communist revolutionist named Kalyaev. (I should have said Sazonov.) He was arrested for a minor part in the assassination of the Tsarist prime minister, von Plehve. He was sent into Siberian exile to one of the worst prison camps, where the political prisoners were flogged. Kalyaev sought some way to protest this outrage to the world. The means were few, but at last he found a way. In protest against the flogging of other men, Kalyaev drenched himself in kerosene, set himself on fire and burned himself to death. That also is what it meant to be a communist."

That also is what it means to be a witness.

This was the experience of the first half of the 20th Century of what it means to be a communist. And so, Mr. Whittaker Chambers broke with communism "Slowly, reluctantly, in agony." The second part of the book is about rising passion of doubt, and the dawn of faith, when Whittaker begins to realize the necessity of God. One may not agree with Whittaker in substituting God for Stalin. Stalin himself is an alternative to God, the only difference is that he does not admit of a man's soul. But Chambers had touched the transcendental experience of religious mysticism and the conflict of doubt intensified his faith that communism was not an answer to man's problem, that Society of man could not be organised without God. God and not Stalin was the solution to his problem, the ideal of his testament, which led him to stand as a Witness against Hiss, but for Truth.

The importance of the book is in its being a personal document of a rare and troubled spirit; in its being an eloquent warning against the infiltration of communists into the life of our institutions. A declaration of the shortcomings of communism, both as a faith and as an ideology of mankind. And it is this churning of man's mind and soul that makes the book vitally important; because the right to be a witness to one's own faith, against the conspiracy, is inherent; it is no crime to repudiate the faith, even if repudiation leads one to "Golgotha," for only then can one find Salvation.

A. S. P.

To The Editor

A GENERAL GONE ASTRAY

MAJOR-GENERAL S. S. Sokhey's admiration over the past two decades for the Soviet Union has been taken by those who have known of it as a peccadillo of a man proficient as a scientist but otherwise somewhat naive. Since his nomination to the Council of States a year back, however, Gen. Sokhey's public expression of his views has become increasingly noticeable. For several months now, he has been harping on the germ warfare business in a manner indicative of an attitude of being "willing to wound but afraid to strike." Using the sympathetic platform of the Association of Scientific Workers, whose international affiliations are not above suspicion, Gen. Sokhey was quoted by the *Free Press Journal* as having said at Lucknow that he had come to the conclusion that "bacteriological warfare had been waged in Korea." A few days later on January 16, while professing to correct "certain categorical statements" on the subject attributed to him, the General delivered himself of this oblique statement: "Germ warfare is alleged again. An International Scientific Commission has published a detailed report giving a mass of technical data. This report is now available. I expressed the view that the technical data presented should be carefully examined by our leading scientists and see what they add up to. They may, if they think necessary, advise our Government to take any step necessary in the interests of our people."

His own likely verdict, if he was ever entrusted with an enquiry, was revealed some time back by none other than *Cross Roads*, the organ of the Communist Party, to whose appeal his present move looks like a belated response. "India's men of science," wrote *Cross Roads*, "look to him to take a lead once again in rousing Indian opinion against the monstrous perversion of science that is spreading death and starvation in our neighbouring Asian lands."

There is an old proverb about the wisdom of the cobbler in sticking to his last, but General Sokhey considers himself equipped to comment on matters economic as well. Following the well-known communist line, he was reported to have said in Bombay on December 25, that so long as India was dependent on other countries for machines and armaments, "it is not an independent country." India, according to him, had a great deal to learn from the Soviet Union and its Five-Year Plan which had achieved "phenomenal developments in a remarkably short space of time." The General then pleaded for "fundamental, political, economic, social and administrative changes in the present set-up of the country."

Step by step, it would appear the communists are muscling in on their naive dupe. For, it is now announced that General Sokhey has become a member of the preparatory committee set up in Delhi by the International Students Relief, in the company of other well-known fellow-travellers like Prof. Gyanchand.

This body, which operates behind the Iron Curtain from Prague, is nothing but a straight Comintern front (see *Freedom First*, October 1952).

If the General goes on like this much longer, it will also become apparent that his nomination to the Council of States showed singular lack of judgment about his intellectual maturity.

"A SCIENTIST"

DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

IN pursuance of the Cominform directive of January 27th 1950 to the Indian Communist Party that "the peace movement must become the pivot of the entire activity of the party," a campaign to enlist the support of the medical profession is being developed with the holding of a Bihar State Conference of Doctors for Peace which met in Patna in the last days of December 1952. As if the very nomenclature of the meeting 'Conference of Doctors for Peace' was not clear enough to suggest its political affiliations and international patronage, Dr. U. B. Narayan Rao, a fellow-travelling member of the medical profession from Bombay, made it quite explicit by telling the Conference that "if the members of the medical profession lent their support to the peace movement it would be possible to hold the International Doctors' Congress in India in a few months time."

It may not be widely known that when the Rome Congress for Doctors was still in the offing the Indian Communists had set up a Preparatory Committee with Dr. R. N. Cooper, a well-known Bombay surgeon as Chairman. However, Dr. Cooper was enabled by the efforts of the Democratic Research Service to find out for himself the secret hand of the Cominform behind the International Doctors' Congress and, let it be mentioned to his credit, he promptly dissociated himself from the Preparatory Committee. One other member of the Committee also similarly tendered resignation on learning of its partisan character.

In parenthesis special attention must be drawn towards the ominous hint in Dr. Narayan Rao's speech. It appears as if the International Doctors' Congress which could not be held in Rome is likely to be held in India. Public opinion in India and especially among the medical profession needs to be educated and aroused and forewarned against this attempt to exploit the fair name of India's medical profession for the partisan ends of Soviet Communism which is even now engaged in persecuting nine leading members of the medical profession in Russia. The accusations against the Russian doctors that they murdered Andrei Zhdanov and the Red Army political chief Alexander Sergeivitch Scherbekov by deliberately giving them wrong treatment cannot but be a smear on the entire medical profession. No Indian doctor with any regard for the prestige and fair name of his noble profession would knowingly associate himself with the Indian counterparts of those who have launched these pogroms against doctors.

D. G. SAKRIKAR,
Executive Secretary,
Democratic Research Service, Bombay.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

"In the final choice, a soldier's pack is not so heavy
a burden as a prisoner's chains."

—President Eisenhower in his Inaugural Address.

"The peace we seek then is nothing less than the
practice and the fulfilment of our whole faith among
ourselves and in our dealings with others. It signifies
more than stilling the guns and easing the sorrow of
war. More than an escape from death it is a way of
life. More than a haven for the weary it is a hope
for the brave."

—President Eisenhower in his Inaugural Address.

In the New Year broadcasts the only writer in the
world quoted by AIR was Ilya Ehrenberg. Is it that
he is the most eminent member of the literary
fraternity, or that he is most news? Or that no one
else could have produced so platitudinous a statement?

—Thought, January 10, 1953.

"... There is something I would say to Stalin: You
claim belief in Lenin's prophecy that one stage in the
development of Communist society would be war
between your world and ours. But Lenin was a pre-
atomic man. . . . War . . . cannot now be a stage in
the development of anything save ruin for your regime
and your homeland." (Mr. Truman)

—New York Times, January 11, 1953.

"There is no meaning at all in the terms Communist,
Fascist, etc. The distinction should be between
centralization and decentralization."

—Dr. J. C. Kumarappa in *The Hindustan Times*,
January 9, 1953.

The most likely explanation is that Moscow sticks
to the Bismarckian maxim: "I don't care whether I
am loved so long as I am feared."

—Thought, January 10, 1953.

Lucerne, January 3: Czechoslovak chess champion
Cenek Kottanauer, announced here today that he had
applied for asylum in Switzerland and would not
return to Czechoslovakia. Kottanauer, who is forty-
two, has been playing in an International Chess
Tournament here which ends today. He wished to
leave the country before it was too late.

—Times of India, January 4, 1953.

The Russian and Chinese Ambassadors to Burma,
M. Vladimirov and Gen. Yao Ming-chaung, today
boycotted an official Burmese National Day function
presided over by President Dr. Ba U. This is the
second time in succession the Chinese Ambassador
has boycotted the National Day function.

—Times of India, January 5, 1953.

The Government of India has suggested to State
Governments to allow, at least, western-style hotels
in their areas to have "late nights" once a week.

As part of its campaign to promote tourist traffic
industry, the Centre is also bringing out a book on
hunting and fishing, illustrating the wide variety of
game which this country offers.

—Times of India, December 26, 1952.

"I am only a mouthpiece, but all thinking has been
done by the Government of India," said Mr. V. K.
Krishna Menon, on his arrival at Santa Cruz airport,
Bombay, on Monday.

—Times of India, January 6, 1953.

Careful of punctuation, he (Mr. Tandon) is careless
of punctuality. "Evidently," wrote Mr. Sampurnanand,
"Mr. Tandon has made the concept of the infinitude
of time a guiding principle of his conduct."

—Times of India, January 4, 1953.

"If we conduct our foreign policy on the assumption
that the United States is engaged in a worldwide
popularity contest, then we are likely to wind up
neither popular nor successful."

—Mr. Daniel Brewster, reviewing the American
record in the Far East, *New Leader*,
December 22, 1952.

Moving the foreign policy resolution before the
plenary session of the Congress, he (Mr. C. Raja-
gopalachari) said: "Instead of fear of God, nations
are conducting themselves in the fear of the atomic
bomb. That has given us a spell of peace for the
time being."

—Times of India, January 18, 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