

A Significant Conference

by V. B. Karnik

CONFERENCES are usually convened in our country for passing resolutions and staging demonstrations.

Conferences of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom are not patterned on that model. They are usually held for quiet deliberations over a few selected topics. The fourth Conference of the Committee held last month in Patna was true to form and is significant for the topics that it took for discussion.

A discussion need not necessarily lead to the acceptance of a set of conclusions. What is much more important is to stimulate thinking, thinking over a problem in all its aspects on the basis of an objective analysis of facts and with a scientific outlook in view. The purpose of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom to stimulate such thinking on all problems bearing upon the growth of a free society.

The "Democratic Alternative" was one topic taken for consideration at the Patna Conference. There is a dispute now about the necessity of planning and everybody in India has accepted it. But is the plan that is current at present conducive to the development of a democratic society? Is centralised planning from the top the only way of building a planned society? Will not the impatience to keep up with other industrially advanced countries impose a forced pace of industrialisation, bringing in mass regimentation and a police State? Is it not better to plan on the basis of the satisfaction of the needs of the people rather than on the basis of abstract theories and calculations of economists and statisticians? These and many other questions which tormenting thinking people were raised in Patna were discussed objectively and dispassionately.

The discussion made it clear that those who are opposed to the present form and shape of the Second Year Plan are not opposed to planning as such, are they the advocates of *laissez faire*. What they suggest is a different type of planning, a planning from the bottom undertaken with the objective of satisfying the immediate needs of the people. In carrying up such a plan and implementing it, it is possible to bring about a synthesis between Liberalism

and Gandhism. The synthesis was not concretely worked out, but a way of thought was indicated which may yield rich fruits.

It is in this context that the contribution that Bhoomdan and Gramdan can make requires to be considered. Decentralised production is now accepted as a desirable objective. It is also accepted that technology has made it possible to decentralise production without too much loss in productivity. But, in search of that objective, is it necessary to go to the length of village self-sufficiency? Apart from its practicability, is it a desirable ideal? Self-sufficient villages are not a new thing to our country. According to many historians and sociologists they are the root cause of our old malady—political slavery and social stagnation.

Another topic discussed at the Conference was the problem of the integration of the Tribal peoples in Indian society. The problem has assumed serious proportions since the rise of a political party like the Jharkhand Party and the outbreak of hostilities in the land of the Nagas. Various methods have been suggested for its solution, such as isolation, assimilation and integration. There was a discussion of the merits and demerits of all these methods, but the consensus of opinion was in favour of integration.

Prof. Narmadeshwar Prasad who initiated the discussion pointed out:

"Neither isolation nor assimilation but integration of the tribal people in Indian Society will solve their several elements into a complex entirety in which the elements can be clearly distinguished. Our country abounds in many heterogeneous cultural patterns and social groups. It is only through integration, and that can be done only by allowing maximum freedom to the different groups to maintain and develop their identity and individuality, that the emergence of a free social democratic life in India is possible."

He also pointed out the dangers of isolation or segregation. Echoing the views of Mr. Majumdar, and Mr. Madan in their *Introduction to Social Anthropology* he asserted: "When isolated, the tribesmen have to fight a losing battle against ruthless nature, a desiccated, eroded soil, deforested hill slopes, and irated rivers. In such circumstances over specialisation necessitated by an extremely unkind geographical environment leads to a check in growth and may even lead to extinction."

One may or may not agree with the view that was expressed, but one must admit that the Conference has invited pointed attention to a vital problem. The problem is not, as a matter of fact, confined only to the tribal people. It is part of a much larger problem

of the emotional and intellectual integration of the various sections of the Indian people. The Indian people are still divided into various small or big groups on the basis of caste, religion, language and community. There is very little social contact between these groups and very little of the feeling of social or national solidarity. The political unity that has been established will not endure unless it is cemented by the growth of a sentiment of common brotherhood between the people who inhabit the country. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan did well to emphasise this aspect of the question.

An artist of all-India repute, Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale presided over the Conference. Her participation in the Conference was a testimony of the Indian artists' keen desire for cultural freedom and for a free society which alone can guarantee it. Her presidential address was an eloquent statement of the role of art in life and a ringing warning against the use of art for politics. It is to be hoped that her warning will be taken to heart by those who are trying to utilise Indian artists and writers for the political purposes of international communism.

Another point which adds significance to the Conference is the eloquent appeal for a new type of revolution made at the public meeting held at the end by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. Jayaprakashji took a keen interest in the Conference; he attended the sessions on both the days from morning till late in the evening. He called the revolution that he had in view

"the human revolution," the revolution to change the individual. He talked of the vast strides made in science and technology, but pointed out how the moral progress of the human individual had lagged far behind. Man had become the slave of technology and had surrendered all his power and freedom into the hands of the State which controlled and manipulated technological processes. Jayaprakashji issued a clarion call for the emancipation of the individual, stressing at the same time the urgency of changing the methods to be adopted for bringing about "the human revolution." But the thought itself is of great importance, more particularly when the whole trend is in the direction of expanding the power of the State and reducing the individual to the position of an insignificant cog on the wheel of its ever-expanding machine.

The Conference was a significant gathering of intellectuals from many parts of the country. The number was necessarily small owing to long distances and other difficulties of travel. But it was an interesting gathering. The participants belonged to many schools of thought. The only bond amongst them was their dedication to the ideals of freedom and democracy. A passionate desire to advance the cause of a free society informed all their discussions. Having compared notes and learnt from each other, they will now work in their respective spheres to develop the democratic alternative and to bring about the integration of the Indian people. That will make the meeting in Patna a significant event.

A Meeting With Djilas' Wife

by Max Lerner

I PAID a visit the other evening to the wife of the most important political prisoner in the world today—Milovan Djilas.

I should have liked to talk with Djilas himself, especially in the light of his book, *The New Class*, which has shaken intellectual circles in every European capital. But Tito's government has that stormy dissenter locked up in the Sremska Mitrovica prison, from which no more of his highly dangerous views about the nature of the Communist system can reach his people and the world. Now Djilas has been tried again, while his sentence still has two years to run. This time some of the earlier pretense was ripped away, and the book itself is on trial.

So I made some inquiries, found Mrs. Djilas' address, and went to see her.

She lives with Djilas' old and bedridden mother in a flat of a somewhat seedy apartment house behind the Parliament, over which Djilas used to preside in his days of power. There is an elevator but it looks as if it had not run for months. When I first trudged up the stairs in the afternoon and knocked on the door, it was opened by a handsome, self-possessed little boy who said (as I managed to make out) that his mother

was out and he was alone. I left a note and came back in the evening. Mrs. Djilas was expecting me and so was the blond Alexei, all of 4½ years old.

She is a gentle, attractive woman, perhaps in her late 20s—stoical, quiet, contained, but with an inner pain and tension that break through the reserve. With her husband, to whom she has been married for six years, she had once been part of the small top ruling group of Yugoslavia. Now the room we sat in had a frayed sofa, a table, a chair, a picture. Through an open door I glimpsed a bedroom-study which had once been Djilas's and was now Alexei's.

It was a dingy little flat with the air of emptiness and gloom one feels in a house that obviously needs and misses a man.

She has cut herself off from the outside world. She answers no mail and accepts no food packages from abroad. But when I asked whether I could write about my visit to her, she offered no objections. When her husband was arrested, she told the police she would see newspapermen who came to see her. It was her duty, she told them, to talk with the press.

She does not seem to be embarked on any crusade.

(Continued on page 10)

Notes

Spectre Of National Communism

ALL is not well on the communist front inspite of sputniks and ICBMs. Reports emanating from communist countries indicate that inspite of the new Communist Manifesto issued at the conclusion of the "summit" meeting of communist parties of the Soviet Union and of the eleven other communist-ruling States closely tied to the Soviet Union, the Moscow mentors are still finding it difficult to ensure the monolithic unity of the Red bloc and re-assert their overlordship over their satellites. The main purpose of the "summit" meeting was to repair the breaches in the Iron Curtain caused by the policy of de-Stalinisation, to try for a more formal organisational unity and integration of various ruling communist parties and thereby to obviate any further trouble arising out of the centrifugal tendencies generated by the policy of "different roads to socialism." At the end of the meeting was issued a general declaration of "basic laws" and "unity of aims" signed by the party leaders of the twelve Communist Parties. The declaration asserted firm faith in the unity of the "invincible camp of socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union" and at the same time it pointed out that the communist world leadership should "hold more conferences of communist parties to discuss current problems and concert action in the general struggle for common goals."

Thus Moscow could succeed to a certain extent in re-establishing, at least formally, its leadership of the communist world and in reviving some of the spirit, if not the form, of the Comintern or Cominform.

But in spite of this formal declaration, it is fairly obvious that the Kremlin has failed to restore real unity among different parties and to bring about a reconciliation of conflicting views prevailing in the so-called socialist camp. It was clear from the beginning that Marshal Tito's refusal to go to Moscow was mainly because of the sharp policy differences arising out of Zhukov's sudden dismissal. This was further proved by Yugoslavia's flat refusal to sign the Moscow declaration worked out by other twelve Communist Parties. This was in a way inevitable as Yugoslavia could not have endorsed the declaration without compromising its policy of non-alignment.

Even though the main theme of the document was the necessity for the communist unity, Gomulka returned to Poland after the conference only to announce that "there have been, there are and there will be" differences among parties of the communist bloc. What precisely is the nature of those differences he refused to elaborate, but it should be evident from his other statements made in the course of his address to his partymen. He clearly stated that though the Moscow declaration envisaged bilateral and larger conferences for discussions among various Communist

Parties, these conferences would not discuss "internal problems" of any party.

That the course of the deliberations in Moscow, lasting for over two weeks, was none too smooth was evident from the beginning from the conflicting opinions held by the various leaders. It has been publicly admitted by a prominent East German communist leader that "there was not full unanimity on all issues among the twelve communist parties." He even went to the length of claiming credit for the East German communists that a unanimous declaration was signed at all in Moscow despite these differences. There are indications that the tensions involved primarily the degree of authority to be exercised by the Soviet Communist Party over other Communist Parties and the importance to be given to the national peculiarities of different communist-ruled countries. This has been openly admitted by East German communist leaders after their return from Moscow. Besides, Gomulka's statement that "some key ideas contained in the Moscow declaration could not have been accepted a year ago," also suggests that ultimately Moscow had to yield to the polycentric tendencies and had to come round to the Polish point of view. This clearly indicates that inspite of the recent attempts at re-Stalinisation, the spectre of national communism is still haunting the Kremlin bosses.

Events In Indonesia

HOWEVER much one may sympathise with Indonesia's claim to West Irian, the recent developments in that archipelago cannot but disturb sober-minded people throughout Asia. The Indian Prime Minister voiced their reaction when he gave expression to his feeling of disquiet.

The resentment of the Indonesians at the failure of the Afro-Asian resolution in the United Nations calling for the renewal of negotiations between Jakarta and the Hague over the future of West Irian (West New Guinea, now under Dutch control) is understandable. But what is not understandable is the manner in which that resentment is being sought to be expressed. The character of the Indonesian events indicate clearly that the communists have largely succeeded in exploiting the situation and precipitating a crisis which has rendered the solution of the West Irian question all the more difficult. It is surprising that President Sukarno and the Indonesian Government should thus play into communist hands. If they hope that by playing to communist gallery they would divert the attention of the Indonesian people from the conflicts of island-wise local patriotisms, which have since recently become the bane of Indonesia, they are sadly mistaken. For the problems that would arise as a result of their conniving at the rowdism, that has characterised the mass usurpation of the Dutch enterprises and the sudden displacement of thousands of Dutch nationals will prove more disastrous for Indonesia than the internal conflicts. Apart from the political repercussions they will have abroad, the recent developments in Indonesia will scare away foreign capital, which is so necessary for Indonesia's

economic development. No foreign investor will feel secure enough to invest his capital in Indonesia—for that matter in any other Asian country with political instability—after what has happened in that country.

The report that other foreign enterprises have not been touched and the statement of the Indonesian Government that the seizure of the Dutch interests was not nationalisation are a poor consolation and hardly enough to win the confidence of non-Dutch foreign investors. The contemplated management without ownership by Indonesian Government of the Dutch enterprises under a new law on foreign investments is not also going to help much. What has happened is not a prelude to socialism but to chaos and anarchy, which, unless checked in time, will destroy Indonesian independence.

Frank Appraisal

MR. MORARJI DESAI, the Union Minister for Commerce and Industry, must be congratulated on the forthright manner in which he talked about the situation in Kerala under the communist regime. Unlike some others who had earlier visited the State, he did not mince words about what he found in the course of his visit.

Mr. Desai found that 'a sense of insecurity' was noticeable among certain sections of the people. He found moreover that the climate was not congenial for the development of new industries. He said that he had brought these facts to the notice of the Ministry and hoped that suitable steps would be taken to improve the situation.

Mr. Desai also found that the complaints about the existence of Cell Courts were well-founded. A photostat copy of a summons issued by a Cell Court was, he said, shown to him. Mr. Desai took strong exception to the functioning of these illegal institutions and said that 'no democratic Government could be expected to allow this challenge to our institutions taking root and blossoming out.'

Pointing out the differences between a democracy and a dictatorship, Mr. Desai said in a dictatorship 'the opposition has no *raison d'être*; should they be so ill-advised as to criticise, they simply have to face the firing squad.' On the other hand, in a democracy, he pointed out, 'the right to criticise or elect the rulers of their choice and unseat them, if need be, is a God-given right residing in the people.'

Mr. Desai has no illusions about communists turning democrats. He said he would be happy if the unbelievable happened and the communists transformed themselves into democrats. He added, however, 'If they did that, automatically they ceased to be communists.' He was aware of the possibility that this was 'only a mere profession to hoodwink us' and that privately they might be proceeding 'in just the opposite direction.'

This frank appraisal of the situation made by Mr. Desai should clear the air and enable Congressmen and others to get a correct idea of the things that are happening in Kerala.

Curse Of Untouchability

SOME shocking details about the treatment meted out to Scheduled Castes in certain parts of the country came to light the other day in the course of a discussion in Lok Sabha. The most shocking piece of information was the murder of a Harijan boy in Bulandshahr district in Uttar Pradesh only because in a school examination he secured higher marks than caste Hindu boys. Details were also given about a number of other humiliating social restrictions imposed upon the Harijans.

This, indeed, is a depressing state of affairs. Untouchability has been abolished by the Constitution. Laws have been passed throwing open tanks, temples and other public places to Harijans and making it a penal offence to prevent them from using them. And yet this has had very little effect on the actual practice of untouchability and the various social and other restrictions imposed upon the untouchables.

The conscience of the community has not been yet awakened to the gross inequity and inhumanity of the practice of untouchability. Religion and long established social custom have sanctified it in the eyes of many. The religious and social support of untouchability must be blasted if the evil is to be destroyed lock, stock and barrel. That requires a vigorous and consistent propaganda against religious and social prejudices which have acquired a deep hold on the mind of the Indian people. Cultural and educational organisations must undertake this task and the Government must help them in that work if rapid progress is to be achieved in eradicating the curse of untouchability.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

THE UN-ANGRY YOUNG MEN:
AMERICA'S POST-WAR GENERATION

by Leslie A. Fielder

MAN Vs. TECHNICS?

by Denis de Rougemont

NOT BY RICE ALONE

by Robert Guillain

JANUARY 1958

52

Annual Rs. 12/-

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

The Writer And The Commissar

by Howard Fast

WHATEVER his particular work, the writer is a singular and lonely person. In the small hours of the night, tearing out of himself his particular story, he is perhaps more alone than almost any other person can be. He is the prisoner of his thoughts and fancies and visions, and he must struggle with them, capture them and order them into a structural whole. No matter how bad a writer he is, he is still a creature of conscience and is dedicated to the truth as he may see such truth within his own limitations; and no small part of his being less than a great writer is the result of limitations, both inner and outer, in his search for the truth.

To me, at least, it was neither surprising nor mysterious that the first bitter voices raised against the Communist Party tyranny in Hungary were the voices of writers; therein was the logic of my own existence and the existence of so many colleagues I had known well for long years; and therein was also the tragic and implacable dilemma of the writer in our time.

The simple crux of it is that the writer, as an artist, must perish under tyranny. I do not know whether the growth of literature as an art is a vital and necessary dynamic within a society of free men. I do know that it is the result of such a society; and I also know that when freedom is interdicted, literature shrivels and dies. Under a tyranny, the doctor can continue his practice of medicine; the carpenter can build houses as surely and precisely as before; and even the worker can continue to play his ordinary role in production. But from the writer tyranny demands the antithesis of his art, which is obedience...

For myself, the fact that a functioning democratic society is imperfect in its operative extension of democracy is not conclusive. We live in an imperfect world, a fact that men of goodwill have realized for centuries. They have tried to make this world better.

In the United States, I was crippled in my function as a writer. At great cost and financial loss, I had to publish my own books. From comparative wealth and success, I was reduced to a struggle for literary existence; and gradually my continuing work became less and less known.

But beyond deprivation, these facts are important:

1. I continued to write.
2. I continued to live.
3. I continued to fight for my inalienable privilege of writing as I pleased.

I spell them out like that because of the savage and unjustifiable experience of that time. I opposed the policies of my government and minced no words about it. I asked no quarter and gave no quarter; yet one, two and three, as specified above, were maintained.

My colleague in the Soviet Union, however, did far less than I in terms of his own government. He did

not oppose it. He did not challenge it. At most, he dared to challenge within his craft. And concerning him, these facts are important:

1. He did not continue to write; he was silenced.

2. He did not continue to live: he was cruelly tortured and he was put to death.

3. He did not continue to fight for his "inalienable privilege" of writing as he pleased. The privilege was alien to him; "as he pleased" was philosophically unknown to him, and when he tried to discover and embrace this unknown, his rulers rewarded him with death for the misfortune of plying his trade...

It was Ignazio Silone who cried out so poignantly to the editor of the *Russian Literary Gazette*, in the recent exchange of correspondence between them, that if a poet were murdered by the government of Italy, the voice of the people's rage would rise like thunder. I do not know that as fact, for I do not know Italy; but in a land where poets and novelists can be tortured, beaten to pulp, and then executed in silent degradation, freedom is a stranger.

I asked about a certain Russian poet. All good writers are poets to one extent or another, but that is a way of saying something. It is something else and clearer, to say that the poet is a very special sort of writer; and when the poet is a great poet, his songs come as close to probing the meaning of human existence and human destiny as any human effort can. This poet I refer to was Itzik Feffer. It happened that some of us here in America knew him personally, for early during the war he came here on a good-will mission and he won our hearts. A tall, handsome man, wearing the uniform of a colonel in the Red Army, he appeared to be a symbol of what the Soviet had pledged in the way of wiping anti-Semitism out of Russia; for Feffer was a Jew, a beloved poet in the Soviet Union, an army officer, and a man who in every word he spoke breathed the love of his fatherland.

How then that the rumour came to us, a good while before the Twentieth Congress of the Bolshevik Party, that he was dead, and that he had died strangely? We didn't know. I asked and others asked,

"Where is Itzik Feffer and how did he die?"

A hundred times that question was asked and left unanswered, and we who asked it were looked at as fools because we could not understand the political subtleties of the murder of poets. I asked it of a *Pravda* correspondent, only a few days before I finally broke with the Party—but I was an unwelcome guest now in the beautiful building on Park Avenue, for I had already spoken my first angry criticism in the pages of the *Daily Worker* and the Communist cultural magazine, *Mainstream*. As the diplomatic reception eddied around us, this man from *Pravda*, talking with the voice of "socialism" and "brotherhood" said to me angrily, in English, which he spoke very well,

"Howard, why do you make so much of the Jews?"

Jews? Jews? That is all we hear from you! Do you think Stalin murdered no one but Jews?"

I will go under oath that I quote him exactly and precisely, for while there are some words that eddy away like smoke, these were graven on my mind.

The Twentieth Congress came and went and still a mocking, derisive silence greeted the question, "Where is Itzik Feffer and how did he die?"

But the death of a poet is not so small a matter as some think. A Pole, tears in his eyes, said that the wind was full of small voices; and bit by bit we put together the story of Itzik Feffer. After the Twentieth Congress, Communists went to Russia and Communists came back, and each had a little bit of the full story and a few a great deal of it. Perhaps this reconstruction of the story is not exact, but it is all I could find. It begins with the arrest of David Bergelson, the internationally famous Jewish Soviet writer. Why he was arrested we don't know; only the Russians can answer that. But in all likelihood it was part of this "Zionist" invention, and the fact is that Bergelson was arrested because he was Jewish, whatever the other reasons were. He was put in prison and systematically beaten so that he might confess to crimes concocted for him to confess to. No brainwashing, no truth serums, none of the science-fiction fantasies; just the truncheon and the whip and the heady injunction of Stalin, "Beat, beat, beat—and beat again."

Before Bergelson died, Itzik Feffer learned where he was and what was happening to him; and being a friend of his, Feffer set out to try to save him. Writer after writer refused to join with Feffer. They were afraid. They told Feffer that if he persisted he would be arrested. Feffer pleaded with Ehrenburg, and the story goes that Ehrenburg refused. Ehrenburg stood high and well with Stalin. The story also goes that Feffer cried out to Ehrenburg:

"Then I'll do it alone—and when they arrest me and kill me, my death will be upon your soul for as long as you live!"

As it was. Thus, because he was driven by his human conscience, Feffer perished with Bergelson. Where then was Fadayevev, who shot himself after the Twentieth Congress? Where was Polovoy, whom I loved and respected as I have loved and respected few men? Where was Simonov? Where was Sholokhov? Where were all of these who had lectured the world upon the honour and integrity of human kind—these "socialist" men? Where were the preachers and righteous ones of the *Literary Gazette*? Where were those Soviet writers of honour who called America a land of barbarians without a heritage or a culture?

Yes, we killed Sacco and Vanzetti, but our own cry went out to haunt the world. Was my own voice ever silent concerning injustice in my own land? In the name of all that is holy to you, my Russian colleagues, where were your voices when murder walked in your land? And today, the question of the poet remains unanswered...

People have asked me why I waited so long to leave the Communist Party. Did I know nothing of what was going on? Yet in their questions, they make it all too simple. I joined because I accepted a premise, as

so many others did, that only through this party could peace, socialism and the brotherhood of man come to this earth. Certain aspects of history appeared to bear this out. To join the Communist Party is a very serious action; and serious people do not leap in and out of such organizations.

I could not have written what I wrote above a month or a year after I joined the Party. I am, perhaps, not easily convinced; I am also not easily unconvinced. It took years of fact, incident and experience to come to these conclusions. And above all, it required the catalyst of Khrushchev's secret speech. Only with his contribution, out of the heart of the first and largest communist party on earth, did all the bits of the puzzle fall into place. Even then, through my heartsickness, horror and anger, the question of whether this was the result of evil individuals or the historic—organizational pattern of the Party remained. It took months of thought, reading and discussion to make up my mind finally. And it took more months of doubt before I was able to write at any length about this. I know that no analysis of just this kind has ever been written before, and I can sense that it may be of very great consequence. I am writing about people whom I loved as well as about people whom I despised.

I left in my own good time because I had come to the above conclusions. I am neither disillusioned nor depressed and I have lived through grim times, but times when mankind made gigantic strides forward. Though the Communist Party is disciplined and often splendid in military action, I do not think it can claim credit for the events we have seen. Socialism, justice and the brotherhood of man are mighty and irresistible forces; they will grow to fruition in spite of the Communist Party—and Soviet socialism will not forever lie supine under the heel of the commissar.

Here in America the term "commissar" is translated as "functionary" and as "chairman". But I think it is one of those words best descriptive in its coloration, and among the rank and file of American Party members it is used constantly as an epithet of contempt toward Party leaders they despise. Therefore no other word is precisely right. The commissar, here as in Russia, is in common usage the spy, the watchdog, the petty priest who reports to the high priest, the mouth of dogma and cant, the reader of ritual, the inquisitor, the finger of suspicion and the ultimate witness for execution.

The Communist Party, with its dogma, its religious, pseudo-Marxist cant, its hatred of ideas and invention, creation and change—its priesthood, temple, and fumbling, small-minded gods—is not a product of civilization and sunlight, nor will it last long in a world that can win and keep peace. Its own membership, who have left it in the thousands and hundreds of thousands throughout the world, are coming to understand it. No more can those of us who speak in these terms be dismissed as "Trotskyites" or "agents" of the capitalists. We are going to speak and be heard—and raise a loud voice against any organization that bids men to deaden their minds.

An extract from the writer's recent book *The Naked God* published by Praeger, New York.

The Passionate Sceptic: Bertrand Russell

by Adam Adil

PHILOSOPHERS exist to ask questions, not to answer them. The more unsolved problems they have on their hands, the better they are doing their job; so the gibes at them by the practical men completely miss the point. Though philosophy can claim no great advances in knowledge compared with sciences, the sciences might never have got started without philosophy first awakening wonder. When the scientists give answers often it is only because philosophers have asked.¹ From this standpoint, Bertrand Russell is one of the greatest philosophers, for he has been the leading questioner of our times. Ever since he could speak as a child, it is said, Bertrand Russell began asking penetrating questions. In fact, three days after he was born, his mother wrote—"He lifts his head up and looks about in a very energetic way." He has still retained that energetic look, and nothing has passed for almost a whole generation without his having noticed it and expressed opinion on it. "He was a passionate sceptic because he wanted to be a passionate believer; he questioned everything because he craved for *certain* knowledge."² He has questioned about mathematics, religion and philosophy, about politics, economics, war, education and sex, and never rested till he got a satisfactory answer—and many a time he did not get satisfactory answer. And like a true philosopher, he frankly admitted whenever he failed to find an answer. For instance in 1927 he had written "When men began to reason, they tried to justify the inferences that they had drawn unthinkingly in earlier days. A great deal of bad philosophy and bad science resulted from this propensity. 'Great principles' such as the uniformity of nature and the 'law of universal causation,' and so on are attempts to bolster up our belief that what has often happened before will happen again, which is no better founded than the horse's belief that you will take the turning you usually take. It is not altogether easy to see what is to replace these pseudo-principles in the practice of science; but perhaps the theory of Relativity gives us a glimpse of the kind of things we may expect." But in his *Human Knowledge: Its scope and limits*, published in 1948, he admitted that he could not find in anything, not even in the Theory of Relativity propounded by Einstein, what could replace those "pseudo-principles." It was a frank admission of his failure to discover a way to *certain* knowledge and that his philosophical beliefs were based on the "horse-sense" or "animal faith" which he had denounced previously.

• The unique contribution of Russell to the philosophical thought of this century lay in his application of mathematics and logic to philosophy. At first, he came under the powerful spell of Hegel, but soon he

got out of that spell by his intense concern for logical and clear-headed thinking. At the turn of the century, along with G.E. Moore, he was drawn towards metaphysical and epistemological realism but with the passage of years he drifted from that too. He, along with Moore, was becoming more and more interested in *analysis*, and found common links with the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein and Rudolf Carnap.

Russell emerged into greatness as one of the chief founders of the "analytic movement" in philosophy. Although there have been other founders, especially G. E. Moore, Russell overshadowed them all by his vigorous advocacy of that School and by his output of philosophical essays, which was far more tremendous than that of anybody else. Although *analysis* by its application of mathematics and logic to philosophy has by and large remained technical and unintelligible, it has wielded powerful influence on many a philosophical movement of the twentieth century. Yet it cannot be said that it has dominated the field of twentieth century philosophy.

What are the chief features of analytic philosophy, which Russell for decades has been striving to popularise? With certain important qualifications, the chief features of analytic philosophy lay in its hostility to speculative, obscurely written and unintelligible metaphysics. It is, therefore, opposed to the latter writings of Whitehead (such as contained in his *Process and Reality* and to some extent in *The Science And the Modern World*); to the works of Bergson and Husserl as well as to eastern philosophies such as those of India which deal with spiritual and obscurely intellectual experiences. The analyst philosophers, especially Russell, think that philosophy is no way a rival of science, but is an intellectual activity which helps in clarifying and advancing scientific ideas. In the field of moral philosophy, *analytic movement* has much less to contribute. But it is vitally concerned in discovering the true meaning or the real character of what is described socially or philosophically as 'good' 'bad' 'right' or 'wrong'. Russell in one of his latest works *Human Society In Ethics and Politics* has endeavoured to find some objective foundation for ethical theory and has stated "Right desires will be those that are capable of being compossible with as many other desires as possible." He has borrowed the word "compossible" from Leibniz "..... we may call two desires or impulses 'compossible' when both can be satisfied, and 'conflicting' when the satisfaction of the one is incompatible with that of the other" he states. "It is obvious that a world in which the aims of different individuals or groups are compossible is likely to be happier than one in which they are conflicting. It follows that it should be part of a wise social system to encourage compossible purposes, and discourage conflicting ones, by means of education and social system designed to this

¹ Bertrand Russell: *The Passionate Sceptic*, by Alan Wood; page 13.

² *Ibid.*, page 14.

end." This is more or less an extension of his argument in his *Principles of Social Reconstruction* in which he points out that creative impulses are good because the pleasure they impart is not at the expense of that of any other; the possessive impulses are not good because they are satisfied at the expense of others; it follows also that possessive impulses are not creative impulses. Again, in *Human Society*, he tries to give a definition of "reason". "Reason has a perfectly clear and precise meaning," he says. "It signifies the choice of right means to an end that you wish to achieve. It has nothing whatever to do with the choice of ends. But opponents of reason do not realise this, and think that advocates of rationality want reason to dictate ends as well as means. They have no excuse for this view in the writings of rationalists." This definition of reason, however, sounds strange in the modern context, especially when the present world is moving towards two diametrically opposite and conflicting ends: one democratic and other totalitarian. And unless it is left to man's reason to decide which of the two ends is preferable for being reasonable and yielding of human happiness and freedom, the world would involve itself into an unprecedented disaster. It is reason which decides to choose freedom against slavery, progress against regress, democracy against totalitarianism, because these lead to human happiness, and it is reason, again, (rather, common sense which is an element of reason) which dictates that happiness is the end of human life. "If I wish to travel by plane to New York, reason tells me" says Mr. Russell "that it is better to take a plane which is going Constantinople. I suppose that those who think me unduly rational, consider that I ought to become so agitated at the airport as to jump into the first plane that I see, and when it lands me in Constantinople I ought to curse the people among whom I find myself for being Turks and not Americans." This is all true. But is it not reason that tells Mr. Russell why to take a plane to New York and not to Constantinople at a particular time, that is, it determines the end? It is so obvious that in the interest of a happy world reason must dictate not only the means but even the ends in the sphere of human relations.

The uniqueness of Bertrand Russell is that he is not merely a philosopher but also a bold agitator on moral and social issues—agitator who is always prepared to suffer for his convictions. To be a philosopher is one thing, he believes, to be a moral critic and an indignant citizen against an injustice is another.

On the questions of morality and the relation between sexes, Russell is bluntly heterodox. As a result he evoked considerable opposition in orthodox circles. He is opposed to conventional views of any kind. He tears old beliefs to smithereens, but—and this is unfortunate—he has given no positive beliefs which can recoup the faith of the world. He is a great sceptic no doubt, but he is not a prophet. And here lies his weakness as a philosopher and the defect of his philosophy. He can demolish the old dilapidated world, but he cannot construct a new.

Being a shrewd observer of things, Russell was probably the first leftist intellectual to see danger and

even to denounce the Soviet Russian experiment when all other intellectuals of the world were waxing eloquent over what they considered the "new civilisation."

He visited Soviet Russia as a member of an Unofficial Labour Delegation in 1920. The delegation arrived in Russia in great enthusiasm and it is said that when they first saw the Soviet flag on reaching the frontier, they spontaneously burst into song with the *Internationale* and *The Red Flag*.

But the delegation—particularly Russell—were soon disappointed. Russell wrote "I was infinitely unhappy in that atmosphere. . . . One who believes, as I do, that the free intellect is the chief engine of human progress, cannot but be fundamentally opposed to Bolshevism. The hopes which inspire communism are, in the main, as admirable as those instilled by the Sermon on the Mount, but they are held as fanatically and are as likely to do . . . much harm."

Immediately after his return from Russia Russell wrote the *Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*. In that book, which is still today as topical as it was then, Russell pointed out that the British Socialists were wrong in thinking that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" was merely a new form of representative government. He made it clear that "dictatorship" meant "dictatorship" whereas the word "proletariat" was used "in a Pickwickian sense" and actually meant the Communist Party or clique.

Russell is a philosopher who is abundantly gifted with a very high sense of humour. He would enjoy a joke even at his own expense. His retorts are as devastating as they are well-known. Whenever he faced hostile social opinion, and suffered due to his convictions, as well as when he was in financial distress or out of job; it was his sense of humour that kept him in good spirits. He would sometimes take an illogical position in relation with others, which would almost verge on personal vendetta on his part; one instance of this is his later dislike for Professor C. E. M. Joad when this eminent philosopher came to be described by certain British papers as "Britain's leading philosopher."

Whatever may be Russell's defects, or those of his philosophy, it is certain that his contribution to the development of modern thought is outstanding. *Principia Mathematica*, which he wrote in collaboration with Whitehead is accepted on all hands as one of the supreme achievements of human mind. (And it is said that no more than 20 people in the world have read it right through!)

His present concern is to prevent an atomic war. Early in July 1955, at the age of eighty-three, he called a press conference in London, and with the support of many Nobel Prize Winners of the world, raised his powerful voice against the production of hydrogen bomb and other nuclear weapons. Only six months earlier on the same question he said in a television broadcast: "I appeal as a human being to human beings. Remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so the way lies open to a new paradise; if you cannot, nothing lies before you but universal death."

I. C. C. F. Conference: A Report

by A Correspondent

AN Exhibition of paintings and photographs and two Seminars were the distinguishing features of the fourth Conference of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom held in Patna on December 14 and 15, under the presidentship of Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale.

The Exhibition of paintings and photographs was held on December 13 and 14 at the Wheeler Senate Hall of the Patna University. During the two days that it was open from 10 in the morning till 8 in the evening it drew eager crowds of students and other citizens of Patna who highly appreciated the rare opportunity that they had got of viewing some of the best paintings and photographs.

The larger collection of paintings in the Exhibition was of Mr. Gopal Ghosh, who had sent many of his bright and beautiful landscapes. Other painters represented in the Exhibition were Mr. K. K. Hebbar, Mr. Ara, Mr. Badri Narayan, Mr. Almelkar, Mr. Shivax Chavda and Mr. Homi Patel. The photographs were by Mr. Sunil Janah, one of the best photographers of India. It was a fine selection of over sixty photographs which gave a picturesque view of the various facets of Indian life and people.

"The Democratic Alternative" was the topic discussed at the first Seminar which was held for a whole day on Saturday the 13th. Prof. Narmadeshwar Prasad of the Patna University presided over the Seminar and prominent amongst the participants were Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, Mr. M. R. Masani, Prof. V. K. N. Menon, Mr. M. P. Mishra, Prof. Rajkrishna and Prof. Amlan Datta.

The discussion took place on the basis of a ninety-page thesis specially written for the Seminar by Miss Devaki Sreenivasan. The discussion centred around the various aspects of Liberalism and Gandhism and how to synthesise one with the other. There was also some discussion about Gramdan and the institutional patterns and land relations that should develop in Gramdan villages. One point that was particularly emphasised in the Seminar was the growing danger of the Statist tendency.

The other Seminar took place on Sunday morning. The topic for discussion was "the Integration of the Tribal People in Indian Society." Three papers had been prepared for the Seminar: the first one by Prof. Narmadeshwar Prasad of the Patna University, the second one by Dr. L. N. Chapekar of Bombay and the last one by Mr. Roy Burman of Calcutta.

Mr. B. S. Guha, Director of the Bihar Tribal Welfare Institute, presided over the Seminar and his was the most outstanding contribution to the discussion. With his long association with and experience of work amongst tribal peoples of Assam and Bihar he made a powerful plea for a psychological identification based on proper understanding of their life and culture. Prominent amongst others who participated in the

Seminar were Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale, Mr. Nabakishore Das, Mr. Ziauddin Ahmed, Mr. H. B. Chandra and Father Lace.

The inaugural session of the Conference was held on Saturday afternoon at the hall of Bihar Chamber of Commerce. The session was largely attended by delegates, members of the Reception Committee and prominent citizens. Mr. R. K. Desai of the Bihar State Financial Corporation welcomed the delegates on behalf of the Reception Committee, Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale, the President of the Conference, then delivered her presidential address.

In the course of her presidential address Mrs. Arundale made a powerful plea for a "perfect balance between head and heart." She said: "The power of the intellect is so great that one almost trembles in anticipation of what may come out of it. In both good and evil intellect can be a common factor, but the one single factor that transmutes the world from evil to good is the power of the heart. If we can develop the human being as we have developed science, we can rise to great heights of beautiful living."

Mrs. Arundale deprecated the use of art for politics or political purposes. She said: "The attempt to use art for creating differences is indeed a tragedy. When politicians try to use art, they do not use it, they destroy it, for the spirit of the creative artist cannot be used." Emphasising the vital necessity of cultural freedom, she said: "When art is created to order, it becomes like a machine-made article." Mrs. Arundale's was an inspiring address and it was heard with rapt attention.

The General Meeting of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom was held on Sunday afternoon. Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale was in the Chair. Delegates who attended the Meeting had come from Madras, Bombay, Delhi and Calcutta. Some delegates had come from Orissa and Andhra. There were also a number of delegates from Patna.

The Meeting adopted the report and the audited statement of accounts. It sanctioned the new arrangement proposed for *Quest*, the bi-monthly journal sponsored by the Committee according to which the journal will be converted into a quarterly of criticism and constructive thought and the editorial responsibility will be entrusted to Mr. Abu Syed Ayyub and Prof. Amlan Datta, both of Calcutta, as Joint Editors. The journal will, however, continue to be published from Bombay. The Meeting placed on record its high appreciation of the selfless services rendered to the journal by the retiring Editor, Mr. Nissim Ezekiel.

The Meeting also adopted a plan of action. Apart from vigorous attempts to enlarge membership and establish new local groups and activate old groups, the Committee will set up four study groups. The first group consisting of Mr. Purshottam Tricumdas, Mr. M. P. Mishra, M. P., and Prof. V. K. N. Menon will

collect information about laws and procedures which are repugnant to self-respect and human dignity. The second group, of which Mr. R. K. Desai was appointed the Convenor, will study import restrictions on the entry of books and periodicals and photographic and other materials required by artists. The third group which will work under the guidance of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan will study the institutional patterns and land relations to be developed in Gramdan villages. The last group will study the problem of State patronage to arts and literature and its effect on the freedom of artists and writers. It was also decided to undertake a study of developments in Kerala under the communist regime.

Messages wishing success to the Conference were received amongst others from Mr. Dennis de Rougemont, the Chairman of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, Mr. Ghorayeb, the Middle East representative of the Congress, the Japan Committee for Cultural Freedom and Sir John Latham on behalf of the Australian Association for Cultural Freedom.

The Meeting then elected an Executive Committee consisting of the following: Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale, Mr. Sampurnanand, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, Mr. Bhaktavatsalam, Mr. M. R. Masani, Mr. Asoka Mehta, Mr. Jaipal Singh, Mr. Eric da Costa, Mr. Laxmanshastri Joshi, Mr. Ramsingh, Prof. V. K. N. Menon, Prof. Amlan Datta, Prof. Narmadeshwar Prasad, Mr. M. P. Mishra and Mr. R. K. Desai. The newly elected Executive Committee which held its first meeting later in the night co-opted Mr. Philip Spratt, Mr. J. B. H. Wadia and Mr. V. B. Karnik as members and elected the latter two as Hon. Secretaries.

The last function of the Conference was a public meeting held at the hall of the Bihar Chamber of Commerce on Sunday evening. Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale presided and speeches were delivered by Mr. M. R. Masani, Mr. M. P. Mishra and Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. Mr. Masani gave an account of the work done by the Indian Committee and by the international organisation, the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Mr. Mishra dealt with the danger to freedom and democracy represented by the international communist movement and urged the necessity of vigorous activities for the defence of the values of free society. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan called attention to the dilemma before the civilised world posed by the conflicting claims of individualism and collectivism. He expressed himself in favour of individualism, but urged the necessity of reforming and changing the individual. This, he said, would be a human revolution, the greatest revolution to be experienced by human society. In her concluding remarks the President, Mrs. Rukminidevi Arundale spoke about higher human values and pleaded for their acceptance and vigorous assertion. She also thanked the Reception Committee for the arrangements made for the Conference and the students and citizens of Patna for their help and co-operation.

Patna, December 15, 1957.

A MEETING WITH DJILAS' WIFE—Contd. from page 2

"My husband had his political ideas," she told me. "I don't know about politics. I know only that he is my husband."

She has been able to keep her job in a bank. As I looked around it was clear that it was a struggle to keep the household going. I asked about Alexei and how he fared at school. Fine, she said, except for one or two incidents. When he had told the children that his father was going to buy him a bicycle, they had said:

"Your father is in jail. How can he buy you a bicycle?" Alexei's answer was, "My father is in jail for freedom."

Djilas gets the same treatment as other prisoners. He is allowed to see his family once a month, write and receive one letter a month, get one parcel a month. Although in solitary, he is in good spirits. But it is a jail, and Sremska Mitrovica prison is a cold one, and the winter months have resulted in his developing arthritis and rheumatic pains. To help against the cold, his wife knitted him a wool pullover.

He is now permitted a daily walk in the prison yard, to get a bit of the sun. From other sources I learned that he had asked for a list of books to read, but no books from outside have been allowed him. He was told he could read the books in the prison library—the dreary, dogmatic books by Communist hacks that he has already read too well.

His wife told me that Djilas's mother, with a bad heart, did not know of the new trial and she was afraid to tell her.

A big question at the trial was how *The New Class* got out of the country and into the hands of its American publisher, Frederick Praeger. In a city full of rumours one hears (I don't know how authentically) that when Djilas was arrested his house was searched and two copies of the manuscripts were confiscated, but that there was a third somewhere. Mrs. Djilas will not talk of this subject.

At present Djilas is working on a "non-political" book, about one of the great Montenegrin prince-bishops who was a champion of his people's freedom. But there is another book of his, finished before he went to prison, which tells the story of his life and of Monenegro between two wars.

It was submitted to a Belgrade publisher first but the manuscripts returned with the curt comment that it was "below the literary standard" which the firm set for its books. It will be published, I gather, by Harcourt Brace in New York. I saw a letter quoting the publisher's reader as saying that it was "the most beautiful book that has been written in the language."

As I said goodbye, Alexei came with his mother to the door. "I know English," he said. "One, two, three, four, five." I remarked on how alive his face was. "He is like my husband," said Mrs. Djilas, "only he is blond and my husband is dark. "Milovan," she added, "is a very handsome man".

Review

Russia Revisited

By Louis Fischer, Published by Jonathan Cape, 30 Bedford Square, London; Pp. 260; price: 25 sh.

MR. FISCHER calls this book *Russia Revisited*, but its scope is not limited to Russia as the title would suggest. The first part of the book records Fischer's impressions of his twenty days' visit to post-Stalin Russia and the later half surveys graphically the situation in East European Satellites, especially in Poland and Hungary.

Fischer visited Russia last year (the date has not been mentioned anywhere in the book) sometime after the Poznan uprising and before the Hungarian Revolution. He is very friendly and sympathetically disposed towards the Russian people many among whom were his old friends. Naturally, the main purpose of his visit to Russia was to study the prevailing mood of the people and the changes in the political climate reflected in their mood. The political climate after the 20th Congress he finds surprisingly free from the fear of the ubiquitous state apparatus even though the state machinery itself remains more or less intact. Material condition of the people has not changed, but the political climate is vastly different. Now the people are free to meet foreigners and discuss with them, though in private, all sorts of topics. But nobody is quite sure how long this relaxation would last and how far one could stretch the limits of his freedom. There is no change in the system, but those at the helm of affairs feel it unnecessary to exercise their all-embracing power over the obedient population. The people, therefore, though relaxed in their mood still are wary of exceeding the limits set by the state and are just not willing to take the risks of freedom. This is because the four decades of Soviet rule have succeeded in striking terror in the hearts of the people at the mere thought of revolt. The regime has succeeded in creating a docile population and making the people obedient puppets at large. The four decades of party dictatorship have embraced their life so thoroughly and completely that they simply shudder at the thought of the consequent vacuum and chaos in their life if the infallible party ceases to guide their destiny. There is, therefore, little popular pressure for change in the system and, if the system changes at all, the change will be brought about by the pressure from above or by the violent struggle for power in the upper party echelon. This is the depressing impression Mr. Fischer brings back from his visit to Russia.

But if the people in post-Stalin Russia are left in a convalescent mood the attempt at de-Stalinisation in some of the East European countries only whetted the people's urge for freedom and induced in them the spirit of defiance which burst out in the form of national communism in Poland and exploded in Hungary when Russian tanks tried to suppress it. The blind imposition of Soviet Communism on East Euro-

pean countries gave rise to the twin urges for national independence and personal freedom and the post-Stalin history of East European communism bristles with dangerous symptoms which point up the popular disillusionment about the communist myth and portend the consequent disintegration of the Soviet monolith in East Europe. The general picture in East European countries, in contradistinction to Russian scene, is of popular unrest—from its articulate and pointed form in Poland to the latent and stunted form in Albania. Fischer surveys the scene impressionistically and concludes on a note of subdued optimism. He sees Soviet communism disintegrating and the Moscow monolith crumbling in East Europe. The post-Stalin developments in and outside Russia have weakened Soviet Communism beyond the hope of staging a recovery and the world is left to witness the death agonies of the communist myth. Mr. Fischer has tried to reconstruct this human drama as it unfolded itself in Poland and Hungary last year and has eminently succeeded in bringing out the basic implications underlying it. "Freedom must win" he concludes, "it is only a matter of time." But how long will it be depends on the outcome of this fascinating struggle between the basic urge of the people for decent and dignified existence as human beings and the totalitarian system which denies them that very basic human privilege.

B. K. DESAI

D. R. S. NEWS

Mr. Chaudhury Dhara Singh, President, Indian National Dock Workers Federation and the editor of *Weekly Kerala Mail* spoke on the "Situation in Kerala," on Friday, December 6. Mr. Adam Adil was in the Chair.

Young Asian Artists Exhibition

Two Bombay painters, Mr. V. S. Gaitonde and Mr. R. V. Savant, won awards at Young Asian Artists Exhibition held in Tokyo from 12th to 17th November. The Exhibition was organised by the Japan Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Mr. V. S. Gaitonde won one of the Fleischmann awards of 100,000 yen, while Mr. R. V. Savant won one of the Stralem prizes. The prize awarded to Mr. Savant is of 100,000 yen.

The \$1500 Grand Prize was awarded to the young Japanese painter, Josaku Maeda. The Grand Prize, which is in the form of a scholarship for study in Paris is granted by the International Congress for Cultural Freedom.

Altogether 441 exhibits were received from Burma, Ceylon, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, Philippines and Thailand. Of these 90 were from Japan and 87 from India.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

The Plan, Sir, God willing, provided the Communist Party does not gain any ascendancy in the economy than what they have today, will be achieved.

—Finance Minister T. T. Krishnamachari,
Free Press Journal, December 14.

✓ Communism helps an easy interpretation of history and hence it often fascinates me.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Sunday Chronicle*,
December 15.

The Bhoodan or Gramdan experiment conducted by Acharya Bhave is the real socialism which India could practice and also demonstrate before the world.

—Mr. Shriman Narayan, *A.I.C.C. Economic Review*,
December 15.

✓ If Sarvodaya as it is, is found to suit the Indian conditions and yields best results, it is nothing but Marxism applied to India. One may not like to call it Marxism, but it is.

—“Krantī”, *Monthly New Age*, December 1957.

I refuse to be hanged because of my “mis-deeds” until such time as my honourable (communist) members opposite take charge of this government, in which case I have been assured by my communist friends that they will probably swing me first.

—Finance Minister T. T. Krishnamachari,
Hindustan Times, November 29.

The economic consequences of Mr. Krishna Menon need now be taken into consideration.

—*The Eastern Economist*, November 29.

In Asia politics is food and food is politics.

—Mr. M. A. deSilva, *New Leader*, November 11.

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service,
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3/Rs. 2 for
members of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Name:

Address:

Signature

But today, at least in the country, the communists have become very very respectable!

—Mr. Tridib Choudhury, M.P., *Thought*,
December 14.

The Second Plan Frame was an imperfect essay of an imaginative person in projecting his ideas into the future without being bound by mundane considerations such as shortage of finance, man power and resources.

—Finance Minister T. T. Krishnamachari *Free Press Journal*, December 14.

Breathes there a Congressman who fears the Congress President? He would be a bold man who answers in the affirmative.

—“Junius”, *Swarajya*, December 2.

The experiment with parliamentary democracy has completely failed in India.

—Jayaprakash Narayan, *Hindustan Times*,
December 18.

Communalism and communism are the two facets of the same sociological and political phenomenon. The two facets are inextricably joined to each other.

—Mr. Shriman Narayan, *AICC Economic Review*, December 1.

Though nobody knows for how long, it is now Noon's day in Pakistan which is, of course, not to say that it is Pakistan's non-day!

—“Junius”, *Swarajya*, December 21.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

A three-day Seminar on “Education for Democracy” was held in Bangalore on 22, 23 and 24 December. Mr. S. Nijalingappa the Chief Minister of Mysore, inaugurated the Seminar. Prominent amongst those who participated in the Seminar were Mr. V. Venkappa, Minister for Education, Mr. P. L. Sastry, M.A. M.L.C., Prof. M. V. Krishna Rao, Prof. C. V. Srinivas Murthy, Prof. Venkateshachar, Rev. I. L. Thomas, Mr. A. N. Krishna Rao, Mr. Philip Spratt and Mr. M. A. Venkata Rao. The Seminar was held at the Hall of Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

* * *

Under the auspices of the Asian Office of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan addressed a public meeting in New Delhi on December 17 on the prospects of parliamentary democracy in India.