

JULY 1953

Bilingualism For India

by P. Kodanda Rao

IN his Presidential Address to the Indian Languages Development Conference, held recently in Poona, Mahamahopadhyaya P. V. Kane, a former Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University and a great scholar and patriot, observed that it would not be in keeping with the dignity and self-respect of India to retain a foreign language like English as the official language of the Union and the medium of instruction in the Universities for an indefinite period. He added that there was probably no *free* country in the world where instruction in the schools and even in the University was imparted through the medium of a foreign language. His main objection to the English language was that it was *foreign* and therefore its retention hurt the self-respect of India, particularly when she became free and independent. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, no less a scholar and patriot, claimed that the English language was one of the languages "given us by our Goddess Saraswati," and pleaded that India should not give up the English language, which was a universal language and the language of modern science, research, politics and scholarship. (Public speech in Madura, March 23, 1953). Mr. Kane admitted that today and perhaps for the next fifty years English had no equal competitor for higher administration and education in the regional languages of India and that it might have to be continued beyond the fifteen-year limit envisaged in the Indian Constitution. His attitude seems to be that the English language should be tolerated for the minimum possible time as an inescapable evil, while Mr. Rajagopalachari would welcome its retention as desirable.

"Foreign" seems a political concept, denoting nationality. But no language has a nationality. The English language is not of the British nationality,

for people of the American, Indian, Japanese, Russian, German, and other nationalities speak it in varying numbers. Indeed, languages have no political, religious, racial or sex correlations. Anybody of any race, religion, sex, profession or nationality can learn any language for work or enjoyment if he or she has the need and the opportunity, even as he or she can learn any branch of knowledge, Arts, Sciences and Technology. Nobody is born with a language; everybody acquires it after birth, even as he acquires other items of knowledge and skill, like eating, dressing, playing, etc. The English language, like any other element of culture, cannot be "foreign" to anybody; it is new until acquired.

The regional languages, including Hindi, are claimed to be "Indian" languages because they are spoken *in* India, though not by *all* Indians. All the languages listed in the Linguistic Survey of India are "Indian" languages. In that special sense English also is an "Indian" language, because some Indians speak it, and more particularly the Anglo-Indians, who are Indian nationals.

Another prevailing concept is the one of "my" language and "your" language. It has led to much linguistic patriotism and imperialism and mutual jealousies and rivalries both in India and elsewhere. But there can be no "my" language since "you" can learn it. In which case it becomes "ours."

Urdu is not the language of the Muslim, for millions of Muslims in the world do not speak it and millions of non-Muslims speak it.

In evolving the language policy of India, as of other countries, the appropriate criterion is communicational utility and not historicity. For language is a medium for the communication of thoughts. Few that love *Shakuntala* or *Hamlet* speak today the languages they spoke. The nature and number of languages which one *should* learn depend on his communicational needs, though one should be free to learn as many languages as one pleases. Of any language, most people need only a working knowledge, and only a few scholars need intensive knowledge.

The maximum communicational needs of most people in India can be met with minimum strain by bilingualism of the regional languages and English. Today the local regional language is the medium of the lower levels of administration while English is the medium of the higher and national and international levels. One language, English, has served both national and international purposes. It is not necessary to have two languages, one for the national and another for international purposes. The retention of the present horizontal bilingualism in administration will involve the least dislocation without lowering efficiency.

In education it is best to have vertical bilingualism of the regional language and English. Broadly speaking, in the post-primary stages including the University, the regional language may be used as the medium of the Arts subjects, and English as the medium of the Sciences and Technology. And every pupil should be required to take at least one course in each of the three branches of knowledge. Thus, every pupil will have a rounded education and be familiar with two languages, the regional language and English.

Eminent Indian educationists have pleaded that English was necessary for higher education in India. But it is even more necessary for almost everybody. Most people have to work for a living, and have to learn to do their work. It pays to go in for up-to-date efficiency. The most up-to-date knowledge in most occupations is more readily and inexpensively available in the English language than in any other, because of the large circulation of published matter. Every Indian worker, skilled, semi-skilled or even unskilled, stands to gain by acquiring a rough working knowledge of the English language.

Hindi is as "foreign" as English to those who have not learnt it. If learnt, English is far more useful than Hindi. Hindi, or for that matter any other language, may be learnt by those who need it for any purpose, but it need not be learnt by all Indians for the sake of national unity. Switzerland is a single nation but has at least three languages. England and America have a single language, but two nationalities. If a common second language be needed to cement national unity, English will do it far more effectively than any other language.

Notes

Riots in Slave Land

THE riots in East Germany and Czechoslovakia have exploded the Soviet myth as nothing else has done. The workers of these two advanced countries of Europe have exposed Soviet rule for what it is. All the gallons of ink and the reams of paper hitherto expended on propaganda have been completely reduced to nothing by these sudden sparks of the workers' anger. These riots serve to indicate the real mood of the people in the satellite countries. They should inspire the Western Democracies to follow liberating policies. Unfortunately they seem to be engaged instead in a policy of appeasement.

Ignoring Facts

PANDIT Jawaharlal Nehru's flamboyant performance on television may do credit to his volatile personality, but certainly it does no credit to the Prime Minister of an expectant nation that has launched upon a great experiment in democracy. Eternal vigilance is said to be the price of democratic liberties, but if his television interview is any guide, Prime Minister Nehru seems to believe the exact opposite. His remarks are not calculated to warn the people about the possible dangers to their security about which he, as the head of the Government, must certainly be conscious. Rather, he seems to be anxious to lull them into a false sense of

safety. But he should at least realise that his latest observations about China and Russia contradict much of what he had only recently said. For instance, he now says that there has been a marked change in the Russian attitude and that Russia desires peace. But did he not earlier pay a glowing tribute to Stalin as a man of peace? By that calculation, a change in the Russian attitude after Stalin should mean war, but Nehru says it is peace!

About China he says that she has no desire to expand and there is absolutely no external danger

FREEDOM FIRST

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

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

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

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

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

to India. If that is so, why did he, only a few days ago, warn the Darjeeling people to guard against infiltration as much as against armed attack? And why did he ask the Northern frontier people to note carefully whether the visitor from across the frontier was a friend or a foe? The Prime Minister seems to be determined to ignore certain obvious facts such as the rape of Tibet and the construction of roads and stationing of troops along the Indian border, and a person who neglects facts cannot be easily consistent.

The Copenhagen Fiasco

THE third World Congress of Democratic Women at Copenhagen will not mean, and was not calculated to mean, freedom for womenkind in general, but it has meant freedom for the tormented soul of at least one person, namely Sophie Ivanenko of Bulgaria, who came as a delegate and escaped into freedom. The scheming organisers of the Congress must have been left wondering whether it was worth while organising a world show which could be turned at one stroke by a mere individual into the laughing stock of the entire globe. The dialectics of dishonesty sometimes do recoil in this strange fashion! They must be having further trouble in trying to convince the rest of the delegates about the evil nature of the delegate from Bulgaria—and convince them in such a manner that they do not go out and contradict one another.

Not the Satellite Way

KING Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia fled his kingdom and took refuge in Bangkok from where he proposed to strive for the independence of his country. Since then although he has returned to his country his determination to free it stands. There has been much rejoicing at his action in the Asian countries and rightly so. But those who have used this incident merely to snipe at the French imperialists have not drawn all the necessary conclusions that they should have. If they had carefully noted the pronouncements he made while leaving his country they would have found that he deliberately chose this path and refused to follow

in the traitorous footsteps of Ho Chi Minh. He had, for instance, impressed on his people the necessity of endeavouring "to avoid any recourse to force in order that our country shall not be weakened when we obtain it." He further said, "in acting thus, the U.N. will record that we have always acted in conformity with its ideal of peace." He is planning to appeal to the U.N. for securing his objectives—which means an appeal to the collective conscience of the world. That is the way to fight for freedom—not the satellite way of Viet Minh or the fifth column way of the communist parties.

Physician, Heal Thyself

THE Health Minister of India Raj Kumari Amrit Kaur found everything wonderful in the world of Soviet medicine. The doctors were wonderful, the hospitals were wonderful, the patients were wonderful—and presumably their diseases too were wonderful! She seems to have fallen a victim to the Soviet practice of brandishing statistics, forgetting the statistician's primary note of caution: Statistics lie the most. She did not find it necessary to enquire into the psychological condition of the doctors, a flood of light on which was thrown recently by the fiasco of the Moscow doctors' confessions! The cat of the Raj Kumari's praise, however, was out of the bag the moment she referred to the Soviet opposition to birth control. She said with evident approval that people there were surprised when Indian people talked of birth control. A person who does not know or does not care to know that the problem of birth control in the context of 296 persons per square mile is different from that in the context of 23 per square mile as in Russia need not be taken seriously.

However, if one has to take her seriously we must say with "Insaf" of the Hindustan Times: "If she is convinced that the Russian methods are the right ones, then in all honesty she should tell the Prime Minister and the Congress Party and either convert them to her views or resign her post, join the ranks of the communists and campaign for the adoption of their creed by the country at large."

Cutting The Gordian Knot

IT has been said that the essence of tragedy, in life as in drama, lies not in the clash between good and evil but in that between good and good. So long as the fight in Korea was between the Republic of Korea and its United Nations allies on the one hand and the communist aggressors on the other, the situation was a clear-cut one and only the perverse outside the ranks of the communists could have many doubts as to where the right lay. The element of real tragedy now enters the Korean scene with the spectacle of a clash between divergent forces among those who have so far been fighting shoulder to shoulder and in the horrible possibilities opened up by the cleavage. It is difficult in such

a situation to say where justice lies. Only those who would like to see the loss of Korean freedom and the undoing of a magnificent experiment in collective security can rejoice at such a situation.

The U.N. case, as explained by President Eisenhower in his letter to President Rhee in such an appealing manner, is: There is a time for fighting and a time for negotiations; unification of the country must now be pursued by political means; in the case of the prisoners of war, the principle of voluntary repatriation has been established; and whether or not the South Korean Government agrees with the U. N. view, it must—as a measure of solidarity of the free world—bow to it. Perhaps there is to be

read between the lines of President Eisenhower's appeal a hint of the fact that the United States is itself not happy about the U.N. position which the pressure of its allies has forced upon it.

To this plea President Syngman Rhee's answer is that there are times in history when a nation must stand up in defence of its existence and vital beliefs, even if this for the moment invites the destruction of its own existence. The Koreans would recall that, after World War II, the U.N. had declared for a free and united Korea and appointed a Commission to bring this into being; that the Commission led by Mr. K. P. S. Menon, was able to organise a free and fair election in South Korea but was stopped by Soviet troops at the 38th Parallel which they were prevented from so much as crossing; that thereupon the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution declaring that the only legitimate Government in the whole of Korea was that of the Republic of Korea headed by President Rhee; that on June 25, 1950, the Soviet puppets from North Korea attacked the Republic; that the U.N. General Assembly authorised General MacArthur to march North and reunite the country; that for President Eisenhower now to hope for reunification while the Chinese aggressors remain in North Korea is utopian and unrealistic.

In regard to the prisoners of war, President Rhee would recall that many of these surrendered to the U.N. on the strength of U.N. leaflets dropped over their ranks promising them safe conduct and asylum; that many of them were found to be members of the South Korean army, no less than 50,000 of whom had earlier been "released" and pressed into service on the communist side and others were members of the Chinese National army similarly conscripted, that many of them had tattooed themselves with anti-communist slogans in order to shame the Americans into not surrendering them to the communists; that the U.N. had made a moral principle of voluntary repatriation; that as recently as May 13, 1953, the U.N. terms proposed to the communists had included a provision for the unconditional release of all North Korean prisoners on the signing of an armistice and for only the Chinese prisoners to be handed over to the Repatriation Commission. The Koreans would then go on to point out that the cumulative effect of the present compromise now negotiated by the U.N., with a provision for 90 days of brain-washing and bludgeoning described as "explanations" supervised by a commission consisting of two Soviet satellites and with a neutral umpire whose spokesmen had publicly declared themselves to be against the principle of voluntary repatriation (see *Freedom First*, June 1953, pp. 5-6), was to betray the trust placed by these Koreans in the U.N. By this agreement a vital principle was thus sought to be smothered with an apparent show of its observance. President Rhee would then point out that the way in which these prisoners, even after Korean guards had been replaced by American guards, fought their way out of the prison camps has proved in action what the

real wishes of the prisoners were.

Here then are the two points of view—both right, perhaps both incomplete in the larger world context. How shall lovers of freedom choose between them?

As far back as January, *Freedom First* had sensed the coming conflict between freedom and sham "peace" and had warned against the forces of appeasement at work. In our June issue, we had in an article entitled *Release the Prisoners* asked the U.N. to cut the Gordian Knot by releasing unconditionally all prisoners who desired to revert to civilian status in South Korea or elsewhere. The tragedy is that the U.N. under pressure of its weaker members, preferred to pursue another path, and it was left to President Rhee to execute that policy.

The communists and their dupes in the Indian press have been accustomed to calling Syngman Rhee an American puppet. It is not in the nature of puppets to stand up to their alleged masters and risk their own position. Syngman Rhee is nobody's stooge, as his whole record testifies. For his country's freedom and unity, he has more than once risked his life, withstood cruel tortures and suffered long years of exile. He is the unquestioned father of his nation and is backed by the overwhelming support of his people. Sir Winston Churchill has expressed his displeasure at President Rhee's action. He is also reported to be concerned over the rising of the workers of East Berlin. This is not to be wondered at, since both are incidents in the war of liberation against Soviet imperialism.

It is a tribute to the perverse state of present-day world politics that even responsible persons can condemn others for deeds they themselves commit. Thus Dr. Radhakrishna criticises President Rhee for putting his country's interest over the interests of the U.N. as a whole. But has Dr. Radhakrishna been known to admonish similarly Sheikh Abdulla, the Premier of Kashmir, when he boldly warns that nobody has a right to settle the future of Kashmir without the consent of the Kashmir people?

We agree that the interests of the U.N. should be generally supreme—but not when the U.N. itself is driven to sacrifice the interests of a small and helpless country and its own cherished principles. It has been left to General James van Fleet, the former U.N. Commander, to concede that while the armistice terms might be in the interests of the U.S., they are against the interests of the Korean people. "President Rhee had no alternative," attests the American General.

Whom should lovers of freedom have supported in 1935, the League of Nations or Abyssinia? The rape of Abyssinia commenced the cycle which was to end in World War II. There is a distinct smell of a Far Eastern Munich in the terms of the armistice the U.N. is about to enter into with the communist aggressors. It can be no pleasure to Dr. Rhee to have to choose between his loyalty to the U.N. and his loyalty to his country's freedom and the rights of thousands of Korean prisoners. Who can, in the

(Continued on Page 5)

Memories Of Yusuf Meherally

by Bertram D. Wolfe

On Thursday, 2nd of July falls the third anniversary of the Late Yusuf Meherally. We are happy that we are able to publish on the occasion an article on Meherally from the celebrated author of THREE WHO MADE A REVOLUTION.

YUSUF MEHERALLY was one of those people that one would gladly go half way around the world to meet, and despite all our differences in background, training and the like, I felt an instant kinship with him as he seemed to with me.

I first met Yusuf in 1930 at the home of V.F. Calverton, Editor of *Modern Monthly*. Yusuf had asked Calverton to introduce him to a number of American writers and Calverton had turned his home for an afternoon into a reception centre for Yusuf Meherally. He was dressed then in a close-fitting grey linen coat of Indian cut with standup collar. He wore a Chandi cap. He seemed slight, slender, frail, but full of the breath of life. He seemed to be able to converse with anybody on anything which interested his companion and eager to question each person on any subject on which that person seemed to be informed or expert.

I spent several hours with him then, after which I did not see him again for many years. I forgot his very existence until he appeared in New York sometime in the late 40's. It was in the winter of 1946 or the spring of 1947. He was already in extremely poor health, was suffering from a bad heart and his doctors had stringently ordered him to rest and do nothing. He spent many hours of the day flat on his back in bed, but it was utterly impossible for him to

be idle. Calverton had died long ago and this time he used Louis Fischer as a means of communication with the people in New York whom he wanted to meet.

The circumstances of his wanting to meet me touched me rather deeply. He said: "One of the tasks I was given when I set out for America was to bring you the greetings and the thanks of my cell mates who shared imprisonment with me. We spent many happy hours reading your *Portrait of Mexico*. We read it, studied it and discussed it together and I have come to thank you on behalf of all of us for the pleasure and enlightenment you afforded us in our prison cell."

One day I arranged to take him in a station-wagon which had specially deflated its baloon tires in order that it could run over the sand dunes. In it we toured the entire tip of the Cape, both the inner shore of the great Bay and the outer shore of the Atlantic Ocean. When we reached the extreme tip of the peninsula I explained to him that it was known as Race Point, because a great tide raced around it where the waters of the Atlantic Ocean and the waters of Massachusetts Bay came together.

"Would you stop here for a while?" he asked shyly. We stopped and he walked down to the point where ocean and bay waters came together, took off his sandals and waded into the swirling water. When he came out his face was lighted up with an expression of happiness that I had not seen before.

"We Indians believe that every confluence of water is a sacred place," he explained to me.

I realized then that in his spirit was a blend of socialist internationalist philosophy with the ancient faith of his own people. His reaction had not been Moslem, but Hindu, and that impulsive action gave me a fresh and deeper insight into his mind.

I never heard Yusuf speak at any length of Nehru or Patel, but he spoke frequently to me of his earlier relations with Mohammed Ali Jinnah under whose tutelage and in whose chambers he had read law, and of Mahatma Gandhi, with whom he had had arguments on industrialization and socialism and other topics but for whom he felt a love of a son for a father and of a disciple for a revered master.

He spoke of his former master, Jinnah, in tones of resolute rejection, but without bitterness. On the whole, Yusuf preferred to talk of things which inspired his enthusiasm rather than matters which he felt called upon to condemn.

Only when he spoke of the negative aspects of British rule in India, and of the monstrous moral corruption spread by the Stalin regime among intellectuals and workers, did I ever hear him become

(Continued from Page 4)

circumstances, blame him for acting as he has done?

It is sad to find that in this country there should be men to advocate the use of violence and force by foreign troops in Korea to suppress an Asian country and its government. We trust President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles will think a thousand times before they venture to take any step in that direction. If the free countries of Asia need the United States, the United States needs friends in Asia even more. Any hostile act against the Korean Government and people will not only lessen the confidence and the trust of their friends throughout Asia, but will earn thereby the contempt of millions who will find in their action the best justification for believing that the future in Asia lies with those who align themselves with the Soviets and their Chinese satellites.

It is good to know, as we go to press, that the first meetings between President Rhee and Assistant Secretary of State Robertson has made progress "in removing misunderstanding" between allies who have fought together for freedom and that the U.S. is refusing to allow itself to be stampeded into precipitate moves against the valiant Republic of Korea.

eloquent on negative things. On English rule in India, he was tireless.

When England finally decided to withdraw from India, I watched Meherally's bitterness suddenly ebb away. There was no rancour in him. Thenceforward he talked very little about British crimes in India, though he had spent much of his life in prison because of British rule. Now he spoke rather of the good things the British had contributed to Indian civilization and culture, above all the sense of justice and safeguard of individual and civil rights that are inherent in the British tradition. He jested about the fact that in the vast sub-continent of India there were so many peoples and dialects that often the only common language in which Indian intellectuals could communicate with each other was the "language of the oppressor." That language, he told me, opened to the Indians a great literature and tradition which might be used to enrich their own.

I teased him about the "British sense of Justice" which had kept him so long in jail. He answered in deep earnest: "Even while they oppressed us, they were uncomfortable about it. A hunger strike in a British jail could get me the Bible and your book to read. In Hitler's jails or in Stalin's it would only have gotten me before a firing squad. Gandhi's whole code of non-violent resistance to the evil of foreign rule was predicated on the unspoken assumption that the English had a better nature to which we could appeal. In the land of blood purges and concentration camps that Stalin has built to sully the name of socialism the great organized campaigns of non-violent resistance to evil could never have gotten started. At Gandhi's first word of protest, he would have disappeared forever from view. The English at least felt that they had to report his defiance, even while they ridiculed it and imprisoned him. And they were always terrified lest he die in one of his protest hunger strikes. That is why he taught us to hate the evil things the English did but not to hate the English, or ever to despair of their regeneration or ours."

On one occasion, I told Yusuf the story of the conversion of an American communist intellectual to the intellectual code of freedom and fair play in culture as in other fields.

When I told this story to Yusuf he plied me with questions and tried to elicit more and more details of this spiritual conversion, like a child trying to get more of a story that he has enjoyed. When I had finally exhausted every aspect, Yusuf said:

"Now start all over again, and tell me the whole story once more. Just as you did before. Don't leave out anything."

"Why, in Heaven's name? You've heard all there is to it. It won't be any different, and I can't add another thing."

"This time I want to memorize it," he answered, "so that I can tell it to Gandhiji when I get back to India. He'll love it." I had to start all over again, and Yusuf would not let me omit a single detail.

I told Yusuf about a change of heart that I had undergone in my attitude towards Gandhi as an Indian leader.

Yusuf was quite moved when he learned that I had publicly acknowledged my erroneous estimate of Gandhi. When Gandhi's birthday came in 1947, Yusuf came to my home and presented me with a Gandhi birthday gift. It was the lovely limited edition of the birthday tribute to Gandhi printed on Gandhi's 75th birthday.

It is the most cherished book in my library, and into its pages I have inserted one of the photographs of Yusuf's face taken in New York before he left.

When he left our shores to return to India, I helped him pack his bags and was shocked by the massiveness and weight of his baggage. He had accumulated hundreds of books, magazines and manuscript articles, including some of mine, which he intended to try to publish in India. He had had too much baggage when he came. Every Indian, it seems to me, carries too much luggage. Perhaps because, unlike us, they are accustomed to many servants and human labour power for personal service is cheap and plentiful in India. But Yusuf's bags were laden far more than any others with the dead weight of books. They contrasted strangely with his frail slight person. With his bad heart, he could not lift the lightest of his bags. For that matter, I with my good heart couldn't either. It was as if he had tried to pack all our art, all our literature, all our culture, and all the mementoes of all the men and women he had known and the places he had seen into his baggage to take them all back with him to India. I secured the help of three men in and around the hotel, and the four of us managed to get the slight Yusuf and the massive baggage into a single cab.

My last words to him were an earnest admonestation that he should slacken up on his party work, his endless journeys and speeches and endless giving of himself to all the sundry. I urged him to conserve his strength and to communicate his thoughts henceforth through books and articles.

He half promised, but then he began to talk of the great eagerness of the Indian masses to hear and learn and the great need to teach what one could. "How can I deny myself to any one" he asked, "at any place or at any hour? There is so much to be done. And there is such joy in doing it."

I was not surprised when mutual friends wrote me from India that Yusuf's frail heart had ceased to beat. He had given it to his people to the very end.

It only remains to say that he has left so profound an impression on so many people that the mention of my friendship with him to almost any new arrival from India serves as a credential. People come and seek me out because they have heard that he was my friend. And I am sure that if I ever get an opportunity to visit the land of which he revealed so much to me, his name will serve as my passport there.

Is Krishna Menon Pro-Communist?

SOME years back, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan expressed the view that any country which allowed a communist into its Cabinet of Ministers was endangering its security, since the primary loyalty of a communist lay towards a foreign power. The election of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon to Parliament and the speculation about his possible nomination to a position in the Union Cabinet recalls Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's warning and raises the question whether that warning applies to those who, while not members of the Communist Party, are known to be pro-communist.

But then is Krishna Menon pro-communist?

Let his whole record speak.

Krishna Menon certainly did not start his political activities in the communist camp. He was a follower of Mrs. Annie Beasant, the Theosophist. When he formed the India League, he and his organisation were in the early thirties often attacked by the Communist Party as reactionaries and even their meetings were disturbed.

The change came when the Seventh Congress of the Comintern adopted the United Front line in Moscow in 1935. This was followed by a change in the attitude of the British communists towards Krishna Menon and his India League. From disruptionists and opponents, they became ardent friends willing to oblige. In course of time, more than one of them like Reginald Bridgeman, Secretary of that well-known communist front, the League Against Imperialism, and Ben Bradley, who had played a prominent part in the Twenties in organising the Indian Communist Party, came to serve as members of the Executive Committee of the India League and their co-operation and support were welcomed by Krishna Menon.

When the British Labour Party called upon its members to dissociate themselves from the "United Front" activities with the communists, Krishna Menon was among those who defied this instruction. He had already been a Borough Councillor in St. Pancras as a nominee of the British Labour Party and was a prospective Labour candidate for Dundee from 1938 to 1941 when, however, his association with communist-controlled organisations resulted in his candidature being rejected by the Labour Party.

Undeterred by this, Krishna Menon continued close association with the communists. He wrote occasional articles on India for the *Daily Worker* and appeared on the platform with Mr. William Gallacher, communist M.P., and such well-known fellow-travellers as Mr. D. N. Pritt and Prof. J. B. S. Haldane.

During World War II, Krishna Menon, like the communists in India and Britain, first followed the "Imperialist War" line and then the "People's War" line. At a communist-sponsored "People's Convention," held in January, 1941, he was asked a question

whether the Indian people would prefer the rule of Nazi Germany to that of Britain. The answer of this great lover of the British people was: "Those who are so foolish as to ask that question would probably ask a fish whether it preferred to be fried in margarine or butter." When, however, Hitler turned on his ally Stalin and attacked Russia, the Menon fish suddenly developed a preference for butter as against margarine.

So violent was this swing-over to the "People's War" line that, when Mahatma Gandhi started his Quit India movement in August, 1942, the India League, which had till then been more or less in line with the Indian National Congress, refused to endorse the Quit India policy as a result of Menon's softness for the Anglo-Russian alliance.

This led to a revolt of Indian students and others in the U.K. against Menon and the India League and resulted in the establishment of rival Indian organisations, such as Swaraj House, and a Federation of Indian groups in the U.K. which took up cudgels on behalf of Indian Independence during the remaining years of World War II.

Perhaps Menon's views have changed since then? Again let the facts speak.

Menon was nominated a member of the Indian Delegation to the U.N. General Assembly in 1947. His colleagues on the Delegation (which included Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Mr. K. P. S. Menon and Mr. Justice Chagla) were greatly disturbed at his violent pro-Soviet stand on every issue that came up. He also distinguished himself, and drew on his head criticism, by associating with the American Negro Congress, a communist front in New York, on whose platform he appeared during the Assembly session.

In 1952, when he again formed part of the Indian Delegation to the U.N. General Assembly and moved his resolution on the Prisoners of War in Korea, Vyshinsky, while viciously attacking the Indian Government and people as "dreamers or worse," made an exception of Krishna Menon, whom he described as an "honest man."

Notwithstanding the fact that his resolution was rejected with contempt by the Soviet and the Chinese Governments Menon, in a public statement in the U.S. a few days later blamed the breakdown not on the communist powers but on the U.S., because it had a year ago attempted to advance to the Yalu river! Within a few days of this high watermark of objectivity, he also publicly stated in the U.S. that he considered both Poland and Czechoslovakia whom he had sponsored in his resolution as "neutrals," to be fully independent countries.

These are a few glimpses into Krishna Menon's record.

Is Krishna Menon pro-communist? Let the reader come to his own conclusion. (*Contributed*)

Containment Or Liberation?

by Philip Spratt

IT is quite the fashion, perhaps following Orwell, to sneer at Burnham. Indeed one feels in *The Managerial Revolution* (not in his later books) an undertone of malicious pleasure at the nasty knocking about that the world is getting. Burnham may be unaware of it himself, and it may be a false impression, due to the transatlantic idiom, but Orwell evidently sensed it, and he seems to be right. But his second criticism is unsound. He accused Burnham of overdramatising and exaggerating the speed of events, and specifically of prostrating himself before Hitler when the Nazis seemed likely to conquer the world, and transferring the hero-worship to Stalin a few months later.

On the contrary, Burnham is one of the very few who have grasped correctly the significance and magnitude of the events of our time. In 1941 Hitler was near conquering the world. That crisis over, his power declined very fast, and by 1943 Stalin was expanding into the vacuum. By 1949 Stalin had seized eastern Europe and China, and was nearer world power than Hitler had ever been. Even Burnham's flashing phrases could not over-dramatise those eight years of victory and disaster.

His newest book* continues to discuss these, the most important phenomena of our time, but in a sober, business-like way which ought to cause no misunderstanding.

Nevertheless, people will continue to sneer. For the basic reason for these sneers is that he tells us the truth, and it is a truth that few people will face. After forty years of turmoil we want to relax, but Burnham insists, with unanswerable logic, that the gravest crisis and perhaps the grimmest fight of all are still to come.

His argument is perfectly straightforward. In relation to the communist empire, the outer world has a choice of three and only three policies. It can submit, it can coexist, or it can attack and destroy. Ruling out the first, we are left with the choice between coexistence and destruction of the communist power.

The world has favoured coexistence up to now. But it takes two to coexist: what do the communists think about it? There can be no doubt whatever that they are not satisfied with coexistence. They want world power. And why not? Their campaign for the conquest of the world has been a brilliant success hitherto. There is no reason why they should stop it. In fact they show no sign of stopping it.

Accordingly, coexistence takes the special form of "containment" — coexistence by superior force.

America, and her allies if any, must be ready and strong enough to repel any outward thrust by the Soviet empire at any point of its long frontier.

The first part of Burnham's book is a discussion, abstract and concrete, of containment. He has many points to make against it, and tears it to pieces very effectively, but really all that need be said is one of his paragraphs:

Containment, as a long-term policy, depends on the condition that the container is and will remain so much stronger, that the contained will eventually be compelled to abandon his expansionist ambitions. Well, says Burnham, look at the map. The Soviet empire covers 13 million square miles and 800 million people, and it is being "contained" by a country of 3 million square miles and 150 million people, situated thousands of miles away across the sea. To be certain of success in its campaign of world conquest the Soviet empire has only to annex a few relatively weak countries on or near its frontiers. Indeed, to be certain of success it has only to consolidate, organise and arm its existing territory and people. The time for containment is already past. If we leave the Soviet in possession of its existing territory, we lose. We must destroy or be destroyed, as Lenin always said.

Containment has only appeared to succeed (ignoring the conquest of China!) in the past few years, because the Soviet Union has been busy with its internal post-war crisis, and because it has lagged behind America in atom-bomb technique. Even so, it has continued to build up the Comintern, and to conduct civil wars in several countries—activities to which, it is worth noting, containment has no answer even in principle.

Burnham makes a further sound point—the weakness of containment from the political and psychological point of view. A purely defensive policy fulfils perfectly the American desire to be morally in the right. But the world is unmoved by these scruples. People are far more interested in who is going to win, and there is a general shrewd awareness that American hesitancy, confusion and half-heartedness, so well expressed in containment, can never win, but that on the contrary the Soviet is winning. Hence all the hedging, the neutralism, the defeatism.

Coexistence is impossible. The free world must submit to liquidation or destroy the Soviet empire. Burnham therefore proceeds to lay down the main lines of a policy of attack. While there must of course be the threat of military force in the background, he believes that a political offensive can achieve the purpose. He pays little attention (fortunately American opinion seems to be against it) to the project of detaching Peking from Moscow. That scheme would amount in practice to appeasing and strengthening

**Containment or Liberation?* by James Burnham (The John Day Co., New York, 1953. Price \$ 3.50)

Red China. He makes a scathing attack on "Psychological Warfare" as America is now waging it—another symptom of the lack of a will to win.

Altogether he relies greatly on the change in the world scene which would follow if America were to go over definitely to the offensive. This is certainly the principal need, but there might be other improvements in the handling of the Asian and African countries. He criticises briefly the policy America has been following in relation to India, but gives nothing like a new positive line. It is surely worth considering whether such a line is possible.

However, in his perspective this is a secondary issue. The main drive of his proposal is an attack upon Russia from Europe. The heart of the Soviet bloc is still the populous and industrialised area of European Russia. This region is divided between national oppressors and oppressed, and is surrounded by colonies, old and new, which have given plenty of evidence of their desire for freedom. Once assured that America is committed effectively to their liberation, these peoples would probably move.

It may seem a dubious prospect, but the alternative is atomic war—or, of course, surrender.

Burnham wrote before Stalin's death. So important a change might be thought to render his book out of date. On the contrary, while leaving the basic argument unaffected, it makes the practical message more acceptable. Stalin's death will not alter the communists' purpose of world conquest, but for the time it has weakened the Soviet bloc. It creates a glorious opportunity for a political offensive such as Burnham advocates. Unfortunately there is as yet no sign that the new American government means to take advantage of it.

Review

Soviet Opposition to Stalin

by George Fischer (Russian Research Centre Studies, Harvard University Press, U.S.A., \$4.00.)

THIS is one of the most remarkable pieces of research scholarship to come off the press in recent times. It is written by a young man whose maturity of judgment is in strange contrast to his age. Obviously tracing his interest in Soviet affairs to his father, Louis Fischer, his writing is in remarkable contrast to the journalese (brilliant though it is) of his illustrious father.

This book is a case study of that portentous yet little-known episode of the second World War, the emergence and impotent end of the Vlasov movement.

How many people know that millions of Soviet people at first welcomed the terrible march of the German *Wehrmacht*? How many people (otherwise well-versed in Soviet affairs) are aware of the fact that during the early stages of the Russo-German war several important officers and hundreds of thousands of soldiers of the Red Army simply went over to the Nazi enemy? General Vlasov, who was

among the dozen or fewer Red Army generals who successfully led the Soviet defence against Hitler in the Battle of Moscow, tried to organise these in a sort of a Russian Liberation Movement; and in this brilliant study Mr. George Fischer has tried to explore the genesis, progress and the tragic denouement of this movement in the most methodical fashion worthy of the Harvard University that has sponsored it.

Here is a fine example of American scholarship that is taking remarkable strides in the post-war years. Yet its tone and conclusions are such as would belie many of the fashionable beliefs on the subject, currently held and acted upon in America. The author, for instance, bluntly rejects the current tendency to attribute the large scale capitulation by the Soviet armies either to the surprise nature of the attack or to the willing revolt of the widespread anti-Stalin elements inside the Soviet Union. "Contrary to the prevailing American interpretation," he says, "the principal cause of the vast initial Soviet retreats and surrenders was not anti-Stalin sentiment but the invaders' seeming dissolution of Soviet authority. It was the resulting chaos, magnified by the all important paralysing inertness of the Soviet populace and officialdom, which explains the German triumphs." (p. 163) In developing this thesis Mr. Fischer has offered a fascinating study of what he calls 'inertness' not only in the Soviet Union, but also (although passing) in other countries of the modern industrial civilisation. It is a tribute to his searching scholarship that he develops his thesis through a zig-zag process of pros and cons with, however, an unfailing eye on a definite conclusion which bears all the marks of relevant qualifications.

This study of Soviet inertness is important not only because it is a clever peep into the psychology of the Soviet people, not only because it is a significant study of the amoral, apolitical and opportunistic attitudes prevailing there, not only because it sheds revealing light on the aspirations of the Russian people, but also because it has very important practical consequences for the conduct of the anti-Soviet strategy of the free world.

Mr. Fischer warns that you will entirely miss the target of your propaganda if you talk the language of American capitalism to the Russian people and preach what now have become to them alien concepts of Western civilisation. You must never forget that the Soviet regime has completely conditioned the minds of the people and has forever destroyed the old world for them. They yearn (however passively) for a new order, but there is no return to the old one. Mr. Fischer says: "The vastly complex attitude of native opposition to the Soviet system may be broken down into four component parts. The most articulated one is rejection of terror, of the Soviet police state. But as important in the total picture is another component part. This is the continuing impact of the ideas and aspirations of the Bolshevik revolution of 1917: its humanitarian idealism, its craving for fundamental (and anticapitalist) social

reorganisation, for equality and — a paradox today—liberty for all. In many ways this aspect of Soviet opposition, the urge for a new social system built around a non-capitalist welfare state, make anti-Stalinists feel closer to the otherwise abhorred Soviet regime than to the capitalist, anti-revolutionary West. The same is true of another component part. This is the strong nationalism, a self-conscious pride and sensibility regarding the international status of their homeland. Lastly, much of Soviet opposition appears to share with the regime its body of authoritarian political mores. This again deepens the gap between Soviet anti-Stalinists and the still largely individualistic parliamentary West." (p. 157).

The author, therefore, while admitting the great significance and desirability to the free world of the Soviet opposition asks the American people not to overestimate or oversimplify its potential—and its rejection of the Soviet system. A very sobering study.

PRABHAKAR PADHYE

East of Eden

by John Steinbeck (William Heinemann Ltd., London 1953, 15 sh., pp. 525).

MORAL relativism and some sort of deterministic philosophy have commonly seemed to be implied in the writings of that school of hardboiled realists with which Mr. John Steinbeck has sometimes been loosely associated. It is difficult however to conceive how any novel could more explicitly reject both than they are rejected in *East of Eden*.

The author who was acclaimed as a social critic in *The Grapes of Wrath* and sometimes abused as a mere writer of sensational melodrama in some subsequent books, plainly announces here that it is as a moralist that he wants to be taken. *East of Eden* is a story of three generations, complex and ambitious and in each generation Biblical Abel-Cain relationship is symbolized by a childish gift offered by each brother to the father and always in one case seemingly rejected. Indeed one of the theses Mr. Steinbeck explores on his broad canvas is: "The greatest terror a child can have is that he is not loved, and rejection is the hell he fears. I think everyone in the world to a large or small extent has felt rejection. And with rejection comes anger and with anger some kind of revenge for rejection, and with the crime guilt—and there is the story of mankind."

Apart from the symbolic meaning, the whole ramifying narrative is sprinkled with quiet, almost idyllic, passages alternated with scenes of extravagant violence. To touch off highly dramatized scenes there are panoramic descriptions of Salinas Valley in California, where most of the action takes place, philosophic dialogues and interpolated disquisitions in which the author, speaking in his own person, discusses ironically upon such subjects as the whore house as a social institution or what goes on when women meet at the village dressmakers.

Conceived in the image of his grandfather, Mr. Steinbeck succeeds in compelling respect for Samuel Hamilton, the most convincingly lovable failure he

has ever created. But it is Lee, a plausible learned Chinese who, significantly, makes Steinbeck's universally religious point that weaves around the crucial Hebrew word: "Timshel" meaning "Thou mayest."

The final verdict will not, I think, depend upon the validity of the thesis which is part of a debate almost as old as human thought or upon any possible doubt concerning the vividness of Mr. Steinbeck's story-telling. It rests with the answer to: Does the fable really carry the thesis, is the moral implicit in or merely imposed upon the story, or has the author created a myth or merely moralised a tale?

R.H.

BOOK NOTES

CZESLAW Milosz, poet, hero of the Polish anti-Nazi Resistance, ex-fellow traveller and frequent contributor to *Preuves* is the author of a new book *The Captive Mind* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York 1953, pp. 251, \$3. 50). "one of the most important soul-searchings ever published about this love-affair—actually a love-hate ambivalence—between communism and the uprooted intellectuals," says Peter Viereck.

Harper will publish in the coming autumn Ignazio Silone's new novel *A Handful of Blackberries*, a story of post-war Italy, an extract from which has been included in the third number of *New World Writing*, published in May by Mentor Books.

In the middle of this month the Philosophical Library will publish *The Life and Work of Van Gogh* by Carl Nordenfalk, translated into English from the original Swedish and containing previously unpublished letters of the artist as well as an introduction by his nephew.

Three books analysing Russia's immediate past and its present and future were published in June. Doubleday published Robert Magidoff's *The Kremlin vs the People*; Oxford, *Russia: What next?* by Isaac Deutscher and *Modern Russian Literature from Chekov to the Present* by Marc Slonim.

From Lenin to Malenkov: A History of Communist Revolution, a new work by Prof. Hugh Seton-Watson, who teaches Russian History at the University of London, will be published late this summer by Frederick A. Praeger. The technique of communist revolution wherever attempted in the 20th century, an analysis of its long-range strategy and its variations to suit short-term objectives, are the subjects of the book.

Frederick A. Praeger will publish this month *Current Soviet Policies: The Documents, Proceedings and Related Material of the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Reorganisation of the Government after Stalin's Death*. Includes the Kremlin doctors' case; a critical introduction by Leo Grulow, editor of *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*.

What may prove to be a very intriguing collection is scheduled for publication in August by Knopf: *The Flowers of Friendship*. Letters to Gertrude Stein from Hemingway, Sinclair Lewis, Picasso, Bennet Cerf and others; material gathered from the Stein collection at Yale.

To The Editor

Sir,—The extent and thoroughness of the efforts at communist infiltration in democratic countries is brought out in a list prepared by the British Labour Party, of proscribed organisations membership of which would result in expulsion from membership of the Labour Party. The list includes the following:

British Soviet Society
British Soviet Friendship Houses Ltd.
Common Wealth
Communist Party of Great Britain
Labour Research Department
Marx House
Militant Labour League
Scottish U.S.S.R. Society
Women's Parliament
Student Labour Federation
International Youth Council in Britain
The World Federation of Democratic Youth
Women's International Democratic Federation
League for Democracy in Greece
British Peace Committee
Welsh Peace Council
Socialist Fellowship
Union Movement
British Youth Festival
International Women's Day Committee
People's Congress for Peace
West Yorkshire Federation of Peace Organisations
World Federation of Trade Unions
The International Union of Students
The International Association of Democratic Lawyers
The International Organisation of Journalists
The World Federation of Scientific Workers
British-Soviet Friendship Society
British-Polish Friendship Society
British-China Friendship Association
British-Czechoslovak Friendship League
British-Rumanian Friendship Association
The Committee for Friendship with Bulgaria
British-Hungarian Friendship Society
Medical Association for the Prevention of War
Artists for Peace
Musicians' Organisation for Peace
Authors' World Peace Appeal
Teachers for Peace
Scientists for Peace

We, of course, have our own counterparts in this country in the form of the All-India Peace Council, Indo-China Friendship Associations, Indo-Soviet Cultural Societies, Indian People's Theatre Association, the Progressive Writers' Association, the Indian Association of Scientific Workers, the Indian branch of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, and the Indian sections of the World Medical Congress, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the Women's International Democratic Federation. Would it not be a good thing if the Indian National Congress

and the Praja Socialist Party were to notify, similarly, that membership of these communist fronts would disqualify anyone from belonging to these democratic political parties?

H. B.

Sir,—I think the review of *Perspectives* in the May issue of *Freedom First* is substantially correct—but for the wrong reasons! I, too, regard it as a waste of money, simply because it's such an artificial concoction. However, I think your review is very unfair to the writers whose articles are reprinted by *Perspectives*. They are not the "lunatic fringe" at all, but really do represent the best.
New York May 5.

K. I.

C.C.F. News

Congratulations to East Berlin

The following is the text of a message sent by the Congress for Cultural Freedom on June 13 to Ernest Reuter, Mayor of Berlin:

"The writers, scientists, creative artists, and trade union representatives associated with the Congress for Cultural Freedom—established three years ago in Berlin under your patronage—ask you to express their complete solidarity to the workers of Berlin and the East Zone of Germany who, unarmed, defended their rights and their freedom against tanks and sub-machine guns. The courage and the sacrifices of the workers of Berlin and the East Zone will remain forever unforgotten in the history of the struggle of freedom-loving people against their oppressors."

Indian Committee Meetings

Friends and members of the Indian Committee had the opportunity of meeting three very interesting persons, during recent weeks. Their background and personalities were widely divergent, but all of them spoke from long personal experience of their subjects. All the meetings took place at the office of the Committee.

On May 29, Dr. Herbert Passin, noted American anthropologist long resident in Japan and a leading research worker on the Social Research Council addressed a meeting on "Cultural Life in Japan," and another one on June 16, on "Modern Trends in Japan," both to warmly responsive audiences. Many writers & thinkers were present at these meetings.

On June 22, Mr. Joseph Murumbi, Secretary General of the India Africa Council gave a talk on "Indo-African Relations and Cultural Contacts."

On June 25, Mr. Dnyaneshwar Nadkarni, recently returned from a long stay in England after making a free-lance study of English drama and theatre, gave a talk on "Theatre Life in England." Some of the well-known, local actors, dancers & producers were present.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

M. Georgi Malenkov's cleanshaven face had nothing whatsoever to do with the disappearance of his own moustache, Mr. A. K. Gopalan, communist M.P., declared here last night.

Insinuations that he had chosen to retain his hirsute adornment so long as Marshal Stalin was alive and that after the moustached Marshal's cleanshaven successor arrived, every comrade was ordered to show a clean upper lip, Mr. Gopalan said, were nothing, but "demeaning propaganda" on the part of his political opponents to catch votes.

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

"I would be surprised if you gentlemen of the Press in India had no sympathy for a Korean who wants to unify his country." (Mr George Allen)

—*Times of India*, June 14, 1953.

"My country has developed an admiration for China and the greatest admirer of all is our Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru." (Maj.-General S.S. Sokhey)

—*National Standard*, June 18, 1953.

The Chinese Premier, Chou En-lai, has sent a directive to Government departments in famine-stricken areas of China telling them to encourage peasants to collect wild vegetables as substitute foods, according to reports reaching here from Tientsin.

—*National Standard*, May 28, 1953.

"If Moscow and Red China can keep us talking a little longer, they will take Indonesia, Thailand, Burma and Malaya and move directly into India." (The Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Editor of *The Christian Herald*.)

—*New York Times*, May 23, 1953.

The greatest challenge to democracy today comes from communism.

—Editorial in *Hindustan Times*, June 13, 1953.

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
BOMBAY 1.

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

Name :

Address :

Signature

"The U.N. willingness to negotiate with the North Koreans or for that matter with the Chinese and the Russians stinks in many nostrils as a compromise with aggression; from a longrange point of view it even looks like a gift to the enemies of the U.N., particularly when we view it in the context of a so-called general settlement in the Far East."

—*Thought*, June 27, 1953.

What is surprising and alarming is to see how little has to be said from Moscow to obscure the memory of so much that has been done.

—*The Economist*, London,

"Be inelegant enough to show indignation. . . ."

—Peter Viereck in *The Shame and Glory of the Intellectual*.

"It is easier for a man to love two women than it is to be a truly free teacher and, at the same time, a Communist Party member."

—Ernest van der Haag, in the *New Leader*, May 25, 1953.

"If India should slip behind the Iron Curtain the Middle East and the Far East would be outflanked."

—*National Standard*, June 13, 1953.

"As there is no weapon too small, no area too remote, to be ignored, so there is no free nation too humble to be forgotten."

—*Times of India*, June 11, 1953.

"You may either win your peace or buy it," said Mr. Atlee's famous author, John Ruskin, "win it, by resistance to evil; buy it, by compromise with evil."

—James Reston in *Times of India*, June 12, 1953.

Mr. Allen said he found no indications to show that communalism was prevalent in India.

—*National Standard*, June 16, 1953.

"Try to visualise this scene in the heart of the forest; the candelabra made of bamboo illuminate the portrait of the Soviet leader, in front of which are green-leaved wreaths of white and violet flowers.

The 500 cadres as well as all governmental leaders stand silently as President Ho speaks briefly. He hails the greatness, the universal significance of Stalin's leadership, and he leads the whole audience in a solemn oath."

—Joseph Starobin in *The Daily Worker*, New York, May 31, 1953.