

JUNE 1954

Two Crusades Or One?

by V. B. Karnik

ONE of the favourite arguments of the Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, in support of his stand of neutrality in the worldwide struggle between the free nations and Soviet Russia has been that it is in the nature of a crusade by each against the other and wise and tolerant men should, therefore, keep away from it.

In a recent speech in Bombay, he gave expression to the idea in the following words:

The two big Powers, Russia and the United States, representing two ideologies, were afraid of each other. If their ideological pursuits were peaceful, it would be possible for the people of the world to make their own choice. But they were using means other than peaceful and each believed that it was carrying on a "crusade" against the other. The "crusades" that the two countries claimed to carry on were for their own ideologies, characterised by the same zeal, fanaticism and bigotry displayed by the crusaders of medieval Europe. The medieval crusaders fought for a religious faith while the present day crusaders for the cult of communism and anti-communism were fighting for an economic ideology.

Coming as it does from such a distinguished source, the idea requires to be examined. But before the idea is examined, a preliminary issue must be settled. The Prime Minister has represented as if the struggle is joined only between the United States on one hand and the Soviet Union on the other. This is a very superficial reading of the situation. America is no doubt the most important nation on one side of the struggle. But it is as the leader of the free nations of the world that America is shouldering that burden. The struggle that is developing is between the free nations of the world and Soviet Russia.

The idea that the free nations of the world are waging a crusade against Russia will be found to be

without any substance when it is realised that those nations are not bound by any one economic or political system. In the economic field they follow diverse practices. Some believe in private enterprise, while some others have found it necessary to bring a large number of their industries under the control and ownership of the State. The political institutions of the free nations also differ from country to country. These have been evolved by each one of them according to its own genius over a period of years, extending in some cases over centuries. The only thing that unites them is their love of liberty and their ardent desire to be left in peace to manage their affairs as they think best.

With such differing views on economic and political matters, the free nations differ many a time on vital issues of international politics. The difference of opinion between Great Britain and the United States of America on the issue of recognition of the People's Republic of China is a glaring example of this lack of unanimity amongst the free nations. Many such differences of opinion come to light in every international conference. Superficially they indicate a lack of cohesion and many a time some people get impatient about them. But such differences of opinion are the very essence of the free way of life which differentiates the free nations from the nations belonging to the Soviet camp.

The nations which champion a free way of life cannot come together and work together to impose any set of political and economic institutions or ideas on any other people. In the first place they are not agreed amongst themselves about the efficacy or superiority of any particular set of institutions or ideas. And, in the second place, to impose anything on another people by force of arms runs counter to the basic purpose which has brought them together into an alliance of free nations. The basic purpose of their alliance is the defence of their free way of life and a free way of life cannot countenance the imposition by force of political and social institutions.

The Prime Minister said that the present day crusaders were fighting for an economic ideology. Soviet Russia has no doubt an economic ideology, the

State control of all economic affairs. But the free nations do not swear by any particular economic ideology. They have a variety of economic practices, ranging from unrestricted private enterprise to full scale socialism or communism as in Tito's Yugoslavia. Which particular practice can they be said to be seeking to impose on the nations of the Soviet camp?

The United States of America believes in private enterprise. But can it be said that she is seeking to impose her system of private enterprise on other countries of the world? If it were so, she would not have offered generous help that she did to many semi-socialist countries of Europe. She is also helping in one way or the other many other countries. But she never made the acceptance of her economic system a condition precedent for granting that aid. Is America trying to impose her economic system on Soviet Russia? Can anybody in his senses say that America and other free nations are out today to destroy the existing economic order in Soviet Russia and to replace it by the system of private enterprise? Some nations attempted to do that in the years immediately after the Russian Revolution, but since then many things have happened and even big capitalist States have learnt that it is best to allow the people of each country to choose the economic order of their own liking.

What the free nations stand for and insist upon is that the people of each country must have the freedom to choose the system according to which they will order their political and economic affairs and to choose the people who will be entrusted with the responsibility of looking after them. It is not possible to say that in the free nations that freedom exists in the fullest measure and for all sections of the people. There are many limitations of quality which detract from the fullness of that freedom. But it must be said to the credit of the free nations that they proclaim that freedom is committed to its defence and expansion.

Communism has no place for that freedom. Under communism the all-wise, all-powerful coterie constituting the State decides everything and the people must blindly and ungrudgingly accept all those decisions and act according to them. Communism cannot conceive of two answers to any question or of two solutions of any problem. There is always one and the only answer and the one and the only solution. Under communism there can be only one economic system, only one social order and only one centre of political power. It is the duty of communists to establish all over the world that communist economic system and social order and to develop that centre of communist political power. Communism is a world religion and, according to its prophets, it can succeed only when it is established all over the world. If, therefore, there are any crusaders, they belong to the communist camp and there is no doubt that the crusade carried on by them is characterised by, as stated by Mr. Nehru, "the same zeal, fanaticism and bigotry displayed by the crusaders of medieval Europe."

The crusade is not a matter of choice for commu-

nists or communist Powers. It is enjoined upon them by the doctrines of their faith. Moreover, the very existence of free nations is inimical to the growth and sustenance of communism and communist Powers. They could not tolerate the existence as a free nation of even such a tiny and harmless country like Tibet. The breath of free air that blows from those quarters undermines the foundations of communism. Tyranny cannot regard itself as safe so long as freedom exists anywhere in the world. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the communist hostility towards free nations. It is this hostility and the communist manoeuvres to devour the free nations and to expand their tyranny that brought into existence the alliance of free nations to defend their freedom and integrity.

The alliance may not be the pure gold that one would have liked it to be. There may be some dross in it. The free nations which constitute it are not uniformly free, nor are all of them rid of the vestiges of colonialism which still stick to some of them. On many an occasion some of them utter words which sound very bitter and uncompromising. Sometimes somebody recommends wrathful policies which give people, seeing from outside, an excuse to say that the free nations are also bigoted. These defects and short-comings should not, however, blind any of us to the real issues involved in the struggle. The struggle appears to be a struggle between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, but it is essentially a struggle between liberty and tyranny. The age-old struggle has taken many forms in many ages. In this age it has assumed the form of a struggle between those two giants of the world.

It would have been very pleasant, indeed, if both the parties had agreed to wage the struggle only by peaceful means. It is necessary, however, to re-

(Continued on p. 11)

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 7sh.
Single Copy " " 2 annas

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

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

Notes

Colombo—A Balance Sheet

NOW that the din of controversy about "who won" at the Colombo Conference of Prime Ministers has died down, it is possible to take a quiet look at the long-term results of the conference which would appear to provide grounds for a measure of sober satisfaction.

From the word "go", it was clear that the five Prime Ministers were divided by considerable differences of opinion on a variety of subjects. This was of course inevitable, since there is no 'Asian' point of view on any topic any more than there is an 'European' opinion. Men these days are divided not by shades of colour but by beliefs and ideas.

Ultimately, as a result of the statesmanship of the five Prime Ministers and the process of give and take, inevitable on such an occasion, agreed formulae of a general nature emerged in the *communiqué* put out by the Ceylonese Prime Minister. For that measure of agreement, credit undoubtedly goes to Sir John Kotelawala who piloted the Conference with good humour and sound instinct.

The man whose name figured least in the Press reports of the Conference was yet perhaps its real hero. This was U Nu, the gentle, thoughtful, socialist Prime Minister of Burma. Occupying as he did the position of a fulcrum round which the Conference with its conflicting pulls rotated, he became the conscience to which everyone in turn appealed. It is to him that democrats in Asia owe the declaration, so badly needed, of "unshakable determination to resist interference in the affairs of their countries" by external communism. The incongruous insertion of the word "anti-communist" at this point was a verbal concession to the neutralists which means nothing and can deceive no one. It was again due to Burmese socialist government opposition that the ominous slogan of "non-intervention" in the affairs of Indo-China, so reminiscent of the cynical non intervention that handed Spain over to Franco and sent the Spanish Republic to its doom, had to be dropped.

There is much that could have been done at Colombo that yet remains to be accomplished. U Nu has confessed to his disappointment that his plea for closer economic co-operation was not heeded. Such practices of co-operation would certainly have been worth a great deal more than the so-called points of agreements which are basically negative. The vital subject of common defence was evidently not even broached. Is it not sad that the Prime Ministers who found time to urge the admission of the Chinese Communist aggressors to the United Nations forgot to raise their voices on behalf of Ceylon, Nepal and Japan, whose membership of that body has been blocked by an insolent Soviet veto?

All the same, on balance, the forces of neutralism

have emerged from the Conference somewhat weakened, and all observers unite in their estimate of the resounding defeat suffered by the egregious Mr. Krishna Menon in his efforts to misuse the occasion for the grinding of his ideological axe.

The Colombo Conference was incomplete and lopsided in the absence of consistently anti-communist countries like the Philippines and Thailand, which had as much right to be there as Indonesia, with its communist-backed Government. Yet, even so, it has been shown that, of the five countries represented, the majority were not prepared to be silenced on the crucial threat of international communism to the freedom of the region. There was a time at the end of World War II, when similar indecision and tendencies at appeasement of communist imperialism as are now present in this region were rampant in Europe. Asia, too, will undoubtedly learn the facts of life the hard way.

The Pan-Buddhist Conference

THE Pan-Buddhist Conference, which opened in Rangoon in May, is a great occasion. It is the first such conference for 500 years, and only the sixth since the death of Buddha. Monks and laymen from all over the Buddhist world are attending and a large committee of scholars are expected to remain in Rangoon for two years preparing the first systematic collection of the Buddhist Scriptures.

U Nu is a devout man. He has given the preparations a great deal of personal attention. A special pagoda has been built, a vast structure has been erected to make the assembly hall for the conference—a replica of one of the ancient caves — and to the latter, at least, U Nu himself gave much thought and Government money.

U Nu, as was seen from the proceedings at Colombo, understands the danger of communism. He is also more sensitive than most to the futility of fighting it with arms alone, or with a merely negative idea. Thus, at the time when the communist rebels had advanced so far that his Government controlled only Rangoon and some of its immediate surroundings, U Nu appointed a Minister of War and Religion. Some people were apt to sneer at such a combination; but it was rather a recognition of Napoleon's maxim that in war morale is to material as four to one. It is a fact that it was from this time, and the mobilisation of Burma's 80,000 monks in the national struggle, that the Government began to make headway against the insurgents.

It is widely felt that U Nu sees in the Pan-Buddhist Conference a chance to build a Buddhist front, ideologically, in South East Asia which can turn the ideological attack of communism. And certainly communism cannot be stopped in this region without a moral renaissance of Buddhism. The manpower available to an aroused Buddhism is great—there are 200,000 Buddhist monks in Thailand alone.

But democrats are not the only people who have plans for the Conference. Mao has been gaining great kudos in the Buddhist world by repairing some

Buddhist temples in China which had fallen into decay during the Civil War. And many monks from China, Tibet and Soviet Russia itself are expected at Rangoon, along with those of all other Buddhist territories. Such monks will obviously be carefully chosen for their ideological 'reliability' and will come with adequate instructions and a common strategy.

Moreover, it is known that a group in Rangoon itself is ready to co-operate in this process. At the centre of this group is at least one non-Asian "convert" to Buddhism, and its aim is to make the Conference a gigantic communist front.

Neo-Imperialism of Soviet Russia

PRESIDING over a meeting of the coordination committee of the Anti-Colonial Bureau of the Asian Socialist Conference which just completed its meeting in Rangoon, the Chairman, U Kyaw Nyein, drew pointed attention to 'the colonialism in another form' which is rarely noticed by most people in Asia. Explaining his point, U Kyaw Nyein said: "We may call it neo-colonialism or neo-imperialism. I refer to the Soviet form of imperialism. To my mind both types of colonialism are dangerous. In fact the Soviet type of imperialism is even more degrading and even more dangerous because it is more ruthless, more systematic and more blatantly justified in the name of world communist revolution." This is a very penetrating analysis of the new danger that threatens Asian countries. We commend it to the attention of all.

The Tibetan Sell Out

THE voice of protest against the treaty between India and China over Tibet must not be silenced. The 'sell-out', as some people have called it, did not consist in the withdrawal of troops, the surrender of certain trading rights or in the free gift to China of a communication system paid for by Indian taxpayers, but in the surrender of a principle. The worst of the deal is that the Treaty has been hailed as the cornerstone of a new policy in Asia and, according to the Chinese, as an example for others to follow.

India, a country which on every platform of the world points an accusing finger at everybody who denies the right of self-determination to enslaved peoples, concludes a treaty with China about Tibet to the total exclusion of the Tibetans themselves. This is a rather heavy price to pay for 'peaceful co-existence' and the 'enlargement of the area of peace'. Historical casuistry is brought into play to justify the surrender. Chinese suzerainty over Tibet is a historical fact, so we are told, and has never been disputed, not even by the bad old imperial powers. Ancient imperialist expediency is evidently now good enough to prop up a new imperialism enforced by armies of suppression. It appears that an imperialism that comes from the west over the seas is an anachronism but that an imperialism that marches over the land from Asia is a historical fact to be accepted and condoned. The Prime Minister referred

sarcastically to the Indian troops in Tibet, now to be withdrawn, as the outdated left-overs of an obsolete imperialism in retreat. What are then the Chinese troops in Tibet but the *avant garde* of a new, more merciless imperialism come to stay?

If our affairs in Tibet had to be accommodated to the new circumstances, would it not have been better to treat this as a necessary evil imposed on us by Tibet's new implacable masters before whom we are powerless, rather than praising this accommodation as a great new political principle? Would it not have been more honest and more in line with our pre-professed policy to raise at least a small voice of protest on this occasion and say that we stand, in principle, for freedom and self-determination *also* for the Tibetans?

Acharya Kripalani and Shri P. D. Tandon were among the very few honest people who made this point in Parliament only to be talked down by the sophistry of the Treasury benches and the hollow shouts of approval of a complacent assembly.

The lesson of this Treaty cannot be lost on the free nations of Asia. They will fear that India cannot be depended upon to stand up for the rights of free nations in this region against the new communist imperialism. Already, with ominous promptness, suggestions emanate from Jakarta for a non-aggression pact between China, India, Burma and Indonesia. With the silent anticipation of the loss of Indo-China to the Reds, the free nations of Asia are to be put at their ease by a non-aggression pact which would give China a free hand in Korea, Formosa or elsewhere while preparing to gobble up the rest of Asia, piece by piece, according to Hitler's well-tried little game in Europe. It is reassuring to know, however, that Indonesian opposition parties like the Socialists and the Masjumi have severely criticised the very suggestion of this proposal. Dr. Mohammed Natsir, the progressive Masjumi leader, deserves to be congratulated for speaking out against the manoeuvres of the present communist-backed Indonesian cabinet.

Communists in Government Service

THERE was a lot of adverse criticism in India when the steps taken by the Government of the United States of America to remove communists in the ranks of government servants were first reported in the press. Many thought that they were an encroachment on the democratic rights of citizens and some even went to the extent of condemning them as a witch-hunt. It was only later and very slowly recognised that every government has the right of insisting upon the loyalty of its servants and that a communist can be loyal only to a communist government.

A number of democratic governments were later compelled to follow in the foot-steps of the American government and take measures to prevent the infiltration of communists in government service. The Government of India has been also compelled to take similar steps. Replying to an interpellation in Parliament, the Home Minister, Dr. Katju, revealed that 85 government employees were proceeded against in

1953-54 for subversive activities or association with such activities. Four of the employees were compulsorily retired, while 19 cases were dropped and 62 cases are still pending.

Justifying the action Dr. Katju said: "If the loyalty of any particular employee to the Constitution is doubted, the government is entitled, after giving the employee concerned every reasonable opportunity to explain, to get rid of him."

It is heartening to note that the awareness of the communist danger is growing in the ranks of Congress leaders. Recently the Chief Minister of U.P., Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant, came out with a forthright condemnation of communists and their practices and ideas. Inaugurating the Jhansi District Political Conference, he said that 'Indian communists were behaving like foreign nationals owing allegiance to a foreign State, flag and leadership.' He warned the people to beware of communists as they were "out to destroy independence and usher in a new brand of imperialism." Mr. Ujjal Singh, the Finance Minister of the Punjab, was equally critical of communists in the course of his convocation address to the D.A.V. College in Jullundur. He said that the intention of communists was "to disrupt society and hamper the peaceful progress of our nation."

It is also heartening to observe that the All India Congress Committee has repeated its instruction to Congressmen not to associate with communist-sponsored peace committees or organisations. The circular issued in that behalf says: "Certain peace organisations though ostensibly working for the promotion of international peace were designed to further certain political purposes and that was why Congressmen should not only not join this movement but they should not go abroad to attend any such peace conference or congress."

It is unfortunate that some Congressmen are still disobeying the directive of the A.I.C.C. It is still more unfortunate that the Government of India have a divided mind on the issue and do many things which help the communist cause here and abroad.

A Great Decision

DR. RALPH J. BUNCHE has rightly hailed the U.S. Supreme Court's decision against racial segregation in public schools as 'an historic event in the annals of American democracy.' American democracy has long been tainted by the persecution of the Negroes and the Supreme Court's judgment given nearly sixty years ago that it was not against the law to provide 'equal but separate facilities' for Negro children was an example of the many subtle ways in which this discrimination operated. It is to the great credit of the American people that there has always been an enlightened section among them with the consecrated purpose of fighting for human equality and, inspired by the noble example of the great Lincoln, it has accomplished note-worthy success, of which this latest decision of the Supreme Court is a shining example.

Shaikh Abdulla's Detention

THE continued detention without trial of Shaikh Abdulla, once the nationalist hero of Kashmir, has been all along a sore point with democrats all over the country. We congratulate Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan on inviting public attention to this gross violation of civil liberties and on forcefully demanding either the immediate release or a trial in a court of law of Mr. Abdulla. It is to be hoped that even at this late hour better counsel will prevail with the Government of India and that they will heed the demand put forward by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan.

This simple demand for the release or trial of Mr. Abdulla made by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has aroused the wrath of Mr. Abdulla's successor in office, Bakshi Ghulam Mahomed. In a press conference in Lucknow he is reported to have wildly objected to the demand and warned all "outsiders" to keep their hands off the question. According to the Chief Minister the decision regarding Mr. Abdulla rested with the people of Kashmir and their representatives and they would not tolerate outsiders dictating to them in the matter. The Chief Minister is obviously carried away by his anger. He should know that no Indian is an "outsider" so far as Kashmir is concerned and that a national leader of the status of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has as much right to express his opinion about things happening in Kashmir as a person who happens to be the Chief Minister of the State. Bakshi Ghulam Mahomed is railing against "outsiders" and desires to preserve for the people of Kashmir the right of deciding their own affairs. Let him, however, beware of what is happening under his very nose. It is "outsiders" of a different variety, the communists, who owe allegiance neither to India nor to Kashmir, who are quietly taking over the reins of his government. It is to those "outsiders" that he should turn his attention rather than to others who merely protest against a gross violation of civil liberties committed by him and his government.

Asoka Mehta

WE heartily welcome the election of Mr. Asoka Mehta to the House of People. We should be pardoned if we take some sort of personal pride in the fact that a member of our Executive Committee has been elected to the highest law-making body with an impressively large majority. We have no doubt that the intellectual atmosphere in the House will bristle with Mr. Mehta's accomplishments. He will enliven the debates with his scintillating eloquence and enrich their content by his penetrating study and thoughtful pronouncements. The Committee has now two distinguished members of its Executive in the Indian Parliament and we are sure that the voice of freedom will acquire a firmer tone because of their presence there.

The P.E.N. Conference At Chidambaram

by R. B. Joshi

THE P.E.N. Third All-India Writers' Conference recently held at Chidambaram (in South India) was one of the rare opportunities afforded to writers from all over India to come together, to get to know each other and to discuss problems pertaining to the literatures in the regional languages. But it is much to be regretted that the best was not made of the opportunity. More than two hundred delegates had come to Chidambaram from such distant states as the Punjab and Assam. There was a delegate from Pakistan, too, and a few Americans were also present. There must be many eminent writers among these, but most of them went away ignorant of each other. Writers in Northern states of India know very little about the literatures of the South and vice versa. Chidambaram did not enable them to know of each other.

This is not to say that the organisers had not provided for discussions and meetings. There were three symposia and two discussions. The symposia were on (1) Influence of the Ramayana on Regional Literature; (2) The Short Story and its Development (in Regional languages); (3) The Progress of Regional Literatures during 1948-53. All the three were important topics and the symposia on them should have proved very enlightening, especially since representatives from all important languages of India were participating in them. But this itself proved to be an obstacle. There were too many speakers and too little time. The time for each speaker, therefore, had to be curtailed to ten minutes. This resulted in hasty, confused and impatient speeches and made any discussion afterwards impossible.

Although the subject, 'The Progress of Regional Literatures during 1948-53,' did not specifically mention Independence it was understood that the question was whether and how far the Independence, we won in 1947 had influenced the development of regional literatures. Most of the speeches gave the impression that the fact of Independence had not materially affected the development of these literatures. According to some, Independence, before it was achieved, was a great inspiring force in literature but it ceased to be so after it was achieved. These were very serious views and reached out to much larger issues involving the relations between socio-political conditions and literature and arts. These should have been discussed but were not.

The organisers had very properly devoted one session to the discussion on "The Role of English in Free India." This question has been exercising the minds of most teachers of English and other educationists and politicians. There were many professors of English and other educationists present at the Conference. They could have contributed something valuable to the consideration of this problem. But

it was not done. Most of the speakers merely stressed the importance of English as a language of culture and international communication. No one denies this however. Not even the most extreme protagonist of the regional language denies the wisdom and necessity of having an adequate knowledge of English. But one cannot overlook the fact that English will no longer play the role in this country that it has played for the last 150 years. What should have been discussed is how much English do we expect our graduates in future to know? What is the measure and standard of this adequacy? And by what method are we going to enable them to acquire it? What was given was a series of speeches and no discussion.

One or two points arising out of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's inaugural address deserved some notice at some time during the conference. He said, for instance, that writers would be doing a national service by striving for one literature in the country. He did not elaborate what he meant by this. If he meant that the literatures in the various Indian languages should be inspired by the same set of values, he was saying something which was redundant. Because the ancient and modern literatures in most of our regional languages actually show a striking similarity. They have drawn from the same sources and developed under similar influences. The only difference may be one of stress on this or that particular or in the time sequence. If, on the other hand, he meant that all the regional languages should have identical and uniform literature it would be something not only absurd but dangerous and fatal to the proper development of literature. One only hopes that he did not mean this.

Pandit Nehru also said that "Indian writers would have to think in terms of the nation and not any particular part of the country." This is something that runs counter to the processes of creative writing. The creative writer thinks in terms of the particular and the concrete. His source of inspiration is the world of his experience. His men and women and situations arise from this experience. And the universality of the appeal of this has nothing to do with the size of his world.

These are problems that have a direct bearing on the profession of writing and they should have been taken up and discussed by the writers at Chidambaram. But there was no room for this. Too much was attempted to be done in too short a time, with the result that nothing was done to the satisfaction of anybody.

One word about the P.E.N. All-India Centre. What it attempted was the right thing. But it should do something more. The P.E.N. All-India Centre is the only non-official All-India Association of writers and has the additional advantage of being affiliated to the

(Continued on p. 7)

The Committee And The Arts

by Prabhakar Padhye

THE Congress For Cultural Freedom, to which the Indian Committee is affiliated, has defined its objective as the "defence of intellectual liberties against all encroachments upon the creative and the critical spirit of man."

In my article on 'The Committee and America' last month, I had examined some of the factors that interfere with the critical spirit of man. Let us now see how the creative spirit of man has been sought to be stifled in this age of totalitarian challenge.

The problem here is more subtle and complex and, therefore, much more dangerous to the creative spirit of man, without the free flow of which arts can never flourish.

In the first place, the problem is not a product of the current Cold War. It has existed since the time when the vogue of so-called 'Progressive Literature' started in our country. Secondly, not merely the totalitarians have contributed to the problem. Many democrats, under a mistaken notion of the relation of Art to Society, have denied the sovereignty of Art. Finally, the attack here is made in the name of the people and service of society and, therefore, it easily beguiles many of our well-meaning intellectuals.

Art like Science is concerned with the problem of Truth. But artistic truth is not the same thing as the truths of science, or even the truths of the practical world. All art is pattern-weaving and every artistic pattern is a manifestation of truth as the artist sees it. These truths do not belong to the mathematical continuum. They rather belong to the aesthetic continuum in which the artist instinctively believes.

All artistic experience is unique. It is unique in a two-fold sense. It is unique because it is intensely individual and it is unique also because it belongs to the aesthetic world as apart from the logical or the practical world.

(Continued from p. 6)

International P.E.N. It could easily serve as a link between the various regional literatures of India on the one hand, and the world body on the other. It should take note of the fact that there is no Indian literature as such (and there cannot be) but many Indian literatures and it is in them that the life and problems of the Indian man and woman are reflected. In order to function more fruitfully, the Indian P.E.N. should get into closer touch with the writers of the various Indian languages, should organise regional P.E.N. centres and hold periodical regional conferences. This way it would be more useful to the writers and will come nearer them. Otherwise it will remain an isolated organisation composed of a few persons remotely, though piously, interested in literature.

It is easy to see how the aesthetic quality of a work of art differs from its practical quality. The emotion in art is aesthetic and not practical and to those who object to the use of the phrase 'aesthetic emotion' I will only reply with that fine English critic and poet, C. Day Lewis: "Psychologists, I know, rage exceedingly if they catch anyone talking about aesthetic emotion. I can only mumble in self-defence that when I am moved by a poem, the emotion I feel seems distinct from any other human emotion." (*The Poetic Image*, page 22). And that is crucial to my argument. The tragic in life, for instance, is not the same as the tragic in art. The one gives you pain, the other pleasure. You enjoy the tragic in art; not the tragic in life.

When, therefore, you try to impose the purposes of the practical world on the purposes of art, you interfere with its legitimate functions; and when these purposes are of a general and collective nature, you destroy the enchanting uniqueness of the intensely individualistic experiences of the artist.

This is what the totalitarians are doing in the name of 'progressive literature.' They are trying to destroy the fundamental springs and impulses of the artist. They are, of course, doing this in the name of 'the people' and service to society. They, perhaps, do not realise that thereby they insult the people. They imply that the people, the common folk, do not need and cannot enjoy pure art and pure literature, and that art and literature for them must serve their practical purposes. The vast stores of folk-art and folk-literature of all climes and ages is a standing refutation of their insulting impositions. The people are as much lost in the ecstasy of pure art as any of the sophisticated folk!

The so-called progressive art and writing not only deprive the people of their legitimate enjoyment of artistic ecstasy, but actually destroy the artist. I need not go to the tragic history of the Soviet holocaust in the world of art and letters. There are plenty of examples nearer home. For instance, Krishna Chandra whose 'flames' which once illumined and inspired are now full of soot and whose 'flowers' which once filled the atmosphere with ethereal fragrance now just stink!

The Indian Committee will warn writers and artists against this tragedy which is bound to overtake an artist who has surrendered the sovereignty of his art to the propagandist's trick. The Committee will not even ask the artist to be anti-totalitarian or anti-communist. That itself is a propagandist trick. It will ask the artist to be free — to be himself, cherishing the conviction that he in his art is the true harbinger of Progress, since art widens and subtilizes consciousness of mankind, which, as Mr. J. W. N. Sullivan has aptly pointed out, has been the most significant factor in the evolution from amoeba to man.

Science And Moral Responsibility

by Professor Dr. Theodor Litt

THE concept of intellectual "objectivity" which has for many years been dominant in the outlook of academic thinkers is based on the view that the pursuit of science is neutral in the moral sphere and cannot be founded upon any particular set of moral assumptions. It has been thought that acceptance of such basic assumptions would impose on the investigator an initial bias, since it would determine from the outset the ideals which science should promote, and those which it should seek to combat. Thus, the investigator would lose his impartiality and, in doing so, forfeit his status as a scientist.

This very widespread opinion is based on the idea that function of science is confined to a mere reflection of reality as it exists in the outside world. Participation in the struggle of ideas is, in this view, the business of men of action and not of the scientist. But in my view, science, even conceived as a pure theory of reality, is bound to exert its own effect upon the state of the world which is the subject of its enquiries.

In the first place, I consider that, in the very act of engaging in the activity of investigation the human observer is bound to transform himself into something other than he would be were he to desist from such enquiries. The pursuit of knowledge is itself a vital part of man's development. From this it follows that the spirit in which he uses these inborn faculties is bound to be a powerful factor in shaping his own character. To be "objective" is not to extinguish one's personality, but rather to exert one's determination in the pursuit of truth against all inner and external temptations which might lead to a falsification of reality. Adherence to the truth is itself a moral quality of the highest order. It is one whose value increases as the forces which seek to destroy the truth mount in strength.

But the impact of science on reality is not confined to its effect in transforming those who are engaged in the pursuit of knowledge. Science is bound to affect the appearance of the very phenomena which the scientist sets himself to examine.

In so far as scientific thought is directed towards material reality, it is concerned with objects which, in their existence and characteristics, are not affected by the existence or success of human enquiries into nature. In this field, therefore, it would seem to be comparatively easy for science to maintain its "objectivity". Nevertheless, even here, there can be no question of eliminating moral responsibility, since the "objective" recognition of reality is bound to open up for mankind possibilities of good or evil whose immense significance has only lately been fully disclosed. And when we come to the evaluation of the significance of these effects we are confronted with a task which could never be undertaken without the fullest consciousness of moral responsibility.

The issue becomes much more difficult when we

turn to the study of human society. For here the object under investigation is at the same time the being which investigates; or at any rate one which belongs to the same species as the enquirer. The task of reflection concerning the physical and spiritual nature of man, the development of nations and of their laws, or the growth of industry and technical knowledge, is far more than the mere contemplation of objects and the recording of their characteristics; it is bound to constitute an active participation in the life of the society which is being studied.

In this province of investigation there is a double effect of any failure in veracity on the part of the investigator, since he thereby damages not only his own conscience but also the society which is the object of his studies. Material reality cannot be harmed by any errors in the theories which are constructed upon it. But human reality is bound to be drawn



into any falsities inherent in the thought which is directed towards it; for humanity is itself moulded in the shape of these ideas. A community could never be what it is, were it not for the tradition of thought which has formed within it. Out of this background arise the day to day decisions which fashion its essential character.

Thus, the moral responsibility of science assumes a dominant place when science functions as an enlightening and advisory force in human society. For every false step—be it intentional or unintentional—is in fact a blow at the very society which should be conscious of this responsibility. For at no time in the past have the forces opposed to the truth been so successful in their endeavours to conscript the representatives of science in the service of their own particular ends, and to seduce them from the pursuit of truth to the propagation of lies.

(A paper presented to the Hamburg Conference on 'Science and Freedom'.)

In The Sartrian Mesh

by Yatim Ghaznavi

"WHY," to quote Gabriel Marcel, "does Sartre find the contingent overabundance of the world nauseating rather than glorious?" The answer is presumably that the world is irremediably other than, and over against, himself. However wholeheartedly one commits oneself, it is to a projected world of human purposes that one is committed; the objective world of *en soi* pursues its indifferent course without regard to the fragile stirrings of what is merely *pour soi*. If the self could be forgotten, the world might be what it tends to be for the mere scientist, a field of dispassionate departmental investigation; if the mocking solidity of the world were not so evident, the self might inflate into the absolute ego of the idealist philosophers. But neither arbitrary extreme can maintain itself in face of facts. The point is not only that the whole world of existence is *de trop*, but that the self is *de trop* for the world and the world is *de trop* for the self.

The self is odious, said Pascal when he woke up to the egocentric predicament. The world is nauseating, says M. Sartre in the same embarrassment. But, to judge from the features of human nature that he delights to describe, M. Sartre finds the self fairly nauseating too.

Few of us dare to claim an objective philosophy or, if we do so, we carefully restrict it to some task of linguistic analysis which by-passes the human situation. M Sartre, in attempting something more ambitious, becomes perforce very much of an autobiographer. What Sartre certainly has given is a brilliant and generally instructive self-analysis. We are tempted to say to him: this is one kind of person, yes—but there are others. I will not have it however, that M Sartre's work reduces to a kind of historical psychology; I prefer to regard psychological systems as metaphysical in so far as they involve a systematic reflection on contemporary self-awareness.

Zola once said that the novelist 'must kill the hero.' He must do this because, according to Zola, his job is to show 'the ordinary, course of average lives.' Sartre too believes in killing 'the hero,' in the sense of a magnified central figure who enjoys the author's exclusive approval; but for different reasons, reasons connected not with the author's subject-matter but with the author's standpoint. He says: 'No more characters; the heroes are freedoms caught in a trap like all of us.'

Jean Aguerra is one 'freedom' caught in trap.

In the attainment of power, the dictator, Aguerra, has exercised freedom, thus satisfying Sartre's first demand in his particular conception of existence. But we come upon him in *In The Mesh*,* when he has faltered. Others want him as their instrument, want to reduce his capacity to resist them.

But Jean Aguerra does resist:

"Yes, I caused his (Lucien) death, as I've caused the

death of many others. Don't you realise that I loathe myself?"

He points to the jury with a gesture.

"These men there have made their revolution, and now they are going to kill me, but I regret nothing, . . . and if it had to be done again, I would do it again."

The public feels itself flouted and begins to whistle and hiss Jean. The latter straightens himself up, regards the crowd coldly and cries: "Everything. Even Lucien!" . . .

"You poor idiots. You believe in change of policy. All you'll get is a change of personnel."

He points a finger at Francois who has sat down.

"You'll follow my policy. You'll have to follow because there's no alternative. Do you imagine I'm going to justify it? It is you who will have to justify it in three or in six months."

In *L'Être et le Neant*, Sartre observes: 'Character has no distinct existence except as an object of knowledge to other people. Consciousness does not know its own character — except in so far as it may consider itself reflexively from the point of view of another . . . This is why pure introspective description of oneself does not reveal a character: Proust's hero *has* no character which can be grasped directly.'

Aguerra is revealed to us through his own testimony and of his mistresses, of his friends who no longer support his policies, of the Judases and the turncoats, and above all his own valet. They subject him to the mockery of a trial; they deride, oppress and torment him. Yet he and his accusers remain on terms of equality and must continue to do so unless Aguerra himself wills that their will shall prevail. Here then is the core of Sartre's belief: even in its final extremities, the human spirit is free. If crimes are committed, then the least of us must do something to prevent them or accept our share of guilt.

Men, Sartre believes, are free and they do not know it. To Sartre, the man who, in any crisis of his life, chooses between alternative courses of action according to the rules of his party, the dictates of his religion, or the law of his morality, is denying the freedom which, by mere exercise of his will, he could assert: for he is then behaving, not in the fulfilment and development of his own personality, but in obedience to the resolution of others. He is handing over his right to decision, in the Sartrian view, to Lenin, to Moses, or to Christ.

Though *In The Mesh* does what Sartre says literature should do: it keeps alive an uneasy conscience in hope that men and women may be provoked to change what they cannot relish; to the Existentialist the triumph in the downfall of Jean Aguerra is that he refused to abdicate his freedom. But Sartre forgets that he cannot equate his concept of freedom with what Jean Aguerra actually exercised. Surely, even in existentialist vocabulary, a line must somewhere be drawn between freedom and unmitigated licence.

* *In The Mesh*, a Scenario by Jean-Paul Sartre. Translated by Mervyn Savill, London, Andrew Dakers, 1954, pp. 128, sh 9/-

Review

Jana

The Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd., P. O. Box 834, Colombo, Ceylon.

WE have received the first issue of this new "news magazine of resurgent Asia and Africa." The first issue contains, besides articles and news reports from many countries of Asia and Africa, messages of greetings and good wishes from the five Prime Ministers who had gathered then in Colombo for the first Asian Prime Ministers' Conference. *Jana* proposes to be an independent news magazine without any attachment to any party or government. Every month it will give news about important happenings in Asia and Africa and about world events that may have a bearing upon them. The first issue is brought out in an attractive form and articles published are both interesting and instructive. We wish the magazine all success. The Indian price of the magazine is Rs. 1-4-0 per issue.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

WITHIN the twelve months 1818 to 1819 – September to September—Keats was to write all his major poems: the *Odes*, the two *Hyperions*, the *Eve of St. Agnes*, the *Eve of St. Mark*, *La Belle Dame*, *Lamia*, the plays, and a number of shorter pieces and sonnets. Mr. Robert Gittings in his *John Keats: The Living Year* (Heinemann, sh.16/-), probing in the meticulous fashion of our time into the impulses behind this extraordinary and terrifying achievement, traces day by day the course of the poet's year with its impacts from books and conversation as well as from love and death.

*

Modern Painting longs, like modern poetry, for a superior degree of intellectuality, and is intent on the impact of Things on intuitive reason – to the very extent to which it is true to poetic knowledge. But at the same time, M. Jacques Maritain observes in his *Creative Intuition in Art And Poetry* (Pantheon Books, \$ 6.50) "is tempted to go on in the opposite direction and runs the risk of dispersing in mere sensationalism or in a merely taste-guided and superficial release of imagination, to the very extent to which it mistakes the now logical character of poetic knowledge, or the liberation from conceptual reason, for a total break with and liberation from reason itself," and neglecting those *mysterious centres of thought* of which Gauguin spoke.

*

Neither Kierkegaard nor Nietzsche had any use for mediocrity. Neither cared for dispassionate processes of rational analysis and argument. Both demanded that a man should stake his all on the cause that he adopted. Both regarded the average Christian of their day as caricature of the teachings of Christ. Both were in revolt against anything established, accepted and respectable. Yet Kierkegaard aimed at recovery of true christianity and Nietzsche at its destruction. The reasons for the difference perhaps

require more probing than the obvious similarities of approach which is what Conrad Bonifazi sets out to do in his *Christendom Attacked* (Rockliff, sh 21/-).

*

In spite of its wealth of ideas, *The Man Without Qualities* should never be mistaken for a *roman a these*. The second volume (Secker and Warburg, sh 25/-)—excellently translated, as was the first—takes us up to the critical turning point of Robert Musil's great novel. Like a human life, it moves on many levels towards destination that can be guessed at, but never foretold with certainty; its characters develop according to their own laws, not according to laws imposed by the author. Nor did Musil have Proust's advantage of a circular frame, for his novel is as much concerned with the future as with the past.

R.H.

C. C. F. NEWS

A YOUNG American composer, Lou Harrison and a French composer, Jean-Louis Martinet were winners of "XXth Century Masterpiece Festival" Awards in the category of chamber music in solo voice in Rome during the international contest sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

Other winners in the international contest were Italy's Mario Peragallo in the category of violin concertos, and Russian-born Vladimir Vogel and Germany's Giselher Klebe in the category of short orchestral works.

The international jury which judged the "XXth Century Masterpieces" Contest was composed of Paul Collaer (Belgium), Aron Copland (U.S.A.), Roland-Maunel (France), Rollo H. Myres (Great Britain), Goreda Petrassi (Italy), Robert Soetens (France) and Heinrich Strobel (Germany).

The contest, which was conceived during the "XXth Century Masterpieces Festival" of May 1952 in Paris, was designed for the recognition of young composers by international audiences.

It is reported that a similar initiative in the field of painting is being planned by the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

*

The American Committee for Cultural Freedom recently protested against the denial of a passport* to Arthur Miller, noted playwright. The ACCF said, "While we deplore Arthur Miller's politics, we see no reason why he should be forbidden to see his own plays in Brussels. If his actions are sufficiently within the law to keep him out of jail, he should get a passport. . . . Unless there is evidence that Miller is an espionage agent or a courier for a subversive group, it would be a mark against cultural freedom in this country if his freedom of travel were obstructed."

I. C. C. F. NEWS

On May 10th, Prof. R. B. Joshi addressed a meeting under the ICCF auspices on the All-India Writers' Conference held recently at Chidambaram under the auspices of the PEN. Mr. Jambunathan of the PEN also spoke on the occasion.

TWO CRUSADES OR ONE? (from page 2)

member that the choice of means does not depend only on one party. The use of "other than peaceful" means by both parties is no doubt bringing the world to the brink of ruin. Civilised men all over the world will, therefore, support all measures that may be suggested for lessening the danger of an armed clash between the two big Powers. At the same time they cannot forget that it was only the armed might of the free nations which acted as an effective check on the crusading zeal of the communists as evidenced in Berlin, in Iran and in Korea. One need not necessarily join the armed struggle on the side of the free nations. For a variety of reasons it may be possible to adopt an attitude of non-alignment. Such an attitude by a few big nations may possibly help the cause of peace and put off the danger of war. The issue must be decided by each nation after taking into consideration its own peculiar situation. Under the leadership of the Prime Minister, India has decided to follow a policy of non-involvement. One need not quarrel with that policy provided it makes no difference to India's attitude towards the issues involved in the struggle.

The Prime Minister is in the habit of putting communism and anti-communism on the same level. He appears to be taking the view that both are equally bad. This amounts to carrying non-involvement or neutrality or independence to an absurd length. If communism is an evil, to oppose it cannot be regarded as equally evil. Communism can be, of course, opposed by an essentially similar system like that of fascism. But it is nobody's case that the free nations which are today opposing communism are a bunch of fascist States. It is illogical, therefore, to place communism and anti-communism on the same level. An

anti-communist may not be all that you wish him to be. But in any case he is fighting for the preservation of liberty and, for that purpose, he is opposing a system which represents the gravest threat that liberty has faced so far. And, in so far as he is rendering that essential service to the cause of human freedom, he deserves the support and sympathy of all those who stand for it.

The issue involved in the anti-communist struggle is the issue of liberty versus tyranny. It is not an attempt to foist any particular ideology or economic institution on Soviet Russia and her satellites. The free nations are not engaged in any crusade of that type. What they are up against is a crusade started by Soviet Russia for the imposition of her own peculiar social and economic system on the rest of the world. The crusade is fast degenerating into a struggle for world domination. The free nations of the world are compelled to fight back to preserve their own liberty, to choose the ideology and institutions of their own choice and to secure for the rest of the world the same liberty. That is the real nature of their struggle against the communists.

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru has done a grave injustice to the anti-communist fighters for freedom by labelling their struggle as a crusade for the imposition of an economic ideology. Nothing could be farther away from the minds of those fighters than the imposition of an economic ideology upon anybody on which they are not agreed amongst themselves. Such a wrong characterisation of that struggle creates confusion in the minds of the Indian people. That confusion is harmful not only for the world struggle against communism but also for the cause of Indian freedom and democracy. The Prime Minister may be indifferent to the former but cannot but be vitally interested in the latter. It is desirable, therefore, that he should think a little more calmly before pronouncing such hasty opinions on matters of such grave import.

COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY PROVED

"Lucknow, April 23: The Home Minister of the U.P., Dr. Sampurnanand, said in the Legislative Assembly that Government knew that the documents attributed to the Communist Party of India in the booklet entitled *Communist Conspiracy at Madurai* published by Democratic Research Service were genuine. —P.T.I."

Have you read the startling revelation?

If not, get a copy

from

THE POPULAR BOOK DEPOT, BOMBAY 7.
or your local bookseller.
(Price Rs 1/12/-)

ARE HUMAN VALUES UNIVERSAL?

Do you remember the exchange of views between Minoo Masani and R.H.S. Crossman, M.P., published in 'Freedom First'?

*Now available in pamphlet form
free on demand from*

**THE INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR
CULTURAL FREEDOM**
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
BOMBAY.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

"Fundamentally, only those terrified of death need be obsessed by the hydrogen bomb."

—A. D. Gorwala, *Statesman*, May 7, 1954.

"To say that we have been willing to meet with the Soviet Union and attempt to find a solution to the problems that disturb the world's peace would be an understatement. We have, you might say, chased Soviet Russia across the map of Europe and of Asia in our efforts to get its rulers to negotiate."

—Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, U.S.A., in an article entitled *We Have The Initiative* appearing in *Nations' Business*.

"Neither individuals nor nations are safe with a vacuum in their souls."

—The Archbishop of York, as reported in *Sunday Times*, May 9, 1954.

"There are superficial observers who have contended that the Cold War can be kept out of South-East Asia. The Colombo Conference showed conclusively what egregious non-sense this was. The Cold War was in every Prime Minister's mind; it was a misfortune that they could think of so little else."

—*The Eastern Economist*, May 14, 1954.

The Pakistan Prime Minister, Mr. Mahommed Ali, told pressmen here today that he would 'impose reciprocal restrictions on the movement of Soviet diplomats in Pakistan.' He said: 'I feel very strongly about it. In diplomatic relations it has all to be on a strictly reciprocal basis. If restrictions have not already been imposed I shall impose them!'

—*Indian Express*, May 5, 1954.

Mr. Nehru told Shri Valiula in a written reply in the Council of States that the Indian Government did not consider it necessary or desirable to place reciprocal restriction on the movement within India of Soviet diplomatic personnel.

—*Free Press Journal*, May 12, 1954.

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
BOMBAY 1.

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

Name :

Address :

Date : Signature

"Petrov said the *Tass* News Agency men were always active and intelligent members of the MVD, as they mixed with other newspapermen and because of their job met other members of the community in which they lived. The *Tass* Agency man also acted as contact man for the Embassy."

—*Hindu*, May 18, 1954.

"Mr. Nehru is not left alone, and the crusading zeal of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon threatens seriously to upset the Asian apple-cart."

—Frank Moraes, *Times of India*, May 1, 1954.

"There has been criticism of the part played by Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon and there are some who believe he was responsible for restraining Mr. Nehru from agreeing to some of the resolutions."

—*Hindustan Times*, May 3, 1954.

"The name of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon has been prominently associated in Ceylon with a strong leaning towards the communist bloc and he certainly gave the impression to more than one delegation that India was carrying neutralism in ideology a little too far. Perhaps the differences would not have been so widely felt if Mr. Krishna Menon had not been a member of the Indian delegation. It is an open secret that his inclusion weakened the Indian delegation at this Conference."

—*Eastern Economist*, May 7, 1954.

"According to Petrov, Soviet Russia aimed to get helpers and agents through a mixture of conversion, compromise and corruption."

—*Hindu*, May 18, 1954.

"Colombo has posed the question whether communism as an ideology and as a political force should be permitted to exist in the countries which have free democratic institutions. For some time past thinkers in India have been considering the question of the desirability of amending the Constitution to declare communism illegal."

—*Insaf* in *Hindustan Times*, May 4, 1954.

"It was not only France which was defeated in Dien Bien Phu. It was the whole of South-East Asia."

—*The Eastern Economist*, May 14, 1954.

"Now Bakshi Sahib has become our favourite. Whatever he does is absolutely right and we raise no objection. Recently he declared that Mr. J. P. Narain was an outsider. While he is an outsider, Dr. Ashraf with his new foreign wife—I suppose a communist wife—is welcome."

—Acharya Kripalani in Foreign Affairs debate, *Hindustan Times*, May 16, 1954.