

MARCH 1953

On Academic Freedom

by Prof. G. D. Parikh

THE educational policies of the Indian Union and of some of the State Governments have been responsible recently for raising the issue of academic freedom. The Universities (Regulation of Standards) Bill, circulated by the Ministry of Education to the universities for eliciting their opinion, came in for a strong criticism from these bodies on the ground that it threatened their autonomy and was likely to jeopardise academic freedom. In U.P. a controversy seems to be growing around the issue of interference by the State Government in the working of the universities. In Bombay, a Bill to consolidate the law relating to the University of Bombay has been published and has come in for criticism on the ground of its failure to concede the autonomy of the university. These and similar other developments are likely to focus increasingly the attention of the people on the nature of the freedom of the institutions of higher education. The purpose of this note is to analyse briefly this problem and to bring out possible directions in which it can be tackled, given our concern for promoting the democratic way of life.

To formulate a clear definition of academic freedom and to indicate its precise limitations is a difficult task, not perhaps altogether free from controversy. What can better be attempted is a general description of it which may serve a useful purpose in tackling problems pertaining to it on a practical level. It is generally recognised that such freedom is essential for institutions working at all the different levels of the educational pyramid. Although the respective spheres of 'guidance' and 'spontaneity' and the relation between the two at the early levels of education may

be a matter of difference of opinion, prevention of indoctrination is a point of general agreement. At the same time, the responsibility of the public authority, national, regional or local, has generally been viewed as more direct at these levels, and a certain amount of control in their behalf as unavoidable. Instruction tends to become education, 'method' begins yielding place to 'content,' which again later comes to serve the purpose of promoting the quest of truth as we proceed higher up in the educational structure and the need for freedom becomes all the more pronounced and essential. Such freedom has therefore come to be looked upon as one of the most basic and vital principles of a free society.

Academic freedom can be said to imply the freedom and autonomy of the institutions of higher education in their functioning, the freedom of their academic and administrative bodies from any external influence or authority in laying down courses and curricula, prescribing texts, recommending readings and references, determining minimum standards for entrance as well as the necessary attainments to qualify for the degrees, diplomas and other honours, and regulating the nature and functioning of constituent or affiliated institutions. It also implies the freedom of research, of collecting and arranging data and presenting the same along with findings deduced therefrom, on any problem considered as worthy of investigation. It also involves the freedom of the teacher to teach the prescribed courses of studies in his own manner, on the basis of free access to all material with a bearing, direct or remote, on his work and in doing so, the freedom to comment on issues, events, personalities or controversies in a manner he considers necessary for enhancing the understanding and appreciation of the subject. It is also essential that a teacher as a citizen must be free to participate in the social, political and cultural life of the community provided that such participation does not affect adversely the discharge of the duties and responsibilities of his function as a teacher. And in respect of

the latter, the verdict of his academic and administrative supervisors, and not the *prima facie* views of an external authority, ought to be the decisive factor.

Given the level of our development along democratic lines, it is natural that the problem of academic freedom should arise in our country in a form different from that elsewhere. We have a formal democratic constitution but hardly any deep-rooted democratic sentiments or traditions. Our institutions of higher education do not have their autonomy threatened; by and large, they have still to win it. On the other hand, the continual characterisation of the existent system as built up essentially for producing suitable personnel to man the administrative machinery of an alien rule has promoted a crass utilitarian attitude towards education, further rendered vulgar through growing skepticism about its usefulness. The system has thus come to be dominated by curriculum, the teachers preoccupied with texts and the students, with their degree-mindedness, concerned solely with the examinations. Though improving when viewed against the background of the past, our educational standards compare unfavourably with many other countries of the world. Thus a peculiarity of our educational situation is the simultaneous appearance of the problem of widening the freedom of our universities and other institutions of higher education and ensuring an improvement in their functional efficiency and standards. And with the passage of time, growing numbers and the resultant overcrowding in institutions, or issues like that of the medium of instruction may be expected to aggravate these problems.

Two distinct points of view seem to be gradually crystallising regarding the basic issue. One is the view that improvements in functional efficiency and standards of education are not possible in the absence of an external control, exercised directly by or under the supervision of the political authority; and the other is the view of those who argue that widening of the freedom of educational institutions is an essential pre-condition for improving their functioning and the educational standards. The former finds an expression in the policies of the governments, the latter in the report of the University Education Commission and the views of the Inter-University Board, individual universities and educationists. A choice between the two approaches is inescapable.

It is not necessary, however, that the protagonists of the two aforementioned views must come in clash with each other. Given the realisation, on one side, that state control of education making it subservient to ends considered by politicians as desirable is the very negation of a democratic outlook, and the recognition, on the other, that the autonomy of educational institutions cannot be absolute, any possibility of such a clash can be easily ruled out. And a common ground between the conflicting approaches can be discovered on which solutions consistent with the promotion of the freedom and autonomy of educational institutions can be tried on the practical level with a view to improving the standards of education.

External control can only pave the way to regimentation. It can lead to standardisation and not

to an improvement of standards. It will substitute a dull lifeless uniformity for the enriching variety available at present. Instead of trying to impose such control, the state should, while devising suitable methods of co-ordination and safeguards against any irretrievable deterioration, recognise and respect the autonomy of institutions of higher education. An intensive functioning of the Inter-University Board can be depended upon for solving the problem of co-ordination; the power of the State to lay down the constitution of the universities is, on the other hand, one significant safeguard against deterioration in their functioning; and a University Grants Commission along the lines recommended by the University Education Commission can be another. There is hardly any reason why the autonomy of the universities should not be recognised in such a setting by those concerned with the promotion of the democratic life and institutions. To refuse to do so is not merely to harm the present but also to undermine all healthy possibilities for the future.

It would not be desirable to be scared away by the argument that the universities have hitherto shown numerous defects and deficiencies in their functioning, and if left to themselves, may deteriorate further. It is true that abuse of freedom is potentially involved in freedom itself. But there is no better guarantee against the possibility of such abuse than a sense of responsibility and discrimination which freedom alone can produce. It is therefore desirable to create an atmosphere in which the inner correctives of our university life will be able to emerge and influence the situation. That alone will create the basis of a sound and stable improvement. Our universities need not be looked upon as our despair; they are, on the other hand, one of the few hopes we have for the future of a free society in India.

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.

Notes

Our New Honorary President

WHEN the late Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, was introduced for the first time to Reinhold Niebuhr, he declared, "At last I've met the troubler of my peace." Dr. Temple's remark was no complaint; it was a tribute. It was a recognition of the provocative thinking of the Reverend Dr. Niebuhr, an acknowledgment of Niebuhr's gadfly effect upon modern-day Protestant theology.

Tall, husky, hawk-nosed Niebuhr, with his bald head and penetrating eyes, his ringing voice and explosive manner, has looked deeply into the attitudes which overtook Protestantism in the 19th century and have largely guided it since, and has found these attitudes wanting.

It is this man who has been honoured by election as an Honorary President of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in the void left by the passing away of that other great philosopher and teacher, John Dewey.

Niebuhr has argued that the human self is inclined to destroy itself because it is too intent upon itself. It is in perpetual need of reversing the process and "dying to self" so that it may live. According to him, man must not only expiate the original sin of Adam but even the earlier sin of Lucifer in rebelling against the Lord.

He has demanded that the world's 193,000,000 Protestants admit the "real truth," abandon the soft, comforting road of "liberalism" and return to the severe orthodox faith of aged times. They must, he has insisted, concur in the olden tenet that "Man is a spirit who stands outside of nature, life, himself, his reason and the world."

Niebuhr was born on June 21st, 1892, in Wright City, Missouri, the son of an Evangelical pastor. He won his B.D. from the Yale Divinity School in 1914. His first parish, in fact, the only parish he has ever had, was a tiny one in a slum area of Detroit; exactly 18 people came to hear his inaugural sermon in 1915. He intended to stay there for two years at the most; he remained 13.

He was a socialist and immediately upon his arrival in Detroit he threw himself into the fight to improve the lot of the exploited, bullied automobile workers. "The lowliest peasant of the Dark Ages," he publicly proclaimed, "had more opportunity for self-expression than the highest-paid employee of the Ford factory." Night after night, year after year, he spoke before labour, educational and other groups, exhorting his audiences to strive for social, political and economic reforms. The automobile magnates were not unhappy when he finally left Detroit.

He began to write as a means of boosting his \$50-a-month salary. His first book, *Does Civilization Need Religion?*, was published in 1927. The two volumes

of his greatest work, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, appeared in 1941 and 1943.

Perhaps the best-known work of Niebuhr's in India has been *Moral Man and Immoral Society* which includes a sympathetic discussion of Gandhiji's thinking. The late Yusuf Meherally saw to it that Civil Disobedience prisoners in various jails had a copy to pass round.

In 1928, Niebuhr became an associate professor at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. In 1950, he was appointed dean of the Seminary.

Despite his preoccupation with religious problems, Niebuhr has continued his activity in the progressive movement. He is vice-chairman of the Liberal party, a New Deal group in New York State, and very prominent in the Americans for Democratic Action. He is now a genuine pragmatist in his political outlook.

Onwards to Liberation

NOW that the jitters in wide sections of the Indian and British Press over President Eisenhower's action in taking the wraps off Formosa are subsiding, it becomes possible to analyse the spate of criticism voiced during the past fortnight. There appear to be two grounds on which exception has been taken to the U.S. Government's action. The first is that America's allies were not consulted. So far as Britain is concerned, there might perhaps be some point to this, but one wonders on what ground a country like India, which has not sent a single soldier to fight in Korea in response to the U.N. call, can presume to claim a veto on the use of half-a-million Chinese Nationalist troops which are prepared to go into action for the U.N.? Also, it may be pertinently asked, did India and Britain consult the U.S. when they rushed precipitately to recognise the forcible conquest of China by Mao-tse Tung and his Soviet-armed forces and thus made a wide rent in the unity of the free world?

The second complaint has been that President Eisenhower's action threatens to widen the area of conflict in Asia and indeed to precipitate World War III. Three weeks have since passed and the world has not yet come to an end. The basic answer to the panic-mongers is that to talk of "provocation" where the Soviet Politburo is concerned is to talk the most object nonsense. Students of Soviet imperialism are clear that the Politburo has a time-table of its own, and that it will not be made to depart from it by actions such as a blockade of China or an advance to the Yalu river any more than it was "provoked" by the successful democratic defiance of its Berlin blockade. Critics of President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles find themselves impaled on the horns of a dilemma:

If Stalin thinks he can today win World War III, he will not wait for the de-neutralisation of Formosa or some such act to provide him with an excuse for starting a conflagration; if Stalin realises that he is not yet prepared for World War III and faces ultimate defeat and destruction at its end, not even the liberation of China from its present satellite government will "provoke" him to launch a global war.

In the face of this dilemma, how is the howl against

the present trend of United States policy to be explained? One factor is the colonial and mercantile outlook that lingers on in Britain and with which the dubious prospect of trade with Communist China and the maintenance of its colony in Hongkong appear to take precedence over the lives of those who one day will have to pay for this short-sighted selfishness. There is a tanker at present on its way to Communist China carrying 7000 tons of oil for jet planes. An embargo or blockade of the Chinese aggressors in Korea, in so far as strategic goods are concerned, is not only authorised by the United Nations General Assembly resolution calling for such an embargo, it is also the most elementary act of enlightened self-interest. Those who today oppose an embargo or blockade of Communist China are placing themselves in the unenviable company of those British and other reactionary interests who sent war supplies to Japan after it had aggressed against China, with the result that these supplies were in the end used against them in the course of World War II.

The other element that goes into the protest against President Eisenhower's action is the natural discomfiture of the neutralist at being forced to make up his mind. Allowing for the denunciation of such fellow-travellers as Professor Gyan Chand, Mr. Chelapathy Rau and Pandit Sunderlal, who have already made up their minds, the bulk of criticism in India must be deemed to be actuated by some such feelings of reluctance to decide. We are convinced, nonetheless, that even in this country the moving on from a policy of containment to one of liberation by U.S. diplomacy will achieve positive results in rallying genuine democrats and bringing the indecisive off the fence. A policy of liberation of the peoples today subject to Soviet imperialism is one which no anti-imperialist worth the name can possibly help supporting. Or is it to be argued that, while the freedom of the people of Tunisia from French imperialism is a legitimate matter of concern to us, the freedom of the Tibetan people from Chinese imperialism and of the peoples of Czechoslovakia, Poland and other countries of Eastern Europe from Russian imperialism is something on which we may turn our backs with a clean conscience?

We believe that all in this country who really love freedom have thrilled to President Eisenhower's stirring call in his State of the Union message: "The policy we embrace must be a coherent global policy. The freedom which we cherish and defend in Europe and America is no different from the freedom that is imperilled in Asia. We shall never acquiesce with enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancy gains for ourselves."

General Templer confessed recently that there could be no end to the rebellion in Malaya until accounts had first been settled with International Communism as a whole. Those who talk of localising the war in Korea have yet to realise that World War III is already on and Korea is only one of its many fronts.

The policy that President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles are following is in line with the grand tradition of the United States which, many times since 1776,

has helped revolt against tyranny in different parts of the world. The Formosa decision and the proposed repudiation of the infamous secret imperialist treaty signed at Yalta will, we trust, prove to be only the first of the master strokes which have already seized the psychological initiative from Stalinist imperialism and which, if relentlessly pursued despite the wails of doubting Thomases, may yet relieve the great pressure that Soviet imperialism today exercises on the free countries of Asia from Israel at one end to the Korean Republic on the other.

Well Done!

CUSTOMS authorities in Bombay were reported the other day to have seized at the instance of the police books and papers brought from abroad by two Communist leaders, P. C. Joshi and Romesh Chandra. The Comrades had returned from London after attending the Vienna Peace Congress and paying a brief visit to their Fatherland, Russia.

The timely action has saved the country from a major disaster. One shudders to think what would have happened to us all had these few books and documents got through the customs and added to the enormous quantity of subversive literature from Russia which floods the streets of the principal Indian cities and towns! The customs and police authorities deserve to be congratulated on straining at a gnat while swallowing a whole camel.

Bevan and Lohia

FEW can deny the right of the citizen of a democratic country to go abroad and criticise his own government's domestic or foreign policies, but many have questioned the propriety of a responsible public figure exercising this democratic right except within rather narrow limits. This issue is once again raised by the many speeches and statements made by Mr. Aneurin Bevan during the past few weeks in this country. Mr. Bevan has shown no hesitation in supporting the policy of a "third force," which is tantamount to neutrality in the cold war between Soviet totalitarianism and the free world, and thus by implication criticising and undermining the foreign policy of his own country, which is a leading member of the North Atlantic Pact, one of the other two "forces" against which Mr. Bevan constantly rails.

We are of the view that Mr. Bevan was perfectly within his rights in exercising this democratic freedom of dissociating himself while abroad from his own country's foreign policy. Indeed, one can sympathise with a man who in recent months has lost ground within his own party at home and is apparently seeking to bolster his waning prestige in the British Labour Party by securing the plaudits of neutralist audiences in this country, even though in doing so he has added to the existing volume of confusion in this country. Mr. Bevan has today replaced Mr. Henry Wallace as the main prophet of Confusionism in the free world, and it is interesting to observe, that while the

"Rightist" Attlee fraternised with the Socialists of Asia, the "Leftist" Bevan finds himself there at home among non-Socialist Governors and Cabinet Ministers!

What is really intriguing is that, while introducing Mr. Bevan to Members of Parliament House on 16th February, India's Vice-President, Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan should have introduced the distinguished visitor as "the most outstanding critic of the present government of Great Britain" and that the Prime Minister should have listened with great approval to the address that followed. When Indian citizens like Dr. Rammanohar Lohia have gone abroad and criticised the policy of the Indian Government, they have been made the victims of a smear campaign emanating from Indian Embassies and Consulates abroad and influential quarters in New Delhi which have not scrupled to portray them as persons of doubtful patriotism who have lowered India's prestige abroad. This has been one of the many instances of a double standard of morality that is maintained in certain circles, and it is time that those in New Delhi who patted Mr. Bevan on the back realise that they cannot have it both ways, and that what is sauce for the British goose is also sauce for the Indian gander. Or are Indians citizens of a second-class democracy who may not exercise abroad rights which are exercised by British and American critics of their own governments to the accompaniment of official applause in New Delhi?

No Shaking Hands with Murder

Freedom First congratulates Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Chief U.S. Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, for categorically refusing to shake hands with Soviet Foreign Minister Vyshinsky. After Mussolini had aggressed in Abyssinia, it is on record that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru refused to meet Mussolini on the ground that he had the blood of Abyssinia on his hands. In that regard, times have unfortunately changed. Ambassador Lodge's action is, however, an echo of that act and recalls that Vyshinsky not only has the blood of thousands of members of the Russian Communist Party and others whom he helped to prosecute in the so-called Moscow "Trials," but is also the representative of a brutal imperialism which has the blood of Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria on its hands, not to mention North Korea, China and Tibet. It is time that the habit of shaking hands with murder became recognised for what it is.

Praja Parishad Agitation

THE Praja Parishad agitation in Kashmir is gathering momentum. Much as we deplore the composition of the Praja Parishad as communal, we cannot help sympathising with some of its aims, such as, to get Kashmir in closer relation with India, to establish the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India over Kashmir, to have the Indian flag flying over Kashmir, and to secure the immediate implementation of the terms of agreement between India and Kashmir, which

have not been implemented hitherto, though more than six months have already passed since the agreement was arrived at. It is unfortunate that a genuine cause is sought to be condemned just because those who have sponsored it belong to a particular religious community or social group.

What we fail to understand is the logic behind the use of the Preventive Detention Act to detain the supporters of the Praja Parishad in the Punjab. The liberal leader, Shri M. N. Kunzru was on sound grounds in the Council of States the other day when he counselled the Praja Parishad agitators in Kashmir to assure the people that notwithstanding the delay, the July agreement would be implemented in full. Why should the Kashmir Government be reluctant to give the assurances? At times from the professions of some of the leaders of the National Conference it appears that they are nearer to Russia than India. Particularly in the light of this, the Praja Parishad agitation appears legitimate and justified.

It may be true that the agitation is dominated by a certain section of vested interests. But vested interests are on the other side too. We have no sympathy for the vested interests in the Praja Parishad. But we would like to point out that it is the short-sighted policies of the Kashmir as well as Indian governments which have placed the vested interests in the dominating position in the agitation.

Again, the fact that the composition of the Praja Parishad is communal, does not justify the alliance with the communists which the Congressmen in Delhi and the Punjab seem to have made. Totalitarian forces are hardly the right kind of allies in any fight, for an alliance with them might easily lead to the subversion of the very democracy which is sought to be saved from communal forces.

To The Editor

It was interesting to read your review of *Witness* by Whitaker Chambers, in your issue of February. An appropriate footnote underlining the relevance of this book for India at the present juncture is provided by the following extract from *Mysindia* of January 18, 1953 :

A picture remains in the mind: not directly presented, but suggested by Chambers' book. It is of Roosevelt in the White House, receiving memoranda from officials and warnings from friends about the Communist infiltration into his departments. He is not worried. He knows there are reds in the Government. They are sincere young men, good New Dealers, and keen on beating Hitler: on our side after all. Moreover there is no sense in annoying Uncle Joe. Leave them alone. They can do no harm. He laughs at all the warnings.

Then one thinks of Delhi. There infiltration is going on just as in Washington in the thirties and forties, and by just the same type of polished, well-connected young men. And Nehru doubtless answers warnings with just the same kind of arguments.

"BANGALORIAN"

The Tasks Of Our Leadership

by J. B. H. Wadia

MR. SAMPURNANAND'S stimulating article, called "The Tasks Of Our Leaders," deserves the attention of all those who are seriously interested in the resurgence of India. In fact, his brilliant analysis of the crisis of culture would apply with equal force to almost any other country in the world of today.

It is, however, a pity that just when one was well settled for an exciting journey in the approaches of a scientific inquiry, one experienced an unexpected jolt as it were. The article ends on the clarion call of the vital need to train "the younger generations for the citizenship of this world" through a moral education the basis of which must be either "religion or a philosophic substitute for it."

I have a feeling that Mr. Sampurnanand would personally choose the philosophic substitute for religion rather than religion itself as a more desirable remedy to overcome the malaise which prevails in the Indian society of today. In such a case, this somewhat longish rejoinder would become redundant. But if he were also to subscribe to the efficacy of religion to root out the disease which has run deep into the vitals of our society, I, for one, should have liked to be enlightened as to how exactly religion in its accepted sense could succeed in bringing the Indian society out of the morass of moral degradation and lay the foundations of the age of the moral man in Indian society.

No one will deny that India is in sore need of developing "a new sense of values." In fact, and as it has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Sampurnanand himself, it has become the fashion of the times to pay lip homage to this *sine qua non* of human happiness.

Why, even the communists, who subscribe to the immoral doctrine of the end justifying the means, never stop shouting about it from the house-tops of their very enemies in non-communist countries. And why should they not, when the liberal entrances to our democratic edifices are kept all open to them to enter as and when they will? That these enemies of cultural freedom would certainly transform their visits into visitations and thrust upon a dazed and gullible public *their* new sense of values is also a factor which has to be reckoned with.

Therefore, the crux of the problem is not the development of a new sense but *that* new sense of values which alone can lead us best to the desired goal of social emancipation.

Of course, Mr. Sampurnanand is not the type of person to be waylaid by the siren song of communism. But his reliance on religion to solve or resolve the problem of the hour is also fraught with danger, especially when he says that "a society can be inspired by religion without its government ceasing to be secular."

Society *was* at times inspired by religion in the preceding centuries of the civilised man's existence on earth. But religious education and secular

education are irreconcilables today. None of the permutations or combinations of their various forms can any longer result in a happy formula, which will enable the state to keep the authority of religion in check, if ever such a state were once to encourage it.

I cannot help dragging the category of the state in my arguments as the term "leaders" in the context of his article naturally applies as much to those in the high seats of authority today as to those who are still struggling for capturing it.

Once the state is in league with religion which has an authority of its own, it is just a question of time before the authority of the state would change itself into authoritarianism. The pages of human history are strewn with dire illustrations which one can afford to overlook or gloss over only at the cost of humanity.

All the temples of Augustus could not but hasten the decline and fall of the empire of the Caesars. The advent of Christianity brought new values and new hope. But instead of leading man to the Ultima Thule and the Vision Beatific, it actually pushed him on to the perdition of the Dark Ages. When in the wake of the European Renaissance, the Reformation emerged triumphant, it did not turn out to be the promised panacea, but became the precursor of Puritanism.

In our own country, all that was best in the different successful forms of Hindu religion could not prevent the peoples from becoming a prey to Brahmanic priestcraft for more than two millenia and from which they have not as yet completely come out. The best values of Jainism, or for that matter Buddhism, could not save the adherents from social degeneration once they got mixed up with the rigidity of a strictly religious approach. Even Islam which started as a great reformistic religion took no time before it became intolerant in practice. The history of Zoroastrianism in the Sassanid Era shows the same sorry tale of Zoroastrian priests leading that empire to its inevitable doom.

Coming near to our own times, take the case of a philosophy of life like communism, the essence of which lies in its being able to usurp the place of religion and work as a substitute opiate for the people. The messianic aspect of Marxism has logically ended in exposing the clay feet of its god in all their ugliness.

One can go on multiplying these instances. Suffice it to say that underlying the sorry spectacle of human tragedy will be found the greatest common denominator of religion in all its chameleon colours.

If I am told that it is not religion but its abuse which has been responsible for the misfortune, I will answer that *that abuse* is inherent in the very concept of religion which demands abject subservience to a postulated Supreme of Supremes. Once a secular state encourages or is encouraged to draw its inspiration therefrom, however innocent and however well-meaning it be, its internal logic cannot prevent it in

course of time from becoming identified with that religion, if not merged into it.

Mr. Sampurnanand has pointed out that the concept of secularism is "perhaps the greatest tyrant" of all. This is true only when secularism or rather the so-called secularism usurps the authority of religion and becomes authoritarian as in totalitarian countries. That is to say, it becomes the greatest of tyrants only when it loses its identity and begins to sail under false colours.

Therefore, I humbly submit that the main task of our leaders is not to be secular in a loose sense but to be so in its real democratic perspective.

The concept of secularism is comparatively new for the world at large. And so far as the consciousness of all its implications are concerned, it is a most recent experience as such. If I may be allowed to say so, I would name the type of secularism most likely to take us to the goal of emancipation as liberal secularism, that is to say, the practice of secularism in the best traditions of liberalism.

It is the only potent weapon available to the democratic body politic to keep religion in its proper place. It respects the liberty of man as an individual in society and gives him an opportunity to choose religion for himself as an individual or discard it as a

staff which he no longer needs to walk erect in the sun. It is also the only safeguard of the individual man to be protected from the onslaught of a hypocritical political system which would masquerade itself behind the fair name of secularism and pour its anti-religious bias down his throat at the point of bayonet. My remarks must have made it clear to the reader that I am not against the usefulness of religion to society at its present level. But I would emphatically maintain that its use by our leaders in their tasks would be nothing but rank opportunism. And opportunism is certainly one of the greatest obstacles to social progress.

I have stated somewhere in the beginning that the problem of the hour is to find out *which* new sense of values is required to bring about the age of the moral man in society through a moral education. Moral education to be effective and progressive will have to be secular in the best traditions of the liberal philosophy of life — to live and let live and with a view to preserve that noble ideal to consider it our birthright to fight to the bitter end all those who will not allow us to live and let live.

This, I submit, is the task of tasks of our leaders today.

Demosthenes' Reproach

This article was published before President Eisenhower's inaugural address on assuming office and, in so far as the U.S.A. is concerned, the reproach of Demosthenes may no longer be justified.

THERE is one thing to be said for the Seventh General Assembly of United Nations—it is not starting off with a lot of fancy phrases and pious hopes of what it is going to accomplish. It is said, even, that there is gloom about the place.

There should be gloom around U.N.—and a determination to do something about it. For the world, this Fall of 1952, is an uneasy, frustrating sort of place to live in if you look at its international affairs. The list of problems facing U.N. is woeful and weighty, and it embraces several items to which there seems to be no solution: Korea, Indo-China, the South African colour war—and Russia.

People put Russia last only because if we put it first the mind scarcely has any energy left to go on to the others. Besides there is a natural but possibly dangerous desire to put Russia last. Being unable to tackle it outright the democratic side seems to be trying to let time or fortune look after it.

Which brings us to a recent piece of reading that, frankly, gave us the creeps. It was the foreword to a new book on the state of the world in 1939 which has been edited by Arnold Toynbee. Looking about for something to set the mood of the world in 1938 and 1939 as it anxiously stared at Hitler's Germany, historian Toynbee went back to 351 B.C. to quote Demosthenes speaking to the Athenians about Philip of Macedon:

"You take your marching orders from him; you have never made an adequate plan of campaign for yourselves; you do not foresee any event—until you learn that something has already happened or is actually happening. Hitherto perhaps you have been able to get away with this; now things have reached a major crisis and it is no longer possible. It seems to me, Athenians, as if one of the gods, from shame at the policy of our city, has put his aggressive appetite into Philip. For if he wished to remain quiet in possession of what he has already seized and snatched, and made no further move, I think some of you would be satisfied with a state of affairs which would have earned us as a people the reproach of shame, cowardice, and utter disgrace. Now, by always attempting something new and grasping after more, he may perhaps provoke even you, if in fact you have not abdicated all moral purpose."

Now that is what Toynbee thought of the world's democracies as they sat fixed in fascination at Hitler as he took his countries one by one, like a man eating artichokes leaf by leaf.

"How silly we were!", we say now, as we look the other way so as to avoid the disturbing signs of Russian imperialism.

Which brings us to another meeting with Demosthenes. About a year ago an Indian politician and student of international affairs was visiting Canada as a sort of break from his official duties at U.N. His name was Masani and he spoke to several groups in Ottawa on international affairs.

(Continued on page 11)

Tito And Stalin—II

by Bertram D. Wolfe

TITO visited Moscow in April, 1945. He came back with a twenty-year treaty of friendship and mutual aid, with a military mission to run his army, an economic mission to integrate his industry into the Soviet economic plan. And he learned, to his dismay, that that plan envisaged Yugoslavia as a kind of second-class agricultural, raw material, metal-producing land, subordinate in rank to Czechoslovakia, to Poland and to Hungary, for Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary were slated for a greater degree of industrialization.

Tito was, moreover, at that interview urged into open battle with his own people. One way in which Stalin keeps puppets as puppets is to get them thus into open struggle with their own people. He was urged to go head-on into forced collectivization of Yugoslav agriculture. He recognized that his army was to be reduced to an auxiliary troop of the Soviet Army and that the whole scheme reduced Yugoslavia to a subordinate part in a detailed blueprint from Moscow to all her satellites. He recognized, too, that far from "withering away," this form of state domination was destined to grow stronger and the Soviet Empire would be ever more unified, and the Balkan portions of it ever more subjected and co-ordinated into the Soviet Empire.

He paid a second visit to Stalin in May and June, 1946. Here they went into more detail on the same matters. He learned that the U.S.S.R. was going to reorganize the Yugoslav Army with modern tactics and modern equipment. There was to be no national manual of arms in this thoroughly national Guerrilla Army, but it was to take the Soviet manual of arms, just as, a little later, Hungary was ordered to teach its soldiers to take commands in Russian as well as in Hungarian. There was to be no national arms industry—generous equipment with weapons but if at any time they wore out or at any time Tito needed new munitions for them, he would have to come "hat in hand" to the Soviet Union once more. There was a Soviet Mission to go to Yugoslavia and take virtual command of the Yugoslav Army, just as the Yugoslavs were permitted to send a mission to Albania to take virtual command of the Albanian Army.

Tito Draws First

Tito left Moscow crestfallen and conferred with his Balkan confederates for closer co-operation to make counter-pressure so that the communists of the Balkans would be treated with more wisdom (as he thought) and more dignity than had thus far been the case. For the moment, all the leaders of the other Balkan countries looked to Tito for leadership, not realizing how far things would go. There followed a period of manoeuvre.

Stalin was as smart as Tito, and so the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union began

secret consultations with selected members of other Central Committees concerning Tito's "errors" and Tito's "excessive independence." And the Cominform (which had been set up for the fight on the Marshall Plan) now sharpened its offensive instruments for a major war on Tito and Titoism.

In late 1947 the Cominform met in Belgrade—on September 27—and Tito was still a leader among the Cominform leaders. At the beginning of March, 1948, the Vice-Premier of Yugoslavia, Kardelj, went to Moscow in a vain effort to persuade Moscow to send more machinery for the purpose of the industrialization of Yugoslavia. He came back empty-handed. On March 18, the Soviet Government secretly withdrew all military advisors and instructors from Tito's army, charging that they were "surrounded by hostility." On March 19, they withdrew all civilian missions, charging "a lack of hospitality and a lack of confidence." On March 20, Tito demanded an explanation.

He wrote to Molotov, "We are amazed. We cannot understand. We are deeply hurt. Openly inform us what the trouble is."

On June 29, 1948, the unsuspecting world was startled by the publication of a Cominform blast against Tito entitled, "Concerning the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia;" and a Tito counter-blast, defensive in character but nevertheless obviously a counter-blast. The break was in the open. The period is an instructive one; it was the period when the Berlin crisis had come to a head. Berlin was being blockaded by the Russians. We were debating whether we should smash the blockade by running armoured trains, properly defended, through the blockade lines.

At that time the Soviet military men were considering a military plan in case open war should begin. That military plan involved something which was of great importance to Tito and helps to explain Stalin's attitude towards Tito's army. The plan was to smash westward, through Germany in a frontal attack towards France and the Atlantic; but, at the same time to outflank France by sending an army through the relatively less mountainous areas of Yugoslavia into Italy following the valleys of the Po and the Adige and the Plains of Lombardy; then striking up into France through the most accessible of the passes, thus hitting our troops from the rear at the same time they were being hit from the front by the major forces of the Soviet army.

This same period was one in which U.N.R.R.A. supplies had been completely used up and the Yugoslav Trade Delegation in Moscow was begging in vain for aid in the industrialization of the country to get its Five Year Plan of Industrialization underway. It was directed instead to gear its minerals and ores

into the more advanced industries of neighbour countries and of the Soviet Union.

Soviet Imperialism

This brings us to the notion of Kremlin Imperialism, which Tito's break has made so clear. The subordination of the Yugoslav economy into the over-all plans and profits of Soviet industry; the attempt by the Soviet Union to get pro-consul's rights and extra-territorial status for its agents; its ambassador to be entitled to interfere in Yugoslav internal affairs; its agents to have the right to access to state secrets; its right to organise its own intelligence service to spy on the Yugoslav leaders to be exempt from Yugoslav espionage and to recruit Yugoslav citizens as Soviet spies; its insistence that Soviet officers should get three or four times as much salary from Yugoslavia as the Yugoslavia generals and to have over-riding powers; its insistence of the rights of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to interfere in the affairs of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and of the Yugoslav state.

Now Soviet Imperialism combines all the imperialisms that have ever been invented in the long history of man: from the most ancient direct pillage and plunder and kidnapping of populations and extermination of elites to leave peoples leaderless, and the sowing of waste lands for strategic purposes, to the early 20th Century form of economic penetration and then it has super-added its own forms of expansion of the total state through terror, concentration camps, deportations, police systems and the like.

Let us examine for a moment what we might call "classic economic Imperialism." The Soviet Union had set up (as Tito has now made clear by publishing the documents) mixed companies, *juspad* and *justa*—shipping and aviation. Theoretically, the stock is owned 50-50 by the Soviet Government and the Yugoslav Government, but the Soviet Government paid in only 9.83 per cent of its share during the period in which the Yugoslav Government had paid in 76.25 per cent of its share. The managing director in Yugoslavia was a Soviet appointee; his assistant was a Yugoslav who was ignored for all practical purposes. Soviet planes were allowed to fly into Yugoslavia, but Yugoslav planes were not allowed to fly into the Soviet Union. Yugoslavia paid 52 per cent more for her freight shipments on the Danube than the Soviet Union did and 30 per cent more (for reasons that are not clear to me) than any other satellite did. In other words, here was a system of direct economic exploitation thinly disguised under the guise of an equal partnership.

Similarly, the army equipment of Yugoslavia was left without replacement parts to keep it in subjection. Yugoslavia sent metals (principally iron) to Czechoslovakia and had asked in return for machinery in order to manufacture trucks. Czechoslovakia under Soviet orders sent not machinery to manufacture trucks, but sent trucks, meaning "you will never manufacture your own trucks." Yugoslavia found all its molybdenum monopolized by the Soviet Government. Its cost of production was fantastically high—500,000

dinars per ton according to the Yugoslav White Book; but the Soviet monopoly paid only the world price—instead of 500,000 dinars, 45,000 dinars—so that Yugoslavia lost 455,000 dinars on every ton that was delivered, and the more it delivered the more it lost.

Finally, in this relation of metropolis to colony, there was an ill-concealed basic contempt. One example will suffice: In one of the notes of the Soviet Government to the Yugoslav Government dated August 30, 1949, you will find this sentence: "The puppy is feeling so good that it barks at the elephant." Nevertheless, the puppy has so far checked the elephant, so we must now examine how the puppy managed to hold the elephant at bay.

First, Stalin had unexamined illusions as to the absoluteness of his own power. Up until that time no one had been able to stand against him. Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev—they all looked bigger to him than did little Tito, but at his breath they were blown over. Not only Bukharin, Trotsky and Zinoviev proved vulnerable to his anathema, but he had no difficulty with Poland, Hungary and Rumania. However, Tito had a power centre of his own just out of reach. Moreover, he was the perfect disciple—a kind of pocket Stalin.

The Crack in the Kremlin Wall

In the chess game which now ensued they both played by the same book. Tito was able to anticipate each move. He was invited to Moscow to parley—he politely declined the invitation. He was invited to Bucharest to parley at the Second Cominform session—he stayed away. Attempts were made to assassinate him—he protected himself well, though not as cautiously as Stalin does.

A "revolution" in Yugoslavia has been called for, and called for, and called for—but the call falls on deaf years. Tito, who had enormous opposition in his own country, undoubtedly has less opposition today than he had when Stalin attacked him, rather than more opposition. With his internal opposition, every knock from Stalin is a kind of boost. He was gradually moved over into the position of a national hero. Without ceasing to be a Communist he is also in the position of a national hero, defending Yugoslavia's independence against a great, bullying power.

Charging Tito with ingratitude and lack of discipline has not proved effective, so Stalin has tried more complex ideological attacks. But an ideological attack permits an ideological defense. The Cominform has said that Yugoslavia has a police regime, terror, no party democracy, holds no party congresses. Tito answers: "You have a police regime; you have terror; you also, have no party democracy; you hold no party congresses."

So every article of the indictment has become a *fortiori* an article of the indictment of the Stalin regime itself and this is the most distressing thing that has happened to Stalin since he came to power. Gradually, Tito has stepped up his defensive until it has become an offensive, and he has done it with rare tactical skill. Today, the Soviet regime is truly on the

defensive against this tiny, ridiculous "puppy who is barking at the elephant;" on the defensive because from inside the communist camp come the clear words of truth about Soviet Imperialism and Soviet terror and Soviet ruthlessness which, when they come from non-communists, have less effectiveness. This is the true crack in the Kremlin wall of infallibility. Therefore, Stalin cannot tolerate it and refuses to tolerate it but he tries expedient after expedient, move after move, and every time playing by the same book, having gone through the same hard school, having a somewhat better moral case, Tito out-guesses him and blocks each move on his party.

There are only two possible moves which might bring results. One of them is to run all his neighbour states into an attack—an open war upon him. This is too dangerous. Danger No. 1—that the armies of the Balkan neighbour states are themselves infected with some admiration for this assertion of independence of a Balkan power; Danger No. 2—Tito has (on a Balkan scale) a mighty good army and may not be overthrown without the intervention of the Soviet Union; Danger No. 3 (and largest of all)—during the period when Stalin wants neither total peace nor total war he cannot risk an open attack upon Tito, for out of a local war too easily can come a total war.

Now there is a certain logic to Tito's position which we in the democratic lands watch with the closest attention. He is engaged in a critique of Stalinism which has ended with a complete rejection of Stalinism. Nevertheless, the structure of his own state is still basically Stalinist in character: that is to say, he still has his political prisoners; he still has his forced collectivization; he still has his one-party state; he still has his secret police; he still has his terror—all the things he learned from Stalin. He has glossed them over a bit, undoubtedly softened them a bit as his relations with his own people become less tense; nevertheless, the structure is there. But the logic is one which compels him anxiously to re-examine that structure. I do not say to dismantle it, but certainly he is constantly re-examining it.

The logic also of his position requires him to seek allies. He has been forced into calling off the war on Greece and in Greece. He has been forced into closer relations with Greece, Turkey, Italy and Austria (which is all that is left of the possibilities of a Balkan Federation against Soviet aggression). He has been forced to apply for help from the Free World, and we have given him help, and that too has its logic. We have not made conditions. We are not endorsing his internal regime, but on the other hand neither are we making our critique of this internal regime a major criterion at present. The major criterion is that he represents a crack in the Cominform. He represents a communist defiance of communist aggressive imperialism that emanates from the Soviet Union, and he represents a struggle for independence of his country against the Soviet Empire. These things we are prepared to support to the extent that we are now supporting them because in the kind of world in which we live they are definitely assets, creating a better situation rather than a worse situation.

The full logic of his position is limited by his own dogmas and predispositions. I have recently spoken with Bebler and I found that Bebler, Kardelj and Pijade (who are the major theoreticians of Tito-slavia) are approaching very tenderly the question of re-examining Leninism. They are grave and bold in re-examining Stalinism. They are at the point now in their thinking where they are asking themselves: "Shall we also re-examine Leninism to see if in Lenin, too, there was some imperfection which gave rise to Stalinism?" And they are beginning to come to the conclusion that there was. How far that process will go, I do not venture to predict.

There is also logic to Stalin's position. Leninism was defined by a Russian Marxist once as "*Marxism à la tartar*" (Marxism with tartar sauce). If that is true, we will have to find a much more drastic qualification for Stalinism. It is a kind of mountaineer blood-feud Marxism, geared to a total state and an aspiration to total rule of the world. But there within the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist camp Stalinism has suffered its first check. And I do not believe that Stalin is so dumb as not to learn from what has happened.

Just as the British after 1776 never lost another colony, so Stalin has determined after June 1948, never to permit another Tito and never to lose another Yugoslavia. But Britain's response was appropriate to the organic nature of the British regime. It was a slow, hesitant, blundering but incessant loosening of the bonds, until the British Empire changed (and is still changing under our eyes) into the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Now, according to the inner nature of the Stalin regime, the direct opposite procedure is taken—to tighten the bonds. Being the ruthless total state that it is and Stalin being the kind of man he is, he can think of nothing but to squeeze tighter; to co-ordinate the countries more rapidly into his machine; to hasten the conflict between rulers and ruled; to remove those who have any roots in their own country and put in their places puppets who are completely dependent upon him; to let loose a hail of blood purges, executions of faithful and devoted communists like Laszlo Rajk, Traicho Kostov, Clementis, Gomulka, and like loyal collaborators such as Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk of Czechoslovakia. There has been hail of accusations of Titoism, and one by one the men who have national roots in their own country, in their own Communist Parties and in their own labouring classes—these men have been executed in advance of the possibility that they may some day commit the crime of considering the interests of their country as different from the interests of the Soviet Empire.

However, there is also a danger in that method of solving the problem of Titoism. When you draw the bonds tighter and tighter, you augment the potential discontent. Thus the Soviet Empire appears to grow tighter and stronger with its more ruthless co-ordination of all of its parts, but at the same time that introduces fresh elements of weakness into every one of the lands that Stalin dominates.

Review

What Can A Man Believe?

by Arthur Goodfriend (Farrar, Strauss and Young, New York City, 1952.)

The Only War We Seek

by Arthur Goodfriend, with a foreword by Chester Bowles (Published for "Americans for Democratic Action" by Farrar, Straus and Young, 1951, \$1.)

These two books of extremely effective photographs accompanied by pointed comments linking them into a chain of deep-sighted argument cannot be too highly recommended. The earlier one underlines the mistake committed by the author's own country with regard to China when the communists had not yet taken it over. The author proves America's intentions to be just and humane and also that it wants no war except against poverty, disease, hunger and illiteracy in the backward parts of the world. What he castigates, with the freedom possible only in a democratic country, is the choice of the wrong men and the wrong methods in the right cause, while the communists served the wrong cause with the right men. It is encouraging to find Mr. Chester Bowles contributing a foreword, for it gives us hope that the method mostly pursued at present in India by America, of working on Government level instead of coming down to the problems and perplexities, dreams and aspirations of the common people and tuning the democratic ideal to their heart-throbs, will undergo a salutary change. Large-scale gifts are, of course, most welcome, but the mind of the masses must also be intimately approached and skilfully enlightened in terms natural to it.

In his more recent publication, *What Can A Man Believe?*, Mr. Goodfriend has precisely made the intimate approach and thrown light on the puzzled mind of the common man, especially the average Asian. His work deserves all the greater praise because he touches the religious level which is particularly marked in the common man of Asia. No doubt, he does not go very deep into the religious consciousness, but that is no real defect since his book is aimed at relating the elementary needs of life — food, peace, land, family, freedom — to the faith in a hidden Divine Power and fundamental ethical values. Also, he considers these needs in the context of Communism's threat to civilisation and culture, and so his prime job is to show by vivid visual and ideative presentation how a Democracy attempts to secure for the masses the things which it holds to be God's first gifts to them, whereas a totalitarian regime seeks with deceptive propaganda to deprive them of these precious necessities.

It was high time somebody touched the religious level. One of the shortcomings of the usual anti-communist front is that it works too often on the surface of man's consciousness, appealing to his so-called commonsense and self-interest. The communists, on the other hand, try to give their doctrines a sort of Messianic meaning, a kind of apocalyptic air. Stalin is figured as a world-saviour and the Collectivist

State is presented in the colours of a perfect society, a species of earthly heaven. Marxism is doled out as the revelation of an ultimate truth, a philosophy rooted in the very nature of things: its tenets and injunctions are therefore delivered as imperative, unescapable, absolute. The religious instinct in man is thus awakened on behalf of a Godless, soul-denying and individuality-destroying movement. The Democracies keep striking too much the secular and scientific note, taking little cognisance of the spiritual depths in man. This is rather paradoxical, since democratic thought with its insistence on the fundamental value of the individual and on the basic ideal of liberty becomes rather shaky if the individual is only a casual assemblage of atoms instead of a genuine soul-unit which is not an automaton but the spark of a supreme free Spirit, secretly purposive within and behind Nature. Some authentic philosophy charged with religious truth is very much required as at least the background of democratic thinking if the latter is to be both logical and an effective force against Communism's pseudo-religion.

Mr. Goodfriend has introduced just the right tincture of this philosophy into his book in order to make it deal predominantly with practical problems without being shallow. He must be congratulated on avoiding both dogmatism and unctuousness while doing this. His profundity conforms to the modern temper — and not least in that the wisdom of the Upanishads, Buddha, Lao-Tse, Mahavira, Mohammed as well as Christ is drawn upon by him in its native freshness with an easy pertinence to burning contemporary issues. His book is sure to go straight to the modern Asian heart. The best appreciation of his superb pairing of picture and precept would be to render it widely available in the East in editions speaking to the Oriental peoples in their own languages.

K. D. SETHNA

(DEMOSTHENES — *Cont'd from page 7*)

Mr. Masani was clearly worried about the menace of Soviet imperialism. He was anxious about India and other countries in Asia, and he was fearful that the democratic side wasn't awake to communism's slow but inevitable motion. How to tell his audiences of what he feared was happening? He went back to Demosthenes who in 351 BC was disturbed enough to make several speeches to the Athenians about Philip. The one Mr. Masani invoked was this:

"Shame on you Athenians... for not wishing to understand that in war one must not allow oneself to be at the command of events, but to forestall them. ... You make war against Philip like a barbarian when he wrestles. ... If you hear that Philip has attacked in the Chersonese, you send help there; if he is at Thermopylae, you run there; and if he turns aside you follow him to right or left, as if you were acting on his orders. Never a fixed plan, never any precautions; you wait for bad news before you act."

Demosthenes said the Athenians did it in 351 B.C. Toynbee says we all did it in 1938 and 1939.

Masani says we are doing it now.

I.N.S. in the Ottawa Journal

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

"There is but one sure way to avoid total war—and that is to win the cold war." (President Eisenhower).

—*Hindustan Times* (Sunday Magazine),
February 8, 1953.

In a curious way Krishna Menon plays to Nehru the role which Nehru played to Gandhi.

Jawaharlal rationalised the teachings of the Mahatma. Krishna Menon has the ability to rationalise the Prime Minister's foreign policy.

—*Sunday Standard*, January 25, 1953.

"Colonialism is dying out and will soon be only a memory of the past, but Russian expansionism is the new danger to Asia." (Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan).

—*Free Press Journal*, January 17, 1953.

On one occasion Churchill was informed that Bevan was ill. "Nothing trivial, I hope," said the Tory leader, genially.

—*Times of India*, February 8, 1953.

Mr. Bebler: "The Russians are not communists. They are anything but that. Only in Burma they describe themselves correctly—white rebels."

—*Hindustan Times*, January 24, 1953.

The emphasis is to be no longer so much on the avoidance of war and the containment of the communists as on the defeat of the communists and the avoidance of war, if possible.

—'Vivek' in the *Times of India*, February 1, 1953.

Pandit Nehru thinks that when he dubs some party "communal" he has passed final judgment.

—*Blitz*, February 14, 1953.

"We must try to understand the Marshal. I think we in this country would feel very severe domestic

pre-occupations making it difficult to have conversations with heads of Governments if, for instance, so many of our best doctors were being charged for murdering leaders." (Mr. Winston Churchill).

—*Hindustan Times*, February 12, 1953.

PREUVES

A Monthly Review

Published in French by the International
Secretariat of the Congress for Cultural
Freedom

PREUVES is designed to defend and extend that freedom most gravely menaced in our century—freedom of critical and creative thought.

PREUVES

Publishes in each number—

- articles, stories, and poems by French and international writers of diverse tendencies
- information on political, intellectual, and cultural developments on the world scene
- exposé of totalitarian oppression, wherever it prevails, openly or disguised, to the detriment of human culture
- documents serving to broaden cultural horizons and strengthen resistance to conformist thinking

PREUVES: 41, Avenue Montaigne, Paris(8)—
CCP 178—00 Paris

Sample copy on request

Annual Subscription: France 700 francs;
Foreign 1000 francs.

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