

SEPTEMBER 1953

Another Landmark

OVER two years have passed since the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom met in Bombay in March 1951, when many leading intellectuals from India and abroad joined to consider the problem of cultural freedom and the various forces in the country and outside that were trying to subvert it. Out of their deliberations emerged a Declaration on Cultural Freedom—a document that at once tries to define culture and explores the conditions for its free flowering. It comes to the conclusion that the defence of cultural freedom is, in the main, the defence of free society against the challenge of totalitarian tyranny, and that this tyranny is the gravest danger that had ever faced civilised society.

The Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom was founded at this Congress with the implementing of this Declaration as one of its tasks. During its brief existence, the Committee has tried to fulfil this purpose by efforts to spread the awareness of the problems of cultural freedom among writers, artists and thinkers in general. These efforts include, among other things, the publication of *Freedom First* and the organisation of intellectual gatherings, discussion meetings and exhibitions of paintings.

The Central Committee has been able to organise groups in Madras, Delhi, Patna, Bangalore, Nagpur and Poona. The Madras Group has been functioning very actively for some time and has invited the Committee to hold its second Annual General Meeting that the Madras Group has chalked out and the arrangements it has made in connection with the meeting are indications of the growing strength of the movement for cultural freedom and the increasing response the Committee is meeting in that great centre of culture and learning in India.

The Conference will be held under the Chairmanship of Mr. Sampurnanand, the Home and Labour Minister in the Government of Uttar Pradesh and a member of the Executive of the Indian Committee.

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, the Chief Minister of Madras, has kindly consented to inaugurate it. The Madras Group has organised a Reception Committee with Mr. M. Bhaktavatsalam, the veteran Congress leader of Madras as Chairman, and Mr. Chengalvarayan, the Mayor of Madras and Mr. K. Bhashyam, a leading lawyer and ex-minister as Vice-Chairman.

Along with the Annual General Meeting, when stock of the situation will be taken and directions of future work will be chalked out, a Public Rally under the Presidentship of Mr. C. Subramaniam, the Finance Minister of Madras, will be held when some leading thinkers of India will address the gathering. There will also be a cultural show consisting of classical music, dancing and drama in which some of the leading musicians and artists of South India are expecting to take part.

Besides this, there will be three seminars devoted to a discussion of: (1) Why Freedom First? (2) The Writer's Responsibility, (3) Contemporary Trends in Music and Fine Arts.

The programme of the Conference will be:

Saturday, September 12

2—5 p.m. Seminars

9—12 p.m. Cultural Show

Sunday, September 13

9—11 a.m. Annual Conference—Inaugural Session

2—5 p.m. Annual General Meeting of the Committee

6—8 p.m. Public Rally

Members of the Committee who have not yet intimated their intention to attend the Conference should please communicate immediately to Mr. Kaa Naa Subramaniam, Hon. Secretary, Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, 64U Luz Church Road, Mylapore, Madras 4.

From the response that the organisers have already had it is confidently expected that the Madras Conference will be another landmark in the Movement for Cultural Freedom in this country and will open up a new vista of purposes and perspectives before the Committee.

Notes

Autonomy For Radio

THE only way to solve the present muddle in the A.I.R. is, to set up a truly autonomous broadcasting corporation free from political nepotism. In this direction Mr. S. K. Patil's recent call on the Central Government to establish a Broadcasting Commission and a listener's organisation is laudable. It is also heartening to note that Dr. Keskar, Minister for Information and Broadcasting, is not wholly averse to the idea of forming a corporation though, of course, he has indicated his disapproval of commercial broadcasting in very strong terms.

It is undeniable that the present administrative set up of the A.I.R. abounds with vice. Nepotism in appointments, political interference, Government propaganda, dull and stereotyped programmes, an indifference to the time and convenience of listeners, and an absence of realism and common touch with the masses are some of its obvious shortcomings. But, perhaps, the most disagreeable characteristic of the A.I.R. policy is its dogmatic attitude of sermonising and opinionating instead of entertaining and educating. It has degenerated into a "mouth-piece of the Government" and taken the stand of a moral "umpire" in judging what is good and bad.

The formation of an independent corporation like the B.B.C. responsible only to Parliament would rid us of this stagnation in reviews and discussions by making audible the "opposition" view point. In entertainment, if Mr. Patil's suggestion of a listener's organization be implemented, it would cater to what people like and not, as at present, what they *should* like.

Commercial Broadcasts?

THIS naturally raises the question of introducing commercial broadcasting and giving full scope of operation to private limited companies. There are some definite reasons for not favouring such suggestions with zest. As in the case of the U.S.A., it is undeniable that excessive commercialisation results in a vulgarisation of the art.

There are, however, some distinct advantages of sponsored programmes. They would offer increased employment to technical staff and artists. Moreover, radio would render service in yet another field, viz. advertising. But even more than these, private capital can be the only answer to the setting up of a chain of medium-wave transmitters, as envisaged in the Five-Year Plan. There are about 3,000 such broadcasting stations in the U.S. As opposed to short-wave, medium-wave gives very high quality reproduction free from fading and distortion and makes propagation in a limited locality very effective. This

characteristic has special significance in disseminating the "spoken word" in rural areas of India.

It would, therefore, seem that a compromise after the Australian model would offer a solution. It would involve the setting up of an autonomous corporation responsible only to Parliament and side by side guiding private capital along proper channels, so as to enable radio to possess the zest of a "business concern" and yet not forego the sober temper of a "Government" agency.

Iran Saved

AFTER dithering perilously over the edge of the Soviet abyss, Iran has saved itself. It is natural that a feeling of relief should be experienced right through the free world at the averting of what might have been a veritable catastrophe. For India in particular, further deterioration in the direction in which the ubiquitous Dr. Mossadegh was taking his country would have meant grave danger. "So far as India and Pakistan are concerned," wrote *Vivek*, when things looked black in Iran, "there is not the least doubt that their position is greatly endangered by this flanking movement which places the communist fatherland athwart their line of communication with the West and brings the old North West Frontier of India, now the sole responsibility of a not too strong Pakistan, into grave peril."

What should be a matter of particular concern to intellectual circles in this country is the way in which a section of the Indian press had encouraged and played up Dr. Mossadegh right up to the very moment of his downfall. They had mistaken him and the Tudeh (communist) Party mob in Teheran, which had become his main prop, as the voice of the Iranian people, and had taken little pains to conceal their jubilation at the overthrow of the Shah. But events have falsified their entire prognosis. It is clear

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.

that Iran has been saved not only by the army but also by an irresistible upsurge of popular opinion against the country being taken within the Soviet orbit. The popular raids on a communist theatre and a Russian shop indicate that the Iranian people had, at last, spotted their real enemies.

The Right to Travel

Freedom First is glad to be informed that Mr. D. F. Karaka's passport facilities, which formed the subject matter of a letter to the press, (*Freedom First*, August 1953) by the Honorary Secretary of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, have been restored to him. We are happy that the Government of Bombay have done the right thing in thus restoring the valuable right to travel freely abroad of an Indian citizen.

Citizens' Meetings

A NEW technique for forcing a United Front on coy and unwilling parties has been evolved by the Communist Party of India. This is the device of a "citizens' meeting." The latest crop of these erupted in Delhi, Agra, Bombay and other places on the conclusion of an armistice in Korea. In their attempt to convert the defeat of Soviet-backed aggression against the Republic of Korea by the United Nations into a victory for their "peace" campaign, the communists succeeded in inveigling certain gullible persons on the lookout for a platform into joining them in these "citizens' meetings" to celebrate the achievement of "peace" in Korea.

The fact is that these meetings are nothing but *ad hoc* fronts which are put up by the Communist Party, publicised by posters and leaflets paid for by that Party, and taking place in halls the rent of which is paid by the communists. Congress and Socialist leaders and other independent citizens would do well to beware of such an obvious device.

Polio in Bucharest

NO more shocking testimony to the cynical contempt for human life and welfare which is an essential part of communism has come in recent times than the report that the organisers of the "World Festival of Youth and Students" in Bucharest encouraged thousands of young men and women to come to that city notwithstanding their knowledge that a polio epidemic was in full blast in that unfortunate capital. In an article published, unfortunately a little belatedly, on August 3, that well-known author and press correspondent, Mr. G. E. R. Gedyé, writes from Vienna:

"The sponsors are likely to be disappointed, however, since word has by now gotten around of the appearance in Rumania of an uninvited guest: polio. Rumors of the outbreak first reached Vienna several weeks ago. Now confirmation is forthcoming over the Bucharest radio. Polio is not mentioned, of course. But special precautions are urgently advised to avoid what are euphemistically called 'contagious summer diseases.'

"In the free world, a festival of this sort would be postponed or cancelled at the first hint of an epidemic. Not so behind the Curtain. The participants will simply have to take their chances, for the huge sums invested in preparatory scene-shifting must bring their propaganda dividends."

British Defeatism

THE argument we carry on another page in this issue between Mr. R. H. S. Crossman and Mr. M. R. Masani on "The Universality of Human Values" shows how bemused British Left-wing intellectuals can be, presumably as a result of many years' reading of journals like *The New Statesman and Nation*. Unfortunately, neutralism has now advanced in the U.K. far beyond the confines of the Bevanites.

Speaking at Hyderabad during a session of the Bureau of the Asian Socialist Conference on August 11, Mr. Morgan Phillips, who is a staunch democrat and a mature socialist, declared that "the British Labour Party stood for the immediate and unconditional admission" of Communist China to the United Nations. "Mr. Phillips accepted the principle," continues the report in the *Times of India* of August 12, "that the United Nations must admit all sovereign states, but refused to extend it to Fascist countries like Spain." When challenged on August 18 in Yugoslavia on making a similar distinction, Mr. Attlee made matters worse by justifying this unprincipled stand on the ground that "he did not think Spain would subscribe to the general principles of the U.N. On the other hand, he thought that generally speaking China would subscribe to them." Surely a ridiculous claim belied by the facts of aggression in Korea, Tibet and Indo-China. The fact is that, both at home and abroad, Mao and his clique have consistently violated numerous clauses of the U.N. Charter.

Freedom First is not primarily concerned with a political issue like the admission of Communist China to the U.N. on which difference of opinion among democrats is possible. What is shocking in these statements is the distinction that is sought to be drawn between a communist dictatorship like that in China and the Franco dictatorship in Spain.

The Movement for Cultural Freedom is opposed to all forms of totalitarianism, of the communist and fascist varieties alike. It deplores, therefore, the double standard of morality accepted by the British Labour movement which connives at a communist dictatorship while setting its face against that of Franco's.

This defeatism in Britain can only be explained by the fact that, as Mr. Bevan's paper has put it, Britain has suffered "a stunning diplomatic defeat" in the signing of the Mutual Security Pact between the Republic of Korea and the United States combined with the Sixteen Power anti-aggression declaration. "Not for years has the U.S. Government dared to snub its principal ally in so flagrant a fashion," whines the *Tribune*. For lovers of freedom in Asia, however, the defeat of British machinations is a victory.

Science And Freedom

by Francois Bondy

(Francois Bondy is the Publications Director of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, Paris. In this article he reports on the Conference on Science and Freedom organised in Hamburg from July 23 to 26 by the University of Hamburg and the Congress)

A HUNDRED and twenty scientists from 19 countries just met here in the free Hanseatic city of Hamburg under the auspices of the Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Hamburg University. For four crowded days they have debated not only "the rights and responsibilities" of free scientists in the shadow of the totalitarian danger of intellectual oppression, but also, with mature awareness the problems, difficulties and challenges to "the freedom of research, of teaching and of publication," which arise in non-totalitarian societies. It was a "long week-end" in which biologists, physicists,—among them some of the most important pioneers of nuclear-physics such as Lisa Meitner, James Frank, Arthur Compton, Max Von Laue and E. Rabinovitch (editor of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*), philosophers and historians, like Sydney Hook and Hans Kohn, participated, and several scientists who had a first-hand experience of science in the Soviet Union such as Alexander Weissberg-Cybulski and F. G. Houtermans (both had been arrested and delivered by Stalin to Hitler) and the geneticist Dobzhansky.

This Congress was significant not only for the relevance of its debates and the spirit in which scientists of varied background and differing philosophical convictions found a common ground, but also because it is a dramatic starting point for a continuing international collaboration in which the world-wide community of free science will now find permanent expression. The ground for this new and quite revolutionary attempt has been laid just three years ago at the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Berlin which had devoted its first session to the "problems of science and totalitarianism." And the presence of the Mayor of Berlin, Ernst Reuter, who was constantly to be seen at the Hamburg debates, and of the distinguished Berlin geneticist Hans Nachtsheim, expressed this continuity of inspiration.

The keynote of the conference was hit in the very opening. Denis de Rougemont—speaking in the public inaugural meeting in the large magnificent hall of the old Hamburg *Rathaus* after the Mayor of Hamburg, Max Brauer—asked the public of over a thousand professors and students to reflect on the condition of scientists in Soviet Russia "who have to teach biology in accordance with the forthcoming confessions of Beria."

Later on, historians and biologists gave documented reports on the fate of their disciples in the Communist Empire. A distinction was made between the "humane sciences" such as history and sociology where state regimentation has gone farthest and political propaganda has replaced any concept of

objectivity and truthfulness, and on the other hand, the natural sciences in which the desire for technological progress has, by and large, been stronger than the impulse to adapt them to an ideological strait jacket. Alexander Weissberg, author of *The Accused*, recalled that when he edited his *Soviet Journal of Physics* he had been forced to include a reference to dialectical materialism as a method to which modern physics allegedly owed an "immense debt of gratitude," but he added that no serious scientist in the Soviet Union ever took this formula seriously. He recalled how embarrassed his colleagues and he himself were when a German Academy of Science accepted these remarks with teutonic earnestness and offered to pay for the trip of two Russian scientists who could instruct their German colleagues in "the application of dialectical materialism in physics."

Fedor Stepun, the grand old Russian revolutionary who now teaches in Munich, compared Soviet science to "a stale *boullion* with plenty of ideological fat on the surface, but nevertheless not quite deprived of nourishing value underneath."

The Swiss socialist, Valentin Gitermann, author of a recent three-volume study of Russian history, noted that despite totalitarian pressure "some cases" of erudition and genuine research and some standards of objectivity were maintained in the field of monographs treating "the more remote epochs," and he extended (to the Congress' great and unanimous applause!) his fraternal greetings to "those colleagues who under extreme hardship and unimaginable difficulties strive to keep up the standards of intellectual integrity." Later on, the Congress as a whole sent a message to their fellow-scientists behind the Iron Curtain expressing the same feelings of compassion and solidarity.

On the other hand, it was shown by geneticists like Dobzhansky, Nachtsheim from Berlin and Komai from Japan, that the imposition of "Lyssenkoism" and "Mitschurinism" in the whole Soviet world has gravely damaged a science of great practical importance. Scientists have been banned, institutes of genetics which have done priceless work, equal to the best work of western genetics, have been disbanded. Efficiency in a branch of science whose importance for agriculture is continuous and inestimable was sacrificed to an ideological craze, to censoring authorities and dogmatic decisions by central committees.

During one press conference, a young German journalist raised the provocative question whether "the free world really had any cause to deplore the setbacks to Soviet science caused by its political and

ideological subjectivity" and whether the scientists in Hamburg "could really wish that their colleagues in the service of an aggressive imperialism should make more discoveries leading to rapid technical progress and thereby to greater military efficiency and power." Sydney Hook replied that scientific freedom is a positive value in itself. Although scientists may have to weigh their responsibilities when their inventions directly benefit the military programme of an oppressor, he and his colleagues were unanimous in their belief that genuine scientific freedom implied other freedoms and ultimately the freedom of the scientist as a citizen; "Liberty is contagious and revolutionary," and this kind of freedom once obtained for the scientists would inevitably spread to other domains, thereby tearing through the totalitarian fabric itself.

It was, nevertheless, significant that the question came from a German, since in Hitler-Germany atomic scientists like Otto Hahn were faced with the responsibility of developing the process of nuclear physics. True, "in the long run," totalitarianism may dry out the spiritual sources of inventiveness and scientific creation, but a totalitarian state like the Third Reich had been able to muster for its aims so much scientific talent and ingenuity and efficiency that it was brought to the very edge of victory. It was striking, therefore, that it should be the German scientists at the Hamburg Congress who expressed their deep awareness of "the need to confront the freedom of the scientific research constantly with other moral values" and never to consider "scientific freedom" as an ultimate and sufficient value by itself. A Professor of Medicine, Jores, Pro-Rector of the Hamburg University, gave in this connection a terrifying account of the "human experiments" conducted by German doctors in concentration camps and concluded that the "freedom" of these doctors to conduct research of this kind was in conflict with elementary moral duties of these doctors as human beings. Another German scientist, Prof. Kuhn from the *Max Planck Institut* in Tuebingen, said "when Hitler prepared the seizure of power he never took into account a possible resistance of the German scientists and he, unfortunately, was proved right. I am tormented by the thought that much could have been prevented if, at the first attacks of Hitler against the principles of freedom and justice and the first elimination of Jewish teachers, a group of German scientists had protested regardless of the consequences."

As to the future, he added, if once an experiment has blown into the air a whole laboratory, should then this same experiment be repeated?

These remarks occurred in the discussion of "the neutrality" of scientists. The accent was on the necessity for scientists to act as citizens—citizens who could not claim greater insight into most political problems than their next-door neighbours but who because they handle such truly explosive factors of modern power must expect to bear especially heavy responsibilities. Nobel-Prize winner James Franck (from Hamburg and Chicago) gave an instance of civic awareness by calling attention to "security

methods" in the United States which needlessly hamper the work of scientists, and he underlined the damages of a visa policy which prevented so many foreign fellow-scientists from entering the United States. Samuel K. Allison, of the Institute of Nuclear Physics in Chicago, explained that despite the loyalty and security checks most researches in atomic physics were publicized and institutes like his own open to any visitor.

Are scientists especially susceptible to totalitarian ideologies? This was one of the most hotly debated problems of the Hamburg Congress and on which many sociologists intervened. Sweeping generalisations on the "psychology of the historian," or of the physicist, were not always avoided but it was important to state that scientists do believe in "systems of universal validity" for which Marxism, even in its degenerate Stalinist form, may appear to offer a substitute,—old-fashioned national and spiritual traditions do not satisfy this need which grows out of his own professional experience. Two prominent German thinkers, Theodor Litt and Helmut Plessner, argued that the *historians* may be more attracted to those authoritarian regimes embodying special national traditions, and precisely for that reason it was necessary to recognize the dangerous hunger for universal visions of history among all professional intellectuals. The brilliant French political scientist, Raymond Aron, believed that "national and social conditions" may well influence the work of historians, sociologists and economists, and it is just these limitations which make it imperative to "keep the discussion open" in order that a plurality of viewpoints are able to correct each other. Friedrich V. Hayek, the liberal economist, argued with similar dialectical irony that the best argument for scientific freedom does not lie in the progressively successful search for final truth and absolute knowledge, but rather in the "omnipresence of ignorance," and the impermissibility for any single person (or group) to superimpose his beliefs on the constant need of exploring the vast unknown from a thousand different sides.

Michael Polanyi, from Manchester, who has uniquely combined research in nuclear physics with sociology, compared the freedom of the scientist with the "free market" and insisted on the necessity for the State to recognize the basic assumptions of the scientific community as one autonomous factor of social life which cannot be reduced to any other criterion of "usefulness" and "expediency." There was agreement on the necessity to "develop the awareness of the international responsibility of scientists," and when Nicolas Nabokov, as General-Secretary of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, proposed that an International Secretariat of scientists proceed with the work inaugurated in Hamburg, this corresponded to the feeling of every participant.

The scientists of the free world have pledged themselves never to surrender—neither as scholars nor as citizens—their responsibilities to the cause of freedom, which for them is so obviously identical with their duty and their loyalty to the ideals of objectivity and of truth.

The Universality Of Human Values

(The article that appeared under this title in *FREEDOM FIRST* (November 1952) is making history. *SOCIALIST COMMENTARY*, the organ of the Socialist Union in Britain, which republished the article, publishes in its August issue a comment by the well-known British Labour M.P., Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, and a reply by Mr. M. R. Masani which, in view of their interest, are reproduced below.)

R. H. S. CROSSMAN, M.P:

IN his most stimulating article, Mr. Masani takes issue with me on three points. The first is my assertion that "both intellectually and emotionally communism outside Europe is still a liberative force." The second is my belief that "we should influence the Americans to revert to the moderate policies of the period of Marshall Aid, to limit their arms programme to what they can sustain for at least a generation and to take the risk in Asia and Africa of leaving unfilled the 'political vacuum' left by the dismantling of the old European empires." In the third place, he accuses me of "questioning the universality of human values" and assuming that, "if we put bread into the hungry mouths of the Asian masses and fill their empty stomachs, we shall save Asia from communism."

On the first two points Mr. Masani and I are in genuine disagreement, and I am glad of the opportunity to continue the controversy. But before that, let us clear away the third of Mr. Masani's criticisms. So far from falling into the error with which he charges me, I was at pains to point out throughout my Fabian Essay the fallacy of the belief that material progress makes men either free or equal. "One particularly vicious form of this fallacy," I observed, "is the belief that economics are the determinant factors in social change and that, if we achieve economic justice, we automatically secure human freedom." In applying this principle to the problem of the colonial people, I remarked: "It is important not to claim more for mutual aid than it can achieve. . . . The dynamic of social revolution in Asia and Africa is not a mass demand for tractors or for bread, but the will and the social conscience of a small intelligentsia." And again: "Even if the U.S.A. provided sufficient resources for a world-wide attack on low living standards, the result in many countries would not be to contain communism." On this issue, the fallacy of materialism, Mr. Masani and I seem to be in complete agreement.

Let us turn, then, to the main matter of controversy, the role of Russian communism and American capitalism in world politics. Mr. Masani indignantly repudiates the notion that communism is still a liberative force outside Europe, and equates it with Rudyard Kipling's "East is East and West is West," implying that I regard Asians as "lesser breeds without the law." He goes on very eloquently to reassert Gandhi's creed. But to assert the supremacy of spiritual values does not confute my argument that, in certain social and political conditions, a communist revolution liberates. My belief is that forms of government are not good or bad in themselves, but

must be judged by the function they perform. The test to which they may be submitted I defined in *Fabian Essays* as "the degree of equality and respect for individual personality expressed in the distribution of power and in the institution of law and property within a state."

Parliamentary democracy of the British type has been evolved over many centuries and is suited to a country where the break-up of feudal power, the distribution of land and the democratic revolution have all already taken place. But it must be realised that parliamentary institutions provide almost infinite possibilities of delaying action to minority groups and vested interests, and are therefore incompatible with rapid social change. Indeed, as we learnt in Britain during the Irish troubles of 1910-14, Parliament can be brought to a halt, and a nation to the edge of civil war, by a determined minority which happens to obtain the balance of parliamentary power. Or, to take another example from British history, had we been ruled by a system of parliamentary democracy when Henry VIII challenged the power of the Church, the national and social revolution he initiated might have been indefinitely postponed.

Let me put this in another way. Our parliamentary institutions are adapted to the needs of a society, in which political, civil and social freedom is already firmly established. They work well in Britain and Scandinavia. They work much less well in Italy, where the democratic revolution was not completely successful. But what about the social order prevalent throughout the Middle East, where revolution, as distinct from evolution, is still necessary in order to establish popular freedom? In these Arab countries, parliamentary institutions are exploited by small, privileged groups to deny freedom to the masses and to maintain an iniquitous social order, which must be forcibly changed. In such countries a period of authoritarian rule may be necessary in order to lay the foundations of freedom. Sometimes—in Turkey, for instance—this is provided by a non-communist dictator. But where this does not happen, communism will appear as a liberative force. What is a young Arab to do who sees that Western parliamentary democracy is the facade of a corrupt social revolution? Where is he to turn for his philosophy, if not to the writings of Marx and Lenin? And if you tell him that Stalin corrupted Lenin's revolution and turned it into an autocratic imperialism, he will reply, "That may be so. But in my country we hope to follow Mao Tse-tung's example and to maintain the Leninist tradition."

I am not qualified to write about India, but I would only observe that, if the necessary social revo-

lution and land distribution are unduly postponed under parliamentary institutions, the Indian communists will obtain their chance. Every country has the communists it deserves, just as every communist revolution (as distinct from occupation by the Red Army) is the result of the failure by other forces to accomplish the overthrow of an effete system. When I remark, therefore, that communism is no longer a liberative force in Western Europe and North America what I mean is that, in this part of the world the democratic revolution has already been successfully achieved. Social *evolution* towards freedom is possible because of *revolutions* which have already taken place. Outside Europe and North America, there are few countries where this fortunate process has occurred.

I can only deal briefly with Mr. Masani's last criticism, his strong distaste for my suggestion that America would be wise to leave unfilled the political vacuum left by the dismantling of the old European empires in Asia. This does not mean, as he suggests, that "the West should write off these countries and these peoples and do nothing to protect them." It does mean that America should not support Bao Dai in Indo-China, Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa and Syngman Rhee in Korea, unless she wishes to give military backing to counter-revolutionary forces. A political vacuum is merely another name for a genuinely independent state. I believe that the Labour Government was wise to permit a political vacuum to occur in Burma, instead of trying to hold Burma within the Empire. I believe that the French and the Americans are unwise to try to fill the political vacuum in Indo-China.

The danger to-day is not a recrudescence of American isolationism, but the use of American power to organise a crusade against communism, which can merely retard the liberation of Asia and poison the relationships between East and West. Dangerous though it may be, I would rather see America and France cut their losses in Indo-China and recognise Ho Chi-minh's regime than support the odious colonial war which is now taking place in that unfortunate country.

I cannot help believing that, on this point too, Mr. Masani's views really coincide with mine.

M. R. MASANI:

WHILE I appreciate the friendly spirit of Mr. Crossman's reply to my article, I am distressed that it should seem to drive us wider apart. I limit myself to dealing with five points made by him:

1. Mr. Crossman re-states his thesis that "in certain social and political conditions, a communist revolution liberates." He then goes on to provide the test by which he judges one form of government as against another. I wonder in which free country of Asia Mr. Crossman finds a form of government which, by his own test, is more reactionary than the Soviet or Chinese communist dictatorships? In

which self-governing country of Asia is there less respect for the individual personality and more total regimentation of thought than in the Soviet empire? Where is power more centralised? Where is respect for the law weaker? Where is the range of inequality in industry wider? And where is a peaceful change in the system less likely? It may be that, in one or other of these respects, certain Asian countries may lag sadly behind the needs of the twentieth century, but I would make bold to say that each one of them is humane, liberal and progressive in comparison with the Soviet system, which must by all democratic socialist criteria be regarded as the most tyrannical and reactionary form of government in the world to-day.

2. Mr. Crossman perhaps does not realise that, in his anxiety to find a short cut to "rapid social change," he has—may be without knowing it—accepted the Leninist concept of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat"—the concept of a seizure of power by a small group which would make far-reaching social changes and at the end of the process relax the dictatorship and re-establish the fullest democracy, what time the State withers away. I may be mistaken in my understanding of his meaning, but I find it difficult to distinguish between Lenin's thesis—rejected by all good socialists and democrats—and Mr. Crossman's propositions that democracy "is suited to a country where the break-up of feudal power, the distribution of land and the democratic revolution have already taken place" and that "parliamentary institutions are adapted to the needs of a society in which political, civil and social freedom is already firmly established." Democracy, according to Mr. Crossman, is thus a form of government which is only tolerable when all the real work has been done. Democracy as the most decent, the most lasting and, in the last analysis, the speediest weapon for achieving social progress would, alas, appear to have dropped out of Mr. Crossman's armoury.

3. The "young Arab" of Mr. Crossman's imagination has, according to him, no other choice than that between a corrupt social system and the philosophy of Marx and Lenin. What a mortal insult to the intelligence and moral sensibility of the "young Arab!" As it happens, Mr. Crossman, there are thousands of Arabs and Asians who reject the phoney philosophy of Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung precisely as they reject the corrupt social systems by which they are surrounded. They are still able to draw sustenance and inspiration from the diverse philosophies of such men as Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, John Bright, John Stuart Mill, John Ruskin, Jean Jaures, John Dewey, Bertrand Russell and, last though not least, Mahatma Gandhi. In other words, despite Mr. Crossman's rather contemptuous understanding of their intelligence, large numbers of young Arabs and Asians are not prepared to rush into one evil in their desire to escape from another. What they are doing is, like Jayaprakash Narayan, Ram Manohar Lohia and Asoka Mehta in my own country, to strive for social change while

resisting the advance of Soviet and Chinese imperialism. Mr. Crossman's description of this new imperialism as "liberation" hardly helps them in their difficult task.

As I brood in depression over Mr. Crossman's lack of faith, I see with relief in *Thought* magazine of Delhi, of June 6, an article on "Revolutionary Illusions" by Amlan Dutta, an Indian intellectual perhaps half Mr. Crossman's age. "People like to believe," writes Mr. Dutta, "that there is a short-cut from the distressful reality of the present to a new world of abounding happiness. They have always felt a desperate need to put their trust in magical formulæ like 'open sesame.' If the Marxian idea of a 'qualitative leap' at crucial points in social evolution has caught the fascination of not a few people, the explanation is, at least partly, psychological. . . . In India, for all foreseeable future the ballot box will remain an important institution for all those who care to contest for political power. . . . Leftists may feel that this is a long way. But there is no short-cut. The search for a short-cut may make the journey longer and more hazardous."

4. Now in regard to America's role. I fear Mr. Crossman's explanations here does nothing to weaken my original understanding of his thesis to be that "the West should write off these countries and peoples and do nothing to protect them." What else can it mean when Mr. Crossman goes on a few lines later seriously to suggest that the bandit regime of the Soviet agent Ho Chi-minh should be recognised? Must one remind Mr. Crossman that this so-called Indo-Chinese patriot was indoctrinated in Moscow in the early twenties, that he became a Soviet citizen and has served his masters ever since in China, Thailand and in his own native land? Does he wish to see in Indo-China the horrors of "brain washing" and the liquidation of a large number of Indo-Chinese comparable to the two millions whom Chou En-lai proudly claims he has so far liquidated in China?

5. Again, how wrong is Mr. Crossman when he says that "the danger to-day is not a recrudescence of American isolationism." This is precisely the danger, and men like Mr. Crossman are unfortunately doing everything they can to make it a grim reality. It is because of their awareness of this that liberal leaders of America associated with Freedom House, including Ralph Bunche and Paul Hoffman, appealed on May 24, 1953, that "the responsible leaders of the free world must shun the opportunistic methods of the ambition-ridden Bevans and McCarthys."

I have a suspicion that these instances of confusion of thought to which it is my sad duty to draw attention all have a common source in the basic fallacy of neutralism. It is a sad disappointment that Mr. Crossman, who not so many years ago won our gratitude by editing that magnificent compilation *The God That Failed*, should to-day be worshipping at the shrine of that other false god of neutralism under whose shadow totalitarian communism covertly advances.

Review

Lucifer And The Lord

by Jean-Paul Sartre (Hamish Hamilton, 1952, pp. 140, Sh. 9/6)

THAT Sartre and God have never got along well is by now an old story and, in *Lucifer and The Lord*, Sartre seems to have decided to have it out with God once and for all.

Set in 16th century Germany during the peasants' uprising the central idea of *Lucifer and The Lord*—as explained by Sartre himself in an interview with *L'Observator*—is that "if God exists Good and Evil are the same. This means that if the main character acts evilly at first and then benevolently, but always in relation to God, he gets exactly the same results: in both cases, man is destroyed. Goetz, for example, ends up with massacres when he is evil and with other massacres when he is good. . . . (But) Goetz perceives. . . . the total indifference of God, who allows him to act without ever manifesting himself. Thus when Heinrich, the defrocked priest, who has lost his faith, points this out to Goetz, he is obliged to conclude the non-existence of the Divinity. Then he understands himself and turns toward men. A morality dependent on God can lead only to an anti-humanism. But Goetz, in the final *tableau*, accepts the absolute by history."

I think Sartre has been anything but successful in *Lucifer and The Lord*. The play is rambling and ill-constructed, and the character of Goetz, after the first act, totally incoherent. If we take his belief in God seriously—as we must if the ending is to have any sense—then such action as cheating against God in the dice game, or giving himself fake stigmata to fool the superstitious peasants, are simply incredible. But if he never really believes in God, as these actions would indicate, then the wind-up conversion from God to Man falls flat. Sartre wants to have it both ways, and the result is sheer chaos. And even if we accept Goetz as so arrogantly pious that he has no qualms about filling in for God whenever the Almighty is a bit shy about manifesting a sign, even then, the ending is still an embarrassing fizzle. There is no good reason (either logical or dramatic) why Goetz should throw in his lot with the peasants after disposing of God. Goetz might no less (or no more) convincingly have done anything under the sun: atheism and social revolution do not have the ironclad causal connection that Sartre, in his more optimistic moments, would probably like to assume.

And what are we to make of Goetz's willingness to place himself at the head of an army of God-fearing peasants right after concluding that God is dead? Does this mean that an individual, after painfully hammering out his own morality, has to forget about it in order to take part in the struggle of the working class?

R.H.

A Year Of Achievement

ANNUAL REPORT OF ICCF: MAY 1952 — AUGUST 1953.

THE tone for this year's work was set by the First Annual General Meeting, which met on Sunday April 27, 1952, in Bombay with Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan in the Chair.

In the course of the discussion which took place regarding the programme of work for the ensuing year several interesting suggestions were put forth, which included, among other things, the formation of regional groups, the issuing of a monthly bulletin, closer relations with writers in the Indian languages, an attempt by means of discussion groups to popularise the aims and objects of the Indian Committee as delineated in the Declaration on Cultural Freedom adopted by the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom in March 1951. At the end of the discussion, a resolution was passed that membership of the Committee should be open to those who adhere to the Declaration on Cultural Freedom and pay a subscription of Rs 3/- per year. This subscription was to include the free supply of the bulletin proposed to be published.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The following Executive Committee and office bearers (with powers to co-opt additional members) were unanimously elected:

Mr. M. R. Masani	
Mr. Asoka Mehta	
Mr. Ram Singh	
Mr. Jaipal Singh	
Mr. Sampurnanand	
Mr. Raja Rao	
Mr. P. Kodanda Rao (Hon. Treasurer)	
Mr. Philip Spratt	} Hon. Secretaries.
Mr. P. Y. Deshpande	
Prof. J. C. Daruvala	

The new Executive Committee co-opted K. N. Subramaniam to the Executive Committee and appointed him as an additional Honorary Secretary.

The Executive Committee also decided to publish a monthly bulletin, to be called *Freedom First*, in the English language, and appointed an editorial board consisting of Mr. M. R. Masani, Mr. Prabhakar Padhye and Prof. J. C. Daruvala. The first issue of *Freedom First* was published on June 1, 1952. The editorial board appointed Mr. Aziz Madni to act as editor in January 1953.

FREEDOM FIRST

During its career of fifteen issues *Freedom First*, apart from timely articles and topical notes, has published the following significant articles:

The Open Society (Editorial); Salute to John Dewey—Sydney Hook; The Poet and the Challenge of Our Times—Tambimuttu; Incentives for Goodness

—Jayaprakash Narayan; Soviet Technique of Historiography—Bertram Wolfe; The Universality of Human Values—M. R. Masani; Universals and Purposes—Rohit Dave; Freedom First? A Discussion—Prof. Dantwala, M. R. Masani; The Buddha—Aamir Ali; The Tasks of Our Leadership—Sampurnanand (followed by a discussion between J. B. H. Wadia and Adam Adil); Tito and Stalin—Bertram Wolfe; Academic Freedom—G. D. Parikh; Stalin—Asoka Mehta; The Intelligentsia in the Modern World: A Discussion in Tokyo—M. R. Masani, Herbert Passin, Francois Bondy, Prof. Kenzo Takayanagi and others; Indoctrination and Academic Freedom—Sydney Hook; Common Endeavour—Prabhakar Padhye; The Scientist's Responsibility—Philip Spratt; Memories of Yusuf Meherally—Bertram Wolfe; Protests and Problems—Michael Polanyi.

Freedom First has made reviews an important feature. Among books reviewed were: *Logic of Liberty*—Michael Polanyi; *Russia and her Colonies*—Walter Kolarz; *In Place of Fear*—Aneurin Bevan; *Life and Death of Stalin*—Louis Fischer; *The Old Man and the Sea*—Ernest Hemingway; *Witness*—Whitaker Chambers; *Eclipse of God*—Martin Buber; *East of Eden*—John Steinbeck; *Soviet Opposition to Stalin*—George Fischer; *Arrow in the Blue*—Arthur Koestler; and *Feast of Unreason*—Hector Hawton.

INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATION

The Committee is represented on the International Executive Committee by Mr. M. R. Masani. In his absence Mr. P. Y. Deshpande attended a meeting of the International Executive held in Paris in May 1952.

In the autumn of 1952 Mr. Masani spent three weeks in the countries of the Far East and South-East Asia, making contacts for the Congress in Tokyo, Hongkong, Bangkok, Singapore, Djakarta and Rangoon. He was accompanied on this tour by Mr. Francois Bondy, Director of Publications of the Congress. It is hoped that the contacts thus made will be of value in developing further consultation and co-operation between those who think alike in the region.

THE PARIS EXPOSITION

One of the most important events during the year under review was the visit of the Indian Committee's representatives to the Paris Exposition of Arts (called "The Masterpieces of the Twentieth Century") organised in May 1952 by the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Sir R. P. Masani and Messrs Philip Spratt, P. Y. Deshpande, Kaa. Naa. Subramaniam, Rambriksha Benipuri and Udayraj Sinha

were those who participated in the Exposition from this country.

The object of the Exposition was to demonstrate the continued cultural vitality of the free nations of the world and thus to refute the communist jibe that the so-called 'bourgeois' culture was decadent. The Exposition achieved a marvellous success in this.

The Indian delegates took part in the literary debates on "Communication and Communion" and on "Revolt and Isolation." Mr Philip Spratt, one of the Indian delegates, argued that Gandhi had solved the problem of communication by identifying himself with the people, by sacrifice and by love. Mr. Spratt appealed to the West to be willing to follow the path of Gandhi. Mr. P. Y. Deshpande contributed a paper on the subject of "Revolt and Isolation" and was warmly congratulated by W. H. Auden. Mr. Kaa Naa Subramaniam contributed a paper on "Freedom and the Arts." Both these papers have been published in *Freedom First*.

MEETINGS AND EXHIBITIONS

During the year the Committee organised a series of meetings and group discussions wherein many well-known thinkers and writers (notably a group of Marathi literateurs) took part. Mention should be made of the following meetings in Bombay:

November 3, 1952: Dr. Alfred Fisk, Head of the San Francisco State College, lectured on "Contemporary Trends in American Philosophy."

November 4, 1952: Mr. Harvey Breit, Assistant Editor of the *New York Times*, spoke on "Recent Trends in American Literature."

November 26, 1952: Mr. Kyo Komatzu, the noted Japanese novelist and writer, gave a talk on "Modern Japanese Writers."

November 28, 1952: M. Francois Bondy, Editor of *Preuves*, addressed a large gathering of members and friends at the offices of the Committee.

December 11, 1952: Mr. Raymond Gram Swing met the group for discussion.

February 6, 1953: Mr. Asahi Okura and Dr. Ryoichi Oka of the Japanese Socialist Party (Right Wing) had a friendly discussion with a group of ICCF members.

February 16, 1953: Prof. Kenzo Takayanagi, President of Seikei University and Chairman of the Japanese Committee for Cultural Freedom, accompanied by Dr. Miss Shio Sakanishi, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Councillors of Japan, paid a visit to the offices of the Committee and exchanged views with members of the Committee.

March 16, 1953: Mr. Herrick B. Young, Executive Director of International House Association, gave a talk to members and invitees, preceded by a short programme of films showing life in the International House Chapter at New York.

May 29, 1953: Dr. Herbert Passin, the noted American anthropologist and member of the American Committee, spoke to a select group of writers, and professors on "Modern Japanese Literature."

June 16, 1953: Dr. Passin gave a talk on "Modern Trends in Japan."

June 22, 1953: Mr. Joseph Murumbi, Secretary-General of the India-Africa Council, spoke on "Indo-African Relations and Cultural Contacts" at the offices of the Committee.

June 25, 1953: Mr. Dnyaneshwar Nadkarni spoke to a group on "Theatre Life in England."

The Nagpur Group organised an Exhibition of paintings of Vinayak Masoji. The Exhibition was inaugurated by the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh.

RECEPTIONS AND FAREWELLS

On May 9, 1952 the representatives of the Indian Committee gave a send-off to the Indian representatives to the International Exposition of Arts in Paris. Mr. Purshottam Tricumdas wished them *bon voyage* and Sir R. P. Masani, the leader of the delegation responded.

On June 23, 1952 the Indian Committee held a reception to welcome back the delegates who had attended the Exposition referred to above.

On October 8, 1952 the Committee held a meeting of literateurs to honour Prof. K. P. Kulkarni on his election to the Presidentship of the Marathi Literary Conference.

On November 27, 1952 the Committee held a reception at the Cricket Club of India for M. Francois Bondy, Publications Director of the Congress for Cultural Freedom and Editor of *Preuves*.

M. FRANCOIS BONDY

During his short visit, M. Bondy met some of the distinguished educationists, scientists and public men and addressed a public meeting organised by the PEN on "Recent Trends in European Literature and Arts."

In Madras, a number of meetings of artists, writers and scientists were arranged for M. Bondy. He also spoke at a public meeting presided over by Prof. R Bhaskaran of the University of Madras on "The Struggle for Cultural Freedom."

MR. ADLAI STEVENSON

On Monday May 11, 1953 the Committee held a reception at the Taj Mahal Hotel for Mr. Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic candidate in the last American Presidential Elections. The Indian Committee was the only organisation in the country whose invitation Mr. Stevenson accepted. About fifty members and friends of the Committee were present, among whom were Mr. D. K. Kunte, Speaker of the Bombay Legislative Assembly; Mr. Shantilal Shah, Minister for Labour, Bombay; Mr. N. J. Wadia, Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University; Dr. John Mathai; Mr. Asoka Mehta; Mr. J. R. D. Tata; and Mr. A. D. Gorwala.

ANNIVERSARIES

During the year the Committee organised anniversary meetings to commemorate the deaths of

Sri Aurobindo Ghose, Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy, and Raja Ram Mohan Roy. Messrs K. D. Sethna and Frank Moraes were among the speakers.

Mr. P. M. Lad I.C.S., gave a discourse on the poetry and personality of Saint Tukaram.

At Madras the Group celebrated the Bharathi Day in October 1952 and the Pudumaippitan Day on July 1, 1953. Mr. Justice A. S. P. Ayyar on the Bharathi Day and Mr. Chandrasekharan on the Pudumaippitan Day were the speakers. Messrs K. Srinivasan, S. D. S. Yogi, Ki Vaa Jagannathan and B. S. Ramiah also spoke. The Madras Group also celebrated the Tagore Day on August 7, 1953 when Mr. K. Chandrasekharan spoke on Tagore's songs and stories.

LITERATURE, PRESS RELEASES & MAILINGS

It is part of the Committee's work to issue statements to the press on important happenings of cultural significance and also to make available to the press significant articles on important issues. During the period under review the Committee released to the press:—

- 1) An Open Letter to Aneurin Bevan by Salvador de Madariaga;
- 2) An Open Letter to Joliot-Curie on Germ Warfare charges signed by twelve Nobel Prize winning scientists;
- 3) A Letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations signed by many world-famous thinkers and philosophers on behalf of the Congress for Cultural Freedom appealing for the establishment of a special UN Commission to investigate the circumstances surrounding the infamous Prague trial;
- 4) A Statement by the Hon. Secretary regarding the cancellation of Mr. D. F. Karaka's passport;
- 5) A Statement by the Bombay Group regarding the Cultural Festival organised by the Indian Peoples Theatre Association;
- 6) An Open Letter to Uday Shankar by Mr. J. B. H. Wadia regarding the former's association with the Cultural Festival of I. P. T. A.

The Committee also released to the press the speeches and statements of the ICCF delegates delivered at the Paris Exposition and also an important article on "Culture and the Total State" by Bertram D. Wolfe.

Many leading English and language journals such as *The Hindu*, *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, *Andra Patrika*, *Chandrika*, *Bharat Jyoti*, *Tribune*, *Orient Illustrated Weekly*, *Thought*, *Mysindia*, *Eastern Times*, *Bombay Chronicle*, *Free Press Journal*, *National Standard*, and *Times of India* published them. The Committee takes this opportunity to thank them.

The Committee also organised press conferences for M. Francois Bondy, Mr. Purshottam Tricumdas (delegate to the International Jurists' Conference at Berlin), and Mr. Kaa Naa Subramaniam, one of our representatives at the Paris Exposition of Arts.

The Congress headquarters in Paris and the American and British Committees made available to the Indian Committee from time to time valuable

literature to be distributed in India. The headquarters sent us a few copies of Denis de Rougemont's *Freedoms We May Lose* and of *Excerpts from the Soviet Philosophical Dictionary*. The American Committee sent us copies of the *Partisan Review* publication *America & the Intellectuals* and of *Operation Rewrite*, while the British Committee sent the pamphlets *Who Has Lied?*, *Champion of Women's Rights* and a thousand reprints of an article by John Clews on Germ Warfare charges from the *Birmingham Post*. The Committee has distributed and continues to distribute this literature among members and friends and potential adherents. The office has mailed copies of *Freedom First* carrying specially significant articles to selected groups of people. For instance, the issue containing Philip Spratt's article 'The Scientist's Responsibility' was mailed to over five hundred scientists.

A thousand copies of Mr. Edward Hunter's *Brain Washing in Red China* were imported by the ICCF in July 1952 and were placed for distribution in the hands of M/s Thacker & Co., Ltd. This book got very appreciative reviews in the Indian press.

OFFICE

The Executive Committee decided to locate the headquarters of the Indian Committee in Bombay and the office was being managed by an office secretary. Since June 1, 1953, Mr. Prabhakar Padhye (former editor of *Navashakti*), who had been associated with the work of the Committee since the beginning, has assumed the Secretaryship of the Committee and has been in charge of the office.

The ICCF began functioning in Madras in August 1952. Apart from organising intellectual discussions and celebrating anniversaries the Group there has issued news items and articles originally issued by the ICCF. Recently it gave out to the press the news of the Hamburg Conference of Scientists organised by the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

The Madras Group runs a literary circle which meets every fortnight and is currently engaged in discussions on the Tamil short story. The Group has also sponsored an actor's group.

In July 1953, Mr. Padhye visited Madras, Bangalore, Hyderabad and Nagpur. He was able to further activate the group already set up in Bangalore and also to establish a group in Nagpur. The report that he gave about the work at Madras was encouraging and it was decided to hold the second Annual General Meeting in Madras on September 12 and 13.

MEMBERSHIP

The total membership of the Committee stands on August 25, 1953 at 495 and is distributed as follows:

Bombay	204	Calcutta	6
Madras	102	Gwalior	5
Chidambaram	5	Nagpur	15
Poona	20	Allahabad	4
Patna	22	Bangalore & Mysore	14
Delhi & New Delhi	11	Ahmedabad	4
Madurai	4	Other Places	79

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

If secret agents cleverly disguised as defeated American Presidential candidates have really been subverting India's position in Kashmir, it is a great surprise to students of U.S. policy here.

—“American Diary” in *Hindustan Times*,
August 20, 1953.

“We have no sympathy whatsoever with communism.”

—Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, in *Free Press Bulletin*, August 13, 1953.

“Asia has given a most timely warning: It must never again be taken for granted by anybody, no matter who or how powerful. President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea was not only Asia's mouthpiece, but also its conscience when he gave the fateful order to release the Korean prisoners.”

—Modesto Farolin, Editor of the *Philippines Herald*, Manila, August 3, 1953.

Trivandrum, August 15: The municipality of Irinjalakuda, a small town in the former Cochin State, is agitating for the establishment of an International Court to ensure a fair trial for the dismissed Soviet Vice-Premier, M. Lavrenti Beria.

—*Times of India*, August 17, 1953.

“There is a truly Russian touch about happenings in Kashmir.”

—‘Vivek’ in *Bombay Chronicle*, August 13, 1953.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council yesterday adopted a resolution calling for world-wide disarmament, with the savings to be devoted to a world fund for under-developed countries.

The voting was 15 in favour and two against (Russia and Poland).

—*Free Press Bulletin*, August 7, 1953.

“Xenophobia, the easiest escape for weak and disturbed minds, is rampant.”

—“After Sheikh Abdulla's Exit” in *Thought*,
August 15, 1953.

If printed with attribution in a non-communist paper, much of Mr. Malenkov's description of the current Soviet conditions would have seemed the product of an anti-communist.

—*New York Times*, August 10, 1953.

“The people danced in the streets of Belgrade the day Stalin died.”

—Adlai Stevenson in the
Hindu, August 12, 1953.

ARE YOU A TIRED NATIONALIST?

- Now that India's struggle for national independence has concluded, do you feel at a loss for a cause to live and work for?
- Do you feel dispirited in the endless maze of conflicting reports, claims and charges emanating from our politicians and the popular press?
- Are you going to let the totalitarians win by default?

Join the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom and read FREEDOM FIRST

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS :

Sydney Hook
P. Y. Deshpande
Tambimuttu
Jayaprakash Narayan
Michael Padev
J. B. H. Wadia
Rohit Dave

Prof. M. L. Dantwala
Prof. A. V. Hill
Ignazio Silone
Michael Polanyi
Kaa Naa Subramaniam
Philip Spratt
Prabhakar Padhye

Sampurnanand
Bertram D. Wolfe
Purshottam Tricumdas
M. R. Masani
Aamir Ali
Asoka Mehta
P. Kodanda Rao

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