

Our Concern For Africa

by Nissim Ezekiel

INDIA'S official and non-official attitude to Asia and Africa is based on an unconditional and uncompromising condemnation of colonialism. Although this finds meagre practical expression, it weighs heavily on the conscience of Western political commentators. Their view of white dominance and exploitation of Asian and African territories, even when determinedly anti-colonial, is less simple than that of their Asian counterparts. Some sort of rapprochement seems necessary between the two points of view when they are the result of good faith and genuine concern for human dignity and freedom.

To the Indian mind colonialism is evil and almost any alternative is preferable. If it can be shaken off, it does not matter what evil replaces it. To acknowledge that one evil may be replaced by another, is, of course, to give away one's case. There develops, therefore, a certain obstinate refusal to face the realities of the African situation, to consider the social, political, cultural and racial problems involved, and to be discriminating in the support one gives to the anti-colonial forces. It tacitly accepts the principle that the enemies of our enemies are our friends. It dismisses criticism of undesirable tendencies in the anti-colonial camp as heresy and insists on the exclusive honesty of a single, massive, inflexible, moral dogmatic approach to the African question. The result is that our political analysts economise in their study of Africa's problems and make moral indignation a substitute for political understanding. The politically-minded among India's intelligentsia are miserably ill-informed about Africa and are kept that way by the Press. Not only for the sake of intelligence and clarity but also in order to be *effective* in the service of the African people, this situation needs to be remedied.

A serious interest in the sufferings of the African

people and a desire to mitigate them makes unmistakable intellectual demands—the most urgent of which is to make our support of Africa's struggle for independence consistent with our domestic policy and our social attitudes. We cannot remain in the Commonwealth and be disdainful of the declared goal of certain African leaders of independence within the Commonwealth. We cannot damn our communists as unpatriotic and motivated by extraterritorial loyalties while aiding the growth of communism in the colonies (This, of course, is part of a larger contradiction between our national and international politics). We cannot condemn the colour bar while retaining an overwhelming colour consciousness which does not operate as a full-fledged bar because the opportunities are so limited. Let the streets of Indian cities frequently witness African young men walking along with our women in friendly conversation and the consequences may show little trace of "ahinsa". On many of these issues we have not yet faced the acid test. Within a short time after African students first began to live and study in this country "incidents" were reported which showed up the deep-rooted weaknesses in our attitude to colour. On cultural issues, notwithstanding the present wave of enthusiasm for international peace, and brotherhood, a shallow jingoism accompanied by feelings of inferiority may soon mess up our relations with the Negro race. It is hardly necessary to mention, in this context, that "overseas Indians" (Indians who have settled down abroad much in the style of European colonial careerists who eventually go "home") are not regarded by Africans as their best friends or sympathisers with their cause.

The Government of India recently sponsored a Department of African Studies. It sanctioned Rs. 65,000 for an exhibition on Africa organised by an Indian quarterly journal. These moves may dramatically symbolise our keenness to establish links with the African struggle and to that extent they are welcome. In the long-term perspective, it is the reality behind the symbol by which our interest in Africa will be judged. Will the Department of African Studies

(Continued on page 11)

“The Future Of Freedom”

IT has long since been accepted that there is very little individual liberty allowed to people under communist governments. What is even more alarming is the fact that even in democratic countries, the State is making intrusions into the privacy and freedom of individuals. The heavy complicated machinery of modern governments no doubt makes it a great temptation for them to withdraw certain freedoms from the people; it is so much easier to govern peoples who can be regimented by laws. All thinking persons, however, are united in preferring the untidy, slow-moving society, where every single individual has the greatest political and individual freedom to the controlled, fast-moving type of totalitarian State.

The Congress for Cultural Freedom is the first to do something concrete for encouraging clear thinking on this issue.

An International Conference on “the Future of Freedom” will be held in Milan from 12 to 17 September, 1955. It will be in the nature of a research project, to distinguish between real problems and pseudo-problems, actual solutions and specious ones. The Conference will serve as a forum for the discussion of diverse topics in economics, sociology, and political philosophy, and the main subjects to be discussed are: Challenge to a Free Society; Economic Systems, their Aims and their Realities; Threats to a Free Society; Safeguards of a Free Society; the Future of Freedom, the Strategy of Freedom.

A great deal of spade work has already been done all over the world to get the most useful results from the Conference. Members of the Organising Committee have discussed the main subjects with leading personalities, and the response has been most encouraging. Representatives from a number of well-known Universities will attend. The non-partisan and catholic nature of the conference is shown by the number of people of widely divergent views who will attend the Conference. Prominent among these are Mr. Raymond Aron, Prof. John R. Galbraith, The Right Honourable Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, M.P., Prof. Friedrich von Hayek, Prof. Sidney Hook, Mr. George F. Kennan, Mr. Carlo Schmid and Mr. D. Sumitro. People who differ as widely as Mr. R.H.S. Crossman and Mr. M.R. Masani will be sharing the same platform. Others in the Indian delegation are Mr. Patanjali Sastry, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Eric da Costa, Mr. A. D. Gorwala, Prof. B. R. Shenoy, and Mr. Amlan Dutta.

Unlike most conferences where lengthy reports are read by delegates with advance copies in the hands of the audience, a more imaginative procedure will be in force and the participants in Milan have been asked only to comment briefly on their reports. This

will make the discussions more lively and a large number of people will have the opportunity to take part in the debate.

A Conference of this type has been long overdue. During the 19th Century there was a vision of a continuous and harmonious development of man's material and spiritual forces. When this was contradicted by facts it came to be believed that the root cause of all evil in the world was the fact that the individual had been left free to decide his economic and political destiny. Beginning with Marx a savage attack was made on all forms of *laissez faire*, and it is only now that it is being realized that the attack has been overdone. It was a mistake to think that the universal vote would keep citizens free. There is adult suffrage everywhere today, but that has not prevented people from losing their personal freedoms in Russia, China and in a host of other lands.

It is the manner in which a Constitution is worked that is of significance. If a few Commissars were transferred to key posts now manned by Americans, they could, while keeping within the letter of the law, turn America into a polite State. Even in England, within the limits of the existing Constitution it would be possible to govern in a manner which would soon put an end to the myth of the Englishman's home being his castle. The power of the modern State is indeed enormous and occasional inroads are made from time to time by allegedly democratic States into spheres where no government would have dared to tread twenty-five years ago.

What is then the prospect for the citizen of the world? Is he to rely solely on the goodwill and tolerance of the governors? Is his freedom to be snatched away at will even in the Liberal State? Some safeguards must be found, and at a time when control over the Atom has opened up a limitless vista of material advance let us hope for an equally enlightened progress in the forms of social organisation. The results of this Conference will be watched with the greatest interest by thinking people everywhere.

In a distant age and in another country, King John's barons met in a conference at Runnymede to discuss how their vanishing rights and freedoms could be preserved and retained before the encroaching power of the State. The Charter which they drew up has served as a beacon radiating hope and strength to the peoples of Britain for several centuries. The crisis which freedom faces today is as real as it was in the days of King John. Perhaps the deliberations of the intellectuals of the world in Milan might result in a clear resounding lead which others, more apathetic well-wishers of freedom, will be able to follow.

ZAFAR FUTEHALLY

Notes

Right to Travel

IS the right to travel in the country and also outside a fundamental right of citizens or is it a privilege to be allowed at the caprice of the Government? The right to travel abroad is restricted by the necessity of securing a passport, without which no citizen can leave his country and go abroad. The authority to issue passports is vested in the Government. But can the Government refuse to issue a passport to a citizen without just cause and without giving the citizen an opportunity to meet any allegations that may be made against him?

The question was raised in a number of recent cases in the United States of America. American courts have upheld the citizen's right to travel and have ruled that the executive government cannot claim the unfettered right to refuse passports to anybody that they liked. In the very recent case of *Schachtman vs. Dulles*, the Court of Appeals held: "The denial of a passport causes a deprivation of liberty that a citizen otherwise would have. The right to travel, to go from place to place as the means of transportation permit, is a natural right subject to the rights of others and to reasonable regulation under law. A restraint imposed by the United States upon this liberty, therefore, must conform with the provision of the Fifth Amendment that, 'No person shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law.'"

In India, passports are refused on a variety of grounds which on most occasions are not disclosed to applicants. During the British regime, passports were refused many a time to patriots who wanted to go abroad. Even in free India, citizens do not get passports as a matter of right. Recently there has been the case of a refusal of passport to an Indian publicist who wanted to go to Formosa to attend an anti-communist Asian conference. This was a strange exercise of executive authority when literally hundreds are given passports to go abroad to attend communist or communist front conferences and notorious communists commute freely between Moscow and Delhi.

So far, nobody had challenged in a court of law this arbitrary use of authority. Only recently however a citizen has filed a petition in the High Court of Bombay to vindicate his right to get a passport. A writ has been issued. The result of the case will be awaited with keen interest by all lovers of freedom.

Violence in Morocco

THE violence that has again flared up in Morocco and Algeria is of a very serious character. It has so far taken a toll of over fifteen hundred lives. Both

sides, the Nationalists and the French, have resorted to killing and destruction on a large scale.

It is easy to put the blame for violence on the nationalist movement. One wishes that the movement had adopted peaceful methods so as to avoid the necessity for resorting to counter-violence. But it is not always possible for nationalist movements to eschew violence.

The violent methods adopted by the nationalists cannot, however, justify the French insistence on sticking to their colonial rule. The fact is that there will be no end to violence unless the French see their way to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people of Morocco and Algeria.

It is high time European Powers realised that they cannot any longer hold in subjection any parts of Asia or Africa. The struggle in Morocco and Algeria will not remain limited to that tiny part of the world. It will attract the sympathy and support of all countries of Asia and Africa. If the goodwill of these countries is not to be forfeited immediate steps must be taken to liquidate the remaining vestiges of imperialism.

A conference is in progress in France between the French Government and some representatives of the nationalist movement of Morocco. It is to be hoped that France will adopt a reasonable attitude and allow the conference to evolve an agreed solution, as happened recently in the case of Tunisia.

Hartal and Demonstrations

HARTALS and street demonstrations have come to occupy an unduly prominent place in our public life. They played a large part in the national movement and were a useful instrument in the struggle against a foreign government. But eight years have passed since we became independent, and yet hartals and street demonstrations are as much in vogue as before.

The people do not yet appear to have realized sufficiently that a very significant change has taken place in the character of the State. It is no longer a foreign regime imposed upon the people against their will. It is a government of their own which they can change from time to time and whose policies they can shape through their elected representatives. The attitude to be adopted towards this government and its agencies like the police cannot be the same as that towards the old foreign government.

It is an insufficient appreciation of this fact which persuades people to indulge in hartals and street demonstrations on the slightest provocation. Hartals and demonstrations have a place even in a democracy, but democracy also imposes certain restrictions. The people who may be out on the streets cannot take the law in their own hands, cannot coerce others to join their demonstrations and cannot indulge in anti-social acts like trespass, stone-throwing, intimidating or molesting persons and interfering with

traffic. It is the responsibility of those who organise the hartal or the demonstration to see that it remains peaceful and orderly and that it does not lead to acts of mob violence. On many such occasions the organisers fail to exercise that restraint and the police are then compelled to intervene in the interests of law and order, for which they usually earn a bad name.

What happened in Bombay on August 16, when a citywide hartal was observed in honour of those who died in the Goa struggle, bears out what is stated above. There were on that day several acts of stone-throwing at buses, trams and trains, unlawful interference with the normal activities of citizens, wanton destruction of property and defiance of authority. Parts of the city were, as a matter of fact, for several hours in the hands of mobs intent upon imposing their will upon all and sundry. The sanctity of foreign Consulates was also violated, for which the Prime Minister had to tender an apology. It is difficult to see how such acts of mob violence could possibly aid the Goa struggle or any other purpose that the demonstrators may have had in view.

Political parties and leaders of public opinion should pay some attention to these recurring phenomena of hartals and demonstrations and think about ways and means for ensuring their peaceful and orderly character. Democracy gives the people the right to demonstrate, but does not give demonstrators the license to terrorise others or to indulge in anti-social and unlawful acts.

Educating the Police

MR. JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN is known for his gentle words and gentle ways. He will not use harsh words unless something really reprehensible has taken place. What happened in Patna on 12th and 13th August has impelled Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan to express his disapproval in strong terms.

"Firings in Free India", said Mr. Jayaprakash, "have become a chronic disease". But said he: "As far as my knowledge goes, there was no other instance more wanton and condemnable than the firings that took place at Patna under the very noses, as it were, of the top-most officers of the State, and on August 13, of the Cabinet itself."

The trouble in Patna began with a petty quarrel between some students and some employees of the State transport. Incompetent handling of that situation resulted in firing in Patna and a couple of other cities of the State. "Not in one instance," says Mr. Jayaprakash, "do the firings (in Patna) seem to have been justified." He is, however, prepared to await the result of the judicial inquiry, which, unlike other Governments, the Bihar Government has ordered.

One cannot rest satisfied, however, with apportioning blame. What is essential is to prevent the recourse to firing. That firings should become a chronic disease in free India is, as stated by Mr.

Jayaprakash, "a matter of shame for all of us." In order to prevent the recurrence of firing Mr. Jayaprakash has stressed the urgent need for overhauling the police code, for re-educating the police force and for revising our ideas about law and order. Ministers in charge of the police must immediately address themselves to this task.

It will be necessary at the same time to educate the people regarding their responsibilities as citizens particularly when they are engaged in mass demonstrations. In a democracy the people must also behave in an orderly manner and render the task of the police not too unpleasant and arduous.

Homage

WE pay our respectful homage to those who sacrificed their lives for the liberation of Goa. There are many others who were subjected to brutal assaults. We pay our tribute to them also for their courage and for the hardships suffered by them.

There can be no two opinions that the Portuguese are behaving in a most uncivilized manner in using lathis and firearms against unarmed and non-violent Satyagrahis. The stories sought to be spread by them that the Satyagrahis indulged in violence are so palpably untrue that they cannot find credence in any quarter.

Under international law a state has the right of protecting its frontiers. The use of force to protect them may also become necessary in the case of an invasion. But the march of small batches of unarmed men cannot be regarded as an invasion, nor were the satyagrahis at any point of their entry in such numbers as would justify the use of rifles and sten guns.

It is ordinarily the responsibility of the people of a territory to liberate themselves. Attempts by outsiders are not generally viewed with favour as they are likely to give rise to international complications. But when the people are altogether deprived of their civil liberties and when they are placed in such a helpless condition that they can hardly raise even a voice of protest, it becomes necessary to render them assistance from outside. This international obligation has been accepted by all ardent fighters for freedom in the case of the liberation from Soviet tyranny of the peoples of eastern Europe. At the time of the June 17 rising of the workers in East Berlin many voices went up urging assistance from the free world for the victims of Soviet imperialist oppression. The case of Goa stands on a similar footing. The total absence of civil liberties in that Portuguese colony has created a situation where other Indians have felt impelled to rush to the help of its inhabitants in order to secure the creation of conditions in which the Goans will be able to give a free expression to their will.

Portuguese rule in Goa is such an anachronism that it must in any event end with the least possible delay. It is a pity that the Portuguese cannot read the signs of time and emulate the noble example set by the British and later followed by the French in India.

Intellectuals And Politicians In America

by Edward Shils

[Prof. Edward Shils of the Chicago University is an eminent sociologist who is in India for some months to study the mind of Indian intellectuals]

IN its origins the American Republic was the creation of intellectuals. Merchants and gentleman farmers with an interest in the Latin and Greek classics, in theology and liberal political philosophy, learned lawyers and amateur scientists were among the founders of the Republic. The American Constitution was the creation of intellectuals and the debate over its form was conducted by Madison and Hamilton from one side and Thomas Jefferson from the other. The former produced in the *Federalist Papers*, one of the classics of modern political philosophy and Thomas Jefferson was a philosopher, scholar and sage whose ideas were of a piece with those of his great French contemporaries, Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert, and Rousseau. Franklin and the Adamses were not on a lower level. The hegemony of this patrician intelligentsia was severely damaged by the "Jacksonian revolution" which instituted universal suffrage and the recruitment of the public service by patronage distributed to the supporters of the victorious party. The patrician mercantile and banking class was weakened politically by this development and the situation was aggravated in the middle of the century by the great influx of Irish peasants fleeing from the great famine. The Irish who already knew the language of the ruling class, who were kept tightly together by their attachment to the Roman Catholic Church and their hatred of England became the political enemies of the more genteel, more prosperous and far better educated upper class which even at this time and despite many reservations expressed a close affinity with the cultural life of England.

By the end of the Civil War the Irish immigrants had already gained control of the urban party machines in the States of the Eastern Seaboard. In the United States, control of the big city party machinery means a very powerful position in the national party as well, since local national politics are much more closely intertwined than they are, for example, in Great Britain. The defeat of the South in the Civil War also destroyed, economically and politically, the planter class and its professional dependents from whom important intellectuals were drawn. Then after the Civil War the United States began a dramatic development as an industrial economy. The great "robber barons" who played such an important part in the economic growth of the nation and whose business ethics left so much to be desired, now replaced the more refined Boston and New York and Philadelphia commercial and financial aristocracy by a rough handed, vigorous industrial plutocracy. Thus, from these sources the class from which American intellectuals had been predominantly recruited in the first half of the century and whose

way of life and tradition guided their outlook in the second half of the century underwent serious attack. On both the economic and political fronts they were much weakened in the North and crushed in the South.

This is the origin of the estrangement of American intellectuals from the public life of the country. It is an estrangement which has been amply documented by the greatest American writers,—Emerson, contemptuous of the politician and business man, Melville, withdrawn into philosophical meditation which averted his gaze from economic and political life, Henry Adams, rancorous and carping about the decline of culture and of the quality of political life, Henry James, taking refuge in England and ultimately renouncing his American citizenship. These were the responses of those who came directly from the great tradition of the intellectuals who had founded the country.

The reaction of others was not very different. In America, at the turn of the century the naturalistic method in the novel was used to criticise the genteel morality which refused to face the harsh facts of man's animal nature. But it was also used to utter a severely critical judgment of the great powers of public life. Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*, *The Titan* and *The Financier* showed politicians and business men from their seamy side, Frank Norris's *The Pit* and *The Octopus* likewise depicted the ravenous character of the new plutocracy and David Graham Phillips did the same. What was the work of the "muck rakers" of whom Lincoln Steffens and Upton Sinclair were the greatest of a large army of bitterly critical intellectuals, if not a campaign to show the filth and unworthiness of American political and economic life? The emerging social sciences in the universities, especially sociology and political science and certain branches of economics were also directed against the ineptitude and dishonesty of politicians.

Intellectuals remained apart from politics but they were not apolitical. They were angrily anti-political. When they did join in political movements they did so as reformers who sought to control the capitalists or to supplant them and to abolish politics. The populist movement in the West in which journalists and professors in the State Universities were active sought to restrict the freedom of politicians by the initiative, the referendum and the recall. University professors of social sciences in the Eastern states, many of them trained in German universities, sought to establish post-graduate education along the lines they had experienced in Germany—to produce civil servants who would serve the state and restrict the ravages of the politicians. The steady and ultimately successful work of Civil Service Reform on the

Federal level was intended to replace political appointees by university graduates, i.e. to replace politicians by intellectuals.

In the few instances where intellectuals participated actively in party politics they brought with them a special flavour of utopianism and moral righteousness which aroused the distaste and the feelings of inferiority of the politicians. This was the secret of both the success and the ultimate defeat of Woodrow Wilson, the greatest American political intellectual of this century. (He had been a renowned professor of political science and the President of Princeton University before he became President of the United States in 1912).

Against this background it is easy to see why many politicians have disliked intellectuals. In the first instance, the politicians, who have tended in the main, to spring from families of lower social status than intellectuals, have disliked the contemptuous attitude of the intellectuals. But this primary source of the politicians' dislike of intellectuals has been fortified by the resentment of the less educated against the highly educated—there are no educational qualifications for elected offices in the United States,—by the resentment of the lower middle class against the upper middle class, of the Irish (and the Germans and latterly the Poles) against those of British stock or Anglophile outlook, of the Middle West against New England, and of the politician against the Civil Servant.

II

Until the Administration of Franklin Roosevelt, the situation was usually not turbulent. The intellectuals and the politicians did not meet. Each went his own way in his own sphere except for occasional crises like the period just after the First World War. The New Deal changed all that. The Civil Service was greatly expanded to meet the needs of a modern welfare state and in the crisis of the Great Depression greatly increased powers were conferred on it. This expansion in the size and power of the Civil Service was accompanied by a great influx into the Civil Service of University teachers and Ph.D.s in economics, political science, sociology and statistics and the final triumph of the "merit system" which practically eradicated the classical powers of patronage of the politician. The forceful and fascinating personality of President Roosevelt protected the civil servants from the animosity of the politicians who saw their powers and prerogatives taken from them and the intellectual civil servants, aware of the protection they enjoyed, often did not hesitate to show their contempt for the less well educated, cruder politicians.

The entry of the university intellectuals into the executive branch of the Government was accompanied by a new sense of concern for social justice and human welfare. It was a period of great unemployment, of the prosperity of Fascism and Nazism and of the Peoples Front policy of the Communist International. The Soviet regime had of course, shown its true visage to those who were qualified to understand it, but for those in the first flush of uninformed enthusiasm, that visage could still not be clearly

perceived. It was only natural that many young people should fall victim to the Pied Pipers of the People's Front. It should be remembered that, at this time, the policy of the Peoples Front involved supporting many of the measures of the Democratic Administration in domestic affairs. The fact that a small handful of these intellectuals later confessed to having been or were shown to be spies for the Soviets was later cruelly used by a resentful group of politicians to assail a far larger number who had never been spies—who were in fact the innocent victims of the Communist International and the American Communist Party, just as later they became the innocent victims of Senators McCarthy, McCarran, Jenner, and Representatives Velde and Walter and about twenty other members of both Houses of Congress.

After the death of President Roosevelt and the accession of a weaker President, there came the atomic bomb. Soviet refusal to permit the establishment of an effective system of international control of the atomic bomb gave scientists an even greater importance than they would have otherwise had. They became the artisans of national security and the custodians of the secret knowledge on which that security depended. It was a secret knowledge from which the politicians were excluded; it was a secrecy which the politicians resented and of which they were jealous.

Bitterness and anger over the deterioration of their position *vis-a-vis* the intellectuals were strong in the hearts of a vigorous and vociferous minority. Most of the politicians had more or less adjusted themselves to the new situation, not completely comfortable, it is true, but sufficiently to allow the new pattern to work. But a small band of die-hards—it is not accidental that two of the greatest trouble-makers were Senators McCarthy and McCarran whose names alone speak volumes about this traditional antipathy—refused to yield.

The post-war disclosures of Soviet espionage, Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe and the political naïvete of the American intellectuals in the 1930s when they flocked in vast numbers into the Communist Party and its front organisations gave irreconcilable enemies of the intellectuals a golden opportunity. The long exclusion of the Republicans from power and their appetite-whetting proximity to it in the post-war years, heightened their readiness to use the opportunity. This is the background of McCarthyism.

III

In assessing the damage it has caused we should not over-look the injustice done to hundreds of individuals in the Government service and in some State Universities and lesser colleges. The intellectual freedom of the great Universities like Harvard, Chicago, Columbia and Yale has not been confined in any way. In the entertainment profession and in the government service there was more real injustice done and harm was done to the scientific work of the

(Continued on Next Page)

The Trail Of The Dinosaur—II

by Arthur Koestler

AT the beginning of this essay, I made a distinction between the short-term and long-term aspects of the present crisis. All that I have said so far refers to the short-term aspect and to short-term measures. The best we can hope to achieve by these measures is to gain time. Even if courage and reason prevail to a much greater extent than in recent years, the result cannot be more than a strategic and economic patchwork on a divided planet.

And yet by gaining time, by prolonging this misery of co-existence, mankind may hope for a reprieve. The nature of this tenuous hope is based on the possibility of some unexpected mutation in man's dominating passions and interests. Whenever history became polarised between two competing power-centres, roughly one of two things happened. Either one of the contestants was subjugated (the Rome versus Carthage pattern); or a stalemate was reached (the Christianity versus Islam pattern). Such stalemates have always started as unstable and precarious forms of "co-existence," spotted with local outbreaks which threatened to grow into a total conflict. But under certain favourable one, coexistence gradually changed into collaboration, and the crisis was over.

The conditions for this to happen are partly of a physical, partly of a psychological nature. The physical basis of the stalemate is balance of power, both "central" and "peripheral." By "central" power I mean the total strength which each side would be

capable of throwing into a total showdown, and which acts as a mutual deterrent from risking such a showdown. By "peripheral" strength I mean the physical and moral capacity of exposed outposts and conclaves to defend themselves and hold out, if only for a limited time. This "peripheral" strength is essential to the balance, because it makes the potential aggressor realise that he cannot have his way in a swift and discreet manner, and thus multiplies the risks attached to aggression. The Christian enclaves in Jaffa and Acre during the Crusades, the Protestant enclaves in Catholic countries, and vice versa after the Thirty Years War, seem to prove that stalemate may extend to the oddest geographical patchwork if the above-mentioned conditions are fulfilled. The Night of the Long Knives carries such vivid memories because it was an exception, and not the rule. On the other hand, the fate of the Jewish minorities in Europe, and of the Armenian enclaves in Turkey was a kind of St. Bartholomew in permanence, because there was neither a "central" power nor any peripheral strength to defend them.

However, a stalemate based on the balance of physical power is in itself not enough to prevent an ultimate showdown. The second condition is a change of the spiritual climate, a spontaneous mutation of interest, which blunts the horns of the dilemma. While the process of polarisation is at its height, it looks as if the whole world must either go Moslem or Christian, either Catholic or Protestant, either Monarchist or Republican, either Socialist or Capitalist. But if the deadlock lasts long enough, an unexpected mutation of the mass-mind may occur, the inevitable choice no longer appears inevitable, passion drains away and people simply become interested in something else. Religious consciousness yields to national consciousness, the fight for space to the fight for markets, the struggle between "Left" and "Right" to the struggle between East and West. The word "heretic" has now gone into metaphorical use, though once it meant torture and the stake; and whether we live under a King or a President, is the least of our worries. Over and again it happened in history that the dynamo which switched off just before the fuses blew. But in order that this may happen, some new dynamo must enter into action producing a different type of current, a shift of interest to a different set of values, conflicts, and predicaments.

Every branch of human activity—literature, the arts, philosophy, even medicine—seems to be subject to these unpredictable periodic mutations; see the sudden shifts of emphasis in painting from narrative to composition, from contour to surface, from the sculptural to the dynamic, from representational to geometrical. It is not fashion that changes but the focus of the eye and the mind, concentrating its attention on different aspects, in due turn, of the complex

(Continued from page 6)

Government itself. The real damage done by McCarthy rests in the setback it has given to the healing the breach between the intellectuals and the politicians. For twenty-five years, the unwholesome century-old gap between politicians and intellectuals has been improving in slow and sometimes faltering and roundabout ways. Even the enormous fellow-travelling detour of the 30s and 40s was part of this process of renewed acceptance of public responsibilities on the part of the intellectuals—an effort which should have been condoned and understood as a product of an insufficient tradition of political responsibility among American intellectuals. It is this recovery of the original tradition of the American republic which McCarthy has slowed down by appearing to confirm the prejudices of a politically long-alienated intelligentsia. The healing of the breach seems nonetheless very certain and the setback must be interpreted in the perspectives of a century of American history. Seen in that light the sputtering fire of the House Committee on Un-American Affairs seems to be no more than the futile rearguard struggle of an expiring tradition, as no more than an annoying but transient resistance to the improved political, social and economic position of the American intellectuals and to their own increasing acceptance of the corresponding responsibilities.

entity, man—religious man, economic man, homo politicus, homo faber, homo liber.

One of these changes of spiritual climate which is of particular relevance to us, seems to have occurred somewhere halfway through the Thirty Years War. I am quoting from Miss Wedgwood's classic work on the subject, *The Thirty Years War*:

"Never have the Churches seemed stronger than in the opening decades of the 17th century. Yet a single generation was to witness their deposition from political dominance. The tragic results of applied religion had discredited the Churches as the directors of the State. A new emotional urge had to be found to fill the place of spiritual conviction; national feeling welled up to fill the gap. The terms Protestant and Catholic gradually lose their vigour, the terms German, Frenchman, Swede, assume a gathering menace. A new standard of right and wrong came into the political world. Insensibly and rapidly after that, The Cross gave place to the flag, and the "Sancta Maria" cry of the White Hill to the "Viva Espana" of Nordlingen."

Admittedly, by the time this great change came into the world, the war had run half its course and taken its toll of death and devastation; and it took another thirteen years to end. But perhaps the Russian conquest of Eastern Europe and the wars in Greece, China, Korea and Indo-China constitute the first half of our thirty years' war; and perhaps the second half need not be repeated—at least it may be argued that the conflict between Bourbon and Hapsburg had little relation to the original religious issue.

THE age of religious conflict was superseded in the course of the 17th century by the emergence of two apparently unrelated factors: the rise of national consciousness, and the rise of a new philosophy. The latter, based on the discoveries of Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler, was gradually penetrating wider and wider strata of the public mind. If the earth no longer stood firmly planted by God in the centre of His universe, and was merely a small planet hurtling through space, then, though religious belief did survive, it could no longer command the exclusive interest of man. The sky around him had remained the same, but the focus of his eyes had radically changed since he had learnt that the fixed stars of the firmament did not dance attendance to him, and were blinking down with detached irony at the tiny creature of his spinning cannon ball. Within a century, more or less, the mind of European man had undergone a mutation more radical and fraught with consequences than if he had acquired a third eye or additional limb.

It was a historic turning-point—the point where religion and science, religion and art, logics and ethics, began to part company and go their own separate ways. From the beginnings of civilised life, man's fate had been determined, and his conscience guided, by some superhuman agency; from now on this function was taken over by sub-human agencies. The deities of the past may have been coarse or sublime, scandalous Olympians, or a pure God of love; yet they were wiser, more powerful, on a higher

plane of existence than himself. The new determinants of man's fate—mechanical laws, atoms, glands, genes—which gradually took over, were of a lower order than man himself; they defined his condition, but could provide no guidance whatsoever for his conscience.

The consequences of this shift of "destiny from above" to "destiny from below" became only gradually apparent. Before the shift, the various religions had provided man with fragmentary; once the controlling force of daily life, it became a spiritual luxury. The "oceanic feeling" could no longer fill man's horizon; it was preserved in a neat reservoir whose level kept steadily falling through drainage, leaks and evaporation.

Life was so exciting during these hectic, unprecedented centuries, that man did not realise what was happening to him. The navel cord through which he received his spiritual nourishment was shrivelling up, but there were plastic substitutes for it, and various forms of artificial nourishment. For a while the words *Liberte*, *Egalite*, *Fraternite*, produced a seemingly apt substitute for the Holy Trinity. There were breathtaking attempts to create a Humanist creed, and attempts to worship the Goddess of Reason; political movements and secular religions succeeded each other, exerting their immensely dynamic, but short-lived appeal. The vertiginous rise of the power-curve was accompanied by mass-upheavals ideological crusades, and fanatical pursuits of utopian mirages. Each of them promised a secular millennium, a Thousand Years Reich or a Classless Society, born out of a revolutionary apocalypse. Yet all the time, throughout these toxic excesses and spurious illuminations, there was a muffled feeling of uneasiness, of growing frustration, of spiritual desiccation. The explanations of science became more and more formal, non-committal and meaningless as answers to man's eternal question. As his science grew abstract, his art became more esoteric and his pleasures more chemical. In the end he was left with nothing but "an abstract heaven over a naked rock."

WITH the beginning of the 20th century, signs appeared which seemed to indicate an impending turn of the tide. The descendants of Galileo and Newton found that they had been too optimistic in believing that the universe could be reduced to a mechanical model. The perfected measuring instruments signalled the presence of quantities and processes which not only eluded measurement, but by their very nature would always elude it. At nearly the same time, similar crises broke out in the other sciences: cosmology, biology, genetics, psychology. Physical determinism was shaken, rigid causality yielded to the elastic laws of probability; science had to admit that it can never predict, only guess, what will happen next. The living whole asserted its primacy over the measurable aspects of the parts; medicine had to lay increasing stress on the power of mind over matter. The most fashionable school of psychotherapy reverted to the Jamesian view that a transcendental faith was a biological necessity for

man and that "the total absence of it leads to collapse"—the dark, feverish night of the soul.

Slowly, hesitatingly, the pendulum seemed to start swinging back. Man seemed to be getting ready for a new shift of focus, a new mutation. But so far this has failed to materialise; and all attempts at a spiritual revival within the framework of the established churches proved artificial and abortive. History may move in a spiral, but it never moves in circles, never returns to a previous point of departure. The physicist who has witnessed the collapse of his mechanical model of the universe has become a humbler and wiser man, but he cannot be expected to return to Aristotle's four elements and to Ptolemy's sky rotating on hollow crystal spheres; nor will the physician, who has learnt to accept his limitations as a healer, revert to a pre-Harveyan view of the body. Yet the established churches demand from all of us who shiver in the darkness precisely that kind of intellectual suicide and surrender of the critical faculties. To ask 20th century man to believe in a loving god who condemns half his children to eternal damnation without hope of an amnesty, is really a bit thick. The reassuring statements of some modern theologians that Hell does exist but is empty, or that it merely means exclusion from grace without overheating, are hardly on a more adult level; and Mr. Greene's defence of the bodily ascent of the Virgin in the pages of *Life* magazine would embarrass even a saint. John Donne's "with a great, sober, thirst my soul attends" was the statement of a perennial faith in the language of his time; "The Cocktail Party" in "The Living Room" is a parody of it.

Perhaps if Luther had been born after Copernicus and Newton, the gulf between faith and explanations of a kind which gave to everything that happened to him meaning in the wider sense of a transcendental causality and a transcendental justice. But the explanations of the new philosophy were devoid of meaning in this wider sense. The answers of the past had been varied, contradictory, primitive, superstitious or whatever one likes to call them, but they had been firm, definite, imperative. They satisfied, at least for a given time and culture, man's need for reassurance and protection in an unfathomably cruel world, for some guidance in his perplexities. The new answers, to quote William James, "made it impossible to find in the driftings of the cosmic atoms, whether they work on the universal or on the particular scale, anything but a kind of aimless weather, doing and undoing, achieving no proper history, and leaving no result." In a word, the old explanations, with all their arbitrariness and patchiness, answered the questions after "the meaning of life," whereas the new explanations, with all their precision, made the question of meaning itself meaningless.

Our thinking habits are so entirely conditioned by post-Copernican developments that we automatically assume thinking always to have followed the same method. We take the ethical neutrality of our "natural laws," the split between "religious" and "scientific" truth so much for granted that we assume they must have always existed. It requires a great

imaginative effort to realise the full significance of the "shift of destiny" of three hundred years ago, and that it constitutes a new departure, a break in the curve of man's spiritual evolution as unprecedented and unique as the sudden vertiginous rise of his physical power. We don't know how many tens of thousand years ago man for the first time asked the question about the meaning of life; but we do know at what point, so close to us in time, he lost the answer to it.

FOR a long time the majority of mankind remained unaware of the implications of the new philosophy. Its pioneers talked in a timid and tentative voice, without quite realising what they were saying and doing to the mind of man, and often frightened of facing the consequences of their own theories. There were exceptions, men far-sighted enough to realise that the twilight of the gods was at hand, and foolish enough to shout it from the tree-tops—like that *enfant terrible*, Giordano Bruno, the Bertrand Russell of his age, who was burned alive. But when Copernicus set the earth spinning, he did so with a timid and apologetic gesture; Kepler saved his faith by declaring that God was a mathematician by profession; Galileo's career was a life-long walk on a tight-rope; Newton wrote a treatise on the locations of Paradise and Hell; and at the end of the long chain Professor Toynbee claimed that the Catholic Church, possessing the ultimate truth, was quasi exempt from the laws of history.

Thus the new philosophy, with the exception of some of its more brutal propounders in the 18th and 19th centuries, made no frontal attack on religious beliefs; but it gradually undermined their foundations, on which all previous civilisations had been based. In the old days, man hoped to influence the superior powers which decided his fate through magic and prayer; now he could manipulate the mechanical components of his destiny, glands and humours, atoms and genes, and determine his own determinants. Prayer did not fall into disuse but its function, the influencing of fate, was taken over by the laboratories. Slowly but inevitably, divine providence was replaced by the drift of cosmic weather, ethical guidance by the ethical neutrality of science, humility before the supernatural by a feeling of arrogant, unlimited power.

Religion did not die, nor was it driven underground by the new philosophy—it was merely relegated to an airtight compartment of the mind and sealed off from contact with logical reasoning. The incompatibility between the two halves of the split mind was smoothed over by the churches' diplomatic appeasement of science, and by the believers' psychological resistance against admitting the split. Yet in spite of these mental shock-absorbers, religion gradually lost its power, became brittle and reason would be less disastrous. As it is, the established churches are venerable anachronisms. They are capable of giving a limited number of individuals a limited reassurance and a limited, sporadic uplift; but the Sunday driver does not answer the need for public transport-

tation, and a Sunday faith is no answer to the peril threatening our race. We may postpone the atomic Sodom for a few years; but we cannot indefinitely prevent it.

Unfortunately, changes of this kind, the next mutation, the next jump ahead, are not only unpredictable but beyond the power of imagination. The causes which lead to these extraordinary transformations of the global mood—the springtide of Christianity, the ground-swell of the Renaissance, the hurricane age of Science—are equally obscure, even in retrospect. Hegel's dialectic, Spengler's cycles, Toynbee's challenge-response patterns are beautiful prophecies in reverse—and as doubtful as all prophecies are, though they merely predict the past. The more we realise the infinite complexity of historic causation, the Nostradamus-reverse character of all philosophies of History, the more helpless we feel in trying to predict the next mutation. We can point to certain analogies, abstract certain patterns from the Persian carpet, isolate certain trends and chart their curves; the rest is guesswork, hope and prayer.

My own guess and hope, which I have indicated before, is the spontaneous emergence of a new type of faith which satisfies the "great sober thirst" of man's spirit without asking him to split his brain into halves; which restores the navel cord through which he receives the saps of cosmic awareness without reducing him to mental infancy; which relegates reason to its proper humble place yet without contradicting it. It all sounds very vague and irreverent, partly because we can imagine the machines, but not the beliefs of the future, and partly because we have become so accustomed to religion occupying one half of the split mind, that the idea of restoring its unity appears blasphemous.

Is it really too much to ask and hope for a religion whose content is perennial but not archaic, which provides ethical guidance, teaches the lost art of contemplation, and restores contact with the supernatural without demanding reason to abdicate?

Clearly, the devout will regard this question as presumptuous and as betraying a lack of comprehension for the revealed, or symbolic, or mystic essence of faith, according to his notion of it. "After all," he will say, with indignation, or contempt, or pity, "You cannot expect a religion made to measure like a suit, to satisfy your specific requirements." The answer, I submit in all humility, is that the indignation of one's Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Moslem friends mutually cancel out; and secondly, that the objection is historically untrue. For every culture and every age did have its faith "cut to measure," and did re-state the perennial content of all religions on its own level and in its own language and symbols. It is neither an irreverent, nor an impossible hope that this will happen again in the future.

MY starting-point was an imaginary chart, which showed a vertiginous rise of the power-curve coinciding with an equally unprecedented decline of the spiritual curve of living faith. It is this coincidence of the two curves which makes the present crisis so grave, which makes us feel that we are tra-

velling at breakneck speed through the night with the throttle open at full and the steering broken down.

The decline of the spiritual curve remained for a long time hidden or obscured by more dramatic events; and its consequences have only become fully apparent in our day. When, a century and a half ago, the sailors at Spithead and the Nore started their famous mutiny, they took pains to assert their loyalty to the King, and to point out that they were merely rebelling against certain Admiralty rules. They continued to take the supreme authority for granted and regarded themselves as His Majesty's loyal rebels. In a similar manner the founders of new, and reformers of old religions always took the existence of God for granted; they all were the Lord's loyal heretics. This seems to hold true for any period of human culture as far back as the beam of history is able to penetrate into the dark, and as far up towards the present as the beginning of the 18th century. At this point, the unique break occurs. God is dethroned; and although the incognisant masses are tardy in realising the event, they feel the icy draught caused by that vacancy. Man enters upon a spiritual ice age; the established churches can no longer provide more than Eskimo huts where their shivering flock huddles together, while the camp-fires of rival ideologies draw the masses in wild stampedes across the ice. Yet even this desolate state of affairs is preferable to the threat of the medicine men to remedy the climate by turning the frozen waste into a blazing furnace.

The horror of it is that they have the power to do it. If only half the official statements about the new nuclear and bacteriological weapons are true, then the next few decades, or the next half century at the utmost, will decide whether homo sapiens will go the way of the dinosaur, or mutate towards a stabler future.

We shall either destroy ourselves or take off to the stars. Perhaps the conquest of interplanetary space will cause a Copenican revolution in reverse, the emergence of a new type of cosmic consciousness. Perhaps the creation of artificial moons and similar toys will prove such an absorbing diversion that the old passions are deflated and their causes forgotten. Perhaps some unexpected discovery in the field of extra-sensory perception will provide us with a new spiritual insight, a new basis for our metaphysical beliefs, a new intuition for our ultimate responsibilities.

All this is vague and wild speculation, yet less wild and fantastic than what will happen to man if the near-miracle fails to materialise and the giant mushrooms start sprouting into his sky and lungs. The trouble with all near-miracles, such as our ancestors' rising on their hind legs, or the rise of the new star over Bethlehem, or Galileo's climbing the tower of Pisa, is the unpredictability of their timing. Once we hoped for Utopia; now, in a chastened mood, we can at best hope for a reprieve; pray for time and play for time. For had the dinosaur learnt the art of prayer, the only sensible petition for him would have been to go down on his scaly knees and beg, "Lord, give me another chance."

[Reproduced from *Encounter*]

To The Editor

Dear Sir,

In your editorial "At the Post" you have done well in referring to the false dichotomy between bread and freedom. You are absolutely correct when you say that "there is no bread where freedom is lost."

But is there freedom where bread is not available? Man does not live by bread alone, but can we forget that it is bread that makes living at all possible? Therefore, when you say that freedom is "the first and foremost value" must it not include "economic freedom"? When you talk of "bread through freedom" must you not also talk of "freedom through bread"?

Bread and freedom, it should be realised is a unity. This makes freedom a broad and complex notion. It appears to me that in contending one false dichotomy between bread and freedom you are surrendering to another.

Only when *Freedom First* realises that freedom is not merely political freedom, but that it is a complex notion and that freedom of various kinds are essential to each other will it be able to fight communism and totalitarianism successfully.

New Delhi
19th August 1955

PRABHAKAR PADHYE

Read

QUEST

a bi-monthly of arts and ideas edited by NISSIM EZEKIEL, sponsored by the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Subscription Rates

Re. 1 per copy - Rs. 6/- a year

For members of the I.C.C.F., Rs. 4/- a year.

Write to

The Manager,
Quest,
3rd floor, Army and Navy Building,
148, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

I. C. C. F. NEWS

The Congress for Cultural Freedom, has opened an Asian Office in New Delhi. Mr. Prabhakar Padhye, Asian Representative of the Congress, is in charge of the Office which is located at 5, Hailey Road, New Delhi.

The Office was declared open by Mr. Collin Clark, the celebrated Australian economist, on July 31, 1955. Mr. Clark delivered on the occasion a speech on "Problems of Economic Development in Backward Countries". The function, which was attended by a large number of distinguished citizens of Delhi and New Delhi, was presided over by Mr. Eric da Costa, Editor of the *Eastern Economist*. Mr. Asoka Mehta, M.P., thanked the distinguished lecturer on behalf of the Office.

*

✓ Mr. Kodanda Rao of the Servants of India Society delivered a lecture in New Delhi under the auspices of the Delhi Group of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

*

✓ Prof. Edward Shils of Chicago University, who is on a visit to India, spoke under the auspices of the Indian Committee in Bombay on 8th August on "The American Intellectuals". Mr. A. D. Gorwala presided.

*

Mr. Saif Tyabji, Solicitor, gave a talk on "Atheists and Modern Science" in the office of the Committee on Friday, 19th August. The talk was followed by a discussion.

(Continued from page 1)

under the supervision of Peter Wright lay down the foundations of sound tradition of objective scholarship in African affairs? Did anyone even hint that such ought to be the purpose of the Department? Did the exhibition on Africa give a complete picture of that continent's problems or merely add to the existing notion, even if substantially correct, of white exploitation and selfishness? Did it give any clue to the pathological elements which mess up the African picture or choose to reinforce a demand, though valid, which simplifies the situation beyond recognition?

These are inconvenient questions but they must be raised now, not postponed till after the end of colonialism. They do not imply the slightest desire to compromise with the colonial attitude or to apologise for the existing state of affairs. On the contrary, as I see it, it is such questions which indicate a determination to grasp the African question in all its ramifications, avoiding the emotional froth which today passes for political analysis.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

✓ God needed only six days to create the world, but He had the advantage of working alone.

—*Journal de Geneve* on the "Summit" Conference.

If Russia is not prepared to recognise Ceylon as an independent country why should Ceylon have diplomatic relations with her?

—Prime Minister of Ceylon, Sir John Kotelawala, *Times of India*, August 5, 1955.

Give your strength, heart, mind and soul to the welfare of the people, and the people will give theirs back to you.

—Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy, Chief Minister of West Bengal, *Times of India*, July 31, 1955.

India was today governed by an oligarchy, which was slowly trying to convert itself into a democracy.

—Mr. Colin Clark, Director of Agricultural Economics Research Institute, Oxford University, *Times of India*, August 3, 1955.

A worker hankering for increased wages and a power-hungry politician were capitalists in the fundamental sense of the term.

—Congress President, Mr. U. N. Dhebar, *Times of India*, August 3, 1955.

✓ He paid tribute to the Prime Minister for raising the country's international prestige. This, he said, was entirely due to a reorientation of India's foreign policy based on Lenin's thesis of peaceful co-existence.

—Mr. P. Ramamurthi, Communist leader of the Opposition, *Times of India*, August 7, 1955.

To the Editor,

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

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

Name:

Address:

.....

.....

Signature

The carrot of a constantly rising standard of living is the most essential piece of vegetation in a happy country.

—*The Economist* (London),
August 20, 1955.

When South Viet Nam nationalists insist that they are more than prepared to participate in elections provided these can be held freely and fairly there is no reason to suspect their bona fides.

—Surveyor, *Times of India*, August 1, 1955.

The President charmed everybody, captivated all opposition, presented himself as a man impossible to disbelieve and smashed for the first time the familiar caricature of the war-plotting American.

—Mr. R. K. Karanjia, *Blitz*, July 30, 1955.

Cooking is far more important than philosophy.

—Mr. Sri Prakash, Governor of Madras, *Times of India*, July 31, 1955.

Mr. Dulles continues to talk like Mr. Dulles, and yet Moscow is willing to do business with him. Why should not this spectacle embolden Mr. Nehru and his colleagues to speak the truth about Communism without the fear of endangering peace?

—S. N. G. in *Thought*, August 13, 1955.

State Department officials in Washington who have been following events in South Korea and southern Vietnam must sometimes wish that America, like Russia, had its satellites. The wayward and erratic policies of Dr. Syngman Rhee and Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem contrast vividly with the docile conformity of the 'people's republics.'

—*The Economist*, (London), August 20, 1955.

Certain political journalists lick so many boots in public that they have attracted the charge of servility.

—"Ditcher" in *Capital*, August 18, 1955.

The U.S. in its eagerness to avoid war must never participate in any false agreement that would sell out the freedom of men for the pottage of a false peace.

President Eisenhower, *Times of India*,
August, 25, 1955.

It is the duty of all conscientious democrats in the country to end the embargo which has been operative for the last eight years on frank and truthful speech about communism.

—S.N.G. in *Thought*, August 13, 1955.

Ceylon would have nothing to do with Russia until she stops vetoing her application to join the United Nations.

—Prime Minister of Ceylon, Sir John Kotelawala, *Times of India*, July 30, 1955.