

JULY 1952

Salute To John Dewey

by SIDNEY HOOK

The Congress for Cultural Freedom mourns the loss of one of its Honorary Presidents. Sidney Hook studied under John Dewey for several years before receiving his Doctorate at Columbia in 1927, and helped to edit several of Dewey's works. Professor Hook, who is also the author of a biography, "John Dewey—An Intellectual Portrait," is Chairman of the Philosophy Department at New York University and Chairman of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom.

NOT once during the last twenty-eight years—the period of my association with him as graduate student, colleague and friend—did I hear John Dewey reminisce about the past, or mourn the golden days when the world was young. No one who visited him, or even now reads the articles that have come from his pen, could fail to be impressed by the contemporaneity of his interests in ideas, cultural movements and political events.

I do not mean to suggest that Dewey had no sense of history. On the contrary. But the past for him was not a repository of standards by which achievements in the present are to be judged. It is an integral part of the substance or materials of the present. He had often expressed his puzzlement over the common failure to realize that against the cosmic scene man's career is still very young. The role of modern science in that career began only yesterday. He did not therefore yield easily to despair. Nor, for all his modernity, did he ever seem to be in a hurry or in a rage—qualities more in evidence among those of his critics who thunderingly invoke the eternal against him. He was a sage without any of the accents or idioms of the archaic which we associate with the sages of the past. He was a sage because of his wisdom, not because of his age.

John Dewey's amazing intellectual vitality was rooted in his profound and continuing interest in all mani-

festations of growth. He was extremely sensitive to new insights, to new ways of looking at a problem, to all growing things—whether they were children,



organizations or cultural styles. Like everyone else, he took delight in the finished and completely formed, but he found even greater joy in observing and encouraging what was struggling to be born. Every stammering student who had a glimmer of an idea found a natural ally in him. His first question about someone he didn't understand was: "What is he trying to say?"

I have often thought that one aspect of Dewey's philosophy of education can be explained in terms of his essential courtesy to others, of his respect for the dignity of every person, including the growing child. Not to impose an arbitrary pattern upon anyone, to observe and protect the individual's uniqueness, to encourage responsible choices, to evoke an awareness of the discipline of things, of thought, of the social involvements and duties of a democratic community, to substitute the authority of impersonal method for that of institutions and leaders—what else do these commandments of progressive education add up to but respect for the dignity of the human being? The nearest I had ever heard him come to calling a man downright stupid was his reference to a professional dogooder, who couldn't tell a communist from a democrat, as "not very discriminating."

What was there about the ideas of John Dewey, this mild man who looked like the identical twin of so many retired Vermont farmers, to make him one of the great cultural influences of our time? Why do liberals and progressives naturally gravitate toward his views? Why is he hated so wholeheartedly by

(Continued on page 10)

Notes

OPERATION CROSS-EYED

TWO recent articles by Prof. V.K.R.V. Rao entitled "Impressions of New China" were acidly described by a distinguished commentator as "Operation Cross-eyed". Another example of such an operation is provided by the initial statements made by members of the official Goodwill Delegation to Communist China which have confirmed the worst fears entertained before their departure from India by realistic observers like the columnist *Vivek* in the *Times of India* about the kind of shallow, superficial and misleading story that the members of the Mission could be expected to tell on their return. It is not so much that almost half of them were already known, in one degree or another, to be predisposed in favour of the communist regime in that unfortunate country. It was the naivete of the remainder, among whom were several good and estimable persons, and the fact that there was not one among them who had the requisite training and understanding of the workings of a totalitarian State machine.

There is considerable speculation over the factors that have made a group of otherwise intelligent persons make statements which are so demonstrably divorced from reality and observe silence about such factors as, for instance, a million executions admitted by Premier Chou En-Lai in June 1951, or the horrible processes of thought control so graphically portrayed in that excellent piece of reportage, *Brain Washing in Red China*. The determining factors would appear to be twofold. One was the limitation under which everyone laboured that this was an official goodwill mission and not an objective fact-finding one. Truth, if impolite or impolitic, must of necessity be a casualty. Secondly, ignorance of the language—not only of Chinese, but of "double-talk" and "double-think." Keen observers have noticed that most of our innocents abroad have reported to their Indian listeners or readers statements and claims made to them by their hosts as if they were facts.

VOLUNTEERING OUT

MEANWHILE, just a few weeks earlier, prisoners of war from Communist China, who had experienced life in that country, not as favoured guests, but as ordinary citizens, had expressed a strong preference not to be sent back to their fatherland, which

makes so much nonsense of the talk of our distinguished missionaries. Of the 20,700 Chinese prisoners of war in U.N. hands in Korea, only 5,100, or 24 per cent, have agreed to go home. Three out of four Chinese have shown by that one act what they think of Mao Tse-Tung and his regime. These Chinese soldiers have, as Lenin so aptly put it about Russian soldiers at the end of World War I, "voted with their feet", and no amount of smooth talk in the drawing rooms of Delhi or the banqueting rooms in Bombay can undo the moral of that vote—which is the only free vote any Chinese has exercised since Mao Tse-Tung seized power in China on behalf of his Russian masters.

The U.N. refusal to hand over these prisoners of war by force to their oppressors is one that is fully in line with the Charter of the U.N. and its Declaration of Human Rights. Any departure from this stand will not only lower the prestige of the U.N., it will destroy the confidence of the peoples of Asia—for it is Asian lives that are involved—in the good faith of the Democracies. The issue of repatriation is above all a moral one. Those in India who regret that it is "only" this issue that comes in the way of "peace" (can there be any peace so long as the communists occupy North Korea?) have imbibed as little of Gandhiji's teachings as they have understood about the U.N. and its guiding principles. Even the *Tribune*, that independent socialist weekly that is so close to Mr. Aneurin Bevan, has come to the conclusion that "the prisoner-of-war who, because of his political or religious beliefs, may fear imprisonment or exile, deprivation or even death when he is repatriated has

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,
MANEKJI WADIA BUILDING,
127, MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD,
BOMBAY 1.

a right to expect protection against such dangers. No socialist can think otherwise, and so there can be no doubt that the United Nations stand in this matter must have our support."

The Chinese Communist dictatorship pushed troops into Korea and called them "volunteers". Now, Mao and his minions have the mortification of seeing their "volunteers" really exercise their volition for once and volunteering out.

DELHI AND GAUTEMALA

AN interesting sign of the times was the small but significant demonstration in front of Parliament House on May 16 calling for the outlawing of the Communist Party of India and the expulsion of its members from Parliament as fifth columnists who had infiltrated into that democratic institution in order to encompass its destruction. This development reflects the growing impatience in the country at the inordinately long rope—along with other facilities—that is being provided at present in this country to those who are busily at work encompassing the destruction of the Republic and its democratic Constitution.

Symptomatic of the times we call it—because round the globe in Latin America similar but much bigger demonstrations were seen not long ago. In Gautemala City on March 23 this year, some 40,000 democrats demonstrated in favour of the outlawing of the Communist Party and the removal of its members and friends from governmental positions. Thousands of other citizens lined the route of the procession wearing badges inscribed: "*I am an anti-Communist*". These demonstrations were organised by a coalition of five anti-Red organisations, including the Committee of Anti-Communist University Students, against the benevolently equivocal attitude of the present government in Gautemala towards the communists.

The plea made in Delhi and Gautemala has much in principle to recommend it. For parliaments no communist worth his name has anything but hatred and contempt. Such enemies of democracy can only be permitted to utilize democratic institutions at great peril to Democracy itself.

OBLIGATIONS OF FRIENDSHIP

SIR CHINTAMAN DESHMUKH, the Union Finance Minister, has added to the obligations of friendship, as they are known to civilised mankind, viz., the obligation to desist from speaking the truth about one's friends. For, recently, while replying to the debate on the Budget in the House of the People, he expressed a peculiar difficulty in answering the communist members who persistently flouted the so-called achievements of Russia and China. He said

it was difficult to bring out into the open the facts which the Government had in their possession and which went counter to the claims of these people, because the Government had friendly feelings towards these countries. One would have congratulated Mr. Deshmukh for ennobling the concept of friendship, had it not been for the fact that this was altogether unworthy of a Government that swears by the hallowed name of Gandhi and amounted to being a party to the communist conspiracy which aims at subverting this country by means of systematic spreading of illusions about their two fatherlands.

Sir Chintaman's answer reveals the same sad and suicidal outlook recently revealed by an eminent Indian scientist who, when asked to join with twelve American and five German Nobel Prize winning scientists in a call to the communist scientist Joliot Curie to agree to an International Red Cross Investigation into the charges of waging germ-warfare made against the United Nations' forces in Korea, pleaded his inability to do so since he was an official of the Indian Government which maintains friendly relations with the communist countries.

DELHI MARRIAGE

THIS is a country that is trying to forget that religion has played a disruptive role in the past and that some of our greatest disasters in recent times have been due to the wrong emphasis we put in beliefs and customs based on religious creeds. We thought that we had learnt a lesson when, after the partition of our country, we stressed the secularity of the new Republic; and we hoped that there would be an effort to pass over or belittle the differences which exist between the members of different religions. The incidents in Delhi, where public interference forced a Hindu bride to abandon her intention of marrying a Muslim, have shown that we are very far indeed from realising any such hope.

We know, of course, that not all inter-communal marriages create so much excitement and bad feeling. And, though this is beside the point, that many have been very happy. But the law in India demands that both husband and wife should sign away the religious beliefs in which they were brought up. Surely this is a barbarous state of things which ought to be changed.

In this, as in many other instances, we would do well to follow the example of the canny Swiss. A clause embodied in their Constitution says that difference of religion alone should not be an impediment to marriage. The Swiss, whatever one thinks of their other qualities, are most emphatically the sanest people on earth.

(Continued on bottom of page 4)

Yusuf Meherally Memorial Library

GREAT people can generally be divided into two groups. Those who are intellectually great and those others whose gifts lie in the field of human relationships. Yusuf Meherally was unique in that he combined in himself the two kinds of greatness. He was an intellectual with a genius for friendship and books were the connecting link between the two sides of his personality. The intellectual in him was so obsessed by a fascination for books that he spent his whole fortune on them, while the other side of his nature could not resist lending, sending, or giving his books to friends almost as soon as he had bought them. A bibliophile who was always parting with books, because, on the whole, he loved people even more than he loved books; that is how his friends will remember Yusuf.

It is now proposed that a Yusuf Meherally memorial library be set up. Meherally's own splendid collection of books could be the nucleus of such a library; donations of books from other sources have already been received, among them from the

girls of Mount Holyoke College in the U.S.A. His other friends and admirers in the United States have expressed a desire to help any library which bears Yusuf's name.

In order that the books in this library might reach the greatest number of people it would be a good idea to arrange to have it as mobile as possible. That is, a plan may be worked out by which batches of books could be lent to other libraries, colleges, Universities and Students' Unions for a few months at a time. In this way the books would benefit the greatest number of people; just as, in his lifetime, Yusuf's books did benefit an incredibly large number.

Many of his Indian friends have also asked to be allowed to share in the building of any memorial for Yusuf. We now invite them to come forward, if they think the project worthy. Donations of books or money will be gratefully received by Mr. Kantilal Shah, Hon. Secretary of the Yusuf Meherally Memorial Committee, c/o S. C. Sheth & Co., 8, Hanam Street, Bombay I. L. F.

NOTES—(Continued from page 3)

SOUTH AFRICAN SATYAGRAHA

ON 26th June Africans and Indians in South Africa launched a passive resistance struggle against race segregation laws. It is deplorable that the "white" people in S. Africa, forming only a quarter of the total population, by monopolising political power should have forced this struggle on the "coloured" peoples. While not overlooking the fact that communists have infiltrated into the leadership of the movement for political and social equality, the basic fact that fundamental human rights are being denied to Africans and Indians in their own country remains incontrovertible. Malan and his racial policies are acting as the recruiting agents for the communists in S. Africa, for it is their policies and actions that have helped the communists in building their noxious influence over the coloured peoples.

Democrats all over the world will watch with sympathy the struggle of the Africans and Indians in South Africa. The stakes in the struggle are too high to be ignored by anyone pledged to the defence of freedom and democracy in the world. It is a tragedy of the age that, when Democracy is fighting a grim battle against totalitarianism, the anti-democratic racialists of S. Africa should have created this division in its ranks.

LATTIMORE IN INDIA?

WHETHER the verdict of history ultimately allots to Owen Lattimore—the subject of U.S. Congressional investigations—the role of fellow traveller or worse, he has certainly established an indisputable claim to the position of one who has done as much as any other to mislead his countrymen in regard to the role of the Soviets and their Chinese agents in the Far East. The report that Mr. Lattimore admits to discussing a "year's leave of absence" which he may "spend lecturing at the University of Delhi in India"—where he has been preceded by Mr. Maurice Dobb—is therefore a disturbing one.

It would appear from press reports that the U. S. authorities, who have banned his departure from the country, would be prepared to give him a passport if the allegation that Mr. Lattimore planned to go behind the Iron Curtain proves to be unfounded. This is logic somewhat difficult to follow. In India, where neutralism and confusion-ism abound, the baleful influence of such a sophisticated propagandist on impressionable minds—and those not only in the University—can be much greater than in the Soviet Union. It is to be hoped that, through a reassertion of better counsel in Delhi University or otherwise, we in India may yet be spared this visitation.

Freedom and the Arts

by Ka. Naa. SUBRAMANIAM

THE Twentieth Century has been a period of experiment in all the arts. We have only to think of James Joyce and T. S. Eliot in English letters, of Picasso and the Surrealists in painting, Hindemuth and Schoenberg in music to know the diversity of experiment in content, form and approach. All these experiments have been completely free, uninhibited, unfettered by any authority other than that of the art and the artist himself. The coming of communism was hailed by many of the intellectuals of the West as a new experiment, a political ideology and a social revolution which betokened well for the experimental in all the arts.

In the course of a decade, it became apparent to the intellectuals of the world that the coming of communism was not the thing it was claimed to be. The arts, especially in Russia, were enslaved and dictated to. The artists were told about what they should and should not do, and in many cases, *how* they should do it.

Stalin became the greatest artist of Russia—the greatest writer, the greatest painter, the greatest musician, the greatest critic. The break with the glorious traditions of the XIXth Century was complete but there was nothing to replace it. During the thirties the imposition of a supreme political authority on all the arts became complete and the intellectuals of the world were aghast at the quality of Soviet work produced; the quantity of course was impressive. Many an artist felt that this superimposition of an authority—an authority and an ideology that had nothing to do with art—was tyrannical, but the political control was thorough; there was no escape from the political imposition from on top for the artist or his art. All art became political propaganda and all artists mouthpieces of the Stalin regime. The necessity for toeing the party line in anything that the artist did was paramount; none could hope to escape it. This phenomenon numbed the intellectuals of the rest of the world into inaction.

What was happening inside Russia was for a long time largely a matter of conjecture. But reading between the lines, and from material gathered from the statements in the Soviet Press, and more emphatically from the artists who were bold enough to defy Stalin and get out before it became too late, it was becoming more and more apparent to the free world that the State in Russia had gained complete control

over the culture and the arts and on the artists. Artists who were praised last year for a certain performance were in danger of losing their dignity (by being forced to ridicule themselves in public), their living (because the State discouraged their being supported by anyone) and their lives. It did not matter that they were praised for the very things for which they were condemned a year later, condemned because the party line had slightly deviated or because Stalin had on second thoughts not considered the performance so good this year as he had considered it last year.

After the second world war, Soviet art, like Soviet ideology and politics, was exported in alarming quantities to all the world. The intellectuals of the rest of the free world were alarmed for their freedoms. In France, in Italy, in non-communist Germany, in the United States, the freedoms of the artist and the intellectual were threatened by this ideological invasion. Only a few of the intellectuals were conscious of this ideological invasion; there were however many who were not aware of the threat to their cultural and artistic freedoms.

It became the function of the International Congress for Cultural Freedom, with its headquarters in Paris and its roots in various countries of the world—in Germany, in Italy, in the United States, in Japan and in India—to organise the forces and natural resources of freedom in its own interests and enlighten those who were unconscious of the threat to their freedoms. The work it has been doing is familiar to every lover of freedom in the world today. But the latest of its activities is interesting from many points of view, and unique.

The International Exposition of the Arts was held in May 1952, in Paris. In music, in ballet, in drama, in painting and in sculpture the best works of the first fifty years of the XXth century were presented to the most art-conscious people of the world, the people of Paris.

The Exposition presented in retrospect the new modes of expression, new techniques, new styles, and forms which have been the product of this almost unprecedented period of activity by the writers, thinkers, painters and composers of the western world. The finest achievements of western civilization in the realms of music, drama, painting, sculpture, cinema, ballet and creative thought—all the abundant

riches which the mind of free man has created in the first half of our century—were combined in a demonstration of the importance of freedom to creative thinking'. The Exposition symbolized the genius of men when they are free to think and create as they wish.

Literary artists from various countries—including India and Japan—participated in a series of discussions on topics of great importance to the creative writer. The importance of freedom in every field of creative activity was stressed in all these debates and discussions. Quite a few of the authors stressed the point that man does not communicate by air and wire, but by love. The Indian delegates, especially Philip Spratt and P. Y. Deshpande, stressed the Indian point of view on most of the points under debate. Mr. Spratt spoke of how Mahatma Gandhi achieved a technique of communication evolved through love and sacrifice. Mr. Deshpande spoke on 'Revolt and Human Fellowship' (*vide page 7*) and said that "every scientist, every artist, every creative writer, everyone interested in the search for the hitherto unknown, and everyone who values freedom, truth and a dynamic and progressive human fellowship must rise in revolt against all forms of totalitarian doctrines".

Chief among those who took part in these literary discussions should be mentioned William Faulkner, Andre Malraux, Denis de Rougemont (Chairman of the International Executive Committee for Cultural Freedom), Salvador de Madariaga, W. H. Auden, Herbert Read, Ignazio Silone, Stephen Spender, Roger Caillois, Raymond Aron, Glenway Wescott, Katherine Anne Porter, Marc Aldanov and James T. Farrell.

It was not a conference in the general sense of the word. It was more like a getting together of a group of writers from various parts of the world, informed by a common love of freedom and a common hatred of the totalitarian regimentation in arts. However diverse the geographical dispositions, the artistic temperaments, the spiritual climates and the material prosperity of the participants brought together on the platform of the International Exposition of the Arts, they expressed themselves unanimously in support of the freedoms of the arts. The Conference passed no resolutions—but it achieved an unanimity of purpose for the writers of the free world.

The paintings and sculptures of artists like Seurat, Derain, Bonnard, Matisse, Wouters, Modigliani, Picasso and many others of the Surrealist and other schools were exhibited. Paintings by several great precursors of contemporary art—Van Gogh, Cezanne,

Renoir, and Toulouse-Lautrec — were exhibited. Herbert Read who took part in a discussion on Modern Art said that we are only halfway through the XXth Century, and more masterpieces—masterpieces made possible by the freedom of the artist to create—would be coming before the end of the century. Some of the world's finest musical groups participated in the musical programme of the Exposition. These included the Hall Orchestra, and the entire company of the Royal Opera House of England; the French National Radio Orchestra and the Paris conservatory Orchestra of France; the Vienna State Opera and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra of Austria, and the Boston Symphony Orchestra of the United States. World famous conductors like Sir John Barbirolli, Karl Boehm, Igor Stravinsky, Benjamin Britten, Charles Munch, and Virgil Thomson led these orchestras. The New York City Ballet group too was featured. E. M. Forster, Jean Cocteau, Gertrude Stein were some of the authors whose words were set to music and presented.

We attended also the International session of the Association *Les Amis de la Liberte*—The Friends of Freedom. It is not a party or a movement but aims at bringing together all parties and movements which consider freedom their main object. The Friends of Freedom appealed for the establishment of corresponding bodies in other countries. About 200 delegates from France, Germany, Italy, Britain, Belgium, America, Spain, Switzerland, India, Japan, Burma, Indonesia and Indo-China took part in day-long debates on totalitarianism and the Christian conscience, totalitarianism and the working class, totalitarianism and the men of letters and arts, and totalitarianism and freedom. Phillip Spratt speaking on the first theme said that "if the West stands for liberty it must show it in its politics". I spoke on men of letters and arts and said that the Indian writer to-day is aware of communism as a potent idea, as a humane ideal and not yet aware of it as it really is—as a conspiracy or as a political plot. Speakers of various political tendencies and various faiths—there were priests and rationalists—spoke from the same platform and made brilliant analyses of the methods of totalitarianism.

The International Congress for Cultural Freedom, through the Exposition of the Arts, has laid the foundations for a new and significant human fellowship. I, as an Indian writer, would be glad if the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom would sponsor an All Asian Conference of writers in the near future on the lines of the Literary Conference at Paris and further the work of the International movement for Cultural Freedom in Asia.

Revolt and Human Fellowship

by P. Y. DESHPANDE

Based on an address delivered in the course of a literary discussion forming part of the International Exposition of the Arts organised by the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Paris.

HOW can we simultaneously assert the values of revolt and those of human fellowship?"

In posing the problem in this form it is assumed that there is a necessary conflict between the values of revolt and those of human fellowship. It is also assumed that this conflict is undesirable; and therefore, we are called upon to suggest ways and means to mitigate and if possible to avoid this conflict.

I maintain that the assumptions made are wrong. As I view the problem I see no contradiction between the values of revolt and those of human fellowship.

I. Historical Background

In order to understand the significance of revolt in its relation to human fellowship it is necessary to go a little into history. J. H. Rob in his article on 'Civilization', published in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, makes out a strong case for the animal origin of man with no means of foreseeing the enterprise in which he was engaged. He says: "His evolution as a civilised being, was no more pre-meditated than his rise from the earlier simian ancestors. There seems to be sufficient evidence, that for hundreds of thousands of years, changes in his mode of life were so gradual and rare as to pass unperceived. Each generation accepted the conditions in which it was reared without thought of betterment. Our modern hope of progress...an indefinite increase of human knowledge and its application to the improvement of man's estate...was practically unknown even to the Greeks and Romans. From the thirteenth century onwards a few writers dwelt upon the promise of the future, but they were out-clamoured by those convinced that human woes were attributable to a departure from ancient standards. . . . Only three centuries ago did Bacon unroll a programme of aggressive search for the hitherto unknown, which has any very wide influence. In the 18th century the conception of reform and progress found illustrious spokesmen, and their anticipations of coming changes in the economy of human life were destined, as it proved, to be far outrun by the events of the 19th and early 20th centuries".

It is clear from this that the spirit of revolt, properly so called, is of recent origin. But for the developments that took place during the last three

hundred years, in the fields of science, technology, art, literature and philosophy, mankind would have continued to remain in a state of conservative or reactionary mood which has been its dominant characteristic from the very beginning of history. As opposed to this age-long conservatism and an innate attitude of opposition to change or progress, the most dominant characteristic evinced by the newly awakened section of mankind, during the last three hundred years is the spirit of revolt. Has this spirit of revolt and this aggressive search for the hitherto unknown, helped or hindered the development of human fellowship and the awareness of the brotherhood of man?

II. The Nature of Revolt

The spirit of revolt, as it has emerged during the last three centuries, has unmistakably shown that it was not a revolt of man against man. It was, and remains even today, the revolt of man's spirit of free enquiry against traditional blind faith and superstition; of man's irrepressible thirst for more and more knowledge calculated to smash the dead walls of dark ignorance; of man's new aspiration to disentangle himself from all chains that hold him in bondage; of man's new urge for an open mind and an open society as against a closed mind and a closed society.

It is necessary to understand the nature of this revolt and the precise form in which it was manifested. Whether it was science or art, philosophy or literature, in each case this new revolt manifested itself through the creative activities of a few gifted individuals. In each field of human activity the form which the revolt assumed was: individual consciousness in search of the hitherto unknown—*versus*—the established forms of traditional social consciousness.

When Galileo went up to the top of the Leaning Tower of Pisa with a ten-pound shot and a one-pound shot, and dropped the two weights down and thus conclusively demonstrated the truth of the new Law of falling Bodies, all his contemporaries were profoundly shocked. The truth established by Galileo's experiment went against what had been maintained by Aristotle and what was accepted as an eternal truth on his authority. Nobody had taken the trouble to find out for nearly two thousand years, whether

what Aristotle has said was true. The very idea of doing so, was a novelty, and Galileo's disrespect for authority was considered abominable.

In the field of literature also, the revolt took the same form. A poem, a novel, a story or a play involving new ideas and a new vision of a society based on a more significant, more varied, more dynamic and yet infinitely more human relationship between man and man, profoundly disturbed the still waters of age-long traditional beliefs. When I published my first novel in 1927, "Beyond Bondage" in Marathi, it raised a tremendous storm which overwhelmed the Marathi reading public. While there were a few appreciative criticisms, most of the journals indulged in savage criticism of the book and the most influential of them, with the largest circulation declared that the book was so profane that it should be publicly burnt! Within less than ten years, the storm died down and today nobody considers those ideas so dangerously revolutionary, because most of them now form an integral of the social attitude of countless men and women.

The point is that the new spirit of revolt properly so called never manifested itself in the form of a conflict between man and man or in the form of an ideological war between class and class. It was not the pioneers of the new revolt, but the upholders of the traditional beliefs and their countless blind followers held in hypnotic spell by the established form of social consciousness, that went wild with rage and sought to hound out creative artists, who dared to seek the truth and give expression to it. Despite this opposition, the truth ultimately did triumph, ushering in an era of a new human fellowship richer in content, deeper in understanding and more liberating in its influence on the mind of man.

The new spirit of revolt set in motion a process of social change which was unique in human history. (a) A new individual consciousness coming into conflict with some of the traditional beliefs; (b) A storm of opposition upsetting to some extent the social equilibrium, and lastly, (c) The element of truth in the new ideas forming an integral part of social consciousness, with social equilibrium restored at a somewhat higher level of understanding and progress.

III. Challenge to Human Fellowship

Thus the new spirit of revolt never assumed the form of a challenge to human fellowship. The challenge to human fellowship came from quite another source. It came principally from totalitarian

doctrines propounded by Marx and Engels. These doctrines came to the forefront, in the form of a violent reaction to the numerous atrocities perpetrated on large sections of humanity, physically uprooted from the soil and cut asunder from their traditional crafts, as a result of the introduction of the new mechanically propelled machines during the earlier stages of the Industrial revolution. This violent reaction had nothing whatever in common with the new spirit of revolt properly so-called. In fact, it developed as the very anti-thesis of the new spirit of revolt. The theories of dialectical materialism and class war banished all that was human in the process of historical change. Man as an individual lost all meaning in these theories and men in a mass forming part of the material forces of production assumed an all-embracing and a dominating importance. The reality of man as an individual was totally denied and nameless men as members of a metaphysical class came to assume the role of an ultimate reality.

There is a world of difference between the process of change set in motion by the spirit of revolt, properly so-called, on the one hand, and by the totalitarian doctrines on the other. Revolt never meant, and never could mean, total revolt. It was always a case of individual consciousness in search of the hitherto unknown coming into conflict, for a time, with old and outmoded forms of social consciousness. On the part of the individual in revolt, it was always a case of take it or leave it; it was always a case of an appeal to the human conscience to make an earnest effort to see the truth and accept it in all humility; and it was never a case of dogmatic assertion which must be accepted by others on pain of dire consequences or even death.

Totalitarian doctrines, on the other hand, developed a dogmatic form of assertion insisting on total acceptance on pain of death. This is the essence of the class-war slogan. It denies freedom of conscience, freedom of choice, freedom of unfettered enquiry, and consequently, truth itself. Doctrines that deny freedom and truth can lay no claim to human fellowship and brotherhood of man.

Every scientist, every artist, every creative writer, everyone interested in the search for the hitherto unknown, and everyone who values freedom, truth and a dynamic and progressive human fellowship must rise in revolt against all forms of totalitarian doctrine.

It is my firm conviction that out of a worldwide revolt against totalitarianism will emerge a new and significant human fellowship, so far unknown to human history.

Review

The Logic of Liberty by M. Polanyi (Routledge: International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction. 1951. 15sh.)

Commenting on the poverty of British political writing between the wars, George Orwell remarked that the Continentals had felt totalitarianism in their own bodies, and such experience is a potent stimulus to thought. Prof. Polanyi is a Continental, a refugee from totalitarianism, and a scientific man of some reputation. In this book he considers intellectual and political liberty from the point of view of scientific thought, and with the urgency of one who knows what total denial of liberty means.

Fleeing to Britain, he seems to have been struck by the difference in the intellectual atmosphere, and to have guessed that in this difference he had a clue to the durability of Anglo-Saxon liberalism as contrasted with the Continental variety. His conclusion is that Anglo-Saxon liberalism has lasted better because it has been associated with religion. This is part of the truth, though not the whole of it—one would have also to study the assimilation of the British intellectual class to the aristocracy, and its adoption of the detached, amateurish style of thought characteristic of the aristocracy.

But that does not affect his main argument, that the weakness lies in the traditional doctrine of liberalism. This doctrine upholds the ideal of a complete absence of restraint, at least in thought, and therefore provides no principle by which one can justify anything more than an argumentative opposition to totalitarianism. A majority dedicated to anarchy cannot effectively resist a minority organised to enforce some other doctrine.

Complete liberty of thought moreover seems to lead eventually to complete scepticism, a state of mind in which even liberty seems no longer worth defending, and men are eager to grasp at any plausible belief presented with dogmatic assurance. Totalitarianism in short is "the child of unbelief", as another author has put it. Polanyi has a striking passage on the psychology of totalitarianism, in which he makes the point that scepticism does not destroy the passion for ethical values, but suppresses it, and it reasserts itself through the belief in a purely mechanical, and indeed brutal process, which is ultimately to result in an earthly paradise.

This then is the fate which overtook Continental liberalism; Anglo-Saxon liberalism has been saved from it hitherto because, from whatever causes, it has

not believed in the liberty of the individual to the exclusion of all other principles.

Thus Polanyi arrives at the conclusion that liberty cannot be defended as an absolute. Liberty must flow from other absolutes, and even in the realm of thought must be relative and limited. We stand for an orthodoxy and impose it; as opposed to the totalitarians we can only argue that our orthodoxy is philosophically more respectable, and that it allows of a wider, though not an unlimited, liberty.

If a man is to succeed in pure science, he must be free to tackle in his own way the problems which interest him. At the same time he must acknowledge the basic principles of science in general, and the established results in his special science. He uses his individual ability and originality to get results which because of their truth will compel recognition from the scientific world. This combination of freedom and discipline is necessary because the scientific man is exploring an objective universe.

Polanyi uses the position of the scientific man as an analogy to show the true position of the individual in a community. For the scientific man truth is supreme, and his freedom of research has value only as subserving truth. The citizen's freedom, similarly, has value or significance only in a spiritual universe, in which truth, justice, kindness, tolerance, loyalty, beauty, are realities.

Moreover, it is only where people acknowledge these supreme values or principles that they will consistently set limits to the State's authority. "The usual antithesis of the individual versus the State is a false guide to the issue of freedom versus totalitarianism. The true antithesis is between the State and the invisible things which guide men's creative impulses and in which men's consciences are naturally rooted. The totalitarian form of the State arises logically from the denial of reality to this realm of transcendent ideas. When the spiritual foundations of all freely dedicated human activities—of the cultivation of science and scholarship, of the vindication of justice, of the profession of religion, of the pursuit of free art and free political discussion—are denied, then the State becomes, of necessity, inheritor to all ultimate devotion of men."

The later part of his book pursues the argument against planning complex activities on grounds of efficiency—economists especially should read it. His philosophical position, set forth in the first half of the book, is that summarised above.

P. SPRATT

SALUTE TO JOHN DEWEY—(Continued from page 1)

clerical authoritarians and communists? The answer is to be found in his concept of "experience," which departs radically from traditional concepts.

In working out the details of his theory of experience Dewey was moved by three considerations. The findings of modern biology and psychology and medicine led him to stress the activity of the organism as a whole in its response to environing conditions, and the selective character of that response. Second, fortified by anthropological evidence, he interpreted culture as a set of selective, institutional controls upon nature, physical and human. Third, he observed the place and use of instruments, among which are language and the organs of the body, in the growth of our knowledge and in the control of nature and society. The upshot of his theory is the conclusion that "everything experienced is in part made what it is because there enters into it a way of experiencing something." For Dewey, knowing, too, is an experience which mediates between other experiences. It, too, leads to operations upon things and symbols. It involves some experimental act before we can claim to be in possession of reliable knowledge. And that experimental act leaves the objective situation—the world which challenges us to inquiry—different in some respect from what it was before it was known. That is what Dewey meant when he said that thought is "practical",—not, as he was often caricatured as maintaining, that thought is necessarily personally useful or convenient.

Dewey's doctrines owe their wide popular acceptance to his explanation of how and why thinking counts in the world, of how and why reflective behaviour makes a difference to the issue of events. Dewey's doctrine has the merit of making sense of ordinary experience, and of suggesting ways by which that experience can be controlled and enriched.

Dewey's interest seems closer to the actual problems of men than do those of other contemporary philosophers, even when he is discussing traditional problems of philosophy. The starting point of philosophers like Feuerbach, Marx, Heidegger and the French existentialists who depart from concrete situations of human need seem hauntingly familiar to readers of Dewey. Dewey is sympathetic to their attempts to relate the problems of philosophy to the problems of men. But he differs from all existentialists, past and present, in that he believes that genuine problems exist to be settled, not agonized over; that problems can be settled, if at all, not by acts of spontaneous violence, but by intelligence

that the method of intelligence is the method of scientific inquiry in its widest sense; and that science and freedom are not hostile, but mutually support each other.

The doctrine that the processes of scientific inquiry constitute the matrix out of which all reliable beliefs about ends as well as means are to be generated is anathema to those who give ecclesiastical or political institutions a privileged role in social life. The validity of human ends and the means of achieving them depend not on the authority of the College of Cardinals or the Communist Politbureau, but solely on the authority of rational scientific methods of testing our values in experience. It goes without saying that any view which holds that man has an absolute supernatural end to which he owes first allegiance, and in whose light he must organize his natural life, will find Dewey's devotion to the critical methods of science an abomination.

The hostility of the communists against Dewey borders on the frenetic. Two extended articles denouncing him in the Moscow 'Bolshevik' (March and July, 1947) are composed in the language of Vishinsky. They indicate that not all who cry "Science! Science!" are free from superstition and barbarous repression of inquiry. Dewey's proposal to test the validity of all social ideals—our own as well as Franco's and Stalin's—by the actual consequences of the means used to achieve them, appears to the Communist Party philosophers a clear case of "imperialistic warmongering."

Dewey has, in the eyes of the communists, compounded his ideological felonies by his public criticism of the Russian domestic reign of terror in all fields of culture. He was one of the few American philosophers who made a detailed study of the Communist movement at home and abroad. In 1937 he interrupted the writing of his monumental 'Logic' to accept the chairmanship of the committee of inquiry into the truth of the Moscow trials, which held sessions in New York and Mexico City. The task was arduous, and many speculated on the reason which led him to embark on it. The reason was characteristic—a desire to investigate the truth at first hand about one of the most important political movements of the world. I still recall his amusement when a representative of the Russian regime suddenly visited him a few days before the hearings were scheduled to begin, and asked him to head another trip to the Soviet Union—"all expenses paid—best travelling conditions to and in Russia"—to report on the educational system he had previously inspected

in 1927. The incident hardened his determination to go through with his investigations. His findings are well known.

Dewey often referred to the whole experience as one of the most educational and enjoyable in his long life. Whenever he engaged himself in a struggle for a large issue, he proved to be an indomitable fighter and surprised those who had mistaken his gentleness for softness. The followers of Leon Trotsky were dismayed when he subsequently declared that although Trotsky was completely innocent of the charges made against him at the Moscow trials, the social philosophies of both Trotsky and Stalin had more in common with each other than with the principles of democracy and free scientific inquiry.

There is still another type of reaction to Dewey's unqualified faith in the liberating possibilities of science. It comes from philosophers, some of whom, like Bertrand Russell, share Dewey's liberal views, and some of whom, like George Santayana, do not. They suggest that Dewey's faith in knowledge and science is a kind of power-philosophy which breathes a spirit of "cosmic impiety." According to them, there is not enough of the spirit of play and resignation in his conception of man and his role in the universe. Man is always up and doing, too much in the foreground of nature, oblivious to the pitiful fate which must overtake him, no matter how much of the world he succeeds in controlling.

Dewey was almost eloquent when he commented

on criticisms of this character. He wanted to know what problems we ought to meet with play or resignation—the control of depressions, of nuclear energy, of cancer? He wanted to know, echoing a Spinozistic line, how else nature can be controlled than by natural means? He admitted that his philosophy is for human beings who are born to problems, but added that for most human beings, life, unfortunately, is one problem after another. Problems cannot be resolved through play or acquiescence. What one needs for play, he held, is not a philosophy, but a healthy body and a good conscience.

For Dewey, the refreshing experiences, the absorptions and detachments of delight, the sense of joyous exhilaration necessary to sustain a life of problems, is derived from art and love, not traditional religion. I remember his once saying that he saw no point in striking an attitude toward the cosmos. Cosmic piety is possible without sentimental glorification of nature, or acquiescence in every brute fact just because it is so. As deep as his optimism may be, it falls far short of the silly dream of remaking the world completely. However, there will always be, he added dryly, a few, but important, things that will need changing.

Seen in the perspective of our historical experience, the philosophy of John Dewey represents the most distinctive expression of the American liberal faith. It articulates its goodwill, its hard headedness and imaginative daring.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF AND BY JOHN DEWEY

John Dewey on Education

- John Dewey. *Art As Experience*. Minton, 1934. 335 pp.
Democracy and Education, Macmillan, 1916. 434 pp.
Education Today, Putnam, 1940. 373 pp.
Freedom and Culture. Putnam, 1939. 176 pp.
How We Think. Boston: Heath, 1933. 301 pp.
Interest and Effort in Education. Houghton, Mifflin, 1913. 101 pp.
Moral Principles in Education. Boston: Houghton, 1909. 60 pp.
The Child and the Curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934. 40 pp.
The Quest for Certainty. Minton, 1929. 318 pp.
The School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930. 164 pp.
The Sources of a Science Education. Liveright, 1929. 77 pp.
The Way Out of Educational Confusion. Harvard University Press, 1931. 41 pp.
Dewey, John and Dewey, Evelyn. *School of Tomorrow*, Dutton, 1915. 316 pp.

John Dewey on Social Action

- Dewey, John. *A Common Faith*. New Haven: Yale, 1934. 87 pp.
Human Nature and Conduct. Modern Library 1930. 336 pp.
Individualism Old and New. Minton, Bakch, 1930. 171 pp.
Intelligence and the Modern World. Modern Library, 1939. 197 pp.
Liberalism and Social Action. Putnam, 1935. 93 pp.

- Philosophy and Civilization*. Minton, 1931. 354 pp.
Problems of Man. Philosophical Library, 1946. 424 pp.
The Public and Its Problems. Holt, 1927. 224 pp.

John Dewey—The Man and His Works

- Essays in Honour of John Dewey, on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, Oct. 20, 1929, Holt, 1929. 425 pp.
Childs, John L. and Kilpatrick, William H. *John Dewey As Educator*. Progressive Education Association, 1939.
Feldman, William T. *The Philosophy of John Dewey*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. 127 pp.
Hook, Sidney. *John Dewey, an Intellectual Portrait*. John Day, 1939. 242 pp.
Kilpatrick, William H., Editor. *The Educational Frontier*. Written in collaboration with Bode, Dewey, Childs, Raup, Hellfish, Thayer. Century, 1933. 325 pp.
Kilpatrick, William H. and Others. *John Dewey and the Promise of America*. Columbus, Ohio: Progressive Education Association, 1939. 40 pp.
Meyer, Adolph E. *John Dewey and Modern Education and Other Essays*. Avon Press, 1931. 154 pp.
Ratner, Joseph, Editor. *The Philosophy of John Dewey*. Holt, 1928. 560 pp.
Schilpp, Paul A. *The Philosophy of John Dewey*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University, 1939. 708 pp.
The Philosophy of the Common Man; Essays in Honour of John Dewey to Celebrate his Eightieth Birthday. Putnam, 1940.
Thomas, Milton H. A. *Bibliography of John Dewey, 1882-1939*. Columbia University Press, 1939. 246 pp.

Child Art Exhibition

WHAT with so little real art being available, it was a treat to sore eyes to witness the spontaneity and simplicity of the work of children at the Child Art Exhibition held recently in Bombay. As one entered, the sheer joy of childhood seemed to embrace and welcome you. In creating, there is so much joy, life and freedom. The innocent child lives with creation—nearer to Nature, and unspoilt by the rigid, robot-like discipline which so characterises the adult.

There was no dearth of talent in this exhibition, and one spotted it in the first few minutes, just as one can tell a good musician from the opening chords of his music. Even the babyish scribbles sent a thrill through one. For who can pass that by without, in a split second, having the feeling of wanting to be a child again—free, happy and full of life? I doubt if any sane adult could help feeling a wave of tenderness pass over him as he saw those crawly lines all over the paper. And then the breath-taking colours, and ideas as they came up against one's hungry eyes!

Beauty of form can be judged by the amount of time one can live with the picture. The unconscious creation at several places renewed the ecstasy one felt at the very outset. It was only natural that when

asked to symbolise music in form, many of the exhibits depicted scenes in which Nature played a prominent part. How important this emotional development is necessary for a balanced mind is a point which must constantly be driven into the heads of the parents and educators of our children.

As one moved from the work of the younger children to that of the older, it was very noticeable that less imagination and freedom of expression was present. Although the work was good, it was already displaying signs of adult control, pattern, order and rigidity, thereby losing much of the charm. Where the modern artist has to strive unceasingly towards consciously and deliberately creating on canvas the manifestation of artistic instinct, to the child it is really child's play. One of the most fascinating portions of the exhibition was the comparison between Child Art and that of the great painters of this modern age. Where the artist tries to break away from the bondage, the child merely gives vent to the joy within him. Happy the child, and happy the human being that can share this happiness with him. For if, as Pullin Dutt says, Child Art is eternal art, then let all men become children again, and join hands in living with Reality which is Joy, Love and Freedom.

A. B.

Why not join The Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom?

The I.C.C.F. is a non-partisan organisation affiliated to the International Congress for Cultural Freedom, which has as its Honorary Presidents Benedetto Croce, Karl Jaspers, Salvador de Madariaga, Jacques Maritain and Bertrand Russell.

.....CUT HERE.....

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

Manekji Wadia Building, 127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
BOMBAY 1.

I wish to be enrolled as a member of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Herewith Rs. 1/- in payment of my membership fee which also covers subscription to *Freedom First*.

Name :

Address :

Signature.