

**G A N D H I S M  
A N D  
C O M M U N I S M**

**RAMSWARUP**

*Published by*  
**Manav Samaj,**  
5/47, W. E. A.,  
New Delhi—5

*Second Edition, September, 1955*

**Re. 1/-**

*Printed at*  
**The New India Press,**  
Connaught Circus,  
New Delhi.

# GANDHISM AND COMMUNISM

Principles and Technique

RAM SWARUP

*Published by*  
Ram Swarup  
C-58, Maharani Bagh  
New Delhi – 14.

1st Edn.: 1955  
Pdf: 2015.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface	5

## PART I—PRINCIPLES

Fundamentals of Gandhism	9
Gandhism and Communism	18
India's Role in the World Conflict	27

## PART II—TECHNIQUE

Premises of a Fourth Force	37
Peace With Freedom	42
Love Against Hate	49



## **PREFACE**

This pamphlet pieces together the several articles written on several occasions and published under various titles in different papers. Is Gandhism merely a technique which helped India to regain her freedom? Or does it contain elements of wider and more permanent application? Can it help nations to forge new bonds of friendship and realise their ideal of human unity? Can it also help them to stand up against new tyrannies which threaten not only their political freedom but also seek to regiment their minds and soul?

Together these articles, I hope, may help the reader towards a truer perspective of not only the principles and aims underlying Gandhiji's basic teachings, but also of a possible adaptation of these principles and aims for a peaceful and yet effective defence against the aggressive forces of enslaving and deadening communism. Though originally written for the Indian public, the ideas developed in these articles should be of interest to peoples throughout the world, who are seeking to maintain peace without surrendering their human dignity and freedom, and wanting to bring about One World.

RAM SWARUP



PART ONE

*Principles*



## FUNDAMENTALS OF GANDHISM

What is Gandhism? Is there a body of doctrines, theories or opinions which could adequately describe it? Many speak for Gandhiji, and several parties claim to follow him. In their utterances and practices there is a bewildering variety which confuses rather than illuminates. Can we understand something of Gandhiji's message by studying his writings or personality?

Gandhiji had no time to develop a coherent system, a logical exposition of his ideas to which a reference could be made for guidance. But even if he had, that would have been of no avail. At least, that is what the history of all great teachings shows. All teachings have to be re-interpreted, and there is always disagreement on what a great master or a great thinker *really* meant.

There is another difficulty. Every great message is mixed up with accidents and imageries of its age, which are difficult to disengage from its universal elements. Sometime the accidents and the local elements in the picture become more important than the universal elements. For example, Gandhism stressed a simple system of economy, but can we say that Gandhism is only true of times and countries which have only this system and that it has no message for countries which are industrialized except to scuttle away their industries and return to primitive economy?

Secondly, any great message has to be re-understood by every person for himself. We cannot have truth ready-made. Its meaning has to be discovered again and again by every age. Not only the universal truth of a message has to pass through an individual mind which lends to the former its own colour, temperament, but also it has to be applied under changing social and political circumstances. That calls for great ability and resourcefulness. Old solutions and formulations become irrelevant in due time. So what we can do is not to try to resurrect specific remedies, but only bring to bear that large spirit, openmindedness and discrimination which informed the old formulas and which must infuse the new ones also.

But these difficulties should not deter us. The fact that we cannot finally say what a particular master really meant should not bother us very much. We must again and again look for the guide within. The truth that showed the way in the past through an inspired individual is within us too. Let us be open to it and it will guide our steps as well. And even when it seems to speak through different tongues and lead to divergent ways, its inner intention is the same, its goal is the same.

### **GANDHIAN FUNDAMENTALS**

Though there is no consistent exposition of Gandhiji's ideas, we detect an astounding consistency in the attitude and consciousness with which he approached different problems and conducted his affairs. If we study Gandhiji's personality and attitudes, the following characteristics stand out prominently.

(1) His deep-rooted belief in God; (2) his humanism;

and (3) his advocacy of a decentralized, simplified mode of production.

The first he regarded as the most fundamental, even more important than the political and social work he did. Asked what he would choose if the choice was between India's political freedom and his own salvation he voted for the latter. He also felt deeply for the poor and the weak. Throughout his life he worked for them. The methods he used were the methods of tolerance, patience and persuasion. Even when his actions were firm, determined and decisive, they were infused with goodwill and friendly feelings towards those against whom they were apparently directed.

Gandhiji also stood for a system of small-scale production, for austerity and simplicity in living. This, to my mind, was an expression of his humanist approach; his ability to see nobility and dignity in ordinary human beings and their occupations. Our intellectualized leftist conscience sees nothing but illiteracy, inadequacy, misery and frustration around and hopes to remove these by the blue-prints of 5-year plans. Gandhiji, on the other hand, brought in a message of hope and suggested ways of improvement, not by destroying existing patterns but by bearing with them, by improving them.

These different strands in Gandhism make different appeals. Some respond to Gandhi's theism; some to his humanism; yet others to his economic "doctrines". For example, Nehru regards Gandhi's theism as a superstitious Mumbo Jumbo, probably politically useful but intellectually obscurantist, and rejects his economy too, but he accepts his humanism, at least, the secular side of it and at least

intellectually. Others reject all these elements. They advocate centralized industrialization, even a forced one; though they claim that after a more or less long-drawn period of violence, dictatorship, regimented life, purges and forced labour camps, humanity will emerge into the secular paradise of plenty and equality. Thus Gandhism is accepted or rejected in different combinations of its various elements. Some of these combinations have led to certain distortions in Gandhism, which we shall discuss here.

### **First Distortion: False Identification**

The first distortion is the tendency to identify Gandhism with less comprehensive creeds, with ideas which, though part of the Gandhian ethos, are not co-equal with Gandhism. For example, though Gandhism advocates small-scale production, the two are not identical.

Nor is Gandhism co-equal with humanism, as ordinarily understood. Gandhiji's faith in humanity flowed from his faith in God. He derived his strength to serve man from his devotion to God. The inspiration of his social and political work was spiritual. He worked for the lowly and the downtrodden, not dictated by any social theory of action, not because of any overflowing activist nature, but because he felt the living oneness of all life.

The same holds true of his pacifism. Pacifism is only a part of Gandhism, not the whole of it. It is true only when it is indicative of the unity of life, when it serves moral and spiritual growth, and generates goodwill and mutual understanding. But it becomes false when it is born of fear and non-discrimination, when it surrenders to power and tyranny. This point needs emphasis, because there is a

tendency in certain quarters to seize upon non-violence and pacifism in Gandhism and turn them into a programme of appeasement and surrender to communism.

### **Second Distortion: A New Determinism**

Closely allied to the first, and directly flowing from it, is a second distortion: a new economic determinism. In Marxism-Stalinism a certain mode of production is the basic fact, the basic value; other values and facts like God, virtue, conscience, political liberty and well-being are mere *derivatives*, mere *epiphenomena*. Gandhism is acquiring a similar bias at the hands of some of its exponents. The only difference is that the “basics” which lead to a degraded and dwarfed life in Gandhism lead to a virtuous and fuller life in Marxism. According to this Marxist variant of Gandhism, the first thing is to establish a village economy, a decentralized system of production and distribution, and the rest will follow automatically. God, Truth, Beauty, non-violence, mutual help, monogamy, brotherliness will be added as a necessary byproduct, as an inevitable concomitant.

These two attitudes—false identification and neo-economic determinism—have been utilized to feed anti-West bias, particularly anti-American bias. Organized by the communists, it has been caught up by some of the Gandhians and has found a ready justification in Gandhian economics. The Western countries in general, and America in particular, are industrialized; therefore they must incarnate the very devil—they must lack all virtue and conscience, all elements of spiritual seeking and promise which, after all, are functions of a decentralized, village economy. The East and West can never meet unless the

world is formed in the image of “Gandhian economics”. That seems to be the new slogan. Of course these very persons who damn the West for its industrialization have a soft corner for Soviet Russia, the temple of centralization and industrialization. When they castigate America and Europe, they appeal in the name of Gandhian decentralization; when they advocate and worship Russia and China, they plead Gandhian ‘forget and forgive’ and Gandhian charity of judgment.

Such attitude of studied bias and hostility is dangerous, particularly when the world is in need of a larger unity, and when we should be exploring and emphasizing points of agreement rather than of disagreement. We should be seeking points that unite us rather than points which divide us.

Secondly, this attitude narrows down the usefulness of the Gandhian philosophy. If Gandhism has any universal message, it must be applicable to an age and to nations where non-industrialization and decentralization no longer obtain. There are things which are more important than the industrial structure of a country, and men and nations have to be judged by the values they realize in their life. This basic unity between India and the West is provided by the values of theism and democracy. Hinduism and Christianity affirm the same Reality, the same underlying truth of our Being. And that is where we meet, and that is what we have been called upon to defend together against a common attack.

Last, such identifications and derivations are foreign to Gandhism. If Gandhism represents a spiritual stand-point, its reality cannot be so *congealed*, so materialized, so secularized. Its value-norm can never be a particular mode

of production, or a particular form of social behaviour. It can never lend such primacy to matter. Its reality flows inward-outward, not otherwise.

Even the economic doctrine of Gandhi was not so objective. It had a strong subjective element. His doctrine of decentralized small-scale production had a psychological counterpart. He emphasized the need of simplicity in life, a re-definition of human needs, a new approach towards labour, a new responsibility towards the poor. People should work not because they have to earn a living, but because work is sacred and ennobling.

In the Gandhian scheme, a simple economy was to flow from a love of simple living. At present the process has been reversed. People who do not believe or practise simple living in particular do advocate a simple, village economy!

Even their social work is losing its deeper meaning. These persons engage in social work, not because they are identified with a larger life, but because social service is a fashionable creed, a respectable creed, an egoistically satisfying creed. They do constructive work, not because they have a particular talent or inspiration for it, but because they want to put a politician, or a scholar, or a businessman in the wrong. Their driving force is, at the best, intellect and emotion. It is rarely and only partially spiritual—identification with fellow-beings and a living sense of the oneness of life.

### **Third Distortion: Moral Solipsism**

There is yet a third distortion. Not only is Gandhism being depleted of its subjectivity, it is also being depleted

of its objectivity. If, on the one hand, Gandhism is being identified with a rigid economic system or social behaviour, on the other hand it is being identified with certain states of mind. According to this school, there is no evil, no goodness, only thinking makes it so. This way of thinking is best illustrated by the attitude of some Gandhians towards the present struggle between democracy and communism. According to them, this struggle is only imaginary, an unfortunate misunderstanding fanned to white-heat by wordy recrimination till the world is threatened with atomic destruction. It is doubly tragic particularly when it could be prevented by a counsel of moderation here and a word of goodwill there.

This robbing of Gandhism of its objectivity has led not to the softening of the heart, but to the softening of the head. It has led to a lack of discrimination, to neutralism and moral solipsism. It has led to false equations, to appeasement and surrender, to unnecessary confusion and distortion.

Gandhism also suffers from a reversal of values. It makes secondary things primary. It exaggerates the importance of economy; it neglects the fundamental importance of theism and humanism. A new cult of administration for Soviet Russia and China is growing among a certain section of the Gandhians. The facts of mass killing, purges, false and forced confessions, complete suppression of intellectual and cultural freedom, fear and terror, the state-enforced atheism, forced migration and deportation, new-style imperialism, the inherent violence of communism—all these things are forgotten or explained

away. Gandhism should be saved from this distortion and vandalism.

Gandhi was deeply religious. Fundamental to Gandhism is the view held by all religions that man emanates from God and after the soul's adventure through the world unites again with Him; and that while in this world, he has an inalienable right to seek this unity, this oneness with God. True, man should also work for his economic well-being, but any view which reduces him to a mere economic function, which regards him merely as a meeting-point of certain economic wants, or merely as a unit of production, is opposed to the spirit of Gandhism. If this view is trying to generalize itself, impose itself by force of arms, with the help of military and police-dictatorship, powerful fifth-columns and high pressured propaganda; if in the pursuit of its ends it practises violence, chicanery, deceit, and double-talk it must be resisted, non-violently if possible, by military strength if necessary. This does not detract from Gandhism but fulfils it.

## GANDHISM AND COMMUNISM

Today, we face a grave problem: the problem of a communist threat to our national freedom and cultural heritage, to the human spirit and mind themselves. The threat is not local, but universal; not to India alone, but to humanity the world over; not only to the institutions of private property and individual initiative, to the democratic values of liberty and civil rights, but to the deeper values and urges of mankind.

People all the world over are slowly but surely waking up to the nature and scope of this danger, and are improvising their own forms of defence, sometimes mighty, sometimes meager. If and when this defence is weak or inadequate, there is the danger of communist conquest and annexation, which, let us remember, has been effected in many places under such circumstances. But if the resistance to communist aggression is sufficiently armed and determined, there is acute tension, prolongation of the cold war, and, at least, apparently, the danger of a third world war. Can we check communism from engulfing humanity and, at the same time, decrease tension in the world? Can we defend freedom without endangering the peace? Can we fight for freedom in a manner which, in the process, does not dry up or altogether destroy brotherliness, goodwill, tolerance and human warmth among mankind? In short, is there a Gandhian answer to the threat of the communist domination of the world and the communist destruction of liberty? Can we meet this threat in a way which is at once non-violent, honourable

and effective?

The question has not been posed in this way and discussed directly in this fashion by anyone so far. Many have appealed in the name of Gandhiji in advancing their particular viewpoints. Their utterances and statements suggest that there is a Gandhian way. Let us try to explore and find out in what sense and how far it is true.

### **Limitations of the Gandhian Technique**

In a discussion of Gandhism, two points are relevant. First, we have to inquire into those objective and subjective factors which made it possible for Gandhiji to succeed. Is Gandhism a universal principle, or has it but a limited application? Is it true that Gandhism succeeded in a particular moral and political environment? Or is the technique true of a different environment also?

Secondly, can Gandhism succeed without a Gandhi? Is Gandhism the name of a set of formulas, or is it the name of a technique which can be applied by anyone who may happen to show a preference for it?

To the first question our answer is that there were elements under the British regime which are not available under the communist domination. British rulers allowed martyrdom. They allowed myths to grow round a person; political leaders were not made to growl and confess before they were gallowed. Smouldering opposition was allowed to grow into a mighty rebellion. Individuals did not disappear for good at the dead of night at the first sign of *hostile* thoughts. Opponents were not blackened and blackmailed morally, and their character assassinated through whisper campaign and planned, high pressured propaganda. Many of them were even respected.

One of our allies in our struggle for national independence was democracy in England and America whose good opinion weighed with the former. So we got our freedom not only through our own strength, but partly through the strength of democracy in the world, and because, deep down, the British people had the same conscience and scruples as we do. This admission should not offend our patriotic sentiments. Rather we should be pleased that humanity has reached a stage where one's national gain is, at least partly, humanity's bequest. As Indians we should be glad that we were part of a movement which was on the whole non-violent. As members of the human family and of a moral community, we should be glad that we belong to a moral atmosphere which responded to our struggle without that amount of bloodshed which could be considered copious by history.

### **Gandhism Without Gandhi**

To the second question also, we should give a similar reply. Gandhism succeeded because of Gandhiji. There are no Gandhian formulas which can be applied by anybody. One must have Gandhiji's personality and charity and courage to apply Gandhism. Without these elements, Gandhism becomes a mere slogan, an expression of fear, appeasement, hypocrisy and moral indifference.

Something like this is happening at present. Persons very much less than Gandhiji in faith, charity, broadmindedness and intuition are coming forward and offering to apply Gandhian technique to a situation which probably does not admit of such wholesale application. No wonder this leads to a distortion of perspective and of

assessment, leads to wrong diagnosis and quack solutions. Unless our minds and hearts are equal to the situation, we will only botch, blunder and opine. Our synthesis will be no true synthesis, but a mean, and equidistant mid-point struck mechanically between two opinions or positions held by others. Our politics will not be the politics of discrimination and transcendence, but of stimulus and response, of action and reaction. Similarly, our suggested cures will be no true cures, not even palliatives. We will aggravate the disease we set out to cure.

### **Distortions in Gandhism**

One such distortion is arithmetic in character. Communism and Gandhism are regarded by certain Gandhians as two equations made up of several constituent quantities, which can be subtracted from one and added to the other, with a change of signs without injuring the equation. Communism, they define, is Gandhism plus violence and Gandhism is communism minus violence. Nothing could be more untrue.

Gandhism and communism do not represent arithmetical quantities with more of the one quantity and less of the other. They represent two different tempers of mind, two ways of life, two incompatible world-views and life-views. The one is based on and founded in God; the other denies God. This difference is most fundamental. Other differences regarding centralization of politics and production, violent or non-violent revolution are important so far as they go but as compared to the former difference, they belong to the second order of smalls. Even the similarity in their humanism is more apparent than real.

The humanism of the one leads to democracy, to tolerance, to faith, to hope; while the humanism of the other leads to violence, wholesale massacre, thought-control, purges, dictatorship, over-centralization, secret police, forced confession and mutual spying. In short, though both the creeds stress man, the one tries to serve him by nourishing his charity, love, faith and patience; the other by nourishing his suspicion, his hatred, his fears, greed and possessive instincts.

### **Second Distortion**

There is another distortion closely allied to the first. It is claimed that communism and Gandhism have the same ends in view, though their methods and approach are different. Some Gandhians proclaim that they have no quarrel with the communist ends and are quite prepared to subscribe to them; they only disagree with communist means. We disagree.

We reject communist ends, and the communist shape of society and politics more than we reject communist methods. If communism could eventually establish peace, prosperity, equality and freedom for all, who should not be prepared to forget intermediary violence on the way, particularly once it has taken place and has become a thing of the past? It is only Gandhian not to hug too much to old wrongs, and not to react too persistently to past violence.

That may partly explain Pt. Nehru's attitude. Because he shares with many fellow-Gandhians the belief in the *humane* ends of communism, he invites us not to make too much of the difference in methods. If eventually we are all aiming at the same destination and really reach it, what

does it matter what roads we take? This is reasonable enough. Only one fails to understand how different means—dictatorial and democratic, violent and non-violent, persuasive and coercive—could all indifferently subserve the same ends. The truth is that this moral indifference towards the means is part of the larger indifference towards the ends. Both are parts of the same prevailing atmosphere of moral neutralism which characterizes our whole political thinking.

We must here make it clear that the communist ends are not the same as the ends of Gandhism or social democracy, or for that matter of any humane system of thought. Communism stands for dictatorship, for a culturally regimented society, for the state control of all thought, for a monolithic control of all sectors of life, for the active denial of any principle of divinity in man. These ends are opposed not only to any theistic systems of thought, but also to the ends of secular democracy as ordinarily understood.

Not only the communist ends should be distinguished from the ends envisaged by any other ideology, communist violence should also be distinguished from other forms of violence that we have hitherto known in history at different times and to which we are still prone. Communist violence is not impulsive; it is organic, inherent, cultivated, calculated, planned. After it has captured power, it is sustained and institutionalized. Throughout its history it is not only externally directed, but also internally perfected. It operates not only through the world's most massive armed strength; it also maintains a powerful fifth column throughout the world, utilizes ideology, exploits and

sharpens conflicts among its victims, sows confusion and distrust and morally blackens its opponents. Communist violence is gross as well as subtle, open as well as hidden. It is a total, whole-time thing.

### **Third Distortion: Neutralism**

Gandhism suffers from yet another distortion: moral neutralism between democracy and communism. According to this variety, there is nothing to choose between communism and democracy. They are morally of one piece—both equally bad. In normal times, they are bad enough; but at present, in the era of hydrogen bombs and napalm bombs, they have become a positive menace. And what is at the base of this menace, this suicidal instinct? Nothing of any special worthiness. Only fear, recrimination, an unfortunate misunderstanding which has been allowed to grow too long. According to the exponents of this school the present struggle between communism and freedom is a dichotomy, a bad habit of thinking in false categories, an incapacity to rise above the habit of our mind which thinks in opposed terms.

If such is their estimate of the moral worth of the present struggle, moral neutrality is the right attitude and the right policy. But if this neutrality is based on the ignorance of the issues involved, on non-discrimination, then this neutrality is reprehensible, anti-Gandhian, dangerous and suicidal.

We believe that the issues involved are grave. Not only a possible destruction of mankind threatens us—a destruction from which we must salvage as much of the world as possible—but man's deepest urges and most

sacred institutions are threatened by world's most aggressive, determined and ruthlessly organized conspiracy of all ages. On the outcome of this struggle will depend our own destiny and future. If a nation fails or falters today, woe to her!

### **The True Nature of Gandhism**

So in a struggle which so intimately bears upon our deepest beliefs and ultimate destiny, there can be no place for neutrality or equi-distance. In a struggle which is essentially ideological, moral neutrality is out of the question, at least so far as Gandhism is concerned. Gandhiji was non-violent but not neutral. Gandhism was forgiving and compromising but not appeasing. Gandhism was based on a deep psychological truth but it did not regard all problems as having only psychological import. Truth and justice and freedom, however limited, were real things for Gandhiji. Gandhism was detached but not sensitive or aloof. Gandhism was large-hearted and broadminded, but it was not blurful of all distinctions. It was not harsh in judgement, but it was not skeptical of all values.

Gandhism as a non-violent method of resistance was based on several premises: (1) That there is an evil which is real and not merely a psychological emanation; (2) that this evil should be resisted; (3) that non-violence is the best resistance; (4) that if we are incapable of non-violence, let us not make a virtue of it. A violent resistance is better than no resistance at all.

These are some of the premises on which Gandhism is based. Basic to Gandhism are discrimination, a living sense of truth, a deep respect for values. Non-violence should

serve truth, not falsehood. It should serve forces of freedom and evolution, not forces of oppression, bondage and decay.

In the present world-struggle, the duty of a Gandhian is clear. He should be a partisan of democracy, should occupy a foremost place in the struggle against atheistic, totalitarian communism. He should not allow his sense of values to be confused by communist propaganda or allow himself to be paralysed into inaction by soviet might. Of course, he should try to raise the level of the struggle, introduce elements of morality and moderation in the struggle. He should be prepared to fight without hatred, without ill-will, without revenge, spite and self-will, with sentiments of love and brotherliness in his heart. Though it is true the present struggle will generate its inevitable quota of hatred and recrimination as all significant, large-scale movements do—but this fact should not confuse our sense of the issues involved—there is plenty of room for a sublimated conception and conduct of this struggle. It is also true that while, at present, there is available a non-violent technique against a more or less democratic regime, no such technique has been evolved to fight a ruthless, determined dictatorship. But we hope that once man's mind turns to the search of such a technique, it may find and evolve it. The present struggle is a challenge to man's resourcefulness, his discrimination and goodwill, his instinct of survival, and his deep-seated urge of freedom. Let us see how he responds to this challenge.

## **INDIA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD CONFLICT**

India's destiny is to be united. It is not because a larger political unification or a bigger geographical aggregate is sacred in itself, but because a United India is the most natural and inevitable expression of India's underlying culture and spiritual urge. This urge may be balked for a time by unwise political decisions and the lack of vision, courage and faith on the part of those who are at the helm of affairs but that eventually this urge will find fulfillment I have no doubt.

No sooner had we suffered from the physical dismemberment of our country than we were faced with a still blacker threat. This threat is not to the geographic expression or political garment of India's inner soul, but to this soul itself. If our people lived in the consciousness of their cultural heritage and spiritual destiny, physical hurts and scars could heal in time; if the inner spark lived, any soil that we might inhabit would become India. But if that soul died, nothing would be saved and nothing would be worth saving.

What is the nature of this inner soul? In what sense it is especially Indian? What is the nature of the threat? How can it be met? These are some of the questions that come up before us.

### **Two Competing World-Views**

At present two world-views are contending for supremacy. According to one view, man is a physical

being, a chance product of mechanical forces of nature, a specific organization of matter which has come to happen either through accident or through adaptation, and giving rise to a specific pattern of behaviour. There is no higher power, no higher motivation, no higher ideation, no higher source of our being or becoming. This outlook bears many variations, some even including morality and mind, but still remains essentially physical, utilitarian and pragmatic in outlook.

There is another outlook which does not deny the reality of matter, or the validity of utilitarian and pragmatic elements in life, but which does not give them the same primacy. According to this view man is a spiritual being, a soul descended into Matter and evolving to Godhead in a Divine play. Of his present plight, strain and strife and forgetfulness, God is the justification. If there is no God, even a life of ease, pleasure, peace and plenty will have been in vain. But if there is God, if man attains to his promised destiny, his present status, his sorrows and joys, his little loves and hates, his envies and charities, his travails from birth to birth, will all be more than justified. If ultimately man arrives, the long and dreary path, so full of pitfalls, will have been of no account.

### **India Expresses Spiritual View-Point**

This outlook is common to all humanity and to all ages, but it has found its highest expression in Indian thought and aspirations. Thus what is India's specific, distinguishing attribute is also the underlying faith of all other religions and nations. There is nothing strange about it. What is deeply individual is also truly universal. The innermost

principle of our individual being is also the underlying principle of the whole cosmos. Thus there is nothing exclusive or insular in India's nationalism. India's nationalism is not an Ishmaelitic something with its fingers raised against every other nation. India's nationalism embraces humanity. Of course this nationalism should not be confused with that spurious internationalism which is ignorant of its own greatness, which surrenders to every wind that blows from outside. India's nationalism is truly international, truly humanist. Its sages have borne testimony to the truth and vision which have sustained peoples belonging to different ages and different nations. India has expressed consistently throughout its chequered history the deeper hope and larger promise of mankind.

India's authentic voice has been expressed through its sages, not through its kings and government functionaries. Now, of course, the tendency is to mistake this voice with the speeches of our ministers. So in an atmosphere that has been considerably politicalized the West hears its own echoes through the speeches of our secularized ministers.

### **The Secularist Attack**

Now this vision faces a ruthless attack. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, this attack came from science. But this attack was more apparent than real. It was really directed against the superstitions of religion, against the rigidities and hard-heartedness of a creed that made use of a terminology borrowed from spiritual literature but whose spiritual springs of action and thought had dried up, had been poisoned. To this extent the new science, the new rationalist approach did God's work in spite of being anti-

God terminologically. The new spirituality of India should be capable of embracing science, embracing mind, embracing life and social action. It must be prepared to include the new values of secularist humanism and rationalist approach: it must even be capable of assimilating the values of the new industrial civilization. It must not reject doubt and empiricism. It must be able to include them, utilize them, understand their utility, and their field of operation and their limitations.

### **Two Secularist Trends**

But very soon, the 19<sup>th</sup> century rationalist approach got divided into two main streams. Though both denied God, and put their faith in human effort alone, they soon parted company and took to two different paths. One emphasized the values of tolerance, peace, plenty, goodwill, compromise, give-and-take, individual freedom, the rule of law, and believed in the organic nature of human societies and the theory of evolutionary progress. The other thought that society was a machine, an aggregate made of individual atoms which could be handled in any way, broken up and combined in any proportion. It thought that human ends could be exactly laid down and statistically measured in the production of coal and iron; that the blueprint and the contents and forms of a perfect social organization could be prescribed and pursued rather precisely; that the rules of a revolution could be laid down once for all. This view emphasized tactics, strategy, sloganized politics, propaganda, satellite political parties, controlled political movements, censored thought, social

manipulation, and psychological conditioning. Artists and writers were merely “engineers of the soul” who themselves could be manipulated without any difficulty by the “carrot and stick” method.

These are the two trends of the rationalist, secularist approach which are sometimes confused with each other owing to their common origin. But the opposition between the two is daily getting more and more clear. It is being increasingly realized that the two trends are aiming at two different goals, leading through two different paths.

### **Communist Secularism**

The latter trend—the mechanistic trend—has found its culmination in communism, which is opposed not only to the spiritual vision of our sages and seers, but is also opposed to the secularist ends of social reforms, human happiness and individual freedom. Communism must be clearly distinguished from secularist democracy, more particularly by secularist democrats themselves. It should be realized that the terrestrial, mundane values of humanity cannot be served through communism. Communist secularism has become anti-man, anti-progress. It is a new idol, a new cruel god which inspires persecution, aggression, thought-control, purges, liquidation, intolerance, fanaticism, indoctrination.

Similarly communist atheism should be distinguished from all other forms of atheism. This atheism is no longer a philosophy, a competing view-point, a possible *darshan*. India is herself distinguished by a spirit of free enquiry which led some of her sages to uphold certain ‘atheistic’ systems of thought. But the new communist atheism is

different. It is a state creed, politically organized, psychologically manipulated, and enforced with the help of the police. It involves roaring publishing business, millions of trained agitators, organization of social censure and praise, reward and punishment, large-scale indoctrination, complete suppression of any rival point of view. The high-pressured publicity of which the present technical civilization is capable is pushed in the service of inculcating atheism. Education, press, radio, film, all serve the same purpose. In the present-day Russia, a certain amount of piety and ritualism is allowed as a concession to world opinion among persons and groups who may choose to remain in the backwaters of life, but any living manifestation of divine life is at once reported to the police, and destroyed physically.

### **Ideological Basis of the Struggle**

These are the issues of the present-day world struggle. Its nature is very much misunderstood. Many people in India think that the basic struggle is between two power-blocs which utilize ideologies for their national power expansion. This is not true. The two power-blocs are there, but they are themselves instruments of two opposed ideas. God's forces work through men, through individuals and groups, through human motives of fear, self-interest and idealism, of hate and love; but in the larger scheme of things all these have no more than instrumental value. It does not mean those ideas or ends that find fulfillment in this way through human instruments are supra-human. On the other hand these ideas are supremely significant to

humanity, to its present status and future evolution. For example, in the present struggle if communism triumphs, humanity will be formed in the image of Soviet Russia: a godless, soulless humanity. If, on the other hand, democracy wins, there will always be scope for experimenting with any kind of life one may choose, or responding to any call that may come to one.

So while power is involved in the present struggle—and without power and armies the battle may well be lost—power itself is the least attribute of this struggle. This point needs emphasis because the presence of power, of arms and soldiers confuses the minds of many people. There are persons who say that if the cause of freedom is good enough for defending, then it must prove its goodness by disbanding its armies, by scuttling away its defensive might, by showing absolutely no manifestation of any fanaticism, jingoism, or political excesses like McCarthyism. They argue that if there is the least sign of any armed might, of any McCarthyism or fanaticism, freedom is disproved, the issue of the struggle is disproved! But such is not our understanding of the problem.

### **India's Role**

If such is the nature of the present-day struggle, there is no room for moral neutralism, particularly for India. She must be where she belongs to by virtue of her cultural heritage and spiritual vision. She must oppose the forces of aggressive communism, forces of darkness and falsehood. She must realize her community of purpose with those nations that are fighting the same enemy in the defence of

at least similar values. Because America is in the forefront of this struggle, and materially best equipped to fight it, let us not make the mistake of thinking that it is solely America's fight. The struggle belongs equally to all those who have the same vision and the same values to preserve. We should also not be put off by the fact that the fight which is essentially ideological also involves, at least on the surface, national egoism and national self-interest among those who are fighting it. Nor can India remain unconcerned about the outcome of the struggle. If Russia wins, India—India that we know and cherish and hope to build up in future—will fall. Humanity itself will perish, at least spiritually. And there could be no worse disaster than that. Let us therefore wake up and with clarity and fearlessness advance forward and prove equal to the task imposed on us by the greatest challenge of the day.

PART TWO

*Technique*



## THE PREMISES OF A FOURTH FORCE

Today the free world is faced with a dilemma: the defence of freedom against a very total evil which is communism and a world war which this defence apparently involves and which would mean a probable destruction of the human race. Can we escape or transcend this dilemma? Can we both save freedom and avoid a third world war?

The escape generally sought is either in minimizing the evil nature of communism, or in denying the horrible nature of an atomic third world war. The pacifists, rightly frightened by the prospects of an atomic war, wrongly minimize the moral horror of communism. According to them, there is nothing the matter with the world except that two excitable, but otherwise likable chaps have become agitated about nothing; resulting from this have been suspicions and recriminations which have brought the world to the brink of a war. They say, or rather imply, that in their understanding of world politics the horror of communism is nothing objective, but is purely a psychological effervescence, quite the same in quality as the equally subjective distrust of the communists against democracy. They add that these two distrusts of purely psychological dimensions, have led the world to an arena of wordy recriminations, to mutually re-inforcing rearmament, which will ultimately lead to mutually

destructive, physical war. Therefore, they argue, let us give up these subjective fears and the world will be rid of the objective horrors of war.

This variety of pacifism—and there is hardly any other variety in the field today—is neutralist between democracy and totalitarianism. In terms of this faith, there is nothing to choose between the two ways of life. Accordingly, in its programme of action it tends to assume the role of a mediator between the two.

Similarly, there is a group of anti-communists who deny the horrors of the next world war. They believe that communism can only be stayed by a third world war and that it should be so stayed. Communism is worse than war—even a third world war. War is never so bad as is imagined.

*There is no question of soft-pedaling either the one or the other. War threatens the existence of the race, while communism threatens the spirit of man—negates and denies it completely. This point should be well understood. Communism is not an evil in the ordinary sense of the term like violating some social convention of monogamy or property. Its horror is deeper, more deadly than any physical pain. The whole spiritual evolution of man is at stake. Fashionable pacifism which is blind to this fact must be rejected.*

But can we combine anti-communism with anti-war and integrate both with the positive forces of love and justice? And can we combine all these sentiments into an effective programme of action—a programme of action which while uncompromising on principles is still plastic and patient enough to discuss and undertake gradual measures and make piecemeal efforts?

We believe that such a synthesis is possible; and in the world situation of today it is eminently desirable.

This programme consists of a moral and intellectual mobilization of the free peoples of the world. If these resources could be mobilized, the chances are that military defence would be rendered superfluous. The moral and spiritual premises of communism should be very widely discussed and their insufficiency shown. Communists must be shown that wherever they sow communism, people reap the harvest of forced labour, thought-control, purges, speed-ups and a reduced standard of living. This item of the programme must discuss fully and frankly those appeals of communism which attract our young men and women and must show how the communist promises have been belied.

Secondly, a way must be found to reach the Soviet leaders. It should be understood that the threat of a third world war is forced on the world by the existence of a dictatorial and monolithic system in Soviet Russia and until this system is modified, this threat would continue. We must argue with the Soviet leaders and try to enlist the elements of reason and humanism in them against the cruelty, inhumanity and irresponsibility of their own system. Let us remember that reason is universal, and while it may be warped for a time with the help of a seductive ideology, it is capable of a right response. We should organize meetings, demonstrations and signature-campaigns in all free countries, requesting the Soviet leaders to introduce civil and political liberties in their country.

Third, we must approach the Russian people—and this is the most important point. The Iron Curtain must be broken. No political authority, however powerful and self-

righteous, has a right to stand between different peoples of the world who inherit the earth in common. It is their birthright to know each other, talk to each other and communicate with each other. Unless this communication flows freely and so long as people are kept in political quarantines, artificially divided from each other, war will loom large on the world. People in free countries should mobilize public opinion for the lifting up of this Curtain. Moral pressure should be brought to bear on the Soviet leaders in implementing this programme. People who are both pacifists and anti-communists should organize a signature campaign for a freely accessible Russia, should organize peaceful demonstrations before the Soviet embassies in all capitals of the world, calling upon Soviet leaders to open up their country to outside communication. If these steps fail, **we should raise an international force of satyagrahis (or volunteers) who are ready to cross the Soviet borders** at the risk of their lives to speak to the Soviet people. This would be symbolic of the fact that the free people regard the existence of the Iron Curtain as most dangerous to international peace and human freedom and would raise the idea of democratic defence from a military to a moral level.

There is a risk that such a movement might degenerate into another item in the cold war, becoming an instrument of anti-communism in the same manner as the communist Peace Appeal is an instrument of the Soviet foreign policy—that is, unless it is carried on by persons with genuinely pacifist disposition. The movement can succeed only when it is led by persons capable of identification even with their worst adversaries; persons who while criticizing communism can accept communists; who while believing that communism

is a soulless creed can believe that communists have a soul and who work on that belief. The movement would succeed to the extent to which it keeps clear of the fidgeting, chauvinistic crowd of blind anti-communist mentality too rabid to know anything else, or the mediator pacifists too frightened to know what is at stake.

The premises of what may be called the “Fourth Force” is that communism is an evil which must be resisted, that due to the total nature of present-day war, a war is the least effective method of resistance, that the best way of resistance is the intellectual and moral mobilization of the common people. This resistance involves the following:—

1. A vastly expanded informational-interpretative programme. People should be told about the true conditions in Soviet Russia and her satellite countries;
2. A special programme for converting the communists and fellow-travellers, particularly those who believe in communism because of its original generous impulses. They should learn that communism has failed and they should be invited to start a reformist, revisionist movement from within;
3. Approaching communist leaders to encourage their giving up communist doctrines *ex-cathedra*, particularly those relating to tactics and strategy. So long as they believe in amoral approach and primacy of means over the ends, they would always inspire fear and suspicion;
4. Calling upon the Soviet leaders to call off their local fifth-columns in non-communist countries;
5. Calling upon Soviet leaders to close down forced labour camps, and introduce civil liberties and free elections in their country;

6. Calling upon the Soviet leaders to lift up the Iron Curtain. If there is no response, *the free people should organize an international volunteer-force ready to cross the Soviet borders*;
7. Organizing an agitational programme for a world government among the peoples of the world. Non-governmental agencies may run their own candidates in local elections on the ticket of a world government. These agencies could also convene an experimental world-parliament, its members being elected directly by the people. During the time the idea of a world Government matures, we should be working for greater regional co-operation and larger political units. For example, let India, America and the British Commonwealth come into some kind of loose federal relationship;
8. Promoting progressive disarmament and international control of all dangerous weapons; and
9. Promoting equality of productivity between individuals and nations by working for population control, free economic aid and exchange of techniques.

### **PEACE WITH FREEDOM**

A world over which hangs the shadow of a third world war is frantically seizing on any explanation and on any formula of peace. She is in a mood to believe in anything, rely on anything. One can understand statesmen and

nations losing their wits in the face of a possible atomic destruction, but such panicky and dumbstruck condition is hardly conducive to peace.

According to Marxism-Stalinism, the crisis of over-production, the scramble for foreign markets, and periodic economic depressions are inherent features of capitalism. These inner “contradictions” inevitably lead to war. Armament industries are built to bolster up the declining profitability of capitalist peace. But since a third World War will involve Soviet Russia, this “inevitability” of war is not stressed at present. Instead of prophesying a series of conflicts between socialism and capitalism, co-existence is conceded between the two systems.

There is another explanation, equally naturalistic. According to this, the cause of war is armament. Arms once piled up lead to tension and eventually to war. Therefore, disarmament is the only way to peace. But this explanation too is inadequate. Arms do not precede tension; they follow it. Secondly, the explanation is too deterministic to be true about man. If man has a choice to throw away his arms in the cause of peace, he has also a choice to take them up in the defence of his freedom. Man need not go to war simply because he has arms; and he will make arms if there is a cause to defend or an ambition to realize or an idea to impose.

The causes of a modern war are not traceable to the nature of a particular economy, or to the level of the armament, but to the psychology, ideas, ambitions, power-organization and political and ideological drives of groups and nations. In the past, greed, ambition, glory, woman and gold might have caused wars; but at present, a new factor is

entering: ideas. Aggressors have ideas about the final shape of a society which they want to impose on other nations. Hitler was a military leader as well as an ideologue. He wanted to fashion a world after his image. So does communist Russia; she not only exploits economically; she also destroys the soul of a people she conquers and seeks to impose a rigid system of ideas and values on them. In this fundamental sense the present struggle is ideological; those who care for the freedom of mind and soul cannot be neutral.

### **Communism Causes War**

The cause of the present conflict is that communist Russia after having destroyed freedom in her own country is trying to extend her system to other countries. To achieve this end, she maintains the world's biggest army and plants fifth-columns in the heart of other nations. This point has found expression, though however belatedly, in Pt. Nehru's recent speech. Russia is ideologically committed to world conquest. In pursuing this end, she is troubled by no scruples. What makes possible her imperialist expansion abroad is her totalitarian destruction of freedom and democracy at home. Today, almost all threats to peace arise from the fact that vast masses of people are kept in a political quarantine and are unable to influence the policies of their rulers. Internal democratization of Soviet Russia and her satellites is the basic condition of peace in the world. Peace and freedom are indivisible. We cannot have world half free and half slave.

This point is difficult to grasp. Men's eyes are caught by loud, surface happenings, by military movements in Korea

or Indo-China. They fail to see underlying forces and hope to eliminate war by negotiating agreement on certain trouble-spots. But unless the Iron Curtain snaps, and the totalitarian regimes in communist countries end, peace will remain an uncertain and distant goal.

### **Non-Violent Resistance: Informational Programme**

But the above does not mean that this change should be attempted by military means. Of course, the free world needs all the armed strength it can muster so that the communists are not easily provoked, but it must also try to develop methods of resistance which may render a third world war superfluous.

The first step has to be taken within the confines of the free world itself. In fact, it is a misnomer to call it a free world. It is free in the sense that it has not already been swallowed up by the communist world. But within it are working powerful forces on behalf of totalitarian regimes, spreading the Soviet myth, selling division and disunity and plotting and sabotaging for Soviet Russia. Therefore, in order to disabuse the minds of the peoples of the free world, an adequate informational programme should be launched, issues involved in the present struggle explained, the truth about Soviet regimes imparted. The first essential is that the free world should know clearly its own mind, know the nature of the danger it faces, the values it is called upon to defend, and develop that minimum unity of thought and action so indispensable for any common enterprise, whether in war or in peace.

When the public opinion is prepared, Russia should be invited to call off her fifth-columns and undertake internal

democratization of her regime. A signature campaign should be launched calling upon the Russian rulers to open their country and allow free intercourse between the peoples across the Iron Curtain. It is basically wrong to keep a people cut off from brotherly contact with their fellow brethren.

### **Satyagraha Against the Iron Curtain**

Learning from Gandhiji's Champaran campaign, an International Volunteer Force of Satyagrahis should be organized who are ready to cross the Iron Curtain unarmed at the risk of their lives. This will demonstrate in a symbolic form—what any other method may fail to do at all—that the present struggle is against apartheid and segregation, against the regimentation of human mind and soul, and for human freedom and oneness. It will demonstrate that while we mean no harm to the Soviet hierarchs, we do believe that peace in the world can only be ensured by freedom in Soviet Russia and China. Even if this campaign fails to convince the communist leaders, it may arouse the conscience of the people of the free world. That in itself is no mean achievement.

The task is not easy and Gandhi's experiment is no parallel. Gandhi was able to launch his satyagraha against the British imperialism, but communism is a different matter. There are many difficulties. Absence of a personality like Gandhi is only one. Besides the hurdles of language and travel, the satyagrahis might be arrested and made to grovel and confess to all sorts of crimes before they are shot. They will not be volunteers going to gaols at intervals, cheered and loved by an enthusiastic public. Martyrdom is not

allowed in Soviet Russia. But all these risks have to be borne. Once communists know that we are ready to undergo any sacrifice, they might be impressed and a world war avoided.

There seems to be a vague realization in certain quarters of the free world that the existence of the Iron Curtain is the real threat to peace. The "*Voice of America*" seems to be an attempt to reach the Soviet people. But this mechanical method will not do. Freedom demands the willing sacrifice of its votaries. If we would die without killing, our determination may convince the Soviet authorities. The experiment may eventually fail but it is worthwhile making it.

### **Converting the Communists**

We must also make a sustained effort to convert communists in free countries to democracy. We must be able to tell them that communism may have succeeded as a power-technique, but has failed miserably as a social experiment and as a humanitarian movement. Today communism is a naked exercise of brutal force to subjugate mankind on a large scale and has trampled over the small man, and magnified the monolithic power of a dictator.

We should tell the communists that their original impulse might have been humanitarian, but the end-product of their methods is hideous; that the Frankenstein they create crushes not only the opposition and the people but also themselves. Let us learn from Soviet Russia; ninety-eight percent of the members of the Communist Party in 1918-19 had been liquidated by 1936-37. We should tell them that it takes two to play at a game; that if they believe

in force, they would invite force. They must be helped to see that through them man's evolution and future possibilities are getting typified and standardized, that through them man is becoming a spiritual dwarf and humanity is committing suicide, that their slogans of equality and peace hide ruthless exploitation and aggression.

The above is the programme of a non-violent struggle. It is positive, self-confident, and aims at achieving peace without surrendering freedom. It is not neutralist between democracy and totalitarianism. Nor is it based on Bevanism—that fashionable school of thought which hopes to fight communism by fighting America. No advocate of Americanism or Westernism, it does believe that free nations everywhere should recognize the community of values of theism and democracy, recognize the common danger to these, and unite to fight it. Fundamentally pacifist in disposition, it does not rule out a military defence *a priori* if that is forced on the free countries. It believes that communism should be resisted at all costs, though the best way of doing it is to mobilize the intellectual, moral and spiritual resources of all free nations.

## LOVE AGAINST HATE

Ethical values belong to all times. They belong to all peoples and nations whether they come from the East or from the West. Love nourishes human personality; hatred dwarfs it.

In Gandhiji this ancient principle of love and non-violence acquired a new significance. From a personal acquisition or a point of individual excellence, it became a driving force of great social action. In an intellectual atmosphere which accepted wars and violent upheavals as the sole engines of political and social change, the Gandhian technique as practised by Gandhiji came as a new method, a more potent and effective instrument of opposing the evil and bringing about socially desirable ends. One advantage of this technique was that in a battle waged with the weapon of love and non-violence nobody really lost, but everybody won.

Now the next question is: Can the Gandhian technique be applied to combating another danger, a danger far more monolithic, determined, ruthless, and less scrupulous than British imperialism? I refer to the danger of communist imperialism. Can Russia's totalitarianism be fought by Satyagraha?

Gandhism must find an answer to this question if it is not to be accused of being irrelevant to the most important issue of the day.

### **The Three Trends**

Many Gandhians have answered. Their answers do not lack variety. Dr. Kumarappa's and Pt. Sunderlal's answers, though not representative of the whole Gandhian movement, yet represent a trend. According to them communism is not a curse but a blessing, not an affliction but a godsend. Communism, as they see it practised in China and Soviet Russia, is the nearest approximation to Gandhism. Therefore, from their point of view, there is no question of opposing communism. People should instead be ardently working for it, as they themselves are doing.

The other answer which is probably also a popular one is not so frankly partisan, but it is blind. Those who give this answer show no awareness of the communist danger and of the Soviet imperialism. While they loudly denounce a gasping, dying, on-its-legs colonialism of the West, they fail to see the new ruthless, thorough-going, totalitarian imperialism of the communists. According to them communism is a political system just like democracy, both having their merits and demerits. We in India should have nothing to do with these foreign 'isms' and ideologies. On the other hand, like true followers of Gandhiji, we should cultivate friendship with all nations and be open to their influence *equally* irrespective of their political beliefs and drive. There is nothing to choose, nothing to lose; and there is nothing at stake except peace in the present cold war. Pt. Nehru is the exponent of this view.

While these are the premises of the neutralist school, which is many times justified in the name of Gandhian non-

violence, in practice, this neutralism has already become pro-Soviet. In discipline and power structure, it is democratic. *Eventually* and *broadly* speaking, it is even anti-communist as it claims to be. But it is more than a coincidence that in concrete policies on any major issue, whether it be Nato, Meado, or Seato, whether Syngmen Rhee, or Chiang, or Bao Dai, its position is very much similar to Moscow's.

There is also a third trend among the Gandhians represented by persons like Rajaji, Jayaprakash Narain, S.N. Agarwal, Vinobhaji, Kaka Kalelkar and others. These Gandhians are opposed to communism whether in India or in Soviet Russia or in China. They know communism is built on violence, dictatorship and denial of individual freedom. Hence they reject communism as a philosophy and as a way of life. But not all of them are equally conversant with the tactical and conspiratorial aspect of communism, with its slogans, plans and strategy of world conquest, front organizations, zigzag practices, and the flexibility of means combined with rigidity of ends. They still think of communism in terms of local communist parties pursuing their ends rather violently that defeats their objectives which probable are not so bad. Not all of them see communism as a world idea, world force and world organization using subversion, infiltration, civil wars and deceptive slogans and fronts as a part of an unfolding process of world conquest for imposing values which not only will destroy local traditions and national cultures but also oppose and silence man's deeper urges and premises which give meaning to his existence and direction and

hope to his evolution. Understanding communism but partially, their opposition to it is not as effective as is demanded by the situation.

### **Gandhism and Neutralism**

Coming back to the question with which we started: Is there a Gandhian technique which could be employed to oppose communist imperialism and aggression? As regards my own answer to this question, I should not like to be dogmatic about it. Not ruling out military defence altogether, I feel that there is scope for a good deal of Gandhian action. In fact if this action succeeds, military action may be rendered superfluous and thus the world may be saved from a third world war, which will destroy a good many values whatever be the initial issues of the war.

The first requisite of this technique is that we should not lose hold of our sense of values.

We should not be morally neutral. We should be protagonists of democracy in this struggle against totalitarianism. Thus knowing clearly where we belong to, and what really is at stake, we should do our best to raise the struggle from the military to the moral-ideological level. We must approach the communists without hatred, without spite, and ask them to think out their assumptions afresh. We must launch an informational programme, supported by men of goodwill and means everywhere. We must bring out objective, truthful literature on conditions and happenings in communist countries. The fallacies of communism should be exposed. We must also help individual communists to outgrow the lies of communism.

We must tell our people that terrorism and spying are the most important levers of a communist society. In these societies not only opposition to communism is punished as treason, but the people are required to show positive enthusiasm for the dictatorship and its activities. Even when they are starving, they have to sing of the “happy and abundant” life.

### **Freedom and Peace Indivisible**

We must realize that the existence of the Iron Curtain is the main reason for the present world tension. Let us tell the Russian leaders that if they do not want to open the country to the outsiders, let them at least open it to their own people. Let the people of Soviet Russia and its satellite countries be in a position to know uncensored facts about other nations and be in a position to influence their own Government’s actions. In short, let there be democracy inside communist countries. *Freedom inside Soviet Russia and China is the key to world peace.*

Let us therefore build up a world movement based on the recognition of this truth. Let us help the awareness of this truth to grow among the peoples and leaders of different democratic countries. Let us initiate a signature campaign demanding civil liberties and free elections for the peoples of communist countries. Let us organize an international volunteer force pledged to cross the Soviet borders unarmed, symbolic of our determination to break the Iron Curtain peacefully. Of course, there are many risks involved in this course of action. Many might be forced to confess that they were American spies. Many might be

shot. But there is a chance that these sacrifices may convince the Soviet leaders; these sacrifices may also at least arouse the conscience of the world, which, after all, will be no small gain. Such a programme of action will also help millions of people to be identified with defence of their freedom in an active and purposive manner.

Today humanity faces a grave crisis. Humanity stands at the cross-roads of existence. If freedom and peace could be saved, the other things that make life worthwhile would be added in due course. If we surrender to communism, it will lead to the degradation of humanity, to Mind's regimentation and Spirit's thralldom. If in the defence of freedom war becomes inevitable, humanity may sink into barbarism—and that is a very sad reflection. How to avoid war without surrendering to neutralism, without losing hold of the value of human freedom? The answer may lie in Gandhiji's sense of values, in his love of Satya and in his technique of a non-violent struggle. But never should the technique be exalted above truth.

Last, but not the least, though love is the superior way, in the present situation love is not enough. What we need is Grace, God's vision of things. Everything depends on what He wants and how He wants to achieve it and whether He chooses to use us as His channel or instrument. Let us, therefore, seek His guidance, call upon His help, and aspire to serve Him whether be it in peace or war.

# Manav Samaj

*(Devoted to the Cause of Human Unity in Freedom)*

## DECLARATION OF FAITH

1. All men are equal and one. They live in each other and through each other.

2. The base, centre and summit of this unity is God. In Him, mankind is united and develops; divorced from Him, it is divided and scattered.

3. The law of this unity is freedom and diversity. Therefore the true basis of a world community is local self-articulation and free national cultures. A universal state holding its uprooted individuals in uniformity and regimentation debases human life.

4. Man's true destiny and motive-force is moral-spiritual. For human growth, both in the individual and in society, freedom of thought and aspiration is essential. Any creed which does not respect this central truth of man's being and regards him as a mere cog in a machine or a means to an end is pernicious.

5. Poverty and want degrades a people. For full human development, we should build a mutually-shared prosperity.

6. Hatred and vengeance cannot bring about a just, joyous and free society. Humanity evolves through love and co-operation; through hatred and strife it degenerates. War was bad enough in the past; it threatens human survival itself in the present atomic age.

7. Manav Samaj believes in free intercourse between the peoples of the world. To keep a people behind iron curtains cut off from the rest of their brethren is a sin against human oneness. There is a natural link between individual freedom, human unity and world peace. Forces that stand for dictatorship and segregation inevitably make for war.

8. Manav Samaj will try to evolve such methods against the forces of totalitarianism and apartheid as will preserve as far as possible peace without surrendering freedom.

9. Manav Samaj is open to all people who believe in the unity of mankind developing in freedom.