

The Coming Collapse of Communism

Nehru—Man in the Middle

Schweitzer vs. Stalin



Three Articles by
HAROLD E. STASSEN

Reprinted from the *Ladies' Home*
JOURNAL April, May, July Issues, 1951

The Coming Collapse of Communism

*For the liberation and upward climb
of mankind, here are the goals of
the counter-revolutionary
movement which the people of
America must stimulate.*

By HAROLD E. STASSEN
President, University of Pennsylvania

THE gaunt, brown-skinned young Moslem stood there on the rocky hillside in Central Asia, south of the Russian border. Looking north toward the Turkomen Republic of the USSR, he said with burning intensity, "There is only one reason why I will ever return to the Soviet Union from which I escaped."

"And what is that reason?" he was asked.

His eyes flashed, he stood erect in his ragged, dusty clothing. "If war comes," he replied, "I will parachute in to help my people resist their Communist oppressors."

"But that will mean sure death," he was told.

"It will mean death for many," he replied. "But in the end our people will win their freedom. That is what counts, not my life."

Less than a year before he had been one of the 25,000,000 Moslems inside the Soviet Union who are largely concentrated in the Central Asiatic Soviet Republics north of the Iran and Afghanistan borders. He had observed the harsh measures used by the secret police against his people and he had felt the rigid restrictions enforced by the political commissars imported from Moscow. Mosques had been desecrated. Relatives and friends had been spirited off by secret police, never to return. And soon after they had disappeared,

stories would seep back of cruelty and forced labor and death. The endlessly repeated promises of better living conditions through five-year plans became hollow and meaningless. Terror of torture and fear of death lost their force in the tragedy of continued life.

Resolved at last to escape, he and two friends, traveling by night with forged papers, managed to reach the southern-border area. He found the border, which followed a river, stripped of trees and bushes and foliage of all kinds, doubly guarded with machine guns that pointed inward. It was crisscrossed with barbed wire and watched by trained dogs. To get through seemed hopeless, but he and his two companions spent weeks listening and looking and studying. During the long waiting period, they were picked up on suspicion in the local market place by two of the secret police. But as they were being led from the market place, they suddenly overpowered their captors and escaped through the crowd, not one of whom tried to detain them.

Then came the thrilling rumor that all the frontier dogs in one section were ill, had probably been poisoned, and had not yet been replaced. That night, under cover of a diversionary clamor nearby, they made their break. The one young Moslem got through the network of barbed wire to the river and swam across. But neither of his two friends reached the agreed rendezvous on the other side, and he never saw them again. He made his way through the mountains until at last, half dead from hunger, with a leg infected where the wire had torn it, he was taken in by a goat herdsman. With him he remained, tending the goats, worshipping Allah, and brooding over the wrongs done his people.

He is just one of the 100 who escape every day from the prison that is the Soviet Union to the freedom of nations over the border. His two companions were just two of the 200 who, every day, fail in their attempts to escape.

These estimates of 100 who escape every day and at least twice that number who fall and fail at the border are based

on the information I received as I traveled along the outside of the Communist empire all the way around the world. Many of the stories are epic in themselves. They include a thirty-two-hour trek through a raging blizzard in a mountain pass by two sturdy sisters in their teens. A long icy swim cost eleven Red Army soldiers their lives, but brought freedom to three others. A commandeered airplane riddled with bullet holes brought out four more.

The estimated 100 who escape every day is a very small number set against the 205,000,000 inside and the 18,900 miles of border! Yet I believe these escapees have an importance out of all proportion to their numbers, for they are the messengers of the coming collapse of Communism. Of course the story of no one of them can be accepted unquestioningly as a true picture of conditions in the USSR, or be made the basis for confident conclusions. Some may invent stories which they believe will improve their chances of being accepted on the outside. Some may, in fact, have fled from one point outside the Soviet empire to another point on the outside, and use this means of shedding an undesirable identity. Some may even be Communist spies deliberately permitted to feign escape.

But it is my judgment, founded on a careful fitting together of reports and bits of information from public and private sources in a dozen countries on my recent trip, that there is serious trouble inside the Soviet Union, that it affects the Red Army itself, that, if aided from the outside, it would burst forth in counterrevolution if the rulers in the Kremlin should begin a third world war. And I believe that this trouble inside and the knowledge of it on the outside will ultimately lead to the collapse of Communism. It may take ten years. It may take twenty years. It may take more, but I do not think it will. It may result, just before the collapse, in a reckless rush into aggressive world war, but I do not think it will.

The rest of the world has been so busy thinking about

the Communist Kremlin's threats of external action, and our own American policy of mere defensive containment has been so narrow, that we have not given proper attention to the conditions within the Soviet Union and have not evaluated the facts that no Iron Curtain can conceal.

The first important fact to keep in mind is that the 205,000,000 people who now live within the Soviet Union itself are not all one people. Far from it. There are, in fact, over 175 different ethnic nationality groups, with 17 nationalities having populations of over 1,000,000 each. In addition there are several strong religious groups cutting across nationalities. There are 40,000,000 Ukrainians, 2,000,000 Lithuanians, 1,500,000 Latvians, 1,000,000 Estonians, 25,000,000 Moslems, 10,000,000 White Russians, 2,000,000 Armenians, and 2,000,000 Jews.

Every one of these groups other than the Russians themselves burns with intense resentment over their domination by the Kremlin rulers in Moscow, and all the people, including the Russians themselves, are filled with uneasiness, a deep unrest. For there is hatred of the secret-police methods, opposition to the completely dominated economy, with its collective farms from which the farmers themselves get very little, with its banning of all private merchants and private business, with its high standard of living for Communist officials and its very low standard for everyone else, with its interference with religious worship, its concentration camps, its savage cruelty and repression.

In recent years this rising resentment and harassing opposition have caused a steady increase in the intensity of the border patrol. Over vast stretches searchlights have been installed, and everywhere the guards, the trained dogs, the barbed wire have been increased.

And still they escape. In fact, the border guards themselves have been escaping over the line. And so a double network of guards has been established under separate commands, each to guard against the escape of the other and to

provide a double vigilance against the people. The Iron Curtain has become a murdering network of barbed wire and machine guns around an enormous prison of nations.

Naturally the same sort of prison atmosphere has deepened in the interior. There the secret police have stepped up their activities; tortures unthought of by even the Nazis have become the normal punishment; concentration camps have grown in size and number. But notwithstanding all this, resistance inside the Soviet Union is increasing. Terror has reached its ultimate and is losing its power to restrain. Young men conclude that if they and their families are to be wiped out without cause by the savagery of the secret police, they might as well take up active resistance in the mountains and the forests regardless of the consequences.

Thus, in the outer provinces, the point has been reached where the secret police and the imported Communist administrators are themselves captured, tortured and killed by the resisters. Trains leaving for Siberian concentration camps are dynamited, guards killed, and exiles released and recruited into the outlaw forces. The life of the resisters is usually a short and rugged one. But new recruits are ever moving to the mountains and the forests. Basing my opinion on what I learned on my journey and on a study of all available reports, I believe that at this time more than 1,000,000 armed resisters are scattered through the wide expanse of the Soviet Union. I believe that their ranks would swell rapidly if the Soviet Union started a third world war. I believe that Marshal Stalin and his Politburo in the Kremlin know this, and that this knowledge and their knowledge of the great power of the American Air Force and its atomic weapons are the two key deterrents to direct Soviet aggression. And that is why I believe that the long odds are that the Communist dictators in the Kremlin will not start a third world war.

I hasten to add that no one can guarantee that they will not. It is always possible that they may make a mad move toward all-out war this year, or next year, or soon. Some-

times interior trouble itself has led dictators toward the rash experiment of external war. But this usually has occurred when the dictator believed that the war itself, or the alleged principles for which it was fought, would unite his country. Hitler's slogan of "*Lebensraum*" and the theory of a superior race with which the Germans were indoctrinated were typical of such a situation. But the Communist leaders of Russia have not been able to give their people any convincing reason why they should wage aggressive war against the rest of the world. Neither the Red Army nor the people have any fervor for extending Communism—the social system which they now know fetters them in permanent poverty. Stalin remembers the mass surrenders of the Red Army to the Germans in the early part of World War II, running into the millions in the first year, and he recalls his soldiers' willingness to form armies to turn and march against the Soviet.

As we know, the tide turned. Hitler's vicious orders for atrocities and devastation against the Ukrainian and the Russian peasant, and Stalin's crafty shifting of the line from Communism to the defense of Mother Russia, halted the mass defections and led to the ultimate stalwart stands at Stalingrad and at Moscow. And so, in my judgment, the very poor showing of the Russian armies against Finland is a better guide to the conditions that prevail today than is the record of Stalingrad.

Much information is gradually coming to the surface about the various national groups imprisoned within the Soviet Union. Of all these groups one of the most important is the Ukrainians, who in 1941 welcomed the German armies and now are engaged once more in very active resistance to Communist domination. Located on the broad, fertile plains of the southwestern portion of Russia, adjoining Poland and Rumania and bordering on the Black Sea, the Ukraine is the most densely populated of the constituent republics of the Soviet Union. It contains the famous black-soil belt which is the chief wheat-producing section of the

Soviet Union. The Donets Basin, with its huge supply of coal and iron and other metals, is in the Ukraine. Here are produced 54 per cent of the coal mined in the country, 60 per cent of the pig iron, 48 per cent of the steel, and 35 per cent of the manganese. Also in the Ukraine, on the Dnieper River, is the largest hydroelectric development in Europe, a rich prize, the loss of which nearly crippled Russian industry when the Nazis seized it.

For years these people have maintained an active and well-organized resistance army which operates from hide-outs in the forests and mountains of the Carpathian area. And ever since the end of World War II, the Kremlin rulers have been making a continuous effort to wipe out this resistance. There have been many battles and much violence. In March of 1950 Gen. Taras Chuprynka, the commander of the Ukrainian underground forces, was killed in a battle with the secret police in a village near Lviv. But his place in the underground was promptly taken by Col. Vosyl Kovol, who continues to lead raids upon secret-police headquarters and to carry on other forms of active resistance against the cruelties of the central government. The enduring aim of the Ukrainian underground is the establishment of an independent sovereign Ukrainian Republic in which the people will enjoy individual freedom and the peasants will own the land they farm.

Continued bitter resistance has been carried on likewise by the Lithuanians, the Latvians and the Estonians, over whom Russia took jurisdiction in 1940. Hundreds of thousands of these Baltic people have been killed or sent off to Siberia, and yet both their spirit of resistance and their acts of resistance continue.

The use of Mongolians as guards over the Ukrainians and Balts is one more aspect of Communist repression in the richest and most advanced areas of the Soviet, and a cause for bitter resentment. Large numbers of barbarous tribesmen have been brought from Eastern and Central Asia to the

Baltic coast and the Ukrainian border, where they have been settled on lands of families who have been moved to Siberia or otherwise forcibly ejected. These Mongolians are used as border guards in the hope that they will prove more reliable and also will instill more fear than either local Russians or other people have in the past.

THE Jewish populations within the Soviet Union have not yet actively resisted the regime. But in recent years repressive measures have also been taken against them, and disaffection is spreading. Jews have nearly all been removed from positions of leadership in both the government and the army. Their religious and cultural organizations and even their centers of population have been broken up and scattered. Many of their intellectual leaders have been sent to Siberia. The Kremlin has steadfastly refused the Jews permission to emigrate to Israel and has attacked them as deviationists and as too cosmopolitan to fit into the monolithic Communist political structure.

The Soviet policy against the Jews began at the end of 1948 and has been carried on with increased severity ever since. The new policy was introduced with a sharp attack against Zionism, Jewish nationalism and the new State of Israel. Soon Jewish organizations within Russia were being dissolved, their press was suppressed, and many outstanding Yiddish writers were arrested. The Jewish newspaper, *Einikeit*, was closed down in December, 1948. On January 28, 1949, *Pravda* contained a slashing attack on Jewish cosmopolitanism. Likewise all contact between the Jews in Moscow and the Jews in Kiev and in Minsk was broken up.

One of the dramatic reports on Russia's treatment of its Jews has been obtained from an Australian carpenter, Carlos Melman, who emigrated in 1947 to Birobidjan, "the autonomous Jewish province" set up as a haven for Jews in the Soviet Far East. He was appalled by the conditions there, and luckily, because he had not surrendered his Australian

citizenship, was able to obtain an exit visa from the Australian legation in Moscow. After his escape he reported first-hand on the increasing oppression of the Jewish peoples.

The Moslems, too, have felt the heavy hand of oppression. Along the borders of Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan 70 per cent of the Soviet population are Moslems. These, too, have suffered because of their religious faith, and have experienced all the wide range of cruelties that is inevitably a part of government by Communists. But these peoples also have a fierce determination to continue to worship as they wish and in Turkestan especially there is an extreme desire for the establishment of an independent sovereign Moslem state.

Religion, whether Moslem as in Turkestan, or Jewish, or Christian, is a deep and abiding force throughout the Soviet Union as in other lands, and the Communist suppression of it only provokes increased resistance. As this resistance rises, a new and desperate attempt is being made by the Communist leadership to undermine the age-old religious beliefs and faiths of the captive peoples. They realize that these subject populations persistently believe, in accordance with their respective faiths, that there is a god, and will not accept the Communist line that there is no god.

A recent attack by Bagirob, first secretary of the Azerbaidzhan Communist Party, upon the Islamic religion and Islamic traditions in the south of Russia labeled Mohammed a representative of the feudal mercantile aristocracy, and other writings against Judaism and against Christianity are of the same pattern. The newspaper in the Soviet republic of Kirghiz stated on June 26, 1949: "The Bolshevik Party cannot be neutral in regard to religion. The Party has never concealed its negative attitude toward religious beliefs and prejudices. Lenin wrote that the Party program is constructed entirely upon a scientific and at the same time materialist world outlook."

Which is true enough if we add "pseudo" to the word "scientific," for, referring back to Lenin, we note that in his "Socialism and Religion," 1905 (Selected Works, vol. XI, page 658), he wrote: "Religion is the opium of the people. Religion is a kind of spiritual gin in which the slaves of capital drown their human shape and their claims to any decent human life." And again in his letter to Gorky in 1913: "Every religious idea, every idea of god, even every flirting with the idea of god, is unutterable vileness . . . vileness of the most dangerous kind, 'contagion' of the most abominable kind. Millions of sins, filthy deeds, acts of violence and physical contagions . . . are far less dangerous than the subtle, spiritual ideas of a god decked out in the smartest 'ideological' costumes."

And harping on the familiar theme, Radio Moscow declared on June 11, 1948: "There is no place or job for god in the universe."

But this renewed attack upon the religions of the peoples of Russia, far from weaning them away from their religious faiths, has deepened their resistance to the Soviet rulers and increased their faith to the point of martyrdom, all of which bodes ill for a united Soviet front should the Politburo plunge the world into a general war.

THE story of the Armenians is another significant tale of tragedy and bottled-up resentment. According to the 1939 census, there were 2,152,000 Armenians living in the Soviet Union, of whom about 1,280,000 lived within the Armenian-Soviet Republic. In June of 1945, just at the end of World War II, the Soviet government permitted the Armenian Church to hold a church congress in the Armenian-Soviet Republic and endeavored to induce some of the 815,000 Armenians living outside the USSR to move to the Armenian-Soviet Republic. At this conference Soviet-Armenian delegates spoke brazenly of Soviet plans for the annexation of Armenian provinces in Turkey. This took place at the same

time that Molotov was making demands upon the Turkish foreign minister for the return of the old Armenian provinces of Kars and Ardahan to the Soviet Union. The propaganda had its effect. Armenians from abroad were attracted by the promise of nationalism within the Soviet Union, and in 1948 Tass, the Soviet news agency, reported that 86,000 Armenians had migrated to the USSR.

It is not surprising that these migrants—in fact, the Armenian people as a whole—have been bitterly disappointed by the Kremlin's failure to make good the glowing promise of local self-government and economic security and a favored status. Consequently, those who migrated now wish to get out, but are refused permission, and the entire Armenian population is restless and resentful and full of resistance.

A story is told of one of these Armenian families who migrated into Russia. Mindful of their own safety once they were within the Soviet Union, they promised Armenian friends who were considering following them into Russia that, regardless of what they found in the Soviet Union, they would write only very favorable letters, but that they would let them know the true situation by sending a picture. The picture would be of the family bathing. If they were in the water up to their ankles, it meant the friends should come and join them. If they were in up to their knees, it meant they did not recommend it. If they were in up to their hips, it meant they wished to return. When the glowing letter finally arrived, the enclosed picture showed the family in the water up to their necks. That family was never heard from again.

The situation in the Eastern European countries which are behind the Iron Curtain, but are not a part of the Soviet Union itself, is also important. In each of these—Poland, Eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania—the native Communist leadership, with increasing direct assistance from Russia, has been clamping an ever-tightening, iron control on schools and churches,

industries and labor unions, farmers and merchants. Socialist leaders and others who joined with the Communists in "united fronts" or people's fronts in the early days have largely disappeared. The lucky ones, perhaps, are executed at once; those less lucky become slave laborers in frozen lumber camps deep inside the Arctic circle. Even party members, on the slightest suspicion of Titoism, or other form of deviation, are imprisoned or shot. But here, too, the resistance is increasing, and deep and bitter anger is everywhere. A quip reported from Prague is that no satellite Communist leader can get insurance on his life for more than ten years, because, if the resistance movement does not get him, his superiors are sure to liquidate him for suspected deviation.

From these satellite countries escapes are much more frequent than from the Soviet Union itself, and there is a fairly steady flow of desperate people from each of these once independent nations into Western Europe, each refugee adding details to the shocking picture of what is taking place on the inside.

For the most part, these many thousands of unofficial messengers from Moscow have avoided American officials and American-occupation territories. The reason for this is the tragic error which our State Department committed right after the end of the war. It was American policy and practice then that all those who did escape be turned over to Soviet authorities, who in turn tortured them, found out who had helped them escape, and used them as terrible examples of what would happen. The United States permitted Soviet teams to roam through American-occupation territory and use force in recapturing and returning Russians who did not want to go back. This inhumane policy of forcibly returning these escapees to the Soviet Union in the immediate postwar period not only was contrary to basic American humanitarian tradition, but it did more to help the Soviet Union hold a tight grip on their prisoner populations than

any other one thing. It discouraged escape, spread hopelessness, and undermined resistance at the very time when it had its greatest chance of success. After I had probed, by searching questioning of an Asiatic leader, for an explanation of some of the actions of his government which seemed contrary to their expressed opposition to Communism and the principles of their religion, I was asked for an explanation of this action of my Government, which seemed contrary to our opposition to Communism and the principles of our religion!

Careful analysis of the reports of the recent escapees will reveal the kind of counter-approach which America and the other peace-desiring nations must make to the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the Iron Curtain countries. Such an examination of the evidence now fully available will show that the repressed goals of the majority of the captive peoples inside the USSR are these:

1. The establishment of separate national sovereignty and true independence for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, White Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and Turkestan.

2. The release of the many millions of political prisoners now in concentration camps and under forced labor in the Soviet Union.

3. The giving of the land they farm to the Russian peasants who farm them.

4. The granting of the right of genuine labor unions to organize and bargain collectively.

5. The winning of the right of all the people to worship God as they choose.

6. The establishment of a free, democratic and united Germany, under a representative government that will guarantee human rights for all the people, East and West.

THESE, then, should be the goals of the counterrevolutionary movement which the people of America must stimulate. A deeply intelligent and ingenious program for these ends

should be carried on with skill and determination by a special agency established for that purpose—not under the State Department and not under the military. It should be staffed by men who have the highest ability and who are confident that the evil dynamics of Communism and of the Russian Cominform can be met with the overpowering dynamics of the basic desires of people everywhere and of every race for freedom, for better conditions of living, and for the right to worship God.

Such a program, properly carried on, not only would be added assurance that the Soviet Union will not become an effective machine for aggressive world war, but it would also hasten the day when Communist dictatorships will collapse.

THIS does not mean that there will not be difficult and dangerous times before that collapse arrives. It does not mean that America and the other free nations can fail to carry on extremely resourceful policies and to keep strong and alert in these years ahead. On the contrary, it assumes that America will at last begin to show some increased intelligence in her foreign policy and will become much stronger militarily. It further assumes that the defenses of Western Europe will be rebuilt, and rebuilt promptly. I am confident that they will be and that the reconstruction will have the complete support of the people of this country, who will stand united behind that outstanding leader, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and his efforts to end the dangers of a Communist offensive across Europe.

Furthermore, I do not share the panic of some Americans who fear that the Chinese Communists will overrun all Asia. Despite the confused softness displayed by India and other Asiatic countries on the clear-cut issue of Red aggression in Korea, I believe that if the Chinese Communists invade Burma or India or Pakistan, they will find a united Asia turning against their aggression. And once a united Asia has turned against the Red invaders, China's vulnerable

cities and factories and transportation lines will be obliterated by air and sea attacks from the United States and the other Western powers. Her only hope to avoid such devastation by air and sea would be Russian counterattack by air. Therefore the Chinese cannot move through Southern Asia without the support of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union, in turn, cannot give that support unless it dares to plunge into World War III. But fortunately, if my appraisal is correct, the long odds are that the Soviet Union does not dare, and thus direct military aggression by the Communists will be stalemated both in Europe and in Asia.

That, of course, leaves us with the threat of the typical Communist tactics of infiltration and the fomenting of civil war. But in Asia, I am convinced, these will fail, just as they have failed in France and Italy. In fact, they already have failed in India and Indonesia because the populace at last realized that Communist agitators were bent on advancing not the welfare of the native populations but the imperialism of totalitarian Russia.

This awakening can be traced, at least in large part, to a Communist Congress in Calcutta in February and March of 1948. During my recent Calcutta visit a man in a position to know told me that approximately 800 delegates attended and a special "comrade from Russia" sat on the rostrum. The Congress adopted a militant and violent program, which included attacks on Premier Nehru as a "collaborator with imperialism." At once violent strikes and other disorders instigated by the Communists broke out in India and neighboring South Asia countries. But the governments took firm countermeasures, jailing many Communists and, in a number of areas, declaring the Communist parties illegal. Soon the peasants and workers had also become aware of the true objectives of these Communist leaders, and the popular support of the Communist parties declined. In India, security measures are now very thorough, and it seems certain that a Communist conquest by revolution—or threat-

ened revolution, such as occurred in Czechoslovakia—is not a menace.

Nor is it now a menace in Indonesia, where the Communist Party joined in the national independence movement against the Dutch after World War II and thus gained a considerable following. But the moment independence was achieved, the Communists began to work openly for the overthrow of the new native government. Their leader, Muso, had been an active Communist in Java in 1925, fled to Moscow in 1926, and spent many years there. In August, 1948, he returned to Indonesia from Prague, under the false name of Suparto and in the guise of secretary to an Indonesian government representative.

The non-Communist Soekarno government soon knew of his activity and in September, 1948, raided Communist-led groups in the barracks at Solo. The Communists then began an open rebellion at Madioen. This rebellion was effectively put down, and on November 1, 1948, it was reported that Muso had been killed in the Wilis Mountains. I personally observed the manner in which the capable young leaders of the non-Communist Nationalist Government are gradually restoring law and order throughout the islands, and am convinced that they have the Communist threat well in hand.

Nevertheless, there is danger in non-Communist Asia, and the Communists never give up. The two most dangerous aspects of the situation are the extreme economic distress in India, a condition in which Communism readily breeds, and the large Chinese minorities in other Asiatic countries, upon which the Communists are now concentrating.

APPROXIMATELY 10,000,000 Chinese live outside of China in the South Asiatic countries. Indo-China has a Chinese population of 1,125,000 out of a total population of 27,000,000; Indonesia, 2,000,000 out of 76,000,000; Thailand (Siam), 3,000,000 out of 18,000,000; Malaya, 2,750,000

out of 6,000,000; Burma, 500,000 out of 17,000,000; Philippines, 120,000 out of 19,500,000; and India and Pakistan, only 9000 out of 430,000,000.

The families of some of these Chinese migrated centuries ago, but most of them date back at the farthest to within the past century. As a whole they do have a sense of Chinese nationality, and the new Chinese Communist rulers are endeavoring to use them as a means of Communist infiltration.

Generally speaking, however, the Chinese immigrants to South Asia were, and still are, exclusively interested in gaining a livelihood. Originally they supplied labor for mines and to a lesser extent for plantations. For the most part, they are now retail traders and middlemen, and are therefore not the most receptive subjects of Communist indoctrination. Furthermore, they nearly all realize that they are better off in their adopted lands than they would be in China. Finally, the South Asian governments are fully alert to the special Communist efforts directed toward their subversion. These Chinese minorities do constitute a danger, but I do not believe that they will be able to take over control of any of the South Asian countries.

ON one hand, the Moscow-trained agitators, with their schemes of violence and their clearly recognized roles as agents of Soviet imperialism, and, on the other, the unofficial messengers who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, have seen to that! They have alerted the Asian governments just as they have alerted Europe and—at long last—the Government of the United States.

I recognize that predictions which go wrong can do much to discredit an individual. Yet, impelled by the seriousness of the world situation, I have given my frank appraisal, which is based not only on my personal observations and the conferences I have participated in around the world on my recent journey, but also on years of study. If my countrymen and other free men adopt and carry out

intelligent and alert policies which will take advantage of the weaknesses of the Soviet system and will hold up the hands of peace-loving and democratic nations, I look forward, first, to a continuing stalemate of the Russian threat of a new world war and therefore to the greater likelihood that all-out World War III will not start; second, to increased trouble within the Iron Curtain and within Russia itself; third, to the failure of the Communist attempts to infiltrate and undermine the nations on the outside; and finally to the collapse of the Communist dictatorships and their ruthless and godless systems.

Beyond this, I believe, will come the liberation and upward climb of mankind toward those better conditions that a free and democratic world can provide. This latter goal will not come quickly, but I anticipate that the half century that lies before the youth of today will see this expanding freedom, this better life.

NEHRU—Man in the Middle

*Number One target of World
Communism, India is as yet neither
friend nor foe, neither an echo of
America nor a voice of Moscow.
The Indian way of life is unique.*

By HAROLD E. STASSEN
President, University of Pennsylvania

MY recent conference with Prime Minister Nehru in the attractive garden of his official residence in New Delhi, India, confirmed my impression that this leader of 350,000,000 people on the subcontinent of Asia is a supporter of neither Communism nor Capitalism, is a believer in neither Stalin's materialistic ideology of force, nor our Western dynamic philosophy of liberty; that he has not the slightest inclination toward transforming India into a satellite of the Soviet Union or of making it subservient toward the United States.

He is a man who is very difficult for us in America to understand. Recent articles in American publications under titles such as "Nehru the Enigma" and "Puzzle: What Does Nehru Really Want?" confirm this observation. When I appeared in February before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services committees to testify regarding the Western European rearmament program, Senator Tom Connally suddenly shifted the subject to ask whether I could account for Nehru's recent actions toward the United States. The senator's request for information, which was sincere and straightforward, further highlights the interest in Nehru and the difficulty involved in explaining his character and the position he holds in India—in fact, in the whole of Asia.

Nehru is India's Prime Minister, but, more than that, he is unquestionably the true leader of the crowded millions

of his nation. Indeed, if it were possible to take a vote among all of the literate and informed people among the billion who live in Asia, Nehru would receive the highest total as the leader of all Asia. He is a great man.

As he approached across the lawn, hurrying a bit because his parliamentary duties had caused him to be somewhat late for luncheon, his thin, slightly stooped figure was not imposing. His smooth-shaven, brown-skinned face, his rather prominent nose, his lips, which are always partially parted—these when taken together are not especially impressive. But when his brown eyes, with their curious combination of distant dreaminess and flashes of burning intensity, come into play, and when his voice, soft but deeply expressive, begins to reveal the depth of his thinking, the firmness of his convictions, and the love of his people, and when his thin artistic hands make their presence known, one of the world's leading personalities is soon recognized.

He is now sixty-one years of age, having been born on November 14, 1889, in the city of Allahabad, which is in Central India at the juncture of the Ganges and Jumna rivers. His father and mother were wealthy Brahmans, the Brahmans being the highest of the four castes of the Hindu religion. He is five feet nine inches in height, and, clothed in the neat Congress Party uniform of white homespun cotton, or "khaddar," he possesses to the full the appearance of vitality that one would expect in a man fond of mountain climbing and riding.

I believe and hope that for the next ten years or more Nehru will be the leader of the people of India not only in office but in fact. It will be a difficult ten years for him, for India, and for the world. Some of the difficulty will be caused by his own hot temper, which smolders beneath the surface and at times breaks out in real turbulence. Kashmir is an example of that. He has an emotional affinity for Kashmir as the birthplace of his deceased wife and as the home of his own ancestors, and he passionately wanted Kash-

mir to be part of India when that huge nation emerged into independent sovereignty after a century of British colonial rule. But the 4,000,000 people of Kashmir, including Jammu, are 78 per cent Moslem. Its location is far to the north. And thus its logical and natural relationship would have been with Pakistan, the other new sovereign state, which through the partition that took place in August, 1947, also attained national independence from British colonial rule.

Impetuously and angrily, Nehru sent the Indian army into Kashmir and touched off both a local conflagration and a nation-wide tension and bitterness. This in turn, I believe, was a background factor in Pakistan's decision not to devalue when Britain and India and the rest of the sterling area devalued in 1949. A senseless economic isolation was then practiced until recently by both India and Pakistan toward each other—a senseless economic isolation which stopped the jute of Pakistan from coming to the huge jute mills of India, which stopped the coal of India from moving to the factories of Pakistan, which stopped the wheat of Pakistan from moving to the tables and stomachs of India, and which has thus added heavily to the poverty and hunger and suffering of people on both sides of the Pakistan-Indian line.

But this temper is by no means the most important thing we need to understand about Nehru. There is a very great need for a broad understanding of Nehru and India by America and its leaders, and an equally great need for a broad understanding of America and its leaders by Nehru and India.

We in America, by nature and by experience, always think of only two sides in any contest; we are always inclined to ask, "Which side are you on?" We are slow to realize that in the clash of ways of life between the Communist ideology of the Soviet Union's leadership and the free way of life which America represents, neither Nehru nor India can be properly placed on either side, and will not be so placed in

the immediate years ahead. They definitely belong in a third position, and they belong there by reason of their age-old religious and philosophic background, by reason of their geographic position, and by reason of their recent experiences.

It is well to keep in mind that Nehru, himself, spent many years of his life in jail, put there by the British in the course of the long struggle for Indian independence. Here is the record: December, 1921, to March, 1922, in the Lucknow District Jail for participation in Gandhi's campaign of civil disobedience—3 months.

April, 1922, to January, 1923, again in Lucknow District Jail for participation in the civil-disobedience campaign—8 months.

In the autumn of 1923 in Nabha jail for breach of an order to leave Nabha territory—3 weeks.

April 14, 1930, to October 11, 1930, in Naini Prison for opposition to the British Salt Tax Act—6 months.

October 19, 1930, to January 26, 1931, in Naini Prison again for his part in the no-tax campaign in Allahabad—3 months.

December 26, 1931, to August, 1933, first in Naini Prison for civil disobedience, then transferred to Bareilly District Jail, then transferred to Dehra Dun Jail at the foot of the Himalayas—20 months.

February 16, 1934, until September 4, 1935, in Alipore Jail, Calcutta, for again taking part in the civil-disobedience movement; released on August 11, 1934, for eleven days to visit his seriously ill wife, Kamala; returned to prison August 23, 1934, at Naini Prison and then transferred to Almora District Jail because it was nearer to his ill wife's home—19 months. (Kamala died in 1936.)

October, 1940, to December, 1941, in detention as one of the initiators of Gandhi's token civil-disobedience campaign against the "Defense of India" regulations—14 months.

August, 1942, to June 15, 1945, in Ahmadnagar Fort Prison for taking part in the Congress Party's resolution to

campaign on non-violent lines for India's independence—34 months.

All told, he was imprisoned on nine different occasions between 1921 and 1945 for a total of 107 months and 3 weeks, or just one week short of nine years, all in connection with the Indian campaign for independence from Great Britain.

Nehru's three principal books were all written during these periods in prison. His first book, *Glimpses of World History*, is a collection of letters to his daughter, Indira, written between October, 1930, and August, 1933. His second principal book, the autobiography, *Toward Freedom*, was written between June, 1934, and February, 1935, with final additions in 1940. *Discovery of India* was written in Ahmadnagar Fort Prison from April to September, 1944. His other three volumes are collections of speeches given since 1922, the last being *Visit to America*, published in 1950. In addition he wrote *Soviet Russia* in 1928, following a brief visit to Moscow in 1927 on the tenth anniversary of the Communist Revolution.

During these early years, in prison and between prison terms, Nehru was strongly attracted to the Soviet Union of Russia and to Communism as it was practiced there. He expressed then the confident belief that India had nothing to fear from Russia and that British rule over minorities in India compared very badly with the Soviet rule in Russia.

In his autobiography written in 1934-1935 Nehru stated:

"I had long been drawn to socialism and Communism and Russia had appealed to me. Much in Soviet Russia I dislike—the ruthless suppression of all contrary opinion, the wholesale regimentation, the unnecessary violence (as I thought) in carrying out various policies. But there was no lack of violence and suppression in the capitalist world, and I realized more and more how the very basis and foundation of our acquisitive society and property was violence."

He went on to say that the violence of the capitalist order seemed inherent in it, while the violence of Russia, bad though it was, aimed at a new order "based on peace and co-operation and real freedom for the masses." He was especially impressed by what appeared to him "the great progress made by the backward regions of Central Asia under the Soviet system." But though, at that time, he believed the Soviets, on the whole, were setting a good example, he thought it "absurd to copy blindly what is taking place in Russia, for its applications depended on the particular conditions prevailing in the country in question and the stage of its historical development."

"As between Fascism and Communism," he wrote, "my sympathies are entirely with Communism." But in the next sentence he said he was far from being a Communist. He disliked dogmatism and the treatment of Karl Marx's writings or any other books as revealed scripture which cannot be challenged. He didn't care for the regimentation and heresy hunts which seemed to him to be a feature of modern Communism. "I dislike also much that has happened in Russia, and especially the use of violence in normal times, but I still incline more and more toward a Communist philosophy," Nehru stated.

But after noting the developments in the Balkans after World War II and observing the violent and subversive role of the Communist Party in India and in other Asiatic countries following the Communist Calcutta Conference of February, 1948, Nehru was fully disillusioned.

Last December he said, "What I object to about Communism . . . is the suppression of the individual, which I am convinced is bad for the individual, the race, and everybody."

In his visit to Indonesia in June, 1950, he told the Indonesian Parliament that Communists do not tend to build up anything but rather disrupt everything, producing chaotic conditions and evoking reactionary forces.

If anything, this attitude has stiffened. During my visit to New Delhi, I found him to be not only thoroughly alert to the evils of Russian Communist imperialism but fully aware that a campaign of passive resistance would be ruthlessly crushed by Russian Communism. He well knew that passive resistance could be effective only against a nation such as the British, a nation with a moral code and a restraining public opinion. It is clear, therefore, that he, and India with him, intends to resist—actively and effectively—all Communist threats from within or from without.

INDIA continues to hope, I think erroneously, that Chinese Communist leadership will not be aggressive and will take a benign turn. Nevertheless, India is concerned over Tibet, took forthright measures to stabilize Nepal on the Chinese border, and continues to take vigorous action against internal Communist activity. For instance, late in February of this year the national Parliament, with only one dissenting vote, took firm action against Communists within India.

This change in Nehru's attitude toward Russian Communism, and the effect of that change upon America's relations with him and the nation that he leads, raises the very important question of Nehru's integrity. Can we believe him? Is he a man of his word? Does he have inflexible personal honor? I believe the answer is Yes.

This was Gandhi's appraisal:

"He [Nehru] is pure as the crystal. He is truthful beyond suspicion. He is a knight without fear, without reproach. The nation is safe in his hands."

Nehru's India has many serious problems. Five of the most acute are represented by these five words: Land, Water, Babies, Cows, and Capital.

A sweeping land reform, to wipe out the major abuses of the old landlord system, under which most of the land is tilled in small fragments by peasants without either ownership or tenure rights, must be put into effect if the peasants'

progress and increased food production so urgently needed for political and economic stability are to be obtained.

THE shortage of water and periodic drought must be met by vast new irrigation projects which will utilize the dependable, even inexhaustible, flow of the many rivers that have their never-drying sources in the vast Himalayan Mountain snow fields.

The birth rate is high—very high—and this, combined with the reduction in the death rate through the control of epidemics and famine, has produced a sharp rise in population in the past thirty years. No accurate statistics are available as yet, but all indications are that the population growth of the past five years has set a record. There are approximately 10,000,000 births each year and approximately 6,000,000 deaths—a net gain of 4,000,000 in population every year. The effect of these additional hungry mouths on already existing shortages of food and present low levels of living is evident.

Another important economic fact is that the Hindu philosophy results in the refusal to kill or eat cows—200,000,000 overgraze the dusty countryside and congest village and city streets.

The extreme lack of the capital needed to expand the industry, develop the extensive mineral resources, irrigate the soil and expand the trade is a serious handicap. The Indian leaders do not realize how different our American people's capitalism is today from the colonial imperialistic capitalism and from the classic capitalism of decades ago. They sense the difference, but they do not fully understand it. They are seeking for, in fact are almost groping for, an economic system that will fit with their philosophy and outlook on life and will not create the evils of Communism or of Imperialism.

Capital formation, therefore, is one of the great problems. India has been a country of extremes—of riches and

poverty—of multimillionaires and misery. The millionaires as a whole have not been merchants or industrialists. Rather they have been landlords and rulers of provinces. Most of the enterprise capital came from Western countries, and much of it left India when national sovereignty was obtained. At first the new leaders planned to fill the gap by putting government into business and nationalizing the major industries. But as they became aware of the unfortunate experience of England with its nationalization of coal, and of the very bad results of nationalization in the Soviet Union, they veered away from a state-operated economy.

Much depends upon what happens to Indian economy. India does have one of the lowest standards of living in the whole world. If under Nehru's leadership it can successfully keep out of the clutches of Communist imperialism, maintain political stability, and slowly but steadily improve its standard of living, its success may mark the crucial turning point in the world Communist drive. It is my own view that the men in the Kremlin now look on India as the number one target of world Communism. I base that belief on the indications of heightened activity in the Communist cells in India. I base it also on the Tibet move. The march of Chinese Communist troops into Tibet does not make sense on any basis other than as a move by the Soviet Union to bring pressure on India.

I believe India will feel more of these pressures. The Communists will try to keep the Kashmir dispute aflame. They will stir up other conflicts between Pakistan and India. They will constantly endeavor to divide Nehru and India from the West, and at the same time try to undermine Nehru at home by clamoring that he is subservient to the West.

Lenin said:

"The outcome of the world struggle will be determined by Russia, India and China, in as much as they constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe."

The five acute problems I have named are recognized

by Nehru and his government. I believe the seriousness of the situation will result in lessening the negative emphasis implicit in the religions of India and will substitute a more affirmative approach to national problems.

Not only are the top leaders of India Hindus, but also 270,000,000 of the 350,000,000 people. Only 40,000,000 are Moslems, 10,000,000 are Christians, and the remaining 30,000,000 are divided between Buddhist, Jainist, Sikh, tribal and other religions. On the other hand, in Pakistan, both the leadership and 66,000,000 of the 80,000,000 people are Moslem.

I give these figures because in seeking an understanding of Nehru and India, some knowledge of the religious population of the country and of the Hindu religion is essential. Hinduism has developed through at least six different forms, set forth in successive sets of documents which together constitute the sacred scriptures of Hinduism. The oldest set of documents are the Vedas, written about 1000 B.C. In its essence, the religion of the Vedas is a matter of prayer. The second set of sacred documents, written between 1000 and 800 B.C., are called the Brahmanas, stress sacrifice. The third set, the Upanishads, which were written between 800 and 600 B.C., stress philosophic speculation. The Laws of Manu, which came fourth, were written about 250 B.C. and contain the elaborate code of Hindu religious law with commandments and prohibitions for daily living in all stages of life. Fifth is the Bhagavad-Gita, a sacred dramatic poem written about A.D. 1. I believe that it is the most highly esteemed sacred scripture of the Hindus. Finally, between A.D. 1 and A.D. 250, came a set of sacred documents entitled the Epics and Puranas.

THE fundamentals of Hinduism that run through these six sets of sacred documents are that caste is the basic social organization, that there is one all-inclusive being or spirit—Brahma—that the “Karma,” or the total of the individual

creature's acts, determines his fate or destiny after death, and that at death the individual soul transmigrates from one material body to another, perhaps to a higher order, perhaps to a lower.

Outsiders insist that the essence of Hinduism is the mere requirement that you do your duty as a member of your caste and then trust to God for your salvation. Because the "Karma" may well have unfortunate consequences, it is asserted that Hinduism encourages abstention from all efforts and all desires; by doing nothing, a Hindu avoids the consequences of previous deeds and thus may escape altogether into "Nirvana," that superior state of complete impersonality in which the individual soul is wedded to the universal soul, Brahma. The human individual, in this view of Hinduism, is looked on as only a temporary phenomenon of no permanent worth, and there can be no possible improvement in a person's condition except after he dies.

Two other religions founded in India, Buddhism in 560 B.C. and Jainism in 599 B.C., are similar to Hinduism in many respects. As an outsider would look at them, they all appear to agree in their general pessimism concerning human life on earth, and specifically concerning the worthlessness of the human body, of human activity, and of the individual as such. They seem to accept subservience and passivity as the ideal of conduct; salvation is to be obtained by methods that are largely negative and not self-expressive. And they have a common acceptance of the religious value of suffering, even voluntary self-imposed suffering, and finally a common belief in "Karma" and transmigration.

If this interpretation of the religions of India is correct, it is especially interesting to note that Rajagopalachari, whom I believe to be the number two man in India, has a much more affirmative attitude toward Hinduism. He speaks out against fatalism, against the caste system, against occupations fixed by birth, and he urges the value of personal effort for

material well-being and advancement on earth. He explains that under the Hindu religion human beings are born with certain qualities and potentialities of body and mind which hold them in a strong grip, but that they do have the freedom to liberate themselves, and that the soul's positive activities in its present body decide its future and determine whether there is to be a partial or complete liberation from the past.

It is my personal view that all the major religions have within them elements of negation toward life on earth and also elements of affirmation. Christianity went through a period when great stress was laid on the negative, on renunciation of the material and withdrawal from physical surroundings. But it changed over to affirmation, and in so doing it achieved a vital impact on Western society. It changed men's philosophy and became the motivating force of their active, affirmative life on earth.

Now that the Hindu leaders have come out from under British rule and themselves have assumed and cannot escape responsibility for the material and earthly welfare of the millions of their fellow Hindus, I believe that the affirmative side of the Hindu religion will come to the fore, that the negative indifference to human life will gradually fade.

Much depends on such an evolvment. For it will have a direct bearing upon India's progress in solving the problems represented by the words Land, Water, Babies, Cows, and Capital.

But in the solving of each of these problems, much will also depend upon the future relationships between India and America. Nehru must learn more of the truth about America. I believe he will. I strongly believe that if we in America once realize that Nehru and his country are and will be neither close friends to us nor distant opponents, neither an echo of America nor a voice of Moscow, and then develop a policy toward them that accords full recognition of their third position, tremendous good will result for the people of both countries.

SCHWEITZER vs. STALIN

"Which concept will ultimately prevail in our world of conflicting ideologies—disdain for life or reverence for life?"

By HAROLD E. STASSEN
President, University of Pennsylvania

I HAVE met the kindest man in the world and I have met the most ruthless man in the world. One is, in my opinion, the greatest living philosopher. The other is the most powerful living ruler. They are Dr. Albert Schweitzer, of Africa, and Marshal Joseph Stalin, of Russia.

One is a living symbol of the ideals, the humanitarianism and the philosophy of our way of life. The other is the personal embodiment of the goals, the force and the ideology of the Communist way of life.

The circumstances and surroundings of my conferences with each of these two men are interesting and provide deeply significant contrasts.

I met Dr. Albert Schweitzer on a small, grass-covered jungle air strip in the heart of French Equatorial Africa in the course of my recent journey through Asia and Africa and around the world. From the regular airlines stop in Léopoldville, in the Belgian Congo, I flew in a Sabena DC-3 to Libreville, the capital of Gabon Province, a distance of six hundred miles. There I was met by the able French Governor of Gabon, Pierre Pelieu, and flew with him in an old trimotored German-made Junkers plane to Lambaréné, ninety miles up on the Ogowe River.

As I stepped off the plane, Doctor Schweitzer advanced, extended his hand, and said simply, "I am Albert Schweit-

zer." A white jungle helmet covered his gray, Einsteinlike hair and shaded his furrowed and expressive face. One of the nurses of his hospital, Miss Emma Haussknecht, stood by as interpreter, and forty or fifty African natives of all ages were gathered at the edge of the airstrip. After he had greeted the French governor and had been introduced to Robert Matteson, my assistant, who accompanied me around the world, and to others who joined us at Léopoldville, I climbed into a waiting jeep with Doctor Schweitzer, and off we went over a rough jungle road down to the river. A launch ride past natives in dugout canoes through beautiful stretches of heavy timber ended at his hospital.

I had met Marshal Stalin in April, 1947, during my journey through Europe and Russia. [Ed. note: Mr. Stassen reported this interview with Stalin fully in the LADIES' HOME JOURNAL for July, 1947.] I was taken to his office, in the center of the Kremlin, by Sergei Kondrashov, our Russian guide, for an appointment at eleven P.M. When I entered he stepped out from behind his desk, and through his interpreter, Pavlov, said, "How do you do?" It was a simple acknowledgment of my presence in a sparsely furnished room. But reaching that spot was not simple.

We approached Stalin at night through the guarded gates of the walled Kremlin, past electric eyes and alarm bells, through a screen of secret police, and down long, patrolled, zigzag corridors. We approached Schweitzer in the open day, in a setting of river and sky and virgin forest, with the towering mahogany, *okoume* and oil-palm trees as the only guards, and the weaver birds, the parrots and the monkeys as the only alarm bells.

Stalin's office is really his prison, deep in the heart of the Kremlin fortress, austere and unadorned except for pictures of the revolutionists Lenin, Marx and Engels, and the Czarist military heroes Kutuzov and Suvorov. There are no windows, but one is fully conscious of the Red Square and

Lenin's tomb just a block away. The accent is on death and war and ruthless power.

Schweitzer's office is a simple frame room adjacent to his bedroom, open on three sides to the green world of Nature that surrounds him. It is shared by two small antelope, a cat, a kitten, a bird, a small organ, and books on philosophy and theology. The numerous buildings of the hospital and the broad river are in plain view. The accent is on life and friendliness and human sympathy.

Both men are in their seventies. Stalin was born on December 21, 1879, in the village of Gori, in Georgia in the south of the Soviet Union. Schweitzer was born on January 14, 1875, in Kaysersburg, Alsace, then a part of Germany, now of France.

Stalin is the son of a shoemaker who was the son of Georgian peasants. Stalin's mother, Ekaterina, was a girl of similar humble origin. She was a pious Greek Catholic, and she worked as a washerwoman to eke out the low income of her husband.

Determined that her son should have a better life than her husband, she sent him at the age of nine to the Ecclesiastical School at Gori, which he attended for six years, from 1888 to 1894. In October, 1894, he matriculated at the Theological Seminary in Tiflis. Because his mother, now a widow, had no money for his education at the seminary, the headmaster of the Gori school and a local priest obtained a scholarship for him.

In August of 1898, while at the seminary, Stalin joined his first secret socialist organization, and it was then that he first read a copy of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*. Though studying for the priesthood, he was planning revolution, and on May 29, 1899, he was expelled from the seminary for what he himself later stated was the propagation of Marxism. In 1901, while he was employed as a clerk at the Tiflis Observatory and vigorously carrying on his socialist activities, his room was raided by the Czarist police, who sought to arrest

him. He fled, and for the next fifteen years lived under false names and with spurious passports, an active underground worker for the revolution.

He met Lenin for the first time at the end of 1905 at Tammerfors, Finland. In April, 1906, he attended a Stockholm socialist conference, and in May, 1907, he took part in a similar London conference and there met Trotsky. He spent a total of seven years either in prison for socialist and underground activity, or on his way to or in Siberia. During this period his many revolutionary articles attracted the attention of Lenin, who placed him on the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party. Then in October, 1917, on the very eve of the Bolshevik Revolution, Stalin was elected to the Communist Politburo, which at that time had only seven members. With the revolution a success, Lenin next appointed him People's Commissar of Nationalities, from which position he slowly consolidated his power, and on April 3, 1922, he was elected General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

When Lenin died on January 21, 1924, a triumvirate consisting of Stalin, Kamenev and Zinoviev took over. But Stalin gradually displaced Kamenev and Zinoviev, and finally, in the purge trials of the 1930's, both of them were liquidated at his command. In the spring of 1935 nearly forty men of his own bodyguard were tried in secret. Two were executed and the rest were sentenced to long prison terms. Toward the close of 1935 the seemingly endless purge trials began, during the course of which nearly all Stalin's earliest associates in the Communist movement were executed, among them one former prime minister, several vice prime ministers, two ex-chiefs of the Communist International, the chief of the trade-unions, the chief of the General Staff, the chief political commissar of the army, the supreme commanders of all important military districts, nearly all the Soviet ambassadors in Europe and Asia, and two chiefs of the political police. One of these was Yagoda, who had

provided the evidence for the trials of some of the first purgees, and Yeshov, who gathered the evidence for the later major trials.

Stalin's face mirrors a personality that combines hardness, cynicism, deception, strength of will and utter ruthlessness.

Albert Schweitzer is the son of a Lutheran minister. He began his study of the piano at five and the organ at eight. By the time he was nine he was able to substitute for the parish organist at the church services. He attended primary school at Gunsbach, secondary school at Münster, and in 1893 entered the Theological College of St. Thomas at the University of Strasbourg and soon thereafter began the study of the organ under Charles Widor in Paris. In 1898, at the Sorbonne, he began to write his dissertation on the religious philosophy of Kant. That completed, he was a preacher at the Church of St. Nicholas in Strasbourg, and in 1901, then twenty-six years old, he became the acting principal of the Theological College at Strasbourg.

But because works as well as faith seemed important to him at the age of thirty, he decided on an entirely new career. He would study medicine in order that he might go to Africa as a doctor for the natives. Eight years later he was a doctor of medicine, and had become a master in four major fields of learning and a skillful writer as well. He was a Doctor of Philosophy at the age of twenty-four, with an important study of Kant's religious philosophy as his main work; at twenty-six he published a book on the Last Supper, which won him the degree of Licentiate in Theology and gave him the right to serve as a *Privatdocent* at the University of Strasbourg; when he was thirty-one, he published his celebrated book on Bach and a remarkable volume on organ construction. In 1913 he and his wife left for the station of the Paris Missionary Society at Lambaréné in French Equatorial Africa, and there he built this jungle hospital on the edge

of the primeval forest, which now for thirty-six years he has operated.

Albert Schweitzer's face reflects kindness, sensitivity of feeling, sympathy, deep moral strength and genuine humility.

The ideas of the two men have the deepest significance. During his years in Africa, Albert Schweitzer, to a greater degree than any other man, has thought through to the means of translating into action and conduct the ideas that for centuries have formed the stream of philosophic thought behind our Western way of life, and what Doctor Schweitzer has found he has set down as a guide for civilization.

His philosophy appears principally in two volumes, *The Decay and Restoration of Civilization*, and *Civilization and Ethics*, which are Parts 1 and 2 of his projected four-volume *Philosophy of Civilization*. The core of his ethical concepts is expressed in his phrase "reverence for life." He discusses the will of each to live, and the nature of an existence in which each is surrounded by others with a will to live. These words express his belief in life itself better than any others that I can quote:

"True philosophy must start from the most immediate and comprehensive fact of consciousness which says, 'I am life which wills to live in the midst of life which wills to live!' . . . Ethics consists, therefore, in my experiencing the compulsion to show to all will to live the same reverence as I do to my own. . . . It is good to maintain and to encourage life; it is bad to destroy life or to obstruct it."

Thus he insists on "reverence for life" as the guiding principle by which all social, economic and political systems should be developed. The clear and close similarity between his concept and the belief in inherent human rights that characterizes our way of life in America, between his ideals and ours, whereby we respect the dignity of fellow men and recognize their brotherhood with us, is at once apparent. His entire personal life is a reflection of his own deep "reverence for life!"

My talks with Doctor Schweitzer occurred in three sessions. The first took place shortly after our arrival. We had been taken to the main staff dining hall, which is a room approximately fifteen by twenty feet, constructed on a platform raised about five feet above the ground on timbers, to protect it from ants and other vermin. Screened openings on two sides face toward the hospital and toward the river, and it has a long central table, adequate for seating approximately twenty-five people, and plain wooden chairs. An old piano in one corner, and a few benches and extra chairs and small tables in the opposite end of the room from the entrance, complete the furniture. Lighting is by means of kerosene lamps. Here we had tea and then we were taken to our rooms.

I was shown to a room which one of the nurses had temporarily vacated. Its furnishings were a simple and reasonably comfortable bed completely protected with mosquito netting, a washstand with washbowl and a pitcher of water, a chair, a stool, a bench, a narrow cot and a small table. The walls were whitewashed and all was neat and clean.

Shortly after I reached my room, Doctor Schweitzer, accompanied by Nurse Haussknecht, who acted as interpreter, came to join me there. Robert Matteson also came in and we began an earnest discussion which continued for close to two hours.

Doctor Schweitzer next took us on a tour of his hospital, accompanied by Dr. Emeric Percy, a twenty-eight-year-old Hungarian neurosurgeon who had met Doctor Schweitzer in Switzerland, and Dr. Jean Pierre Naegele, a thirty-year-old Alsatian doctor who was a general practitioner.

Our four hundred native patients were then being cared for in the hospital. The chief wards were for surgery, accidents, dysentery, tuberculosis and leprosy. One was a well-filled nursery. The surgical ward is especially active. In 1949 over five hundred major operations were performed.

The patients were principally of two tribes—the Galosas,

a coastal tribe, and the Fans, or Pahouins, an interior tribe. Many had traveled through the jungle for weeks to reach the hospital, and most of them were accompanied by some of the members of their families, who lived in a temporary village a short distance from the hospital. During the day these families of the patients and those patients strong enough to help gathered food, broke up rocks for future hospital construction, gathered firewood, and assisted in caring for the patients, cooking food for them on small fires near the various wards and in other ways helping out as they could. Unable to make other payment, they give their services to the hospital.

THE hospital itself stands in a grove of mahogany, *okume* and oil-palm trees, and off to the north is a plantation of mango, orange, lemon, avocado, *pomme de cythre*, banana and other fruit trees. The hospital also maintains a garden in which are grown maize, manioc, tomatoes, beans, cabbage, lettuce and even coffee. In addition, the natives catch fish in the river for the hospital, and one of the great delicacies is the tail of the crocodile. Over one hundred goats roam about the hillside and are a bountiful source of milk.

Following the hospital tour, we all gathered for dinner when the gong rang at seven-thirty o'clock. Doctor Schweitzer asked a blessing and then about twenty-five people sat down to a meal of vegetable soup, rice and cheese and gravy, bread, a large boiled banana, and a compote of fruit made up of mangoes and bananas. After the meal Doctor Schweitzer sat down at the piano and led the group in the singing of *Abide With Me*, in French, and then pronounced a benediction.

My second discussion with Doctor Schweitzer followed. Drawing us all to the far corner of the room, he sat down on a bench behind a small table and invited me to sit next to him. Tea was served, and then for two hours Doctor Schweitzer answered my questions on a wide range of subjects, with

Governor Pelieu and Nurse Haussknecht acting as interpreters and the entire staff and visitors seated in a semicircle listening. In the midst of the dialogue, Doctor Schweitzer commented with a chuckle that our talk reminded him of the salons of Paris in years gone by.

THE following morning, after breakfast, I accompanied Doctor Schweitzer to his office. Here we had our final discussion. It lasted about an hour and a half and came to an end only because it was time to take the launch back to the airport. During this final talk I referred to a copy of his book, *Civilization and Ethics*, which I had carried with me, and he thoughtfully autographed it in French, "To the students of the University of Pennsylvania with best wishes for their future studies. Albert Schweitzer."

The range of his knowledge of what was happening in the world was amazing, and his constant interpretation of the world's problems by relating them to his basic philosophy of "reverence for life" was very stimulating.

"History is a stream of events shaped by the human mind," Doctor Schweitzer said to me as we sat there in the office of his jungle hospital, "and not by forces over which man has no control. The solution of our present problems lies in combining again, as was done in the eighteenth century, analytical thought with affirmative religious concepts based on humanitarianism. There is a great need," he continued, "for rational humanitarian and morally responsible individuals."

"And do you think that such a need will be filled?" I asked.

Doctor Schweitzer looked out over the river before answering. Then he said, simply but firmly, "I look to the future with hope."

Quite obviously, Doctor Schweitzer does not believe that freedom alone should be the goal of mankind. He earnestly emphasized this point in his conversations with me, and

the same warning runs through his writings. Liberty without moral responsibility can lead only to individual excesses, to the use of force by one free man against his fellow men and the ultimate destruction of freedom. Thus he emphasized the need for combining a personal ethic with freedom; or, in other words, of submitting to the restraints of a civilized freedom.

Perhaps another way to express it is that if the individual has complete freedom but lacks a sense of moral and ethical values, the absence of self-restraint will produce social chaos as it did in the French Revolution. Then the only method of restoring stability to a society shot through with utter licentiousness will be for a tyranny to prescribe conduct, with rules and laws down to the most minute detail, and to enforce those rules and laws by ruthless power.

It is only with a humanitarian code of conduct, such as that which springs from the basic religious background of our country and which causes the vast majority of people to conduct themselves with respect and consideration for their fellow men, regardless of what the laws may be or even without knowledge of the laws, that a free society can successfully function. When such a code is generally accepted and is passed on from generation to generation, only a minimum of restrictive laws is needed to interpret that code of ethics to the people as a whole and to enforce it upon the small minority who do not by their own understanding and nature respond to it. In short, with such a code a free society can function successfully.

If Doctor Schweitzer is correct—and no one who has felt the spell of his personality can doubt it—the realization of the truth of his beliefs should result in much greater stress upon moral and ethical and spiritual values among the free nations of the world. It should also result in a clearer realization that the ruthless cruelty of the Communist imperialism is the almost inevitable consequence of the lack of a humani-

tarian code of conduct and a lack of respect for the lives and welfare of our fellow men.

If one phrase could be used to characterize Stalin's philosophy, it would be "disdain for life." The ruthless sacrifice of the lives of others, the cruel oppression, the use of might to force other men to conform, are all the exact antithesis of what Albert Schweitzer stands for. The advocacy of godlessness by Stalin is at the opposite pole from the devout worship of God by that great-souled man with whom I talked in the hospital that he had built in the African jungle.

If you think it through, you cannot escape the conclusion that if men do not adopt an ethic which carries with it a respect for the dignity of others and hence the submission to a personal moral restraint, then the only two other alternatives are anarchy with inevitable chaos and demoralization, and rule by might with decrees and an order established by ruthlessness, as is done by the Communists. Thus Stalin, by attempting to destroy religion, perpetuates in his totalitarian system the need for terror as the principal tool of government.

Schweitzer's emphasis on "reverence for life" leads to a truer definition of liberalism than the outright materialist will accept. By this definition, liberalism is the endeavor to win for each person the enjoyment of the maximum freedom of a social, economic, civil and religious nature consistent with the enjoyment of the same degree of freedom by his fellow men. "In a society imbued with true liberalism," Doctor Schweitzer remarked near the close of our last conversation, "a highly developed state of civilization occurs and can be maintained. A man's ability to be a pioneer of progress depends, therefore, on his being a thinker and on his being free. And he must be free if he is to launch his ideals out into general life," he added with evident conviction. His eyes looked earnestly and directly into mine as he said, "A genuine state of civilization presupposes that free men and

material and spiritual freedom are closely bound up with one another."

Schweitzer, a man who has enjoyed very little of material wealth, living with and for the ill and injured natives in his crowded hospital, is the one eminent man of the many with whom I have talked in foreign lands who expressed a sympathy for America and an understanding of the difficulties and problems and responsibilities which America faces in its position of wealth and leadership and success. He understands the problems and burdens which come to America in the wake of, and as an essential part of, its success in attaining high production, material welfare and an eminent world position.

Stalin, on the other hand, in personal command of infinitely greater wealth and possessed of dictatorial powers over the lives of more people than any other individual in the history of the world, revealed to me a jealousy of America's position, an envy of its accomplishment, and the hopeful expectation that an economic crash would topple both it and the capitalist system.

Stalin adheres to Lenin, and it was Lenin who said, "But I can't listen to music too often. It affects your nerves, and makes you want to say stupid, nice things, and stroke the heads of people who could create such beauty. . . . And now you mustn't stroke anyone's head . . . you might get your hand bitten off. You have to hit them on the head."

But Schweitzer said, "Music is an act of worship," and speaking particularly of Bach's music, "It belongs not to the church but to religious humanity."

Which concept will ultimately prevail in our world of conflicting ideologies—disdain for life or reverence for life? The answer to that lies in the question: What is the nature of man and how was he meant to live?

I believe man was meant to be free. I believe man was intended to respect other men. I believe there is a God. I be-

lieve that in the half century ahead the philosophy of Albert Schweitzer will be victorious and that of Joseph Stalin will fade.

NEHRU PHOTO BY MAGNUM

STALIN PHOTO BY U. S. ARMY

Reprinted from the April, May, July 1951 issues of The Ladies Home Journal

© COPYRIGHT 1951 THE CURTIS PUBLISHING COMPANY



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org