

Der 58

revision. When asked by newsmen in Europe about his future political ambitions, he was so cautious as to appear calculating. The Indian press pounced on one interview granted to a Manchester *Guardian* correspondent in which Narayan hinted he might reconsider his refusal to accept governmental responsibility should a national emergency arise. The story was spread across India under headlines such as "INDIAN DE GAULLE" or "J.P. PREPARED TO LEAD NATION."

The Indian reports came to Narayan's attention while he was still in England. He dashed off an angry letter to his countrymen which was published in *Thought*, a prominent New Delhi weekly, on July 14. He had "grown sick of this whole business," he said, but admitted that "it is always difficult to say what anyone would do in an emergency." If such a situation arose "and I felt and the people felt that I would be useful in government I would perhaps have no hesitation to temporarily re-enter politics." But, explained Narayan, "I make it clear that even in such a case I would never join any political party."

When Jayaprakash returned to India September 20, he immediately launched into a round of speaking engagements on his impressions of the world outside India, eschewing talk of his own role in Indian politics. Public speculation over the country's plight without Nehru was again considered poor taste. Nevertheless, the evening Narayan spoke at Sapru House, New Delhi's largest auditorium, hundreds were turned away and had to squat on the lawn outside to hear his voice over a loudspeaker. This was the biggest audience ever seen at Sapru House. And, observed one Indian reporter, "J.P. got such a record audience without any propaganda build-up or political lobbying!"

To have renounced "power politics" and to be surrounded by a certain amount of mystery never hurt a politician—especially in India. Even if it emerges that Narayan's moves have been premeditated all along, few of his countrymen will hold it against him. The saintliest man of modern times told his followers not too long ago: "Politics is a poisonous snake; but I must wrestle with it."

Israel's Ben-Gurion

A Modern Moses

by LEONARD S. KENWORTHY

THE MOST isolated area I visited in nine months of recent travel in the new and emerging nations of the world was not some village in the interior of Africa or Asia but the tiny state of Israel.

Walking through the Mandelbaum Gate in Jerusalem and the narrow no man's land which separates Jordan and Israel is a good introduction to this new country. The swath of deserted houses, guarded by the representatives of the United Nations, is a grim reminder that an uneasy truce exists between Israel and all of its near neighbors, and the special passport required makes it clear that this new country has not even been recognized by the Arab nations.

For several days I wandered about Israel, seeing the old sights and viewing the new. From Jerusalem I journeyed north to Haifa, Acre, and Nazareth; south to Beersheba and the frontier outpost of Sde Boker in the Negev desert; and west to Tel-Aviv. Several times I stopped to visit *kibbutzim*, the collective communities, and *moshavim*, the cooperative settlements.

Everywhere I saw evidence of extensive surveys, of government and private planning, of the application of the latest scientific knowledge to everyday living as well as evidence of conflict within the country and between Israel and its neighbors.

I was impressed by the electric machines for milking sheep at the Ein

Harod *kibbutz* and the small art gallery in that collective community; the magnificent new buildings of the University of Jerusalem and the mammoth stadium in which the Tenth Anniversary celebrations took place; the beautiful new Mann auditorium in Tel-Aviv where the Israel Symphony Orchestra concerts are held; and the use of solar heating in the Sde Boker settlement as well as the common room made delightfully cool by the use of gypsum in its construction. Everywhere there were new roads, new schools, new factories, new fields, new homes, and giant new concrete pipes to carry the precious water to fields and factories. But I was also struck by the rioting in Jerusalem by orthodox Jews protesting the innovation of men and women bathing together in a new swimming pool and by the evidence of military might on the trip into the Negev.

After several days of intensive travel, extensive reading, and numerous interviews, I was ready to see the general manager of this new and impressive laboratory—David Ben-Gurion, Israel's prime minister and secretary of defense.

When I met him in his office in Tel-Aviv, I found a short, stocky, 72-year-old man with a large face, deep-set twinkling eyes, dark busy eyebrows, and a halo of long, fluffy, white hair. His grey suit was set off by a blue tie.

I asked him if there were any special qualities required of the leaders of new nations, whether they had to represent the aspirations of their people. His head was tilted back against the chair and his eyes half-closed, but he was alert, ready to set me straight on my use of the word "nation."

LEONARD S. KENWORTHY, professor of Social Studies at Brooklyn College, recently completed an extensive swing through Asia and Africa where he interviewed the rulers of newly independent countries in preparation for writing a book on that subject.

The Progressive

"Israel," he said, "is not a new nation. It is a new state and it differs radically from the others. In fact, they are each different and should not be grouped together. Think, for instance, of the difference between rich, primitive Ghana which has never really been a country and Burma with its long, uninterrupted history."

Then he turned to my question about leaders. "Yes, leaders represent the aspirations of their people but they are often hidden aspirations, aspirations not realized by the people. At different periods in their lives leaders must call upon different qualities, for freedom and what to do with freedom are vastly different problems."

This comment struck a responsive chord for I had wondered whether the men who had led their countries to freedom were likely to be endowed with the qualities which were needed as administrators of newly formed nations and I commented on the sense of urgency I had noticed in Nkrumah of Ghana.

Again he chided me, saying, "Now, remember that you in the United States have 'arrived' and do not need to do things in a hurry. Here in Israel we understand Ghana better than you do for we must achieve in a few years what it took you generations to accomplish. But to come back to Ghana, you cannot get rid of chiefs in a hurry but you can get rid of the attachment of people to chiefs. You can change people considerably in ten years. We do not have chiefs here but the problems of Ghana we have in miniature here in Israel."



The necessity of forging a new state in Israel out of people from 79 or more countries led Ben-Gurion to say on another occasion: "This is a people unique, hurled to all the ends of the earth, speaking with many tongues, apprenticed to alien cultures, asunder in different communities and tribes. We must melt down this fantastically divergent assemblage and cast it afresh in the die of a renewed nationhood . . . giving it a single language, a single culture, a single citizenship, a single loyalty."

To learn about his youth and where he acquired his passion for Zionism, I inquired what life was

like for him when he was 13 or 14.

He smiled and his eyes twinkled and I saw the warm, human Ben-Gurion rather than the grim, pugnacious fighter I had seen before in a television interview and read and heard about. "At 14 we did not consider ourselves young in Plonsk [his birthplace in Poland while it was under the control of the Czar]. We were not minors. We thought we understood the world. We had a group of boys, a Zionist Socialist group, who spoke Hebrew and taught the children of poorer people. The Jewish people there were not a part of the land in which they lived. They didn't consider themselves part of it and local people did not consider them a part of their world. We received a Russian education rather than a Polish one for that was part of the Russification of the period. As early as five, I began to think about Palestine for I felt like a stranger in Russia. We had a beautiful synagogue with a Torah and pictures of Palestine. Very early we knew everything possible about Palestine.

"The Hebrew and Russian writers were terribly important to me," he continued. "And of course the Bible. We read it in our generation, not just the commentaries upon it as many did in those days. We were in revolt against the older generation on this."

And he might have added on many other things for it was out of the late Nineteenth Century Russian that he, Chaim Weizmann, Isaac Ben-Zvi, and so many others had emerged, all dissatisfied with Jewish life and all determined to bring changes to their people. They were men who had been saturated in Jewish literature and lore and the writings of the Nineteenth Century Russian novelists and poets.

But I knew that Ben-Gurion was also interested in the literature of Greece, of India, and China and I asked him when he had discovered this rich vein of writings.

"My interest in the Greeks came early," he said. "I decided to learn Greek in order to understand them. You know that someone has said that reading a book in translation is like kissing a girl through a handkerchief [and he chuckled at this idea]. My interest in Indian and Chinese philosophy has come in the last 15 years. I learned Hindi because the

various translations of Buddha varied so widely and I wondered what the original really said."

Here was Ben-Gurion "the curious" speaking, an avid reader all his life, reading in new fields and in new languages when it was necessary to discover what he wanted to know—military history and tactics, science and technological development, and, recently, the relation of mind and health and the problems of old age.

"And besides reading, what other influences have there been in your life?" I asked.



His face became serious again, his jaw stuck out and his eyes almost closed as he said firmly, "Life here has been the greatest teacher. Things have not been given us here; everything has had to be made. Here we have had to face the realities of history. We did not realize what the land was like when we came. It was not a question merely of going to Palestine; it was a question of remaking ourselves. There was no Jewish community when we came. There were no roads. No stable government. No safety. No language. No trees. Life could not continue as it was. As young men we asked ourselves what life would be like for the oncoming generation. Hebrew was almost a dead language. There was no Hebrew literature. It lived on in poetry and in prayers. It was not spoken. No words were being added. There was no vitality in it. Yes, the greatest teacher was the necessity to face life, nature, ourselves. We were not used to this. Nothing was taken for granted, as nothing existed. We had to achieve it all.

"The Jews were limited in the trades and vocations," he added. "When we wanted to build houses, we had to hire Arabs. The first roads were a tremendous achievement, not just of construction but of culture. This was a change in *our* culture, for we did the manual labor."

Then, as if to summarize, he said, "Yes, changing the face of the country meant more to us than all the books we read. Pioneering is the richest and greatest experience that men can have—developing all kinds of human abilities."

I had heard Ben-Gurion the historian and Ben-Gurion the dreamer

and visionary, and so I said, "On my trip I have heard almost nothing about atomic energy and other possibilities for the future. How much interest do you have in these new scientific developments for Israel?"

"Our two biggest problems," he replied, "are water and power, and the most important is water. We have electrical power but it is expensive as the raw materials have to be brought from abroad. We need to be self-sufficient and therefore we need to harness the power of the sun, the atom, the wind, the sea tides. We must make advantages of disadvantages. Distilled water is already in use in the United States and Kuwait. Here is a cheap process for irrigation. For atomic energy we have the materials—uranium is a by-product of our phosphates. We do not have water power; we must find other means to generate power."

This was the kind of talk which I had expected from several of the leaders of new nations—and had not heard. Ben-Gurion's grasp of the importance of new methods of power was one of the explanations of Israel's remarkable advancement. To hear more about his thinking along these lines, I asked him what he foresaw for Israel in the next 10 years.

"Prophecy is limited to fools," he replied. "All I can tell you is what I would like to see happen here. Some of these things depend upon us; others depend upon others."

This time he closed his eyes completely and I felt I was hearing some Old Testament prophet dreaming his dreams, seeing his visions of the future. His answer came in clipped phrases:

"Millions of trees. Whole neighborhoods like Jerusalem, the Negev, the dunes along the seashore covered with trees. Two new ports, one south on the Mediterranean to serve such cities as Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem. Another port at Elath on the Gulf of Aquaba, to connect us to the two great areas of Asia and Africa with more than half of the world's population. This should strengthen our economic relations for we have something to offer them and they have something to give us in return.

"We must exploit our known resources in the Negev and in the north as well as the mineral resources of the Dead Sea, which are tremendous. We

will need to pump water from the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean areas on one side and Elath on the other. We will have to improve transportation. Then we will need to exploit the new resources we are sure exist."

I was especially interested in his description of the importance of the Negev, that tremendous wasteland in the south which has captured his imagination and whose importance Ben-Gurion had dramatized by making his home at Sde Boker in the heart of the Negev.

"We must settle all the available land, especially in the Negev, using all the water we can find to make farming and industrialization and living possible there. We must create several industrial centers in the Negev. And that is possible. Remember that Beersheba nine years ago was a town of 3,000; now it is a city of 30,000. We need another such center at Elath and a road between Elath and Beersheba. Then we must develop the use of flint for smelting iron. That is a rare mineral and only a couple of other nations have this resource. Also there must be a railroad extending from Elath to the Dead Sea from Beersheba. There ought to be a half million increase by immigration in the population of the Negev area."

I had noticed that he repeatedly used the word "must." This was the Ben-Gurion who had always been fearful of moderation and compromise. At times this quality had alienated friends like Chaim Weizmann and Judah Magnes and had perhaps pushed the Arabs into extreme positions, but it was also the quality which had brought about the formation of Israel and the incredible achievements of its first ten years.

He paused and opened his eyes. It was my cue for another question and I said, "I have been struck by the small number of Americans who have come to Israel to live. What about the part of the American Jews in all this?" I knew that he felt strongly

on this point and I was prepared for a diatribe. At times he had exploded against those who talked about Israel as if it were their land and yet were not willing to migrate there. He had said: "In New York and Miami, in London and Paris, it is impossible to take part in the building of Israel. Though we must not belittle the value of the moral, political, and material assistance that the Diaspora is giving to Israel, we must not confuse this with personal assistance, for such confusion is nothing less than a profanation and a distortion of the truth."

But now there was no diatribe. He merely said, with emphasis: "We want to attract pioneering youth from the U.S.A. Urge them to come. The pioneering spirit has not died out among the Jewish youth there. I believe it is still alive."



I asked about political events in relation to his hopes for the future.

"These depend largely upon the relations of East and West," he replied. "I said in the beginning that there were some things over which we have control, some over which we have no control. Nobody can foresee the political future. We are willing to live in peace; we want to live in peace—more than that, we want to live cooperatively. If not—we will wait. We need to be in a hurry as we said of Nkrumah but also we need to learn to have patience. We will go on with our plans undisturbed by outside events.

"Between now and the year 2000," he continued, "people will see the greatest changes in the history of man. All the changes of the last 6,000 years will be negligible compared to those which will come. Much depends upon the scientists—if they achieve the use of thermonuclear energy, not fission but fusion. If they do, the changes will be impossible to foresee. We might conceivably have a million horsepower for every man, woman, and child."

Turning to the role American youth could play and the type of education they needed, he commented: "What American youth needs is less personal comfort, less television, less cinema. What they need is more communal spirit, more spiritual interest. They will have to live in a larger com-



munity than America, for humanity, after all, is one. One world now is a practicality, a necessity. If we are divided, we will be destroyed. In the words of one of your great Americans, a house divided against itself cannot stand. We are all living in that one house. The great 'cosmic attachment'—that view must be developed in American youth. They must learn that man belongs to something bigger than himself in the human sense and in the cosmic sense. I am afraid that sense is lacking in America now. You need more emphasis upon human values, more emphasis upon spiritual values—not merely technology and comfort."

In only one other instance in a series of interviews with 20 or more of the world's current political leaders, had I found a person—Nehru of India—who could articulate his beliefs as tersely as David Ben-Gurion, and who could reach ahead into the future as well as far back into the past.

I thanked him and left. This, I thought, is a man with a sense of belonging to history, of creating history. This is a man with a singleness of purpose which has dominated his life since he was a boy, which drove him to Palestine and sustained him through long and difficult years as a farmer and laborer, as a labor organizer, as the secretary-general of the Histadrut and chairman of the Jewish Agency, and later as the protagonist for a separate state of Israel. Perhaps this singleness of purpose had even become an obsession, making him at times pugnacious, unrelenting, ruthless.

This is a man, nevertheless, who has soared above his compatriots partly because he is curious, inquisitive, ready to learn something new—whether Indian philosophy, military tactics, or the latest advances of scientific research. At 72 he is still fresh, eager, growing, a single-minded, stern, serious, shrewd, essentially shy man.

As I thought of the great Jewish leaders through the centuries, he seemed to come closest to the Old Testament prophet Moses, who had led the Jewish people out of Egypt centuries ago and had taken them as far as the Promised Land. Ben-Gurion had been able to lead his people into the Promised Land and to help them rebuild it as a modern Moses, a Twentieth Century leader.

Genius of Caricature

by ALFRED WERNER

FOR A PROPER background to the period in which Honore Daumier, with a grease crayon, fought the totalitarian tendencies of a corrupt regime, you must read Heinrich Heine. The exiled German poet and the French lithographer never met, though they lived in the same city, Paris, and belonged to the same generation. Indubitably, the master of the poignant word, and the master of the expressive line, would have found much in common: a sharp wit, a flair for the essential, and an abhorrence of any sort of tyranny. In 1832 Heine noted with dismay that the "Bourgeois King," Louis-Philippe, originally believed a liberal, turned out to be a reactionary, interested in the welfare of the rich only. The Republicans' demand for justice and freedom was answered with the bayonets of the National Guard. "More than a thousand men have been arrested," Heine wrote to the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* . . . the liberal journals are being suppressed. The shopkeepers rejoice, egoism flourishes, and many of the best must don mourning."

Heine lived to see the end of this hated regime. Reporting on the revolution of 1848 he praised the French workers' "contempt of death," and emphasized the fact that there was no looting. Daumier, though he never fired a rifle, did more than any other

Frenchman to make the loathed king surrender his throne. Middle-aged, the artist once more had to take up his only cudgel, the crayon, in defense of liberty. He was too modest to think that his satires had undermined not only Louis-Philippe but also his successor, Napoleon III. But this was an undeniable fact; he, more than any artist before or after, turned his skill into propaganda equaling the strength of several army divisions. I am referring, of course, to the four thousand lithographs he published in a long, busy life, drawings that were feared by the men in power but loved by the oppressed who, buying a copy of the satirical paper *Caricature*, and its successor, *Charivari*, knew that they were not alone. But Daumier, utterly shy, reserved, non-intellectual, a man of few words, completely devoid of egocentricity, probably did not realize that none had dealt more crushing blows to glib dictatorships than he.

Today, men of all nationalities pay tribute to this Frenchman on the 150th anniversary of his birth, but they no longer think of him exclusively as the David Low of the last century. Curiously, when he died in 1879, few were aware that with him had gone not only a witty cartoonist but one of the greatest artists France has ever produced. One of the most versatile, too, although decades had to pass before his magnificent oils were recognized as trail-blazers of modern art, as precursors of Expressionism, which had no name until 1911.

The son of an unsuccessful glazier-poet, Honore got very little schooling. Taught by a friend the technique of

ALFRED WERNER, Vienna-born art critic, has written and lectured widely in the United States and Europe. His articles on art have appeared in a score of publications including *Commentary*, *The American Scholar*, and *Saturday Review*.
