

THE VOICE OF THE UNINVOLVED

SPEECHES AND STATEMENTS ON
ATOMIC WARFARE AND TEST EXPLOSIONS

75

3/2

231
1-62

73
2008

C. RAJAGOPALACHARI

Accn. No: 1698

Pages: 12 + 198
= 210

2F31



1960
NEW DELHI
NATIONAL BOOK TRUST INDIA

s.
of
is
st
o-
it
in
y
ly
st
er
ng
going
ople
res-
nd,
of
in
uch
sion
city,
ught
the
830 :
rging
then.
rror.
sense
to in

nuclear
by the
he book

First Published January. 1960|Pausha 1881

A NATIONAL BOOK TRUST BOOK

© National Book Trust India, 1960

N60
Acc. No.

7698

21.12.77

355 2322

Raj-

V

Rs. 2.50 nP.

11.2.147M781698
N60

SET IN TEN ON TWELVE POINT BASKERVILLE AND PRINTED
IN INDIA BY S. VISWANATHAN AT THE CENTRAL ART PRESS
ACTON LODGE MCNICHOL ROAD CHETPUT MADRAS FOR
NATIONAL BOOK TRUST INDIA OLD MILL ROAD NEW DELHI

7698
iii
AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO *MANKIND PROTESTS**

It is the lay public that ultimately controls governments. If people are not alive in an adequate measure to the mischief of any policy, governments will act according to their own notions of expediency. It seems as if between the fear of Communist aggression and what the scientists have warned about radio-active pollution as a consequence of the test explosions, governments have deliberately chosen the latter as the lesser evil. It is alleged that the fear of laymen about radio-active pollution is exaggerated, and this argument is sought to be supported by the comparative statements of scientists of natural and already tolerated radio-activity as against the addition through test explosions. The fallacy is that what we add takes us nearer and nearer to danger point. Far from the fears of laymen being exaggerated, the truth is that the consequences of what is going on are not fully appreciated by laymen. If they were, the people of America or Britain or Russia would not allow the fear of aggression to overwhelm the warnings of science. On the other hand, fear of aggression is exaggerated until it has taken the shape of a morbid complex which interferes with sane discrimination in the choosing of the lesser evil when faced with the need for such choice.

In avoiding and preparing for an apprehended aggression mankind is led by unrestrained technology into certain calamity, casting away all wisdom and prudence. The lay public who ought to control government policy are not adequately alive to the mischief, the experts having played it down.

Goethe wrote in a letter to Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1830 : "The world is ruled today by bewildering wrong counsel, urging bewildered wrong action." We have not improved since then. After another hundred years we are in a state of 'balanced terror.' We are held prisoners by technologists who have lost the sense of restraint in the intoxication of their discoveries, and who in

* A collection of the author's speeches and writings on the subject of nuclear warfare and test explosions, entitled *Mankind Protest*, was published by the Delhi Peace Council in the Spring of 1957. A Russian translation of the book appeared in Moscow in 1958. This is the author's preface to that book

turn have made governments dangerously mad. The wiser men of science have woken up to the danger and have been issuing admonishments and serious warnings. The latest among the important statements about the harmful consequences of nuclear test explosions is that of Prof. C. F. Powell of Britain and Prof. Joliot-Curie of France, both Nobel Prize winners. These and others like them have achieved their eminence because their first loyalty is to science. Eminent men of science have a public opinion and a censorship they cannot escape, whatever their politics may be. These two atomic scientists said in April 30 this year :—

"In spite of repeated grave warnings by scientists of the highest eminence in many countries, test explosions of nuclear weapons are continuing. Once again, therefore, in the name of all scientists in our federation and with an added sense of urgency we wish to reiterate these solemn warnings.

"Today the dangers resulting from the pollution of the atmosphere and the ground are better known and the latest information increases our anxiety. The radio-strontium produced by explosions of A. and H. bombs with its 'half life' of about 30 years is carried to the higher levels of the atmosphere and circles the earth. It settles slowly and continually on the ground in dust or rain and is taken up by plants. The depositing of radio-strontium resulting from previous nuclear explosions is still occurring and will continue for several more years.

"Human beings as well as domestic animals consume vegetation and thereby absorb into their bodies radio-strontium with its harmful radiations. Milk contains radio-strontium.

"If further test explosions are not prevented the level of radio-strontium in adults and more important in children is likely to rise sufficiently to produce many cases of bone cancer and leukemia. From radio-strontium and other products of the test explosions particularly radio-caesium, the amount of radiation to which man is exposed is increasing and constitutes a threat to future generations.

"We call on scientists to spread clear and precise information far and wide so that all men may understand the danger. We call on all governments to reach agreement leading to the immediate cessation of tests of nuclear weapons. This indispensable safety measure is of prime concern for all governments and all peoples, not only those of nations which have made or intend to make such tests."

The British medical journal, *The Lancet*, has dealt with the subject in two recent editorials. On April 26, 1957, it has appealed as follows :—

"Proposals for nuclear disarmament have been put before the Disarmament Sub-Committee by Mr. Stassen. Russia avows her eagerness to call a halt to testing, and from many sides there come signs that

and governments realise that something must be done very quickly. The British Government should acknowledge that the situation is a new and deadly one, in which it has become an urgent duty to negotiate an agreement with all speed so that tests can stop very soon and not at some vague appropriate stage.

"Perhaps no single act could do more to bring agreement on disarmament nearer than the abandonment of the British tests."

It is therefore not the exaggerated fears of laymen that have induced these protests against test explosions. The opinion of the veterans of science is the basis of the world's opposition. The cold war, or for that matter even an outbreak of full-scale belligerency can furnish no justification to any of the belligerents for the poisoning of the whole world's atmosphere, and its sources of food and drink. There is no question that when the belligerency starts the end is certain. The present argument that there is no real danger to mankind arising out of the manufacture of these so-called deterrent weapons and the race for such manufacture is not supported by independent men of science.

(ii)

A symposium was held in Frankfurt-on-Main in June 1956 in which the President of the Federal Institute for Civil Defence as well as an expert from the Federal Physico-Technical Institute took part among other distinguished and responsible men. The following conclusions are gathered from that symposium as it has been reported in medical journals :—

Whereas, formerly, a person would absorb from cosmic space and the earth's surface only about 0.3 to 0.4 r. in a year, this amount has now been greatly increased through exposure to therapeutic and diagnostic X-rays, the manufacture and distribution of radio-active isotopes, construction of nuclear reactors for peaceful purposes, and the experimental explosions staged by the Great Powers. While it is alleged that laymen exaggerate the terrible consequences, it is also true that the dangers are often played down by specialists engaged by the Powers. The question of tolerance is still under debate, the tolerance dose being the amount of radiation absorbed in a lifetime which is not expected to cause any degree of damage to the organism.

There is no such thing as a tolerance dose as far as genetic effects are concerned. Any amount of radiation affecting the

organism can lead to changes in the germplasm. For functional impairment of cells an exposure of 0.3 r. per week has been accepted as the tolerance dose. This dose, however, has been already reached by regular television watching for two hours a day. It was clearly affirmed at the symposium that there is no tolerance dose for genetic injury, nor is there any causal therapy for acute radiation injuries. Therapeutic management is limited to symptomatic measures. There is no prophylaxis against delayed effects.

The lymphatic system is the most sensitive and liable to suffer damage. Second place is taken by bone marrow, the most sensitive components being the blasts that make the red corpuscles. In the gonads the maturing follicles and spermatogonia are those most exposed to danger—of castration in women and sterility in men. Changes in the heredity structure are irreversible. Once affected there is no going back. The extent of the damage is in direct proportion to the dose of radiation. With increasing mutation consequent on radio-active damage there is an increased tendency to spontaneous mutation.

Mutations induced by radiation may not show at once or even in the next generation, but are there to come out later in our progeny. Mutations are nearly always detrimental. As already stated, there is no threshold below which mutations may be expected not to occur. Doses of radiation are cumulative in action. Genetically active doses are lower than those leading to functional changes. The danger of radiation mutation occurring in man is great. Subsequent generations will consist of increased numbers of unfit individuals and families will have to bear greater misery and worry. The scientists who met at Frankfurt were of the view that exposure to radiation otherwise than as the result of test explosions is greater than the average layman assumes. To this is added the fall-out of the test explosions.

The stratosphere stores the radio-activity liberated by the nuclear explosions. As a result of meteorological conditions stratospheric radio-activity is continuously for many years carried to earth by rain. Radio strontium coupled with calcium accumulates on the earth's surface, contaminating vegetable life, pastures, and thence milk and cheese.

Artificial sources of radiation, besides nuclear test explosions, such as increasing installations of X-ray apparatus, isotopes and their products, excretions of patients treated with radio-active

drugs, luminous paint industry, artificial manure, uranium mines, television sets, nuclear reactors and their waste products, have not yet been assessed in the estimates so far made.

(iii)

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd was asked whether the Christmas Island tests would not prejudice Britain's moral leadership of the Asian world. To everyone in Asia it is clear that such moral leadership as Britain still held has been completely shattered by Britain's obstinacy. How could any moral leadership survive this continual victimisation of Japan which has suffered so much already? The history of Asia has been such that we cannot but look at these things from the racial angle. It is, however, not only Japan but all the people of this part of the earth who apprehend injury from this programme of two or three nations who are poisoning the world in order to deter one another from aggression. What greater injury can be conceived than that which medical men and the biologists have so repeatedly predicted?

We are told seriously that the reason for this agitation is Russian deceit. We are deceived by nobody, but believe that the best scientists that America, Britain, France and Germany have produced and who know all about the business are speaking the truth. We do not wish to be poisoned, and we do not want our progeny to be the victims of genetic damage just because the Powers cannot trust one another and settle their problems.

"It would be quite fatuous," said Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, "to devote so much money, materials and men to the making of these nuclear weapons and then not test them." What has happened to British sensitivity that they are not ashamed to repeat this argument?

"Britain's test in this respect can be completely disregarded," pleads Mr. Lloyd. How can we disregard additions to a poison whose cumulative character is beyond doubt? Each addition small or great, is an addition, and not a comparison. "If Britain did not have thermo-nuclear weapons it would mean leaving the supreme power in the hands of the U.S. and Russia." "I do not think," said Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, "we should contract out of the influence and power that being a nuclear power involves." Here is the real impelling motive, the fear of going down in the

scale of the new caste-system of world powers, ignoring the potential rise in the far better caste-system of the world that it would bring to Britain, if it responded to world-protest.

(iv)

It is idle to expect the world to give up its opposition to present poisoning because the tests may lead to the evolution of more manageable nuclear weapons. Whether it be one big blast or one hundred smaller blasts, the nuclear programme is a delusion and a snare for everybody. Once the game starts the frustrated party has no escape from using its power to strike effectively and that means the last, or last but one step to annihilation.

I am grateful to the All India Peace Council who have arranged to bring this book out.

MADRAS, May 5, 1957

C. RAJAGOPALACHAR

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Author's Preface to <i>Mankind Protests</i>	iii
1922	
The Aeroplane	1
1945	
The Atom Bomb	2
1954	
Unilateral Action	3
1955	
Criticism and Friendship	6
Nuclear Weapons Will Lead to Total Disaster	7
The Bomb and the Commonwealth	10
India Has A Mission	13
The Nightmare of Nuclear Arms	14
Why Were Hiroshima and Nagasaki Atom-bombed ?	33
India Should Sacrifice U.S. Aid	34
Address to the Thirty-third Convocation of the Delhi University	36
1956	
Unilateral Action	44
Questions and Answers—Radio Moscow	46
Radio-active Pollution	47
Hiroshima Day 1956—A Message	49
Taming the Bomb	50
Must Nuclear Preparations Go on ?	52
A Strange Consequence	54
International Totalitarianism	56
Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles	57
To the People of America	58

1957

	PAGE
Radio-Active Contamination	60
The Rising Tempo of Danger	61
The Spreading Danger	62
The Western Mind	64
Test Explosions	65
Tactical Atomics	66
Stop this Nuclear Lunacy	67
World Experts' Report on Atomic Radiation	69
Soviet Disarmament Proposals	70
Our Clear Duty	71
Nuclear Totalitarianism	73
Bad Law and Bad Medicine	74
The Greater Danger	75
Bargaining Counters	78
Required : An Act of Heroism	80
Commonwealth and Christmas Island	82
The Christmas Island Programme	83
Nuclear Fallacies	85
Message to the World Peace Council: June 1957	87
International Barbarity	89
The Aggression of Missiles	92
Some Good Omens	94
Eisenhower Begins to See	95
Two Thousand Scientists Have Warned	97
The Familiar Pattern	98
America's No	99
The Obduracy of the West	100
Weather Report	101
The Commonwealth Connections	103
Tactical Weapons	104
Package Plan	106
Living by the Bomb	107
American Arms Aid in Asia	110
The Anti-Nuclear Test Movement	112
The New Doctrine of War	113
The Toy Moon	114
Sputnik	115
Correspondence with Mr. Khrushchev	117

	PAGE
Mr. Khrushchev's Reply	119
To Mr. Khrushchev	124
Mr. Khrushchev's Reply	125
The Supreme Weapon	128
Nemesis Nearing	129
A Perilous Plan	131

1958

	PAGE
India's Appeal to the West	134
America's New War Policy	137
The Only Strategy	139
Must Be Halted	141
" Benefits of Test Explosions "	143
Interview with Moscow Radio	144
America's Chance	145
Solemn Advice	147
Western Reactions	148
Summit Conference	149
Pro-Nuclear Test Drug	150
A Field of Hope	151
Obstinacy	153
Secret Poisoning	155
" A Monstrous Decision "	157
Where We Stand Now	158
The Futility of Limited Nuclear War	159
Farewell to Civilization	161
Anti-Communism and the Value of Life	164
Freedom May be Saved	166
Mankind Protests	169
Wisdom Crieth without	171
A Most Dangerous Situation	172
The Geneva Conference	174
The U.N. Report on Test Explosions	176
America's China Policy	178
Yet We Must Hope	181
A Letter from Mr. Khrushchev	183
A Note on Mr. Khrushchev's Letter	186
Neutral Nations Should Confer	188

1959

	PAGE
What Prevents ?	190
The Unsolved Issue	192
Mikoyan's Peace Invasion	193
The Power of Love	194
Formula to Break the Deadlock	195
To the Uninvolved	196
After Tibet	197

1922

THE AEROPLANE

WESTERN civilization is trembling at its own engines of destruction. The British have been developing the Aeroplane chiefly as a weapon against savages and semi-civilized men. "It has hunted mad Mullahs and subdued the Bedouin of Iraq," and has added to the chapters of British military romance. But this game of romance and amusement on one side and indescribable pain and misery on the other, will not always be played against 'savages.' Other people also have aeroplanes and, we are told, many more than the British. It is realised that these satanic engines can be used not only by nation against nation, but also in civil war. . . Such are the tendencies and the future for what is known as civilization. . .

Young India, June 8, 1922

1945

THE ATOM BOMB

Now that Japan has fallen, India has a very great responsibility in Asia. . . . On the question of the use of the atom bomb there is a lot of suppression of honest indignation at the last phase of the war. It cannot be gainsaid that it has made people think rather sadly and even bitterly about it all. People restrained themselves from using poison gas, because they restrained themselves from doing something which, though possibly effective, was too bad to be practised. Even under great stress and trial, neither Britain nor Germany yielded to the temptation of using poison gas; and the European war came to an end without horrors of that kind. But the last act in the Japanese war ended with the use of the physicist's weapon, the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb is worse than poison gas, or anything one can imagine could be found. Yet it must be the result of silent investigation and research work for a good length of time, because science, as was known before the war, did not develop anything like the bomb out of the resources on which atomic bombs were based, though they had imagined there was great power in the disintegrated atom. A new and terrible weapon of destruction has been made out of this scientific possibility and used actually. The process is still a secret. But when men have discovered a wicked thing, it would not remain a secret for long. The data available are quite enough for people to develop it further. No doubt, the war has ended, but it has ended in a terrible way and people are not inclined to be jolly about it. Let us hope that oblivion will rest on this latest invention, if for no other reason, now that there is nobody against whom they need use it.

*From an Address to the Madras Christian College Union,
August 16, 1945*

1954

UNILATERAL ACTION

THERE is in the fable of the Tree of Knowledge and man's fall something more than mere theology. There is in it a pre-vision of what dreadful fate hangs now over our heads as a result of the discovery of atomic energy—the Supreme Issue, as Churchill rightly called it recently. We have eaten of the forbidden fruit, and the fate that awaits the world is more dreadful than the legendary expulsion from Paradise.

Is there any way to regain the Paradise from which we expelled ourselves, or is it too late? Respectfully and in all humility, from this obscure corner of the busy world, I say it is possible yet to save mankind. The way, however, lies through tremendous courage—courage against one's own fear. It does not lie through negotiation with evil.

Most experienced statesmen, all well-wishers of mankind, are busy with negotiations about conventional weapons and inspection and control of stock. These terms will not work. At the critical moment they will be found to fail.

International opinion is clear that germ warfare would be disgraceful. We have succeeded in keeping even the thought of germ warfare out. Is atomic warfare more humane than germ warfare? Should we not pause to consider whether the way of negotiation is really the path to follow?

How did we arrive at a state of things wherein cannon, tanks, torpedoes, submarines and aerial bombing have become quite 'conventional'? It was by a process of quiet, secret competition equivalent to negotiation. The state of things thus reached was bad enough even before the atom bomb came. Now we are unconsciously preparing the next stage of barbarity by the same process of making terms with Satan, giving and taking. We are daily and steadily progressing towards making the atom bomb, too, a conventional weapon.

America has evolved a thesis based on a calculation of relative potentiality in respect of conventional weapons. The weaker

... and ... terrible weapon—this is the new thesis

1955

CRITICISM AND FRIENDSHIP

(An interview with a correspondent of the United Press of India)

Question : WHY have you appealed to America and not to the U.S.S.R. ?

Answer : I have appealed to both, but I addressed the letter to a leading newspaper of America because the test of true friendship is the readiness to give and take good advice, though it may be unpalatable. What hope have I that any newspaper in Russia will take a letter from me ?

There is another reason, too. I am anxious that America should not lose the goodwill of the intellectuals of Asia or let it diminish. Intelligent men in Asia are beginning to wonder if totalitarianism or Communist economy is after all so dangerous to humanity or to Asia in particular as these new diabolical weapons and the race in them started by America. They are asking whether the burning of the whole house is the best way to roast the pig. After the H-bombs are used, where will totalitarianism, or individual freedom or private enterprise be ?

Intellectuals in Asia are getting to fear that America is pushing things towards the use of these demoniac weapons in Asia to create terror at a safe (I question whether it is safe) distance. If we do not desire Communist infiltration, this loss or diminution of goodwill towards America is just what we do not like. The atom and hydrogen policy of America is making Communist infiltration in Asia easier. In the net result, American fission bombs are reducing American power and influence, not increasing it.

The goodwill of the people is more important than armaments. Without goodwill arms potential creates only fear and not real power.

It is good to carry on the campaign against all war. But it should not be used as an escape to cover the disgrace of making and piling up these diabolical weapons. This can and should be stopped at once, whether we are able to prevent all war or not. I respectfully welcome the statement of the ailing Pope that peace

through fear is not real peace. It is a continuous hell-condition. This is the answer to the American argument about making war more and more dangerous to all parties.

Even the talk about constructive uses of fission power is, I fear, a camouflage to familiarise the world to the bomb policy. Scientists can go on with research for constructive use, but why should bomb-making governments speak about it so much in advance ?

Why do I fear that these bombs will be used in Asia ? Because I remember Hiroshima. I believe that not even all the Allies knew about it before the bomb was dropped there, after Japan had been smashed on the sea. I cannot ignore the unfortunate fact that values of human life differ from continent to continent. Anyway, my fear is confirmed by the threat issued by Admiral Radford and the Chinese reply to it since I sent my letter to the *New York Times*.

The Hindu, January 6, 1955

NUCLEAR WEAPONS WILL LEAD TO TOTAL DISASTER

AMERICA is suffering from a strange illusion. The U.S. Government has succeeded in making most of the people in that country believe that the holding of a heavier quantity of nuclear weapons as compared with that held by the U.S.S.R. has ensured for America and the world a kind of peace, not the best form of it but a good second best, as against the ambitious plots of the U.S.S.R. and her populous allied friend in Asia. The idea is that no nation will go light-heartedly to war against a Power that holds these nuclear weapons in great bulk, seeing the cataclysmal nature of the destruction that will be involved in any large-scale war at the present time. I say definitely that this is but an illusion.

No one goes light-heartedly to war in these latter days, with nuclear weapons or no nuclear weapons. It has been abundantly shown, and every nation has realised fully, that war does not end and cannot advance the interests of either party in the conflict. What leads to war is, however, not cold calculation but the

irresistible hatred or anger which seizes nations at aggression or injustice, real or supposed, or fear, which counts no cost.

The American thesis of peace through nuclear weapons is based on certain assumptions. It is assumed that the enemy is extremely wicked, bent on aggression and world domination. It is also assumed at the same time that the enemy will be governed by selfish interests and, therefore, on an intelligent calculation, that he will abstain from giving provocation such as must lead to total disaster from the enemy's nuclear weapons.

The deterrent potentiality of nuclear weapons would be real only if it is made clear that America will use these weapons when found necessary. Proceeding from this it is easy to see that the enemy's calculation of selfish interest will lead to his immediate, effective and ruthless use of the same weapon. This is so because it is only by such prior and ruthless use that he can save himself. Even an erroneous belief that one party has prepared, and intends, a sudden attack would be enough provocation for the other for a preventive anticipatory attack on Britain or America.

Supposing a wicked Government calculates the dire consequences of a big war and its intelligence is not clouded by anger or hatred, it could easily see that the destructive nature of the new weapon is such that it would be dangerous to wait for the other side to use it first; for once it is used, it would be so used that no chance would be left for the victim to draw on his own reserves of nuclear weapons for retaliation. It is something like the situation in hunting big game. One does not, and cannot, safely use anything but the most deadly and effective weapons. The sportsman must assure himself that there is no chance for the tiger to spring on him after receiving a wound.

More than one eminent American has, in discussing my letter to the *New York Times*, argued that bad as nuclear weapons are, they have made war more dangerous and so the nuclear weapons work for peace in an indirect way. I see a wholly different picture. Some nations are bound to be hesitant. They will not resort to the use of these most deadly weapons at the outset. This hesitation of theirs is exactly what has raised their prestige and reputation to the moral plane and that position cannot be given up easily on considerations of military strategy. But what about others? They are bound to anticipate the danger of hesitancy and, somehow, to find adequate reason for seizing the

initiative and making the most deadly and effective use of the weapons.

The power potential of these new weapons is not just the tonnage and the number of the weapons. There is another coefficient in the calculation, the absence of any compunction in the use of it. Twenty cartridges in the hands of a hesitant moralist are no good against an enemy who does not hesitate, although the latter may have only a couple of cartridges in his belt but knows how to hit his mark and do it without waiting. All this is ugly to argue: but it has become necessary in view of the widespread illusion and the specious points raised by some people. The conclusion is that these nuclear weapons definitely do not add to the strength of the truly peace-loving and conscientious party while it greatly adds to the strength of the wicked. The only result of the possession of these weapons by the peace-loving party is that it gives a justification and an incentive to the party that is less conscientious. How one wishes that America had not invented the atomic bomb and proved its diabolical efficacy in actual war and initiated a race in the manufacture of nuclear weapons! The world would have been so different had this not happened. There is really no quantitative law of potential that is applicable to these new weapons. A race in them has lost meaning after the H-bomb was made. Strength lies much more in the element of unhesitating readiness to use the weapon than in the tonnage held by either party.

Recently a story was started that a U.S. air division in Britain had been authorized to make an atomic attack on the Soviet Union and Britain had to contradict the allegation. Such and even more provocative allegations or genuine suspicion will ever be forthcoming once the nations have resolved, with public approval, to hold these diabolical contraptions in their armoury. At any time, a strong suspicion will justify an 'intelligent' calculation and the cataclysmal use of the H-bomb in pure self-defence. Or on a long-range 'intelligent' calculation, an allegation can be floated even without belief, to get up a situation for the use of H-bombs so as to end an otherwise unending nightmare.

We know now from very authoritative sources how extensive and irrecoverable will be the damage resulting from the use of the new weapons. Whoever makes up his mind to use the

nuclear weapons gains his object, no matter what reserves of the same the victim may have held on his side. There is no time for graduating retaliation with this weapon, which is an essential element in the proper and effective use of any form of violence for the proper purposes of defence. If I mix arsenic in the tea of my enemy, what does it matter and how would it help if he had laboriously stored a lot more poison in his cupboard than I had? He wins who first dares to commit the crime. There is no question of defending oneself by retaliation graduated to suit the enormity of the enemy's crime.

Aneurin Bevan said the other day that if a major war broke out Britain would last only 32 hours and he added that scientists held this gloomy view with "every circumstantiation to prove it." Others too have said that all ideas of defensive measures against nuclear attacks are a sheer impossibility.

It is good to take steps to prevent all war; but what is the measure of success that such attempts can hope to obtain so as to warrant giving precedence to the all-out agitation against war over the particular agitation against nuclear weapons and allow humanity's horror at these new weapons to cool down? The immediate duty should not be forgotten in the hope that we may succeed on the wider issue. President Eisenhower has not improved the situation by his frank admission when questioned that nothing could be precluded in military affairs. What one nation may consider to be 'police action' another may treat as a military affair, and then there is room for a most disastrous diabolical surprise.

The Hindustan Times, January 17, 1955

THE BOMB AND THE COMMONWEALTH

THE least satisfactory part of the statement issued at the conclusion of the Commonwealth Premiers' Conference is that which deals with the menace of the nuclear weapons. The menace is recognized but the issue is left to lie unsolved in a maze of good words.

When a particular and definite evil is found beset with diffi-

culties which, for some reason, one is not willing to tackle, the tendency is to make that evil part of a much bigger problem, the insolubility of which is well-known; and the world is told that with the solution of that insoluble problem, this particular evil also will be automatically ended. Thus the abolition of war altogether and cease-fire in the intervals and the solution of disputes by negotiations are placed against the footlights, so that the issue of nuclear weapons may remain where it stood.

Obviously the U.S.A. is not willing to let go her illusion and like the Old Man of the Sea on Sinbad's shoulders, the nuclear weapon is firmly fixed on Uncle Sam's shoulders and Uncle Sam is, so to say, on the shoulders of the Commonwealth. I mean no offence, but this represents the position that has resulted from the great error of 1945.

The nuclear weapon came into existence and instead of being a source of power, it has proved, by reason of the race in that armament that has followed the display of America's successful exploits in the field of misdirected science, to be the cause of continuous dread to each party that it might be used first by the other side, a cause for insecurity instead of a means to greater security.

Two illusions are encouraged by the great powers: (1) That the power of retaliation in the use of the nuclear weapons is an advantage against aggression, and (2) that gradual diversion of the nuclear power to peaceful purposes will take place and thereby reduce the menace of its use in war.

About illusion No. 1, it has only to be pointed out that nuclear weapons, by reason of their inflexibility and cataclysmal consequences are not fitted to be used as a means of protection against aggression, whichever side may become the aggressor. Again, aggression is a term that has completely failed of being defined or being grasped after being defined. The danger of aggression becomes sometimes as good as aggression itself, and when a chain of consequences has been set going it becomes extremely difficult to catch the aggressor, or even to tell who it is. Further again, to live in a hell of continuous fear is not what men and women want, if we can help it. The whole question is, whether we cannot help it at all. Some people think we cannot. But the better opinion is that we can put the monster down. The question is: Shall we go on bargaining and waiting, each side wanting the other to begin, knowing very well that it

cannot be reasonably expected? The only way is unilateral action. Awaiting bilateral action or an international declaration that the war is, for ever, ended, is tantamount to choosing to remain in hell.

As for the second illusion that the gradual increase of constructive uses will reduce the destructive uses, it is so obviously absurd that it has only to be stated to be perceived as sheer nonsense. The increasing use of wool will not reduce the breeding of sheep: the increasing use of gunpowder for fireworks is not reducing the manufacture of cartridges. It is not as if the resources of intelligence and raw material will get exhausted by priority for industrial uses so as automatically to starve the military use out. Indeed the minor industrial uses will serve more effectively to maintain and advance the Frankenstein.

To choose to remain in continuous fear or to take courage to begin—these are the two alternatives. The right choice is the latter and it is rendered all the easier as it is now well understood that it is not a paying proposition to use it at all. Even if one chose to keep the weapon, one is bound, and has practically resolved not to use it. What then is gained by choosing to remain in continuous fear? Nothing.

There is no trust, and this has to be admitted. But admitting it, what follows? There is no conceivable point of time at which our distrust will disappear of itself, if we maintain the conditions for mutual distrust and especially this supreme cause for mutual fear and distrust.

One wishes the Commonwealth Conference had discovered a way out of this moral and psychological deadlock. It would have been the most powerful form of unilateral action if the Commonwealth Conference had plumped for a courageous decision.

*Interview with the United Press of India,
February 11, 1955*

INDIA HAS A MISSION

COMPLAISANCE can never cope with the evils of this world. Indeed it is often the greatest ally of evil. The leading article in the *Sunday Standard* of February 27 leads me to utter this warning. Newspapers run on rotaries have acquired great power these days. Their headlines do all the thinking for most people. You have, forgive me for saying it, done great disservice to a cause in which India is the most important fighter.

In 1806 protests were raised when Napoleon issued his decree for a blockade against Britain by which England was to be cut off from its food imports. It was considered disgraceful that Napoleon should lead a war against women and children. Those were days when international morality was still alive. It felt outraged even so late as during the victorious days of Japan when she took Port Arthur and her soldiers were guilty of barbarous acts. I was at college then and my Scotch professor argued then that the material advancement achieved by Japan did not amount to civilization. Western civilization has advanced now to the manufacture of bombs expressly intended for mass destruction of non-combatants and the target is to be state-wide and the 'guided' missiles are to traverse continental spaces. British collaboration in this business is the latest feather in the cap of the monster that America has made a gift of to civilization. It is indeed a feather in the devil's cap, for is not Britain still the leader of international wisdom and the maturest among the great powers?

Scientists have now come forward to plead that the syllogism of the anti-bomb people is fallacious, for they say the destructive effects of these nuclear bursts have not been definitely proved beyond doubt to be as great as apprehended by some. As if it matters much, our Prime Minister put it well, whether it is only half a continent that will be destroyed or the whole of it. The benefit of the doubt must be given to the delinquent, these propagandists claim, for British jurisprudence must remain though Britain may be burnt up!

To kill non-combatants is mean enough. But to kill them deliberately and in mass, and by using gadgets which save you from putting out your own men to die is cowardly in the extreme.

The advance guards of human civilization have reached indeed the limit of meanness.

Yet I take it if a calamity occurs tomorrow in one of these satanic laboratories, and a holocaust is reported, we shall hold condolence meetings!

And then this talk of "taming the beast!" It is puerile to be led to believe that the evil is to be met by making some good use of the waste-products of this monstrous affair. Tigers' excreta may contain some very useful medical stuff, but we do not allow tigers to roam about among our women and children because of that. Heavy water and other bye-products and the use to which they may be put if exported away, have no bearing whatsoever on the issue. But we are all too ready to be deceived.

The one answer is: "It has come to stay." So it could be said of every evil known to the world. Let us hope and pray still that man is made of braver stuff than is assumed in that formula of complaisance.

It is no defence whatsoever to possess these weapons. The most reckless has the advantage and not the wisest.

India has a mission in this. It must be deemed a shame for us to collaborate anyway with this Enemy of Mankind let loose by the folly of a thoughtless nation.

Letter to The Indian Express, February 28, 1955

THE NIGHTMARE OF NUCLEAR ARMS

THE subject of the evening is "Mankind's Self-made Precipice." I have borrowed this apt phrase from *The Times* of London.

It pains me very much that the Western Powers are going wrong in what they are doing and that it has fallen to my lot to be pointing it out in unequivocal terms. I would have felt far happier perhaps if it had been the other way about and I had to point out only the faults of another party. I have said at another meeting how greatly we are bounden to America and I need not repeat the reason here. It is, however, good that I repeat my hope that what I say should be interpreted as the

anxious thoughts of a friend and not as carping criticism from one who is not concerned in the welfare of America or the other Western Powers.

So much has recently appeared in the daily press about nuclear weapons that everyone now knows quite a deal about them. It is possible to know a lot in a vague way and yet not have it all in order in the mind so as to be able to come to reasoned conclusions. The papers daily bring fresh news of what is done and said about these nuclear weapons. We may thus by verbal familiarity and repetition even lose the sense of danger about them. This is the reason why I am before you to attempt to explain the points involved.

Much has been said in defence of science in general, as if science stood accused, and we were in need of being told about the advantage of scientific knowledge and progress. I am completely in favour of the search of truth that is called science, lead it where it may. I do not for a moment support state or church control over knowledge. It is impossible and undesirable to put restraints on the search for truth; but it is desirable and possible to put restraints on the application of what we unravel out of the mysteries of Nature. If we control our application of knowledge there is no danger in knowledge itself. The responsibility is on those who rule the affairs of men not to misuse science or employ men of science for wicked purposes.

There is a spate of written and spoken matter about the constructive uses to which atomic knowledge can be put. Most of this comes from Governments and Government agencies, not scientists or industrialists. The industrial use of atomic energy is not likely to spring out of Government hand-outs. It is all totally irrelevant for my plea which is that we should prohibit the production and the use of nuclear weapons and that we should stop the test explosions that are carried out, which contaminate the atmosphere and waters of the world and endanger present life and the normality of the human species for future generations. I can see no relevancy in these political tributes to atomic energy unless the Governments that want to keep nuclear weapons going want to confuse the public mind.

Who hates or disrespects science? Who disbelieves in the power of knowledge as capable of being used for good purposes? How does the possibility of using atomic energy for good objects

justify the present use of nuclear weapons for indiscriminate mass destruction and injury to future generations with all the incidents of cowardly assassination? Everything in the world can be put both to good and bad use and atomic energy is not an exception. The good use need not be called up to confuse a calm examination of the bad uses or the prohibition thereof. If it is proposed to poison the wells of enemy countries and some people object to such methods of warfare, is it relevant to talk of the excellent medical uses to which arsenic can be put? It is not contended or proposed or possible that we shall speedily use up all the nuclear material available so as to starve out the military requirements. On the contrary it is proposed to use mostly the waste by-products of the regular military use of such material.

It was my good fortune to study physics in my College when nuclear physics began its career. I was in college in the closing years of the nineteenth century when the X-rays were discovered and made known to the world. Thereafter began the great work of Rutherford, the Curies, Becquerel and others. My professor at College was an able Scot whose talent for demonstrating the wonders of science endeared him to all of us. He was a fine teacher who believed not in dictating notes to help us pass our examinations but arranged and showed exciting beautiful demonstrations throughout the year and kept us entranced in the wonderland of optics and electricity. And when the X-rays came he showed us the new wonders and lost no time in making us see through opaque wooden boxes and to project the bones of our hands on the fluorescent screen. All this and more I saw in College and my professor explained the causes and the theories behind them. We saw the glow in the cathode tubes in all those wonderful phenomena of the moving particles of electrified matter. Those borderland days when old theories of science were put to severe trials were truly great days. Soon came thereafter the break-up of the whole atomic theory and I knew enough when I left College to follow what was going on in the world of science which brought matter and energy together into one equation. I am not a hater of science or its wonders. But I wish to warn those who examine the issues of disarmament and of prohibition of anti-civilization weapons of the irrelevancy of all the talk of the blessings of the atom. One should love science but we should hate the making of nuclear weapons for cowardly

mass destruction leading to the annihilation of the civilization that man has achieved.

Disarmament does not mean the shutting-up of science. The prohibition of nuclear weapons for purposes of war does not mean the closing up of laboratories or of research in the field of fundamental or applied science for the good of mankind. On the contrary the prohibition of nuclear weapons for war would mean the release of the monopoly of Governments and the abolition of secrecy which comes into operation to prevent the spread of knowledge when anything is held for war purposes. The present military use of atomic science in fact blocks the free exchange of knowledge which is necessary for the progress of science and its beneficent application. What I plead for is the emancipation of science from the trammels of war.

When in fear and trouble, men's brains like those of other animals are sharpened. It is true that war and its fears and hatreds quicken the brains of the men of science engaged by Governments. War is said to be the mother of inventions. What a mother! Let us not fall in love with war because for war purposes some clever things are discovered. Secrecy goes with the work of science in war and secrecy impedes science. It is reported that a very eminent Cambridge scientist who desired to go to America was refused permission. I read that a broadcast proposed by an eminent scientist in America was recently prohibited and he had to talk only what had already been widely known. I believe that the most valuable report of an important commission was delayed by order of the American Government and published only when the policy of Government demanded it later. All these are illustrative. Dr. James B. Conant, an American who served in the Department of War, has made the matter perfectly clear.

Before going to the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the issue of disarmament which has been mixed up with it, I should like to point out, indeed I should like to emphasise, that the most urgent matter is the immediate prohibition by international authority of the test explosions which are going on in spite of every protest. It will not do to suppress only the bang, as Churchill said. What is demanded is to stop either loud or silent radio-active poisoning of the world atmosphere and of the clouds that pour the rain for man and beast

and plants. The world has some rights in spite of the fears of one great power of aggression by another and their mutual dislikes. It is truly scandalous that these tests could be going on when eminent men of science, one after another, have pointed out the grave danger to world health and to future generations in the clearest possible language that men of science can command. I cannot believe that any civilized nation could ignore the evidence that has been adduced and which is accumulating every day. The *News Chronicle* (March 24), writing on the effects of nuclear radiation, says: "Professor Rotblat, an experienced and responsible nuclear scientist, says in an article in the *Atomic Scientists' Journal* published this morning that it is imperative the data on the dose of radiation we have all received from nuclear tests up to date, and the rate at which this dose is increasing, shall be known to the Government and published."

Would 75 H-bomb tests over the next 30 years bring everyone in the world to the point where many children might be born mentally or physically deformed for generations to come? Professor Rotblat thinks it may be so. The Federation of American Scientists is similarly alarmed over possible genetic disasters of the future. But on both sides of the Atlantic the Governments utter soothing and reassuring statements. No Government can decently claim the benefit of the doubt in such a case in its own favour as defence lawyers do in criminal cases. Where danger to humanity is apprehended by men of science, the thing should not be done.

It was reported that an attempt was made on behalf of India at the recent Commonwealth Conference of Premiers to get an international agreement at once that all these test explosions should be stopped, but the attempt did not go through. Surely when the West has enough and more of these nuclear weapons further production and test explosions may well be stopped at once. I am aware that the strategy of nuclear weapons requires a lot more of testing. Indeed I would grant that testing in the actual battle-field will soon become necessary as no amount of parade drill is equivalent to battle practice! Tests may be necessary even to reduce the intensity or the area of destruction so as to conventionalise the new weapons. Whatever be the motive or necessity, the cold war Powers have no right to disregard the rights of the world to continue in good health and in the

prospect of successive uncontaminated generations of men and women being born.

There are people in the world with a conscience that is troubled. There are others who do not suffer at all this way. The bombing of Japan at the close of the last world war is troubling the conscience of America. The point is irrelevant for the present issues. Indeed all matters relating to past history, where men and rulers have committed mistakes are irrelevant, when we propose to do something to correct all those errors and to avoid future calamities. All the same, America is proud of her ideals, past and present, and anything that goes to the detriment of her moral position has a tendency to cause pain. Let me dwell on it for a moment. There is no question about the fact that the use of the atom bomb over Japan followed closely upon a successful test in a desert and that two bombs were burst one after another with only a very short interval, August 6 and August 9 of 1945. About the advisability of this atomic bombing there was just an exchange of information in an informal way between the President of America and Churchill. Stalin was kept uninformed till the last moment. It was felt that something should be mentioned to Stalin. This was perhaps done but nothing was conveyed beyond a vague and ununderstandable hint. One could understand this because the American Government then was not sure whether such valuable, secret and dangerous progress in military science could safely be conveyed to Russia even though at the moment she happened to be an honoured ally.

It does not matter, however, whether it was the entire responsibility of America or it was shared by others. The moral issue is not altered on that account. So far as we are concerned, if it was wrong, it was wrong whether it was done by one or more than one or by all of them. The crime of Japan was that she was on the wrong side during this war. A further crime in the opinion of the West was that although Germany had been completely crushed by that time, Japan's courage could not be overwhelmed by defeat and that some groups among the Japanese nation were prepared for mass suicide rather than for unconditional surrender. This was called fanaticism and so any new monstrous weapon could be permitted by Christian morality. More American lives could not be sacrificed to meet this fanaticism

although all power had been knocked out of Japan by that time. It is best I refer to Churchill's narrative and as far as possible in his own words.

"A more intricate question was what to tell Stalin. The President and I no longer felt that we needed his aid to conquer Japan. A devastating attack on Japan had continued from the air and sea. Among the principal targets were the remnants of the Japanese fleet now dispersed for shelter in the inland sea. One by one big ships were picked out and by the end of July the Japanese navy had completely ceased to exist. The homeland of Japan was in chaos and on the verge of collapse. The professional diplomats of Japan were convinced that only immediate surrender under the authority of the Emperor could save Japan from complete annihilation. The only point the Japanese were particular about was the saving of the Emperor's honour. This was known to the allies. A message had been sent by the Emperor to Stalin. It had not been addressed probably because it was not clear to the Japanese then to whom the Emperor's letter should properly be addressed; but Stalin knew what it contained and it had been delivered by the Japanese Ambassador. It was meant either for Stalin or the President of the U.S.S.R. It stated that Japan could not agree to what was then called 'unconditional surrender,' which included the handing over of the Emperor as a war criminal but Japan was prepared for admission of defeat and cessation of war. It was decided by the allied authorities not to recognise this appeal and to give an ultimatum calling for an immediate 'unconditional surrender.' This was published on July 26th. By that time terrific air bombing of cities had already become familiar to the world and leaflet-throwing was also a familiar process. A large number of leaflets were thus thrown over Japan warning her not of the atom bomb but of destruction by bombing. In fact, as I have already stated, even Stalin was very imperfectly informed and deliberately kept out of any information beyond this that a novel weapon had been got ready and tried and would be used. He was not told about radio-active or atom action. The two bombs were thrown on August 6th and August 9th. We know the rest."

"It would be a mistake to suppose," writes Churchill, "that the fate of Japan was settled by the atomic bomb. Her defeat was

certain before the first bomb fell and was brought about by overwhelming maritime power. Her metropolitan army had capitulated without striking a blow. Her shipping had been destroyed."

Now Churchill is not a negligible authority. These are the circumstances under which I believe one is entitled to say that there was no real necessity to use the atom bombs and the unnecessary use was due to either of two causes. (One), that although Japan was crushed completely it was intended to save wasteful sacrifice of American lives in street and house to house fighting, before she could be reduced to complete possession and therefore the new weapon and its horrors had to be exhibited, or (two), the irrepressible urge of science to demonstrate itself when the ground for the demonstration was all clear. My own view is that the second cause prevailed and that the political authorities of America were induced to accept the decision to use the bomb by reason of this urge operating on those who were working on military science. Those who have lived and worked for science and research in the mechanical arts can understand the intensity of the urge to which I refer. Progress in science is based on the natural force called curiosity. There is an equal and obverse force operating in science, the hunger for demonstration of what has been discovered. But again I wish to remind you that this is irrelevant for the present discussion of policy. One who believes in the Law of Karma may well attribute the present tension and the pain and anxiety now suffered by all the victorious allies to the moral consequence of crimes committed by the triumphant allies. Triumph leads to delusion and error. As a result of that American use of the Atom and following it, science has progressed; but equally rapidly has the Law of Karma pursued those who triumphed. Little consolation it is for those who do not believe in the Law of Karma to be told all this and perhaps it may even hurt.

Leaving the Law of Karma aside, the use of the Bomb had an immediate effect on Russia, between whom and the other two victorious allies there had already begun fear and suspicion as to the future. Is it a matter for surprise that the automatic result was a quickening of Russian scientific research to meet the newly demonstrated power of America? And we have what we now have. We need not give the name of Karma to this. But it is in accordance with the permanent pattern of human affairs.

My earnest plea that the nuclear weapons should be done away with can be justified entirely on reasons of pure military strategy and commonsense. Apart from any question of ethics or the future of civilization, I am convinced that it is good for America and for all the Western nations that these weapons be given up boldly, openly and as soon as possible even from the point of view of their own self-preservation and future safety. My advice for unilateral action apart, we have now a definite, clear and reiterated proposal and readiness on the part of the U.S.S.R. that immediately all nuclear weapons should be destroyed and no more of them should be made. Here then is a splendid opportunity for the West to accept the position without putting forward any further conditions. Let us not try to find and attribute this to base motives or fear. This proposal unfortunately is strenuously opposed by America. And Britain supports the American unwillingness and the machinery of political parties and the Press have been successfully roped in.

Here is an incubus sitting on the world. Everybody really wants to get rid of the incubus. "But," says America, "the world is not yet free from fear. We suspect, we distrust, we fear aggression. This is the only thing that enables us to feel strong. We cannot drop it." Now one can understand this, if this new weapon had been only in America's possession. Unfortunately it is now with the other party also and as Churchill put it very graphically and very correctly, it is no use relying merely on keeping ahead in the race. The other side's capacity for destruction, however much less than what is ours, is yet so great that the difference is irrelevant. In this admitted circumstance of extreme danger, if the other side definitely offers that the new weapons should unconditionally be given up by all parties, is it not time that we accept that offer even though America might reject the proposal that she should act in the unilateral, Christian-Gandhian way? It would be wisdom to show at least relative courage if not the absolute kind of faith that is required for unilateral action.

In spite of this, what does America say? "Set the balance right in regard to strength in conventional weapons and manpower, before we deal with nuclear weapons." She asks for a favourable balance in conventional weapons and manpower or at least equality before she can give up nuclear weapons. This is neither

wise nor reasonable. There is not any reality in the idea of equalisation of strength in conventional warfare. One can understand the ideal of total disarmament. But there is no meaning in asking for equalisation. Equalisation between whom and whom? It is a wrong assumption that the world must, for purposes of war appraisement, be divided solely on the issue of Communism and anti-Communism. The pattern of international grouping cannot be assumed always to remain what it is now. Whatever arrangement we make for equalisation of conventional arms on the basis of the present pattern of friendships, it would be of no avail if the pattern alters. Russia was with the West against Hitler. Indeed it fought all the time in a manner which extorted the admiration of the world. America came to help Russia and the Yalta papers show Roosevelt was quite fond of Stalin and his people. We cannot rely on any particular pattern of likes and dislikes or alliance in assessing dangers and safeguards. It is only those who lived in the Hitler days that can realise the intensity of hatred that had been developed against Germany and the German people as a whole. The entire nation to a man was behind Hitler and his atrocious ways. But now the world is ready and eager to put Germany on her feet and arm and trust her. It is a hopeful turn in the affairs of man, and we should welcome it because it proves that so much hatred and fear can be forgotten by men as if it were just an ugly dream. But it also proves the folly of relying on any particular international pattern as a permanent thing.

Again, apart from the pattern of international grouping, is there any commonsense behind the demand for an assessment of strength in conventional warfare? Would anybody believe that much time would be lost in adding to conventional strength in equipment and manpower if the necessity arose? Again, although it is a matter of faith and not of reason or argument, let me say that I am fully convinced that the power of the West is quite good enough if nuclear weapons are out of the field and there is no cause for fear. A great issue is involved in solving which we should set aside all other considerations. It is not right therefore that the acceptance of the Russian proposal entirely to abolish nuclear weapons by international agreement should be delayed on grounds based on the relative strength in conventional arms.

if the offer of the U.S.S.R. in this respect stands accepted by the West and the great incubus is removed. Let us not revert to the feeling that Russia has made this offer because she is weaker in nuclear weapons. Let us remember what Churchill has stated on this point which I have already quoted. Weaker she may be to-day, but she has enough to destroy Western civilization if she makes up her mind? Why did Churchill fear the Japanese suicide man? When a certain point of desperation is reached, there is no question of deterrence through self-interest. Mad courage takes the place of calculation and history has recorded many instances of this.

When once this nuclear incubus is removed by solemn international agreement, it will not be easy, for many reasons, to revert to it suddenly by a party guilty of aggression. The time lag necessarily operates. It is no reason for not doing the right thing now.

If the world is freed from the incubus of nuclear weapons, is there much ground to fear aggression and a new world war with conventional weapons? A set of people will tell us to be afraid. But let us remember that the results, positive and negative, of war, stand much better understood now than ever before. International negotiations will have a much better chance in the present world than they had ever before. It is therefore not reasonable to demand what is called balanced disarmament and make it a previous condition for doing anything on the nuclear weapon issue.

We were told the other day that both America and India have the common goal of peace before us. This is true but we should not forget means are as important as ends. The great difference between America and India is that the means America is adopting for establishing peace on earth do not appeal to India. The *Daily Telegraph* wrote on March 21: "The pace of nuclear rearmament is getting faster. Can it avoid becoming furious? Can the pacific end prevail over the warlike means?" The Avadi Congress passed the following resolution: "The ominous developments in respect of atomic and hydrogen bombs are a menace not only to world peace but to civilization itself. Even the experiments of the hydrogen bombs, if continued, threaten the entire world by their far-reaching and unascertained effects, which may lead to grave and permanent damage to human life and civilization. The total prohibition of the manufacture

and use of atomic and hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction is imperative if civilization is to be saved from destruction. This Congress earnestly requests all concerned to bring about a cessation of the experiments and the immediate consideration of this matter by the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations." This is the Indian position. It is no use mixing our Prime Minister with the Commonwealth policy about nuclear weapons.

The U.S.A. does not accept this and that is the issue I am dealing with. The free world, according to American opinion, must demand 'balanced disarmament' in respect of all weapons, and meanwhile, till an agreement is reached on balanced disarmament, she must continue to make, test and stock nuclear weapons. What is the climate likely to result from U.S.A. continuing to manufacture these weapons and making the necessary tests and in order that they may have the necessary deterrent effect, to announce from time to time her increasing and accumulating strength? This process would necessarily develop a climate of increasing fear and distrust. Can any agreement towards disarmament grow or be given effect to in this climate? Can any plant of peace but fail to wither in this scorching condition?

It is simple logic that if America and the Western Powers cannot agree to disarmament in respect of nuclear weapons where-in they are superior, much less could it be expected that the other party would agree to disarmament of conventional weapons. Stopping of further nuclear production is not an adequate offer when you have an established present superiority. The idea that it is easier to obtain general disarmament than to give up nuclear weapons is based on the belief that the terror of nuclear weapons would induce people, by nature wicked, to do the right thing at once. The more I examine the position, the more nonsensical it seems to me. These ideas remind one of the country behind Alice's looking-glass in Lewis Carroll's book, where if you ran in the opposite direction, you got more quickly to where you wished to go.

Distrust and fear are at the root of the present international malaise. If we desire to change the situation, we should do something to remove the causes of fear and distrust. Maybe it is a vicious circle but we should cut it somewhere and in any case, the opposite course namely, doing that which will create more distrust

and fear, is no remedy. But that is exactly what you are doing through nuclear weapons and by the stand you are taking in respect of them. We are told that war is the real enemy and not the nuclear weapons, and we should therefore all try to prevent war and meanwhile both sides should go on making nuclear weapons and rattling the sword and use the possession of nuclear weapons as an instrument of terror in order that men may agree to end war. Mr. Clement Attlee wrote in an article in the *Daily Mirror* in the first week of March : "Proposals for banning weapons of mass destruction get us nowhere. War cannot be regulated like a football game. It cannot be humanised. It must be abolished. Delay increases the danger that some spark may set the world ablaze."

Is it not absolutely absurd that we could abolish war in such a hurry ? We are asked to believe that it is impossible to give up these weapons which instead of helping to win wars certainly lead to bring civilization to an end. Yet we are asked to believe we can get war abolished straightway. The testimony of history is contrary to this as Mr. C. R. Srinivasan pointed out the other day when he presided over the address of my friend, the American Consul-General.

My plea is that instead of talking of what is impossible in the present climate, deceiving ourselves and deceiving others, we take up the lesser issue of getting the nuclear weapons out of the way because they threaten mankind in general and not only one warring nation or another and its interests or peace of mind. The Western thesis is that we are arming to disarm, obtaining peace through terror. Attractive epigrammatic forms of speech, but they will not help to convert what is psychologically impossible into a possibility. And we forget all the time that the instrument of terror is possessed by both sides and there is enough of it on either side although one may have more of it than the other. Winston Churchill said truly the other day that "it is no use relying on keeping ahead in the race of nuclear weapons. The production is rapidly reaching the point of no return, when the other side's capacity for destruction, however much less than ours, will be so great that the difference will be irrelevant."

The British war-horse has understood the position. Yet he wants Britain to make more H-bombs as if America had not enough already.

We were told the other day that the disarmament talks have made some progress ; I should be very glad if even beginning at the wrong end, disarmament in the true sense became a reality. Whether they begin with nuclear weapons as I want or with conventional weapons as America desires, if a satisfactory situation is reached we shall all be glad.

My view that they should begin with nuclear weapons is not a religious dogma to which I hold fast even if the other way about succeeded. But let me read the *Daily Telegraph* of March 21 : "Disarmament is a monstrous paradox. It becomes more necessary as the Powers move farther away from it. The bigger the Hydrogen bombs we build, the more urgent becomes the need to control their production and prohibit their use. Certainly the current disarmament talks in London, which apparently have reached a deadlock, give no cause for hope." *The Times* of March 21 said : "The London talks have achieved nothing, and there is no sign that the Soviet Government thinks of them as more than an opportunity to divide opinion." *The News Chronicle* of March 21 wrote : "Mr. Eisenhower observes that the current United Nations meeting on disarmament has got nowhere." After these concurrent expressions of opinion on the part of important London papers, it is difficult to believe that anything has been or will be achieved beginning with conventional weapons, keeping nuclear weapons going.

There is a report that Harold Stassen has been appointed to a newly created post, namely an Assistant Secretaryship for Disarmament. Much hope has been expressed over this gesture. But an important British paper has expatiated on this appointment in a way which leads one to think that it is just a budgetary job to reduce unnecessary and overlapping expenditure. Since according to American policy nuclear weapons have come to stay, much expenditure on the old-fashioned weapons could be cut out and so someone has to work on this. Does this lead to any hope ? Disarmament in one direction plus rearmament in another and worse direction is not much of an improvement.

The Archbishop of York, Dr. Garbett, made a tremendous speech in support of the British H-Bomb programme. He repeated the American thesis that the nuclear weapons will provide a good umbrella beneath which the work of peace-making can be continued. I am afraid that this thesis has found a great deal of hasty accep-

tance in British thought, in spite of previous doubts and native commonsense. The leaders of all the political parties in Britain have rallied round this policy of Peace through terror with remarkable unanimity. The fear of a world war starting with aggression by the U.S.S.R. has seized the Western mind and is leading it blindly to very erroneous policies which take it in a direction contrary to where civilization has to go. We have a repetition of Hitler's days when the fear of Jewish conspiracies brought so much calamity into being.

In order to support the thesis of apprehended aggression and the consequent need for going on with nuclear weapons as a deterrent force, we are referred to three grounds.

The Western Nations have had the experience they say, of what happens when they are weak. They have seen, they say, how their weakness tempted Hitler to aggression. Secondly they refer to the temporary unpreparedness of America which led to the Northern attack on Korea. Thirdly, they point out how Czechoslovakian freedom was trampled upon by Soviet Russia.

As this fear of aggression is at the root of the unwillingness to give up nuclear weapons, it is important though unpleasant to analyse the position in respect of these three grounds. First about Hitler. Would it not be better to agree completely to forget those days? Have not all nations including Russia learnt lessons from Hitler and from the war against Hitler? Is it sensible to assume that the U.S.S.R. will repeat the errors of Hitler? The history of no nation is so clean as to enable us to refer to past history for present purposes. Indeed I would suggest that the policy of hugging nuclear weapons is itself a dangerous copy of Hitler's vast errors.

Then as regards Korea, is it so completely clear that the partition of Korea into North and South was so good and permanent that we should consider any attempted unification to be aggression? Of course, all violent efforts are to be condemned, but can we maintain that the use of violence to unify Korea should be deemed as a proof of unalterable Communist aggressive spirit? I think it is unfair to use what happened in Korea as a ground for holding on to these new dreadful weapons.

The third ground for apprehending Communist aggression is what happened to Czechoslovakia. Even before the war came to a conclusion, soon after the Allies smelt victory, there was a

deplorable competition among the powers whose coalition had been forged only for the purpose of defeating Germany and was therefore not deep-rooted enough to last. There was a race between Britain and America on one side and Russia on the other to occupy ground with their armies which they respectively believed to be either their just reward for sacrifices suffered or necessary for national security. Czechoslovakia was all through that period, assumed to fall within the Soviet zone. Czechoslovakia was at the very outset taken under Soviet control. What happened subsequently is not relevant. Czechoslovakia was 'liberated' but the earliest opportunity was taken by Soviet Russia to regain what she felt to be her own. I am not taking sides. I wish nobody played with the freedom of nations in the manner in which it has been done. My point is what happened in Czechoslovakia is not adequate reason to feel that the moment nuclear weapons are now given up Soviet Russia will start aggression again against the West and will not abstain from throwing the world into a fresh world war.

Past history in respect of Czechoslovakia cannot therefore help us to come to correct conclusions as to what we should now do to save civilization. The Yalta disclosures have served if nothing else, one good purpose—that we should not now rake up what was thought or said or decided upon or done in the flush of victory in those ugly days of ambition, hatred and folly. I have no objection to reasonable suspicions and reasonable vigilance. But I object to the misanthropy of unalterable distrust and uncontrolled, unreasoned fear. These are our real dangers and real enemies. We should not allow worry and suspicion to develop into madness and anti-civilizationist folly. I have no objection to defence plans. But I object to blind faith in retaliation as an effective form of defence or 'deterrence' as intimidation is now renamed. Retaliation has been sufficiently demonstrated to be no defence.

We cannot assume at one and the same time contrary psychologies in our enemy. We believe that he is so madly aggressive that he will forget all lessons of history and create a new world war. At the same time and contrarily we believe that talk about total destruction will deter him. Deterrence requires occasional use of the bombs and that is fatal.

I object to anybody assuming that the U.S.S.R. will proceed beyond her present boundaries and start a world war even if we,

by international agreements, drop all nuclear weapons on both sides. I want nations to pursue the path of friendship, to be cautious but to be friendly, to watch each step and go forward in the path of trust and friendship. I want nations not to go the contrary way, *viz.*, to create terror, hoping it will deter the enemy from doing what is wrong. I do not want nations to announce and rehearse preparations to evacuate cities when nuclear attack is threatened. All this does not create an atmosphere for friendliness to grow. I do not believe that there is any danger so great as to bring about a feeling of desperation. The weaker party is always likely to get this and then he will not mind the consequences and do what we just do not want him to do.

I do not want Government departments to be talking about the vast power that lies in the atom to do good, when it is irrelevant and premature and is just counter-propaganda against the growing world opinion that it is cowardly to be occupied in producing instruments for mass killing by pressing a button without even the compensation of personal sacrifice and risk, which went with conventional weapons.

No one hates nuclear *Energy* as such ; no one hates atomic power or constructive uses thereof when such uses are ready to be brought into operation. But the talk of such matters undertaken by the political and military arms of a Government serve only as propaganda.

I do not approve of people talking about the 'atomic age' having arrived and to believe and make others believe that there is no escape from it. I am wholly against men throwing the blame on abstract phrases when what counts is human action or human forbearance. The atomic age comes through the activities of men, not by itself. We want it to come in one way and not in another way. I do not approve of people talking of the atomic age having come in order to make people accept a nuclear weapon policy. It is our business to see that the atomic age in this sense does not come. Such talk is a form of escapism, throwing the blame on the age, as if we were compelled to it by some supernatural agency. We should not develop a kindly attitude towards evil saying that evil has come to stay.

An incidental matter is that the preparation of nuclear weapons by the great powers leads to a considerable quantity of by-products which are most deleterious to local health. A lot

of these by-products are accumulating in the countries manufacturing nuclear weapons and have to be got rid of. They carry radio-activity. It is possible to utilise them to good purposes abroad. Now what happens if we buy such stuff? We get radio-active energy but we co-operate with the manufacture of nuclear weapons by the cold war nations, which is bad. I would rather prefer waiting to manufacture radio-active material ourselves without co-operating with evil.

If any official reports lead people in America to think that there is in India a want of goodwill for America, it is entirely due to the stupidity or impatience of those impression-gatherers. There is deep-rooted respect and gratitude and even partiality for America among intelligent sections in India. Indeed they are unwilling to do anything that is likely to give the impression of antipathy to America.

"I do not think," wrote Bertrand Russell in a recent book, "that the sum of human misery has ever in the past been as great as during the last 25 years," and the reviewer of Russell's book adds, "with the latest advance in technique it looks as if we might surpass even that achievement. It is literally true that if the species were to exploit to the full the resources of destruction now at its disposal, it would be the end of humanity as we know it."

There is irremediable catastrophe facing the world. Yet the 'realists' will not listen to Bertrand Russell or to the evidence of the greatest men of science or even to smaller men of the world among whom I claim to be one. Is America to be the nation Providence has chosen for the melancholy task of perfecting and using this last weapon of destruction and bringing about the supreme climax in the brilliant play of civilization that man born out of the ape had in his foolish conceit, started enacting?

Again and again comes up the question of realism. Can there be anything more unrealistic, I ask, than this notion that we can defend ourselves through retaliation when we know that there is enough and more of these weapons on both sides? Which master strategist will arrange the sequence of retaliatory measures so as to prevent, one after another, American civilization from being utterly destroyed, British civilization from being utterly destroyed, Russia from being utterly destroyed and all hope of civilization in Asia from being similarly destroyed? Captain Liddell Hart, one of Britain's most eminent experts on war, has

roundly condemned all these defence plans as absurd, insane and lunatic. "After devoting forty years to the study of warfare," says Captain Liddell Hart, he has now to face up to the fact that "this accumulated knowledge has become useless, that any war in the atomic age would lead to the destruction of all the nations concerned." Now this conclusion should not be used by either side merely to threaten the other side. It should be utilised to come to only one conclusion, that this new defence scheme of retaliatory use of nuclear weapons should be given up. The way should be shown for the abnegation of this folly as soon as possible, while still it can be shown. It should be obvious to those conversant with war-psychology that as soon as the lunacy begins to take concrete shape, the weaker will be much more desperately inclined to make an anticipatory attack than those who believe they are stronger. Here lies the greatest danger for the democratic world. Safety does not lie through preparation for retaliation as far as nuclear weapons are concerned.

On the last Christmas the 'comfortable words' were spoken from Cathedral Hill and James Reston commented on it that "for all its bickering and divisions, Washington has sought in these past ten years to carry the message of Christmas into its foreign policy" and that "it has striven to carry the Commandments into its relations with other nations." So it is that I have dared to persist as I am doing, though it may look funny for an individual like me to play the part of adviser to great and powerful nations. I know that there are many hearts in America and Britain and France beating in sympathy with what I say although they dare not say in America as I say lest they be thought to be communist hearts. I believe there is a fundamental loyalty to the word of Christ in America such as there is not in other places and on which humanity's fate hangs.

Brotherhood Week was celebrated according to a 21 years' custom in the United States and Canada in the last week of February and Dwight Eisenhower who is Chairman of the 1955 Brotherhood Campaign sent a message which contained these words: "In the face of forces which work to lock each man within the prison of his own mind, which make friend distrust friend, nation distrust nation, it is imperative that we heroically, by word and deed, gave voice to our faith: that every man is indeed his brother's keeper, that no human being in the world can escape his spiritual involve-

ment in what happens to any other human being, that no man in the troubled sea of mankind can be an island."

Speech at Madras Y.M.C.A., March 1955

WHY WERE HIROSHIMA AND NAGASAKI ATOM-BOMBED ?

I QUOTED from Churchill's book in my recent speech at the Madras Y.M.C.A. Here are extracts from pp. 441 and 442 of *I Was There* by Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy (Chief of Staff to President Roosevelt and President Truman) with a foreword by President Truman, October 1949 :—

"It is my opinion that the use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender because of the effective sea blockade and the successful bombing with conventional weapons. It was my reaction that the scientists and others wanted to make this test because of the vast sums that had been spent on the project. Truman knew that, and so did the other people involved. However, the Chief Executive made a decision to use the bomb on two cities in Japan. 'Bomb' is the wrong word to use for this new weapon. It is not a bomb. It is not an explosive. It is a poisonous thing that kills people by its deadly radio-active reaction more than by the explosive force it develops. The lethal possibilities of atomic warfare in the future are frightening. My own feeling was that, in being the first to use it, we had adopted an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages. I was not taught to make war in that fashion, and wars cannot be won by destroying women and children. We were the first to have this weapon in our possession, and the first to use it. There is a practical certainty that potential enemies will develop it in the future and that atomic bombs will sometime be used against us. That is why, as a professional military man with a half-century of service to his Government, I come to the end of my war story with an apprehension about the future. Employment of the atomic bomb in war will take us back in cruelty towards noncombatants to the days of Chengis

Khan. It will be a form of pillage and rape of a society, done impersonally by one State against another, whereas in the Dark Ages it was the result of individual greed and vandalism. These new and terrible instruments of uncivilized warfare represent a modern type of barbarism not worthy of Christian man."

The above words written in 1949 by an American Admiral who had so much to do with the last war have, alas, proved too true. Yet great nations refuse to learn. They refuse to draw the only true lesson from what has happened, but persist perversely to come to the very opposite of that lesson. Such is the force of evil and perhaps the irresistible hand of fate. When I made certain observations in the Y.M.C.A. address about the urges that must have led to the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombing, I had not been aware of the existence of such good authority for my remarks as the above extracts from the American Chief of Staff's almost contemporaneous notes and observations furnish.

Letter to The Hindu, April 15, 1955

INDIA SHOULD SACRIFICE U.S. AID

I AM anxious that I should not be misunderstood. I am in dead earnest. What I want is not boycott but sacrifice. I want to inflict not the slightest injury, but I want India to be ready to injure herself for the sake of the world.

There were people who most genuinely and strongly felt that our non-co-operation with the British Government in India and the legislatures under that Government was wrong and involved serious losses. Yet if we had not stuck to it and carried it out, courageously facing the obloquy and misunderstanding and suffering the losses and sacrifices, we would today have been still a British dependency, and English rulers and Anglo-Saxon personnel in the main services would have still held us in effective obedience. Or we would have given away the initiative to Communists and been wallowing in the morass of disorder and subversion on the one side, and on the other side subjected to intense repression by British authority, as witness the conditions in Malaya.

We would not have had independence. And there would not have been free Burma and dominion status in Ceylon. In fact, Asia would have been quite a different picture from what it is today but for the firm policy followed by India under the leadership of Gandhiji and the independence we have thereby secured.

There were most convincing arguments advanced even then by worthy friends that it would be a blunder to go through the sacrifices involved and that we were generating ill-will. That mentality still persists in several quarters. But we see now not only that we have secured freedom but maintained goodwill and friendship of the highest order both in quality and measure with Britain.

Britain had entrenched herself in full authority over India, and non-co-operation with her authority and government meant something tremendous, far more sweeping than the trifling gesture of self-respect that I am now advocating, *viz.*, not to ask for or take economic aid from an external Government.

I am not asking for the withdrawal of friendship or for the withdrawal of even the smallest assistance we might be able to give to the U.S.A. on our part, or even non-co-operation as a whole or in any extensive sense. All that I ask for is that while we are pleading on behalf of the world for sanity and restraint on the part of the U.S.A. in her efforts to strengthen her defences, we should not nullify the earnestness of our protest or render our displeasure into hypocrisy by accepting monetary assistance from the same party. Let it be remembered that what I suggest is very limited in time as well as in scope.

If we could recover and maintain goodwill and cordial friendship and mutual trust with the British Government and British men and women after non-co-operation for 27 years and all that it implied, surely there need be no alarm on account of what I have suggested. It cannot and will not lead to dangerous or deadly ill-will or even loss of goodwill. Far from it, we shall have earned the respect of the Americans for I know they have, with all their faults, a keen and just emotional understanding. As for the cause, it is a great one, a world cause, one for which we might sacrifice this and much more.

Our need for economic aid is great. Hence the sacrifice is real, and hence its power. If we give up what we can easily

afford to give up there is no sacrifice or sanction in it. On the other hand, sacrifices for great and good causes ultimately never result in harm. Surely we shall gain in the net result provided we are brave and honest.

Even as I say to the Americans that, had they not gone on with the Manhattan project, had they never worked on the atom, had they never made these nuclear bombs, they would yet have won the war as they did and the U.S.A. would have held its present position without the slightest doubt, I say to my countrymen that we would be on our steady uphill path to progress and prosperity even if the U.S.A. never offered us economic aid. Surely those who seem to be alarmed over my suggestion do not believe that we would perish but for the U.S. aid that is offered.

What I say about American aid, I need not point out, applies to a hypothetical case of U.S.S.R. aid.

There is no time to be lost. The matter is most urgent, for the reckless cumulative poisoning of the world and the dangerous dissemination of deleterious matter into the world's atmosphere is going on. It is as foolish to imagine that by scattering into the moving air or into the seas these deadly anti-biotics and monster-producers we get rid of the evil, as it is foolish for common folk to believe that by spitting out tubercular spittle into the broad roads or sending infected clothes to the laundry we get rid of danger to public health.

Interview with Press Trust of India, May 12, 1955

ADDRESS TO THE THIRTY-THIRD CONVOCATION OF THE DELHI UNIVERSITY

MR. CHANCELLOR, Members of the Court, Professors and Graduates ! I have had the privilege of delivering a number of Convocation addresses at various Universities. I have a feeling that the graduates to whom these disquisitions are addressed are rather bored by oft-repeated advice. It is an exciting moment for young people when they gather to receive the diplomas which classify them as the elite of the nation ; but the crowding and the long waiting and the dull uniformity of dress all over the hall are not

pleasant and a long lecture at the end is not exactly what is indicated for relieving the tedium. A string of platitudes on the unquestioned importance of character and discipline which one has heard or read so often until they have lost their meaning does not, I am afraid, rouse much interest. Every Convocation address by whomsoever given covers a wide range of subjects leaving nothing untouched. On one occasion when I deliberately avoided this plan, a retired Headmaster came down upon me and wrote a critical letter to the Press condemning my speech for not being as comprehensive as a Convocation address should be. I think it is time some University gave a bold lead and dropped the Convocation address altogether and substituted for it some lighter and more attractive programme devised for the occasion.

This evening I shall obediently fulfil my part, but I shall try to avoid the subject of discipline in colleges—not out of despair, my young friends, but for the reason already explained. I shall not only avoid the subject of discipline but shall not suggest any plans for the improvement of education. I shall deal with just one specific matter and try to do it briefly. It is a subject that does not concern students or college life at all and therefore I hope the graduates may listen with that interest which is generally attracted by extra-mural matters.

Among the things that make the evening of my life not very cheerful, that which distresses most is that America has not seen her way to give up nuclear weapons. Not even does she show signs of encouragement to others to think on those lines. The Powers have not seen their way to give up these weapons, the use of which it is well known will certainly destroy civilization. Even after fully realising the consequences apprehended by the most eminent scientists, some of them active workers in the technical field that produced these weapons, the great Powers do not appear at all able to sum up the courage required to give them up. I wonder whether this indicates what Providence has definitely decreed for mankind in this century. If America has not done well in this matter, Britain has not helped at all. Negotiations by expert Foreign Secretaries may take us some distance, but ultimately it is as plain as the proverbial pike-staff that unilateral action is the only path that can lead to the goal. Courage is another word for trust and trust is not folly but heroism.

Two men can stand for hours together without shaking hands

although they come together for that very purpose, if each one of them suspects the other to have his hand equipped with poisoned *waagnaks*.* The stronger and the braver must extend his bare hand without waiting for the other to do it first.

I wrote a letter last December appealing for unilateral action on the part of America to make a beginning. The *New York Times* was good enough to publish my letter on Christmas Sunday of 1954. Since then much has happened in connection with these weapons, alternately raising and shattering hopes. Recently I received a communication from the International Fellowship of Reconciliation along with a copy of a preliminary report of what they call the 'Third Way' Conference, that was held in London early in September last. The conference aimed at promoting opposition to all war and to encourage nations to remain neutral. The general aim of the 'Third Way' Conference may be said to be a reiteration of the brotherhood of man.

All nations and all races—black, brown, white or yellow—are derived from the same parents. This is what the Bible tells if I have understood it aright. Every religion tells its votaries that we are all children of one great and good Father. Graduates! Strangely enough this good doctrine of religion is the conclusion of modern science also. Charles Darwin in his book, *The Origin of Species*, written after an enormous number of careful unbiassed observations has declared that no single species could possibly have started at more than one spot in the world. So many circumstances must combine to produce a species according to the theory of natural evolution, that by the mathematical law of probabilities it is impossible that it could happen at more than one spot. Man according to Darwin and the evolutionists was not evolved at various points of the earth. It could have happened at only one place. I shall give you Darwin's own words :—

"All the individuals of the same species and of the species of the same genus are descended from common parents ; and therefore in however distant and isolated parts of the world they may now be found, they must in the course of successive generations have travelled from one point to all the others. When we feel assured that all the

individuals of the same species and all the closely allied species of most genera have within a not very remote period descended from one parent and have migrated from some one birthplace ; and when we better know the many means of migration, then, by the light which geology now throws and will continue to throw on former changes of climate and of the level of the land we shall surely be enabled to trace in an admirable manner the former migrations of the inhabitants of the whole world."

What Darwin said is a much bigger thing covering all species of animals. But nothing is more certain according to him than that man who is a more complicated phenomenon was evolved at only one point. All the men and women of the world according to Darwin therefore are children of the same parents. Even if we reject religion, we dare not reject science also.

In the struggle of man to survive in spite of very adverse environments, civilization has been evolved. We have arrived however at a counter-force, *viz.*, mutual war among men, and so good men and women are seeking to end war which hinders the onward progress of civilization.

The 'Third Way' of the International Fellowship must in my opinion be only a way of thought, growing into a way of life, without any organisation behind it. To form an organisation and a party is the surest way to ruin a good cause. The way of thinking and the consequent way of life must in course of time become a force in national affairs and thereby affect policy. It may seem to be a slow process, but there is no quicker way and when men begin to think sincerely, the process I have described will not be so slow as may be imagined. The only road to peace and goodwill is unilateral action and the guiding lamp of that path is courage.

Friends in Canada, Britain and other countries including America ask me, what guarantee is there that Communist nations will not resort to atomic warfare once they see the disappearance of America's power to wage it ? There is and there can be no guarantee. The other side can urge the same fears and there is no end to that kind of mutual fear. There is no devil-proof defence against evil, fraud or violence. Retaliatory preparations for violence only prolong and increase wickedness.

* A kind of steel claws shaped like tiger's claws.

I wish to point out on this occasion that the readiness to do the right thing irrespective of what others may or may not do has begun to be rapidly practised in unexpected quarters. I am referring to the principle of unilateral action and not to the particular question of nuclear weapons. The U.S.S.R. has begun to act on this principle in several matters, whereas in quarters where one might have expected it to be understood and swiftly practised, it has not happened. To use an undignified phrase, the U.S.S.R. is stealing a march. The Government of Russia has taken the initiative during the last few months in several matters with surprising rapidity applying in its practice the doctrine of unilateral action. We are prone to search and find wrong explanations for this. The true explanation is that Russia has seen the light and the promise thereof. Whatever be the cause, Russia is determined to settle down, be it out of a sense of expediency or the force of truth itself. It is not too late, nor is there any humiliation involved in it for America or Britain to make up for lost time in the manufacture of this much better bomb, the bomb of unilateral action. There is more power in it than even in $E = MC^2$. Moral power is a reality and not a mere phrase. On the other hand when there is no one to fight with, the power of explosives has no real value but is a cause only for suicidal expenditure of resources. I believe the U.S.S.R. has seen this and is stealing a march when America like the hare in the old story is sleeping on the roadside.

The thing to be remembered is that Gandhi and India have established that it is no longer possible for any nation to overwhelm and govern a people beyond their borders if the latter are determined not to be so governed. Apart from little trespasses and infringements on the borders, the idea of one country governing another country against their will is a demonstrated impossibility. No one is going to try it hereafter. It is therefore pure waste of resources to build up huge armaments of any kind in fear of this.

Another fact to be realised is that trespasses and infringements of borders can never be met by the use of A and H bombs. It is just impossible. In no case, therefore, is there any use for nuclear weapons. As for their potentiality of deterrence, it is a rapidly diminishing quantity seeing that it is more and more realised that they can and will never be used.

After winning a great victory in the most terrible war of the world's history and reaching the highest heights of power and

lustre, is it not a tragedy that a sense of insecurity has seized America and for ensuring safety and peace of mind she hugs to her bosom a monster of horror and ugliness and disaster? It is no figure of speech but a feeble attempt on the part of a prosaic man to express the sadness that oppresses his mind. No greater disservice to the world can be imagined than what has been unwittingly accomplished by America during this decade in the invention and perfection and practically completed conventionalisation of weapons that must inevitably destroy civilization and corrupt the very seed of man if ever they are used. I have watched America's steady progress in its propaganda for the abolition of the difference between these new weapons and those till now classed as conventional weapons.

We are told that these new weapons are not for use and are only for deterring the other side from misbehaving. Meanwhile we succeed in banishing all peace of mind, we deter real progress, and powerful nations not only hurt themselves but commit serious infractions on the rights of neutral people to an atmosphere unpoisoned by radio-active elements.

The question commonly raised in answer to my plea is: Why do you not address your panacea to Russia? How can we accept your proposal when we know that the other party will retain its advantages? Whether the one or the other side puts this question, it is a plea for bilateral agreement and prior performance on the other side before anything is to be done by oneself. It is the negation of the principle of unilateral action. I have already explained that without the readiness to take the initiative for giving up this evil, we can never begin or accomplish anything in that direction. But let us see what exactly Russia has done and is prepared to do. She has not, it is true, offered to throw away her nuclear weapons unilaterally. But she definitely and repeatedly asks for an agreement on the earliest date for an international prohibition of all nuclear weapons, to which the answer of the West is: "We cannot trust you and therefore we cannot agree to an international prohibition. We cannot give up nuclear power as without it you are not definitely weaker than us."

A brief news item from New York dated November 7, giving what happened in U.N. debates, said: "Another Soviet amendment called for a ban on atom tests and prohibition of nuclear weapons. This was rejected by 39 to 6 with 12 abstentions."

I have not in the whole period of my life read anything so depressing as the views expressed in the British and American Press about the initiatives on other connected matters recently taken by Russia. Frowns were disliked ; now smiles are suspected and caricatured. Sphinx faces, the only other alternative, were always disliked. Every good gesture is systematically suspected and caricatured in the international press. This is not the way to develop trust or friendliness or goodwill. It is tragic the way the West is going.

In a change-over from enmity to friendliness every gesture towards the latter can be interpreted as a sign of weakness, but it is not right or wise to put that construction and by ridicule or contempt nip in the bud every good though belated attempt at friendliness.

Mr. Dulles said recently : "When there is a sense of insecurity and when arms consequently seem needed, limitation of armaments is virtually unattainable." Can there be anything more categorical or more depressing ? What a thought to go with, to discuss disarmament at Geneva ! And the *Glasgow Herald* quoting this statement of Mr. Dulles with much satisfaction adds : "The West will retain its nuclear superiority and the Soviet bloc its man-power advantages until mutual confidence is sufficient for both sides to begin to dispense with safeguards." The *London Times* welcomes the relaxation of tension on the basis of what it calls military equilibrium and insists that the former is dependent on the latter, that is to say, the Cold War and nuclear weapons must continue as permanent elements of the world atmosphere. Deterrence is declared to be the settled official foreign policy of America and this is printed on donated space in bold advertisement type in the *New York Times* (International Edition). And we know that 'deterrence' is another word for a race in nuclear armament.

I have used strong language. But when human civilization is threatened according to the testimony of the most reliable and well-informed and qualified men in the world, is it not time some one uses strong language ?

It is not a noble approach to interpret the Russian insistence on priority for the question of prohibition of nuclear weapons as a sign of weakness or as a trick to secure a secret advantage. Almost all men of science join in that demand for a prohibition of nuclear weapons, apart from the question of equalisation of strength as

between East and West. It would be wrong to attribute stupidity or want of patriotism to men of science.

I am not unaware that the problem of world-peace involves many issues which I have not touched. There is the great German issue. And in the East there are the problems of China *irredenta*, viz., Formosa, and the steady Communist drive towards the southern seas with armed backing. I have however deliberately restricted myself to one matter because that matter affects the physical basis of life itself and of civilization apart from international peace ; and also because by its nature this matter permits of no delay, for the world is being steadily poisoned by the new armament programme and the experiments and processes involved therein.

Friends ! What I have said I wrote out some days ago so that the Registrar may have it printed. Some things have happened since then and much has been said by the men that govern the affairs of nations. But they only confirmed my depression. The sentiments expressed by important leaders of the West and by the great newspapers of America and Britain after the break-up of the last Geneva meeting are even more depressing than what had been said before to which I made reference at the outset.

Those who have received their degrees to-day have listened to words that represent the gravest apprehensions and thoughts of one who still deems himself an understanding friend of the western people. May Providence bless us and enable the peoples of the world to secure the peace of mind that is necessary for progress.

Graduates of the Year ! I invoke on your behalf the blessings of God and of the Rishis who built the enduring culture of our land and, in particular, of the last of them whom we call the Father of the Nation.

November 26, 1955

1956

UNILATERAL ACTION

In connection with nuclear weapons sometime ago I pleaded for an appreciation of an ancient tactic against evil—that one must do the right thing without waiting for the ‘other fellow.’ My letter to the *New York Times* fell on sceptical ears as far as government was concerned. Private men and women in America, I believe a very large number, were in agreement but they felt it was not their job but their government’s.

In this world, the unexpected often happens. The a-moral government of the U.S.S.R. has accepted the principle of unilateral action. It has successfully seized the initiative. It has announced and proceeded with unilateral action in many important matters and now publicly presses for the adoption of that principle by all nations concerned in World-disarmament. This attitude has met with cold and cynical reaction instead of encouragement and imitation or co-operation. Instead of welcoming this great and hopeful line of action, the Western nations actually plead against it and protest that what is wanted is agreement and simultaneous multilateral action. To those who cling to the ancient faith that right ever wins and not might, this is a sad and grievous disappointment.

Some of us thought that the West being professedly Christian would be the first to understand. But the ways of Providence are mysterious and it may be that this is God’s way to humble the proud. An a-moral government has proved to be the better Christian! I do not say that Russia has accepted the full moral doctrine of unilateral action. But she has, I believe, seen the expediency of it. She has realised the necessity of it for getting out of the present fatal entanglement. To realise the practical necessity of a step and to have realised it so clearly as to begin to act on that basis in spite of the risks, is the first step to a more complete acceptance of the moral doctrine. It is wrong to indulge in belittling what Russia has done and is doing, when we are not prepared to do even so much.

Mankind was blessed with a brain constituted for co-operation

and peaceful progress. Is it not a pity that after so many millennia, men are full of fear of one another? And in this we are worse than our fellow-beings that are not blessed with our brains and have no speech—the beasts of the forest and the birds and reptiles. With all our tremendous advantages we have not learnt the way of peace and look out for caves in which to hide against human enemies and are engaged in manufacturing poisons and making monstrous contrivances to kill one another that we and our properties may be safe.

Yet we all know for certain, not even the armament-industrialists would deny it, that men and women of all nations fervently believe in and desire peace and mutual trust and heartily hate the opposite. The saddest and strangest paradox of human civilization is this contradiction between what we all desire and what notwithstanding that desire we do. And it is a tremendously expensive contradiction, and a most perilous one.

Fear is eating into the vitals of all the proud nations. The humble have no means to make armaments of ‘deterrence’ and cannot afford to indulge in what fear dictates. There is what I may call a law of abstinence, by which if we do not feed an emotion, the emotion dies of starvation. The poorer nations of the world have therefore learnt to be less afraid and are comparatively happier than the prosperous and great.

The human family is however one and the progress of invention has brought about a total unity of human disaster. Madness at any point in the world will involve the whole of it in utter disaster. The peril is imminent. I respectfully appeal to my friends in the Peace Groups throughout the world to give a concrete shape to the Pacifist movement, concentrating on the most dangerous aspects of the present cold war, rather than contenting themselves with preaching the doctrine of not bearing arms and losing themselves in a vague effort to prevent all armed conflicts.

War has been prevented as Bertrand Russell expected. But the prevention is worse than the disease. The most urgent problem is the particular evil of nuclear armaments. I would appeal to all friends of Peace to concentrate on this and carry on a vigorous campaign for the furtherance of the way of unilateral action which is the only way in this as in other things.

Can all the nations who are not in any particular war of aggres-

sion or defence rest completely assured about the marksmanship of nuclear combatants and assume that the guided missiles will not err but will always reach only the intended targets ? Human experience has demonstrated that despite every caution errors happen and can produce unintended and irreparable harm to those who have nothing to do with the particular war.

All international morality seems to have come to an end. The powers are engaged in a programme of continually poisoning the air and the waters of the world, disregarding the rights of nations against whom no war has been declared. In the name of preparation for security against possible aggression, wholesale and reckless aggression is *practised* against the whole world, disregarding the protests of those who are not parties in the cold war and who suffer irreparable damage by this programme. The highest scientific authority backs their objection, but it is not heeded and unconvincing explanations are occasionally given as dope.

What Mr. Gromyko has said about the plan of aerial inspection is true. The proposal was no doubt well-intentioned, but there is no doubt that such inspection will only promote the 'lust' for further invention and inflame the passion to make deadlier things than what the 'other fellow' has. There is no use harping on aerial inspection and taking no action meanwhile. The hour has struck for seizing the offer made by Russia. When earnest men and women pray, the needed courage will arrive. What moral initiative has been lost to Russia cannot now be recovered, but we can save further loss by the courage not to be ashamed and to do all we can even now.

Peace News, London, July 27, 1956

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :

TELEGRAM FROM RADIO MOSCOW

DEAR SIR, Radio Moscow is circulating a questionnaire among public and political figures of different countries of the East and the West. The questions that we have decided to address are the following :—

(1) What is your attitude towards peaceful co-existence ?

(2) What are in your opinion the possibilities of a solution of the disarmament problem ?

(3) What do you think about the proposal to stop nuclear weapons tests ?

We shall be very grateful if you will kindly take part in this discussion by correspondence.

REPLY

Question one : Peaceful co-existence is a sound policy and is the first step towards good mutual understanding and world progress.

Question two : Disarmament in the total sense is, in the present circumstances, even of internal affairs in unsettled countries, impossible. It has been now established beyond doubt and demonstrated by experience that no nation can be governed by another people against their will. A considerable reduction of armaments is possible and desirable in order to release resources for promoting happiness. The U.S.S.R.'s initiative in this respect is most commendable.

Question three : I have been shrieking for a total ban on all nuclear weapons and for the immediate stopping of all nuclear weapon tests that cumulatively and irretrievably pollute the world and gravely threaten to hurt the normality of future generations of humanity. Any scientific opinion that now lamely seeks to minimise the evil is obviously a political prostitution of science. Every proposal to stop these tests is most welcome and opposition to it is wicked.

July 24, 1956

RADIO-ACTIVE POLLUTION

WHY do we allow ourselves to be classified as backward and receive aid from superior nations who generously wish to raise us ? We are not backward and we do not wish to be gradually involved in the doubtful superiority of all-round expensive life as individuals and as a nation. We can help ourselves to fulfil our mission in life whatever we feel it is.

By all means let us fit ourselves into world co-operation,

but not as poor relations who must be silent about the bad behaviour of our benefactors. What I am driving at is that we cannot effectively protest against nuclear armaments and radio-active pollution of the world, if at the same time we go on taking financial assistance from the guilty nations.

The U.N. has refused to stay the British or any other test explosions, either in Trust Territory or elsewhere, whatever be the scientific evidence about the lasting cumulative evil effects on the present and future generations of the radio-active fall-outs. America is of course deaf to all protests. Her one consuming passion, Fear, makes her blind and deaf to all else but security through demonstrated power to destroy in retaliation. Britain and America who have joined in refusing to stop this process of pollution of life on this planet have, we should realise, declared a nuclear war against humanity.

In their preparations and strategies against those who, they consider, are their potential or possible enemies, they do not care about other people's rights or what happens to them. International morality is at an end.

What about the Russians, it will be asked. They have repeatedly and publicly declared, and have recently made it plain again, that they are ready to stop this poisoning process and want all the powers to come to this decision at once, but their proposals have always fallen on deaf ears. Instead, arguments based on mistrust are advanced for inspections *et cetera* which are likely to operate as incentives to baneful competition rather than to a termination of this evil.

What we are up against is not a cold war but a real hot radio-active war against us all. Let us recall to mind the principle which played so important a part in our own national evolution. We realised the truth when Gandhiji explained it to us that it is no use protesting, when at the same time we go on taking benefits from the wrong-doer. We bear no ill-will but we must drive our protest home. So long as America and Britain know that we are gratefully receiving benefits from them, our protests can have no effect. Indeed I go so far as to say that we must be taken to be co-operating with them in these test explosions so long as we receive aid from them. Do we really deem the value of these benefits that we receive from them to be much greater than the evil that these nuclear tests are, or is it mere thoughtless drift?

If we desire that our protests against this continuous radio-active pollution should be taken seriously, we should forego assistance from those responsible for the obstinate disregard of those protests.

If we are resolved on fighting a great evil with moral weapons we must be prepared to suffer losses and privations as a result of our opposition. That is how we fought the British. It is time we face the issue squarely. We should declare that these activities of nuclear powers are acts of aggression and we should demonstrate our conviction by readiness to forego something that is valuable for the sake of that conviction. If our national plans of development are going to succeed, certainly they will not fail for our foregoing these benefits and because we reconcile ourselves to some consequent delay in the execution of our plans. Maybe this sacrifice will put more spiritual content into the propaganda about our plans. It will be linked to a world-benefit and to a great moral issue.

Swarajya, July 28, 1956

HIROSHIMA DAY 1956—A MESSAGE

AUGUST 15 is our Independence Day. But August 6 before that is the anniversary of Hiroshima. On that day the pilot trial of the atomic bomb took place. Japan can never forget it, for on that day began what is called the atomic age by those who think it is a good thing.

Every new organisation or factory has its debris to be disposed of, and the debris of the atomic reactors will ruin the world, unless we invent a way of shooting it all into the moon, there to stay!

A trust area has been created near Japan for the victorious nations of 1945 to carry on their explosions and further researches into the speediest way of ending human progress. Japan's suffering has not ended with Hiroshima.

May God grant to the men in power among the great nations the light that can come only from above. Let us devote August 6 to prayer that this may happen.

George Kennan, an eminent publicist of America, former U.S. C.R.—4

Ambassador to the Soviet Union, recently said that "the image of a Stalinist Russia poised and yearning to attack the west and deterred only by our possession of atomic weapons was largely a creation of our own imagination against which some of us who were familiar with Russian matters tried in vain over the course of years to make our voices heard." Even America may shed her fear of the U.S.S.R. once Heaven so wills it.

All the science doctors that were honoured with the Nobel award have warned, but it will be all in vain unless God wills that politicians should think otherwise. May He so will it, let us pray on August 6.

TAMING THE BOMB

MILITARY activities in research on both sides at present appear to be assiduously engaged in the designing of relatively milder nuclear weapons. The race for destructive capacity has defeated its own purpose. So now, the object is to produce weapons which while serving to destroy on a more extensive and effective scale than conventional weapons will yet not be so greatly destructive as to invite reprisals from the other side against city populations. The idea is to utilise nuclear energy for warfare but to tame it to a lower level in order to keep off the total horror. The nuclear powers have stocked enough thermo-nuclear bombs of the civilization-destroying type ready on each side, if it comes to it, for retaliatory use. The capacity of these is so monstrous that compared to them the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs are mere children's toys.

All this wealth of satanic weapons has however achieved nothing, for their very power of total destruction bars their use. The law that makes human wishes vain has operated. Hence the present drive is for the making and testing of weapons that can be considered 'usable.' The objective is to make bombs as well as the means of effectively delivering them, such as will confound and incapacitate the enemy without enraging him to the point of an insane reprisal involving city populations. The hope is that a nuclear war can be designed which will not mean the wiping out of civilization as predicted by the scientists. Professor Raymond Aaron seems to think that this is possible. But the hard truth is that war in the atomic age cannot be limited in this manner.

The use of nuclear explosives even if either side starts with only the milder types will lead to the total horror that is sought to be avoided. The belligerent who feels he is in a dangerously inferior position will surely have recourse to what is sought to be kept out of the programme. The attack on city targets with high-grade thermo-nuclear bombs is bound to follow. At the moment when the crisis of defeat is reached and surrender must be faced, no considerations will have weight enough to defer the use of the H-bomb. The enemy is sure to use all the power he has and will not mind dragging all mankind into the catastrophe. We cannot tease and wound a tiger without making it angry.

The way to prevent the enemy from using the weapons that will spell total horror is not the engagement of the enemy with less horrible weapons but the renouncing of all atomic power for destructive purposes. Tit-for-tat cannot be regulated. The *tit* will at each step be bigger than the *tat*, until it reaches the total horror plane. Nations at bay cannot be expected to preserve sanity or consideration for others. The side threatened with utter defeat will cease to be rational or normal.

If what is sought to be done with milder explosives is effective defeat, the atmosphere created by all that must happen to reach the point will be such that it is most unlikely that any restraining influence will be felt. The angry enemy facing defeat and surrender, shame and disaster and the penalty of 'war-crime,' will not agree to it with self-respect but would rather disappear, taking along with its own disappearance millions of men and women on the opposite side and human civilization with it.

It is futile to try to devise ways of carrying on nuclear war without leading up to city-bombing. The monster whom the scientific nations have indentured for fighting their battles cannot be tamed to tactical requirements.

It is not as if the clever technicians at work in this new phase of research are unaware of the futility. But they hope against hope and are blindly led by science. Science drives them, it is not they who drive science. Satanic knowledge has acquired an inorganic soul-less will-power of its own which is irresistible. And so they are all absorbed in this vain chapter of research. Much the better occupation would be to devise a way to summon the courage to take the initiative for unilateral renunciation of all nuclear weapons of any sort or type. If this be not possible, let

the nations devise steps for an agreement all round for such renunciation. It is not as if this last is impractical, for there is a definite offer from Moscow which has not been withdrawn and which awaits acceptance.

Peace News, London, September 12, 1956

MUST NUCLEAR PREPARATIONS GO ON ?

WRITING on the subject of 'Security' in a high-class journal issued from Harvard, Mr. James Burnham poses the question: "Is war worse than Communism?" He asks: "What is at issue? No sane person will wish or choose all-out nuclear war for its own sake. What then is in dispute? The issue is, whether war in the nuclear age is worst of all, worse than *anything*? Specifically, the issue is whether war is worse than Communism."

He proceeds to analyse the position and contends that the consequences of acceptance of this doctrine that war is worse than anything and therefore worse than Communism, would mean surrender and the acceptance of defeat.

This appears to be a fallacious simplification of the issue of nuclear weapons. The confusion arises over the use of the abstract word, Communism. No one can possibly believe that war can be a means of demolishing Communism or any other 'ism.' No one seriously suggests that armed forces can hold philosophies or ways of life. The dilemma, properly stated, would be: "Nuclear war or submission to force and aggression by a Communist State."

It is not Communism that we level our guns against. It is a Communist State and its armed forces that in the hypothetical case we have to resist. Armed forces resist not Communism but aggression, plain and simple.

No one will deny that war is preferable as an alternative to grave dishonour of any kind, if there be no other way of opposing it. But other means are certainly preferable to war. Any grave dishonour threatened presents the same problem as aggression by Communists—for example, to refer to a topical issue: aggression by U.K. and France against Egypt. It must be admitted that

war is *not* worse than grave dishonour and grave injustice of any kind, be it threatened by Communists or by any others. But, should we not find other ways of meeting aggression or dishonour rather than assume that nuclear war is the only alternative to defeat and submission to injustice and dishonour?

Again the issue is whether the mere apprehension of aggression at a future time justifies the preparation for nuclear war and all that it implies. Indeed, it implies a great deal that trespasses on the natural rights of other peoples who are not in the quarrel.

These considerations vitiate Mr. Burnham's logic. And therefore, the quantitative nature of the destruction involved in the use of nuclear weapons becomes very relevant, and is not, as Mr. Burnham argues, irrelevant. The evidence of eminent men of science—whose eminence is of the Nobel-Prize-proved type and not merely of the vague and general variety—must be accepted if the human race does not desire the annihilation of civilization. Satire or any other literary device cannot throw doubt on their evidence which has been publicly given without a dissentient voice in clear and unvarnished terms.

Maybe democracy and pacifism have no valid arguments to meet Mr. Burnham's case for secrecy or national security. But the nations that are not involved in the hot or cold war have certainly a claim to urge that has not so far been attempted to be met, against injury done and lasting injury threatened by the would-be belligerents. If nation A must fight or prepare to fight nation B with diabolical weapons, is nation A justified in poisoning people C or people D and their future generations on the ground that it is inevitable in A's attack or defence against B? If I cannot conduct my quarrel without causing damage to my peaceful neighbours, I must abstain from causing that damage. No one is allowed to commit even a small nuisance to others by erecting a factory of great importance to his own financial interests. International damage is not less than what is prohibited by domestic law, but immensely greater, and the prohibition must in that proportion be of greater validity.

Swarajya, September 29, 1956

A STRANGE CONSEQUENCE

WHEN America began her research in the explosive and destructive potential of the atom and discovered a radio-active weapon of immense power, she thought she finally won her place in the sun and could feel high and secure in the midst of a vastly inferior crowd of nations. Alas, however, the Devil had wings and escaped into the enemies' camp. His work was in both places thereafter and the race began. In a few years the feeling of security was gone and was replaced by a terror the like of which no one had known before. It seemed this terror could never be escaped and the Powers were doomed for all time to live in an unbroken nightmare.

But philosophers, civil and military, came to the rescue, and assured the Powers that out of evil cometh good and these nuclear weapons that came to stay actually *prevented* war, and so they might offer thanks to the very Devil. They said, here was Evil frustrated in a strange way and where Jesus and Buddha failed, the A and H bombs did the trick of bringing Peace on earth.

Some sceptics croaked dissent and said that this unbroken Terror was no better than war, that the maintenance of a balance of nuclear power meant an ungodly wicked waste of the world's resources, and that we could even so not rule out the catastrophe one day that will end civilization and doom man to begin from the cave again. These fears were expressed but had no visible effect on the Proud Powers to whom an inferiority in armament potentiality meant immediate danger. So the race is going on to the immense satisfaction of watching Satan. The atmosphere of the earth and the waters on which it floats is being continually poisoned for future generations, the race during Peace being not much less dangerous than War itself.

The psychological effects of the nuclear danger are unfolding themselves in strange and yet newer ways. It has begun to be realised now that war has not been banned by this Great Terror. The Powers are inventing *localised* destruction and designing ways to hurt one another in a graduated way. Not total destruction, but graduated retaliation shall be the target of our inventive talent, say the new scientists that have been hired by the Powers

to help their armament programme. Here, too, both sides are at work and the race has begun. Both sides are rapidly testing, trying and progressing in organising 'graduated retaliation.' The Devil is laughing for he knows better what it will be than these military scientists.

There are some nations who are neutral, who hate war and all these preparations. They imagined they would just be peace-makers and help the war-mongers to maintain peace, even if they must keep this armament race going. But what do we see now ?

The threat of war is used not only against one another as a deterrent against aggression, but it is used effectively against the peace-makers themselves—"Make peace, force acceptance of terms such as we impose, otherwise we are likely to burst and you will see civilization disappear !" This is what the nuclear Powers, one or the other, tell the peace-makers. And so the latter are more terrified than the cold war participants themselves and are gradually getting lost in the fray.

We have arrived at a strange and unexpected development. The idea that nuclear weapons have ruled out war has proved wrong. A power can wage *localised* war and win its unjust objective, for the rest of the world dare not intervene because that may lead to an all-destroying war with nuclear weapons. To illustrate, an attack on Egypt will not mean a big war, for the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. do not want a nuclear war in any case and between the two evils would prefer to let Egypt be crushed. They would be disinclined to intervene. To give another illustration if only to avoid a charge of prejudice, let me state a hypothetical case. If India led physical force against Goa, once upon a time it was thought it might lead to world war and so force against Goa was ruled out. But now it seems that if—God forbid that it ever be done—India exercise her national right to end this Portuguese anomaly in India by force, the probabilities are that no nuclear power will intervene for to them their own existence is dearer than Goa and her affairs. This was not the case before the 'atomic age.'

Strange are the ways that things take ! The Atom no longer deters. It actually isolates the weak from possible external protection. The call of justice will no longer be heard and aggression will have a freer field. There can be no salvation for the world

unless nuclear armaments are banned and to this end the whole world must unite and work.

Swarajya, October 20, 1956

INTERNATIONAL TOTALITARIANISM

NORMALLY, we in India can find nothing to interest us in the trends of American electioneering. But it appears that the battle between Stevenson and Eisenhower has taken a turn that must interest even us in India in a greater measure than mere news-hunger. The Democratic candidate has definitely and stoutly taken up the issue of test explosions and stuck to it in spite of Eisenhower's appeal to the chronic fear of Communists which America suffers from and by which the people of that great continent can so easily be whipped into frantic partisanship. Stevenson has so far stood firm and declares that it is folly to go on piling what is useless for either offence or defence and cannot add in the least to security but only augments danger to the world and with it to America also. The American President's latest defence of the test explosions is that they are required for organizing civil defence measures! It has never been reported during any of these many nuclear tests that scientists or engineers were engaged in investigating this aspect of the matter.

There seems little ground to doubt that these tests were solely intended to make new ultra-monstrous weapons or to discover ways of using these satanic inventions along with conventional weapons and as a deceptive part of old-time munitions. It was never hitherto hinted that the devising of safety measures was the aim of these terrible explosions. It is therefore legitimate that those interested in the abolition of nuclear war should pray for Stevenson's success although American domestic politics is not our concern.

The cry of 'security' which reverberates so loudly in America is an unquenchable fire such as is so often referred to in our scriptures. It is really a hunger for liquidating all possible enemies, which of course is impossible. He who today is friend may become a foe the day after tomorrow. Indeed Stalin and his P. R. ...

were great allies during Roosevelt's time. Now the world knows what has happened to that friendship. As national parties in power have a craving to abolish all opposition parties to become totalitarian and that, too, in spite of every confession of faith that an opposition party is always necessary for the working of democracy, so also in international affairs, although a balance of powers is secretly admitted to be the safest thing for the world, and co-existence is proclaimed to be possible and desirable, nations in a position of power are not satisfied and cannot sleep for the thought that there is a co-existing power to whom science is not a stranger and who does not lag behind in the possession of demoniac weapons of destruction. There is a hunger for totalitarianism in international affairs even as there is in domestic politics. The nations have to learn co-existence yet, even as they have learnt to run democracy without fear in spite of the existence of an opposition party with a large following. This will come about only with substantial disarmament in conventional weapons and total abandonment of nuclear munitions open or concealed. This again can come only when nations begin to accept one another's word and give to an offer the full value it bears on its face. The policy that America has been following, of not trusting what is solemnly offered to be undertaken on the other side, must be given up.

Swarajya, November 10, 1956

INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES

THE Daily Express Service tells us that the U.S. Air Force is ready with the first model of a ballistic intercontinental missile that makes 1,500 miles "in a matter of minutes." 'Thor,' the Pagan god of war, is the appropriate name given to this weapon. We are told that the U.S. Air Force is establishing a centre to train men in firing these intercontinental pilotless missiles. We are assured that America is well ahead of U.S.S.R. in these matters. Whoever is ahead and whatever be the velocity of these missiles, as I have asked many times, are the people in between the firing party and the target across continents to submit

without any rights of protest? Are they to remain unperturbed on the assumption that either or both belligerents employ such expert and accurate hands that the self-operating missile will not go wrong or miss its way on any occasion and will not destroy other people and other towns that are to be crossed before reaching their targets? Is sovereignty over the atmosphere above no longer to be deemed a valid right of nations?

A few days ago we read a report that a test missile of this sort went amuck and nothing was known of what became of it. Surely the nations of the world have some rights too while this mad race between U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. is going on. No one seems to care and yet there is sickening talk of morality and love of peace. These intercontinental missiles are a challenge to the whole world and not only to the partisans in the cold war. The issue has never been squarely faced by those who have an undoubted right to protest. If General Motors devise a pilotless motor car, can we let it go at, say 500 miles an hour, through New York or the Calcutta streets relying on the perfect condition of the safety mechanism? The I.C.B.M. is a thousand times more reckless.

Swarajya, December 22, 1956

TO THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA

I AM renewing the appeal I made during Christmas 1954 in the *New York Times*. And I shall do it quoting a great American.

General Douglas MacArthur asked in a speech on January 20, 1955, at Los Angeles: "Must we live for generations under the killing punishment of accelerating preparedness for war?"

General MacArthur was discussing a "possibility that would mark the greatest advance in civilization since the Sermon on the Mount." The present tensions, he said, were kept alive by "two great illusions."

He used this term to denote the belief, on the one hand of America, and of the Soviet on the other, that sooner or later its adversary intends to strike.

"Both are wrong," the conqueror of Japan declared, and

said that the problem was one of "who will lead? When will some great figure in power have the imagination and courage to translate the universal wish for peace into action?"

A miracle is the only solution for the cold war. When God wills that America should wield the courage for it, that miracle will happen. Divine missions are not given to two at a time, nor ever to delegations with typed briefs negotiating with and suspecting one another.

Unilateral Initiative and no other is the way to smite the illusion referred to by General MacArthur, and to do away this wasteful monster, "this peace of balanced terror."

The problem is of leadership, of a divine mission, not of negotiation. To quote the hero of Japan again: "Old methods no longer suffice. We must break out of the strait jacket of the past. There must always be one to lead, and we should be that one."

"Why don't you address this appeal to Russia also?" ask adherents to the principle of parity. Jesus has answered the question nineteen centuries ago. You do not cast pearls everywhere and surely there is no meaning in asking two hostile parties to take 'unilateral' action. I can make my appeal only to the one I have faith in, and who has more than once shown capacity for moral leadership.

Peace News, London, December 14, 1956

1957

RADIO-ACTIVE CONTAMINATION

The Hague, January 8—The Dutch Government told Parliament yesterday that precautions against food contamination would become necessary if nuclear weapon tests continue at the present rate. Measurements taken after each test showed an increase of radioactivity in the air and in rain and drinking water. Apart from weapon tests, there was also a danger that the peaceful use of atomic energy might cause harmful radiation, according to a Government reply to a parliamentary question.

THE above is a Reuter's message. It has found a corner in some of the Indian newspaper columns. At least the Dutch Government has realised the gravity of the situation. No precautions save putting the food market in caves and underground cells can meet the danger and such would be a manifestly impossible programme for continual practice : continual, because the contamination is not when an air-raid is on and a siren is sounded, but always, right through day and night and all the year round as long as the cold war is going !

It is not only the military weapons, but the so-called peaceful and unwanted use of atomic energy instead of conventional fuel that will cause this nonstop contamination. Truly the Forbidden Fruit is operating. Man will not retrace his foolish steps. He must slide down to perdition for he has discovered a great thing and will not give it up ; *anichchannapi vaarshneya, balaadiva niyojitah*. He goes on doing the wrong things as if pushed by external force to do it, though he knows it is wrong. Such is the compelling urge of the know-how !

There is no alternative for saving humanity but the total giving up of this atomic energy. For the evil strikes at the root of the matter, the seed of humanity, which according to Darwin, it took many millions of years to shape.

Chennaiya, January 19, 1957

THE RISING TEMPO OF DANGER

THE message of Christ and the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi were that the more powerful should unilaterally take the first step to counter wickedness. But the exact opposite of it we see in Eisenhower's Budget Message to Congress for 1957-58. Never was a louder voice of war heard in the history of nations including even Hitler's mad career. The American lion's roar is redoubled in tone by the sounding board of Dollars infinite.

"We shall continue to expand our nuclear arsenals. Until an agreement for limitation of armaments is negotiated and an effective inspection system is functioning, the nation will continue to increase the number and variety of nuclear weapons. In the fiscal year 1958, emphasis will be placed on weapons for tactical purposes and weapons with reduced radio-active fallout. By the end of the current fiscal year the stock-pile of strategic and critical materials will have reached a value greater than 6,000 million dollars."

The American Budget, in spite of this, is a balanced budget. That is to say, the resources of America are gigantic and they will be put into full service for the accumulation of nuclear weapons for use when fear and anger reach a predestined point. Thus is human civilization threatened with destruction. America is making more and more danger and calls it 'peace' and commands the world to sit on that pile of danger.

All efforts will be put forth for making the diabolical Atom play the role of conventional weapons and in such a way that the objections of humanitarians could be bamboozled into silence. "Until an agreement is negotiated"—is the velvet phrase that hides the mailed fist. Anyone can see that the way to bring about any negotiation is completely blocked by this provocative challenge of brute force. The pride of the American Budget of 1957-58 is a record performance in the history of the world. It was an unfortunate date for the world that a war-lord was re-elected to the Presidency of America.

Psychological studies are said to command the largest vogue in America. Yet it is the Government of America that is doing all it can to provoke the forces of evil and destroy any chances

that yet remain for conversion and for the recovery of courage and sanity. America has come to believe itself to be a chosen agent to guard the world against the evil of proletarian mismanagement. "One of the besetting infirmities of living creatures is egotism," said a great student of history. This truth applies to living organisms of all kinds including national governments. It is in full swing in Eisenhower's administration which has determined to build up and look upon a dynamite barrel as Peace.

As a result of the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt and the American preparations over the Middle East, the function of the U.N. is rapidly becoming paradoxical—the protection of the smaller member-States against the aggression of the States wielding supreme authority in the U.N. Assembly itself. "If the salt lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men—" strong language, but these are words of Jesus Christ as given in the Holy Book.

Swarajya, January 26, 1957

THE SPREADING DANGER

THE new policy of America of putting toned nuclear energy in the field is perhaps even more calamitous than the bombs of total destruction. Pitching the explosions at lower intensity and dressing the atom up as part of the conventional equipment of military forces deployed in various parts of the world is fraught with grave and permanent evil, because of the insidious completeness of its penetration into orthodox military strategy. This masking of the Devil has been under way for a long time, and it transpires from Eisenhower's recent announcement of 'Atomic Fire-Brigades' that things are now ready for an extensive policy of fixing up low-pitch atomic bases in Asia wherever the Communist danger is smelled. Atomic bases are sure doom for the territories they will be located in. Nothing but predestined catastrophe can be the meaning of succumbing to the call to serve as tools for such a provocative strategy.

Once upon a time some of the philosophers of science thought the very monstrosity of nuclear weapons was a blessing in disguise, because they believed civilized man would abandon war in which these weapons would now surely play a part. But this paradoxical argument has been circumvented by the now toned-down weapons of nuclear explosion. Each discharge will not destroy a whole continental area but only a thousand square miles will be affected, and it will be done only as graduated strategy may require! All this is indeed the Prince of Darkness's progress towards his impending victory over civilization.

How long will the West continue to refuse to recognise that Russia may now truly desire peace and co-existence and there may be no deceit in it? How long will the West continue to persist in rejecting the proffered hand? How long will America go on doing what she knows to be of no use, namely, to oppose doctrine by military force?

The cold war is eating into the vitals of all nations involved and even those not involved. Disarmament is fleeing farther and farther away as the need for it is growing greater and greater. The toned atomic energy weapons have set the seal of impracticability on ever reaching agreed disarmament.

There is only one way of getting out of the present world mess. But that would be only by the grace of God. Britain is great still and if the Power above guides her, she will one day declare herself neutral in the cold war! Such a declaration will work a real revolution and bring in the dawn of a new day for the world. Perhaps this is Britain's mission.

The cold war cannot be eliminated by more and more nations being invited to join it. That will only serve to intensify it. It will fade out only if, one by one, nations get out of it, and declare neutrality. It will then meet its natural death one day.

Swarajya, February 9, 1957

THE WESTERN MIND

THERE is fine material and plenty of scope for study by Eastern psychologists of eminence in the attitude and approach of Western nations and their leaders towards problems concerning non-Western peoples and the non-Western areas of the world. One cannot help wondering sometimes whether if an Asiatic Government, comparatively poor and otherwise backward, held the secrets of nuclear fission and fusion and used that knowledge for warlike purposes and experimented as the nuclear powers are now doing with explosions, contaminating the air and waters of the world and spreading deleterious radio activity and perverting the genes of humanity and poisoning the food of men and live-stock everywhere—whether the Western nations and their governments would have sat quietly and watched. Would they not have thundered their just objection and demanded that these wicked processes should cease at once, being an infringement of the rights of other people all over the world?

Again, psychologists should examine how far and why the Western peoples take for granted in spite of all their recent protests that they have an exclusive right to colonise backward areas and give new forms of happiness to the people living in those areas, and to create spheres of influence and penetrate and 'advise' in order to protect those people against enemies and against their own weaknesses. If and when India or China does that kind of thing to people who live in neighbouring areas, it is considered inconsistent with principles of independence and highly reprehensible; but the right of America, or Britain to do these things is not only a right but human obligation arising out of fundamental charity. "Withdraw all military forces, hold a plebiscite and give what form of government the people desire under impartial external supervision" is a formula that cannot for a moment apply to South Africa or Kenya or Algeria or Cyprus, but it is a policy over which all political parties unite in western countries, being based on eternal truth so far as Kashmir or Tibet or Nepal or any other conceivable Asiatic territory is concerned.

These are not mere political controversies but interesting material for scientific psychological research. How is it that the

human mind genuinely sees differently in different contexts and what is the remedy for the perversions noticed, if any? A pilot experiment of actual destruction of human beings and their cities by nuclear bombs was made over Japan. I raised the question then whether Truman and Churchill would have done it over German people and German cities. Friends raised their brows in surprise and indignation over this suggestion of racial bias. But I am still unconvinced. It is not anything that touches the soul or the moral being. It is, I believe, just a psychological phenomenon and want of education in universalism. Look at the attitude of Western Christians over such social segregation as is observed in India and their attitude towards the same in Africa. Exaggeration and unmitigated condemnation is the attitude in the one case, whereas underestimates, cautious statesmanship and black-out of facts mark the treatment of the same disease in the other case. These things call for impartial research by competent men versed in modern mental sciences.

Swarajya, February 16, 1957

TEST EXPLOSIONS

WE are told that Mr. Macmillan's Government refuses to listen to the Japanese protests. *Critic* in the London diary of *New Statesman and Nation* writes: "To millions of Asians the atom bomb is the bomb which white men dropped on yellow men and which they would never have dropped on other white men. Every time there is an H-bomb test in the Pacific, the Asians believe that their theory of racial discrimination is confirmed."

Bombs may be exploded at high level in order to minimise the local fall-out. But high level bursts augment the radio-active material in the upper atmosphere and it returns to the earth at the rate of 10 to 20 per cent a year. The strontium found in the bones of Britain's atom-age babies and in the bones of Welsh sheep browsing 12,000 miles from the testing grounds show that the mischief is dangerous even from the British point of view. It seems as if the Destiny of the Kaliyuga is implacably working out its programme.

And now we have the Eisenhower 'doctrine' of planting 'atomic fire-brigades' in the Middle East and at other available outskirts of the Communist world ! There can be no speedier way of setting the world on fire.

Swarajya, February 23, 1957

TACTICAL ATOMICS

RECEIVING 'aid without strings' is what we are revelling in. If any one tried, one could see that what seemed a soft and pleasant bed of loose strings to dance upon, would soon develop into a coil and an entanglement for the feet. Being out of touch with affairs, I asked for dissociation with the Commonwealth as it were an easy affair. Only those who are in intimate touch can understand the entanglements !

Aid without strings apart, ear-marked military aid including 'tactical' atomic weapons, tactically so-called, are an even more complicated affair. In spite of any negative ear-marking—that is that these weapons should not be used for aggression against countries friendly to America, when 'aggression' reaches a stage of 'self-defence,' amidst attacks and counter-attacks, what exactly is 'defence' and what is 'offence' will all become as complicated as metaphysics. It is as futile and silly on the whole to ear-mark weapons as to ear-mark coins for a foolish messenger sent to the bazaar for buying odd things.

I am not an alarmist, but it will not require much greater frenzy or folly than prevails now in Pakistan, to try an aerial experiment with the tactical atomic weapons on the rear of our lines. The atomic scientists can note with mixed satisfaction how the law of nature follows its steady and predestined course. Give weapons and they will be used. Bombers carrying tactical atomic explosives will, if the Powers go on as they now do, become the normal feature of border enterprises all over the world. U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. may advertise their super and super-super bombs and their inter-continental ballistic missiles, but the tactical atom is the more disastrous invention in fact, being more tempt-

ing for actual use by ardent pupils who have no need to make them but have only to buy or beg for them.

These tactical atomic explosives can probably send to perdition a hundred square miles apiece. And a score of them fired from bombers flying in the air can accomplish quite a deal in Asia.

The American aid programme then must force India also to look out for these tactical weapons ; because, against these new explosives the only defence is a previous attack. What are we coming to, as a result of the West's mission to protect and advance the cause of backward peoples ! I write in this strain because it is better to laugh than to cry though the latter be easier.

Swarajya, March 2, 1957

STOP THIS NUCLEAR LUNACY

"GIVE the benefit of the doubt to mankind and not to the destroyers," Professor Haddow said in an address to members of Parliament. I am glad that this cancer research chief of Britain has urged in unequivocal terms what ought to be dinned into the ears of all the non-nuclear governments of the world. United and firm action has not yet been organised in spite of the urgent need for it and meanwhile the nuclear-mad governments are going on in their lunatic career. The dangers of atomic fall-out have been deliberately underestimated in many government publications. Some of them seek to confuse the understanding by pushing the danger to a distant future, as if that were an answer at all and as if present mankind were not interested in their children and grandchildren but were intensely interested in immediately opposing economic doctrine by physical force, not minding the dangerous consequences to future generations. All of us, says Professor Haddow, should address our protest to the Americans, the British and the Russians and it is not right that the Japanese should be left in isolation to appeal to the British to stop these dreadful operations. It is not the Japanese but the children of all the countries of the world that will suffer.

We cannot improve on the scientific precision and the force of the Professor's words : " The case for stopping atomic tests rests not on grounds of scientific certainty but on those of scientific doubt, on the unique responsibility of medicine, on grounds of moral certainty, and possibly on grounds of law." How can the three or four nuclear powers claim the right to poison the air and waters of the whole world in a process that science says is cumulatively injurious to generations of mankind all over the world ? The fears of particular nations and their capacity to produce these nuclear weapons cannot give them the right to commit the most pernicious of all conceivable nuisances to their neighbours. The law of nations must be invoked against this violence and a strong group of prosecuting peace-loving nations should be formed for this purpose. They cannot shirk their responsibility by waiting for the dawning of reason in the minds of the lunatics.

Here is the news item about Professor Haddow :—

Professor Alexander Haddow, British cancer research chief and head of the London Chester Beatty Research Institute, addressing a meeting of Members of Parliament on 27th February, said that the American, British and Soviet Governments had all underestimated the dangers of atomic fallout. He said the atomic tests of the past few years might result in many thousands of cases of leukaemia—a kind of blood cancer—within the next 15 to 20 years.

Referring to the recent Japanese Government note to Britain about the forthcoming hydrogen bomb tests on Christmas Islands, Professor Haddow said it should not have been addressed by the Japanese to the British, " but by all of us to the Americans, the British and the Russians."

Professor Haddow said the case for an international ban on the tests was a humane one. He said : " No one who has seen a child stricken with leukaemia can be in doubt as to the humane answer."

When will the Powers learn that peace is better than a standing army, that friendship is better than security, and that security based on cumulatively poisoning the world is as wicked as it is mad ?

Swarajya, March 9, 1957

WORLD EXPERTS' REPORT ON ATOMIC RADIATION

At last Truth has found its way out through the cold war barrage. A distinction was made by even very eminent men between ' Atom for Peace ' and Atom for War as if the evil effects of radio-active pollution would differ in the two cases. The nuclear reactors installed for peaceful purposes are just there for conversion at any time into what will serve the other object. It is like arms-aid for defence as distinguished from aggression ! The following warning from World Health experts has come not a day too early. It is a warning not ' to humanity ' but to the wicked governments and their experts who are marching their people to ruin.

Geneva, March 12. World Health Organisation experts today warned humanity that the well-being of descendants of the present generation was seriously threatened by developments in the use of nuclear energy.

This was the unanimous opinion of twenty W.H.O. experts from nine countries who met in Copenhagen last August to discuss the effect of radiation on human heredity.

The nine countries were : Britain, United States, Brazil, India, Canada, Denmark, France, Sweden and West Germany.

Their report published today said : " Radiation has been demonstrated to be one of the agents which produces mutations in a wide range of organisms from bacteria to mammals. The group is agreed that additional mutation produced in man will be harmful to individuals and to their descendants."

" In essence, all man-made radiation must be regarded as harmful to man from the genetic point of view," they said.

Swarajya, March 23, 1957

and not with weapons that will poison unconcerned nations and future generations.

Swarajya, March 30, 1957

SOVIET DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

COMPREHENSIVE, and to those who are not obsessed by implacable suspicion, obviously very reasonable proposals have been made by Mr. Valorian Zorin on behalf of the Soviet Government for reduction of all armaments and for quickly reaching a complete prohibition of the military use of atomic energy. These proposals if quickly accepted and carried out in the right spirit can save the world from the almost certain fate to which the present race in nuclear weapons of all kinds must lead.

A subtle programme has been put in operation by the nuclear Powers, of screening off spectacular fall-outs, lulling humanists to sleep by lowering potential and at the same time vastly increasing the spread of masked atomic weapons all over the world. All this is stated to be entirely defensive as it probably is genuinely intended to be. 'Defence' in the case of atomic weapons is attack and never anything else and is a misleading term. The poison emanated by the explosions is the same whatever the motive of the operator may be. In the ultimate analysis it is fear that operates in all armament programmes and there is no aggression that cannot be proved to be an advance defence against an anticipated attack. Military dialectics have made considerable progress since the last war.

We are facing today the main question: Can humanity survive if offers and proposals are not taken at face value and if agreements are made impossible by implacable distrust? Modifications of proposals, if arising out of careful analysis, are relevant. But out-of-hand rejection on the old ground of the unreliability of Soviet promises is suicidal. Few Western thinkers really believe now that the U.S.S.R. intends to gobble up Europe by force or lead a mad undertaking such as Hitler did. What was folly fifteen years ago would be impossible idiocy today. It is doctrine and not aggression that we dislike and fear. And doctrine cannot be met or stemmed by weapons, either conventional or atomic. If a quixotic attempt of that type must be made, to oppose doctrine by arms, let it be with conventional weapons

OUR CLEAR DUTY

A CRISIS has developed on the nuclear issue. The persistence of governments on the one hand and the opposition of informed and enlightened opinion on the other have both reached a pitch this month which promises a decisive conflict. My solemn appeal is that India should recognise the importance of this occasion for supreme service.

Bertrand Russell has once again come out with his powerful protest against the programme of his Government for the Christmas Island test. He has disentangled the nuclear issue from the almost unavoidable generalities about the evils of war and concentrated on the immediate question. A great man still alive with us has pointed out that to let this crime go on is to be an accomplice in it. He has used language which reminds one of Thoreau and Gandhi.

All enlightened opinion has expressed itself in severe and unqualified condemnation of these tests that are cumulatively and dangerously polluting humanity's present and future conditions for life. Again and again the wisest among the people of the world have called for a complete ban of these tests and these weapons. Again and again have the U.S.S.R. offered to accept an agreed ban.

But America has her world superiority anchored in nuclear armament. She feels it is not easy for her to deal with local conflicts in a vast world for which she has been compelled by fate to take responsibility and she feels her only policy can be to be prepared for a total war with the inescapable corollary of mass retaliation meaning total destruction of civilization. Her plans for decentralisation of destruction by means of multiplied bases spread over treaty-bound non-nuclear territories have not met with much encouragement.

Britain is emphatic that she ought not to become a satellite

as she fears she must be if she has not her own nuclear programme. Unless she explodes her test bombs, she will, she thinks, completely lose her place among the Powers.

The time has arrived when something must be done to relieve the melancholy fruitlessness of the offers of the U.S.S.R. Others who are not tarred by the brush of nuclear production must take up the battle with fierce determination. The Japanese Government, as distinguished from her scientists and her unofficial organisations, have now vigorously taken up the question. The voice of martyrdom cries through Japan's appeal and the issue has reached a high pitch. If this decisive moment is let go and the occasion is not utilised, the powers of darkness will have it all their own way.

How I wish Gandhi were alive at this critical hour in the history of the world! He would not have hesitated to throw India into this supreme battle. The moral issue is clear. In his name and inspired by his spirit let us take up the challenge. We are supposed to be in the Commonwealth. If the connection has any meaning and our being in it has to serve any purpose, it is time we solemnly demand in the name of that Commonwealth that the British proposal to carry out the Christmas Island programme against the Japanese Government's protest must be given up. We have indubitably shown that we greatly value the connection with Britain, but our continuance in the Commonwealth would be totally immoral if our protest in this matter is not heeded. The connection would be selfish and maintained for mere pottage at the cost of our soul. Our economic entanglements are no answer to the supreme call of duty to dissociate ourselves from this deliberate offence against humanity. The dissociation cannot be deemed as done if we stop with verbal condemnation. Is our Commonwealth connection voluntary or is it imposed? Is it a high-minded bond in the interest of world-peace or is it a low-class treaty for selfish purposes? If it is a noble high-minded voluntary attachment, there can be no greater or juster occasion and reason to sunder it than this criminal obstinacy of the British Government. We have the chance of rendering supreme service to humanity and I hope and pray that the Guardian Spirit of our nation may inform us now, so that the occasion may not be lost. The step I suggest is a very serious step, but the cause and the call are great and

sufficient for such a big step and history will vindicate it in golden memory for future generations. May we be blessed with the courage needed!

Swarajya, April 6, 1957

NUCLEAR TOTALITARIANISM

THE 'heartening' news has been received by a newspaper in London that America has leapt five years ahead of Russia because it is now in a position to fire a long-range rocket over inter-continental space with a hydrogen-bomb warhead. 'Heartening' it may be to the British newspaper, but not to sane men and women in areas below the flying rocket's passage in space. Even American technologists working under orders of the Pentagon may make mistakes in the course of their tests during this cold war, not to speak of activities during a period, when it arrives, of greater hurry and consequent inadvertence.

The nuclear powers have their plans. But are the rest of humanity to live under a constant dread of damage from missiles passing over their heads and humbly submit to this new domination of totalitarian nuclearism? In days of yore, according to Hindu mythology, the mountains had wings and flew over the heads of men hither and thither and Indra, the chief of the gods, led a fierce campaign against the menace of these lawless mountains and with his thunderbolt struck them down clipping their wings and reduced them to their present civil condition. The current menace of long-range rockets to carry A and H warheads darting over the heads of nations who are not in the quarrel calls for a more indignant and more terrible saviour-avenger.

Once as a youngman-at-law, I was told that nation-rights included in international law all space overhead straight up to the skies. What has happened to all those cobwebs of public law? And what has happened to the publicists whose reputation was once so great and who spent their days spinning these webs of law? Or must we wait for an 'accident' to take place for a cause of action to arise? The damage will be so compre-

hensive then that there will be no one to lodge a complaint and no one to try the action.

What has happened to the mind of the scientists that they have sold themselves body and soul to the war-offices? We read the statements of some men of science pleading that the additional pollution is each time not much. Our hats off to the men of science of Germany. Is it too late for others of their tribe to follow a good example? The time is now—it is not too early by a day—that the rights of man in the truest sense of the term must be asserted and the Proud Powers clipped of their wings and made to settle down to immobile grandeur like the post-Indra mountains. Can India find any other nation to undertake this mission? I fear the task is hers and hers alone.

Swarajya, April 20, 1957

BAD LAW AND BAD MEDICINE

WHEN some Labour members in the British Parliament raised the question of the legality of test explosions and of the walling off of 'danger zones' during the tests, the Minister of Supply replied that he was not competent to reply in such matters of law—which was true enough in more senses than one—but that there is a 'convention' that danger areas may be declared and such declarations have "never been regarded before as an infraction of the high seas." A reference to legal dictionaries will show what a 'convention' is and that the Supply Minister's claim is entirely without foundation. Impositions by force and by causing extreme fear of danger to life, however often repeated, cannot result in a 'convention' the fundamental essence of which is agreement. Nor can the practice of the nuclear powers during the last ten years become law without agreement on the part of the majority of the nations of the world who are suffering what has been imposed at the point of death without any corresponding advantage of any sort, not even an imagined sense of security through a show of the power of retaliation.

We were seriously told the other day to make up for the dangerous strontium poisoning that is steadily going on, by drinking more milk and imbibing other dairy products! Truly both medical and legal doctrines are hitched on to the military waggon in a manner that would be amusing were it not thoroughly dishonest and tragic. Some scientists appear to be ready not only to sell their souls for salaries and work for the steady and sure poisoning of the human race but also to give false testimony which is a vulgar crime not even relieved by the satanic splendour of bigger crimes.

Swarajya, April 20, 1957

THE GREATER DANGER

THE best news of the week is that the Prime Minister of India has publicly raised the question whether the nuclear powers have the right to spread radio-active poison over other parts of the world. I hope the matter will not be allowed to rest there but the issue will be vigorously fought out by all the leaders of the neutral nations of the world.

The most significant element in the psychology of present day America, the fear of communism, is a two-fold fear: a fear that the doctrine will spread and a fear of physical aggression. The daily programme of America's representatives everywhere and of her press is to spread this two-fold fear over the world and infect all nations with it. The belief is that this fear-programme is a measure of defence. The spread of this two-fold fear is expected to help the organisation of anti-Communist defence. But actually it does nothing of the sort, but only creates a pathological condition that interferes with the normal healthy functioning of individuals as well as national enterprise and the frugal utilisation of resources. It encourages the wasteful misapplication of talent and resources against a conjured-up danger and the neglect of substantial objects. Fear supplants courage with resulting deterioration of spirit. A constant anxiety to obtain external assistance takes the place of healthy self-confidence. The consequences of these are far-reaching. Nations who have

recently emancipated themselves tend to fall back into a state of financial and moral dependence.

The strange thing is that on account of this fear of communism, measures are adopted by powerful nations which are incalculably injurious to the physical basis of man's life and to the future of human civilization. I refer to the development of nuclear weapons which have now assumed the role of the main defence against communist aggression. The magnitude of this evil development is disclosing itself daily.

The pollution of the world's air, water and food caused by the testing of these nuclear weapons for adaptation for the various strategical purposes of war is cumulative and, unlike other pollutions, is not washable by water or removed by exposure to air. Scientists—not old women or persons of morbid psychology—but the most eminent well-qualified men of science have repeatedly explained the nature and the magnitude of this cumulative poisoning. They have pointed out that each relatively small addition is an *addition* to what is already there and its relative smallness is, therefore, no mitigation of the evil. Eminent and reliable men of science—as distinguished from those hired for organising manufacture in the war departments—have also made it clear that all their abstruse investigations and calculations do not enable them to make a true and trustworthy quantitative appraisal, but that the danger is beyond doubt great and they have warned mankind not to be indifferent about the consequences.

The conjured-up fear of communist aggression has made the opposing powers blind to these dire and certain consequences and deaf to all scientific warning. They even occasionally bring up witnesses to lull public anxiety on the basis that the benefit of quantitative doubt should be given to the poison rather than go in favour of caution and wisdom.

Instead of fearing what is the gravest and truest danger, America persists in indulging in the morbid fear of communist territorial aggression which she has conjured up and insists on spreading. This is a tragic error that has to be set right if we have to save mankind and civilization. The communist menace is not so serious or so certain as the menace of nuclear poison which is both serious and certain. The latter is the present menace and neutral nations must unite against this threat to man and his civilization.

The worst feature of American policy and now of British policy too, is that in trying to erect a defence for themselves, these powers consider it right and proper to cause fatal damage to man's environment all over the world irrespective of the natural and national rights of the other peoples of the world. They are able to persist in inflicting this damage on all the inhabitants of the world and their progeny by reason of their great power. Had America or Britain been a small nation it is inconceivable that either would have been allowed to commit this international crime. Had India discovered the secret and made nuclear weapons to defend herself against possible Pak aggression and no one else in the world had the technology, would we have been permitted to poison mankind? Because we could not overcome our fear of Pak aggression and preferred to defend ourselves only in that way, would we have been allowed to indulge in such poisoning? We have only to exercise a moderate degree of imagination and reasoning to see the monstrosity of the claim the nuclear powers are making to spread poison all over the world.

That America is not alone in causing this pollution and that her enemy is also doing this at the same time is an argument that does not stand to reason. It no doubt helps to confuse the real issue. Two wrongs do not make a right. So far as the rest of the world can see, Russia has, over and over again, offered immediately to ban all nuclear weapons and refrain from all further test explosions if America also would agree. But the offer has been always rejected on the ground that Russia's word cannot be trusted. No agreement can ever be reached, no peace is possible, not even a truce would be practicable, if such a stand were to be permitted. How can America claim to be trusted if she refused to trust the other party? No human agreement can ever be arrived at if this attitude is persisted in and justified. An international agreement is absolutely necessary and imperatively called for if the warning of Science is to be heeded and if we wish to save mankind and civilization. Offers become mere propaganda, only if we reject them. They become a basis for agreement if we receive them as genuine and proceed to deal with them. It is the attitude of the West that converts all Russian offers into mere propaganda.

That Russia is carrying on her tests even while she makes

these offers is no reason to reject them or to treat them as insincere. America is not prepared for unilateral action in advance of agreement and that being so, how can she expect Russia to begin unilateral action? American technologists have not called a halt to their activities because talks are going on in London or elsewhere. So have the Russians not called a halt to the activities of their technologists. Technology all over the world today has taken the bit between its teeth and is running its international race. This should not confuse the issue before us but should rather hasten us to speedy achievement of an agreed ban. One cannot expect other technologists to follow a moral law and exhibit a Christian courage which one's own technologists are refusing to do. This cannot be made an excuse for continuing the vicious circle and waging a radio-active war against the unoffending peoples of the world. An agreed 'cease-poison' must be reached immediately and any breach of that agreement should be the subject of indictment when the breach does take place. The breach should not be anticipated and the fear of it made an objection to arriving at a truce at once and working for an agreement thereafter. On issues of lesser gravity suspicions may be an answer or cause for delay. But this issue is far too grave to be allowed to be confused and postponed on such grounds. The world demands an agreement. It cannot submit any longer to this cumulative poisoning. Distrust of the Russian word is no answer to the imperative call. These nuclear explosions are a graver and more immediate danger than communism or Soviet Russia.

The Indian Express, April 20, 1957

BARGAINING COUNTERS

It is sad to find the *New Statesman* prefacing its argument for the postponement of the Christmas Island tests with a statement which seems to indicate some sympathy with the point of view of politicians who are dealing with this great moral issue in terms of what you call 'bargaining counters.' Since these 'counters' are about to be used for gambling with the future of humanity on a scale which the most eminent scientists are

unable to calculate, the decision as to whether unilateral action should be taken to stop the tests is surely not, as you suggest, a question to be decided on scientific or political grounds, but in terms of the simple choice between right and wrong.

The first principle of political, as of personal, morality is not to do wrong because another does it. The great wrong about to be committed by the British Government cannot be excused on the ground that such things have been done by the Governments of Russia and the U.S.A.

To Britain's friends in India it is a source of great grief and disappointment that British public opinion should so far have proved not strong enough to compel those in authority to see the issue in its true light, and to act. Now it seems that even the moving appeal of the Japanese people and of their government have been equally ineffective.

The non-nuclear powers have to do what they can in order to stop these tests and prevent further damage. That is why I have said that India must, on this issue, exercise her right as a partner and leave the Commonwealth. I am one with those who believe that membership in a great Commonwealth is something we should hold to be precious. But there are occasions when the best use to which you can put a precious possession is to offer to lose it. To break over the Kashmir resolution sponsored by Britain would have been selfish and wrong. Equally, to remain in the Commonwealth now would be to share in the guilt of a crime whose magnitude can only be guessed.

The hesitation of India's many friends in Britain to approve of my suggestion is understandable. It is just a further proof of their friendship, and that again is the measure of the sacrifice I propose.

Letter to the New Statesman, April 14, 1957

REQUIRED : AN ACT OF HEROISM

My friends in Britain have been puzzled by the appeals I have recently been making for gestures of non-cooperation on the part of India to emphasize India's disapproval of nuclear armaments and test explosions* and, in particular, of British policy in respect of them. I hope you will allow me the hospitality of your columns to try to remove misunderstanding by explaining my position, and to make an appeal to the British people and to all the governments who make nuclear weapons.

It is agreed that steady, cumulative poisoning is going on of the air, water and food on which the world must sustain itself, and that the health of the present generation of men and the future normality of man and his environment are endangered. In spite of the evidence of most eminent men of science and their repeated warnings, why, I ask myself, are the enlightened governments of the West proceeding with this insane plan of what they call and seem to think to be defence, but which is nothing but a reckless drive towards catastrophe ?

The causes, I believe, are distrust and Micawberism.

Taking the second first, the great powers believe that somehow catastrophe will not arrive, that the poison emitted by the continuing race in manufacture and testing may not accumulate, and that by some new magic of nature it may be dissipated. They just ignore science when wishfully thinking this, even while using science in the most real and diabolic way when making these poisons. Or do the powers go on with these tests and preparations in the hope that agreement will be reached to limit the poisoning before, in their opinion, any 'real' harm can be done ?

If this were the case, one would wish it had been explained, because distrust accumulates more rapidly than the poison, making an agreement more and more difficult to reach.

Distrust is the real menace. So long as the 'other' fellow is so incorrigibly wicked, one whose word we can never trust, how can we stop our preparations for defence ? It is because of this adamant distrust of the word of the Soviet Government that it has become impossible for either side to stop these test explosions and to halt their drive towards what science has

TWO THOUSAND SCIENTISTS HAVE WARNED

DR. RALPH LAPP, atomic scientist of the United States of America, has testified before the special Congressional sub-committee studying radiation dangers. On Wednesday, June 5, he said that there was so much radio-active matter in the atmosphere already that in Washington itself one could wipe a tissue over a car top and cause a 'geiger counter' to respond readily. He has suggested that the United States might consider creating a 'human sperm bank' to carry on succeeding generations in case of a nuclear war. The grim irony of this suggestion may perhaps be explained to the uninformed. The genetic effects of radio-activity, Dr. Lapp believes, will be so serious that to maintain the race of American citizens in health and normality, a bank of sperm of normal health may have to be opened (like the 'blood banks') for fertilisation in future generations ! Dr. Lapp is not a layman or 'fellow traveller.' He is one of the group who worked and rose to prominence during World War II in the metallurgical laboratory of the Atomic Weapons Project of U.S.A. (called the Manhattan Project). It was the project that produced the bombs that were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After the war, among other things, he has been head of the Nuclear Physics Branch of the Office of Naval Research and Director of Nuclear Science Service in Washington. He has declared it as his opinion that limited and small-scale atomic wars which are the hope of the West in their present day military circles, is a futility. (*Atoms and People*, by Dr. Ralph Lapp : Harper). He has already expressed the view emphatically in this book that "the decision to use the bomb (over Japan in 1945) will rank as one of the greatest errors of judgment on the part of U.S. officials."

Dr. Lawrence Snyder, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said on Friday, June 7, that the President was "a little out of line" in underestimating the value of scientific opinion protesting against further nuclear tests. "Certainly the men who signed the appeal," he said, "knew what they were talking about. Some were physicists, chemists and mathematicians, of course ; but the majority of them were highly competent biologists and all of them have intimate knowledge of radiation effects."

Two thousand scientists led by Nobel Prizeman Dr. Linus Pauling have appealed for a ban on nuclear tests in a signed petition.

Swarajya, June 15, 1957

THE FAMILIAR PATTERN

THERE was a gleam of hope in the closing week of June but again the sky has been darkened by incorrigible distrust and the desire to get an advantage. The international disarmament talks have assumed the familiar shape of our talks with Jinnah. Whatever you offer is a basis for further conditions and not a thing to be accepted and closed into a pact. Whenever a condition is accepted, it is treated as a concession and made a foundation for a further condition. Russia's offers have all gone to waste in the same way. Each time when the world's hope is raised reading a Soviet proposal, the reaction is a further condition that strangles the hope. One is sorry to say this, as we were sorry to say it when Jinnah was alive.

And if it is true that on behalf of his government Mr. Stassen has stated in the Disarmament Committee that the U.S.A. will never agree to the total ban on nuclear weapons even if other powers agree to it, then it is a turning point in the history of America's moral influence in the world. From now on, America will be known to stand for barbarity and destruction and the most cowardly weapons of war that mankind ever invented even when her opponent was willing to forego them. Of what use are other conditions invented to cover this disgrace, when it is well-known that nuclear weapons can be effective only if used in anticipation and can never await the enemy's attack? To refuse to give them up means a readiness to use them in advance on some pretext or other, to examine the justification of which no time will be given to any one else.

We have it now clear on the record that U.S.S.R. has declared her eagerness to agree to a ban on all Atomic and Hydrogen bombs and other masked weapons evolved out of nuclear power, whereas U.S.A. has refused to accept any such international ban. That is, if Mr. Stassen has truly declared his government's policy. If it is true, it is a challenge to all anti-nuclear weapon nations

which they must take up with the determination to win. It is civilization's cause.

Former American Ambassador Mr. Chester Bowles has recently written in the *New York Times*: "India has felt it necessary to match United States build-up of Pakistan's military establishment and committed over one hundred million dollars in hard currency toward the purchase of British and French military planes at full market price." This money, Mr. Chester Bowles points out, "was withdrawn necessarily from the funds available for India's Second Plan."

Our battle for progress therefore includes a relentless battle against the cold war of the Powers and particularly against their jet-nuclear programme. Without winning the battle for civilization, our battle against poverty will be lost as fast again as each time we seem to win. To relent in this is to lose all our policies.

Swarajya, July 13, 1957

AMERICA'S NO

NEITHER the poet's satire nor the warnings of the learned men who have attained the highest distinction in the world of science have had any effect. The solemn appeals of the Church have fallen on deaf ears and have proved as vain as the expressed fears of the biologists. America shakes it all off as "a lion shakes the dew off its mane." The evolution of nuclear power has captured the imagination of the rulers of the United States.

It is costlier than other armaments and that is an attraction by itself to America. It saves the element of human agency to the maximum and it eliminates distance. It is therefore a complete answer to the man-power and the land-mass which are the Communists' strength and America's headache. So she must have it and can never agree to give it up, whatever others may be willing to do.

After all it is her own baby to whom she gave the baptism at Hiroshima. The mother loves her child. She does not realise that it is Satan's progeny and hugs it to her bosom. And now Satan promises to make the baby quite 'clean.'

Swarajya, July 20, 1957

THE OBDURACY OF THE WEST

THE political institutions and way of life of the West are certainly far superior to those of the totalitarian governments. But in the matter of A and H weapons they have displayed an attitude that puts them far below the Soviet government in the scale of civilization. Even when Distrust has substantially disappeared, Fear seems to strangle reason and morality. Man-power and the land-mass advantage of the Soviet power and its own inferiority in these respects have created a morbid fear that has pushed the West into an indissoluble embrace of the nuclear weapon. They seem to believe that the marriage of their military policy with the H-bomb is now final and can never be dissolved.

Those vast millions of the world's people who want these nuclear weapons to be given up and consigned to the limbo of forgotten evils should cast off the hypnotism of the money power of the West and translate their just wishes into active policy. If world opinion gives up its effeminacy, victory is certain. The West German League has spoken in the language that is called for at this juncture, when the 'clean' American H-bomb is offered to the world as the coming Messiah of Peace. It is unabashedly offered as an alternative to accepting the U.S.S.R.'s repeated offer that all these nuclear weapons and bomb tests should be totally banned and the nuclear powers should sign an international agreement to that effect at once and see to its execution and for that purpose exercise all powers irrespective of national boundaries. All this is considered no good and that the coming 'clean' American bomb will solve all difficulties.

It is refreshing to read the appeal of the West German League against atomic weapons. This league claims 250,000 members and in its statement (July 10) appeals for the formation of an international league to oppose the development of atomic weapons. It asks for "world-wide strikes and boycotts to bring unreasonable and unteachable rulers to reason and make them bow to world opinion." Only a downright earnest attitude and readiness of action of this nature can stop the obduracy displayed by the Western Powers in this respect.

International friendship and good manners are necessary;

but it is fatal to include in that code a relenting towards the nuclear weapons-programme of the Powers. A tolerance of the obdurate nuclear policy of the West as it has now developed is no part of civilization. A more relentless battle is called for than what has so far been given to this monstrous and too long permitted programme that stands so justly condemned by all the enlightened leaders of humanity and science.

Swarajya, July 20, 1957

WEATHER REPORT

HOPE glimmered for a time on the horizon. But now black clouds have returned and the sky is dark again. Arrangements are being made for the winding-up of the disarmament talks in courteous and conventional terms.

The only thing that remains in the scrap-heap is a definite offer of Mr. Khrushchev that Russia is prepared here and now to sign an agreement for a ban on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. America does not agree to this. She says this offer of Russia is only propaganda. But it was in America's power at once to nail it to the counter by saying Yes.

Is deterrence better effected by an unending technical and armaments race in nuclear weapons than with this ban that Russia offers to sign? Will not an agreed ban on the use of nuclear weapons be a powerful added deterrent? If Russia and the U.S.A. and Britain lodged an agreed ban on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons in the U.N. archives, it would have been a step in the recovery of civilization of which the year 1957 could have been proud.

It is a pity that America has got into this delusion. A vast scattering about of nuclear-head missiles and weapons all over the world among the various nations, on the strength of temporary and doubtful pacts, will not build peace. Asia will be a perilous house to live in. It is easy to prepare a multi-continental network of danger, but it will not be possible later to undo the mischief. It would be a calamitous inheritance that this generation would leave for the future men and women of this globe.

1192

V211, 21y7 M

America has given, and is giving, assistance to Pakistan with the intention that Pakistan may stand up to Russia, but the thing works altogether differently. It has set up a minor armaments race between Pakistan and India, which is of major significance to us because it eats up whatever Plan-resources are available. All the internal difficulties in India's economics that have recently come into the limelight are traceable to the armaments race which India has been thus forced into. It is not easy for India to turn a blind eye on this. It is one of the reasons for the growing coldness of India towards America.

It is foolish for India ever to hope to equip her military forces to cope with any country which has America as a financing and technical partner. It may also be unnecessary to attempt it, because America will never tolerate war between Pakistan and India. Yet national psychologies go their own way. The armaments race between India and Pakistan has become a reality.

Our not being in the cold war of the West is paying a good dividend in international influence. We have been useful to others and they appreciate it. But in budgetary consequences for ourselves our non-alignment has not been of much use by way of saving us from military expenditure. Even those who stoutly oppose the new taxation measures will not ask for reduction in the defence budget. They support the armaments race, and in fact want it to be further intensified. This is the unintended consequence in India of the global strategy of Mr. Dulles.

Thus, America, while thinking and talking of helping India with funds for her Plan, is actually forcing a diversion of available funds from the Plan and reducing India's foreign exchange for nothing. America is bound to see her error if this is frankly explained. But if America does persist in this policy, India is not going to double the folly by herself accepting Defence Aid from America in parity with Pakistan. This is inconceivable for more reasons than one. India will have to think of what she will have to do to meet this difficult situation.

Whatever she may or may not do, one thing is clear. India must set her teeth against being pushed into a suicidal race in defence expenditure, in spite of the pressures that may naturally come from certain sections. It should be made plain to the world, and to America first, how the Asiatic arms policy of the United States postpones economic and industrial development and increases

local mutual tensions, weakening instead of strengthening the nations whom Mr. Dulles wishes to set up as a bulwark against Communism.

Swarajya, July 27, 1957

THE COMMONWEALTH CONNECTIONS

THE Prime Minister has claimed in his recent speech in the Lok Sabha that our Commonwealth connection "has not injured our policies or advocacy of any cause that we hold dear." I admit the claim in the particular form it is put. But must we not be prepared to throw this connection on the counter, if by readiness to give it away we can make our expression of disgust and our advocacy more effective than it has so far been in the matter of nuclear weapons about which it may be truly said that they have come to destroy and not to save or fulfil the hopes of mankind? The issue is not on a par with a question of tariff or things of that kind but is admittedly as important as civilization itself and our conviction on the matter is definite and unqualified, a conviction for which the highest form of sacrifice is called for.

Here is an offer repeated many times and most recently reaffirmed by Mr. Khrushchev at Prague, that Russia is prepared for an agreement 'here and now' to a ban on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. England does not agree and blocks it along with America. Why should not India make supreme use of her Commonwealth connection forging a sanction out of it for achieving something great and good for all humankind? Can this question stand further delay? If Britain agreed, could America resist world pressure; and will a better occasion arise for achieving the end?

If an agreement not to use these weapons be registered in the U.N., would it not certainly postpone the terrible occasion when according to Mr. Selwyn Lloyd the agreement "would not be worth the paper it was written on?" It may be admitted that "in the ultimate recourse" the promise to renounce the use of the weapons one possesses may be broken, but is it not supremely worth-while to push the "ultimate recourse" as far away as possible? An agreement by itself pushes the breaking point away.

Once this agreement is obtained and registered, making these weapons declaredly unusable, would it not be easier thereafter to discuss dismantling the stocks held and to take up all other issues involved ?

We should not accept the policy of tying up all issues together as the last word on the subject. The wedge must be driven in somewhere. The logic of entirety must be opposed by the non-nuclear powers in a combined effort because they are interested directly in the abolition of nuclear warfare and the ban on these weapons even more than in the balancing of power, round which the disarmament talks are fruitlessly turning. The united mind of America and Britain is closed against reason on this matter and so we have to think what we do about it and not drift helplessly. It is not a question only of freedom of advocacy. What is needed at this juncture is a sanction. The best and greatest use of what we possess is sometimes the giving up of it :

तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथा
tena tyaktena bhunjeethaa.

Swarajya, August 3, 1957

TACTICAL WEAPONS

SPECIFIC civilizations rise, prosper and fall. But for mankind as a whole there is no doubt of the reality of progress. This is Professor Barraclough's formula of faith in his *History in A Changing World*. His conviction however carries an important conditional clause. *If we control and inhibit the new technological implements of mass-murder in warfare*, there is every reason, he says, to believe that better periods than the past has ever known may lie ahead. This is an important qualification which cannot be too often or too strongly emphasised at this hour of crisis in human civilization. The Atlantic powers have adopted a policy that threatens the world with the opposite of Professor Barraclough's prognosis, for these seem bent on negating the Professor's condition. America as well as Britain have chosen a most perilous policy of 'economy' attempting to cut costs and reducing man-power investment in defence by shifting decisively from conventional arms to nuclear

and guided missiles. The British Premier clearly indicated the mind of these nuclear powers when recently he was answering a question in Parliament. "They *do not hope* that nuclear bombs will not be resorted to if war breaks out."

Now, this is to make war mean certain annihilation for Western Europe, if not for the whole of what has been proudly calling itself the 'civilized world.' Western Europe, everyone knows, is far more exposed to atomic attack than the U.S.A. As a well-known columnist has written in the *New Leader*, a tactical atomic campaign in Central Europe would not only mean the annihilation of the population it was intended to defend, but also lead to total global thermonuclear war.

The Social Democrats—and in this they have German public opinion on their side—oppose German possession of American atomic weapons. They also protest against the stationing of American and British atomic weapons on German soil. Their rivals the Christian Democrats have tried to meet popular feeling by re-affirming their renunciation of atomic weapon production and demanding a suspension of H-bomb tests.

NATO's new strategy has been to equip all continental armies including Germany's with 'tactical' nuclear weapons. When Adenauer gave a press conference statement in which he supported the strategy and described these 'tactical' weapons as having by now become 'virtually normal weapons' and merely a "further development of artillery," the eighteen German atomic scientists immediately issued their celebrated protest. Every notable German figure in nuclear physics has warned against any minimizing of the atomic peril and demanded that Germany should renounce the use of atomic weapons. These scientists have made it clear that their warning has nothing to do with the forthcoming German elections and their sincerity cannot be questioned. The 'atomic awareness' of Germany has undoubtedly undermined Adenauer's position.

Whatever be the result of the German elections as concerns the party position, let us hope that Germany will save Europe from annihilation which is the plain consequence of the policy of using Western Europe as a base for 'tactical' atomic warfare. The weapons may have been christened 'Tactical' by American military priests, but the policy behind these weapons is the most untactical of all conceivable policies and is sure to touch off the

total-annihilation-war that is hanging over humanity. German wisdom, born of bitter experience, may yet, God willing, guide Western Europe eventually to prefer neutrality to the cold war policies now pursued by the NATO powers.

Swarajya, August 3, 1957

PACKAGE PLAN

THE West's package plan has ended the Disarmament talks. This closes another chapter of hope.

"We must continue to poison the whole world because U.S.S.R. has no much superior manpower." If America said it this way, it would look wholly absurd and wicked. But this is the full and true meaning of the package offer.

The unanimous voice of Science and the protests of scared mankind will be listened to, only if Russia agrees to all and every one of those things that will completely remove fear of Russia in the western mind; otherwise they must spread poison for present and future generations, and in every part of the globe. This is the package offer. Surely there are men and women in the United States who can see the unreasonableness of this attitude. And if there are, they should speak out and not let America be judged by the world by what her present Government is doing.

It seems as if Great Britain has lost her soul along with her Empire. Why should she allow herself to be dragged into incalculable danger by America's scare of Russia? She has a history of unbroken courage. She has lived for centuries within a couple of hours' reach of her enemies without losing her head. This courage of Britain has gone into classic poetry. Why should she agree to a U.S. and U.S.S.R. race in producing an illegal intercontinental ballistic armament which, when ready, means total destruction at any moment for her? There can be, it is obvious, nothing more deadly and dangerous for the countries of Europe including Britain than this contemplated intercontinental transport of timed 'A' and 'H' bombs across the Atlantic, be it from west or east. And if a ban on all nuclear weapons is offered, would it not be wise for her to accept it for whatever it is worth?

It appears as if in the middle of the twentieth century, Reason stands dethroned. Can it be that the world must wait for a great catastrophe somewhere, to resume commonsense thinking? Can it be that it is God's intent that a trans-Atlantic automatic H-bomb must miss its way and stop to burst at some wrong place and then Reason wake up?

The Powers are gambling with life and civilization. The story of Yudhistira staking his wife and brothers in the Mahabharata gamble pales into flatness before this great and foul enterprise that has been conceived and is threatening to take shape. It was a moot point whether the foolish Prince of Hasthinapura had the right to stake his wife and his brothers. It was violently challenged by Draupadi. But the nations that are not in the cold war have not the courage of that princess to talk straight and ask the U.S. to accept the Soviet offer and not to tie up the nuclear ban with other disarmament issues.

Swarajya, September 14, 1957

LIVING BY THE BOMB

THERE was considerable dissatisfaction in certain sections of the American Press at the confession made by President Eisenhower in July of this year that in 1945 he had found it far from easy to uphold the American way of life against Marshal Zhukov "through the long and many discussions" that they had about their respective doctrines. In reaction to this anti-American admission, James Reston of the *New York Times* asked: "Do you want to leave the inference that it is difficult to defend the proposition that democracy is a more idealistic system than Communism?" Others suggested that the President of the United States should "give more time to books and less to bridge, more time to appointments with Washington, Emerson, Jefferson, Franklin, Whitman, Lincoln and others, and less to appointments with Dulles, Nixon, Knowland, Sherman Adams, etc."

Zhukov claimed that Communism appealed to the idealistic and the American system "completely to the materialistic." The President confessed he had a very tough time trying to defend

the American position because Zhukov said : " You tell a person he can do as he pleases, you appeal to him through everything that is selfish in man. We tell him that he must sacrifice for the State, which is more idealistic."

Eisenhower's failure to meet Zhukov's point was taken up by many journals, and the explanation was offered that Ike " let it go too much in terms of black and white. Both sides are mixed, all systems are in fact mixed, much more than their champions like to admit."

But that would be a way of withdrawing from the contest. The real bottom of the matter is, however, something else. The free way of life as distinguished from Communism accepts the element of selfishness in human nature and exploits it for the benefit of society. It seeks to canalise the energies issuing out of materialistic selfishness in the direction of the welfare of the community. The process is, though regulated by the State, largely based on willingness. Communism ignores human nature and seeks to attain society's material welfare by force, fear and the strength of imposed habit. Therein lies the essential difference that ultimately leads in the one case to the spirit of the individual surviving, and in the other to its being killed on the altar of State compulsion. What is based on a conflict against human nature always carried with it the seeds of revolt. What accepts human nature and canalises it makes for lasting peace.

Again, the President might have taken up the issue of democracy against totalitarianism : democracy, which gives first place to the wishes of the people, and totalitarianism, which gives first place to the materialist goal and shapes its course through coercion.

But what concerns humanity today is not the psychological or logical justification for either of these two ways of life. We have to deal not with possibilities and alternatives, but with facts. The two ways of life have been respectively adopted by large masses of people, and the experiments are going on. What causes grave concern to the rest of the world is that both these ways of life have got wedded to new weapons of mass destruction fraught with incalculable harm to humanity and civilization both in the processes of manufacture and in their use when the hour strikes.

Judge Robert Wilkins, in a recent article in *Freedom and Union*, Washington, writes :—

' If events and attitudes continue in their present trend, one could today predict a third World War as confidently as President Wilson predicted World War II in his famous St. Louis speech. There is a scriptural adage that still applies. If we substitute ' bomb ' for the word ' sword,' it takes an increased significance : Those who live by the bomb will die by the bomb."

The words " those who live by the bomb " have an additional meaning beyond that of the words of Jesus about the sword. The manufacture of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles gives employment, and very great profit to a large number of private capitalists. To change this policy requires, in democracy, the courage to face a great dislocation in internal economy, in addition to the considerations associated with defence. Difficulties in correcting the fundamental error of nuclear policy have been increased by reason of this. Vested interests have been created in the bomb. Past attempts at disarmament, in the days when the Powers possessed only what are now called ' conventional weapons,' were repeatedly frustrated for this reason, although the change-over of factories, equipment and skill would have been a relatively simple matter. The processes of nuclear weapon production have greatly magnified the problem, and even if all other difficulties were removed this would be a very big hurdle. It is a serious additional misfortune for the world that people running the nuclear race have settled down to *live* by the bomb—live, in a very material sense, and not alone in the sense that Jesus condemned.

Swarajya, September 30, 1957

AMERICAN ARMS AID IN ASIA

PROB- BLY no one has written such strong language as I have so often used to protest against the nuclear weapon activities of the Government of the United States, and if harsh criticism be a bar against making a friendly appeal, I should have no right to claim attention from your readers. But if fundamental goodwill and an unalterable faith in the way of life wherein state regulation of personal behaviour and occupation has no place gives a title to speak frankly to America, I have a claim. My conviction that the individual's personality should be something inviolable and sacred is a basic creed, and I hope that a fellow-believer may be given a hearing on matters that affect both our nations.

No subject can be of much greater importance than a good and true understanding between the Republic of the United States of America and the Republic of India, which holds four hundred million people, who give unqualified support to their present government under a democratic regime.

American aid to Pakistan, by way of military equipment, has again come to public notice on account of the present financial position of India. It was tolerated without much objection until this year's budget debates disclosed the full picture of the armaments race between Pakistan and India caused by this American aid to Pakistan. Resources available for our development plans have been eaten into by this unequal race for military equipment between India on the one hand and Pakistan aided by America on the other. This has resulted in severely adverse feeling against America which calls for immediate attention on the part of those who desire Indo-American friendship.

It is widely known that America agreed to help Pakistan in military equipment only in order to build up another outpost against Communist aggression. India also could have taken such assistance and maintained parity, but on several grounds which cannot be dismissed as unreasonable, India preferred not to do so. Nobody in India believes—and nobody in Pakistan believes either—that there is any intention or likelihood of Russian aggression against Pakistan. It is therefore felt in India that American aid serves only to increase Pakistan's power for mischief

against her neighbour. This belief has brought about a minor armaments race in this part of the world. Though this race is a minor one compared with the arms race between the great powers, it is a very serious one for India. That the Government of India is forced into it against its own inclination will be obvious to American readers if they scan the Indian Prime Minister's speech in Parliament on September 9. Let it be remembered that he made this speech even while sending his Finance Minister on a mission to obtain a large loan from America to make it possible to execute the second Five-Year Plan of development. The very contradiction superficial observers may see in this proves the sincerity and intensity of the Prime Minister's feeling about American military aid to Pakistan and its baneful consequences. That it is necessary to execute the Plan and that it is therefore necessary to borrow money from America are beyond controversy. From the American point of view it is also unquestionably right and wise to give India assistance for her Plan. The question on which differences of opinion may arise is whether America should continue military assistance to Pakistan, when it is now quite obvious that this assistance serves no other purpose but to increase India's military expenditure and widen her Plan deficit.

It is plain enough that the United States Government would stoutly disapprove of any aggressive operation against India, and the people of India know it. But they know also that such disapproval would not serve to undo mischief once it has begun. Nor could it serve even as a deterrent. Hence the public pressure for an armaments race against Pakistan.

I am conscious of the difficulty of any change in policy at this stage on the part of America towards Pakistan. But I believe that when a new situation has arisen and it is necessary to meet it, American statesmanship will not hesitate. It is true that an additional barrier against Communist Russia was the motive for military assistance to Pakistan. Any advantage arising out of that policy must be weighed now against what is happening to Indo-American friendship.

New York Times, September 22, 1957

THE ANTI-NUCLEAR TEST MOVEMENT

THOMAS HAMILTON, prominent columnist in the *New York Times*, writes for the September 22 issue in his survey of the position in the U.N. :—

“There is dependable evidence about the increasing amount of radio-activity from nuclear test explosions and the Soviet demand for suspending them will certainly win considerable support. It is upto the Western Powers to make a better case than they have until now for their position that nuclear tests should be suspended only in connection with a comprehensive disarmament program.”

The tragic fallacy that must be exposed, the truth that must be pushed through the hard skull of the Western Powers is that the Disarmament programme is a mutual affair between the Western Powers and Russia, but the nuclear test programme is an active war of poisoning the whole world for the sake of Western military strength.

Nothing can be a more glaring aggression than this on the lives of people with whom the West has no quarrel. There must be a limit on what one can do to protect oneself—surely it cannot go up to poisoning other people, poisoning the coming generations of those against whom you have no cause of action. This is the plain issue about these tests. The world has already been guilty of too long laches over this patent illegality. “All these sensational revelations, coming in rapid succession in the last few months,” writes Giacomo Troiano in *Contemporary Issues* (London and New York) of October-November 1957, “have opened the flood-gates of public hostility to the continuation of nuclear weapons tests. Unfortunately, it must be recognised that this opinion has not yet reached that level of determination which would make it openly decisive for events. The bureaucratic armour of the governments is still able to resist the assaults of a more and more outraged and terrified general opinion.”

The decisive defect in the movement as it has developed till now, is, according to this writer, its lack of any organisation. That is so from the American citizens' point of view. Outside of America, the position is worsened by the economic aid which

chokes the voices of nations struggling to raise themselves on the strength of dollar support. Even the strong voice of India seems muffled.

Swarajya, October 12, 1957

THE NEW DOCTRINE OF WAR

At the Tokyo anti-nuclear conference last August, Dr. Rotblat, one of the leading nuclear physicists of Britain, spoke important truth. He pointed out that in the course of the twelve years that have passed since the Hiroshima bomb, the destructive power of the bomb has been increased several thousand times. It was doubled every year and 2 to the power of 12 takes us beyond 4,000. After pointing this out, he proceeded to explain that even worse than the increase of the destructive power of the bombs, was the gradually changing attitude of some people towards the use of weapons of mass destruction—the growing callousness and the acceptance of the necessity of using such weapons in certain conditions. In 1945, the world was horrified. That horror has now paled. This growing callousness is not less of a danger than the increased destructive capacity of the bomb itself. Together, they make for a fatal combination.

What Dr. Rotblat did not refer to, and which is equally noteworthy, is the insidious attempt to assume that non-involved nations have no objection to the casualties involved in guided missiles and to intercontinentals flying over their heads with all the chances of error accompanying them. The public law that gave a nation the right of its being left alone up the entire height of space over its head is now openly ignored and denied without any protest being raised. From this to actually indulging in such manoeuvres and battles is a simple step. It seems obvious that the nations must raise their loud voices at once against such trespass. We have allowed far too many encroachments already by permitting the tests to poison the atmosphere and the waters of the seas that do not belong to the experimenting powers. We cannot allow belligerents to send intercontinental missiles over the heads of others who are not in the conflict. It seems so patent.

But the illusion of helplessness created by the nuclear power of two or three nations is so great that the most obvious of rights seem to have lapsed.

We have the right not to be in a war or to be in it. This right is being slowly but surely nullified by the big powers. These think that the whole world must be in any war that may be declared by one or the other of them. All war shall be shared by all—this is the new doctrine. If we mean to deny this new doctrine and if we are resolved to remain out when we like, we must protest betimes against preparations to send missiles over our heads, be it propelled ballistically or otherwise. The issue should be stated and squarely faced by all those who are not in the nuclear race.

Swarajya, October 12, 1957

THE TOY MOON

THE U.S. Government say they are now ready for space-missile control talks. Mr. K. W. Gatland, a British astronomer, has now realised that the legal issues of international law regarding the sovereignty of the air space above the countries of the world, should be carefully studied.

It took the launching of a Russian satellite for these intellectual realisations and thoughts of world control of what endangers the world and infringes the sovereignty of many nations. So long as it was not quite certain that Russia had her intercontinental ballistic missile technique, these issues of international law were not recognised as important, or even referred to. The definitely established superiority of Russia has, however, made a great change. Better late than never!

The artificial moon has put the U.S.S.R. achievement beyond question. The U.S.S.R. can undoubtedly shoot a missile carrying deadly mechanism across horizontal space between the Urals and the Rockies, if we have seen with our own eyes the successful vertical propulsion of the heavy satellite to where it has been circling for some days past. And so they say we *must* control this unwanted and excessive power.

It is not these toy moons that should cause worry. It is the power behind them. How one wishes we had learned to admire and fear the One Power behind the Sun and Moon and all the Stars!

Swarajya, October 19, 1957

SPUTNIK

Two problems are agitating the mind of the West which have now brought Macmillan and Ike together for consultations. These are the spread of Soviet influence in the Middle East and the psychological damage which the Russian *Sputnik* has caused to the West. The American press has frankly interpreted the British Premier's visit as an occasion to call for the pooling of the West's total technological assets in the 'struggle of ideologies.' It is felt that the mutual jealousy and strict secrecy observed so far by the Western Powers among themselves in technological advance must be dropped in order to make a united effort to overtake what the Sputnik represents. But the Sputnik is the product of the unaided power of Russia in the field of technology and science. The trans-Atlantic effort at co-operation is therefore itself a confession of inferiority. But what is this 'struggle of ideologies' referred to in the American press as if it were an incontrovertible concrete fact? If 'ideology' means anything at all, the 'struggle' must be in the plane of logic and reason, not in fire and physical conflict. It is a tragedy that a question of which way of life is the better one is to be settled by exploding bombs, like a duel with pistols to prove who spoke the truth. To some of us it would appear that he who is less effective with his bombs teaches the better way of life!

As for the other problems, the Mid-East, it is now generally accepted by the West that the much advertised Eisenhower Doctrine has failed as an instrument of policy. "We don't think that the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine is a cure-all for everything in the area," said Mr. John Foster Dulles himself at a news conference. News conferences in the United States correspond to our parliamentary question-hour. The Executive and the

Congress meet only that way in America. The statements made in news conferences are important. The Eisenhower Doctrine has therefore collapsed.

It is an obvious consequence of the mass-destruction weapons now possessed by the cold war combatants that none of them can possibly intervene by any form of belligerent activity in any conflicts that arise in the Mid-East. Neither side would care to touch off a nuclear war at any stage of the intervention. The only available way of helping or hindering is by 'peaceful' diplomacy. The Eisenhower Doctrine based on physical force was fore-doomed to be useless from the outset.

The 'ultimate' weapons have served no real purpose in spite of all that has been and is being spent on them. They are as worthless as suicide by way of sanction in private life. Meanwhile the mutual recriminations of Republican and Democratic leaders, of scientists and defence service men in America must be furnishing great satisfaction to the Soviet leaders whose 'moon' has made the people of U.S.A. really mad. "What do we do about Sputnik?" cried patriotic Clare Booth Luce. "We take our hats off to the Soviet moon and our coats off to Russian rocketry. We collect our wits and dig into pockets. It is twelve years from Hiroshima to the moon. Six of them were Democratic, six Republican. Let us say no more."

There is a furious drive now for reorganisation of research programme in America. Not only the Democrats but the British also are now pressing for changes of U.S. policy in order to 'over-take' Russia. There is no one wise enough to tell them that accepting the ban on the use of all nuclear weapons which the Soviets proposed so often and which they have still kept open would go a great way to solve all anxiety. One affirmative Yes to that proposal is worth a dozen reorganised programmes of Sputnik or other technical research.

Swarajya, November 9, 1957

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. KHRUSHCHEV

LETTER TO MR. KHRUSHCHEV

Madras 17
November 9, 1957

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV,

Your Excellency may remember the conversation we had in Madras when you and Mr. Bulganin visited this City. The frank and clear statements I had the honour of hearing you and Mr. Bulganin make in answer to my queries during that quiet and private talk in the Governor's house and the events that have happened since then encourage me to approach you with a proposition which I trust you will not reject out of hand as merely idealistic. It is a practical move of creative power that I am suggesting, one emerging from the very special nature of the present moment.

Now that you have established beyond doubt the definite superiority of your technical achievement and potentialities which have left the opposite party dumb-founded, no gesture on your part of a peace-seeking nature can possibly be misconstrued as arising out of desire to cover weakness. I submit therefore the supreme occasion for you has arrived to declare on behalf of your country that you not merely ask for an agreed ban on nuclear weapons but you will unilaterally abjure the use of those weapons in warfare. This unqualified declaration will give the start for the moral law to work out its chain reactions in the field of the human spirit even as the broken atom does in your atomic plants.

It is not pacifism that I am asking you to declare, but only the abjuring of the nuclear weapons. It is this new development that has robbed war of all its automatic gradualness which had been the all-important safeguard for peace, for humanity and civilization to survive in spite of what would otherwise be an unqualified evil. It is therefore these new weapons of destruction that change the character of war that have to be abjured for the sake of civilization. There is a point at which man's instruments unfortunately and without his knowing it become

his master instead of being his inanimate instrument. The dangerous point has been almost reached in the case of nuclear weapons. It is necessary to halt before it is too late and to restore man's control over his tools and prevent his becoming a helpless victim of his own invention.

It is needless for you to point out to me the lapses of the Western Powers. I know them all and I have been pointing them out publicly. But a supreme moment has now arrived when your Republic can attain undying glory by a great and historic step whose moral force will be irresistible, a glory not less than Russia's heroic defence against the might and ferocity of Hitler when she bore the whole brunt of his attack. If this unqualified and absolute declaration I am suggesting be forthcoming from you, the West will have to bow in awe and reverence before your moral height. It would be an achievement in the spiritual field no less than what you have demonstrated in technology which has extorted the admiration and envy of the West. As you recently said in your Jubilee Speech in Moscow, the pattern of competition in the future will change from one of destruction to the unravelling of the mysteries of nature and the promotion of human welfare, if you take this great creative unilateral step without caring what others may do or not do.

I have made appeals for unilaterally abjuring nuclear weapons to America and to Britain in the columns of the *New York Times* and the *Manchester Guardian*. This appeal that I make to you, may I say, I make with greater hope? For as I have said already, you are in a position of great and demonstrated strength which gives you the status and power to make such a proud declaration.

With highest regards,

Yours sincerely,
C. RAJAGOPALACHARI

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S REPLY

December 3, 1957

YOUR EXCELLENCY,

Your letter has given me great pleasure, having revived the pleasant recollections of our sojourn in your wonderful country and of the talks I enjoyed with you in Madras. I remember our conversation during the concert when even the performance of the magnificent dancing art of the Indian people could not distract us from the discussion of the important problems stirring all the people who are sincerely striving for the preservation of peace.

I read your letter with great attention and I am very grateful for it. In my reply I would like to express some ideas concerning the proposal, made in your letter.

We consider your wish that the Soviet Union should make its contribution to the cause of establishing a lasting peace among the nations as an expression of the genuine nobility of your convictions, as a great concern for peace of a prominent public and state figure whose life and efforts are devoted to the struggle for the cause of peace.

In your letter you speak favourably of our country, of our people, of the successes achieved by them and in particular, of the achievements of Soviet science and technique. I shall make no secret of the fact that we ourselves are proud of these successes because they testify to the progress of the people who have liberated themselves from capitalist slavery. You are of course aware of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the population of Tzarist Russia was illiterate; Russia was a backward peasant country with underdeveloped industry. During the 40 years of the existence of the Soviet system our people have displayed their mighty forces and talents, developed an advanced industry, reorganised agriculture on the most up-to-date basis, brought up their people's intelligentsia, their scientists of all profiles. The vivid expression of the success of our people was the creation and launching of the first artificial earth satellite in the world. All this makes us happy and encourages us for new deeds in the name of achievement of the great goal set by the Communist Party, of building up in our country Communist society, *i.e.*, such a society where people will be brothers, indeed where every person will

work for himself and for others according to his abilities and where all the needs of the people will be fully satisfied. The Soviet people spare no efforts for building such a social order.

We highly appreciate the anxiety for the destinies of the world with which your letter is imbued. Humanity is facing the threat of an unprecedented war which, if it breaks out, will cost many millions of lives.

Such a perspective is especially senseless in our days when science is developing so rapidly man's possibilities for lightening his work and utilizing the natural resources, for the satisfaction of our requirements of all the peoples of our planet are increasing limitlessly. Therefore on the basis of peaceful co-existence of all states, of friendly co-operation and mutual assistance, there are all possibilities now to ensure progress and prosperity for every country and every nation.

At present, more than ever before, every honest person and society as a whole must persistently look for a way not only to put off war but to preclude the possibility of its ever being unleashed. Of course, this problem can be solved completely and finally only when mankind comes in its development to the creation of a society in which there will be no poor nor rich, where all will be equal and will equally enjoy the products of common labour. We call such a society Communist. We are convinced that humanity will achieve such a just social system in the long run. However, many efforts will be required for this because various peoples are at different levels of development and in many countries the forces which want to dominate and live at the expense of other people's labour are still strong.

Our common duty today is to avert war. If we cannot eliminate it for ever we can and must create such conditions that the people could live in peace without fears that a war of annihilation may be unleashed at the will of some mad men.

You suggest that in the name of strengthening international confidence and saving mankind from the threat of a disastrous atomic war, the Soviet Union should unilaterally declare its rejection of using thermo-nuclear weapons for war purposes. We highly appreciate the great confidence which you place in us by appealing to the Soviet Union with such a proposal and would like to be in a position to follow your advice. The Soviet Union resolutely stands for the condemnation and banning of atomic

and hydrogen weapons as weapons of mass destruction and demands their removal from the arsenals of the states. We continue to insist on this and are ready to conclude a corresponding agreement with other powers at any moment. At present the matter depends on the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain.

I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that it was solemnly declared on behalf of the Soviet Government and the Communist party of the Soviet Union at the Jubilee Session of of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in Moscow on November 6, this year, that our people had never thought and would not think of using any means of destruction provided our country was not attacked by the imperialist states. I believe that this statement answers, to a considerable extent, the thought expressed in your letter. If the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain for their part made analogous official statements, would it not be a great step towards the elimination of the threat of a new war?

As the repudiation of thermo-nuclear weapons by only one power, the Soviet Union, irrespective of how the other powers possessing such weapons will act—although we fully understand the motives of your proposal dictated by your great faith in the good beginning laid in every man—we cannot forget, however, that there are facts and circumstances which compel us to approach such questions very carefully.

You suppose that the unilateral declaration of the Soviet Union about renouncing thermo-nuclear weapons will give start to a moral 'chain reaction' in the world and the West will have to answer in the same way. I must, however, tell you frankly that the facts do not give us grounds for such an optimistic supposition.

In this connection I cannot but recollect the absolutely correct idea expressed in one of your articles that the U.S.A. cannot demand from the Soviet Union unilateral actions on stopping nuclear weapons tests if the U.S.A. itself does not intend to do the same. This consideration is the more correct when the question of using nuclear weapons is concerned.

Realising our great responsibility for the well-being and security of the peoples of the Soviet Union, can we lose sight of such actions of the Governments of the Western Powers as the creation of the network of American military bases on the territories of tens of states in Europe, Asia, Africa, along the borders of the Soviet Union and of the countries friendly to it? Have we the right to

forget that the U.S.A. and its West European allies in the NATO military bloc are doing their best to make the atomic and hydrogen weapons the main element of their armaments, and even declare about it officially?

It is also well-known that the main question on the agenda of the forthcoming December session of the NATO Council will be the distribution of roles among the participants of this bloc in the preparation of war with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The Governments of the U.S.A., Great Britain and other Western Powers persistently refuse to agree even to such measures as the immediate and unconditional suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests on conditions equal for all sides.

Keeping in mind all this, we fear that if the Soviet Union declares its unilateral rejection of thermo-nuclear weapons, those Governments which are planning evil designs against our country—blinded by their hatred towards our new system and everything that is being created by us—will yield to temptation to take advantage of the consequently weakened defensive possibilities of the Soviet Union. They may try to deal a blow to our state with atomic and hydrogen weapons to liquidate the socialist achievements attained by the Soviet people at the cost of great efforts. And we consider the achievements of the Soviet people not only as ours but also as those of all progressive humanity, of all those who are striving to build the mutual relations among the people on the basis of equality and mutual assistance and respect.

Being aware of the fact that when the Soviet Union gives its word, it strongly keeps this word and never breaks it, the aggressive circles of the Western Powers on our unilateral obligation not to use thermo-nuclear weapons would reciprocate with intensified piling of stocks of such weapons in order to achieve superiority and then to submit to the Soviet Union their ultimatum-demands.

But if the Soviet Union, having declared its unilateral renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons, after some time is forced by certain actions of the Western Powers to change its stand on this question, this might only undermine the faith of the nations in our word and cause confusion among those who struggle for peace and whose support we appreciate. Such course of events would badly harm our—common for us and you—cause of securing peace in the whole world, and would cause a great enough moral damage to the ideas of peaceful co-existence. And this, in its

turn, would complicate the struggle for general disarmament, for prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, sharpen distrust in relations among countries, intensify the armaments drive and stockpiling of means of mass annihilation of people.

All this, it is understood, would be not for the good of those who stand for the strengthening of peace but would be to the benefit of the exponents of the policy from 'a position of strength.' Is it necessary to say that we do not want at all such a development of events just as, I am sure, you do not want it either?

As you see, your proposal raises complicated and difficult problems which affect essentially the interests of security of the Soviet state and the interests of safeguarding universal peace. There was an exchange of views among the leaders of our Party and Government on the question put in your letter. Having weighed and thought over your proposal we came to the conclusion, that due to the aforesaid reasons, the circumstances, unfortunately, do not allow the Soviet Government to take upon itself the unilateral obligation mentioned in your letter.

While the Governments of the Western Powers do not display their readiness to enter the path of practical measures for disarmament and to agree to denunciation of use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, we have obviously nothing to do but continue our efforts in the struggle for peace, explaining to the peoples the perniciousness of the policy which is being pursued now by the imperialist circles.

Can we reconcile ourselves to such a situation when the dreadful threat of atomic war hangs over every man and whenever greater and greater portion of man's labour is used not for the creation of material values and raising welfare but for the production of weapons of mass annihilation and destruction? We are sure that the peoples will strengthen their pressure on the Governments whose policy runs contrary to the interests of peace and in the long run will induce these Governments to listen to the voice and demands of millions and millions of people and to find such a decision which would once and for all rule out the possibility of a war catastrophe.

In conclusion, may I, dear Mr. Rajagopalachari, wish you good health and every success in your work in the field of the struggle for peace, friendship and co-operation among nations.

Respectfully yours,
N. KHRUSHCHEV

TO MR. KHRUSHCHEV

Madras 17
10th December, 1957

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV,

Mr. Peter Petrov, first Secretary in your Embassy in Delhi brought an 'unofficial translation' of your Excellency's letter of December 3, and gave it to me personally at Madras in my little room. I am grateful to him for the courtesy shown and trouble taken.

A private person like me has reason to be proud when a letter from him is given earnest and such full consideration by your Excellency and your Government. The subject is of such momentous importance that I am grateful for the thought I have been able to provoke whatever may be your reaction to my proposal. I thank you for this.

You said to Mr. Hearst on 2nd November last: "Let us put an end to the cold war." The very pith and substance of the cold war is suspicion. The very nature of the cold war—this suspicion—prevents hope for any 'agreement' that can end the cold war. It can be put an end to only by one party or the other beginning with its own unilateral step. There is no way to end the cold war except by taking a first voluntary unilateral step in the conviction that it must lead to a good reaction on the other side. This necessarily involves risk. But the cold war cannot be ended by any process that does not involve risk. The cold war is going on developing a terrible risk by itself. We have to compare one risk with the other. Ending the cold war means suspending our suspicions.

The argument against any step towards it is suspicion itself. We are therefore in a terribly vicious circle. The more I think of it the clearer it is to me that unless we produce the miracle in the shape of unilateral action, we cannot hope to end this cold war before it bursts into flame, and I fear this is relentlessly approaching. The strikingly strong position Russia is now in, induced me to appeal to you.

If the step I suggested is unequivocally taken, the U.S.A.

will be drawn as by a steel chain to follow suit. There can be no imputation of breach of faith if by aggression the other party forfeits the benefit of the pledge and disgraces itself. If we begin this way the time will arrive when the apprehension will wear away, and as you have said everybody can sink these weapons in the sea. My appeal differs from your standing offer for an agreement in that no condition is attached to the declaration. You need not fear reproach if, by aggression, which will be universally condemned, the other party invites annihilation.

I have written this letter without waiting for your Excellency's original letter to arrive. My highest regards and greetings for the New Year.

Yours sincerely,
C. RAJAGOPALACHARI

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S REPLY

31st December, 1957

YOUR EXCELLENCY,

I have received your letter dated December 10th, 1957, in which you write with sincere and understandable anxiety about the danger of the 'cold war' and call for its stopping by means of unilateral actions on the part of the Government of the Soviet Union. Relying upon force of moral influence you consider that unilateral repudiation by the U.S.S.R. of nuclear weapons will force the U.S.A. and its allies to follow this example and will lead to the stopping of the 'cold war' and armaments drive.

I fully agree with you that the continuation of the 'cold war' by itself increases the danger of an outbreak of a new war with the annihilation of millions of human lives. One should not forget that even now there is not a single country nor a people for whom the present 'cold war' would not mean the growing of the danger of atomic war and further increase of the burden of war expenditure.

Due to the socialist nature of its regime the Soviet Union has never been and cannot be interested in the maintenance of the atmosphere of the 'cold war' and suspicions. On the contrary,

we have been doing our best to restore confidence and liquidate tension. We have extended the hand of friendship to those who told us about their suspicions and more than once have agreed, as you propose to do now, to definite unilateral actions in the sphere of disarmament supposing that others would follow our example.

In the course of the last 2 or 3 years we reduced our army approximately by 2 million people. But nobody has followed our example.

You know that on December 10, Soviet Government sent a message in reply to the appeal of the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, in which he calls upon the Governments of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union to end the tests of nuclear weapons. We readily responded to this appeal of Mr. Nehru and informed that the Soviet Government was ready to solemnly declare that from January 1, 1958, the U.S.S.R. would not perform any explosion whatever of nuclear weapons if the U.S.A. and Britain also declare their agreement to stop as from January 1, 1958, the tests they are preparing. Declaring our readiness to take upon ourselves this serious international obligation we hoped sincerely that the United States and its partners would show a goodwill and follow our example.

Unfortunately, this time also, the course of developments has not justified our hopes. In reply to Mr. Nehru's appeal and to the concrete proposal of the Soviet Government, the President of the United States declared that the U.S.A. considered it necessary to continue the tests of nuclear weapons.

You admit in your letter that the unilateral refusal to use nuclear weapons would represent a great risk for our country and would not exclude the possibility of an aggression, but you hope that the U.S.A. will not go along the way of war but will follow our example. You can see, however, that we are again and again being confronted with such facts which cannot but convince us that such a risk would be unjustifiably great and very dangerous not only for the security of the Soviet State but for the cause of universal peace as well. Judge by yourself whether we can reckon that the unilateral actions of the U.S.S.R., you speak about, will lead to desirable results in such conditions when the U.S.A. openly confirms that it does not intend to stop further development of the lethal weapon.

As you must know, American planes carrying a load of atom

id hydrogen bombs are flying around the clock over England and other countries of Western Europe. The aim of these flights is to demonstrate the readiness of the U.S.A. to launch an atomic war at any moment. If we take into consideration the fact that there are more and more calls in the U.S.A. to start a preventive war and the American Government is recommended to accept a war policy based on the doctrine of the preventive war—i.e., of an open aggression against peace-loving States—then all this compels us in the U.S.S.R. to be extremely vigilant in order to meet any unexpectedness properly.

I shall not repeat here the considerations expressed by me in my previous letter to you. Undoubtedly you are very well aware of the proposals made by the Government of the Soviet Union in the recent message to the Governments of the U.S.A., Britain and other countries as well as the work of the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. which recently adopted an important resolution on the question of foreign policy. I should only like to draw your attention to the fact that the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. authorised the Soviet Government to consider again the question of further reduction of Soviet armed forces. Considering this decision as a new serious contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and creating an atmosphere of confidence among nations we expect that the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain and France will also undertake a reduction of their armed forces in the interests of real international security.

We are convinced that if the unilateral actions undertaken by us now were supported by similar efforts of the Western Powers it would lead not only to the improvement of the international situation but would open the way to new steps with the purpose of deliverance of humanity from the armaments race and from the menace of atomic war which inevitably would lead to terrible consequences for humanity.

Your ardent aspiration to contribute to the stopping of the cold war evokes in us the feeling of great and sincere respect. It strengthens our assurance that the voice of the people, for whom the future of peace is dear and close, will sound louder and louder and that the growing strength of the peace-loving powers will triumph in the long run and secure a lasting and stable peace.

I thank you for your congratulations on the occasion of the New Year and on my part I send you New Year's congratulations and my sincere wishes of happiness and success in your noble activities in defence of peace.

Sincerely yours,
N. KHRUSHCHEV

THE SUPREME WEAPON

It was easy to burst the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and demonstrate that the Western Powers no longer depended upon the Russians and had no need to ask favours of them. Churchill rejoiced at the consequent happier prospect in Europe. Explanations were given that it was to save human lives that this horrid step was taken even though Japan had virtually surrendered. And it was done giving Stalin the barest notice of it but without fully informing him of the nature of the new weapon. But the law of *karma* has taken its course. Russia has now achieved mastery over the ultimate in weapons, the intercontinental ballistic missile with nuclear warhead.

Possession of this weapon gives the Soviet Union unquestioned superiority over Britain and her allies in Europe. The elaborate mechanism of Western military power in the continent is now found to be of no real utility. This realisation of inutility includes ground and air forces established by NATO, and the vast system of logistical support for these forces as well as the air bases in Britain, on the continent and in Africa, from which 'the great deterrent' of nuclear bombing was to be exerted.

The leadership of the West, so confidently assumed by the United States at the close of the war, is now very much in question. The British have realised this. They also know that they cannot resume the leadership themselves and therefore they are all the more concerned with the non-technical aspect of the situation, what is now called 'bargaining power.' Sooner or later the question will be raised in the minds of the public of these countries whether membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation is any longer the best way of avoiding nuclear war, and whether America must be allowed to take all the political decisions in moments of crisis.

Meanwhile in the ledger of spiritual losses and gains, everyone including the *New York Times* agrees that American society is not as free as it was half-a-century ago, the defence programme forced on America having interfered with a substantial part of the freedoms on which she had been priding herself.

A very very brief letter from one David Figart of Briarcliff Manor, New York, dated November 10, 1957, that appeared in the *New York Times* puts the reality in a nutshell: "The supreme problem facing the American people today is not to surpass Russia in nuclear weapons nor even to overtake her. It is to recover some of our spiritual vision. There is a weapon with which we could win this cold war. It is goodwill. The Russian people bear us no enmity. We bear them none. Any other starting point for negotiations will surely fail."

This small letter contains better advice than what President Eisenhower has been getting from all his newly enrolled scientific and other advisers. It is difficult for pride to retrace steps, especially frustrated pride. It was easier for America to do what Mr. Figart and others like him advise when it was believed on all hands that she was the stronger party. But it is not too late, though indeed late.

Churchill gave the sad title, *Triumph and Tragedy*, to the last volume of his narrative of the world war, "because the overwhelming victory of the Grand Alliance has failed so far to bring general peace to our anxious world." It is yet possible to turn the tragedy into a triumph if Britain and America recover their spiritual vision.

Swarajya, December 7, 1957

NEMESIS NEARING

GEORGE F. KENNAN commands among all the eminent ambassadors of America who served in Moscow the highest respect. He is now professor of history at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. Though not in the diplomatic service, he is still regarded as an eminent authority on foreign affairs. Last week he gave a Reith Lecture for the B.B.C. and Reuter has cabled

the points the ex-ambassador made. He warned the nations that distributing tactical nuclear weapons to the NATO countries would make the position worse and lead to grave danger. It would, according to him, make it impossible for Russia ever to withdraw her forces from central and eastern Europe. He has expressed the view that placing such weapons in the hands of the NATO governments would make it certain for every minor difficulty in Europe to develop into a major one. The ex-ambassador urges that the countries of western Europe should have only paramilitary forces on the Swiss pattern to guard against any internal coup, exactly as Mr. Priestley said in his recent article. "Western Europe of 1957 reminds me," Mr. Kennan said, "of the man who has grown accustomed to swimming with water-wings and cannot realise that he is capable of swimming without them."

George Kennan is definitely of the view that the suicidal nature of nuclear weapons renders them unsuitable as a sanction in diplomacy or as a basis of alliance, because, he says, these are not weapons of a kind "with which one readily springs to the defence of one's friends."

"I cannot over-emphasize," says ex-ambassador Kennan, "the fatefulness of this plan to equip the western European nations with nuclear weapons. I do not see how it could fail to produce a serious increase in the existing military tension in Europe. It would be bound to raise a grave problem for the Russians in respect of their own military dispositions and their relations with the other Warsaw Pact countries. It would inevitably bring about a further complication of the German and satellite countries."

The great deterrent was dangerous enough where it was. The distribution of nuclear weapons over numerous allies will increase the danger ten-fold, for any one of these allies can take a political decision to spark off a world explosion. Instead of graduating the nuclear terror, which is probably the intention of the plan, it will only serve to bring nearer the temptation to use the anticipatory ultimate weapon. What should be done is to reduce Russian fears; but America proposes to increase those fears and when the proposed distribution of nuclear weapons has taken place, fear instead of deterring would tend to accelerate the I.C.B.M. moving across the world.

The attachment to nuclear discovery has been so reinforced by fear and habit that the very capacity to think in other terms

seems to have been seriously affected. This alone explains how such an obviously wrong and perilous step has been conceived by the U.S. as to scatter nuclear weapons all over the world to be handled by her several allies and dependents. It is no real answer to the I.C.B.M. of Russia. It amounts to a fatal abdication of responsibility and a confession of frustrated confusion of mind. One of America's most esteemed statesmen, now working in a highly intellectual centre, has sounded a clear note of warning which none but the ill-fated can ignore.

Swarajya, December 14, 1957

A PERILOUS PLAN

"LET us not attempt to reconcile contradictions but firmly embrace a rational alternative." This was Alexander Hamilton's doctrine when he campaigned for the union of the thirteen States of America into one nation and laid the foundation for the present power of the United States.

There were contradictions then and there are contradictions now in the wishes of men. Too often do those responsible for the governance of human affairs in democracies have contrary wishes and aims and play for safety and popularity among men holding contrary views by adding up one thing to another and ignoring the hard but fundamental doctrine of policy enunciated by Hamilton as above. They attempt to bundle together contradictory aims and imagine that this would be what is recommended by saints, philosophers and statesmen as the middle path. Contradictory things tied up together do not make a middle path but remain an untenable bundle.

Hamilton's fundamental proposition about policies must be remembered by all statesmen in all matters. We must take the risk of adopting and firmly embracing a rational alternative and not seek the worthless and illusory safety obtained by a seeming reconciliation of contradictions.

America has been true to her traditional ethic in resisting the idea of an anticipatory attack to liquidate her great opponent. The American people desire world peace. They would resent

y suggestion that they were indifferent to that cause. But at the same time they desire national security. Now, security can be either from international agreement or from overwhelming power. The latter has now become impossible as several causes have contributed to produce parity between the two opposing powers. The former, *viz.*, international agreement, can only be based on mutual trust. But America cannot see her way to put trust in the good faith of the Soviet power. Meanwhile time passes and her traditional defensive attitude allows the Soviet power to grow into an almost invincible enemy. An anticipatory attack is the only available dynamic that the H-bomb can furnish, but it would be totally un-American to make use of it in that way. An attack would be permissible only by way of retaliation after Soviet Russia has taken some belligerent first step.

And so a scheme has been devised after great deliberation, and it is sought to be put in action through NATO, to organize nuclear equipment for the allied nations in Europe in order that 'actual' nuclear weapons may have a chance to go into action—what may be called small wars and the Soviet power may be forced to take the first belligerent nuclear action. The aim is to place Russia in a dilemma and to content herself with local wars with second grade nuclear weapons. If Russia resorted to the H-bomb she would thereby solve the moral problem for American conscience. All this is nicely planned and backed by high grade experts in the science of foreign relations.

But the calculations of men often bring about results other than expected, too dreadful to contemplate. This plan of surrounding Russia and Russian-controlled areas with nuclear weapons which can operate at relatively short range way, instead of trapping the enemy into smaller wars, force him at a moment decided upon by Nemesis to take the big decision which certainly is not what America wants. The folly of a single military officer or his political boss, or even an accident or mistake of fact may lead to total catastrophe.

The new plan is playing—not with fire—but with Doom. It is not the middle way nor the right solution for a moral dilemma. The only way is to ask oneself the plain question: Do we object to the existence of Russia? If not, can we object to her choosing to live as a Communist State? If neither of these can be objected to, it follows that we must depend on agreement and accept

co-existence on this planet whatever be its dangers. It follows therefore that Bulganin's offer must be accepted and tried out before adopting any perilous military strategy to divert Russia from the big to the medium nuclears and keep her at that. Medium nuclear weapons are not mild by any means. Their potential is greater than that of the Hiroshima bomb.

One thing is certain: this scheme of saturating Europe and laying siege to Russia with tactical weapons spells near-disaster to one or more of the European nations. This cannot be the price to be paid for the over-all safety of the West. The hope of peace is in the commonsense of the European nations who in their own interests must reject this offer of nuclear aid.

The intelligence of the world must be concentrated on how to expunge this new knowledge and this nuclear war technique. It is not beyond human power to make the using of these weapons as detestable as poisoning the drinking water of rival nations or any other such shameful and cowardly devices.

If only America and Britain of their own unilateral choice publicly renounce the use of nuclear weapons, the whole situation would change at once. Christ in whom Russia pretends not to believe would bring the infidel to her knees and produce a miracle in the twentieth century. It would have been grand if this had been done before Russia demonstrated her I.C.B.M. superiority. It would now be the gesture of a weaker party and have lesser potency. If indeed Russia could summon up the courage to do it now, to what heights of glory would she be raised, paling the glory of all her sputniks!

Swarajya, December 21, 1957

1958

INDIA'S APPEAL TO THE WEST

(i)

In the New Year Review of the World that the *New York Times* carries in its issue of the last Sunday of the old year, the piece relating to India is worth reading :—

NEW DELHI

“This has been a harsh and deeply troubling year for India. At its end there is little cause for rejoicing, little reason for merriment.

“In 1957 India saw hopes of economic independence, to which she has been clinging for ten years, begin to wither. These hopes still live but Indian leaders know it will take an enormous amount of effort and an enormous amount of goodwill from the rest of the world to make them bloom.

“In international affairs, India deplors the East-West struggle and tries to remain neutral. But the fact is that almost every aspect of United States foreign policy is considered wrong by this country's government. In the past couple of months, partly because India knows she must look to the West for some help, there has been an effort to be not quite so acid in comments about the West. But deep down, Indians, although they do not seriously question Washington's motives, think United States policy is harmful.”

It is a fine and well-considered objective appraisal of India's mind. What India begs of the West is to try in foreign policy the technique of trust if only as a tentative technique; instead of the interminable race in mutual ‘deterrence.’

India believes that Man was made to grow in mutual trust and co-operation. Humanity has no chance of survival if it divides itself into two warring groups, each armed with weapons that can destroy totally and reduce the world to a cloud of broken

atoms. Mutual trust is at least as sound and well-tried a technique as mutual distrust and immensely more potent with good results. If this is taken up if only for a time for trial's sake by the West, instead of rejecting all proposals for peace and co-existence as traps to defraud and encompass, or as a competitive game of proposals and counter-proposals for propaganda, there will be an immediate result—good relationship at least between India and the U.S.A.

(ii)

Look now at the following piece of information cabled from Washington :—

Washington, January 8. A magazine said yesterday that the U.S. Strategic Air Command was demonstrating its capability against the Soviet Union by continuing to fly over Russian territory “with a relative degree of immunity.”

The magazine, *Missiles and Rockets*, in an article dealing with the advantage which the Strategic Air Command gave the U.S.A. said :—

“It is true that modern Russian planes can attack our bombers with major advantages of altitude, speed and manoeuvrability. It is also true that they can score some hits.

“But so far no attacks have been made by the Russians with missiles, either because they do not have anti-aircraft missiles that are operational or because they do not want to tip their hand.”

Can there be a more fool-hardy invitation to a general conflagration of nuclear war? It is just the ‘brink of war’ tactics of John Foster Dulles. The U.S. Strategic Air Command is not practising strategy. It is doing the biggest crime that can be conceived today for sparking the cold war—if this foolish boast be true indeed. Perhaps, however, this is only internal propaganda for sanction of more armament expenditure—a sort of counter to the rising tide of American opinion after the Sputnik towards peace and co-existence. The news item continues as follows :—

“The article said the Strategic Air Command was making radar and photographic mapping missions over the Russian land mass.

"This indicates that in the event of an all-out situation, Strategic Air Command bombers would get through in high enough proportion to result in a major catastrophe to the Soviet Union. The Kremlin knows this."

"Two years hence, however, it is a safe assumption that the communists will have both our cities and our bases zeroed in with intercontinental ballistic missiles; that they will be able to destroy us and that because of their capability then with anti-aircraft missiles, our retaliatory capability will be strongly diminished."

The intention of the propaganda is obvious. "We are strong and mighty. Do not lose confidence in the American war-machine. But Russia is fast getting mightier. So give us your moneys!" This is the appeal. If this is the U.S. policy, India does think that the United States policy is harmful. It is time to change it so that the world may be safe.

The British Premier proclaimed in New Delhi that fear of world war must go. Surely he should know that the strategy of his great ally's aircraft flying over the U.S.S.R. is a direct invitation straightaway to a nuclear war, a tempting of fate. Let us hope the news is all wrong.

But this sort of perilous experiment in aggression is the natural sequel to the possession and stocking of marvellous weapons. We cannot go on piling up secret power and expect it to remain cold. Nemesis soon finds a fatal spark to explode it. Sita said this to Rama when they entered the forest. It is in Valmiki in the beginning of the Aranya Kanda.

Swarajya, January 18, 1958

AMERICA'S NEW WAR POLICY

"AMERICA appears to be once more isolating herself. But this isolation is of a sort different from the previous one. The leadership now coming from the United States is a source of disappointment and dismay throughout the entire world. The world is drawing itself apart from America rather than her detaching herself from the rest of the world. The responsibility is of the failure of American leadership in this the greatest crisis mankind has had to face," writes Aneurin Bevan in his latest contribution to the Press.

As if to underline the British labour leader's criticism comes news the same day that General Norstad, the Supreme Commander of NATO, was confident that ballistic missiles will be accepted and located at all North Atlantic Pact bases in Europe.

This policy of planting intermediate range missiles in Europe is the result of over eighteen months of discussion among a well-selected body of experts—military, diplomatic and administrative—which has found shape in a recently published thick book by Dr. Henry Kissinger, of nearly 450 pages.*

The plan is to utilise local provocation and defeat the enemy with intermediate range missiles without inducing him to use the intercontinental missile. The very statement of the aim, however, is enough to disprove its validity. Where the wish guides instead of thought, we arrive at dangerous errors, dangerous not only to those who plan such errors but to the human family at large.

The terrible fallacy at which the nuclear powers have arrived step by step is that the entire world with all its space above belongs to the two nuclear powers jointly and severally and that those not in the cold war have, through the irresistible force of science, lost their rights of sovereignty! Atomic knowledge, so to say, has polarised the entire material world into Communist and non-Communist and neutrality has forfeited the very right to exist.

No one who reads Dr. Kissinger's book and realizes these developments of American policy can rest in peace or help feeling

* *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*. By H. A. Kissinger, Harper and Brothers, New York.

totally depressed. The entire thesis is based on the possibility of a graduated nuclear battle to be waged against Russia without waiting for an all-out attack by her on America. According to this new doctrine, it is wrong to hesitate entering the little wars that the Soviets may at any time provoke, but on the contrary such challenges should be promptly taken up with intermediate range missiles.

[The philosophy behind it is that America must make up her mind to live with catastrophe round the corner. She must use 'tactical' weapons and attack as soon as any occasion arises for intervention in Europe, without caring for consequences. For otherwise, the enemy will go on that way and conquer the world. The last is presumed to be his unalterable intention and his appeal for co-existence is mere strategic policy for the attainment of world-dominion. It is plainly suggested in Kissinger's book that it is wrong policy for America to say that she will use force only to resist aggression. It should be used to increase America's strength and meet the Soviet ways of subversion.]

The appeal is that America should give up the traditional military concept of deterrence and adopt a policy of courage to wage limited wars without fearing a consequent all-out war. The enormity of modern weapons, the author argues, makes the thought of war repugnant, but the refusal to run risks would amount to giving the Soviet rulers a blank cheque. Diplomacy having lost its sanction, *viz.*, a big war, on account of its obvious unprofitability, all disputes, however trivial, perpetuate themselves. The penalty for intransigence has been eliminated. It is argued therefore that limited wars must boldly and promptly be entered into.

Truly, as the author himself has said, the gods have punished man by granting his wishes too completely ; he has now an excess of power and is in the grip of the tragedy of using it to his own destruction.

Swarajya, January 25, 1958

THE ONLY STRATEGY

A SPECIAL correspondent's message from the United Nations Headquarters to the *Hindustan Times* says :—

Until this week the impression in U.N. circles—never too deep though—had been that the H-bomb was to be considered a deterrent or an "ultimate weapon" in the event of a nuclear war. But Britain's firm declaration that even an attack by the Soviet Union using conventional forces is sufficient for the West to unleash nuclear bombardment has now torn the veil off all pretensions.

It is now becoming clear that both Britain and the U.S.A. have long planned to use their tactical atomic weapons against conventional attacks by any Soviet forces, but the present White Paper is the first time that Britain has officially mentioned use of the H-bomb in such circumstances.

It is regarded in Washington that Britain's White Paper declaring readiness to retaliate with strategic nuclear weapons is consistent with NATO's policy.

While on the one hand a fairly strong movement headed by some of the most eminent men of Britain has been started there for the outlawing of all nuclear armaments as something that can no longer be delayed if the world has to be saved, the British Government has thrown off all hesitation and doubt and plumped for what may be considered a sure step to annihilation and embodied the decision in a white paper. Military strategy in the pre-atom days was, with all its evils, based on reality and dealt with probabilities and possibilities on a concrete calculation of achievable success. Strategy has changed with changes in the nature of armaments but with the invention of nuclear weapons a change-over has taken place from reality to unreality. This transformation has taken place in a pretty steep curve.

Defence became deterrence. The new weapons made defence impossible. Total retaliation became the only possible reaction on the part of the nation attacked. It was considered a great achievement that what was called deterrence could be given the name of defence and military strategy concentrated on deterrence.

The problem of resources compelled a further degree of concentration to the exclusion of expenditure on conventional arms, so that the dependence on nuclear arms and on deterrence became almost exclusive.

In the old days, too, and at all times, there was a strategy of deterrence. But this was an integrated part in the larger whole of concrete defence. Deterrence did not hang by itself in the air. It was linked to defence.

Now, however, it is well known that deterrence has become a substitute for defence. It hangs by itself. If the deterrent deters, and until it deters, it serves a purpose. But, if for one cause or another it fails, it no longer serves, and it does not defend. Indeed it becomes a delusion. There is no mechanism by way of defence to supplement the deterrent. When it fails there is an end of it!

A devastating counter-attack is a possibility if the enemy has not anticipated it and gone all out and made it impossible. From this position which was ridiculous enough, we have proceeded to enlarge the unreality of it by making what was a single nation's operation into a wide-spread NATO strategy. We are told that Britain has a powerful and growing force of bombers equipped with megaton bombs and will soon possess 'intermediate' range ballistic missiles. These strategic deterrents are to be used in the event of aggression anywhere in the NATO field of defence. And not only when an assault is made with nuclear weapons, but whenever a major assault even with only conventional forces takes place. When such a deterrent attack is made the consequences are obvious. An assault with nuclear weapons on Britain means virtual extermination of life there. British bombers may be flying somewhere out there. *The New Statesman* rightly asks what will be their function. What is it they will defend, where will they return to and land?

The strategy of deterrence has been reduced to a mere "theoretical concept designed to meet a contingency which the strategists believe will never occur." If the contingency does arise the deterrent automatically loses its pretended character. Deterrence is thus nothing beyond bluff. Once it is called, it stands exposed and there is nothing to halt annihilation. Here is a strategy which is conditioned upon its never being called upon to prove itself and in which untold expenditure is invested.

Matter has been all converted into pure energy by the

application of atomic physical theory. Military strategy has similarly been transformed into pure bluff. Disarmament has become the only real military strategy available for both and for either of the cold war combatants.

It only remains to add one more strange but very true conclusion: Disarmament does not depend on agreement! Deterrence having become a doctrine of unreality, disarmament has been reduced to a question of one party's decision. Either side can completely effectuate it if it so wills and gives up the game of moving unreal men on an unreal chessboard.

Swarajya, March 1, 1958

MUST BE HALTED

Had she known the world better she might have felt perhaps that something was expected where so much was given.

—Anthony Trollope, in *The Prime Minister*.

I think foreign aid is an essential weapon in the armoury of American diplomacy.

—Adlai Stevenson, at a conference held in Washington on February 25, 1958, at the President's request.

HARSH as it may seem for one to say it, I welcome the South Carolina accident on Tuesday, March 11. A few more such warnings from Providence may enable the men and women of America in whose name and by authority derived from whom America is governed. The peoples of the world should realise the full possibilities of these nuclear parades and intercontinental strategies. Accidents may now be merely of the propelling explosive. Now and then they will soon be of the more poisonous material that has arrived to destroy man and his civilization.

We cannot hope to order everything as we desire; much less can we regulate accidents to conform to a relatively safe type. Such and more things must happen as happened at Florence in South Carolina and elsewhere in the world though not made fully known. The nuclear strategists are against spreading news about such casualties. As the strategy gets to be nearer and nearer

he requirements of actual belligerency, the nature of casualties of this type will develop more fully.

Are the neutral states of the world to permit this lawless attack on the right of uninvolved people? Have the jurists of the world lost all influence? Why are they dumb witnesses to this flagrant crime? The mad strategists must be halted. The world has not been sold out to the nuclear powers for practice in moving this poison about.

The uninvolved nations of the world must get rid of their dependency-complex and declare a moral strike against these satanic strategies. Instead of accepting the widespread net of aid and entanglement, we should all combine to speak out for God and refuse to touch tainted aid. Even Norman Angell has begun to write in favour of what amounts to a policy of expansion of NATO and a vigorous continuation of the cold war. We cannot escape the nature of obligation when we allow ourselves to be obliged. Aid is practically thrust on nations disarming them of moral power and an unreal sense of success is generated when each such success is really a moral defeat. All other considerations must be halted until we win the battle against nuclear weapons.

Prime Minister Macmillan refused to "opt out of history." But history has opted Britain out and there is no good wrangling over it with Churchillian phrases. But history offers a new and great option to Britain and the men and women of that island who are demonstrating against nuclear weapons have accepted that invitation. There is the marble gate to glory, not through satellitism and playing on the unreal chessboard of deterrence by nuclear threats, which, if foolishly persisted in, is bound to end in disaster; for the enemy of mankind is greedily watching this game of his.

Swarajya, March 22, 1958

"BENEFITS OF TEST EXPLOSIONS"

AMERICAN atomic chief Dr. Willard Libby has listed fits of nuclear test explosions. This is, I suppose, believed to be a timely answer to the threatened unilateral action of Russia. The six benefits are a mix-up of all sorts of things that have nothing to do with the tests for military purposes. The one thing claimed for the military test explosions that is relevant is that the process of world poisoning may lead to the manufacture of milder nuclear weapons—what are called 'clean,' which are by no means clean in the dhoby sense. The argument would be equivalent to a cobra's plea that it intends to bite people in order to discover for mankind a curable clean bite. The poisoning now going on by the tests is, according to the best scientific expert opinion, daily increasing in volume—a very serious affair for generations to come. The plea that it may lead to the development of tactical 'clean' weapons for the advantage of military policy is totally inadmissible, if, as must be admitted, in the process of hunting for 'clean' weapons, mankind is poisoned most effectively. What is the need for either 'clean' or unclean weapons except to satisfy the unsatisfiable desire of America to be safe and secure against Russia through nuclear armament?

We can follow Dr. Libby and list the benefits to mankind arising even out of common murder. For instance, it reduces the acute population problem. It acts better and more quickly by way of punishing a wrong-doer than resort to courts. It keeps up the very essential art of killing which is necessary for national defence and so on.

It is said that nuclear explosions can make mining easier. It is hoped that mines made radio-active will attract miners enough for mine-owners to reap the advantage of nuclear blasting. When we have set our minds on something, we can produce a hundred reasons to confuse simple folk.

All this is absurd. It is no answer to the case against nuclear test explosions. It is just propaganda by boosting irrelevant facts.

Swarajya, April 5, 1958

INTERVIEW WITH MOSCOW RADIO

I wish Mahatma Gandhi were alive now to express his appreciation and give his comments and advice to the Government of the U.S.S.R. He alone knew the technique of unilateral action and the value and implication of the approach in the context of the modern world and its materialistic climate. Had he been alive now he would have been the happiest man (because of the Soviet decision). He would have given most convincing advice to both parties.

I am much disappointed by the way in which America and her friends have received this great Soviet step. Instead of approaching it sympathetically and appreciatively, they have applied to it a mind full of suspicion and cynicism, probably owing to their own inner feeling of disappointment with themselves at being unable to do such a thing. Unilateral action is unprecedented in the annals of political history. Taking into account the long-standing differences and doubts that have prevailed among the nations fearing one another, we should be patient with one another until the moral force has had time to work. The effect of the decision to act unilaterally will be found to be irresistible in spite of all the detractions poured on it at present.

Unsatisfactory reactions of the Western Governments are, indeed, the external symptoms of the internal unrest of heart created by the right step so unexpectedly taken by the U.S.S.R. After some interval of time we shall see healthier reactions among the peoples concerned. That is how such things must work and we should not be deceived or deterred by the first cynical reception. Something akin to jealousy is now operating. Soon, emulation will take its place. What is called for on the side of the party that has taken the unilateral step is patience and calm and continued faith in the correctness of that moral strategy, if one may use such a gross word for describing a very noble step of high spiritual quality. If the other side seeks to ignore this step and proceeds with its own tests, the world reaction will be ten-fold adverse to them. Indeed, disgust will grow with accelerated force among the people inhabiting this great and wonderful planet.

In answer to the doubts and allegations about propaganda

motives, Mr. Khrushchev has said all that should be said. To every right act, each one can give his own meaning and can attribute selfish motives. But one thing is clear—that the people of the world, who want this poisoning process to cease, do most cordially welcome the brave step and its detractors are not going to be admired for their foolish firmness. No one wants to be poisoned because America is afraid.

The Indian Express, April 17, 1958

AMERICA'S CHANCE

Men at some time are masters of their fates.

—Julius Caesar.

For the first time in political history we have an example of unilateral action and an experiment in the law of spirit in a field hitherto dominated by materialistic calculation ending in agreements based on mutual fear and suspicion. The initiative taken by Russia without waiting for previous agreement does not cover all that one would have desired but it does set a great example, and a new kind of competition may be induced thereby to take the place of the pernicious race in the production of nuclear weapons to suit newer and yet newer ideas of mutual destruction.

The occasion is one for great satisfaction and I hesitate to mar it with even constructive criticism. But after expressing fullest appreciation, it may be useful to think aloud about the immediate future. Russia has taken a Gandhian initiative. It would have been complete had not Mr. Khrushchev chosen to be cautious and added an anticipatory warning as to resumption. This was consistent with the fears expressed by him in reply to my letter to him last December, but it does give the initiative again to America. It only remains for us to hope that America will read the future aright and abstain from her programmed tests.

If America obstinately persists with her test explosions and the poisoning of the world with radio-active fall-out, and Russia even then does not yield to the provocation and abstains from resuming the tests, what will be the moral position? It will be

much worse for America than before ; for the peoples of the world who hate this process of poisoning will condemn American action with redoubled justification, and Russian forbearance will attract universal admiration and be irresistible with its moral force.

However inadequate it may be, the step taken by the Russian Government is a step in the right direction. It is a great step because of its being the first of its kind in history. It can be doubted and sneered at, because it does not mean a cessation of activities in the production of nuclear weapons already tested, and on the ground that the declaration does not prevent the use of the present stockpile. But that would be ignoring the value of a first step in the right direction.

We should be careful but we should also be just. America would be wronging herself if she ignored the value and the importance of the Russian step and proceed with her test explosions as if nothing had happened. It would be sure to produce most adverse reactions in the minds of all the unbiassed peoples of the world and offer to Russia just that propaganda material which America in her own interests ought not to give. It would be firmness and faith in her own rectitude, but of a degree that would be injurious to herself. America's moral asset is bound to be considerably damaged by such a policy and Russia would correspondingly gain with accelerated pace.

To think of unilateral cessation of tests after going through the tests already programmed is so obviously inadequate that it will draw ridicule. Men would look upon such a unilateral proposal as on that of one who declares he would confess and repent but asks for time to complete the crimes already planned. The essence of unilateral action will be prominently absent in it. If the tests have to be stopped on account of their highly poisonous character, the analogy, far from being a caricature, suffers for mildness.

What the genius of America calls for is not defensive argument but a counter-initiative by way of unilateral action. If America takes a step of even greater significance than that of Russia, for example, if America definitely declares, without waiting for any agreement on the part of Russia, that she will not use H-bombs under any circumstances, it would be a shining act that will draw forth peals of congratulations from all over the world. Indeed if such a declaration were made by America, a new enthusiasm

will develop for mutual trust and integrity of purpose which will be irresistible. It will begin at once to remove the dark clouds of destruction that hang today on this wonderful planet and let the rays of renewed hope pierce through. It would make for true world peace. America should pause and ponder now and not be hustled by the mongers of obstinacy. She should see her way to take some unilateral action greater than that of Mr. Khrushchev's. Let carping comment cease and let jealousy give place to thoughtful emulation. America has a choice at this turning point in history. She can reject the proffered hand and meanly nullify Russia's glorious act or she can herself seize the initiative and declare no H-bombs at all and earn humanity's gratitude.

Swarajya, April 19, 1958

SOLEMN ADVICE

THE recent declaration by the U.S.S.R. to abstain from further test explosions is a step in the right direction, however inadequate it may be. It is unprecedented in its unilateral character and therefore it is a great step. It can be ignored as unimportant because it does not mean a cessation of activities in the production of nuclear weapons. It is not a declaration that can even at face value remove fears of aggression, for it is only a cessation of tests and not a declaration to cease production or abstain from using these horrible weapons.

The present is a critical point of time and I implore America to ponder over the situation. Let us be careful even in our suspicions. We will be doing wrong to ourselves if we ignore this solemn declaration of the U.S.S.R. and go on with our test explosions. It would produce most adverse reactions and feelings among those who are not nuclear powers but who are the vast majority of the inhabitants of the earth and who do not like this poisoning of the world with more and more radio-active fall-out. America will automatically lose moral stature with any further test explosions directed by her Government and Russia will correspondingly profit. This is as certain as two and two make four.

What is now called for by the true genius of America and the

spirit of the Founding Fathers is not arguments, but some step of even greater significance than the one taken by the U.S.S.R. What is wanted on the part of America is a declaration made clearly and unconditionally, without reference to agreement on the part of other nations, not to use H-bombs, come what may. For indeed if any occasion should ever arise to use them, it would admittedly mean such destruction as would leave mankind unable ever to recover.

A declaration of this nature will be so greatly appreciated by the peoples of the world that a new enthusiasm will develop for mutual trust and integrity of purpose which will be irresistible. What is more, it will be an enthusiasm unmixed with any discrimination in favour of one or the other contending powers and will make for true world peace.

America should pause now and not be in a hurry to prove her firmness, and should think constructively and give to the world the benefit of a great unilateral step towards peace.

Letter to the New York Times, April 15, 1958

WESTERN REACTIONS

"THEY have done all the tests and they now declare they will not have any further test explosions. What is there wonderful in this ?"

But what prevented you from doing similarly before March 30 ? At any point of time when a unilateral step is taken by anybody, the same thing may be said. "They must have finished their tests," the carping comment can be made. So every good act can be belittled. Are the Russians so superior that they have done all their tests with a much smaller number of radio-active explosions and before March 30, 1958, while the West has still to run the race of poisoning the world before finding its own holy grail ? The West must confess morally beaten if they have not the courage to follow with their own unilateral action. Is there any sense in Britain or America saying that it has the right to stop its tests unilaterally after completing its investigation ? Who contested that 'right' ? These arguments will not make any

impression on those who do not want to be poisoned and who do not want their progeny to be born defective or monstrous. The question is: Are you prepared to stop before achieving your purpose and in order to induce trust and goodwill by your courage to face a disadvantage for that sake ?

Swarajya, April 19, 1958

SUMMIT CONFERENCE

WHAT hopes can a summit or other conference raise if the principal member-powers are most unwilling to come together and have to be almost physically dragged to it ? So many hurdles are placed deliberately by the invited parties making their unwillingness obvious. Again, of what use can any conference be when on issues so vitally concerning human life and civilization and not merely the so-called security of this or that power, some of the heads of governments concerned (and they are very powerful units) meet beforehand and come to agreements as to points likely to arise for discussion at the conference—sealed against breach at the conference and sealed before that from the rest of the world's knowledge. Of what use can a conference be if the members are afraid to meet lest they be forced by reason to come to an agreement ? If the minds are closed against fresh thoughts and views and sold and sealed to previously and separately arrived at conclusions, closed even against fresh information, what hopes can be entertained about the summit conference ? We shall have at the conference a replica of democratic parliamentary debates and voting where each group has previously made up its mind as well as its vote, and party 'discipline' overrules reason and wisdom. Such a summit conference would really be the summit of folly and waste. If only closed minds must meet and no one can change his views, it shall be a play, not a conference. Let us hope and pray that when so much unwillingness is overcome by the compulsion of world opinion, we shall not have a conference of mere automats but of human thinking souls.

The idea of having a conference of 'summits' and not of intervening ministers or officials is based on the belief that at the

conference minds would be open and discussion would be free and the members powerful enough to modify opinions or even accept previously rejected views and come to new conclusions. If this basis of the plan is sabotaged by anticipatory negations arrived at between some of the participants, the conference will be no better than a Security Council debate wherein briefed representatives really talk to the world press while pretending to discuss. The presence of representatives of non-bloc states cannot make any difference when the powers primarily concerned come with closed minds and secret agreements holding them to unalterable positions. After the dispersal, the world will have been familiarised to one more frustration and the sum of hope definitely reduced. The play will become a tragedy and the pain more poignant.

Indeed when the summit conference comes off, I should like each of the heads of States to be asked to swear or affirm solemnly that he sits down for discussion with an open mind and has not bound himself beforehand to any conclusion on any point.

Swarajya, April 26, 1958

PRO-NUCLEAR TEST DRUG

NUMEROUS are the forms which pro-nuclear propaganda takes in certain circles in certain countries. The latest is news from San Francisco that Dr. Lindenbaum has claimed to have developed a tasteless yellow drug (to which he has given an attractive name) which, if administered to fall-out patients, will eliminate the strontium. So let the tests go on. The *Lindenbaum drug* is *tasteless*, so it can be easily swallowed and we are then perfectly safe whatever be the number of Pacific Ocean tests. Japan and Asia should at once order large quantities of the new drug from San Francisco, as a precautionary civil defence equipment.

Swarajya, April 26, 1958

A FIELD OF HOPE

BARRING those who have sold their hearts to one side or the other, every lover of peace must see that in the atmosphere of fear and distrust generated by the latest weapons of destruction and the diabolical success in the technology of annihilation achieved therein by both sides of the polarised world, no agreement is ever possible. Agreement depends on acceptance of the assurances given on either side. Distrust, deep and unalterable, prevents such acceptance; what is more, it is believed that assurances are given by Russia only to be secretly broken and for fraudulently building up an advantage. If there is no room for inducing trust by assurances of the most solemn character, how can any agreement be ever reached? Both sides are eager for peace but disable themselves by their own incorrigible distrust from ever achieving what they desire.

I therefore pressed on the great-minded Americans as well as on the shrewd Russian leaders to examine the position fundamentally and find a way out of this impasse. The Russian leaders were prepared in spite of their fears and their distrust to accept assurances from the other side at face value and enter into agreement on that basis. This is a great thing to start with but America (England closely follows American policy in all such matters) would not accept Russian assurances at face value as a basis for any agreement but formulated fraud-proof inspections and controls.

As two sides must agree for any agreement on the basis of package offers, the problem became insoluble. On the other hand, the race in nuclear technique and production went on so successfully that the peril of annihilation that hangs over humanity hangs now by a very slender thread.

The system of alliances has definitely aggravated this peril. It may be reasonable that America should seek bases near to Russia as the latter appears to possess intercontinental ballistic missiles while America does not. But whatever justification this may furnish, catastrophe becomes more and more imminent as more and more people are empowered to switch it on. This is so obvious that no attempt has been made to deny it.

Under these circumstances, the Russian Government have

at last accepted the doctrine of unilateral action pressed on them last December by me, hoping against hope. Although the Russian Government's declaration is cautious, so cautious that their action almost nullifies itself, it is unilateral action.

Unilateral action threatened to be withdrawn, if no similar action is taken by the other side, is, however, not far removed from a fresh attempt at agreement. It is only where a party is firm in its faith, whatever doubts others may cast on it and takes action irrespective of the response on the other side, that we have true unilateral action. It is for such unilateral action that great spiritual power is claimed. It is one thing to hope and believe that the moral compulsion generated by unilateral action will evoke a positive response from the other side, but it is another to make it conditional on the other side's equivalent immediate action or forbearance. This reduces the potentiality of the unilateral action and brings it to the level of a new way of attempting at getting an agreement.

In spite of these failings and defects, it must be admitted that a great field of hope has been opened by Russia's declaration that she has decided on abstaining from test explosions even in the absence of any previous reciprocal agreement. It almost promises a change in the outlook of Soviet Russia from materialism to moral forces and their power. If this comes to nothing by America's precipitate action the blame will lie heavily on America and on Britain, too, if she does not do everything to prevent such a result. It is no good saying that the Russians expected this persistence and knowing what would happen made a gesture for mere propaganda's sake. There is nothing to prevent America and Britain from fixing Russia to its gesture by accepting the challenge, so to say, and not proceeding with their own programme of tests. It is in their power to convert Russian hypocrisy into factual virtue. At no point of time in an armaments race can any unilateral action be taken without some advantage to one side or the other automatically resulting from the step. This cannot be made a grievance or a just point of criticism.

The problem is not a problem only of America or of any other nuclear power. It is a matter in which life on this plane and civilization are involved. It is a case where the major part of the inhabitants of the earth demand that they should not be poisoned just because America or Britain cannot trust Russia.

The case for distrust on the ground of undisclosed tests has been demonstrated to be very weak. No test of any consequence can escape detection. At any rate such evasion as is available is available for either side.

That the tests programme of Russia was completed recent and America's programme remains yet to be gone through made into a big argument. This has been conclusively smashed by Mr. Aneurin Bevan in his speech on April 13 at Trafalgar Square. Russia had offered to agree to stop all tests if America would also agree as early as last December. If that offer had been accepted Russia's recent tests would not have been carried out.

Another attempt to find an infirmative motive for Russia's unprecedented action is a conjecture that Russia had found a catastrophic increase in radio-active contamination in her own territories. If this be indeed true, how clear it is that America's test programmes may lead to similar irremediable accidents either in America or in other people's territories. Are we to assume that America is blessed with technology that never fails? The assumption is disproved by the many failures that have been admitted recently in the rocket race.

Swarajya, April 26, 1958

OBSTINACY

AND lo, in her mouth was an olive leaf plucked off. This was what Noah saw from his Ark when the flood subsided. Russian unilateral action abjuring nuclear tests is a great and promising sign in the history of civilization. If the West should give up its *mourkhyam* and co-operate with this symptom of a trust in no materialistic moral power, for the first time exhibited by the Soviet Government, very great results might follow from one step to another. Indeed the cold war may soon melt away.

It is a tragic paradox that while we want our opponent to give up his purely materialistic attitude and be converted to a moral outlook on life, we are deceived by immediate politics and discourage the very revolution of thought that we were all also wanting in our opponent.

A parallel tragedy is available in recent political development in our own country. Here are the Communists of India doing what I advised them to do when I met them at close quarters in the Madras Legislative Assembly, from the summer of 1952 onwards. They have now met in an All-India session and have publicly declared their solemn decision abjuring the way of violence and also, should they ever get into power, of ever seeking one-party monolithic domination. But Congressmen refuse to believe or welcome this decision and behave as if they did not like the Communists to be converted to non-violence and democratic ways! The immediate politics of the situation blinds them to the more permanent gains of a moral conversion. Exactly the same is the cold reception and the cynical attitude of the West to the most remarkable event in the history of our times, the U.S.S.R.'s unilateral declaration in April, abjuring nuclear tests. After meeting with failure and obstruction in many attempts to arrive at an agreed ban, instead of welcoming the Soviet Government's gesture of new-born confidence in the moral power of a unilateral good act, the West is doing what one should have feared the Russian Government might have done consistently with their materialistic attitude had America or Britain taken such a step consistently with their professed Christian faith. The West is seeking to kill the new-born and much-wanted baby.

Western reluctance to recognise the greatness and the importance of the Soviet Union's step is a disservice to the cause of peace and civilization. Look at the two pictures: after the Soviet Union's unilateral step to reduce the nuclear poisoning of the world, America and Britain propose to carry out their tests for 'clean' weapons and thereby to send into the stratosphere-poison-bank fresh quantities of radio-active fall-out that must sooner or later come down to injure human health and interfere with biological integrity. Why? Because they are not satisfied that Russia will not attack them and their friends some day. They claim for this reason the right to cause injury and grave risk to all mankind despite the protests of Japan and of good men and women all over the world. If there were a tribunal to give effect to international law, these tests would have been prohibited by legal injunction as an illegal trespass on other people's rights and well-being. But power, the most brutal and uncivilized form of it, rules out international law and morality. Four Americans

have, in the tradition of Thoreau, started out in a ketch to enter the danger zone as a protest against their Government's inhuman policy, but the Government's *mourkhyam* remains undissolved. "Nothing will change our decision to go on with the tests," says the Atomic Energy Commission of U.S. "Nothing will change my decision," re-echoes Mr. Macmillan. "America will not let me have her scientific results," says he, "so I must go on with my own poisoning programme."

And so the dove with the olive leaf in her mouth must be turned out as an irrelevant phenomenon in a world ruled by Macmillan and Dulles.

Swarajya, May 3, 1958

SECRET POISONING

YET another instance of the international anarchy brought into being by nuclear science has been revealed. It is generally not appreciated that not only nuclear explosions during tests but the continuous discharge of radio-active waste in all nuclear installations, *be it for industrial or military purposes*, is poisoning the world without intermission ever since the craze for nuclear energy seized the world. Nuclear installations are producing waste products just as other factories throw out their fuel ashes and the nuclear ashes are disposed of in all sorts of concealed ways which do not much lessen their danger to human and vegetable hygiene. There is no way of escaping the poison. It is only a matter of time for it to get out of the *ad hoc* concealment provided for it. The nuclear scientists have found the evil so great that it has become very doubtful whether mankind will ever find a solution for it. A message from Sydney of June 4 says: The U.S. had seriously considered sending radio-active wastes into outer space by rockets. This was disclosed by an American scientist at an atomic energy symposium at the Sydney University.

Outer space has become the illegal property of nuclear powers by the law of the jungle. We would have no objection to adventurer colonists going and living in outer space, setting up their flags in space for exclusive possession. But to throw poison into

outer space would distribute it over the whole world. The dark races, the yellow ones, and the people of Southern Asia will all share the poison that is unintermittently produced for benefiting the industrialists of 'nuclear' nations. Can anything be conceived more subversive of human rights and international law and morality?

It has been revealed that, as a result of radio-active fall-outs of test explosions and the waste products of atomic installations, there has been an enormous increase of radio-activity in the vegetable and dairy products of U.K. This must be the case in U.S.A. also. Hence the enquiry into the possibility of other ways of disposal besides dumping the radio-active ash into the waters of the ocean. They may shoot the stuff out into 'Space'; the space they have in view is some miles up the atmosphere and the idea is that if that is done, it is the business of subsequent generations of mankind as a whole to bear the future consequences and treat them as astronomical phenomena and not as injury done by any particular nuclear installation.

There ought to be a high grade and disinterested factual enquiry into the present practice as to disposal of the poisonous material produced in nuclear installations. It has all been a hole-and-corner business although it affects the health of innocent people not concerned in any way in the profit-and-loss account of the installations.

Nature has a way of absorbing all waste matter and converting it into fresh nutriment for man, beast and plant. But, now that our scientific advance has interfered with the constitution of matter itself and reversed the process of evolution of matter, man and life, there is no provision in nature for absorbing the mischief of all this interference. Are the mischief-makers entitled to distribute the evil over those who have taken no part in the anti-natural operations? Obviously not, but who dare challenge the activities of nuclear powers and their technicians and industrialists?

Swarajya, June 14, 1958

"A MONSTROUS DECISION"

THE title is taken from the *New Statesman's* comments on the news that the East Islington Labour Party has excluded certain applicants from admission, for the reason that they are members of the campaign for nuclear disarmament in Britain. The *New Statesman* hopes this monstrous decision will be reversed by the National Executive of the Labour Party.

The Labour Party appears to be passing through a moral crisis over the nuclear issue. Cannot British Labour make up its mind in a simple straightforward way that as the nuclear tests have been shown definitely to be poisoning the world in a dangerous manner for all people, whatever the advantages may be to a particular nation, Britain should cease committing the crime whatever others may or may not do? In attempting to add to a clear moral principle, arguments of military strategy and political expediency, we confuse what otherwise is simple for people to grasp.

The principle of unilateral action is essentially a moral principle and arguments of expediency serve only to confuse the application of a principle of morality. Adulterating a clear moral principle with arguments of military expediency leads only to barren controversy. Surely the British Labour Party with all its traditions should not lag far behind the government of the U.S.S.R. which has unilaterally stopped its tests and which has committed itself to agree to a complete ban of the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons as soon as other nuclear Powers join in such a ban.

It may be easy enough to prove that deterrence through the H-bomb and rocket missiles is just suicide and no deterrence. But when fear and passions rule, with a good people the sword of the moral law is more effective than arguments of military expediency. Unilateral action requires courage, and the inspiration for courage must come from conscience, not from War Office noting.

Swarajya, July 19, 1958

s a great and good man once put it, and do not see the gravest catastrophes to which we recklessly advance.

Swarajya, July 19, 1958

WHERE WE STAND NOW

NUCLEAR armaments are taking us with accelerated pace towards the abyss of death. We have spoken and heard so often about the annihilation that is in the offing, that we have put it aside from thought just as people who, when travelling in a saloon, playing bridge, forget the motion of a train. We are going on with our daily domestic and national affairs in the train which is all the time speeding to total destruction with all of us in it.

Not I, a melancholy philosopher, but Thomas J. Hamilton, the *New York Times*' United Nations correspondent, winds up a long discussion about the summit conference with these words: "But all this seems to rule out any prospect of real disarmament and the shadow of the Hydrogen bomb hangs over the world more menacingly than ever before."

And on July 9, the Moscow Radio commentator endorsed this: "The result is that the world really is practically on the brink of war. There might be a clash between atomic squadrons in the air and an atomic war might be touched off. A war might be started by some U.S. pilot releasing a bomb about, say, somewhere near the Russian borders. It is a terrible strain to pilot jet bombers and even the strongest might break under it."

Mr. Dulles and his colleagues are juggling with the fate of the world. A preference for total annihilation is postulated against accepting Communist domination and this preference is forced not only on the people subject to their own government as they may be entitled to do but on all mankind. The alternative is one between domination that is feared and annihilation that is certain. Some people believe that it is not a certainty but only a chance that the H-bomb will mean the destruction of civilization. It is not a chance but a certainty, say those who know science and prefer truth to politics.

It is remarkable how men become strangely incompetent to understand or to judge when once they are under the influence of a bias. A particular evil when constantly and morbidly made the object of obsession completely dislocates our mental apparatus. "We are for ever deceiving ourselves with names and theories,"

THE FUTILITY OF LIMITED NUCLEAR WAR

WHAT do you know about war, about atoms and things so far out of the reach of common men? Thus may I be met when I speak about the futility of the conception of limited nuclear wars and the unworkability of any doctrine of graduation in what may be called the field of Total Fright. I wrote about this in *Peace News*, in September 1956. But let us hear some of the latest opinions of experts now:—

Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, F.R.S., who delivered a course of lectures to the Trinity College, Cambridge, on military science, and who is one of the best known British experts in the use of physics and chemistry for military purposes, has recently expressed his conclusion on this much debated subject in the clearest terms possible. In an article contributed to the *New Statesman*, Professor Blackett, after a thorough discussion of the situation, says "We see therefore that neither of the two conditions which must be satisfied if the West is to gain by the initiation of limited nuclear war can be proved true; it cannot be shown that the war could be kept limited, and it cannot be shown that the use of tactical atomic weapons would favour the West. The initiative by the West of tactical nuclear war might either hasten military defeat or lead to the destruction of Europe by H-bombs—or both."

After discussing the inherent dangers of the use of tactical nuclear weapons and the inhibitions which will, in the event, impede their use and the unreality of the concept of a 'limited nuclear war,' he concludes: "I am convinced that unless we face realistically the possible situations which we may encounter, Britain may find herself led by events beyond her control into political and military fiascos, compared with which Munich will appear to future historians as a monument of courage and Suez as a triumph of military planning."

What is even more important than these definitely threatening

conclusions about tactical atomic weapons and limited nuclear war, Prof. Blackett exposes to public view a fallacy in the over-all picture that is commonly painted. "The main argument for spreading tactical nuclear weapons among the nations of NATO is that they would enable the West to use its superior technology to defeat the hordes of Soviet soldiers. On the other hand, the actual population of the NATO countries is some 430 millions, which is over 50 per cent higher than the 280 millions in the U.S.S.R. and her European satellites." He explains that the assumed superior technology (which is however no longer real) was to compensate not for a deficiency of man-power but for the disinclination of the western peoples to serve as soldiers.

Dean Acheson, one of the outstanding men of U.S.A., a 'stern anti-Communist' in foreign policy, one who accepts dependence on NATO as an article of faith, has, in a recent book, *Power and Diplomacy*, expressed the same views. In contrast to the general conclusions of Mr. Henry Kissinger's Harvard symposium on the subject, Dean Acheson has exposed the utter futility of the twin doctrines of the graduated deterrent and limited nuclear war which that big book advocates as a result of much study.

"It would be a disastrous mistake," says Dean Acheson, "to increase nuclear power in Europe as part of our present policy of increasing our military reliance on nuclear weapons. To do this would perpetuate the danger and horror of living under the sword of Damocles. The escape lies in the development of allied conventional forces capable of safeguarding Europe against attack by conventional forces."

These statements of important and very well informed witnesses testify to the significant trend among the *people* of the West that has resulted from the terrible wars of recent times, a great and deep-rooted unwillingness to go out as soldiers in the field and expose their lives in the old style. Hence the persistent dependence on nuclear weapons which the governments believe will reduce, if not almost wholly do away with dependence on individual readiness to go to the battlefield. On the other hand, it has led governments to indulge in unreal concepts of graduated war as an escape from total suicide which is the necessary consequence of a full-scale nuclear war. The graduated deterrent and the strategy of limited nuclear war will lead to suicide, sure enough.

That people who were once eager to go to the battlefield and gloried in the feats of courage that war gave opportunities for, have now definitely become war-haters and do not believe in the glories of killing and dying, is a positive advance in the evolution of human thought and need not be cause for shame. Let us all pray that the insanity of the alternative, depending on nuclear and gadget wars will also be ultimately realised and that the nations of the world will learn to live without fear of one another, *taking peace for granted*, without asking for security arrangements and running suicidal armament races to that end.

Swarajya, May 31, 1958

FAREWELL TO CIVILIZATION

A world too cruel for laughter
Too miserable to hate
So crazy that, hereafter,
One can't exaggerate.

—Reginald Reynolds

"I do not believe any country has the right to condemn unknown, unnamed and unborn children to mutilation, torture and death, merely by experimenting with weapons for its own defence. That is a fundamental immorality," said Mr. Aneurin Bevan on June 10 in Parliament. Logic and humanism must lead such a strong conviction into pressing for the unilateral suspension of tests by Britain and Mr. Bevan should join the movement initiated by Bertrand Russell, Priestley, Stephen King-Hall and others. Not a day passes but some ugly news is printed in the papers disclosing with what remarkable and tragic ease the Western conscience has accommodated itself to barbarities once thought unthinkable. Nations claiming high descent and noble men and women grateful to their historic founders and leaders are now engaged preparing wretched poisons of all kinds for use in war. Cricket is confined to the playfield. The powers have determined that there shall be no code or cricket in international life.

We are told from Washington that a new array of weapons,

"as effective if not more effective than H-bombs" is under study by U.S. Defence officials, and C.B.R. is the comprehensive name for this type of weapons. These letters stand for Chemical, Biological and Radiological deadly poisons. The plan includes gas to kill and blind and mutilate human beings. We are assured in this news item from Washington that "even if H-bombs were banned, the powers have enough destructive agents at their command to wage war efficiently"—that is with monstrous barbarity. And so the banning of H-bombs would not matter.

A frontpage headline in the *New York Times* reads :—

U.S. READY TO COPE WITH THE SOVIET END OF NUCLEAR TESTS

Reading this, an old-fashioned indignant American wrote in a letter to a leading weekly : "*To cope*, according to Webster, is to struggle or contend on equal terms or with some success. Odd, isn't it, that we should need to contend against a plan which might reduce the cancer of blood and bone in millions of children ?" The correspondent has not marched with his government ! What grim humour that the aims of America and other great powers are not only to surpass one another in military equipment but to undo all efforts at reducing the horrors of war and that they should congratulate themselves on coping with difficulties in that line !

We watch with tragic interest the successful manner in which America has been combating the proposal for a summit meeting for disarmament. America seems indeed in love with the cold war !

Richard Armour contributes some doggerel lines to *New Leader* :

Though Russia's bomb tests are suspended,
That doesn't mean that they are ended,
But just suspended, if you please,
As was the sword of Damocles.

One is inclined to play some bad verses back to this :

I tell you, Armour, they're bound to end
If Ike but say, "We too suspend !"
Shed your fear of a Soviet trap,
The sword of D can be sold for a scrap !

What is this strange attachment to a disastrous cold war ? Is it only fear and suspicion ? Or, God forbid, is it also that America's economy has got entangled with cold war ? What a

sad pass for the world indeed if industries, vested interests and national economies prevented the suspension of all diabolical forms of war, or if the continuous poisoning of the world's air must be kept up to support employment. Let us hope this cannot be.

After what has been sworn by eminent men of science over and over again, no good citizen or nation can escape the conclusion that we should rather ourselves die than use these explosions and poisons on human beings. In no case can any nation have the right to contaminate the air that belongs to all peoples. I am using the very language in which Mr. Norman Cousins has expressed his considered opinion on the subject in a very recent article. He has there discussed the whole question from the American angle and concludes that there being a serious question about the effects of nuclear testing on human tissue, he would have America *suspend her tests at once* and call upon the United Nations to institute immediate compliance by all nations.

The stopping of test explosions does not of course dispose of the problem of war or of the use of nuclear weapons in war, but as Mr. Norman Cousins has said, it is "a good place to begin."

It seems as if science too has split into one science for Western and another for Eastern ! The United Nations' fifteen-member committee appointed to investigate into the hazards of test explosions has not been able to speak the truth with one voice. Secrecy, the great enemy of science and the best accomplice of untruth and quackery, has crept into where it does not belong. There is a curtain drawn over the proceedings of this committee of scientific investigation. The committee's views and proceedings are of urgent and universal interest and of capital importance if U.N. still holds to its foundational duties. It seems as if political considerations may asphyxiate truth. Even in less important matters there should have been no doubt as to the function of science. Here is a case where the quality and the magnitude of the matter involved call for utmost frankness and adherence to truth which is the only code of conduct for scientific investigation. It is not the responsibility of such committees to help or hinder policy, either western or eastern, or to advise on political steps. There ought to be no hesitation in the public promulgation of what they have found as men of science—and after weighing expert scientific opinion.

The world, however, will not find it difficult to perceive where the

ruth lies in spite of political pressures seeking to suppress or distort ! Unwillingness to publish will lead men to infer the worst about what is sought to be covered up. In fact, however, there is nothing new to be discovered. So much has been publicly told already by the best and most eminent men of science. The arguments for rushing all mankind into serious hazards in order that American or other technicians may perfect their weapons of destruction or even moderate their effects for tactical reasons cannot possibly make any appeal to the judgment of independent men, be they jurists or be they men of science. The whole thing is a barbarous programme of aggression on world health and human rights and a total repudiation of civilization—Heaven knows for what purpose !

Varajya, June 21, 1958

ANTI-COMMUNISM AND THE VALUE OF LIFE

THE other day a young assistant editor of an Indian paper and his wife, a Cambridge Ph.D. in law, came to honour me with a visit on their way back from Kerala which has now become a place of pilgrimage in India.

"What did you take your Ph.D in ?" I asked. "What was your thesis ?"

"The conflict of laws," the young lady said.

I remembered what this subject was. I knew it when I was myself a law student.

"You were in Cambridge for three-and-a-half years on this single subject ?"

"Yes," she said, and we talked on, about a number of things including Communism in office and about a Communist ministry in a provincial government in India. But I am not putting all that or anything of it here. My mind went on to think about the conflict of laws.

It is a chapter of private international law as it is called. Is there any international law now ? I am afraid there is not. It is all gone. It belonged to an age that has terminated. There is at present no international law or morality as poor old Austin

called it with concern for juristic accuracy. There is no one to guard that department of morality and so there is no one observing it. It is remarkable how things that live only in conscience die so unobserved.

Edward Teller and a collaborator have produced a book on nuclear energy in which the danger to mankind from strontium-90 fall-out is dealt with. Teller's exposition is frank and clear. The difference is pointed out between estimates of world average increase in radio-active intensity and of increase in any particular region. Everyone knows that a poison or, for that matter, any human misfortune, if uniformly distributed over the entire population of the world, wouldn't hurt any single person. Yet it may have obviously fatal effects if concentrated all on a single individual or on the population of a district. It is pointed out that danger from fall-out cannot be correctly estimated by taking the low world averages of increased radio-activity. The last rice crop in Japan showed strontium-90 content eight times the world average.

Even this however is not my point. The point is that the book discloses the revolution that has happened in conscience. In the next thirty years six million people will die of leukemia and bone cancer. The past nuclear tests have produced fall-out that may increase this by 10,000. "It has been claimed that it is wrong to endanger any human life. Is it not more realistic," ask the scientist authors of the book, "and in fact more in keeping with the ideals of humanitarianism to strive towards a better life for all mankind ?"

A thing done by you may endanger human life—human life wherever it may be, not in your own family or in your nation. Is it to be excused because your test explosions are supposed to help America's striving toward a better life for all mankind by confounding the knavish tricks of Communist Russia ? What does it matter, modern conscience says, if 10,000 or more people die of bone cancer or leukemia in any country in the world if, as a result, we *may be able* to add one more effective type of weapon to defend the American way of life against Communism ?

"We are certainly talking here about questions," says the book, "which may strike hard on some individuals, but which from the point of view of the community or race are not serious."

The meaning of this sentence in American language is that

nuclear explosions are justifiable from the point of view of adding something to the defence of the world against Communist aggression, although these explosions may cause disease and death to a number of individuals who would otherwise have not died of cancer of bone or blood.

Where is international law now? Even if the whole world had become subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, these tests that poisoned the air and the earth would be criminally punishable unless a special law were passed authorizing the dangerous contamination as an act of State in the interests of the U.S.A. But the whole world has not passed into the jurisdiction of the U.S.A. yet and the poison spreads over the non-American world and non-American air and soil as well as over the U.S.A. Had there been any international law alive, these test explosions were inconceivable.

Yet young men and women study international law and spend money and energy over it. They might as well spend time over the study of astrology or haunted houses and the mutual behaviour of ghosts.

Swarajya, June 21, 1958

FREEDOM MAY BE SAVED

I AM quoting from a recent article appearing in a widely read American journal, the *New Leader* :—

"I am convinced that if the Soviet Union were by some magic to disappear tomorrow, the situation would not be eased—we should soon be confronted by other difficulties of equally grave magnitude. I am convinced that as industrialisation continues its relentless spread within the framework of international anarchy, we are going to be faced by new Germanys, new Japans, and new Soviet Unions.

"We have only seen the beginnings of rules and regulations designed to regulate and bind men's actions. The people of the United States will be driven steadily towards increased organisation, increased conformity, and increased control over the thoughts and actions of the individual. In the face of the powerful modern

tools of persuasion and coercion, I fear that what dignity and freedom we still possess may one day vanish."

Dr. Harrison Brown, Professor of Geochemistry at the California Institute of Technology, who lectured in this strain at the Minnesota University, only gave expression to a settled feeling among enlightened people all over the world. The desire to oppose and liquidate the enemy of individual freedom and personality, the active steps taken to prevent the aggression and infiltration of Communism, seem to result in the loss of the very freedom which it is the aim of non-Communist countries to protect by those activities. We must therefore look for the secret of freedom afresh, if we desire to guard it.

Looking around at 'progress' on both sides of the Iron Curtain it seems that as we advance in 'prosperity' and 'civilization' we must of necessity sacrifice individual freedom.

Now is this really inevitable? Does not everything depend on what we mean by and aim at as civilization and progress? If civilization is to be bound up with material advancement we must accept its inevitable consequence, loss of freedom in exact proportion to the forward march. And loss of freedom is loss of soul. This is as certain as the obverse of it, that if civilization is high thinking and simple living, and true and abiding happiness is what issues from such a way of life, civilization will bring more and more of freedom and not reduce it. If we make the mistake of confounding civilization with ever-increasing material advancement, we are bound to become slaves to tyrants and to tyrant organisations—governments, parties, cartels, trusts and trade unions. If we aim at what the saints and philosophers have told us to aim at, even in a changing world there will be happiness; and individual freedom which is its chief element will increase in the measure that we realise more and more of the ideal. The inevitable corollary of material advancement is competition first among individuals and next between nations and war and unending preparations against fear of aggression. Competition to be effective has to be organised into coercion, and as the race proceeds, the coercion must become ruthless.

The only way to freedom is the simple life and the courage to be wise even in a world that is ceaselessly busy in the opposite direction, given over to complicating life in every way that human ingenuity can do it. Co-operation, which in its simple

form is a joy, is organised until it becomes a despotism and a tyranny of the community over the individual. It soon reaches the monstrous shape of dictatorship of one kind or another. A special type of human being is bred for the work—the ruler-type who is born to the task of extracting the implicit obedience of his fellow-citizens. 'Ways of Life' are held forth to admiration, each as effective as the other in the matter of extinguishing freedom. It is forgotten that the only way worth living is the way that Socrates, Buddha, Christ and the Rishis of India preached.

The question arises: Is it possible to 'go back' to this? It is not only possible, it is not difficult to go back to it. It is much less difficult and much less hazardous than the way of ambition and war which we now blindly follow.

This is of course Revivalism. But to revive is not necessarily bad! If we have lost a good thing, it is good to get it back. When we have gone wrong, it is better to go back than to go forward along the same wrong path. The moral world is not a sphere like the earth where, if you go far enough even in a wrong direction, you come back to where you were. In the moral world, if we have gone wrong we must retrace our steps. What is the vaunted freedom of the Will if we *cannot* do this?

I know that America must laugh at this doctrine of the simple life. But we may take it that America is not always wise. Prosperity *plus* tension does not make either happiness or wisdom or religion. We see where America and Russia have both landed themselves—in the hell of endless fear under the shadow of total annihilation. What is left for *others* to do is to get rid of the *ectasis* of false civilization and to show a new way. Who can fulfil the mission of true civilization but the people of this land where the words of the Rishis are still in vogue and are reverently recited in the very accents of those sages? Where except in India can the holy task begin?

Swarajya, May 24, 1958

MANKIND PROTESTS

THE *New York Times* (International Edition of June 15, 1950), in a beautiful map, charts out world conditions which the United States' foreign policy must now tackle. It has this significant pointer against Washington: "*Pressure mounts for decision to spend atomic bomb tests.*"

It is refreshing to learn this from such a reliable judge of American opinion as the *New York Times*. The latest information as to the contents of the U.N. Scientific Committee's report (which has not been released up to the time these lines are written) confirms this appraisal of the situation. The Press Trust of India is responsible for the information that the report is known to estimate that continuation of nuclear tests after this year might cause up to 1,20,000 cases yearly of bone cancer, leukemia and genetic defects and it is added that the report is said to have warned that "mankind should proceed with great caution in view of possible underestimation." But why should 'mankind' proceed with caution? It is not 'mankind' that is exploding these nuclear tests, or a government of the world or a major part of it. Three nuclear powers have been doing it in spite of mankind's protests and a fourth is likely to start poisoning the world from Sahara. One of the three powers and one who was deemed farthest from any inclination to yield to moral or spiritual considerations, declared unilaterally the cessation of further explosions on its part. We hoped the other powers would soon follow the example. This has not happened so far.

It is hoped the U.N. Scientific Committee's report and the pressure of mankind's opinion will bring about a cessation of this high-handed poisoning programme. President Sukarno's appeal in the *New Statesman* last week deserves the attention of all civilized governments.

There are a few voices still maintaining that as the West cannot trust the Russians, the West must go on poisoning mankind in general. The mere statement of this claim is enough to condemn it. The continuance, any longer, of these tests on the part of any Power is a naked programme of attack on the health of mankind and the genetic integrity of the race. The plan of

defending national security by nuclear weapons and deterrent power of total annihilation may be wise, stupid, reckless or anything else. But the immorality and wickedness of doing something that injures mankind in general is not open to any doubt.

The nuclear scientists of the world, the most eminent biologists of all nations and thousands of other doctors of science have, in clear terms, condemned these explosions and have also pleaded in the name of science for a total ban on the use of nuclear weapons apart from any other issues involved in disarmament. The Government of the U.S.S.R. have repeatedly affirmed their readiness to sign an agreement for such a ban. There is no doubt whatsoever that the blame now rests on the U.S. and British Governments for any delay in this matter.

There are some writers, chiefly American, who confuse the public by statements that the havoc caused by conventional weapons was as terrible as what is being apprehended now by scientists as a result of the use of nuclear weapons. These people ignore, deliberately or otherwise, the great difference that genetic damage involves. Arguments of quantity of radio-active poison are advanced on the basis of a uniform spread over the entire world, whereas what will actually happen is a heavy concentration in places causing fatal results.

It is a wretched phase of the new development of science that seemingly scientific talk can be terribly dishonest. There will be a great meeting at Stockholm in the middle week of July and there will be another important world-meet at Tokyo on Hiroshima Day in August. Let us pray that these meetings may see the end of this menace to the world that presents to us in real concrete form the meaning of the fable of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge.

Swarajya, Jul. 12, 1958

WISDOM TRIETH WITHOUT

It is easy for one who commands on his side nationalist passions, viz., fear and hatred of a strong power in strategic neighbourhood, to win public plaudits against a philosopher who pleads for all mankind and for civilization as a whole. Bertrand Russell has been assailed by columnists in American journals as contradicting himself or as a being impractical upon his own confession. The lower-level tricks of controversy are well-known and Bertrand Russell treats them with deserved contempt.

The controversy arose out of an alleged statement on Bertrand Russell's part that if we cannot avoid a nuclear war and the inevitable total annihilation that it meant, it is better for the wiser side to surrender, if that be the only way to prevent the full-scale nuclear war. The word 'surrender' was met by immediate and loud chauvinistic opposition and the philosopher was dubbed a fool. He never advocated a declaration of readiness to surrender beforehand for that would spell defeat in negotiation as well as in war. What Bertrand Russell stands for is clear. He claims for mankind the right to survive, to survive the new fatal knowledge. He claims the right for civilization to correct its errors and live. Those who threaten one another, preferring death to surrender, not only threaten total destruction to themselves claiming the right to suicide but they propose to deprive the uncommitted nations of the world of their right to live and survive other people's fatal blunders. The advocates of nuclear war deny, says Bertrand Russell, the most elementary freedom, viz., the freedom to live not only to the inhabitants of Communist countries whom they oppose but to the inhabitants of all the uncommitted nations, that is those who have not forfeited their right by any partisanship on either side.

Both sides have unqualified and deadly dislike of the way of life of the 'enemy' and have no hope that it will ever change for the better. The West would rather perish totally than accept Communism and all that it stands for. On the other side, the feeling against Capitalism is not less strong. Bertrand Russell takes note of this and points out that the worst features

of Communism have been developed under the influence of fear and would almost certainly grow less if fear were removed. This is not likely to be accepted by men who have worked themselves up to utter hatred and would rather depend on fear and yet more fear, than on any such hope of change or reclamation.

Bertrand Russell puts the case clearly to the West: "I think that with wise statesmanship on the part of the West, it will not be at all difficult to avoid both nuclear war and surrender." What he advocates is a conclusion of agreements between East and West, admitting the inevitability of co-existence and the disastrous futility of war.

"Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets."

Swarajya, September 6, 1958

A MOST DANGEROUS SITUATION

WHILE Pandit Nehru is enjoying the hospitalities of the rulers of Bhutan and Sikkim, the world is being taken by Mr. Dulles to the very brink of war. It seems as if America's present rulers have decided that war is inevitable and it is better it comes now than later. The majority of the world's people do not however think so. They still believe that war is not inevitable, that patience can avert it and that co-existence is possible.

It is a cheap way out to refuse to receive the representations of a brother government when one finds it difficult to answer them. The issue of America's right to stand between China and her islands, and the question why real China should not replace the discredited ex-dictator who sits in the Chinese chair in the U.N. are difficult to answer. An objection to form and language may for the time being serve to screen evasion and to give to American voters a sense of self-righteous fulfilment but cannot be a substitute for wise policy or international justice or serve the cause of world peace.

The present American policy has been severely condemned by Mr. Acheson and Mr. Adlai Stevenson. Mr. Dulles has accelerated his brinkmanship. Is it possible that something near

to a world war is played to begin before November when Congressional elections must lead to the displacement of the G.O.P. ? Should the world be plunged into catastrophic risk over an unjustifiable issue because of the party situation in American politics ? Mr. Dulles hopes perhaps that the atomic weapons which Admiral Felt will unwillingly use (so he has said) against the Chinese mainland will quell Chinese arrogance and that out of a desire to avoid total war, Russia will let China down and stand aside. This would be a terrible miscalculation. Men are more loyal than that and there are causes and occasions which drive them to desperate steps. It will be a signal for general nuclear warfare. That satanic thing has been hungrily waiting for it far too long. The situation is just the sort that wise men have all along been apprehending as the inescapable result of the manufacture and accumulation of nuclear weapons. Despite the universal awareness of the consequences of a nuclear war and the unwillingness of everybody to begin it, the machine has an infernal will of its own and takes possession of the rulers of men and urges them on to destruction.

Britain is not unaware of what will happen to her in the matter of a few hours, but her blindfold alliance with America carries her forward to catastrophe. The words 'Munich' and 'Appeasement' are enough to drown commonsense and cloud the vision of men. Is it moral for America to give military assistance to help China against China ten years after the revolution was over ? And is it wicked for Russia to intervene to support a government accepted by 600 millions against a foreign supported insurgent section ? It is extraordinary that the immoral support that America has chosen to give to the discredited dictator of China, Chiang Kai-Shek, and the fiction of a Chinese republic under his presidentship should be kept alive for so long and now taken to the length of inviting world annihilation. Quemoy is part of China as the coastal islands of America or Britain belong to them. If the world must be ruined, it seems far too unreasonable that so poor a provocation and so wrong an issue should furnish the occasion.

Swarajya, September 27, 1958

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

MR. DULLES in his book, *War, Peace and Change*, wrote some years ago : " For a nation to base its relations with the outside world on the assumption that change brought about by force is in fact non-existent is a policy of absurdity . . . For any nation to close its eyes to such changes and to treat them as non-existent, means the election of such nation to live in a world as unrelated to reality as that of Alice in Wonderland." Mr. Dulles who wrote this is himself precisely doing what he condemned in such strong terms.

(It is refreshing to read what Nye Bevan has said at Scarborough pledging himself, if not the whole Labour Party, unconditionally to do away with British nuclear tests when the Party takes office irrespective of what others may or may not do. And he bases this promise on the solid Christian ground that Britain can't do something that undoubtedly poisons other innocent nations and succeeding generations. America makes a cheap jibe saying Russia has finished her 'propaganda' exercise and has therefore resumed nuclear test explosions. What is called 'propaganda' is nothing but the *moral power* of any unilateral action in the right direction. If one likes it, one gives it the right name. If you dislike it and wish to resist it, you call it 'propaganda.' The fanatics who crucified Christ called his teaching by some such name. Yet that propaganda has come to stay and is the only hope of western mankind.

Citizens in all democracies have become flocks of timid and industrious animals, of which ruling politicians have become the shepherds who undertake " to spare the citizens all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living," as De Toqueville prophetically wrote in his book on Democracy in America. This criminal activity that goes by the name of test explosions must serve to wake up indifference and rouse mankind to a sense of responsibility to prevent governments from committing any longer this insane crime of poisoning God's world. Russia unilaterally stopped her tests and called on America and Britain to follow. But these Great Powers did not respond. Khrushchev has not been able to hold out very long. He has yielded to the siege of the other nuclear Powers. But Russia is even now ready and

eager, so Khrushchev declares, that these test explosions should be stopped by all the Powers and at once and unconditionally. Russia has realised that poisoning uninvolved nations and future generations of mankind is no legitimate part of any national defence. But the U.S. government is still arguing as if this crime against innocent nations were a lawful right and must be considered and negotiated along with other issues related to disarmament. And Britain loyally joins this claim of her dominant partner. Opinion in Britain has definitely revolted and repudiated this claim that the poisoning of the world's atmosphere and land and water is part of legitimate national defence, even if nuclear weapons were any real defence at all for Britain.

A reading of the latest British official hand-out as to what citizens should do by way of previous precaution against nuclear bombing makes dismal reading and confirms the universal conviction that there is no such thing as civil protection or precaution in this kind of warfare. Indeed this official hand-out must itself serve to turn the people of Britain against nuclear tests. The awful danger into which the present foreign policy of the Conservative government is leading Britain is made clear by this hand-out as to so-called 'precautions.'

It is unfortunate that the Labour Party has not yet summoned the strength of character to make its nuclear armament policy more definite. The card-vote by which delegates' votes are multiplied by the number of members of each union is not a true indication of public opinion among the workers of Britain. It is more an indication of confidence in a particular leadership than a vote on the issue of nuclear tests or any other particular issue. The anti-nuclear campaigners who are doing vigorous work in Britain have a great deal yet to do to bring the Labour Party policy to definite shape. The Geneva conference which appeared to be almost a certainty has again lapsed into the realm of may-be or may-not-be. It is unfortunate that test explosions galore have started again. But it may be that this itself may induce re-thinking instead of indulgence in light-hearted recrimination. The fate of the world is in the hands of leaders whose wisdom appears to be open to much doubt. It is only Providence that can save the world.

Swarajya, October 11, 1958

THE U.N. REPORT ON TEST EXPLOSIONS

London, Oct. 18.—The dust from distant nuclear explosions is now a regular component of London's atmospheric radio-activity, Dr. Burgess, scientific adviser to the London County Council, says in his report for 1957. The dust contains some components which by direct inhalation and by deposition on the ground and subsequent incorporation in food can be assimilated in the body.

The present level of such contamination is, however, supposed to be well within the limits regarded as tolerable by the International Commission on Radiological Protection.

The above is a report from the special correspondent of a leading daily in India. If London atmosphere shows this poisonous deposit, how much more exposed to this disease and genetic mutation causing poison are the people of Asia and her islands! It is true that the 'peaceful use' reactors of the British Isles, and, specially, the occasional accidents occurring therein have contributed to the deposit in the London atmosphere. But the biggest contribution must be from the test explosions carried on in spite of mankind's protest for the alleged security of a few war-mongering nations. If the British Isles situated in the Atlantic Ocean has been affected, what about the Pacific Ocean and the lands in and around it?

When a village is on fire and all the houses are going to be burnt down, people do not discuss legal points and property disputes, but proceed all of them to put out the fire. So also should we attend to the radio-active danger to mankind from test explosions and not mix it up with other problems which we shall not be able to solve in a hurry. It is immoral and unwise to use mankind's fear of total poisoning as a sanction to achieve settlement of international disputes as to sizes of armaments posed against one another.

The United Nations Scientific Committee on the effects of atomic radiation, after a three-year study, submitted their conclusions in August last. *The Scientific American*, a leading journal of America, devoted to science and truth, summarises the conclusions of this U.N. Committee in the following words :—

"The Committee recommends the avoidance of unnecessary exposure resulting from medical, industrial and other procedures for peaceful uses, and the cessation of contamination of the environment by explosions of nuclear weapons. The control of all these sources of radiation involves national and international decisions which lie outside the scope of its work.

"The U.N. group concurred in the virtually unanimous opinion that there is no lower limit on the genetic effects. That is, any dose, however small, causes mutations, and the number of mutations is proportional to the amount of radiation."

Other extracts are given below which will also be found very instructive :—

The contamination is serious in milk-drinking countries and very much more serious in countries in which rice is the staple diet. If testing will continue at the rate of the past four years, the danger of contamination in milk-drinking countries and rice-eating areas is represented by the following figures : 28 in the former and 17 in the latter. In addition to clearly recognizable hereditary traits, the genetic changes will affect intelligence and longevity.

The U.N. Scientific Committee could go no further than giving the above conclusions. The action called for is within the jurisdiction of the political body. It is inconceivable that any government claiming to be civilized should any longer carry on test explosions and refuse immediately and unconditionally to stop them as Russia has formally and repeatedly asked America and Britain to agree to do, herself offering to do it at once if the others agreed.

It is a tragedy that Russia's unilateral move seven months ago was not followed up by action on the part of the other nuclear powers. A barefaced race has been persisted in, claiming to burst an equal number of poison bombs on either side. It would have been tolerable if every explosion poisoned the atmosphere of that nation only that exploded it, as in horseracing where the loss accrues to the side that persists in the gamble and does not hurt the spectators. Here, however, the poison race poisons the whole world and yet it is persisted in and justifications are gravely offered for the crime.

Swarajya, October 25, 1958

AMERICA'S CHINA POLICY

THE condemnation of American policy in regard to China is fairly universal. But it is specially refreshing to read the frank criticism and censure by enlightened American public men of their own government. Their language is unambiguous and marked by the forthrightness of American style.

The criticism is not only of the Quemoy strategy but of the whole of the China policy. It was least expected but it has happened that Dulles has returned from Formosa with the conviction that Quemoy must be defended against China. It seems as if Dulles is one of the scourges of God sent to confound human arrogance and bring it to its destiny.

It should not be difficult for the most foolish among wishful thinkers to give up the hope that Chiang Kai-Shek will ever reconquer the Chinese people and hold China. Not only is he not the type that could achieve such a conquest of hearts, but there is not the least chance for such a miracle in the external conditions that govern the course of history.

Can the Chinese people be divided into two nations on the basis of two *isms* or on the basis of two foreign policies? Nothing can be more illusory than such a hope. It is, therefore, not surprising that the censure of American policy is not confined to America's friends abroad and that men and women have risen in America itself to condemn the policy followed in respect of China and Chiang Kai-Shek. If the *New York Times* reflects American public opinion, there is a present and insistent demand that America's China policy must be drastically changed.

Lewis Mumford, the well-known social philosopher and writer, has raised his voice against the current American policy in respect of China: "The government of the so-called Chinese nationalists," says he, "is not a Government at all, but a displaced army." This strikes at the root of the matter. It is not merely a Quemoy issue or a question of military expediency. It calls for a total revision of attitude and a drastic change from A to Z.

"Whatever the original merits of the American decision," proceeds Lewis Mumford, "to back Chiang Kai-Shek after his

army had abjectly yielded to the Communists, our present alliance with this defunct government and our support of its supine army has ceased to have any justification."

It is not only Russia and China that level charges of aggression against America. Lewis Mumford points out how Taiwan (Formosa) serves as a base for American nuclear forces which openly keep threatening the Chinese mainland. It is on this background that we should appraise Mr. Dulles's latest pronouncement on the strategic necessity of holding Quemoy against China.

It is clear that there is a rising tide of public opinion in America itself against America's China policy and against America's nuclear policy. The sooner the backing of Chiang is given up as a first step in the required change the better will the cause of world-peace be served.

It is nothing short of silly for a great power to attempt leaning on the fiction of a Chiang Kai-Shek-China and keep the China seat in the U.N. from its lawful occupant. If the U.N. is to be an instrument for peace and not of cold war, the *de facto* government of China must occupy that chair at once. The whole world knows China to be somewhere else and not with Chiang Kai-Shek but the farce is solemnly played and allowed to be played.

Equally foolish would it be for America to depend on an Asiatic wall of military dictatorships to contain Communism. Whether it be in Pakistan or Thailand today or in other lands tomorrow, such dictatorships cannot last and while they are propped up would incite and encourage the underground march of Communism. Military rule and the terror on which it rests invites the very enemy whom it is the intention to keep off through such futile defences. Has not the history of India shown that military administration depends on the co-operation of the people and its days are ever numbered, however terrible and awe-inspiring its beginning may be? It would be as futile as dishonourable for America to prop up these military administrations that are growing up like mushrooms in Asia around the Communist bloc. America would be false to her fundamental political philosophy if she did this. It is as true in politics as in other matters that the best and safest course is to follow *swadharma*—one's own philosophy of life—and not to adopt another's *dharma* however attractive

it may be at the moment. The world is not inadvertent but is marking with dissatisfaction how America is supporting monarchic, feudal, military and other undemocratic regimes inconsistent with America's basic spirit and fundamental political convictions.

Unlike in other democratic countries high American officials are in the habit of making public statements which in other governments would be impermissible to officials and reserved only for a Prime Minister. A Vice-Admiral who will soon be Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces in Southern Europe has declared that "World War III has long since started" and that we foolishly refuse to recognize the fact. "We are locked in a life-and-death struggle with the Communists and we are not doing too well," says this officer on behalf of the Allied powers.

A British officer would hesitate uttering at this juncture a war-mongering and provocative untruth such as this. "The only logic that makes sense to our enemy is backed by military power and the willingness to use that power," says this Admiral Brown to remove all doubt.

The rest of the world is somehow seeking to prevent war while these American officials exult in beating the most dangerous drums of war, urging people towards that tragic futility Homer of Greece and the Mahabharata of India have described both the fascination and the futility and tragedy of war long before mankind realised it again at the end of World War II. But atom bombs and arrogance cloud the brains of nations who imagine they are born to guide the affairs of all the nations on earth. Apollo thus describes mankind to Zeus in Homer: "Those wretched creatures who like the leaves flourish for a little while on the bounty of the earth and flaunt their brilliance, but in a moment droop and fade away." Once Zeus himself said to the horses that the gods gave to Achilles's father: "O, why did we give you to share the sorrows of unhappy men? Of all creatures that breathe and creep about on mother earth there is none so miserable as man." The gods who saw the tragic futility of war have no respect for man who has not ceased to indulge in it in spite of every bitter experience.

Swarajya, November 1, 1958

YET WE MUST HOPE

AMERICA has slowly begun to see the folly of maintaining in office people whose definite policy is to make danger for the world. The voters may not have yet visualised what the new policy should be, but they have no doubts as to the present policy being wrong. This is not a case for maintaining the *status quo* and throwing the burden of proof on those who seek a change. Where hatred and war are being ceaselessly provoked and all negotiation degenerates into angling for advantage—which is only too obvious to the other party and becomes easy material for exposure and ridicule—it is clear that the want of confidence of the voters must be recorded. And that has been done in the clearest manner.

Not brinkmanship, but something else is wanted. What is that something? It is leadership, leadership in a true sense, not of one bloc or another but of the world. American policy should give a lead to the world. This is the leadership that is wanted. One must take the right step oneself without waiting for the other parties to do it. This alone is what can rightly be called leadership in the world sense as distinguished from the leadership of a political group or of a group of nations involved in belligerency against another group.

In spite of all the immediately available arguments based on scepticism and fear, the doctrine of unilateral action has made steady progress. More people see now that there is no other way, and that if we do not wish impotently to wait for annihilation we must accept this policy for healing the world's malady.

As George B. Caird of the McGill University in Montreal has pointed out, the great moral advances of the past have all been achieved when one man, one group, one nation has obeyed the Voice of God, whatever might be the cost of obedience, and has dared the rest of the world to follow. And he instanced the abolition of the slave trade. It was postponed for years because the British government was afraid that renunciation on its part while other nations continued to enjoy the commercial benefits of the trade, might mean economic disaster. But when Wilberforce won his case for unilateral abolition, he was invited to one

European capital after another to give the leadership he had given to his own people.

Surely, the destruction of civilization and the poisoning of the world's atmosphere, of man's creative cells for generations to come, must be a more urgent call than even the iniquities of the slave trade.

A says to B that unless he, the latter, stops doing it, A will continue to poison C. B says that he has to poison C so long as A does not stop doing it. No one speaks for C. He must continue to be poisoned by both, because A and B do not trust one another. The advantage of science has strangled the moral law. A less 'civilized' world was able to behave better. Strange paradox!

Professor George Caird had a legitimate ground to ask: "Has it ever occurred to you how desperately illogical we of the western world are in our attitude to Russia? We exalt our own way of life with its liberty of conscience and freedom of enterprise and decry the Russian way in which a man cannot call his soul his own; and then having assigned all Communists to their place of inferiority, we demand that they shall be the ones to perform the act of grace that is to break the deadlock of mutual suspicion."

And this is done even when Russia says: "We are ready to sign now and here along with you." The World Federation of Scientific Workers sent its message to Tokyo asking those that gathered there recently "to see to it that the dangerous nuclear arms race be put to an end."

The jurists of the world who assembled at the Tokyo conference reached the following conclusions after full discussion:—

1. The use of nuclear weapons is illegal because it is contrary to the principle of international law that prohibits indiscriminate bombing and to Article 23(a) of the Hague Convention.
2. No government has under international law any right to designate a vast danger-zone and carry out nuclear tests. The announcement of the U.S.S.R. government of the cessation of nuclear tests conforms with the above principles of international law and we believe that the U.S.A. and Great Britain are under an obligation to the law of nations to do likewise.

The tragedy of the situation now is that after waiting for six months the U.S.S.R. has recalled its decision and resumed

tests. And the comedy is that America finds fault with the U.S.S.R. for cancelling the suspension which the latter had unilaterally undertaken, although America herself did not in the least co-operate with or follow the Russian lead and actually ridiculed it.

There is neither a sense of moral obligation which once governed the activities of nations, nor even a sense of humour.

Yet we must hope. For, without it, we face death. We have reached a stage when hope has become almost a superstition and yet we have to cling to it.

Swarajya, November 15, 1958

A LETTER FROM MR. KHRUSHCHEV

MR. KHRUSHCHEV writes to Rajaji as follows:—

I have received your letter in which you mention the initiative of the Soviet Union who, from March 31 of this year, unilaterally suspended the tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons as a step directed at the achievement of general cessation of these weapons tests. Unfortunately, the further actions of the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain did not justify our hopes.

In your letter you are suggesting again that the Soviet Union should unilaterally declare that it would not use nuclear bombs or nuclear weapons of any type. At the same time you are expressing the hope that such an act by the Soviet Government will lead to the fact that the Western Powers possessing the atomic weapon, will come out with an analogical declaration and assent to the conclusion on this question of a lasting international agreement that would also include consent to the destruction of all existing stocks of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

I can assure you, dear Mr. Rajagopalachari, that with all their power the Soviet Government are striving to completely prohibit the atomic and hydrogen weapons and in doing so to remove the menace of atomic war threatening mankind.

During all the post-war years the Soviet Union has been steadily fighting to outlaw the use of atomic weapon, to stop its manufacture, to withdraw it from the armaments of states, and

to destroy all the stocks of these weapons. However, this struggle has not led us to success so far.

The main reason why no agreement on this question has been concluded up till now is the fact that all the military plans of the Western Powers are based on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. American war bases are situated near our borders, on the take-off strips of which there are bombers with the load of atomic and hydrogen bombs on board perfectly ready for action. American bombers with the same lethal load are always in the air over the territories of a number of NATO countries. Rocket weapons are also being feverishly installed now at many U.S. military bases.

Now judge for yourself whether under these circumstances the Soviet Union can unilaterally give up the use of nuclear weapons even for one year without endangering the security of our people.

We cannot shut our eyes on the following circumstances either. In order to improve the international situation and to make a start for the successful solution of the disarmament problem the Soviet Government repeatedly carried out unilateral reduction of the armed forces and armaments with the result that in the course of last years its armed forces were cut by 2,140 thousand men. In doing so, the Soviet Government hoped that our measures to cut our armed forces would find a positive response from the Governments of the U.S.A. and other Western Powers, and that they would, in their turn, carry out corresponding reduction of their armed forces. And what happened? Western Powers passed by the peace-loving efforts of the Soviet Government, and, as before, they are going on with the armament drive, giving no thought to reduction of their army, navy and air forces which are unusually large in a peaceful time.

While taking the decision of a unilateral suspension of tests of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons, we expected that this step would impel the Western Powers in their turn to stop their nuclear test explosions and in that way the universal suspension of nuclear tests would be provided for good. However, in this case, too, the example of the Soviet Union did not affect the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain. On the contrary, just after the unilateral suspension of tests by the Soviet Union and after the appeal of the Soviet Government to the Government of the U.S.A. and Great Britain with the suggestion to stop all

tests immediately, the U.S.A. undertook the largest series of tests of atomic and hydrogen bombs in the region of the Pacific Ocean. Great Britain followed in the U.S. footsteps and also started a series of nuclear tests.

Attaching paramount importance to the suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, the Soviet Union raised this question at the 13th Session of the U.N. General Assembly and introduced a draft resolution which called upon all the states, which are carrying out tests of these weapons, to stop such tests immediately and recommended to begin negotiations with the purpose of concluding a corresponding agreement among them. However, the U.S.A. and Great Britain did not show any desire to support this resolution.

Do these facts disclose any desire on the part of the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain to stop the test of atom and nuclear weapons?

As for the statements by the U.S. President, Mr. Eisenhower, and by the British Government of August 22, 1958, concerning a temporary suspension of tests, the promises which are contained in them to stop the tests do not solve the problem. The statements deal with suspension of nuclear weapons tests for one year only, i.e., just for such a term which is required to prepare the next series of similar tests. The consent to prolong this term in the future for one year more each time does not change the position so far as it is accompanied by the reservations and conditions, the obvious purpose of which is to give the Western Powers a possibility to evade stopping the nuclear weapons tests. Therefore, the Western Powers have not actually given up their policy of obstruction on the question of the cessation of tests and likely intend to pursue it in the future also.

One cannot help drawing a conclusion that the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain are obviously using the cessation of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union in order to win for themselves one-sided military advantages. The Soviet Government, naturally, cannot allow the security interests of the Soviet Union to suffer and they found themselves compelled to declare that the actions of the U.S.A. and Great Britain freed the Soviet Union of its unilateral commitment to stop the nuclear weapons tests.

The Soviet Union will keep on striving to achieve a speedy final solution of the question of discontinuance of atomic and

hydrogen weapons tests. We suggest to the U.S.A and Britain—and already to sign it ourselves—an agreement on the universal cessation of nuclear tests for all time. But we cannot remain indifferent in the face of a stubborn refusal on the part of the Western Powers to conclude such an agreement. The refusal of the U.S.A. and Britain to stop tests of nuclear weapons immediately and unconditionally gives ground to the Soviet Union for continuing the nuclear tests started by it in the one-to-one proportion, in relation to the combined number of nuclear explosions carried out by these Powers, until the number of explosions conducted by the Soviet Union after its resumption of tests equals that of the experimental explosions carried out by the U.S.A. and Britain taken together after March 31 last.

Does it not seem to you, Mr. Rajagopalachari, that should the Soviet Union keep on taking unilateral measures on disarmament, while the Western Powers continued the unrestrained arms race and were increasingly arming themselves, a rather dangerous situation might arise creating a real threat not only to the security of the Soviet Union but also to the maintenance of international peace?

Collective security cannot be created at the expense of unilateral efforts on the part of one country. The desire and corresponding efforts on the part of all countries are necessary for this. We have proved our goodwill by practical deeds. Now it is the turn of the United States and other Western countries, which should make a real contribution to the cause of removing the menace of atomic and hydrogen war.

Yours sincerely,
N. KHRUSHCHEV

November 17, 1958

A NOTE ON MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S LETTER

MR. KHRUSHCHEV's latest letter to me has been published in *Swarajya* of last week. In spite of all the realistic logic of Mr. Khrushchev and the reasons he gives for his inability to take a unilateral step, in spite of the apparent failure of his first trial to

produce any good results by way of co-operation from the West, I feel that there is no other way for mankind to be saved. It may require explanation why I pester the Russian leader with these suggestions for unilateral action. I confess that somehow I still entertain greater hopes in that quarter than in Mr. Dulles. Further, Mr. Khrushchev did respond early this year in a manner which, in spite of every hostile analysis, must be recognised as unique. And again, is there not Jesus Christ together with all his churches daily appealing to the secular powers of the West? Is not adherence to the Sermon on the Mount their greatest external advantage over their brothers in Russia? Where this appeal is ignored, would it not be presumptuous for me to enter the field?

We cannot overcome evil by evil or folly by folly. We cannot overcome the enemy's doubts or his fears except by unilateral action, not caring whether the opponent will or will not immediately co-operate. If two men or two nations must give up enmity and arrive at trust, goodwill or friendship, one of them must some time step forward with faith. If this is not possible, it means we discard all the religions of the world as illusion and futile nonsense, and the doom of the world is certain. I see no agreement in the offing. But I clearly still see the possibility of unilateral action, out of which an agreement is bound to issue. The solution of ill-will and fear lies in unilateral action. This is as fundamental as any other law of nature.

Have those who are not in this cold war no rights to object and no real power to bring to a stop this programme of poisoning the present and future generations of mankind? I do not think Mr. Nehru and his great friends among the nations of the world have given adequate attention to this aspect of the matter. Genetic damage is caused by the fall-out of nuclear explosions in two ways. One is the immediate and direct effect on the gonad tissue of the radiations from fall-out. The changes thus produced in the human hereditary material are passed on to future generations. Again, there is the long-term effect of carbon-14 produced from the bomb. This isotope has, we are told by scientists, a life of 8,000 years. Throughout this long period of eighty centuries this poison goes on damaging the human hereditary material and these mutations are passed on to future generations. It will thus be seen that these explosions accumulate poison for generations and generations of mankind. Can we not hope that the uncontroverted

facts repeatedly testified to by eminent scientists in the clearest terms may make some impression on the people of the great democracies of the world ? Here is Mr. Khrushchev definitely offering to sign below the dotted line for an unconditional cessation of test explosions if the other powers agree to sign. Is it not worthwhile to take him at his word, be he as bad as bad can be, and give to the world a charter against poison. A new chapter of world negotiations may begin if this be done.

Postscript

I have just received a cable from Clarence Pickett and A. J. Muste (Philadelphia, U.S.), asking me to join the deputation of the crew of Golden Rule and Phoenix at Geneva and assist in their plea to U.S.A., Soviet and British representatives at the conference to draft an unconditional agreement to end nuclear tests. The Golden Rule and Phoenix sailed to the Pacific last summer in protest of U.S. testing programme. The voice of Japan has so far failed to be heard. May these American Knights of Christ fare better. My view is that the American Government is now the great stumbling block.

If only the good people of America knew their strength much could be achieved. The mothers of America and the prospective mothers of deformed children—can they not smash the near-war strategists and the security hunters who are poisoning mankind and children to be born ?

Swarajya, December 6, 1958

NEUTRAL NATIONS SHOULD CONFER

THE Government of India is doing a great deal at the diplomatic level to get a cessation of nuclear test explosions. Our Prime Minister naturally feels that his office and responsibility limit him to certain channels of approach. This is a correct attitude although Khrushchev and Eisenhower do not restrict their expressions of opinion on world issues in the same manner. But our Prime Minister need not accept the ways of other governments if he thinks they are wrong.

The question still remains whether the neutral nations of the world and their governments should officially confer among themselves and find a proper forum and process to present a combined note of protest against the invasion on world health that is being indulged in by the nuclear powers against all international morality.

The cessation of the explosions should not depend on the will and pleasure of the nuclear powers but is a right which the neutral nations can demand through their governments. The poisoning affects generations and affects nations who are not on one side or the other of the cold war. It is irrelevant for the offending governments to plead want of agreement among themselves as an excuse for the transgression of the rights of the peoples who are not in the cold war. It would be as wrong as a plea on the part of two criminal gangs that they cannot stop their crimes because they have not been able to agree among themselves as to how to live honestly. The news from Geneva is good—at least it looks like it. But things would greatly improve if the neutral governments put forward their case which stands on its own ground and apart from the fears and suspicions of the cold war governments.

Swarajya, December 13, 1958

1959

WHAT PREVENTS

THE unqualified assertion of the right of mankind to the purity of the atmosphere with which the planet is endowed and to the integrity of the hereditary human cells must precede the organisation of any machinery for detection and prevention of evasion. The wrong-doers have no right to be left alone in their career of crime, infringing this right of mankind until the machinery to prevent evasion is perfected to their satisfaction, any more than ordinary criminals are entitled to carry on their trade until courts and police are perfected.

What prevents an anti-tests group of nations in the U.N. raising the issue whether the U.N. is not bound by its Charter unconditionally to ban the poisoning of the earth's atmosphere by any individual power in its own supposed or even real interests? It would not be interference in the internal affairs of a State, for this poisoning of the air and the human cells for generations to come is not just a matter of national defence but an infringement of other peoples' rights. What prevents even a minority in the U.N. from claiming this over-riding fundamental right to call for a cessation of wrong-doing, although the offending power or powers may secure a majority of votes in favour of continued poisoning?

What prevents is Brute Force. It is a naked revolt against international law. This must be brought to the open by a combined attack on the part of those nations that can unite on this issue of the protection of the purity of the planet's atmosphere and the integrity of the hereditary seed of the human race.

The crew of the Golden Rule have returned from their visit to Geneva, greatly satisfied with the reception accorded to them. The representatives of the three governments that met at Geneva seem to believe, each one of them, in its own innocence and welcomed the protest of the Golden Rule as a criticism of the 'other fellow.'

If America has a divine mission in the world to liquidate Communism and if the Government of the U.S. is executing that mandate, the men and women of America have a still diviner

mission to perform in respect of their own Government. And that is to battle against their own Government against the use of nuclear weapons and to stop the poisoning that is going on in the test explosions. They have to take steps for making the own Government give up their illusion that mutual intimidation is the only way to international life.

The latest witness that has come to testify about the poison is Dr. I. Gardner, Professor of Pediatrics in the College of Medicine of New York State University. According to him C. 14, one of the isotopes of nuclear fall-out, has a life of 8,000 years during which the chain action of poisoning hereditary cells will go on. Whether it be 8,000 years or a few years more or less makes no difference in this crime.

The American Civil Resisters and others who disapprove of the nuclear activities of their Government have their work cut out for them in America. The Government of Eisenhower cannot treat a great demonstration of mothers in New York or Washington with indifference. The women of America should make up their mind to tell their Government that they do not want this slow and sure genetic poisoning and that the American Government should find other ways of protecting the independence of America and the freedom of the individual. If America stops her nuclear programme, Russia must automatically follow. About this there can be no moral doubt, whatever the brink-of-war statesmen and those who have made the ramifications of atomic defence the economic content of their life may say to the contrary. The world, Communist and non-Communist, united against Hitler when he proved himself to be a danger to civilization. The nuclear menace is a greater, far greater menace than Hitler and the world must unite against it. What prevents but the illusions that Brut Power creates and which it is the duty of enlightened nations to dispel with vigour.

Swarajya, January 10, 1959

THE UNSOLVED ISSUE

THE West has great cause to feel discomfited. Russia has not only gone ahead of America in the rocket game, but in the more significant competition in fearlessness.

America may feel that her good conduct must be taken for granted. She may think that she must be presumed to conform to her promises. But enemies do not allow what self-righteousness is for granted. Yet Russia is prepared to accept and act on America's promise if they both enter into a treaty to ban all tests. America is not ready to accept Russia's declaration, it may be guessed, because Russia must be presumed to be always willing to break her word. This, however, is neither fair nor in the present context true. Russia is prepared to take the risk of a treaty to give up tests while America is not as fearless. She has lost in the competition for fearlessness as in Science. This is a great pity and it can yet be rectified. Fear can be conquered if there is enough of will. The courage to believe your enemy's word is an essential foundation for all international agreements. As against this what a poor substitute is the readiness to retaliate and destroy civilization! Fearlessness is a better substitute, trust is a more human and civilized alternative to what is believed to be security through the threat of retaliation.

And now the issue unsolved is said to be whether the ban agreed should be on a year-to-year basis or be permanent. The package plea has been given up and general disarmament has been separated from the issue of nuclear tests.

Can this disagreement about year-to-year or permanent ban be solved by some formula that provides for the fear of America—namely, by agreeing that the ban should be permanent, but either party is free to denounce the treaty with a year's notice and giving the reasons for the abrogation publicly so that the civilized world may see why it is done? This is a formula that may well be considered by the nuclear powers, in view of mankind's protest against the continued poisoning of the atmosphere and the mal-mutation of the hereditary cells of the human race.

Warajya, January 31, 1959

MIKOYAN'S PEACE INVASION

THERE are Americans who are positively afraid that the tension may melt! The fear of Communist Russia which has become chronic creates a peculiar sense of security that finds its balance only in fear. The victim is afraid that danger may overtake him if he casts off his fear! Fear which is the same thing as distrust is equated to vigilance and is believed to be the guarantee for safety. This is pathological but it seems to be the present phase in America after Mikoyan's visit.

"This is a dangerous man, he actually inspires confidence in our people!" This seems to be what the established political leaders of America feel. Finding that a wave of goodwill threatens to sweep the country and undermine the official fear, the leaders are trying every art to frighten the people with possibilities of subtle fraud. Maybe the world is unfortunate and they will succeed and the sunlight that brightened the scene for a time may darken again.

But what good can such 'success' produce, except a continuation of the dismal atmosphere that has befouled the earth ever since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. To keep the tension at full stretch, to nurse the cold war by every means, this seems to be American policy, a policy that not only injures America but is a canker to the whole world that wishes to live in peace.

There is on both sides a growing accumulation of the most dreadful weapons of destruction. We have a volcano built under us with a very thin crust to cover the fire that will not only kill but fill the earth with diseases and deformities unknown to mankind so far. We are sitting not on a cask of gunpowder but on something immeasurably more deadly which cannot for ever remain dormant. The accumulated danger is alive and itching to burst.

In addition we have, we are told, bacteriological terrors being organized. It is said that the revelation of the British Radar scientist is "a gross exaggeration." But whatever the actual measure of the preparation for bacteriological warfare may be, whether it is quite true or is a quantitative exaggeration, the thing is there, contrary to express convention, the outrageous meanness

of preparing to kill people by planting disease. Truly, civilization has attained total godlessness. The 'civilized' world is threatening not only to annihilate itself but to suck into the nemesis the innocent world outside the limits of its diabolical technology.

Swarajya, February 7, 1959

THE POWER OF LOVE

In January, all over India, we hold prayer meetings to remind ourselves of what Gandhi taught. It was on the thirtieth of January, eleven years ago, that a Hindu young man brought Gandhi's life to a close, as he and his friends detested Gandhi's policy of goodwill towards Moslems.

The terms of Khrushchev's message to the President of the United States and Mr. Mikoyan's friendly visit seem to be more than merely conventional and ordinary and raise hopes among some of us of a new era of international goodwill instead of international intimidation and suspicion. It would be good at this time for Americans to read what Sir Stafford Cripps said at the service of intercession held in Westminster Abbey on February 17, 1948 :—

"May not the whole world learn from his (Gandhi's) life something of fundamental value : that it is idle to try to save ourselves from destruction by the use of force and that our greatest weapon of salvation is the supreme and redeeming power of love. No words could perhaps better sum up his spirit than those of Thomas a Kempis : 'Love feels no burdens, thinks nothing of trouble, attempts what is above its strength, pleads no excuses for impossibility ; for it thinks all things lawful for itself and all things possible. It is therefore able to undertake all things, and it completes many things and brings them to a conclusion where he who does not love faints and lies down.' "

Letter in the New York Times, January 18, 1959

FORMULA TO BREAK THE DEADLOCK

THOSE of us who live round about the Pacific Ocean but who are not in the cold war are naturally impatient over the delay in an agreement being reached at Geneva about the suspension of test explosions. It seems to us rather odd that we cannot be saved from being poisoned unless the two sides in the cold war agree between themselves. No one has denied the right of the non-involved peoples to be saved from being poisoned. We feel that our rights are being totally ignored in the battle between the two parties.

But this impatience of ours does not blind us to the real difficulties in the situation as between the two sides of the cold conflict. The fears and suspicions of America are genuine and stand in the way of an agreement being reached on this as on the other issues connected with disarmament. I write this letter in the hope that a formula on the following lines may serve to give sufficient assurance to those who fear and doubt the opposite side, while at the same time it will secure an immediate suspension of the tests :—

Let there be a suspension by treaty without any time limit, but let a proviso be attached that any one of the nuclear powers signing the treaty shall have the right to denounce the treaty, giving a year's notice and publicly explaining the reasons justifying the step.

Those who desire a treaty of suspension for all time ought to be satisfied with such a proviso, because if there are reasons which can stand the test of public scrutiny and world judgment it would be impossible to justify the continuance of such a treaty from the point of view of national security as foreign policies now stand. Those who are unwilling to agree to indefinite suspension but desire only a year-to-year basis should also be completely satisfied with what I have here suggested. The principle of suspension having been accepted, any limit of time put on the suspension can only be in the interest of security against fraud, and if there are good reasons to suspect such fraud or evasions they should be publicly stated and supported with evidence acceptable to the world at large.

May I appeal that this question, which affects not only America but the whole world and its health, should be decided

justly and properly and not merely on the basis of giving oneself the benefit of all doubts ?

Letter in the New York Times, March 16, 1959

TO THE UNINVOLVED

WORLD opinion, the verdict of Science, and the fundamental international rights of non-cold war nations—all three demand that America should do better than she is now doing in respect of the suspension of nuclear tests.

We could add commonsense too as a fourth element in this list, so Bertrand Russell has claimed ; for can any intelligent American believe that further nuclear weapon development will be a bar to the spread of the Communist or any other doctrine ? The danger is not military aggression at all unless morbidity is allowed to befog commonsense, but the spread of an unwanted ideology. Soviet Russia and China claim day in and day out that their way of life leads to happiness and is the cause of their phenomenal and rapid rise to strength and prosperity. This claim cannot be met by nuclear or other weapons or even by lavish distribution of dollars to needy countries who wish to catch up with Western standards of living. It must be met otherwise.

It is remarkable indeed that world opinion should be so obstinately ignored by America in this matter of nuclear test explosions. It is more remarkable still that America should believe that she has a right under any circumstances to poison the world without taking any notice of the latter's protests or of the ordinary laws of good behaviour. But it is most remarkable among all things that the non-cold war governments of the world do not exert to stop this great and disastrous infringement on the world's right to health and life and genetic normality, and that they should content themselves by waiting for America and Russia to come to terms.

Power corrupts, it has often been repeated. And to illustrate this the ambitions of politicians are quoted. But in a more important sense the power of money and technology has completely corrupted America's judgment of right and wrong. Else,

how could any nation that started so gloriously with public allegiance to the doctrine of right and wrong believe that it has an even arguable right to ask for conditions in order that it may not poison the people of the world ! Whatever be its fears about Russia, it has no right to poison other people. It is time that all the governments of the world that are free from the obligations of cold war alliances should realise their duty and their strength in this respect. It is a shame that over and above the torpor that has come over unofficial life by reason of over-government all over the world, even governments should exhibit inertia in a matter of this great importance to the health of mankind and of the purity of the atmosphere and the health of the animal and vegetable world on which man depends for life. All the governments outside the cold war seem to be suffering from a deficiency of spirit and courage which Hippocrates attributed to the people who inhabit temperate lands where seasonal variations are not severe.

American policies should not benumb the sense of duty of the other governments of the world. There is a moral power available to mankind which can, if called up and properly used, battle successfully against wrongs even if they are wrongs committed by great governments, the more so when they do not really serve even those nations on whose behalf they are committed.

Swarajya, March 21, 1959

AFTER TIBET

SRI BALARAMAN, representative of *The Hindu* in New York, reported on March 30 this year : " The Tibetan revolt has evoked much sympathy both at the United Nations and the United States. But while there is general indignation . . . there is at the same time the realisation that apart from protesting . . . there is nothing the outside world can do at the present juncture to help the Tibetan people in their travail."

Sri Shelvankar, the *Hindu* representative in London, has sent a report on March 31 about British reactions : " There is no doubt that British opinion has been deeply stirred by the news of revolt, but since there is no question of any Western

intervention owing to military as well as political considerations, attention is focussed largely on India's reactions and Mr. Nehru's attitude in particular."

The focussing of attention on Mr. Nehru's attitude is tragic though amusing. The West admits unanimously that apart from protest no help can be rendered. They could not possibly imagine under these circumstances that India could do what America and her powerful allies find separately or jointly impossible. It is obvious that for the West, Tibet is just an opportunity for propaganda and Mr. Nehru's attitude is seized only for this purpose. Not any desire to help Tibet, but a hope that Nehru may be further held on the side of the West in the cold war is the driving force of all their reactions.

The Atom, it was once believed by good Bertrand Russell, would end war and came as a blessing disguised in evil. It is now clear that mutual assistance in the cause of justice and of saving the weak from the aggression of the strong, has been ruled out by the nuclear armaments that have come into being. Thus it is not war in general that has been made improbable, but assistance to victims of any powerful nation has been rendered impossible. Justice had a fair chance in the old days. Now, it is choked out completely. The chapter of chivalry of the strong going to the help of the weak is closed by the Atom, there can be no salvation for the world unless nuclear armaments are banned and to this end the whole world must unite and work. I said this in October 1956. The events of March 1959 remind us of this supreme duty. If there is to be any hope in the midst of this desperate situation, the not too greatly involved nations of the world must think out a way and unite in this holy crusade against nuclear weapons.

As for the test explosions they will in all probability be indefinitely stopped as a result of the Geneva Conference which, I believe, will find a safe formula—safe for both sides. The world issue now is how to get the nuclear weapons outlawed altogether. The use of these weapons under any circumstances and by whomsoever it may be would certainly be a deadly wholesale attack on the life and health of all the uninvolved and non-belligerent population of the world—men, women and children. What greater stake can there be than this to wage a relentless, united crusade against these weapons staying in the world in any form?