

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_154378

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 327.54 Accession No. 36202
M17 I

Author Madam Gopal

Title India as world power.
1948

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

INDIA AS A WORLD POWER

ASPECTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

by
MADAN GOPAL



DELHI
RAJKAMAL PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

1948

All Rights Reserved

Printed by

Gopi Nath Seth at Navin Press, Delhi

Published by

Rajkamal Publications Limited

Price

Rupees Two annas twelve only

To
The Memory of
My Parents
& Bijji.

The foreign policy of a democracy must be the cumulative views of individual citizens; and if those views are to be sound they must in turn be the consequence of a widely diffused knowledge. . . .A sovereign people must, as part of its sovereign duty, take up its own attitude to world problems. . . .The only question is whether that attitude shall be wise and a well-informed one or a short-sighted and ill-informed one. Therefore we need knowledge, exact knowledge.

—*John Buchan*

PREFACE

India's foreign policy, which is just taking shape, is a matter of the utmost importance to her future.

During the present century, a country's relations with the outside world have become the most important function of its government, and the manner in which they are conducted affects the lives of its citizens in all fields and at all levels.

This small book, which deals with some aspects of India's foreign policy, is written in the hope that it may stimulate interest in so vital a subject.

NEW DELHI

MADAN GOPAL

CONTENTS

Preface		
1. The Past Trends	...	I
2. The Rise and Decline of Great Britain	...	25
3. The Growth of the American Power	...	32
4. The Power of Russia	...	53
5. Our Neighbours	...	63
6. The Bases of a Foreign Policy	...	77
7. The Present and Future Trends	...	98
Appendices	...	117
I. Wilson's 14 Points		
II. The Atlantic Charter		
III. Charter of the United Nations		
Index	...	158

CHAPTER I

THE PAST TRENDS

At the beginning of the present century India's foreign policy was determined by the British Foreign Office without the consultation of, and sometimes even reference to, the Government of India. Questioned in Parliament about India's attitude towards the Anglo-Russian convention of 1907, Lord Morley, the then Secretary of State for India, said : "The plain fact is.....that this country (Britain) cannot have two foreign policies." And India was no exception; even the Dominions had no voice in their foreign policy or the foreign policy of the Empire. Addressing the Imperial Conference of 1911, Prime Minister Asquith declared in unequivocal terms :

"The Government of the United Kingdom, subject to its responsibility to the Imperial Parliament exercises the sole responsibility for, and has the sole authority in, all matters relating to the conduct of foreign policy, maintenance of peace or declaration of war ; this authority is not to be shared with the Dominions."

This was the time when a wave of terrorism swept the length and breadth of India. Massacres of British officials became commonplace. All over India the extremists had their cells where co-ordinated terroristic activities were planned. They had contacts with the Yugantar and Ghadar parties in America and Canada, and the powerful cells at work in London, Paris and the other capitals of Europe. The Indian exiles established friendly relations with foreign peoples and Governments with the object of securing arms which could be illegally imported into India. But these schemes did not get far. When Germany went to war with Britain in 1914, Indian exiles intensified their activities

from all their centres in America, on the Continent and in India, and formed a Provisional Government of Free India in Afghanistan.

There was another section of India which was taking an active interest in foreign affairs—the Muslims who were attracted to Abdul Hamid's pan-Islamic dream. But their horizon ended there. When Turkey was engaged in the Balkan wars of 1911-13, Indian Muslims became anti-British because Britain was the principal Power that was responsible for the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire in the Balkans. Thousands of Muslims left India rather than live under the rule of an infidel, and it has been recorded that hundreds died of starvation in Afghanistan and Russia on the roadside.

During World War I, India made great sacrifices. Her soldiers fought on almost every front, in Iran, Mesopotamia, Egypt, France, the Netherlands etc. She bore the cost of her own troops abroad, nearly 150 million pounds sterling, and made a free gift of another £100 millions. These sacrifices made it necessary that India be given a place alongside the Dominions, who had complete monopoly in their internal affairs and a substantial autonomy in external affairs.

Writing of India's contribution to the war effort, Lloyd George said :

"India made large contributions of men and money to the carrying on of the war and her troops were fighting alongside white soldiers and against white enemies. This fact had created a new self-consciousness which showed itself in a demand for greater recognition and it also made consultation with them about the future conduct of the war just and desirable."

He added :

"Without the effective help of the Indian contingent we could not have held the Germans in France and at the same time beaten the Turkish Army.

When the collapse of Russia and the consequent withdrawal of masses of German troops from the Eastern to the Western front forced us to draw our forces in Mesopotamia and Palestine for reinforcement in the French battle area we had to fill up our divisions on the Turkish front from Indian units. All this gave force to the plea that the principle of government with the consent of the governed should be extended to India."¹

In fairness to Lloyd George, it must be conceded that he did his best to persuade his colleagues to apply the principle of self-determination, which was adopted by the British Cabinet as Britain's war aim, to India. He first raised India's status to that of the Dominions and then invited India's representative to the Imperial War Conference which was summoned "on a special basis outside the official constitution." This representation of India in the Imperial War Conference and the Imperial War Cabinet was, to quote Lloyd George again, "the beginning of the open recognition of India's new status."²

The Prime Minister himself drafted the Seventh Resolution³ of the Imperial War Conference which resolved to place India's representatives on a footing of equality with those of the self-governing Dominions. He said :

"This resolution was important not merely because it opened the door for the future appearance of India alongside the Dominions at Imperial conferences, but because it marks the first Imperial recognition of the altered status of India. It was one of the preliminary stages of the reforms on Indian administration, which started that great country on the pathway towards self-government within the British Commonwealth."

Once the status of India had been raised to that of the Dominions, the next concern was to see that all

1. "The Peace Treaties," pp. 754-55. 2. War Memoirs p. 1735.
3. Ibid.

powers that were granted to the Dominions were not denied to India. Lord Sinha wanted to safeguard India's autonomy in external affairs, even though she lacked autonomy in internal affairs. In the end it proved a great fallacy; because, whereas the Dominions were able to exercise this autonomy in foreign relations, in the case of India this autonomy was nullified by the lack of popular control of the Government of India.

The Imperial War Conference met in April, 1917. On August 6, Sir Austen Chamberlain described India's new status to Parliament (which he recounted to Parliament on October 24, 1933) reaffirming Britain's intention to give India autonomy in internal and external affairs. This was further borne out by Mr. Walter Long's speeches. (In certain British circles even the prospect of making India a mandatory over Tanganyika was discussed.)

Forces of reaction in the British public life did not, however, take long to put pressure on the Cabinet to retrace this step. The promise given to India by Britain in her hour of dire need was later replaced by the statement on India dated August 20, 1917, which was read out to Parliament by Montagu, wherein the spirit and letter of the pledge given at the Imperial War Conference was set aside.

In this withdrawal of the concession which India had thus secured at great sacrifice in men and materials, the Tories in England had the support of the British administration in India. That the people of India had no control over the Government of India was indicated by the fact that, whereas the Dominions were represented on the Imperial War Cabinet by their respective Prime Ministers, India was represented by the Secretary of State for India, and the delegates sent by the Viceroy on behalf of the Government of India were given the role of mere advisers to the Secretary of State.

Popular opinion in India, voiced through the Indian National Congress now allied to the Muslim League, nominated Lokmanya B. G. Tilak to represent the case of India at the Peace Conference.

Although, as is shown by his letter to Clemenceau, Tilak envisaged that an India given the status of a Dominion of the British Commonwealth would act as a watchdog of British Imperial interests in Asia, the Government of India refused him a passport to proceed to France for participation in the deliberations of the Peace Conference, as a representative of the Indian people. The Government of India nominated Lord Sinha and the Maharaja of Bikaner instead, because they were interested more in the welfare of the British Empire. It may, incidentally, be noted that at this time none differentiated between British India and the Indian States. By a coincidence they represented India as a single entity.

As a member of the Empire Delegation, India, like the Dominions, alongside which she was placed, assumed a sovereign status. She was an original signatory to the Peace Treaty, and thus a member of the League of Nations in her own right. The position was highly anomalous because she was the only country among the signatories which was not self-governing. The Dominions objected to this arrangement of being listed with a country which not only had no voice in foreign affairs, but had also no internal autonomy.

Even the President of the United States of America, who had done so much to insist on the right of self-determination of the subject peoples, objected to India's signature on the Treaty in her own right. He warned Britain that should she insist on making docile India a signatory to the Peace Treaty he would insist on asking for the right of the Philippines to be a signatory too. It needed prolonged manoeuvres on the part of Britain to conciliate opposition of the Dominions and America to giving India the status of a sovereign nation in international affairs. Lord Cecil appealed to the American President to grant India this status, for otherwise, this "will be taken as an insult to a people already in unrest."

Constitutional historians of the British Commonwealth of Nations hold that India was marching alongside the

Dominions, or ahead of them, in her progress. They point out that India had attained autonomy in several matters, *e. g.* in the matter of signing technical and trade treaties.

The Treaty of Montenegro concluded in 1882 between the United Kingdom and Serbia stated that it was not to be applicable to the Dominions until they so desired and ratified the Treaty within one year of its ratification by the United Kingdom. The Anglo-Italian Treaty in the following year made a similar provision in the case of the Dominions and India.

By the turn of the century India had been given the freedom not only to enter into the treaties concluded by the United Kingdom but also the right to opt out. When an old treaty between the United Kingdom and Liberia came up for renewal in 1908 it was provided that the Dominions and India might contract out by giving due notice, this withdrawal not to have any effect on the application of the treaty to the United Kingdom. A treaty with Paraguay also provided that His Majesty's Dominions, colonies and possessions might withdraw if they so desired, without impairing the validity of the treaty.

The development of India's independence held good also in the case of administrative and technical agreements. Under the Berne Convention of 1874, India was admitted to the membership of the Universal Postal Union in 1876, like any other sovereign nation. India was ahead of the Dominions. The 1878 Convention was signed by one delegate on behalf of India and one delegate on behalf of the United Kingdom and the Dominion of Canada. It was not until 1906 that other Dominions sent their delegates to sign the Convention. At the conference of the International Union for the Publication of Tariff Customs in 1890, India had a separate representative among the delegation which was sent by "Great Britain and the various English colonies." India had her vote at the International Radio Telegraph Conference held in

London in 1912. The resulting Convention was signed by India's plenipotentiary in her own right.

In this connection it is often pointed out that India's delegates to the League of Nations and its various ancillary bodies did noteworthy work, and signed the various statutes in the name of India and sometimes such conventions and statutes were ratified by the Indian Central Assembly. In particular the following conventions etc. are referred to: The Permanent Court of International Justice and the Optional Clause, Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, Declaration Recognising the Right to a flag of States having no Sea Coast, International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of Traffic in Obscene Publications, International Convention Relating to Simplification of Customs Formalities, Convention and Statutes on Inter-Regime Maritime Ports, International Opium Convention, Prohibition in the Use in War of Asphyxiating Poisonous and Other Gases, Slavery Convention, International Statute Relating to the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, International Convention Relating to Economic Statistics, Whale Fishing Convention, Labour Convention, etc. etc.

But this view of India's independence in deliberations and ratification of such conventions and technical and administrative agreements is only a superficial one. Three facts have to be noted in this connection.

First, India attained autonomy by virtue of her huge population and vast area, which did not obtain in any other Dominion. It was the magnitude of the problems in relation to India that made it necessary for India to have her own representatives in the handling of affairs relating to India and the foreign world;

Secondly, India was not represented by her own nationals who only could know India's true interests and needs. Delegates sent on behalf of India were mostly Britons in India's superior services, who naturally safeguarded Imperial interests first and last; they were not familiar

with India's national needs and always put them subordinate to the interests of the United Kingdom and the Empire ; and

Thirdly, the representatives who went to international conferences on behalf of India were not representatives of the Indian people, but representatives of, and responsible to, the Secretary of State for India, who was a member of the British Cabinet and thus responsible not to the Indian people but to the British Parliament.

Efforts were made to show that India was on equality with the Dominions in her own affairs. Thus in 1919 it was decided that, like other self-governing Dominions, India also must have her own High Commissioner in London. Lord Crewe's Committee reported, "The time has come for a demarcation between the agency work of the India Office and its political and administrative functions, and that the step would commend itself to all classes of opinion in India as marking a stage towards full Dominion Status."

Accordingly, a provision was made in the Government of India Act, 1919, for the transfer of the "contractual powers" of the Secretary of State for India to the High Commissioner for India in London, and the conditions under which he was to work.

The High Commissioner was to "make, sign, and, where necessary, seal contracts in the name and on behalf of the Secretary of State-in-Council and to carry and discharge contracts made on behalf of the Secretary of State-in-Council.....The benefit and liability of every such contract made in pursuance of this provision shall pass to the Secretary of State-in-Council."

The High Commissioner representing the self-governing Dominions in London were outstanding people in the national life of the countries they represented ; they were popular figures in their own countries and always of the Cabinet rank. Ever since the days of King Edward they were given a status which was accorded to ambassadors of foreign countries, thus emphasizing the sovereign status of the Dominions.

But the High Commissioner for India¹ had no such status. He was nothing more than a "glorified agent" of the Secretary of State. His responsibility was to the Commerce Department and not to the External affairs Department of the Government of India. He and his staff enjoyed no diplomatic or consular privileges. Politics did not fall within his domain and continued to be dealt with by the India Office of the Secretary of State for India, who was the real representative for India in London. It was the Secretary of State who represented India at all important functions and conferences, and delegated others to the minor conferences.

The Secretary of State for India was the bottleneck for all communications between India and the foreign world, including Britain.

Although India was a member of the League of Nations and the various organisations connected with it in her own right, invitations to India to send her delegates were always sent to the India Office in London and not to New Delhi. The Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report said :

"The Secretary of State for India is the prescribed channel for correspondence on important issues of policy, and communications addressed to the League of Nations and the International Labour Office, except those on routine matters or relating to the supply of information regarding signature of, or accession to, or ratification of international instruments, are not made direct by the Government of India to the international authority. The Director of the I. L. O usually addresses the Government of India direct, sending the India Office a copy of his communications, but the reply from India to

1. Originally housed in two or three flats in Grosvenor Gardens, on July 8, 1930, the High Commissioner moved in, with his students, Stores, and Trade Departments to the India House, Aldwych, built at a cost of £324,000, designed by Sir Herbert Baker. The project was sanctioned by the Indian Legislature.

his questionnaires and communications on matters of policy pass through the Secretary of State. Communications from the Secretariat of the League invariably come through the Secretary of State.

The Report adds that before the Secretary of State made appointments of delegates, he might consult the Government in New Delhi, but the latter "nearly always" deferred to the judgment of the Secretary of State.

It is significant that in the Indian delegate's credentials the appointing authority was seldom mentioned. India's representatives were described as simply "delegates of India."

The Secretary of State for India was a member of the British Cabinet, and it was his function to see that the delegates who represented India at the Imperial and international conferences kept in line with the policy laid down by the British Cabinet or the British Foreign Office.

It was because of this non-representative character of the Indian delegations to Imperial and international conferences that Mr Churchill said before the Joint Parliamentary Committee that India's representation was "unreal."

Because the Secretary of State and the India Office controlled India's affairs, the delegates to Imperial conferences seldom had a free hand. India's shipping, fiscal and trade policies were tied to the Imperial system, and delegates, Indian or British, cared for the interests of the United Kingdom and the Empire before they thought of India's own interests.

Until 1928, India was represented in the League of Nations assemblies by British delegates. Thus in 1920-21 she was represented by Sir William Meyer, in 1922 by Lord Chelmsford, in 1923 and 1924 by Lord Hardinge, in 1925 by Lord Willingdon, in 1926 by William Vincent, in 1927 and 1928 by Lord Lytton. One of the reasons, given for European representation for India was that the Government in New Delhi could not afford the expenses of sending a delegation all the way from India. And yet

the same reasons were forgotten when India's contribution to the League of Nations was decided upon. India paid more than £ 100,000 every year as her contribution, and the high percentage of her contribution is proved by the following figures of contribution based on one thousand units:

Great Britain 105; Soviet Russia 97; France 80; Germany 78; Japan 78; Italy 60; India 55; China 42; Spain 42; Canada 35; Poland 32; Australia 27; Irish Free State 10; Finland 10.

In spite of this lavish contribution to the funds of the League of Nations, one cannot ignore the fact that smaller States like Spain, Canada, Australia, the Irish Free State, Finland, Peru, Panama and Guatemala, all at one time or another got representation on the nine temporary seats on the League of Nations Council, but India was never elected to any office. The only office worth any mention occupied by an Indian was by the Aga Khan, whose representative capacity in relation to India hardly needs a comment. Neither was an Indian ever given any responsible post in the League Secretariat. It was only in the I. L. O. that two Indians held posts deserved by the position of India in the labour world. In the League Secretariat there were two junior clerical posts given to Indians. Appointments to responsible posts were always manoeuvred and haggled for among the powerful European States, and became an instrument for placation of this Power or that.

Indian public opinion was sensitive to this state of affairs and in 1933 the Council of State at its Simla session called for the withdrawal of India from the League of Nations, because it thought it to be too expensive and useless a business for India.

That the penny-wise-pound-foolish-policy of the Government could be taken to ridiculous lengths was shown by the reduction in the expenses allowed to the Indian delegates to the League sessions after 1929 when Sir Mohammed Habibullah and other Indians represented India. The British

Finance Minister of the Government of India cut down the expenditure as follows:

1932-33	Rs. 3641
1933-34	Rs. 2320
1934-35	Rs. 630

It is also to be noted that no Indian delegation had more than half a dozen in its personnel. In contrast several smaller Powers sent as many as 50 delegates and advisers to the League sessions at Geneva. Neither had India any permanent legation for liaison work. This placed the Indian delegation in a disadvantageous position, because there was none to watch India's interests and advise them on the most appropriate course to be adopted in regard to certain policies. Even small countries like Czechoslovakia maintained their own legations. Persistent public opinion in India did not succeed in persuading the Government of India to set up a legation or appoint a liaison officer.

In view of the step-motherly treatment meted out to Indian delegates by the Government of India, the Indian delegates could not live impressively. Whereas other delegations held cocktail parties where, it is common knowledge, major decisions in regard to policies were taken, the Indian delegates had to lead a secluded life. They could not attend many of these functions, because they could not return the hospitality, which is necessary in social relations. When European delegates acted for India they gave the impression that India was not independent ; when Indians represented her, the denial of reasonable expenses made them keep aloof and thus not establish contacts with other Powers and their representatives. More often than not the delegates sent on behalf of India sided with Britain and toed the line laid down by the Secretary of State for India.

They made their appearance to make nice, humanitarian speeches and retired. The Indian delegates did not argue; they pleaded. Two extracts may be given, one from a European and another from an Indian delegate's speech to demonstrate this point. Speaking before the Assembly in 1928, Lord Lytton said :

"If it can be truly said that the League of Nations is firmly established in Europe, that can certainly not yet be said of Asia ; and for that reason it is important that the work of those trying to support the principles of the League of Nations in the East, who are trying to promote its ideals, should be made as easy as possible. The more the East can be brought into contact with the work of the League, the more the League itself can demonstrate that it is working as much and as impartially for Asia as it is for Europe, the less necessary will it be for the League to hear of financial difficulties such as are now being expressed. I have no desire, I need hardly say, to stereotype for all times the activities of the League, and I think the best solution of the difficulties I am discussing is to be found along the lines of increasing its activities outside Europe—of increasing, that is to say, the collaboration and cooperation between Europe and Asia, between the East and the West."

Sir B. L. Mitter in 1931 said more pointedly :

"We cannot indeed plan any important part in the supreme question of disarmament. It is in the spheres of intellectual, social and humanitarian work of the League that India can play an important part. Our efforts in these directions are being increasingly appreciated every succeeding year."

There were two streams of thought running in opposite directions—the Indian people's wishes and the wishes of the Government of India dictated from London. We have referred above to Tilak's letter to Clemenceau. It put forth the outlines of India's foreign policy—acting as the League of Nations' ward in Asia and as a guardian of peace. The Indian National Congress, for the first time in its history, passed a resolution at its annual session in 1920, declaring its avowed intention to develop friendly relations with all nations, particularly those near the borders of India. This policy later led to invitations being extended to nationalist parties in other Oriental countries to send their fraternal delegates to the Congress sessions.

In 1927 Congress had passed a resolution that in the event of Britain being engaged in an Imperialist war India could not be a party to it unless she was given freedom to decide the issue. This declaration was repeated year after year until the war broke out in 1939. When the Axis Powers set out on their path of aggression, official Congress resolutions condemned fascism as also British Imperialism which, in spite of all its soft talk did not resist the dictators. European leaders were actually kowtowing before the Duce and the Fuehrer—a fact which heightens the quality of Nehru's behaviour in regard to Mussolini. On the death of his wife in February, 1936, Nehru received not only a condolence message from Mussolini but also an invitation to meet the Duce. Even the time for the appointment was fixed up by Mussolini's Chief of the Cabinet. Nehru refused to meet him and spurned a favour which many a European Leader would have felt proud to receive.

Nehru, who gave the lead to Congress, which led the politically conscious opinion in the country, is an ardent anti-fascist. These sentiments of his were strengthened particularly after his visit to the Continent in 1927, six years before Hitler's rise to power. Nehru being the most important Indian who has moulded public opinion on international affairs, Indian sentiment has always favoured progressive democratic movements. On the outbreak of the civil war in Spain, India's sympathy was on the side of Republican Spain and against Franco who was receiving help from the dictators. Indian leaders would have gladly supported Britain if the latter had declared war on Franco but Britain pursued a policy of non-intervention which amounted to non-intervention in Axis supplies to Franco. Nehru visited the Republican front and was terribly moved by the sufferings there, and when he returned to Bombay he wept with tears in his eyes for help to Republican Spain.

Great enthusiasm was also aroused for China's fight against Japan. Public demonstrations and tributes to the heroic resistance to Japan became an everyday happening in India. The Indian sentiment was definitely pro-China

and wanted Britain to intervene in favour of China. But public sympathy could only be negative in the case of India. Public subscriptions to help the Chinese wounded were raised. In 1938 Congress sent a medical mission to China. The sentiments of the Indian people were voiced by Rabin-dranath Tagore in his letter to a well-known Japanese poet, exposing the real nature of Japanese aggression.

It is necessary here to repeat that Muslim opinion, as represented by the Muslim League, did not interest itself in affairs which did not relate to India or the Middle East. Nearly all of the League's resolutions were confined to the Indian Muslim's demands against Congress and their sympathies for the Muslim movements in Western Asia and Egypt. For instance, there is not one resolution which clearly defines the League's policy in regard to the Axis Powers. The opinion of the thinking Muslims in regard to vital international events was voiced only by Congress whose policy was definitely anti-imperialist and anti-fascist.

There was, however, a small section within Congress which advocated that Congress must not align itself with any Power and should keep its goal of independence as the only objective in view. The leader of this group was Subhas C. Bose who advocated giving an ultimatum to the British Government to quit India, and, if Britain did not, launching a civil disobedience movement at once. He believed in the philosophy of non-violence, not as an article of faith but only as an expediency. He did not hesitate to make his views on the subject clear. This, combined with other factors, led to his fall from Gandhiji's favour and his subsequent expulsion from Congress. In 1938 when Bose was President, it was only unwillingly that he agreed to the despatch of the Indian medical mission to China because he did not wish to alienate Japan. He wanted to take advantage of Britain's weak international position in order to achieve India's independence and would not hesitate in seeking help from Britain's enemies, no matter who they were. But the Congress under the influence of Nehru would not have anything to do with the dictators, but that did not mean that India supported Britain.

The official resolution passed by Congress in 1938 indicted British Imperialism for encouragement afforded to fascists and went on :

“India can be no party to such an imperialist war and will not permit her manpower and resources to be exploited in the interests of British Imperialism. Nor can India join any war without the express consent of her people. The Congress therefore, entirely disapproves of war preparations being made in India. In the event of an attempt being made involving India into war this will be resisted.”

Indian public opinion demanded that its leaders must be consulted before Indian troops might be sent abroad.

None of these warnings, however, were taken into account by the British Government in London or their representative in India, the Viceroy. Seven months before the war, at a time when popular Governments were in power in eleven Indian provinces and Indian opinion could be ascertained from their elected representatives in the Central Assembly, Indian troops were sent to Middle East and Singapore without the knowledge of either the provincial Governments or leaders in the Central Assembly.

In September, 1939, Congress declared :

“In this world crisis the sympathies of the Working Committee are entirely with the people who stand for democracy and freedom, and the Congress has repeatedly condemned fascist aggression in Europe, Africa and the Far East of Asia, as well as the betrayal of democracy by British Imperialism in Czechoslovakia and Spain. The past policy of the British Government as well as the recent developments demonstrated...abundantly that this Government does not stand for freedom and democracy and may at any time betray these ideals. India cannot associate herself with such a Government, or be asked to give her resources for democratic freedom which is denied to her and which is likely to be betrayed.”

And indeed it was betrayed in so far as India was concerned. Immediately on the declaration of war in Europe, the Viceroy, on behalf of India, but without consulting or getting the approval of the representatives of her people, declared war on Germany. Says Pandit Nehru :

“One man and he a foreigner and a representative of a hated system could plunge four hundred millions of human beings into war without the slightest reference to them.”

Here then was once again an emphasis, if emphasis were necessary, on the contradictory policies which the people of India and the Government of India were pursuing. The Muslim League at this time was not a very representative organisation, and a good cross-section of Muslim opinion found expression through the National Congress, which declared :

“If Great Britain fights for the maintenance and extension of democracy then she must speedily end imperialism in her own possessions.....A free and democratic India will gladly associate herself with other free nations for mutual defence against aggression and for economic cooperation. She will work for the establishment of a real world order based on freedom and democracy, utilising the world's knowledge and resources for the progress and advancement of humanity.”

But these offers of cooperation were not heeded. Britain was sure of holding India by force, and she did hold it by force. The foreign policy of the Government of India was therefore the policy of the British Cabinet and the British Commonwealth of Nations, namely, a policy of opposition to the Nazis and passive appeasement of Japanese militarists who forced Britain to close the Burma Road, which led to the isolation of democratic China, thus giving a blow to the democratic cause. This again came as a rude shock to Indian public opinion about the intentions of the British Government.

There is hardly any doubt that the sympathies of the

Indian people were genuinely democratic. When the war had become global in character we did not wish the alliance of Britain, America, Russia and China to go under. But we felt frustrated at Britain's determination to hold on to the Empire. Churchill's declaration that the Atlantic Charter was not applicable to India and Roosevelt's silence made every one of us bitter. In our frustration lay the cause of that which is very baffling to outsiders namely our glee at the German victories.

Never for a moment did we wish the Nazis to win, or the Japanese to dominate Asia, but our bitter feelings towards imperialist Britain made us look with interest to the victories of the enemy; "perhaps if the enemy had advanced to India there might be chance for us in India to shake off the British yoke." Hence Bose's popularity. Upto August, 1942, he was looked upon as the only Indian leader who had taken a positive course, and not followed the negative role of Congress by opposition of imperialism and moral support to Britain's fight against Germany and Italy. Then in the wake of Cripps mission's failure we launched the August movement—"war within a war." There was a countrywide spontaneous outburst of violence and sabotage; schools and colleges closed down; post offices, police stations and courts, symbolic of Britain's hold on India, were burnt down; communications were paralysed, and in a number of places, parallel governments set up.

If the British Government had been far-sighted, it could have marshalled far greater forces in support of the Allies than it did. But that was not to be. Britain appeased Japan and then faced the consequences at Singapore, and realised the mistake of hampering the development of an Indian Navy. Bose had effected his escape in the fall of 1940 and travelled to Germany on a Japanese passport. There he set up a Provisional Government of Free India, organised an Indian centre and trained the nucleus of the Free India Army. Bose had three radio stations at his service. After Japan's spectacular victories he made his way to Japan and thence to South-East Asia, the scene of his well-

known activities, *e. g.* the invasion of India on the Manipur front by the Indian National Army who were supported by the Japanese armed forces. But Bose did not have an air arm and this led to a hasty withdrawal of his forces before the Allied armies.

However, the war brought one good in its train. The means of communications between India, China and Iran were developed and contacts with foreign countries extended. A goodwill mission from Thailand visited India in October, 1940, and in the same month New Delhi was the venue of the Eastern Group Conference of the countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations lying east and south of the Suez, which was called at the instance of the Imperial Government in order to enable these countries to coordinate their war effort, by taking stock of the potentialities and actualities of the resources. The Viceroy said that the idea underlying the Conference

“is by no means new ; it arises from the Imperial Conference of 1937. It is unique in the political experience of the Commonwealth ; it represents the active collaboration of a part of the Commonwealth in the interest of the whole.”

The entry of Japan into the war had brought out a change in the situation of the relations between India and China. After the fall of Burma, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was appointed Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in the Chinese theatre of war. In February, 1942, he visited India and renewed contact with Jawaharlal Nehru, who had met the Generalissimo and Madame Chiang in 1939 in Chungking, and met the Mahatma. That little had changed in the outlook of the New Delhi bureaucracy was indicated by the obstacles put in the way of Chiang meeting Gandhi, until Nehru just managed it on the eve of the Generalissimo's departure from India. The visit to India of the Generalissimo paved the ground for the official strengthening of the Indo-Chinese relations. A well-known figure like Mohammed Zafarullah Khan was appointed India's Agent-General to China.

The exigencies of the war also necessitated strengthening of the Indo-American economic bond. The Grady mission visited India, and India sent the Meek-Gregory mission to the United States. The U. S. President sent his personal representative William Phillips to India, and India appointed an Agent-General to America. Although India's foreign trading had passed into the hands of the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation, it was decided to appoint more Trade Commissioners. Thus one new Trade Commissioner was appointed to Australia. In 1945, India exchanged a High Commissioner with her.

India was also represented at important international conferences like the Pacific Relations and the Commonwealth Relations Conferences and, of course, bodies like the Bretton Woods, San Francisco and meetings of the War Cabinet. The Government in New Delhi claimed that as a result of India's important role in the war they appointed their own representatives. This was necessitated by the emergency created by the strain of war and the state of communications between India and London. The Instruments of Instructions were from now onwards drafted in New Delhi and not in London. The delegates went as the representatives of the Government of India and not as representatives of the Secretary of State for India, although technically they were still responsible to the Governor-General-in-Council, who was himself answerable to the Secretary of State for India.

Although the representatives were appointed by the Government of India they did not voice popular sentiments, because the Government of India was not a popular Government. The views that delegates like Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, Sir Jeremy Raisman and Sir Feroz Khan Noon aired were the views of the British bureaucracy. For instance at San Francisco the views propagated by the popular nationalist leader Mrs. V. L. Pandit were the exact opposite of Noon's pleas.

The fact that the state of affairs in regard to the conduct of India's foreign relations was not what it should

have been was indicated by the quickening of the speed of India's diplomatic representation abroad, and by the formulation of the foreign policy of an independent India under the aegis of the first National Government which, under the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, was sworn in on September 2, 1946, and particularly after August 15, 1947, when India became a Dominion.

Pandit Nehru announced that plans had been drawn up for the creation of an Indian Foreign Service. "The Government of India follows international etiquette and chooses to function as far as possible as an independent Indian Government."

On October 19, Dr. L. C. Jain, the Government of India's Economic Adviser to the British Commonwealth Member on the Allied Council for Japan, was appointed the Political Representative of the Government of India with the Supreme Commander for Allied Powers in Tokio.

On October 22, it was announced that "being desirous of maintaining and furthering the friendly relations existing between China and India, the Governments of India and China have decided to raise their respective diplomatic missions to the rank of embassies." Two days later came a similar announcement in regard to diplomatic representation in America. Mr. K. P. S. Menon was appointed Ambassador to China and Mr. Asaf Ali as Ambassador to the U. S. A.

Besides, Pandit Nehru sent greetings to all foreign Governments through their representatives in London. These were conveyed by Mr. V. Krishna Menon, Nehru's personal envoy, who took a letter from Nehru to Molotov in Paris. Mr. Menon explored the possibilities of independent Indian diplomatic representation in other countries of Europe and Russia. The announcement of the appointment of Mrs. V. L. Pandit as Indian Ambassador in Moscow in June, 1947, was the culmination of negotiations with M. Molotov.

Side by side with this extension of diplomatic representation came the extension of consular services. On

October 30th a prominent Indian member of the Rangoon bar before the war was appointed India's representative to the Government of Burma. The status of the Indian representative in Shanghai was raised to that of Consul-General. Consuls were also appointed at Bangkok and Saigon.

These developments were followed in the following year by the announcements of exchange of High Commissioners with British Dominions and ambassadorial exchanges with France, Indonesia and the Netherlands.

So far as the formulation of India's foreign policy goes it was indeed a stroke of good fortune that Nehru, who had done the most in making Indians world-conscious, entered the first National Government and himself took charge of the External Affairs Department, the Indian Overseas Department, and the Commonwealth Relations Department, as India's first responsible Foreign Minister. Within the first few days of office he set various precedents, *e. g.* by addressing the Press correspondents in Hindustani, thus bringing the foreign policy of India into the lives of Indians. He emphasised the fact that the foreign policy of the Government was to be in accordance with the people's wishes, and if the people of India differed with the policy pursued by Nehru's Government, it was their will that should prevail. He made it clear that as soon as his Government lost the confidence of the people they would resign and another Government which would be prepared to carry out the wishes of the people of India would come into being.

As in his capacity of a popular leader, so in his capacity of India's Foreign Minister Pandit Nehru emphasised India's close bonds with the countries of Asia. With his encouragement the Indian Council of World Affairs called the first Inter-Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi in March-April, 1947. Although the Conference was not sponsored by the Government of India, or had any official backing, it represented the popular wishes of the peoples of Asia. This was so because all the popular leaders, *e. g.*

Dr. Sjahriar from Indonesia and Bhandaranaik from Ceylon, the representatives of Viet Nam, and Nehru, Radhakrishnan and Gandhiji from India, had had the masses behind them. It was their representative character that lent weight to the proceedings of the Conference.

In Europe and the United States it was thought that the Conference would lead to a East *versus* West bloc, that it was the familiar Japanese cry of Asia for Asiatics in a different garb. It was in reply to their criticisms that Pandit Nehru said:

“We have no designs against anybody ; ours is the great design of promoting peace and progress all over the world.”

He added :

“ If any person thinks Asia is going to prosper in future at the cost of Europe, he is mistaken, for if Europe falls it will drag Asia too with it, just as if Asia remains fallen or had remained fallen, undoubtedly it would have dragged Europe and other parts of the world with it. You are going to have either war or peace in the world. When we think of freedom and progress in Asia, we think of it in terms of other people's freedom also.”

That was the spirit in which the entire deliberations of the conference took place, in a spirit of “one world”; except in so far as it was necessary to rid Asia of Western imperialisms, there was an absence of any anti-West feelings. Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru all recognised the value of the contribution of the West. Sarojini Naidu emphasised the ideological kinship that brought every Asian nation together, namely “one common ideal of peace, not the peace of negation, not the peace of surrender, but the peace of a militant creative human spirit that rises to exaltation.”

Said Gandhiji :

“ The West is today pining for wisdom. It is despairing of the multiplication of the atom bomb, because the atom bomb means destruction not merely of the West

but also of the whole world. You will achieve a complete conquest of the West not through vengeance, because you have been exploited, but with real understanding...I am sanguine that if all of you put your hearts together, not merely your heads, to understand the message the wise men of the East have left to us and if we really become worthy of that great message, conquest of the West will be completed."

CHAPTER II

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF GREAT BRITAIN

Thanks to Britain's initial advantage in the race for manufactures and inventions, easily accessible coal wealth, insular position and numerous excellent harbours, she became the industrial and financial leader of the world. Her vast Empire extending to all parts of the globe provided her with the raw materials necessary for her industries and with cheaper food. Until 1870 she basked in the sun of unparalleled prosperity.

London became not only the political but also the commercial and financial capital of the world, an honour that had previously been enjoyed by Amsterdam. Commercial rivalries in England assumed international importance. It is reported that in three years preceding 1836 as many as 72 new banks came into being, a sure indication of the extension of British business and commerce.

By 1850 Britain had £250 million worth of investments oversea (the corresponding figures for 1875 and 1914 are £1200 and £4000 million respectively). She controlled nearly four-fifths of the world's exports in coal, two-thirds of the trade in textiles and one-half of the shipbuilding trade. It has been estimated that the goods that she manufactured yielded her profits at the rate of 33 per cent.

But side by side with this expansion of trade there was another development which was sapping the foundations of this economic stability. Britain trained technicians and engineers to work the machinery which she was exporting to the Continent, notably Germany, and to America. The exports of machinery increased from £1 million worth in 1850 to £9 million worth in 1875. Coal exports

during the same period rose from 1.25 million to 9.5 million tons.

These factors led to the manufacture by European countries of consumers' goods that the Continent needed. To encourage their own industries the Continental countries imposed traffic barriers so as to eliminate British goods. What was more, some of the Continental countries, Germany in particular, produced more than what was necessary for home consumption. Thus started the mad race for colonies wherein they could dump goods as Britain was doing in her empire.

The Pan-Germanic League formed in 1893 aspired to Teutonic world domination. From the steps of Bismarck's monument the Kaiser declared that "Our future is on the water" and that Germany must have a big navy to protect her oversea colonies and to give Germany "her place in the sun." The Kiel Canal was built and in 1899 the first Navy Act was passed, in order to increase the German fleet. In the following year the second Navy Act ordered doubling the fleet. This was a direct challenge to Britain, and the British Government recognised it.

By the turn of the century Germany had become a serious rival to Britain's commercial supremacy, let alone the naval supremacy. Whereas in 1867 Britain produced 4 million tons of the world's 7.5 million tons output of iron, in 1914 she produced 10.25 million of a world output of 75 million tons.

Before World War I broke out, Britain had lost her oversea markets on the European and American continents. In so far as production of consumers' goods went, the United States alone had reached parity with Britain, who now diverted the traffic of her surplus goods manufactured on large scale to her Dominions and the Empire areas where industrial development had been deliberately hampered by denying freedom to the subject countries.

Then came the war, Britain was temporarily cut off

from her oversea markets. The "white" Dominions built up their own industries. Even in the dependent countries the native bourgeois struck a bargain with the Imperial rulers by which they helped the war effort in return for facilities to develop industries, as was the case in India.

When Britain emerged from the ordeal in 1919 she found that the world had changed. The pre-war conditions no longer prevailed. The war had given a fillip to economic and political nationalism. The nationalist movements in the dependent countries clamoured for the imposition of protective tariffs. Either local capitalists had built up industries or markets had changed hands. Was it possible to return to the 1913 conditions, to free trade, to Gold Standard? No, it was not.

For a time Britain shifted the centre of gravity to the Home market; public utility and the civil services were expanded; more hands went to agriculture. The proportion of exports to the total production steadily declined; from 40 per cent in 1912, it became 27 per cent in 1924, about 17 per cent in 1935, and 15 per cent in 1938.

During the 20 years between the two wars Britain exported new types of goods and capital; instead of exporting consumers' goods she exported machinery to develop some of the undeveloped countries of the Empire, with a view to sharing the profits with the native bourgeoisie of those countries. This meant the loss to Britain of several of her markets. The process was accelerated during World War II, because not only could Britain not supply goods that her Empire countries needed but also she needed help from those very countries.

The industrial capacity of the Empire countries gradually increased. This was particularly true in the case of what are called the "white" Dominions. Markets which had been Britain's monopoly were flooded with American goods. Britain's debt jumped up to astronomical figures, nearly £5000 million to Empire countries alone. This was in

addition to the loss of some of her oversea investments, moderately estimated at a quarter of her national wealth. After the war it was found impossible to recover from this near collapse without outside assistance, which the United States was only too keen to offer, obviously with a view to "buying over" Britain's bases and markets abroad and to secure a stable base in Europe.

Today Britain has abdicated not only parts of her Imperial possessions but also her naval supremacy to America. Britain's dominant role in the last century has now been usurped by the United States. The use of under-water and above-water torpedo has entirely changed the situation, not to speak of the headway made by the U. S. in the utilisation of atomic energy.

Britain can now maintain only a semblance of her past greatness by exporting machinery to manufacture machinery for the production of consumers' goods and by taking protection under the wings of expanding American imperialism, because Britain has neither the manpower, nor the economic resources, nor even the old monopoly of access to raw materials and foodstuffs, which contributed to her greatness in the nineteenth century.

Although Britain has lost her Imperial greatness, as a disciplined nation she is still very great. The average Briton has certain qualities which enabled him to make Great Britain a worldwide imperial Power. The position has been lost because of the reactionary policy of her rulers and not because of the mistakes of the masses of Britain, who, whenever they have detected the pursuance of an unpopular policy, have replaced a reactionary Government. The Briton still has great qualities and in time of crisis he or she can rise to very great heights and stand as one man in defence of certain values of life held dear. It is these qualities that will enable Britain to restore her shattered economy and still be the leading nation of Europe.

The British Commonwealth of Nations is a unique constitutional unit in international organisation. It is

unique because it is neither a unitary State nor a union, nor even an alliance; and yet it has elements of all these. The Commonwealth has within its fold sovereign States, self-governing Dominions defined as "autonomous units, independent of each other, in no way subordinate one to another", and a large part of the dependent Empire in the shape of colonies or protectorates of the United Kingdom or Dominions thereof.

The Englishman abhors being guided by any rigid laws, or definitions or logic; he revels in keeping things beautifully vague. Take England's constitution as an instance. It consists of conventions and it is conventions which have gradually deprived the King of his privileges. Instances of the "muddle" in constitutional practices in the Empire are far too many. As King of the United Kingdom, George VI in 1937 refused to acknowledge the conquest of Abyssinia by Italy, but in the credentials presented by the Irish Minister to the Quirinal the same King addressed King Emmanuel of Italy as the King of Italy and "Emperor of Abyssinia". Again, King George VI as King of the United Kingdom and the Dominions declared war on Germany in 1939, but as King of Ireland he was not at war with Germany.

All parts of the Commonwealth and the Empire are bound by the single bond of a common Crown which is as often proved to be divisible as it is proved to be indivisible. The unity of, or bond between, the Commonwealth countries is not legal, juridical or rational. It is not constitutional even. At best it is conventional. Prominent statesmen like Vincent Massey have gone so far as to call it a "mystical unity based on an identity of not only interests but of spirit."¹

Agreements between members of Commonwealth are simply agreements or pacts between the countries concerned and never treaties between the heads of two States, in this case the same Crown. In the international field countries

¹ "International Affairs" Nov. 1934 p. 829.

of the Commonwealth, particularly the self-governing Dominions, assume the independent status of sovereign nations. The relations between two members of the Commonwealth are conducted not through ambassadors or ministers but through High Commissioners from one country to another. That is the basis of the so-called "Inter Se" doctrine, which enabled the Commonwealth countries to refuse to apply the "most favoured nation" clause to countries outside the Commonwealth, even though the Commonwealth countries might have enforced preferential tariffs amongst themselves or between two members.

The resolution of the Imperial Conference in 1926, later incorporated into the Statute of Westminster of 1931, said: "The Dominions are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any respect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations."

Britain's abdication of her control over India, Burma and Ceylon means no more than the transfer of her power from the mainland of Asia to the Indian Ocean where, so long as the United States is friendly, her power is still supreme. So long as India is not strong on the seas, Britain is in a position to hamper any Indian policy in regard to the Middle East and South-East Asia. India will therefore be helping herself by having the friendliest relations with Britain.

India must think in terms of her own security. Because of the peculiar geographical situation she must take into account the possibility of her becoming a battlefield for the collision between the supreme Eurasian Power and the American bloc or a base for Middle Eastern operations. Should that clash unfortunately come, any Power or group of Powers in control of the Indian defence zone stretching from Aden to Singapore—the vital strategic regions of the Middle East and South-East Asia—can be a great threat to India.

Britain is now the third Big Power. It is because of her relative weakness that India should go to her for help. By doing so India will not only help herself and Britain materially, but by virtue of her great resources in minerals and manpower she can play an important role in the Commonwealth affairs. Aligning with Britain does not necessarily alienate her from the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R.

CHAPTER III

THE GROWTH OF THE AMERICAN POWER

The dominant role played by the Pax Britannica during the nineteenth century has now been completely usurped by the Pax Americana of the United States of America, today by far the strongest Power industrially, financially and militarily, a great land Power, the greatest naval and air Power and the jealous guardian of the atom bomb. By its gigantic productive apparatus, its abundant resources and the high-degree technical developments, the United States of America has made British Imperialism its junior partner. Thanks to her tremendous power today she wields influence in the remotest parts of the world.

In order to appreciate the growth of the American Power and trends in her foreign policy, it is necessary to briefly trace the gradual stages through which she has passed in order to arrive at her triumphant position.

At Waterloo Britain had defeated the strongest land and the second strongest naval Power in the world at that time. The British navy was supreme and scoured all the seas. But in the wake of her victory, apprehensive of the plans of member States of the Holy Alliance—France, Spain, Austria and Russia—to acquire empires or political or commercial interests in the Western Hemisphere, the British Foreign Secretary Canning encouraged Richard Rush, the U. S. Minister in London, to persuade his Government to tell the Holy Alliance to keep their hands off the South American nations. The United States at that time did not have huge armies; nor had she any great naval forces to defend her oversea commitments. Units of the British fleet had bombarded the White House.

Canning promised the United States full support of the Grand Fleet against any of the Holy Alliance Powers. It was this support that enabled President Monroe to enunciate the famous doctrine that goes after his name, viz. that "the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonisation by any European Powers."

In pursuance of this policy the United States of America resisted the pretensions of all European Powers to be masters of the destinies of any of the American peoples. In the name of "restoring order" she landed her Marines in Nicaragua, Panama, the Caribbean Sea areas, and ousted Maximilian of Mexico.

Japan was "opened up." In 1876 America bought Alaska from Russia for 7 million dollars. She had already started on a policy of expansion.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century America did not have the industrial and military potential necessary to conquer an empire in the way the European Powers had done. It was not until towards the middle of the century that America passed through the initial stages of industrialisation. The country was vast. The original inhabitants having been wiped out of existence she did not have to face any racial or internal problems.

Up to the end of the century whatever the American capitalists produced was barely enough to meet the local demand for consumers' goods. It was only when her production capacity increased that her monopoly capitalists started to look beyond her frontiers. They had, however, one difficulty to face, namely there were a few undeveloped areas which had escaped subjugation by one or another European Power. The only areas of considerable size that were left were South America and China.

Every historical epoch has its own popular slogans—slogans which are often masks to cover certain unpleasant facts. America's slogan in regard to the South American

States was that of Good Neighbourly policy, advertised by the various Pan-American Conferences, which in practice amounted to assumption by the United States of ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of stable governments or to establishing law and order in the South American States. These States were allowed to have their own armies, their own navies, their own tariffs, even their own revolutions—so long as their Governments were stable and provided a free and unhampered scope for investment of, and returns for, American capital. Collapse of law and order immediately invited their overwhelmingly powerful neighbour, who intervened by landing Marines, established order, which meant she reinstated indigenous privileged ruling groups their political complexion did not matter in the least; they could be fascists, as for instance in Argentine—and withdrew. The Good Neighbourly policy was not imperialism in the traditional sense of the word. But in practice it was in no way different from imperialism. There was the proverbial difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Whereas South America, ever since 1822 protected by the Monroe Doctrine, was connected to the U. S. A. by land, the case of China was different, because it was separated by a vast ocean which presented insuperable military and technical difficulties. The first opportunity that presented itself to the United States imperialists was the U. S. Spanish war of 1898. Americans captured Guam, and under the Treaty of Paris Spain ceded to her the Philippine Islands. America was now definitely started on the path leading to the domination of Asia.

Admiral Mahon said, "the annexation of the Philippines (was) the widest sweep in space of our national extension". The implications of this annexation are summed up by the well-known American imperialist foreign policy expert, Walter Lippmann, who says this annexation

"committed the United States to the defence of a large territory nearly five thousand nautical miles west of Honolulu and almost 7000 nautical miles west of

California, but only 700 miles off the China Coast, only 250 miles from Formosa, only 1700 miles from Yokohama and less than 1400 miles from Singapore. A circle which has Manila as its centre and a radius of about 1500 miles encloses the industrial region of Japan, all of Korea, practically all of China proper, French Indo-China, British Burma and Malaya and the Netherland Indies. Thus by the acquisition of the Philippines the United States had placed itself at the geographical centre of the empires of Eastern Asia, and at the strategic crossroads of their lines of communication”.

No wonder within a few months of the annexation of the Philippines came the enunciation of the Open Door policy, which demanded for the United States her due share in the exploitation of China by the Western Powers. The policy, in simple terms, meant : “Yes. Do exploit China, but give us our share of the concessions such as treaty ports, trade facilities and extra-territorial rights. If you deny the U.S. her share, we shall oppose.” Thus the United States secured all the advantages that the Western Powers had secured for themselves, without any share in the burden which the white man was carrying.

The only challenge to the U. S. domination of the Latin American countries and Far East came from Japan. In 1922 it was with great difficulty that the Anglo-American bloc succeeded in theoretically restricting Japan’s naval construction programme according to the 5:5:3 ratio.

Japan, whose rise was phenomenal, was a serious rival of the United States in all the Pacific markets and her hold on the Eastern markets was second to none. Her military power was great, as was proved at Pearl Harbour and Singapore and during the one-hundred-day campaign when she overran the whole of South-East Asia and captured the Andamans and the Nicobars, her right arm controlling the Bay of Bengal and the left threatening Australia. The British fleet which had been supreme in the Pacific for one hundred years was helpless. Japan plastered British naval

units at Trincomalee and threatened Ceylon. Her submarines appeared all over the Indian Ocean right up to the Cape of Good Hope in the south and the Baluchistan Coast of India in the north.

It was the decisive action of the United States fleet in the Central and South-West Pacific which forced the Japanese fleet to halt its advance on Ceylon and to withdraw to meet the Americans.

Since the defeat of Japan the Pacific has become an American lake. British commentators openly admit that Great Britain has completely resigned her interests in the Pacific. The reactionary policy which General McArthur is pursuing in Occupied Japan is gradually making Japan a partner of Wall Street and a base for the U. S. against Russia. American imperialists are demanding the retention of strategic bases all over the Pacific. The Naval Affairs Committee of the U. S. House of Representatives asked the Security Council to admit America's right to fortify and maintain 99 naval and air bases in the Pacific. "From Hudson Bay to Cape Horn" is the latest slogan of America. Canada has become an appendage of the U. S. imperial system, and Australia and New Zealand, saved from Japanese menace by the U. S. fleet, are increasingly looking to Washington, instead of London.

Now the Pacific Ocean, which has taken the place of the Atlantic of the nineteenth century as the nerve-centre of trade and the new power relationships, has a direct relation to India's security system. It was a Pacific Power that conquered Singapore and knocked at India's security system.

India's powerful neighbour on the north, Russia, has a very small fleet, and that too is bottled up in the home waters. But Russia is a great land Power, with a huge land mass which has saved her from conquerors time and again. As a strong land Power she is in a position to influence the destinies of those of her neighbours which are

bounded by land frontiers. It is difficult for her to extend her direct control over countries with long seabords, because here the U. S. with the biggest navy in the world, can make her presence felt.

With the United States' undisputed mastery over Japan and the hegemony of the Wall Street in the Kuomintang regime in China—of course, with the ostensible object of saving her from the Chinese Communists—the supremacy of America in the Pacific ensures her domination over South-East Asia. It can either be a Pacific or an Indian Oceanic Power that can influence this vital region. Before long all the remaining European bases in this region will be transferred to the United States because with the withdrawal of the British supremacy in the Indian Ocean, the position of the satellite empires of France, Holland and Portugal has weakened.

Until America's entry into World War II the U. S. A. was a champion of the right of self-determination and freedom of the subject peoples, but during the course of the war, and particularly after the untimely death of President Roosevelt she has emerged as a strong "super-colonial" Power. Immediately on the cessation of hostilities against Japan, France and Holland found it difficult to re-impose their rule over the peoples of Viet Nam and Indonesia. So they secured the assistance of the United States of America. It were American troops who suppressed the national liberation movements in Indonesia and Indo-China. And after the Americans left there, it was American lend-lease aid, American bombers, American arms and ammunition transported to Western Europe and thence to South-East Asia in American ships, that suppressed the South-East Asian fight for independence.

There is no common ground between U. S. deeds and words. In talk, and talk alone, the Americans have supported the nationalist movements and the late President Roosevelt's conception of the four freedoms. In action, on the other hand, they have given all possible help to France and Holland in their imperialist designs, under the pleasant name of helping recovery of the Western Europe. The

Americans know where the huge loans that they have given to France and Holland have gone and are going—to suppress patriotic movements in Indonesia and Viet Nam.

Although in deliberations of the United Nations organisation the United States have sympathised with the national liberation movements, they have always used their voting power for the postponement of a decision in such issues. When the U. N. Security Council appointed observers to go to Indonesia to investigate into the observance of the cease fire order, the U. S. group reached one month late, a month during which the Dutch carried on their “mopping up” operations with American armaments and American technical advice.

Let us now see U. S. penetration in the Middle East.

In 1901 William Knox d'Arcy acquired a concession to work the oil resources within 500,000 miles of the Iranian empire, excluding the provinces of Azerbaijan, Gilan, Mazendaran, Astorabad and Khorasan. Operations under the auspices of the Burma Oil Company were started, but did not bear any fruit until 1903 when, it is reported, the directors actually cabled the prospectors to cease work. Soon, however, oil was struck and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company formed. The construction of a refinery at Abadan and a 145-mile-long pipeline joining it to the oilfields, necessary roads, factories, houses, etc., was immediately started. By August, 1912, the oilfields were working and in two months six million gallons of oil was refined. In the following year the Company needed more capital and approached the British Government. Working on the advice of the Admiralty which needed oil for the defence of the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean regions, the British Government acquired a 52.55 per cent share.

A significant development in connection with the exploitation of the Middle Eastern oil resources in the present century has been that whereas the end of World War I left Britain in complete control of these oil-fields, the end of World War II has seen the acquisition of most of those oilfields, either wholly or partially, by the United States.

American business groups have gradually acquired shares

in British holdings in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. An agreement dated 26th December, 1946, between the A. I. O. C., on the one hand and the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and the Socony Vacuum Oil Company, on the other, in regard to the supply of crude oil for a period of twenty years is bound to have far-reaching consequences on future international relations, because the agreement means that in any international dispute concerning Iran, the British Government can count on American help without any reservations.

The same is true of the other oil combines in the Middle East. In 1929 a Canadian Corporation, controlled by the Socony Oil Co. and the Texas Corporation, bought over British holdings of the Bahrein Petroleum Co. Four years later Britain, finding that the Saudi Arabian oilfields did not promise good yields, sold them over to what came to be known as the Arabian-American Oil Co. Today the United States control 240,000 square miles out of the 800,000 square miles of Saudi Arabia. The Standard Oil and Texas Oil Company are now laying a 1250 mile long oil pipe-line from Kuwait to Haifa on the Mediterranean coast, across Saudi Arabia and Palestine. This pipe-line is to be jointly owned by the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain, under the terms of the agreement signed in London in September, 1945. This agreement provides for a joint Anglo-American exploitation of the Middle Eastern oilfields. This will hold good also of the deposits in Hedjaz and Egypt where further prospecting is under way. There are a host of other ancillary oil companies such as the Basra Petroleum Co., the Petroleum Qatar Ltd., the Petroleum Concessions Ltd. operating on the Trucial Coast, Oman and the Aden Protectorates, the Mosul Petroleum Co., the Palestine Development and the Iraq Petroleum Co., the Khanquin and Kuwait and Gulf Oil Companies which are directly controlled by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. in which, as we have said above, American business groups have acquired considerable shares.

Britain has gone into partnership with America because alone she could not face the growing Arab nationalism,

and has thus prolonged her life in the Middle East. Britain and the United States have come to pursue identical aims and policies in the Middle East. Both are determined to keep Russia as far away from the Iraq oilfields as possible. Hence the Anglo-Saxon support to Turkey's refusal to part with the districts of Kars and Ardahan which were returned to Turkey by Soviet Russia in 1919 and which are hardly 60 miles from the Mosul oilfields.

Side by side with the increasing U. S. interest in the Middle Eastern oil, American business groups have affected the economic penetration of these countries. At the beginning of the century America came to these countries in the role of a friend opposed to domination by the British and German imperialisms. Let us consider the case of Iran as an instance, which illustrates how the U.S. has come to occupy the same place in the Middle and Near East as did Britain and Germany during the past 150 years.

Following the constitutional revolution of 1905, the Iranian nationalists' hatred of Russia and Britain led them to welcome German and American assistance. In 1910 Iran invited an American administrator Morgan W. Schuster to become the Treasurer-General of the Iranian Empire. His disgust with Anglo-Russian intrigues led him to resign his post a few months after his appointment. His opposition to the two dominant Powers in Iran, however, brought popularity to the Americans. In 1922 another American, A.C. Millspaugh*, was appointed Administrator-General of Finances. He held this post until 1927. American interests in Iran were increasing. By 1937 an American oilgroup had secured concessions to work the oilfields in Northern and North-Eastern Iran, and although prospecting here did not yield very satisfactory results, American business made headway in Iran. This tendency became very marked during the occupation of Iran by the Allied forces in 1941.

Iran's trade balance, adverse to the extent of nearly three million sterling every year during the 1936-39 period, became favourable during 1939-41 when trade between

* Author of "American Task in Persia" (1925).

Britain and Russia declined and that between Germany and Japan steadily increased. After the Allied occupation, however, the trade balance was one of exceptionally heavy deficit. The following figures in terms of Iran's "commercial" imports and exports * with the principal sources of supply and destination, speak for themselves.

"Commercial" Imports.			Value in £000's.		
March	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44
Total	7,930	13,177	5,914	10,049	11,839
of which from					
Germany	2,068	5,646	1,120	211	35
U. S. S. R.	93	1,276	657	1,371	2,289
N. East Indies	235	1,208	733	335	182
India ...	840	1,192	900	5,542	4,323
U. S. A. ...	392	1,105	1,546	1,116	930
United Kingdom	611	1,021	304	454	624
Japan	1,242	659	116	232	79
Iraq	12	14	11	479	1,205
"Commercial" Exports.			Value in £000's		
March	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44
Total ...	10,413	14,095	7,823	4,266	5,457
of which to					
Germany ...	5,095	6,747	1,668	...	...
U. S. A. ...	1,203	1,922	1,608	1,319	1,221
U. S. S. R. ...	4	1,784	1,207	916	1,839
India	735	871	1,283	695	840
Iraq	467	626	600	440	322
United Kingdom	966	320	360	349	322
Trade balance on "Commercial imports and exports :					
...	+2,483	+918	+1,908	5,783	6,382

The period of Allied occupation was marked by a deterioration in Iran's economic situation. The cost of living rose out of all proportion. Inflation soared high. The supply of goods decreased. There was discontent in the coun-

* "Persian Review of Commercial Conditions", H. M. Stationery Office, London.

try. Once again Dr. A.C. Millsbaugh was called upon to put an end to this rot. It was towards the end of 1942 that he again became Administrator General of Finances, although his failure to achieve any concrete results in short time led to hostile Press criticism and he resigned in February, 1945. Be that as it may, during the years of his administration American interest increased considerably. The United States has become Iran's second best customer and her third best supplier.

The culmination of this process has been the U. S.-Iranian agreement signed in October, 1947, which irrevocably commits Iran to accept military advice from the United States. Similar moves are afoot in the Arab States ranging from Egypt, where U. S. military and economic missions have been paying visits, to Saudi Arabia. Within the next few months it is also likely that an American-Pakistan loan agreement will be negotiated, an eventuality against which India should take all possible steps, because by selling away Pakistan to U. S. imperialism we would be placing ourselves at the mercy of the United States.

The United States has also asserted herself as a strong Mediterranean Power, replacing Britain. She has acquired great economic and military interests in Turkey and taken over from Britain the strategic country of Greece, the door to the Balkans. It is not without significance that British and American warships have been carrying out joint manoeuvres in the Mediterranean to demonstrate their desire to support Turkey in the latter's opposition to Russia's demand for a share in the defence of the Straits of Dardanelles. It is extremely unlikely that Britain will totally quit her Mediterranean outposts, because it suits America's object if Britain shares the control of this area with the United States, and Britain still controls Gibraltar in the Western, Malta in the Central and Cyprus in Eastern Mediterranean. The last named place is being rapidly developed. Britain intends spending 28 million on its naval fortifications.*

*"The Times," dated October 17, 1946.

This insistence on not leaving the Mediterranean explains the Anglo-American opposition to the Russian proposal for an international control of Tripolitania and Britain's differences with Egypt over the question of the Sudan. Without Egypt Britain's position in the Middle East is very vulnerable, for, says the "Times" military correspondent, Cyprus, Cyrenaica and Malta would all be valuable "but none of them could long be tenable in a major war except as outposts of a force based on Egypt. They would serve such a force well, but they could not themselves be maintained without it." Britain is already building substitute bases to defend her communications through the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean.

The bases now being built in Tanganyika and other parts of East Africa are with the object of serving as supply bases for forces in the Mediterranean region. It is well to recall that Egypt did not declare war on the Axis Powers even when Rommel had penetrated deep into Egypt. In accordance with the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, Britain landed her forces and engaged the enemy. Efforts were made to persuade Egypt to declare war on the Axis, but in vain. At a time when Britain's destiny was at a low ebb, in May 1942, British tanks and forces, under the leadership of the British Ambassador himself, entered the palace of King Farouk, overpowered the guards and at the point of the pistol made the king dismiss his pro-Axis cabinet.

If ever in future a hostile Power secured control of Egypt, Britain still hopes that it will be possible for her to rush forces from the Sudan, Tanganyika and Transjordan bases to repeat that incident, in defence of Anglo-American interests.

It seems certain too, that Britain and America will go to any length to stop Russia from getting a foothold in the Mediterranean, and it is with that object that the policy of encirclement of Russia is being tenaciously pursued in Western Asia, Southern, Western and Northern Europe.

Shorn of all diplomatic subtleties the Marshall Plan expounded at Harvard was the last notable attempt to bring the Western Bloc into being, a close follow-up of the enunciation of the Truman Doctrine. The countries of Europe, devastated by war and Axis occupation, need help to restore their economy; they need food; and they need agricultural and industrial machinery.

America is only too willing to assist, but at a price, namely to draw these countries which accept American help into its own sphere of influence. Help in international affairs has no philanthropic aims, and the United States naturally wants certain rights in return for these credits. One of these rights is for the United States to decide what sort of help that particular country wants. Thus the military aid which has been offered to Greece, Turkey and Iran is to be spent on purely military needs.

"Not one dollar to be given to Turkey would be spent on non-military needs," said Mr. W. L. Clayton, the Assistant Secretary of State speaking on the aid to Turkey before the Appropriations Committee. And so it was. United States army surplus material and current production of war industries—incidentally it keeps these industries going, yielding high profits—found their way to Turkey and Greece. American military missions have been visiting Egypt and Iran to train local armies against any Power that might go against America's interests. Leaving Britain alone, there are a host of other European countries which are prepared to accept help on almost similar terms. These range from Italy, Austria, France, Netherlands of the Western Bloc, Denmark and the Scandinavian countries of the Northern Bloc.

Geo-politics, which failed in Britain and Germany respectively, has now found a new home in the United States. Now it is the Americans who are talking of attempts to forestall the possibility of the "heartland" Russia joining the "rimland" which stretches from China to the Scandinavian Bloc as it suits the argument. The Greek Foreign Minister Tsaldaris, defining Greece's frontiers, said that they were "ideological" and extended

from Albania to Afghanistan. The foremost U. S. authority on geo-politics, M.J. Spykman, writes :

“Because of the inadequacy of the Arctic Coast as an outlet to the ocean, the great hinterland can find access to the sea only by routes that cross the encircling mountain barrier and the border zone beyond. The only easy accesses are through the Baltic and Black Seas and by the overland routes through the North German plain between the Scandinavian massive and the Carpathians. The other passages are narrow and difficult and limited to single roads over arduous mountain passes. Russian Turkestan can find an outlet only across the Khyber Pass to the Valley of the Indus. It has one other outlet to a distant Ocean, the old silk route across the passes of the Tien Shan Mountains through Sinkiang, north of Tibet, to Central China and the Pacific. Central Siberia can reach the sea through the depression between the Tien Shan and the Altai Mountains over the Mongolian plateau to Peking and the Gulf of Chihli, or north of the Altai ranges, around Lake Baikal, down the valley of the Amur to the Japanese Sea. From Central Asia came the early invasions into the border zone, the eruptions of nomadic barbarians into Europe and China because geography forces the flow of power into the East-West channel. To the north lie Tundra waste and the Polar Sea ; to the south stretches a zone of barren desert and the highest mountain barrier in the world ; in between an easy grassland belt provides an area of mobility. Along this broad way the ancient horsemen of the plains exerted pressure on Vienna and Peking and along this same line have flowed the power thrusts of modern Russia. For two hundred years, since the time of Peter the Great, Russia has attempted to break through the encircling of border States and reach the ocean. Geography and sea power have persistently thwarted her.”*

*“American Strategy In World Politics,” M. J. Spykman pp. 181-182.

Imperialists use this argument as a cloak for their own expansion. Thanks to the so-called freedom of the Press every one talks of the Russian expansion in South-Eastern Europe, in the Middle and the Far East, but few discuss the complete ring which U. S. imperialism is building round the U. S. S. R., traversing from Alaska to Japan, Korea, China, South-East Asia, Iran, Middle East, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Western Europe and the Scandinavian Bloc.

The wartime U. S.-Russian co-operation is now a thing of the past. The cessation of hostilities in 1945 witnessed the immediate resumption of anti-Russian propaganda in America. Today a wave of Russophobia is sweeping the length and breadth of the United States. Actually a "cold war" is already on.

The monopolist Press in America, controlled or guided by Big Business and armament industrialists and the politicians who look after their interests, has been carrying on a vicious campaign to convince the people of the U. S. A. that the Russian polar bear is mauling the rest of the world. The best way to prepare for peace, they say, is to prepare for war. There is little that appears in the U. S. Press about the devastation which Russia suffered during the war and her peaceful reconstruction activities. On the other hand, there are plenty of stories about Russia's preparations for a new war directed against America.

The United States is guarded by the vast stretches of the Pacific on one side and the Atlantic on the other. She has a complete hegemony over the entire continent of South America ; and as a result of the last war the security of Canada has been integrated with the defence requirements of the U. S. American bonds with New Zealand and Australia have also been strengthened : she is practically the sole master of Japan; her influence in China is not inconsiderable ; and she is the Power which counts in the Middle East. Britain is her junior partner for the control of Africa and the Mediterranean region.

One wonders, therefore, from which quarter could a danger to America's security system come. Besides what earthly need has a devastated Russia, or what resources has she, to venture on the hazardous task of the conquest of America which is so far away? The Russians are not fools. They know what a command of the seas means; and what dire consequences atomic warfare might bring in its wake.

In her neighbouring countries Russia has definitely manoeuvred to have Communist Governments, but that possibility is ruled out in the case of America, because the two countries are separated not by land frontiers but by vast stretches of water over which the U. S. S. R.'s influence is negligible. Even across some distance on the land Russia's influence is little, as for instance in Spain, where a fascist rules today.

In the public mind the United States is the embodiment of the maximum liberty for the individual, an unhampered freedom of expression and competitive enterprise. The Declaration of Independence of 1779 laid down that since "life, liberty and happiness" of the people are their "inalienable rights" it follows that "whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organising its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to bring safety and happiness."

One would only wish these conditions prevailed in the United States and world. Instead, what one sees in America is the stifling of those essential liberties, quite as much as in any other dictatorship. In various States all sorts of restrictions are placed on the people's right to exercise their vote. Lynching and negro-baiting are commonplace, in no way different from Himmler's Jew-baiting, indeed worse.

In actual practice even the freedom to express what one thinks, about which there is so much fanfare, amounts

to precious little. This is so because the Press, the means of production of opinion, is entirely in the hands of monopolists. There is no Government censorship. But there is what is worse than Governmental censorship—the private monopoly of censorship by owners of newspapers, who control not only all sources of information but also the means of dissemination of that information. In the actual working of the Press in America, every news item is sifted and distorted by emphasis and presentation. What degree of freedom could the average citizen exercise when a standard set of ideas is put out by the well-known columnists who could count their readers by the million? That is a dangerous tendency, because the unscrupulous writers, which a good many of them are, could influence public opinion for aggressive purposes. And that is exactly what has happened in the United States.

American public opinion revolves round the policy or activities, or the alleged activities, of Russia or the Communists. For some time past now a witch-hunting process, to comb all departments of the national life of people and influences sympathising with progressive movements in any part of the world, has been in operation.

There are various executive inquiries and Federal and State legislative measures which restrict the individual's right to enjoy his essential liberties, his "inalienable right."

The Bureau of Federal Investigation and the notorious Committee on "un-American" activities have a record as black as that of any gestapo system. Eleven million dollars sanctioned for the activities of the latter give an indication of the extent of its activities. It has been sitting in one form or another for nearly ten years, and has been responsible for the dismissal of hundreds of officials of the State and War Departments. There have been instances when people have been dismissed because they took interest in the activities of the Spanish Republican movement, or showed tendencies towards liberalism in matters relating to trade unions, or expressed sympathy for a system of planned economy. People

have been dismissed also for having participated in the activities of organisations set up after 1941 for the promotion of Russo-American understanding, or those who have not expressed definitely anti-Russian views, or have been subscribers of (until some time ago Henry Wallace's) *New Republic*. The vague term "un-American" activities can apply to anything from an exposition of the concept of liberty to a belief that the U. S. Constitution allows an American citizen to believe in any system of social relations. The trials of Communists in America have not been different in character from similar trials of those whom the Communists in South-Eastern Europe call neo-Fascists, trials against which there has been hue and cry in America.

In the ultimate terms the Russo-American rivalry is directed towards securing world domination, a control of the markets. America, as every one knows, is the champion of freedom of enterprise, which means freedom for the U. S. to exploit—a priority for her in the exploitation of world's mineral resources and markets for consumers' goods.

Above, we have mentioned America's late start in industrialisation and the grab for markets. Because of her geographical isolation the United States was able to develop her resources without let or hinderance. On the one hand she restricted British imports by imposing tariff barriers and on the other she imported capital goods and technical help. Between 1870 and 1900 she outstripped Britain by increasing her production twelve times, as against Britain's corresponding figure of three.

During the present century she has left not only Britain but also the entire world far behind in production. World War I gave a tremendous fillip to America's productive apparatus. Before she entered the fray in 1917 she had amassed huge wealth by exporting arms to both the camps. She also got the opportunity of attaining parity with Britain in her shipping

In the years following World War I her production

curve rose so steeply that in 1929, when 19 per cent of her productive system was idle, her exportable surplus led to an economic crisis that upset the economy of the entire world. Even today America does not export more than 10 per cent of its total production, but this low percentage is sufficient to violently shake the world economy.

The United States has emerged from World War II a tremendously powerful nation. Little of her industrial apparatus or manpower suffered war damage experienced by other countries. America's gigantic means of production and scientific research were working at full blast during the war. The output in 1946 was 65 per cent higher than the 1939 figure. It has been estimated that the total number of Americans killed throughout the war was far below the total of those killed in accidents in the United States during the same period.

It is well known that about a hundred big corporations control 90 per cent of the means of production in America. During the years 1940 to 1945 they made, after payment of taxes, over 53,000 million dollars as profits. The war was a gold mine for them and gave them access to many a market closed to them so far in all the continents.

The United States, according to one estimate, today embraces 70 per cent of the producing capacity of the capitalist world. The home market being more or less saturated, they must find markets for manufactured goods and capital investment—or burst. India would naturally be a sound proposition for investment.

In order to exploit the mineral wealth of India, we naturally need technical help and capital. Unfortunately there is an impression in responsible circles here that such help can come either from the United States or Britain. Generally, these circles rule out Britain because they think that Britain is down and out and has not much to teach us. They look to the U. S. and because they own the means of production of opinion and use them for propagating their

views, the common citizen, without going into the pros and cons of such a proposition, believes what he is told.

We must remember that there are several small nations who are in a position to render us technical assistance in no way inferior to that which the two greatest industrial nations can give us. Sweden, Switzerland and Czechoslovakia may be cited as illustrations in point. These countries have made strides which are a matter of pride and great national asset to those countries.

The Swedes are master shipbuilders. All Europe and America admit their great superiority in this industry. To build ships and weapons of coastal defence, let us import technical experts from Sweden, a neutral country as yet not definitely tied to any Power group. Sweden has also made great strides in consumers' cooperatives. Every visitor to the Scandinavian countries is impressed with their remarkable achievement in this field.

The Swiss make excellent engineers for transport and electrical goods industries. The first longest tunnel in the world was driven by them ; they have been the pioneers in many other fields too. They provided the bulk of technical assistance in the construction of the Berlin-Baghdad railway. They are also a leading nation in the exploitation of water resources for hydro-electricity. Nearly all their railways are electrified. All industry in Italy is run by the Italians in the Swiss part of Italy, where the bulk of their industry is concentrated.

In Southern Italy shipbuilding is a great industry and it is worth recalling that Italians were first to make light luxury ships which amazed the world.

Technical help from these small countries will be cheaper and quite as efficient as from the U. S. It will not cost us more than the money that we are spending on getting our students "trained" abroad.

The other important problem in this connection is the capital that we shall need to import capital goods. Indian capitalists, whose interests are indetical with those of foreign

business, are arguing that India must take a dollar loan from the U.S.A.

This is a prospect fraught with grave danger. In international affairs and business there is never any philanthropy. Behind all talk of financial aid to help reconstruction there is a considerable degree of business shrewdness. The device of foreign aid is well-known in books of imperial strategy. Wherever U.S. capital has penetrated it has ultimately succeeded in making its debtor country an economic dependency and a base for operations against a Power likely to be hostile to U. S. interests. If we accept U. S. aid we shall be tying our hands for the future.

Our national interests dictate that not only must we not accept U. S. financial help but also that we shall do our utmost to see that no Power in the Indian Oceanic zone, is brought to those straits when it will be forced to accept such help.

There is also another point. Do we really stand in need of foreign capital ? There is a great reserve of wealth in this country, until now untapped. Because of our hostility to Britain a good deal of gold stock was buried underground. If the popular leaders arouse interest among the masses and succeed in convincing them that normal wealth in the shape of capital goods is more of an asset than gold lying buried, the people of this country will gladly lend it to the Government. It is known that ever since the establishment of the National Government in August, 1946, the national savings drive succeeded in drawing a degree of the wealth that was until then "shy." An intensification of the drive will certainly yield better results—once the enthusiasm of the people is aroused. Our wealthy capitalists should be pressed to spend less on building temples and dharamshalas and investing in means of production.

India's alignment with the United States, certain advantages though it may confer, will only mean providing the missing link in the chain of encirclement round the U. S. S. R., and thus hasten World War III.

CHAPTER IV

THE POWER OF RUSSIA

More than a hundred years ago, the noted French philosopher-traveller de Tocqville wrote :

“There are at the present time two great nations which seem to tend towards the same end, although they start from different points. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same ; yet each one of them seems to be worked by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.”

And so it is.

The world has actually been divided into two blocs, one dominated by the United States and the other by the U. S. S. R. ; and so sharp is the difference in their method that the situation is very explosive. The whole world looks to them with anxiety.

The Soviet Union is the dominant Power in the Balkans, in Finland, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia and Austria ; that is a domain where she will brook no opposition from any outside Power. Her ideological influence in France, Belgium and Italy is considerable. It is a commonplace remark on the Continent of Europe that Russia could occupy the whole of France in 24 hours. So great is Russia's power in Central and Eastern Europe that even the countries of Northern Europe are afraid of Russia's moves in Germany and Western Europe.

Russia is a great Power in Asia. Her southern frontier (longest in the world) extends across Asia from Vladivostock on the Pacific Coast to the Black Sea, touching Japanese possessions in the Pacific, China, Afghanistan,

Iran and Turkey. Except for a few miles where the U. S. S. R. and Kashmir are contiguous, we have no common geographical frontier. Nevertheless, Russia, because of her power and influence in our neighbouring countries, has played an important part in our recent history.

Throughout the nineteenth century the primary preoccupation of the Government of India, as directed from London, was to counter Russia's advance towards India's borders or towards her security ring which extended from Tibet to the Mediterranean. "Russian influence" was detected in many places, known and obscure. It was a pet theory that the Czar meant to execute Napoleon's plan of a grand invasion of India. British fear of Russian expansion led to the conquest of Asam, Sind and the Punjab, the two disastrous expeditions to Afghanistan and clashes in the Persian Gulf region ; and Russian fear of British expansion led to the extension of the Czarist empire in Central Asia.

Once in the last century the Czarist and British imperialisms did stare into each other's eyes ; there was hardly a gap of 500 miles separating the two from coming to grips with each other. The British had acquired Baluchistan and built railways to Quetta and New Chaman where material, enough to construct a railway line to Kandhar in 60 days, was collected. Russia, on the other hand, collected material at Kushklinsky and Askabad for extension to Meshed and Herat. But for the menacing rise of Germany there is little doubt that the two imperialisms would have come to a clash.

That Russia ever planned an invasion of India is extremely unlikely. The object of the expansion towards India was nothing more than a threat to Great Britain, as is borne out by a letter written to the Russian Ambassador in London, which said :

"Great historic lessons have taught us that we cannot count on the friendship of England, and that she can strike at us by means of Continental alliances, while we cannot reach her anywhere. No great nation

THE POWER OF RUSSIA

can accept such a position. In order to escape from it the Emperor Alexander II...ordered an expansion in Central Asia, leading us to occupy today Turkestan and the Turkestan steppes, as a military position strong enough to keep England in check by the threat of intervention in India."

British statesmen also realised the significance of the southward expansion of Russia. Lord Curzon explained it thus :

"Neither Russian statesmen nor Russian generals are foolish enough to dream of India. Their object is not Calcutta but Constantinople, not the Ganges but the Golden Horn. To keep England quiet in Europe by keeping her employed in Asia, that briefly put is the sum and substance of the Russian policy."

The era wherein Russia held a threat to India in order to disturb the equanimity of Britain is at an end. The creation of Pakistan and the history of Central Asian republics are factors which have recently been introduced into the situation.

Russia's window on India is the Central Asian Republics. A chronicler of the future will perhaps characterise the development of the Central Asian Soviet Republics of Kazakh, Tadjik, Turkoman, Uzbek and Kirghiz as the greatest constructive effort of the present century. Ever since the October Revolution these regions which had been kept in worse than colonial conditions under the Czars were completely transformed. Although the opposition of the priestly class took some time to disappear, it was ultimately suppressed. In most of these Republics hydro-electric power and irrigation schemes were developed; farming was mechanised ; air, road and railway transport systems were extended ; oil and mineral resources more fully exploited and new industries based on all the available scientific advances started. Developments of these Republics have played an important part

in arousing the political consciousness of the neighbouring countries, for, in spite of difficulties put in the way of transmission of information, news travelled to Afghanistan, China, Sinkiang and India very rapidly.

The British bureaucracy in India was not slow in taking note of these developments. The Anglo-Russian Trade Agreement of March 16, 1921, contained a significant preliminary conditional clause which laid down :

“The present agreement is subject to the fulfilment of the following conditions...that each party refrained from action or undertaking against each other and from conducting, outside its own borders, any official propaganda, direct or indirect, to encourage any of the peoples of Asia in any form of hostile action against British interests, or the British Empire, especially in British India and in the independent State of Afghanistan. The British Government gives a similar undertaking to the Russian Soviet Government in respect of the countries which formed part of the former Russian Empire and which have now become independent.”

Area for area and population for population, the Tadjik Republic is far more advanced in the exploitation of its mineral wealth, in transport and communications and the satisfaction of physical and intellectual needs of her people than Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan and India. “It is the meeting place of many peoples—Tibet, China, India, Central Asia, and Afghanistan find common ground there. In so far as a policy is successful in that area a great diversity of people hear of it and feel it than is likely to happen elsewhere. The nearness of Tadjikistan to India lends a special point to this. Soviet Tadjik literature concerns itself particularly with Indian grievances.”

Thus the Tadjik Soviet Socialist Republic, though not strictly contiguous with India, is “strategical in a special sense.”

The Tadjik Republic, Afghanistan and Pakistan have many connecting links. For instance, over two million Tadjiks live in Afghanistan, as against one and a half million in the Republic itself. The Afghans are divided between Afghanistan and the North-West Frontier province of Pakistan.

Besides, the basis on which Russia's relations with her neighbours rest have undergone a radical change ever since the Bolshevik Revolution. Russia renounced all capitulations imposed by the Czar or Russian citizens. For instance, in the case of Iran all capitulations, concessions and privileges acquired after 1828 were renounced. Russia gave Kars and Ardahan to Turkey. She was friendly to all her neighbours.* Slowly and slowly the Afghan indifference to Russia was got over. Ever since the abdication of King Amanullah, in which the British had a hand, the Afghans have been looking more and more towards Russia. Afghanistan was the one country that exploded the myth of Islamic unity by her lonely opposition to the newly established Pakistan's admission into the United Nations—presumably with Russian connivance.

Developments in the means of communications during

*The Russo-Iranian treaty of friendship, which became the model of similar treaties with Afghanistan, Turkey, Poland, Estonia, Rumania and Latvia, provides the most comprehensive definition of aggression. Article Two of this treaty laid down "The aggressor in an international conflict.....will be considered the State which will be the first to commit any of the following acts: (1) declaration of war against another State; (2) invasion by armed forces, even without a declaration of war, of the territory of another State; (3) an attack by armed land, naval and air forces even without a declaration of war upon the territory, naval vessels or aircraft of another State; (4) naval blockade of the coasts or parts of another State; (5) aid to armed bands formed on the territory of another State or refusal, despite demands on the parts of the State subjected to attack, to take all possible measures on its own territory to deprive the said bands of any aid and protection."

Article Three further laid down: "No consideration of a political, military, economic or any nature can serve as an excuse or justification of aggression as specified under Article Two."

the last twenty years have brought Russia very close to the borders of India. Afghanistan has built an extensive network of highways suitable for automobile traffic. These roads connect not only the big cities but also the provincial centres and the district towns. There is a road joining Kabul to Herat. From the Russian frontier to Kabul it takes only 24 hours, and from Kushka to Herat is a matter of only a few hours, to Kandhar three days and to Kabul four. And it takes only twelve hours to travel from Kabul to the frontier of Pakistan, which is linked with the Indian railway system.

The 870-mile-long Trans-Iranian Railway joins the Caspian Sea with the Persian Gulf. The Russian frontier is joined to Tabriz by a railway link, with a branch to Lake Urmia. Considerable attention has also been paid to the construction of roads. It has been estimated that by 1929 there were 20,000 miles of road fit for motor traffic in Iran.

During World War II the rail link between India and Zahidan, suspended after the first world war, came into operation again. Besides, a 3000-mile-long road was built to link Zahidan with the Russian frontier. On this road a continuous convoy service was maintained.

As a result of these developments, in the near future, it would be possible to travel from India to Russia and back. These links can be of use in wartime also, as much against Russia as against India.

The transition between the Dark Ages and the Middle Ages in European history signified a stop to the East-West movement. Europe was rejuvenated by the renaissance which replaced the cultural order imposed in the name of primitive Christianity. Reformation which overtook the renaissance disrupted the social order based on religious totalitarianism and gave rise to the cult of individualism and materialism which remained the dominant note in Europe for nearly 400 years. This cult of individualism brought into being a social and economic order

of its own, which expanded from West to East. Europe became triumphant all over the world, as far away as America, India and China.

Time and again Europe attempted to subdue Russia, but there was something in the set-up in Russia where, as in India, the community sense holds the individuals together, that enabled it to withstand the onslaughts of the individualist philosophy. In the last century machine transformed individualism into a mass civilisation, based on standardisation of the means of production and regimentation of human beings—the next opposite of individualism. Out of this situation arose Marxism which gave the last blow to individualism.

Today the Soviet system contains within itself a great driving force which is reversing the stream of history by replacing the *Drang Nach Osten* by the *Drang Nach Westen*. The Soviet system of production is gradually replacing its capitalist predecessor. Several parts of the Soviet economic system have been adopted by the countries of Europe. Throughout the 1930's the Soviet State monopoly of the means of production, compulsory rationing of the necessities of life and the insistence on economic planning and foreign trade monopoly came as rude shocks to "democratic" opinion in the world. But today economic planning and rationing are established facts and the world is tending towards a State monopoly of the means of production and foreign trade.

For one thing the success of the Soviet system does not depend upon keeping down colonial subjects. Unlike European capitalism, which lives on oversea markets, Russia tries to be self-sufficient. She needs no dependencies in the name of the white man's burden or of preparing them for self-government and democracy. Not only does the Soviet system need no colonies, but its mainspring is the liberation of the colonial peoples, replacing the capitalist system by one of cooperative effort based upon respect for the human being. During the last couple of years the system has shown a marked success

in the countries of South Eastern Europe and Central Europe where supporters of the Russian system have put through far-reaching ameliorative measures which are not approved by the Anglo-Saxon way of thinking which has led them to adopt dying Goebbel's slogan "the iron curtain" to explain Russia's relationship with those countries. When dealing with the argument against Russian expansionist tendencies, we must remember that Russia has been invaded time and again from, and through, the Balkans, and the countries on the Baltic Coast. Any hostile Power or group of Powers controlling the affairs of these countries can jeopardise the security system of Russia. In the present century she had to pay a heavy price in two major wars waged by Kaiser Germany and by the hordes of Hitler.

The security of these countries, therefore, is as vital to the Soviet Union as is the Security of the Netherlands to Britain and that of Canada and the Latin America to the U. S. A. Britain will never allow any Continental Power to control the destinies of France and the Netherlands, and the U. S. will go to any lengths to assert the Monroe Doctrine. The Soviet Union, with as much or as little justification, also ensures that the Governments of the countries of the South-Eastern Europe will be in the hands of pro-Russian political parties. Nearly all neutral observers speak of the tremendous advances made by the Balkan countries during the last two years.

Unfortunately India has so far been isolated from the currents of Marxist thought, which is the source of Russia's strength. This is due partly to the anti-Russian policy pursued by our erstwhile rulers and partly to our preoccupation with our national liberation movement. These two factors no longer hold good, and we must take stock of the strong position of the greatest Asian Power, without letting the policy of the Communist Party of India create prejudice in our minds.

All talk about Russian policy and activities starts and ends with speculation. Views on Russia are either pro or anti : there is never any mean. Russia has so far done

little to remove the current apprehensions, and whatever she says or does is distorted or suppressed by the Press controlled by the monopolists in the "democratic" countries.

Because Russia is top priority in this process of distortion and suppression, naturally there are those who believe that whatever the Russians say is the gospel truth, and there are those who believe that whatever the Russians say is precisely the opposite of what they really mean. Some try to be "fair-minded" and attempt to "discover" the real hidden motives behind every word from the Russian sources; "Now why do they say this or do this; surely it must have a significance."

Russian influence anywhere and everywhere is associated with Red agitators "in the pay of the Soviets" who are alleged to be responsible for all trouble. In any labour unrest it is presumed that if the Russians had not given directives everything in the garden would be lovely. Any student of Marxism, not to speak of students of Marxism as practised in Russia, is suspect. Mention of the remarkable achievements of Soviet Communism always puts one in the category of quislings owing allegiance to Russia.

This state of affairs, illogical and stupid in some cases, is dangerous in the case of India. It is dangerous because Russia is very near to India's borders and Russian power in Asia, by no means small, has been associated with the national liberation movement.

In all international conferences Russia's weight has been exercised on the side of the oppressed and subject peoples. True that in regard to countries that form an essential part of her security system, namely countries near her borders, she has jealously guarded her own interests. But whenever the question of Western Powers' interference in the affairs of Asian countries has come up Russia has always followed a line which is identical with the goal of democracy.

In January, 1946, the writer of these lines attended

the United Nations Conference in London. Two issues, which caused a good deal of heart-searching and pungent criticism, were those regarding the presence of British and Dutch troops in Greece and Indonesia, and the necessity of evacuation of Russian forces from Iran. There was much thumping of tables, and many threats were uttered. The Powers concerned agreed that by the earliest date they would withdraw their occupation forces.

What do we see today, more than two years after the debate? Russian troops have been withdrawn from Iran, but the Americans have established themselves in key positions there. The British troops have been withdrawn from Greece, but the Americans have taken that country over. The Dutch are still in Indonesia—with U. S. help.

All American talk for the peoples' democratic rights is for pushing out Russian influence in order to be replaced by American. On the contrary, wherever Russia has supported the stand of the oppressed peoples, be it of Indians in South Africa, or of the Indonesians in the East Indies, the support has always been given on moral and humanitarian grounds, and the case has been well fought out.

Russia is the one hope of the oppressed humanity in Asia and Africa. By joining hands with Russia for the elimination of Western influences from these two continents, we not only do what is right and just but also strengthen our position.

CHAPTER V

OUR NEIGHBOURS

The area between Pakistan and Morocco, inhabited by Muslims, is of vital interest to the security and prosperity of India. For centuries it has been the jumping-off ground for ambitious invaders in their assault on India ; for centuries too it has been the scene of great commercial activity directed from the Indian mainland.

Through its inherent weakness this entire region presents a dangerous situation. The Big Power rivalry for the control of this vital region has given this area the role played by the Balkans during the nineteenth century. There is talk too of the likelihood of the next world conflagration starting from this region, a contingency wherein India will be called upon to intervene, or participate, or become a base for operations, even against her will.

The pattern of politics of these countries is essentially the same, weak feudal States which become tools in the hands of Big Powers, pawns in the game of international political chess. During the short time since its creation, Pakistan is getting closer and closer to the Mid-Eastern pattern. Considerations of defence and economy make that country our problem number one in the domain of foreign policy, and she will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter.

Considerations of mineral wealth and strategy make the Middle East of the greatest importance to India. In the 16th century, Albuquerque's imperial system successfully stood the onslaughts of European rivals for nearly a hundred years ; it stood it successfully because Albuquerque secured control of the entrances to the Indian Ocean, Ormuz and Socotra at the mouth of the Gulf.

Napoleon's strategy against England also revolved round the Middle Eastern States. "We must seize Egypt," he wrote, because "through Egypt we come into contact with India." He claimed to be the Protector of Islam, professed friendship with the Sheriff of Mecca, the Imam of Muscat and the Shah of Iran. He wrote to Tipu of his "innumerable and invincible army filled with the desire of delivering you from the iron yoke of England".

Napoleon's activities had perturbed the East India Company so much that they lost no time in dealing with the menace presented by the influence of France and her allies in the Arab countries and the Indian Courts. In 1799 Wellesley sent Malcolm to Teheran to negotiate an offensive-defensive alliance with the Shah against the French. In the following year he sent an Indian force which landed at Kosser, on the Red Sea, marched across the desert and down the Nile to Rosetta on the shores of the Mediterranean—only to find that the forces left by Napoleon behind him had capitulated at Alexandria. Wellesley also persuaded the Home authorities to send forces, or sanction the Company's forces to be sent, to capture the Dutch (then allied to France) bases of Java, the Cape and the Isles of France and Bourbon, the south-eastern and south-western entrances to the Indian Ocean.

Napoleon renewed his contact with the Imam of Muscat in 1803, and when Britain refused help demanded by Iran, in the name of the Indo-Iranian Treaty of 1800, to defend herself against Russian advance in Georgia, Napoleon at once responded to the Shah's request, concluded an alliance promising mediation, or, failing that, help against Russia in return for expulsion by the Shah of British ships and men from his territory and help in the French expedition to India through the Shah's dominions. Napoleon sent special missions to Teheran in 1805-6, and in 1807 an Iranian envoy met Napoleon, in Poland.

The Emperor of France by this time was not only the master of Europe but also the senior partner in the Franco-

Russian alliance concluded by the Treaty of Tilsit, which envisaged a joint expedition to India. "The more chimerical it appears, the more it will alarm England when it is actually undertaken, and what could not France and Russia accomplish? Forty thousand Frenchmen to whom the Porte would allow passage through Constantinople, in cooperation with forty thousand Russians, advancing over the Caucasus would be sufficient to spread terror throughout Asia and to conquer it."

In the year of the Treaty of Tilsit, he sent General Garden to Iran, who said that the small force under him was the vanguard of the French expedition to India. The General had been instructed to keep in touch with the Governor of the Isle of France and the French agents working in Egypt and the Indian courts. Napoleon had also ordered the despatch of 12,000 troops to Egypt.

The British Government of India sent expeditions to the Trucial Coast, that is the region on the east coast of the Arabian Peninsular stretching from Ras-el-Kheima to Odied, namely the Sheikdoms of Debai, Shergah, Abu Thabee, Ajmian, Umal and Gawain, states which concluded friendly engagements between the six chiefs and Britain and India who laid down their foreign policy. The Government of India became a protector and kept a Resident in Bushire. Aden was acquired in 1839 and continued to be administered by the Government of Bombay until 1937.

The partition of Africa in the last century had brought several European Powers on the periphery of the Near and Middle East. France had acquired Madagascar in the Indian Ocean and Jibouti on the Red Sea. So far so good. But when France acquired Jessi from the Sultan of Muscat in the Persian Gulf and a French Deputy declared that with the control of these bases and her dominions in Pondicherry and Indochina, France had once again become an Indian Oceanic power, Britain and the Government of India were seriously perturbed at these

developments. They had taken the view expounded by Admiral Mahon who had said :

“Concession in the Persian Gulf whether by formal agreement or by neglect of the local commercial interests which now underline political and military control, will imperil Great Britain’s naval position in the farther east, her political position in India, her commercial interests in both and the imperial tie between herself and Australia.”

Taking this view Lord Lansdowne, the Secretary of State of India, declared in Parliament :

“We should regard the establishment of a naval base or of a fortified port in the Persian Gulf by any other Power as a very grave menace to British interests, which we shall certainly resist with all the means at our disposal.”

And Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India, sent a naval force from Calcutta to threaten the Sultan of Muscat that if he insisted on the French retention of the base at Jessi, his palace would be bombarded. Faced with this threat the Sultan gave way and rescinded the concession to France. Again, when Russia tried to secure a coaling station in the Gulf and sent one of her best warships to assert the freedom of commerce in the Gulf region, Britain insisted on her monopoly of policing these waters. Lord Curzon himself visited the Gulf and reorganised the consulates.

Exigencies of the political situation in Europe demanded an Anglo-French and Anglo-Russian rapprochement. Afraid of a resurgent Germany, France advanced a large loan to Russia, concluded an alliance against Germany and settled all points of differences with Britain. She also exerted great pressure on Britain and Russia to arrive at a compromise in regard to the Asian situation. The year 1892, when construction on the Trans-Siberian Railway started, marks the deflection of Russian expansion eastwards across Asia rather than southwards, thus

preparing the ground for the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907.

This agreement is a definite landmark in the sense that the Anglo-Russian rivalry ended and the Anglo-German rivalry began. Germany and her allies in the present century have occupied the same place in the conduct of India's foreign policy as did France in the 18th and Russia in the 19th centuries. The nature of German menace to India, however, was different from the menace of France and Russia; it was a clash of two imperialist systems more economic than territorial.

The strategy of the 25 years before World War I can be neatly summed up in terms of the three ambitious railway projects—the Cape to Cairo scheme of Britain which never materialised, the Trans-Siberian System of Russia, and the Berlin-Byzantine-Baghdad railway project of Germany.

Bismarck had not only unified Germany but created the role as leader of Europe for her. At the conference of Berlin in 1878 he had played the honest broker. On his fall in 1890 the Kaiser pursued a more aggressive line. He travelled widely in the Middle and Near East, posed as the Protector of Islam and made friends with Abdul Hamid of Turkey, promised him help against any aggressor. In return the Ottoman granted concessions to German firms for the BBB railway project. German firms built the Anatolian railway system from Haider Pasha (opposite Constantinople) which became a beehive of activity. Construction on this railway link was also started from Baghdad terminus. By this railway project Germany was endeavouring to extend her land arm to the Indian Ocean where she already held Tanganyika and claimed protectorate over the Sultan of Zanzibar whom Britain had deprived of his suzerainty of Muscat and Oman.

The more sinister aspect of this railway system concerned its extension to Basrah and Koweit on the Persian Gulf—the plan which ran counter to Britain's

Euphrates Valley scheme of a 1000-mile-long railway line from Koweit to Cairo, evolved by a House of Commons Committee in 1895. The Kaiser persuaded the Ottoman to send a punitive expedition against Bahrein and Koweit so as to assert his paramountcy. But these Sultanates took protection behind Treaties of Friendship with Britain.

The German business house of Wonkaus had plans to acquire Shargah in the Persian Gulf, and the vast interest acquired by the German-controlled Hamburg American Line in the trade of this region was full of grave dangers to British commercial interests. The Anglo-German trade rivalry was developing into an open clash of arms near the borders of India. To avoid this, Great Britain negotiated for a convention with Germany more or less on the model of the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907. These negotiations were going on when the volcano erupted in 1914.

Germany's ally, the Sultan of Turkey, who was the Caliph of the entire Muslim world, called upon all Muslims to wage a *Jihad* against Britain. Wassmus in Iran and a powerful German nucleus in Afghanistan fanned anti-British sentiment. Some of the Indian exiles, often with German money, found their way to Kabul and established a "provisional government of free India."

Turkish divisions overran almost the whole of Arabia, penetrated into western Iran and advanced on Teheran. Indian divisions were at once immobilised in the Bushire area and South Persian Rifles took control of the strategic area east of the Persian Gulf. To ensure safety of communications the Indian railway link in Baluchistan was hurriedly extended from Nushki to Zahidan, 54 miles within the Iranian border.

The Turks were repelled. Indian troops were poured into Mesopotamia. Basrah was captured. So was Baghdad. To ensure the security of India, Indian troops under Allenby and T. E. Lawrence overran almost the whole of Asia Minor.

In return for the assistance which the Arabs rendered to the Allied and Associated Powers against the Ottoman the Arab nationalists had hoped for a consolidated independent Arab kingdom, embracing all the Arab countries which formed parts of the Turkish empire. Instead, what they witnessed at the end of World War I was a share-out of the Arab dominions of the Turkish empire between Britain and France, or the setting up of small Arab kingdoms put under British stooges. Besides, the British Government supported the Zionist demand for a national home in Palestine. All this led to bitter anti-British sentiment which gathered strength with the passage of years. Mussolini was among the first to cash in on this Arab disillusionment against the British. The Italian broadcasts in Arabic carried on a vicious anti-British propaganda. The Duce claimed for himself the role of the defender of Islam; he strengthened relations with Imam Yahya of Yemen who fought a minor war against king Ibn Saud of Arabia whom the British supported, and with Reza Shah of Iran. To the latter he sold a fleet unit of two sloops and four launches for patrolling the Persian Gulf, an action which later necessitated the transfer of British naval base at Kishim to Bahrein. The Fascist propaganda became popular also because of the anti-Jewish moves of Hitler's Germany. Italy's conquest of Abyssinia was followed by enthusiastic demonstrations by the Muslims of Libya for the Axis powers.

During the early stages of World War II Italian forces conquered the French and British Somaliland. Indian forces were again landed for the defence of Islamic countries.

The fall of France led to a feverish activity by the Nazis in pro-Vichy Syria and engineered the revolt of Rashid Ali in Iraq, which the Indian troops were called upon to suppress. Later when the Nazi pincers through Egypt, on the one hand, and the Caucasus and Asia Minor, on the other, were closing in it, were the Indian troops in Egypt, Iraq, Syria and Iran which foiled the German

plans to approach towards the gateway of India. Indian and British troops stopped Rommel's advance on Alexandria and defeated him at El Alamein. The Indian forces also ensured the supplies to Russia through Iran, which enabled the Russians to defeat the Germans at Stalingrad.

It is well to remember that the Indian troops bore the brunt of fighting in East and North Africa and also participated in the landings in Tunisia, Sicily and Italy—an advance of 4,500 miles. The PAI force, sent to forestal the possible Nazi advance towards India, numbered 220,000. By tearing up her own railway track India supplied nearly all the rolling stock, locomotives and pipelines in this area. Indian forces also constructed a 3,000-mile-long supply road linking the railway terminus at Zahidan with the Russian border; 1 1/2 million tons of vital material was sent to Russia by this route where the Indian forces maintained a 24-hour convoy service.

All this would have been impossible but for the help of the British navy in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean. Although the control of the Mediterranean is gradually passing to the U.S.A we must note that Britain is still the most powerful naval power in the Indian Ocean; the rule of her navy from Aden to Singapore is still supreme.

The security of the Suez Canal and the countries round the Persian Gulf is as much of India's concern as any one else's.

The Persian Gulf bases can be a great danger to sea communications and can be used as bases for bombing India's principal industrial centres. Some of these bases are already playing an important role as hops for the airlines to the East. Three such lines already converge there, along the Trucial Coast, the Iranian Littoral, and in the direction of a tangent to the latter route.

Apart from the small oil resources of Burma and Indonesia, India has no oil within her defence zone,

except here in the Middle East. The richest and the most easily tapped oil wealth of the Middle Eastern countries have made them a vital source of power intensely coveted by Britain, which has no oil within her borders, by Russia which has only 10 per cent of world's output in oil, and by America which fears that the oilwells in her zone are running dry. That is why the U. S. State Department holds that the fate of three continents depends on keeping the *status quo* in the Middle East. "It is clearly in the interests of our national security and in those of world peace that there should be no aggression in this area," declared Loy W. Henderson, Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs.

During the past fifty years the importance of oil has grown immensely because of its lavish use in the internal combustion engine which is the basis of air, land, and sea transport today. "The Allies," wrote Lord Curzon at the end of the World War I, "floated to victory on a wave of oil." And the oil shortage which Germany faced was an important factor in Hitler's defeat; that was what led him to attack Russia, because without the necessary oil he could not undertake decisive operations in the West.

There are only four great oil-bearing areas in the world. These are :

1. The Carribean field extending to Venezuela. It yields 62 per cent of the entire world production.
2. The area in and around the Caucasus. This produces 10 per cent of world output in oil.
3. The Middle East which yielded 6 per cent of the world production before the war. During the last war the comparative figures of production of the oilwells of Iraq, Egypt, Bahrein and Arabia increased by about 50 per cent. The comparative figures of Iran trebled.
4. The Dutch East Indies and the Burma oil fields whose total production is indeed very small.

In the year 1943 a scare swept the United States. It was based on a rumour that the oilwells in the United States zone were running dry and that by 1965 the U. S. needs would exceed the entire world production of oil inside and outside the States. Possibly it was a scare started with a view to eliciting U. S. mass support for moves to justify increased U. S. interest in the Middle East.

Now the reported oil reserves of the world are as follows :

Western Hemisphere	4,400 million metric tons.
U.S.S.R. and zone.	1,000 „
Middle East.	4,000 „
Rest of the world.	300 „

Thus 62 per cent of the world reserves outside the U.S. are concentrated in the Middle Eastern countries. In 1938 the production of this region was 6 per cent of the world oil output. By 1951 it is estimated to reach the figure of 24 per cent.

The oilfields in the Middle East and Iran have several advantages over the oilfields in other parts of the world, because here in the Middle East the oilwells are far more easily tapped, far fewer drillings being necessary. Refinement is also easier because the impurities are few. The working of the oilwells is, therefore, easier and economical. Besides, the daily output is very high. For instance as against the daily output of $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons of a U.S. oilwell and $7\frac{1}{2}$ of a Rumanian oilwell, the output of an Iranian oilwell is between 40 to 2,000 tons. The Iranian oilfields are perhaps the easiest worked.

In the absence of any oil wealth within her own borders, therefore, India has a great stake in these countries of the Middle East. India's policies must be directed towards eliminating the influence in these countries of Big Powers from outside Asia ; and she must be the leader of this small bloc in any international gathering. Our links with this area are very ancient and we must re-forged them.

In a way the problems facing these countries are identical with the problems facing the countries of South-East Asia whose defence and prosperity is interdependent with the defence and prosperity of India.

The first important empire-builder in the East, Albuquerque, followed his capture of Ormuz and Socotora at the mouth of the Persian Gulf by a treaty of friendship with the Sultan of Pegu on the Arakan Coast, which enabled him to capture the Straits of Malaccas in 1513; within the short span of 7 years he succeeded in securing the control of the eastern and western entrances to the Indian Ocean which paved the way for Portuguese supremacy in India's trade for 100 years.

In the wake of the conquest of India by Britain came the severance of our bonds with the countries in Farther India. It was from India that the East India Company dumped opium worth £400 million in China. What was worse, India became the base for the conquest of these countries. Actually we became the tools of Britain to impose Western rule over these countries; and behind the shield of British fleet, France grabbed Indochina and the Dutch extended their dominion in Indonesia.

It was about this time that nationalist India, now coming into her own, diverted her attention to this vital region.

The conquest of India by the British was thus a prelude to the conquest of the countries of South-East Asia. Conversely, the conquest of these countries can be a prelude to the conquest of India, as it actually threatened to become in 1942 when the Japanese got complete control over the Bay of Bengal, bombed Vizagapatam, Madras and Calcutta and sent submarines to the farthest western limits of the Arabian Sea. Indian coalfields at Digboi were exposed to enemy attacks from the air. Rangoon itself assumed new importance in the defence of the Indian Ocean. Thus Japan's conquest of South-East Asia not

only isolated China completely but also threatened the very security of India.

During the present century history helped India to attempt compensation for the slavery that she had brought to her eastern neighbours, by making her lead the Asian liberation movements. The popular movement in India inspired the people of the countries in South-East Asia and provided them with a model for the independence movements in Burma, Malaya, Indochina and Indonesia. In 1927 the Dutch suppressed a mighty insurrection in the East Indies and deported thousands of patriots, labelled as Communists along with their families, to New Guinea. In Indochina too the French took the opportunity of suppressing a mutiny in the Indochinese army ranks and ruthlessly put down the National Party.

The debt of these countries' popular movements to the inspiring leadership of Nehru and Gandhiji has been publicly acknowledged by leaders like Sjahriar of Indonesia and Duong van Gieu of Viet Nam.

C.R. Das was the first important Indian public leader who, in 1927, emphasised the identity of aims of the national liberation movements of India and the Far East. "The time has perhaps come for us Indians to think of a federation of the Asiatic peoples for their common good," said the late Srinivasa Iyengar to the annual session of Congress at Gauhati. In 1928 Congress directed the Working Committee "to correspond with the leaders and representatives of other Asiatic nations and to take other steps to summon the first of a pan-Asian federation in 1939 India." This did not materialise.

In the following year the late Dr. Ansari declared, "In this conflict between Europe and Asia, Asia has been worsted because Europe could take concerted action against her piecemeal and defeat her in detail. The only hope of success in our efforts to check the forces of European imperialism and capitalism lies in the Eastern nations coming closer and taking a more intimate interest in the problems facing them.

Our economic problems are more or less similar. Common culture and common interest should, therefore, facilitate the consummation of the scheme of an Asiatic federation”.

Throughout the thirties, politically conscious India continued taking an ever-increasing interest in the possibilities of further cementing the cultural bonds that existed between India and South-East Asia. Nearly every annual session of Congress passed resolutions specially mentioning the problems confronting India and South-East Asia.

The “Quit India” resolution of August 1942 declared in irrevocable terms :

“... The A. I. C. C. is of the opinion that the future peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a world federation of free nations, and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved. Such a world federation would ensure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation by one nation over another, the protection of national minorities, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples and the pooling of the world’s resources for the common good of all. On the establishment of such a world federation, disarmament would be practicable in all countries ; national armies, navies and air forces would no longer be necessary, and a world federal defence would keep world peace and prevent aggression. An independent India would gladly join such a world federation and cooperate on an equal basis with other countries in the solution of international problems”.

It further declared :

“The freedom of India must be the symbol to all other Asiatic nations under foreign domination. Burma, Malaya, Indochina, the Dutch East Indies, Iran and Iraq must also attain their complete freedom. It must be clearly understood that such of these countries as are under Japanese control now must

not subsequently be placed under the rule or control of any other colonial Power”.

This was indeed a noble stand that India took when she was not free. Full credit for this goes to Pandit Nehru who became the most fiery champion of a pan-Asian federation. It was actually under his leadership that India sent out a medical mission to China. When war broke out in 1939 Pandit Nehru was touring Farther India.

In this context we have to admire Nehru's stand in regard to Dutch suppression in Indonesia, and the first Inter-Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi in March-April, 1947. The Conference at that time could only be on a non-official basis. Time has now come for the Government of India to make full use of that experience and call periodic conferences on official level, like Eastern Group Council in the midst of war, in order to explore the possibilities of pooling in our resources and coordinating our defence and economic measures.

From the point of view of the sinews of war, South-East Asia, the richest area in the world, is one unit. It produces what India lacks for the defence of the Indian Oceanic zone. Ninety per cent of world's output in rubber, 66 per cent of tin, 90 per cent of quinine and nearly all manila hemp come from this area. It produces a surplus of sugar, rice and forest wealth and has all the oil wealth that has so far been found in the Indian defence zone—the oil production of the Dutch East Indies is equal to half the combined supply of Iran and Iraq. South-East Asia can meet India's needs in sugar, rice, forest wealth for shipbuilding etc. and oil and in return expects consumers goods that India manufactures, such as textiles, cement and leather goods, commodities in which India's trade with these countries has been in considerable volume. Our economic bonds with these countries are quite as strong as our spiritual links. We have what they need and need what they have. In our self-interest alone we must cultivate a close friendship with all these countries.

CHAPTER VI

THE BASES OF A FOREIGN POLICY

It is axiomatic that the foreign policy of a country is the projection of its internal policies. A good foreign policy, said Palmerston, is a good home policy. A progressive democracy works for raising the standard of living of its masses, and wishes to create conditions of peace and progress in the world so that it may achieve its goal. A fascist State, on the other hand, works for the enrichment and betterment of a minority of its people at the cost of its neighbours, but manages to mobilise public opinion for a war of aggression which cannot improve the lot of the average citizen.

In order to be a strong power, based on the happiness and prosperity of the masses of India, our Government must follow a progressive policy in regard to internal matters. We must institute measures which must lead to the advancement of the masses of India, the workers and the peasants.

The present Government of India has not been in the saddle for a long time, to enable us to pass judgment with any certainty. But there are certain tendencies in our national life which augur ill for the future and it is our duty to guard ourselves against those reactionary forces. The climate of office, it appears, is different from the heat of revolution; our provincial and Central Governments seem to be stepping into the shoes of the old British bureaucracy. Not only are many of the sections of the Indian Criminal and Penal Codes in operation, but they are being buttressed by Public Security (Goonda) Acts, the chief victims of which are the progressive sections of the people, the Left workers.

During the past quarter-century, the Indian National Congress, led by Gandhiji, launched three mass movements (1919-21, 1929-32, 1942-45) which broadened the base of Congress by bringing within its fold both the workers and the peasants. The failure of the first non-violent civil disobedience movement impressed upon a small group of serious-minded patriotic young men the need of studying Marxian thought, and of studying the history of the October Revolution with a view to applying the lessons of that epoch-making event to Indian conditions. This group, formed in 1923 in Bombay, a city which provides the sharpest labour-capital relations in India, became the nucleus of the present-day Communist Party of India. Realizing the importance of the historical role of the working classes, it devoted its attention to organizing the industrial workers. Organization of workers meant demand for better wages and improved living conditions. When this was not conceded agitation and industrial unrest followed. The struggle of the workers became an integral part of the nationalist movement.

Gandhiji, a reformer but not a revolutionary, did not favour industrial strikes. In the famous 1928 Bombay strike, he advised the workers' wives to refuse to see the faces of their husbands unless they returned to work. He had always advocated company unions, as opposed to trade unions. But other front-rank leaders encouraged organization of the workers. Jawaharlal Nehru, on his return from the conference of the League against Imperialism and his visit to Moscow, became President of the All-India Trade Union Congress. Communist workers operated from within the ranks of Congress, although they did not always adhere to the Gandhi policy. In 1927, for instance, when Congress' goal was vague and indefinite, the infant Communist Party of India declared its objective to be a Union of Socialist Republics of India.

By their extremist policy and their part in industrial unrest, the Communists invited the heavy hand of the steel-frame bureaucracy obsessed with a fear of Bolshevik Russia. Police searches and trials for alleged conspiracy

to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty over India became the order of the day, the most famous being the Meerut conspiracy trial of 1929-33. In 1934, when the active membership of the party stood at 150, it was banned. Communist workers, almost all of the present leadership, were harassed and hunted from place to place.

Meanwhile, the failure of the second civil disobedience movement led a number of young men, educated in foreign universities, to help Jai Prakash Narain found the Congress Socialist Party. The party, whose patron-leader was Nehru, was weak. Because it lacked experience in working class organization, it welcomed the Communists within its fold. The Communists took over the task of organizing the workers and the peasants, and left the Congress Socialists to maintain a close liaison with the Congress High Command and to influence its policy. But the Socialists came to exercise a great influence over the peasant leagues, which federated into a central organization, the All-India Kisan Sabha, in 1936.

Through its election manifesto and the speeches of Nehru, Congress had promised far-reaching ameliorative measures to the workers and the peasants. Once in office Congress ministries became conservative. Acting as a bridge between the Left and the Right, Nehru, then President of Congress, tried to influence the policy of the Congress Working Committee. He took three Socialists in his cabinet, among them Jai Prakash Narain. But this unity of Left and Right did not prove workable. Inside the Working Committee, Nehru was opposed and criticised for his Leftish utterances. Indeed this opposition amounted to hostility from Vallabhbhai Patel, the dictatorial spokesman of the Right. Jai Prakash resigned from the Committee, and it was only Gandhiji's intervention which dissuaded Nehru from handing in his resignation.

At the outbreak of war nearly all political parties declared the war to be an imperialistic war, and withheld support unless a substantial degree of power was transferred to the Indian people. Socialists and Communists, working

together at this time, organized popular demonstrations and strikes against the war effort. They called upon Gandhiji to launch a mass movement to oust the British from India, and assured him of all support from the working classes and peasants. But Gandhiji hoped to strike a bargain with imperialism, carried on ~~protracted~~ negotiations, using all his delaying tactics, called the war a "just" one and that he must support it "even when it is espoused by an enemy". He declared that he would do anything but face "red ruin".

Leftist workers organized large-scale strikes against the war effort and in support of workers' demands for increased wages. In one place alone in 1940, 175,000 workers stayed away from work for 40 days. Countrywide arrests of workers' leaders followed. At the beginning of 1941, the Government claimed that "out of 700 detained in jail without trial, about 480 persons were almost without exception either acknowledged Communists or else active supporters of the Communist programme of violent mass revolution." Among those arrested were followers of the Forward Bloc, formed by Subhas Bose, who disappeared from India and later found his way to Berlin and Tokio.

The German invasion of Russia and the Japanese conquest of South-East Asia up to Burma brought about a decisive change in the orientation of the Leftist parties in India. Nehru had called the war one of liberation against the forces of darkness and tyranny. The Communists too called it a peoples' war. They were as much concerned at the Japanese menace to India as the Socialists were not. Jai Prakash Narain, leader of the Socialists, said, "A slave has no obligation to defend his country; his only obligation is to break his chains of slavery." He wanted a war within a war—if Britain was not prepared to transfer power to Indian hands.

Nevertheless, the Socialists did not succeed in keeping the workers and peasants away from work. Here the Communist hold became stronger. The C. P. I. inherited itself into the hearts of the workers and peasants. By their

support of the workers' demands and their help in fighting against coercion, the C.P.I. came to secure the largest number of seats on the executive bodies of the 800,000-strong All-India Trade Union Congress, the 700,000-strong All-India Kisan Sabha. They were already in control of the All-India Students' Federation, with a membership of 70,000. Besides, since its inception the party has been in control of the Progressive Writers' and Artists' Association, which today includes nearly all the important writers and artists of India, particularly the under-forty talent. The membership of the party, 150 in 1934 and 4,400 in 1942, rose to 53,000 active members. The party is a very compact and well-disciplined organization, demanding a high degree of political education. During the 1945 elections it contested 108 seats, and won nine, eight of them labour, polling 19 per cent of the votes cast. The popularity of the party, which today occupies the same position as did the League in 1937, was again and again proven in the postal, railway and labour strikes and the R. I. N. and R. I. A. F. mutinies. Attempts made by the Congress Socialists to set up rival workers and peasants organizations have failed so far, in spite of the support of Congress now in office. They must work harder.

So far the Socialists have not succeeded in winning over the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India or the followers of Bose. They must evolve a positive policy before they can be a really strong Left party in India.*

The partition of India, brought about by the British Tories who injected the poison in the body politic of India and the fissiparous minority which misled the Muslim masses, gave rise to reactionary tendencies which are ugly in character. Powerful business and feudal interests in our national life, taking shelter behind communalism and similar slogans, are entrenching themselves in the administration of India. They have secured the support of subversive forces, military or semi-military organisations, whose members go about freely these days. What is dangerous in this development is the support, overt

*Some of the above paragraphs have already appeared in an article published in the American "Current History", August, 1947,

or open, given to them by important leaders in the Indian administration itself. In the prevailing situation of India any unscrupulous leader may win over these forces and stage a *putsch*, as was done in various European countries in the wake of World War I. Already they have deprived India of her greatest leader. It seems at the moment they have gone underground.

If these sections and leaders come to power we shall not only see the end of peace, progress and genuine democracy in India but also India taking a road leading to aggression against our neighbours, the repudiation of all the sacred pledges that a popular democratic Congress gave to countries lying on our left and right flanks.

During the course of his convocation address to the Allahabad University, Pandit Nehru pointedly drew attention to these dangerous tendencies, when he said :

“Fascism and nazism were narrow and over-bearing and based on hatred and violence. I watched their growth in their respective countries as well as elsewhere. They brought a certain prestige to their people for a while, but they also killed the spirit and destroyed all values and standards of thought and behaviour. They ended by ruining the nations they sought to exalt.

“I see something very similar to that flourishing in India today; it talks in the name of nationalism, sometimes of religion and culture, and yet is the very opposite of nationalism, of true morality and of real culture. If there was any doubt of this, the past few months would have shown us the real picture.”

The Pandit once prophesied that he was destined to to be the Trotsky of India, exiled by reactionaries of the country to whose freedom he dedicated his whole life. If that comes about it will be a major disaster not only for India but also for the progressive sections all over the world, who speak of him as a beacon light in darkness that envelops the world today. It is the duty of every lover of peace, progress and democracy to give his or

her unstinted support to the progressive elements symbolised by Pandit Nehru, in order to enable him fight the forces of reaction in our administration, in our national life and in the world abroad.

We in India today stand at the crossroads. By temperament we are a peace-loving nation, standing for universal peace and progress. Our traditions are democratic and the Indian people wish to be left in peace to pursue their reconstruction activities, to increase their production of the necessities of life and to build up their key industries in order to raise their standard of living.

As a concession to the disruptionist elements in our national life we had agreed to have a weak Centre. Now that they have had their bit of the country, we must plan to have a Central Government with a strong backbone, leaving only cultural and linguistic autonomy to the provincial administrations. The economy and defence of India cannot stand any compartmentalisation. Our industrialisation must be planned from the Centre which only can mobilise our resources.

As a result of the technological advances in England towards the end of the eighteenth century and Britain's sway in India, the world-famous industries and handicrafts of India were wiped out with a heavy hand, in order to encourage imports of goods made in England.

Until the end of the 18th century industry and agriculture in India were evenly balanced. Giving his evidence before an enquiry committee set up by the British Parliament, a contemporary historian said in 1840: "India is as much a manufacturing country as an agriculturist, and he who would seek to reduce her to the position of an agricultural country seeks to lower her in the scale of civilisation." And this was precisely what came about. Furthermore, Western education made us believe that agriculture was the primary industry of India; and even today we hear the echo of this artificially inculcated belief. India became the classic example of colonial economy, sending food and raw materials to England, to be

paid for in the shape of consumers goods manufactured there. The process was facilitated by the destruction of India's magnificent shipping and shipbuilding industry and the consequent British control of our exports, denying us direct access to foreign markets. Add to this century-old exploitation the contribution that India was made to meet the expenses of Britain's aggressions this side of the Suez and one can appreciate the degree of impoverishment of the Indian masses and the incredibly low *per capita* income.

In the dawn of our freedom we are today faced with a poor and hungry population. Unless their material conditions of living are improved our independence would mean nothing more than a change of masters, the replacement of a white bureaucracy by a brown one, going about behind the shield of a Gandhi cap.

In any international crisis no Government can count upon the support of a hungry and discontented mass of humanity. Discontent among a people is enemy number one of any State; it saps the foundation of Government. And whenever the administration in India has weakened or disruptionist tendencies have asserted themselves foreign conquerors and Powers have struck a blow at the independence of India, often fatal. Conditions therefore must be created for making the Indian masses well-fed, well-clothed and contented.

An increase in the production of food, sugar, textiles and a marked improvement in housing conditions for workers in the industrial towns is a task which deserves the highest priority. Before the last war we were nearly self-sufficient in sugar. Our maximum production of sugar can actually give us an exportable surplus, particularly for the Middle Eastern countries. In cloth also if we make full use of our existing productive apparatus by increasing the number of shifts from two to three we can meet all our requirements.

But in food we are really short, have been so for quite some time. Our population is on the increase, but our production is steady. The partition of India, leading to

the cession of the surplus food-producing areas of Sind and Western Punjab, has further aggravated the situation. But the position is not yet altogether hopeless. We need Government-sponsored propagation of birth-control to stop the growth of population, a readjustment of arable land by bringing under cultivation large tracts of fallow land still not utilised in spite of our so-called Grow More Food Plan. Unfortunately such plans have meant only a little more work on paper, a few more cushy Government jobs.

A little more honesty with our agricultural planners, our agricultural research institutes, further exploitation of results of agricultural experiments carried out in countries like Russia, Mexico and those in South-East Asia, an intensive drive to propagate agricultural cooperatives backed by genuine enthusiasm among the mass peasantry, and we could make the nation self-sufficient in food and save nearly Rs. 100 crore worth of precious dollars which we need for imports of agricultural machinery, fertilisers and capital goods. To step-up the output of foodstuffs we shall need more dams and irrigation projects which shall make heavy demands on our key industries, like steel, cement, transport and fuel.

India constitutes one of the major reservoirs of iron ore. Our steel industry is not very old, but produces nearly a million tons of steel every year. The production figure is very low as compared to that of industrial Europe which produces nearly 51 million tons of steel every year. It is an uphill task for us to reach a figure so high, but we have the technical men and we have the resources, and given determination we could increase our production many times over. We need well-thought-out plans to achieve that result.

Although our coal reserves are small and our annual output only 35 million tons (as against Europe's 46 million tons monthly) our reserves are capable of better exploitation by the introduction of modern means of coalmining. The shortage of coal production, however, does not present any serious obstacle, because, according to one reliable

authority, so far only two per cent of our resources in white coal—namely hydro-electricity—have been utilised. Like Switzerland we could also draw on our inexhaustible water power and thus also conserve our coal supplies by cutting down our consumption in factories and communications, e.g. by electrification of our railways. Our water resources could also be exploited for navigational purposes. Until the British conquest of India we had had a very efficient river navigational system which provided cheap transport. It was sacrificed in order to popularise British-owned railways. Many of our rivers could be used for navigation or for bringing timber and forest wealth from the mountains down to the plains.

The coal that we can thus conserve can be usefully used for the production of synthetic oil. We have few oil resources and are more or less entirely dependent on foreign oil from the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, Burma and the Dutch East Indies—reserves of oil wealth entirely controlled by Western and U. S. nations. We must be prepared for any contingency which may deprive us of foreign oil, and must see that we make up for as much of our deficiency as possible.

Besides, prospecting of petroleum must go ahead at once in all parts of India—particularly the possible extension of the oil belt that passes through the Middle-East and Iran deserts to the Rajputana desert and Himachal Pradesh.

Intensive geological surveys and exploitation of our resources of other mineral wealth at the earliest time is of the utmost importance. Our last survey was in 1899 when technology was not so advanced. In the past we had no freedom to utilise those resources, and were dependent upon the foreign world for our essential supplies. For the whole sub-continent our annual production of copper is only 6,000 tons and that in aluminium 4,000 tons, figures which are capable of expansion at least a dozen times. Now that we are free to develop our resources let us set about the task with a zeal. Time is an essential factor, and the world situation being what it is we may be

involved in an international crisis any day, which will be fatal to a weak India.

Mention may also be made of the necessity of exploitation of our resources of atomic energy. Dr. Meghnad Saha, who was asked by the Government of India to collect information and report on the atomic energy research in the various European countries, said that he was 'simply amazed' at the progress made in this field by small countries like Britain, France and Sweden. The potentialities of atomic research in India, he added, were very good, in fact next to none in the world; nor did she lack scientists to start the work, though a large personnel had to be trained before exploitation of atomic energy for industrial purposes could be undertaken. Even a small country like Australia is very much ahead of India. The attempt of Indian scientists to extend their hand of friendship to our neighbours across the seas is very welcome, but our scientists deserve the fullest co-operation of the Government. The future of the world lies with the Power that leads in the exploitation of atomic energy for industrial purposes. There should be no delay in this direction, because delay in this respect will mean India lagging behind and again made a dependency, just as technological advance by Britain meant disaster for India.

So far our Government and leaders have indulged in vague generalisations about raising the standard of living of the masses. This is natural because they are engrossed with the day-to-day problems of administration. They will do well to take a leaf out of the book of the history of the N.E.P. of Russia. What we really need is a small committee of three or four economists and technical experts, the best talent that India can muster. These technical men need not be known public leaders and industrialists. They ought to be selected for their merit alone—without fear or favour. Popularly known leaders have a job to perform, but they cannot be burdened with work which is for the experts. It is for the leaders to tell the nation what progress they are making and what tools the people can give them and the experts in order to enable them to deliver the goods.

There is too much of red tape yet. As Dr. Meghnad Saha pointed out, the Government of India were not exploiting Indian scientific talent on a national scale, although they had been announcing their intention of establishing a number of scientific laboratories from time to time. For instance, the idea of starting a national physical laboratory in India was first mooted in 1942 and a planning committee was appointed which just took four years to evolve a plan contained in bare 20 pages. "I think", he added, "at the present rate of progress another seven years will be required before the buildings for laboratories are completed and fitted with apparatus." In this connection Pandit Nehru's move for stock-taking of scientific talent in India deserves high praise.

The implications of importing foreign technical help and capital will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter. Suffice it to state that in such matters we must proceed on the basis of self-help and must exploit to the full all our assets, e.g. our favourable trade balance etc.

India has been nature's favourite daughter. Although the separation of Burma cost us oil, tin, tungsten, lead, forest wealth and rice; and the secession of territories of Pakistan deprived us of wheat, the bulk of our raw jute industry and a part of our finest cotton, we still have great resources which we must mobilise in order to increase exports. With the balance of trade we can buy capital goods and import technical help.

Our exportable surplus in forest and plantation wealth is considerable. Our tea output is a great asset. We have $\frac{3}{5}$ ths of the world's output of mica; in manganese we are next only to Russia. And we produce half of world's output of groundnuts and considerable quantities of oil-seeds. If we could exploit our position of near-monopoly in these fields by exporting manufactured or semi-manufactured goods, for which these resources are used, instead of the raw materials, we could have a good margin of foreign exchange necessary for the purchase of capital goods.

In this connection it has to be mentioned that the reputation of our exports in consumers goods is not high ; indeed it is very low. That is so because Indian capital expects quick and maximum profits and does not act on the sound business policies of industrial countries like Britain, America or Germany whose manufacturers have a reputation for high quality goods. This policy of the Indian capitalists brings a bad name to India. The Government must set high standards for exportable consumers goods and see that nothing inferior in quality is exported, even if such industries have to be nationalised.

Already India carries on a great volume of trade with the countries of Middle and Far East, particularly in textiles, cement, steel, iron and leather goods. For most of these countries, India is the best or second best customer and an important supplier. Indian goods successfully compete with the products of Britain and America, her only two rivals. The collapse of Japan has presented her with a gap in the shape of markets which she can fill. She can also supply these areas with capital goods. If private enterprise were to get a free hand in this area there is a great likelihood that at some future date India may have to play the role of an imperialist Power in the Middle East and South-East Asia, merely stepping into the shoes of European imperialism. Indian capital, as at present invested, is deeply resented in all these countries, and although it is true that Indian indentured labour played an important part in the development of South-East Asia, its successors today are identified with Western imperialists. Two-thirds of the cultivatable land in Burma, it is well-known, had passed into the hands of Indian moneylenders. Steps must be taken to forestall events moving in that direction.

One such step would be the establishment of State monopoly in India's oversea trade. History of the present century alone is a sufficient proof of the dangers of private trading to international peace. In one form or another most nations had had recourse to instituting State monopoly in trade, started by Russia after the Revolution. Germany,

Turkey and Iran—all adopted it during the 1930's with great advantage to their national economy. So did Britain and the United States during the war. There is nothing wrong if India too adopts that policy. A State monopoly in foreign trade does away with various artificial protection devices, like tariff, quota, barter and clearing agreements; it eliminates the private individual's trade in imports and exports, and makes the State, with the apparatus of administration at its back, the principal in all transactions; it also enables the State to plan its imports and exports.

It will not be out of place in this connection to point out that Russia which, unlike India, never had any appreciable turn-over of trade or world monopoly in any commodity, could not fully exploit her foreign trade monopoly in order to influence her international relations. But India, whose annual turn-over of trade is considerable and who has a monopoly or semi-monopoly in a number of commodities, could take advantage of her unassailable position in this field to influence her relations with the nations of the world in the interests of world peace.

To be masters of our foreign trade we must have our own shipping. Long before the Christian era Hindus were pioneers in maritime navigation; their ships went as far as Japan and China—possibly America—and the Middle East. India kept her naval supremacy until the thirteenth century, when the Arabs snatched it from her, to lose, in their turn, to the European nations. Recognising the high quality of workmanship of our shipbuilders the East India Company established shipbuilding yards on the Western coast of India; it was cheaper to have ships built in India than in England. But "the arrival in the Port of London of Indian produce in India-built ships created a sensation among the monopolists which could not have exceeded if a hostile fleet had appeared in the Thames", says Dr. Taylor in *Ancient and Modern India*. "Shipbuilders of the Port of London took the lead in raising the cry of alarm. They declared that their business

was in danger and that the families of all the shipwrights in England were certain to be reduced to starvation". India's marine was sacrificed at the altar of the British Imperialism in India, because India, it was argued, did not need a mercantile marine. There was the British shipping to carry on the trade of India. By and by even the small Indian shipping companies went out of existence.

Indian shipping business have always been alive to the importance of Indian shipping. It has been estimated that during the last sixty years or so as many as 102 Indian shipping companies were floated with the object of building an Indian mercantile marine, but they had to be liquidated, as Sir Alfred Watson pointed out, "by a combination of British interests".

Before the last war India's coastal trade totalled six million tons and two million passengers. Her overseas trade amounted to 25 million tons and 250,000 passengers. All this vast trade was carried on by the British shipping interests, and for these services India had to pay nearly £50 million annually. We were unable to build our own marine because we were not masters of our own destinies. It was with the greatest difficulty that Indian shipping was allowed to carry up to 25 per cent of her coastal trade only.

When the British decided to quit India we had 100,000 tons of shipping. Today it is below 200,000 tons, as against Britain's per-war tonnage of over 20 million tons. American mercantile marine is far stronger, as can be guessed from the fact that the U. S. is willing to sell 20 million tons of her shipping in Liberty ships.

The Government of India's policy in regard to building an Indian mercantile marine may be summarised as follows : They accept the target, laid down by the Reconstruction Policy Committee, of two million tons of shipping in the course of next seven years, in order to be able to transport 10 million tons of cargo a year and about 3 million passengers. The Government have decided that they themselves would contribute 51 per cent of the capital in each shipping corporation, that no corpor-

ation, individually or by rings, should secure a monopoly in shipping and own more than 100,00 tons.

They have tried to strike a compromise between nationalisation and 'private enterprise'. Only the results achieved in the next few years will show how far this policy is in India's national interests. The Government of India have done well in sanctioning dollars for the purchase of shipping and Indian shipping interests deserve praise for their work on the construction of ships of as much as 10,000 tons. But our efforts must be doubled, trebled and increased ten times in this direction, with a view to asserting India's role in the sphere shipping in the Indian Ocean. For the construction of still bigger ships we might well ask for Swedish or Italian technical help.

A strong mercantile marine is essential for the economic prosperity of India and is of immense help in wartime as the second line of defence. India is as much of a sea power as she is a land power. The importance of her naval defence cannot be over-emphasised. She has a vast coastline where a hostile fleet can land its forces. Our progress in building a navy and our submarine war potential for defence is yet very slow. The time has arrived for a gigantic effort in this direction.

The reverberations of Prime Minister Palmerston's thumping on the despatch box in St. Stephen's Hall, says Professor E. H. Carr, could be heard in any part of the world, because the British Navy, supreme on all the seas, stood at his back and lent weight to his forceful speeches. But today, when the overwhelming preponderance of the British warships, air squadrons and military divisions is gone, no amount of banging the despatch box or provocative speeches will add weight to Britain's greatness.

Sea power is important, very important. To quote Lord Curzon "it was the interposition of the sea that England lost America, that the Dutch and the Portuguese lost the greater part of their Eastern Empire, that Napoleon, equally with Rome, experienced so many difficulties in Egypt; that

the Mexican adventure of France and Austria ended in a fiasco, that Spain was robbed almost in a day of her possessions in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines”.

To this may be the defeat of the two wars of aggression by Germany in the present century. Hitler stood across the Channel but the 27-mile-wide moat foiled all his plans. On the contrary, Britain could, as she did, land armies on the shores of France because she had a grand fleet. It also explains the defeat of Italy in Abyssinia and the Italian Somaliland soon after she was cut off from the African mainland by the British fleet.

Furthermore, it explains the defeat of Britain in South-East Asia, because Japan challenged her with a navy much more formidable than the one that Britain could spare for the defence of the Indian Ocean; and the Japanese could not invade India, in spite of their possession of the bases in the Andamans and their air raids on Trincomalee and Vizagapatam, because the American fleet appeared in the Pacific and forced the Japanese fleet to withdraw to meet it.

The painful realisation that by destroying India's naval traditions Britain had jeopardised her own and India's defence position came only too late. In August 1940 Sir Herbert Fitzherbert lamented “at the present moment no (shipbuilding) industry exists (in India), although, as every one knows, in the past India's shipbuilding industry was world famous. It is obvious to me and I think to a great many other people that the sooner a shipbuilding industry is started the better for India. Such an industry to be successful needs courage, enterprise and forethought. That all these are present in India is a fact that cannot be denied”.

The needs of a strong mercantile marine and a navy are much more paramount today than they ever were. The protection which the British navy afforded us is no longer there; and we have got to stand on our own feet. With this object in view the problem of securing our share in the reparations against Japan in the shape of warships is worth

serious consideration. India bore the brunt of fighting in South-East Asia (70 per cent of the troops engaged in Burma were Indian), and we must not let sentimental idealism blind us against our due share in the reparations, and fight to have it in the shape of ships and naval craft. If we really feel philanthropic about it, we can pay the Japanese in cash, for any naval units that we secure.

Apart from being the strongest land power in Asia, India must be the strongest Indian Oceanic power, capable of defending her coast, the entrances to the Indian Ocean, and the bases off the coast of India, Ceylon, the Andamans, the Maldives and Lacadives, and the Seychellas.

From Aden to Bombay is 1900 miles, about seven days' sailing in fine weather; and from Singapore to Madras, Vizagpatam and Colombo is 1800 miles. Besides the vital strategic points of Aden and Singapore there are also the two entrances to the Indian Ocean, the Cape of Good Hope and the channel between Australia and New Zealand.

Aden has been controlled by the Government of India in the past; and it was only in 1937 that the British Colonial Office took over the defence of this base. Singapore has also again reverted to Britain. The two extreme southern gateways to the Indian Ocean are also controlled by the "white" Dominions of South Africa and Australia and New Zealand, members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Great Britain is thus our great neighbour on the seas. The power of Britain, now in her decline, has only been transferred from the mainland of India, Ceylon and Burma to the Indian Ocean, where she still remains supreme. In the interests of our own security, therefore, we must have the friendliest relations with Britain and, if possible, share in the defence of the Indian Ocean bases controlled by her. If India leaves the British Commonwealth of Nations, it is very necessary for her to enter into defensive alliances with individual members of the Commonwealth in the control of entrances to the Indian Ocean.

Alternatively, she must conclude mutually beneficial agreements or offensive-defensive alliances with the Indonesian Republic and agreements in regard to share in the defence of Mauritius and Seychellas, islands which have to be developed into strong naval, submarine and air bases.

There are two other points which are of great strategic importance to the security of India. These are Ceylon and the Western coast of Burma.

Ceylon has always played an important role throughout India's history. The first definite historical evidence about India's relation to her is the landing of Prince Vijaya on the day that the Budha attained Nirvana. The Dutch and the Portuguese realised the strategic value of Ceylon as a base. The Dutch wrote in 1654 to their Directors in the Hague: "when they (the Portuguese) are turned out of Ceylon, they are out of India, as the island is the centre of India".

Ceylon changed hands many times and "remained on the map" during the Napoleonic wars. It was after more than a century that Ceylon was threatened. The menace came from Japan in 1942, when Indian ports were bombed and the Andamans and Nicobars were occupied. There is little doubt that if Ceylon had fallen into the hands of the Japanese, the security of India would have been in great jeopardy. With Ceylon, more than with Burma, we need an offensive-defensive alliance.

The Japanese supremacy of the Bay of Bengal was facilitated by their mastery of the Arakan Coast. It is worth mentioning that in the absence of a control over the Straits of Malaccas this coast assumes a major importance for a command of the Bay of Bengal. Albuquerque entered into a treaty with the Sultan of Pegu because this was to facilitate his conquest of the Straits. He who holds one holds the key to the other. The Japanese strategy again emphasised this fact in 1942.

During the last war, air power assumed an ascendancy over land and sea power. Actually the supremacy of land and sea have become only appendages dependent on air support. We have seen the importance of air power

in our counter-offensive operations in Kashmir, when, but for the magnificent role of the R.I.A.F., we would have lost Kashmir.

Air wing has become the pivotal point of defence and offence. The German Chief of the Air Staff, General Koller, wrote in his memoirs dealing with the concluding stages of war: "All plans for the defence of a country, continent, or a sphere of interest, or for offensive operations, must be in the hands of the air command". He contended that the defeat of Germany was due primarily to the defeat of her air power, and concluded: "The country that has air supremacy and vigorously strengthens its air power over all other forms of armament to maintain its supremacy will rule the lands and the seas, will rule the world".

Such being the importance of air power, we must pause for a moment how strong our air power is and how many aircraft we manufacture in India or can manufacture in India. The picture is disappointing, because we are dependent on the U.K. and U.S.A., and dependence upon foreign countries for aircraft is fraught with great dangers. We have been spending too many of our dollars on the imports of aircraft, and could utilise them better by purchasing patent rights for India and by importing technical experts to enable us build, not assemble, plants but aircraft manufacturing concerns in very large numbers in India. We need the immediate establishment of aeronautical research laboratories, a step which even our airline companies can undertake at once—possibly jointly.

With the advent of precision bombing and the incredible range of bombers today India is very vulnerable from the air. Leaving Pakistan's likely role in a war against India out of discussion for the next chapter Russian bases in the Pamirs region are only 800 miles from Delhi, some 1300 miles from Bombay and only about 1500 miles from Calcutta, all within easy bombing range. From the farthest south-eastern point of Russia Calcutta is only 2200 miles

The danger from the air from bases in the Middle East and the Far East also is very real. On the western side too it is possible to bomb vital Indian administrative and strategic points in India from bases in Iran, where the American stranglehold is increasing. Mention may also be made of the possibility of Ceylon passing under a sea power hostile to India.

CHAPTER VII

THE PRESENT & FUTURE TRENDS

It is too early yet to assess in detail the significance of the trends of the foreign policy of India since she became independent. A few landmarks in her foreign policy, however, deserve notice.

One fact which stands out like a beam of light in darkness is that in a world lost in greed and selfishness India has been trying to follow a path of virtuous idealism.

In the days of our hostility to British Imperialism we outlined a programme in regard to oppressed peoples, which does not fit into the world situation today ; and as we insist on pursuing that programme, our foreign policy lacks a realistic appreciation of the world events. It is all right for India's Foreign Minister to keep his head in the clouds, but in order that he may not stumble, in order that India may not stumble, we must take note of the obstacles in the path that India is treading.

Pandit Nehru has defended his policy of "ploughing the lonely furrow" by saying to his critics that the foreign policy of each of the Big Powers, Russia, the U.S.A. and U.K., also is a failure. This is a fallacy conjured up to confuse the public mind. The foreign policy of any of the Big Powers is not a failure, because their international position is stronger than it was before. Our foreign policy, on the other hand, is unsuccessful because it has alienated us from most of the big and small Powers, as has been shown in the debates of the United Nations. To put it bluntly, we are throwing away our bargaining position.

Enlightened self-interest directed towards ensuring

the security and prosperity of a country is the only yardstick of her foreign policy.

All idealistic talk in terms of laudable principles like international security, peace and progress is easy, but without meaning, unless a country's national interests coincide with considerations of international peace and progress. National sovereignties are still the most important factor in international relations.

It was only in the interests of their nation that in 1933 leading British statesmen, behind the back of the League of Nations, offered help to Japan in the latter's conquest of Manchuria; that Russia concluded a Non-Aggression Pact with Hitler in 1939; that throughout the thirties the Democracies, behind pleasant names like non-intervention in Spain, gave a free hand to the Axis Powers to help Franco and pursue a path of aggression.

It was only when their national interests were attacked that champions of democracy like Great Britain, the United States of America and the Soviet Union took up arms against the dictators—although, as every one knows, the Fascist Powers' policies did not undergo any fundamental change.

Furthermore, it is purely in self-interest that the mightiest Powers of today, Russia and America, are entering into alliances with small Powers either near or far from their borders. Again it is in national interests alone that Russia wants a breathing space before the next world conflagration overtakes her, and that the United States, confident of the power of the atomic bomb, wishes to provoke a war with the Soviet Union before the latter finds the secret of the deadly weapon.

There is nothing wrong, therefore, if in the present world set-up we in India put our national interests before our international ideals. India's security and prosperity needs demand that our Foreign Office must not take any hasty and ill-advised step. Our commitments must be entered into with the greatest caution and after ensuring of

our ability to fulfil those commitments. The remark of Theodore Roosevelt, "I never take a step in foreign policy unless I am assured that I shall be able eventually to carry out my will by force", might as well serve as a motto to the framers of India's foreign policy.

So far our Foreign Office has placed considerations of international morality before national interests. For instance our commitment in regard to Indonesia was too hasty a step, forcing us to retrace it. It was not only a disservice to Indonesia but also to our own interests. We committed full support to the new Republic without ensuring of our ability to honour that commitment. Had we waited and watched for a few days as an *apparently* dispassionate and neutral Power, we could have at least secured a seat on the reconciliation commission or the Good Offices Committee which was sent out by the United Nations Security Council. Inside that committee we could have exercised our power, could have even forced issues. Our voice then would have carried weight.

By pronouncing our bias in favour of Indonesia in advance we not only forfeited the right to have any decisive say in the matter, but also weakend the position of Indonesia, our strong neighbour across the Bay of Bengal. Our premature announcement made us one of the fifty and odd States interested in Indonesia, while a little delay would have made us one of the three or four Powers who were to make recommendations for the future of the Indonesian Republic.

Again our national interests demanded that we should not have allowed our idealism to make us half-hearted about claiming our legitimate share in the reparations imposed on Germany, Italy and Japan. The succeeding generations of Japanese and Germans would not remember the magnanimous gesture made by the Government of India. How many today remember the grievous losses inflicted on Germany after the defeat of 1919?

In the last war India made great sacrifices in the Allied cause; we fought the Italians and Germans in North and

East Africa ; we fought them in Italy and in the Middle East. We fought the Japanese in Malaya and Burma. Seventy per cent of the soldiers who fought and defeated the Japanese in Burma were from India, which was also the base for the operations in the entire Far Eastern theatre of war. It passes comprehension of the average Indian why we, who badly need shipping and capital goods, should whittle down our share of the reparations. The position is not yet hopeless. When the peace treaty with Japan comes up, we in India must demand of our Government to claim our due share—in the shape of shipping and capital goods.

Towards the close of World War II it was believed that the creation of the United Nations Organisation, which was described as the new League of Nations "provided with teeth", had ushered in a new era of international peace and progress. It was fondly hoped that this new international body would avoid the mistakes of its predecessor and lead humanity on a different path, in a new direction. There were hopeful signs too. The United States, which had kept out of the League of Nations, joined its ranks, and Russia, which had adopted a cold attitude towards the League, had now become an active member determined to make the U. N. a success. But alas

The active participation by America and Russia introduced various complications, more so because all the Powers that had mattered in the the League of Nations had become second-rate and started falling into either of the groups of Powers revolving round the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

The United States and the Soviet Union are suspicious of each other. America believes that Russian Communism is the greatest evil force in the world today and that if Russia were given a free hand, the Communist flood would inundate the world.

Looking at things from Moscow, on the other hand, one feels that America is out to dominate the world and

has already encircled Russia by occupying large territories of various countries, or by actively interfering in the internal affairs of the States situated around Russia.

One lamentable result of the Russo-American clash of ideologies and interests has been a stiffening of the wartime attitude towards the question of national sovereignties. All talk of restricting them has now receded into the background. Russia, which at one time was favourably disposed towards restricting sovereignties in the interests of world peace, today believes that the first consequence of such a move would be the domination of those countries by the United States. That is a prospect fraught with grave dangers because it would lead to American interference in the internal affairs of the newly established democracies of South-Eastern Europe. So fierce is the Russian opposition to America's intrusion into the affairs of the nations of Western Europe that that continent is being divided into two camps, each poising for a place of vantage for an assault by one on the other.

Most of the wartime undertakings have been thrown to the winds, as much by America as by Russia. Today the United States is confident of success in any conflict with Russia, and, although the embers of the last one have not yet died down, a visitor to Germany, Greece, Turkey and the Middle East senses preparations for the next war.

The discussions in the United Nations Organisation are reminiscent of the old days of Geneva, of the same intrigues and power politics. All debates in the Security Council have indicated beyond doubt that in the international arena military force is still the deciding factor. So long as India does not build up her military and industrial power, her voice will not be heard in the councils of nations. That, however, does not mean that in international affairs we should remain helpless spectators, abstain from the United Nations discussions of issues not directly related to India. In problems that have concerned any of the European countries or the smaller States, our delegates so far have generally avoided active interest, and

have tried to take up a "disinterested" and neutral attitude, e.g. in Greece, Iran, Palestine . . .

That is doing harm to India's interest, because here is a field where India can put her internationalism into practice. In the world constituted as it is today every event that takes place in the remotest corner of the world must have some influence on human destinies. We must interest ourselves into the affairs of other States, and not only make our own people world-minded, but also strengthen our home front and raise India's prestige in the councils of the world. By our contributions we shall also make the U.N.O. discussions more realistic. In this connection Mrs. V. L. Pandit's move in regard to United Nations' diplomatic relations with Franco Spain was a very progressive and praiseworthy one.

Neutrality and impartiality in international relations are meaningless, and when any member of the U. N. avoids the solution of major issues she is only weakening its position.

Whether one likes it or not the unrealistic measures put into effect by the United Nations make her only a paper body. Whenever we move the United Nations or any of her political affiliates we must take this vital factor into consideration.

Our decision to refer the question of raiders' aggression in Kashmir, which is a part of India, in the form it was done, was a hasty and ill-advised step. It was hasty because the United Nations without any military and police arm can do nothing whatsoever. Before we did refer the issue to the Security Council we should have ensured of our ability to force a quick decision in Kashmir by force of arms. Had we done that we would have been in a position to instruct our delegate to walk out of the Council as soon it took up discussion of matters irrelevant to the main issue of fighting in Kashmir, which we had referred to the Council.

The charges made by Pakistan against India, he could have insisted, should be discussed only after our

reference had been properly dealt with. And while the discussions continued we should have poured forces into Kashmir to push the raiders out. Moral consideration do not make the U. N.O. take any decisions ; it is the armed strength that does it.

The step to refer to the Security Council was ill-advised because our Foreign Office had before its eyes the result of three similar issues referred to the United Nations Security Council : Greece, Indonesia and Palestine. For the last two years the Council had on its agenda these issues, and yet nothing concrete has come out of its discussions and decisions. On the contrary, what has happened is active interference in the affairs of those countries by the United States that dominates the United Nations. The question of Kashmir, like the other three issues, was bound to be a long-protracted affair, making confusion worse confounded.

The U.N. Good Offices committees and similar bodies only delay decisions. In the case of Indonesia, the United States group of observers delayed their arrival in Indonesia by a month, while fighting continued. Inside the Committee the United States helped the Dutch who were suppressing the independence movement. Similarly the issue of Palestine has been complicated by the United Nations. And that is the likely fate of our reference in regard to Pakistan.

Pakistan, a part of the Indian peninsula, is problem No. I in the domain of our foreign policy. The defence considerations of the two Dominions are identical. The Indo-Pakistan border is the most unsatisfactory frontier that could exist between any two States; there is no river or mountain or any other natural feature to demarcate one State from the other ; the frontier is neither ethnical nor ethnological. It is arbitrary. The announcement by the Government of India in September last year that they were determined to adjust it by all means available to them was a sensible move.

From the military point of view Pakistan as such presents no serious problem to India. But its strategic im-

portance to India is overwhelming. Its creation by Anglo-American imperialism is against the course of history. The territories that constitute Pakistan have never led an independent existence for any length of time. They have either dominated regions in Central Asia and the Indian mainland, or been dominated by them. Sooner or later history will force a merger of the two Dominions.

Until the time the progress and advance that we make voluntarily draw our neighbour into our fold it is in our interest to make Pakistan strong, strong enough to resist any foreign influence. If, however, during this period Pakistan goes against our interests and gives concessions to some non-Asian Power, it would be our duty to enter into alliances with the other Asian or Eurasian Powers to step in and nip the Pakistan trouble in the bud.

Our larger interests dictate that we must see that Pakistan stands on her own feet. By herself she presents no threat to India. It is in her weakness, strange though it may seem, that the danger to India lies. A weak Pakistan would naturally fall into line with the Middle Eastern States which are dominated by America and/or Britain. A sufficiently strong Pakistan can be a good buffer State between India and the America-dominated Muslim States of the Middle East.

There is a fear in the Indian mind that the Anglo-American Powers are strengthening the Muslim States of the Middle East so that collectively they may act as a check to the growing power of India. This popular impression is confirmed by Anglo-U. S. policy in the Middle East, the loud talk of pan-Islamism and the creation of the Arab League of some of the Muslim States of the Middle East. At the moment, in spite of their ancient and recent links with India, these Muslim countries are closer to Pakistan than to India and on a superficial view there seems to be a real danger to India from these States if they ever form a bloc against India. But that is only a superficial view.

The Arab League is a reactionary body, subservient to Great Britain who sponsored it, in order to curb the rising power of the poverty-stricken masses who favourably looked towards Russia. The most powerful factor in the politics of the Arab League today is the British Foreign Office representative to the Middle East, Brigadier Clayton. No Muslim potentate, nor even the Arab League, dare defy him. Actually it is he who lays down the policy of the League through behind-the-scenes manoeuvrings. He advises the Arab kings and leaders alike.

The Arab League is controlled by the wealthy and privileged ruling classes who wish to cling to their privileges and positions, no matter what it means to the masses, or costs the countries that they represent. In most of these countries all progressive movements have been suppressed, and the independence of the Press is a farce. The leaders are corrupt, and to them Islam is only a means to hold on to their privileged positions. The usual reshuffling of the Cabinets in the Middle Eastern States is like the reshuffling of the familiar 52 cards ; it is just a new grouping of the socially privileged leaders, a few more favours to this group or that.

Within the ranks of the Arab League there are deep dissensions. There are the differences between the Shias and Sunnis. There are the irreconcilable aspirations to the Khalifate. King Ibn Saud and King Farouk are rivals for the leadership of the Middle East. The late Imam Yahya of Yemen did not see eye to eye with any other Muslim ruler. And the ambitions of Emir Abdullah of Trans-jordan in regard to Palestine, Iraq, Syria and the Lebanon constitute another disturbing factor. The Sheikdoms of the Trucial Coast toe the line laid down by Britain for them. In spite of all talk of Arab unity and Muslim solidarity, Saudi Arabia did not take the lead in harming United States interests as a counter to the latter's stand regarding Palestine ; nor did Egypt. Neither would Trans-jordan go against the wishes of Great Britain. In the Middle East it was an open secret that in the days preceding British withdrawal from Palestine the Syrian and Iraqi

railway systems, in pursuance of the Arab boycott of Jews, would book no consignments for the Jewish Jerusalem, but they accepted these consignments for dispatch to Transjordan, whence the goods found their way to the Jews. Where exactly could one find evidence for the Islamic solidarity in practice ?

The fate of the Saadabad Pact of 1934 for political collaboration and joint consultation between Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Afghanistan is a fact that is not without significance. Neither Iran, nor Turkey, nor Afghanistan came to the aid of Iraq in 1941-42, when the Allies landed there ; nor did the signatory Powers go to the aid of the Islamic State of Iran when the Allied troops occupied it. The bonds of Islam disappeared into thin air.

Only last year, Afghanistan, a Muslim Power, opposed the entry of Pakistan, another Muslim Power, into the United Nations, proving that the links of the so-called brotherhood of Islam mean little. Even Mr. Jinnah declared last year that the theory of pan-Islamism had been "exploded" long ago.

Turkey is the strongest Muslim Power, the focus of the attention of all Middle Eastern States. Thanks to Mustafa Kemal's remarkable achievements, Turkey is a modern secular State. She renounced the religious bias of a State long ago--when she abolished the Khalifate. She resents being counted as a Muslim Power, or even as an Asian Power. Thanks to the adoption of European clothes and the Latin script, her outlook is European. She likes being called a European Power.

Turkey's foreign policy is one of extreme caution, one might say a model of caution. Although, in view of her geographical proximity to the Middle Eastern States, which once formed part of the Turkish dominions, she does not want to alienate them and carefully and cautiously grooms them in the hope that some day they might return to her fold, but she would not have any ties with them or be associated with them.

Though a modern State, Turkey's industrial and military potential is low. The Turk is a tough fighter, but for armaments and equipment he is dependent on the United States in whose camp he is gradually falling—for how long remains to be seen.

That is also true of other Muslim States. Rich in mineral wealth which they have mortgaged to the Anglo-Saxon Powers, for armament and equipment and industrially produced goods they too are dependent on Britain or the United States. Dates and Arab horses, of use in maintaining a favourable trade balance, do not contribute to military or industrial power. And war in the present century has become a battle of machines ; man-power considerations are secondary.

It is doubtful in the extreme if all the Arab States combined can suppress the Jews in Palestine, for all time. The Jews have a strong body of well-trained men supplied with the latest weapons of war manufactured by themselves or procured by them through channels which can never be intercepted. The Jews are a remarkable community. Scattered all over the world, it has succeeded in keeping its individuality, no matter what the climate and the country. Their international ramifications make them a force to be reckoned with. They are the biggest financiers of the world, having a great say in matters relating to the economic life of the United States and Great Britain, not to mention the smaller Powers.

However deep our sympathies with the Arabs, in international affairs we must not definitely alienate International Jewry. They could be of much assistance to us not only in the deliberations of international conferences but also in building up a strong India, in which task no Muslim Power can help us. How best to do this is a job for our Foreign Office to consider, for it is a matter to be dealt with most cautiously. Done in too open a manner it might arouse the Muslims of the Middle Eastern States against us.

During the war, and particularly since the end of hostilities, the All-India Muslim League's anti-Indian

propaganda found a fertile soil in the Middle East where pan-Islamic dreamers were only too willing to whip up anti-Hindu (which in this case became anti-Indian) enthusiasm by spreading half-truths or presenting only one side of the picture. The Arab Press took a very uncharitable view of the events in India in 1947. Thousands of pilgrims who visited Iraq and Syria last year spread vicious stories about the atrocities perpetrated on the Muslims of the Indian Union.

To make matters worse, the Indian Consuls in Iraq, originally appointed to give assistance to the Hajis, themselves spread or exaggerated the current vicious stories. One of them, a servant of the Government of India, I saw with my own eyes, was collecting money for the Qaid-e-Azam's Pakistan Fund, to be presented to Sir Feroz Khan Noon, then on a tour of the Middle East.

There is a large community of Indian traders in all countries of the Middle East. They have expressed fears that any anti-Jew rising in the Arab countries is bound to lead to anti-foreign feeling, of which they would be the worst sufferers, as was proved during the Rashid Ali *coup* in Iraq, when even the British Consuls did nothing to protect their lives or property. It is the duty of the Government of India to do something at once, before the anti-Indian poison spreads. We need counter-propaganda to clear the atmosphere of hatred and suspicion.

Throughout the war, All India Radio's services to the Middle East were as, if not more, popular as the broadcasts of the B. B. C. The people who form public opinion are, generally speaking, the town dwellers, who do listen in to the radio. Given a varied programme interspersed with music, for which A. I. R. may have to send a special recording unit to these countries, it is not difficult to get their ears. Technically there is much room for improvement in our external services.

During the war our External Affairs Department published two periodicals in Arabic, one of which has closed down,

leaving a gap which has not yet been filled. The other, *Al Nafir*, remains the best seller among all Arabic periodicals. This is another vehicle which could be used to great advantage, provided there is imagination and apparent objectivity in presentation of our side.

In many places in the Persian Gulf, in Baghdad and Basrah, Hindi is easily understood. The currency throughout the Gulf region is the Indian rupee; and for a long time the responsibility for the post and telegraphic communications in this area has been with the Indian P. & T. Department.

All these countries have very close trade relations with India who is their best customer and their biggest supplier. When the present vicious atmosphere clears up and the communal passions subside, the psychological and cultural bonds too would assert themselves. India is one of the biggest Islamic Powers. The four and a half million Indian Muslims' peaceful existence in the secular State that we wish to make of India will be the strongest argument against the charge of imperialism levelled against India.

It has been reported that certain delegates to the Inter-Asian Relations Conference carried with them the impression that India was assuming the role of an imperialist Power in relation of her small neighbours. If that is so it was an unfortunate event. We must create conditions and act in a matter so as to remove that impression.

The Western Powers that once held sway in Southern Asia are now bankrupt; and it is only through American help in the shape of money, armaments and technical assistance that France and Holland are trying to re-impose their rule on Viet-Nam and Indonesia. The prospect of the powerful non-Asian States dominating South-East Asia is fraught with grave dangers to the security of India and China.

Between themselves, India and China control the economic life of the South-East Asian countries. In the past there has been great rivalry between Indian and

Chinese commercial interests ; 58 per cent of the capital invested in Burma before the war was Indian and China accounted for 20 per cent of that country's trade. In Malaya, Indians formed 17 per cent of the population, as against 39 per cent of the Chinese element.

The present Indian and Chinese population is derived from the indentured labour which went to the countries of South-East Asia, but, through sheer hard work and ingenuity, succeeded in carving out a place for themselves in the life of those countries. But in this process they came to be associated with the "white" rulers, and had to share the burden of the hatred towards the British and the French.

The British strategy consisted in arousing the Malayans and Burmans against the Indians and Chinese, and vice versa. This resulted in anti-Indian feeling among the Chinese and the local population.

But the differences are not too difficult to be resolved. The step taken at the Inter-Asian Relations Conference, to emphasise the need of a common Asian citizenship, if pursued further, would go a long way in mitigating hostility to Indians.

The Indian population there would have to choose between Indian nationality or the nationality of the countries of their adoption. Harmonious relations between India and the countries of South-East Asia are of the gravest importance to the future of India and Asia.

India's geographical location makes her the pivot of Western, Southern and Eastern Asia, and by encouraging closer economic bonds and integrated defence arrangements with the countries lying on our eastern and western flanks we are helping ourselves more than those countries ; in their security and prosperity lie our security and prosperity. The first task, therefore, that India will have to undertake will be to eliminate non-Asian influences from this vast continent. This is not an easy task, and needs to be tackled with great caution.

Deep down in the subconscious of the average American and European is the fear of the "yellow peril". He is afraid that the ascendancy of a strong bloc of the Asian nations, totalling 100 million out of the total world population of 2000 million people, will spell disaster to the prosperity of Europe and America. We see the havoc wrought by imperialist interference in China, and the ascendent Powers would like to see the Indian Union and Pakistan come to loggerheads, so that they might weaken each other's power. That is a danger we have to guard against.

Commenting upon the results of the Inter-Asian Relations Conference a Western observer said : The conference "may be regarded as the outcome of the decline of the European political influence in the East, more particularly in South-East Asia, and the concomitant growth of national consciousness among the Asian peoples . . . The world has a new force to reckon with—the awakened spirit of Asia".

The Orient stands at the threshold of a great era, the age of Asia. During the last century, Europe, with her virtually complete monopoly of industrialisation, dominated the entire world, thrived on exports which were dumped on "colonies" kept in subjection for the exploitation of their resources in raw materials and food-stuffs. This supremacy is gone today because the European Powers quarrelled amongst themselves, a conflict inherent in the imperialist system, for the control of a larger part of the world. The last two wars have dealt the death blow to Europe's ascendancy and the basis of that ascendancy—the "colonial economy". Europe is now prostrate, and the United States alone produces more than the whole of Europe ever produced. Japan, Asian Russia and India have increased their industrial production within the present century to a degree which would have sounded fantastic in the last century.

Asia has already become a force in international affairs. A significant fact emphasised during World

War II was the decisive role played by the continent of Asia in determining the destinies of the world. The triumphant Nazi tide was rolled back at two points, El Alamein and Stalingrad, both lying in Africa and Asia. The brilliant part played by the Indian troops in the defence of North Africa is well-known and needs no recounting. The Soviet victory at Stalingrad was made possible by the aid rushed to Russia through Iran where Indian troops maintained the lines of communication, and by the help given by the Central Asian republics. Commenting upon the magnificent contribution rendered by the latter the London *Economist* wrote: "The centre of gravity of the U.S.S.R.'s economic life has shifted to Asia, and 1942 may rank in the U.S.S.R.'s history as the year of the industrial ascendancy of its Asiatic republics. Asia is putting a new impress upon all sectors of Soviet life. In the army, soldiers of the West Siberian and South Asiatic nationalities have become most prominent. The Tadjik and Uzbek detachments have been fighting in Stalingrad under the Siberian General Rudimtsev".

China's vast resources in mineral and manpower wealth are not even partially utilised, and she continues to be the plaything of Russo-American rivalry.

By keeping the peculiar chaotic situation in China, it seems Nature is only providing India with a chance to assume the leadership in re-interpreting the great spiritual and moral values which once had their home in this Continent, and in the advancement of Asia a role which she played magnificently and magnanimously for several centuries. The countries of the Middle and Far East present world problems in miniature. We must so force the pace of events that these countries may cease looking to Europe and the United States, and help India in evolving a pattern of government which may bring peace and progress to this war-distracted world. Here is a field where we could try an experiment which would provide a model for world government.

Even in the limited sphere of national interest, it is our duty to enable these countries to be militarily and

industrially strong to defend their independence, which has a vital bearing on the security and prosperity of India.

An advance in the political, social, cultural and economic life of these countries individually, in order to enable them to stand on their own feet, is a very sound investment. It is in India's own interests to see that these countries are strong economically and militarily, and also that they are freed from any restraints, economic or political, of the Big Powers. India, therefore, should render all assistance, technical and financial, to the countries on her left and right flanks, to make it possible for them to be independent. Naturally this assistance must be in a spirit of cooperation, and from one government to another.

If need arises India should be prepared to rush to the aid of these countries against designs of any non-Asian Power or Powers. In consultation with China and Australia, India must evolve plans for the pooling in of resources of the countries in the Indian Oceanic zone for purposes of a defensive war, common foreign policy and economic union. There is a strong body of opinion in these countries that would welcome such arrangements.

In the absence of any other strong Asian Power, India may have to assume the role of a Big Power and enunciate a sort of a Monroe Doctrine, shorn of its domination and exploitation bias, applicable to these countries, as also to those of the Middle East. In order to be able to do that she must be strong, militarily and economically. Any commitment in foreign affairs must be backed by military power ; otherwise it does not get the hearing of any one and remains a meaningless statement on paper.

A strong India is the principal condition of a successful foreign policy, and, therefore, the immediate problem facing India before she enters into any commitment is to build up her military and industrial power, which cannot

be done by "ploughing a lonely furrow", because that policy leads to our isolation, and it is a very unhappy situation to be left without friends and allies. Our best chance lies in aligning ourselves with the other Asian Powers—and, until the time we are not strong, playing off one Big Power against the other.

APPENDICES

1. WILSON'S 14 POINTS.

(Extracts from address to Congress on January 8, 1918).

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations

under institutions of her own choosing ; and more than a welcome assistance of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their goodwill, of their comprehension of her needs, as distinguished from their own needs, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they themselves have set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is for ever impaired,

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interests of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The people of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the

other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish State should be erected, which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike.

2. THE ATLANTIC CHARTER.

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. Their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live ; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

4. They will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security.

6. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

7. Such a peace shall enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hinderance.

8. They believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament."

—announced in a broadcast by Mr. Attlee, Deputy Prime Minister, on August 14, 1941.

3. CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

We, the Peoples of the United Nations, determined

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

And for these ends

to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and

to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of peoples.

Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims

Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

I PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

Article 1

The purposes of the United Nations are :

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end : to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve internal cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

Article 2

The Organization and its Members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in Article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles :

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

5. All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

6. The Organization shall ensure that States which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

7. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter, but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.

II MEMBERSHIP

Article 3

The original Members of the United Nations shall be the States which, having participated in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, or having previously signed the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, sign the present Charter and ratify it in accordance with Article 110.

Article 4

1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving States which accept the obligations

contained in the present Charter and, in the judgement of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

2. The admission of any such State to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Article 5

A Member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council.

Article 6

A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

III ORGANS

Article 7

1. There are established as the principal organs of the United Nations : a General Assembly, a Security Council, an Economic and Social Council, a Trusteeship Council, an International Court of Justice, and a Secretariat.

2. Such subsidiary organs as may be found necessary may be established in accordance with the present Charter.

Article 8

The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity

and under conditions of equality in its principal and the subsidiary organs.

IV THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) Composition

Article 9

1. The General Assembly shall consist of all the Members of the United Nations.

2. Each Member shall have not more than five representatives in the General Assembly.

(b) Functions and powers

Article 10

The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters.

Article 11

1. The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both.

2. The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council, or by a State which is not a Member of the United Nations in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations with regard to any such questions to the States concerned or to the Security Council or to both. Any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion.

The General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and Security.

4. The powers of the General Assembly set forth in this Article shall not limit the general scope of Article 10.

Article 12

1. While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.

2. The Secretary-General, with the consent of the Security Council, shall notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of internal peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and shall similarly notify the General Assembly, or the members of the United Nations if the General Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.

Article 13

1. The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of :

(a) promoting internal cooperation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification ;

(b) promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

2. The further responsibilities, functions, and powers of the General Assembly with respect to matters mentioned in paragraph 1 (b) above are set forth in Chapters IX and X.

Article 14

Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 14

1. The General Assembly shall receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; these reports shall include an account of the measures that the Security Council has decided upon or taken to maintain international peace and security.

2. The General Assembly shall receive and consider reports from the other organs of the United Nations.

Article 15

The General Assembly shall perform such functions with respect to the international trusteeship system as are assigned to it under Chapters XII and XIII, including the approval of the trusteeship agreements for areas not designated as strategic.

Article 16

1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the Organization.

2. The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the Members as apportioned by the General Assembly.

3. The General Assembly shall consider and approve any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies referred to in Article 57 and shall examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned.

*Voting**Article 18*

1. Each member of the General Assembly shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include : recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the election of the Security Council, the election of the members of the Economic and Social Council, the election of members of the Trusteeship Council in accordance with paragraph 1 (c) of Article 86, the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members, questions relating to the operation of the trusteeship system, and budgetary questions.

3. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Article 19

A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions of the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member.

*Procedure**Article 20*

The General Assembly shall meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require. Special sessions shall be convoked by the Secretary-General at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the Members of the United Nations.

Article 21

The General Assembly shall adopt its own rules of procedure. It shall elect its President for each session.

Article 22

The General Assembly may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

V THE SECURITY COUNCIL

*(a) Composition**Article 23*

1. The Security Council shall consist of eleven Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect six other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

2. The non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of two years. In the first election of the non-permanent members, however, three shall be chosen for a term of one year. A retiring member shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. Each member of the Security Council shall have one representative.

*(b) Functions and Powers**Article 24*

1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of

international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

2. In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII and XII.

3. The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.

Article 25

The members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

Article 26

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

(c) Voting

Article 27

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

*(b) Procedure**Article 28*

1. The Security Council shall be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Each member of the Security Council shall for this purpose be represented at all times at the seat of the Organization.

2. The Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which each of its members may, if it so desires, be represented by a member of the government or by some other specially designated representative.

3. The Security Council may hold meetings at such places other than the seat of the Organization as in its judgment will best facilitate its work.

Article 29

The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Article 30

The Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

Article 31

Any member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the latter considers that the interests of that Member are specially affected.

Article 32

Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a Member of the United Nations.

VI PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first, of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party, if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

Article 36

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

Article 37

1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37 the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

VII ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THREATS
TO THE PEACE, BREACHES OF THE
PEACE, AND ACTS OF AGGRESSION

Article 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Article 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in

Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such actions may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Article 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security

Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

Article 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

Article 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chief of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated

with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies may establish regional sub-committees.

Article 48

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

Article 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

Article 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures

necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at anytime such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

VIII REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Article 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

2. The Members of the United Nations entering such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

4. This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35.

Article 53

1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this Article, provided for pursuant to Article 107 or in regional arrangements direc-

ted against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.

2. The term enemy State as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.

Article 54

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

IX INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COOPERATION

Article 55

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development ;

b. solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 56

All Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

Article 67

1. The various specialized agencies, established by inter-governmental agreement and having wide interna-

tional responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields, shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of Article 63.

2. Such agencies thus brought into relationship with the United Nations are hereinafter referred to as specialized agencies.

Article 58

The Organization shall make recommendations for the coordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies.

Article 59

The Organization shall, where appropriate, initiate negotiations among the states concerned for the creation of any new specialized agencies required for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

Article 60

Responsibility for the discharge of the functions of the Organization set forth in this Chapter shall be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the economic and Social Council, which shall have for this purpose the powers set forth in Chapter X.

X ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

(a) Composition

Article 61

1. The Economic and Social Council shall consist of eighteen members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, six members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of three years. A retiring member shall be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. At the first election, eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council shall be chosen. The term of

office of six members so chosen shall expire at the end of one year; and of six other members at the end of two years, in accordance with arrangements made by the General Assembly.

4. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one representative.

(b) *Functions and Powers*

Article 62

1. The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations with respect to any such matters to the General Assembly, to the Members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.

2. It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

3. It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly, with respect to matters falling within its competence.

4. It may call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international conferences on matters falling within its competence.

Article 63

1. The Economic and Social Council may enter into agreements with any of the agencies referred to in Article 57, defining the terms on which the agency concerned shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations. Such agreements shall be subject to approval by the General Assembly.

2. It may coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies through consultation with and recommendations to such agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Members of the United Nations.

Article 64

1. The Economic and Social Council may take appropriate steps to obtain regular reports from the specialized agencies. It may make arrangements with the Members of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies to obtain reports on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations and to recommendations on matters falling within its competence made by the General Assembly.

2. It may communicate its observations on these reports to the General Assembly.

Article 65

The Economic and Social Council may furnish information to the Security Council and shall assist the Security Council upon its request.

Article 66

1. The Economic and Social Council shall perform such functions as fall within its competence in connexion with the carrying out of the recommendations of the General Assembly.

2. It may, with the approval of the General Assembly, perform services at the request of Members of the United Nations and at the request of specialized agencies.

3. It shall perform such other functions as are specified elsewhere in the present Charter or as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

*(c) Voting**Article 67*

1. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

*(d) Procedure**Article 68*

The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in economic and social fields and for the promo-

ion of human rights, and such other commissions as may be required for the performance of its functions.

Article 69

The Economic and Social Council shall invite any Member of the United Nations to participate, without vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that Member.

Article 70

The Economic and Social Council may make arrangements for representatives of the specialized agencies to participate, without vote, in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it, and for its representatives to participate in the deliberations of the specialized agencies.

Article 71

The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned.

Article 72

1. The Economic and Social Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

2. The Economic and Social Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

XI DECLARATION REGARDING NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Article 73

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self

government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end :

(a) to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses ;

(b) to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement ;

(c) to further international peace and security ;

(d) to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this Article ; and

(e) to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which Chapters XII and XIII apply.

Article 74

Members of the United Nations also agree that their policy in respect of the territories to which this Chapter applies, no less than in respect of their metropolitan areas, must be based on the general principle of good-neighborliness due account being taken of the interests and well-

being of the rest of the world, in social, economic, and commercial matters.

XII INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM

Article 75

The United Nations shall establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements. These territories are hereinafter referred to as trust territories.

Article 76

The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be .

- (a) to further international peace and security ;
- (b) to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement ;
- (c) to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the inter-dependence of the peoples of the world ; and
- (d) to ensure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of Article 80.

Article 77

1. The trusteeship system shall apply to such territories

in the following categories as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship agreements :

- (a) territories now held under mandate ;
- (b) territories which may be detached from enemy states as a result of the Second World War ; and
- (c) territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration.

2. It will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories in the foregoing categories will be brought under the trusteeship system and upon what terms.

Article 78

The trusteeship system shall not apply to territories which have become Members of the United Nations, relationship among which shall be based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality.

Article 79

The terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate by a Member of the United Nations, and shall be approved as provided for in Articles 83 and 85.

Article 80

1. Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements made under Articles 77, 79, and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties.

2. Paragraph 1 of this Article shall not be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of the negotiation and conclusion of agreements for placing mandated

and other territories under the trusteeship system as provided for in Article 77.

Article 81

The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which will exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority, hereinafter called the administering authority, may be one or more states or the Organization itself.

Article 82

There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under Article 43.

Article 83

1. All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council.

2. The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area.

3. The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas.

Article 84

It shall be the duty of the administering authority to ensure that the trust territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority may make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority

as well as for local defence and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

Article 85

1. The functions of the United Nations with regard to trusteeship agreements for all areas not designated as strategic, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the General Assembly.

2. The Trusteeship Council, operating under the General Assembly, shall assist the General Assembly in carrying out these functions.

XIII THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

(a) Composition

Article 86

1. The Trusteeship Council shall consist of the following Members of the United Nations :

(a) those Members administering trust territories ;

(b) such of those Members mentioned by name in Article 23 as are not administering trust territories ; and

(c) as many other members elected for three-year terms by the General Assembly as may be necessary to ensure that the total number of members of the Trusteeship Council is equally divided between those Members of the United Nations which administer trust territories and those which do not.

2. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall designate one specially qualified person to represent it therein.

(b) Functions and Powers

Article 87

The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may :

(a) consider reports submitted by the administering authority ;

(b) accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority ;

(c) provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority ; and

(d) take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of trusteeship agreements.

Article 88

The Trusteeship Council shall formulate a questionnaire on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of each trust territory, and the administering authority for each trust territory within the competence of the General Assembly shall make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of such a questionnaire.

(c) *Voting*

Article 89

1. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Trusteeship Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

(b) *Procedure*

Article 90

1. The Trusteeship Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

2. The Trusteeship Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

Article 91

The Trusteeship Council shall, when appropriate, avail itself of the assistance of the Economic and Social Council and of the specialized agencies in regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned.

XIV THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Article 92

The International Court of Justice shall be the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. It shall function in accordance with the annexed Statute, which is based upon the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and forms an integral part of the present Chapter.

Article 93

1. All Members of the United Nations are *ipso facto* parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on conditions to be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Article 94

1. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.

2. If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.

Article 95

Nothing in the present Charter shall prevent Members of the United Nations from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

Article 96

1. The General Assembly of the Security Council

may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.

2. Other organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, which may at any time be so authorised by the General Assembly, may also request advisory opinions of the Court on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.

XV THE SECRETARIAT

Article 97

The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such staff as the Organization may require. The Secretary-General shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organization.

Article 98

The Secretary-General shall act in that capacity in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, of the Economic and Social Council, and of the Trusteeship Council, and shall perform such other functions as are entrusted to him by these organs. The Secretary-General shall make an annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization.

Article 99

The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 100

1. In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization.

2. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the respono

sibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Article 101

1. The staff shall be appointed by the Secretary-General under regulations established by the General Assembly.

2. Appropriate staffs shall be permanently assigned to the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and, as required, to other organs of the United Nations. These staffs shall form a part of the Secretariat.

3. The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

XVI MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 102

1. Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any Member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.

2. No party to any such treaty or international agreement which has not been registered in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the United Nations.

Article 103

In the event of a conflict between the obligation of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.

Article 104

The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such legal capacity as may be necessary

for the exercise of its functions and the fulfilment of its purposes.

Article 105

1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes.

2. Representatives of the Members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for independent exercise of their functions in connexion with the Organization.

3. The General Assembly may make recommendations with a view to determining the details of the application of paragraph 1 and 2 of this Article or may propose conventions to the Members of the United Nations for this purpose.

XVII TRANSITIONAL SECURITY
ARRANGEMENTS

Article 106

Pending the coming into force of such special agreements referred to in Article 43 as in the opinion of the Security Council enable it to begin the exercise of its responsibilities under Article 42, the parties to the Four-Nation Declaration, signed at Moscow, October 30, 1943, and France, shall, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of that Declaration, consult with one another and as occasion requires with other Members of the United Nations with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Article 107

Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of

that war by the Government having responsibility for such action.

XVIII AMENDMENTS

Article 108

Amendments to the present Charter shall come into force for all Members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

Article 109

1. A General Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council. Each Member of the United Nations shall have one vote in the conference.

2. Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the Members of the United Nations including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

3. If such a conference has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming into force of the present Charter, the proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

XIX RATIFICATION AND SIGNATURE

Article 110

1. The present Charter shall be ratified by the signatory

states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

2. The ratifications shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which shall notify all the signatory states of each deposit as well as the Secretary-General of the Organization when he has been appointed.

3. The present Charter shall come into force upon the deposit of ratifications by the Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and by a majority of the other signatory states. A protocol of the ratifications deposited shall thereupon be drawn up by the Government of the United States of America which shall communicate copies thereof to all the signatory states.

4. The states signatory to the present Charter which ratify it after it has come into force will become original Members of the United Nations on the date of the deposit of their respective ratifications.

Article III

The present Charter, of which the Chinese, French, Russian, English, and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other signatory states.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the representatives of the Governments of the United Nations have signed the present Charter.

Done at the city of San Francisco the twentysixth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and forty-five.

INDEX

- Abdul Hamid 2
 Afghanistan 2, 56-8, 107
 Aga Khan 11
 Aggression, defined 57 n.
 Albuquerque's strategy 63, 73
 Ali, Asaf 21
 Allenby 68
 Ansari, Dr. 74
 Arab League 105-8
 Asia, awakening and role of 112-3
 Attlee, Mr. 123

 Baker, Sir Herbert 9 n.
 Bose, Subhas Chandra 15, 18, 19, 80, 81
 Burma 73, 74, 94, 98

 Canning, Lord 32-3
 Carr, E. H. 92
 Cecil, Lord 5
 Central Asia 55-7
 Ceylon 94, 95, 97
 Chamberlain, Sir Austin 4
 Chiang Kai-Shek 19
 China 110, 113
 Churchill, Winston 10, 18, 122
 Clayton, Brig. 106
 Clayton, W. L. 44
 Clemenceau 5, 13
 Communism 48-9, 59-61, 78-81
 Credentials, Indian delegate's 9, 10, 20
 Crewe, Lord, Report 8
 Cripps Mission 18
 Curzon, Lord 55, 66, 92

 d'Arcy, William Knox 38
 de Tocquville 53
 Das, C. R. 74

 Eastern Group Council 19, 76
 Edward, King 8

 Farouk, King 43, 106
 Fascism and India 81-3
 Foreign capital for India 51-2
 Foreign trade of India 88-92
 Foreign policy, object of 76, 98

 Gandhi ji, 15, 19, 23, 74, 78, 79, 80, 84
 Geopolitics 44-5
 George, Lloyd 2
 Gieu, Duong van 74

 Habibullah, Sir Mohd. 11
 Hardinge, Lord 10
 Hitler 14, 99

 Imperial war Conference 3-4
 Indian High Commissioner 8-9
 Indian Ocean, Strategy 94-7
 Indonesia 22, 37, 74, 100
 Inter-Asian Relations Conference 22-3, 76, 110, 112
 International Conventions and India 6-7
 I. L. O. 9, 11
 Iran, 38, 42, 57-8, 64

 Jain, L. C. 21
 Japan, 18, 21, 33, 35-7, 46, 73, 80, 93-5,
 Jews and India 108
 Jinnah, M. A. 109

 Kashmir 54, 96, 103-4

 Lawrence, T. E. 68
 League of Nations 5, 7, 9, 101
 Lippmann, Walter 34
 Long, Walter 4
 Lytton, Lord 10, 12

 Mac Arthur 36
 Mahon 34, 66

- Malcolm 64
 Marshall Plan 11, 44
 Massey Vincent 29
 Meek-Gregory mission 20
 Menon, K. P. S. 21
 Menon, V. Krishna 21
 Meyer, Sir William 10
 Middle East 2-3, 38-42, 64-72, 79,
 89, 105-110, 113-14
 Millspaugh, A. C. 40, 41, 42
 Mitter, Sir B. L. 13
 Monroe Doctrine 33, 114
 Montagu 4
 Morely, Lord 1
 Mudaliar, Sir Ramaswami 20
 Mussolini 14, 69
- Naidu, Mrs. Sarojini 23
 Napoleon 54, 64
 Narain, J. P. 79, 80
 Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal ;
 opposition to fascism 14, 82-3;
 outbreak of 1939 war 17 ;
 meets Generalissimo Chiang
 19 ; expands India foreign
 and consular services 21 ;
 Inter-Asian Relations
 Conference 22-3 ; gives lead to
 S. E. Asia 74-6 ; presides over
 A. I. T. U. C. 78 ; on the role
 of the last war 80 ; marshals
 scientific talent 88 ;
 reflections on his present
 foreign policy 98-115
 Noon, Feroz Khan 20
- Oil 38-41, 70-2, 76-86
- Pacific Ocean 34-7
 Pacific Relations Conference 20
 Pakistan 56-7, 63, 88, 96, 103-5,
 107
 Palmerston 77, 92
 Pandit, Mrs. V. L. 21, 103
 Pan-Islamic movement 2, 107
 Patel, Vallabhbhai 79
 Peace Treaty 4-5
 Philippines 5, 34, 35
 Phillips William 20
- Reparations 100-1
 Radhakrishnan, Sir S. 23
 Raisman Sir Jeremy 20
 Rommel 17, 43
 Roosevelt 20, 37, 121
 Rush, Richard 32
- Saha, Meghnad 87-8
 Schuster 40
 Sea Power, importance of 92-4
 Sinha Lord 4, 5
 Sjahriar 74
 Socialists, Indian 18, 79-81
 South-East Asia 37, 73-6, 89, 94,
 110-14
 Spain 14, 103
 Spykman, N. J. 45
- Taylor, Dr. 90
 Technical help for India 51
 Tilak, B. G. 4, 5, 15
 Tipu 64
 Trotsky 82
 Truman Doctrine 44
 Turkey 42-4, 107-8
- U. K. attitude towards
 Dominions and India 1-4 ;
 rise of British Power 25-6 ;
 clash with Germany 2-3, 26 ;
 results of World War I 27-8 ;
 national character 28-9 ;
 Commonwealth 28-30 : Power
 in the Indian Ocean 30-1 ;
 Mid-East Policy 42-3 ;
 attitude to Russia 54-6, 62 ;
 in the Persian Gulf 65-8
 U. N. O. 38, 101-4, 124-57
 U. S. A. Strength of 32, 50 ;
 Good Neighbourly Policy 34 ;
 Open Door Policy 35 ;
 Japan's challenge 36 ;
 demand for Pacific bases 36-7 ;
 policy towards S. E. Asia 37 ;
 towards Europe 37-8 ;
 towards the Middle East 38-42 ;
 towards Mediterranean
 Powers 42-6 ; opposition to
 the Soviet Union and

- suppression of Communism 46-9, 101-2 ; dollar loan to India 51 ; to Pakistan 105, scare of oil shortage 72
- U. S. S. R. Power of 36, 53-7 ; misrepresentation 46-7 ; India and 54-6 ; relation to Europe 59 ; liberation movements and 59-60, 62 ; Policy towards Balkans 60 ; fallacies regarding 60-2 ; ascendancy of Central Asian republics in 113
- Viet-Nam 37, 74
Vincent William 10
Wallace, Henry 49
Wassmuss 68
Watson 91
Wellesley, Lord 64
Westminster Statute 30
Willingdon, Lord 10
Wilson 5, 119
Zafrullah, Sir Mohd. 19
-

