

# MUST WE FIGHT ?

SHĀHID PRAVIN

*PRAVIN PUBLICATION*

CALCUTTA & BOMBAY

## The Author

The Author, for the reason of having developed a peculiar dislike from infancy for his present name, wants to remain anonymous for the time being. He is a young Indian, aged twenty six, who began writing poetry at the age of eleven, which, he now claims, he has left off since long. Completing his secondary education at a very low age he took up University education, but had to put an end to that having gone half through, and took to Commerce. By twenty one he had annexed half a dozen professional certificates and Diplomas, and established a reputation for writing on financial topics through the medium of a large number of periodicals and newspapers including '*The Madras Mail*' and '*The Times of India*'. He has'nt belonged to any political party, but is keenly interested in politics and assures that his opinions on Indian political problems will be heard more widely and frequently hereafter.

# MUST WE FIGHT ?

## CHAPTER ONE

### A SURVEY OF EVENTS

The war has entered a decisive phase. To-day the whole of the mighty German military machine is again on the march. This time it is not against a small State but against one of the most powerful of the present day States. The Soviet Union ever since the advent of fascism has been preparing for such an eventuality. In fact the whole gang of international counter-revolutionary forces have been thirsting for such a fight. It is this set of people the most virulent of anti-social elements the scum and refuse of society lifted to the top by accident who have been planning such an attack on the U. S. S. R., and to which plan the leading politicians of all the existant and non-existant Democracies lent their active or passive support. Great Britain who bore the brunt of the German attack hitherto also actively supported the venture. Lloyd George in the House of Commons in November 1934 declared. In a short time perhaps in a year or two the Conservative elements in this country will be looking to Germany as the bulwark against Communism in Europe. She is planted right in the centre of Europe and if Germany is seized by the Communists Europe will follow.

because the German could make a much better job of it than any other country. Do not let us be in a hurry to condemn Germany. We shall soon be welcoming Germany as a friend." Chamberlain and his followers were only putting into effect this precept, and in that they were only obeying the dictates of the gentry and the City of London. The direct hostility of the British Government against Soviet Russia is evident to every student of political affairs. It was Britain who instigated and launched armed intervention during the years of the Revolution in that country and the British Expeditionary Force did not actually withdraw from Russia until the end of November 1920. This date only marks an end to the policy of active intervention in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. Since the rise of National Socialism in Germany with the avowed intention of wiping out Communism from the face of the earth, British politicians have been rallying round the Swastika, the Nazi banner, like any other German. Munich in September, 1938 only lent colour to this long deliberated policy gradually being put into effect. Chamberlain and Daladier in yielding to the aggressor was warding off aggression in another direction. With what result? To-day Spain threatens to cut off the British Empire's vital lines of communication. It is also a certainty that she will do so if the British carry the war to its real end. All that withholds Spain from acting for the present is the hesitant attitude of the

British and such an attitude fits in admirably with the German plan of things. Germany is not anxious to shut off her main neutral Clearing house when she needs such an outlet, for her sinister activities in neutral countries. Moreover it is a fact that Germany ever since the beginning of the war has been receiving raw materials and supplies through Spanish ports. Truly with imagination and political foresight Hitler planted the advance guard of his forces on the shores of the Atlantic. Franco is only a link in the whole machinery of Fascist aggression deliberately planned and cunningly being executed. Munich and Spain worked well together.

In Abyssinia Italy's conquest brought the forces of the Axis as far as the Indian Ocean. In this as well the French and the British Democracies contrived to manage a success for the Fascist aggressors with the *fasco* of an economic Blockade which in fact, did never operate. What is the cause for such a policy on the part of the so called democracies. I let Mr G D H Cole explain that for you. It is of course that in every Capitalist country the Capitalists in the mass though they may still repudiate Fascism greatly prefer it to any sort of Socialism. They are determined above all else to keep their wealth and, while they do not want Fascism where they can govern without it they will do nothing that might strengthen Socialism against it in the world as a whole. As long as a Capitalist

Government governs Great Britain, it will be impossible for Great Britain to range itself internationally with any group that stands for united opposition to the Fascist aggressors. For such a grouping must include the Socialists, and indeed depend upon them for leadership and direction. British Capitalism will have none of such an alliance, within or without the League of Nations. It prefers Hitler and Mussolini to a democracy which is based upon the Left."

Against this set of circumstances one must compare the attitude adopted by the Soviet Union. Stalin has followed a policy, ever since the days of the Revolution, calculated to foster peace on earth. When Japan invaded Manchuria, perhaps, Soviet Russia alone helped the victim. When the question of Sanctions against Italy, as a result of its invasion of Abyssinia, came up for discussion in the League of Nations, Moscow alone supported the measure whole-heartedly. Kremlins entry into the League of Nations on September 18, 1934 was with the clear intention of resisting aggression of any sort whatsoever through the means of collective security. Louis Fischer, whose opinion of Russia could not in any way be favourable to that country expressed "the Soviet Government was the only effectively anti-Fascist Government in the world". None of Stalin's utterances can be spotted to point out that Russia ever supported aggression. Think of this in terms of the utterances of the Dictators and

you will fully understand who stood for real and lasting peace in the world. But this policy of Stalin was never with any pacifist intentions. He has often declared in the most unmistakable manner that Russia did not want a single patch of foreign territory but she would not give up a single inch of her own.

The occurrence of this war fully demonstrated how collective security was sabotaged by countries who stood directly to benefit from it. Much earlier than the war started Russia had made proposals to the French and British Governments for an effective Anglo-French-Soviet alliance to counteract the menacing Rome-Berlin Tokyo Axis. This alliance with the economic support of the United States of America would have proved to be the strongest bulwark against any sort of combination with aggressive intentions. When the time came for devising the ways and means of rendering help to Poland Russia once again submitted concrete proposals for implementing such promises of assistance. British and French Statesmen were rather wary in accepting such proposals the future events clearly demonstrated. The Polish Government actually refused any sort of military assistance by the Red Army. They rather preferred their country to be over run by the Nazi hordes rather than accept assistance from their powerful Red neighbour. Neither the British nor the French Government did any thing in their power to influence the decision of their Polish comrades otherwise

The bankrupt nature of the promises of assistance offered by the British and the French became evident when one considered that neither Britain nor France was in a position to rush assistance to Poland in the event of a Nazi Blitzkrieg. Russia by reason of her proximity to Poland was in an entirely different position. The substance of Russia's proposals was to meet the German Army on the Polish soil as it would be greatly difficult to check an Army on victorious march farther afield. British, French and Polish Generals greatly under-estimated the strength and potential value of Soviet assistance to their own detriment as the subsequent events proved. All through the negotiations with Russia those statesmen were following an abortive attempt. Chamberlain could fly to and back from Hitler at the latter's beck and call while he could only find a Civil Servant of no status in the politics of the country to conduct negotiations on behalf of England with Russia. This minor official one Mr Strang, had constantly to refer back and seek instructions from London for each question put by the Russians arising out of the negotiations. Consequently the negotiations were unduly delayed. Till the last minute Mr Chamberlain who said so much on the sincerity of the contracting parties at Munich, believed in the good will of Hitler and wrote on August 22, 1939, a letter calculated to deter Hitler from the contemplated march on Poland.



What the British and French Democracies were planning at that moment was a sort of giving effect to their pious hope that Hitler after taking Poland would march safely into Soviet Union upset the regime there and plant the Swastika in the Ukraine and the Caucasus. In the mean time they could make their plans complete in the west and settle accounts with Hitler subsequently if at all he had any plans for conquest in the west. To cover up all these pious intentions they put forward that Russia should give all sorts of assistance by way of planes, munitions and tanks but falling short of the Red Army contacting the *Reichswehr*. This exactly fitted with the noble motives explicitly carried through in January 1937 by concluding a Gentleman's agreement with Mussolini containing a secret clause to allow Italy special facilities for sending arms and ammunitions to Abyssinia through Berbera and Zelelah. The same powers who overshadowed the League of Nations in its policies engineered the Sanctions. What pious intentions and with what piety they execute their plans! The same principle was adopted in the present case also. They wanted to goad Russia into a fight with Germany and during the course of the fight remain passive spectators to see both the powers losing their strength and of Russia so much so as to make Communism impossible of application even at home.

These policies became clearly manifest during the negotiations and Stalin was not so thick headed as not to notice these. In the meanwhile Herr Von Ribbentrop

See British White Paper published in June 1938.

placed before him a proposal for a non-aggression pact with Germany. No doubt, the pact was greatly helpful to Germany at that time, but subsequent events proved that Stalin too had much to gain out of the alliance. This pact has been the cause of much misunderstanding of the Soviet's real intentions. For a justification of this policy we shall revert later. The world Press speculated on the issues involved by the alliance, in a manner, which would set at naught the wildest fiction. Some claimed that Stalin had even exacted a promise from Hitler to turn Germany Communist. Others held that Hitler scored a direct victory over Stalin by isolating the Russia from the Democracies for all time and that would take control of Russia gradually—or rather Stalin had played into the hands of Hitler. Mr Neville Chamberlain, the then Prime Minister of England, remarked that the pact was a humiliation for Hitler.

While these criticisms were going on and the world was passing through the gravest moment in its history, the Diplomatic Corps of Kremlin were busy negotiating a truce with Japan in the East, on the Mongolian war, which was actually signed on September 16, 1939. The real intentions of this truce also were enigmatical to the British and French public. They interpreted, or were rather told by their masters, that the act signified Russia's assent to march in the Axis plan. We shall subsequently discuss this and try to answer the charges levelled against the U S S R on this count as well.

German Army confident of their diplomatic triumph in warding off a fight on the Eastern frontier straight away marched into Poland. But Russia was not to sit idle and allow the Nazi hordes appear on the border of the Ukraine—the object of Nazi Lebensraum. The Red Army on September 17 1939 marched in and occupied the territory which once belonged to Russia. For this act also she has been greatly vilified by the international Press and public men. To a student of contemporary politics the extent to which the Polish Government had deteriorated is not a matter for conjecture. Poland was a hot bed for counterrevolutionary activities against the Soviet Union and the Polish General Staff had complete plans for an invasion of Russia in collaboration with the Nazis. It might as well prove to be consoling to know that in the 1 96 000 Square Kilometres of Polish territory that passed to Russian hands more than 7 000 000 are Ukrainians 3 000 000 White Russians and only 1 million Poles out of a total of 13 million inhabitants.

With the assurance gained out of a Non-Aggression Pact with Germany the U S S R still did not feel immune from external threats. Finland in collaboration with the German General Staff had perfected the most secure fortifications on the borderland with Russia and preparations had gone far for an attack on the Soviet Union. The only defect in the plan was that the Soviet was not caught unawares. Russia at first warned Finland for such unwarranted acts of

aggression against her peaceful but powerful neighbour To this no heed was given and Finland actually refused the concrete suggestions made by the Soviet for the continuance of good neighbourly relations between the two countries At last an ultimatum was presented, and on that being refused, the Soviet-Finnish war started Brave little Finland was lauded to the skies Volunteers, supplies and all sorts of assistance poured from every corner of the Globe Due to certain miscalculations made by the Soviet Military Staff the Finnish campaign turned out to be not an easy walk-over, and the campaign even threatened to emerge as a big offensive against the U S S R with all the Democracies and the totalitarian States arrayed against it But these miscalculations were soon rectified and the Finnish war was brought to a close For this act of self defence also, the country was made the target of venomous attack by politicians of all shades in the neutral and belligerent countries We shall try to answer these charges also in a subsequent chapter

Efforts were made at this stage for a peace between the belligerent countries Russia also supported the move This was also criticised vehemently Russia's contention was, that to go to war over Poland with the then preparedness of the Democracies was beset with grave possibilities Stalin had no miscalculations of the German military strength and the comparative weakness of the Allies Moreover even in

the fact of such weakness the Allies were not prepared for any effective alliance against aggression. The United States of America were still hesitant over the professed war aims of those two countries. They were rather distrustful of the real intentions of France and Britain. The political life in France presented grave symptoms. There was little or no co-operation with the Army and the Politicians. Ogoniards and other Fascist agents had prepared the ground for an early breakdown in the event of a crisis. This was proved by subsequent events. Within fifteen days the best French military tradition was brought down. Stalin's forebodings proved to be correct. His warnings were unheeded. To what result the reader can to-day very well judge.

Countries one by one were overrun all throughout Europe by the Nazi hordes some peacefully others violently—with a violence the world had not witnessed before. The major successes were not however brought about by actual warfare. Through political manoeuvrings Fifth column activities and augmenting internal strifes the Nazis brought under the shadow of the Swastika the whole of the continent of Europe excepting Turkey, Sweden and few other nonentities to be swallowed up readily at any moment. Where submission could not be obtained systems of black mailing and show of force were resorted to with brilliant results.

Yugoslavia and Greece were the last of the countries to put up any serious resistance to the Nazi

advantage Turkey's action during the past few months with all her professions of friendship with Britain and the confident avowals of British victory in the end does not seem to convey an encouraging outlook for the Allies. Turkey is to-day faced with the alternative of ranging herself whole-heartedly with Britain and meet the attack of Germany or willingly incorporate herself in the new Axis sub-order.

Dr Goebbels revelation of Russia's demands on Turkish territory can either be a fiction or a reasonable strategic proposition for Russia. Strategically Dardanelles and the entrance to the Black Sea are vitally important for Russia there is no doubt. But the only doubt is as to under what circumstances Stalin might have made such demands. Evidently Germany wants to link up Turkey with Iraq and Iran in her march towards Egypt and the East. Hitler must have actually made plans for such acquisition of the right of way through Turkey. Knowing fully such plans and the fate in store for them the Turks have acquiesced to German demands in that direction is evident from the events in Iraq and Syria. They did not much care for British precautions against such, has been clear as otherwise they would not have acted likewise. It was only Stalin's actual or fictional demands that made possible Turkey's independence so long. And to-day Russia and Germany ranged against each other the matter of Turkey's future independence hangs in the

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE FASCIST TECHNIQUE

I have no programme I have only objectives and goals All the rest is tactics Herr Hitler is reported to have said to a Journalist, Karl Von Wiegand What are these objectives and what are those tactics we shall presently examine As regards the objectives Hitler and Mussolini have made it clear countless of times that the restoration of the 1914 boundaries and the removal of the stigma and inferiority complex created by the Versailles are not their objectives Their objective is something higher and nullification of the Versailles is only a tactical plan adopted for further extension Mein Kampf gives us the clue

To demand the restoration of the 1914 frontiers is from every point of view a political folly which amounts to a crime

The frontiers of 1914 mean nothing at all for the future of the German nation At another place "When the territory of the Reich includes all Germans and if the Reich finds itself unable to support them, from that necessity will arise its right to acquire foreign territory The plough will then give place to the sword and the tears of war will prepare a harvest for the future world

Thoroughly aware of this perspective the British and French politicians have all along been piously demanding the treatment of Germany as a good Big Boy

who will protect their hearths, their wives and children from some other imaginary menace, in time to come

Let us examine how Hitler has succeeded in his tactics His own speech at Reichenberg on December 3, 1938, gives the answer

In January, 1934, I became Chancellor In 1934 a new Army was created In 1935, the first clause of the Versailles Treaty was cancelled by creating compulsory military service

In 1936, a further clause of the Treaty was cancelled by the re-occupation of the Rhineland

"In the autumn of 1936, the last vestige of international control was wiped away Germany for the first time since the war, appeared as a world power, determined to ask for her rights, if necessary with arms"

In March 1938, Austria was incorporated in the Reich At the same time Italy was not keeping quiet To this Axis partner Albania fell victim, which move, many of the British politicians regarded as an aggrandisement on the part of Italy against its Axis partner This myth was only exploded on May 22, 1939, when the Axis further affirmed their alliance by a mutual pact which turned over the military control of Italy to Germany Then followed a series of conquests, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the war, to some of which successes M Flandin sent greetings and Chamberlain toasted

In all these campaigns there was kept behind a deliberate plan which none of the Democratic

'Quoted from *The Attack From Within* by Elwyn Jones



politicians could see through. Every one of them was a prominent conquest and none of them seemed to be worth while to go to the extent of declaring war. In the beginning there was always the Bolshevik League to blind the eye of the British and the French Statesmen. Sometimes the Axis partners rivaled with each other, mock mobilizations were carried through. Tokyo to nullify any American intervention in the event of a future conflict was won over and was prompted to embark on a peace bringing campaign in China with the avowed motive of eliminating British and American influence from the Far East. The German racial theory and anti Jewish demonstration were only meant to train the German mind for the future concept of things. Maps of Europe, Africa and Asia were distributed wherein Russia, France and Great Britain including their colonies were marked as German areas and the Mediterranean—on Italian Lake. The importance as a naval power after the fall of Britain was assigned to the Italians. That's why the control of the Naval forces was retained with the Italians and the control of the Army and Air forces with the Germans with such vast areas to keep order. German factories began to turn out tropical helmets. German Muslims and detailed military maps of all the African and Middle East possessions. Dr. Schacht came on a mission to find out the Aryan sympathies of the Indian Nationalists particularly the big businessmen competing with the British and assured

them of Germany's good intentions towards India. When he went back, he carried with him detailed impressions regarding the economic potentiality of this vast subcontinent and plans to exploit it more thoroughly. He was feasted by all and sundry, and some of the Indian Congressmen turned Aryan.

Certain broad outlines are distinctly visible from the foregoing. Hitler and his partners know fully well that all the different nations of the world outside the Axis group have no common bond of sympathy amongst themselves. Moreover, they are so loosely knit and rife with internal dissensions that an outsider can very easily get in and manage things for his own ends. In fact, in most of the small countries the outside agency would be welcomed as a Saviour, in other instances, a show of force was only needed to bring the victims to submission.

It can be said that with her military strength alone, Germany is not in a position to annex all the countries which she has been able to annex by this time. Taking the Balkan countries, for example, let us compare a possible combination of their military strength with that of Germany. Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Greece and Turkey have a peace-time strength of 140 divisions against which Germany can never expect an easy walk over. Some of these countries are possessed of the best military tradition, particularly Greece, which made a very brilliant show of her toughness in

this war and Turkey with her inherent military qualities. Before these countries were vanquished one by one they were not devoid of any sort of alliance. Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania formed the Little Entente and Turkey, Greece, Rumania and Yugoslavia formed the Balkan Entente. Moreover these countries are of much strategic importance in the event of an attack on Germany. Such a combination with a more cordial understanding with Soviet Russia would have formed the strongest bulwark against aggression of any kind. It was against such a combination Hitler set his secret service agents, Fascist doctrinaires and Diplomatic corps to undermine, wean one from the other and finally subjugate all of them.

The same principle has been adopted in isolating the Western Powers from Russia. A Franco-British-Soviet alliance was and is still viewed by Nazi Germany as the most invincible combination. To avoid such an understanding Hitler adopted one of the greatest tactics of fomenting the political bankruptcy of the French and British statesmen through his anti-Communist professions. The bluff succeeded and he could annihilate France and its bordering States in no time. All the while the pact with Russia safeguarded the Eastern flank of his Army. In this Hitler has gained and the Democracies including Russia have miserably failed. But to lay the blame for this on Russia alone is not justifiable as we have already seen from the foregoing

analysis The charges against the Soviet Union will be further answered in a subsequent chapter

To lay blame on France for its capitulation does not save Britain from its responsibility I do not think the campaign on the continent was planned with imagination To give guarantee to Poland without perfecting the means for implementing the same was a blunder of serious consequences The most immediate of the consequences was that Poland was over-run in no time with untold sufferings for its inhabitants But equally important was that the Balkan Countries learned a lesson from it They began to distrust British sincerity and the usefulness of British assistance in the event of an emergency, and they and the French were told so by the Germans repeatedly Dr Goebbel's propaganda machinery squeaked day and night to impress on the small countries and the French middle class, tottering on the brink of a precipitate fall, that the English people were prompting them to fight the battle for safeguarding Britain's interests and not a whit of their own They were told to believe that the British did not care much for the safety of these small States but all they cared pertained to their own safety and their comparative strength at the time of peace British withdrawals from the other theatres of war have only confirmed this notion among the small countries and hence their mistrust in British offers of assistance

England could have acted in an entirely different manner They should have reasonably taken the

brunt of the first attack on their own shoulders from the very beginning instead of reserving their all for the last and thus kept her Allies going for a longer while than was possible in the present time. Going for a longer while is meant in two different senses. First, they would have resisted for a longer duration, and secondly they would not have been weaned away from the Allies by enemy propaganda. Any reasonable person would understand the validity of my second statement. If the British were not to lose sympathy of the French, even after the defeat of France occupied France would have presented Germany with very serious difficulties presently and with explosive possibilities sooner than expected. Through systematic propaganda calculated to rouse the basest of feelings and hatred against England in the French mind, the politicians and the laymen in that country are to day receding from the British and the democratic idea of things rapidly and are being won over to the Fascist concept. That is a serious problem when we think of driving the enemy from the occupied countries when we take the offensive which has been promised and without which there can be no victory for democracy. "Through the skilful and persistent application of propaganda, an entire people can be shown Heaven as Hell and equally the most miserable life can be made to seem paradise. Hitler has demonstrated with his actions

The Franco-British union or fusion was belated wisdom. French politicians did not seriously view it

was evident from their inattention to that demonstration. British statesmen, I mean of the more liberal and democratic minded lot, should have found an example from their own midst, of how far financial interest and consequential narrow mindedness could go in betraying freedom, democracy and all the virtues associated with it and ally with Fascism and its symptoms of regimentation, for the sake of safeguarding their monetary interests. Counterparts of the category outlined above were countless in France and the French political machinery was virtually controlled by these people. Popular will and feelings were forcibly subdued to the will and caprices of the two hundred families, and the Army, permeated with fascist ideas, were planning things in an unhealthy direction. To trust such a lot without properly examining their credentials was a folly on the part of England. They didn't even imagine that their comrades were actually planning a mortgage of the house and property, to evade a distraint warrant issued by the lawful creditor (the French citizens and workers), to a third party with the hope of being allowed to live therein under the powerful protection of such third party.

Germany is playing the same trick with Turkey and America. Vain pleas, assurances and threats are woven in a constant stream of propaganda intended for consumption in these countries. Moreover, Axis sympathisers and agents are actively employed in neutralising the effect of pro-democratic elements in these countries. Big

businessmen are appealed with economic prospects under a German hegemony and the saving from gradual Bolshevization—a reverse terribly dreaded by every one of them. Money is already pouring into Turkey for they need it and Turks are a gullible sort of people. Few men like Roosevelt and Cordell Hull cannot turn Heaven over earth pitted against such an array of big business and sentimental hobnobs deliberately digging their own graves.

I say Franco-British union was belated wisdom for this reason. Germans could then tell the Frenchmen that Britain without actually fighting had subjugated them by a masterly stroke of British statesmanship. Anti-English elements exaggerated on this and Germans lent them support more and more. France was not then standing she was falling and these meant terrible words and painful ideas. Suppose we to-day tell the Italians after their major defeats in Africa and Greece that the Germans have planned the battle to bring them and their nation under German control and that Hitler and not Mussolini would henceforth be ruling over them. I believe Englishmen ought to begin telling so to Italians now instead of engaging the Propaganda Ministry to tabulate points for talk on India. Bundles of propaganda material and leaflets must be smuggled into Italy or thrown in the face of Italians saying that by being dragged into a war against democracy they have become victims to the Nazi monster. We should tell them so we should also tell the Finns the Rumanians the Dutchmen

and everybody on the continent of Europe likewise Not in plain common language with diplomatic niceties, but in a language endowed with violence, spirit and revolutionary import And then imagine how the Italians, Finns, Rumanians, Poles, Frenchmen and Dutchmen would take it They would all prove to be a stiff lot for the Germans to control





## CHAPTER THREE

### CHARGES AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

The Russo-German Pact of August 1939 has been the object of much speculation criticism and heart breaking Mr Louis Fischer that reputed author following everyman's opinion has produced a book titled "*Stalin and Hitler*" which doesn't give credit to its author He has made certain conclusions principally that a change came over the Kremlin Government in 1936 Stalin turned Nationalist and with the Nazi Soviet Pact in August 1939 he joined the camp of the aggressors How far these conclusions are correct the reader would have judged by the time he lays down this short analysis The ground has already been covered in the matter that England and France connived ever since the advent of Fascism to power both in Italy and Germany to use this force against the rising Communism in Russia Communism is red rag still to many of the members of the ruling Cabinet in England If any one says that Stalin has not got to take lesson from this must be then, that one is discrediting his own reasoning capacity Suppose that Stalin went to war with Germany over the issue of Poland after a successful Franco-British-Soviet alliance in August 1939 what would have been the fate of Russia to-day? The victorious Nazi hordes in Poland would then have marched into Russia, and engaged the Red Army

there (according to the terms of the agreement with Poland proposed at that time, the Russian Army would meet the enemy on Russian territory and not on Polish soil) With what disastrous results, I believe subsequent events have fully demonstrated The French or the British sending immediate assistance either to Poland or Russia, apart from their mental reservations at that time, was not a practical possibility because of transport difficulties and strategic reasons How far the British and French Premiers were sincere in their guarantees to Poland, in that matter, the Poles in the days of the Nazi *Blitzkrieg* fully realised Stalin did not allow himself to be duped by such promises, had the effect of putting him on the Black list according to Democratic public opinion A man who alone had the courage to disregard the Fascists and act as if they were not in existence, when Chamberlains and hundreds of his counter-parts both in England and France were bent upon wooing the Dictators, was the next day another aggressor before the eyes of the world, simply because, he didn't want his country to be over-run by the Nazis

The Red Army's preparedness for a major war in 1939 can only be relatively less than what is its preparedness to-day. The world could form their own opinion from the Russo-Finnish war without hunting for expert opinion Stalin, more than any one else, realised this and acted accordingly In the event of a major war breaking out against Russia in August 1939, Stalin would

.

have been required to engage himself in battle not on one front but on two fronts. The understanding between Germany and Japan in August 1939 was more complete and reciprocal than it is to-day everybody would admit. Democracies also know that fully but the safety of Russia they were not much after. Russia defeated and occupied by Germany and Japan, would still be better from the French American and British view point, for the reason if not their Governments at least their citizens would have the opportunity of exploiting that hitherto closed region to their mutual advantage. It would also remove for some years at least the haunting spectre of Communism from the world.

It was the Russo-German Pact that induced the Axis partner Japan to make overtures to Russia. The truce on the Mongolian war was signed on September 16 1939. This truce is significant for two reasons. In spite of the Pact concluded in August 1939 Stalin was not sure of Hitler's professions of good will. He was still afraid of a major conflict arising out of the Red Army's march into Poland. In the event of such a conflict he wanted to give a short relief to his far eastern wing of the Army and concentrate his attention on the west. The August Pact thoroughly exposed the hollowness of the Anti-Comintern alliance. It simply cut through the roots and the trunk withered down to ruins in no time. Stalin accomplished with a few pieces of paper a remarkable achievement of isolating for a while

at least, these two partners in a plunderer's game, and Rome blinked at the whole episode. The Red Army marched into Poland on September 17, 1939, the very next day after the signing of the truce with Japan. Mr. Louis Fischer interprets this as a premeditated plan with Hitler, but how he does it I cannot understand. Is it an intellectual jugglery? It cannot be common sense any way.

What has been Stalin's gains out of the August 1939 Pact. Let me quote extensively and verbatim from an Editorial which appeared in an Indian evening Newspaper, whose opinion of the Russo-German war perhaps is the most clearheaded. It cannot be suspected of communistic tendencies, however.

"Stalin had not been unmindful of the eventual conflict with Germany. And at every stage, he had been driving a hard bargain, which gave him more than what he parted with.

"The first gain is what one can't buy in any market or produce in any factory—Time. He has had nearly two years in which to tie up the loose ends of the Soviet Plan in the military sphere.

"Secondly, he has taken the Russian border to the pre-Great War position. Half of Poland, all the Baltic Republics, Bessarabia and Bukovina, closer diplomatic contacts with Japan, ostensibly to help Germany but certainly motivated differently—all these, Stalin has had

at no greater cost than a bottle of ink and a few sheets of parchment

Thirdly he has had for the last one year and a half the help of German technicians and one may be sure that the Russians have taken good care to provide against the risks involved

Fourthly he can now be sure in a way he could not be in September 1939 of the cordial co-operation of Britain and the U S A

If to these you can add the advantage of a better understanding with Japan—that is extremely doubtful—then there can be no doubt that Stalin has played his hand most adroitly

The policy can be considered unwise only if Russia were fit to face Germany in conflict at any earlier stage. On that no outsider can judge

But you may ask, is Russia more fit now than in September to face the German challenge?

Presumably Yes. Stalin has been clear eyed. He was prepared to co-operate with the Democracies at the time of the Munich Pact. But with Czecho-slovakia wiped out and Colonel Beck's Poland remaining as pig headed as ever he had no choice but to abide his time. He was never under any illusion about Germany's intentions regarding Russia

The above is only one side of the picture. *The Statesman* in an editorial on June 28 1941 presents the opposite view that Russia's entry into the war

*The Telegraph* dated June 23 1941

Russian spokesmen at the beginning of the Russo—German war declared that Russian strategy is not based on outside assistance. That explains the role of Russian attitude towards the other nations. From past professions of all these countries she has reason to distrust their attitude towards her. Ever now I do not think, they want Russia to win the war against Germany. They believe that both the countries will be so worn out by the time the war is over, and the Allies so much strengthened, that the influence of these countries would

not count at all in world politics. Here also for such a short sighted view of the war and the resulting policy which is put into execution, you cannot blame Russia.

The next important charge against Russia is the annexation of half of Poland which used to be Russian territory before. As we have already seen that in the area occupied by Russia out of a population of 13 million only 1 million are Poles and the rest Ukrainians, White Russians and Jews. The Poles have been notorious for their treatment of non Polish minorities in the country and what apology there used to be for such an arbitrary State was over by the Government ceasing to be representative of its national character. Moreover it is extremely dangerous to allow Germany to get a foothold as near to the Ukraine and the industrial areas of White Russia. An attack on these regions by Germans from occupied Poland is wrought with serious possibilities is being demonstrated by the progress of the German campaign in the present war.

The more serious of the charges levelled against the Union is its attack on Finland. A Moscow Radio communique issued on June 25 1941 throws much light on this controversy.

“Obviously not against Finland that the U S S R need to take precautions but it was realised that Germany would have used Finnish territory for an attack on the Soviet Union. The position of Leningrad would have been utterly untenable with the border line which existed

before the Soviet-Finnish war. The real cause of the first Russo-Finnish war was the presence in Europe of an aggressor. It was this that compelled the Soviet Union to seek security in reverting to the old policy of acquiring strategic positions. If the Finnish people are again involved in a war to-day it is quite accurate to say that they are merely the innocent victims of the German aggressor. Because it is Germany that Russia fought in Finland in 1940 and it is Germany she fights there to-day.

“Finland ought to know that she is being bombed only on account of the presence of German troops on her territory. The aggressor in Finland is really Germany. Moscow does not know what the Finnish declaration implies but at any rate Finland will do what is dictated to her by the Germans.

There are some admirable publications by eminent British politicians which throw much light on the Finnish question, unfortunately which are not available to the Indians. These show with much clarity the extent to which British interests had got entangled in the Finnish affair. Finland, such a small country with not much resources how could she go to the extent of building a net work of fortifications known as the Mannerheim line, which according to the best military authorities equals or is superior to the Siegfried or Maginot line, has yet to be answered. Without German technical assistance and British monetary advances such a line could not



have been built. With what purpose such a line was built? Finland's security was never threatened. There was no indication of any sort of tension between Russia and Finland. Even when Russia presented her ultimatum she did not want the Finns to surrender their independence. All that she wanted was Finland should cease to be a tool in the hands of other nations acting as a spring board for an attack on the Soviet Union by any of these powers or all of them combined. The reasonableness of Russian demands could be gauged from the fact that Russia was prepared to cede much more territory to Finland than what she was required to cede to Russia. The importance of the territory ceded to Russia is purely military and that too in a way not for the defence of Finland against an attack by a third party but for an attack on Leningrad. All the Russian demands were refused and Russia had to go to war with Finland for enforcement of her demands. Even when the war was won by Russia to the discomfiture of all the powers involved Russia did not want Finnish independence to be surrendered. The Government at Helsinki including that reactionary General Baron Von Mannerheim were allowed to function as before. Compare this with the attitude of Germans towards a conquered country. In Poland if reports are true every Jew has been either put in prison or compulsorily sterilized. Young Polish girls have been forcibly torn away from their homes and drafted to German ammunition and

other factories German officials in occupied countries are strictly warned not to fraternize with the local population. A regime of terror has been set up everywhere and the local citizens are treated as worse than dogs. Their Armies have been disarmed and the equipment transferred to the German Regiments. Nazi plunderings and lootings are ceaselessly going on and whole villages and streets are demolished and the citizens shot for acts of discourtesy or provocation against such fiendish Germans. Universities have been closed and hundreds of students shot dead. Scientific education is denied to all except Germans under fear that if others are given the opportunity they would one day rise in revolt and defeat the Germans.

One has only to compare these with the reports, of the whole of the civilian population in Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland welcoming the Red Army and their national Parliaments unanimously voting for incorporation of their respective countries in the Soviet Union. Certain reports, by British and American Press Correspondents during the Russo-Finnish war, were illuminating in this matter. Hundreds of Russian Bombers flew over Finnish territory in wave after waves bombing severely, but no casualties to human lives or property were reported. Russians could not be so foolish as to allow their Bombers to be shot down by Finnish artillery without inflicting equally severe losses on the Finns. They could not be wasting their ammunition on the

meadows, lakes and the hills. It is therefore evident that the Russians did not want to inflict losses on their Finnish brethren, the innocent civilians. In fact all these Bombers were engaged in raining leaflets over the civilian population exposing the intrigues of their pro-Fascist masters. This was in the beginning of the war. Russia had to modify her tactics on account of the stubborn Finnish resistance as subsequent reports clearly showed. And you hear to-day the Government at Bucharest running away from the Capital to an unknown destination due to the effectiveness of Russian bombing of the Rumanian Capital. The Government at Helsinki is once again controlled by Nazis and Hitler in his proclamation of war against Russia on June 22 1941 declared. At this moment the greatest marching in the world is taking place. German troops together with Finnish Divisions and the conquerors of Norway under the command of the Commanding Officer Norway are marching together from East Prussia to the Carpathian. The very next day the Finnish Minister in England gave out the information that the Finnish people were being dragged into the war against their will. Then how the German Feuhrer could declare that the Finns were marching against Russia in the north the day previous? It is evident there is a huge clique ruling in Helsinki who have given the Germans a blank card regarding Finnish foreign relations without consulting the Finnish Parliament or the people. This explains how

far Finland has gone in truck with the aggressive nation and how far her national interests are safe in the hands of these traitors

Further, the incorporation of the Baltic States i e Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the Soviet Union is a fact to which democratic public opinion cannot take exception As Hitler pointed out in his war proclamation, these were intended against Germany and not against any other power Moreover these were not prompted by desires for conquest but purely from motives of self defence And it was exactly on these points the British rapprochement with Russia was held up till the outbreak of the Russo-German War Britain refused to recognise the annexation of these countries and Sir Stafford Cripps did find it very hard to impress the Soviet Government as to the sincere desire of England for any effective alliance with Russia But for the premature declaration of war by Germany the whole world would have still found these two great nations isolated as ever and the cause of world freedom and democracy hanging in the balance

We must now examine the charges Hitler has against the Soviet Union These are the points on which democratic public opinion should now focus attention, for in these they would find the far seeing motives of the Kremlin You may imagine for yourself, in whose hands the cause of democracy is safe, in the hands of Stalin, who by every action of his has brought

Germany nearer to its end or in the hands of those of the Allied Statesmen who have given way to Hitler one by one and enhanced his hold on Europe's smaller nations

What are these charges of Hitler against Stalin! The German note to the Soviet on the declaration of war and the Feuhrer's speech are well worth studying. After sketching the circumstances which brought about the pact on August 23 1939 both of them continue to bring out a catalogue of charges against the Soviet Union. About the terms of the Pact Herr Von Ribbentrop stated the essence of these Agreements consisted in (1) Reciprocal engagement on the part of both states not to attack one another and to live on peaceful and neighbourly terms and (2) A definition of spheres of interest the German Reich renouncing all influence in Finland Latvia Estonia and Lithuania and Bessarabia with territories of the Former Polish state as far as a line formed by the rivers Nared Bug and San being incorporated in Russia in accordance with the desire of the Soviets. The note further adds that the Reich Government made adjustments in her policies to bring into effect the terms of the agreement but the Soviet persisted in continuing its Anti German activities. The major evidence cited in support of the declaration are M Krisov the Commissar of the Ogpu arranging a systematic course of training for sabotage in Germany and occupied territories and the contents of a document

alleged to have been unearthed in Belgrade which had the remarks "The U S S R, will not react until opportune moment occurs. The Axis powers have further dissipated their forces and the U S S R will consequently strike a sudden blow against Germany". Then the Soviet union is further charged with the act of extending her frontiers and increasing her military power while Germany was engaged in mortal combat in the west with Britain and France. The note continues "Although the Soviet Government had declared during the Moscow negotiations that they would never make the first move towards achieving a settlement of the Bessarabian question, the German Government were informed on June 24, 1940 by the Soviet Government that they were now determined to settle the Bessarabian question by force. It was stated at the same time that the Soviet claims also extended to Bukovina, that is to say a territory which was ancient Austrian Crown land, and never belonged to Russia and had, moreover, not even been mentioned at the time of the Moscow negotiations". In spite of all these affronts the Reich continued to carry its obligations including, the note added, the large scale resettlement scheme whereby all Germans in the areas occupied by the U S S R were brought back to Germany.

The further charges which the Fuehrer's oration and the note contain are connected with the demands purported to have been made by M Molotov when he

visited Berlin at the invitation of the German Foreign Minister. These are

(1) The Soviet union desired to give a guarantee to Bulgaria and over and above this to conclude with her a pact of assistance on the same lines as those concluded with the Baltic states that is providing for military bases

(2) The Soviet union demanded an Agreement in the form of a treaty with Turkey for the purpose of providing on the basis of a long term lease bases for Soviet land and naval forces on the Bosphorus and in the Dardanelles

(3) Soviet Union declared that once more it felt itself threatened by Finland and therefore demanded complete abandonment of Finland by Germany. These were refused by Germany but as regards the second term even well informed circles in Ankara declare these as to be products of Dr Goebbels imagination rather than fact. The Soviet Government have also emphatically denied the charge in this respect.

It is also alleged that the Soviet Government objected to Germany's taking military precautions in Bulgaria directed against the British and published a declaration which was of a character hostile to the Reich. The Soviet Government on April 5 1941 concluded a friendly agreement with the illegal Government of General Simovitch, which was to lend moral support

to the anti-German putsch in Yugoslavia and with its weight, assist the joint Anglo-Jugoslav-Greek front

It is also stated that "at the same time German troops were being concentrated on Rumanian and Bulgarian territory against the growing landing of British troops in Greece, the Soviet Union, now obviously in concerted action with the British, was attempting to stab Germany in the back by, firstly giving Yugoslavia open political aid, secondly, attempting to move Turkey to help Russia in her aggressive attitude, towards Bulgaria and Germany by an agreement not to attack her and to concentrate her army in very favourable strategic positions in Thrace, and thirdly, by itself concentrating a strong force along the Rumanian frontier in Bessarabia and along Moldavia "

In all these charges brought against the Union, one fact emerges as true, that is, the Soviet Union had no illusions regarding the professed German friendship. In spite of this clear proposition British Statesmen were still distrustful of the Kremlin's attitude and all sorts of speculations regarding the Soviet Foreign policy were allowed to be spread through British propaganda channels in India, the Dominions, the America and England. A vestige of the interpretation of Russian Foreign policy as it affected India could be gained from a Simla Communiqué issued through the Associated Press on the question of Indian reaction to the Russo-German war which declared "The Soviet



absorption in meeting the attack must lead if it has not already led to immobilisation so far as any designs that they may have had in the direction of India's North West Frontier are concerned. However it resolved to Germany's part to teach wisdom to the Allies when they lacked it altogether.

All through the past two years of Kremlin's professed friendship with Berlin Stalin has been uneasy of the Nazis' growing might. But he still refused to be moved into a policy of direct opposition to Berlin. During the beginning of June this year when rumours of increasing tension between Russia and Germany began to spread Moscow issued emphatic denials. Reports from Moscow the day before the declaration of war by Germany tended to give the impression that all was well between Russia and Germany. However rumours persisted in pouring out probably inspired by Nazi mechanisms with a view to squeezing out concessions from Stalin at the last minute and interpreted accordingly by all concerned that Germany was going to attack Russia. Stalin wanted the day of reckoning with the Nazis to be postponed as far as practicable so that he might perfect his military machine to meet the Nazi onslaught, severe it would be as proved by the progress of the war. That was the essence of his policy though he wanted a rapprochement with the Allies just as the Allies wanted a rapprochement with Russia. How such a rapprochement would turn the scale against Russia

was what he was anxiously worried about Mr Anthony Eden pointed out in a speech in the House of Commons, in the presence of the Soviet Ambassador, M Maisky, on Tuesday June 24, 1941 "At every phase in recent history in the development of Anglo-Soviet relations, we were always retarded by the attention paid by the Soviet Union to the observance of their pact with Germany" The action of Stalin all these days have been very careful, careful in the sense that his work all these twenty years should not be wasted Mr Eden in the same speech indicated how devoid of foundations were Ribbentrop's charges against the Soviet Union in the matter of Anglo-Soviet co-operation At another place in his speech Mr Eden gave further concrete evidence of Stalin's scrupulousness in this regard "We at the Foreign office were already convinced from information at our disposal that Hitler, true to his usual technique, was going to attack Russia from behind the smoke-screen of his Non-Aggression Pact With Prime Minister's consent, I told the Soviet Ambassador of the information at our disposal and of the danger which, I was convinced, confronted his country I gave him at his request details of that information as we thought we were bound to do But even at that late hour, the Soviet Government were careful to avoid any expression of opinion which might seem to throw doubt on their observance of their engagement with Germany"

M. Molotov denying the charges in the Fuehrer's declaration and the note handed over by the German Foreign Minister gave out "The attack on our country has been made in spite of the fact that throughout the time this pact was valid the German Government could not furnish proof that the Government of the U S S R has ever infringed a single one of the clauses of the pact and until the last minute the German Government had made no representation to the Soviet Government. With criminal ingenuity the Germans launched an attack on a 1500 mile front two hours prior to the formal declaration of war. But the fact was that Russians were not entirely taken by surprise because of Stalin's realisation of Hitler's ultimate intentions. Any other country would have reeled by such a surprise attack with the force of the whole of Germany's military machinery thrown into the battle from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea. In meeting such a foe under such treacherous circumstances the U S S R. needs not only our full sympathy but material assistance in whatever form it can take



## CHAPTER FOUR

### WHAT WE SHOULD GUARD AGAINST

There is a wide spread opinion that the Democracies should not actively support the Soviet Union in its war against Germany. This section of the population base their argument on the fact that the internal political structure of Russia is widely different from and antagonistic to their viewpoint. It is not the Indian public alone who share this suicidal outlook, majority of Americans and Englishmen have the same outlook as could be seen from despatches cabled out from Washington and London on June 22, 1941, depicting the latest reaction in those countries to the Russo-German War. Reuters' Washington message contained these words

"Of the immediate importance, as seen here, is the fact that the attack on Russia means that the invasion of Britain is definitely postponed. The question whether Russia, which has helped Germany, should now be given Allied aid is being discussed avidly and opinions differ widely. There is no love here, for Russia, nor the policy she has pursued but realists appreciate that anything which helps destroy Hitlerism is good."

After having experienced so much of humiliation at the hands of Fascism vast sections of humanity should nurture minor sympathies with the creed is rather a pitiable phenomenon. Fascism is the avowed enemy

of civilization and orderly progress the Hitler regime on the continent has fully demonstrated. It exercises a diabolical terror over the minds of the citizens through systems of espionage, cold murder, series of protracted and painful torture in concentration camps and demonstrations of fiendish might to suppress any and every sort of opposition to the system. A common method adopted by the State authorities is that of bribing innocent children by offering prizes and other rewards in schools for betraying their own parents by reporting simple expressions of opinion in their private talks at home to the secret police. What prospects such a system of Government holds to these people no sane person can guess.

Even Mr Churchill in his speech soon after the declaration of war by Germany on Russia had some hard words to say in the matter of ideological difference between the Government of Britain and the Government of Russia. "The regime is indistinguishable from the worst features of Communism. No one has been more a consistent opponent of Communism than I have been for the last twenty five years. I will unsay no word that I have spoken about it. These are the words which Dr Goebbels' propaganda machinery will now set to enlarge upon to impress the neutral minds and the subjected populace in occupied countries with the idea that the enemy's camp is divided and that they would not be in a position to offer

concerted resistance to the all powerful German military machine With these words he will now on spread defeatism and terror in the minds of all who are now under the yoke of Nazism and who look with anxiety the vast horizon to see a glimmering of hope to redeem them from this monstrous bondage With the same words he will bombard the American mind, the minds of the millionaire businessmen and the commoner and pave the way for potential fifth column activities in all these states

Regrettably enough, the statements of all important British and American personalities are tinged with the same feeling and the same dark spots with which the enemy can now onwards erect strong barriers in all these countries to offset the renewed efforts and vigour of large masses of citizens directed towards the task of defeating Fascism from the homeland and the international front Mr Anthony Eden's words "The political systems of our two countries (Russia and Britain) are antipathetic Our ways of life are widely divergent. . . . Britain has probably fewer Communists than any nation in Europe I always hate that creed . . . " and conservative Mr Robertson's remarks "The many millions of the King's very loyal Roman Catholic subjects, we hate both Communism and Nazism We would support whatever measures may be necessary so long as the Government stand by their assurances that they do not wish to withdraw their

previous opinion of Communism as a crood leave the same loophole for the enemy to drive a wedge into the home front and split it gradually but steadily This bad taste is not characteristic of the liberal and conservative members alone but also of influential Trade Unionists as evidenced by the remark of Mr Jhon Marshboink, Secretary of the National Union of Railway-men who remarked "Those who enter the struggle with us are our friends and Allies but they must understand that we do not compromise with our principles Commenting on this feature an Indian Daily wrote by way of Editorial "It is passing strange that it seems to be against the grain of any member of the British Government to think of Russia and behave towards Russia without any mental reserve Mr Neville Chamberlain was not troubled by any squeamish ideas about Nazism when he went all out to placate Hitler His visit to Mussolini did not betray any great horror on his part for the professions and practices of Fascism. It is only Communism that fills the Britons mind with holy horror And the same paper also wrote subsequently one cannot help feeling that, so long as the British Government is swayed by City interests and other vested interests the anti Communist bias is difficult to get rid of, even though it must be admitted that the influence of those interests is slowly diminishing

What we should guard against is the possibility of a slackening of the war efforts on the part of our

country and that of England, her Dominions and America, engineered by such feeling as outlined above Expression of similar remarks too frequently will only tend to spread the defeatist mentality and pave the way for fifth column activities Nazi fifth column works right at the top and actually its recruits are from the biggest businessmen, Civil Servants and Military Officials as seen from the experience of Norway, France and Rumania India has not escaped from Nazi attention in this regard and how far fifth column activities have taken hold of the public mind can be gauged from the utterances of prominent public personalities There is also a widespread belief that Hitler is a Saint endowed with certain mission and to go under the Nazi heels is not in any way detrimental These foolish individuals base their arguments on the assumption that Hitler is extremely virtuous because of his abstentions and being a teetotaller and a vegetarian ( according to some ) he cannot do any real harm to the present modes of worship All that these gentlemen care are the question of worship and the freedom for exploitation

Mr Vernon Bartlett writing in the *News Chronicle* strikes a clear note on the dangers that beset Democracy by following this train of thought The concluding portion of his article is revealing, "One is led back for an explanation of this to the conflict of ideologies which in the past British Statesmen attempted to



deny Hess it appears genuinely believed that he could organize an Anglo-German peace here on the basis of an Anglo-German war against Russia.<sup>1</sup> Hitler with whom he had discussed the matter may quite easily have decided that the British and Americans would really be willing to listen to his assurance that Communism, rather than Fascism, is their enemy

Indeed unless we are very careful the assurance might easily be accepted. There are some people in this country who would willingly listen to arguments that Germany conquered Europe that she promised to leave us alone if we left her alone that it would be dangerous to try to starve her out and drive her out now that she has so increased her sources of supply that after all, she is ready to take over the responsibility of crushing Communism. There are many more such people in America

That presumably is why Hitler has made an attack for which there was no other necessity. He might keep America neutral might split public opinion in the Democracies

Perhaps the above is exactly what Hitler wants to be done of the Democracies. To split public opinion both in America and England on an issue of like importance is easy enough. His propaganda department is fully aware of it and we have enough indications as to in which direction the wind is blowing. The day on which Germany attacked Russia, the Official German

News Agency gave out the information that the German Episcopate had sent a message to pastors of all dioceses describing the war against Soviet Union as a fight for Christianity in the whole world. Moreover pastors are instructed to point out in their Sermons that Christianity is persecuted in Russia. Dr Rosenberg, the Nazi intellectual, wrote in the *Voelkischer Beobachter* that Germany undertook the fateful mission with the task of overthrowing Bolshevism and freeing this vital region for its historic task. Reuter telegraphed on the same day that a torrent of German propaganda in justification of the attack upon Russia continued to pour from German Wireless Stations.

What results have been achieved by such streams of propaganda, the following example bears adequate testimony. One has only to consider Ex-President Herbert Hoover's statement at the beginning of the Russo-German war and his subsequent Broadcast talk on June 30, 1941. In the first instance he is reported to have said that Germany's declaration of war against the Soviet should benefit both Britain and America. "It will ease the British position in the Pacific as well as Europe" and added "It may also obviate the necessity of the United States entering the war as an active combatant". In his subsequent speech he turned the wrong side and advocated continued aid to Britain and China without putting United State's troops into war zones urging arming the Western Hemisphere without in the

meantime provoking war. As regards assistance to Russia his words make contrasting reading. "There is no doubt we will make good our promise to aid Russia but an ideological war to bring our freedom to the world died spiritually when we made that promise. It is also reported that he went to the extent of accusing Stalin of contributing to the downfall of France, implanting class hatred in America, and waging a stealthy war against American institutions. It is evident from his speech representative as it should be of large circles of American opinion, that the decision of sending American aid to Russia perhaps spontaneously made is capable of being revised or modified at least in the same way as his own utterances on the two different occasions. His first pronouncement was spontaneous the subsequent one after careful and deliberate thinking. To a passing observer taught in the sinister methods adopted by Fascists of diverting public opinion into tunnels previously prepared leading to an abyss of confused dimensions where one loses all his self balance and falls a victim to the Nazi way of thinking the subsequent utterance of an Ex President of the United States sounds dangerous reasoning. The more so because the opinion is not shared by an Ex President alone but by millions of influential citizens throughout the length and breadth of America.

To counteract such narrow minded vision of the war that is being presently fought should be the aim of all

reasonable persons. Governments should work day and night with their respective propaganda machineries to nullify the effects of such diabolical sense of reasoning that Communism and not Fascism is the real danger to democracy. We have seen earlier, which type of Government has stood more by the principles of democracy and justice, and evidently and none would point the accusing finger against Stalin but at the same time thousands would direct not only their fingers, but their bayonets and thumbs against Hitler, Mussolini and Japan, the representatives of Fascism and its torch bearers.

Against the will of such a vast proportion of divided public opinion President Roosevelt is striving to rush assistance to the Democracies and his task every body would realise is not an easy one. To mould public opinion so as to carry always a majority with one to gain sanction for his actions, the President has been toiling day and night. It ought to be our proclaimed aim now to make the President's task easier. There are ways and ways of doing it. The first and foremost is that we as a nation should ally ourselves with our own free will by the side of the Democracies in the fight against Fascism and show to the reactionary Americans that in such a crisis as this we with all our grievances against the British Statesmen have found it possible to sink our differences and unite for a common cause. Secondly, our leaders and public men should appeal more and more to American sentiment

and aspirations to support the Democracies in a total war against Fascism. Thirdly we must fight Fascism on the home front by exposing fifth column activities on the part of influential citizens and political organizations and wage a relentless war on all symptoms of defeatism and disinterestedness. Subsequently we should press the Government and the country to raise a huge army equipped in the most modern way and arm the civilian population to resist any thrust by Fascist forces.

About British Die hard prejudice Mr M. N. Roy that able Indian politician has drawn pointed attention in a Press statement issued prior to the declaration of war on Russia by Germany and elaborated subsequently in an article in the *Independent India*, of June 22 1941. Mr Roy citing an example to indicate how far diehard prejudice can go writes "The prejudice against the Soviet Union in Britain is so insane that even the possibility of its entering into war against Germany is interpreted in a way sympathetic for the latter! The *King Hall News Letter* of June 5 for example contains the following passage 'In the former case (Hitler attacking Britain this summer) - he must do everything within his power to forestall a stab in the back from Stalin while he is concentrating his forces against Britain. Can prejudice go any farther? An act on the part of the Soviet Union which obviously would be most welcome is described as an instance of bad faith! Such is the antiquated ways of thinking by

eminent British politicians this hour. How suicidal such ways of thinking could be, it seems, events in France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Bulgaria and Hungary have not been able to show to these British eyes blinded by diehard prejudice.

When this war is over, when this carnage of wholesale death and destruction is ended, we shall be in a position to discuss who are those agents who brought such endless sources of destruction, pillage and plunder to this earth. In the meanwhile we can only guard ourselves against such agents, and against falling prey to their arguments, flavoured with fiendish wisdom and a power to foretell events with cocksure certainty, an art taught them by their master the Nazi Fuehrer. They tell us that all our ways of living and aspirations have gone out of date and these are going to be definitely replaced, soon they say, by their ways and means of living and thinking. Pity to such of our contemporaries who fall victim to this type of reasoning and contribute innocently enough to the fall of social justice everywhere.

In the midst of such calamities we can only be fortified with wisdom and courage which the latter part of Churchill's speech tries to unfold. "We have but one aim and one single irrevocable purpose. We are resolved to destroy Hitler and every vestige of the Nazi regime. From this nothing will turn us—nothing. We

shall never parley we shall never negotiate with Hitler or any of his gang We shall fight him by land we shall fight him by sea we shall fight him in the air until with God's help we will rid the earth of all those who have shadowed it and liberate the people from his yoke Any man or State who fights against Nazism will have our aid. Any man or State who marches with Hitler is our foe This applies not only to an organised State but to all representatives of that vile race of Quislings who make themselves the tools and agents of the Nazi regime against their fellow countrymen and against the land of their birth. These Quislings like the Nazi leaders have not been disposed of by their fellow countrymen which would save trouble but will be delivered by us on the morn of victory to the justice of the Allied tribunals That is our policy and that is our declaration

We are equally concerned if not more with the opinion of the British working class the farmers and the broad masses of men and women whose opposition to Fascism is more thorough and sustaining As the following words of Alvarez del Vayo Foreign Minister of Republican Spain prove as regard the Spaniards the mind of the common people in England and India will go to a great extent to determine the policy of these countries towards Fascism "In Spain to-day as yesterday only the *canaille*, the common people are on the side of democracy This is a distressing fact for the die-hards of the democratic countries who would prefer to

have as allies the other die-hards every where. But without the final aid of the *camarilla* of all Europe, Hitler cannot be beaten. Now is the time to "choose sides." British Labour in spite of its lacking a determined leadership capable of fulfilling professions and promises have been strong in the condemnation of Fascism. Mr. Lees Smith's remark that, "if Hitler imagined that by this act, he would be regarded by any party or quarter in this country or the United States as a crusader against Communism, he under-estimates our intelligence," throws much light on the Labour Party's attitude to the latest phase in the war. The subsequent utterance of Dr. Hugh Dalton, the Minister of Economic Warfare at the Regional Labour Conference at Cardiff on 28th June, that no party of the British nation is more firmly determined to fight the war to the end than the Labour Party is an additional guarantee that Labour will not be found wanting at this crucial hour. He also gave the warning "Hitler thought that when he committed his last act of treacherous and unprovoked aggression against Russia, the people of other countries would forget his filthy crimes and think of him once more as a world saviour against Communism. I hope those who believed in that rubbish, know better now." As regards the Anti-Comintern pact he said it was a bait for simpletons and was directed against the liberties of freemen everywhere and most of all against the British commonwealth. His words "Today the Red Army and the Red Air Force



are our comrades in Arms. They and we are out on the same errand to crush the German war machine and the economic apparatus that feeds it. It should represent equally the view of Indian and English workmen.

The last few pages are meant for the Indian die-hards including the reactionary set of Nationalists as a warning against viewing the war as of no immediate consequence to them. By fostering defeatism by their very acts and professions they are breeding in these very waters the germs of Fascism which would one day break out into the most virulent of diseases that can possibly affect the Indian body politic. Having concluded such a warning we shall now proceed to examine how Russia's and Britain's war is as much our own war.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### RUSSIA'S AND BRITAIN'S WAR IS AS MUCH OUR OWN

There is a wide spread notion that this war is fought on imperialist aims and that it is a war of rival Imperialisms striving against each other for world domination. This view finds support from the ardent Congress Nationalists to the Liberals and the Labourites and those reactionary set of people who do not bother about any party or creed except their own creed of exploiting the masses to the utmost. The Muslim League, the Hindu Mahasabha and other Communal organisations also encourage similar views though slight changes have become visible in the utterances of their leaders, particularly those of the Mahasabha Congressmen, before Russian entry into the struggle were grouped into two broad categories known commonly as the Left and the Right wings. With the Right wing the question of supporting the war is a matter of prestige, since the British Government are not prepared to concede their demands there can be no question of assisting the British Government in its war against Germany. The Left wing used to give all sorts of interpretations regarding Soviet neutrality and indulged in a sort of wishful thinking that the Indian liberation would be accomplished by the Red Army. They went as far as to infer some sort of secret understanding between Germany and Russia whereby India would be demarcated

as Russian sphere of influence to the jubilation and glory of these Indian pseudo-revolutionaries. There was yet another group who thought in terms of revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat without giving thought to either of these from the realm of possibility that when the Fascists actually invaded the country in the consternation and the preoccupation of the British Army of occupation in India a revolution would be fomented and probably assisted by the invaders so that a classless State would be established on the ruins of the British Empire. How far such a scheme of things would become possible under the very heels of an invader who is the accredited crusader against Socialism in all countries they stoop not to think. However Germany's declaration of war against Russia has helped a lot to clear the head of these Left wing politicians who now clamour for outright mobilisation. For that reason to convince them of the danger of Fascism there is no necessity now since they have received a good knock on their heads from Hitler himself. Wisdom dawns rather late in life and as the Turkish proverb puts it, is a comb which you actually get when the hair is gone.

The Right wing Congressmen are for the most part composed of the rich businessmen (Banias and Marwaris) the landlords and money lenders supported by a credulous mass of ignorant people who are moved by the incantation of the magic word of Mahatma

Gandhi. This section actually control the Congress machinery either through their own personal influence or through their agents Mahatma Gandhi is their Chief whom they implicitly follow and who in turns exacts implicit faith in his creed to put forth their plans into execution. What these people want Mahatma Gandhi to do for them is exactly what the rich businessmen of Germany and Europe wanted Hitler to do for them in the beginning of his career. Hitler gave them the promise to retain the status quo and crush every symptom of revolution or social progress, but he told that he would do so by armed might. Mahatma Gandhi also has given the promise towards the same end, but he proposes to do it by more subtle means. He has adopted the creed of non-violence to keep the oppressed people where they are, ignorant and non-complaining believing in the supreme ordainment. The Millionaires of Europe gave Hitler money for Armaments, the Millionaires of India gave Gandhi money and faith (for external appearances) and both of them seem to be fulfilling their promises, Gandhi peacefully with benevolent devotion meaning no harm and Hitler with fire and brim stone and infuriated like a Genu invoked for the purpose threatening to devour its own master. What are the results, and what a contrast? You see in Europe in hideous onslaught, the Nazi war machine with its clanking, hell-clicking, dandified Prussian Officers, its crafty expert agents

fresh from the cowering and lying down of a dozen countries (in the approved Churchillian style of expression) and the plumpy red faced red cheeked businessmen vying with Goering and here in India you see khaddar-cled incarnations of simplicity moving about in Rols Royces fed on the toils and privations of a vast section of humanity ridden to serfdom God and misery flocking at the doors of temples, churches and mosques to get redemption from all these and in such attempt drawing daggers at one another's throats on the question of the correct approach to that redemption, and millions of khaddar-cled simpletons muttering indistinctly the latest mantras issued from Wardha to the humming sound of half a dozen Charkas and marching to what goal we know not. It is not by accident we find some sort of affinity in these two sets of humanity. Both of them march with a fatalist attitude towards some unknown destination despondently viewing and reviewing their progress and into what abyss they will be ultimately driven to, only people endowed with vision can foresee.

The above set of people have begun to regard the Nazis as invincible and freely canvass the prospect that success of the Nazis would ensure liberation for India. They feel that the Nazi now comers would not be in a position to administer the country themselves properly and for that reason would entrust the Government to Indians. Their other argument equally futile is that

it would not make much difference to be under the yoke of Germans or Japanese so long as India remains fit to be ruled by some foreign power They feel no horror for Fascism and as a matter of sympathy they feel themselves drawn to the creed They take inspiration from their leader who is terribly afraid of "Red Ruin" just as much as Adolf Hitler is

These represent only the nationalist view point. The liberals according to their professions are persons who do not much care whether the country is ruled or not ruled, badly ruled or efficiently carried on They are mostly drawn from old pensioners and other superannuated persons from all walks of life and all they care are peaceful ends to their lives And Politics to them is formal affair of annual conferences, handshakes, statements and dinner parties and the results of their work they gauge from the number of columns their deliberations carry in the *Statesman*, the *Times of India*, the *Madras Mail* and other Anglo-Indian Dalies in the country By looking to these they have reason to be satisfied of their efforts, strenuous of course since they are all old To them it does not matter whether there is an English Governor or a German in his place they are all sure to get invitations to the annual garden parties and opportunities to present their wives and daughters to dignitaries in the approved ceremonial style to be caught by camera-men of Fashion Editors Ofcourse it might need changes in the ways

of saluting and revision of certain chapters in their Free Masonry manuals and there ends their vision of the future

What defines the attitude of the Muslim League the less said the better Modelled after the Congress—Jinnah had his schooling there— their goal is complete independence and now a days Pakistan Both of them sound romantic and inviting for the generation that is coming and the generation that is going What are the practical needs of the Community and what are the ways of achieving such aims the leaders are not much concerned nor do the rank and file Jinnah's attitude resembles that of a shepherd boy waving a red cloth before the Congress bull trying to excite and block its way simultaneously The professions and practice of the Muslim League on the question of India's participation in the war are ambiguous Members of the Muslim League are not supposed to serve on War Committees but there is nothing to restrict leaders of the organisation marching straight to the trenches The League is atonce Imperial, National, Pan Arabic Pan Islamic and Pakistanic if you are to view that body through its components. If you are to gauge the sympathies of an organisation from the Publications which are favourable to it, German High Command Communiques find more prominence in some of these probably due to the fact that Berlin's Urdu Commentator happens to be a Muslim. These

observations of mine are however not disparagingly meant , all that I mean to say is that the present attitude of the Muslim League is rather problematical. And to me, it seems, the attitude of the League would be determined by the attitude of Turkey, Egypt, Afghanistan and Arabia to the War rather than the political considerations confronting the Muslim inhabitants of India, and if that assumption proves to be correct, such a decision would be made outside and not within the country

The votaries of the Hindu Mahasabha have of late become more realist in their assessment of the forces threatening India's safety. The word safety is purposely used and any other writer would have substituted the word independence for it, but to me such can only be an extravagance in the usage. India's independence is never threatened because she is not independent at all. Mahasabha Leaders have become pronounced in their appeals for supporting the War efforts. This zeal I believe is due to the fact that the principles of Hindudom are incompatible with those of Nazidom. They may have other motives as well in their support of war efforts, may be to get more and more Hindus enrolled in the Army, Air force and the Navy as nucleus for the future Hindu Militia. But this can only be secondary and the main reason for their attitude is the aware-ness of the dangers of Nazism. In this regard the leaders of the Mahasabha amongst the many other



political organisations in the country have assessed the situation in a more realistic sense than many of their contemporaries, emerges as a fact.

We have by this time formed a basic idea of the whole of India's attitude towards the war. A broad mass of people still remain confused over the issue and their mentality can best be described as feeble-mindedness. As I write these words I have before me an article by Mr J. B. Kripalani the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress headed "Is there a way out" which to a great extent helps to understand the whole situation. Mr Kripalani begins his article with the quotation "While unfavourable news in a free country steels people to greater determination and exertion, here it depresses and unnerves them. Why this difference." He answers with three reasons. The first is that India is woefully lacking an Army which could be called an Army at all in the modern sense of the word capable of resisting an invasion by any of the Powers. The second is that efforts are not being made to remedy this defect and thirdly the people are not trusted in the matters of defence. One cannot doubt Mr Kripalani's sincerity in examining these problems and stating that the Indian does not fight with any enthusiasm born of the consciousness of serving a noble cause its Navy and Air Force are only in names and that the industrial organisation needed for sustaining a good fighting army has not at all been given

consideration to, in India. Naturally he asks, why the Government of India was in a hurry to declare India a belligerent country when Spain, Japan and United States of America remain neutral even to-day. In surveying the whole situation including the possible attitude of the present supporters of the Government, the Congress standpoint and the utter helplessness of the Indian masses, the writer has shown much perspecuity, but the discomfoting feature is the end "Such situations (as the present Indian situation) in which human efforts appear puny, vain and futile, create great tragedies. They are also fit occasions for a miracle to happen. Let us, therefore, hold our souls in peace and faith, ready for all emergencies, banishing all petty thoughts and fear."

Can we as Mr Kripalani suggests, afford to wait for some miracle to happen to save the whole world from the endless destitution that is now threatening. The war is only a beginning for still greater sufferings. Admittedly there are short-comings in the policies followed by the Government of India, one of such is, as Mr Kripalani points out, the defining of India's defence boundaries as the Mediterranean and the Far East. For the present the Government cannot but do that. The war is and will be fought in those theatres before it ever approaches the frontiers of India. I do not pretend to say that India's frontiers are not threatened. If the war continues with the same tempo as at present it

*'Amrita Bazar Patrika dated July 2, 1941*

59

would not be far off when we too will be in the midst of it. We have therefore to reinforce the outer defences as far as possible to keep the enemy away from the frontiers and at the same time prepare the home front for a total defence even if the frontiers are threatened and give way. This was the point Stalin emphasised in his historic Broad-cast message to Soviet citizens on July 3 and the same message applies with equal importance to our own problems. "We must subordinate everything to the interests of the Front and the task of crushing the enemy" should be the motto of every citizen in the countries which are now threatened by the Nazi onslaught.

It is sheer madness to imagine that Germany has no aggressive intentions as regards India. Of course these lunatics base their assumptions on the Broad-casts from German Wireless Stations. Some of them even go to the extent of saying that Hitler has promised the liberation of India and the award of Independence to the country. It is reported that Hitler made the pronouncement that the fate of India would not be settled in India but on the continent of Europe and if the statement is true Hitler has only given out his plans earlier. What is exactly the fate that Hitler has ordained for India? From what he has done with other countries in Europe we can imagine well in advance the miseries that would be the lot of Indians, if ever they have the misfortune to become his victims one day. The present leaders nationalist politicians students and scientists

will all be sterilized or put into Concentration Camps, Indian Universities and educational institutions of all kinds closed down, all able bodied Indian men and women will be drafted to build roads and high ways for the Nazi masters, for, Indian women are not goodlooking enough to serve as Mistresses for the Nazi Officers as in the case of French and Polish women, and the whole of the Indian continent will be made to serve as a huge granary and source of raw materials for Nazi Germany No amount of exaggeration goes into this picture of Nazi India for these are exactly what Hitler himself has told he would do with the black races And yet there are large number of people who would welcome him as the Saviour Short sightedness and narrow mindedness can't go further

If Hitler himself does not propose to start a campaign to invade India, his other Axis Partner, Japan is ever willing to embark on such an adventure provided the opportunity seems sufficiently ripe to ensure success of the plan By the time these words appear in print Japan would have made the decision already One thing is certain that in the Axis plan of things there can't be any free country or institution and everything would exist as only instruments for Axis exploitation And who will control this Axis, is necessarily the question Germany of course By edging Italy to embark on adventurous campaigns on behalf of herself and Germany, Italy has surrendered her everything to Germany

By surrendering the *Passo Brennero* (Brenner Pass) Mussolini has received in exchange the *Passo Romano* (the goose step). The same fate is to be Japan's as well. In the Chinese affair Germany gave hopes to Japan that by adopting Blitz tactics the whole affair would be a matter of days and now every one knows to what extent Japan has got into the mud. Japan, if it serves the purpose of Hitler will be required to embark on many more such campaigns and just like Italy she is sure to get into the mud up to her head, and then Germany would save her by one pull at the last hour. That's how Berlin plans the conquest of Japan on the same lines she planned for that of Italy. But shall we see Hitler sustaining all these and feel strong in the end to go through her planned conquest of the world. It is not enough to answer in the negative but positive proof must be shown to see Germany at the foot of all lying prostrate begging for mercy. For that we must strive hard now onwards and then we can say we have served Democracy and have been served by Democracy well for that.

The German General Staff have made decisions already and as regards this war they say

"There will no longer be victors and vanquished but survivors and those whose names are struck from the list of nations."

A war waged energetically and consciously for the purpose of spiritually breaking and destroying them

can be a death blow especially for those civilised nations whose elasticity and whose power of regeneration have already suffered to a considerable degree.

“Many an apparently invincible colossus (like Britian ? ) in reality stands on feet of clay, and what one or two generations ago was impossible has today already become possible ; with a single powerful blow to break a nation's spiritual backbone, to destroy it for ever and trample it in the dust ”

Hitler has done it with many of the European nations one by one. Shall we allow that to be done of Russia, Great Britain, India and China also That is a question which has to be answered immediately and with all force. Can India expect to remain an idle spectator when her very life and existence are threatened with sudden doom, our politicians need think over.

What is Britian fighting for ? What is Russia fighting for ? What France and every other fallen country is fighting for ? It is not for the national sovereignty they are fighting. They are fighting for the very life and existence of the individual citizens of these countries Fascism, or Nazism as you may call it is the very antithesis of everything that is dear to the human heart It is this menace they are fighting and the same menace is knocking at our doors also This is no time for complacency or to think that this war is fought for Imperialist ends. The moment U S S R entered the conflict that pretence has ceased to exist

Communism cannot be expected to fight hand in hand with Imperialism if the war is fought on Imperialist aims. To-day workers of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics are comrades in Arms of the workers and Aristocracy of Britain, India and America fighting against a common enemy and endowed with almost the same ideals and aspirations. Perhaps it is a miracle that we see to-day, before our very eyes Communists and Imperialists joined together having sunk all their differences before a common cause. An equivalent miracle should occur here within this country as well as happened during the last war of Indian nationalists and their rulers uniting for the same purpose. Will Indian leaders rise to the occasion is the question?

*Deutsche Wehr* June 13 1935, quoted from *Hitler's Conspiracy Against Peace*, S. Eckner



## CHAPTER SIX

### THE SUICIDAL POLICY OF THE CONGRESS

Assessing Indian Nationalism in terms of prestige and achieving Indian freedom as a matter of pride are not ideal conditions. The question usually discussed is can the present Indian attitude help any way in gaining the country's freedom. The answer can only be in the negative. Congress recalcitrance is no forceful threat to Britain to abdicate power. It can only help the British harden their mind and the consequential grip on India. Moreover the Liberal and Labourite attitude towards India would gradually become cold if the people of the country continue their life and death struggle with cold calculation. They are not to be blamed for that. How far such a turn in the mentality of the Liberal and Labourite elements in England will affect Indian Independence adversely the Congress Leadership, is fully capable of understanding. Congress has not been planning for the wresting of Independence as a matter of right. If such would have been Congress ideals, there would be less reason for the Congress to think and act in terms of non-violence. Gandhiji on countless number of occasions has made that point clear. Congress expects and has hitherto prepared the country to receive Independence as a matter of gift from England. With this end in view Congress



Resolutions on complete Independence have been watered down by means of Gandhiji's interpretations to virtually amount to Dominion Status of the Statute of Westminster variety with a clause giving power to cede from the British Commonwealth if found necessary. The latter condition is only meant to placate Pandit Jawaharlal, Bose and few other so called extremists in the Congress body politic. It was exactly on these points i.e. on the approach to the independence and the question of ceding from the Commonwealth, Subhas Chandra Bose broke away from Gandhi. Bose's impatience was only a secondary matter. Mahatma Gandhi's vision of Independent India is something like Australia or Canada attained by some sort of compromise between the present ruling class and the Indian Nationalists. Jawaharlal, Subhas Bose and few other Left wing Congressmen visualise India as any other nation like Japan, Russia or America with complete independence as regards her internal regime and foreign policies. Subhas Bose might prefer an alliance with Japan or Germany while Jawaharlal would like his country following in the footsteps of Russia and closely collaborating with the latter like China. But the latter two forms of aspirations cannot be taken to be the official view point of the Congress since that body is controlled by Mahatma Gandhi. Therefore an analysis of the Congress policy must necessarily be in terms of Mahatma Gandhi's ideas.

As we have seen Indian Nationalists and th  
 come if the outlook o  
 remains the same I d  
 mise with the present  
 rulers are unwilling  
 be interpreted in two  
 in regard to India is re  
 England by many of her  
 Secondly when such p  
 the Congress they  
 the present leadership  
 to exercise such power  
 to exercise her will, h  
 more and more by th  
 outside it, and for wh  
 distrust Added to  
 the communal organis  
 trically opposed to the  
 country once again in  
 as legitimate even by  
 view of the Muslim Lea  
 may gravitate toward  
 Nations composed of Th  
 and the Islamic States  
 part of the Muslim would  
 elements in the Cou  
 such divided loyalty w

different directions and the strain might even break the country into two unequal halves. With the present leadership of the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress remaining in power there is little likelihood of the country uniting into one compact whole and pursuing a policy that would perpetuate the country's existence as one nation. There is also much less likelihood of the British abdicating power under such circumstances.

In this confused light we have to examine the present policy of the Indian National Congress. Congress has started the Satyagraha movement as a mild protest against the British in not recognising India forthright as an independent nation when they claim to be fighting for the cause of freedom for small nations. Gandhiji has made it clear that such expression of protest should not be diverted to mean any sort of harassment of the Government in its war efforts. If the movement is only meant as such a protest, its usefulness and purpose are now past. Its usefulness is gone in the sense that it has failed to rouse a sufficiently strong public opinion in this country or outside and its purpose is lost in the sense that a mere protest cannot be made into a permanent policy. Moreover by pursuing such a policy the Congress is losing its grip on the public as could be seen from the sudden fall in the number of satyagrahis and the enthusiasm evinced in the movement. There is nothing to speak of as a movement

in the present *satyagraha* in its restricted scope and application. Moreover the movement has deteriorated into a sham debacle in the face of growing communal dissensions and international political turmoil and is doing harm to the country in more than one respect.

The prospect of India attaining independence is receding gradually to a distant future. If the political situation returns to normal, supposing that the Democracies succeed in retaining the status quo after the war, the presentation of a demand by the Indian public for independence would meet with increasing resistance from the British public. They would be in no good mood to favourably consider such a proposal when the Indian public have remained so recalcitrant in the days of their grim struggle for life against heavy odds. The Congress to enforce its demands may enter into a struggle in the characteristic non-violent manner and with what results? It would end in a fiasco, and if Gandhiji lives to guide such a struggle the end would be nothing but a turn of the inner voice.

To day the problem that faces the country is not one of gaining independence but of retaining the vestige of independence that it now enjoys. Gandhiji himself has asked what would be India's Independence worth if Britain and every other freedom loving country were to be overrun by the Nazis. Of course India would not be let to gain independence and then lose it. Her

turn to be overrun is delayed only because of Hitler's other preoccupations and he is actually preparing for such a final assault. If the war proceeds in the same tempo as in the past it is only a matter of days when we will be sighting the Nazis on our very borders. When once they reach the borders there will be no necessity to fight, as any sort of resistance with the present equipment of the Indian Army would not even amount to a pin prick to the Nazi war machine. By the end of an year's war preparations at the present rate we would be having a few dozen Aeroplanes and three hundred Pilots half way under training! That is the prospect India faces to-day.

India is on the brink of disaster. To her it is only a matter of jumping from the frying pan into the fire. What makes her prepared to jump into the fire instead of remaining in the frying pan is the question. Her politicians are under a delusion in assessing the intensity of heat in the frying pan and the fire. Scorched for a long while in the pan they believe the consummating heat of the fire would be a deliverance. The Indian National Congress policy at present amounts to such a thing. The country is shown the way to commit suicide when she wants to know the way to deliverance. If my interpretation of the Congress policy is correct then it is criminal for the Congress to adopt such a policy.

Mahatma Gandhi during the last war acted as a recruiting agent for Britain for men money and

materials with surprisingly good results. The last war was not fought for such high stakes as at present. That conflict could be classed as an Imperialist war for settling the claims of rival Imperialisms. The success of one Imperialism or the other did not matter much if the sum total of human happiness were to be considered. But to-day it is entirely a different affair, for the struggle is between human liberty and barbarism. Fascism came to be recognised as a world force only after the first World War. If ever the theory was in existence before the war it was as a matter of academic interest to curious persons. For the present it is attempting to envelope the whole globe spreading destruction, slavery and suffering in its trail. Never in the history of the world has a war been fought on such ideological conflict as in the present war. The result of this war will determine the future of mankind for a considerably long stretch of time unless some sort of miracle or accident overtakes the world and changes the course of history contrary to all expectations. The disheartening feature however is that we are not living in an age of miracles and our faith in miracles is practically non-existent. Destiny of nations and cultural institutions have responded to deliberate pre-hand planning and action are matters of common belief to-day and which could be justified from a survey of historical events during the past few years. History is often credited with accident, but such an assumption

cannot carry weight with persons who have been taught to view it in a scientific and purposeful manner and it is not wise to carry such an assumption, or conviction as the case may be to the extent of politically blind folding a whole country. We are living in an age of reality and illusions can have no place in it. Illusions serve the purpose of charlatans or devils but broad masses of people are neither. It would serve the purpose of a devil like Hitler to create an illusion in the minds of the people as to his real purpose and then suddenly break on them and terrorise them to death.

There are persons who say that the whole Congress attitude is one of bargaining rather than a tactical expression of disapproval. These very same people also point out that Britain did not fulfil her promises made during the last war as regards the granting of independence to India. I do not ignore this very reasonable doubt on the part of Indians and they also point out to me as example the extreme short sightedness of the present day administration in not trusting the Indians in their own defence matters. Englishmen engaged in a life and death struggle, have also certain moral responsibilities at this very grave hour and if they fail to carry out such responsibilities they shall have to stand on trial and submit to proper punishment at the hands of the generation that is rising. It would be no easy task to explain away things as they like for by their action now they shall have betrayed the trust the countless ages of

tradition and civilisation reposed in them. I shall deal more fully with this aspect of the question subsequently. Accepting this very grave doubt I wish still to appeal to my countrymen to rise above all such dubious feelings and act in a manner befitting the present occasion. I want you to place your trust not in the present ruling classes in England but in a generation that is gradually rising and is bound to come to power not only in England but in India also. We will discharge our moral responsibility, I say on behalf of the Indian counterparts of such a generation, and they will, I am sure, take example from us and rise to their proper heights. This generation will not carry with them the petty ideas which blind the present generation, and they will act with courage and vision when the old bark is worn out presenting the new to the full sunshine.

Prestige for a country which is slave of another is a desideratum only. To act and think in terms of prestige, the country cannot, when it is incapable of asserting its own will and give expression to its latent desires either due to its inefficiency or lack of opportunity. A country fully grown with a virile national sentiment cannot be kept under bondage for such a long period as in the case of India. Therefore a country which chooses to remain servile can never impress its prestige abroad. Even if an opportunity arises Congress in its present development cannot be expected to



grasp that opportunity and act according to the will of the nation. The leadership as vindicated on many previous occasions will sit tight on the back and hold the rein and keep back the horse instead of allowing it to proceed to its goal, to reach which she has been striving since her birth. By giving the rein in the hands of the present leaders of the Congress we are neither here nor there we smart in between I hold that oppressed nations too have certain responsibilities When others are enslaved we should protest, and if it pleases our masters we should help the victim and beat the oppressor By adopting such a procedure we earn the gratitude of the victim vindicate our own resentment at being slaves and please our master which would go to relieve the rigours of our slavery We do not feel diminutive when we fight for such a cause, but on the contrary we feel diminutive before other eyes if we refuse such a call or prompting and sit tight and show grimaces at our master The whole of the present is analogous to such a picture

Let us examine the opposite to the present Congress policy By aligning with the forces of freedom and taking an active part in the struggle against aggression the Congress will be vindicating its stand fully with the cause of the oppressed nations. Such a new alignment of forces will hearten the despondent masses in the country who are at present in complete bewilderment Something tells them that all is not well with the world

and that their own safety is threatened by outside agencies. The Congress declaration in favour of pursuing the fight against Fascism with added vigour would give them the feeling that they too are taking an active interest in their future. War work and civilian organisation to combat the works of saboteurs, fifth columnists and stray forces of the invading army will be a dress rehearsal of their objective fight and a political preparation which cannot be gained by years of lecture work. In fighting the invading forces of Fascism they will be demolishing the native forces of reaction and officialdom at the same time. An army as thick as the entire nation itself can only withstand the opposing forces of Fascism. The fall of France clearly vindicated the folly of reposing confidence in the Army alone without paying attention to the civilian defence front. Japan's struggle in China and Germany's progress in Russia are examples of how civilian defences can slow down the enemy's progress and ultimately contribute to its defeat. There is no doubt that Fascism to-day is unequally matched. With all the huge mechanised forces and drilled armies at its disposal the internal contradictions of the system will force it one day to reach the breaking point. Our purpose should be to aggravate and assist those internal contradictions to gather strength and beat the whole mass so that the entire structure may collapse under the impact. One major defeat on the military plane will hasten the

internal collapse. In bringing about that major military defeat, India can now play a decisive part for the importance of the war has shifted to the East. India's arsenals are away from the enemy but not so far away as that of Canada, America and Australia from this theatre of the war as to make quick transportation impossible which is essentially an advantage not to be overlooked. Hitler cannot be easily expected to close our arsenals and we must see that more and more of our munition and forces are sent to the front to stem the advance of the enemy and drag him to his slow but certain defeat. In that respect India is to-day very favourably placed and advantage should be taken of the situation. That is how we can prove the saying that the destiny of the world would be guided from the East. If India can unite body and soul for such a purpose and bring about the destruction of Hitler near her frontiers by that act alone, India shall have won her independence and pride of place among the nations of the world. In case British Government delays the recognition of such an actuality we have the greatest moral force in the world then to challenge the British and any extremity to which we may have resort to in furtherance of our claim would be supported by world public opinion. Congress is faced with such a situation to-day and in deciding the future course of action of Indians the Congress would be turning the tide of war in favour of democracy and freedom throughout the world.

The Indian National Committee in London have already appealed to Gandhiji and other Leaders of the Congress to review their policy regarding the war. In a resolution passed by them and cabled to Mahatma Gandhi, they suggest the intensification of the effort for the formation of a National Government with the sole object of defending India against any threat of her security. This resolution was passed after the outbreak of Russo-German hostilities, but earlier to this *The Hindu* which occupies a front rank position among the Indian Nationalist news-papers came out with the suggestion of restoring popular Ministries in the provinces and the Congress taking control of the administration. The suggestion contained in a leading Editorial was criticized by various circles in the Congress and the lead suggested by *The Hindu* was branded as a reactionary measure fitting the Liberals and not a self respecting Congress. But events have proved the wisdom of such a move. *Amrita Bazar Patrika* claiming to be representative of the Official Congress opinion in Bengal has been justifying the Congress stand from the very beginning and this leading daily in a series of articles subsequently endorsed the Congress stand. But, however, its leading Editorial under the caption "The Congress Lead" in its issue dated June 28, 1941 present contrasting reading. In its concluding portion are the significant words

\*Whether that Government do or do not react to the present phase of the war with a promptitude and decisiveness worthy of the cause which they profess to hold dear the Congress as an organisation cannot afford to ignore it and pursue a policy which is causing grave misgivings among a large section of its adherents. We submit these points for Gandhiji's earnest consideration and since plenary authority vests in him the initiative must be his. We repeat that the Russo-German conflict has created a new situation both internally and from the international point of view and that it calls for reconsideration at an early date of the entire position of the Congress with reference to war and peace, violence and non violence and the Congress past record, its present programme and its future role in the struggle for human emancipation.

Exactly the above was the stand taken by M. N. Roy two years back and for which he was expelled from the Congress. His crime is that he is capable of more clear thinking than most of the present day Congress Leaders. Every Congress organ including *Amrita Bazar Patrika* has been denouncing him for his boldness of vision which has at last proved true. I ask this question of the Congress can it not rescind its past decisions now and reinstate Roy and his associates in the Congress for their lead and assistance would be invaluable to the organisation on the whole. I hold no brief for Mr. M. N. Roy nor have I met

him even, nor do I belong to his political party I am neither a Congressman nor a Royist, but dispassionately viewing the whole controversy I say as every one else would say that Mr, M N Roy has been correct and the justification for the Congress action is lost now

The unfortunate thing in the whole situation is that Pandit Jawaharlal who holds considerable sway over the Congress organisation and for whose opinion Gandhiji has great respect is in Jail Along with him are Jai Prakash Narain and the President Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Pandit Jawaharlal and Jai Prakash must be grievously hurt to hear of Russia's misfortune and were these gentlemen outside the Jails to-day, they would have certainly set the Congress wings on sail I know they all would rise to still laudable heights but for Gandhiji, and his retarding influence

What makes Gandhiji hold to his present tactics ? As far as a reasonably well informed critic can see, there are two reasons The first is his reactionary doctrine of politics placing implicit trust in the *status quo* To this he has been pitted by his rich patrons and his own mental background The second reason is his non-violence creed Since he has come to be regarded as a Saint and an Apostle of Truth and Non-violence, he feels, it is not fitting to change tactics at all as regards his pet non-violence doctrine Truth plays a role of lesser importance in the scheme of things political, but that is not the case with non-violence it being the end

and aim of all his political actions. Congress by playing into Gandhiji's hands has got stuck up in mid-stream with this dead load non violence. During the last war Gandhiji to all purposes was a different man. He was far from a saint then, he was a leader who had succeeded with certain new tactics particularly his non violence but that was not his all. So he could adapt himself to the new circumstances created by the war. But to-day his popularity has reached saintly proportions and saints are often credited with certain immobility like the Sphinx or the Pyramids. The pity is that Gandhiji cares to remain a politician even after becoming a saint—a tragic chapter in the history of India and a tragic chapter in his own life story. Gandhiji in his present complex would be gaining more popularity as an apostle of truth and non violence and more of his countrymen's gratitude if he determine to remain a pure saint and not a saint-cum politician. However such a change in Gandhiji's attitude is a remote possibility and we can not now afford to wait for such a turn. That change can only come through the call of another Inner Voice making itself heard in a moment of bewilderment.

In the meanwhile we must base our plans on more concrete things. The rank and file of the Congress should agitate for an open session of the Congress or atleast for a meeting of the All India Congress Committee for reconsidering the whole of the Congress attitude towards the war. If that is impracticable ceaseless

agitation must be carried on for the Working Committee of the Congress to meet and come to such a conclusion or a clarification of the Congress attitude in the present development of the war. The opportunity must also be made use of, to examine the communal problem in a fresh light so as to enable the restoration of popular Ministries and confidence in the minds of the civilian population.

Equally distressing, if not more, is the attitude of the All-India Trade-Union Congress. Its President is reported to have remarked regarding the latest phase of the war in the following terms

“The Russo-German war is not a conflict between Democracy and Dictatorship nor is it a fight over ideals. Russia is not engaged in war in order to liberate India or its toiling masses from thralldom, but is fighting for her own existence if not for the retention of the newly acquired territories which make her vast country, already boundless, vaster still.”

Such narrow-mindedness is unpardonable on the part of a President of a body like the All-India Trade-Union Congress supposed to represent the cause of the workers in this country. By leading men to blind-alleys India's political leaders take pride in their vision and soundness of judgement, criminal folly can go no further. History will bring these men to task when the present storm is blown over and clear impartial reasoning dawns on earth. Can Russia profess to fight on



behalf of the toiling masses of India when such masses have for their leaders men of like calibre. Russia has never promised to fight for the liberation of Indian masses she can only sympathise with their aspirations as she is doing in the case of China, and as she did in the case of Spain. If Indians are engaged in a similar fight I am sure the present heads of the Russian Government would not be found wanting in the fulfilment of their moral responsibilities. If we analyse the composition of every State in the world and the policies of their Governments we shall come to the conclusion that there is only one State in the world which stands by the cause of oppressed nations like India and that country is the lone solid champion of the freedom of the dark and coloured races. Lenin a Russian was responsible for inspiring a long suppressed hope in the minds of the toiling masses of India and the East that there exist still ways for them to act and think in terms of self mastery and independence. It is a tragedy in the world to-day that the masses of people in all the countries in the present state of enlightenment, should leave control of their thoughts and actions in the hands of men with worn out ideas petty prejudices and reckless devotion in spent up forces reactionaries of the first order salvaged from the bottom of a polluted sea and resurrected by constant injections of self interest and pride.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### AN ANSWER TO THE PACIFIST'S CASE AGAINST WAR

Every sort of pacifist argument against war must be considered in the light of the following two statements one by Adolf Hitler and the other by Benito Mussolini

"Whoever really desires the victory of pacifist thought must give his whole hearted support to the German conquest of the world. The pacifist-humanitarian idea may perhaps be quite good when the world has been conquered and subjected by the highest type of man, who would be made supreme ruler of the earth. Therefore, war first, and afterwards perhaps pacifism." Writes Adolf Hitler setting out his plan for world conquest in *Mein Kampf*, the Nazi Gospel

"War alone" wrote Benito Mussolini in his book *The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism* "Brings up to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamps of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it. Though words are very beautiful things, rifles, machineguns, ships and cannons are more beautiful things still."

Pacifists must also consider the indisputable fact provided by events that all their writings, pleadings, arguments, reasoning and following are of no avail to the will of these Dictators with all their Military, Air

Force Tanks Machineguns and Polson Gas to declare war wage war and subordinate every thing to war

The whole of pacifist thought may be classified into two broad categories. One set denounce the use of force under any circumstances and for any cause. To this group most probably belongs Mahatma Gandhi. The other section claiming themselves to be utilitarian pacifists hold that war between nations is immoral and should not be allowed to carry on but do not believe that the use of force is always and necessarily wrong. An admirable exposition of this type of argument is the book, *Why War* by C. E. M. Joad. Professor Joad's argument I believe must now hold no value as the book was written and the argument was addressed before Hitler declared war and began a campaign of endless destruction all throughout Europe and now spreading to Asia and the Far East. He begins by summarising his arguments against war which are

(1) "That preparedness for fighting and willingness to fight do not give security to the nation which is prepared and willing. Armaments in fact do not give safety in the short run

(2) "That the disposition to achieve its ends by violence is not a characteristic that promotes survival either in an organism or in a community. Belligerence in fact has no survival value in the long run

(3) "That nations who go to war do not even if victorious succeed under modern conditions in

achieving the aims for which they were ostensibly fighting, and that the effects of war are in general other than those which are either wished or intended

(4) "That this generalisation is convincingly illustrated by the results of the last war.

(5) "That it will be illustrated even more convincingly by the results of the next "

These arguments as will be seen are directed more against the declaration of war rather than against its prosecution when once it is declared Mr Joad himself admits that the use of force is not necessarily an evil when it is meant to correct a wrong and he cites the example of pinching the ears of a boy when the boy turns naughty In this instance it is not the question of a boy turning naughty but so many big grown up boys, some even nearing the end of their lives, raining destruction on all corners of the earth and carrying such destruction into a matter of policy Mr Joad's examples of naughtiness are thumbing at the piano next room and the tormenting of a kitten, and for stopping which, he says, he should not hesitate with whatever force he could command That is too much and will the same Joad be unwilling to punish a boy like this describing his exploits, "we had to set fire to the wooded hills, to the fields and little villages . . . It was almost diverting . . . The bombs hardly touched the earth before they burst into white smoke and an enormous flame and the dry grass began to

burn. I thought of the animals God how they ran

After the bomb racks were emptied I began throwing bombs by the hand It was most amusing A big zariba surrounded by tall trees was not easy to hit. I had to aim carefully at the straw roof and only succeeded at the third shot. The wretches who were inside seeing their roof burning jumped out and ran off like mad

*'Surrounded by a circle of fire about 5 000 Abyssinians came to a sticky end It was like Hell.*

The boy in this case is Mussolini's son, Bruno Mussolini and the place where the boy plays is Abyssinia. Mr Load cannot but be aware of this boy's naughtiness for I am quoting this from his own book of course reproduced at another place depicting the horrors of war Abyssinia did not go to play mischief with the boy or his father and Italy had no charges against Abyssinia And as regards the results of war on which his subsequent argument is based I should think he is nearly correct He is not fully correct because war fought on such principles bears some results and those are that the mischief maker would be brought to his senses for some time atleast and his incentives for further aggression would be curbed Apart from that the war might bring in some unexpectedly good results like the revolution in Russia which brought about the subsequent transformation of that vast region in a manner undreamt of, but of course

which results in the subsequent war are being nullified. As regards the biological aspect implied, I do not wish to question Mr Joad's authority, and even if Mr Joad be correct and wrong at the same time, the question of the supremacy of the Slav, Anglo-saxon and Aryan races and the fitness for survival of any of these would not be settled for quite a long time to come. And if at all the question is to be settled it will not be settled by one race surviving the other but by the annihilation of the whole racial theory and the merger of all races into one indivisible whole that is mankind. When such a state of affairs comes we shall not have to auction Victoria Crosses won for valour, for living.

Mr Joad subsequently examines the methods for preventing war. The first method is the same as envisaged by the quotation reproduced in the beginning from Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, i. e. the world domination of a single Power. This alternative is however dismissed by Professor Joad for two obvious reasons. Firstly such a power cannot be stable on account of the latent disaffection among the subject nations ultimately resulting in open revolt and a series of wars. Secondly that state would only be the beginning for more extensive repression, which, if not resented would result in the establishment of a society of reasonably contented Robots, such as is envisaged in Aldous Huxley's "*Brave New World*", and if resented would again result in

revolution and the overthrow of the Government. However the description of Mr Joad falls far short of the mark probably for the reason that Mr Joad had before him when he wrote it Huxley's *"Brave New World"* and not Adolf Hitler's *"New Order"*.

The second method is the establishment of an International Government. Arguing and counter arguing on the point Mr Joad does not seem to convince himself. He will perhaps want Britain, America and the other countries of Europe including Germany and Italy go Socialist if possible and the Christian Church introduced in Communist Russia since Christianity is practical politics\* and certain Treaties revised as to give Italy and Germany more of Colonies and the disbanding of the Air Forces of all these nations. He sees hope in another League since the original League of Nations is now defunct, and plans a policy of appeasement and concessions to the Fascist States and deals with an extension of the theory of Dual Mandate in respect of the administration of undeveloped territories. All these I am prepared to say would have sounded liberal mindedness on the part of an Englishman before the war broke out but to-day the whole perspective is different. In the first place can Hitler and Mussolini be brought to reason now? If at all they agree for a peace what will be the terms and what will be the effect of such a truce? Many vested interests in England and America would willingly go to peace on Hitler's terms

the dismantling of Communism from Russia, return of colonies to Germany and recognition of Germany's pre-eminent position and overlordship on the continent of Europe and part of Asia. But that would not bring about a divorce between the Nazi Party and the German people as wished by Professor Joad. Instead Fascism will entrench itself more firmly as to become incapable of being overthrown by any possible means and will gradually envelope the whole world devouring Britain, America and Asia to the much discomfiture of Prof. Joad, unless he finds some way out to reconcile his Socialism with Fascism. I cannot carry the argument farther, unless I am reasonably certain as to whether Prof. Joad still persists in his belief of Nazi goodwill and his own ideas of Pacifism in the latest phase of the war.

The argument of the other set of pacifists, that is, total pacifists like Gandhiji needs more careful analysis. Mahatma Gandhi's advice to Englishmen at the beginning of the war created quite a good sensation. In that he wanted them to lay open their doors to the German invaders, allow their women and children to be killed, watch all these and wait for a moral turn in the minds of the Nazis followed by painful repentance. Gandhiji knew that his appeal would be unheeded and that's why perhaps, he gave it. You must not also forget that Gandhiji appealed to Hitler not to go to war, and Hitler must have surely recollected the sermon addressed to



him by the Priest at the Church in his boyhood if ever he had done so in the flight of his memory and felt a wry smile curling his lips in utter derision over the futility of the Parson's advice then and presently Gandhiji's

Gandhiji's advice is not an entirely new doctrine Bertrand Russell in his book *Justice in Wartime*<sup>2</sup> has described with characteristic vividness such an invasion by Germans of a non resisting England which I would like to reproduce in detail but for its length He pictures a military expedition coming from Germany to take control of England "The force would not be large since there would be no resistance and consequently no ferocity The conquest would be no conquest, no glory to be won and the whole expedition would be ridiculous causing a feeling of disgust instead of pride After having completed such a conquest the Germans would peacefully evict the King from the Buckingham Palace and the Members from the House of Commons and set on the task of administering the country with the existing personnel of the Civil Service and a few imported bureaucrats But this would not simply go on since all of them would non-co-operate with the result of some being shot even But all of them would still refuse to carry out instructions issued by Germans and persist in carrying on the existing regulations until every one of them would be dismissed from the Cabinet Minister to the Postman and substituted by Germans

Mr Russell goes on to add "The dismissed officials could not all be imprisoned or shot, since no fighting would have occurred, such wholesale brutality would be out of the question" The Germans would then find themselves in a whole mess to carry on with the administration. If the Germans decree that German should be the language taught in schools, teachers would refuse to teach and they would be dismissed, and parents would not send their children to school. No body would serve in the Military or the Police or the Customs and there would be strikes of work every where including the docks and the railways. "Whatever they touched would instantly become paralysed, and it would soon be evident, even to them, that nothing was to be made out of England unless the population could be conciliated" His final argument which is perhaps the most important runs as follows

"Such a method of dealing with invasion would, of course, require fortitude and discipline. But fortitude and discipline are required in war. For ages past, education has been largely directed to producing these qualities for the sake of war. They now exist so widely that in every civilised country almost everyman is willing to die on the battle field whenever his Government thinks the moment suitable. The same courage and idealism which are now put into war could quite easily be directed by education into the channel of passive resistance. I do not know what losses England may

suffer before the present war is ended but if they amount to a million no one will be surprised. An immensely smaller number of losses incurred in passive resistance would prove to any invading army that the task of subjecting England to alien domination was an impossible one. And this proof would be made once for all, without dependence upon the doubtful accidents of war.

In the above description and the concluding argument there are certain basic facts which stand in bold relief to the casual observer. The first is: Is such a suggestion practicable? Would there not be some section of the population as at present who would consciously object to such a policy of passive resistance? Would not these gentlemen have to be shot at the sacrifice of pacifism or otherwise dealt with before such a plan of passive resistance is agreed upon? And would not there be also another section who would acquiesce in letting in the Germans but would not non-co-operate and would instead co-operate with the Germans to merit special favours, Baronetcies and party leadership? What would possibly the non-co-operating country do against these dissenters from their own midst? And suppose by fortitude and discipline all ends well as regards the non-co-operating side but the Germans behave quite differently to what has been pictured of their attitude. They eject you from your house, plunder you, live on your earnings or accumulated

wealth, carry on the administration just as they can or just as they like, put you in prison and starve you out, forcibly take away your women, molest them, and generally make a Hell out of your good old country and boast all about their beastliness as the Nazis actually do now. They come to invade you because they are of such a lot not schooled in passive resistance, non-violence or truth. For a pacifist to carry conviction must either admit that the whole of mankind are made to pattern, acting in one way and responding to one will or throw over board his pacifist claims and submit to reason. That the whole of mankind are not likewise, is evident from the fact that we have got to think in terms of invaders and invaded, good and bad, wicked and wise. Further to preach pacifist doctrines one must overhaul the whole social structure which none of these pacifists is prepared. In the first place there would be needed the abolition of economic inequalities between man and man and then social, religious, racial and intellectual inequalities. Non-violence can be an excellent ideal in a world from where all these inequalities have been removed, but it cannot be practicable in the present day world after any amount of schooling, drilling or discipline is evident from the chaos and confusion we now have after so many years of training in religion, politics, mysticism and sociology. To bring about such a change in the world, there needs a revolution which is atonce social, religious, economic

and also affecting the minds of men. Till then to advocate pacifism on a national and international scale cannot be regarded as sensible instead is definitely harmful to the happiness and well being of large masses of people.

In the *Encyclopaedia of Pacifism* are cited examples of the successes achieved by the application of pacifist doctrines including Gandhiji's non violence and civil disobedience campaigns. To an observer none of these successes can be attributed to the practice of Pacifism or non violence. These successes are really successes of the minds of the opponents in all cases their capacity for after thought and calm and deliberate reasoning assisting their minds to remedy the evil effects of previous wrongs. By having developed these qualities earlier these opponents react in a way different to their previous practices and such a change is interpreted as a success of the application of the Pacifist doctrine. Suppose for example Gandhiji practised his non violence in Germany under the Nazis or India under their control, the results would have been different. By all possible chances he would have been taken away and his whole band of followers put to slow but painful death in concentration camps as a deterrent for other citizens following in his footsteps and the whole civil disobedience campaign put an end to. It follows therefore that the success claimed for the practice of non violence is a questionable one and the

principle of non-violence a questionable virtue in that it affords encouragement rather than deterrent to wickedness in the world

In other parts of the world non-violence is only a topic for discussion, while here in India it is a political creed threatening to become a national policy. The controversy as to whether the country should adopt it as a national policy or leave it to a band of Satyagrahis under Gandhiji's guidance to pursue on idealistic ends in a way they think best, to-day, assumes more importance as the situation both at home and abroad develops. Since Gandhiji took leadership of the Congress he has been persistently trying to convert that huge political organisation into a Satyagraha body with the intent of propagating his pet ideas, to the detriment of the nation as a whole. This statement of mine is based on two facts. The first is that the propagation of the creed has spread defeatism in the minds of Indians and restricted the full development of the national movement. The next is that the country to-day experiences the most serious internal disruption to end which there is no reasonable prospect since the only organisation which can claim to be national and non-communal to a great extent finds its hands tied by its commitment to this inane and asinine creed, to repeat the words of Mr Webb Miller, the author of *"I Found No Peace"*. Mr K M Munshi until lately an ardent follower of Mahatmaji has testified to this by

resigning from the Congress on this principle. The correspondence which passed between Mahatmaji and Munshi clearly vindicate my previous claim that Gandhiji is using the Congress more for his personal ends than that of the nation. In directing Mr Munshi and all those who do not believe in the creed of non-violence to resign from the Congress Gandhiji is not acting true to the democratic nature of the organisation as a whole. On this point the views of *Amrita Bazar Patrika* are relevant. In a leader article the Paper comments "Mr Munshi's views on the subject are probably approved by a majority of Congressmen and if Mahatmaji insists on their resignation or expulsion from the Congress the national organisation will automatically be transferred into a small body of Satyagrahis. . . . But a democratic body which the Congress professes to be is bound to take the shape approved by the majority of its members, and we believe the time has come to ascertain whether Mahatmaji's interpretation of non violence is or is not in accordance with the opinion of the majority.

The above quotation is a clear indication as to how far Gandhiji has succeeded in convincing his countrymen as to the efficacy of his creed. Not even within the Congress can he claim a majority and not to speak of the nation as a whole. The opinion of orthodox Nationalists like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya clearly brings out this point and the vast

number of Socialists and Trade-Unionists are at a still greater distance from Gandhiji. In addressing the conference of Hindu Leaders held at Benares Pandit Malaviya said "Mr Gandhi has for a long time preached that violence should not be used even in the exercise of the right of private defence. I have always differed from him on this point. The great law-givers, Manu and Veda Vyas, laid down ages ago that a man is entitled to use violence to protect himself from violence. The Indian Penal Code also has laid down that one is justified in using violence against his assailant to save himself from attack.

"Mr Gandhi's preaching has produced a great effect on the minds of large numbers of people. But I believe the bulk of them would, if consulted, say, on the basis of experience that it is a reasonable provision of law which permits people to protect themselves by meeting violence by violence where necessary,"

Malaviya's statement is very carefully worded but any ordinary person can clearly discern the main argument contained in it. In spite of the huge following of Gandhiji, the people who have any real faith in his principle form a very small minority. Malaviya's remark at another place in his address, regarding the Arms Act brings out an analogy between the effects of non-violence and the restriction in regard to the possession of Arms. He said the Arms Act imposed restrictions on the possession of Arms even as a means of self



defence by lawful citizens while in spite of such restrictions dacoits and criminals found not much difficulty in possessing these in large quantities. Non violence is a voluntary imposition adopted by righteous and lawful citizens while the aggressive-minded section of the population like the criminals dacoits and Fascists are the least affected by such a preaching. Under both the circumstances in the event of a conflict between the lawful citizens and the unlawful citizens the advantages accrue to the unlawful ones. The difference is only in the manner of the application of the imposition. In the first case it is external and forcible and in the latter it is voluntary and peaceful. The results are more or less the same. The unlawful by whatever names you might call them carry the day not only the day but so many days at a stretch until and unless the lawful realise their folly and shake off the impositions and behave naturally.

In our examination of the causes for the present stultified position of the Congress we had reason therefore to put a large share of the burden on this creed. Congress primarily as a political organisation representing the will of the majority of the citizens of India cannot shut its eyes to the events happening outside the country particularly when those events have a direct bearing on the political development of the country. But every one would at the same time realise how foolish it would be for such an organization, moored

as it is to the principle of non-violence, to attempt any move in the matter of foreign policies. It therefore behoves the Leaders of the Congress to save their faces to adopt the policy of the tortoise, call it, lying in wait. The tortoise however doesn't realise that while lying in wait it may be even carried body and shell and put on the oven. I view the present situation in that particularly alarming perspective and that vision only has prompted me to write this book. It is not my own view point that the Congress should now boldly make its stand clear and dissociate itself from becoming an adjunct to the propagation of a useless creed in the present circumstances, it is the view point of a large majority of the Indian people can be seen from the comments of a Newspaper which has the reputation of standing by the Congress. *Amrita Bazar Patrika* in a significant editorial gives expression to this sentiment.

"For the present the Congress has accepted it (non-violence), if not as a creed, atleast as a policy and there also there is a good deal of difference between Gandhiji and the organisation as a whole, unless the Congress revises its policy it cannot participate in the war directly or indirectly even though it is opposed, bitterly opposed, to the Nazi cult. The point for consideration is whether, the Nazi menace coming nearer and nearer to the Indian scene, particularly after Germany's hostilities with Russia, the Congress would be in a position to fight or repel it by Gandhian non-violence

*'Amrita Bazar Patrika June 28, 1941.*

Speaking for ourselves however much we may respect Gandhiji's views we have our grave doubts as to the efficacy of non violence as solvent of internal turmoil or international gangsterism in the present circumstances or in the existing relation of forces.

-The issue therefore after careful analysis amounts to this. Is the Congress as the Nation's major political organisation to remain as an idle spectator to the events which are now taking place with far reaching consequences affecting her citizens and give room for the suspicion of acting in a way sympathetic to Fascism contrary to the very purpose of its existence by reason of its adherence to a creed which it has not willingly adopted as its own or to throw away all such pretensions and act in a way that would help create a new history for the country and the world? Related to this issue is also the question whether the argument of non violence is sufficiently strong enough as not to warrant the country's participation in the struggle that is now being carried on with the declared object of defeating Fascism. To answer both these points I have tried in the preceding pages and if the average reader is still in doubt over the issue Violence or Non violence in the given circumstances I answer with the questions Freedom or Slavery Virtue or Vice Life or Death for you Sir?

---

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### THE COMMUNAL PROBLEM

It would not be enough if we say we should fight the war. On what basis, in what manner and to what ends we should fight are problems which need attention. The moment we decide to fight we are required to make far reaching arrangements at home to enable us to fight the war thoroughly and with determination. One of such arrangements is the solution of the communal problem particularly in regard to Hindu Muslim relations. This has evaded all sorts of attempts at solution, may be, due to the recalcitrant attitude of the leader of the Muslim League. I make this statement bearing in mind the fact that influential members of the Muslim League are as much anxious for the solution of the communal tension as some of the leaders of the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha are. It is also a fact that the common masses of both the communities are capable of sinking all their differences and uniting for a common cause as they have done previously on many occasions, but that the leaders of the communities are not so capable at the present juncture. The recognition of this fact will have important effects on the attempts to bring these two communities together. At the same time one must also admit that the Muslim League to a great extent represents the legitimate

aspirations of a large mass of Muslim population. These masses before the advent of the Muslim League were greatly sympathetic to the ideals of the Congress and then Congress used to be purely a political organisation. Since some of the Congress leaders began introducing into the fabric of the organisation mystical and religious sentiments alien to the Muslim minds these masses were gradually driven away from the Congress fold and with it went their potential leader Mr M. A. Jinnah. The blame therefore primarily rests with the Congress for isolating large masses of Muslims. Mr Jinnah only took advantage of the situation and exploited their religious fervour just as Gandhiji managed to appeal to the minds of large sections of Hindu population by his mystic utterances and behaviour. A cursory examination of Gandhiji's speeches and writings would reveal how far Gandhiji has made use of religion to win the masses. Jinnah has also done the same thing. Unenlightened masses of both the communities are prone to be won over by such subtleties and it is only political tactics that made both the leaders adopt the same method even though such tactics brought about their isolation. We have an example in the tactics of Adolf Hitler when he launched the campaign of anti-Bolshevism to win over the Western Democracies and thereby gain time for his plans. When it served his purpose he had no difficulty in throwing overboard all his past professions and in

striking a bargain with the very Bolsheviks. It is therefore not unreasonable to expect a change of front on the part of the Muslim League or the Congress, if either of the parties deems it necessary to adopt such a policy for its own benefit. As political observers, our task is to explore the possibilities of such a change of front and the premises on which such an understanding could be brought about.

The whole purpose of the independence movement whether by Muslims or Hindus is economic gain. Members of both the communities regard that under the rule of a foreign Government the national resources cannot be fully exploited for the purpose of enriching solely the citizens of the country. In addition to the commercial and industrial discrimination meted out by the foreign rulers there are restrictions regarding employment in the Army and the Navy. These various restrictions hinder the economic growth of both the communities. To remedy this the choice presented to them is the replacement of the present administration by a national one which would offer no such restriction, but would also give unstinted support for the development of various other national sources of income. Along with this would be the mental satisfaction of having a voice in the administration of their own country. Congress took the field with the declared object of gaining this sort of independence for the country and this the Muslims too welcomed. In

addition the Congress presented a vista of other economic gains to the masses by their progressive land policy and national planning. When these developments were taking place there gathered strength certain sinister movements within the Congress for giving the whole organisation a Hindu bias. Hindu ceremonial rituals and Hindu scriptures began to be adopted by the leaders of the Congress. Such a mastery of the Indian National Congress by Hindu politicians was facilitated by the intellectual backwardness of the Muslim community. This backwardness is evident even to-day and comparatively there are fewer national leaders (in the true sense) among the Muslims than the Hindus. This leaning on the part of the Congress was resented by large bodies of Muslims and they were I think justified in that. If the Conservatives in England were to adopt freely Catholic religious rites and sermons in the political concourses I think there would be serious depletion of the membership of that party. If such a depletion occurs it would be no justification for the leaders of that party to claim that since Catholics formed the majority of the members (of course this is not true of the Conservative Party in England) their ways and modes of thinking and living permeated the whole organisation. Such an analogy is true of the Congress. In India there are various communities all of them equally desirous of gaining independence for their country but they cannot be

expected to subscribe to the view that the results of such a gain should be the monopoly of the Hindus since that community is the largest. Hindu members of the Congress may go to the extent of saying that they contribute in a larger way to the progress of the cause, while the efforts of the minorities are characterised by a great amount of lassitude and disinterestedness. They also claim that these minorities often go to the extent of turning against the fighters for national freedom by whole heartedly supporting the enemies and running into the enemy's camp under the slightest pretext of Congress domination.

The attitude of the minorities can be explained in this way, that they are more and more afraid of the possibility of the Hindus as the major community dominating the whole political life and administration of the country when once the Congress is able to declare the country as independent. They cite as example, in justification of their fear, the attitude of the Congress leadership when that body as the major political organisation conducted the administration in a large number of the provinces quite recently. They also point out the Wardha schemes of Education, the Satyagraha conventions and the essentially Hindu religious background of all Congress activities. Parsis and the backward communities point out Prohibition as one such measure. However I am prepared to state that as far as the legislative measures adopted by the



Provincial Congress Ministries during their tenure of office are concerned none of them could be termed as measures of aggrandisement adopted by one community against the other though I cannot say the same about the utterances or other activities of these Ministers or the higher authorities controlling them. I believe the shouts of "Islam in Danger" "Minority Religions in Danger" heard during the latter half of the Congress regime related to this phase.

It is also evident that by this time the Congress has recognised its previous mistakes and Congress leaders are anxious to-day to rectify these as far as possible. This recognition in fact came some time back and Congress for the past few years have been trying to placate the minorities particularly the Muslim League under Mr Jinnah's leadership. But for this there was evidently no reason for the rise of the Hindu Mahasabha as a rival to the Muslim League and the Congress. When this change in the attitude of the Congress became marked the orthodox Hindu Nationalists wanted to stage a counter bluff to the Muslim League boggy with the result of the Indian political horizon becoming shrouded by the scrambles of these three organisations.

On close examination it would be found that the fears of both the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League are purely imaginary. "Islam in danger" is as much fictitious as the cry of "Hinduism in danger". Under the present circumstances it is very unlikely of

one community over-ruling the other. This can be true of the near future as well. Then why these organisations are trying so hard to create illusions, you might as well ask. The answer is since the Congress is getting into a rut the energies of the masses belonging to both the communities are stifled and which necessarily find a way out in the activities of these two organisations. The task of leading politically a nation is not much different from that of leading a group of school boys on an excursion. If you cannot hold the attention of the led in both the instances on the distant objective sufficiently, there is the likelihood of the grownups and the boys straying away and finding erstwhile pastimes on the way. The masses are endowed with certain amount of impatience in all their actions, which of course is but natural. What is needed is to captivate once again their attention with the prospect of a definite object and lead them to that object with will and determination. The whole theory of Fascist technique is based on this psychological factor and Fascist Dictators carry out all their actions with the intent of dramatically focussing the attention of the whole masses on one object for the time being. It is no use sitting on our backs and throwing abuses at these Dictators for their mastery of the human psychology and the success they make out of it. India can be led on the road to Fascism quite easily enough, provided there is a sufficiently strong hand to lead it. The

heterogeneous masses are in a particularly good mood to be trapped by the evil genius of a Fascist Dictator and once they are trapped quite a dangerous concoction could be made of them. Such a mass is equally susceptible to be carried away by emotion and if that emotion be of the right type they can be led to glory as well with equal ease. It therefore is only a question as to which type of persons take control of the situation. In such a dangerous situation Congress must fall the historical task of giving a correct lead to the country. Steering a course midway between the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League rightly speaking Congress is the only organisation which can by certain changes in its policies inspire confidence in the minds of both the communities. Moreover it is an organisation built by the spontaneous efforts of both the communities and has assumed a great amount of importance within the country. Its success as an organisation depends on its mass support and as a righteous corollary the Congress should at the appropriate moment express the will of the masses rather than retreat to the background. If the organisation fails at the present moment to be guided by these principles there is no justification on the part of the mass to desire its survival after this fateful hour. In averting such an ignominious end lies our hope and if that hope also vanishes woe befall its leaders and the country on the whole. Anything which stands in the way of the Congress in this matter must be ended.

whether it be Gandhism or reactionary communalism Gandhism as a phenomenon can and will be ended provided the masses are given the opportunity to understand the real implications of this sinister creed. The anti-toxins for this are scientific progress, unfettered economic and industrial development and the general enlightenment of the masses, combated by which forces Gandhism would fade away soon from the Indian body politic. If any trace is left behind it would be by way of respectful memory to the moral personality of Mahatma Gandhi and not by way of remnants of his political Philosophy.

For the purpose of giving a correct lead to the country at this juncture, the points which need the immediate attention of the Indian National Congress are the following. In the first place the Congress should reaffirm its faith in the economic and political programmes and make an emphatic denial that in future no side-tracking of these issues would be allowed by pursuit of pseudo-religious activities by Congress leaders and Office-bearers. Opportunity should be given for the rank and file of the Congress to form their own opinion about the present international situation particularly in regard to the problems affecting India's defence, by open discussion preferably at a session of the Congress to be convened immediately. If the calling of a session of the Congress at this moment seems impracticable, opportunity should be given to the

members of the All India Congress Committee to review the situation and form their judgement. The Congress should call off the Satyagraha campaign and declare national defence as the immediate object. Towards this the Congress should once again take Offices and carry on the administration either independently in the case of those Provinces where Congress Ministries can carry a majority or jointly with the Mahasabha and the Muslim League where the Congress cannot have such a majority. Negotiations for such a working alliance with these two communal organisations should be commenced forthwith and if the Muslim League refuses to any such parleys except on the terms that the Congress admits to represent solely the Hindus and denies its non-communal character a manifesto on the signature of the members of the Working Committee should be issued addressed to the Muslim masses stating the terms fully with particular emphasis on the Congress aims and programmes. In this event the reactionary tactics of the Muslim League would be exposed and all those Muslims who are sincere about their professions regarding India's Independence would willingly take sides with the Congress. The Congress to vindicate its full faith and sincerity in the cause of the uplift of the Indian Mussalmans in a way equal to its concern over the Hindus should give opportunity for more and more of Muslims to be elected as its Office bearers and a large number of seats should be allotted to Congress

Muslims in the distribution of Ministerial portfolios. These alone would considerably undermine the influence of the Muslim League and its claim to represent the majority of Mussalmans of India would be thrown to the wind. Any recrudescence of communal riots fomented by way of retaliatory measures should be effectively suppressed by offering the maximum punishment to the miscreants and severe sentences to all Muslim or Hindu Leaders suspected of lending support to the activities of such miscreants irrespective of their political standing and wealth. Adequate military and police protection should be afforded to the public and by all these means it should be brought home to the minds of all citizens, lawful or unlawful that the Congress means business this time and no sort of sentiment would stop the Congress from exercising its righteous discretion. Congress should also declare that it proposes not to carry out any legislative measures calculated to affect the minorities religiously or otherwise without referring such proposed measures to a Minority Commission to be set up jointly by the Congress and other representative minority organisations. Congress should have as its nominees only Muslim members of the Congress having the best reputation for impartial and sound judgement capable of commanding wide respect among the Muslim masses. Congress' intention in these respects should be not to placate the Khan Bahadurs and Khan Sahebs who have found safe

places at the Muslim League Card table but to really satisfy the needs and aspirations of the Muslim masses just as those of other communities including Hindus. During the period of the war the Congress Ministries and other coalition Ministries wherever formed should only press on with economic measures calculated to alleviate the poverty of the masses and to strengthen the country's defences by extensive armament building and fortification programmes. Educational and other social measures should be suspended during the interim period till normal times are restored. A nominated minority commission is suggested on account of the fact that an elective body cannot be convened without effecting far reaching changes in the present Constitution. Such an elective permanent minority commission can only be formed after the present emergency circumstances when the menacing forces threatening the country's security are completely annihilated. Congress by vigorous anti Fascist propaganda should mobilise all democratic elements in the country to take part in the defence programme and form Citizens Committees to actively co-operate with the Government in the upkeep of law and order. Village committees and other Congress primary units should be so organised as to be capable of inspiring the greatest confidence in the masses and of maintaining law and order in the respective areas even if there happens to be a breakdown of the present services. With such an objective outlook and inforced

by courage and determination these units should begin to be regarded by the whole population as custodians of public tranquility and order in future and the heralds of a new era of peace and prosperity for the country

Contrary to expectations, if the Muslim League agrees to discuss terms with the Congress presently, I think, the Congress should offer the following terms. First that the Congress is willing to take the Muslim League into the fullest confidence regarding the administration of the country and as proof for such willingness Congress is prepared to allot Ministerial seats to Muslim League nominees in all the Provinces proportionate to the membership of the Muslim League in the Provinces concerned as compared to that of the Congress. For this purpose the Congress and the Muslim League should be prepared to collect and make public their respective numerical following in all the Provinces. In those Provinces where inspite of a Muslim majority of population, the membership of the League falls below the standard, the Congress should agree to bring up the number of Muslim Ministers to their due proportionate share in the administration by nominating Congress Muslims for the rest of the number over and above the seats legitimately belonging to the League by virtue of its numerical following in the area concerned. Where Hindu Mahasabha or any other Communal organisation is a serious rival from the point of view of numerical following some sort of similar



arrangement should be arrived at to form a stable Ministry in the Province. There coalition or joint Ministries by whatever names you propose to call them should agree to work under the direction of a Parliamentary Board composed of members nominated by the Congress the Muslim League the Hindu Mahasabha and a few other prominent communal or political organisations according to their numerical following. When I write this I have in mind the Depressed Classes but under any circumstances the importance assigned to all such organisations should be on the basis of actual following counted by numbers and not by the standard of the tall claims made by the Leaders. There are many such organisations virtually non-existent their only strength being the strength of the vocal chords of their respective Leaders. The composition of this Parliamentary Board should be on the basis of the all India following of the Muslim League the Hindu Mahasabha and the Congress giving representation and weightage to the various communities according to their proportionate strength derived from census figures. A concrete example is given to indicate the composition the author has in view. Let us assume that the total population of India is the round figure 100 composed of 60 Hindus 30 Mussalmans and 10 other communities. Let us also suppose that out of these Congress has a following of 40 members of which 30 are Hindus 8 Muslims and 2 other communities. The Muslim League

has a following of 20 members, and the Hindu Mahasabha another 10 members. Let us fix the total number of the members of the Parliamentary Board to be 10 in which case according to the census figures the proportionate representation for the communities on the Board would be on the basis of 6 Hindus, 3 Mussalmans and 1 other community man. The representation according to the numerical strength of the Congress, the Mahasabha and the League on the Board would at the same time be as 5 Congressmen, 3 Muslim Leaguers and 1 Hindu Mahasabhite leaving aside the reserved other community man alone. Of the five Congressmen on the Board according to the weightage proposed by me one would be a Muslim taking into consideration the ratio of 30 Hindus to 8 Muslims out of a total membership of 40 for the Congress. According to this the membership of the Parliamentary Board would be recast as 4 Congress Hindus, 1 Hindu Mahasabhite, 1 Congress Muslim, 3 Muslim League and 1 other community. In this composite Board supposing that the Hindu Mahasabha man is willing to sink all his differences with the Congress, the Hindus will have only five members as against 4 Muslims, though by numerical strength based on census figures they are entitled to 6 seats as against 4 Muslims. If the Muslim League is capable of coming to an alliance with any other two members in the body they may become equal to the Congress and thus create a deadlock. I think for such representation the Muslim

League Leaders cannot have any objection since they are offered more than what they can legitimately claim at the expense of the Hindu community. Moreover they gain the additional security of further support from the other members in the event of the Congress threatening to proceed with an entirely unjustified and provocative measure to which the other members may reasonably be expected to stand against. In my example however I have taken entirely arbitrary figures which bear no resemblance to the actual strength of the various Communities and Parties.

The purpose of such a Board would be functional and to an extent disciplinary. The Ministerial members would be selected by the Working Committees of the respective organisations for example the Working Committees of the Indian National Congress, the Hindu Mahasabha and the All India Muslim League. The Board would have no authority to sit on judgement on the discretions of these Working Committees and hence these organisations would be still retaining their independent nature. So also in the event of disciplinary action being taken by a majority decision of the Parliamentary Board against any one Minister, the next incumbent would be selected by the Working Committee of either the Indian National Congress, the All India Muslim League or the Hindu Mahasabha according as to whose nominee has been so subjected to disciplinary action and not by the Parliamentary Board.

The functionary work of this composite Parliamentary Board would be to carry on the programme settled upon by all the three organisations prior to coming to an agreement on the above terms. The programme should be drawn out as to include the more pressing needs of all the communities as embodied in the political programmes of these organisations. These, for the duration of the war, should as far as possible include only economic measures and not socio-religious measures. Added to such a selection would be the needs of the defence work and the armament programme. To come to a satisfactory settlement on these problems I do not think there can be any serious tussle, perhaps, none at all. These measures can in no way turn out to be detrimental to the minorities, and thus there can arise no question of one community riding rough shod over the other. Instead, all the communities would stand to gain by the carrying out of such a programme. If any body still cares to shout "Islam in Danger" or "Minorities in Danger" they should be consigned forthwith to the lunatic asylum or criminal reformatory schools, if we do not attempt at building a replica of the German concentration camp though these people deserve it.

I should like the programme to be settled and agreed upon between all these organisations before going to the polls. Unless a general election takes place there can be very little chance of arriving at any

communal settlement. Many persons might argue that the Congress, the Mahasabha and the League should fight on their present issue, at a forthcoming election so that these bodies would be in a position to vindicate their stand by verdict of the electorate. In such an event it would be still more difficult to come to any sort of working arrangement. If one or more of these organisations fail to reach the requisite standard the winning party would be in no mood to accommodate the other nor would the losing parties be in a position to present a convincing case. On the other hand the presentation of a definite programme would inspire a great amount of confidence and mutual goodwill in the minds of the public and the concerted propaganda before the elections would allay communal distrust. Under the present delicate situation to allow these organisations to fight the elections on their independent stands would mean the fanning of the smouldering communal fire with the wind of rival communal propaganda at the time of the elections and this would result in disturbances on a scale far more serious than hitherto experienced.

Of course my last argument can only take effect if the Government agree to call a general election by dissolving the present Legislatures. If the Government insist that the present Legislatures should continue to function certain modifications in the plan outlined above need be made. A detailed study of the whole

problem would require a more elaborate thesis than the scope of the present work, and an attempt at which must necessarily be reserved for another occasion. However, the modifications needed would not be so drastic as to set aside the whole purport of the plan.

Reverting to disciplinary function of the composite Parliamentary Board, I venture to suggest that a rigorous censorship should be enforced on the Ministers and also on the individual members of the Board that none of them should indulge in any sort of disparaging remarks or statements regarding members of another Community. Contravention of this provision should be severely dealt with by taking disciplinary action against such members. If this censorship could be extended to all the office-bearers of these organisations during the war so much the better. Mr X a Muslim can be permitted to speak something in favour of the Hindus but cannot be permitted to speak anything against the Hindus. He can be permitted to criticize the shortcomings of Muslims but if he has to criticize the shortcomings of Hindus he should do so through the agency of a Co-Minister who is a Hindu. In the same way Hindu Ministers must be subjected to a similar code of discipline. This precaution is suggested to preclude the recurrence of the mistakes which were committed in the past.

Orthodox Hindu members of the Congress would severely criticize my plan, so also the members of the

League (the latter two organisations shorn off the Rao-Bahadurs, Dewan-Bahadurs, Khan-Bahadurs and Khan-Sahebs would present very sorry spectacles), the Congress should act and think in terms of the masses. If the Congress is prepared to lay all its cards open on the table and declare the Congress intentions unequivocally I believe the masses irrespective of the fact whether they are Muslims or Hindus would find the Congress stand more correct and appealing to their good senses than the pretensions of any other organisation. Sincere intentions on the part of the Congress to treat the Muslim masses and the Hindu masses on equal terms would cut the roots of the Muslim League right below the ground and in no time that body would be consigned to the back-ground along with many other erstwhile groups. My suggestion is meant as such a bold example and its execution needs unprecedented courage on the part of the Congress Leadership, but the results would also be equally staggering and successful.

One passing remark must be made about the Pakistan scheme over which there is so much of controversy now. I admit it is a dangerous proposition. The mere scheme is not dangerous, but the way it is presented by the Muslim League leaders has something sinister about it. Cultural autonomy for different nationalities is not a harmful proposition, instead, it is a very sound and desirable one. Lenin propounded the scheme very thoroughly and the present-day Soviet

Union has adopted Lenin's dictum in solving its minority problem. The solution has been successful in the U S S R. can be gauged from the existing solidarity of the various autonomous Republics in the Union all of them pursuing one common aim. But Pakistanism does not aim purely such a cultural autonomy as presented above. It aims something more. The undercurrents of Pakistan lie in Pan Arabism and Pan Islamism, the two schemes buried for some time past but resurrected by Fascist propagandists in Rome and Berlin and energetically propagated through agencies like *Jamiat-e Muslimin* and *El-Nadi-el-Arabi* with head quarters in Berlin to split the Eastern Hemisphere into two or more antagonistic groups. Pan-Arabism and Pan Islamism are calculated to bring about another rival Empire throughout the world composed of Islamic Nations or peoples with Arabic descent to fight the existing Empires from within. Perusal of literature on Pakistan scheme bears out fully this suspicion and if Fascism is allowed to have another gasp the day would not be far off when India would be split into two rival camps one fighting by the side of Nazis as Saviours of Islamic Nationalism and the other in alliance with the British fighting to retain the present democratic structure. The propagandists of Pakistan are inspired by the Fascist ideals that a wrong perpetuated for a sufficiently long time would tend to be regarded as right and a lie repeated many times would gain the authority of an



axiom Hitler has expounded this theory in his *Mein Kampf* in the words

“The magnitude of a lie is always a certain factor in making it believed, for the great masses of the nation are at the bottom of their hearts more apt to be merely demoralized than consciously and purposely bad. Consequently, they more easily fall a prey to a big lie than to a small one, since they themselves often tell petty lies, but would be restrained by shame from too big a one”

The effect of such propaganda method is evident from the public appreciation of the scheme, Pakistan. When the suggestion was first mooted even some of the Muslim League leaders thought it a preposterous claim and the lay public regarded the assertion that the Hindus and the Muslims are two separate irreconcilable nations as a monstrous lie. But to-day by ceaseless application of propaganda vast sections of people have begun to think that there is some substance in the Muslim League claim, and the day would not be far off when this section would go out to stake their lives for the culmination of this preposterous claim.

I do not wish to charge all the Muslim League leaders as accomplices in this dangerous activity. They are innocent victims to Nazi machinations and wire pulling. Some of the members at the same time have become active agents of the Nazi fifth column. The Government of India had reason to suspect the activities of certain Muslim organisations in the country,

who were actively preparing to carry out the Muslim League claims of Pakistan into effect and set up a Military regime on these models. The pity is that these persons who regard co-operation with the National Government of India composed of Muslims and Hindus an outrage and injustice are prepared to go all the way out to become tools and allies of demonical Fascist reactionaries and regard that as highly honourable and commensurate with Islamic traditions. They are only plotting like the Iron Guards in Rumania, the *Cagoulards* in France the *Ustachi* and *Kulturbund* in Yugoslavia the *Heimatbund* and *Dinasos* in Belgium *Landesgruppe* Dane-mark in Denmark and various other minority and cultural groups in almost all the countries of Europe Asia and America with the high hopes of setting up puppet Fuehrers all throughout the world

Not only Muslims have been subjected to this systematic propaganda Hindus with pro-Fascist leaning and Congressmen with dictatorial aspirations are beginning to sympathise with these activities. It is only regrettable that such dangerous sympathies should be allowed to exist without being nipped in the bud

Exploitation and exaggeration of minority claims are tried plans in the Nazi Blue Book. The extent of these highly dangerous activities can be gauged from the success of disruptive movements in all the European countries. The Nazi tactics is to split the country on which they have aggressive intentions internally first,

and then to pounce upon when the civilian morale is at the lowest ebb. It is for these reasons I have expressed the gravest warning against the continuance of the present state of communal dissensions. The Muslim League and the other communal organisations may be innocently voicing their claims for cultural autonomy but there is the likelihood of the situation getting out of the control of the present leaders of these organisations. Enemy agents through local sympathisers may oust the present leaders and implant their own leaders with all their might and propaganda technique to create an entirely new outlook for the masses. I admit my entreaties or solution can have no desired effect and people may even question my competence to put forth such claims. My right is only a sincere desire to see the country march towards progress and freedom instead of being disrupted politically and economically by dissensions within its frontiers. When we are planning the world to assume more unified shape than hitherto existing, to facilitate allround progress, it is no use trying to split the nations composing such a world into disproportionate halves and antagonistic creeds. We should aim at patching up things and cementing strained relations instead of separating the parts tending to break. The latter procedure will only assist disintegration and consequential ruin of all the present national entities and the rise of evil forces in the wake of such a calamity to throw back the world into the abyss of pre-historic barbarism.

## CHAPTER NINE

### THE FUTILITY OF PEACE TALKS

Ever since the flight under mysterious circumstances to England of Rudolf Hess the Deputy Fuehrer of Germany there have been waves after waves of peace talks emanating from all possible sources strangely conceived. The writer wrote a letter to the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* on May 17 1941 few days after the incident hazarding a guess of the real implications of the arrival of this Nazi personage which has proved correct. This letter was not published by the Editors for reasons best known to them and the writer thought of adding it as an appendix to this volume but could not get back the letter from the paper in spite of repeated requests in writing. I ventured to express in that letter that Rudolf Hess took the initiative to leave Germany not by any sort of disillusionment or perfidy but through the actual connivance of the Nazi leaders. I also stated that the Nazis were preparing for an attack on Russia and that all their campaigns in the Balkans, Syria and Iraq were carried out with the intention of encircling the Soviet Union and not as a threat against Britain or British possessions for the time being. As a precautionary measure against this move I cited the leasing of a dozen Aerodromes in Iran by Russia and reported Russian troop movements. It was also pointed

It must be considered that this argument was made at a time when the Press and the public, deliberately inspired by the officials in the know of the Hitler episode were bristling with the assertions that Hitler had come as an escape from, Nazi tyranny and that he was disillusioned by Hitler's rapprochement with Russian Bolshevism and that plans were complete for more full and complete co-operation between Germany and Russia whereby each one of them would proceed with a series of aggressive campaigns in the spheres of influence assigned to the respective parties to the agreement. To the Russian sphere of influence, it was also asserted, were assigned India, Iran and Afghanistan. In such circumstances I could very well imagine the consternation that would have been created by my analysis of the situation in the minds of the public and of the Editors concerned.

However subsequent events proved that my vision was correct and the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* came

out with an editorial, one month after on June 22 1941 under the caption Why this Silence demanding an explanation from the British Cabinet regarding the message brought by Hess and which ended with the warning

"The Hess affair is a solemn warning to those who are fighting for democracy and freedom. We cannot believe that in a democracy anything should happen about which Parliament should be deliberately kept in the dark but diplomatic exchanges should take place between the British Government and the foreign Powers. This is in a way a tribute to Hitler's technique for democracy cannot thrive on diplomatic secrecy or regimentation of the Press and propaganda machine. In the approved totalitarian style. A grave situation has arisen and Hess is only a link in the chain.

This editorial deserves to be studied by all for it contains observations like "There was a widespread rumour which has not been dispelled by subsequent war developments that there was something like a spiritual bond between the exponents of the totalitarian regime in Germany and an influential section of the British aristocracy who would strive for peace at all costs. Representatives of these men and women had held high positions in the Baldwin Cabinet, came to dominate the policy of the Chamberlain Government and claim to assert themselves even to-day in the direction of policy. And it also contains the huge

question mark "Are these men muddling in connection with the Hess episode ? Are they still on the saddle in Britain ?"

My letter also drew pointed attention to Mr Churchill's silence and President Roosevelt's last minute cancellations of important declarations and the constant secret diplomatic exchanges. My assumption of sinister implications in the visit was guided by these pointers and I have no grudge against the Editors of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* since they have given expression to identical views, though a bit late. The purpose of my once again drawing attention to this is to fortify public opinion against the demoralising effect of possible peace offensives. Even to-day the British Cabinet is keeping secret the exact nature of the proposals conveyed by Rudolf Hess and important members of the Cabinet still try to dismiss any legitimate queries regarding the same with such remarks as "no one cares a cuss about Hess." I ask them, then why do they care so much about Hess, and take care to see that every thing connected with the proposals he brought from the Fuehrer's headquarters should be shrouded in mystery.

It is reasonably to be anticipated that as the campaign in Russia proceeds, the peace offensive will also gain momentum. This time it would be more in the Americas and the British capital. By that time circumstances would have so altered as to make public the proposals brought by Rudolf Hess a reasonable

proposition. In the meantime the assistance to Russia would be so timed as to be of practically little importance to Russia. This would be explained as being due to fear of opinion becoming divided in England and America over the issue. I think for all these Hitler would have reason to congratulate himself.

In view of these one has to treat with reservation all sorts of peace proposals emanating from neutral as well as enemy sources. On close scrutiny it would be found that all of them are inspired by enemy propaganda and not by any desire of the common folk of any of the democratic countries. What would be the nature of such peace proposals? Hitler would most probably propose that he would renounce his claims to annex the countries now occupied by him for example Yugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Belgium, Denmark and Norway. He would suggest that the present Governments in these countries should be allowed to carry on and if so desired by Vichy he would also consider a revision of the present boundaries of occupied France. These proposals would be substantiated by independent declarations by the present Governments of all these countries who would unconditionally support Hitler's injunctions in this regard. He would also go to the extent of saying himself or manage others, probably neutral countries, to tell on his behalf that all these proposals go to prove his unselfishness and unaggressive and peaceful intentions.



since by such an act, he would be renouncing his rightful claim to keep what he has conquered by sacrifice of precious German blood and money Hitler has already made known his plans regarding the sharing of conquered Russia These according to the Stockholm correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* quoting Nazi official circles are as follows

“1 Fuehrer would be content with the capture of the Baltic States, Leningrad, the Ukraine, Russian occupied poland and the remainder of Russia as far as Urals This would put an end to “more territorial demands in Europe”

2 Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia to be independent under German protection like Slovakia,

3- Rumania, Hungary, Slovakia and Finland to receive an enlargement of their territory

4 A white Russian State to be formed south of the Baltic States extending to Moscow, possibly including that city

5 A “Free” Ukraine, German controlled and under the nominal leadership of the former Hetman Skoropadsky

6 Independent Caucasian, Georgian and Armenian States, all German controlled and garrisoned

7 All these areas having German Garrisons and under German industrial control to act as suppliers of food and oil to the Reich”

What noble ideas for the Fuehrer to conceive !

All these small countries to benefit at the expense of Germany since Russia of course can have no right for existence for they have an unholy regime !

The City of London and the big guys of Wall Street would begin to convince themselves that these are all reasonable proposals provided of course the Fuehrer agrees to give them the contracts to arm, feed and clothe all these nationals. They would also try to convince their respective Governments that these are all quite fine since these Governments are no longer needed to be vigilant over the Communist menace and that Capitalism would have another lease of life with the restoration of such fine territories to its possession. Sumner Wells declared at the International Wheat Conference the other day that billions of Dollars worth of wheat would be found hanging in the hands of producers without any outlet for sale ere long. I think, instead of talking spaciouly on Freedom New York and English businessmen would like to dispose of their surplus stocks as early as possible.

Let us examine what would be the effect of conceding to such a peace proposal. None of the countries on the Continent would remain independent even after a formal declaration of independence not even Italy. The Governments of all these countries are the mouth pieces of the Nazi Party lackeys employed by Hitler to carry out his instructions. Their main task is to plunder innocent citizens of their everything including their

freedom and make presentation of such plunderings to their masters, the Nazi supermen, trained in the detestable sadistic schools tearing rats and other small animals as routine curriculum to gain proficiency and callousness to murder ruthlessly innocent men and women. The truce on such terms will only be a preparation for another war to annihilate the remaining traces of Democracy in the British Isles, America and probably Australia. But, it is unlikely, there would be left any trace of Democracy in England if the English concede to accept peace on such terms. By the very act, English Democracy will have mortgaged itself into the hands of its businessmen and the aristocracy who would naturally invoke the assistance of a Mosley or some other puppet Fuehrer to keep order for them to carry on their joint plundering. Then Hitler does not need any military conquest of England and all that would be left for him to conquer would be America. The only anti-toxin left in the world for Fascism, that is Communism, would be completely wiped out, by then. There would be no question of oppressed nations and oppressed nationalities, none would dare say so. Everything will be subordinate to the Nazi will to live and every territory on earth will constitute their living space.

The citizens of England and America, I doubt will ever agree for such a sell out. The chances for defeating Hitler are to-day greater than ever. A month

ago that was not the case and if the Democracies do not take opportunity of the present favourable circumstances there is very little hope of Democracy surviving the trial. They have to think in terms of to-morrow and not to-day. To-day's trials and miseries no doubt, are very great, but Englishmen your trials yesterday were greater and more tragic. There are more Comrades in Arms now and you consequently stand to shoulder a lesser burden. You must think vultures are around the place. There is no peace now. If you do not show *life you will be torn to pieces and eaten up*. The tension and dreariness of the present add only to the pervading sense of oppression. It is no relief. It is killing.

---

## CHAPTER TEN

### THE STRUGGLE OF THE OPPRESSED NATIONS

We must consider at this juncture the future of the oppressed nations, particularly India. No doubt the war is a definite set back to the cause of democracy even in the most democratic countries and it can well be imagined how it will affect a country like India where democracy is more in talk than in deeds. I must concede in this respect to Prof Joad's dramatic description of the effects of war on civilian life. Prof Joad in a denunciation of war in his book, *Why War* writes

"A visit to the Grill Room of a West End Hotel during the last war would have opened the eyes of those who still maintain that war has a moral, a cleansing, or a purifying effect upon a nation. There were visible for all to see the men to whom the war had brought power, prominence and wealth. Profiteers rank and lush, and uniformed jacks in office guzzled and swilled and chattered of the profits the war had brought them. The daughters of the aristocratic poor paraded their attractions before the fishy eyes of the newly enriched."

This rise of the scum and refuse of society to the top in war time, which is as much true in England, New York, Berlin and all throughout India and the world, except in Soviet Russia perhaps, presents only a

lesser evil. The more serious evil is the curtailment of civilian liberty by all sorts of Defence Acts and Ordinances invoked by special sanction emergency powers and what not to meet the exigencies of war time. These measures it is said are indispensable for the defence of the country and the security of the people but what sort of security would be left for the people when they are ordered to surrender their everything to the Military is ununderstandable. Rigorous censorship of the Press and public utterances are imposed and freedom of association and speech are denied to the people. Still all this in the name of freedom and democracy and the citizen naturally asks if for this type of freedom and democracy we are asked to fight are these worth fighting for. This only duplicates Fascism at home and Fascism cannot be fought by adapting Fascism.

The substance of democracy lies in the fact that the Military is set up to serve the civilian population and not to dictate to the people and the Government. They are to obey the commands of the people and the people's Government to defend the rights of the people against usurpers. On the contrary if the military takes over the command of the people such act measured by democratic standards has to be regarded as rude and preposterous as the Chief of the Governor's Body Guard taking charge of the administration. Ever since the Mutiny Act in England it has been the rule of law that Military Chiefs every year should go to

the House of Commons and receive Parliamentary sanction for their continued existence. On this measure has depended the democratic nature of the British Constitution which rules out as long as the Act remains in force the possibility of military despotism taking control of civilian affairs. In the face of such a measure Mr Michael Foot in a much discussed article depicts the situation in present day England

“Never again was England threatened by a military dictatorship, or even by the lesser, but more insidious, encroachment of military power into civil life. Never until to-day”

Mr Foot continues to ask

“How powerful is the man, whose control over nearly three millions of his best fellow-citizens is absolute ! How easy to suggest, in the name of efficiency, order and discipline, that he should be allowed to establish a military system on the best Teuton model ! A British Potsdam instead of a British Parliament, Major Generals instead of Regional Commissioners”

This is the penalty of thoughtless action. In France a rigorous Military censorship helped the ruling clique to sell out the country. France was the birth place of Democracy and to the French people Liberty, Equality and Fraternity formed the Trinity ever since the days of the revolution. Still the people were helpless and it was only their helplessness that assisted their rulers to sabotage freedom on a national scale. With the example

of France before the world can people everywhere still feign to be unaware of the dangers they invite by letting others do the task they ought to do themselves. The man in the street is often obsessed with the idea that once he casts his vote in favour of one man his share in the administration is over and it is that other man's job to look after the country's welfare. In the event of an emergency he surrenders his liberty his very existence including his personal possessions to that other man or the Government he represents to do what they like with all these. The effect of panic on man's reasoning capacities can find no better example.

I do not mean to say that men in national emergency should not surrender their everything for the sake of their country. I only suggest that they should also consider whether by such an action they help the cause of the country or the reverse. They have a right to ask of those people who call forth such a surrender their competence to utilise it to the advantage of the country and their honesty of purpose. If they lack both then there is no sense in surrendering things precious to oneself.

We in India have more reason to be afraid of thoughtlessness. If we surrender what little liberty we have it will take years of begging to get a trace of it restored. Emergencies can be prolonged if that suits the purpose or excuses dug out from legal archives to perpetuate measures of erstwhile importance. Many of



the ordinances may become permanent on the Statute Book The measures to-day go to make us tongue-tied, restrict our movements and put us into captivity without the right of being heard for offences which may not be offences at all To speak that we want freedom, to meet persons whom we would like to meet in larger numbers, to write about things which actually take place, to wish to share our comforts with our comrades equally, all these can be offences to-day Why it has become so ? We were thoughtless, when we withdrew our representatives from the Government Even though they would not have been able to help us much, they would have atleast tried to mitigate the rigours of the oppression to-day They would have asked us to shut our mouths but not put cotton wool into our mouths, they would have asked us not to write ill of others, but they would not have surely cut our hands for that

In this war we leave much of our things to others That is our mistake They are not going to win the war for us If they are capable of it they wouldn't have driven us to it If the war is lost we stand to lose our everything Perhaps that might be a victory to them It is our war, the peoples war and it must be won by us If Fascism is defeated by our own efforts there will be nothing left to stop us from having our way

Oppressed nations have their share in this war By helping to defeat Fascism they are helping to loosen the grip of others on them By invoking the aid of

Fascist Imperialist nations are trying to gain a further lease of life. By smashing that ally we leave them with no other weapon to hold us down. There will be less justification for adopting Fascist methods than at present and lesser means of application. Imperialism will have spent itself so much that its very existence will be an obligation worth liquidating. An example of how far this has taken place actually can be seen from the present day relation of Britain to its dominions: Canada, Australia and South Africa. But for the Russian intervention Britain would have found herself at the mercy of the Dominions and made an unprecedented phenomenon in history. Even under the present circumstances the mother country by the time the war is brought to a successful conclusion would be dependent so much on her children that the children would find it a necessity to disclaim their parentage to have a peaceful existence. Then it would fall to us Indians to feed our infirm mistress and if we say no she can't coerce us much longer. By assisting the defeat of Fascism we shall have made our ties with our allies stronger and more complete and our alliance alone will probably be the most lasting contribution to peace throughout the world. Asia will be unified in the face of a withering Europe.

Guided by this vision the struggle of the oppressed nations must take a new turn. Every fresh encroachment of Fascism on the Asiatic continent must be

strongly resisted To us Fascism holds greater danger than Imperialism, to combat the forces of which even an alliance with Imperialism may prove helpful in the same way as Parliamentarianism finds it worthwhile to day to join hands with Communism to fight the menace

Mere realisation of the theme is not enough unless it takes some practical shape To-day our struggle is being waged by the Soviet Union in the West and China in the East Britain is still an interested on looker, so also America The brunt of the fighting falls on the former two nations and it should be our task to relieve their hardship They need more than our moral sympathy now, they need our practical help In what form can our help reach them, you may question, My answer to that is, by our being prepared one and all here to meet the menace, we reinforce their spirit and increase the depth of the fighting line At the same time we help the British to carry some of the standing forces here to the actual theatres of the war These are the practical ways of carrying out the struggle of the oppressed nations It is a mistaken impression to regard that mere complaining by word of mouth constitutes our struggle Every opportunity to increase our striking force must be seized just as the fighting front is growing in extent By that alone Democracy can be saved and can we gain our Freedom

We have to think not in terms of an endless war It is now certain that with the combined might of Britain,

Russia and America Germany and along with it Fascism are going to be defeated That eventuality is not a distant prospect now The defeat of Fascism may be as sudden and unthought of as its victories have been That is why we have to think of a peacetime now and our share in the peacetime reconstruction Unless Russia is capable of retaining a major portion of her present strength which is very unlikely peace negotiations will be dominated by British and American interests as these two countries will be spared the rigours of major encounters and consequently left with reserve energy and strength Measured by our present contribution to the struggle our say in the peace negotiations would be the nose of a Sicilian rather than occupying a seat at the tail of a British Minister Such a peace as far as India is concerned may be worse than a war and its conclusion would only bring in a series of economic repressions and exactions on this poor country To-day every British Official, beginning with the Prime Minister down to the clerk at the Imperial Secretariat at New Delhi, enthusiastically affirms that India is wholly with Britain in the war The same Official finds no hesitation in also saying that India's men materials and money are contributing much to decide the issues of war favourably to Britain But as peace draws nearer all these utterances may be compelled to take a different turn Instead of the Punjab and its warriors the philanthropy of Indian Princes and the

mighty contributions of the country, Mr Gandhi and his Wardha, the prison cells of India and the *Satyagrahi's* obstructionist tactics would occupy the picture and the tragedies of futile war resistance would be multiplied on the typewriters of the British Propaganda Ministry. All this would prove our worthlessness to enjoy a real peace, atleast so, those men in the wigs would decide.

Can such a picture of the peace conference be changed. Can the sustenance of Russia and China be prolonged to enable them to have sufficient energy to stand up at the peace table. Can we too have a representative of ours who will not be afraid to stand up and speak the truth and to say all about us, our share, our rights and our cause? The whole purpose of the book is to enable us to give the answer, we can. It is not always comforting to tell the truth and often it becomes necessary to conceal it. At times these are ugly, but very vital and their value is judged by the consequences one has to suffer by disregarding such truths. May be, truth has lost its charm because men parade with truths, which as Maxim Gorky puts it "are born by lies and possess all the elements of that poisonous untruth which, having distorted the relations of man with man, has made of life a hell, atonce filthy and absurd."

If not for anything else, at least for strengthening our position at the time of peace, we must take part in the struggle now. That would save us from the stigma

that standing in need of freedom we refused to fight for it. There are presently schemes which aim at joint exploitation of backward and undeveloped countries. Pretty words may however be used to cover such ideas but the purpose remains the same. There are large number of politicians British and American who visualise the world after the war as a whole Colony jointly administered by Britain and America as prize for their efforts in salvaging Democracy as they understand it. The whole of Asia including China and Russia and all the countries of Europe would be brought under this domination, conveniently termed a Union just as an Anglo-French joint commission came to be termed as the League of Nations. Schemes are all well begun with high motives but the working tells quite a different tale. To escape falling victims to such schemes which can only mean further servitude we must exert to convert this into a people's war fought by peoples of the world for establishing the rights of people as opposed to those of our overlords. In converting the war into such a struggle for the perpetuation of people's rights lies our hope.



## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### A RE-STATEMENT OF THE CASE

After having analysed, argued and catalogued the issues involved, I beg leave to restate the whole of my case for support in this war

1 Though the war started, under strange circumstances to settle the claims of rival Imperialisms, it no longer is an Imperialistic war. Moreover by the entry of the Soviet Union into the conflict the war has taken a new shape and a new purpose as regards the Indian masses are concerned

2 The war as it develops holds serious threats against the safety of India, and the actual front may ere long be shifted very near the frontiers of India. From the military stand point the combined encroachment by Germany and Japan of the Asiatic continent is a prelude to more far reaching operations including the conquest of India

3 Fascism to-day threatens to envelope the whole globe and to subject every race and nationality to its will. India as an undeveloped country will be ruthlessly exploited if ever India happens to fall under the Fascist heel, resulting in untold misery, poverty and denial of elementary rights of freedom for its citizens

4. Since Britain and Russia are fighting to overthrow Fascism and save the world once for all

from that curse it is as much our duty to help them in the task.

5 Pacifism and non violence as national policies are neither virtuous nor desirable as the application of these two principles on national and international basis will only tend to increase aggression and lawlessness in the world and therefore these ideals are not worth pursuing on such basis

6 It is futile for India to adopt a wait and watch policy for there is every likelihood of such a policy being interpreted as obstructionist or opportunistic tactics Moreover it encourages the growth of Fascism within the country

7 Non participation in the war neither helps the cause of Freedom nor promotes goodwill towards the country in other parts of the world

8 Instead non participation hampers the march towards Independence of the country and creates a serious split in the home front.

9 Efforts to combat an external danger will have the effect of uniting internal dissensions and will also afford an opportunity prompted by expediency to solve the communal problem on a temporary basis and subsequently on a lasting and satisfactory basis

10 The situation offers increasing opportunities for improving India's defences and for bringing India's Military Naval and Air Forces to a high pitch of efficiency even though such developments may be



prompted by necessity and self interest on the part of the country's Rulers

11 India's contribution to the war now can have decisive importance since men and materials can be transported to the theatres of war more easily from India than from any other part of the British Empire

12 Concerted action only can stop the Fascist advance which is fully based on the tactics of piece-meal conquest. The fate of European nations amply illustrate the point

13 The present recalcitrant attitude of the Indian politicians will have serious repercussions at the peace time negotiations and as a consequence Indian claims may receive a serious set back

14 India's present full hearted participation in the war will tend to increase the resisting capacities of China and Russia, and it will also ensure these two nations actively supporting Indian claims at the peace negotiations as opposed to the dominating interests of Britain and America

15 Lastly, from the point of view of a unified Asiatic Union to oppose European and Japanese penetration and further exploitation of the Asiatic people, it falls as a matter of duty on the part of India to carry on the struggle of the oppressed nations along with the fight for the overthrow of Fascism

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### THE TASK NOW

After having presented the case favouring India's full participation in the war it becomes a corollary to devise the ways and means of executing such a decision. These ways and means are not however offered in the nature of an advice but are indicated as responsibilities the fulfilment of which amounts to a task beset with serious difficulties

It is evident to the man in the street that India's defences to-day are no defences at all for an invading army of present day standard. Neither its expansive areas nor its natural boundaries offer any serious obstruction to an army equipped with Tanks, Aeroplanes and high explosives capable of annihilating distance and undermining civilian and military morale. Significant admissions of India's unpreparedness both by officials and non-officials only lend tragedy to the situation. About the strength of the Indian Navy and the Air force the words of a critic a critic who is none other than the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress are illuminating

A few years back we had the establishment of the Royal Indian Navy. It is as royal as the many royalties that misrule parts of India. It is Indian in the sense in which the Government of India is so. It is navy because it has something to do with the sea. With one of the

most extensive coast lines in the world, with all the natural resources for Ship building, and with traditions of building going into the hoary past, India possesses not a single Ship Building Yard. And yet India has a Royal Navy. The doll's house is complete in all its details." About the Air Force the writer quotes the words of Mr J R D Tata, Chairman of the Tatas and of the War Loan Committee making the significant admission. "We are told that the Indian Air Force is being no less than quadrupled. Within a couple of years the skies of India will be clouded by the thundering mass of Indian Army squadrons. About 36 Planes in all." About all these, what we can possibly do is to put a large exclamation mark.

The blame of course is put on the Indians. A Government to whose benevolence this huge country owes its Telegraphs, Railways, Unity, and Post Offices, can such a Government be blamed? One cannot, however, understand the wisdom of a policy which keeps such vast unarmed multitudes at the mercy of prospective invaders. Not only is the Government idle, but does not seem to be taking much interest to remedy the defect. Otherwise what is the explanation for this step-motherly care towards Indian industries, particularly shipping, aviation, motor manufacturing and armaments. Indian Army is woefully lacking all sorts of modern equipment. Why to speak of India, the whole of the British Army lack Tanks and Guns. Mr Hender

son—Stewart's appeal in the House of Commons on July 11 bear ample testimony to the statement. He declared —

One had vision of men English Scottish, Irish and Welsh, left to die or fall into Nazi captivity because they lacked weapons to defend themselves. We must answer that cry for arms if the Army is to be saved from other grievous sacrifice. It is not an appeal of moll—coddling that the workers of this country want but inspired direction.

And what is the position of the enemy? Regarding the equipment left in Crete and Greece Mr Churchill himself remarked that he doubted whether Hitler needed any more guns. Hitler has to-day more guns than men. A military commentator declared during the last war that Russian soldiers were massacred at the front in thousands because they had no guns and reserves waited for his comrade to fall to get his gun.

Cannot these defects be remedied? I believe with a greater amount of vision and courage than hitherto displayed by British statesmen the situation could be altered with striking results. Every theatre of war in which the Allies are to-day engaged could be reinforced with sufficient quantities of equipment provided British possessions near those theatres could be made self sufficient as regards the production of equipment needed for the theatre near to its boundaries. In making such a revolutionary change in their plans

Englishmen are afraid of themselves They fear the Empire countries would turn against the mother country—justifications enough for their past records and confidence in the present !

Not in these respects alone, Indian and Allied Statesmen are showing signs of distorted vision and lack of commonsense At a time when labour leaders and other workers' and peasants' deputies could be expected to supplement the Government's war efforts these men are kept within the prison bars and those who are left behind are not taken into confidence at all This policy is put into force in the face of growing fifth columnists and other Fascist agents who freely move about as very nice people and plan secretly and openly for handing over the country as a present to the Fascist demagogues Times have changed and to-day one can recognise a fifth columnist by his very words not to speak of his actions He is ardently denouncing Communism in official circles, in society groups, in the Press and on the platform and for all that he is regarded as very nice both by officials and non-officials In this regard the remarks of Mr W M Hughes, the Navy Minister of Australia about this very nicest people hit the mark ! "They would rather have Nazism win than Soviet help save us from Nazi domination God save us from such narrow minded treacherous counsels I welcome the alliance with this great Power with unbounded satisfaction."

There are not only such nice individuals but also influential political bodies and their most vociferous organs who support the above argument. *The Free Press Journal* of Bombay whose security was confiscated by the Government many times and which ceased publication on account of that, during the Civil Disobedience movement for its extreme nationalism and support of the Indian National Congress wrote on June 12 1941 "Hitler's fall will make no difference to the war and its complications. The Japanese peril is real so is the Red peril. To avert the Red peril is our national duty. On a subsequent occasion the same paper came out with the comment "We have no sympathies to waste on the Soviet. We are definitely opposed to any active alliance of Britain with the Soviet. We believe Hitler when he says that the Soviet would have stabbed Germany in the back." Commenting on this Mr. M. N. Roy's paper the *Independent India* of July 13 1941 writes "Destruction of Fascism is no concern for the Congress nationalists. They do not believe that the disappearance of Fascism will make any difference for the world. By implication, it means that they do not object to its continued existence. So at least we know the ideal for which the non-violent Army of Indian Nationalism would fight. No wonder that it refuses to lift a finger to help the fight against Fascism."

Mahatma Gandhi's letter to Raghunandan Saran President of the Delhi Provincial Congress Committee

directing to take public notice of the indiscipline of Congressmen who support the war effort, read in this light is perhaps revealing

To combat the fifth column menace is a moral responsibility on the part of the citizens, rather than the Government. If the Government takes any serious action in this regard it would be mistaken and misinterpreted as the suppression of the national movement. To request the Government to take such a course is neither desirable nor self respecting. That would create a precedent for subsequent occasions. Moreover that would tend to create a serious upheaval in the country and the measure would miss the mark. Instead if the country takes the responsibility on itself the consequential danger is averted and the nation retains its self respect. In what manner the country should take such a step? Congressmen who are sensible enough to understand the situation must begin agitating on a mass scale to overthrow the reactionary clique which rules the Congress organisation stock and barrell. In this effort all other right thinking men who do not belong to the Congress or any other political party should lend support. Not the Congress alone is pursuing such a dangerous policy, the Muslim League also is adopting a 'dog in the manger' policy. The same remarks apply to all similar organisations and by such strenuous efforts if we are able to end the fifth column menace we shall have won the major portion of the battle against Fascism.

The next task, equally important which needs attention of the people is the organisation of the present Civic Guards as a body primarily responsible for the internal defence of the country. The regular Army would be required to occupy the external defences and to check the onslaught of stray groups of invaders penetrating through the major lines of defence and to deal with internal miscreants and saboteurs. There needs creation of a sufficiently strong well trained and well equipped body of internal defence volunteers. It must regrettably be admitted that the present Civic Guards hopelessly fall below this standard. The usefulness of such a body of persons in the event of serious internal disturbances is very meagre. It should be the aim of both the people and the Government to reinforce this body with large number of self respecting men who could be expected to discharge their responsibilities with the utmost sense of national honour and prestige. It is therefore the duty of the Government in this respect to make this purely a national organisation entirely manned and controlled from the lowest to the topmost ranks by Indians. When such a conversion has taken place it becomes also necessary to train and equip these volunteers in all phases of warfare and for all types of defence work. The organisation of the Home Guards in England affords a marvellous example of public initiative and fortitude in the event of vital danger. It is also on record that the credit for organising such a



force goes to Mr Tom Wintringham, Editor of the *Daily Worker* and a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party in England, who had experience of the civil war in Spain in which he fought in the ranks of the Militia of Republican Spain, "the army that for year after year held up Fascism's flood-tide towards power, in that Spanish fighting which was the prelude and the signal for the present struggle," to quote his own words. In a series of articles which he contributed to the Press, he describes the task and then the progress of the Osterly Park Training School which during the first month of its existence (on July 10, 1941 the first course started at the school) attracted a thousand members, in the subsequent month two thousand and in the third month over three thousand to get training in the defence of their homeland.

"But all was not plain sailing, there were prejudices to be broken down. Soon after the school was founded, an officer high up in the command of the Local Defence Volunteers requested us to close the school down, because the sort of training we were giving was 'not needed'. This officer explained to us with engaging frankness that the Home Guards did not have to do "any of this crawling around, all they have to do is to sit in a pill-box and shoot straight". The "sit-in-a Pill-box" idea, a remnant of the Maginot folly not yet rooted out of the British Army, met us on other occasions. We fought it in every way we could. We could not accept

the instruction to close the school down. And when the officer who considered Osterley unnecessary sent a circular around to units (of the local Defence volunteers) in his area pointing out that Osterley had not been approved we found an increasing in numbers coming to us from that area. The units not hitherto aware of our existence learned of it through this circular. These words best describe the trials of such an institution and the words "Our work at Osterly received official approval early in September when we were thanked by the Army Council and the War Office decided to take over the school the reward of persistence".

We must also be guided by this example and our efforts should be directed to convert the present Civic Guards into an armed national, self respecting Irregular Army. We need for this Osterleys in hundreds or perhaps a thousand. For that we need not rely on the Government, our own initiative must set example to the Government. What we are interested in is a Peoples Army and that we can't have from the Government. Perhaps Government can assist us with some instructors who had actual experience of the war in Europe and the latest methods adopted by the Nazis in these theatres. The direction and the controlling personnel must be Indian and for this the present Civic Guards should be reconstituted under a National Council. Ample funds must be made available to this body to carry out the

programme, raised through public subscriptions or donations. All that we need from the Government to begin with, is permission to arm such a body, but there seems to be little prospect in this direction. In spite of this we must not be disheartened, we must get going somehow in our preparations for national defence. We who care more for our country, than what the Government care, must take the initiative and ere long we must have a force not less than fifty million, if not more, comprising men and women who regard their country's call stronger than any other. To propagate the correct line of lead and to harmonise the work of different units we also need an organ dealing exclusively with matters of internal defence.

For all such activities as outlined above we need funds, lots of them. The President of the Theosophical Society, Dr G S Arundale wrote :

"I am of opinion, therefore, that it is opportune as well as urgent for a great fund to be raised for India's personal defence. Already, if I have not mistaken Australia has now decided to reserve her available financial resources for the immediate purpose of her own defence. India has equal need to do the same. I only wish the Congress and the Muslim League together could have sponsored such a fund. They could together have made crores available, for the Indian people could thus have been wonderfully inspired by the knowledge that every pie would be used in India to equip Indians

*'Telegraph dated July 8, 1941*

in India directly to defend their Motherland from the invasion of her shores

We must also from now onward press our Government to send as much material as we could possibly get to the Russian fronts by opening the passage through the North West Frontier of India for if the Germans succeed in taking Dardanelles and Murmansk all other sources for reinforcing the Russians would be closed with the exception perhaps of Vladivostock in the east. Materials need also be rushed through Iran and Syria where the Allies are once again in a strong position to the Caucasus and Baku fields to enable the Russians to defend those regions. The defences of those regions are vital since any slackening of effort would lay open to the enemy the most coveted possessions for in those regions lie the vast oil resources of Russia.

As we come to the question of open assistance to Russia there should be an enunciation of British and American policies in this respect. It must be repeated that Allied Statesmen have been woefully mistaken in their estimates of possible enemies and potential allies. In the beginning of the war they distrusted Russia and lavished their sympathies on Italy. All the assistance they rendered to Italy and all the materials Britain and America supplied to Italy were used against them selves. To-day they are indulging in the same folly as regards Spain, Japan, Sweden and to a lesser extent Turkey. *British rapprochement with Russia was neither*

due to the diplomatic excellence of Sir Stafford Cripps nor due to the sincere wish on the part of England for such an alliance. Circumstances alone brought in the event. But for German invasion of Russia there would have been no Russo—British alliance and no Privy Councillor-ship for Sir Stafford Cripps. British policy towards possible enemies can be explained in a way that by such courtship, they succeed in postponing the date of reckoning with these nations. Past experience, however does not justify such an explanation. When Italy came into the war the entry was planned to suit Hitler's time and Italy's preparations, and the delay had no significance whatever to the British wooing. This is equally true of Spain to-day and more than true in the case of Japan. When the time comes for the desperate gamble Hitler will goad Spain, willing or unwilling, to enter the war on Hitler's side and block Gibraltar. Japan, even much earlier than Spain's entry into the war, would line up with Hitler and attack Russia. There is every reason to believe, gauging Hitler's tactics, that Japan will strike Russia and not move into any blessed paradise. There used to be much speculation in the early days of the war that Italy was slowly realising her folly in concluding the Axis Pact and that Italians from the Chef to Mussolini, were turning pro-British rather than pro-German. These speculations were widely advertised through exaggerated Press reports via the usual British propaganda channels. But, with all these,

the world didn't see Italy lining with the Allies and the world did also see Italy joining with Germany and fighting the British and the French. To-day Japan is seen in the same light. It is reported that Japan intends to move into the South Sea and Indo China some even suggest Malaya but these speculations are all due to some sort of complex which blinds vision. Every other member of the Axis group is as much interested as Germany herself in the ultimate victory of the Axis and each member's action would therefore be to bring about this ultimate victory. Following this line of argument if ever Japan moves into the South Seas or Indo China Thailand or any where else it would be as spring boards for major attacks on Russia and China and if Britain joins these countries on Britain as well. At present in Hitler's plans Russia's defeat is preliminary to all others and in the execution of that plan Japan realises herself bound to Hitler. It therefore follows that any and every sympathy either in deed or in words shown to Japan are mere waste exceptionally harmful. The correctness of this statement would be proved most probably before these words appear in print.

The next weak spot in the British Diplomatic field is Turkey. Turkey ere long would be swallowed by Germany if Russia and Britain do not take bold steps in the meanwhile. German attempts in Syria and Iraq were calculated to outreach Turkish defence and outstep British plans. In this the Germans were defeated and

to-day there is no other alternative for them but to invade Turkey, at first to control Dardanelles with a view to blockade Russia and secondly to gain an easy access to the Caucasus and the shores of the Caspian Sea. Regarding the potential value of Dardanelles to Germany Mr A G Gardiner in an article written during March 1941, stated, "If Hitler is able to seize and hold the Dardanelles the fate of Russia is sealed." Whether Turkey would resist Germany effectively in carrying out the plan is the question. Turkish politicians have been friendly to Britain in words and friendly to Germany in deeds. Moreover German control of Turkey is an accomplished fact both economically and politically. Devoid of German technical assistance Turkish industry is nothing, politically Turkish statesmen have learned the goose-step. During the Syrian campaign Turkey afforded facilities for German supplies and men to pass through Turkey is evident from the report "Thrice weekly the Tarus Express disgorges batches of approximately fifty Nazis a time holding false Balkan Passports disguised as Jewish refugees. Under the cover of darkness, the Germans have commandeered vessels, fishing boats, to bring in so called officials by sea hugging the coast inside Turkish territorial waters, disembarking at small ports in North Syria." The Istanbul correspondent of the Times, London, aptly describes the reaction of the Turks to the Russo—German war by stating that every Turk would

plans must be so made to meet all possible eventualities treating Turkey as a potential enemy. I hold that this war against the Nazis cannot be won by adopting the wait and watch policy. Decisive action must be taken at every step and the Nazis must be outstripped in their plans and this would mean a revolutionary change in the military strategy of the Allies. Their actions in Syria and Iraq deserve congratulation in this respect, perhaps these are the greatest achievements of the British Command in the war.

Iran is the next important centre in the map of Asia where Russian and Allied strategy must be made felt. After Turkey Iran is the most vulnerable spot. Russian High Command is not entirely unaware of the strategic importance of Iran and if reports prove correct large number of Aerodromes have already been leased to Russia in this territory. Before Iran becomes an actual theatre of war the utility of Iran as a supply base has to be fully taken advantage of. Towards this the best procedure for Allies and Russia to adapt would be to give guarantees to the Iranian Government to the effect that in consideration of the Iranian Government allowing Britain and Russia to establish strategic and supply bases in Iran, these two Governments would unconditionally restore to Iran after the ceasing of the hostilities the bases surrendered including complete independence for Iran. This procedure is necessary since Iran is a vital source of oil supply to the Allies and



is the nearest approach to the Asiatic mainland including India

Since Italian resistance is dwindling fast it is an opportune moment to press on with the Libyan campaign. The reaction of the Vichy Government is not to be reckoned since Marshal Petain and Admiral Darlan have completely played themselves into the hands of Hitler and Allied and Russian Governments should also concentrate on annexing as much as possible of the African coast facing the Mediterranean. The Axis forces have entrenched themselves on the other side of the Mediterranean from the Spanish coast line to Crete. From an examination of the Map it is evident that such a bold step on the part of Russia and Allies would bring about a complete encirclement of the Continent of Europe in itself a necessary preliminary to more effective and complete blockade of Europe to be followed by offensive warfare. The occupation of Iceland by American forces viewed in this light, unfolds a vista of far reaching possibilities.

In addition to adopting the policy outlined above a revival of the propaganda warfare in an intensified form has also to be considered. This time with the winter approaching is more fit to begin the offensive calculated to hasten revolution in the occupied territories than the early days of the war. To plan a military invasion of the Continent by seaborne troops the time is premature for the execution of such a plan

with the resources at the hands of the 'Allies at present by way of Aeroplanes, Guns, and Tanks falling short of the quantity required to dislodge the Nazis from their seats of vantage, would present serious danger to the Allies. Such an invasion can only be attempted through Russia, by reinforcing Russian supplies. In the beginning of the war Allied Statesmen were talking in terms of revolution within Germany itself, but for some mysterious reason the theme of their propaganda was suddenly changed. May be that as the prospects of success in the war through other means are now increasing, Allied Statesmen are confident of imposing some sort of Capitalist Government in Germany after the war suited to the interests of the British Government. Otherwise with the war going on against Russia, there can be no better occasion to foment revolution within Germany and other German occupied territories. In this respect citizens of Italy, Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia and France are easily susceptible to such revolutionary propaganda. Italians are greatly resenting the German domination and Italy is on the brink of economic breakdown. Mussolini and his regime after serious defeats and loss of prestige still remain in power only because of German bayonets. Frenchmen, Grecians and Yugoslavs with their love of freedom and Bulgarians with their strong Soviet sympathy need only be told that there are prospects of success, to rise in revolt. To infuse confidence in these citizens and to help them carry on their

activities of sabotage raids like that of Lofoten must be repeated in increasing numbers

It is significant here to reproduce the words of Reuter's Military Commentator on the Russo-German hostilities and the opportunity it offers to Britain

"As a result of the great concentration of German divisions along the Russian front those responsible for British strategy should ask themselves how many German divisions or aircraft are now in Northern France Holland and Norway The same question may be asked with regard to Germans in North Africa The defence of Egypt is not now the real question but the defence of Cyrenaica and Libya We have heard brave words from British politicians the time is rapidly approaching for brave deeds

Britain cannot regard the duration of the Russo-German war as a breathing spell If they regard it so it is sheer madness. As M Litvinoff said, every blow given to Germany now would be worth ten times more than that delivered at a later date The Prime Minister of England promised that 1941 would see Britain on the offensive The year is drawing to a close and decisive events are now taking place Can Britain afford to waste time still, is being asked every where If the war is to be won the battles must be fought now If the American and British Military Commands are waiting to see both Russia and Germany wear out in the battles now being fought to deliver their final blow on Germany they are

*Statesman July 8, 1941*

making a serious miscalculation. Such a policy can only help Hitler for he wants to smash his enemies one by one and his enemies, he realises, are foolish enough to render him the opportunity because of their narrow mindedness and mean self-interest. When a comrade is beaten they shed tears on him, waste a few brave words by way of promises to avenge his defeat, but when the beating is actually going on, they polish their swords. Such an error must not be repeated now, the repetition would mean end of democracy.

To Americans are addressed these concluding words. It is the moral responsibility of you Americans to help Britain, to deliver the crushing blow to Hitler now. Whether that necessitates America's entry into the war or not, the question now is which is the easiest way to enable Britain to deliver that final blow. If America could send all possible amount of help now the war would be decided now only. To send that help therefore is the deciding factor. British ships are not able in spite of heavy losses in the Atlantic to cope up with the transport of goods from America to Britain and it is therefore the duty of America to take steps to enable these supplies to reach Britain soon. If that draws America into the war, well and good, the war has to be fought out. General Sir Claude Auchinleck, the new General Officer Commanding in the Middle East is reported to have said that American man-power is needed "if the war is to be won properly, and it must

be won properly not half won' He is also reported to have said in reply to war correspondents I have always thought, it must be won in Europe in Germany on the German's own soil. They must be beaten in the way Napoleon was beaten. Therefore I see as much need for American man power in this war as in the last. In twelve fourteen or twenty four months this need will certainly arise. I hold this need has certainly arisen. America is far away from the Continent of Europe and no hostile forces can step on the shores of America. Japan needs only one serious slap to be taught the essence of commonsense. Therefore American soldiers munitions planes and other weapons need be transported immediately to the European theatres of war to beat the enemies on the enemies own territories.

Large body of Americans I believe are not sure of the sincerity of British Statesmen when they declare they are fighting for democracy. I can hear Americans asking: "What about democracy in the British possessions? What of India. Friends? Is there democracy in that vast sub-continent which you hold now in bondage? There is no sacred trust to be discharged. You held us before and you made us fight to become what we are now. You still beat the drum of democracy and delude us to help you to perpetuate your rule on one fourth of the globe's surface." I wish Americans asked this many more times. I also wish, President Roosevelt presents the same question "in the nature of an ultimatum that

if Britain wants America to fight for democracy, Britain to vindicate its true democratic aims should declare India, independent and for that matter of fact, every subject nation free, forthwith

Well, these are the tests, these are the times to put these tests to trial. If democracy fails the war must go on endlessly

*Published by—*

Mr M P G Menon for Pravin Publication  
from 2/15, Kankulia Road, Calcutta.