

Arjan Singh Chaudhary

INDIA'S VOICE

ARJAN SINGH
CHAND

SEPTEMBER, 1943

Freedom to India now will shorten the war, and will prove the sincerity of the Atlantic Charter.—Ed.

For free literature on India, write to the

HINDUSTAN GADAR PARTY
5 WOOD ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

All Religions Are Fragments of One Religion and One Truth

Arjan Singh Chand

All the great faiths of the world are parts or fragments of one religion and one truth. The Scriptures of all peoples have been written to preserve and at the same time to conceal the secrets of the Eternal Law. To understand any one sacred book completely it is necessary to also understand all other sacred books. It has been difficult for human beings to accept this truth; each man, clinging to his own book, hugging to his heart his own fragment of the law, has believed there is a peculiar virtue in proclaiming a part and denying the rest.

Bibles, so called, are collections of inspired writings, recordings of ancient oral traditions. They can usually be traced to the lore of preceding civilizations. Built up from earliest fragments they should never be regarded as revelations in the sense of being delivered *in toto* to any individual by some divine being. The revelation factor is generally limited to interpretation: Some illumined individual, contemplating sacred matters, perceives some deeply concealed value—and by placing special emphasis upon this new aspect comes to be regarded as a religious founder.

Among ancient peoples sacred writings were available only to the priests. The priests interpreted such parts of the Scripture as applied to the problems of the occasion; they alone were equipped with the keys to the Scriptural allegories.

The Vedas, the sacred books of the ancient Aryan Hindus and of incredible antiquity, ap-

pear to be the source of most of the sacred books now venerated throughout the world. From the Vedas great saints and sages interpreted the ageless wisdom and wrote their commentaries or re-stated in the terms of their own day the Vedic lore and the sacred tradition. In China, Lao-Tze and Confucius were the interpreters, and their writings have become Scripture. In India, Buddha was the great Emissary. In Persia it was Zoroaster. In Egypt, Akhnaton and Hermes. In Greece, Orpheus, Pythagoras and Plato. In Syria it was Moses, and later Jesus.—MANLY P. HALL, Los Angeles, Calif.

* * * * *



LOUIS FISCHER ON CANDHI

This summer I spent a week with Gandhi. I walked with him every morning from a quarter to six to a quarter after six. I took a solid hour's interview with him every afternoon and had lunch and dinner with him each day. That means that I had fourteen meals with him during the week. All those meals were exactly alike in every detail. The Piece de resistance of this unvaried menu was a kind of boiled mush in which I found cut squash and spinach leaves. After Gandhi had handed me this delectable dish for lunch and dinner on the first day and again for lunch and dinner on the second day, and when he gave it to me for lunch the third day I pushed it back and said, "No thank you, Mr. Gandhi, I respect you as a man and as a leader, but not as a chef." He said (he speaks perfect English incidentally), "Oh, you don't like vegetables?" I said, "I don't like the taste of these vegetables." He said, "You should add plenty of lemon juice and salt." I said, "In other words, you want me to kill the taste." He said, "No, enrich the taste." I said, "You're such a Pacifist you wouldn't even kill a taste." Whereupon he laughed, he loves to laugh. I'd gone down expecting to encounter an austere, forbidding, cold Saint. Actually he's very warm and human, with a delicate sense of humor and plays with the kiddies, but he has one extremely embarrassing characteristic — he says everything he thinks. We each of us carry a blue pencil in our minds, we exercise an internal censorship. But among the very few things that Gandhi carries on his person you can find no blue pencil. I was walking with him across the fields one day and asked him how he had come to introduce his weekly day of silence—on Monday, as you know he doesn't speak, which might be recommended to others. He explained that it happened years ago. He said, "I used to travel morning, noon and night in hot trains and on open bullock carts throughout hot India, and thousands of people would come to me to ask questions, to make pleas and to beg that I pray with them and I used to get tired; so I introduced the weekly day of silence.

Since then I have clothed this weekly day of silence in all kinds of moral virtues and given it a philosophical content, but actually it was only because I wanted to take a day off." No he didn't have to put it that way, but Gandhi has a devotion to the truth and an uninhibited tongue which makes him tell the whole story; it gets him into all kinds of difficulties. He said to me, for instance, and he has said subsequently in writing: "I would go to Japan and sign a treaty of peace with the Japanese". Now he immediately added in the conversation to me. "I know the British will never let me go to Japan and I know that if I ever got to Japan the Japanese wouldn't sign a treaty of peace with me." Then why talk about it? Because the idea had occurred to him and for Gandhi the fact that an idea isn't practicable doesn't mean that he mustn't talk about it. However, this statement has enabled persons who for very ulterior motives wish to smear Gandhi—to say that Gandhi is pro-Japanese. Now there are many Americans and many English whose words as to who is pro-Japanese I would not accept, because many of those Americans and Englishmen were themselves pro-Japanese and appeased the Japanese. Sent Japan the scrap and oil which our boys are now getting back in uglier form. There is one man whose word I would take as to who is pro or anti-Japanese, and that is Chiang Kai-shek, the Generalissimo, and he is pro-Gandhi and pro-Indian independent, and he has intervened (as I told you) with President Roosevelt and with Winston Churchill in recent months repeatedly, with a view to the moderation of British policy in India. Chiang Kai-shek knows that Gandhi is anti-Japanese, pro-Chinese and anti-Axis. And Gandhi has proved it. But it's simply Gandhi's manner of speech that exposes him to these false charges.

The Right of Every Nation to Arrange Its Affairs

Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties, the destruction of the Hitlerite regime.—Stalin, No. 6, 1942.

3

A Page from Congressional Record—House— May 21

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the pending lend-lease appropriation bill deals with the prosecution of the war by all the United Nations. I am a great admirer of military strategy. I have confidence in the weapons we are using. I respect our military and naval leadership. I cannot forget, however, a weapon of World War No. 1 that was worth great armies. It was the moral persuasion in Woodrow Wilson's 14 points. He spoke to the common people in the lands of the enemy. He spoke their hopes and their dreams so plainly that he wedged the German people from their leaders, and when all the people of the world were put on one side, fighting for the common ideals of humanity itself, the war ended sooner than it would have otherwise.

The fact that some of those peoples felt let-down later makes our task more difficult today. That does not lessen, however, the value of that kind of a weapon. Indeed it makes even more necessary that the idealism of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter should be given a clear and unmistakable application in the policies of the United Nations.

We can bludgeon our way through to victory solely by relying upon the blood of our boys and the cold steel of our machines—but if we can shorten the road to, and the cost of, victory we should do it.

Now, we probably can count upon revolutionary assistance in Europe whenever we give the signal with an invading army. In Asia, however, Japan preaches the doctrine of liberation from the white man's rule. We like to believe that the Japanese are so clumsy and so cruel that in time the peoples of the lands she occupies will rise up against her. We hope she is making a bad job of civil and military administration. We cannot count upon that, however; and we must do more than wait. Nothing in the situation gives us any reason to think that Japan will collapse. Nothing in the picture gives us any reason to think that the Philippines and the Americans in the Philippines will ever be free again unless we free them.

Everywhere men speak of the great population of China and India, of the manpower that is there. Everyone knows that China needs guns and ammunition, and tanks, and perhaps above all, air power, air power in that overwhelming degree of superiority which paved the way for the success in Tunisia.

We are told that there are 2,000,000 soldiers of the British Empire in India and we are also told that only fifty or sixty thousand Japanese hold the Burma Road. It is no wonder

that a distinguished Member of the United States Senate has called for action to throw those Japanese out of Burma and reopen a way to take the supplies into China, where we would have the land bases necessary for successful operations against Japan.

Now, then, why do fifty or sixty thousand Japanese soldiers stand off an army of 2,000,000, or even 1,000,000, in India?

Most of those Empire soldiers in India are men of India. They wrote a notable chapter in the victories of World War No. 1. Why are they inactive today?

No man can be sure of an answer under the limited and censored conditions of communication and information today. But I, for one, cannot escape the thought that the probable reason is that the people of India do not feel that this is their war. Indeed, I cannot escape the feeling that too many people of India feel that the promises made them during World War No. 1 have not been fulfilled, and that they simply are not going to fight for the perpetuity of an empire in which they are not accorded the voice and the freedom which they believe is rightfully theirs.

The bill before us proposes to make available more than \$6,000,000,000 worth of additional lend-lease goods. It is a mighty amount of money to throw into the conflict. But it seems to me that if there could be put into the conflict at this time the complete productive capacity of India, our efforts in this bill would be insignificant in comparison.

Indeed, if, through the efforts of that portion of the British Empire which is India, the Burma routes to China could be reopened, the effectiveness of all of our lend-lease efforts would be multiplied many times over.

I recognize that I am speaking on a subject which has a good deal of official taboo. What I say has been prompted by nobody. It comes only out of my earnest conviction that if the people of India could feel that the high idealism of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter were real for them, they would put all of their energies and efforts behind the war as they would in a war for freedom itself. In fact, it would become the great cause by which the people of India would come to a place of sovereignty and domain status within the British Empire alongside of other great parts of that great Commonwealth.

I know that men say, "Oh, those things must be put off until the war is over." That kind of counsel was the counsel which Lincoln spurned in the Civil War. You will recall that

when Lincoln proposed to issue the Emancipation Proclamation, many of his advisers counselled against it. Lincoln saw, however, that nothing would write the human purposes of the war into reality as much as the issuance of that proclamation—yes, while the war was on.

India's millions want the opportunity to fight for freedom. If only a fraction of India's vast manpower and resources are in action today, it is because Indians—like other men—can fight for freedom only if they are themselves free.

We—the United Nations—must break the political deadlock in India which is a repudiation of all we are fighting for.

I believe that now is the time to face this problem. To defeat Japan we need China. To sustain China we need Burma. To regain Burma we need India—India with the full strength of that great country freely enlisted in a battle for the freedom of the world; enlisted in a cause where the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter are not words, but indeed the very weapons of victory.

Louis Fischer's Open Letter to Winston Churchill

Reprinted from THE NATION, June 5, 1943

Dear Sir: May I, with all respect, address you briefly on the subject of India?

You, Lord Halifax, and Mr. Amery have stated publicly that the British government's proposal carried to India by Sir Stafford Cripps in March, 1942, still stands. Now all Indian parties, including the Congress Party, the Moslem League, and the Hindu Mahasabha, rejected the Cripps offer. When you say that an offer stands after all parties to whom it was made have rejected it, does not that mean that you propose to do nothing about a settlement in India?

You could reply that the Indian parties may have changed their minds. Then should you not ask them? More than a year has passed since the Cripps offer was rejected. Perhaps the parties have changed their minds. Why not find out?

Gandhi, Nehru, and the other leaders of the Congress Party, to be sure, are in jail. I, of course, would like to see them released, especially after Sir Maurice Gwyer, the British Chief Justice of India, ruled that they had been illegally arrested. But if Britain insists on their continued imprisonment, the Congress Working Committee could be consulted in jail. Why not do that? The British government has negotiated with imprisoned Indian leaders in the past.

I have one more question. All your public utterances, Sir, are heard and read with much interest by countless Americans. The American public was greatly impressed with your declaration in London, on November 10, 1942, "We mean to hold our own." You added, "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire." If the British continue to hold India, the empire will not be liquidated. But if you go on holding India, how can India become independent? Is there not a sharp contradiction between the Cripps offer of independence to India and your subsequent statement that you propose to hold India? This discrepancy might incline some persons to conclude that your government did not intend the Cripps offer to lead to Indian independence.

Very sincerely yours,
LOUIS FISCHER.

A, B, C OF IMPERIALISM

When England feloniously appropriates a country and a people, you do not hear anything about it until you wake up one morning and find that England has established another protectorate.

Then some fine day, when the attention of the world is otherwise engaged, protection becomes possession—and there you are.

Sometimes a vigorous people like the Boers resent and resist the protection and possession program. Then there is war.

But by the time the world has waked up, the nation has been absorbed by a steady python-like process, and another body has been assimilated by the British Empire.

It is all just as easy as if taking a rabbit out of a hat to a skilled magician—but you have to know the trick.

Japan has taken a leaf out of England's book.

You open your paper one morning and find that there is disorder which threatens world peace in Manchuria, and that Japan is proceeding to pacify the land and restore law and order.

Japan restores peace with infantry, artillery, tanks, and bombing planes; and when the smoke clears away, we find that peace has been restored, and that in the process Manchuria has become Manchukuo.

That is all—just as simple as A B C.

In fact, such is the A B C of imperialism.

—W. R. Hearst, S.F. Examiner, Aug. 1, 1943

WHO ARE CHURCHILLS' ADVISERS?

By IVY WATSON COOPER

One wonders who are Mr. Churchill's advisers on the Indian Question and why he is too short-sighted to see he is playing right into the hands of the Axis Powers, who know by refusing India complete and absolute Independence now, it means the taking of India will be even a simpler matter than the conquests of Burma and the Phillipine Islands.

The Indians themselves long since are convinced that the British Government never did intend to give them independence after this war, than they did after the last war; that goes to make a very dangerous situation for British rule in India. The Indian leaders have shown their sagacity by not putting any credence in Mr. Churchill's promises as they did in Mr. Asquith's. Amongst themselves the Indians laugh and quote the English expression. "Once bitten twice shy."

While India is the richest nation in the world, her people are used to a half-starved existence, therefore this war can bring no further hardships in that respect. But India's leaders, one and all, are determined to see this war ends such deplorable conditions for all times.

India's leaders laugh at British stupidity of holding Gandhi and Nehru, their two most revered Indians, in prison incommunicado, thereby agitating the Indian masses to a greater pitch of hatred against the British Government. The Indian masses have always resented being treated as dirt beneath the White man's foot. With Japan at India's gate one wonders at British stupidity. One wonders if Mr. Churchill has forgotten what happened in Russia when the masses took control, the Russian masses had less reason in 1917 to fight for their own personal RIGHTS than the Indian masses have today. The Indian masses also realise that the English Government have not only learned to respect the Russian masses of 1917, but are proud to ask their help in time of stress.

American newspapers tell us; I quote from S F. Chronicle Monday, November 16, 1942: **THE SIKHS, EVEN BRITAIN'S TRADITIONAL LOYAL SOLDIERS ARE STARTING TO TALK INDEPENDENCE.**

Chakravarti Rajagopalachari realising how the Indian masses are taking things into their own hands, now that they lack the wise leadership of Gandhi, made an effort to talk with Gandhi, only to be refused permission by the Marquis of Linlithgow. All India

knows that it has been Mahatma Gandhi's tolerance towards the British Government that has held the masses from rising as one against the British Government.

It has been a great surprise to Mr. Churchill that France threw in their lot with Germany instead of England. **WHAT A DIFFERENT STORY IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN IF THE SHORT-SIGHTED ENGLISH GOVERNMENT HAD GIVEN INDIA COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE.** France then would have had confidence in England's integrity, France would have been able to forget the hundred years war, the conquest of Napoleon. France today is not so sure her fate might not be the same as India's if she ever let England make a conquest of France. France knows from past history every other war she has with Germany France wins.

The granting of complete and absolute INDEPENDENCE to INDIA now, means and has meant more than Mr. Churchill is far-sighted enough to see.

India stands before the world as an example of the English Government's broken promises.

It would be interesting to know who Mr. Churchill's advisers are on the Indian question.

A great many of India's leaders have had the same education as English leaders and American leaders, attending the universities of the British Empire and the United States, and the average Indian has excelled at his studies, which is something some English leaders did not do.

Labor Must Help Colonial Peoples

Mr. Edward D. Vandeleur, Secretary, California State Federation of Labor, says:

"Modern economics no longer recognizes state lines and in the future will be even more obliterated as far as production and exchange are concerned.

"This means simply that if the American worker is to maintain what he has won, if he is to enjoy the wages he has been accustomed to getting, if he is to benefit from his work commensurately with his ability to produce, he will have to take a greater interest in what is going to happen to the millions of Hindus, Chinese, Mexicans and other people who are sources of cheap labor power."

IMPORTANT QUOTATIONS

Of all the five continents of the earth, only Europe has not yet learned to live at peace. Europe is the focus of infection of this earth, and IMPERIALISM is the Toxin by which it spreads until the whole world is so sick, so sick.

—LIN YUTANG, "Asia," July, 1943.

Why the British Imperialists Cannot Afford to Give Up India

An Honest Briton.

In 1925, Sir William Joynson-Hicks (now Lord Brentford) as Minister of the Interior, made a speech in the House of Commons, clearly stating England's position. "We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know it is said in missionary meetings that we conquered India to raise the level of the Indians. That is cant. We conquered India as an outlet for British goods. We conquered India by the sword; and by the sword we shall hold it . . . I am not such a hypocrite as to say we hold India for the Indians . . ."

The Biggest Hypocrisy

Our whole British talk of being Trustees of India, about coming out to India to serve her," about "bearing the white man's burden," about ruling India for her good," and all the rest is the biggest hypocrisy.—C. F. Andrews, an English Missionary who has spent most of his life in India.

Brightest Jewel

India is not only the brightest jewel in the British Crown, she is the whole sapphire, pivot which supports the whole complicated movement of our National Economic System. If we lose India, we lose our imperial standing among the nations of the world.—Viscount Rothermere.

Imperialism Is the Root of War!

Intelligent persons everywhere realize that in colonies, in the rivalry of nations for empire and for the wealth of colonies lies the root of war. So we have this situation, if there will be empires there will be wars.—Louis Fischer, Town Hall, San Francisco, Feb. 23, 1943.

"Divide and Rule"

An imperialist government has it within its powers to divide any country it rules endlessly by giving titles, by financing magazines and newspapers, by giving jobs, by encouraging

somebody to be ambitious. There are all kinds of devious, honest and dishonest measures that can be adopted.—Louis Fischer, San Francisco, Feb. 23, 1943.

I came away from India with the profound conviction that if there were the will, India could be united politically overnight, and that, of course, would be only the first step towards ultimate social and economic union. I came away from India with the conviction that the obstacle to Indian independence does not lie in India. It lies in England. India is a very good thing. Many interests and companies and families in England have grown rich on India.—Louis Fischer, Feb. 23, 1943.

Encouragement to Aggression

"The private imperialism of England, France, Belgium and Portugal are out-of-date, and an encouragement to aggression on the part of countries which, like Germany, have no colonial possessions."—Bertrand Russell, "Free World," April, 1943.

"Ever since the sixteenth century, the arrogance of white men has irritated Asia."—Bertrand Russell, "Free World," April, 1943.

Reject Imperialism!

We must, now and hereafter, cast our lot as a nation with all those other peoples, whatever their race or color, who prize liberty as an innate right, both for themselves and for others. We must, now and hereafter, together with those peoples, reject the doctrine of imperialism which condemns the world to endless war.—Wendell L. Willkie.

Imperialism Must Be Abandoned

Imperialism must be abandoned as a principle of world organization.—Norman Thomas, March 18, 1943.

Churchill Interprets the Charters!

Roosevelt writes the charters, Churchill interprets them.—Norman Thomas.

Tyrants Never Learn

"Thomas Jefferson believed, as we believe, in man. He believed, as we believe, that men are capable of their own government, and that no king, no tyrant, no dictator can govern for them as wisely as they can govern for themselves."—President Roosevelt on Jefferson's birthday, April 13, 1943.

(British tyrants still believe that they can rule India better than the people of India. —Ed.)

What About Striking Down British Tyrants In India?

The simultaneous advance of the British and United States armies side by side into Tunis and Bizerta is an augury full of hope for the future of the world. Long may they march together, striking down tyrants and oppressors of mankind."—Winston Churchill.

Only Excuse

"War is the only excuse for the British remaining in India. Otherwise they have been around too long. After more than 100 years of British rule, the country is in an undeveloped, unhappy, hateful and wrongful condition."—Tom Treanor, American correspondence in India, April 15, 1943.

True Democracy

As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this to the extent of the difference is no democracy.—President Lincoln.

(The British imperialists do not want to be slaves but they want to be masters.—Ed.)

Equal Justice

Those that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.—Benjamin Franklin.

Justice is strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. A highway man is as much a robber when he plunders in a gang as when single; and a nation that makes an unjust war is only a great robber. —Benjamin Franklin.

Guarding the Rights of Others!

Guarding rights of others, we guard our own.—Chester Rowell, S. F. Chronicle, June 26, 1939.

Liberty for One, Liberty for All

Enslave the liberty of but one human being and the liberties of the world are put in peril. —Lloyd Garrison.

He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression. —Thomas Paine.

(British imperialists, who want only liberty for themselves and slavery for the Colonial people, are the disturbing factors in the world. —Ed.)

Democracy is but a dream so long as any person, on account of race and color, is denied any right or freed from any duty generally allowed to or required of those of another race or color.—Curtis W. Reece.

Race Prejudice

"Anti-Chinese laws put upon our statute books many years ago by Congress seem to have anticipated and given approval to the whole Hitler doctrine of race theology."—Representative Clare Boothe Luce (R., Conn.)

"Victory may still be a long way from us, but in the need for us to make up our minds about what we are fighting for it is already late. It is past time for us to be talking the old nonsense about racial, religious and cultural differences that are supposed to make every hope futile."—Wendell Willkie.

We Have No Answer to That!

Chungking's Central Daily News urges the Allies to open a political offensive in the Pacific in order to gain the support of people in countries occupied by Japan. We should begin now, it says, to build underground movements that will aid us when the big push comes.

The idea is excellent and farsighted. But what can we say? Our policy in the Pacific is the negative one of clearing out Japan. A positive one is still unformulated. We can broadcast to peoples in the Pacific: "Get ready to help us. We are coming to liberate you from Japan," and the Filipinos and Chinese will understand and act. But the people of Burma, Java, Indo-China and Thai will reply: "Liberate? You mean change bosses again. Japan promises us independence. What do you promise?" And we have no answer to that worth asking a man to die for.—S. F. Chronicle, Aug. 11, 1943.

War Is Only a Symptom!

The troubles of the world will not end with the war, for war itself is merely the violent outgrowth of major problems against which people everywhere are rebelling—Homer P. Rainey, President of the University of Texas.

Churchill Worked for America's Entry Into This War

In February, 1942, in a speech delivered before the House of Commons in an effort to save his administration at the time of the fall of Singapore, this boast was wrung from him—as reported in the New York Times of Feb. 16, 1942, page 6:

"When I survey and compute the power of the United States and its vast resources and feel that they are now with us, with the British Commonwealth of Nations all together, however long it last, till death or victory, I can not believe that there is any other fact in the whole world which can compare with that. This is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass."

Churchill expected that President Roosevelt will help England in the Pacific even if Japan did not attack America.

Mr. Churchill said in British Parliament, Jan. 28, 1942—as reported in the New York Times of that date, page 10:

"It has been the policy of the Cabinet at almost all costs to avoid embroilment with Japan until we were sure that the United States would also be engaged. . . . On the other hand the probability since the Atlantic conference, at which I discussed these matters with President Roosevelt that the United States, even if not herself attacked, would come into the war in the Far East and thus make the final victory assured, seemed to allay some of these anxieties, and that expectation has not been falsified by the events."

No Desire to Replace Western Imperialism

China has no desire to replace Western imperialism in Asia with an Oriental imperialism or isolation of its own or of anyone else. We hold that we must advance from the narrow idea of exclusive alliances and regional blocs, which in the end make for bigger and better wars, to effective organization of world unity. Unless real world cooperation replaces both isolationism and imperialism of whatever form

in the new interdependent world of free nations, there will be no lasting security for you or for us.—Chiang Kai-Shek in a message to the Western world, delivered through the "New York Herald-Tribune" forum, Nov. 1942.

Real, Not Fake Self-Determinations

"There must be real, not fake self-determination, and at the peace conference a definite date of freedom for each country must be announced publicly."—Madame Chiang Kai-Shek, April 14, 1943.

The Chinese Will Be Pleased To See India Free Today

I think the Chinese people would be very much pleased if the Indian government would be completely nationalized at the present time.—Lin Mousheng, March 18, 1943.

To Politicians, Power Is More Important Than Anything Else In Life.

A Lesson for Statesmen!

The statesman who conducts foreign policy can concern himself with the values of justice, fairness and tolerance only to the extent that they contribute to or do not interfere with the power objective. They can be used instrumentally as moral justification for the power quest, but they must be discarded the moment their application brings weakness. The search for power is not made for the achievement of moral values; moral values are used to facilitate the attainment of power.—Spykman in "Spykman's America's Strategy in World Politics," p. 18.

* * * * *

Nine out of ten readers would think that this was from "Mein Kampf," but no, this is from Spykman's America's Strategy in World Politics, P. 18. This is the book of which an American university president, Isaiah Bowman of John Hopkins says, "It should be read in not less than a million American homes. Every government official responsible for policy should read it once a year for the next twenty years."

Charter

In the light of the reservations by which the Atlantic Charter seems to be hedged around, the document is coming to bear little more weight as a determinant of future policy than American political campaign promises of two chickens in every pot, two cars in every garage.—Institute of Pacific Relations.