

not consist of good men and true, but because it tries to attain the impossible aim of covering all different points of view in one synthesis. It is chary of weeding out, and recognising that certain things are quite irreconcilable. One cannot hope for general decontrol of food and stability of food prices at the same time; nor can one, quite obviously, hope for decontrol and equitable distribution of the available supply. And yet, the Cabinet strives to forge a policy which spares the population the discomfort and degradation of controls, keeps food prices steady and prevents starvation amongst sections of the people all at the same time. No wonder the Ministers differ, and differ openly now.

There is, apparently, a purpose in the Ministers talking at each other openly. The Cabinet has to get the hacking of the Parliamentary Party for its policies and when it cannot curie to a decision appeals to the latter. It may be that the Ministers decide to put their points of view before the Party and gain its approval for one or the other. But the Parliamentary Party is itself undecided between controls and decontrol. And that is so because the Congress is undecided; the State Governments do not see eye to eye in the matter. And the State Governments and the Provincial Congress Committees have yet to agree on the matter. Where does it all lead to? Surely some eggs have to be broken, and no one seems willing to point out the ones that should be.

In this confusion, amazing things could be said and done without anybody pointing an accusing finger. The President of the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee, Shri S. K. Patil said that the Indian National Congress had in its past sessions unmistakably voted for progressive decontrol, and no congressman would be guilty of "indiscipline" if he voted against controls. By implication, Shri Deshmukh, Shri Nanda and the Prime Minister who are presumably convinced that there is still need for controls are liable to be accused of working against the mandate of the Congress Party. And an ex-Cabinet member, who is very much against decontrol, insinuates that pressure was brought by the Chief Minister of Madras to secure Central Government's approval for his policy of decontrol. How an ex-Cabinet Minister could disclose a secret of this sort, and insinuate

against somebody who was not in a position to defend himself on the door of the House without a reprimand from the Speaker or the Prime Minister is more than one can understand.

These are issues of constitutional propriety and procedure; and arising as they do in the very few years of constitutional and responsible government, need to be tackled decisively, so that healthy precedents might be created. Unless they are dealt with resolutely, they can so emasculate the Cabinet that it will be unable to do anything effective.

As regards the food situation itself, the various statements made in the House leave the mind which tries to analyse and pursue the fugitive ideas lost and bewildered. Shri Kidwai asserts that the objective of the Government is to maintain a machinery for equitable distribution of food and goes on to state that controls

have inhibited production in the deficit states, and therefore must be taken off in the deficit states. That surely deserves the cake for casuistry. If progressive decontrol is the ideal, it is surely in the so-called surplus states that it should start. In the deficit states, which would be deficit even if production did not fall, equitable distribution would require proper\* administration of controls and not their abolition. It is difficult to fit all his economic analysis into a consistent pattern. He, priding himself on being a realist, does not attempt it and leaves it to the Finance Minister and the Minister for Planning to do the best they can. And in trying to do so, they contradict the Union Food Minister. It is all very amusing or, rather, would be amusing were it not for the grave consequences it has on the country and on the working of the constitution that the country has given unto itself.

## Witch Hunt in UNO

**P**OLITICAL historians are inclined to extend the duration of the nineteenth century by a decade and a half. They assume that the nineteenth century ended during the first world war. Some are inclined to ring out the century as America, entered the first world war. Others prefer to extend it by a few more years; they would like to fix the date of the beginning of the twentieth century to the year luring which President Wilson crossed the Atlantic to write-in his fourteen points in the Peace Treaty. All political historians are agreed that the nineteenth century was a British century. Not more than three decades have passed since the beginning of the twentieth century. Time alone will show when the political historians will ring out this century. Only the future will record whether they will agree to call it the American century. But within thirty years America has attained a world status which Britain never enjoyed during the nineteenth, her century.

Wars have been fought in modern times, according to one political interpretation of modern history, to maintain a system of balance of power or to create a new one. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Britain had succeeded in treating a balance of

power which she was successful in preserving until Nineteen-fourteen. There was no world organisation then. The League of Nations was created later. But neither Britain, nor any other Power, has ever attained so exalted a status as to dictate her terms to a world organisation. America can claim that within thirty years she has not only become the world's biggest financial and military Power, but she has also reached a supreme status, never before attained by any Power, of dictating her terms to the United Nations.

There is a growing development in the United Nations. Serious students of international affairs are aware that no world organisation can achieve its aims unless it can assume the power and authority of a World Government. That was why the League of Nations failed. It had not the will to intervene in Abyssinia. Strange as it may seem, the United Nations may go the way of the League of Nations because of its intervention in Korea. Whether aggression should be resisted with lone or not, is not in question here. Whether collective security is a legitimate means to ensure world peace is also not the main point at issue. But whether the United Nations was right in intervening in Korea under the instigation of America is the more intriguing

question, There is no reason for doubt that America instigated the United Nations into military intervention in Korea. But there is ample reason for doubt, as facts subsequently made available indicate, whether North Korea was the aggressor in Korea.

This is not the only, or the major, instance of America's exclusive domination of the United Nations. It was, again, at the instance of America that the United Nations labelled Red China as an aggressor in Korea. America, once more, is the inspiration behind the North Atlantic Treaty, the European Defence Community, the other regional Defence Pacts and the various other arrangements which undermine the authority of the United Nations, besides provoking preparations for counter-aggression by the Communist States. Russia is not alone in complaining that America exploits the United Nations in forcing her will and foreign policy on an unwilling world. That the United Nations cannot achieve its aims without the co-operation of the Big Powers, will be readily admitted. To concede this is not to accept that the United Nations must become a subservient tool of the Big Powers, or of any one of the Big Powers.

Not only on wider issues of principle, but even on day-to-day working and on internal administration of the United Nations, America seeks to dominate this world organisation. Mr Lie's resignation as Secretary-General brings this aspect of America's domineering influence on the United Nations to the fore, Russia's violent antipathy to Mr Lie's alleged politics is not the only reason for his resignation. Mr Lie's position has become unenviable. He was a favourite of Moscow at the time of his original appointment. Even after his visit to Moscow to canvass Russia's support to his Peace Plan, and until the beginning of the Korean War, he was cold-shouldered by America as a visionary. He fell foul with the Kremlin because of Moscow's unjustifiable allegation that he instigated the United Nations to military action in Korea.

But he was never a *persona grata* with Washington. And he had always been a *persona non-grata* with the Republicans. While Moscow believes him to be a tool of Washington, the Republicans allege that he is an agent of Moscow. Senator McCarthy has yet to prove that he is an agent of Moscow.

Technically, the Federal Grand Jury in America may argue that its "invitation" to Mr Lie to prove his allegations against it and the McCarran Committee of "indiscriminate smears and exaggerated charges" does not violate the Secretary-General's diplomatic immunity. But Mr Lie's explanation of his resignation and the suicide of his chief legal consultant confirm the widely held suspicions of persecution mania of the American Republicans,

Many American nationals of the United Nations staff have been questioned and interrogated about their political inclination by the McCarran Committee on Un-American Activities. All the American employees of the United Nations are subject to "scrutiny" by the US Government. On many occasions Mr Trygve Lie has had to use summary powers to dismiss such employees because of the American Government's disapproval of their employment by the United Nations. Mr Lie's statement on the suicide of Mr A. M. Feller, head of the UN Legal Department, is revealing. He implies that the tragedy is due to mental stress and strain caused to Mr Keller in his tireless work in unfolding "due process of law and justice in the investigations against indiscriminate smears and exaggerated charges (of the McCarran Committee and the Federal Grand Jury)."

There have been many American victims of the notorious activities of the McCarran Committee. Suspicion deepens that America has interposed on many occasions to judge the "suitability" of even some of the non-American employees of the United Nations. Events subsequent to Mr Lie's announcement of his resignation lend weight to the assumption that he, too, is a victim of McCarranism in America. She is a sovereign nation. She can plead sovereign rights in her internal affairs. But she cannot be tolerated in her interference with the administration and the personnel of the United Nations. America insists on the principle of human rights in solving the issue of repatriation of Korean war prisoners. She must observe the same principle in her domestic affairs, as well as in her attitude to American and non-American staff of the United Nations. This witch hunt must be ended. America must learn the fundamental principle of human rights. This is the major issue involved in Mr Lie's resignation. There are other aspects of the problem. They call for, and justify, a transfer of the seat of the United Nations from America to some neutral country where this world organisation will not be exposed to any domineering influence in its administration of policies by America, or any other dominant Power.

## Valuation Results For Four Years

As at 31st December 1951

**Profits Over Rs. 26,00,000.**

**Bonus on Whole Life Policies : Rs. 10 per thousand per annum**

**Bonus on Endowment Policies : Rs. 7-8-0 per thousand per annum**

## The Industrial & Prudential Assurance Company, Ltd.

Industrial Assurance Bldg., Opp. Churchgate Station,  
B O M B A Y , 1 .

**A COMPANY TO REPRESENT AND INSURE WITH**