

Weekly Copy Ps. 5

Annual Subscription Rs

OPINION

Vol. XX

1st JANUARY 1980

No. 35

RUSSIAN TROOPS PATROLLING DELHI ?

THE Soviet Union has invaded Afghanistan. Russian troops are patrolling the streets of Kabul. The invading army brought in the puppet Prime Minister with itself, set up a puppet government, attacked and destroyed the government in power, tried and executed the incumbent Prime Minister, and offered as an excuse for its presence the fact that it had been invited in by its own puppet regime and that there was a Treaty of Friendship and Defence between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union.

There is also a similar treaty between India and the Soviet Union, a treaty entered into by Indiraji. How long then before Russian troops patrol the streets of Delhi ? By mid-nineteen eighty or the end of the year ? No, perhaps they will not be so precipitate. The Soviets already have quite a base well-established in the capital and the country. A proportion of the Indira Government were staunch fellow-travellers. Russian influence is strong, and works in mysterious ways in this land, they say, its wonders to perform. Rumour has it its part was not little even in the dissolution of the Lok Sabha and in the holding of the present most untimely general election. In any case, the happenings in Afghanistan should serve as a clear and loud warning to even the deafer elements among us. Wake up at least now, friends, wake up, it's much later than you think, the danger to you far more formidable.

If Russian troops get to patrolling the streets of Delhi, they will not have by-passed Islamabad and Karachi. Both will already have been in their bag. If the Governments of India and Pakistan have ordinary commonsense, they should recognise their joint interest in keeping the Bear out of the sub-continent, work out joint contingency military plans, co-ordinate their defence strategies, set aside their own quarrels for the time being, and combine against this much greater danger to both. If you do not hang together, foolish governments, your countries will most certainly hang separately at the gallows set up by the Russian hangmen.

The Afghanistan invasion should at least destroy the myth that many well-intentioned people in various parts of the world have for their own comfort hugged to their bosoms, the myth that the Soviet Government is no longer aggressive, that it has given up its plan to dominate the world, that by bending a little here and giving way a little there it is possible to regard it, and deal with it, as the government of an ordinary nation, that the overwhelming danger from it to freedom and independence is a thing of the past. Nothing of the kind. Its aim still remains what it always was, to make the world over in its own image, itself triumphant over all. It changes its tactics with its weapons ; its purpose, its over-all

OPINION, January 1, 1980

strategy remains as it was. Discomforting and intensely irritating as it must be for those who have not seen and have not wished to see what was before their eyes all these years, they must if they wish for safety for themselves and independence and liberty for such of the world as has enjoyed it upto now, recognise it fully not only with their minds but also with their hearts. This tyranny lives ; it flourishes ; every day, everywhere, it has to be checked, for it is ever on the prowl, seeking to devour whoever it can seize by deceit or by force.

BIG WEAPONS AND SMALL MINDS

K. B. LAM

QUITE a line of eminent Indian personalities — these include the last three Prime Ministers — assert that India will never manufacture, acquire or employ nuclear weapons. Do such seemingly well-intentioned and peace-loving souls appreciate that by stubbornly embracing such an attitude, they could be condemning their beloved country and her citizens to slavery or, at the very least, to risks of blackmail ?

Why become a nuclear power ? Only for the purposes of self-defence versus other nations in possession of nuclear might and the secure knowledge that the existence of such weapons will act as a deterrent. No country will dare to attack India if she realises that India is capable of destroying her cities within a very short while.

After the 1962 debacle when China reached out almost as far as Assam, whilst prominent Indians were seized by the naive "Indi-Chini Bhai-Bhai" outlook, it would be difficult to contend that there is no likelihood of India's ever being subjected to a nuclear attack. There may even be no actual assault but a mere threat of one unless India places in power a party and government sufficiently acceptable to the aggressor-to-be as an utter stooge. For example, China could threaten to reduce major Indian towns to shreds unless the ruling Indian Government were to make way for the Maoist wing of the Indian Communist Party. Or it could combine with India's other "close friend," Pakistan and lend her nuclear weapons, thus making India unable to resist any Pakistani demands regarding Kashmir. If this seems far-fetched, consider that around 1969, a road was constructed from 'Azad' Kashmir to China via Gilgit and this wasn't exactly an exercise to promote tourism.

It could, of course, be argued that if a nuclear power bullies India, friendly nuclear powers will rush to India's side but this point of view overlooks the nuclear potential for sheer speed and width of destruction. for example, China blasts a nuclear attack on India, much of the try will be ruined well before any other nuclear power, such as cia or Russia can intervene. Even if this were not the case, these untries are unlikely to interfere to bail India out if it meant g the utter ruination of their cities at the hands of Chinese nuclear Furthermore, if at all such aid would be forthcoming, it would

be at the expense of a bargain necessarily unfavourable towards India. If Russia were to come to India's rescue in the wake of a Chinese nuclear attack, it is inconceivable that she would not aim to influence the philosophy of the Indian Government and ensure that positions of power would be made available only to admirers of the Soviet Union. Friendship and alliances with countries whose political creeds must of necessity lead to or require atheism, can scarcely be profitable and tend to recall the ancient English expression of "being in league with the devil."

Given that conventional weapons provide no defence at all in the face of the nuclear ones, India, if she refuses to become a member of the nuclear club, may as well forget about defending her borders and cease to waste large sums of money on the armed forces, whose only effective function, if any, would be a purely internal one — to assist in maintaining law and order within the country.

In other words, the possession of nuclear power is virtually the only way of guaranteeing the continuation of a nation's independence and her cherished way of life and this is what tempts countries like Israel and South Africa, who are heavily outnumbered by their opponents and, generally, on the wrong side of world opinion, to acquire such capabilities.

The late Dr. Bhabha had, in the mid-sixties, estimated that the cost of manufacturing nuclear weapons was, when compared to the Annual National Budget, almost like a drop in the ocean and that Indian scientists could cope without the slightest dependence on foreign assistance.

Why then is India being denied these big weapons by small minds? Alas, though scientifically, artistically and, in general, professionally, Indian talent, particularly at the higher levels can hold its own in the most exalted company, moral character is rarely in evidence. Exponents of the belief that India needs a dictator and that the only interests of the innumerable poor are food and inflationary control also maintain within their armoury the viewpoint that a developing country cannot afford such weapons when the majority of her citizens remain hungry, as if food and nuclear weapons were mutually exclusive concepts. Little notice is taken of the increased employment resulting from the creation of these weapons and the pointlessness of the emphasis on food if the country's independence is endangered, assuming, of course that self-rule is sufficiently high on one's order of priorities.

Others reckon that there is no place for nuclear weapons in a country where the religious teachings include ahimsa and which has adopted the Gandhian concept of non-violence. It is difficult to fathom why conventional weapons would offend the doctrine of ahimsa any less than their nuclear counterparts. Gandhi's concept of non-violence did not incorporate national defencelessness and he revelled in updating and modernising the elements of his idealism.

Though she has steadfastly refused to make the bomb, India seems to be greatly concerned about Pakistan's ambitions in this field. Pakistan has every right to seek to become a nuclear power and would indeed be very wise to so aspire and secure her self-defence. In any case, such a move, by itself, is not an aggressive one. Whatever the political inequities

OPINION, January 1, 1980

the situation in East Bengal in 1971, it is difficult to believe that India could have looked forward to war with Pakistan, if the latter had possessed nuclear armoury and Pakistan would have been spared dismemberment, however much it may have deserved.

Instead of wasting time and energy seeking guarantees from Pakistan that the bomb will not be made, this ought to provide greater motivation towards Indian nuclear thinking, particularly in view of the overwhelming advantages she enjoys over her neighbour. It is just possible that Pakistan, unlike India, does not possess the expertise to create a fully home-grown product and may be compelled to look abroad for help. Besides, in budgetary terms Pakistan has to undergo a far greater sacrifice than India. If, despite the fact that it is much harder for Pakistan to become a nuclear power, she does so, India will not be entitled to blame her for any guarantees Pakistan may have given on the nuclear subject and can point a finger at only herself for attaching importance to such guarantees and not becoming nuclear herself.

India does not have to be sheepish and repeatedly placate the rest of the world that whatever nuclear energy she possesses will be employed merely for peaceful purposes. She can assert that her interest in being a member of the nuclear club is the same as that of other members. It is ridiculously arrogant that countries in possession of nuclear might seek to deny other countries such weapons by endeavouring to emphasise the possible increase in the potential for danger and viewing this as an excuse to monopolise their positions in this regard.

If India has nuclear weapons, she can remain independent and maintain her democracy. She can be indifferent about the designs of America, China and Russia and can be equally friendly with all and thereby achieve true non-alignment, a long-standing corner-stone of her foreign policy, in marked contrast with the bilateral pact signed with the Soviet Union in 1971. As far as India is concerned, manufacture of nuclear weapons is not only compatible with peace but, in fact, a necessary condition for its long-term prevalence.

54. Shri B. Venkatappiah,
B3/59, Safdayang Endow,
New Delhi 110 016.

Central Packet Sorting Office, Bombay on 1-1-1980
BYW 69

14. Licensed to post without pre-payment

Published by A. D. Gorwala at 40C Ridge Road, Bombay 400 006 and
him at the Mouj Printing Bureau, Khatau Wadi, Bombay 400 004.
Proprietor : A. D. Gorwala.