

Great And Grave Responsibility

by V. B. Karnik

THE meeting between the Prime Ministers of India and China will take place in New Delhi in the middle of this month. The meeting, it appears, will be a long drawnout affair, as the Chinese Prime Minister has planned to stay for seven days in the capital. He is coming, it is clear, prepared for hard bargaining and tough negotiations and would like to return with a diplomatic victory in his pocket. It will be a victory for him if he is able to retain what he has swallowed and secure in addition a tacit acceptance of his conquest in return for a promise not to commit any further aggression. The Chinese Prime Minister will have no hesitation in giving the promise as, according to his philosophy of life, promises can be given as well as broken to suit the need of the hour.

The Prime Minister of India is, on the contrary, in a difficult position. He has to persuade his powerful and wily counterpart to disgorge what he has swallowed and to agree never to step across the traditional boundaries between the two countries. He has already tried his best to persuade the Chinese Prime Minister to adopt that course of action through numerous letters and notes. Those letters and notes were full of incontrovertible facts and cogent arguments which should have convinced any reasonable person of the correctness of the Indian position. If they have failed to have any effect on the Government of China, how can any one believe that their repetition in a face to face meeting will prove more effective? Many in the country and abroad have on that ground expressed doubts about the utility of the meeting.

There were other more fundamental objections to the meeting. The Prime Minister had declared on more than one occasion that there would be no meeting unless aggression was vacated and the age-old boundary between the two countries was accepted. The invitation to a meeting that he sent later to the Prime Minister of China was in direct violation of that declaration. Moreover, it is not in keeping with the dignity of a country to enter into a meeting with an aggressor without insisting on his first vacating the aggression. It was on this ground

that many regarded the invitation as a national humiliation.

But now that the invitation has been accepted and the meeting is fixed there should be an end to that controversy. Attention should now be directed to the far more important question of ensuring that the meeting does not result in any disadvantage to or discomfiture of the country. It is to be hoped, however, that in deference to the public feeling over the visit, the Government of India will keep it strictly on an official level and not impose upon the people the burden of according welcome to an unwelcome visitor. If that restraint is observed, the visit may pass off without any untoward incident.

The country as a whole and lovers of peace and freedom all over the world will joyfully applaud the meeting if it leads to an unconditional vacation of the aggression and a categorical assurance to respect the age-old and well-known boundaries on the north and the north-east. Some modifications and adjustments may be necessary and there will be no objection to consider them on the basis of mutually agreed principles. But the aggression must be vacated and the boundaries drawn by history and geography must be accepted without equivocation. There can be no surrender or compromise on those two issues. It will be a happy day both for China and India if the Chinese Prime Minister could be persuaded to agree to such a resolution of the crisis that has developed between the two countries.

It will be a crime, however, to indulge in wishful thinking and to rely on the sweet reasonableness of the other party. If the Chinese Prime Minister had any desire to show his reasonableness, he had plenty of opportunities to show it since he began the quarrel with his aggression on Indian territory. If facts of history and the logic of geography were to decide the issue it should have been decided a long time back on the basis of the facts and arguments marshalled in the letters and notes sent by the Government of India. But these did not count with the communist rulers of China. It has been proved time and again that communist rulers understand and appreciate only one logic and that is the logic of power. They refrain from committing aggression or vacate the aggression that they may have committed only when they know that a superior force will resist or repel their action. In the present case the force of that logic has not been brought sufficiently home to the Government of China.

In the forthcoming meeting between the two Prime Ministers, Prime Minister Nehru will not be able to impress his Chinese counterpart unless he is able to

show him that India has sufficient power and resources to expel the aggressors and to repel any further aggression that may take place. He must further convince the Chinese Prime Minister that India has no intention to take things lying down and that she is determined even to use force to regain her territory if the object is not achieved through peaceful negotiations. The conviction will sink deeper into his mind if he could be informed at the same time that India was not alone in her struggle against communist China but that she could count upon the active support and sympathy of all countries of south-east Asia and of all democratic nations of the world in her fight for the preservation of her territorial integrity.

It is from this point of view that the elder statesman, Mr. Rajagopalachari and others have suggested a defensive alliance of all countries of south-east Asia exposed to the danger of Chinese aggression. If they all come together and agree to regard an attack on one as an attack on all, the communist rulers of China will think a hundred times before hazarding any interference with the boundaries or the internal affairs of any one of those countries. Such an alliance can receive effective help from the United States and other countries of the free world. This can be secured without joining any *bloc* and without giving up the independent foreign policy that any country may desire to pursue. For establishing or joining such an alliance it will not be necessary for India to abandon her policy of non-alignment. She can take part in such an alliance without giving up the right to examine each international issue on its merits and follow a policy which she may consider right and proper. The alliance will be a regional grouping of nations for the common purpose of defence. Such a grouping is permitted by the Charter of the United Nations. It is a purely defensive measure which secures for any victim of aggression the support of all members of the alliance. It is high time that some such alliance is built up. The plan to build up such an alliance will be the most effective argument in the meeting between the two Prime Ministers. It is an argument which will receive the most respectful consideration from the Prime Minister of China.

The whole country will watch with anxiety the progress of the meeting. It is a meeting which may have far-reaching consequences. If the meeting does not succeed in persuading the Chinese Prime Minister to accept and respect the traditional frontiers between the two countries, India will have to gird up her loins for a long and exhausting struggle with China. Nobody who has the interests of the two countries at heart will desire that the meeting should end with such a negative result. On the contrary, if there is a weakening of the Indian stand in order to secure a compromise solution, it will be a weakening of the cause of freedom and democracy in all countries of Asia. By standing firm on the Himalayan borders of India, Pandit Nehru will safeguard the frontiers not merely of our own country but of all countries of south-east Asia. The Himalayas is the barrier which is holding back the tide of communist and

RECONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN POLITY

THE Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom has set up a Discussion Group to discuss the suggestions made by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan for the reconstruction of Indian politics in his thesis entitled "A Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity". The Discussion Group held its first meeting in Bombay on March 16 and 17. The meeting was attended by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan who, at the end of the discussion on the second day, gave an elaborate reply to the questions that were raised and the criticisms that were expressed.

Prominent amongst those who have joined the Group are Mr. G. L. Mehta, former Ambassador of India in the United States, Prof. G. D. Parkh, Rector of the Bombay University, Mr. P. H. Patwardhan, editor of *Bhoothan* weekly, Professors A. H. Somjee and R. Kothari of Baroda, Prof. P. G. Mavalankar, Mr. Jayantilal Dalal, M.L.A. and Mr. Sooryakant Parikh of Ahmedabad, Dr. Sirsikar, Dr. M. P. Mangudkar and Prof. Mukherjee of Poona, Prof. Ram Joshi, Mr. D. K. Kunte and Mr. A. D. Gorwala. It was decided at the end of the meeting on the second day to continue the Group and to hold its meetings from time to time. One of the participants, Prof. Mukherjee, promised to prepare for the meeting a thesis making concrete suggestions regarding the changes to be effected in political institutions according to the ideas adumbrated by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan in his thesis.

The discussion at the meeting mainly turned on the prospects of parliamentary democracy in India. Many of the participants were of the opinion that parliamentary democracy had made a fine start in the country and was bound to develop successfully, if some of the incidental defects, which were due more to the shortcomings of men and the peculiar conditions of the country, were removed. There were others, however, who were of the opinion that parliamentary democracy would not succeed in the conditions obtaining in the country and that it was necessary to think in terms of an alternative system of government which would ensure both political freedom as well as the participation of the people.

In his reply to the discussion, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan pointed out how parliamentary system of government was an inadequate and unsatisfactory form of democracy. He explained in detail his idea of a self-reliant, self-governing community, reiterated his conclusion that the experiment of parliamentary democracy had not succeeded in India and in other Asian countries and that it was not necessary for them blindly to copy what was done in the West.

Chinese expansionism. If there is a weakening of that barrier the tide will sweep not only over India but over many parts of Asia and Africa. It is to be hoped that the Prime Minister will be conscious of the great and grave responsibility which rests on his shoulders.

Swatantra Party Convention

by A Correspondent

THE deliberations of the First National Convention of the Swatantra Party which concluded recently at Patna, decisively proved that the Party has come to stay in the body politic of India. The tumultuous and wild scenes of enthusiasm exhibited by the people of Patna permanently silenced critics who had variously characterised the Party as that of "vested interests", "big business" and consisting of people with "outdated" ideas. The reception accorded to Rajaji, Ranga and other leaders of the Party conclusively demonstrated their popularity with the people. It also proved that in India today a Party which rejects the slogan of socialism and its clichés need not fear isolation but on the contrary could well tread a new path without having to pay lip service to 'popular' slogans.

The primary purpose of the National Convention was to give the Party a Constitution and a Statement of Policy which, in the words of the General Secretary, would give "flesh and blood" to the 21 principles adopted by the Party at its Preparatory Convention held last year in Bombay.

Preceding the Patna Convention itself were held meetings of the Central Organising Committee and General Council of the Party. The Central Organising Committee, which is the highest executive organ of the Party, devoted itself mainly to discussing arrangements for the holding of the Convention. The General Council which met in two sessions discussed at length the draft Statement of Policy and Constitution.

The 50,000-word draft Statement of Policy entitled "To Prosperity Through Freedom" spelt out the policy of the Party on various issues. While holding the ruling Party responsible for the "steady deterioration of the national fibre, due to the placing at a discount the inherent qualities of fortitude, courage and industry and a subordination of these to the decrees of a small group of politicians who have been able to exercise an excessive authority irresponsive to public opinion", the Swatantra Party pledged "to complete the work of training the people in and for freedom which Mahatma Gandhi had begun". The Swatantra Party's Policy Statement further pledged:

"The Party holds that democracy is best served if every political party allows freedom of expression to its members on matters falling outside the fundamental principles of the Party. The Swatantra Party therefore gives its members, whether in Parliament, legislatures or elsewhere, the fullest liberty on all questions not falling within the scope of its Principles and Statement of Policy."

That this was no idle pledge was amply demonstrated at the Delegates' sessions at the National Convention. The Delegates' sessions were open to the Press which reported the numerous amendments that were

moved both to the Statement of Policy and the Constitution. There was no attempt at silencing or gagging. Every member who got up to speak was allowed to have his say and numerous amendments were accepted.

The General Secretary's Report presented to the Convention was devoted to "looking ahead; considering the tasks that face the Party, the pitfalls on the way, and the measures that are necessary to build up the organisation."

The General Secretary reported that the bulk of the members of the party enrolled so far were from the rural areas and small towns. Describing the party as "middle-of-the-road", Mr. M. R. Masani said that the party took a pragmatic view of our national problems in which both Liberals and Conservatives could work together. He cited a Public Opinion Survey conducted by the Indian Institute of Public Opinion in Delhi during June to September 1959. The question put to a cross section of the public was: "Would you like to see a liberal but non-socialist party in opposition to the Congress?" While 68.9% said they had no opinion to offer, 14.3% said 'Yes'. Thus proving that the Party had a "ready minority" with a large majority of open-minded people.

Outlining the task facing the Swatantra Party, the report stated that it consisted primarily in educating Indian public opinion on the validity and soundness of the Party's aims, principles and policies. "It is that of harnessing and mobilising their potential sympathy and support into a mass movement. It is that of providing the Indian people with an alternative government," concluded the report.

Prof. Ranga in his presidential address said that just as in the decade of 1918-28 India had to make her choice between imperialism and Gandhian nationalism, she had to make a "courageous choice" in the present decade between the approaches of Nehru and Gandhi to planning. It also meant making a choice between "centralised totalitarian governance and decentralised governance", Mr. Ranga asserted.

He told the assembled delegates and visitors that the Party stood, among other things, to encourage all voluntary efforts on the part of industrialists and commercial concerns and welfare schemes so as to minimise all possibilities for conscious or unconscious exploitations and to maximise the efforts to develop the practice of trusteeship and redistribution of a part of the profits through voluntarily chosen schemes of social welfare.

The Party stood for welfare society and would help people to develop such a society by putting a premium on all such people as were good enough to spare a liberal share of their surplus wealth for helping the socially underdeveloped people and economically needy but enterprising individuals and groups.

Rajaji's inaugural address was as usual delivered extempore. Placing the emphasis on *dharma*, Rajaji said that until *dharma* was installed on the throne of New Delhi the people should not rest. This could only be done by changing the Congress Government which had become unpopular. He added that after 12 years of office, the Congressmen today were more concerned with their own-party affairs than with the Government which they were running. Justifying the emergence of the Swatantra Party, Rajaji said:

"Without Opposition, a ruling party takes a wrong path. We should have an opposition party in Parliament to oppose the Government. Everybody is praising Prime Minister Nehru and his government.... There are opposition parties like Communist Party and Socialist Party. But they are not parties. They are only ginger groups.a good opposition will be offered by the party which is fundamentally opposed to the ruling party."

Expressing his satisfaction with the growing strength of the Swatantra Party, Rajaji said that he had not believed that within a period of six months support in such a large measure would be forthcoming for the Swatantra Party. It was at Gaya that the Congress had confirmed its policy of non-cooperation. That was the battle against the British giant. But the present battle was more difficult because it was against our own government.

The Convention adopted four resolutions. The Party Flag, which is a five-pointed white star on a blue background, found the unanimous approval of the delegates. Similarly the General Secretary's report was unanimously adopted. The third resolution dealt with National Defence. This resolution reaffirmed the stand taken by the Party at Hyderabad in December last that India should forge bonds of cooperation with all South and Southeast Asian nations as the best means of facilitating aid to flow from the prosperous non-communist nations of the world on honourable terms and so as not to give rise to mutual apprehensions. The resolution expressed the Party's disapproval of the "unresponsive attitude" of the Government of India to "the proposals and approaches of Pakistan while at the same time it (Government) is slow to react in a proper manner to the insulting and aggressive attitude of China." It wanted the Government of India to take a more realistic and correct policy in regard to international friendship with the non-communist powers in the face of the growing danger from Communist China.

In a resolution on Tibet, the Party expressed its solidarity with the oppressed people of Tibet and held that the Tibetan Revolution of March 1959 was a grim reminder to this country of the cruel fate that had befallen a nation of peace loving people at the hands of aggressive and imperialist communism. The resolution hoped that in the course of time Tibet would throw out the aggressor and enjoy a full and free life of national self-determination.

Even a casual perusal of the Statement of Policy adopted by the Convention would be sufficient to demonstrate that the Party, far from being either con-

trolled by the mythical "vested interests," or "outdated" in its ideas, is alive to the problems of our country generally and the difficulties faced by every segment of our population specifically. For instance, the Policy Statement dwelling on the needs of the Common Man states: "The Swatantra Party holds that the first duty of a government is to meet the common man's needs of food, clothing, housing and water in adequate measure. The Swatantra Party holds that self-sufficiency in food and raw materials is the first condition of the economy of a country like ours. Food being the principal item in the Common Man's budget, the production of food should be the first concern of the State."

On trade unions, the Policy Statement observes: "The Swatantra Party accepts the workers' right to organise themselves and through these organisations to improve the conditions of their life and work.... Collective bargaining connotes the right to strike; if bargaining does not end in settlement, both parties should be free to adopt any course of action that they think is necessary and desirable.... The Swatantra Party stands for a good wage for a good day's work..."

On industry the Statement reads: "The Party stands for the preservation of the freedom of the small and self-employed artisans, craftsmen and traders and will work for a decentralised distribution of industry.... The Party believes in the incentives for higher production and expansion inherent in competitive enterprise, with adequate safeguards for the protection of labour and against unreasonable profits, prices and dividends in those cases where there is no competition or where competition is not adequate to secure the necessary corrective."

In short, the Swatantra Party has broken away from the vicious circle that has dogged other Indian political parties. The other parties who for the sake of popularity echo popular slogans and clichés find themselves unable to fulfil their promises without sacrificing basic values. The emergence of the Swatantra Party has for the first time opened up the chances of a powerful opposition to the Congress and a democratic alternative Government. The Patna Convention has shown that within the short span of 8 months, the Party has emerged with an all-India character. It has branches in all the States except Kerala and Kashmir. In Kerala a unit is to be inaugurated very shortly. District units have sprung up in most States and its membership figure, according to the General Secretary, has reached well over 3,36,000. The Patna Convention itself was attended by well over 750 delegates and one lakh visitors. In the context of Indian politics this phenomenal development could almost be termed miraculous. What I saw at Patna convinced me that it had all the makings of a powerful party capable of organised action and of providing an alternative Government. The 1-lakh audience who witnessed the Convention were a reminder to the ruling party of its growing unpopularity and an unprecedented faith in the policies and programme of the Swatantra Party.

International Law

by Phiroze J. Shroff

INTERNATIONAL law which has for its objects the establishment of the rule of law amongst nations and the outlawry of war has been a plant of slow growth. Notwithstanding the tardiness of its growth and the various hazards to which it has been subject, the plant of international law has been taking firmer roots and shooting out more and healthier branches, particularly during the last three centuries.

At the turn of the nineteenth century the leading colonial powers appeared to be strongly entrenched in their far-flung empires. Apart from the fact that the colonies and the dependencies supplied raw materials to the ruling countries and provided markets for the manufactured goods of these countries, it was considered a matter of prestige for the Western Powers to have colonies. The expansion of these colonial powers contained in itself the germ of their eventual destruction. Germany under Kaiser Wilhelm II considered herself a have-not power. The Germans wanted a place in the sun. They wanted living space for their fast multiplying population. They said that time had come for them to launch out on their drive towards the east. They asserted that the great colonial powers were like retired burglars who wanted to hold on to their loot.

The outcome of the challenge by Germany to the colonial powers was the First World War of 1914-18, which was fought out with great bitterness and unprecedented loss in men and materials. Germany did not adhere to the principles of international law about the avoidance of unrestricted submarine warfare, the avoidance of bacteriological warfare and the bombing of the Red Cross personnel and equipment. The Allies and the Central Powers charged each other with the commission of atrocities. After several vicissitudes and great carnage on both sides, Germany had to sue for an armistice.

The Treaty of Versailles and the other peace treaties which were its offshoots did not lead to the lessening of tensions amongst the great powers. Notwithstanding the ever-recurrent rivalries amongst the victorious powers, there was a growing desire amongst the peoples of the world to bring into existence an international body, which would maintain world peace and be instrumental in beating swords into ploughshares. President Woodrow Wilson of America who had enunciated the famous Fourteen Points was a powerful protagonist of the idea of an international organization to maintain world peace.

From the ashes of an undescribably destructive war was born the League of Nations. The Covenant of the League was incorporated in the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. The basic principles of the League were (1) the maintenance of peace, (2) the solution of international disputes by means of law, when it exists and when it does not, by generally accepted principles

of right and wrong and negotiations and (3) the promotion of international co-operation. The executive bodies of the League were an Assembly and a Council with a permanent Secretariat, comprising a Secretary-General and other secretaries and staff.

Though the League had a fairly extensive membership neither the U.S.A. nor the U.S.S.R. joined as members along with other big powers. The criterion for the membership of states was self-government, but though India could not satisfy that test she was admitted as a member because of her very substantial contribution to the war effort. In later years more than one Indian statesman made important contributions to the deliberations and the work of the League.

One of the important terms of agreement between the members of the League was that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they would submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to enquiry by the Council and that in no case they would resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the Council. The Covenant provided that the League should not interfere in disputes which by international law were solely within the domestic jurisdiction of a state.

The formidable rock on which the bark of the League was wrecked was the lack of adequate sanctions for enforcing its decisions and for maintaining peace and international rule of law. Indeed, article 16 of the Covenant provided for the application of some sanctions in the case of recalcitrant nations. The leading members of the League, however, were not prepared to take the matters to their logical conclusion under the operation of the Article 16, with the result that more than one body-blow was dealt to the League by some militant powers which were bent on self-aggrandisement.

In total disregard of the League Covenant, Japan pounced upon Manchuria in 1931 and began to consolidate her power in that territory which possessed a great industrial potential. Italy began her aggression on Ethiopia in 1935. The half-hearted attempts of the members of the League to apply sanctions to the Duce's Italy came to naught. Germany, smarting under the imposition of the Treaty of Versailles, had found an aggressive and forceful leader in the person of Adolf Hitler, who defied the League and started a one-sided revision of the Treaty by arming in contravention of its terms and by occupying Rhineland and Sudetenland and perpetrating other acts of aggression and defiance of the League Covenant. The policy of appeasement pursued by the leading members of the League whetted the appetite of the aggressors. The Berlin-Rome-Tokyo

Axis began to arm for another world war at a furious pace.

The uneasy peace after the First World War came to an end when Hitler in his thirst for power and territory unleashed the hounds of war and marched against Poland on September 1, 1939. As the German mechanized units poured into Poland a lethargic world learnt the hard way that a policy of appeasement which leads to surrender after surrender, far from bringing peace, only smooths the path of the aggressor and paves the way for further aggression. The second world conflagration was on a far more extensive scale than its predecessor. In spite of the Geneva Conventions to the contrary, hardly any distinction was made by the belligerents between the civilian and the combatant personnel and property. This was a total war in every sense of that term. In the earlier stages of the war the victorious German panzer divisions goose-stepped through the capitals of many European countries. Hitler in his thundering orations declared that he had revived the glories of the Reich and put it on sound foundations to last for a thousand years. To the shouts of Deutschland Uber Alles the Germans established their hegemony over extensive tracts in Europe and were poised for their conquest of Africa and the East. But little did Hitler know that the tide was soon to turn and that the Reich was soon to be reduced to burning and blasted shambles. Never was the text "sic transit gloria mundi" so well illustrated as by the inglorious exit of Hitler and the total destruction of the Reich with her allies.

Even when the nations of the world were gripped in the throes of war President Roosevelt of America and Prime Minister Churchill of the United Kingdom, together with the representatives of some other nations, were applying their mind to evolving a world organization which would free the world from the law of the jungle and usher in an era of universal peace and rule of law. Thinking people all over the world were realizing that not only war was ruinous both to the victor and vanquished alike but that it left in its wake more untractable problems than what it attempted to solve. The progressive statesmen of the world were determined to bring into existence a world organization which would avoid the mistakes and shortcomings of the League of Nations. By now there was a substantial change in the concept of international law. The nations of the world were more convinced than ever that it was not enough to avow their allegiance to an international body to maintain world peace. They realized that it was necessary to modify the hitherto accepted notions of national sovereignty and to bring into existence an internationally accepted world body armed with sufficient powers to maintain universal peace.

The San Francisco Conference which met in April-June 1945 agreed upon the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice. The Charter was passed unanimously and came into force on October 24, 1945. India was one of the original members, numbering 51 of the United

Nations. Subsequently, several other nations were admitted from time to time as members of the United Nations Organization. The present total membership is 82.

The U.N.O. acts in accordance with the following basic principles:-

- (1) The sovereign equality of all the members is recognized;
- (2) Members must fulfil in good faith the obligations they have assumed under the Charter;
- (3) Members must settle their international disputes by peaceful means;
- (4) They must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter;
- (5) They must give to the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter; and refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the U.N. is taking any preventive or enforcement action;
- (6) The U.N. is to ensure that non-members act in accordance with these principles so far as is necessary for maintaining international peace and security;
- (7) The Organization must refrain from intervening in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state;

The International Court of Justice is the principal judicial organ of the U.N. Every member of the U.N. is *ipso facto* a party to the Statute of the International Court. The Court consists of 15 judges who are elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council voting independently. Their term of office is for nine years but they are eligible for re-election. The Court's jurisdiction is confined to cases in which the dispute is between states. It is competent to decide the limits of its own jurisdiction. It decides all cases before it in accordance with the recognized principles of international law. The Court is also competent to give an advisory opinion in cases where it is requested by the General Assembly or the Security Council to do so.

If the nations of the world adhere unreservedly to the principles of the United Nations Charter and refer any disputes that may arise between them to the International Court of Justice and abide faithfully by its decision, the scourge of war will have been banished from the face of the earth. (Courtesy A.I.R.)

India, Tibet and China

by B. K. DESAI

Price Re. 1

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

BOMBAY.

The Role Of English

by J. B. H. Wadia

THE grand role which English has played in the making of modern India under an alien rule, which has happily ended, is a fact of history. No amount of casuistry, no amount of emotional outburst, will ever succeed in effacing that fact from the pages of Indian history.

Please note that I do not want to discount the immense hardships caused to us by our erstwhile alien imperialistic rulers. What I want to point out is this: that we should not ignore the valuable contributions made by them in many walks of life. As to whether they did so out of selfish motives or not is beside the point.

From Warren Hastings to Lord Mountbatten and from Sir William Jones to Sir Mortimer Wheeler, there is a magnificent procession of English savants and scholars, scientists and jurists, politicians and philosophers, missionaries and true democrats, who have given positive contributions to the making of modern India. It would not be fair if we were to develop blind spots and deliberately fail to see the light that has also been shed by them in many a dark corner of our ancient land.

A language lives so long as the people want it to live. Besides, a language of an era is an inalienable part of that era. And it is a tragic error both to foist a language on the people which they do not want as to deprive the people of a language they have adopted. I am not at all against having a national language. Not to have one certainly creates a big hiatus, a big gap, in the life of the people. Our Constitution has decreed that Hindi should become our national language; and we need not enter in any hot-headed controversy about it here except stating this much: that the language meant to grow up as our national language should not be composed of a closed vocabulary but should be allowed to borrow freely from the various languages of the Indian people, including English, which I consider as one of our languages, be it by dint of history or fortuitous circumstances.

To wit: We should make our national language as elastic and as broadbased as English itself. A living language is the result of cultural fusion. It is presupposed to be dynamic and evolutionary. Hence I do not see any bright future for Hindi if the present ingenious but none the less futile policy of coining words from Sanskrit roots were to continue. Did not Gandhiji himself use to quote often that classic phrase of Sheridan, "The way to hell is paved with good intentions"?

Coming back on the main line, as it were, from the side-tracking: As literacy increases, as education advances, more and more Indians are bound to be better and better acquainted with English. No amount of artificially stirred-up emotionalism in the name of patriotism and no amount of pedantic sophis-

try evoked in the name of nationalism will ever succeed in stifling the growing interest of the Indian people in the English language and literature and thought—unless, of course, we get a communist rule, in which case our new rulers might foist another foreign language, say Russian, on us as the official international language of the country.

In the democratic set-up of our 20th century civilisation, English has become an integral part of our daily life. In the free countries of the world, English has become the language *par excellence* of international diplomacy and the medium of exchange of ideas. Historically, the position of English in the 20th century is more or less similar to that of French in the 19th century when in the wake of Bonapartism, French had become the necessary language of diplomacy; or say, that of Latin in the Era of Splendour that was Rome.

Whether English has become so today due to fortuitous circumstances or not is again beside the point. There is no going back on that score, at least in our times, whether we like it or not.

This brings me to the other important reason as to why we should retain English. In the intoxicating wake of National Independence we ran away with our feelings. In the first flush of our awakening we subjugated our reasoning faculties and equated the desirable ouster of the alien English rule with the unreasonable overthrow of the English language itself. But it is by dint of history that English has become one of our Indian languages.

In the fascinating book of Mr. Panikkar called *A survey of Indian History*, the historian pays a unique tribute to three Englishmen. He states something to the effect that there are three Englishmen who will always be remembered in Indian history which he shrewdly distinguishes from the history of the English in India. And they are Edmund Burke, Sir William Jones and Lord Macaulay.

And then, what of the glorious heritage of English literature and English thought! It is a treasure house of which even the gods would become jealous. Far be it from me to belittle the importance of world literature and thought, for example, the French, the German, the Italian and others in West Europe and before the communist rulers stultified free criticism and creative art in the high-sounding but intellectually dishonest name of Socialist Realism, even in Russia.

So also in the ancient land of China. And, last but not the least, in our own glorious land. All this heritage belongs to the community of mankind. I have always said that whatever is cherished and is of abiding value in our own India by right belongs to the rest of the world. And whatever is cherished and of abiding value in the world by right belongs to us.

(Continued on Page 10)

Nehru On China And Tibet

As far as other countries are concerned, our relations with them are quite friendly. Take, for instance, Afghanistan. Our relations with Afghanistan are exceedingly friendly and our relations with Tibet, Nepal and all the neighbouring countries are also very friendly.

— Speech at the Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi, March 22, 1949. (*Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches*, Vol. I, Second Edition, page 253.)

It was not right for any country to talk about its suzerainty or sovereignty over any area outside its own immediate range. Since Tibet is different from China, it is ultimately the wishes of the people of Tibet that should prevail, not any legal or constitutional argument.

— Speech in Parliament on December 6, 1950.

Our interest in the internal conditions of Nepal has become still more acute and personal because of the developments across our borders, to be frank especially those in China and Tibet. We are also interested in the security of our own country. From time immemorial, the Himalayas have provided us with a magnificent frontier. Of course, they are no longer as impassable as they used to be, but are still fairly effective. We cannot allow that barrier to be penetrated because it is also the principal barrier to India. We cannot allow anything to go wrong in Nepal or permit that barrier to be crossed or weakened, because that would be a risk to our own security.

— Speech in Parliament, December 6, 1950.

I am going to resist every type of aggression, regardless of whether it is communist or not.

— Speech in Parliament, December 7, 1950

I should imagine that at the present moment what China desires, above everything else, is peace to solve its terrible problems and consolidate itself. Therefore it cannot possibly think in terms of extension towards south-east Asia or any other direction. So far as India is concerned, I have not a shadow of doubt that any kind of aggression against India will be met by resistance. India will not tolerate it. I do not expect it, but I have made it perfectly clear that we will not tolerate any aggression.

Question : Will you be ready for it if it comes ?

Mr. Nehru : Absolutely, at any time, from any direction.

— Interview with Mr. Norman Cousins, *Bharat Jyoti*, April 29, 1951.

Asked whether he saw any threat to India from outside through communist expansion in south-east Asia, Mr. Nehru said : "I see absolutely no external

danger in India from communism or any other source". He did not think that China had any desire to expand. So far as India was concerned, she had most friendly relations with China.

— Broadcast for television in London, *Times of India*, June 14, 1953.

China wants peace for many years for reconstruction of the country and would not like to get entangled in any war.

— Press Conference in New Delhi after his two-week visit to China, *Times of India*, November 14, 1954.

Replying to a question by a Member in the Lok Sabha, Mr. Nehru said that he could not imagine that these incidents (at Longju) were a precursor to something more serious. Such a development would be foolish and the Chinese probably realised that.

— *Times of India*, August 29, 1959.

It would be "absurd" for the two countries to "rush at each other's throat for two miles of mountainous territory where no one lives".

— *Times of India*, September 5, 1959.

At no time had we denied the Chinese overlordship of Tibet. Nevertheless we were rather pained and upset at the way things were happening in Tibet and armies marching into that country and at what appeared to be a forcible conquest and occupation of Tibet.

— Speech in Lok Sabha, *Times of India*, Sept. 5, 1959.

Mr. Nehru said at his press conference that while the situation arising out of Mr. Chou En-Lai's latest letter was no doubt "a serious one", he did not at all expect "any sudden development which would lead to any kind of conflict, even a small one".

— *Hindustan Times*, Sept. 12, 1959.

I do not expect and I do not want anyone to imagine that something serious is going to happen in our frontiers. I do not at all expect it—it is not an easy matter to happen either — but the basic difficulty is this apparent change in the attitude of the Chinese Government when it has come out quite clearly with a demand which is absolutely and wholly impossible for us to look at.

— Speech in Lok Sabha, *Hindustan Times*, Sept. 13, 1959.

Mr. Nehru said that he did not think there was any "major idea" behind the recent Chinese incursions into Indian territory. "I am inclined to think that all these (incursions) are tagged on to Tibet".

"I consider the Soviet Union as a territorially satis-

(Continued on Page 12)

The Roof Has Fallen

by Piloo Mody

THE roof of the world has fallen, and the world goes on much the same—unconcerned, indifferent, unfettered. We remember reading vaguely that China invaded Tibet some nine years ago; we may recall some intellectual discussion about Indian protests to China—greatly confused by communist propaganda and intermittent visits of the Chinese Prime Minister Chou En-lai, with distant echoes of Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai. But time heals our indignation, and distance eases our conscience, and it all becomes as remote as the price of cheese in China. Then one day we hear of the dramatic escape of the Dalai Lama. Our hearts warm up, and then cool, at his indifferent reception. The God king is put in deep freeze, and no one cares for the steady and silent flow of Tibetan refugees into India, except when one occasionally sees an old Tibetan heirloom, or a money purse at a curio shop, pawned before its sweat is dry, to buy a meal under our hospitality.

At the risk of being called a war monger—a term of abuse that comes very easily—I must state that there should be no compromise, where the lives of millions of people are peddled at international conference tables without any reference to them at all.

To procrastinate issues to avoid immediate trouble and unpleasantness is the bane of international relations. The British were primarily responsible for perpetuating the concept of Tibetan autonomy under Chinese suzerainty, long after the concept of suzerainty no longer applied in the context of relations between nations. Suzerainty is a rather vague idea of a country, recognizing as superior the head or King of another country. But it has no significance in the era of republics. If this is true, Tibet should have been an independent country since 1911. Perhaps the revolutionary government of China at the time would have felt browbeaten by the British, but certainly that situation was infinitely preferable to what has happened in Tibet today. However, it is not fair for us to sit in judgement on the motives that inspire the foreign affairs of other countries. We must, however, each one of us, feel responsible for our own foreign affairs, conducted by our representative, the foreign affairs minister.

In this particular respect I am not very proud of the record of our government. For the purpose of appeasing and currying favour with the Chinese, we have sold the Tibetan People to their Han conquerors, and presented to the world the ludicrous picture of sponsoring at the United Nations the cause of these communist aggressors.

From 1947 to 1949, India lost a valuable opportunity to recognize Tibet as an independent country, and enhance our relations which had started since 1935. Instead we kept singing the old imperialist tune of autonomy and suzerainty. And we flew with sputnik

haste to recognize the the Chinese communists in January 1950.

This crude and savage recourse to political expediency, this indecent haste to recognize, aid and abet the violent, fascistic government of a country, was a negation of the most precious ideals on which we fought for our freedom.

Two days after we recognized the communists in China, they proclaimed the 'liberation' of Tibet. There ended all hopes of Tibetan autonomy. Any negotiations that they carried out with the Tibetans, or any assurances that they gave to friendly nations about Tibetan autonomy, were only eyewash and propaganda stalling for time. They invaded Tibet when a Tibetan mission was on its way to Peking to negotiate an agreement—highly reminiscent of the Ribentrop mission to Russia when Hitler invaded that country.

India's protest to Peking was answered by calling Tibet a 'domestic problem of China'. From hereon Tibet was lost to China.

It is not claimed that India could have stemmed the events in Tibet, but it must be stated to our discredit that our subsequent behaviour was not worthy of our high ideals or good intentions. When in November 1950, Tibet complained to the United Nations about Chinese aggression, it was India that did not support it. In fact, we were instrumental in suppressing it, relying on the assurances of the Chinese Prime Minister. That we should rely on these assurances baffles our imagination and abuses our intellect. What is there so important, or so sacred, in preserving friendly relations with a country, whose political philosophy recognizes no friends and whose leaders have resorted to every barbaric means to acquire power?

In 1951 China annexed Tibet and in 1954 India and China signed an agreement about Tibet recognizing Tibet as the 'Tibet region of China', incorporating for the first time the much talked about Panchsheel. The principles of Panchsheel—our fundamental approach to international relations, the international projection of our sainted philosophy of non-violence, the corner stone of our Foreign Policy, was laid by our shameful surrender of our sacred duties and obligations to the Tibetan People.

The cause of Tibetan independence has suffered at several hands throughout this century and reads like a story of lost opportunities.

The British could have recognized Tibet as a free country at any time between 1911 and 1947. The Tibetans could have established foreign legations at any time during the same period. The Indian Government could have pushed Tibetan independence between 1947 and 1949. Again in 1950, 1954 and 1959, our Government could have taken a stronger line of action on the autonomous position of Tibet. Instead,

we first accepted Chinese suzerainty, then we accepted Chinese sovereignty, then we accepted Tibet being called the "Tibet area of China" and finally we have taken the stand that Tibet is an "internal affair of the Chinese". Let us hope that we do not some day start talking of the "Indian regions of China".

The basic fallacies in our thinking arise out of confusing political legalities with the desirability of socially accepted political norms, justifying the melange with a readily adjustable conscience. On this basis, any crime against human nature can be justified—apartheid in South Africa, colonial empires, economic exploitation of under-developed countries and communist domestic tyrannies.

In each case, the anxiety is to employ political expedients like the balance of power and the fear of conflict to maintain a status-quo.

If we are to have peace in our time, let us have a just and fair peace. It is all very well for the great nations of this world to talk glibly of peace, pointing out the horrors of wars, after they have feathered their nests with colonies, satellites or economic empires. The conscienceless barter of nationalities and races of the so-called under-developed peoples of the world will weigh heavily on the 'civilized' conscience of the great powers. To rule out war without eradicating injustice is to ask half the people of the world to accept slavery.

Churchill was reluctant to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire in the interests of the British People. But in 1954 we in India have willingly presided over the colonization of Tibet against our own self-interest. Now we have a hostile, unreasonable, unpredictable enemy on our northern borders, and the independence of the Himalayan Kingdoms of Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan are not worth the paper on which they have been proclaimed. History is likely to repeat itself, if we do not sit up and realize that the price of peace can become too high.

At this late stage, we should consider every means possible to bring about moral redress by a stimulation of world opinion through special conferences convened for the purpose, and actively sponsoring the issue at the United Nations. This procedure would be of particular benefit to the under-developed countries of Asia and Africa, who are still unaware of the means and methods of international communism.

The roof of the world has fallen to a ruthless communist aggressor. Let us take a simple lesson from our humble peasant—when his roof falls, he does not sit and watch, he immediately borrows help and money to put it right.

Massacre In South Africa

A public meeting under the auspices of the Africa Society was held on March 24 to condemn the brutal firing in the Union of South Africa on African citizens. Miss Maniben Kara, Mr. Mustafa Faki and Mr. Kodua addressed the meeting. Mr. M. R. Masani, M.P., was in the Chair. The meeting adopted the following resolution unanimously:

"This public meeting held under the auspices of the Africa Society condemns the brutal firing in the Union of South Africa on African citizens resulting in the death of about a hundred persons and severe injuries to several hundreds.

The meeting conveys its deep sense of sorrow and sympathy to the victims of the grave tragedy and expresses its sense of solidarity with the struggle of the African people for freedom and racial equality.

The meeting is of the opinion that the tragedy is the direct result of the racial policies followed by the Government of South Africa and of its attempt to perpetuate the tyrannical rule of a privileged minority. The meeting is convinced that the racialist policy of *apartheid* followed by the Government of South Africa will never succeed and that the only solution of the African problem is the development of a multi-racial democracy. The meeting appeals to progressive forces all over the world to mobilise public opinion against the reactionary and dangerous policies of the Government of South Africa and to compel it to abandon them. The meeting assures the African people of the Union of South Africa of the full support of the Indian people in their fight against the policy of *apartheid*."

(Continued from Page 7)

That is the correct evaluation of things. And so far as English is concerned, is it not much more ours than other European languages? Just give a thought to the amazing contribution of us Indians to the Treasury of English. What a high standard of achievement! Volumes and volumes of English written by us Indians have already passed into the Elysian fields of classics. Books on all subjects and all themes under the sun; prose, poetry and literary criticism, history and politics, law, equity and Jurisprudence, anthropology and archeology, religion and philosophy, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology and all the allied forty sciences and what not.

Lest I am misunderstood as an extreme advocate of English only, let me take this opportunity and rectify the misunderstanding. With all my love for English, with all my defence of English, it is far, far from my my thought to stultify the growth of our own languages. My only object is to point out that there is no sense, that it is sheer madness, to throw English overboard. Enlightened self-interest should prompt us to retain it as an important Second Language in the critical period of the Indian Renaissance through which we are passing. It is only on our healthy emergence from the throes of new birth that we shall be in a position to look in the face of the new world that is in shaping and walk hand in hand in the front line of the free and democratic countries of the world.

The Democratic Alternative

BY MISS M. A. DEVIKI
Rs. 2.50

Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom,
148 Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Red Man's Burden And Yellow Peril

by M. Devadas Kini

WHITE man's burden has tumbled down and is tumbling down. Now the Red man has picked up the burden of civilising the world and "liberating" the people from themselves. Of course, communists believe in self-determination. But they also believe that "whether it is appropriate for a nationality to be independent.... is for the Communist Party to decide." Indian communists, for example, supported the formation of Pakistan, but they oppose the same right to Tibet and it is so for the simple reason that Tibet has been occupied by the Chinese communists. Smacks of double standard? Oh! No. Consistency is the virtue of only fools and asses. And you know the Communist Party can do no wrong and has the divine right to decide what is what!

Kuomintang corruption, communist occupation of Yen-an with arms from Russia and Manchuria and dissatisfaction among the peasantry conspired together to catapult the communists into the saddle of China. They were not mere land reformers, as some people suspected, wished and hoped. After all "communism changes its mask, but never its character" as later the peasantry of China discovered.

It is not mere Red man's burden alone that has made China aggressive. Coupled with this are the historical facts of the Han Expansionism or the Yellow Peril and the population pressure. Even Sun-Yat-Sen claimed for China all land from Korea to Ceylon. Tibet is only the first victim of the awakened giant. In the book under review*, Mr. Frank Moraes in his inimitable style traces the history of the Roof of the World in a brief compass of 223 pages upto the flight of the God-King Dalai Lama and his dilemma.

Many traditions have died in Red China, but the Chinese tradition of imperialism is not one among them. It is an irony of History (or is it a vengeance?) that they should claim "sovereignty or, if you please, suzerainty", as Nehru put it, over Tibet on the ground that it was a vassal state of China once upon a time. As a matter of historical fact China was also a vassal state of Tibet once upon a time.

"During the reign of Ti-Song Detsan, China paid a yearly tribute of 50,000 yards of Chinese brocade to Tibet" (35), says the author. "From prehistoric days until 1951 the Tibetans have functioned as a free people for around 3,500 years with two interruptions, each of about 200 years—the first during the Manchu Era." (152)

The Chinese claim has well been described as "a constitutional fiction" and "political affectation".

Chinese have tried to paint the revolt in the hideous colours of their moth-eaten clichés of class-conflict. Even the figure of 13,000 refugees who have come to India in a population of a few millions is

enough to nail the lie. And the people have had enough reason to revolt. And here is what the Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party's Tibet Work Committee has to say:

"Great Han chauvinism in Tibet is manifested in the feeling of superiority of the Han race, repugnance at the backwardness of Tibet, discrimination against Tibet, distortion of Tibet, failure to respect the freedom of religious belief and traditional customs of the Tibetan people.... As a result, some cases have occurred where the nationalities policy was impaired, law and discipline were violated, and the freedom of religious belief and the customs of the Tibetans were not respected." (75-6)

This is straight from the horse's mouth.

Chinese have killed and deported thousands of Tibetans. They have imposed forced labour on many more. They have tried to extinguish and obliterate Tibet as a separate entity with a distant language, culture, religion and government.

"What at the moment appears to be attempted genocide may become the full act of genocide unless prompt and adequate action is taken" (78) says a report of the International Commission of Jurists.

Not all the perfumes of Arabia can sweeten and can all the waters of Ganga purify the hands that perpetrated this fate on Tibet.

So a new imperialism has emerged in Asia. Asia can be also dominate over Asians.

Moral of the Tibetan tragedy—a tragedy too deep for tears and too near to be forgotten—is that the communist leopard cannot change its spots, that their pledges are like pie-crusts, made only to be broken, that the old law that bigger fish swallow smaller ones still holds good and that the non-communist Asia must join together to defend itself before it is too late, before the Chinese dragon develops a taste for the blood of weaker nations. If the rape of Tibet has made collective defense necessary, cartographic aggression, nibbling at the borders and swallowing large chunks of Indian territory have made it imperative. A giant nation should not be allowed to run riot like a giant.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

Single Copy Re. 1

Annual Rs. 12

For members of the I.C.C.F. Rs. 10/-

ENCOUNTER is sold in India by all good booksellers, including International Bookhouse, 9 Ash Lane, Bombay; Central News Agency, Delhi; Foreign Publishers Agency, Grand Hotel Arcade, Calcutta; and Higginbotham's, Madras. The U.K. address of ENCOUNTER is 25 Haymarket, London S.W.1.

* *The Revolt in Tibet* by Frank Moraes, the MacMillan Company, New York. Pages: 223. Price Rs 7.50.

With Many Voices

"The deep
Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world."

—Tennyson.

If Nehru-Chou negotiations do not succeed in bringing about an agreement between the two countries on the peaceful solution of the problem, India will have to send an ultimatum to China to withdraw her troops from the Indian territory. Even a powerful personality like Mr. Nehru will be repudiated by the country if the Government of India take no effective steps to recover the territory from the illegal possession of the Chinese forces.

—Searchlight, March 7.

Mr. Nehru has developed some sort of secret diplomacy, and in his anxiety to go down in history as the greatest peacemaker of his age, he always sacrifices the country's interests.

—Deen Dayal Upadhyaya, *Indian Express*, March 4.

The Chinese idea of friendship and peaceful settlement seems to be forcible occupation of territory, accompanied by correspondence for the consolidation of the gains obtained by violence, with talks, meetings negotiations.

—Saka, *Swarajya*, March 5.

NEHRU ON CHINA AND TIBET—from page 8

fied power. I do not think they want any territory at all.....But China has not got over the first flush of its revolutionary mentality".

—Press Conference in Calcutta, *Hindustan Times*, October 22, 1959.

Addressing a public meeting in New Delhi on November 1, 1959, Mr. Nehru said that the border question was a big one, but it had possibilities of becoming bigger in the future. A "new chapter" opened between the relations of the two countries when Chinese opened fire at Longju and in Ladakh.

—*Times of India*, November 2, 1959.

The whole world, except China, is trying to go towards peace.

—Speech at a public meeting in New Delhi, *Hindustan Times*, November 2, 1959.

I think it (Chinese expansionism) is traditional, typically Chinese.....the urge made stronger by two factors. One is, of course, their growing strength. When you are weak you cannot indulge in it, and communism also helps in the process; but I think it is more Chinese than communistic.

—TV interview for Columbia Broadcasting System's Programme on December 20, 1959.

Mr. Nehru's policy of "non-alignment" has become such a fundamental article of faith with him that he will not, or cannot, understand that in the present juncture it hurts national interests.

—*The Mail*, March 23.

The Prime Minister has lapsed into the dangerous mood of hailing concurrence as wisdom and damning dissent as service to some vested interest or other.

—Saka, *Swarajya*, March 5.

The Communist Party is ruling India through Mr. Nehru.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Hindu*, March 17

The Prime Minister is throwing his ample mantle over the Defence Minister precisely because he recognises that the country resents the Defence Minister's undue influence in the conduct of many matters of large consequence to the country.

—*Eastern Economist*, March 18.

The real national danger is Mr. Nehru's increasing belief that he is an economist.

—Prem Bhatia, *Times of India*, March 22.

A White Book

TIBET FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM

The Story of the March 1959 Uprising as Recorded in
Documents, Despatches, Eye-Witness Accounts
and World-wide Reactions

With a Foreword by the DALAI LAMA
Edited by RAJA HUTHEESING

Crown 4 to viii+244 pp. 24 Photographs,
6 cartoons, 3 maps. Rs. 15

Published for

THE INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL
FREEDOM

148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

by

ORIENT LONGMANS

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
NEW DELHI HYDERABAD DACCA