

South Vietnam and Ourselves

Raman Desai

ABOUT a hundred years ago, the French occupied and set up Cochin China, as a protectorate. The Japanese occupied Indo-China during the last war. In 1945 and after, when the French tried to reoccupy the country, they were faced by the Communist revolt led by Ho Chi Minh assisted by Communist China. In 1954 when the French were decisively beaten, a ceasefire accord was signed in Geneva by which Vietnam, as it is now called, was divided along the Ben Hai river. The agreement provided for future elections to determine the status of the country; such a plebiscite has not been held. It may be noted that this agreement was signed by China, Communist of Indo-China, France and U.K; U.S.A. was only an observer.

The whole of Vietnam comprises an area of about 1.27 lac sq. miles with a population of about 3 crores. The Northern area under Ho Chi Minh comprises 62000 sq. miles, population 1.6 crores. The Southern area is about equal in area and population, 65000 sq. miles, population 1.5 crores. As usual with the Communists, their portion is called Democratic Republic, the word democracy being their purloined trademark, and the other, simply the Republic of Vietnam. Under a referendum, Ngo Dinh Diem was elected President of Southern Vietnam. The South has been assisted in every way by the U.S.A. ever since. From the beginning the Communist Viet Cong has launched a guerrilla warfare. In 1962 the U.S.A. placed a military advisory group in charge of all the South Vietnam forces. Ho Chi Minh has been actively assisted by China.

Ever since the Communists took power in China, in 1950, it has been their systematic endeavour to promote local civil wars in areas round the seaboard of Asia, to assist Communists in a guerrilla war with the object of dominating the entire South East Asia through their comrades and henchmen, the local Communist leaders. In Korea they succeeded partially. In this adventure they had the active assistance of Russia. In South East Asia, the vital centres, with which China is mischievously occupied to-day, are Laos and South Vietnam.

Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam comprise the three former French Indo-China. The area of the first is about 88000 sq. miles, population about 50 lacs; the second has 91000 sq. miles, population 18 lacs. The importance of these, comparatively small populations, to the major area of South Vietnam lies in their strategic situation. Laos has China to the North, Vietnam to the East, and Cambodia to the South; it has Thailand and Burma to its West. It is easy for North Vietnam to infiltrate into the eastern borders of Laos to attack South Vietnam on the western front, as well as on the northern front. Laos, at the evacuation of France, became an independent State, with a Constitutional monarchy. This was recognised by the Communists in a ceasefire agreement with France in 1954, in Geneva, endorsed by the U.S.A. and U.N. Laos is a U.N. member.

In Laos, parties which really are factions, may be termed, Communists, anti-communists, neutralists. Theoretically the country's policy is neutralist. The minor conflict has been kept ablaze with Russian arms, North Vietnam guerrillas and today with the help of China. Strangely, there are Princes involved in internecine war, the Communist Pathet Lao movement in the northern third of the country led by Prince Souphanouvong. The three rival Princes agreed on a Coalition Government in June 1962. In July 1962, the Geneva Conference of 14 nations signed agreements guaranteeing the neutrality and independence of Laos.

This is the background in which China, actively assisting the local communist factions, has embarked, for the last 7 years, on a campaign to subjugate the South East countries of Asia. Recently, by its actions, the Burmese Government has made it clear that its alignment lies with China. If Burma is actively dragged into this warfare, as it well may be forced to, the entire future of the sub-continent of India and Pakistan, the State of Malaysia, Singapore and the lifeline to Australia are threatened in a manner more deadly than the Japanese occupation of these areas during the last War. President Ayub regards these attempts as intended to capture, not territory but the minds of the people. Looking to the history of Eastern European Countries, this distinction looks more esoteric than genuine. The Chinese have not bothered about the minds of Tibetans, except as objects of slavery, with a definite conquest of territory and it is not as if they are interested only in the zealous promotion of Marxist Leninist maxims of

Communist theory. The U.S. which had kept aloof from these events has been driven into active participation, firstly with economic aid, then with military advice and then into active military action with their soldiers and material, in face of a steady influx of arms from Communist North Vietnam and even from China, into Laos and South Vietnam.

Today, an action which U.S.A. took in 1950, an appeal to Security Council of U.N. with the resultant approval for action to stop the invasion in Korea, is impractical. The idea of an U.N. army in South East Asia would be vetoed by the communist members in the Security Council.

"The issues", said President Johnson, "are political as well as military, economic as well as strategic." For the U.S. armies to withdraw from participation in the conflict in South Vietnam is to surrender the whole of South East Asia to China. Enormous supplies of rice, coal, tin, rubber, and from Cambodia supplies of cotton, and oil seeds, would be available to China for its enrichment. A further involvement would, on the other hand, mean a supply by U.S.A. of arms and men, of the extent and size of Korean War. From the beginning of the Geneva agreements, the Communists, local and of China, have regarded any settlement as a breathing space for regrouping and consolidation. Any further attempt at a political settlement, by way of neutralisation or further markings of parallels and partitions, will be regarded by the communists as a tactic to stave off action by a determined U.S.A. Government, a period of delay to reorganise guerrilla forces. Such settlements can only mean a face saving device, in case the democratic powers intend to surrender. Malaysia and its gallant creator, would be routed in a few weeks, thereafter, and the lines of communication to Australia sundered. A defeat of democracy in this area would involve a loss, to the free world, far greater than the occupation of these states during the war by Japan.

It is for these reasons that India's foreign policy, in so far as it affects South East Asia, should be radically changed. Hitherto we have befriended Burma, year after year, and unhappily we have failed to-day to save our citizens from a forced ouster in a destitute condition. We, or rather our government, in a hypnotic trance of mumbling mantrams of panchsheel, have openly showed our goodwill to China, and offered not even sympathy in the ordeal

of South Vietnam. Towards Malaysia we have turned a little sympathetic, only recently. And yet our security, in the most literal sense, against China is intimately bound with the fate of Burma and the part of South East Asia. It is the Indian archipelago under the British, which kept peace and freedom for the whole of South East Asia, before independence. The British had a stake in the vast sea communications within their Empire. But today their, may be selfish, intentions have become the vital motivations of our safety, and the policy and the method of keeping our security ought to go back to the British days. We ought to inform our people of the pressing needs, not only to arm ourselves on the Northern borders, but we should be willing to assist in all ways we can, the people of Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Malaysia. These are our allies, as the Czechs and the Poles were of U.K. and France against Hitler, and our foreign policy should recognise the dangers of the men of Munich, the appeasers and betrayers of tomorrow. And if all this involves an active support of U.S.A. in its lone fight against Communist dictatorship in Asia, there need be no feeling of inferiority about it. It must be recognised that brinkmanship would have paid off in 1914, and again in 1937, in support of the Czechs by the Western Powers, and if there is no other way to arrest China, well, it just cannot be helped. Lastly, I trust we and the government need no reminder that China is in occupation of large areas of our country, is poised to strike and it is mere pusillanimity on the part of our ruling class that refrains from calling our relations with China by their proper name, open war. And would the fact that Russia has declared its inability to support China in any conflict that the latter, in pursuit of "China's special goals and interests", as *Izvestia* puts it, may get into with U.S.A., contribute to this our change of mentality?

Tibet Fights For Freedom

An Orient Longmans Publication

Price Rs. 15



"This hose is also leaky!"

Courtesy: B.P.A.

After The Das Report

A. G. Mulgaonkar

THE tide has turned. Although it is true that tide turns every twelve hours and it has taken seventeen years in India for the tide of ministerial corruption to turn, future historians will look upon the Das report as the turn of the tide. It has revealed, as only a judicial probe could have revealed, the wide ramifications of ministerial corruption. But, far more it has established the principle that never must a party colleague, however eminent and personally incorruptible, be entrusted with the inquiry into the charges. The attitude of corrupt ministers was beautifully summed up by Robert Clive nearly two centuries ago. When himself charged with corruption, in Parliament he exclaimed, "Gentlemen, I am amazed at my own moderation. An empire was at my feet and I only took two million pounds!"

In England, where also ministerial corruption previously was rampant, the tide is said to have turned with the disclosures in what has been called the South Sea Bubble and the penalties then imposed with a heavy hand upon the ministers implicated. John Aislabie, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, found guilty of the "most notorious, dangerous and infamous corruption" was expelled from the House and imprisoned. By act of Parliament estates were confiscated and Stanhope, the head of the ministry and predecessor of Robert Walpole, though himself acquitted, soon died of shame. In the early East India Company days corruption was no less common among the Company's free-booting servants and it was a common sight in England of those days to see many of these India-returned Navabs living in the luxury of their extravagances while famine stalked India and the Company nearly went bankrupt.

In India today corruption has assumed such wide proportions that it has become the talk of the marketplace. You hear of it in the factories, in the lifts and on the stairs, indeed, everywhere. Names are mentioned, official and ministerial, details given and however far-fetched, people incline to believe them. Who can blame them? For the last seventeen years, as in the early days of the East India Company, the corrupt have had a field day. The efforts of Mr. Nanda, therefore, deserve every support provided these efforts genuinely meet the situation and carry in them the possibilities of success. It is hardly necessary to mention names or the details of their perfidy, but it will be readily conceded that some of them are among the most powerful in the land and they have used their power to enrich themselves and their relations. Mr. Nanda's proposals fall considerably short of what is required. An effort is made

to distinguish the official from the minister and it is the official who is to disclose his assets and prove that they were legitimately come by. Now let us not forget that the minister is the trusted representative of the people whose function, indeed duty, is to protect the public from the official. If then, instead, he uses his power and influence to defraud them and enrich himself, his conduct is far more heinous. Therefore, it is altogether out of place to deal with the question of ministerial corruption as if it were a party-matter or on the basis of ad hoc improvisation. Today the country will not stand for it. Upto now the method usually followed was, and surprisingly it seems to be indicated also in the reported scheme of Mr. Nanda, for the Prime Minister to deal with the matter or as in the cases of Mr. Datar and Mr. Kannamwar to refer the matter to a colleague. And what was invariably the result?

Take the classic case of Mr. Profumo in England where public life is definitely cleaner than in this country. He was cleared by five or six of his senior ministerial colleagues including the two law officers, the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General (who in that country are members of the Government and are party-men). These five or six senior ministers were all highly experienced politicians and the two law-officers leading members of the legal profession with vast experience in cross-examination. And yet, why was Mr. Profumo able to hoodwink them? It was because they were willing to be hoodwinked or as Lord Denning says, their approach was wrong in that they omitted to consider what was easily available to them, the notorious Profumo letter.

Consider the Kairon Case here. The sordid details of this matter had been pressed before the Prime Minister, officially, at least three times, in 1958, 1960 and in 1963. On all these occasions the late Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, refused to take any action because he was satisfied with Mr. Kairon's explanation. It was only after this when on July 13, 1963 Master Tara Singh and twenty-two others waited upon the President of India and submitted a Memorandum in writing containing certain allegations against Mr. Kairon, that the decision to appoint the Das Commission was taken — presumably on the insistence of the President. The Das Commission, which adopted very severe standards of proof and held Mr. Kairon not guilty on several charges in the Memorandum and on some others entitled to benefit of the doubt, held him guilty of some very serious charges. It is a natural inference that but for the persistence of the memorialists over the years, the

Punjab would have been saddled with Mr. Kairon for many years to come.

It is permissible here to refer to only one of the charges against Mr. Kairon, if only to show how powerfully party affiliations influence the conduct of even upright men. This charge was in respect of purchase by the Punjab Government of lands belonging to the mother-in-law of Mr. Kairon's son and the findings in brief are (p. 212, Das Commission Report): that the purchase of such lands in disregard of legal opinion and in violation of certain Acts was effected with the full knowledge of Mr. Kairon, if not directly at his behest. In order to give this transaction a semblance of decency a colleague of Mr. Kairon wrote to Mr. N. V. Gadgil, then the Governor of the Punjab, that Mr. Kairon was reluctant to permit this purchase but "I earnestly seek your help in asking the Chief Minister not to press his objection...." "In good faith" the Governor complied. The attention of the Governor was not drawn to the opinion of the Legal Remembrancer or to the provisions of the two relevant Acts nor did the Governor ask for the relevant papers to be sent to him. An earlier Congress panel to whom some charges had been referred in 1958, recorded: "As a result of our investigation we have come to the conclusion that there is no basis at all for any corruption" (sic), though there might be some constructive responsibility.

It is clear from these instances that a colleague of the impugned minister is the last person to be trusted with the objective task of evaluating the evidence against him. In any serious attempt to deal with ministerial corruption, it is most essential that this should be done by an agency which should not be suspect. An excellent solution would be to entrust this important task of evaluating evidence to the President at the Centre and to the Governors at the State level, with a right of appeal to the President. With the assistance of a small secretariat the task of vetting can be done quite efficiently at this stage. In doubtful cases the President or the Governor can seek the help of one of the judges of either the Supreme or the local High Court, such judge to be nominated by the Chief Justice of that Court.

But the success of any scheme to root out this evil, which today has become a serious national security risk, however sincere and however determined, must depend upon one measure which can not now be delayed. Every minister, present and past, and his relatives in the immediate degrees, must be called upon, indeed forced by legislation, if necessary, to declare his assets. The new Punjab Chief Minister has shown the way and the country will be satisfied with nothing less. The supposed risk of blackmail is nil. Can anyone who has nothing to

conceal, nothing to be ashamed of, ever be blackmailed?

The following, therefore, must be regarded as fundamental to any legislation which seeks to eradicate corruption:—

1. (a) Declaration of assets by everyone who has held political office. Income-Tax returns to be made available to declared complainants. (b) Such declaration to include statement of investments outside country and deposits in banks abroad.
2. Total elimination of informal examination of complaints (including those by party colleagues) at any stage.
3. Prima Facie finding to be entrusted to the President (for the whole country) and to the Governors, for their respective States, in their individual judgment. Special secretariat to be provided to them for the purpose and they to proceed on complaints authenticated in the prescribed manner.
4. On a finding of prima facie case the matter to be referred to a Commission of Inquiry — a special act to be passed for this purpose, which will lay down the functions and powers of the Commission including those of punishment; the qualifications of the Commissioners, etc.
5. The non-declaration of assets as required in (1) should automatically, and in any other fit case on a notification by the President or Governor, make the defaulter liable to penalties as prescribed in the Insolvency Act, i.e. all his property would vest in the Secretary to the President or Governor, an allowance being made for his maintenance and defence during the pendency of the proceedings.
6. The offence of corruption on the part of minister, deputy minister etc. (definition to include all elective political functionaries of party organisations) and public officials (above the rank of Deputy-Secretaries to Government by a schedule to be prepared) to be included in the Chapter of Offences against the State in the Indian Penal Code, making the person convicted, among other things, liable to total confiscation of property; this to apply posthumously also so that by death or suicide liability cannot be evaded.

We must bear in mind one aspect of the matter. Why is it that public confidence in the judiciary stands so high when the politician in the white cap is universally suspect? It is because the probity in the judiciary remains unassailable.

Goldwater On Goldwater

Now that Senator Barry Goldwater has been nominated Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, it is important that people in India should know a little about the man and what he stands for. Here in his own words are his reasons for his stand on the issues of the day. "Freedom First" carries the text of Goldwater's recent interview with the German magazine, "Der Spiegel" as a document that should be of interest to its readers.—EDITOR

Q. Senator Goldwater, why do you think your candidacy was opposed so bitterly by some elements in the Republican Party?

A. I know the very widely held theory, and I have never heard it disputed in my life, that the Eastern money interests—the large banks, the financial houses—have most always been able to control the selection of the Republican candidate.

They want to be able to control not the foreign policy as you and I think of foreign policy based on peace and war, but the foreign policy of this country relative to interest rates, gold balances, values, etc., and in my case they don't have this control and they are getting quite frantic in their efforts to have somebody get me out.

Q. Senator, how come you are referred to in the United States, and even more so in Europe, as a man of the "far right"? Do you consider yourself a radical?

A. No. I don't. If being for the Constitution of our Government is radical, then I am a radical. I have never considered myself an extremist.

Q. How would you define "far right"?

A. Well, I would say that the "far right" would be fascism, and the "far left" would be Communism, and we have a very, very, very small part of either party that I would call "far right."

I can't think of anybody in the Congress now that you might term "far right."

Q. You have been criticized as an impulsive man who shoots from the hip occasionally, even on important issues—

A. That may be so, but every time I have shot from the hip it has come later to be the accepted position of this country.

I remember when they built the wall in Berlin and I said, "Tear it down." Oh, the American press stood aghast. Yet it wasn't two weeks later that our Ambassador said the same thing, and today everybody agrees it should come down.

I was one of the first to come out strongly for NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization], and for having the NATO forces supplied with our modern weapons. And everybody said, "This man wants nuclear war." Yet today they're advocating similar policies.

Q. But haven't you advocated the use of nuclear weapons in South Vietnam to defoliate the jungle?

A. About a month and a half ago, on a television

show, I was asked the technical question, "How could you get at the trails through the rain forests of North Vietnam?" Well, I served in the rain forests of Burma, and I know that the only practical way to get at them is defoliation, so in answer to a technical question like this, one possible way of doing it, even though I made clear that this would never be done, would be the use of low-yield nuclear devices.

Q. You have termed the idea of peaceful coexistence an illusion, and you said, "Between Communists and those who believe in a transcendent spiritual order there can be no enduring compromise." How would you preserve peace without such a compromise?

A. First of all, there are two interpretations of coexistence: one is living in a world with other people. We do that all the time. But this struggle today is a struggle between godless people and the people of God, and if you want to put it in its basic form, it's between slavery and freedom. It's now worldwide.

I claim that we cannot live with these two philosophies in the world forever. Sometime there'll be only one. We're not fighting the Russian people; we're not fighting the Red Chinese people. Our conflict is a conflict between governments and the government philosophies.

Q. What other choice do we have, then, except to bring about negotiations between these different governments?

A. Well, I'm not skeptical to an extreme point, except that out of 52 formal agreements that they made with the Western powers since World War II, the Communists have broken 50 or 51. If you cheated me once, I might forgive you. But if you cheated me twice, then it would be pretty hard for me to forgive you, and in this respect I say that the Russians should show by activity, by some action, that they are to be trusted.

Q. But would it really help to withdraw diplomatic recognition from Russia?

A. My disagreement with diplomatic recognition of Russia goes back to the day when we did it in the 1930s. I opposed it then, and I never thought that it has redounded to the benefit of the Western world.

Today I look upon this as a tool. Before we go blithely selling Russia wheat, for instance, let's ask for some concessions. Let's use as a threat to get

those concessions the terrific need she has for our recognition. This is not something I would do just overnight. This is something that would come about through consultation with our own people and our allies.

Q. When you say that we should look for victory rather than peace in the cold war, what could that victory be?

A. The victory would be not a military victory necessarily. I don't think it need be, but an ideological victory where our concepts of government, our concepts of freedom would replace the false concepts of Communism.

I don't think this is going to happen the day after tomorrow, but I do think that it can come without going to war.

Q. Would you go to the brink of war?

A. Yes, just as your country has used "brinkmanship" down through the years and done so very, very successfully. We've tried it; we've been successful, and we've gone closer to peace in the Strait of Formosa, in Lebanon, in Egypt, in Greece, in Berlin than we have ever been since.

Germany under Hitler would never have gone to war had the United States been a strong military nation and made it clear to our allies that any intervention by Hitler would mean intervention by us.

Q. What would you do if the Russians should try to block the access routes to Berlin again?

A. I think we would have to match their force, not from the outset with shooting. We again should use diplomatic weapons, or we could establish the Berlin Airlift again. In other words, we should demonstrate the determination that the traffic to West Berlin is not going to stop, and we will do whatever we have to do to keep it open.

We could put on economic pressure, too. Russia is not in good shape economically, nor will she be, and I think there are some long-range chances here for a real breakthrough if the Western world would use them.

Q. NATO is in a state of crisis. Do you know how to cure it?

A. NATO, I happen to think, is the greatest organization ever put together for peace and for long-range political possibilities and economic possibilities. We see NATO deteriorating because they are not getting modern weapons. They are not commanders of their own weapons. And I think that this is one area that we must greatly strengthen, and this, in itself, will show the potential enemy the determination of the United States to back her NATO partners.

Q. Do you want to give the member states of NATO command over nuclear weapons?

A. No. These should be weapons for NATO, and there still has to be some measure of control, but

that control ought to be rested as closely as possible in NATO itself.

Q. What nuclear weapons are you talking about now?

A. We are talking about tactical nuclear weapons of a very small nature.

There is real need for the supreme commander, not local commanders, as has been reported, to be able to use judgment on the use of these weapons more expeditiously than he could by telephoning the White House. I would say that, in these cases, the supreme commander should be given great leeway in the decision to use them or not to use them.

Q. Do you go along with De Gaulle's views of the alliance?

A. I recognize De Gaulle's interest. He is a Frenchman. They are the largest country over there. He's going to be charged with a large part of the defence of Europe if any trouble comes. I believe that we should have given him a little help with his nuclear development, although this to me is not too important, because he will get it anyway. But by giving NATO better weapons, more modern weapons, I think we could have satisfied De Gaulle.

Q. What do you think about the part Germany should play politically and militarily?

A. In fact, I'll say this, not because you're here in the interest of a German magazine: that I think the peace of the world depends upon a large measure to a constant alliance between our country and Germany. I think we have to work, although I can't suggest any route, to a united Germany.

An alliance with Germany, I think, is imperative. I think two wars have demonstrated it, and I say this with all due respect to our military: Had not Germany in both wars been subjected to the supreme command of men, or a man, in any case, who didn't understand war, I think Germany would have won both of them.

Q. Do you also still advocate helping possible uprisings in Eastern Europe by being prepared to move a task force, equipped with appropriate nuclear weapons, along with an ultimatum?

A. If that became necessary, if that were the only way, yes.

For example, go back to Hungary. Had the United States followed through her commitments to Hungary, I think Hungary would be a free country today. These are tools that we have to be ready to use if we're going to be able to say to people, "If you're willing to fight for freedom, we're willing to help you."

Q. Why did you vote "No" to the civil-rights bill in the Senate the other day?

A. I voted against this because of constitutional principles.

Q. Could the fact that you believe the bill is partly

unconstitutional keep you from enforcing it if you became President?

A. No, it could not. You have to take an oath of office. In fact, I may say one of the troubles we have today with civil rights in this country is the fact that the Administration refuses to enforce the laws that are on the books.

Q. Do you think you would stand a chance to win over President Johnson in November?

A. If you ask that question as of now—and I always like to answer political questions “as of now”—no, I don’t think any Republican can, as of now.

But I’ll say this: that no Republican can do anything against Johnson without the support of the South. And they cannot support Scranton, Rockefeller or Lodge down there. They could support Nixon to some extent. But they could support me more completely. How much, I don’t know.

I don’t think I’d be rash enough to say I could beat Johnson in the South as of now, but, come Election Day, there’s going to be another horse race, I believe.

In its own version, “Der Spiegel” did not print the complete text of the interview as authorized by Senator Goldwater. The editors of “Der Spiegel” granted to “U.S. News & World Report” permission to present the following excerpts from the unpublished text—

Senator Goldwater was asked about the military strength of U.S. and Russia—where each stands now. His reply:

“You ask me that question at this moment, and so I would say that the United States is strong enough militarily to do pretty much what she wants to do with Russia.

“But if you ask that question again in 1970, I would have to agree that our failure to provide new strategic weapons—particularly in manned aircraft and in improved missiles—will put us behind the Russians. At that point, I think we can expect trouble.”

During the interview, the conversation shifted to a discussion of “liberal” and “conservative” Republicans. The questioner quoted Governor William Scranton of Pennsylvania as saying Senator Goldwater wants to split the party, and asked, “Do you?” The Senator answered in these words:

“No. And I think probably I have made more speeches on that subject than Scranton has had birthdays. I am opposed to a third-party movement. I believe in the two-party system. I have spoken on it time and time again.

“I don’t know, frankly, who is writing Scranton’s stuff. It’s getting a little bit on the silly side. He’s been a member of my Air Force squadron for years. We know each other intimately. He knows these things aren’t true.

“I see again he’s not going to support me if I’m nominated. On again, off again.

“Foreign correspondents fail to see this. A conservative never threatens to bolt the party. The only threats we get are from men like Javits, Keating, Kuchel, Scranton and Rockefeller. These are the liberals in the Republican Party. They say: ‘Either do it my way or I won’t do it your way.’ The liberals are the ones that always leave the party. It’s we conservatives that get out and break our necks.”

At one point the questioning turned to economic foreign aid and a public-opinion poll indicating 30 per cent of the public favors it. The Senator was asked if he favored granting such aid only to friendly, non-Communist countries. His reply:

“I don’t want to give it, period.

“I think that in the days of the Marshall Plan there was wisdom in it then—to help build up Europe. Now Europe stands on her own feet.

“I would ask our allies to participate in a multi-lateral fund that could be used for loan purposes or, in the case of no possibility to pay it back, then a grant. But this business of the United States just willy-nilly giving billions of dollars away and receiving nothing in return—I can’t buy that. We can’t afford it.

“Nobody can ever prove these polls. I can take polls that will show you 90 per cent of the people are against foreign aid, because I know how to make a poll. If foreign aid could be voted on by the American people, they would reject it. Just like the civil-rights bill. If they could have locked the doors to the Senate and turned the lights off, it wouldn’t have gotten 25 votes.”

The questioning developed discussion of a World War III that brought this comment from Senator Goldwater:

“I think we’re pretty well engaged in World War III right now in Southeast Asia. We started again when France found herself in trouble back in the late ’50s.

“We could have very easily gone to her help, and World War III would have been diverted. Now we stand in Southeast Asia and yet we refuse to say what we’re going to do. And as long as we remain weak, the Communists are going to take advantage. Wars are always risked when supposedly strong and peaceful nations become weak.”

The Senator was asked what he would do about Southeast Asia. The answer:

“I would make it abundantly clear—and I think President Johnson is tending in that direction—that we aren’t going to pull out of Southeast Asia but that we are going to win in fact.

“Now the next decision becomes based on military decisions. I don’t think that’s up to a presidential candidate, or even the President.

“I would turn to my Joint Chiefs of Staff and say:

'Fellows, we made the decision to win, now it's your problem.'

The subject of Communist China and the U.N. came up, and the questioner said polls show that never had more than 13 per cent of the American people favored withdrawing from the United Nations. Senator Goldwater said this:

"If Red China comes in, these polls don't mean a thing.

"The American people unanimously are opposed to admission of Red China. And, upon sober reflection

of what that would do to the United Nations without changing the rules or the Charter, I think they would favor either pulling out or a very great slowing down of the activities of the United Nations in this country.

"I've never advocated withdrawing from the United Nations. In fact, I've given more support to the United Nations than have some of my critics. But I'm a realist, and I don't want to see the Western world subjected to the domination of the Afro-Asian-neutral-Communist bloc."

Is Your Travel Necessary?

Raman Desai

MR. K. P. S. MENON writing his diary, of his projected tour with his wife last month, in a local paper, stated that this dream voyage would never have been permitted if Mr. Morarji Desai were still the Finance Minister. Another beneficiary of Mr. Desai's departure is Mr. Naik, the Chief Minister of Bombay who, with his wife and son, took a short tour of Europe recently. It is not to be thought of that Mr. Naik had this tour in mind, when he voted for the new Prime Minister, perish the thought. Mr. Naik's defence is that he was only stepping in Mr. Chavan's shoes in accepting hospitality from Mr. Chowgule. If a mere Secretary in the Government had dared to go forth on a similar voyage I am sure there would have been a vast show of indignation. That Mr. Naik should state in the Assembly that if others thought it wrong, he was sorry for it, shows amazing lack of perception. Is it nothing for a Minister to accept lavish hospitality from a businessman with whom the Government has dealing when Mr. Nanda is worrying about with whom officials should stay when on tour? I suppose foreign exchange was provided, on this travel, by friends. But the foreign exchange regulations do not permit ordinary citizens the right to go abroad even though friends may provide foreign exchange, without considerable enquiry. Anyone who returns after such an outing is faced with a letter from the Government asking him to disclose the source of such foreign exchange.

Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari must have made many recent changes in foreign exchange rules because I know a father who was not allowed to visit his daughter in U.K. although she was providing exchange for him from her earnings there. And wives were not allowed to accompany husbands even on official visits. I am sure Mr. Naik's son has benefited greatly from this educative tour. Here again until recently only first class graduates were permitted to go abroad for study and a pleasure jaunt was out of

question. Administrators in India ought to make a study of the Indian Tradition affecting the actual administration at all levels. The influence of caste is obvious. But the influence of the idea of the Son as an indispensable agent for the salvation, after death, of the father, on the conduct of public administration should provide a fertile field for research. The Hindu Son not only ensures salvation, he provides rice balls as nutrition in heaven. It is reported that Mr. Shukla, late Chief Minister of M.P. stated that if a son ensured salvation to the father in heaven, it was the duty of the father to look after his son on this earth. A sentiment which did not receive due appreciation in the Das Report.

In this connection, considering how desperate our position with regard to foreign exchange continues, it is necessary to review the permission granted to Indian citizens to maintain foreign exchange abroad in respect of balances stored prior to independence. There is no reason why after all these years, and in view of our dire necessity, Indian nationals should not be forced to relinquish such foreign currency and accept rupees instead. During the first and the second World Wars the balances of U.K. citizens in U.S.A. whether in the form of shares, investments and cash with bankers, were taken over by the U.S.A. Government, in return for pounds to finance war material purchases in U.S.A. and the citizens of U.K. willingly agreed to these arrangements. I do not know what is the situation with regard to foreign exchange earned and stored by citizens of Goa before liberation. But if these citizens have been permitted to retain their balances abroad, the same argument applies to them. It is understood that the balances of Goa citizens abroad are vast.

Mr. K. P. S. Menon will no doubt continue to regale us with his flimsy stories on his voyage every Sunday. I suppose there is a market for these I.C.S. men who weave stories around themselves, stretching a tiny

episode over many columns, in the manner of foreign journalists. Mr. Menon knew little enough of Stalin and his ways in Moscow but how well he builds up the lament on May 27. And then Mr. Iyengar was so intimate with Mr. Nehru and Mr. Patel; note how Mr. Nehru revealed himself on Gandhiji's passing; to his secretary. The conversations are so vivid, no doubt one suspects Mr. Iyengar has kept an invaluable diary, happily one diary which did not get misplaced. It would be interesting to know what researches in Cooperative farming and Dairy products have resulted from Mr. Naik's whirlwind tour to Europe. I remember an American scholar, on a world tour to study economic conditions in Asia. I took him

to Macneice of "Capital" to learn all about the Tea Trade. I remember the scathing para in Ditcher's Diary the next week about such globetrotters. For, it appeared that the American's total stay in Calcutta for this purpose was less than 24 hours; later no doubt he submitted a learned thesis to UNESCO on the entire Tea and Jute trade in India. Mr. Naik however, may have been faced with one difficulty and it would be interesting to know how he overcame it. In his itinerary was included Venice. The last time I saw Venice there was hardly any land visible among the lagoons and in the Grande Canal, conditions not quite favourable to research in Cooperative farming.

A Visit To Free China (June 1964)

Dahyabhai V. Patel

OUR first halt was at Saigon, South Viet-nam. We often read of the war or unrest there, we even heard the gun fire nearly every night. Yet Saigon appeared to be peaceful and people calmly went round for their business unperturbed. Even women who take very active part in all activities are moving about, some on foot, some on bicycles, some on motor-cycles.

There was something peculiar about the people of Viet-nam whether it is their food or their particular type of fish or oil they use, they all look so young and slim, even mothers of a dozen children look quite young and healthy and there is no grey hair on their heads. The Government seems to be formed of young, determined people. The President and the Prime Minister both belonging to the army that had taken control after the fall of the Diem regime. There are talks of holding an election, but when it would be possible is difficult to forecast. The earnestness of the people and the Government and their determination to resist Communist aggression was evident everywhere. They are willing to take the help, technical know-how from friendly countries wherever possible. We were shown Dalat, a hill station, beautiful and green. We also saw their Military Academy nearby. We met a number of South-Indians who have been staying there for quite some years, perhaps a couple of generations, who carry on their trade. There is also a South Indian Restaurant, where people from India, passing through Saigon, can find some Indian type of food of their liking.

After six days in Viet-nam, we passed through Hongkong. Our halt there was more or less for a few hours only just to catch the connecting flight for Taipei. Hongkong has developed into a busy city

and is still growing. Sindhi refugees from Karachi, some of whom came to Bombay after the partition, have moved to Hongkong and are doing well. They have all participated in building activities just as they have in Bombay. But, there are fewer restriction and more encouragement from the State. So the pace of development is much faster and buildings much taller. Daily, refugees inspite of difficulties, evading sentinels, are trekking into Hongkong because they find easy employment and life is more comfortable. Hongkong can easily absorb them in trade, industry and building activities.

We then proceeded to Taiwan (Formosa). On arrival at Taipei, Capital of Taiwan, we were welcomed by friends of the Asian People's Anti Communist League. A group of Chinese girl students who were born in India greeted us with garlands of flowers. We had an opportunity of meeting important people in the Government besides the Speaker, the President of the Upper House, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Defence, and on the last day of our visit, we were honoured by an invitation to tea with the President of the Republic, The Generalissimo, Chiang Kaishek and Madam Chiang, whom we were agreeably surprised to see in such good health, looking very much younger than the age of 75 that he has reached. During our fortyfive minutes talk with him he recalled his earlier visit to India, his meeting with Gandhiji and how he had advocated freedom for India even during the war to the annoyance of his allies, the British Government, particularly Mr. Winston Churchill.

The administration of Chiang Kaishek during his last few years on the Mainland had come in for some criticism for corruption and inefficiency by the

administration of Taiwan (Formosa) is something quite different. It has made spectacular progress in the field of agriculture which provided employment to 48% of the population. Full advantage is taken of the favourable weather, 1/3rd of the land is cultivable and two crops of rice and two subsidiary crops are raised. Production is being stepped up continuously for the last twelve years. It may be useful to send a few study teams and see how that little country has succeeded in stepping up its agricultural production, after introducing land ceilings, while our agricultural production has been failing. We were assured that such visits would be welcome. We were shown charts and diagrams based on 1946 with 100 as the general index. The increase in 1963 was 369 in agricultural production. Similarly forestry production under the same period was 746, advance in fishery production was not so fast as before 1951, but was stepped up in the next decade to 681. These are some of the figures which show how food and agricultural production has been stepped up. While passing through the country, we saw men and women working in the fields well-dressed. We saw no beggars or anyone in tattered clothes. In the field of education also Taiwan has made rapid progress. There is universal compulsory education. Instead of the 5 colleges and Universities in 1944, there are now 35 Institutions for advanced training. Instead of 73 middle-schools in 1944, there are now 481. Literacy of 98 per cent is claimed. 22.8 per cent of the population is attending college, middle or elementary schools. Railways, Bus routes, Fertilizer Factories and Sugar Factories are all public sector undertakings and each one of them is working at a profit and paying a handsome dividend. These factories were built or purchased from the owners by paying them the market value in bonds. Similarly bonds were also paid as purchase price for most of the owners of the lands when the ceiling law was introduced. The method of introducing Ceiling Law has perhaps been the reason for their agricultural development. The owner-cultivator was allowed to keep the land when he was cultivator upto the ceilings. The absentee-landlord was paid off in instalments spread over for a period of 10 years by the new owner-cultivator. So he is now the permanent owner of the land he cultivates and because of the stepping up of agriculture, he earns a higher income from the same land and invests it in industry, earning a dividend on this investment. Even though a small country, its industry has been considerably modernised, shops were full and were open till 10 o'clock at night.

We were taken to the Quemoi Island, which is about 2500 meters away from the nearest Red Chinese Island and where there is some firing on both the sides every alternate day. We were shown their fortifications which appear to us similar to Magino line in France. The Communist did make an attempt

to land troops to capture the island a couple of years ago. 15,000 men were landed. Hardly anyone got back. They were either killed or taken prisoners. Taiwan claims that they do not lose more than 200 and since then there has been no invasion. Literature, food parcels and clothing are being air-dropped to the Mainland from aeroplanes or by filled balloons so that the people on the Mainland might know of the progress the Taiwan Regime is making, of the type of food they are eating and of the type of clothes they wear, all of which are in short supply in the Mainland.

Fishermen from both sides often meet in the open sea and through them, the people of Taiwan know what is happening inside the Mainland China and the amount of discontent prevailing among the masses there, and the failure of agricultural production through their much-advertised "take off" plans. While we were at the Quemoi Island, we were invited to lunch by the Commander-in-Chief of the Chinese forces, there was their other guest the Chief of Viet-namese armies and his advisers, possibly exchanging news and learning from each other's experience. After the defeat of the invading army from the Mainland, South-East Asian countries seem to feel that Taiwan or free China as they call themselves, have built up a technique and are well-equipped to meet an invasion. They have, of course, the advantage of being an Island. But, South East Asian countries, who are all sufferers from Communist infiltration are now looking towards Taiwan with the hope to learn how to meet an invasion. One felt that this was particularly so after the debacle our country suffered at the hands of the Chinese Communists two years ago on our northern borders. They were looking more towards us. But they are distressed at our country's stand towards Communist China. Today there appeared to be growing a fellow-feeling in all the South-East Asian countries, that are suffering infiltration and have fear of the Chinese invasion. What is going to be our country's role is the question everybody asks? The first question we were asked almost everywhere was whether our Government would recognise Free China or Taiwan. We made it clear that we were a Non-Official Delegation, representing members of Opposition Parties and therefore we could not speak on behalf of the Government. But certainly we would, in our own way, urge the Government to recognise a Government, a Regime that has been in existence for 15 years, that has been able to establish a proper Government, that has been able to give its people peace and progress. A land that has been suffering from the colonial rule under the Japanese for 50 years just as India before independence, the President of which had pleaded for India's independence many many years ago.

Review

Wage Determination and Organised Labour in India

A. J. Fonseca, Oxford University Press. — Rs. 10

DR. FONSECA has examined in the book the impact of trade unions on the determination of wages. He has examined it historically by reference to wage rates that have developed in various industries during the last quarter of a century as well as statistically. He has also examined it on the background of conditions obtaining in some European countries. The conclusion that he has reached is as follows: "In other words, the trade unions are now accepted as an established group that has a say in the determination of wages. During times of prosperity, the unions can effectively lever the level of wages in an upward direction, and during time of depression, when the wage level tends to decline, they can exercise a restraining influence." Another conclusion that he has reached is: "In India, at the present time, the absence of labour organisation correlates with low wages."

It is clear from Dr. Fonseca's discussion that as a result of trade union action and its impact even on unorganised sectors money wages and earnings have registered big increases. But trade unions have no control over prices and they have registered far bigger increases. As a result, real wages have lagged far behind and it is only in recent years that they reached the pre-war level. This is a sad reflection on the effectiveness of trade unions and on the success of their efforts to improve workers' standard of living. No dispassionate student of the trade union movement can shut his eyes to this aspect of the problem. Trade unions have also no control over employment which is another big impediment in the way of their exercising effective influence on wages.

Dr. Fonseca has discussed in detail the Government's role in wage determination as well as the forms and methods of wage settlement. The information that he has collected will be of immense use to trade-unionists and others. He has not, however, paid as much attention as he should have to the new trend that is developing of withdrawing wage determination from the purview of collective bargaining. Wages are now being determined more and more by courts and tribunals and commissions and Wage Boards. That may be inevitable in a planned economy, but what will be its effect on the role and functioning of trade unions? That is a vital question which deserves the attention of scholars like Dr. Fonseca.

The book begins with a theoretical discussion of various theories of wages. The discussion is undertaken

with a view to find out if there is any scope for trade unions to influence wages. It shows that in all theories "except for the bargaining theories, the influence of the trade unions on the level and the structure of wages is either denied or considered negligible." Dr. Fonseca is, however, convinced that "a modern wage theory, especially if it is to be a reliable guide to wage policy, must include the influence of the institutional factors in its analysis of the formation of wages." He therefore sketches towards the end of the chapter "a tentative wage theory that gives to collective bargaining its central importance in wage determination." The theory buttresses the claim of trade unions to have a voice in wage determination, but how influential and effective that voice will be will depend, as the rest of the book has shown, on the economic condition on one hand and the strength that they succeed in building up.

Dr. Fonseca has also added a chapter on the history and present condition of workers' organisations in India. This makes the book all the more valuable to students of Indian labour problems.

V. B. KARNIK

TO BE OR NOT TO BE — CORRUPT

Goulart became President in 1961 — fled in 1964.

"In a way, it was unfair that President "Jango" Goulart was thrown out of Brazil. He owned so much more of it than anyone else."

"Jango" Goulart was a leftist. He was strongly for agrarian reform and redistribution of land. He redistributed about 19 lacs acres of land to himself and when he fled he was about to acquire another vast area. He owned many houses, ranches, dairy farms, borrowed vast sums from banks.

His successor Humberto Castello Branco wrote a note to the president of the Senate:—

"Because of my inauguration tomorrow as President of the republic, I have the honour of presenting your excellency this declaration of the worldly goods which I possess."

There were seven items: an apartment in Rio worth \$5,000, four parcels of stock worth \$9,000, "one Aero-Willys automobile, 1961 model" and a perpetual tomb in the Sao Joao Batesta cemetery in Rio de Janeiro". The note was the considered duty of an honest man, and it marked the first time in history that a President of Brazil had ever declared his assets—before, during or after his term of office.

Under Goulart, leftist groups were nourished by Government corruption. The large Communist labor unions lived off federal doles; Petrobras, the state oil monopoly, spent billions of cruzeiros to bankroll the National Student Union and other extremists of the left.

Time, April 24 and May 1.

With Many Voices

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

Algeria is a developed country that is moving towards underdevelopment.

—A Western joke quoted in *Time*, June 26.

All cows know communism is their friend.

—Khrushchev quoted in *Time*, June 26.

As to me, I like international tension.

—Mao Tse-Tung, *New Age*, June 28.

Use of English is like the use of English trousers.

—S. Chandrasekhara Rao, *Organiser*, June 29.

It would be a tragedy if in our eagerness to usher in socialism, we lost democracy.

—Mr. Kamaraj, *Times of India*, July 2.

I and my party do not stand for giving Kashmir to Pakistan. We stand for giving Kashmir to the people of Kashmir.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Hindustan Times*, July 2.

On the East-West conflict, Mr. Nehru thought like a free-world man but felt like a communist, and often his heart beat in unison with Moscow.

—Salvador de Madariaga, *Thought*, July 4.

When communists creep into any democratic system, it is only to destroy it by corruption and fraud.

—Pothan Joseph, *Swarajya*, July 4.

Within the federal harem, the States today are merely eunuchs.

—William F. Buckley Jr., *Time*, July 10.

Mob-deployment in circumstances that call for thought and discussion is a dangerous resort.

—William F. Buckley Jr., *Time*, July 10.

Let me remind all chauvinists that the present aim of all good and wise men in the world, in the second half of the twentieth century, is to give up as much of national sovereignty as is necessary to enable a world government to come into being and to function.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Swarajya*, July 11.

If protests are treason, there is an end to democracy.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Swarajya*, July 11.

Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.

—Senator Barry Goldwater
in his acceptance speech.

When we speak of peace today, and the threats to it, we must, whether we like it or not, speak of Communism.

—Barry Goldwater quoted in *Time*, July 17.

Half a generation ago we were bitterly opposed to doing business as usual with Stalin. Today we are equally opposed to doing business as usual with Stalin's de-Stalinized successors.

—George Meany quoted in *Time*, July 17.

Who has heard of a bishop dying in child-birth?

—Dr. Iris Tempowski, a Roman Catholic mother,
quoted in *Swarajya*, July 25.

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service.
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road.
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.

I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3.00

Name:

Address:

Signature