

A Democracy At War

by M. R. Masani

THERE are two concepts of national unity in wartime. One is the democratic concept, the other the totalitarian one. The example of Britain during the last World War is an example of unity in freedom. The example of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia is an example of enforced totalitarian unity. We in India live under a democratic Constitution, and it is worth while for us to consider the two concepts of unity. To start with the good one, let us consider how Britain, America and other Democracies behave during a war. The Constitution is kept intact. Parliament functions. The press is not muzzled. It is believed that freedom of discussion is part of the war effort because, unless there is free discussion, how can sound policies be arrived at?

The limits of this freedom are sometimes startling. It will be recalled that Sir Oswald Mosley was a supporter of Hitler. He was detained for a while under the Defence of the Realm Act, but Mr. Herbert Morrison, Home Minister in the National Government, decided to release him right in the middle of the war. This is what Winston Churchill, no mealy mouthed liberal, as Prime Minister said in support of Mr. Herbert Morrison's decision which was carried out: "The power of the Executive to cast a man into prison without formulating any charge known to the law and particularly to deny him judgement by his peers for an indefinite period is in the highest degree odious and is the foundation of all totalitarian governments whether Nazi or Communist. It is only when extreme danger to the State can be pleaded that this power may be temporarily assumed by the Executive. And even so its working must be interpreted with the utmost vigilance by a free Parliament."

In contrast to that, we have the Hitlerite or Stalinist concept of unity. I was very sorry to see in the press a report of a circular alleged to have been issued by the AICC office which said that Opposition parties must be prevented from criticising the Government and in particular the Prime Minister and that those who criticised him were traitors. Many of us consider it our duty in a free country at war to criticise actions and policies of Government and of individuals who constitute the Government if in our opinion they are injurious to the national interest. This circular was an example of the totalitarian mind.

What is the role of an opposition Party in wartime?

It is of a dual nature. It is that of a loyal opposition, a faithful opposition, faithful to the Constitution and the way of life of the country, its integrity and solidarity. So, first of all, it is a hundred per cent behind the war effort. In the fight for victory over the enemy, there is unqualified support. But the support is not to the government of the day which is a party government and deserves support only to the extent that it advances the cause of victory. It deserves and should have criticism to the extent that its policies deviate from what individual citizens or the press or parties consider to be mistaken policies in the pursuit of that objective. So there is a dual role: all out support to the defence effort, but critical, qualified support to the Government of the day—judging each policy, if I may quote our Prime Minister's words in the international sphere, on its own merits, supporting those that are advantageous to the cause of victory, opposing those that are harmful to the country's security and its interests.

Labour and Chamberlain

In Britain in 1939, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the architect of Munich and the apostle of appeasement, was the Prime Minister of the Conservative Government. The Conservative Party repeatedly invited the Labour Party, the Opposition, to join the Government in a coalition and the Labour Party refused. On what grounds did they refuse? I shall quote a passage from *Fifty Years' March—The Rise of the Labour Party* by Mr. Francis Williams who says: "Nor is there need to restate the reasons why so long as Neville Chamberlain remained head of the Government, Labour, while putting the whole force of its massive strength behind the war effort, rejected the invitation to participate in the Government. It would have been impossible for any Labour man to have worked with confidence under a Prime Minister Labour so much distrusted and whose blindness and folly had contributed so greatly to world disaster. So long as he was in charge, Labour felt that it could work best for victory outside the Government."

Chamberlain, however, refused to retire. He clung to office. One military disaster followed another. Then, on May 7 and 8, 1940, a great debate took place in Parliament, where the Labour and Liberal parties, the Opposition parties, moved a vote of no confidence in the Chamberlain Government. It was a historic debate. It found the Conservative Party divided between supporters of Chamberlain and those who wanted him to quit.

Mr. Atlee, the Leader of the Opposition, said: "In

this life and death struggle we cannot afford to have our destinies in the hands of failures and men who need a rest." Mr. Herbert Morrison said: "The issues are too great for us to risk losing the war by keeping in office men who had not shown themselves too well-fitted for the task." Mr. Duff Cooper, a Conservative rebel, said: "It was not right to taunt the Opposition with its unwillingness to take responsibility, because the Opposition was unwilling to accept a certain leadership." The climax came when Mr. Amery, quoting the words of Oliver Cromwell, said to Chamberlain: "You have sat too long here for any good you are doing. Depart, I say, let us have done with you. In the name of God, go." And Mr. Chamberlain went.

Two days after the debate, on May 10, Mr. Chamberlain resigned. On the same day, the National Executive of the Labour Party unanimously decided "to take their share of responsibility as a full partner in a new Government under a new Prime Minister, which would command the confidence of the nation."

This shows how a mature democracy is not put off by that timorous slogan: "Don't change horses in midstream". There are occasions when, if you do not change horses in midstream, you sink. This was one of them, and the mature British democracy showed how democratically, with a sense of high purpose, members of different patriotic parties came together to make the necessary political dispositions which would clear the way to victory over the enemy.

Root Cause

Now what is our situation in India today? We are today faced with this great disaster that is overtaking our armies at the front as a result of ten years of misguided policies of neutralism and of appeasement of Chinese Communist expansionism. The root cause has been the failure to understand the nature of international communism.

In 1949, because of this, our Government rushed forward to embrace the bandit regime of Mao Tse-tung which is today attacking our country and to recognise it as the Government of China, turning its back on a loyal friend and ally, Marshal Chiang Kai-shek of the Chinese National Government, who was the only War leader to have advocated the independence of India repeatedly and publicly during the war when we were engaged in the *Quit India* struggle.

The second act of the drama came with the betrayal of Tibet in 1950, when the Chinese, in breach of faith with our Government, advanced their armies into Tibet. To our shame, our representative in the U.N. was instructed to tell the Security Council which was considering the appeal of the Dalai Lama for help, the kind of appeal we have been making in the last few days, that the Indian Government saw no cause for United Nations' intervention in Tibet! The British Government readily agreed and, led by these two appeasers the Security Council suspended discussion of the item which still remains on the order

paper. The guilt of having handed over the Tibetan people to be dominated and brutally oppressed by the Chinese belongs to us and our Government.

We Were Warned

It was not as if there were no warnings. In Parliament on 5th and 6th December, 1950, there was a big debate in Parliament and some ten speakers warned our Prime Minister and Government that, if they persisted in allowing Tibet to be overrun by the Chinese, our turn would come next; that the Chinese were in fact attacking Tibet as a first step to the attack on India. We were brushed aside as alarmists. In all seriousness, we were told that the Chinese occupation of Tibet had no relevance to the security of India!

But it was not our warnings alone that were ignored. It was also Mao Tse-tung, who had given warnings much more significant than ours. In my own speech in Parliament on that occasion, I had quoted the New China News Agency who, a few weeks earlier, had said that the day would come when "the Chinese People's Liberation Army will hoist the Red Flag over the Himalayas". They are very frank, these gentlemen—Hitler, Stalin, Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung. They tell us what they are going to do, but we are so naive that we will not believe them! Mao Tse-tung had made certain very interesting remarks: "Power grows out of the barrel of a gun." "There are only two camps—the camp of socialism and the camp of imperialism. He who talks of neutrality is a fraud." Mr. Ranadive as Secretary of the Indian Communist Party had written a letter to Mao Tse-tung on 12th October, 1949, and Mao Tse-tung had cabled to him in reply assuring the Indian Communist Party of the full support of the Chinese people to the Indian Communists in their struggle and expressing the hope that the day was not far off when India too would be liberated by the Communist Party from the oppression of Anglo-American imperialism and its Indian lackeys. This is the promise that Mao Tse-tung made. He is a man of his word. He has tried to carry it out in the last few weeks.

We were told that if we kept talking about this kind of thing we would only bring the cold war to India and invite attack. There were, however, other countries led by people with a different mentality who believed in getting involved in the cold war, fighting the cold war and winning the cold war—Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines and Japan. They were all aligned. They all invited the cold war and fought it and won it. Not a hair of their heads has been touched by either Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung. It has now been proved that refusal to fight the cold war invites a hot war on one's own soil.

Panchashtala

Undeterred by all this, in 1954, our Government signed that infamous Panchashtala pact. As someone

(Continued on page 10)

The Iron Curtain And World Peace

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE striking difference in the way in which the two delegations from Gandhi Peace Foundation and Convention were received is symptomatic of the strange and unprecedented "mind-control" known as the iron curtain in Soviet Russia. The two members of the delegation to Moscow were received by Mr. Khrushchev no doubt but returned without stirring the slightest ripple in Russian public opinion. They were given a statement repeating the Russian official position regarding nuclear disarmament rather about the mere agreement to cease from further tests.

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari and his two colleagues who went to Washington and London on the other hand were not only warmly received by the President and Prime Minister but had great opportunities to put their case before the highest official circles and personalities. They had press conferences, a T.V. appearance in the USA and could get their appeal across to the wide American public through hospitality in the columns of the most influential papers like *The New York Times*, whose editor even got up at a dinner meeting to welcome the delegates. Mr. Rajagopalachari felt that it was American public fear that deterred the American Government from accepting the proposal to cease testing unilaterally. He appealed to leaders of public opinion there to work to change it so that it may come to favour the proposed action. He said that such a gesture, though it involved some risk vis-a-vis the Soviet Power would release such a flood of moral support to America in the whole world that Russia would be unable to take any unfair advantage and would on the contrary be obliged to bow to world opinion and follow suit herself and announce the cessation of her own tests. Though in the abstract, this is arguable, its grave defect stems from ignoring the presence and operation of the Iron Curtain in Russia and her dominions which follow her in controlling the minds of their people through the system known as the iron curtain.

The contrast between the reception in the two worlds to the two delegations highlights the source of the cold war and the psychological need to make the abolition of the iron curtain the most important target of free world publicity and criticism. The free world should concentrate on focussing public opinion on the inhuman and unprecedented control of the people's mind that communist states led by Soviet Russia have instituted from the beginning of their regimes.

They have used the behaviourist psychology of Dr. Pavlov, the hypnotic methods of psychiatrists, the association techniques of psychoanalytic practitioners and the "Big Lie" distortions and reiterations of Dr. Goebbels and the devices of high-power salesmanship of modern global advertisement to remake the minds—the thoughts, feelings and voluntary

attitudes—of their hapless subjects to determine their idea of the outside world, of the inside regime, of history, science and the economic and social environment of today. The civil and political rights that Euro-Americans have secured through a thousand years of thought and sacrifice are not given any the least entry inside the iron curtain.

The ersatz minds thus created are sustained by the complete centralisation of economic power, so that no one can have his means of living (at any level on the economic ladder from worker and peasant to manager to scientist and diplomat) unless he conforms to the official view of the world in everything.

Partiism is supreme in every walk of life—theoretical or practical. Overall policy is laid down even for music composers, novelists and poets, scientists and philosophers. The fates of Lysenko, the biologist and Pasternak's novel and of his innocent women assistants after his death are a grim reminder that the Khrushchevian thaw is yet far from bridging the gulf in this respect between the free world and the iron curtain countries.

Law, far from being an impartial source of justice between man and man and between citizens and state, as it is expected to be in the free world from times immemorial, is openly and frankly required to favour the Government (by revolution established and maintained by terror, more or less).

The role that such a system of mind-control over the whole people plays in the cold war and in international diplomacy is decisive and is usually forgotten by the free world press and publicists. The iron curtain plays a double role. It envelops the people under its sway in a false and distorted world calculated to support the policies of their dictatorial government as against the rest of the world in everything. And it prevents the communist public from access to sources of fact and knowledge in the rest of the world—books, pamphlets, science reports, histories, literature, economic and political interpretations—everything is severely and thoroughly censored and only a trickle is admitted through the sieve.

The result is the perpetuation of the totalitarian regimes and the enslavement of the peoples under their heel from decade to decade. Those regimes can defy public opinion, for they make it themselves in large part.

While the U.S.A., Britain and France and the other Allies demobilised immediately after the cessation of War in 1946, Stalin could maintain his forces at war strength for years, because of his iron curtain control over his public.

Disarmament, whether of nuclear arms or of conventional arms, can come about only on the wave of an irresistible public opinion global in character.

organised, sustained and led by thinkers equipped with the fullest knowledge on the subject. Only if the peoples of the communist empire are included in this world-wide canvass and a united global public opinion is mobilised by voluntary unofficial bodies, Gandhi Peace Squads, World Federalists, UNO enthusiasts, disarmament enthusiasts of all kinds etc. is there any chance of the abolition of war or postponement of war till an effective world federal government is established.

A determined attempt, therefore, should be made to reach the public behind the iron curtain with schemes of world federation and stages of disarmament, nuclear and other.

Plans for banning the use of air bombing of unarmed populations in unfortified cities should be urged by some groups who specialise in it. Lord Davies and Lord Robert Cecil tried to secure support for such proposals in the inter-war years in the League of Nations. But they failed. But it is necessary to take it up again.

There is no panacea for world peace. Innumerable movements for limited objectives may coalesce in their overall effects to mobilise public opinion to the required degree of intensity. This will not happen so long as large masses of population like those behind the iron curtain are insulated from world communications and free exchange of thought and feeling with the rest of humanity.

Roll up the iron curtain, withdraw your armies behind the old Czarist borders and cease your moral and material support to communist parties in free

world states. This was the demand that Sir Winston Churchill wanted America and free world to make of Soviet Russia in his famous speech at Fulton in the USA so early as 1947. The demand needs to be pressed even today.

A blue-print of a global world order with free and equal nations living peacefully under governments and leaders of their own free choice and cooperating through a world institution for collective security with a world court (and world police force) to back it should be prepared for which the assent and allegiance of all free men everywhere should be secured. All other movements for disarmament, nuclear and other, for a free press, just laws, social security, aid to underdeveloped nations etc. should be subordinate but organise aspects of such a blue-print. The melting of the iron curtain, by satyagraha in the crucial stages if necessary, and if the right groups appear on the scene takes high precedence in such a world publicity campaign for the final liberation war of humanity.

This can be the counter to the cold war of the communists and has a chance of being carried to victory, if all movements for freedom coalesce in a global effort on a federal basis.

SRI AUROBINDO ON CHINESE DESIGN

Yes, the basic significance of Mao's Tibetan adventure is to advance China's frontiers right down to India and stand poised there to strike at the right moment and with right strategy unless India precipitately declares herself on the side of the Russian bloc. But to go over to Mao and Stalin in order to avert their wrath is not in any sense a saving gesture. It is a gesture spelling the utmost ruin to all our ideals and aspiration. Really the gesture that can save is to take a firm line with China, denounce openly her nefarious intentions, stand without reservation by the USA and make every possible arrangement consonant with our self-respect to facilitate an American intervention in our favour and what is of still greater moment, an American prevention of Mao's evil designs on India. Militarily China is almost ten times as strong as we are, but India as the spearhead of an American defence of democracy can easily halt Mao's mechanised millions. And the hour is upon us of constituting ourselves such a spearhead and saving not only our own dear country but also of South-East Asia whose bulwark we are. We must burn it into our minds that the primary motive of Mao's attack on Tibet is to threaten India as soon as possible.

—November 11, 1950



END OF A DREAM

—Courtesy: Hindu

Will Chiang Attack Chinese Mainland?

NOW that Red China is at war with India, this question is being asked in many Asian capitals: Is Chiang Kai-shek finally ready for a return to the mainland to renew his personal war against the communists?

The answer you get, as of now, is a qualified yes. It goes this way:

Chiang is ready. In fact, he has already stepped up the military, political and psychological pressure against the Reds. But how far he will actually go is still debatable.

The reason is that Chiang Kai-shek does not control his own destiny. The U.S. Government is dead set against his attacking the mainland. And some of his military subordinates say any invasion of China would be suicidal without U. S. support.

Yet a quickening of the "military pulse" is noticeable all along the China Coast from Shanghai to Canton.

Undercover activity by the Nationalists is at a higher level than at any time since Chiang was driven from the mainland in 1949.

The Reds admit that Nationalist agents have infiltrated the countryside. It is accepted as fact that Chiang has managed to land small, well-trained commando groups—wearing communist uniforms.

A few years ago such landings would have been fatal. But now, agents and commandos have what the Nationalists call "considerable freedom of movement." Villagers are less likely to report the presence of Nationalists to the nearest communist military headquarters. On occasion, junior-grade communist officials have helped the Nationalist agents.

In 1957, the Chinese Nationalists report, more than 400 of their agents were captured on the mainland, and 100 were executed. Last year, Nationalist activity was rising to new heights, but the communists caught only 100 agents.

Chiang's objectives on the mainland are quite clear. Sabotage is incidental. Agents try to fan the unrest in the countryside. The Nationalists are trying to organize bases or resistance to the communists.

Chiang has offered high rewards to those who will join the Nationalist underground. Responsible positions are offered to Chinese communists military commanders who defect and organize guerrillas. Chiang has pledged "quick assistance" to the guerrillas, and "total amnesty" to any communists who turned against the Peiping Government.

The Chinese Reds are reacting to this "creeping pressure" from Formosa. Elite troops and command headquarters formerly stationed in the north near the Manchurian-Korean border have moved south. Torpedo boats and submarines formerly based at Shanghai and Tsingtao have been moved closer to the so-called "invasion coast."

Refugees from the mainland report that recruiting for the communist armed forces has been stepped up.

Inside the Red Army itself, political officers are being given more responsibility in an effort to head off defections.

In spite of what is going on, however, most Western experts believe Chiang's return to the mainland is either a myth or an irresponsible dream. These experts believe that if there is an upheaval in China big enough to overthrow the Government, it will occur only inside the Army. A new Government, thus, most likely would be based on the Army rather than on an attempt to restore Chiang.

Chiang's position, though, is clear. He has no patience with skeptics. He is convinced he knows more about the situation in China than Westerners do and that, because he is Chinese, he understands the capacity for revolt that lies under the surface of communist control.

As the Generalissimo celebrated his 75th birthday on October 31, he saw his enemies, the communists, involved in a war with India and losing friends and support in the United Nations. Chiang felt that the hungry masses in China had turned sharply against the communists. He felt that the seeds of revolt had been planted in the Communist Army and that these seeds would blossom into major defections if they were properly nourished by the Nationalists.

Others in Asia recognize, that, aside from encouraging unrest and revolt inside China, Chiang's freedom of action is limited. For one thing, treaty obligations require that the "use of force will be a matter of joint agreement" between the Nationalists and the U.S.—and the U. S. shows no signs yet of being ready to agree. The only exception is in case of an emergency which is "clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defence." An invasion of the mainland would hardly be an act of self-defence.

Also, Chiang's armed forces are not considered strong enough to establish and expand a beachhead against Red resistance.

The Nationalist Army of 430,000 men is organized into 21 infantry divisions, two armoured divisions and an airborne regiment of 3,000 men. Chiang has 25,000 marines trained for assault landings.

The Navy has five destroyers, five destroyer escorts, 50 other ships and several hundred landing craft. The Air Force, probably the best in Asia, has 400 jet fighters and 1,000 pilots.

The Nationalists have the capability for an initial landing of 6,000 to 15,000 men, depending on where the assault is made. But ship losses could not be replaced. Without continuous resupply and reinforcement, an invasion force would quickly run out of fighting power.

Nevertheless, Chiang is going ahead as if his return to the mainland were a certainty. An economic-mobilization board and a war-administration bureau have been organized to co-ordinate activities both on

(Continued on page 6)

Ideological Warfare In Russia

DURING the last twelve months, 194 people were sentenced to death and shot in the Soviet Union. A hundred-and-eighty-seven of them were convicted of economic crimes.

In 1947, Stalin's abolition of capital punishment, except in cases of treason, was regarded as a step towards liberalising internal policy, even though it was clear that the courts could easily interpret almost any crime they wished as treason.

Khrushchev has now given up all pretence of liberalising the law on capital punishment. Economic crimes are punished with great severity as crimes against the State. Capital crimes include possession or smuggling of foreign currency, private production with resulting accumulation of personal wealth, falsifying reports to the State Planning Board, issuing false statements about attainment of plan targets, theft of national property, black marketeering and corruption.

The last big show trial took place in the capital of the Kirghiz SSR. Nine accused persons were before the court, among them the Minister for Planning. They were accused of using the complicated Communist planning and production system for their personal advantage and of embezzling property worth about a million dollars. All were sentenced to death.

Death sentences were passed last year on a 19-year old currency hoarder from Moscow, three members of a collective farm near Kazakhstan who had rented land to private tenants, a cobbler who had made footwear from leather scraps bought on the black market, a party secretary from Tula who had accepted bribes for appointing people to certain offices, and a disgruntled Leningrad worker who had set fire to his factory in anger at disciplinary measures which had been taken against him.

Public opinion, is, however, different when corrupt

party and government officials who have feathered their own nests at the cost of the people are involved. Naturally, the Government does not like to proceed against these corrupt officials. It is more important to prosecute private producers and traders whose activities are a constant reminder to the Russian people that capitalism is not so inefficient a system as the communists make it out to be.

The Soviet Union is trying desperately to keep knowledge of these death sentences from being spread abroad. This is understandable, for there is no worse propaganda for communism than the fact that it needs the death penalty to protect it from capitalistic inroads from within. It is positive proof that there is something basically rotten, and even the Soviet public is disturbed.

It is reminded of the early days of the Bolshevik revolution, when the only thing that carried weight was the gun in the hand of the political commissar.

During the 'twenties, not only the seed grain was taken from the farmers, but even their food; and workers were shot down at the factory gate if they came to work fifteen minutes late.

Such extremes are not apt to recur, but the enforcement of "plan discipline" and loyalty to a Socialist government by death sentences is a kind of modern communist war. The more dangerous Khrushchev sees the food situation becoming, the more harshly he will have to enforce government decrees and economic directives. Almost twenty death sentences every month make this very clear.

—*Intelligence Digest*

(Continued from page 5)

Formosa and on the mainland, once an attack gets under way. Special taxes have been applied to raise 62.5 million for a war chest.

Chiang seems to be counting on a series of new crises in Southeast Asia to strengthen his position. He expects the fighting between India and Red China to expand. He believes the war in South Vietnam will grow. If these things happen, he believes the U. S. will not do as it did in Korea and put the Nationalists on a "leash." He hopes the U. S. will give him greater freedom to act against the mainland.

The Generalissimo knows he cannot move now without U. S. support. But while Chiang waits for crises to develop in Southeast Asia, his commandos and agents are stirring the flames of dissatisfaction and resistance on the mainland.

In Chiang's view—one that most Western experts disagree with—mainland pressure will reach an explosive point, and rebellion could spread like wildfire.

The Nationalists then would have an opportunity to return to China without taking the extraordinary risk of an amphibious attack against organized resistance by the communists.

Unknown quantity in Asia is Chiang's determination. In view of his age, he may be pondering that he may never another opportunity to retake China.

—*U. S. News & World Report*



"Why can't you two co-exist in India?"

—*Courtesy: Hindustan Times*

War Between Opposing Ideologies

by Tunku Abdul Rehman

(English text of a speech over Radio Malaya by the Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rehman delivered on November 10, 1962)

WHEN I was in India, the border trouble blew up and it caught the Indian Government and the Indian people by surprise. They never thought that Communist China, whose cause they have been championing in the United Nations from time to time, and whose occupation of Tibet they have tolerated without a murmur of disapproval, should have turned against them without a word of warning and without rhyme or reason. To me it came as no surprise. I told my Indian friends when I was there that Malaya had 12 years of emergency because of the acts of terrorism by the communists. After the first election, even before we were independent, I met the communist leader, Chin Peng, and pleaded with him to give up the struggle as we were approaching independence. He agreed to stop all hostilities as soon as Malaya gained independence from the British and as soon as my appointment as Chief Minister turned to Prime Minister. He tried to convince me that he was fighting not against the Malayan people but against the British to end colonialism and bring freedom to the Malayan people. I myself metaphorically speaking, saw him safely into the jungle, and gave a tacit order that in no circumstances should Chin Peng be hurt and if he were captured his life would be spared as I admired his honesty and sincerity. It was through him I learnt that communism will tolerate no other ideology or "ism". I told him before we parted that his ideology and mine did not agree as I believe in democracy which means complete freedom. Between us there could be no pact, either he triumphed and I was vanquished or more likely than not, he would be vanquished and I would triumph as I was sure the Malayan people were with me.

On 31st August 1957, we obtained our independence but the communists under Chin Peng carried on with their acts of murder, arson and other terrorism. He did not honour that pledge made to me in Baling and to be truthful I did not expect it of him. True to my belief the people of this country, irrespective of race and creed, rose as one with me and we defended this country with such vigour that Chin Peng lost the fight and is now in hiding on the Thai-Malayan border. But he is perhaps waiting for the opportunity to strike back and this opportunity I gather could present itself if the border war goes badly for India.

Chiang Kai Shek, when told that he must not trust the communists, said that he could deal with them and could control them with the strength he possessed, but later he found out, at great cost to himself and to his people, that the communists cannot be trusted and that no amount of strength could control this well organised force. The result is that millions

of Chinese have been driven out of their homes and separated from their families, never to see their motherland and those they left behind again. There are also other leaders of Asia who think that they can make friends with the communists, and they too will find out at no little cost to themselves, that all their dreams of friendly ties with the communists will prove to be futile.

Now on this border issue in India, you would ask yourself. "Why is it that communists started it when India had gone out of her way to be friendly with them?" "What use would a place in rugged mountains be to them?" "Why do they want to contest the right or wrong of the MacMahon Line when they had put up with it for so long?" "Why would they want to shoot down all these Indian soldiers who were not prepared for the fight and so ill-equipped for it?" "Why this sudden feeling of animosity when in fact Chou En Lai had just been there on a goodwill visit and parted with protestation of friendship for the Indian people?" "Why then all this sudden change of heart, from a friend to an enemy?" The answer is simple. They have no quarrel with India. As between Chinese and Indians the feeling is one of goodwill and friendship but as between the ideologies there is a wide gulf of difference. One is communist which carried out the teachings of Stalin religiously while the other, an equally vast country in Asia, believes in and practises democracy. Therefore as between the two biggest countries in Asia there is a strong undercurrent of jealousy from the communist side which has now come out to the surface and threatens to engulf the whole continent of Asia in open war.

Communist China would want all the other smaller countries of Asia to come into their fold, either through gentle persuasion or if this is not possible through force. Indeed they won a good number over to their side. The communists realise that the effect of a successful attack on India would give them the highest stature and prestige in the continent of Asia. For India to fall would not be their aim because that would cause a world war. They don't want a world war, but merely to display their strength by an attack on India and thereby win a psychological war by spreading fear in the minds of all wavering nations and anti-communist nations. To attack a small country is not of much value to them but to attack a country of her size is another matter. If she can succeed in humiliating India then Communist China's desire of a moral victory is satisfied. Therefore, this border trouble, I repeat is not a fight between the Chinese and the Indians but rather between two opposing

(Continued on page 8)

Some Thoughts On Defence

by N. C. Zamindar

SHRI Nehru delights in being called "a prophet of modernization in the underdeveloped atmosphere of India. He is also author of several books on history and as such can claim to have "a historical perspective". But the situation on the eve of Chinese aggression it seems that both these descriptions do not stand the test of reality. Churchill wrote in his classic "Gathering storm" that "the veils of the future are lifted one by one and mortals must act from day to day". Here Shri Nehru has been obsessed by perspective planning and dreaming of the year say 1984. It is because of this that he lived in a world of his own imagination and therefore "shocked into reality."

Let us examine the claim of "a prophet of modernization" in context of the Indian situation. It has been confessed that our brave Jawans on the Eastern front did not possess even automatic rifles. The out of date Russian helicopters purchased with great enthusiasm proved useless. What did this great prophet of modernization do all these days? Admire the coffee percolators produced by Ordnance factories of the Defence Ministry or ride in Shaktimans? As a prophet of modernization was it not his duty to fill up these serious short-comings of the defence forces? And where was his historical perspective? Did he not know that India was conquered by Muslim and British invaders because of the technical and military superiority? In "Military History of India" late Sir Jadunath Sirkar has remarked in his chapter on "Islamic invasion" that "the arms and horses of these transborder invaders gave them indisputable military superiority" (p. 26). In "Discovery of India", Shri Nehru himself remarks: "The superiority in discipline and technique of foreign trained armies" was one of the important causes of British victory. He has also remarked: "The British often had a powerful fifth column both in the administration and the armies of the Indian rulers" (page 326). Then what are the reasons for this terrible shortage of weaponry? Why were our Jawans outweaponed? Surely, he must search for answers and make them known to the people. Ignorant people will support him uncritically but that will not mean a vindication of his policies. His historical perspective has proved wrong.

Even now we find him following his favourite habit of thinking at large on all subjects under the sun. In these few weeks one can find contradictions abounding in his speeches. People pity him and say that he is bewildered. If he is, then he must not speak. Creating avoidable confusion cannot be appreciated.

In 1939 we pestered the Britishers about the war aims. Have we also any aims? It is really painful to note that nobody has given utterance to the fundamental faith of the Indian people. The message of India is forgotten. What is the ideology which the country is asked to defend? Was Gandhism merely a peace time credo? In 1939 the sage of Sevagram not

only fought the Britishers but also grimly took his stand against the Japanese. Week after week "Harijan" carried his message in a fighting spirit. Nobody during these days speaks of Gandhiji. It pains me immensely. No body seems to have realized the importance of the ideological defence of India.

Do we not know that China wants a communist state in India? Do we not know that we possess a superior ideology to communism? Can communism be fought with crypto communism? No, we must assert the supremacy of Dharma above all. It is not a platitude but a burning faith that Dharma alone will prevail. The message of Dharma is not irrelevant in this context of war? We must emphasize the message of the Gita and Gandhiji. It is incorrect to say that Gandhiji would have advocated appeasement. He would have been the first man to go to the front as a non-violent soldier. I remember a booklet with the mischievous caption of "Gandhi in arms". Yes he would have fearlessly sacrificed his life for the message and heritage of this land.

The blood of the Jawans is being shed not for the preservation of a few - air-conditioned offices but the great and noble heritage of India.

(Continued from page 7)

ideologies. It is an attack by communism upon democracy. It is not difficult for me to declare our stand because we believe in democracy, for, under democracy, Malaya has triumphed and advanced, and the people of Malaya have lived in peace and harmony and in progress. Democracy is congenial to our Malayan way of life and we want to live this life at whatever cost. Therefore our duty it to defend democracy.

There may be Malaysians who feel themselves involved in a racial conflict because of this trouble on the border rather than an ideological conflict. I say to them, if that is so, they are not true Malaysians and all their protestations of loyalty to this country as Malaysians is all false and nonsense.

If the prestige of India is lowered, and India is humiliated, it will only be a question of time before democratic Malaya will go under. So those who live our way of life and believe in democracy must give their full support to democratic India. They must support India not in words alone, but by giving material help. I therefore need your help in money or kind, or whatever form you can afford to give by way of aid to India in her hour of need. I have therefore set up a committee under my own chairmanship to receive donations, big or small, and have appointed the Bank Nagara our treasurer. I hope you will give freely in the cause of democracy and in the cause of peace, so send your donation to Bank Nagara under "Save Democracy Fund."

Review

The Sino-Soviet Conflict 1956-1961

Donald S. Zagoria, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Oxford University Press, London, 1962. 50s.

FEW events have been so unexpected and, at the same time, so far-reaching for the future history of mankind as the gradually widening divergence of views between the two main communist powers over the past five years. The myth of the monolithic nature of world communism, so assiduously fostered in Stalin's day, has been one of the most important casualties of de-stalinisation. The Hungarian and Polish events of 1956 sapped its strength, but may people could not really believe that the era when communism necessarily spoke with one voice was over. In a world used or inured to the Marxist doctrine of the contradictions of capitalism, the Sino-Soviet conflict piquantly demonstrated that communism has its own set of built-in contradictions.

Mr. Zagoria's book chronicles the development of the quarrel with great care—so great, in fact, that in explaining the doctrinal differences between the two powers it tends to be somewhat repetitive. But this is no serious fault since it will help the general reader to become fully conversant with the points at issue. Moreover, the extent to which the interpretation of ideology is based on historical, national, and political differences is brought out with great clarity. In particular, the change in China's attitude from being 'liberal' and, in communist jargon, 'rightist' in 1956 to a more militant and even Trotskyist posture since 1957 is analysed in detail. The main reason for this change, as Mr. Zagoria convincingly shows, was the excessive confidence vis-a-vis the West displayed by China as a result of Soviet successes in the development of cosmic rockets and inter-continental missiles—a confidence which was in glaring contrast to the more responsible caution of the Russians themselves. In this context, it must be recognised that Khrushchev emerges with far more credit than Mao.

Far from passing judgment on either side, however, the author is content to let the facts speak for themselves and to explain why the Chinese and Soviet attitudes were as they were (e.g. the different stages of economic development, the different historical experience, even to some extent the difference in the nature of the leaders involved). Only rarely does his impartiality slip, as when on p. 172 he refers to China's 'revolutionary hubris'. Nonetheless the reader cannot but conclude from the unadorned presentation of the facts as they are known to Western observers that if China's unrealistic enthusiasm had prevailed over Russian restraint (however qualified in Western eyes), the long-term outlook would have been grim for Russia, China, and the West alike.

Errors and weaknesses are commendably few. The

dispute is formulated as between 'left deviation' and 'right deviation', depending on whether Soviet or Chinese spectacles are used. Perhaps the point ought to have been made that doctrinally Khrushchev stands (or would 'moves' be more appropriate?) somewhere between the 'revisionism' of Yugoslavia and the 'dogmatism' of China. Hence the continued attacks on these two concepts in the Soviet press and ideological journals. There should also have been a more detailed examination of the effect of the U.2 incident in 1960 on Soviet and Chinese thinking. Incidentally, this event occurred before the failure of the Summit conference, not after (p. 366).

Looking to the future, Mr. Zagoria is rightly cautious on possible exploitation of the situation by the West. Since both the USSR and China are messianically certain that communism will prevail, the challenge to the West is, in a sense, increased by the prospect of two centres of hostility instead of one as heretofore. The only thing for the West to do in these circumstances is to remain strong and confident in its own way of life. In Mr. Zagoria's view, the small powers, both in the communist bloc and in the uncommitted areas of the world, are likely to derive most benefit from the Sino-Soviet dispute. As China becomes wealthier they will have another source of aid and support to tap should the existing ones be denied them for political reasons. However much Moscow and Peking attempt to disguise the fact, some measure of polycentrism appears to be here to stay.

A.R.

What a Life!



"You are half-dismissed so that we may half-fight to half-win this half-war!"

—Courtesy: Hindustan Times

(A DEMOCRACY AT WAR—Continued from page 2)

aply put it the other day, Panchashila now remains only the name of a road in New Delhi! Under cover of Panchashila, by which non-intervention and co-existence were to be practised between the Chinese Communists and ourselves, we put our seal of approval on the conquest of Tibet. We know now that the ink was hardly dry on that treaty when the Chinese started infiltrating into Ladakh. We know this from the Prime Minister himself. He knew about it but he did not tell us about it. The Indian Government was guilty of suppressing from Parliament and people for some four years the fact of occupation of Indian territory by foreign troops. Mr. Nehru later explained his motives in a letter to Mr. Chou En Lai: "We did not release to the public the information we had about various Chinese intrusion into our territory by Chinese personnel in 1954, the construction of a road across Indian territory in Ladakh and the arrest of our men in Aksai Chin area in 1958 and their detention. We did not give publicity to this in the hope that peaceful solutions of the disputes could be found by agreement between the two countries without public excitement on both sides." In other words, the Indian people were to be kept in blissful ignorance of what was happening to their country so that this beautiful dream of Panchashila could be perpetuated and the failure of the policy did not have to be admitted at that stage.

In 1960, the Chinese completed their work in Tibet and the Dalai Lama fled to our frontiers; we again did nothing. This continuing appeasement bred continuing aggression until this major invasion took place precisely because we showed no readiness to fight earlier. Because the policies of the future can only be sound if the mistakes of the past are understood, these lessons have to be learnt even today. Perhaps it would not be necessary to go into the past if there was clear evidence that the lesson had in fact been learnt.

Hope Dashed

There was great hope in the country when, on 25th October, the Prime Minister said in Parliament: "We were getting out of touch with reality in the modern world" and "we were living in an artificial atmosphere of our own creation". I was one among the many who hoped, after many years of despair, that at last we would be saved.

On 7th November, however, the Prime Minister said to the Congress Parliamentary Party that he deprecated wild suggestions made by Opposition Parties some of whom advocated the conquest of Tibet. Mark the word "conquest". "Liberation", yes; but conquest?

On 9th November, the Prime Minister ridiculed, according to the press, widespread opposition demands that there be no talks until the invaders pulled out completely.

On the 10th, the Prime Minister described the

thoroughly cynical and hypocritical resolution of the Council of the Communist Party of India as a "resolution which is clear and nationalistic... as good as could be drafted by a hundred percent nationalist".

On the 10th of November, he told the Rajya Sabha: "It is very difficult for the Chinese to defeat us and it is still more difficult for us to defeat the Chinese."

On the 14th, he said in the Lok Sabha: "That we should undertake the job of liberating Tibet (a suggestion which our retired President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, had among others made) at this moment or at any moment seems to be extraordinary and fantastic and has no relation to reality".

Then came the final blow. The Prime Minister explained away his admission that he had been out of touch with reality. On 11th December, he said to a mass meeting: "I did not mean that we were pursuing a wrong policy. I had only wanted to point out that we had not been vigilant enough".

Wide Gulf

The result is that there is today a wide gulf between the Prime Minister on one side and Parliament, Chief Ministers, Opposition Parties and the Army on the other. The *Hindustan Times* on 16th November said of Mr. Nehru's reply to the Parliamentary debate in an editorial entitled *Off Key*: "The whole House was behind Mr. Nehru to a man in pressing forward with the objectives of the official motion, admirable alike in its wording and sentiment. Here was an opportunity for a clarion call to action, a call for which the entire nation was waiting. Mr. Nehru did not respond to the mood. He was content to make a partisan speech, defending what he was not seriously asked to defend and failing to give the one assurance for which there was a universal demand, that a new chapter would begin of firmness in decision and resoluteness in policy."

Mr. Rajeshwar Patel, a Congress member from Bihar, had pointed out the difficulty during the debate. He said: "The mere removal of Mr. Krishna Menon is not going to help the country. The entire machinery which thinks in those terms has to be recast or realigned and overhauled."

When the Chief Ministers met in Delhi for consultations with the Home Minister, they had a shock. They found that the mind of New Delhi was different from the mind of India. 'Insaf', a well-known commentator writing in the *Indian Express* of the 9th, says: "The Chief Ministers were generally of the view that the crisis marks a final breach with the communist world and that all plans must be based on this assumption. The national leadership on the other hand is not prepared to go that far yet.... The Chief Ministers do not share New Delhi's hope but are willing to let the national leadership learn further by experience."

A Correspondent from the NEFA Front writes in the *U.S. News and World Report* of November 26:

"The impression you get in visiting the war zone is that the Indian Army is far ahead of Nehru's civilian government in its thinking. Nehru apparently clings to the hope that Russia will somehow restrain Red China. Indian military men see no alternative but to win the war. . . . Said one officer to me: 'Our Prime Minister was fond of standing on his head. Maybe he saw world issues that way. I hope he is on his feet now'."

Role of Opposition

In such a situation, what should be the role of the Opposition? The present Government is a minority government. It enjoys the support of only 45 per cent of the electorate as evidenced only last February. Allowing for 11 per cent of the vote which went to the Communist fifth column, which must be written off for the moment even though many patriotic people must have voted for them, that leaves another 44 per cent of opposition and independent votes. Thus, 45 per cent for the Congress, 44 per cent for the democratic Opposition parties and groups. The title of the democratic opposition parties to speak for the country is not therefore much weaker than that of the Congress Party. If there had been one Opposition, things would have been different. Never has the need for an alternative government been felt as badly as it is today. The Opposition Parties have to speak for the 44 per cent who, because of their internecine quarrels, have more or less got disfranchised or under-represented in Parliament. Hence the correct thing for the Opposition is to maintain an oppositional role wherever they feel that the Congress Government's policies are not in the country's interests. That is precisely what all of them have been doing.

The Praja-Socialist Party is perhaps nearest to the present Government ideologically, but it has certainly not given full support to the Government. It has opposed very vital policies of the Government. They have just finished observing a week in Bombay and throughout the country called "No Negotiations Week", attacking Mr. Nehru and his Government for suggesting that they would negotiate on the 8th September line. The Praja-Socialist Party also demands, what the Congress Government will not agree to, the banning or outlawing of the Communist Party of India. The position of the Jan Sangh is roughly the same on both these issues. The Socialist Party of Dr. Lohia goes further. It has tried to move a no-confidence motion in Mr. Nehru's Government, and it says this Government must change so that the war may be won. The position of the Swatantra Party is outlined in a Statement issued by the Parliamentary Board of the Party in New Delhi on November 6, the essence of which is the following: Snatch the initiative from the enemy; arm our men with the best available weapons from throughout the world; get planes and even air forces from friendly countries to stop enemy bombing of our troops and cities; bring the issue of Chinese aggression before the U.N., so that the U.N. can

send forces to defend our country alongside of ourselves; restore friendship with Pakistan, so that the three or four divisions which are today frozen opposite the Pakistan frontiers can be released to fight the Chinese; and, finally, scrap the outmoded and discredited policy of neutralism masquerading as non-alignment.

In Paragraph 11 of the Statement, the role of Parliament and political parties is described as follows: "The declaration of a state of emergency should not be made into a charter for winding up parliamentary government. The Opposition should 'carry out' its responsibility of free and frank criticism whenever it is necessary. There has been a commendable shift in the attitude and policies of Government. The Prime Minister's admissions in particular have given rise to considerable hope of change. On the other hand, there are disturbing signs that some old illusions still persist and that the dead hand of these illusions and out-moded policies still lie heavily on the present Government."

Prof. Ranga summed up the matter aptly when he said in Parliament: "We stand here as an Opposition Party. We have been sent here to play the role of a responsible Opposition in a parliamentary democracy. The moment we give up this role, the moment we accept the advice so suddenly tendered by the Communists for their own reasons, we cease to be a parliamentary democracy. We here play our role as an opposition, a responsible opposition, a cooperative link in our total democratic effort. It is possible for the Government to gain from the criticism made from time to time by the Opposition. But that does not mean that we do not line up with all the rest of the country in strengthening and maximising the defence effort, in promoting the national will to resistance against aggression."

(Based on an Address delivered to the Commerce Graduates' Association, Bombay, on November 22, 1962).



—Courtesy: Hindustan Times

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Our credulity and our negligence have caused us some initial reverses.

—President Radhakrishnan quoted in
Indian Express, November 9.

Mr. Krishna Menon is unduly modest in the statement that by his resignation he is making 'a small contribution to the national effort'. His resignation is, in fact, an enormous contribution.

—*Opinion*, November 13.

Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon today warned the people against 'fifth columnists'.

—P.T.I. report in *Sunday Standard*, November 18.

The inclusion of communists (in national defence committees) would only be like allowing rats into a rice godown.

—C. Rajagopalachari, in *Times of India*,
November 16.

"..... It's all being done on a 'commercial basis.'
We provide the money and they buy our arms."

—Western official quoted in *U.S. News & World
Report*, November 12.

I have great respect for intellectuals, but I must say I'm moved to find some chairs of horse sense in some of our universities.

—Lord Home quoted in *Time*, November 9.

Far more important is it that India should continue to be independent and free than that Nehru should be Prime Minister.

—*Opinion*, November 6.

The best place for Mr. Menon in the future would be the salubrious locality of Camden Town from which Mr. Nehru originally dragged him out.

—*Opinion*, November 13.

All the bitterness of Indian anger and humiliation, all the resentment that Nehru has so remarkably escaped, is now being poured on Krishna Menon's head.

—*Sunday Times* (London), October 28.

The country (India) is now angrily fighting off the kind of attack that, when suffered by others in the past, Indians always tried to talk away with smug moral platitudes.

—*Time*, November 9.

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/

Name:

Address:

Signature

The former President (Dr. Rajendra Prasad) urged that Tibet should be liberated.

Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, former Defence Minister, today ridiculed the talk of liberating Tibet at this juncture.

—*Times of India*, November 19.

The real enemy remains not the dead Stalin, not live 'neo-Stalinists,' not Peking, but Communism, which Lenin first brought to power 45 years ago with the slogan 'Away with democracy. All power to the Soviets.'

—*Time*, November 16.