

Resist Aggression

by V. B. Karnik

IN the situation that has developed on the northern frontiers, it is no longer possible to adopt a complacent attitude and hope that in the end sweet reasonableness will prevail and the Chinese Government will be persuaded to drop their fantastic claims to large chunks of Indian territory. The Chinese Government have made it more than clear that they have no intention of dropping their claims, that they regard those territories as their own and that they are determined to establish their domination over them. That is the plain meaning of the letters that Chou-En-Lai has written to Prime Minister Nehru, whatever the language that may have been used from time to time. Owing to weather conditions, the military operations of the Chinese Government have now come to a standstill. But the process of consolidation in the territory that has been occupied is going ahead and there is news that military preparations are taking place in many parts of Tibet. Who can say that there will be no further attempt to occupy more Indian territory as soon as the weather improves? In any case, it will be stupid not to foresee that possibility and prepare to resist the attempt if and when it is made.

It is gratifying to note that the Government of India are slowly waking up to the seriousness of the problem posed by the Chinese action. They appear to have now realised that what they are facing is not a demand for a few border adjustments but a claim to the entire Himalayan and sub-Himalayan region and the expansionist urge of a powerful nation. The Prime Minister has now discovered that the Chinese were expansionists throughout their history and that it is that historical trait which is finding expression in aggressive activities on the borders of India. He has now realised that the problem created by the Chinese aggressiveness is a problem which is going to stay with us for a long time to come.

This awareness is welcome, but one cannot be sure if even now the Prime Minister has realised the full seriousness of the problem. The Chinese will not rest content with the seizure and occupation of the Himalayan States and regions of Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, Ladakh and NEFA. That really is only the first

or the preliminary step. Their ultimate aim is the establishment of their supremacy over the entire region of South East Asia. This may have been a dream of the Chinese in earlier years. But the establishment of a communist regime has given it a point and substance. Communism is by the very nature of its social and political philosophy an expansionist and exclusive creed. It cannot tolerate the existence of a free and democratic India, as its very existence poses a challenge to the infallibility of that creed. Communism will find no response in the countries of south east Asia, as long as there will be a democratic India holding aloft the banner of Democracy and by her example inviting others to follow a different road. A democratic India can have no place in the scheme of things as envisaged by the communist rulers of China. It is only in this larger perspective that one can understand the real seriousness of the threat posed by the aggressive actions of China. It is to be deeply regretted that this awareness is not as yet as deep and widespread as it should be.

The Prime Minister declared in the Lok Sabha that no further encroachments on Indian territory would be tolerated. They would be resisted at all cost and under any circumstances. Dilating on the point, he said: "A country does not count the cost it pays if its honour, self respect and freedom are involved. No cost is too great then. It is better to perish in the attempt than to surrender". These are welcome words which will find an immediate response in the country. The people were waiting for just such words of courage and determination. They will be happy if the Prime Minister sticks to them and will be prepared to do all that may be asked of them in order that the country's honour, self-respect and freedom may be preserved. The Prime Minister did not, however, say what he would do to regain the territory that has been already occupied by the Chinese. In spite of several demands, he refused to disclose his mind. If the refusal was due to reasons of military security, the people will not insist on getting the information. Let it be remembered, however, that the people will not tolerate any loss of territory through aggression. They will expect the Government to recover the territory and to throw out the aggressor. A concession to an aggressor, they know, whets his appetite and increases his aggressiveness.

Faced with aggression on its borders, the country should be prepared to accept help from all quarters, more particularly when it is known that the aggression is not an isolated incident, but is part of a grand

design for expansion. It is always best to be able to stand on one's own legs. But no country in the world, excepting perhaps the two most powerful nations, is now in a position to stand alone. Every country needs the help of other betterplaced countries. Some take economic aid, while some others take in addition military aid. India has so long taken only economic aid and refused to accept military aid. But, if circumstances demand, the country should be prepared to effect a shift in that line. It is not the policy of non-alignment that is now in issue. Ordinarily none will complain against non-alignment. As a policy it enables a country to discuss each issue on its merits and to follow a line that may be just and proper. The time has now come to exercise that right. By accepting aid to repel aggression the country will not tie itself down to any particular bloc. It is prepared to accept help from all quarters. If a group of countries refuses to render help, it will only prove that they are not interested in preserving the freedom and integrity of India. Surely, the preservation of the freedom and integrity of the country is far more important than a doctrinaire attachment to a particular line of action.

The Prime Minister is correct, however, in laying emphasis on self help. Any foreign help that may come can only supplement the effort that the country itself will make. The country will no doubt have to make a big effort. Apart from the front line where the battles may be fought, it will have to be a big effort in the fields as well as in factories. Increased agricultural and industrial production will be necessary in order to sustain the military effort. But that does not necessarily mean, as the Prime Minister appears to be contemplating, a greater emphasis on heavy and basic industries. If our military efforts are to wait until heavy and basic industries develop, they will have to wait for fifteen, twenty or twenty five years. There is

no sense in linking the two. The utmost that we can hope to achieve immediately is some increase in our agricultural and industrial production and that should be enough to finance and sustain the military operations on the frontier. Any forced march toward rapid industrialisation, in the form of establishment of heavy and basic industries on the excuse of Chinese aggression, will give rise to economic difficulties and create economic discontent which will weaken the home front and thus play into the hands of the aggressors. The Government, it is to be hoped, will not blunder into adopting that shortsighted policy. Another important effort that will have to be made is to win over the people in the regions that the Chinese are seeking to annex. The people of those regions must be made to feel that they are Indians and that they have to defend their land against Chinese aggression. A lot of propaganda is already taking place in those areas representing the Chinese aggressors as liberators. The Chinese and their Indian agents are carrying on that propaganda. It must be immediately counteracted through more effective propaganda and through action on the administrative and executive level to assure the people of the hilly regions of their rightful place in the nation and in national life. Such strengthening of the home front is absolutely essential if the Indian army is to wage a successful battle in those regions.

The country has left the Government and the Prime Minister in no doubt about the policy that should be pursued in the matter of the Chinese aggression. It wants the Government to be firm and bold in resisting the aggression. Such a firm and bold policy will receive the fullest measure of support from all sections of the people. A few communists and fellow-travellers may suggest a different policy at the command of their alien masters. But they cannot thwart the united will of the people. The will of the people as it has manifested itself through innumerable meetings and demonstrations and through statements and resolutions of all democratic and patriotic parties and organisations is asking the Government to resist the aggression. It is to be hoped that the Government will take notice of this writing on the wall and adopt effective measures for fulfilling the will of the people.

• FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 nP

Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor,
127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Co-operative Farming

THE GREAT DEBATE

Price Rs. 3

Available from

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Notes

U.S. President's Visit

IN all respects President Eisenhower's visit to India was a magnificent success. The tumultuous welcome that the American President received on his arrival in Delhi exceeded all expectations. The unprecedented ovation which the crowd of more than a million accorded to the President truly reflected the warmth of friendship of the common people towards the U.S. It was the greatest and warmest reception accorded by New Delhi to any foreign dignitary visiting India since independence. The keynote of the stormy reception was the spontaneity of popular feeling and enthusiasm which was infectious and moved even the American President. The visit highlighted the tremendous fund of popular goodwill existing in this country for the U.S. in spite of many irritating and unfortunate factors that had strained relations between the countries for so many years in the past.

In a way the visit was most opportune and timely. It came about at the right time when psychological barriers between the two countries had started breaking down under the impact of international developments. Since Hungary, India has been forced to reconsider many of the fond assumptions underlying her foreign policy. The rape of Tibet and the recent naked Chinese expansionism accelerated this process and brought home the need to undertake an agonising reappraisal of our stand on many basic issues relating to international developments. This has had a sobering effect on our foreign policy thinking and in the process India again came to discover, though grudgingly, the fundamental bonds that bind us to western democracies. President Eisenhower's visit cemented these ideological bonds and it also fostered in Indian minds the sense of solidarity with the free world. It is significant that Mr. Nehru described American President's visit as "a blessing for India and the world". There is thus a better appreciation on this side of America's role in international affairs.

The visit will also help, on the U.S. side, to clear some of the cobwebs of misunderstanding that had distorted, to some extent, the image of India in the American minds. Mr. Eisenhower, as he himself stated, came here to do "a little bit of discovery" himself. His brief stay in India convinced the U.S. President that India, like America, is dedicated to the cause of freedom and is determined to progress through peaceful democratic methods. It confirmed his belief that India is a vital bastion of democracy in Asia and that its economic progress must be supported if it is to flourish in freedom. "India is becoming one of the great investment opportunities of our time", the President asserted, "an investment in the strengthening of freedom, in the prosperity of the world".

There are many in the country who had in their minds a distorted picture of the United States, its Government and leaders, some of them are in high places. They utilised on many occasions their high places for misrepresenting the United States to the Indian people and India to the American people. Anybody who spoke the truth about America earned their disfavour and ill-will. It is to be hoped that the visit of President Eisenhower will help them to do "a little bit of discovery for themselves". The discovery that they make will remove their misunderstandings and enable them to appreciate better the role that the United States has to play in the world-wide struggle for the defence of freedom and democracy.

The visit has helped both the countries to re-discover the identity of interests and ideals between themselves which was obscured during the last few years by unfortunate prejudices and misunderstanding on both the sides. This does not mean that the two countries would have identical views and policies on all matters. Differences will inevitably be there, but they will be friendly differences of opinion. The area of agreement between the two countries is far more fundamental and vital than the differences between the two which result from different conditions under which the two democracies function. The visit has thus paved the way for closer understanding and cooperation between the two great democracies of the world and marks a happy augury for better East-West relations.

Chinese Threat to Indonesia

IT appears that after India Peking is spoiling for a fight with Indonesia. The relations between the two countries have become very much strained during the last two months and already there have been levelled charges and counter-charges by Peking and Jakarta against each other. The Chinese behaviour in Indonesia is in keeping with the general pattern of its aggressive posture throughout South-East Asia. But there is every likelihood of China anytime taking the inevitable next step which might throw Indonesia in a turmoil of civil war.

The Chinese quarrel with Indonesia is different in kind from its quarrel with India, though attitude and motive behind the both are the same. The Indonesian Government has banned trade by aliens in rural areas from January 1st. In practice, this will mean driving some 300,000 Chinese traders out of business in the countryside. Even though this legislation was enacted by Jakarta some months back it began executing it only in the first week of December. Chinese traders, at the instigation of Peking, resisted this order and this defiance naturally forced the Indonesian army to make widespread arrests of Chinese traders in West Java.

The drastic action against the Chinese traders is bound to affect the latter for which they have themselves to thank. Though the Chinese comprise less than 3% of the 87 million Indonesians, they have a

tight hold on the nation's economy. They control a total capital officially evaluated at 300 crores rupiahs and dominate the industrial field, river and road transport, wholesale trade, banking and import-export business.

This Chinese stranglehold over the 90 percent of the economic activity of Indonesia has naturally made the Chinese most hated in Indonesia which is now striving to assert its economic independence. The Indonesians justify their measures as being an attempt to remove remnants of colonialism. The Indonesian Government has charged the Chinese with "monopolistic capitalistic speculation, hoarding and smuggling and no one can blame the Indonesian Government if it attempts to curb these evil practices by stern measures.

Besides, the Chinese have played an ignominious role in internal politics. In the pre-independence days, the Chinese always sided with the Dutch and during the Japanese occupation, they helped the Japanese against the Indonesians. Now, after the independence, the Indonesian Government is faced with the problem of the economically powerful Chinese minority with extra-territorial loyalty. The Chinese have never considered themselves as Indonesian citizens and Peking also considers them as Chinese citizens. The Indonesian Government in the past tried to solve the problem by the treaty which was signed during the Bandung Conference by the Chinese and Indonesian Foreign Ministers. But even after five years it was signed, the treaty is still not in force; it has been ratified, but the instruments of ratification have never been exchanged. The treaty required the Chinese minority in Indonesia to choose between Chinese and Indonesian citizenship. But Peking has been reluctant to give up its control over the Chinese settlers who could play the role of Peking's fifth column in Indonesia. The recent Indonesian action has therefore enraged Peking which has given a stern warning that "unless these anti-Chinese measures are withdrawn, Sino-Indonesian relations will be seriously impaired". The Chinese Embassy in Jakarta has been found to have incited the Chinese traders in West Java to defy the ban. The Indonesian Government has, therefore,

banned all travel outside Jakarta for Chinese diplomats, except the ambassador. Peking is thus queering the pitch in Indonesia and if the relations between the two countries deteriorate further, Indonesia may have to face the threat of a civil war.

Restrictions on Dalai Lama?

THE recent visit of the Dalai Lama to this city has brought to light the strange attitude of the Government towards the Tibetan leader. The Dalai Lama was on his pilgrimage to Buddhist shrines in India and on his way he stayed for four days in Bombay. But during his brief stay in the city, it appears that he was restrained in his activities by the Government of India which had drawn up and was looking after his programme. No political workers were permitted to see the Tibetan leader and all attempts to seek an interview with him were discouraged. The Committee for Solidarity with Tibet, for example, sought to organise a public reception in his honour or, failing which, to send a delegation to meet the Dalai Lama. But it was refused permission to do either because of the "nature of the Dalai Lama's visit and the short time at his disposal". Even when Mr. Raja Hutheesing, who is editing a White Book on Tibet and to which the Dalai Lama had consented to write a foreword, sought an interview with the Dalai Lama in connection with the publication of the White Book, he was not allowed to meet him. This deliberate attempt of the Government to keep the Dalai Lama away from the Indian people is quite inexplicable and strange. It lends credence to the popular belief that in its attempts to appease China, the Government of India has placed a number of restrictions on the venerable Tibetan leader.

The Democratic Alternative

BY MISS M. A. DEVIKI

Rs. 2.50

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

KERALA UNDER COMMUNISM

A Report

Prepared by the Research Staff of the
Democratic Research Service

Pages 176+viii Price Rs. 4

Available from:

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Peace Congress In Australia

by Tibor Meray

FEW peace conferences have begun in an atmosphere as belligerent as that prevailing at the "Australian and New Zealand Congress for International Cooperation and Disarmament." There were accusations and counter-accusations, demonstrations and counter-demonstrations, expositions and counter-expositions; the warm summer days were alive with suspicion, hatred, distrustful glances and loud abuse. Removed from Hungary by thousands of miles, I still could not help remembering the Budapest saying: "When the fight for peace really begins there won't be a house left standing here!"

The principal accusation against the conference was that it was a direct descendent of the World Peace Council controlled by the Soviet Union, and that it was organized by communists and fellow-travellers who used the popular slogans of peace and disarmament to mislead democrats, radicals, pacifists and socialists and line them up on the side of Eastern bloc policies. When the sponsors of the congress, well-known scientists, churchmen and Labour M.P.s, began to protest against being called puppets of Soviet politics and asked their opponents to furnish proof, the head of the Australian secret police paid a visit to Professor A. K. Stout, head of the Department of Moral Philosophy at Sydney University, and submitted various documents to him. These documents convinced Professor Stout that he should indeed withdraw as a sponsor and when he was asked to state the reasons for his withdrawal he made no secret of the visit he had received.

His revelations fanned the sparks into flame. Not only the organizers and participants of the conference but also circles that were not at all sympathetic to the Melbourne rally broke into vociferous protest, accusing the Australian government of McCarthyism and Australia of being a police state. The unfortunate form the government intervention had taken, and the battle-cries called forth by it, almost over-shadowed the undeniable fact that there was a strong though hidden link between the conference and the World Peace Council and that there were many more communists and fellow-travellers among its organizers than was warranted by the size of the Australian Communist Party or the efforts of the Soviet, Chinese, Hungarian, Tibetan and Indian peace-fighters.

To give a clear idea of the nature of the conference we should perhaps compare it to the peace movement in Great Britain. In England there are two so-called peace movements. One is represented by the small and insignificant British Peace Council, in which members of the Labour Party are not allowed to participate because of its well known tendencies and connections. The other is the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament led by Bertrand Russell, J. B. Priestley and other outstanding personalities. The latter is

independent of all power blocs and governments and is directed exclusively against the dangers of nuclear warfare. In Melbourne, the Australian communists succeeded in merging and confounding the two trends, and thus achieved something that was very important to them, namely to emerge from their decade-long isolation and to become "respectable". In spite of their being a tiny minority, in spite of their unpopularity, and their Soviet-Chinese connections, they acted out here as the organizing force of a conference officially supported by the Australian Labour Party, the Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Quakers, and Congregationalists, with the speakers including Nobel Prize winner Linus Pauling, the Indian Stalin Prize winner Mulk Raj Anand, and the well-known writer J. B. Priestley.

In this rather delicate situation the organizers of the conference thought it best to adopt the following slogan: let us keep to subjects on which we agree and avoid controversial issues. The result was that the speakers repeated again and again the dull slogans so well known from the Stockholm conference concerning the dangers of rearmament and the hope for disarmament without, however, putting forward a single original and independent idea concerning the realization of these lofty aims. The "avoidance of controversial issues" meant that anyone was free to proclaim the importance of admitting Mao's China to the U.N. or rant against West German rearmament — but when someone took the liberty of mentioning the desire for independence of the Eastern European countries, or the events taking place on the Sino-Indian border, he was immediately considered a "cold-war-monger and provocateur". One of the principal ambitions of the Melbourne conference was to pass unanimous resolutions, as the considerably more homogeneous World Peace Council tends to do.

However, here things were much less simple than in Vienna, Budapest, Peking or Stockholm. In spite of its cleverness and circumspection the organizing committee made quite a few blunders. One of the most striking among these was that while the conference denied every link with the World Peace Council it filled its offices with members of the Australian Peace Council and invited that well-known professional peace-fighter, Isabelle Blum, one of the leaders of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council. Another, even more important factor was the activity at the conference of a small but erudite and militant oppositional group consisting of young Labour Party men, left-wing Catholics, young trade unionists and "revisionists" who were expelled or had withdrawn from the Communist Party after the Hungarian Revolution. The principal ambition of this group was to free the conference from the influence of the World Peace Council and steer it towards the British movement for nuclear

disarmament. To this effect they issued a number of pamphlets and submitted to the conference a number of resolutions which clearly revealed the intention to eliminate the influence of the mischief makers.

In the ensuing debate the rigid Communist group committed mistake after mistake, showing that nothing can be more embarrassing to a sectarian than free debate.

The most surprising incident took place in the Education Conference of the Melbourne congress, when a University lecturer moved a resolution calling on "all governments to permit the free dissemination, through all mediums, of pacifist propaganda". The party members and fellow travellers — obviously because they thought this was an anti-Soviet trap — refused by 70 votes to 20 even to put the question on the agenda of the conference. The matter became public and the other participants of the conference were left wondering what kind of peace conference it was that considered pacifism its enemy?

Another eye-opening incident was the one connected with Tibor Dery and the other imprisoned Hungarian writers and journalists. Steven Murray-Smith, editor of the extreme left-wing literary periodical "Overland", the poets David Martin and Vincent Buckley, as well as the present writer repeatedly requested the Art and Literature group of the conference to speak up for the imprisoned Hungarian writers, or at least for all imprisoned writers and artists in the world at large. The group in which writers and artists formed the minority and faithful Communist Party members the majority, reacted to the request with frigid antipathy. When the draft resolution came up for a vote six writers submitted a minority addition to the resolution which said: "In a number of countries many writers still do not have freedom of expression and communication". But even this mild generalization was too much for many party members because — as the party-hack Frank Hardy remarked — it could have been considered a reference to Hungary. The writers and artists conference of the congress rejected the minority addendum by 25 votes against 10.

This, however, was too much for J.B. Priestley who, because of his fame and popularity was one of the central figures of the congress. Priestley and his wife, the writer-archaeologist Jaquetta Hawkes, immediately issued a signed statement. The statement stresses that Priestley and his wife associate themselves with the minority opinion expressed in the writers' and artists' commission of the Congress on the subject of the freedom of writers — but they go further than that. They voice their regret that the writers' and artists' conference found itself unable to respond to the appeal for a protest on behalf of the distinguished Hungarian writer Tibor Dery, now in prison. . . "Many wellknown writers of Western Europe — the statement concludes — of widely varying political opinions, have sent appeals to the Hungarian government to release Mr. Dery."

Priestley's statement was one of the major events of the conference. The newspapers printed it on their front pages and the Melbourne streets were filled

with automobiles carrying the "Herald's" headline: "J. B. Priestley protests at Peace talks!". (It is interesting that Mulk Raj Anand also issued a statement in which, without going so far as to raise his voice for Dery, he supported the minority view on the addendum against the line-toeing majority.)

When the Priestley statement hit the streets some eighty delegates of the Congress were holding a meeting in the Assembly Hall in the centre of town. The meeting was presided over by Dr. Babbage, Anglican Dean of Melbourne, who was originally one of the sponsors but, noticing how biased the preparations were, had resigned. At the meeting the young socialists and Catholics, dissatisfied with the trend of the peace talks, rose and reported on their discouraging experiences. They said that though there was no doubt about the honesty and sincerity of the majority of the participants and guests, and though in certain groups, for instance among churchmen and scientists, the freedom of debate seemed assured, in other groups a communist minority held the reins and the central organization of the congress was closely linked with the Australian Communist Party and the Australian Peace Council. They cited innumerable examples to show how free debate had been prevented in those groups and with what tricks, time limits, etc., they had made it impossible to accomplish useful work.

These events, published and commented on in the Australian press, radio and television did not exactly contribute to raising the congress' prestige. The organizers were careful not overshoot the mark, at least in their concluding statement, so that the "Declaration of Hope" passed by the closing session is somewhat restrained. Side by side with the principal demands (total disarmament, the first steps toward which should be taken at once and which should be accompanied at all stages by an accepted system of inspection . . . the immediate banning of nuclear tests . . . the transition from an armament economy to a peace economy on an orderly, planned basis . . . the increased effectiveness of the United Nations . . . the admission of the Chinese People's Republic and of all other non-member nations . . . a summit meeting without delay . . . the promotion of free cultural, scientific, industrial, sporting and other exchanges between countries), there were a few that do not fit in very well with official Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. Thus, for instance: "We deplore any breach of international peace . . . We believe that responsibility for war is never one sided".

In the long run, the Melbourne peace conference is unlikely to have any effect. It was probably the first manifestation of the dual tendency that will soon become evident in various Western countries: the increased and ever bolder effort of the isolated communist parties to establish, in the shadow of the sputniks and luniks, some kind of popular front of peace — and the increased opportunity for socialists and democrats to play a leading role in movements that have hitherto been communist monopolies. It is too early yet to say whether there is much point in taking advantage of the latter opportunity.

Chinese Expansionism

by K. M. Munshi

THE tragedy of Tibet hangs heavily on our conscience. For a young independent nation like ours with its spiritual heritage, our handling of the Tibetan situation has been a crime in history.

Tibet has been an independent country in the past; the so-called sovereignty of China hung over it by the slender thread of a shadowy claim of doubtful international validity. Seven years ago, we, out of weakness, conceded that the fiction was a fact. We possibly thought—fallaciously as it is now being realised—that if we so appeased China, we would have eternal friendship with her. Sardar, I remember, struck a note of caution against such weakness. But some of our leaders thought otherwise. They were dreaming of India and China walking down the corridor of history, hand in hand, as the joint architects of a new Asia of peace and justice.

When Chou En-lai was here—those honeymoon days of Bhair-Bhaism,—we secured nebulous assurances from him about Tibet's autonomy in some pious, vague words uttered in a passing mood of effusive friendship. Thanks to our gullibility, some of our leaders, anxious to usher in a new era of Panchshila, believed in them. To promote the doctrine, they were even willing to misread history by popularising the myth of 2,000 years of friendship between China and India.

When the rape of Tibet began, some of these leaders were even willing to find an excuse for the Chinese who perpetrated it. They claimed that feudalism in a country justified its conquest by a foreign aggressor, the butchery of its people and the desecration of its shrines.

Some amongst us were loudest in our protest, and rightly when Egypt was invaded. But the intensity of their righteous indignation rises or falls in inverse ratio with the temperature of their timidity. When Hungary's liberties were destroyed, our official indignation was tepid. When Tibet was raped—Tibet, which for centuries had been militarily our own outer bastion, geographically our nearest neighbour and culturally our blood-brother—our official timidity reached its height as the righteous indignation fell to its very depth. Our representative in the U.N.O. even argued that, China not having accepted fundamental rights, the U.N.O. had no right to discuss the outrage on the helpless people of Tibet. Righteous indignation, according to this dictum, can turn its blind eye to tyranny, oppression and genocides, as long as the aggressor does not recognise that they are fundamentally wrong. A murderer need not be condemned so long as he is unwilling to hold life sacred!

But that is a thing of the past. For four years now, our frontiers were threatened and encroached upon—and still we slept. Longju was taken from us—yet the Government was 'maturely' inactive. It was only when the country almost unanimously resented this weak policy, that the leaders of the Congress have

spoken brave words and promised brave deeds. We have to thank our stars that such wisdom has dawned on them—and none too late. And let us hope that those who have given the promise will promptly keep it.

These series of mistakes and failures have been invited by refusing to face facts or by ignoring what Chinese expansion is pledged to.

China, let us not forget, is dominated by Han Chinese chauvinism. The State-sponsored movement to settle the Han Chinese in the outlying parts of Red China is proceeding apace, displacing and expropriating non-Hans. The Mongols of Inner Mongolia, the Muslims of Kamsu and the Ulghars of Sikiang now incorporated in Szechwan, have lost their lands and autonomy to Han migrants. In most of these colonies there are revolts of non-Han peoples and 'liberation' campaigns as in Tibet.

The complete military subjugation of Tibet had also for its aim the settling of the Hans in Tibet. In 1956, the Chinese General Chang Kuo-hara quoted Mao Tse-Tung as saying: 'In a few years the population of Tibet must be raised from two or three millions to over ten millions.' We now know from Dalai Lama that the colonisation of Tibet is an accomplished fact.

When the unfortunate victims resist such deprivation of land and freedom, it is condemned, to use the words of Saifudin, as 'bourgeois clamouring for national independence.' Quite a few millions of Han Chinese are thus sent out to occupy other lands.

All this is done for purely imperialistic purposes, for 80-90 per cent of the total oil resources, 55 per cent of lead, 47 per cent of copper and 22 per cent of coal are found outside China proper in the frontier regions inhabited by such non-Han peoples.

South Korea and Taiwan, but for American help, would have gone under. Pressure continues on Japan to disown its alliance with America. There are many millions of Overseas Chinese in the countries in South-East Asia, which the local people feel are a danger to national existence.

The well-advertised 'spirit of Bandung' has given Chinese expansionism a new validity. North Viet-Nam is under Chinese sphere of influence and today it flourishes on Chinese support. South Viet-Nam is under pressure of infiltration from North Viet-Nam; so is Laos; so is Indonesia.

The pressure continues on the frontiers of Burma. The Chinese Embassy in Rangoon forced the Burmese Government to close a movie that it thought was critical of China and got the visas cancelled to a Hong Kong football team. In Jakarta, the Chinese Communist Embassy defends the interests of all Chinese in spite of general statements that the Chinese in Indonesia should no longer consider themselves Chinese citizens.

Weapons of economic warfare are in constant use.

China has become the major low-cost exporter of light consumer goods, foodstuffs and textiles in Asia, progressively eliminating other exporting countries.

Instead of Tibet being the outer bastion of India, it has become a spring-board for Chinese infiltration and penetration. The two major highways in China—the Sikang-Tibet and the Chinghai-Tibet highways—have been constructed connecting far-flung Chinese territories and making India vulnerable.

The dispute over the McMahon line; the prohibition of Indian pilgrims to Tibet; the jamming of 'Voice of India' programmes; the occupation of Longju and the aggression over Ladakh—all indicate a strategy of all-Asian expansion.

Claims are now being made that China extends to the southern foot-hills of the Himalayas, thereby including not only Ladakh, but Sikkim, Bhutan, Nepal and parts of Uttar Pradesh.

Thus, the Chinese Communists have combined traditional Chinese tactics with Communist ideology, making Chinese Communism more deadly. And it is at our door.

Let us make no mistake about it. Han Chinese expansionism is on the move; Communism has given it an ideological pretext under which to 'liberate' every other nation in Asia.

Let us not be gullible any more. Our hearts bleed for the Tibetans, despoiled of their country and their freedom, who are in a helpless position. At present, we cannot help them in any way except to give them sympathy and enable them to win the sympathy of the world and extend to them the traditional hospitality of our land. Tibet's ultimate destiny—as our own—is bound up with India's strength. That strength we must have.

Let us not talk impossible things. Let us not, like the ostrich, bury our heads in the sands of pacifism. The danger of Chinese expansion is at our very door. Whether it stays where it is for the time being; whether it accepts the Prime Minister's terms and calls a tactical halt; whether it slows down the pace of expansion, let us not blind ourselves to realities of power politics. Han Chinese chauvinism is on the march against Japan, Taiwan, South Viet-Nam, Laos, Thailand, Burma and India.

We need not accept the Defence Minister's fallacious dichotomy of 'conquest or negotiations'. There is a third way and the only sound way, to be so strong as to make aggression impossible and negotiation unnecessary. Balance of power in Asia cannot be maintained—nor peace remain unbroken—till we become, as the Prime Minister has truly said, a 'nation in arms.'

Let us not hesitate. If the Prime Minister takes steps to redeem the promise to make us a 'nation in arms,' let us unite to give him our heartiest support. Let every able-bodied young man join the Territorial Army. Let us have the latest equipment from wherever we can find it. We do not want strings to foreign aid, but we need not hamstring ourselves by the fear of strings.

Let our Plan be geared—not to plan-frames inspired by near-Communist adventures, not to revolutionis-

ing social pattern by trial and error—but to a practical end of gathering such defensive strength as would render Chinese expansion innocuous—not only on the Indian frontier, but in the whole of South-East Asia.

There is no choice. If we want to survive, if we want to preserve our freedom and national existence, we must be a 'nation in arms'.

—Speech delivered in Agra on Dec. 13, 1959, while inaugurating the Tibet Convention.

A NOTABLE EXHIBITION

From Our Correspondent

AN Exhibition of photographs taken during the Liberation Struggle which developed in Kerala in the months of June and July was organised by the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom in its office in Bombay for four days from 19th to 22nd December. The exhibition consisted of photographs taken on the spot as the struggle was developing in the State. Some of the photographs were enlarged while the rest of them were in the sizes in which they were taken.

The exhibition gave a clear picture of the struggle as it developed. It showed the enthusiasm of the people for the struggle. The photographs depicted the various phases of the struggle as well as the brutal attempts of the communist Ministry to suppress it. There were many photographs of meetings and processions as well as of picketing and other forms of civil disobedience. There were also photographs of the beatings of the volunteers by policemen, of shootings and of their victims. Some of the pictures of the martyrs and of their relatives weeping over their dead bodies were very impressive. The photographs also showed how the Liberation Struggle was a state-wide mass movement of the people in which persons of all communities, religions and castes participated with equal enthusiasm. There were also some charts giving useful information about Kerala.

During the four days that the exhibition was open, it was visited by over 1500 persons. A large number of them were Keralites residing in Bombay. Other sections of the people also visited the exhibition and they were highly appreciative of the attempt made by the Indian Committee to give a clear picture of the Liberation Struggle as it took place in Kerala.

The exhibition was inaugurated on Friday 18th December by Mr. K. M. Munshi, the former Governor of Uttar Pradesh. In his inaugural speech he said that Kerala had given a concrete proof to the people of India that even when a communist Government came into power through democratic means, once having got the power, it utilised it for undermining democratic institutions and for suppressing individual liberty. He said that it was for the first time in the history of communism that under a communist Government, the forces of democracy and communism had been pitted against each other in Kerala and the communists had gone under. He said that it was mainly because there was not a communist army in a neighbouring country, as it happened in Hungary, to come

(Continued on page 12)

Soviet Society In Transition

(Contributed)

DURING his recent tour in Siberia, Mr. Khrushchev put the question of Soviet living standards in perspective. The Communist system, he said, was superior to the capitalist system. In future, Soviet citizens would be able to eat five times as much as American citizens, but at present "we cannot yet ensure the production of a sufficient quantity of goods", nor could there be any sharp decrease in prices since this would entail queues in the shops. Siberian workers must continue to work hard building new metal combines and other plants which, in the long term, would mean more consumer goods.

Replying at Krasnoyarsk to complaints about living conditions, Khrushchev said, in effect, that to achieve a high living standard, industry, agriculture, science, technology and consumer goods must be given their relative priorities:

"We set ourselves this aim: to develop thoroughly our industry, agriculture, science, technology and culture; to build more apartments, to produce more of all types of goods... Our clothes are still rather dull. We must increase the output of consumer goods" (October 9).

Mr. Khrushchev acknowledged that the workers in Siberia lived "in difficult conditions"; that the question of housing was acute and that there were shortcomings in supplies. An article in *Sovetskaya Rossiya* of October 3 and other articles in the Soviet Press have confirmed that the main preoccupation of the workers in the newly developed areas is with shelter from the Siberian winter. Describing conditions in a district of Orenburg province, *Sovetskaya Rossiya* attributed the numerous desertions from the area to hardships, especially in housing. It described the case of a tractor driver who after his arrival in 1954 had spent his first winter in a tent. The hardship proved too much for his wife and children and he asked for a transfer.

Moscow Radio on October 1 reported that 47 shops in the capital were "hospitably welcoming the people of Moscow" on their first day of hire-purchase sales which were proving very popular. Yet, a year ago, Soviet propaganda was describing the hire-purchase system as an evil Western practice that had led workers into debt and enabled the capitalists to get rid of their surplus goods at high profits. The hire-purchase system was introduced on an experimental basis in the Ukraine during February and March. Since then it has been extended throughout the USSR by order of the Ministers of Trade of the Union Republics. The buyers pay between 20 and 25 per cent in cash and the remainder in six to 12 monthly instalments. The rate of interest is from one to two per cent. The goods sold on credit include clothing (overcoats, suits and furs), but exclude such major items as cars. The most popular purchases are radio and television sets, sewing machines, watches and children's bicycles.

It is possible that the hire-purchase system was first

introduced in the Ukraine because excessive stocks of certain durable consumer goods had accumulated in the retail trade network of the republic. The fact, however, that the system now operates throughout the USSR and covers a fair range of durable goods suggests that they can be produced in larger quantities and made accessible to low wage earners. The introduction of the hire-purchase system would thus seem to initiate a trend towards mass consumption.

This conclusion is confirmed by a decree of October 16 which provides for a substantial increase in the output of household goods. Judging by one passage, however, the Soviet consumer is still a long way from enjoying the abundance that his Western counterpart takes for granted. "The level of production of many goods of cultural and everyday type is lagging behind the constantly growing demands of the population... In several towns, and in some rural areas, it is not always possible to buy the simplest items of domestic necessity..."

Any measure to meet consumer demand is naturally popular. The desire of the average Soviet citizen to live well emerges clearly from readers' letters to the Press. *Sovetskaya Rossiya* on October 4 published the following extract from an anonymous letter:

"It is time to stop justifying it all by Spartans and Luniks. Come down to earth—to the most ordinary pair of shoes. I have only one pair, but I have worn them for four years already. And why? Because it is a Western pair with a foreign mark... Personally I do not need the TU-114. I use the tramway, but I want to live well and dress well".

Up to a point the authorities encourage the desire of Soviet citizens to live well, but they take a different view of attempts to accumulate sizeable private fortunes. In an article discussing harmful tendencies among Party members, the periodicals *Partiinaya Zhizn* (Party Life) No. 15, 1959, quoted a reader's letter dealing with the tendency towards personal enrichment:

"In the Party organisation of the settlement Zhilevo (Moscow Province) the Communists who own their houses and allotments systematically carry on a trade in fruit, vegetables and meat in the markets of Moscow. A few years ago this kind of trading was carried on by members of the family, but now Communists themselves frequently appear behind the stalls... There are some Communists who let living space at speculative rents or sell houses built with State assistance at very high prices".

A decree which came into force on October 1, ordering urban dwellers to sell their privately-owned animals to collective and State farms, has in fact put an end to the kind of trading in meat and dairy produce described in the letter. But the problem of the

(Continued on Page 11)

House That Stalin Built

by M. Devadas Kini

HERESY of the 19th century has become the orthodoxy of the 20th. What is called the dictatorship of the proletariat has really become the dictatorship over the proletariat. A new class of bureaucrats and technocrats has taken upon itself the "burden" of "managing" the society, but with new forms of exploitation. Communists, of course, do not believe in an elite or at least say so. But if History has thrust on them the task of leading humanity to the Promised Land from the Wilderness, they cannot help it.

The trouble with communism is that it wants to make robots of us all. Ant-hill and the bee-hive have perfect order. But what is the use of winning the whole world if we lose our soul in the process? Society is not a military barrack. Marx over-emphasised the one side of the private property; he ignored that it is also a condition of freedom.

A concatenation of events and episodes, which were as accidental and as momentous as the nose of Cleopatra, helped Lenin to establish the Marxian Church. Ten days that shook Russia changed the course of its destiny. Lenin's early death was followed by a battle of succession. In the battle Stalin manoeuvred himself into the throne by manipulating the party machinery, and liquidating, or "vapourising" as Orwell would have it, his opponents. Stalin became the master of all he surveyed and he surveyed a wide landscape.

The book* under review gives a peep into the house (or is it a prison?) that was founded by Lenin and built by Stalin. The period covered by the book is 1917 to 1938 and the area is Smolensk, an oblast or guberniya as it is called in Russian language. It is a province some 418 kilometers to the south-west of Moscow. The book reconstructs the history of Smolensk from the authoritative but fragmentary records—"more than 500 files containing approximately 2,00,000 pages of documents"—that fell into the hands of the Nazis at the beginning of the II World War and found their way into the U.S.A. at the end of the war.

The Smolensk Archive is to a student of communism what a collection of fossils is to an anthropologist. The author has delved deep and has produced a discriminating and well-documented study full of official quotations. It is a treasure-house of information on what the author calls a "grandiose experiment in human engineering".

Total control of life and society has been the distinct feature of all totalitarian states. And the Russian brand is no exception. They identified state with society and mixed party with state. Society is not multi-centred but unicentred. Nothing is citizen-centred, everything is state-centred, state-controlled

and state-directed. "Indeed, with the possible exception of the army and the NKVD, there was no organised activity in the oblast which was free from the bureau's guidance and direction. A leafing of the protocols unfolds a miscellany of resolutions on such diverse topics as the Atheist League and Aero Club, a celebration of the Pushkin jubilee, an increase in the print order of a newsheet at a construction project, an authorization of funds for needy students and for the purchase of portraits of Party leaders, vacation leaves for Party and governmental officials in the oblast and the raions, authorization to rename a theater and factory after Rumyantsev, and a host of other matters, large and small." "The terror apparatus was undoubtedly efficient, and one cannot come away from a reading of the OGPU or NKVD reports in the Archive without realizing that there was little that went on in even the most obscure corner of Smolensk that the secret police did not know." When the State is the only owner of the Press and the presses, educational institutions and other organs that create public opinions, it can mould people into any required shape. In this servile state hundred flowers cannot bloom, nor hundred schools of thought contend. Man can be made to believe and do anything including the Gopak dance, because the penalty-for disobedience is death by starvation.

Peasants have always resisted totalitarianism with their robust individualism. A regime committed to create a "brave new world" of surfs and slaves and bent on a programme of rapid industrialisation to create powerful military apparatus, capable of conquering the world has to do away with the peasants. But they were a hard nut to crack. So the strategy employed was to divide and then to destroy the peasantry. First they isolated kulaks, the relatively rich peasants and destroyed them by economic sanctions, such as heavy tax burdens and ultimately by confiscation. This was only the thin end of the wedge. And then came the turn of the middle and poor peasants. Writes a peasant: "Comrades you write that all the middle peasants and poor peasants join the kolkhoz voluntarily, but it is not true. For example, in our village of Podbuzhye, all do not enter the kolkhoz willingly. When the register made the rounds, only 25% signed it while 75% did not. They collected seeds by frightening (the peasants) with protocols and arrests. If any one spoke against it, he was threatened with arrest and forced labour. You are deceived by the Comrades. . . . I beg you not to divulge my name because the Party people will be angry. (Signed) POLZIKOV." Obviously people do not know that History has appointed Communists to reform them! How ignorant of them! Collectivisation helped Stalin to get the most out of what the peasants had produced, but it did increase production

* **SMOLENSK UNDER SOVIET RULE** by Merle Fainsod. Published by Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Price \$8.50.

Trade Unions in the Soviet Union are only transmission belts to pass the directives from above, to mobilise support and to carry out the decisions. Workers have been denied the right to strike. When progressively their belts were tightened they began to act upon the principle "as the pay, so shall be the work". At a conference of shock workers, a group of "backward" workers declaimed: "Socialist competition sucks the last juices out of the worker. It is necessary first to improve working conditions, to increase wages. Labour discipline is intolerable. There are no foodstuffs. They oppress the kulaks, and therefore there is nothing.... exploitation is worse than under capitalism". Even communists cannot distribute before production.

There is no communist man in Soviet Russia. He is as mythical as the economic man of the 19th century economists. Unhealthy and disgraceful symptoms which exist in a number of organisations; mass violations of revolutionary legality, administrative excesses in regard to individual farmers and kolkhozes, cheating in workers' wages, embezzlement and speculation in the co-operative trade network, and what is most important, the insensitive reactions of many party organisations to these disorders and abuses. Rumyantsev pointed out that the situation inside and in the system of co-operative was "especially unfavourable", that in the consumers' cooperatives "in 1933 there were embezzlements and speculations to the sum of 4,793,000 rubles, which is 35% of the shares collected. In the first quarter of 1934 they ran to 1,160,000 rubles, or fifty per cent of the share fees." This is one of the many instances quoted in the book. This is what the trustees of the people have done.

Surges have been one of the scourges of the Soviet Union. "Operation Purge" is a very good stick to deal with the disobedients and to eliminate undesirables under the pretext of "right-wing deviation" or "left-wing excesses". Smolensk was not untouched by this. This is very interesting "...The case of Ya. K. Sinelnikov expelled because he wrote a review of a book by Zhdanov who was subsequently unmasked as an enemy of the people." Here is an unanswered question which perhaps gives clues to the whole affair, "while reading newspapers to the soldiers the officers asked him, 'Why do enemies of the people always occupy the leading posts?' He could not answer." Are we to understand that only scum, not cream gets at the top?

Strangely enough verdict on this "people's democracy" has been passed by a worker himself: "Formerly there was one Tsar—now a whole lot of them—every communist is a Tsar." That is to say some are more equal than others, with privileges, prerogatives and preferences.

Revolutions have come and gone, but eternal question has remained—how to rule the rulers? Society has well been likened to a pyramid and some will always be at the top. Marx has ignored the question of equality of status and power. Here we enter the realm of religion, philosophy and Dharma.

SOVIET SOCIETY—(Cont'd from page 9)

authorities in limiting unearned income is better illustrated by the discussion now going on in the Soviet Press about the inheritance law. Under this, the heir can inherit any sum of money and property without paying death duty, and thus live on unearned income.

The main implication of an article in *Izvestiya* of August 7, 1959, entitled "Private property and its supporters", and of readers' letters (published in the issue of September 27), was that the State should have the right to confiscate part of a person's estate upon his death and that the possibility of living on unearned income should be removed. It was pointed out that *dachas* were built with money embezzled from the State. Concern was also expressed about the corrupting effect of "property-owning psychology" on young people who looked down on the children of parents not owning *dachas*.

The *Izvestiya* article and readers' letters made various proposals to limit the right of inheritance, including the introduction of tax on unearned income and the imposition of death duties on part of the immovable property inherited. In the meantime, it was suggested, certain measures could be taken: *dacha* owners could be subjected to stricter control, more care could be taken in allocating land to prospective villa-builders, more public trials of *dacha* speculators could be staged, and they could be deprived of their town flats or, alternatively, allowed to build small bungalows only.

Izvestiya also raised the question of the inheritance rights to royalties accruing from the works of authors, composers and scientists. Their heirs could well live on the proceeds. A prominent writer may receive 250,000 roubles (about £6,250) for a novel of 400 pages, for the first edition alone. A play commissioned by the Ministry of Culture may earn a dramatist 60,000 roubles for the first 150 performances; for a film scenario a writer may get up to 120,000 roubles. The President of the Academy of Sciences is reported to have a salary of 23,000 roubles a month, and, like other scientists, inventors and top-ranking technicians, he would have a chance of winning a Lenin Prize of 75,000 roubles.

It is clear that there is no shortage of money among the members of the "New Class" to invest in *dachas* and pass on to their heirs. It would be quite possible for a young man to live comfortably by investing his inheritance in the Government savings bank. This pays interest of three per cent.

Izvestiya closed its review with the recommendation that the Ministry of Finance and the Supreme Court of the USSR should inform its readers about the steps they propose to take to remedy this state of affairs. Changes may be expected in the Soviet inheritance law.

Soviet society in its transition to Communism is manifesting increasingly individualistic trends. The views of the members of the New Class on the future of the Soviet State may not coincide with those of Mr. Khrushchev.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

"So far as I am concerned, and so far as the Government is concerned, we will negotiate, negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Times of India*,
December 22.

"If we carry on negotiations to the bitter end, the bitter end will be that we will lose what is ours and we shall endanger the safety and security of the country.

—Acharya Kripalani, M.P., *Hindustan Times*,

The Chinese must be told firmly that we too can flourish and use pistols—if and when necessary.

—*Indian Express*, December 21.

Prime Minister's approach to India-China border problem is exactly the same as that of the Communist Party.

—P. Ramamurthy, Madras Communist Leader,
Indian Express, December 14.

Whereas India is making history internally and externally, China is making geography by expanding its territory at our expense.

—Kamal Nayan Bajaj, M.P., *Hindustan Times*,
December 23.

All the delegations that came from China during the past ten years came for espionage just to convince themselves of how unprepared India was.

—Dahyabhai Patel, M.P., *Hindustan Times*
December 2

Finance Minister Morarji Desai angrily set out to get the facts about the Red (Sinkiang-Tibet) Road. Cross-examining India's army Chief of Staff, Gen. I. S. Thimaya, he asked when he first knew about the road. In 1957, said the General and he had offered proposals to safeguard the security of India, but were turned down by the Defence Minister. "Why," asked Desai. "Because," replied Thimaya, "he the enemy was on the other side (i.e. Pakistan,) on this side".

—*Time Magazine*, December

I am surprised that the Defence Ministry is passing 4,000 copies of the Delhi weekly which has been talking as a slave of China and praised the torture of Karam Singh and other innocent Indian prisoners.

—Dr. Ram Subhag, M.P., *Hindustan Times*,
December

Mr. Menon described the Chinese occupation of Indian territory as incursion and added that use of the word major invasion had serious implications.

—News item in *Indian Express*, December

(Continued from page 8)

to their aid. Referring to the Chinese aggression, Munshi said that the main object of the Chinese was to bring their army to the borders of India for "extending" the country.

A representative gathering of prominent citizens of Bombay was present on the occasion. Mr. V. K. Karnik, Honorary Secretary of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, welcomed the guests and requested Mr. Munshi to inaugurate the exhibition. He said that no more fitting person could have been found for the purpose as Mr. Munshi contributed a good deal to the success of the Liberation Struggle by securing for it the support and the sympathy of democratic elements in other parts of the country.

The exhibition was organised out of the photographs placed at the disposal of the Indian Committee by the Vinoychana Samar Samiti of Kerala. It is now proposed to take the exhibition to some other places so that democratic elements in those places may get a clear idea of how the struggle developed and what happened in the course of the struggle.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

BOLSHEVISM REVISITED

Arthur Schlesinger Jr

THE USES OF TELEVISION

Richard Hoggart

NORTH ATLANTIC LEFT

D. W. Brogan

January 1960

76

Annual Rs. 12

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