

Myth Exposed

by B. K. Desai

The liberation of the people of Goa, Daman and Diu from the Portuguese colonial rule is one of the happiest events in the history of India since independence. The existence of the Portuguese colonies on the Indian soil was a standing insult to India which no self-respecting nation could tolerate long. That at a time when Western colonialism was on the decline the Portuguese rulers should insist on clinging to their tiny enclaves was a measure of the sheer anachronistic nature of the policies of the Portuguese dictator, Dr. Salazar, who stubbornly refused to see the signs of changing times both at home and abroad. In a sense, therefore, the Portuguese dictator invited upon himself the evacuation by refusing to come to terms with reality. No one can blame the Indian Government for using force for eliminating the Portuguese colonial possessions. India waited patiently for the last four years in the hope that the Portuguese would see the light of the day and gracefully withdraw from the pockets. But the Portuguese refused to bow to changing times and persisted in deluding themselves by claiming fictitious sovereignty over Goa and two pockets. They even refused to heed the advice of their friends, the U.K. and the U.S., who urged them to produce a "peaceful solution" of the Goa problem. Thus India, as a self-respecting nation, was left with no alternative but to use force to bring an end to the anomaly of the so-called Portuguese sovereignty over a part of her soil.

The patriotic elements in India and democratic nations all over the world should therefore feel deeply disappointed at the elimination of yet another vestige of colonialism from Asia. It is, therefore, unfortunate that the forcible liquidation of the Portuguese colonies in India should have produced hostile reactions in the West, and especially in the U.S. India was not blamed for taking recourse to force but, what is more, the U.S. delegate in the U.N., Mr. Stevenson, went to the extent of accusing India of having "betrayed" Goa, and thus accepting the Portuguese sovereignty over their overseas possessions. Stevenson even struck a melodramatic note and said that the Indian action would mark the beginning of the end of the U.N.! This near-hysterical reaction from the U.S. spokesman was, to say the least, unfortunate, as it betrayed an utter lack of

sense of proportion. It also betrayed the lack of appreciation, on the part of the U.S., of the strength of the forces of anti-colonialism. To be sure, there is room for honest differences of opinion over the propriety of the method used by India. But, then, the West cannot, at the same time, forget that India waited for full fourteen years before taking the ultimate step and that she used force as a last resort when all the peaceful methods proved utterly infructuous. It was only after she was totally convinced that Portugal was completely untouched by the movements for self-determination in Asia and Africa, that India decided to seek the solution by force. Thus the choice before India was the one between the continuance of the Portuguese colonial possessions with all the repression and violence it involved, and the use of force once for all to put an end to this intolerable situation. If India chose the lesser evil of the two, no one can criticise her for adopting wrong methods for the purpose. It was precisely the failure of the West to persuade Portugal to read the writing on the wall that compelled India to undertake the military action.

While the Western spokesmen were vehement in their criticism of the Indian action, they had nothing to say about the Portuguese colonialism. This one-sided attack therefore made their criticism sound almost hypocritical, and it once more gave opportunity to spokesmen of the Soviet bloc to pose as real friends of the Afro-Asian countries by identifying themselves with the anti-colonial aspirations and sentiments of the Afro-Asian peoples. The result of this failure of the West to understand how powerful a force anti-colonialism continues to be even in a country like India was clear in the case of the liberation of Goa. The angry opposition from the West to the military operation caused widespread indignation in India and, as a result, even a leader like Jayaprakash Narayan, was impelled to charge the U.S. of having betrayed, by its opposition to the Indian action, its "lingering love for colonialism." On the other hand, the Soviet President, whose visit to India coincided with the liberation of Goa, and who expressed his country's unreserved support to the Indian action, was successful in projecting a favourable image of his country as the real friend in the Indian mind. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Soviet President should have exploited the position to the full and tried to drive the point home by reminding repeatedly the Indian people as to "who are the real friends of India and who are not."

If the West has emerged from the Goa episode with its prestige badly shaken, the military operation in

Goa, let it be clearly stated, has also not enhanced the reputation of the Government of India. First of all, the timing of the Goa operation was obviously inspired purely by narrow partisan considerations. No amount of gloss can hide the fact that the action was inspired and timed to enable Mr. Krishna Menon, Defence Minister, to cash in on the achievement and boost his own prospects in the ensuing general election. Mr. Menon's sordid record as the Defence Minister on the question of the Chinese aggression has created a revulsion in the mind of the intelligentsia and even Congressmen are not happy about his role. As a result, the Defence Minister's chance in the coming election were none too bright. Mr. Menon was, therefore, keen on diverting the public attention from the Chinese aggression and, thereby, trying to swing the pendulum in his favour. How far the liberation of Goa has furthered Mr. Menon's cause could be seen only after the election. But the fact that the Congress leadership felt no qualms in using a national issue like that of Goa to its partisan advantage is a measure of its utter degradation.

Prime Minister Nehru was obviously not very happy about the choice of means used for liquidating the Portuguese colonialism from the Indian soil. And he had every reason to feel uneasy about it. So far the Prime Minister has lost no opportunity in lecturing the world, especially the West, about employing right means to achieve right ends. He has always stressed the need for the preservation of peace at any cost in this nuclear age and urged others to solve their problems through the method of peaceful negotiations. Even in the case of the Chinese aggression, the Prime Minister has always accused his critics of "using brave words" without realising their implications and insisted on using peaceful approach to solve the problem. "I will negotiate, negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end", has been his formula for solving the Sino-Indian

dispute. This obsession for peaceful negotiations had become practically a substitute for a firm and meaningful policy on the Sino-Indian problem. The Chinese aggression undoubtedly poses the worst possible threat not only to India's territorial integrity, but to its very survival as a democratic and independent country. Compared to the Chinese threat, the Portuguese colonialism was a minor irritation. And still Mr. Nehru decided to use force to put an end to it. Naturally, even many of Mr. Nehru's friends and admirers abroad were not convinced that "all the alternatives to war had been fully explored" by Mr. Nehru before undertaking military measures for the purpose. The result is their bitter disillusionment at the downfall of their idol.

Thus, the Goa operation has shattered the myth, built-up assiduously by Mr. Nehru's admirers, that Mr. Nehru, the apostle of non-violence and peace, embodies the moral conscience of the world. No one of course need feel sorry about the exposure of the myth. It was more a product of wishful thinking and had little basis in reality. It had, on the contrary, encouraged our leaders to ignore the realities of the international situation and lay stress on moral overtones without considering their relevance to the actualities of the situation. This emphasis on high-sounding principles and pious but meaningless platitudes, had, as a result, practically paralysed the Government into inactivity. The Goa operation has proved the utter irrelevance and futility of these platitudes as a guide for effective action to further vital national interests. This realisation should have a salutary effect on our policy-planners, if the lesson is driven home properly. If the peaceful approach was futile in the case of a tiny dictator like Salazar, "negotiating to the bitter end", can certainly be no solution for the Sino-Indian dispute.

A Plea For Positive Non-Violent Action

(The following is the full text of the statement issued by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan on the liberation of Goa)

EVERY Indian will rejoice at the final consummation of the Freedom movement and the disappearance of the last remnants of colonialism from Indian soil. All peoples who have regained freedom from colonialism—including, one hopes, the people of Pakistan—as also those yet struggling to be free will share in that joy. And if freedom is truly valued, and colonialism abhorred, all the other nations of the world should also rejoice with India. Those governments, such as of Britain and the U.S., that have deplored the use of force by India have only betrayed their lingering love for colonialism. No Government in the world has accepted Gandhian non-violence and disarmed and forsworn never to use force. According to the accepted political ethics of the nations, force was never more justified than the force employed by India in Goa. That India, after waiting

patiently for fourteen years, was finally compelled to resort to force was wholly due to the refusal of the NATO powers, particularly of Britain, to discharge honestly their responsibilities to the ideals of freedom they have so loudly professed, as leaders of the so-called 'free world'.

Having said all this, I feel called upon, as one dedicated to the proposition that violence even in a good cause is immoral and an offence against humanity, to express my sorrow that my country had to take recourse to it. Only fourteen years ago, aided by forces of history, we liberated most of our country without taking arms against the foreign ruler. Now, when we are immeasurably stronger and the forces of history too are even more favourable, we have failed to find non-violent means to free a tiny part of our

(Continued on page 6)

Guerrilla War In South Vietnam

by P. G. Honey

THE principal trouble spot in South East Asia at the present time is South Vietnam, where large numbers of Viet Cong (the local name for Vietnamese Communists) are engaged in an armed struggle to overthrow the legally elected Government of President Ngo Dinh Diem. The President, who recently declared a state of national emergency, has described the situation as one of full-scale war, while President Kennedy of the U. S. placed South Vietnam before Berlin in his address to the General Assembly of the United Nations, which is indicative of the seriousness with which recent developments are regarded there.

To understand the reasons for the fighting in Vietnam, it is necessary to go back to the Geneva Conference on Indo-China, which met in the early summer of 1954 and brought to an end the long war in Indo-China. Under the terms of the cease-fire agreements, Vietnam was divided into two roughly equal halves, the northern half being placed under the control of the Communists and the southern half under the rule of the non-Communist nationalists. Ngo Dinh Diem refused to sign these agreements because he opposed the division of his country, but he agreed to be bound by the cease-fire and to accept the International Truce Supervisory Commission (comprising India as Chairman, with Canada and Poland as members).

Appended to the Geneva Agreements was an unsigned "Declaration of Intent", the legal validity of which is extremely doubtful, and that envisaged free national elections throughout the whole of Vietnam to be held not later than July, 1956. The Vietnamese Communists, who signed the Agreements reluctantly, and only under strong Russian pressure, excused themselves for splitting Vietnam by saying that the division was only temporary, since elections would reunify the country in 1956.

In the event, President Diem refused to have anything to do with elections in 1956 for two reasons. Firstly, he said, he had not signed the Geneva Agreements and nobody had signed the "Declaration of Intent". In the second place, he alleged that free elections were not possible under a Communist regime. As a result, the division of Vietnam persisted after 1956.

Now the failure to hold elections involved the Vietnamese Communists in a public loss of face. Moreover, their disastrous attempts to carry out a Chinese-style agrarian reform in North Vietnam and the chaos brought about by their industrialisation plans combined to reduce living standards dramatically and to antagonise the population. At the present moment, North Vietnam faces famine before the next harvest in May, 1962, and sizeable sections of the

population are in open revolt against the Communist regime.

The Vietnamese Communists, therefore, see the rich ricelands of South Vietnam as the solution to their food problems, and are also anxious to end the embarrassing division of Vietnam for which they are held responsible by the Vietnamese people. Another equally important reason why they wish to seize South Vietnam is that the existence of an alternative Vietnamese Government poses a constant threat to their unpopular regime in the North.

A straightforward military attack on South Vietnam would have risked provoking direct intervention by the outside world and the outbreak of a major international war, so the Vietnamese Communists decided to achieve their objective by subversion. That is why, since 1957, they have been infiltrating Communist agents into South Vietnam. This has not proved too difficult, for, although the frontier between North and South Vietnam has always been well guarded and policed, the South has a very long frontier with Laos and Cambodia. Much of that frontier runs through mountains and jungles, which it has proved impossible to control, and the Viet Cong have been making their way southwards through Laos along a route now known in Vietnam as the "Ho Chi Minh trail". (Ho Chi Minh is President of North Vietnam.)

Once inside South Vietnam, the Viet Cong have practised classic guerrilla tactics, operating only in the countryside, establishing bases in the most inaccessible areas, and terrorising the people by attacking isolated villages whose headmen and officials they killed as a warning to the others. In this way they established their reign of terror in country areas, far from the main towns and roads, forcing the peasants to help them by their terror tactics.

Throughout 1957 and 1958, the Viet Cong build-up in South Vietnam proceeded steadily. As their numbers increased, the areas of their operations spread and they even established bases, arms dumps, and training camps on the Laotian and Cambodian sides of the frontier. In Laos this was relatively straightforward because the countryside is wild and inaccessible, but in Cambodia they secured the co-operation of local Cambodian officials in the remote frontier districts by bribery.

The fighting in Laos during 1959 enabled the Vietnamese Communists to send increased numbers of men and supplies to the South and thereby considerably increase the scope of their terrorist operations. Moreover, they deliberately provoked the Government of President Ngo Dinh Diem into adopting repressive measures against them. These measures, which took the form of increased security operations, restrictions on personal freedom, increased military patrolling of

the countryside, and the like, displeased the population and diminished the popularity of President Diem's Government, which is precisely what the Communists intended them to do.

Once more, fighting in Laos late in 1960 and early in 1961, with large parts of that country falling under the control of the pro-Communist Pathet Lao, provided the North Vietnamese Communists with just the opportunity they wanted. It became possible for them to send through Laos virtually any quantities of supplies and any numbers of troops they wished. Their only obstacle was the difficult nature of the terrain in Laos through which they had to pass. Indeed, attacks were launched against the highland regions of Central Vietnam from Laos by regular units of the North Vietnamese Army. These units were operating in company strength — about 100 soldiers to a unit — and prisoners taken by the South Vietnamese confessed that they had been inside Laos for as long as twelve months.

Massively reinforced in South Vietnam, the Viet Cong further increased the scale of their operations. A regular pattern is discernible in their terrorism. They commence by terrorising a small area, and then, when the inhabitants of that area are thoroughly cowed, they extend its frontiers so that it spreads outwards like an oil stain. During the stage of expansion, they carry out assassinations along the frontiers of the area, and when the villages there are subdued, they push these frontiers outwards. There is no need for more terrorism inside the area because the peasants there are very frightened and completely co-operative. A map on which the incidents are plotted with their dates will show clearly where these areas are and how they are spreading. The most ominous one is the terrorist area extending from the Svay Reing salient of Cambodia towards the mouth of the River Mekong in the region of Go-cong. If this reaches the river mouth, it will effectively cut South Vietnam in half.

For its part, the Government of President Diem has reacted strongly, and the United States has assisted its efforts with generous grants of economic aid and military training missions.

The field of military operations is shared by three organisations, the first and most important of which is the regular army. After the Geneva Agreements, the strength of the army was cut drastically and the numbers of soldiers reduced to 150,000. It was trained as a fighting force to contain an attack by the North Vietnamese Army, which reduced its effectiveness in guerrilla warfare. During the past few months, however, a further 20,000 new men have been recruited and, since a full-scale attack by the Communists now seems improbable, the regular army is undergoing intensive training in anti-guerrilla warfare.

Secondly, there is a force called in Vietnamese Bao-An, or Civil Guard. Its task is to maintain order locally, and its members are stationed in posts scattered throughout the provinces of South Vietnam. Since its formation, the Civil Guard has been hampered by the lack of modern weapons, but it has now been given more modern weapons and will be able to

compete on more equal terms with the well-armed Viet Cong.

The third force, the Tu-Ve, is a village militia made up of part-time volunteers from among the villagers. Its principal weakness has always been the small size of its individual units, because these offer easy targets for the Viet Cong, who can attack with superior numbers and arms.

In this kind of war the advantage is always with the attackers, and statistics show that 15 soldiers are required to contain one guerrilla fighter. The Vietnamese Government has, therefore, wisely decided to supplement its military efforts with others in the civil field. Foremost among these is the programme for building Agrovilles, or large towns into which the populations of several villages and isolated farms are moved. The larger agglomerations are more easily defended, and they enable Government expenditure on such improvements as the supply of electricity, piped water, hospitals, schools, cinemas, and so on, to benefit far larger numbers of people than hitherto.

A land-reform programme, designed to help every peasant to possess his own farm, is making good progress. It will provide the rural population with a much greater incentive for resisting the Viet Cong, because people will have a personal interest in preserving their small farms from confiscation or communisation by the Viet Cong. In addition, rural Co-operative Societies have been formed, and these bring innumerable economic and other advantages to the private money-lender.

The struggle goes on, and both sides are exerting every effort to win it. In past weeks, the Viet Cong have felt themselves strong enough to launch major attacks by several battalions on provincial capitals, but some of these have proved costly failures. President Diem can, if he so decides, appeal for SEATO military help, but thus far he has preferred not to involve foreign forces. The future of South Vietnam is in the balance, but there is much more than that at stake. The outcome of this war may well decide whether Communism is to expand into South and South East Asia or whether it can be contained within its present frontiers.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

ENCOUNTER is easily available in India—and at a price (Re. 1/- per copy) well within the reach of anyone's pocket. The sole wholesale distributors for India (except Delhi & Calcutta) are FOUR OCEANS PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LTD., 412 Mirabelle Hotel Chambers, 33 Marine Lines, Bombay 1.

Annual Subscription Rs 12

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

Illusion About Russian Foreign Policy

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE Prime Minister's illusions about China's communist revolution—that it is more nationalist than communist and internationalist, that it is essentially pacifist being more interested in social justice for her poverty-stricken millions, than in Red revolution, that in her land reforms, she was more interested in enabling the poorest strata of peasants to own land than in the Russian type of collectivisation through liquidation of property, that she will be fully absorbed in building socialism in her vast country to think of aggression on neighbouring lands etc. etc.—are or should be recognised widely by our intelligentsia by now.

The Chinese forcible liquidation amounting to genocide of the defenceless Tibetan nation and her aggression into Indian territory into Ladakh (in glaring and hypocritical contradiction to her adherence to Panchsheel principles) have helped to expel the illusion of Chinese Revolutionary Innocence and moral respectability.

The Prime Minister is nonplussed but shows no sign of any heart-searching and the consequent desire for a change of strategy and change of appraisal of the realities which he has so naively and grossly misapprehended.

The country watches the situation with deepening fear and foreboding and is casting about for an alternative viewpoint, policy and leadership *vis à vis* China.

But those acquainted with the full nature of Russian (international) communism (including the Chinese role within it) are disturbed by the fateful inadequacy—to say the least—of the Prime Minister's interpretation of and attitudes to the role of Soviet Russia in world politics as a whole. They are uneasy that the Prime Minister's naive, impressionistic appreciation of the Russian Revolution and system of society as the self appointed leader of Human Betterment all round in a new era (superceding the old one of wicked capitalism) may lead to further disasters to Indian security and independence before the sponsors of more realistic policies could awaken the people and attain power in the democratic counsels of the country.

The Chinese intransigence has not taught any lesson to the Prime Minister, to judge by his defence of his policies and of the Defence Minister whose doings, omissions and utterances at home and abroad tend to whitewash the aggressor's crimes.

To read the Prime Minister's opinions of the non-aggressive nature of Russian policy and of his refusal to recognise the Russian control of her satellite States as a type of imperialism as bad as Hitlerism and much worse than the historic imperialisms of Britain, French and Dutch in the immediate past is to receive

an accession of legitimate fears about the future when Russia may deem it propitious to become "tough with India."

The Declaration of 1960 and the results of the 22nd Communist Party Congress of the USSR under the lead of Khrushchev are indications of a shift in policy towards the Tough End of the Red Spectrum. They give the "Line Clear" towards a new attack or renewed attack, suspended in 1956 in the 20th Congress on the National Bourgeoisie or national capital. Mahatma Gandhi becomes again the "arch reactionary defender of bourgeois nationalism and bourgeois democracy" — that is, the leader of the capitalist and feudal classes and collaborator with foreign imperialism! Attacks on Nehru too have begun in the Russian ideological journals.

Word of the New Line has been passed to the Leaders of the Indian Communist Party.

In this context, it is not exactly reassuring to read the following favourable appraisal of Russian world policy by Mr. Nehru:

"He seemed convinced that the Russians would ease their grip on the entire area (... East European States...) once this wretched Cold War is ended... They will give it up but not so long as they are threatened" "As Khrushchev said to me 'for forty years we have had to defend ourselves! They have never had a chance to settle down. If only they were allowed to do so, this fear would give way and they could give up their hold on Eastern Europe.'"

In addition to this extraordinarily naive and innocent interpretation of Russian revolutionary psychology, Nehru added, "I cannot myself see the value of a military approach to these problems. Besides, I do not see why some people think the Russians are out to conquer other peoples. They are not interested in this... The Russian people want peace." (Page 30, *Nehru: A Political Biography* by Michael Brecher. The interview took place in 1958 — after Nehru's experience of China's Panchasheel on our Northern borders and her invasion and absorption of Tibet.)

To confront this simple-minded "innocence" masquerading as morality and wisdom with the cold reality of the classical texts of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism and of the actual policies pursued by the Kremlin since the end of World War II is to feel the touch of murderous steel bayonets poised against our hearts — the heart of the free world.

Knowledgeable persons are disagreeably surprised about Sri Nehru's attitude to the Cold War. He speaks as if both parties are equally to blame. The plain fact is that the Cold war is the inevitable outcome of the aggressive policies of the Kremlin-leadership making towards world conquest for communism.

Hardly had the sound of guns subsided in the Western Front and Russian armies were entering Berlin and the Allied armies were taking positions in agreed occupation areas in Germany than Stalin terminated the war-time comradeship and ordered a ruthless and all-out resumption of the old communist propaganda against Western "imperialism".

The confidence of President Roosevelt in the reliability of Stalin's word about post-war collaboration proved to be a frail bubble in a matter of weeks. The promises made in Yalta and Potsdam about free elections in the Russian Zone of influence were broken in high Machiavellian fashion.

In the period 1945-48 Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia passed under the iron control of the new Marxist imperialists through "scientific" techniques of force and fraud via "People's Democracies." Mao joined the communist empire of his own accord under the magic of New Democracy, in 1949.

The Socialist camp became a world power more or less able to challenge the rest of the whole free world led by the United States!

Our Prime Minister's error consists in refusing to see the nature of Russia as a revolutionary *Crusading State* pledged to convert and conquer the whole world to communism under their hegemony and leadership.

Russian foreign policy is committed inexorably to world conquest by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism it is based upon.

"The victory of socialism in one country is *not* a self-sufficient task. The revolution that has succeeded in one country must regard itself... as an aid, a means for hastening the victory of the revolution in all countries; in the present case, the Russian revolution is the beginning of and the groundwork for the world revolution... it is a base for the further unfolding of the world revolution, a lever for the further disintegration of imperialism." (*Stalin: Problems of Stalinism*. Moscow 1941. p 113)

Further, the procedure laid down for it is military in the technique and discipline activating communist parties in the capitalist countries. The strategy speaks of the main blow, direction of the main blow, and the plan for the disposition of forces etc!

In actual fact, we see this policy in operation in Korea, Indo-China (Laos, South Vietnam), Guatemala, Cuba, several new African States like Guinea. The puzzle of the Congo is due to the efforts of the Western Powers to checkmate the entry of Russian influence into the province of Lumumba and Gizenga.

Dr. Fidel Castro has at last revealed that he had the full communist consummation in view from the beginning, though he kept it back and sailed under the flag of bourgeois nationalism in the early stages!

Can this be the inner, unspoken Motive of our own charismatic Leader?

(Continued from page 2)

Motherland. I am not blaming the Prime Minister or the Government of India. They are undoubtedly and truthfully wedded to the cause of peace, but they too have not forsworn violence of which the very existence of the Indian army is a constant reminder. True, they have eloquently and persistently denounced the use of force to solve international disputes and always advocated peaceful means. The Goa action, therefore, does lay them open to the charge of inconsistency and threaten to lower their prestige; but in this world of *realpolitik*, that is not a damage that cannot soon be repaired by correct and humane behaviour, as is already evident, towards Portugal and her legitimate interests.

The blame in truth must be laid at the door of those of us in this country who claim to be working to build a non-violent society and a world order based on love. More particularly and pointedly, the blame lies on Vinoba's head, the commander of the Shanti Sena, and us, his soldiers. We have deliberately and resolutely turned our backs upon the international disputes in which our country has been involved on the plea that we were not strong enough to offer non-violent solutions. It was wrong to my mind to think in terms of solutions, which are hidden in the lap of the gods. All that is required is that one should do what is right. Events will not wait until we have completed our targets of Shanti-patras and Bhodan-Gramdan. Even if there were one *Satyagrahi*, he should have acted in the face of a situation like that of Goa. It is action that will give us strength, not inaction. There is no reason to believe that even today there are not thousands, perhaps, hundreds of thousands, who will be ready to respond to the call of positive non-violent action. What is wanted is leadership. I do hope there will be real heart-searching and re-thinking on the matter. The question of war and peace cannot be left to governments alone. No government can be expected to embrace non-violence. If non-violent action has to be taken, the people alone can take it. And there is no people in the world more fitted for the task than the India people.

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

India, Tibet and China

by B. K. DESAI

Price Re. 1

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

BOMBAY 1.

United Nations & Congo

by Adam Adil

COMPARED to trouble spots like Berlin, Laos, South Vietnam, the situation in Congo is not so serious in the context of the cold war, yet it is not without an element of risk to the world peace. Apart from the fact that it sheds lurid light on the immaturity and mutual incompatibility of Africans, demolishing the very concept of Pan-Africanism, the situation in the Congo has brought into bold relief certain questions of an international political morality. It can be questioned whether the United Nations troops engaged as they are in a mortal combat with the Katanga soldiers have any right to force a political solution on the Congo and to deny the right of self-determination to the Katangese or, for that matter, to the people of any other province of the Congo. This question assumes poignancy of its own in view of the obvious fact the Central Government of Premier Adoula wants Katanga not for its concern for the unity of the Congo but for sharing the benefits of the rich mineral resources of Katanga.

The Western Allies are sharply divided on the question of the Congo. Britain, France and Belgium want the immediate cession of the United Nations hostilities against Katanga while the United States backs the U.N. action and is anxious to force Katanga to join the rest of the Congo in a single political system. The division of Western Allies on the question of the Congo is based partly on principle, and partly on self-interest. While insisting upon the application of the principle of self-determination in relation to Katanga, Britain, France and Belgium have high financial stakes in that mineral rich province. Katanga's Union Miniere, which employs 30,000 Katangese workers—thus being the biggest employer in the state—is a Belgian concern with considerable British investment. It produces 8% of the world's copper, 60% of its cobalt as well as cadmium, zinc silver etc. British interest in the firm is through the London-dominated Tanganyika Concessions Ltd., which holds 14% of Union Miniere shares and which in 1959 enjoyed \$45 million in dividends. The Union Miniere, in addition to giving all benefits to its workers, covers at least 80% of Katanga's entire annual budget. The firm, this year, is due to hand Katanga nearly \$52 million in dividends, mineral export taxes and other fees. As against the principle-cum-self interest of Belgium, France and Britain, the United States of America argues that Katanga must end its secession and join the central government in the interest of the Congo as a whole. The United States believes that Tshombe does not represent the whole of Katanga, and further, that the principle of self-determination cannot be invoked indiscriminately by any territory or province. The United States does not think that Katanga can lay claim to separate nationhood, but the whole of Congo, with its continuous 75-years his-

tory as a Belgian colony can legitimately do so. When the Western European nations point out that Tshombe, being anti-communist and anti-Russian, must be helped, United States replies that central government of the Congo under Adoula cannot survive long if Tshombe continues defying it, and that without Adoula, who is Congo's ablest and most reliable politician, instability and chaos would get better of the Congo situation, thus paving the way for communist influence, and in the face of such a development, Tshombe's anti-communism, even if genuine, would be of no avail.

Whatever be the attitude of different nations towards the issues involved in the Congolese situation, it is disturbing to see the United Nations, whose presence in Congo was primarily motivated by a desire to keep peace and prevent chaos, is shooting at the Congolese people and blasting buildings and destroying property. It may be true that United Nations hands were forced to resort to violence by the unfriendly attitude of Mr. Tshombe and his friends. But should the United Nations go to the length of imposing political solutions by military means as it aims to do at present? Will unity forced upon the Congo by the armed intervention of the United Nations have any chance of survival?

Considered dispassionately the action of the United Nations in trying to integrate Katanga, by military means, with the rest of the Congo is inconsistent with the primary object of the U.N.'s presence in that country. Again, it would be wrong to imagine as United States does, that Tshombe, in his attempt to keep Katanga independent, does not represent the Katangese people. The fact that the people of Katanga, except the Baluba tribe of the northern region, have risen in revolt against the United Nations action clearly demonstrates that that Mr. Tshombe is not alone and that he enjoys the support and the confidence of the generality of the Katangese.

Yet, it is legitimate to hope that Congo must be a unitary state and Katanga must not only join the rest of the Congo in one political system but also be prepared to share its wealth with other Congolese for the ultimate good of the Congo including Katanga; and Katanga as a rich and solvent partner in the unitary government of the Congo would enjoy far greater status and respect than as an independent nation.

But Katanga has to be brought in line with the rest of Congo, not by force as is being done at present, but by persuasion and sweet reasonableness. Katanga must be convinced that in their integration with the rest of the country lies the ultimate good not only of the Congo as a whole but also of itself. This is precisely what the United Nations and

(Continued on page 11)

Communist Conspiracy In Guinea

(Contributed)

THE expulsion of the Soviet Ambassador from Guinea for fomenting subversion of the Sékou Touré regime may well be a watershed in the relations between Russia and the new African states, since none was more closely tied to the Soviet Union than Guinea. It also throws a sudden light on a series of obscure events that have taken place here in the last month.

The incidents started on November 24, 1961, when the High Court of Conakry condemned five members of the Guinean Teachers' Union to jail terms ranging from five to ten years each. Then, three days later, when students throughout Conakry demonstrated in protest, the Government and President Sékou Touré's Parti Democratique de Guinée (PDG) ordered all schools closed and students sent home until further notice.

The severe penalties against the instructors were based on allegations that they had "edited and distributed within Guinea and abroad a mendacious and subversive document". Authorities judged the teachers' actions to have been part of "a new counter-revolutionary attempt". Among those condemned to ten-year sentences were M. Koumandean Meita, Secretary General of the Teachers' Union, and M. Mamadou Rayautra, Director of the Institute for Research and Documentation.

In view of the fact that Guinean students rose to the defence of the teachers, it is interesting to note that the High Court included among its charges the Union's "systematic efforts tending to divide and demoralise the young". Evidently the Government felt that its case was none too clear. While the trials were being held in Conakry a series of "meetings" were organised throughout the country in order to explain, and justify, the measures taken against the teachers. The Government spokesman, M. Ismael Touré, the President's brother, who is Minister for Public Works, brought up a few extra charges of his own, declaring that the Teachers' Union had been responsible for the recent demonstrations at Labe where three persons were killed and several injured.

A special communique issued by the PDG was broadcast to the nation by Radio Conakry. In no uncertain terms the radio stated that, "All students, with the exception of several ringleaders being held for questioning, will be sent home. Since last Sunday (November 26, 1961) special trucks and trains have already begun carrying the students back to their families."

In the capital of Conakry, passers by looked on in silence while details of armed and helmeted gendarmes patrolled in front of the empty school buildings. Then, in a startling revelation made public on December 11, President Touré declared that the student riots had been part of a Communist design

to overthrow his regime. He said that an official investigation into the rioting had "uncovered the existence of a subversive network reaching from an Eastern bloc embassy in Conakry to Dakar and Paris".

These words are in startling contrast to Guinean attitudes of the last few years, and it should be remembered that Sékou Touré is a Lenin Peace Prize winner. Guinea has occupied a special position among the new African states, for from the very beginning its political leaders have shown particular susceptibility to Communist doctrines and have tolerated far-reaching Communist infiltration. Their political education and commitments even before Guinea became independent led the leading officials of the PDG into a specially intimate relation with Communism. The schools have been infiltrated, as the trails have indicated, a Czech military mission reorganised and trained local army units, and Soviet bloc propaganda is found everywhere: in government offices, Party headquarters, and all state institutions.

Perhaps this will change with the expulsion of the Soviet Ambassador, Daniel Solod. Formerly the head of the Near East department of the Foreign Ministry in Moscow, he is a well-known figure on the diplomatic scene. From 1944 to 1950 he was in Beirut and then from 1953 to 1956 in Cairo as chef de mission, minister and ambassador — and succeeded in making these places key positions for Communist action in the Middle East. He is a Ukrainian by origin, and speaks English, French and Arabic. His transfer to Conakry in January, 1960, indicated the importance Moscow attached to Guinea, and how seriously it had set out to develop this state into a bridgehead for the Communist penetration of West Africa. Now that Sékou Touré has taken the extreme step of expelling Ambassador Solod, it will be interesting to see what other consequences will follow the discovery of the plot against his regime.

INDIAN TRADE UNIONS

A SURVEY

by V. B. Karnik

A survey of the trade union movement in India during the last forty years.

Price Rs 15.

PUBLISHERS

LABOUR EDUCATION SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

Without Comment

CASTRO OWNS UP TO COMMUNIST LABEL

Fidel Castro, proclaiming "I believe absolutely in Marxism," admitted publicly he was leading Cuba down the road to communism.

"I am a Marxist-Leninist and will be one until the day I die," the Cuban Premier declared in a midnight television speech.

"We must all study the experiences in building up the world's first communist society," he said. "Socialism is a world reality today as the force defeating imperialism."

"The world is on the road toward communism," he added.

Senor Castro's statements were in sharp contrast to declarations that "ours is not a communist revolution" made six months after he seized power from dictator Fulgencio Batista, Jan. 1, 1959.

Apparently in reference to his anti-communist statements, Senor Castro said Friday night that until a few years ago he was "biased against communism because of imperialist propaganda."

He said the change in his political thinking began after he seized power.

Senor Castro praised Lenin for "developing Marx's and Engels' theories and putting them into practice" in the Bolshevik revolution.

"Marxism or scientific socialism has become the revolutionary movement of the working class," he said.

Senor Castro's assertion that he was a confirmed Marxist was one of his strongest public admissions that he had been converted toward the communist line.

— *Christian Science Monitor*, December 4.

INDONESIA TO MOVE?

Exhaustion of patience can apparently be contagious: in India popular reaction to troop movements in Indonesia may be one of embarrassed support with several reservations. In the West some may already be talking of President Soekarno being on the verge of "doing a Goa"; and this is the time to prevent confusion of thought by stating the many and substantial differences between India's attitude to the former Portuguese possessions and Indonesia's to Western New Guinea — or West Iran, as the Indonesians prefer to call the Dutch part of that island in the Pacific. The ethnic character of the population (700,000) of Western New Guinea, mostly Papuan, is so obviously different from that of the Indonesians that, apart from the historical accident (as the Dutch put it) that both Indonesia and Western New Guinea were once under

the same alien administration, the Indonesian case is a good deal less than cast-iron.

Also to be remembered is the sharp contrast between the Dutch and the Portuguese in their recent attitudes to colonialism and the United Nations. Although this is what may have precipitated the crisis, some form of representative government has been introduced in Western New Guinea by the Dutch. At Hollandia on April 15 last was inaugurated the New Guinea Council, which has a majority of elected members. The Council is now engaged in drafting a constitution on the basis of early self-government, which is not necessarily synonymous with Indonesian government. The Dutch have also been consistently respectful to the U.N. Trusteeship Council. On January 4 Mr Schuurman, the Netherlands representative at the U.N., told the late Mr. Hammarskjöld that his Government would "wholeheartedly welcome" a personal representative of the Secretary-General to report on conditions in New Guinea. None was sent because in February Dr. Subandrio declared that a U.N. mission would be "illegal" if appointed "without our prior consent". Portugal simply said that the U.N. had no business to ask any questions and lies the latter was told often enough.

During General Nasution's visit to Australia in April this year there were some agreeably conciliatory pronouncements. He did indeed say that the ethnic character of the Papuans made no difference to the Indonesian claim; he seemed to say, echoing some others, that New Guinea was a part of metropolitan Indonesia and that was that. But the use of force was not then envisaged. On April 23 he even said that the Dutch in New Guinea had never been strong enough to threaten Indonesia. This must be equally true today. Indonesia has enough problems, and the world enough tensions, to make avoidable additions to either is highly undesirable. It may be in Dr Soekarno's, and Indonesia's, own interests to let the United Nations work out a peaceful settlement that will assure the people of New Guinea true self-determination.

— *Statesman*, December 22.

INDIAN COMMUNISTS AND CHINA

Patna, Dec. 13. Mr. Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of the Communist Party, said here yesterday that China had not committed any aggression on the northern border of the country.

Addressing a news conference, Mr. Ghosh, however, conceded that there was a border dispute between India and China. The dispute should be solved by negotiations he asserted.

"The Government of India will be perfectly justified to resort to any means to repel aggression by any one should the sanctity of the country's border be violated," he said.

The General Secretary of the CPI charged the Union Government with having made contradictory

statements on the border dispute with China and said that the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, himself had said in Parliament two years ago that the Chinese had not committed any aggression.

The stand taken by the Communist Party in November, 1959, recognising the MacMahon Line as India's border with China held good even today, he added.

Replying to a question, Mr. Ghosh said that there could be only two ways of solving the Sino-Indian dispute, by peaceful negotiations or war. "No one with an ounce of wisdom will advocate war to solve this complicated question," he added.

Mr. Ghosh declined to comment upon the recent Chinese charge that he had condemned China without ascertaining facts relating to the Sino-Indian border dispute.

Mr. Ghosh challenged the Government to hold elections for the Kerala Assembly also and see the results. The Government was morally obliged to hold elections in the State as the Congress-Muslim League alliance had broken down, he said.

—*Indian Express*, December 14.

INDIAN COMMUNISTS & MENON

The general secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Ajoy Ghosh, today pledged his party's support to Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon in the election to the Lok Sabha from the North Bombay constituency.

Mr. Ghosh, who was addressing a press conference, also said that the Communist Party, in spite of all propaganda directed against it, would be able to improve its position in the Lok Sabha and in State legislatures.

—*Times of India*, December 13.

TWO RED VOICES

To speak with two different voices is not a new thing for the Communists. They are known to be adept in that art. But even for them it must be an embarrassing experience to do so on the same day and on the same subject. Assailed by China for not understanding properly its position Mr. Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, quickly corrected himself by telling a Press conference at Patna on December 13, that "China had not committed any aggression on the northern border of India." He also told the newsmen that the Government of India "will be perfectly justified to resort to any means to repel aggression should the sanctity of the country's border be violated."

Mr. Ghosh is reported to have declined to comment on the Chinese charge against him that "he had condemned China without ascertaining 'facts' relating to the Sino-Indian border dispute." There was no need of any comments from him on that charge for, like a

loyal friend and ally of China, he has already corrected himself by stating that there has been no aggression.

On the same day on which Mr. Ghosh was holding his Press conference at Patna, Dr. Z. A. Ahmed, a colleague of his in the central secretariat of the Communist Party, has said something different in Delhi. Dr. Ahmed stated that "the Chinese view of the Indian situation was based on a totally wrong appraisal of facts and lack of understanding of the real feelings of the Indian people." This is certainly somewhat different from what the General Secretary of the Party has to say. Or it may be that Dr. Ahmed requires a separate reminder from China that he too, like his comrade Mr. Ajoy Ghosh, has failed to ascertain facts and is hasty in his condemnation of the Chinese attitude howsoever mild the condemnation may be.

All this is, however, of great help to the Indian people to draw conclusions and to remove their doubts, if they had any, that the Communist Party refuses even now to accept the simple fact that China has committed aggression and they can only repeat parrot-like the voices of their foreign masters whether they are located in Moscow or Peking. How impudent it sounds on their part now to keep on repeating that they approve the foreign policy of the Prime Minister, because they consider that "it strengthens the independence of our country." Do they seriously expect that people believe them when they talk of "our country"? What they really mean by "our country" is some times Russia and some times China and always both. By now Indians know it.

— M. HARRIS

— *Indian Express*, December 20.

INDIA'S DOUBLE STANDARD

Another debate, however, gave a less favourable impression of India. The Indian delegation abstained and did not even speak when the U.N. General Assembly discussed the Malayan resolution expressing concern at the violation of fundamental rights in Tibet. This was despite a formidable case against China built up by many delegates on the basis of the report submitted by the International Commission of Jurists on which, as the U.S. delegate pointed out, there were three Indians. The Malayan delegate held that the General Assembly had no less competence to consider the violation of human rights in Tibet as the apartheid in South Africa.

In attacking U.S. motives for seeking to condemn China for the events in the Tibet, the Soviet delegate—to India's embarrassment—placed the U.S. criticism of India concerning Goa on the same plane as the U.S. criticism of China for the repression in Tibet. He also hinted that everyone speaking of repression in Tibet, including members of the Jurists Commission, were in pay of the U.S. Government. Even this did not provoke comment from the Indian delegation.

— *Hindustan Times*, December 22.

Letter to the Editor

Consequences of Nationalisation

Dear Sir,

The recent 'strike' by the drivers of the Transport Undertaking run by the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation, although for a duration of only four hours, has thrown a flood of light on the workings of such nationalised undertakings. It has also provided a poignant instance of how the administrative machinery of the nationalised transport undertaking acting in collusion with the trade union of its employees paralysed the transport and held people at ransom. In fact the strike of the bus drivers was more or less a result of the tussle between administrative officers of the Transport Undertaking and the Police officers who wanted to stick to law regarding traffic regulations. The following details would be of interest both to the public at large and to the political parties obsessed with the ideas of nationalising each and everything under the sun.

On November 16, 1961 at about 8-30 a.m., the drivers of the Ahmedabad Municipal Transport Service went on strike. The reason given was that the Police had lodged complaints against the drivers for wrong parking of the vehicles. This was purely a dispute between the administration of the Ahmedabad Municipal Transport Service and the Police. The drivers were parking the buses at places where they were directed to do so by the transport authorities. Therefore, it was not the fault of the drivers. The Police was not also at fault. They did their duty by observing traffic rules and regulations.

The Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation is controlled by the Congress Party and the Trade Union of the drivers and conductors is affiliated to the Indian National Trade Union Congress. Mr. S. R. Vasavada, the General Secretary of the INTUC is the President of the Drivers and Conductors' Union. There is therefore identity of interest (of course political) between the Transport Undertaking of the Corporation and the Drivers and Conductors Union.

The following paragraph taken from the Ahmedabad evening daily 'Sevak' dated 16-11-1961 would show with what latitude a strike planned by the Congress-controlled trade union is looked at and how police officers have to deal with such trade unions.

"The Deputy Commissioner Mr. Rai Singhani went to the house of Mr. Chandulal Shah (Mr. Shah is the Secretary of the Drivers and Conductors' Union) and discussed matters with him."

Thus a police officer had to go to the Secretary of a trade union controlled by the Congress and possibly persuade him not to strike. But it appears he was not successful and there was a strike.

After paralysing the city's transport for about four hours, the strike was withdrawn. On the withdrawal of the strike, the Transport Manager of the Ahmedabad Municipal Transport Service, explaining the reasons for the strike, uttered the following significant words.

"The Police were harassing US (underlined by me)

for parking Transport buses outside Sarangpur Gate, and the strike was the result of that harassment".

Is any more proof required to show that officers of the nationalised transport undertaking, due to their inability to settle a traffic problem, utilised the drivers to bring pressure on the Police so that places which are not declared as parking places may be utilised for parking purposes. This is a typical case of employers and employees joining together to bring about cessation of work, and causing untold hardship and harassment to citizens for whose benefit the transport was nationalised.

Will Ahmedabad incident prove an eye-opener to the advocates of nationalisation of industries? The people lose their freedom and the protection of the Government as soon as industry is nationalised.

Ahmedabad Nov. 30

AN OBSERVER

(U. N. & CONGO - from page 7)

Central Government of Congo have so far failed to do. The present hostilities against Katanga and the denunciation of the Katangese leaders will only help to worsen matters. Even if integration is forced upon Katanga by military means as United Nations seems intending to do, it will not last and the Katangese will fall out the moment favourable situation arises.

The argument that Mr. Tshombe and his friends are acting under the influence of foreign "mercenaries" is least convincing for it is ambiguous. Who is a "mercenary"? Any one who is employed for anything could be characterised as mercenary. From this standard all foreign technicians and experts in an employ of the government would be mercenaries.

It must be realised that the main responsibility for the mess in the Congo lies squarely upon the shoulders of the murdered leader—Patrice Lumumba. Had Lumumba on the day, if the inauguration of the Congo's independence behaved with a greater sense of responsibility, sagacity and foresight and not derided the Belgians in the very presence of king Leopold the Second, the history of independent Congo would have been different. Lumumba should have recognised with grace the Belgian desire to part with power — indeed, Belgium would not have withdrawn from the Congo, if there was no desire on her part to do so, in spite of the fact she had economically and politically exploited the country for 75 years for her own enrichment at home. Lumumba underestimated Belgian influence on certain Congolese leaders and acted in an infantile manner. Lumumba's initial mistake has cost Congo, its unity and peace and thousands of lives.

Still, the mistake of Lumumba could be mended, the mess cleared and Congo united. The United Nations could play effective role in this respect. But it can do so not by being a party to the dispute but by tactfully conciliating between various Congolese leaders and provinces and more particularly, between Katanga and the rest of the Congo. The Central Government of Congo must depend more on its inherent strength and self-confidence to bring reason to Katanga than on the United Nations to do the job.

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

Anti-communism, of course, is not a sufficient indication of liberalism. After all, Horthy, Franco and other reactionaries were anti-communists too. But although anti-communism is not a sufficient condition for liberalism, it is a necessary one. A liberal "anti-anti-communist" or "anti-anti-Fascist" is a contradiction in terms.

—Prof. Sidney Hook, *East Europe*, October 1961.

Must Krishna Menon be defended in season and out of season, especially when he makes statements that lend themselves always to misinterpretation? Krishna Menon has become a red-herring and irrelevance in the face of the one important and major problem of the country today — the defence of its frontiers.

—*Examiner*, December 9.

If a national government is set up in the near future, Mr. Menon will be the first casualty, for it is doubtful if any of the opposition parties, except the communists, would be prepared to join a government which included him.

—Frank Moraes, *Indian Express*, December 11.

Southeast Asia is the Achille's heel of India. To allow Red China to run amock there is to entrench the communists in this highly sensitive region and to endanger our own existence.

—Frank Moraes, *Indian Express*, December 11.

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

When Mr. Kennedy becomes a communist, we shall have a common language but that won't be for a very long time.

—Nikita Khrushchev, *Hindu*, December 8.

The embarrassing truth is that we pose as a non-violent government and people when it suits our purposes and that similarly and simultaneously the West treats us as violent and non-violent when it suits their purposes. We are hypocrites on both sides. Let us be done with this nonsense of non-violence identified with India and her people. . . . India is no more nor no less human than other countries. Let us finish with this humbug.

—Frank Moraes, *Indian Express*, December 25.

In North Bombay, there is an encounter between two individuals, one a cheap Moscow revolutionist and the other a Gandhian philosopher who does not talk tripe about clean methods and clean ends when messing up both. . . .

—Pothan Joseph, *Swarajya*, December 9.

Only a few weeks ago, in referring to China's violations of India's frontiers, Mr. Nehru said that the training of a long life had led his whole soul to react against the thought of war. How has it come about that he has rejected the final appeals from the United Nations and from the Western leaders and resorted to force?

—*Daily Telegraph*, as quoted in
New Statesman, December 22.

India's Jawaharlal Nehru is like a man who is simultaneously being trampled by an elephant and needled by a mosquito — and goes for the mosquito.

—*Time Magazine*, December 22.

How Communists Destroy Democracy

A LESSON FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA



Price Rupee One

Available from

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road
Bombay 1

W
sador
admin
he wa
Near I
represe
notabl
at Dan
The
vacated
1950 th
onakr
ny far
his aer
and Ru
greeted
out in
frica,
onsible
ook pl
resider
Solod w
mporta
zed as
Damasc
and the
Minister
his fact
The fa
eeper s
original
the gen
Septemb
French c
endum
raise". It
a man at
relations
nunist c
Democrat
spoused
defunct