

Disturbing Trends

by S. N. Aiyer

THE arrest of three anti-communist political workers in Delhi has come as a shock to all democratic-minded people in India. However, such a development should not have been altogether unexpected. The Union Home Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, while replying to the three-day debate on the Defence of India Bill in the Rajya Sabha, had threatened that government would take "firm and strong action" against writings in the press or speeches by members of any political party which tended to create "disaffection against the government and hamper the war effort." This was an indication that Government would not hesitate to resort to undemocratic methods if it had no answer to the public criticism of the governmental policies, especially in relation to the Sino-Indian War. The Union Home Minister, however, did not specify what type of writings, speeches or statements he considered objectionable. Such ambiguity on his part was all the more intriguing because even well-meaning criticism of the government can be branded as objectionable if it is unpalatable.

The arrest of communists all over the country was not only understandable but also welcome. Communists in a democracy, can never be relied upon, especially while at war with a communist country. Communists are more loyal to Moscow or Peking than to the country of their birth. The history of communist parties in the world is replete with betrayals of democratic governments and democratic parties. Communists in India are no exception. Precisely for this reason, it is risky to take chances with the communists. Hence, the arrest of communist leaders was a wise move. Indeed, the Communist Party should be banned.

It would be dangerous, however, if good democrats are treated in the same manner as the communists. No democrat would like to create disaffection against the Government at the present juncture and impede the war effort. As a matter of fact, every democratic-minded person in the country is interested in helping the war effort and strengthen the government's resolve to fight the enemy till complete victory is won and the lost Indian territory is recovered. He is interested in educating the people regarding the nature, theory and practice of communism with special emphasis on its Chinese version. There is absolutely nothing in this attitude which is likely to

create disaffection against the Government and impede the war effort.

The three democrats arrested in Delhi were, on the authority of no less a person than Sri Jayaprakash Narayan, of proven patriotism. Referring to them Sri Jayaprakash Narayan said: "They are as good patriots as I am. I am even prepared to say that they are as good patriots as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri." Further, the Resolution passed in the public meeting in New Delhi is also a testimony of their patriotism. The resolution stated: "Though these people did not belong to any political party now, they had been actively associated with the Socialist and Praja Socialist Parties. They were engaged in constructive work in the fields of social work and rural development. And in the recent months of crisis, they have been playing a prominent part in mobilizing public opinion for defence." This shows that the Government has blundered into arresting the type of people who would be very valuable especially at the time of crisis like the present one.

Yet, there is a calculated move in the country towards throttling democratic rights of the people and suppressing even well-intentioned criticism of the government by equating Prime Minister Nehru with the country. This move is sponsored by so-called "progressives" and communist fellow-travellers within Congress and outside. Recently Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, former Union Defence Minister, in a speech in Bombay called for the acceptance of the Hitlerite cult of "One Nation, One Policy and One Leader". Stated Mr. Menon: "This is the time when we must prove to ourselves, to our enemy, and to the world that this is the land of one nation, one policy and one leader." Obviously, the result of such a cult would be the emergence of a totalitarian regime. It is surprising that the name of the Prime Minister is being exploited to advance the cause of totalitarianism in this country. Mr. Nehru is a democrat and it is all the more saddening, therefore, that he has not so far publicly condemned the cult of "one nation, one policy and one leader." Mr. Shantilal Shah, Maharashtra's Education Minister, has rendered a signal service to democracy by describing Mr. Menon's slogan as "fascist" and warning the Indian people against the acceptance of such a dangerous cult.

Sometime ago, the General Secretary of the All-India Congress Committee, in a circular to Pradesh Congress Committees suggested that all criticism of Mr. Nehru must be regarded as treason. Although Mr. Nehru in his reply to Swatantra Party Chairman, Prof. Ranga, deprecated the AICC circular as highly improper, it is obvious that (Continued on page 4)

Financing The War

by Raman Desai

WE are now faced with the problem of how to recapture our lost positions from the Chinese who presumably intend to sit tight on strategic sites threatening Himalayan passes. The offensive implied would involve investment in a large air-force, since the real issue would be decided by breaking up the supply routes across Tibet. For such defence material, foreign aid alone can be effective. For other defence production, apart from a vast foreign aid which is available only from USA and UK, we must provide for an annual defence budget of about Rs. 1000 crores for the next few years. Here, if I may digress, the political question intrudes itself. If Turkey, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Burma, and Japan are not attacked and we are the chosen enemy, is it not because the others are assured of immediate entry into the war of USA? And if we expect our friends to enable us to manufacture the vast defence material, is it unreasonable of them to pose the question: if your neighbour has a fire brigade of his own, why call on him to provide you with a complete new set of fire engines to satisfy your egotism?

For our own part, we must raise our resources through borrowings, savings and taxation. Assuming that taxes are levied and collected strictly, the borrowing would still have to be substantial. Government loans, even at the existing rates of interest, are absorbed mainly by institutions and do not attract the widespread individual savings. The question arises, whether higher rates of interest would generate savings or channelise savings into public funds. Another question is whether the modern war can be fought with a high rate of interest.

It has been argued that in an expanding economy with increasing incomes, borrowing by the present generation at high rates is justified in that the repayment by the next generation imposes a lesser burden in terms of real money. It has been stated that savings, on a mass scale, can be generated only by inducement of high rates of interest and that such borrowing both by Government and industry, in Japan, has led to its phenomenal growth.

With regard to taxation, taking the year '58/59, the total assesseees, under income taxes, including companies, number about eight lacs; 90% of the assesseees are in the range of income below the super-tax limit. But these 90% yield among themselves only 9% of the total tax levied. Even below the range of income of Rs. 10,000 a year, the assesseees number 80% but contribute only 3% of the yield. It is clear that the yield from direct taxation comes mainly from the higher-income groups and companies. It would thus appear that the scope for direct taxation is limited. In recent years, the levy of indirect taxes has been heavy. But these taxes are manifestly inequitable since they fall more heavily on the poorer people.

But the Central problem in India is to generate

savings, domestic personal savings, among millions of households. This means that 80% of the people, the peasants, must be enabled to save. It is unlikely that in the near future, this percentage can be appreciably reduced. Clearly, if the six crores of families save, only a tiny bit per head per month, our financial problems are solved. Those persons who state that savings can only be effected by large capitalists, and that industry should be enabled by incentives to accumulate vast savings, ignore the true nature of our economy.

Most of us do not realise what poverty implies even in supposedly prosperous cities. If we take Rs. 100 per month for a household as a poverty-line income, how many of us realise that over 56% of urban households have a monthly income below the national average and below the poverty-line? Of Central Government servants, 85% of them have a basic pay less than Rs. 100/- per mensem. Thus a large percentage of the population have an income below the per capita figure, while over a fourth of the total population lives below the poverty-line. Surveys by Agricultural Labour Inquiry Committees are even more shocking! Over four crores of the people, belonging to the category of agricultural labourers and their families, accounted for 12% of the entire population. Their per capita income was Rs. 104 per year, I am taking 58-59 figures, whereas for the entire population, the figure is Rs. 265 per year. Their relative income has gone down in the last ten years. It must be remembered that these four crores are citizens and are entitled to vote. For centuries our problem has been of rural indebtedness. This indebtedness should be substantially reduced, in an inflationary era; but, on the contrary, the debt has doubled.

These are the stark facts of life. Consider another economy — that in USA. Over 71% of its families are in the middle income bracket. Nearly 31 million families, about 58% of the people own their own houses. Incidentally for information, the USA occupies 7% of the world's land area and 6% of its population. But it produces one-third of the world's goods and half of all manufactured products. It is this kind of almost equalitarian economy which can generate mass savings.

It is in the light of these facts that a complete new re-thinking of our Plans must take place. The two earlier Plans have neglected agriculture. Its importance, as our basic industry, has only recently been appreciated. We have been obsessed under the leadership of our Planners, with heavy industries. It is only by enabling this vast mass of peasants to produce at a high rate, to sell at a minimum cost to middlemen, and earn adequately in real money, that vast savings for defence purposes can be generated.

(Continued on page 4)

Open Letter To Members Of Parliament

(We publish below extracts from an Open Letter addressed to Members of Parliament by Messrs. Dharampal, Roop Narain and N. N. Datta of New Delhi. The three are young public workers known for their patriotism and their democratic convictions. A few days back they were arrested under the Defence of India Rules presumably for their criticism of the Prime Minister. The criticism may be harsh or exaggerated, but in a democracy, even in an emergency, everybody should be free to criticise, provided he does not actually hamper the war effort. Whatever one's views may be of the criticism of the Prime Minister in the Open Letter, no one can say that the signatories had the intention of hampering the war effort or that they did it in actual fact. The Letter is being published below not because we necessarily agree with the views expressed but in order to assert the right of free criticism.

—EDITOR)

Dear Friends,

In a circular recently sent to all Congress M.P.s, M.L.A.s, M.L.C.s and Pradesh and District Congress Committees, the All-India Congress Committee has said: "Positive stand against criticism of the Prime Minister should be taken. It must be emphasised that those who criticise him are traitors."

In a broadcast over the All-India Radio announcing the fall of Bomdila, the Prime Minister said: "We are not going to tolerate this kind of invasion of India by any foreign country." "We must train ourselves and we must steel ourselves to meet all these reverses and to make our determination still firmer and to do all we can to repel and throw out the invader from India. We shall not be content till the invader goes out of India or is pushed out. We shall not accept any terms that he may offer because he may think that we are a little frightened by some little set-backs." "Any set-back which may come to us in this way, which has been thrust upon us, will not permit us to waver in our determination." He ended with: "I want to make a pledge to them here and now that we shall see this matter to the end and the end will have to be victory for India."

Alas! these are words and sentiments which the country has been hearing the past 15 years. The context only changes. One day it may be grow-more-food; another, the building of modern temples symbolised by the steel plants; yet another time, national integration or our quarrel with Pakistan or the endless fight against old prejudices and a hundred other things. The fact is that all content has been drained out from such exhortations and instead of leading to courage, to determination, to hope, each pronouncement of the Prime Minister leaves the people limp.

Perhaps the Prime Minister has changed, has seen the light. But how is one to be convinced. The actions of the Government of India during the last 30 days are no pointers. It is not to ignore the steps Government has taken since October 20. These, in fact, can be enumerated. The Prime Minister did demote the Defence Minister and then sacked him; but soon after he publicly regretted this step. A National Defence Council and a National Citizens' Committee have been formed. The 30 and odd members of the first have yet to meet. About the second, the less said the better.

In reply to the Government of India, on November 18, 1950, the Chinese had said: "The Chinese people's liberation army will liberate the Tibetan people and defend the frontiers of China."

Which were those borders which China had referred? Did the Government of India enquire? Did the Prime Minister think?

It brings popularity to call the Chinese "this treacherous enemy," but had not one had sufficient notice? 12 long years is not such a short time.

Can he work as member of a team; can he rise above personal glory? Above all, is he really sorry for all the mess which is there today? In olden times one in his position would have crawled hundreds and thousands of miles to beg forgiveness of ones fellow-beings and of the gods that may be. He at least can tender an unqualified public apology. The people of this country would not deny forgiveness to an old man, if he were really repentant.

It is no crime that in this crisis in India, he is not equal to the tasks. He has done his part in days gone by. But today is no occasion to look to the past. The need is to act so that the Chinese do not come any further and are pushed back in reasonable time; more so, that the fight which is going on serves some purpose. One wants to be certain that we are fighting this battle with firmness, according to some plan.

Today the Chinese have come with a cease-fire. This may rightly be a ruse. But if and when the time for negotiations or a settlement comes, one must have people who can do the job and who can also be trusted by the people. The Prime Minister's past record is of a man engaged in a private deal.

The people of this country have been shamed; they have been bewildered by the ways of Government. How long can they wait? It is for wise people in this country, whoever they are, to see that this shame and anger does not burst its bounds, does not lead to a road which no one desires. Let those be put in charge who can act against the aggressors and not against their own people.

The people who criticise the Prime Minister are no less patriotic than he. If anything their patriotism is more robust.

Mr. Menon's Future?

IN an interview with Mr. William Randolph Hearst Jr. the editor-in-chief of Hearst newspapers, Prime Minister Nehru absolved the former Defence Minister Mr. Krishna Menon of all blame for the unpopularity of the Army and the reverses in Naga and Ladakh and hinted at the possibility of his return

(Continued on page 11)

(FINANCING THE WAR—from page 2)

It is in this light that one must consider the proposals for pruning the social aims of the Plans, such as even distribution of wealth, promotion of small-scale units of industry, health services, education, and welfare. One regrets to notice that Mr. S. G. Barve has attached himself to this school of thought. Another ardent advocate is Padmabhushan Jengar, late of the Reserve Bank of India, in whose case one can only wonder how rapidly a civil servant, when he changes over to private sector service, becomes a devotee of industrial expansion at the cost of welfare services. And yet it is only the accumulated savings of the vast masses of the population that can feed the industrial machine with capital. Only when this populace is adequately fed, clothed, freed of disease and nurtured in all that the welfare services and community development projects have to offer them, that agricultural surplus can be assured and savings generated.

The first essential is for Parliament to reconstitute the Planning Commission. A Commission is normally understood as a body of independent advisers to Parliament. This Commission is merely a Cabinet Committee composed of some Ministers and a few insignificant nominees. The Planning Commission should be represented by influential public men and technicians, and act as an independent Advisory Body.

Industrial production must be linked to the needs of defence. Channels of credit should be diverted to these products.

We have to consider the priorities in terms of lines of supply to the defence personnel. Transport, fuel, power must be accorded their due place in our planning; instead of attempting a thousand items we should complete a few essential lines. While considerable effort will have to be exercised by government in the shape of a policy for development, for vital defence production, policy of legislative control over the trend towards monopoly, the field of consumer goods and general industrial growth may be left to free enterprise.

Wealth is a social product and freedom does not mean unlimited profits, personal or corporate. Agencies for curbing speculation, black marketing, monopoly and mergers, will have to be devised. Control means corruption and unless government is determined to control its bureaucracy, waste and incompetence will run amuck. Collection of taxes ought to have the same urgency as levying them. It is curious that while Parliament has a Committee to watch over waste, there is no Committee to watch collection and evasion of taxes. Civil expenditure must be pruned and supervised. One wonders how with a total disbursement of over Rs. 6000 crores in defence budget over 15 years, the army lacked ammunition even for outdated rifles.

The price line must be held, otherwise there will be no gain in real incomes. A balance of demand and supply must be maintained in the essential commodities, food grains, textiles, sugar, drugs, coal and

cement. The first essential is to increase the production of foodgrains, prices of which form the base of the price line of all commodities. Distribution of essential commodities is as important as production. The idea of consumer co-operative societies is not a new one and its practice in the past discourages belief in its efficacy. But stockpiling by traders and middlemen can be prevented by selective credit by bankers.

The war provides a unique opportunity for organised thinking and effective action, for the simple reason that the people will support any measure, however stringent, calculated to bring the war to an honourable end.

(DISTURBING TRENDS—from page 1)

there is a consistent move in certain Congress circles, backed by communists and fellow-travellers, to silence all criticism of Mr. Nehru and his Government.

Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri's warning to the press and the public in the Rajya Sabha, Mr. Krishna Menon's advocacy of the cult of "one nation..... one leader" and the AICC circular branding criticism of Mr. Nehru as "treason", appear to be the links in the same chain.

Fortunately, there are people in the Congress organisation itself who look at such developments with disfavour and regard any move towards suppression of criticism of Mr. Nehru and the Government as a betrayal of the confidence, the people of India have reposed in the organisation.

It would be in the interest of their own organisation if Congressmen in general begin to realise that at the time of emergency it is all the more necessary to tolerate and even invite public criticism of the government's actions and policies. Democratic government can very much benefit by such criticism, which always represents the collective wisdom of the people. Congressmen by inviting criticism will also help to consolidate the processes of democracy in the country. The British and the American governments, even during the worst days of World War II, did not shirk from public criticism of their conduct.

The present trend towards totalitarianism exhibited in the highest circles in the government and the ruling party, apart from the communist and fellow-travelling quarters, must be resolutely opposed by all democratic minded people of India — both Congressmen and non-Congressmen alike. The fact of national emergency should not deter the people from asserting their democratic rights. Any weakness on the part of the democratic-minded people of India in presenting a determined opposition to the totalitarian trends will spell disaster to the democratic way of life in the country.

Cease Fire Or War By "Other Means"?

by S. R. Mohan Das

SOVIET PEOPLE rejoice, as they always did, in the success of People's China, which... has scaled high summits on the front of peaceful economic development...

"As to India, the rate of her economic growth after achieving Independence, was slower than China....

"The armed collisions on the Sino-Indian border have created a nutritive medium for the harmful bacteria of nationalism and war hysteria...

"There are some who already say that China desisted from hostilities apparently because India started receiving support from American and British imperialists who are supplying her with armaments.

"Therefore, such people say, the Peoples' Republic of China realized that if the armed conflict would continue to develop, it may overgrow into a big war which would result in still greater casualties.

"Yes, clearly, Chinese friends considered the situation and this also speaks of their wisdom and understanding of the fact that when a war breaks out between friendly neighbouring peoples, the imperialists always try to profit by that..."

"It is not fortuitous that recently there were arrests of Communists and other progressives in India, and tomorrow, if the war continues, anyone who says anything against the war will be considered a Communist..."

"And here you have a rampage of reactionary forces, the most rabid militarists and reactionaries."

"This too was taken into consideration by the Chinese comrades when they were studying the question of ceasing fire and withdrawing troops."

(Khrushchev, addressing the Supreme Soviet on Chinese aggression — Reuter — *Hindustan Times*, 14th December, 1962).

These were the clear, unminced words of the oracle of International Communism, Comrade Nikita Khrushchev, on the question of the "Brotherly" Chinese unabashed aggression and massive invasion against "friendly" India. This was the official policy statement of the Soviet Union at last outlined precisely and clearly. This statement was the answer to a series of hopeful endeavours undertaken by Prime Minister Nehru in his unshaken belief that the only solution for taming the Red Chinese shrew lay with the now "liberalised and co-existentialist" Soviet Union under Khrushchev. Indian Ambassador Dutt's efforts were reinforced by the quiet diplomacy of K. P. S. Menon, the former Ambassador. Finally, to leave nothing to chance, no less a person than S. A. Dange, Chairman of the Communist Party of India, was encouraged to proceed to Moscow with Nehru's blessings, to influence Khrushchev in favour of India against China. All these Herculean efforts of Indian diplomacy produced only the policy statement from Khrushchev.

In the thick of the Chinese onslaught against India, it seemed as though many of the fondly-held and

nurtured illusions of our leaders would be given up. The leadership and the nation as a whole were being provided first hand with invaluable education on the realities about Communism. A whole nation, monotonously fed with the illusions that our leaders so fondly held on to, was rudely shaken and felt let down. For instance, in 1949, when the Red Chinese hordes conquered the mainland with the massive help of Stalin, who turned over to Mao the entire arms and equipment of the crack Kwangtung Japanese Army in Manchuria, our leaders interpreted the Communist victory in China as a popular revolution.

In 1948, Stalin directed the Communist parties of the region to start insurrectionary activities. India had its Telengana, Malaya faced a serious threat to its existence, Burma was all but conquered by Communists, the Philippines were threatened with the Huk rebellion. At that time, our leaders drew a distinction between Chinese and Soviet Communism, extolling the Chinese "Asian variety". The atmosphere in those days was ringing with the cry of "Asia for the Asians", and the "Asian Chinese" Communists were projected as "liberal and more humane Communists", tempered with "Confucian traditions", — in fact nothing more sinister than Agrarian Reformers. It was argued that China, with decades of suffering from onslaughts by imperialists, was at last united into a strong but humane government, whose only preoccupation for generations to come would be with the reconstruction of the country.

British left wingers like Kingsley Martin, who were the ideological mentors of Prime Minister Nehru, made out the thesis that the world should not commit the "same mistakes with the Chinese Communists as were committed in regard to the Soviet Communists in 1917." What they meant was that the ruthless and inhuman character of communism was not an inherent character of the ideology itself, but due to the fault of "imperialists" who tried to "liquidate" the "First Workers' State." This argument was readily accepted as a correct one by our leaders. India's policy-makers firmly decided that Red China would be literally given the Red Carpet treatment. Within one year of its debut, however, the Red Chinese regime bared its fangs against India in the occupation of Tibet. In the issue of the "Radical Humanist", M. N. Roy then wrote:—

"The liberation of Tibet by China — announced from Peking will cause a rift in the lyrical lute of Indo-Chinese relations. It is a rude rebuff to Nehru's Asian diplomacy based on an unrealistic and wishful reading of the intentions and record of the Communist regime in China... He would befriend Communism as an anti-imperialist force, as long as it left India alone. But Communism has no intention to please Nehru although it would flatter him as long as that served its purpose.

"The target of (Chinese) attack (in Tibet) is India. "Communism in Tibet will be represented by the expansion of China's military power. This... heralds other conquests in Asia... India's turn may not come soon; but she has reason to be nervous and doubt if Mr. Nehru's foreign policy can guard her against the menace."

(*Radical Humanist*, June 10, 1951)

As it turned out, India's turn came before long. Not only did "not a blade of grass grow" in the Himalayan regions, but the Red Chinese themselves did not allow any grass to grow under their feet. Within three years of the occupation of Tibet, they converted into a mighty arsenal a land which was never a threat to anybody. By 1954 the Chinese were ready for grabbing fresh chunks of territory and did so in Ladakh. How did the Indian leaders react? Just as Lenin sneeringly contemptuously predicted. A recently documented unpublished notes of Lenin says:—

"As a result of my own direct observations during my emigration, I must admit that the so-called cultured elements of Western Europe and America are incapable of comprehending the present state of affairs and actual balance of forces. These elements must be regarded as *deaf-mutes*, and treated accordingly.

"A revolution never develops along direct line, by continuous expansion, but forms a chain of outbursts and withdrawals, *Attacks and Lulls*, during which the revolutionary forces gain strength in preparation for their final victory..."

"We must (a) In order to placate the deaf-mutes, proclaim the (fictional) separation of our government and government institutions (the Council of Peoples Commissars, etc.) from the Party and Politburo and, in particular, from the Comintern, declaring these latter agencies to be independent political groups which are tolerated on the territory of the Soviet Socialist Republics. The *deaf-mutes will believe it.*"

"(b) Express a desire for the immediate resumption of diplomatic relations with capitalist countries on the basis of complete non-interference in their internal affairs. Again, *the deaf-mutes will believe it.* They will even be delighted and will fling wide open their doors, through which emissaries of the Comintern and Party intelligence agencies will quickly infiltrate into these countries disguised as our diplomatic, cultural and trade representatives."

"Speaking the truth is a petty-bourgeois prejudice. A lie, on the other hand, is often justified by the end. Capitalists the world over and their governments will, in their desire to win the Soviet market shut their eyes to the above-mentioned activities and will thus be turned into *Blind Deaf-Mutes*. They will furnish credits, which will serve us as a means of supporting the Communist parties in their countries, and, by supplying us with materials and techniques which are not available to us, will rebuild our war industry, which is essential for our future attacks on our suppliers. In other words, they will be labouring to prepare their own suicide."

The unilateral cease-fire by the Red Chinese created

a problem of policy for our leaders for the simple reason that this seemed to be "inexplicable behaviour". In the context of continuing illusions about Communism, the Chinese cease fire was certainly inexplicable. In other words, as Lenin contemptuously said: "The Deaf-Mutes will believe it." Now Khrushchev has authoritatively explained the reasons for the cease-fire. It was because as a whole nation India stood up to resist and was willing to get the courage to discard her illusions of the past. India was getting in such a short space of time an education on political realities that shocked both the Chinese and Soviet Communist leaders, an education which at all costs had to be prevented. It could not be prevented if the Chinese onslaught on India continued. That would have been a suicidal war for not only Red China but Communism itself. So "war by other means" had to be found. Hence the unilateral cease fire. Incidentally, it also helped Khrushchev to present the Chinese with their own "Cuba"!

This fact now becoming clear, what are the current postures of India's policy-makers? Do the old illusions lie shattered? Apparently not. There is already a tendency to look upon this lull as the "post-war" period. Already the Prime Minister, in his speech in the Lok Sabha advocating reference to the Hague Court of the "Border Dispute", has cut down the size of the Red Chinese threat once again to that of a border dispute. Similarly after correctly assessing the present conflict—"We are fighting not for fighting's sake but to save our country, it is a matter of survival of freedom, of the *Free Society of India*"—Nehru went into a paradoxical anti-climax by immediately adding: "it would be a poor thing if in an attempt to save our country, we somehow help in the process of converting this into a terrible world war." Nehru's old illusions seem to continue in regard to the evaluation of Communism. He said in the Parliament: "China is Communist, of course. We all know that. But it is a peculiar form of Communism, which is considered dangerous and harmful even by other Communist countries. If you bunch them all together, you needlessly increase the animosity."

Though Khrushchev's categorical statement has been available, though Khrushchev does not oblige Nehru by sharing Nehru's wishful thinking about considering Chinese Communism "peculiar, dangerous and harmful", the Prime Minister still clutches at the Soviet straw to maintain his vested interest in the first mistakes he committed about the nature of Communism. The grievance of Khrushchev about the arrest of Communists was apparently hastily assuaged by the arrest in Delhi recently of anti-Communists too, with perhaps more to follow in such manner to "hold the scales even" as part of non-alignment!

A most interesting aspect of Nehru's thinking was revealed when he argued in favour of sending such Communists and pro-Communists as S. A. Dange and Aruna Asaf Ali on missions to Moscow and Colombo respectively to plead India's case. Nehru said in the Parliament: "It is a question of sending certain persons in a certain context. For instance, in

(Continued on page 8)

Non-Alignment Plus

by M. A. Venkata Rao

THE foundation supporting the Indian variety of non-alignment in foreign policy has been destroyed by the treacherous invasion of India by the Chinese Bhais.

The tragedy that has overtaken us is not in strict logic the outcome of the policy of non-alignment at all but rather that of the accessory notions with which our leader identified it to his ideas, actions and attitudes. For instance, there is no contradiction in the nature of things between non-alignment and military preparedness to meet a possible enemy. There was nothing to non-alignment, as such, that, necessitated trust in Communist China and reliance on Russia's friendliness or neutrality in a possible clash with China. We had ample time to study the situation without a film on our eyes and ample warnings from the moment of China's invasion of Tibet. The military preparations of China in Tibet, building up her arsenal and communications and the warning of the publication of maps including areas of Indian territory in their national jurisdiction (and many more such as China's one-sided settlement of her boundary claims with Burma in 1956) pointed only to one conclusion, viz., a deliberate policy of aggression at the cost of India. China's part in Vietnam and Laos was another indication of her expansionist intentions as also her encouragement to Communists in Malaya and Indonesia.

While preserving an overt neutrality in speech and action, India could have in pursuance of her non-alignment policy taken precautions for her own security and built her own armed strength to reasonable levels.

What prevented her from securing her military position was not non-alignment but her faulty reading of the world situation determined as it is by the role of Russia, China and their Communist alliance pledged to world conquest through aggression via local Communist subversive parties and open aggression.

In a word, India failed to understand the nature of the *cold war* between the Soviet bloc and the free world.

There are two distinct ways in which a policy of non-alignment could be pursued.

One is the Swiss way which prefers to keep out of international relations altogether in diplomacy or even UNO membership. The Swiss keep themselves to themselves but maintain their neutrality by readiness to fight for it against invasion or intervention. The Swiss are a nation armed *capapie*. Even Hitler let them alone not out of respect for international law but because he could not afford the number of Panzer divisions that would be necessary to hold the Swiss down if conquered! The Swedes too were let alone by Hitler for the same reason.

India was invaded by China because of her unpreparedness.

Our non-alignment need not make us anxious to assure Russia that we shall not take armed aid from the West or from anywhere else.

But as a matter of fact, Russia and her East European satellites are pouring arms into China even today. Russia could stop China effectively by refusing oil supplies!

We could follow the Swiss way of non-alignment hereafter if we wish to pursue this policy for all time. We could withdraw from the UN and keep silent on all matters of international tension and dispute, while maintaining sufficient armed forces to deter any possible aggression.

But it is clear that so long as the present leadership lasts, India will not relish such a version of non-alignment. She wishes to contribute to international peace and progress actively. She wishes to contribute to the formation of international public opinion. She wishes to end colonialism and imperialism in the world, to which end she is prepared to intervene verbally and by conference and the loan of armed forces and civil service personnel to the UNO.

Hence the Prime Minister qualifies the description of his neutrality by the epithets: *positive or dynamic*. Militarily non-aligned and non-involved automatically with the gladiators of the cold war, he is morally committed to peace and conciliation and non-violence in so far as expression of opinion goes.

Here he is led as much by his temperament and background as by the necessities of the world situation. The politics of the world today have become truly global and international. They are no isolated affairs. The claims and influence of the leaders of the blocs cover the entire comity of nations, great and small.

Even Chamberlain was found to be wrong when he thought that the Sudeten German conflict in Czechoslovakia was too remote from Britain for interference. He had to intervene next year when Hitler invaded Poland even remoter than the land of the Czechs!

The dovetailing of the national interests with each other across national boundaries has gone so far today that every national dispute has repercussions everywhere else. Cuba, the Congo, Laos, Ladakh and NEFA have become spotlights of international interest.

In this predicament, a non-aligned nation could confine her intervention to international affairs strictly to action in the UNO while refraining from action on a national plane.

The most important objective in this policy would be the contribution to the formation of sane, true public opinion on international issues without bias, national or ideological, racial or imperialist.

Non-intervention in the manner of the Swiss is negative and sterile and Indian leaders so far have not been content with it. Intervene they must but the only way in which they can do so without worsening matters is by contributing *light* by applying a humanitarian, universalist or scientific attitude to public questions.

From this point of view, India has failed to live up to her own claims and standards.

Our non-alignment has become a byword in international circles for double standards of judgment. India has been understood as leaning to the side of communists in most questions.

India wobbled in reacting honestly to the Russian suppression of the freedom fighters of Hungary in 1956.

But she was strident, virulent and uncompromising in her condemnation of the Anglo-French-Israeli attack on the Suez canal!

India condemns the vanishing vestiges of Western imperialism without hearty recognition of the wonderful shedding of empire by Western nations so fast after the war. But she keeps silent about the far more ruthless new imperialism of Russia and China.

India professes to be a lover of liberty and spiritual values but she is silent in regard to the ruthless and scientific genocide and control of culture in communist countries. India was ready to sacrifice the freedom of Tibet to please China even as Chamberlain was to sacrifice the Sudetan Germans to appease Hitler!

India in her domestic policy gives respectability to the communist party which is a limb of international communism owing primary loyalty to Russia or China or both.

The way in which Russia leads and maintains local national parties of subversion (as a prelude to a take-over when opportunity offers) is something unique in history. It far surpasses the practice of espionage for information by great nations.

But India suffers such a system of international subversion to go on both within her borders and in the world at large without a challenge in the UNO. Non-alignment does not require silent acquiescence in such subversive aggression by a foreign imperialist system which has acquired control over one-third of the world.

To say that we are non-aligned for the sake of peace necessary to develop our own economy sounds sensible but it is not inspiring. Freedom is indivisible round the globe. Non-alignment is consistent with the championship of freedom throughout the globe but only through the UNO channel in the realm of public opinion while refraining from alliances with either bloc.

Such a policy would be quite consistent with the cashing of international communism in the form of the CPI in our midst and with the calling of an investigation in the UNO into its nature and methods in the world at large.

Intervention in the formation of public opinion through UNO participation while refraining from

action in actual relations and promoting a world federation to banish war for all time would perhaps synthesise our contradictory ideals better than the present self-stultifying attitudes of favouritism to the Soviet bloc and softness to communist ideals and techniques despite of our creed of truth and non-violence.

Mr. Khrushchev's speech in the Supreme Soviet on December 12 is revealing. Apart from his objection to the Sino-Indian War as likely to spark a wider nuclear conflagration, he lets the cat out of the bag by expressing displeasure at the arrest of communists in India. He fears that it betokens the growth of Nationalism that will obstruct Communist infiltration! Thus India has no greater justification for trusting Russia than China!

(CEASE FIRE—from page 6)

choosing a delegation to go to regions in Africa, it was not a person who was known for his brilliance in India's past and present history who was to be chosen but one who understood the people in Africa and went "with the right kind of approach" to them. For instance, a person sent to the Soviet Union must be one who is appreciated there and whose views count there." He then sneeringly referred to Prof. Ranga and commented: "There is no use my sending Prof. Ranga to the Soviet Union. With all respect to him, my sending him there will only ruin our case so far as the Soviet Union is concerned."

This was an interesting revelation by Nehru of his thinking. He was practically admitting that Dange's Moscow visit and Aruna Asaf Ali's Colombo visit were "my sending". Even more interesting was the yardstick which he outlined. When one remembers the alacrity with which he deputed Krishna Menon to the U.S.A., and one recalls the extraordinary lengths to which Menon would go to needle U.S. governmental and public opinion against India, Nehru's present yardstick ceases to have much meaning.

The illusions certainly continue. The "post-war" period will only entrench them. In fact the cease-fire is precisely intended by the Communists for this purpose. Even if the war on India was purely a Communist Chinese affair, the cease-fire has become "the war by other means" of the whole international communist apparatus on India's free society. To meet this "war by other means", the continuing illusions will have to be removed. Lenin, Khrushchev and Mao have done their best to remove the illusions. This has been the real communist aid to India, not the MIGs.

Tibet Fights for Freedom

An Orient Longmans Publication

Price Rs. 15

God That Failed

by Devadas Kini

OUR god has failed. But the tragedy is nobody dares to say that we are worshipping at the shrine and burning incense at the altar of the god that failed, and we should stop it.

Our god is, of course, the policy of non-alignment, which we have elevated to the status of a principle, a creed, a dogma, nay—a religion. That is the fundamental fault with this policy. No policy, however noble it may be, can take the place of enlightened self-interest. Every nation has some permanent interests but no permanent friends and enemies or permanent policies. If any policy has ceased to serve our national interest, we have to throw the policy away.

Our policy of non-alignment has failed and failed miserably because it was out of touch with reality. As Prime Minister Nehru put it, we were living in an artificial atmosphere of our own creation, or as President Radhakrishnan has pointed out, we were credulous and negligent. Our non-alignment policy has disintegrated at the touch of reality. Whether we like it or not, we are aligned today or perhaps Western countries have aligned with us.

Why is our policy out of touch with reality? This is because we started from wrong premises and came to wrong conclusions. What are the premises, basic assumptions of our foreign policy? We believe that there are two warring blocs in the world trying to dominate the world; we believe that we should not join any of these military blocs and that we should decide every issue on its merits.

There is something basically wrong with these basic assumptions. It is not true to say that there are two blocs. There is only one bloc and that is the Soviet bloc. This bloc is solid and monolithic. Of course now there is a rift between Russia and China, but this is more tactical than real. Both believe in exporting their form of government and society. If China wants to impose this by force on other countries, Russia tries to achieve this through the Cominform, through a fifth column in every country. If Mao says that he is not afraid of "paper tigers" and believes in the survival of China after a nuclear war, Khrushchev says "paper tigers have atomic teeth" and atomic bombs make no distinction between Communists and others. It is not exactly a rift but it is just a difference of opinion. The difference between the two is, while Khrushchev believes in more peaceful methods to achieve the goal, Mao does not. But the fact remains that both want to conquer and dominate the world.

If we turn to practical side, we see it is Russia which has extended its sway after the second world war over eastern Europe by force. So also China. It has occupied Tibet and tried to conquer Korea, Indo-China and Laos. China's aggression against India is just a part of its plan to dominate Asia.

Now let us see the Western position. These countries do not constitute a bloc, because they do not

agree with each other except on a few fundamentals one of which is containing communism or stopping its march through force. Since Russia and China have extended their domination on other neighbouring countries through force of arms they have created NATO and other defence pacts. These countries do not have any ambition to dominate the world. As a matter of fact whatever empire they had built during the 19th century has been liquidated or is in the process of liquidation.

So it is the Russian bloc which is a threat to the peace of the world today. Since we are wedded to peace our place is naturally with the Western countries. There is one more bond that invisibly binds us to the Western countries and that is the democratic way of life. They are as much open societies as we are while Russian bloc countries are closed societies.

In spite of this why did we not take this position? That is because of past memories, the memories of subjugation and domination by the Western countries of most of the Afro-Asian countries. It is not an accident that only these newly independent countries are non-aligned. It is the colonial past that made these non-aligned nations turn a Nelson's eye towards Hungarian revolution and Tibetan subjugation. Conditioned as they are by the past, they do not see the present clearly and cannot visualise the future. This is the reason why most of these non-aligned countries are neutral towards the Soviet bloc. But the past should not be allowed to cloud our vision. At least the Chinese aggression against our country should be an eye-opener to all these countries and India in particular.

Now let us analyse the situation created by the Chinese aggression on India.

China has created a "situation" not a "dispute" to borrow a phrase from Shri Menon who used it in a different context. But most of the non-aligned countries seem to think that it is a dispute. There is an aggression, pure and simple. But the six non-aligned countries who met recently at Colombo have not chosen to recognize it as such and condemn it as such. I do not know what is not clear here in this situation. By not condemning this aggression they have condemned themselves and what is more, they have condemned the non-alignment policy. All those countries who have not condemned this aggression without mincing any words have betrayed, in fact, have stabbed the non-aligned policy in the back. There may be an excuse as far as the Hungarian and Tibetan problems are concerned, but there is no such pretext available in this case. It is a very strange non-alignment policy indeed which equates the aggressor and its victim, which allows the aggressor to keep the fruits of its aggression. A non-alignment policy which keeps itself neutral between right and

(Continued on page 10)

An Instructive Reality

[The following is the English translation of an article which appeared in El Plata of Montevideo, one of the most prominent journals of Uruguay.]

AT this crucial juncture in our struggle for the survival of democracy, a neutralist movement has arisen in various quarters like a kind of appendage to the great ideological struggle which divides the world. But it is only a qualified neutrality, since it openly attacks one camp, and spares no pains to demonstrate its least mistakes and defects, while it ignores or generously excuses those of the other side. It is also a suicidal neutrality, as we have previously pointed out, since at the very moment when it is imperative to act positively in order to survive, it acts as a minus quantity for its own side.

If there was ever any doubt on this score, it must have completely disappeared with the Indian crisis. For it is India that has been the principal champion of neutrality, of taking neither one side nor the other, although on several occasions she has veered from her middle course, and always to the same side. Now, she is paying dearly for her belief that she can remain on the fringe of the main conflict without becoming involved. This young Republic, a nation that believed in her millennium, is now feeling the full force of her disastrous mistake as she stands at one of the most terrifying crossroads of her long history, and faces the aggression of a neighbour, who she has so often defended in the United Nations Assembly, fighting for her admission as a member state. This neighbour has now turned on her, and for the last few weeks has been pouring down from the mountains in the North her full armory in an ambitious attempt to extend her dominion over the fertile Ganges valley, and, in the country where Gandhi preached his message of peace, impose a totalitarian system that treats a man as a mere number, and in the collective interests of the government tramples family, creed and liberty underfoot.

Now, in this country we have the curious spectacle of these neutralists or "third-partyists", who have so often veered from their middle course (it is not hard to see where their real sympathies lie in spite of all their efforts at concealment), and who vociferously accused the USA of an alleged invasion of Cuba, appearing to take no notice of Communist China's invasion of India. And yet this time it really is an invasion, and India was almost completely defenseless, because she believed that her much vaunted neutrality would act as a kind of protection. You may say that the Himalayan frontier is a long way away, and that the Chinese act of aggression is an event which scarcely concerns us. But don't forget that distance no longer counts, and that it was this very fact which allowed Russia, with the connivance of Castro, to set up her full offensive armory, aimed at America, at the very gates of the "Hemisphere of the Americas" as Martí called, who would, I think, turn in his grave with shame and indignation if he could see his own country becoming the servile minion of Russian Com-

munist. What is really disturbing, however, and deplorable, since it concerns us more closely, is that there are plenty of people who, in their anxiety to win a following and gain votes, are prepared to play upon the inexperience of the young, who have only recently entered the field of politics and consequently have no knowledge of our past and our democratic traditions, by exploiting that mistaken, romantic sentiment which makes them back what they consider the weaker side, when in reality it is they who are the stronger since they are wholly unscrupulous in the pursuit of their aims.

This is something which merits serious thought if we are to avoid irreparable disaster. India's mistake and its dire consequences are no empty mirage, but a very concrete and tangible reality.

(GOD THAT FAILED—from page 9)

wrong is really neutrality with a vengeance. I know that these countries are militarily not strong but it is a surprise to know that they are not morally strong either.

The same attitude of neutrality between right and wrong has been taken by Russia. Khrushchev in his recent speech says: "Did China ever set the task of invading India? No. We reject the contentions as slanderous. And, of course, we also absolutely disallow the thought that India wanted to start war with China." Khrushchev says in the same speech that to accept arms aid from the U.S.A. and U.K. is "like putting their heads into a noose and fall into dependence." But the same Khrushchev, if press reports are to be believed, has allowed 13 trainloads of armaments to pass through Russia to China from Czechoslovakia. And China has to depend entirely on Russia for petrol as well as other strategic war materials. Call it double-talk or what you like, but there it is. Here I am tempted to recall what USA did when the triumvirate, U.K., France and Israel, attacked United Arab Republic. USA supported UAR and not its allies.

We have received massive and prompt aid from the Western countries. It is very interesting to speculate whether there would have been any invasion if we had a military pact with the West. Just as we cannot afford to forget the massive invasion by China, we should not forget the massive aid from the USA and UK.

An agonising reappraisal is called for in our foreign policy. We have to re-orient it to serve our enlightened self-interest. We should recognise the invisible but strong bonds with the democratic countries and strengthen these bonds. We should also recognise the threat of international Communism. We should foster an association of all democratic Asian countries to defend their freedom and cooperate in the economic field. We cannot afford to forget the lessons learnt at a prohibitive and terrible cost.

A Statement On Indo-Pakistan Talks

[Issued by a number of prominent intellectuals of Calcutta]

WE welcome the decision of the Governments of India and Pakistan to get together directly and try to resolve all outstanding problems between the two countries. These pending problems have been not only behevilling the friendly relations between them but were also coming in the way of mutual co-operation which is essential for the peace and stability in this strategic region of the Asian continent.

In the context of the unprovoked and well-planned Chinese aggression of India, both in the North and the North-East, it is obvious that Chinese success would threaten the stability and integrity not only of India but also of Pakistan. This is so obvious that it is hard for all intelligent people of the subcontinent to overlook it except at their own peril. It has therefore become imperative that early steps should be taken to organise joint defence by the two countries.

The most difficult issue between the two countries is that of Kashmir. Prestige on both sides has been put at stake. But two hopeful factors are now present. One is that the discussion is to take place in the background of a new and a more realistic awareness of the Chinese threat to the sub-continent as a whole in case it is not effectively resisted while there is yet time. The other is that the talk is directly between the two parties and no third party is involved and neither is there the world forum of the United Nations where there is a natural tendency towards defensive debate rather than for arriving at a give-and-take compromise. Thus a private and confidential talk free from legalistic commitments of the past is more conducive to produce positive results. It may be further noted that this time both the USA and Great Britain are genuinely interested that this bilateral endeavour succeeds and this should create a more helpful climate for the same.

In view of the changed international and strategic situation in which India and Pakistan find themselves, the Kashmir problem, in our opinion, no longer obtains (or should obtain) that status and stature as it did before in the eyes of the two countries. In view of the larger and more enveloping threat to the very existence of India and Pakistan, it is this latter question that needs concerted action and the Kashmir problem has become only an irritant and an obstruction that must be removed at the earliest. Therefore, we urge the governments of the two countries to step down from the positions of prestige and prepare themselves for a realistic compromise, keeping the larger issue in the forefront.

If India goes down before the Chinese, Pakistan, both east and west, is bound to be dominated by China. On the other hand, if Pakistan instead of becoming an active ally in a joint defence against the Chinese remains inimical to India while India is fighting the Chinese, not only Kashmir will be threatened but both Assam and Bengal will be very

seriously threatened, let alone the loss of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim as independent States friendly to India.

We believe that as a solidier President Ayub Khan is well aware of these implications and he will not lose his sense of balance by the myopic vision of some of discredited politicians in his country whose only staple political diet consists of anti-Indianism.

We also urge the Government of India to consider the overwhelming advantages in the prospect of joint defence by the two countries on the basis of any compromise that may be arrived at honourably.

Finally we hope that the peoples of the two countries will raise their voice of unity and sense of urgency, and will urge their Governments to open a new chapter in the relation of the two countries in this historic hour, outgrowing the one of bitterness and distrust once and for all. Together we shall fight and live free; singly, both of us shall be devoured by the Communist dragon.

Srikumar Banerjee	Gobinda Lal Banerjee
Kazi Abdul Wadud	Captain Bhag Singh
Ajit Kumar Dutta	K. M. Yusuf
Prof. Amlan Dutta	H. Ghoshal
K. K. Sinha	D. Basu Roy Chowdhury
Dr. Bhupal Bose	Charles Newton
Prof. Dilip Chakravarty	Kshitindra Nath Chowdhury

(Mr. MENON'S FUTURE? — from page 3)

to the Central Cabinet. He said, "He may be back, but perhaps, not for a while." This is the worst news of the week and the month. Mr. Menon had to go because the people had lost confidence in him owing to his pro-Communist and pro-Chinese policies pursued since he became the Defence Minister. He never regarded Communist China as a danger and an enemy and therefore allowed the Army and the country to remain in a state of unpreparedness. The Prime Minister realised that the nation-wide united war effort, which was the need of the hour, would not take place as long as the Defence Ministry continued to be in the hands of a person whom the people did not trust. The same position continues even today, and the Prime Minister should realise that the people have not forgotten the harm that Mr. Menon did to the defences of the country and have not forgiven him. The unity and solidarity that exist today will disappear if he is brought back into the Cabinet. It is to be hoped that the Prime Minister will take into account the intensity of public feeling on the issue and will not insist on foisting on the country an unwanted person as a Minister or in any other capacity.

With Many Voices

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

"Once India is strong enough to liberate itself from Nehru and his peremptory idealism, liberating its territories from the Chinese invaders will be child's play."

—George E. Floris in a letter in *Time*, December 14.

The word 'non' has become a part of our mental equipment. We have non-co-operation, non-alignment and non-violence. The only word with which this 'non' can go is sense.

—Mr. K. Hanumanthayya quoted in *Indian Express*, November 10.

Back Nehru to survive.

—Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon quoted in *Free Press Journal*, December 8.

We cannot fight what we do not understand.

—Mr. Nissim Ezekiel in *Current*, December 1.

He (Prime Minister Nehru) should have been dismissed long ago.... He has failed us so many times.

—Prof. N. G. Ranga in Parliament quoted in *Times of India*, December 11.

Unity can only be formed in India behind the Congress Party, and in the Congress Party only behind my father.

—Indira Gandhi quoted in *Time*, November 30.

Our policy of non-alignment has been a policy of pursuit of peace by compromise with evil.

—R. Jethamalani in *Opinion*, November 27.

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

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.

I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3.00.

Name:

Address:

Signature

The Committee of 100 has perhaps finished with America for the moment: will it now demonstrate against India for its attack on China?

—Mr. R. McGregor in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, November 8.

Underdeveloped nations have a certain 'feminine' attitude towards peaceful nations; admiration for the strongest, regardless of ideology.

—Gilberto Freyre in *Encounter*, November 1962.

The important thing at this point is not to be in de Gaulle's government but in de Gaulle's mind.

—Ex Premier Pflimlin quoted in *Time*, November 30.

With the heat off Cuba, Communist pressure against India confronted U.S. with a challenge on another front and of a different sort—that of trying to save "neutralist" Nehru from the Reds he had long befriended.

—*U.S. News & World Report*, December 13.

The Colombo Conference failed to acknowledge, at least publicly, the patent fact of Chinese aggression was evident from its deliberations.

—*Hindustan Times*, December 13.

Khrushchev said he feared for us modern liberals. He said we were too liberal to fight. I suppose he thought we'd stand there for the next hundred years saying "On the one hand—but on the other hand".

—Robert Frost quoted in *U.S. News & World Report*, December 3.

Opinion inside China does not matter because it does not exist.

Hindustan Times, December 17.

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.