

Dilemma Of Mr. Nehru

by B. K. Desai

MR. NEHRU is a sad man today. Recent events in Tibet and the Chinese incursions across India's northern frontier have deflated his high-sounding creed of Panchsheel and non-alignment. They have profoundly shaken the public confidence in the wisdom of his foreign policy and have raised grave doubts in the public mind about the ability and willingness of his Government to defend India's territorial integrity against the Chinese invader from the north. Almost for the first time Mr. Nehru has to face angry criticism in Parliament from his admirers and critics alike for his mishandling of the problem of India's border security and for holding back from Parliament facts of Chinese aggression during the last few years. More sorrowful than this, he has been obliged to give up his dream and hope and face the hard logic of events. Until now he tried to play the role of the great mediator and pacificator between the East and the West attempting to steer India along the middle road. He tried his best to save India from being drawn into the vortex of cold war by his policy of neutralism, but today he finds himself being forcibly drawn into it by the Chinese communists. He is now forced to recognise, though reluctantly, that the real threat to India's security is the expansionist ambition of the Chinese communists. "We should be prepared for any eventuality", he warned the Lok Sabha on August 28 last. "What we have to face today", he repeated his warning later in Parliament, "is a great and powerful nation which is aggressive". Thus by admitting that China today poses a serious threat to India, Mr. Nehru, by implication, has to confess the failure of his foreign policy.

Mr. Nehru has none but himself to blame for this tragic debacle. If India's foreign policy today is in shambles, it is mainly because it was based on a wrong understanding and judgement of international developments. The friendship between India and China has been an important element in India's foreign policy, it has been a sort of article of faith with Mr. Nehru. But this friendship from the very beginning was a one-way traffic. India yielded to China on

every point at issue even sacrificing her self-interest in many cases in order to humour the Chinese communists, while the latter stubbornly insisted on having their pound of flesh in each and every issue concerning them. This policy of friendship was, in fact, a policy of appeasement on India's part and it was based on an unrealistic and superficial assessment of the Chinese revolution. In the initial stages of the formulation of its China policy, the Government of India failed to note the basic fact of the Chinese revolution, that is, the new Chinese rulers were communists first and last and as such were bent on expanding their frontiers. Instead, the attitude of the Indian Government and leaders towards China was suffused with a kind of poetic glow regarding the ancient bonds of friendship between India and China. The Chinese communists from the very beginning showed their expansionist character in three different directions—in Korea, in Indo-China and in Tibet. But the Indian Government steadfastly refused to believe that the Chinese communists were expansionists as such. It tried to find excuses for Chinese activities which it considered as mere aberrations to be attributed to the initial enthusiasm of the Chinese and to Chinese fear of Western imperialists. When the Chinese communists invaded Tibet in 1950, Mr. Nehru, for example, stated that the "apprehension in Peking that the U.S.A. was bent on destruction of the new regime in China was rightly or wrongly very real", and he wondered whether their apprehensions "might not have influenced the Chinese decision to move into Tibet". (*Times of India*, Oct. 31, 1950)

Indian leaders not only connived at and condoned aggressive behaviour of the Chinese, but they even took it upon themselves to convince the outside world of China's peaceful intentions. Mr. Nehru time and again made statements in India as well as abroad that China had no desire to expand and affirmed definitely that there was no external danger to India from China. India also considered it as her mission to serve as a bridge—a mediator—between China and the non-communist world. Speaking in Parliament on December 6, 1950, Mr. Nehru stated: "India has a rather special responsibility with regard to China because apart from the countries of the Soviet group, India is the only country which could find out through its Ambassador what the reaction of the Chinese Government is to developing events". Similarly in October 1954, Mr. Nehru, while on a visit to China, said that the purpose of his talks with the Chinese leaders was "to improve China's

relations with the outside world, including nations unfriendly to China". Mr. Nehru's mission was to "interpret" China to the outside world. And how did he interpret China? "I am convinced", Mr. Nehru asserted after his return from China, "that China, entirely for its own sake, wants peace, wants time to develop itself and thinks in terms of three or four five-year plans", (*Hindu*, Nov. 14, 1954). Chinese foreign policy, Mr. Nehru announced, was "normal", but she only "used strong words" in relation to certain States or problems which affected her. This was Mr. Nehru's portrait of China for the benefit of the outside world. He tried to portray Chinese leaders in his own image and play the role of a persuasive salesman of China in the international world.

This superficial and rosy view of China naturally led Mr. Nehru to believe that he, in turn, could persuade the Chinese communists to be peaceful by making them adherents of the Panchsheel. The Chinese rulers without hesitation endorsed the five principles of peaceful co-existence as it gave them much needed respectability in the Asian eyes, and helped them to dress up their aggressive aims in the robes of peace. But the magic of Panchsheel could not convert Chinese communists to the peaceful and non-violent creed. Within three months of signifying their adherence to the Panchsheel, Chinese communists violated India's frontier at Bara Hoti in August 1954. Since then there has been a steady aggravation of Chinese hostile activities along India's northern frontier. There have been more than ten border violations by the Chinese communists since August 1954. Thus, instead of taming the Chinese dragon, the Panchsheel only whetted its ambition for further expansion. Five years after the signing of the Panchsheel agreement with China, on May 23, 1959, the Indian Foreign Secretary was constrained to inform the Chinese Ambassador in Delhi: "it appears that according to them (the Chinese Government) Panchsheel may or may not be applied according to convenience or circumstances." This has forced Mr. Nehru to admit that the term peaceful co-existence does not mean the same thing to China as it does to India. "I wonder", he confessed, "whether the Government of India and the Government of China, when they speak to each other and use the same words, mean the same thing". He has thus realised to his grief that there can be no common language between communists and non-communists and that the term peaceful co-existence comes from the infected lexicon of New-speak of the communists in which dictatorship is called liberation and war is called peace, aggression is called liberation and freedom is called slavery. But, then, this warning was sounded even in 1950 by many a discriminating critic, but Mr. Nehru at that time chose to treat them with scorn.

Mr. Nehru today thus finds himself trapped in the vicious logic of his own foreign policy. Initially he set out to interpret China to the world, but now he admits that his own understanding of China was far from correct. "I cannot often enough follow the Chinese line of thought", he confessed in his speech in Parlia-

ment. Similarly in 1954, he felt no compunction in sacrificing the independence of Tibet at the altar of Sino-Indian friendship. He justified India's approval of the Chinese conquest of Tibet by upholding Chinese claim to sovereignty over Tibet. But this has again placed him in a quandary. He now admits that the recent revolt in Tibet was a national uprising, but still he has to stick to his position that Tibet is a part of China and, therefore, whatever might happen in Tibet, it is an internal affair of China. He feels strongly about the suppression of the Tibetan revolt by Chinese communists, but because of his position, he cannot condemn Chinese action in Tibet. India's past commitments to China have vitiated his policy, and he too feels uneasy about it. He still wants to maintain friendly relations with China which forbids him from calling a spade a spade, and at the same time he feels impelled to express India's sympathy for the Tibetan people who are groaning under the yoke of Chinese imperialism. "That might appear to be something contradictory", he himself admitted to Parliament "and it does in the present context slightly contradict each other. That is the difficulty of the situation".

But, then, the Chinese communists are doing no more than to teach Mr. Nehru a lesson in consistency. They are now using the same logic by which he justified Chinese conquest of Tibet in 1954. Mr. Nehru, in 1954, took a purely legalistic stand that China had sovereign rights in Tibet and avoided to face political and moral implications of his position. The Chinese communists today are employing the same logic to justify their claims to Indian territory. The McMahon line, they argue, was never ratified by the Chinese Central Government and, therefore, they would not accept it as final. It has, therefore, no validity in the Chinese eyes. This has again bedevilled Mr. Nehru's position. He refused to concede Tibet's sovereign status in the past and this naturally annuls the validity of the McMahon line from the legal stand point. The Dalai Lama was, therefore, quite justified when he recently pointed out that India's claim that the McMahon line was its frontier would become untenable if it did not recognise the sovereign status of Tibet. But, instead of admitting his own mistakes, Mr. Nehru preferred to warn the Dalai Lama not to indulge in controversial political statements!

Herein lies the main rub. Mr. Nehru realises his dilemma and even openly admits it. But still he refuses to think things out to their logical conclusion. He is unable to resolve the dilemma as he is fettered by his past commitments which he cannot go back upon. He now realises, though belatedly, that communist China is an imperialist power, but he would not side with the Tibetan people in their demand for independence. He admits that "in the final analysis, the Chinese have valued India's friendship only to a very low extent", but he still wants to salvage as much of it as possible from the wreck. "It is difficult to feel friendly", he confesses, "when our people have not been treated even courteously and when we receive

(Continued on Page 4)

Notes

Another Victim?

WHAT is happening on the northern frontier of the small, landlocked kingdom of Laos is disturbing, but far more disturbing is the attitude that the Government of India have adopted on the question. Laos is being subjected to a "campaign of intimidation" by her northern neighbours, Communist China and Communist North Vietnam. They are openly giving all manner of moral and material help to the rebels in Laos and are besides carrying on a campaign of hate against that small kingdom.

In this situation the sympathies of the Government of India should have been with the weak and defenceless Government of Laos and they should have spared no efforts within their power to stop the two communist countries from aiding and abetting treacherous and disruptive forces in the country. It is strange to observe, however, that the Government of India are not prepared to do anything themselves and do not also like others to help the small kingdom. They have expressed in no uncertain terms their disapproval of the decision of the Security Council to constitute and send a four-nation sub-committee to Laos, to inquire into and report on the situation, even when this is the least that the United Nations could have done when Laos had asked for help in the form of United Nations troops to stop the movement of men and arms from the communist countries.

The Government of India's insistence on the use of the machinery set-up by the Geneva Conference of 1954 is understandable. That machinery was set up to solve the problems that were created by the war against France. All those problems were solved, so far as Laos is concerned, by 1956 and that is why she demanded the dissolution of the International Commission headed by India. The problem that has now arisen is entirely of a different character. A revolt has broken out in the northern part of the kingdom and two communist countries, China and North Viet Nam, are, contrary to all international obligations, actively helping the rebels by supplying them with men, money and arms. The International Commission set up by the Geneva Conference was not expected to handle this problem. To insist on the revival of that Commission, more particularly when Laos has declared that she would regard the revival as a serious infringement of her sovereignty, is to adopt an attitude of cruel indifference to the difficulties of that small Kingdom.

China and North Vietnam have accused Laos of not implementing the terms of the Geneva agreements. On that issue the finding of a competent and impartial Indian observer should be conclusive. Writing in the *Times of India*, its special correspondent, Mr. Sudhakar Bhat observed: "(Laos) has scrupulously carried

out every clause and phrase of the Geneva accord including its own Final Declaration". He reiterated the same point when he wrote: "Laos has observed the Geneva clauses to the letter". The only crime that she has committed is to keep away from the communist bloc and to follow in some respects a pro-Western policy. It is for that crime that she is today being harassed and threatened by her two communist neighbours.

The other crime that she has committed is to have asked for the dissolution of the International Commission. The Government of India appears to be particularly angry with her on that account. However justifiable or unjustifiable that anger, should it be allowed to go to the extent of allowing the communist Powers to overrun that country? That will be the net result of the present situation unless something is done immediately to render effective help. It is to be hoped that the Government of India will reconsider their policy and will not lay themselves open to the blame that they sat and watched the communist subjugation of one more Asian nation.

New Move On Algeria

PRESIDENT Charles de Gaulle has recently put forward a new and imaginative proposal for the solution of the Algerian problem. It is admitted on all hands that it is a completely fresh departure from previous statements on Algeria.

According to the proposal, Algeria is given the choice of secession, complete integration or self-government based on French help. The choice is to be exercised by the Algerians through a free election to be held four years after the cessation of present hostilities. There are no doubt some shortcomings and a number of obscure points in the proposal. But the shortcomings can be removed and the obscurities can be cleared through negotiations once it is decided to accept it.

The National Liberation Movement of Algeria has not yet finally decided to accept or reject the proposal. The matter is still being considered. Acceptance of the proposal will no doubt mean a certain climb-down; but rejection will mean the continuation of the long drawn out war of attrition which is causing harm to France as well as Algeria. On the other hand, the proposal is a big advance on the position that France had adopted so long. France has expressed her willingness to give up, through the proposal, once and for all, her claim that Algeria is an integral and indivisible part of France. The separate identity of Algeria is recognised and it is left to her to decide whether or not to continue her association with France.

Many friends of Algeria in Asian and African countries have welcomed the proposal and have expressed the hope that the representatives of the people of Algeria will decide to accept it. It is only those who take delight in the continuation of strife and turmoil who are vigorously canvassing for the rejection of the proposal. Prominent amongst them are, on the

one side, the reactionary elements in France and, on the other side, the Communist Party of France. Some nationalist elements of the extremist variety have also expressed their opposition to this move for a compromise.

It will be well for the National Liberation Movement of Algeria to realise that in modern times no war results in a complete victory for one or the other side. Insistence on complete victory leads many a time to utter destruction. It should be, therefore, prepared for a reasonable settlement. The latest offer of General de Gaulle provides it with an opportunity to secure a settlement of that type.

Zinzaka Tragedy

THE tragedy that took place in Zinzaka, a little village in Saurashtra, should shock the conscience of the community. Fifty-eight persons lost their lives in the tragedy, many of whom were small children and women. The grim incident brings to mind two earlier incidents of the same type. In 1950, five hundred persons lost their lives in a village in Orissa in a similar excitement over a young boy who was supposed to be working "miracles". The other incident was the tragedy at Kumbh Mela near Allahabad in 1954 which resulted in the trampling to death of over a hundred devotees.

The first thing that requires to be said is about the carelessness and callousness of public authorities. Why cannot they be a little more vigilant and efficient and take the necessary precautions for keeping order when large crowds are expected to gather? The fair that was organised in Zinzaka when Devuba was to perform her miracle was not organised as a secret conspiracy. The news was broadcast in the surrounding region, shopkeepers and contractors were on the scene to cater to the needs of the crowds, and the Railway and Bus authorities knew of the additional traffic that they would be required to carry. It appears that it was only the guardians of law and order who did not know of the things that were happening under their very nose. Or knowing, they did not care to take the necessary precautions. It is to be hoped that the Government will enquire into this aspect of the matter and impress upon the police their duty of regulating crowds, on such occasions. In Zinzaka, it is the negligence of the police to perform this elementary duty which is mainly responsible for the great tragedy.

But our worst defect is our credulity and our superstitions. We are prepared to believe in any miracle and in any miracle-monger. The miracle-monger need not be very clever, for there is a disposition amongst us to believe in anything that may be out of ordinary or strange. And there are plenty of crafty persons in the country to take unscrupulous advantage of this credulity and superstition of the people. These defects are so widespread and so general that nobody notices them unless on some occasion they result in a grim tragedy. It will not be enough to deplore the tragedies when they take place. It is essential to detect the root of the evil and to take steps to combat

it. What requires to be combatted is the superstitious mentality of the people. That can be done through the spread of a critical and rational outlook. It will take years to develop it amongst large masses of the people. But much can be accomplished even if there are in each locality or area a few who have imbibed that outlook. The contagion will spread and there will be more questioning when miracle-mongers go about peddling their miracles. The tragedy at Zinzaka should persuade at least some to pay attention to this aspect of the problem.

DILEMMA OF MR. NEHRU—(Continued from Page 2)

communications from the Chinese Government which are singularly lacking even in ordinary politeness". He also admits that not much reliance can now be placed on the Chinese professions of friendship and peace, but he sees no alternative. "If there is a lack of faith and confidence", he asked, "then where are we?" He similarly sees that "gradually, step by step, Chinese policy has become more and more rigid". But again he is puzzled: "why I cannot say." He confesses his failure to fathom the meaning of the Chinese attitude and behaviour.

This is the root cause of Mr. Nehru's dilemma. He sees the Chinese giant threatening India in an "aggressive, violent and insulting manner", to use his own words, but he refuses to trace the mainsprings of the Chinese aggressive ambition. He still clings tenuously to his thesis that it is not communism as such, but rather Chinese imperialism and aggression that threaten India. "I would beg of this House", he pleaded in Parliament, "not to put this issue in the category of communism and anti-communism". He does not want to face up to the logic of events as it undermines his whole position of non-alignment and neutralism. He, therefore, again tries to seek refuge in plausible excuses for Chinese action. India's stand on the recent events in Tibet and her grant of asylum to the Dalai Lama must have affected the Chinese mind, he now argues. "It is due to that and not the logic and reasonableness of the Chinese position in regard to our frontiers that they have taken up this rigid attitude". But this does not explain the Chinese border incursions in Ladakh and other areas which took place even before the outbreak of the recent Tibetan uprising. Even Mr. Nehru feels that this cannot adequately explain the Chinese attitude towards India. "There appears to be a lack of understanding or recognition in China", he stated, "of the revolution in India and to that perhaps is due not only some of their misunderstandings but many of their approaches to India". This is really the cause of the whole trouble. The Chinese and other communists would not recognise the revolution in India, until she is "liberated" and joins the so-called socialist camp. Till then the Indian Government, to them, is a bourgeois government dominated by Western imperialists. Their main aim, therefore, is to "liberate" India and install the local communists in power. This is the meaning of the rigid Chinese attitude towards India. By refusing to admit this, Mr. Nehru is only accentuating his dilemma.

Mannath Padmanabhan

by A Keralite

EIGHTY-TWO-year-old Mannath Padmanabhan, top leader of the historic Kerala struggle for liberation from communist tyranny has become a legendary figure in the Indian political scene. Though Shri Padmanabhan's name has been a house-hold word in Kerala for the last four decades, he was practically unknown outside the State until a few months ago. Hence the eager enquiry from everywhere: Who is this old man who has worked the miracle in Kerala?

Popularly known as *Mannam* and affectionately referred to as *Mooppil* (the Old Man) in the inner circle of his intimate associates, Shri Mannath Padmanabhan was born on the 2nd of January, 1878 in the village of Perunna near the market town of Changancherry in Central Travancore. Owing to utter poverty he could not afford to have regular schooling beyond the elementary stage. It will be surprising to know that this man who has fought and won a significant battle against international communism does not know any language except his mother-tongue, Malayalam, and that he has to rely on an interpreter when he talks to Nehru or any other non-Malayali. Shri Padmanabhan was so poor that even the four year elementary course could not be got through without a break of two years. During these two years he copied legal documents and worked in a touring dramatic troupe in order to earn a few pias to help his mother.

At the age of sixteen, Padmanabhan entered government service as a primary school teacher on five rupees a month. He spent ten years as a teacher and then resigned the post because a headmaster had challenged his self-respect. Now he chose to become a lawyer. Those were days when any person who had passed a special test was allowed to practise as a lawyer in the lower criminal courts. For ten years he worked in this profession and distinguished himself as a provincial lawyer. But once again an incident which wounded his self-respect occurred and Padmanabhan gave up the law in protest against the haughty behaviour of a magistrate.

Shri Padmanabhan had already become fired with the zeal to reform his own community. The Nair community, one of the largest in the State and forming the lowest stratum of upper-caste Hindus, had for long been the backbone of the State. But signs of decay had set in. The matriarchal joint family, a peculiarity of the Nairs and some other communities of Kerala, had become outmoded and this had a crippling effect. Efforts in a small way had already been started to modernise the community by rousing it to shake off the signs of the old feudal social order. But very little had been achieved. Domestic conflicts inherent in the large matriarchal joint family, costly ceremonies and rituals, divisions based on caste and

sub-caste, aversion to trade and industry—these were some of the evils which had to be cured. Padmanabhan and thirteen of his friends decided to meet the challenge by concerted dedicated action and organised a society for the social reform of the community. Thus was born the Nair Service Society on the 31st of October 1914. Shri Padmanabhan was elected its Secretary and Shri K. Kelappan (later leader of the Congress and now of the Sarvodaya movement) was its first President. They had before them the model of the Servants of India Society founded by Gokhale. Soon Padmanabhan took a solemn oath to become a full-time social worker and thus began a saga of arduous struggles and glorious achievements.

The Nair Service Society, popularly known as the N.S.S., began its activities by organising village units, holding conferences, petitioning Government and exhorting members of the community to revitalise themselves. Barriers of sub-castes within the community were shaken, a sense of the urgent need of giving up old ways of living was disseminated everywhere. The first great achievement of the N.S.S. was the Nair Regulation (1924-25) which broke up the matriarchal joint family and provided for the division of both paternal and maternal property among all children. This was a revolutionary change in the centuries-old law of inheritance and family set-up among Nairs. The dominant role in fighting for this law was played by the N.S.S. led by Shri Padmanabhan and Shri Changancherry Parameswaran Pillai who was the President of the organisation at the time.

But Padmanabhan's interests were not confined to the modernisation of his community alone. He was from the very beginning a great champion of the cause of the removal of inequalities in Hindu society and the unification of the Hindus. Untouchability, unapproachability and denial of admission into temples were some of the worst signs of inequality as far as low-caste Hindus were concerned. The greatest contribution to the cause of social equality in Kerala was made by Shri Narayana Guru, a saint and social reformer, born in the Eazhava community, the highest stratum of lowcaste Hindus in the State. But in mobilising the upper-caste Hindus in the fight for social equality, the major role was played by the N.S.S. under the leadership of Padmanabhan. The highlight of the movement in its first phase was the historic *Vaikom Satyagraha* (1924) intended to persuade the Government to throw open to low-caste Hindus the public roads in the vicinity of the famous temple at Vaikom in north-west Travancore. The movement was led by Shri T. K. Madhavan, Organising Secretary of the S. N. D. P. Yogam, the premier social organisation of the Eazhava community and the Indian National Congress actively supported

it. Shri Padmanabhan plunged into it heart and soul. Old men remember with thrill the *Savarna Jatha*, the great march of upper-caste Hindus led by Padmanabhan from Vaikom to Trivandrum, the State capital, to arouse the conscience of the people and to impress upon the Government the overwhelming support of upper-caste Hindus to the movement. Padmanabhan zealously continued this work and lent support to the movement for the admission of low-caste Hindus into temples. One of the great landmarks in this movement was the Guruvayur Satyagraha (1931-'32) led by K. Kelappan with the intention of persuading the Zamorin of Calicut to throw open the great Guruvayur temple in South Malabar to Harijans. Padmanabhan was elected President of the Satyagraha Committee and was directly in charge of publicity. When in 1936 the temples of Travancore were thrown open to all Hindus by proclamation of the Maharaja, the vast majority of Nairs in the State welcomed the move and not a little of this attitude was due to the tireless efforts of men like Padmanabhan. Until a decade ago Padmanabhan was known as Padmanabha Pillai, but in an effort to wipe away the last signs of caste he gave up his surname which suggested caste.

During all this time Padmanabhan was ardently working for the development of the N.S.S. And one of the important activities he undertook was the spread of education. At the time the N.S.S. turned its attention to this field, private (non-government) schools in the State were run mainly by various denominations of the Christian Church. This monopoly was fraught with danger. The first N.S.S. School was started in 1916 in a room originally intended for a fruit shop at the mountainous village of Karukachal, 8 miles to the east of Changanacherry. K. Kelappan was its first Headmaster. The Education Department of the N.S.S. which was thus started four decades ago with a single-standard, single-teacher school and without even a pie as capital today boasts of more than forty secondary schools, four first grade colleges, two training colleges and a polytechnic catering to the needs of more than 40,000 students and employing more than 1200 teachers. This is besides the many elementary schools surrendered to Government. The N.S.S. is one of the foremost non-governmental educational agencies in the State.

The recent movement in Kerala which resulted in the removal of the Communist Ministry found in Padmanabhan the most dynamic leader. To begin with, Padmanabhan was not against the new Ministry. In fact, the communists came to power with his tacit approval. Impatience with the ways of the previous Governments and ignorance of the ways of international communism persuaded him to assume an indifferent attitude. In doing so, Padmanabhan was just following the trend of public opinion. Even after the Reds came to power, he believed in giving them a fair chance to prove their professions. But in the course of two years he came to realise that the communists were not moving in the right direction. His friendly efforts to correct them met with rebuff. By this time all non-communist political parties, student's

organisations and trade unions and various social organisations had expressed their distrust of the Reds and many a minor battle had been fought against them.

Padmanabhan now realised that the real problem he had to face was a basic one — the uncompromising totalitarian attitude of the communists—and that the grievances which had aroused him first were insignificant in relation to this fundamental problem. And he courageously declared that his aim was the removal of communists from power. With this turn in the movement, all sections of the people who had for months been groaning under a corrupt, tyrannical, partisan Government rallied round him and hailed him as the Patriarch of all communities in the State. The Reds shouted in contempt "Let senile Mannam bark; we will pass our Bills," and millions of people who attended mammoth rallies addressed by Padmanabhan warned the Chief Minister in one voice "If you touch grandpa Mannam, you play with fire Oh Nambudiri!" The great mass upsurge shook the foundations of Red power. It was none other than a Red Minister who told Prime Minister Nehru that the 'Mannam crowds' were much larger than 'Nehru crowds', the record gatherings that greet Nehru wherever he goes. Soon all non-communist political parties, trade unions, student's organisations and social organisations were swept into the movement and the struggle began in right earnest. The epoch-making struggle, which has been described as the most spectacular mass movement in India since the attainment of freedom, started on June 12 and ended in the victory of the people on July 31 with the President's proclamation dismissing the Red Ministry. But for Padmanabhan's inspiring leadership, such a struggle would have been impossible.

At the age of 82, Padmanabhan is one of the most vigorous men in the State. A strict vegetarian, non-smoker and teetotaler, Padmanabhan has been a habitual wearer of spotlessly white *Khadi* for four decades. He leads a very simple life and works hard. During the last four or five months he has been working for more than twenty hours a day, moving from place to place, interviewing people, organising committees, collecting funds and addressing mammoth rallies. The tremendous dynamism of this octogenarian has amazed everyone who has met him.

In organising ability, modern Kerala cannot boast of another leader of his stature. He has been the chief architect of the N.S.S., a broad-based organisation with its 2000 local units covering most of the villages in the Travancore region of Kerala. According to its budget for 1959-'60, the estimated income is Rs. 61 lakhs. Shri Padmanabhan's genius for collecting funds is proverbial. The forty secondary schools and the six colleges run by the N.S.S. were built with funds collected mainly from Nair families in the form of a voluntary cess levied in kist on agricultural products like coconut and voluntary birthday gifts in cash. But the greatest asset of Padmanabhan is his powerful tongue. He is perhaps the greatest orator

(Continued on Page 11)

Case Of Comrade Krishna Menon

by "Democrat"

THE recent Defence Ministry crisis and the Parliamentary debate and comments in the press and the public at large following it showed firstly, that there is deep discontent in the armed forces against the Defence Minister and, secondly, that there is wide distrust among Parliament members of the bonafides of Mr. Krishna Menon. It is true that by his usual persuasive methods the Prime Minister has succeeded in averting a crisis which would otherwise have been very serious. But it must be said in fairness to the nation that in shielding Mr. Krishna Menon, Mr. Nehru has not averted the threat to India's security, which Mr. Krishna Menon as Defence Minister constitutes. In fact, the immediate task of the Government of India is, as *Manchester Guardian* aptly put it, "to defend India from its Defence Minister".

The immediate causes that precipitated the crisis are that the Defence Minister interfered too much in the day-to-day administration of services, that he showed scant regard for the advice, experience and susceptibilities of the top officers of the three wings of the armed forces viz. the army, navy and air force, that he planted his own favourites at strategic positions in the Services and maintained direct contact with them over the heads of the Service Chiefs, that he was motivated by political considerations in promoting officers in the Services and that he constantly encroached upon the spheres of powers, rights and privileges of the Service Chiefs.

But there are deeper causes for the loss of confidence of the public in Mr. Krishna Menon, which Mr. Nehru, inspite of being aware of, has left unanswered. These are that Mr. Krishna Menon is an active sympathiser and propagandist of international communism, ardent fellow-traveller and would do anything which would advance the cause of communism. This impression about Mr. Krishna Menon is irrefutably buttressed by the fact that while many a Congressman in Parliament, in his private conversation and lobby talks, expressed serious concern over his political affiliations and his mishandling of the Defence Ministry, the communist Members of Parliament, to a man, rallied behind him to rescue him from his distress.

This was, however, not for the first time that the communists lent their support to Mr. Krishna Menon. As a matter of fact, the Indian communists are very devoted to Mr. Menon. Prior to the General Election in 1957, Mr. A. K. Gopalan, the communist leader, declared that if Mr. Krishna Menon had stood for Parliament from any constituency in Kerala, the Communist Party would not only have pledged him its whole-hearted support but would have also seen that he got elected unopposed. Mr. Gopalan even added that had Mr. Menon contested from his own

constituency, he would have willingly withdrawn in his favour. Inspite of being a constituent unit of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti, communists in Bombay openly helped Mr. Menon to win in the General Election and defeat the Samiti candidate who opposed him. *New Age*, the Communist Party organ, came out in open support of Mr. Krishna Menon. This glaring inconsistency of the Communist Party in support of Mr. Menon was regarded by supporters of Samiti as betrayal of the Samiti and they made no secret of their strong resentment against communist opposition. While Indian communist leaders have attacked every Minister in the Union Cabinet, including Mr. Nehru, they have not only spared Mr. Krishna Menon but helped to build his stock.

It is a well-known fact that Mr. Krishna Menon has been for a long time an active sympathiser and spokesman of the communist countries. While in England, he was closely associated with the communists since 1936. As a member of the British Labour Party, he was conspicuous by his devotion and attachment to its fellow-travelling group. It was due to his efforts, that many members of the notorious communist front, the League Against Imperialism, were elected to the Executive Committee of the India League. When, on being ordered, he refused to disassociate himself from the communists, the Labour Party which had selected him as its candidate for Dundee in the General Elections, had to reject his candidature. During the Second World War, Mr. Krishna Menon followed the communist line. At first, the War was "an imperialist war", but as soon as Hitler attacked Russia, it became a "people's war" with the result that he became extremely critical of Congress opposition to the War. The India League, of which he was the moving spirit, even refused to endorse the "Quit-India" resolution adopted by the All-India Congress Committee on August 8, 1942. Those Indians who did not like Mr. Menon's anti-national activities resigned from India League and founded Swaraj House. Mr. Menon's associations with the British Communist Party were so deep, that when India became independent the Atlee Government was reluctant to agree to his appointment as India's High Commissioner in Britain; it was persuaded to agree only under considerable pressure.

Nominated to represent India at United Nations General Assembly since 1947, Mr. Menon has consistently taken a pro-Soviet stand often to the consternation of his colleagues in U.N. and of the public at home. There has never been an occasion when he has not blatantly attacked the West and insulted Western diplomats on the floor of the U.N. On issue after issue, he has used his position and prestige as India's delegate in emphasising the communist point

of view and explaining away the communist crimes. During the Korean War, Mr. Menon wanted Korean prisoners to be handed over to the communists without giving them a chance to choose where they wanted to go! At the time of the Hungarian revolution in October 1956, Mr. Menon was anxious to prove the innocence of the Russians while they were brutally killing thousands of brave Hungarians by means of tanks and guns and destroying the newly-gained independence of the small country. He described the Hungarian uprising as nothing more than a minor riot similar to that, which had taken place in Ahmedabad then. In U.N. debate on Hungary, instead of abstaining as instructed by the Government of India, Mr. Menon voted with the Soviet bloc. Mr. Menon's crass violation of Government of India's stand on Hungary shocked Indian people so much that men like Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan demanded his immediate withdrawal from the U.N. Again Mr. Menon tried to justify the Chinese seizure of Tibet. Contrary to history, he declared that Tibet was a part of China for the last, 4,000 years.

For the services rendered to the communist bloc, Mr. Menon received warm praise from the late Mr. Vyshinski. The wily Soviet diplomat described Mr. Menon as an "honest man". And what do the communists mean by the word "honest"? Here is what Vyshinski himself says "A real internationalist is one who brings his sympathy and recognition upto the point of practical and maximum help to the U.S.S.R. in support and defence of the U.S.S.R. by every means and in every possible form. This is the holy duty of every honest man everywhere and not only of the citizens of the U.S.S.R."

It is no secret that Mr. Krishna Menon helped the communists in Kerala to come to power. Chosen by the All-India Congress Committee to maintain liaison on behalf of Congress with the Kerala Pradesh Congress Committee, he from the outset opposed any understanding or electoral arrangement between Kerala Congress and other democratic parties in the State like the Praja Socialist Party and the Muslim League, thereby ensuring the emergence of the communists as the majority party in the Kerala Assembly. After the communists assumed power, they found in him a very useful ally. Whenever, due to their slender majority in the Assembly, the Communist Government in Kerala faced the possibility of being out of power, Mr. Krishna Menon came to their rescue. He put every possible hindrance in the way of the Congress campaign in the by-election. He prevented Congressmen from referring in their speeches to the atrocities committed by the Soviet and the Chinese Communist Governments and to the complete lack of freedom in countries ruled by them. He did not allow them to quote the events in Hungary, Poznan and East Berlin, where the people had risen in revolt against communist tyranny. He did not even permit them to refer to the well-known link between Indian Communists and Moscow and Peking. He directed Congressmen to confine themselves only to local affairs.

Thus, deprived of most effective arguments against communists, the Congress Party in Kerala was made to lose the by-election so that communists could continue in power. Even when there was intense agitation and mass upsurge against the Communist Ministry which ultimately led to its dismissal by the President, Mr. Menon never opened his lips even to refer, let alone condemn, the communist atrocities in that southern-most part of India! Whenever he was in Bombay in recent weeks, he was consistently asked by Congress workers themselves to express his views on the Chinese massacre of countless Tibetans, the misdeeds of the Communist Ministry in Kerala and the threat the Chinese border manoeuvres constitute to India's security. Mr. Krishna Menon refused to answer the first two questions while he remained delightfully vague on the last! Also in Bombay, Congress workers who have been conducting the INTUC-affiliated and recognised Indian Naval Dockyard Workers' Union found themselves in a quandary when Mr. Krishna Menon instructed the local Naval Officers to give all facilities and preferential treatment to the communist-dominated, unrecognised Indian Naval Dockyard Employees' Union. Congress Trade Unionists in Bombay are afraid that Mr. Menon is trying to build up the communist union even though it does not command the loyalty of any appreciable percentage of workers.

All these facts point to one thing: that Mr. Krishna Menon cannot be relied upon to carry on major national responsibilities. No fellow-traveller of the communists can be loyal to his own country.

So far as the Defence Ministry is concerned, it would be dangerous to keep Mr. Menon at its helm. Since Mr. Menon became Defence Minister, all has not been well in the Defence Ministry. There is much discontent against him in all the three wings of the armed forces; this discontent will stand in the way of effective functioning of the Services at a time when they must be at the top of their morale. Further, Mr. Menon's "temperamental" behaviour cannot be a good asset when the country's security is at stake.

Just Published

KERALA UNDER COMMUNISM

A Report

*Prepared by the Research Staff of the
Democratic Research Service*

Pages 176+viii Price Rs. 4

Available from:

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
Lamington Road, Bombay 7.

Tibetan Manifesto

(The following are excerpts from the Manifesto presented to Prime Minister Nehru in the summer of 1958 by a number of Tibetan leaders. Among them were Mr. Sitzud Locangua, former Prime Minister of Tibet, Mr. Shacab-ba, Head of the Tibetan Trade Delegation to India, U.S. and U.K. and Mr. Thondup, brother of the Dalai Lama.)

TIBET, independent and peace-loving, has a theocratic form of Government with His Holiness the Dalai Lama as its sole Ruler. Its language, culture and traditions are completely different from those of China. Yet, in the year 1949, when the communists subdued the whole China, they declared to the whole world through the radio that China wanted to "liberate" Tibet.

The Chinese suddenly attacked the eastern regions of our country from eight different directions. Being a non-violent and peace-loving country, Tibet had no stock of arms and ammunitions, and the legal Government of the country approached the United Nation's Assembly for justice to check the further advance of the Chinese invasion. Receiving no reply from that Assembly, we approached the Security Council at its session at Lake Success. To our greatest disappointment both of our appeals were ignored and remain unanswered to this day. It was under these circumstances that the Chinese forced our Governor at Chamdo to submit to their dictates and to make the Government of Lhasa surrender. To the Governor was dictated the so-called "17 point agreement", which he had to translate into Tibetan. Then he was forced to sign it on behalf of the Government of Tibet by the threat of further troops being sent into Tibet if this was not done. No document is legal without the official seal of the Cabinet duly sanctioned by the Dalai Lama, but the Chinese made a seal of their own for the purpose (and this seal is still in their possession); therefore the agreement was never properly signed.

Since that time the Tibetans have suffered untold agonies. The Chinese communists have gradually deprived us of all our political rights. Our Government, right from the top to the provincial and district offices, has been made powerless and today we are governed completely by the Chinese. Soon after their occupation in 1951, the Chinese organised the Regional Military Commands and abolished our National Army, and the Commanders and Vice-Commanders of our own forces were enlisted with the communist forces to bring them into line with the forces of occupation. During 1953-54, the Chinese tried to establish their Military and Political Committee to abolish the Tibetan Government. But the bitter opposition of the people prevented this. By the end of 1954 the Chinese managed to take the Dalai Lama to China and there he was forced to agree and confirm the autonomous status of Tibet submitting to establish the Regional Autonomous Government of Tibet. This Committee is directly governed by the Peking Government. All its members, both Chinese and Tibetans, must be approved by the Peking authorities and all its decisions must

be first confirmed by them. They have installed their own agents in that Committee with fifty-fifty representation of Chinese and Tibetans, and have used those Tibetan puppets to influence the decisions of the Committee. Thus politically the Tibetans have been made completely subservient to the Chinese over-lords.

Economically Tibet used to be self-sufficient for its food supply. But today millions of Chinese are living on our people and our food situation is desperate. The people in the East and North-East are facing a famine. The Chinese, besides laying hands on our current crops, have forced our people to open our centuries-old granaries. They have also taken away our reserves of gold and silver bullion. In the southern and central regions they have destroyed thousands of acres of agricultural lands by giving priority to "national highways" and to the building of barracks and arsenals. In the East and North-East regions, the Chinese have introduced the communist method of land reforms. In these areas half the population are peasants and the other half nomads. To effect their land reforms the Chinese have imported masses of their settlers and distributed the agricultural land of the Tibetans among them. They have in this way introduced the collectivisation of farms. In this process the Chinese have made the Tibetan farmers work twelve hours a day, with daily ration insufficient for a single meal. In the distribution of property they have not even spared the Tibetans' personal requisites of every-day life such as rugs, rooms in the houses and articles of clothings. Our Tibetans are expected to treat these Chinese settlers as their aunts and uncles, and share all their property equally with the immigrants. The nomads too are victims of these so-called reforms. Their flocks of sheep and cattle, their wool and dairy products are all being confiscated by the alien Government.

In the name of education they have opened schools of various denominations, organised training centres such as "Youth's League", "Women Association", "Workers' Party", and they are trying their utmost to enlist as many as possible of our young men and children. In this way they have made thousands of homes unhappy by sending their children to China for the so-called advancement of their education. None of these children are being trained or educated for any constructive purposes. They train their youths to distrust each other. There are no Tibetan engineers, electricians, chemists or doctors. They are trying to indoctrinate the young Tibetans' minds and to strengthen the forces of communism in our land. As a result, they have divided families: son against father, wife against husband, and thus

alienating Tibetans from their own culture, tradition and home-land.

In the matter of religion they have their own schemes to subvert the very basis of Buddha's Teachings. Our religion teaches love for all and malice for none. The communists in their struggle to spread the Marxist ideology have used our well-known Monk scholars to mislead the simple Tibetans. In this endeavour they made Geyshey Sherab Gyatso, one of the well-known monk scholars, propagate their own doctrine by writing pamphlets and translating their various books and articles. They have also used the Panchen Lama as a puppet to advance their political purposes in Tibet. Pamphlets and articles of propaganda have been spread all over Tibet since 1948 and communism is being preached to all our people. In Kumbum (one of the famous monasteries in the east) the Chinese have actually made our head-Lamas study Marxist Dialectics. Ordinary monks they try to overcome by such material arguments as this: The Monks are made to remain in their cells and try to procure food by prayer alone. If the food is not miraculously produced, this is supposed to prove that God does not exist. Meantime the communists prevent the monks from using their God-given natural powers to procure food, torture them by hunger into abandoning their simple faith. The communists preach day in and day out to our simple people and monks that religion is nothing short of an opium to distract the human mind from hard work. They have used hundreds of these monks as labourers in the building of roads and barracks. They have stopped the monasteries from sharing the usual food reserves and thousands of monks starved to death for this reason. They have forced many of our monks to marry and move to China to earn a living. They have laid hands on the capital of these monasteries and even subjected to tax the very idols and statues. Such has been the battle of Marxist ideology against our spiritual heritage.

Outwardly they are telling people that they have come to Tibet to protect and help the Tibetans and to build roads, hospitals and air-fields. As a matter of fact, the roads are being built to connect Tibet with the Chinese mainland in order to transport millions of their armed forces to the far-flung areas of Tibet. In

making these thousands of miles of roads they have used Tibetans as forced labourers and thousands of them have died for want of food and proper care. Their hospitals are not meant for these poor victims but are mainly to use for their armed forces. The Tibetans even in the towns are not allowed to use these army hospitals. The big air-fields that they have built are mainly for the purpose of bringing in fuel, arms and ammunitions. Tibetans are not even allowed to pass near these air-fields, guarded so heavily by our oppressor. All these constructions are mainly for the purpose of consolidating their hold on Tibet and to suppress and preserve the conquered land and people of Tibet.

To us Tibetans, the phrase "the liberation of Tibet", in its normal and spiritual implications, is based as a deadly mockery. The country of a free people was invaded and occupied under the pretext of liberation—liberation from whom and what? Ours was a happy country, solvent Government and a contented people till the Chinese invasion in 1950.

In view of all these facts the Tibetans approached the Chinese to conciliate. But all our efforts went in vain. Instead we are subjected to untold cruelty. The people of eastern Tibet revolted against the Chinese in February 1956. This spontaneous uprising brought about further repression by the conquerors. They have desecrated religious buildings and destroyed monasteries, razed villages to the ground and killed thousands of our people. They have also used poison gas. Bombs have been thrown on innocent children and women. More than fifteen thousand people have been injured in these battles. Life in all parts of Tibet has become unbearable. So much so that more than thirty thousand people in central Tibet round about Lhasa, the capital, left their hearth and home to the far-off valleys and gorges. It is feared that trouble may also flare up in these areas. Many places in Kham and Amdo are still scenes of upheavals and tumults. Our patriots are fighting hard in those areas. Some of the Amdos who fled to the mountains are still not giving up their fight for freedom, suffering at least a hundred casualties a day.

JUST PUBLISHED

India, Tibet and China

by B. K. DESAI

Price Re. 1

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH SERVICE

BOMBAY.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

Single Copy Re. 1

Annual Rs. 12

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

ENCOUNTER is sold in India by all good booksellers, including International Bookhouse, 9 Ash Lane, Bombay; Central News Agency, Delhi; Foreign Publishers Agency, Grand Hotel Arcade, Calcutta; and Higginbotham's, Madras. The U.K. address of ENCOUNTER is 25 Haymarket, London S.W.1.

Unearned Incomes In Russia

by Victor Zorza

IN the Soviet Union it is against the law to derive unearned income from savings and other personal property, but a court case concerning a legacy of 500,000 roubles reported recently by the Moscow paper "Literature and Life" suggests that the law is as often honoured in the breach as in the observance. Will the legatee of such a sum, the paper asks, continue to work if the interest on his deposit account yields 15,000 roubles a year?

Russian savings banks pay an interest rate of 2 per cent on current account and 3 per cent on deposit account. Savings are encouraged and there is no limit on them. The law against unearned income derives from the principle enshrined in the Soviet Constitution that "he who does not work, neither shall he eat". But the Constitution also says:

"The personal property right of citizens in their incomes and savings from work, in their dwelling houses and subsidiary home enterprises, in articles of domestic economy and use and articles of personal use and convenience, as well as the right of citizens to inherit personal property, is protected by law."

This means that he who has worked and saved, but no longer works shall also eat. But what about the children who inherit the savings? In theory, they too must work, but in practice the interest on 500,000 roubles would yield something like double the average wage and enable the legatee to live without working if he was so minded. With the very high earnings received by some categories of Soviet employees, who on their death may pass their savings on to their children, this has created a social as well as a political problem.

Socially it has led to the emergence of a new class whose standard of living is very much higher than the average. Politically, in a state which proclaims the equality of all, except in regard to earnings—it shows every day to 90% of the people that the other ten are in fact far more equal than they. This provokes jealousy and resentment which, in a socialist state based avowedly on equality could, unless the trend is halted and reversed, become more dangerous politically than in the capitalist system, which over the centuries has evolved a certain degree of tolerance.

A wage and salary reform which has now been several years in the making, may, when completed, reduce the wide gap between the highest and the lowest earnings. But Mr. Khrushchev's high regard for material incentives as the surest way of encouraging effort bids fair to perpetuate a new high-income class, even if based on merit, and thus to aggravate the problem.

Mr. Khrushchev is no doubt aware of it, as are other thinking people in Russia and the "Literature and Life" article which mentioned the case of the 500,000 roubles legacy ended with a call for a revision

of the law of inheritance. The writer recalled, with obvious approval, that after the revolution the value of a legacy was limited to 10,000 roubles, the remainder going to the State—and deplored by implication the removal of all restrictions on inheritance in 1926.

The reasons for the 1926 change, as given by the Minister of Finance of the time, included the need to encourage investment in industry and commerce during the period of Lenin's New Economic Policy. It was also recognised that it was difficult, if not impossible, to enforce the restriction. Property owners simply presented their worldly goods to their offsprings before death.

There are, of course, ways of dealing with such evasions, and the Russian Ministry of Justice is now reported to be reviewing the current legislation on inheritance with a view to revising it. Only one of the contributors to the discussion in "Literature and Life" objected to the proposed change, on the grounds that restrictions on inheritance would have a harmful effect on the incentive to work and that "in general we need as few restrictions as possible". But another contributor draws attention to the fact that "cases in which accumulated or inherited personal property becomes a source of unearned income are not infrequent".

—Reproduced from *Manchester Guardian Weekly*

MANNATH PADMANABHAN — *Cont'd from Page 6*

in modern Kerala. A master of wit and irony and humour, he can keep a large audience spell-bound for hours. Speaking in simple, chaste Malayalam, he makes a profuse use of picturesque illustrations taken from everyday life, from the history of Kerala and from the great epics, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*.

Utterly unselfish, Padmanabhan has no political ambitions. He has never regarded politics as his proper field. 'I will leave the State and take refuge somewhere' was his characteristic reply to a correspondent who recently asked him what he would do if he were offered the Chief Ministership. His Committee for Liberation which led the movement against the Reds has been dissolved and the rest of the work in Kerala has been left to the democratic political parties. Padmanabhan's role will be to help them and advise them from outside. "My ambition is to die in peace after seeing the communists routed at the next election and a good, stable Government established in the State", he declared recently. But that is not all. Padmanabhan has sown the seeds of a new cultural movement to save India from communism. And the *Save India Forum* is taking shape with a view to inculcating in the people of India a profound awareness of the dangers of communism.

With Many Voices

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

Nobody is going to send an army into Tibet. Nothing was sent into Hungary which is in the heart of Europe.

—Prime Minister Nehru, *Times of India*, September 5.

I am afraid Panchsheel has been used as a slogan in recent years. I almost said it was used as an opiate to put both the Government and the people of India into a false sense of security.

—H. N. Kunzru, M.P., *Indian Express*, September 11.

The Congress Party is not afraid of China or Pakistan, but is very worried about the activities of the Indian communists who have proved beyond doubt that they are fifth columnists.

—Mrs. Indira Gandhi, *Hindustan Times*, September 11.

The much publicised intrusion into India's border by China is nothing but a bogey raised by newspapers and is a deep-rooted conspiracy by western imperialists and vested interests for whom India-China friendship is an eye-sore.

—A. K. Gopalan, M.P., *Times of India*, September 2.

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

I guarantee that there will be no invasion from China.

—S. A. Dange, M.P., *Hindustan Times*, September 13.

I do not say China is incapable of committing aggression.

—E. M. S. Namboodiripad, *Indian Express*, September 15.

We have no objection to fighting communist troops, if the occasion arises.

—M. C. Chagla, Indian Ambassador to U.S., *Hindustan Times*, September 18.

Let us drive the Chinese and Mr. Krishna Menon out, whether the aggression is in the north or the south.

—A. D. Gorwala, *Indian Express*, September 19.

Nobody can ask me go back from anywhere; I will go wherever I like.

—V. K. Krishna Menon, *Indian Express*, September 5.

A person whose loyalties are not above suspicion has no business to be in Parliament, much less to be the Defence Minister. Mr. Menon must quit the Cabinet.

—Premjibhai Asar, M.P., *Indian Express*, September 5.

If Mr. Nehru insists on sticking to his present Defence Minister inspite of everything, he is in danger of being himself involved in Mr. Menon's fall.

—*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, September 10.

I hope you will go home with the conviction that your Defence Minister is not undermining the defences of the country.

—V. K. Krishna Menon, *Blitz*, September 19.

Why, people are asking in Delhi, had the Defence Minister to make a statement of this kind? Is the negative feeling that the defences of the country are not being undermined by the Defence Minister sufficient at a time like this? Why was Mr. Menon so apologetic? Is there doubt within as well as without?

—*Eastern Economist*, September 13.