

A Climb Down

by M. R. Masani

THIS country has received with the most unpleasant shock the news of the invitation to this country extended on our behalf by the Prime Minister to Mr. Chou En-lai. That shock is heightened by the fact that only a few days ago, replying to the debate in the Rajya Sabha on 12th February, the Prime Minister actually said something that had misled public opinion into what has now apparently proved to be a false sense of complacency and satisfaction. I read the words of the Prime Minister in the Upper House to show that on this occasion, as indeed on previous occasions in this series of events, the Prime Minister has been less fair to the Parliament than is his usual custom as the very fine parliamentarian that he is. What did he say in the Rajya Sabha on the 12th February?

"Let it be understood quite clearly that though we talk about friendly settlement, I see no ground whatever at the present moment, no bridge between the Chinese position and ours. That is to say, our present positions are such that there is no room for negotiations on that basis. There is nothing to negotiate at present. It may arise later, I don't know."

There are three arguments advanced in favour of this move, such as it is. The first is that this meeting will not be negotiation. A morning paper this morning in an editorial has not gone too far when it says that this plea of the Prime Minister and his supporters — I am quoting the words of the newspaper — "is not entirely honest". I think this is a British understatement in this context. It is quite clear that this meeting is negotiations and nothing else; it cannot be otherwise in the present context.

An attempt has been made to say that we should separate the border dispute from the wider complex of Indo-Chinese relations — a very clever argument, but a completely unconvincing one. At a time when foreign troops are on our soil, at a time when one country has committed an act of war against another, to say that we can discuss in the abstract, in the vacuum, Indo-Chinese relations while keeping aside the subject of the aggression and occupation of our territory, is asking too much of the credulity of our public, and I do not think the Indian population will swallow this kind of fiction which is sought to be

imposed on it. Let us be quite clear that this invitation is a climb down.

The second argument is that "It cannot do any harm. Why do you object? After all what harm can happen?" Many good friends have argued along these lines. I can only say that not only do I feel that a meeting in this context, at this time, is fraught with grave consequences but, if I may say so, it can do nothing but harm. I cannot, for the life of me, see any good coming out of this meeting in this context, and I shall give two or three good reasons for this feeling.

First of all, this meeting has to be looked on in the psychological context. What will be the effect on the opponent? What kind of opponent are we up against? We are up against an expansionist, imperialist, communist Power of the most ruthless kind, a power that has before our eyes murdered our neighbouring country of Tibet, a power that, under the guise of volunteers, invaded the Republic of South Korea, a power that even today is infiltrating through its North Viet Nam satellite regime into the country of Laos, a power that is striving to expand in every possible direction. This power showed its understanding of negotiations at the time when there was a truce in Korea, and we all recall those agonising months at Pan Mun Jon, where a new kind of diplomacy was revealed, a diplomacy which used the negotiating table for nothing else than waging a war of nerves. The Chinese communist regime does not believe in negotiations and it has never negotiated in good faith till now. Every promise which it has made, it has violated, whether in Tibet or elsewhere. For the Chinese communist regime, negotiation is an act of war, an act of war at the conference table, a continuation of war by other ways.

It is with such an opponent that we are now dealing, and to say that a friendly meeting between the two Prime Ministers will be used by the Chinese communists for any other purpose than to push forward the process of intimidating us further is to revel in an illusion which is long past its time. All that I can say is that, in future, this will encourage toughness on the part of the Chinese communist regime. They will say: "Ah! We have got them down. These people refused to come to talks except under certain conditions they laid down — the recognition of the MacMahon line and the vacating of aggression on their territory — as preconditions for negotiations and talks. Now, look, within three or four months, they have come down to talk to us unconditionally, as we demanded all along." To a good Christian or a kindly Hindu gentleman, the Gandhian approach of "All right, you have your own way; I will meet you

on your grounds" may be all right. But, then, we have to remember the character of the opponent when we are dealing with this problem and there is nothing in the character of the Chinese communist regime that gives us any reason to hope that this gracious surrender is going to have anything but the most unfortunate consequences on the psychology of the other side.

Then, let us look at our psychology. What is it going to do to us? There is no doubt in my mind that this country will regard this invitation as a national humiliation. I wonder if there is any instance in history where a country has been attacked, a country whose territory has been occupied, has gone out of the way to make a friendly invitation to the opponent. People have sent armies, navies and air forces into action, people have sent ultimatums, people have broken off diplomatic relations, as Nasser did when Britain and France attacked his country during the Suez incident. Here is a brave and patriotic country which is being attacked and pushed around, its men killed, the blood of its troops and policemen on the hands of the other side, and what we do is to invite them to come here as our honoured guest. This, I think, is certainly breaking new ground in history. What we are doing is to perpetuate the illusion about the Chinese communist regime which unfortunately has already been created for the last ten years and which it is high time our people were encouraged to shed. We are trying to perpetuate those illusions which were embodied in our earlier misguided acts.

Then, what will we do to our armed forces? What effect is it going to have on our policemen and our armed forces, who have been killed or maimed, or tortured, by the Chinese. What are going to be the sentiments of that brave man, Karam Singh, a man who in any other country would have been built up as a national hero, whom our government, to our shame, has relegated to obscurity during the last few weeks? That man would have been taken by any patriotic government round the country to educate the people as to what negotiating with the Chinese really means. What effect is this kind of diplomacy going to have on those to whom we look for the defence of our country against aggressions of this nature?

Now, the third argument that has been advanced is: "What can we do? What else is there to do?" Many good friends have put this question: "What else can we do?" That is a counsel of despair.

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.

I believe there are many things which this country can do. We are not privileged to have adequate data from our military forces on which we can recommend specific policies. We do not have enough knowledge to judge. That is a monopoly of the Government, and that must be left to the Government. But it is quite clear that there are two broad alternatives before this country.

One is, if we have the power, to eject by police action the Chinese aggressors from the territory they have occupied. This is what a country normally does. Whether we have the power to do it or not I do not know. Judging by the very optimistic and hopeful announcements made by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Defence Minister, who tell us that the country's armed forces have never been in better condition, that they are adequately equipped to drive out any aggressor from our territory, which we would like to believe, there is no reason why they should not be asked to do their duty. There are many of us, however, who have doubts on that subject. If they were so adequately armed and equipped, why are we where we are today? Why have we allowed to happen what has happened? So, there are grave doubts among the public. The hon. Prime Minister could usefully enlighten these Houses of Parliament about the nature of equipment and the logistical support which may or may not be available to our armed forces for fighting in such terrain. But, as I say, we do not know and therefore we can only make the hypothetical statement that if we have the strength to do what we should be able to do, then there is only one honourable course and that is to give the order to the armed forces to do their duty.

But let us assume for a moment that we are not in that position. Before I move on to that, I would refer to the question that is raised: "But that will lead to war". I do not know if there is any logic in that statement. It will certainly not be an act of war on our part. It has never been held in history that a country that has been invaded, while repelling foreign troops from its territory, is guilty of an act of war. It is an act of defence, of a police nature. But it is possible that the other party will then make it an act of war by broadening the front or by making it a general action. That is possible. But we seem so preoccupied with our own difficulties that one would imagine that the Chinese Government is all dying and ready to launch a major war on India. I would like to question that ready assumption.

Why do we assume that the Chinese communist Government is prepared to have a major war with this country any more than we are prepared to have it with them? We certainly do not want a war. Nobody wants it in this country. But why do we assume that they want it? I am not depending on any peaceful professions of theirs. I am depending on the situation in which they find themselves. They are encountering a severe draught. The regimented communities in which they have penned their

(Continued on page 11)

Notes

Communist Double-Talk

CHINESE aggression has once again exposed the anti-national character of the Communist Party of India. Of course, at no time was there any doubt about the party's activity and role as the fifth column of communist countries and movements in different parts of the world; but still there were many in the country whose goodwill outran their knowledge and who lent their name and prestige to the party and its front organisations. Chinese aggression has again served to unmask the communists as agents of Moscow and Peking. This glaring exposure has made communist leaders a little uneasy; but they are, as usual, employing all their stratagems of double-talk to conceal their true identity. In spite of these clever tactics, they have failed to carry conviction to the people at large. They are therefore falling back upon Prime Minister Nehru's statements that the Sino-Indian dispute should be solved peacefully and that Chinese expansionism has nothing to do with international communism. Skillfully twisting the logic, they are trying to dub as war-mongers all those who urge the Government to take a firm stand on the question and are posing as patriots by professing full support to the Prime Minister's stand.

But some of the recent reports of communist activity in border areas lay bare the true character of the party. Besides, some of the disclosures made recently by a leading member of the party from Maharashtra throw a revealing light on the duplicity of its leaders. Mr. Tushar Pawar, who recently resigned from the party, has brought to light many revealing facts regarding the party's stand on the Sino-Indian dispute. In a statement to the press last month, Mr. Pawar accused the party leaders of openly supporting the Chinese communists and castigating the Indian Government as the aggressor in the Sino-Indian dispute. Giving an account of what transpired at the General Council meeting of the Maharashtra Committee of the party which was held about two months back, Mr. Pawar stated: "On the contrary, Basavapunnaiiah, acting General Secretary of the Party, strongly insisted at the General Council meeting of the Maharashtra Party that to denounce China as aggressor was tantamount to giving up the fundamental principles of communism and it was against the basic tenets of the party's philosophy."

Not only that. Mr. Basavapunnaiiah, speaking on behalf of the Central Secretariat of the party, was cocksure that it was India that was expansionist and not China. According to Mr. Pawar, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah emphatically asserted at the meeting: "After listening to the statements of some of the party members on the question of condemning China as aggressor, I am constrained to disclose true facts about this

episode. Our central leaders have some documents in their possession on this question. After studying those documents carefully, we have been fully convinced that the Indian Government is the real culprit in the India-China dispute. If any one of them is guilty of aggression, it is the Indian Government and not the Chinese."

This shows the depth to which the Communist Party can descend in its servile and traitorous attempt to justify by all means the action of its Chinese mentors. It is revealing that Mr. Basavapunnaiiah in his arrogant reply to Mr. Pawar's charges has preferred to remain silent over these statements attributed to him. Instead of challenging Mr. Pawar on points of facts, he has used the usual vituperative tactics of the communists and dubbed Mr. Pawar's statement as the "lies of the renegade". But it is too stereotyped and typical a communist reply to convince any impartial observer. Mr. Pawar has now hurled an open challenge at the party leaders inviting them to address public meetings with him from the same platform on the question of Chinese aggression. Needless to say, the party leaders have not yet found time to accept the challenge.

Executions In Hungary

MORE than three years have passed since the mass uprising against communist tyranny was ruthlessly suppressed by the Hungarian puppet Government with the help of Soviet tanks. But it appears that the vindictive fury of the Red regime still remains insatiate in spite of large-scale arrests and executions of those who participated in the uprising. Recent reports from Hungary reveal that 150 young persons and 50 adults were executed during the past six months. Their only crime was their alleged complicity in the national revolution of 1956.

According to B. B. C. reports, the 150 young people, who were imprisoned in the Budapest central jail, were put to death early in December. It was at this time only that the Hungarian Minister of Interior assured the Hungarian Communist Party Congress that the Government had never executed, sentenced or tried anyone under the age of 21. But in typical communist double-talk style, this assurance was being violated at the same time the Minister was allaying the fears of his comrades! And just after Christmas, the Government arrested seven young men on the ground that they had taken part in the 1956 revolt; at that time they all had been 16 years old.

Other executions followed the same pattern. In the first week of August, eight workers of Ujpest were hanged after a secret trial at which they were convicted of complicity in the revolution; and at the beginning of October another group of 31 Hungarians was executed for the same reason. At the end of October, 15 more men were condemned and executed.

The tragedy is that these mass executions and tortures have ceased to shock the conscience of the free world which has no time even to shed tears for these helpless victims. Engrossed in its illusory pursuit of relaxing world tension by coming to terms

with the unscrupulous dictator in the Kremlin, the West appears to have already written off Hungary and other East European countries as condemned to perpetual slavery of the Kremlin. Stubbornly refusing to learn from experience, leaders of the free world are now busy in spreading false hopes and dangerous illusions about the so-called spirit of Camp David which is touted as a magic solvent for all the east-west troubles. In the meanwhile, communist regimes are busy pursuing single-mindedly their expansionist ambitions in the East as well as the West, and Hungary continues to suffer silently for its daring and desperate attempt to free itself from the Kremlin yoke.

Kerala

IT is a pity that soon after the victory at the polls in the mid-term election in Kerala, the United Alliance of the Democratic Parties has to face a series of crises which at one time even threatened to wreck the alliance. It appears that the Congress Party in the State as well as the Congress High Command have not learnt anything from the past. This was evident from inner-party wranglings for the leadership of the Legislature Congress Party that emerged to the surface after the election results were announced. The differences this time, it is true, did not assume violent proportions as in the past; but nonetheless the rumblings were audible enough outside. But the main threat to the unity of the Alliance came from the surprising attitude of the Congress High Command which was even prepared to form a single party government of its own; thus throwing all the wider considerations to the wind. Fortunately for Kerala, the crisis was resolved by the generous gesture of the Muslim League to withdraw its demand for inclusion in the Government and at the same time offering its whole-hearted cooperation to the Congress-P.S.P. Ministry in the interest of democracy in Kerala.

Though the crisis is thus solved amicably, the incident leaves a bad taste and legacy behind which is bound to have adverse repercussions sooner or later. Apart from the wisdom of the stand taken by the Congress High Command, the ethics of the stand taken by the Congress Party is open to question. The votes polled by the Congress, which was a party to the United Alliance, were the votes cast for the Alliance and not for the Congress Party as such. Without the understanding cooperation and concerted effort of all the constituent parties, the Alliance and the Congress as its unit, would not have been able to secure such a large and convincing majority in the Assembly. Even though there was no open agreement as such about the formation of a coalition Government of the Alliance after the elections, it was understood by all that the democratic alliance will continue in government also. In a sense, the elections could be considered as a mandate of the people of Kerala in favour of a coalition government representing all the participants in the Alliance. By refusing to concede the people's wish, the Congress has exposed itself to the charge of political opportunism of the worst type.

It has also, by its short-sighted policy, sown the seeds of dissension in the democratic camp — thus again helping the communists.

It is the support of the Muslim League which the Congress Party belatedly affects to despise on grounds that the former is a purely communal organisation. First of all the Muslim League of Kerala is not a separatist anti-national body, the fact admitted even by the Congress leaders themselves. Nor is it communal in the sense of being anti-Hindu or anti-Christian. Its membership consists of the Muslim masses who are an economically and educationally backward community in Malabar. The Muslim League exists to promote and safeguard the interests of the Muslim community and seeks to do so by securing representation in the Legislative Assembly. Much can, of course, be said about the part played by communal forces, in Kerala politics, but it is wise to remember that no major party in Kerala is free from the incubus of communalism. The wisdom therefore consists not in adopting sanctimonious attitude towards an organisation like the Muslim League which genuinely embodies and represents the socio-economic and political aspirations of the Muslims who constitute a well-knit and large community in the State; but in recognising the facts and trying to channelise these aspirations in fruitful democratic ways by providing enough scope for their fulfilment.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

THE FUTURE OF THE LEFT

C. A. R. Crossland

BEYOND NIHILISM

Michael Polanyi

A CONVERSATION WITH KENNAN

Melvin J. Lasky

March

78

Annual Rs. 12

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

Current Trends In Indo-Soviet Relations

by S. R. Mohan Das

"Peaceful co-existence is repudiation of war as means of solving controversial issues.... Renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries complete equality." (Khrushchev in the 1959 autumn issue of the American Quarterly Review Foreign Affairs.)

"Co-existence is the extension of the struggle between two social systems. We should struggle decisively and continuously...." (Khrushchev, Oct. 10, 1959 in Novosibirsk).

"As for relations between bourgeois and socialist (i.e. communist) ideologies there can be no co-existence...." (Khrushchev, Nov. 28, 1959 in Moscow)

INDIA'S relations with the Soviet Union have two aspects, viz. India's own positive attitudes and the responsive attitudes to Soviet policies on India.

Both these aspects have found expression in the context of Chinese aggression against India. The positive Indian evaluation of Soviet Union in all respects, and in the particular context of Chinese aggression against India, has been one of trust and faith in Soviet aims. This faith in Soviet aims towards India, in spite of Chinese aggression, conditions India's responsive attitudes to the Soviet policies on India.

Interestingly enough, the Government of India does not look upon Chinese aggression as a predominant question of relevance in Indo-Soviet relations. This is quite evident from Mr. Nehru's repeated assertions that Chinese aggression has nothing to do with communism, national or international. In fact, Mr. Nehru does not believe in the existence of International Communism as a concerted organized apparatus. In the positive Indian attitudes towards the Soviet Union, what is considered to be very important is the Soviet record towards India as interpreted by the two dominant personalities in India's foreign policy-making, viz. Pandit Nehru and V. K. Krishna Menon. Soviet aid to India during the past few years in such projects as the spectacular Bhilai Steel Plant, Soviet promises of aid for the Third Five Year Plan, Khrushchev's visit to the U. S., the Soviet successful moon-shot, "unilateral disbanding" of Soviet armed forces, and finally, the "historically unique" fact of the Soviet Union not supporting the Chinese against India; these are considered as an impressive record of Soviet friendliness and goodwill to India. What have been the Soviet pronouncements and attitudes towards India during recent months?

Since October 1959, literally a deluge of Soviet delegations has descended on India. India has been visited by:—

1. A Soviet "Aviation Workers" delegation.
2. A Soviet Jurists Delegation.
3. A Soviet Film Delegation.
4. A Soviet Scientists Delegation.

5. A Soviet Journalists and Tourists Delegation.
6. A Soviet Educationists Delegation.
7. A Soviet Medical Delegation.
8. The official visit of President Voroshilov along with such top members of Soviet Government as Kozlov, Madame Furtseva and Kuznetsov.
9. And lastly, the visit of Prime Minister Khrushchev along with Gormyko, Soviet Foreign Minister.

Apart from these visits, there was also a visit to India on his way to Indonesia in October 1959 by N. A. Mukhitdinov, the "Soviet Asia expert" who visited India in March 1959 as the head of Soviet Parliamentary delegation.

Many of these delegations were in India at the official invitation of the Government of India.

Some of the statements made during the visits of these Soviet dignitaries are the best indications of Soviet intentions and attitude towards India.

A. F. Gorkin, leader of the Soviet Jurist delegation said at a reception given to the delegation in Hyderabad:—

"Democratic and progressive people of Russia led the fight for justice. In the Soviet Union the basis of Justice is Social Justice."

During Voroshilov's visit, statements were made which give an interesting indication of Soviet attitudes towards India.

Soon after landing in Delhi, Voroshilov said:— "The positions of the Soviet Union and India on many international questions provide a reliable basis for co-operation between our countries in the International arena." (*Times of India*, 21st January, 1960).

Kozlov, as the high-powered commissar was less inhibited by propriety or protocol. He certified that India's economic planners were right in their heavy industry and Co-operative Farming bias. He pointed out that the great achievements of the Soviet Union in the agricultural field were entirely due to collective farming, "even more so because the base of Soviet economy was ... heavy industry." (*Indian Express*, 22nd January 1960).

Madame Furtseva made her own contributions. In Bombay she told an audience of Film producers that "while over 300 American films were being exhibited in India each year, Soviet pictures just averaged a bare nine. While she had no objections to American films being shown, she wanted Indians to have a better understanding of Russian films too." (*Indian Express* 29th January 1960).

Kozlov proudly asserted, "Some of our enemies keep saying that in Socialism there is no real freedom, that socialist regime does not create conditions for the development of talents. The Soviet Sputniks and Luniks have convincingly disproved their assertions." (*Hindustan Standard*, 3rd February, 1960).

(Continued on page 8)

Democratic Victory In Kerala

by Philip Spratt

IT was a fair election in Kerala. It was thoroughly prepared and supervised by officials from outside the State, and both sides were on the alert for evidence of malpractices. It was fair in the sense that after the experience of the few years this electorate could not be humbugged. They voted on their recent experience of the two rival parties in office, and the dramatic episode of the liberation struggle.

Did the Chinese aggression influence the voting? At one point the communist press accused the Government of creating the trouble with China in order to help the Congress at the polls in Kerala. But reports during the election campaign suggest that this has been a very minor factor, and the heavy communist vote bears out this view. When feelings on domestic questions were so tense, this distant and for the moment quiescent problem lost interest.

The dispute was about Kerala affairs, and the heart of the matter was the old question: are the rulers and their supporters to be above the law or subject to it?

There were other questions. The communists' education policy forced into opposition many non-political but influential people. Their hostility to the churches antagonised the big Christian community and probably alarmed the Muslims. Their low-caste bias antagonised the high-caste Nairs. All parties, in Kerala as elsewhere, are more or less "communal".

Economic considerations weighed a good deal. The previous ministries had failed to make any impression on the difficult economic problems of the State. The Communist Ministry did only slightly better, but it did raise pay scales for some low-paid groups, and it organised and encouraged many of the despised and rejected. If it did little to increase wealth, it made at least a gesture of transferring wealth from the upper to the lower levels. It has gone far to establish itself as the party of the poor and the low castes. This must largely account for its solid vote.

But that would not have accounted for the liberation movement, nor even for its electoral defeat. The class analysis is too simple. There was a sense of moral outrage in the liberation movement.

Communists in power proved to be morally inferior to Congressmen. Some Congressmen are corrupt, but most communists are corrupt. Moreover the Ministry shielded them. Under the previous ministries at least some cases went to court. The Congress has the right principles but is humanly weak in enforcing them. The Communist Ministry itself practised a vast system of corruption in the interest of the party treasury, and in many ways covertly broke the law. It could not afford to enforce bourgeois discipline against its innumerable erring comrades.

Overshadowing all, however, was the Communist Ministry's record in regard to law and order. It transferred administrative functions and much power to

the party apparatus, and that power was abused. It exerted pressure on the police and the courts to exempt party members from the operation of the law. In effect Communists were set above the law, and all others were correspondingly denied their rights. A high-level committee of jurists who have examined the Ministry's record on the spot have concluded that its operations amounted to "a gross and systematic violation of the rule of law".

The three main opposition parties, Congress, Praja Socialist Party and Muslim League, formed and faithfully observed an electoral alliance, which served them all well. Several small parties, mainly left-wing, and many Independents contested, and their intervention may have turned the scales in several constituencies, but it is hard to tell which side it favoured.

The Congress in Kerala still retains some of the prestige of the great national party, but it has never been well organised. It lost an influential group to the P. S. P., and it suffers more than in any other State from the old quarrel with the Muslims. On the other hand, the Communist Party has a powerful organisation, well able to take advantage of divisions among its opponents and apathy among the voters. In the 1957 election, though it polled about the same number of votes as the Congress, it won many more seats.

In this election the situation was reversed. The Communist Party with its Independents fought every seat, and in most cases faced only one opponent, who was backed by all the other parties and interests. Though it polled strongly, it lost over half its seats.

The Assembly contains 126 seats. In 1957 the Communist Party received 35 per cent of the votes, and won 65 seats. The United Front parties (then not united) polled 50 per cent of the votes and won 61 seats. In this election the Communist Party polled about 43 per cent of the votes, and won 29 seats (including its Independents), while the United Front parties polled 53 per cent of the votes and won 94 seats. The big increase in the Communist vote is partly due to the large number of seats contested (126 as opposed to 85). The increase in the United Front vote is wholly due to getting out huge numbers of former non-voters. In 1957 only 67 per cent voted; in 1960 it must have been nearly 90 per cent.

The *Manchester Guardian* has refused to give more than two cheers for this result, on the ground that democracy was gravely wounded by last year's liberation movement. The jurists' committee says that the movement was in fact and in law an insurrection; but "when tyranny becomes intolerable, man has an inherent and inalienable right to stand up against the oppressor". The insurrection has been vindicated by the clear verdict of the voters in an election which was in every way a model.

U Nu's Victory In Burma

by Adam Adil

U NU'S "Clean" AFPFL has gained a sweeping victory in the recent Burmese General Elections. It has captured more than 200 out of 250 seats in the Burmese Parliament. It is clear that once again since the assassination of Aung San, Thakin Mya and others in July 1947, the people of Burma have entrusted their destiny in U Nu's hands. U Nu's sweeping victory was a foregone conclusion especially after the impressive gains of his party in the last Municipal elections in the country. Apart from his personal popularity many other factors contributed to the victory of the U Nu faction of the AFPFL.

The military rule under General Ne Win which was "invited" with the concurrence of the Burmese Parliament on October 28, 1958, had largely cleared the mess which the power-seeking Burmese politicians had created after independence. It also brought about an appropriate climate for free and fair elections to be held. It is a tribute to General Ne Win's administrative ability and his loyalty to country and the Burmese people that the return of democratic rule was made possible in Burma.

There is no doubt that the army rule saved Burma from a cataclysmic crisis which had threatened it as a result of a serious split in the Anti-Fascist Peoples' Freedom League and the mutual bickerings, and mud-slinging and intrigues the split had bred. Taking advantage of the weakness of the ruling party, the insurgents had organised large armies throughout Burma and had under their effective control nearly all important towns and most of the countryside, and had almost penetrated into the outskirts of Rangoon, and were poised for attack on the integrity of Burma. One of the first successful jobs of the army rule was to take stern measures against the insurgent armies, liquidate them for good and ensure the safety and security of the Burmese people even in the outlying regions of the country. It is said that out of 60,000 insurgents at the time of army take-over there are now hardly 5,000 individuals in hiding in the forests and mountains, completely disorganised and scattered in remotely distributed areas and unable to terrorise the people. There is now no fear of being ambushed on the roads or on the inland waterways, no fear of railway bridges being blown or night trains attacked. The insurgent armies had included White-flag communists, Red-flag communists, Karen Defense Organisation, Mon National Defence Organisation, Shan Insurgent Army, Mujahids, KMT forces and their supporters. One communist insurgent leader who had surrendered to the army disclosed that at the instance of the Cominform, the communists in Burma had planned an insurrection and that the order for the insurrection was communicated through an Indian communist, and that the plan of campaign toward insur-

rection was worked out at a secret Calcutta conference of the communists.

The army in order to raise the morale of the people distributed millions of leaflets, booklets and other literature giving out the details of the operations against insurgents. The army also instilled new sense of service and discipline into the ranks of civil service by means of lectures and refresher courses.

The army's record on economic front has also been impressive. Stringent measures were taken against hoarders, black marketeers and smugglers with the result lots of hidden consumer goods were brought out. Prices were fixed and fair price shops opened. The books of accounts of all important firms were examined, and licenses of such firms—numbering about 1,400—as were found having indulged in shady deals and fraudulent transactions were cancelled. Reasonable profit margins were fixed on consumer goods. Especially on drugs and pharmaceuticals, an importer or wholesaler was allowed not more than five percent and the retailer not more than ten per cent profit, with the result the cost of urgently needed medicines which were previously sold at exorbitant prices in the black market, was brought down to be within the means of the common people. Likewise the cost of building materials was reduced which led to increased building activity providing cheap houses to the people. Students and education received special consideration from the army government.

Administratively the army brought about great efficiency at all levels of governmental functioning. It did away with red tape and nepotism and punished corrupt officials. When it found that some state undertakings were running into loss, it turned them into profit-making concerns by changing the management. With such and other measures, the army government succeeded in avoiding waste and diverting state funds into constructive and welfare channels.

Yet, with all these impressive achievements to its credit the army rule, with its forthright and almost ruthless manner of dealing with men and matters, happened to dissatisfy a large number of people. And as the public memory is proverbially short, the Burmese, within a short space of a year or so, forgot the mess the politicians had previously created, began to desire the end of the army rule.

It was generally believed that the army leaders were more favourably inclined towards U Ba Swe and his "stable" faction of the AFPFL. It is possible that since there was general dissatisfaction against the army rule, the "stable" AFPFL has become a suspect and lost its former position in the estimation of the people. This might be one of the reasons for the sweeping landslide against the "stable" AFPFL and in favour of U Nu whom the army leaders never liked.

The fact that U Nu is a devout Buddhist also helped his party to override its opponents. The Burmese masses, particularly women, have great regard for U Nu for his religious-mindedness. It is said that some Burmese even consider him as the reincarnation of Lord Buddha to save the world from atheism of ultra-leftism. Further, U Nu and his party are backed, almost to a man, by Burma's 500,000 Buddhist monks, who wander through the country eulogising his tireless efforts to preserve religious traditions and canvassing support for his party. It was due to the active working of these monks that U Nu's "clean" AFPFL registered resounding victory in the last municipal elections capturing 31 out of the 41 municipalities in the country, thus opening possibilities for a sweeping landslide in his favour in the General Elections. U Nu also fortified his position among the religious people by declaring that he would, if he was placed in power, get Buddhism constitutionally recognised as the State Religion.

The return of parliamentary democracy in Burma after more than a year of military rule must be welcomed. It is true, the military rule under General Ne Win routed the insurgents, introduced many progressive reforms and brought to the country the much needed economic and social stability. But military rule, however enlightened, cannot be a substitute for democracy.

The absolute majority of U Nu's "clean" faction of AFPFL in Burmese parliament will end political uncertainties which were the order of the day prior to the military rule. But at the same time it will have its own disadvantage; it will weaken democratic opposition and render the party-in-power liable to transgress the democratic limits so as to endanger the rights and privileges of the people. The effectiveness of the opposition is all the more reduced by the defeat of the top leaders of the "stable" faction of the AFPFL, such as U Ba Swe and U Kyaw Nyein, who could have voiced on the floor of the Parliament the trend of public opinion on governments' acts of commission and omission from time to time. A government in order to be informed needs a healthy and articulate opposition.

During the previous tenure of his Prime Ministership, U Nu was known to have aligned with crypto-communists to keep himself in power. In view of his absolute majority in the Parliament now, it is obvious that he will not be required to seek the support of the communists and their fellow travellers.

In spite of his fondness for going into meditation occasionally, U Nu is a shrewd politician. He cannot be unaware of the fact that the achievements of his party will be judged in the background of those of the military rule, and unless his party puts a better show, he is bound to lose face with the Burmese people. And in case, his party fails to measure up at least to the army's record or if it resorts to old intrigues and political corruption, the Burmese people are likely to lose faith in parliamentary democracy and long for the return of army dictatorship. It would indeed be a sad day in the history of Burma.

INDO-SOVIET RELATIONS — (Contd. from page 5)

In his broadcast message at the time of leaving India, Voroshilov repeated the famous blueprint for world conquest laid down by Lenin in 1923, but in much softer language in 1960: "As far back as 1923, Lenin wrote that the countries which constituted the bulk of the population of the earth, including India and China, were being drawn into the struggle for their liberation with unusual speed. This liberation has come May Soviet-Indian friendship, which is deep and vast as the Indian ocean, high and unselfishly pure as the summits of the Himalayas and strong as the steel melted in Bhilai, prosper and live for all time." (*Hindustan Times*, 6th February, 1960).

Khrushchev landed in India within five days of Voroshilov's departure and as has been the custom with the Soviet bosses, after the first few days of pleasantries, came up with a lashing attack on the West on India's "nonaligned" soil. Khrushchev warned India to beware of Western aid in the normal Soviet strategy of attempting to isolate India from any potential non-communist friends. This open and crude form of interference in India's affairs is in line with communist double-talk and the opportunistic interpretation of verbal sputniks that Soviets and other communists always coin. This was also in line with the two differing interpretations Khrushchev has given to "co-existence."

Official Indian reactions to these visits did not disappoint the Soviet bosses. Just as the Indian leaders might be under the naive confidence that they could successfully "influence" Soviet leaders about India's objectives, the Soviets were equally confident, but not so naive, about their capacity through organised efforts to commit India further and further towards a position of isolation from any potential non-Soviet friendship.

The studied refusal of the Soviet leaders to commit themselves to any positive position on Chinese aggression evoked remarkably less surprise and grievance from Indian leaders, probably because of their auto-suggested rationalization of their over-charitable evaluation of Soviet record over the years.

All this indicates a trend in Indo-Soviet relations in which the attempt will be made by the Soviet Union more and more towards infiltrating into vulnerable and strategic sections of Indian life. As a part of another aspect of international communist strategy, the pressure from China is intended towards softening up any will to resist communism by Asian countries by the "big brother" the Soviet Union, acting as a "tamer" of the "more impulsive younger brother", Communist China. It looks as though the Soviet bosses are suggesting to India that Soviet friendship has to be earned. If the Chinese aggression question has to be solved, the Soviets might well tell India sweetly, shape your economy thus, stop getting aid from "Western Imperialists", and so on! Otherwise, the Soviets will unleash "neutrality" and "non-alignment" on India !!!

Population Pressure In China

by Dr. C. Chandrasekhar

FROM what has been said earlier about China's census figures and her annual vital statistics, it is possible to foresee that the net annual addition to China's population within a decade may become more than twenty millions. That is, under certain conditions, after 1970 or so, China is likely to add to her population in *one decade* more than the population of the United States of America. And this formidable decennial addition will gradually grow, for it is rather difficult for population numbers to become stabilised at any particular figure in a totalitarian country that has no national policy of restricting its birth rate. It is possible, for China to have within her frontiers a thousand million around 1980, if her death rate continues to decline and her birth rate remains even stationary. Thus China's population may increase at the most conservative estimate somewhat as follows:

1956	..	630 millions
1961	..	700 "
1966	..	770 "
1971	..	850 "
1976	..	930 "
1981	..	1,000 and more millions

At the current rate of growth of 2 per cent (which itself will increase to 2.5 or even 3 per cent possibly within a decade) China will double her population in the next twenty-five years.

Peace, rapid industrialisation and the increase in total national income, the growth of necessary social services and modern methods of disease control through public health, engineering, medical services, and a gradual rise in the levels of living—all are conducive to a growth in numbers.

But mere numbers mean nothing. They must be examined in terms of available habitable, cultivable or otherwise exploitable land area, other resources, the size of the labour force and the stage of technological development of the country. Theoretically, no nation need lament that its population is too large or too small as long as it can balance the twin basic physical activities of man—production and reproduction, between the existing population and available resources for that population's support. Generally speaking, the most desirable quantity of population is also one that attains the highest level of living, political stability and economic security, along with adequate freedom and leisure for the pursuit of creative and cultural values.

Here the question of the relation between population size and national power arises. It is obvious that a nation of teeming millions is not necessarily a powerful nation, if the millions do not have the basic, irreducible minimum needs of decent human existence—food, clothing, housing, education, health services, etc. India with her four hundred millions is not

necessarily stronger than the United States of America or the Soviet Union, each with only about half of her population.

A nation's total income may be taken as the single best index of a nation's power. According to Dr. Cheng Chu-yuan, the per capita income of Communist China in 1952 was about 33 U.S. dollars. In other words, the per capita income of the United States in 1952-54 was 45 times more than that of Communist China; England's was 20 times more than that of Communist China. Thus from the national income point of view, China has not even caught up with India, (85 U.S. dollars in 1950) not to speak of advanced Western nations. But this is only one consideration.

Secondly, the correlation between total population numbers and national power stems from the size of the labour force. It has already been pointed out that China, from the point of view of her age pyramid, is a young nation. While the age statistics of her population may not be exact, the 1953 census indicates that the magnitude of the available labour force is large.

The third factor is the availability of resources. Despite her long history, China has never had a thorough geological survey of her entire land area. This defect is now being rectified with Soviet geological teams and the reports now available indicate that China has a great deal of natural resources awaiting development. And they are being developed at a faster rate than in any other Asian country.

The last consideration is the military aspect of the population problem. The creation of a sizeable defence force—army, navy and air services and the ancillary personnel—demands people of a particular age group with adequate training and necessary skills. A large army, for instance, is possible only where there is a large population from which men of a particular age group and the necessary physical condition can be drawn. China has this advantage.

All these considerations are relevant to any country. And they are particularly so in a totalitarian country with centralised planning, complete control over the nation's material and human resources, and mass regimentation. Such a country can create a formidable defence force. But does this necessarily mean that a strong and unified China, rapidly industrialised and mechanised and with a growing fighting force, will be a source of aggression in the future? This is a difficult question to answer for it depends on the scale of values and priorities that China will set before herself.

Let us examine very briefly the record of national situations—both ideological and demographic—which have led to war in the past.

Germany, Italy and Japan embarked on a pro-

natalist policy and asked their people to multiply like rabbits in Australia. Birth control and contraceptives were banned as so much decadent nonsense. A significant segment of the national income was diverted to the production of arms and ammunition, bullets and bombs. The growing population was absorbed both in the new factories that produced more guns than butter, and in the growing armies. And when numbers grew beyond control, empires came to mind. National leaders began to argue that they had a right to the good things of life beyond their frontiers and belonging to other people. At the slightest pretext of wounded national honour or invaded rights, or with no pretext at all, their armies began to march. And the world was plunged into a holocaust. It is not necessary that a nation should have real difficulties, economic or otherwise. Even imagined grievances, if buttressed home strongly enough—the people have no freedom to argue or protest—can touch the tinder box and start the conflagration.

A backward and impoverished China could not start a war. But a united and strong China with a population spilling over her frontiers and with no emigration outlets, may be different. Even if China were a democracy with an abiding faith in freedom, her population numbers alone might cause concern in the minds of her neighbours. But unfortunately there are two aspects of Communist China which may aggravate her potential role as an aggressor. One is her communist ideology, which attracts the faithful all over the world—and the other is the 11,000,000 overseas Chinese with their ethnic and cultural, if not political and ideological, solidarity with the mainland.

Every Southeast Asian country, with the exception of India, has a sizeable Chinese minority who constitute a potential threat to the political freedom and the various national ways of life in the countries of this region. Out of Thailand's twenty millions, the Chinese number more than three millions. In Singapore nearly eighty per cent of the total one million people are Chinese. In Malaya proper, the Chinese number more than a million and a half. Indonesia has about two million Chinese, Laos and Cambodia about 500,000, and Burma some 20,000. Only in India do the Chinese constitute a microscopic minority.

Peking runs a Department of Overseas Chinese Affairs. China, through the centuries, has claimed all Chinese as her citizens no matter where they are born or where they make a living. How else can one explain the Chinese national census presenting her total population figures inclusive of the overseas Chinese?

In the last few years, China has begun to build "Chinese Overseas Villages"—neat, modern suburban communities near big cities like Canton and Peking. I visited the one near Canton. Modern buildings with all the latest amenities and conveniences, their own schools and social services, have been laid out to attract the overseas Chinese. I learnt that Communist China was anxious to attract the savings of the Overseas Chinese who would like to return to their homeland, invest their savings in the People's Republic, retire and die in the new China. But since

these people, accustomed as they are to certain comforts and a free way of life, might not return to China to barter their precious savings for a regimented way of life, the Overseas villages have been made very different from the rest of China. There are cars and refrigerators, books and washing machines in the Overseas Chinese Villages, and the life that the Overseas Chinese can live in them is not dissimilar to the life that they led overseas, though it is certainly very different from the life led by the 650 million Chinese "Communists." I met there Chinese who had been successful businessmen and traders in such far-flung places as Brazil and Panama, Indonesia and Malaya. Those I met said that they had repatriated their savings and had invested them in the various "joint enterprises" (Government and private owned working together) and had retired to lead a life of ease.

The reason for these Overseas Chinese Villages is not only to attract the much needed exchange provided by the savings of these successful Overseas Chinese, but to use the good offices of these repatriates to indoctrinate the others who are still abroad. Those who have returned have of course latent communist sympathies, and they may convert the unconverted overseas.

Will China ever claim the territories where her children have settled and become large minorities? She has made no official claims except to Tibet (and here successfully), Taiwan, Hongkong and Macao. Kowloon and the Leased Territory can revert to the Mainland when the lease to the British expires.

But Chairman Mao Tse-tung, writing some twenty years ago (1939), pointed out: "In defeating China in war, the imperialist powers have taken away many Chinese dependent states and a part of her territories. Japan took Korea, Taiwan and the Ryu-kyu Islands, the Pescadores, Port Arthur; England seized Burma, Bhutan, Nepal and Hongkong; France occupied Annam and even an insignificant country like Portugal took Macao." Does China now claim all these territories? No, not yet.

But in the face of all this, it may be foolish to assume that the Chinese Communists will go back to their "Middle Kingdom" and ignore the "barbarians beyond their gates."

—Extracts from an article in *Population Review* (Madras)

The Democratic Alternative

BY MISS M. A. DEVIKI

Rs. 2.50

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

(A CLIMB DOWN—Continued from page 2)

people—like animals in a zoo—those people are looking for an opportunity to rise. They have a National Government outside their boundaries which is almost certain to try and land and liberate the mainland. That threat may or may not be a serious one. But are the Chinese communist Government prepared to shift their main forces thousands of miles to our frontiers, leave their mainland and home territory exposed either to internal revolution from discontented people in the country or to a landing from the Nationalist Government outside? I doubt it. I doubt if communist China is prepared to fight a major war on two fronts, today. So, when we think so much of our own weakness, let us also consider the element of bluff on the other side.

If, however, we have not got the fighting force, what do we do? There again, I think there is a great deal that this country can do. Assuming that we have not got the strength to eject the aggressor, does it mean that we have in any way to have any dealings with him? A brave nation has not been known to connive or acquiesce in the aggression or the occupation of its territory. I am not saying that the hon. Prime Minister's letter and the Note—and the Note is a very fine note; it evokes a responsive echo in the hearts of all of us—concedes anything. But where is the need to meet when you are not prepared to concede anything? If we are not in a position to restore the *status quo* before the aggression, let us be dignified enough to stay where we are, to say we will not give up this territory, we shall retake it as and when it becomes possible for us to retake it.

People who have been in South and South East Asia from this country have come back and said that they are very worried. They have pointed out that the Himalayas are the frontiers of free Asia and that in not defending them actively enough, we are imperilling their own freedom. Why do we not call a Bandung Conference and tell them where we stand? Why do we not invite them to a pact—to say that an attack on one is an attack on all? Why do we not do that? Leave all the foreign powers and the so-called imperialists out. Why do we not call our fellow nations, the uncommitted nations in Asia to get into a group?

Why do we not equip our armed forces better than they are? The hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Defence Minister have, in their wisdom, said that they will not accept military equipment without payment. Acharya Kripalani in a previous debate pointed out that between accepting military equipment and adhering to a policy of non-alignment there is no contradiction. Marshal Tito took military assistance from America as long as he needed it, discontinued it when he did not need it any more and nobody has ever suggested that he sacrificed non-alignment for even a minute. If Tito could do it, we can do it. But if we do not want to do it individually or unilaterally, let us do it multilaterally. Let us form a regional organisation of the countries of South and South East

Asia and let that organisation invite assistance and aid from other parts of the world so that the independence of judgement and the independent foreign policy of any single country is not endangered in the slightest.

When I say that, I am aware that the hon. Prime Minister is apt to read too much into the statements as indeed he did at Bangalore at the annual session of the Congress Party where, when an innocent amendment was moved asking for a reconsideration of certain things, he attacked his critics—respectable members of the Congress Party—for daring to suggest that foreign troops should march up and down India trying to defend us from Chinese aggression.

Nobody is asking for foreign troops to be invited to this country. But when this question is raised and the hon. Prime Minister says that he would not agree to one inch of our territory being occupied by foreign troops, the fact remains that 5,000 to 10,000 square miles of our territory are already under foreign occupation. It is a popular game that is going on in certain quarters when people ask: "How many thousand square miles make a square inch?" What kind of arithmetic is this? Therefore, I am not suggesting inviting foreign troops. I am not suggesting alliances. I am suggesting a regional organisation of the countries of South and South East Asia for common security and defence.

This is the line of thought that I would suggest. Now, I will be told, "Are you not suggesting something extreme, when you suggest that diplomatic relations should be broken off with this aggressor regime?" Without any provocation, or much less, we have done as much. We have broken off diplomatic relations with South Africa and Portugal without anything comparable to what we have endured at the hands of the Chinese communist Government. Even worse, we have no diplomatic relations with a friendly, helpful, cooperative country like Israel—a country that has done nothing to us, whose existence we recognise but, for good reasons that the Government alone knows, whom we fail to recognise in the sense of accrediting a diplomatic mission. If we can desist from having diplomatic relations with Israel, surely it is not asking too much that that very mild act of displeasure might be endowed on those who are aggressing against us, who have killed our people and who have on their hands our men's blood.

The Prime Minister's letter ends by saying to Mr. Chou En-lai: "You will be an honoured guest when you come here." Undoubtedly the Prime Minister and the Government are entitled to invite whoever they like as their honoured guests, but may I say that Mr. Chou-En-lai will not be honoured guest of the Indian people? He is not wanted here. If he comes, he will come as the guest of the Government, we cannot help it, but the Indian people do not want to shake hands with murder, with those on whose hands is the blood of our policemen and armed forces.

—Speech delivered in Parliament on February 11

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

A Defence Minister who does not inspire public confidence is a calamity.

—Acharya Kripalani, *Statesman*, February 21

The Party to derive the maximum benefit from the visit of Voroshilov was the Communist Party of India. Ever since he arrived in Delhi on January 20, his utterances and movements constituted the most forceful propaganda in Kerala State for the CPI..... Between thirty and forty per cent of the votes secured by the Communist Party of India and its allies in the general elections in Kerala were due to his visit..... Between one and one and half million votes were secured to the CPI by Voroshilov.

—P. R. Lele, *Blitz*, February 13.

Russia and India can co-exist. But as long as the Indian National Congress cannot have a branch functioning in Russia, murdering Russian citizens, spending Indian money in Russia and putting up disgruntled Kulaks as candidates in Russia, Russia cannot be allowed to play that game in India.

—C. J. Thomas, *Weekly Kerala*, February 20.

Our enemy is not the Congress as such, but the reactionary forces inside and outside the Congress. Hence, all those Congressmen who stand firm on the declared policies of the Congress and are prepared to fight the Swatantra-PSP-Jan Sangh combine and their friends inside the Congress are our allies.

—*New Age*, January 16.

The communists are acting as servants of China and they act as spies on India whenever they get the chance. You must smash the Communist Party.

—V.K. Krishna Menon, Defence Minister, *Current*, February 10.

The greatest misfortune of India at present is that it is being ruled by a weak dictator.

—Dr. P. C. Ghosh, *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, February 23.

The communist defeat (in Kerala) should not be misinterpreted as a rejection of communism or the Nehru-Socialism which Nambudiripad and his colleagues honestly sought to operate.

—*Blitz*, February 6.

Khrushchev proved to be the biggest booster, the biggest salesman of Eisenhower (in India).

—Dr. K. Shridharani, *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, February 22.

The Chinese Communist troops on India's border really threaten the continued existence of India as a nation, and it is in that context that the answer to their challenge must be found.

—*New York Times* as quoted in *Swarajya*, February 6.

In the technique of holding on to power the Congress has learnt whatever the communists can teach and has little more to learn.

—*Swarajya*, February 13.

STATEMENT ABOUT OWNERSHIP AND OTHER PARTICULARS OF FREEDOM FIRST

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Place of Publication | Bombay |
| 2. Periodicity of Publication | Monthly |
| 3. Printer's Name | B. K. DESAI |
| Nationality | Indian |
| Address | The Inland Printers, Bombay 7. |
| 4. Publisher's Name | B. K. DESAI |
| Nationality | Indian |
| Address | 127 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1. |
| 5. Editor's Name | V. B. KARNIK |
| Nationality | Indian |
| Address | 127 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1. |
| 6. Names and addresses of individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital | Democratic Research Service
127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1. |

I, B. K. Desai, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date: 1st March 1960

Signature of Publisher
B. K. DESAI