

161

**MUST INDIA GO
THE VIETNAM
WAY?**

M.R. MASANI, M.P.

MUST INDIA GO
THE VIETNAM
WAY ?

by

M. R. MASANI, M.P.

*This is the text of the
speech delivered by
Mr. M. R. Masani, M.P.,
at Sapru House,
New Delhi,
on 27th July, 1967.*

MUST INDIA GO THE VIETNAM WAY ?

Some months ago, was it two or three months ago, my good friend Jaiprakash Narayan ventured to give expression to some thoughts about the peril in which he thought our democracy, our young democracy, was today, and the dangers to which we would be exposed if our democratic experiment failed. He was immediately chewed up by the Congress Working Committee for these dangerous thoughts and was even described as "irresponsible", a term which does not fit Mr. Jaiprakash Narayan very well, because, while the rest of us are talking in Delhi, he is in the villages of Bihar serving those who need food and helping those in dire need. I think what he said was very sensible and something that needed to be said. There are too many people in a country at any given time who meet any thought of danger with the phrase "It can't happen here". That phrase was heard in European countries

when Fascism raised its ugly head. That phrase was heard in countries which later succumbed to Communist dictatorship. Therefore this idea "It can't happen here, so let's all relax" is a somewhat dangerous one.

Certainly, the state of our country does not call for complacency. We are a picture of gloom. Economically, we are bankrupt, there is moral decay in our public life and standards are dropping. There is an external threat and a domestic fifth column. All along our borders, all the way from Kashmir to Nagaland, there is discontent and incipient revolt. Internationally, we are isolated and our prestige has slumped considerably in the past few years and months. It is true the recent General Elections raised our hopes, but that is an unfinished piece of business that has to be carried forward. I think it would be true to say that our democracy itself is on trial, that our political class is being watched by the people very closely and not with considerable sympathy any more.

A Losing Battle ?

As I sit in Parliament day after day and week after week, my spirits drop. As a democrat I feel that we are fighting a losing battle. That is not to say that we do not have good debates in Parliament and that some useful work is not done. But the trouble with these good debates is that when they are going on, the house is empty and one has the mortification of having to speak to largely empty benches. But when there is mischief in the air, a showdown of some kind, a tamasha of some kind, a row of some kind, then the house is packed, and the great bulk of members who are absent when there is an intelligent debate seem to enjoy being in the middle of a row. You have seen what

has been happening not only in Parliament but in State Assembly after State Assembly. We read reports of what happens in Calcutta, Lucknow, Patna and in our other capitals, and we hang our heads in shame that our legislators, whether in Delhi or elsewhere, would set such an example of lack of discipline, lack of seriousness of purpose that is expected of them. There is too much self-seeking, too much party advantage, indiscipline and defiance of the Chair, a great deal of noise which takes the place of intellectual discussion and very little sense of national purpose.

One looks back to a visit to Israel many years ago, when in a few days one sensed and came back with a tremendous feeling of a sense of national purpose and direction, of a people who were making sacrifices and who knew where they were going, people who knew they would have a better life next year or the year after and they were prepared to wait for that and work for that because it was just within their reach, because they could see it and because reward followed hard work. It was this sense of purpose and discipline that undoubtedly contributed to the magnificent success of their armies a few weeks back. There is no such sense of purpose, no such dedication in our national life. And therefore many people are beginning to feel that Parliament and Government are failing the nation and I would be rather inclined to agree with them.

Our Bourbons

I am not saying that the Congress Party is the only party responsible for this mess. Of course they have the largest share of the responsibility. It is they who have been in office for twenty long years, it is

they who set the pace, and others copy or imitate, and so their responsibility is very large. But I can't say that the other parties who are in opposition have a clean bill. Let us look at them for a few moments and see how they look in a dispassionate analysis.

The Congress Party today is like the Bourbons. They had a very bad defeat in the elections and one hoped they would mend but, like the Bourbons, they have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing. They seem to have a tremendous aptitude for repeating the very same mistakes that have brought them and us to this unfortunate pass. If anyone has any hopes that their economic policies are going to change or improve, I would say: "abandon hope". There is no such prospect at present. On the contrary, like a doctor whose drug has failed and who has no other thoughts in his mind, this quack doctor wants to double the dose. More nationalisation, higher taxation, more inflation, abolition of privy purses. One after another these quack remedies are being trotted out. The kind of appointments they make frighten one somewhat. Recently Professor D. R. Gadgil was appointed Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission. A sympathetic journalist in Delhi wrote a long editorial, a long article on the editorial page of a leading newspaper, saying that it was a very good choice. But as one read the article which expounded the views of Professor Gadgil, one's heart sank. He thought that taxation in India wasn't high enough, it should be increased further and not only for the very rich, but also for the peasants of India who, according to him, are escaping paying their fair share of taxes. As to the Capital market, which is in the doldrums, his remedy is a very simple one—just kill it. There is no need for a

capital market because the Government should get into its hands all the money in the country and the Government must be the only investor. These are some of the bright ideas which Professor Gadgil is now going to be given a chance to try out on that unfortunate guinea pig, the Indian economy. It appears to me that he is very much in the series which has already brought this country to ruin - the series that started with Professor Mahalanobis and went through Professor V.K.R.V. Rao and Mr. Ashok Mehta, now to Professor D.R. Gadgil. It seems that our Government cannot find anyone but a Marxist to place in charge of our planning, with very predictable results.

Then our Prime Minister has asked Mr. Namboodripad, the Chief Minister of Kerala, to become a part-time member of the Planning Commission. There are about twenty Chief Ministers in India, half of them belonging to her own party, the other half belong to various other parties, but she had to choose the one Communist Chief Minister to confer this honour on, and Mr. Namboodripad has said that he will condescend to think it over and decide whether it suits his purpose or not.

That is why I say that if anyone has any hopes of improvement from the Congress Party's policies either at home or abroad, he or she had better abandon hope rightaway.

In international affairs, the gulf between the country and the Congress Party has never been wider. Whether it was in regard to the refusal to sever relations with the bandit regime in Peking, after the

way they treated our diplomats, or whether it was the abject support of one side in the West Asian conflict, throwing all impartiality and justice to the winds, the people of India are well ahead of the Government, but they seem to be unable to make the Government reflect their point of view.

There is this matter of defections of which our press is full. It is undoubtedly a national disgrace. I am not against people changing their views, or even their political party or label. That is a very healthy thing when it comes from within, when there is a feeling that one no longer belongs to a particular school of thought or that a particular party one has served is ceasing to play a positive role and one should move on. Some very good people have changed parties. Mr. Winston Churchill changed his party, I did so too. But when people change their parties, they do it for a very compelling reason of policy or principle. What we see today is not a change of party because your ideas have changed or the party has deteriorated, but a defection from one party to another with a view to creating a situation where you or someone close to you gets a job or becomes a Minister. All the defections that have taken place since last February, whether to the Congress party or from the Congress Party, have been motivated by this rather dishonourable idea. The defections take place so that the balance of power is changed and those who were sitting on the back benches could then move on to a treasury bench. Or if they don't, then somebody else does who has promised to make it worth their while, and these defections now run into hundreds, if you take the country as a whole.

The Rat Race

Now the Congress Party unfortunately, instead of

setting a good example, is leading the rat race. They had a rule till a few weeks ago, till the 7th of July, that they would not admit to their party someone who had already left them and who now wanted to slink back. Well, that was good so far as it went, but on the 7th of July the Congress Parliamentary Board abolished that rule and made it clear to all the opportunists of all parties that they were now most welcome within the Congress portals, and the result is to be seen.

Last week, when the tide ran the other way in Madhya Pradesh, Congress Ministers gnashed their teeth and said that it was a very disgraceful thing that had happened in Madhya Pradesh. But yesterday they admitted an M.P. from an opposition party to their ranks in the Congress Parliamentary party. How do these very inconsistent actions add up, how do they reconcile their protest against an evil and then their practice of it the very next day?

The Congress Party appears to me to be now qualifying for the role that President Soekarno has made so very well known in his own country. The role of a group of people in power, who have lost the confidence of the country but are not prepared to leave office, who wish to cling to it in spite of popular lack of confidence. As this refusal to hand over power or share power develops, as we saw in Rajasthan, as we see in Madhya Pradesh today, there is going to be more and more the kind of situation that ultimately led to President Soekarno's overthrow in his own country, where he is today a puppet president without any function.

There are people who still think that one Congress leader is better than another, that if only Mr.

so-and-so would take the place of Mrs. so-and-so everything will be fine. I wish it was as simple as that. Unfortunately I cannot share that feeling that a choice or a change over from one Congress leader to another will solve our country's problems. Mr. Moraji Desai, for instance, who some people would look upon as a great improvement, made some peculiar statements in the last few days and weeks. When the matter of privy purse was being discussed and the All India Congress Committee, by a snap vote late in the night without a quorum, took a certain decision which was not at all regular or binding, Mr. Desai who had voted against it said : It is true that this represents a breach of faith on the part of the Government and those with whom they had entered into solemn contract and treaty but since the A. I. C. C. has taken this decision, I am bound by it and shall carry it out. Now to him perhaps this appeared obvious but to me it appeared like a **non sequitor** because when your party asks you to commit a breach of faith, then you do not have to remain in office and carry out that breach of faith. You always have the option to resign.

Professor Tawney, the well known statistician and economist, was offered a peerage many years ago by Ramsey Macdonald, whom he did not look upon with favour, as Labour Prime Minister, Professor Tawney wrote a letter to Mr. Macdonald declining the honour very politely and ended his letter with a sentence which I often remember : 'Your party has a right to ask anything of you except one thing—to dishonour yourself.' Now why was it that this thought did not occur to our Deputy Prime Minister ? Two or three days ago when he was meeting some defectors from Madhya Pradesh, he gave expression to the same thought. He

said the party must come first. But should the party come first ? That is a question that might well be considered. Or should the country come first, should principles come first ?

I certainly would say that my party does not come first to me. If my party asked me to do something wrong, they would have to look for someone else to do that job because I believe that the right of the individual and his obligation to his own conscience, to what is good for the country, must take priority over the dictates of the party from time to time.

Therefore I do not find very much hope in any particular Congress politician. It seems to me that the decay and the disintegration in the Congress Party has gone so far that, without a change of Government, there is not very much hope for an improvement of the country's condition.

We have two Opposition Parties, the two Socialist Parties, Mr. Madhu Limaye said the other day that in his view, these were the only pure Opposition and that the rest were only partially in Opposition. I was pondering that thought when I found that his leader, or was it himself and the leader of the P.S.P., had rushed to sign a statement to the Prime Minister saying that, in case there were members of her Party who were not prepared to commit a breach of faith, in regard to the Privy purses, she could count on their support to carry out her policy. It appeared to me that this was hardly the policy of a pure Opposition to rush to the rescue of their opponents before even the invitation had been extended. On the contrary, one might well look upon both Socialist Parties as satellites of the Congress Party and that is because their policies are so close to

the policy of the Congress Party policies, let us say of democratic socialism as understood here or Stateism as we call it, that there is not much room for them to function in opposition, except on a purely personal plane. On the plane of policy, they find it very difficult to distinguish themselves from the policies of the ruling Party.

I think they are moving our way. I think that Dr. Lohia and the S.S.P. in particular are moving away from State Capitalism or Stateism to something a little different. Dr. Lohia now says that he is equi-distant from private capitalism and State capitalism. Coming from a Socialist, I welcome this statement because it seems that he has moved away half from his end and is now in some way between the two camps. I hope that this drift or this strain will persist and that more and more members of the P.S.P. and S.S.P. will come to realise that the Socialism Mr. Nehru has bequeathed to this country has nothing to contribute to the welfare of our people. The policies for which we liberal democrats stand, whether in the Swatantra Party or elsewhere, are likely to be much more rewarding.

United Front From Below

Then there is the Jan Sangh. As you probably recall, when the new Parliament met in March, we had invited them to form a bloc with us in Parliament, so that while the two parties might remain outside keeping their individual existence, in Parliament at least there might be a hundred people sitting together and providing an alternative Government to the country. We were very sorry when they turned down this offer. Our doors are still open and we hope that some time they will think again. But I was sorry to read only two or three

days ago that the General Secretary of the Jan Sangh repeated that there was no question of their coming nearer the Swatantra Party.

That, of course, is their right, but what bothers me is something rather disturbing that I notice these days and that is a Communist attempt to infiltrate into the ranks of the R.S.S. and the Jan Sangh. This is what the Communists call a "United Front from below". Ignore Mr. Balraj Madhok, ignore Mr. Vajpai, get at the boys lower down in the mohallas and the field, flatter them, play up to them, tell them they are progressive, their leaders are reactionary, and bring them closer to the Communist line. Now if you want any evidence for this disturbing thought which worries me, I refer you to a series of very interesting articles in *Link* magazine, you know what its colour is, of the 12th March, the 26th March, the 30th April and the 23rd July. These are very appreciative articles about the R.S.S. and even the Jan Sangh, except for Mr. Balraj Madhok who wants friendship with the Swatantra Party and therefore is a reactionary. But the R.S.S. leadership and the R.S.S. rank and file and particularly Mr. Nana Deshmukh, are praised for not being anti-communist. They are praised for becoming radical. In an article *Link* said: 'Experience is driving large sections of the Jan Sangh rank and file and middle leadership to the conclusion that the political future of their party lies neither in tying it to the apron strings of Swatantra nor in seeking a common language with the Congress, but in turning more and economic radicalism and in building friendly relations with the Left Parties'. The weekly then goes on to say: 'In all his talks and speeches Mr. Nana Deshmukh (he is one of the most powerful RSS Jan Sangh leaders)

has never uttered a word against the Communists and has shown a willingness to take a practical view of all economic problems'. In the Punjab, says *Link*, the shift in the emphasis of the Jan Sangh is even more marked: 'With regard to Communists, their attitude of absolute hostility has changed to one of cooperation on agreed points'. So the *Link* congratulates itself that its political party, the Communists, have had considerable success in this drive to eat up the Jan Sangh and R.S.S. I mention it because this is one more disturbing symptom of how these total forces, the disruptive forces, are gaining ground and functioning at various levels. The Jan Sangh journal, the *Organiser* of March 12, 1967, is appreciatively quoted as saying: "There is not much common between B.J.S. and C.P.I. But we are all children of Bharat Mata and we are all heirs to the spirit of the twentieth century. That sure is some base to try to build on."

And that brings me to the two Communist Parties. It seems to me that the Communists of both the parties today, are indulging in the practice of what they call the theory of increasing misery. The Communist parties traditionally believe that the more miserable, the more oppressed, the more starving a people, the more chance there is for them to capture power, because it is in misery alone that anyone could listen to their nonsense and their lies. Sane people, prosperous people, happy people, are not likely to fall for Communist propaganda and so they believe in accentuating conditions where their message would appear attractive. That is the theory of increasing misery and this it seems to me is what they are practising today in the policies they follow.

There is another theory of theirs that they are

following and that is of the United Front. The United Front is a Communist tactic for destroying their political opponents. Mr. Rakosi, the former Prime Minister of Hungary, who was a real butcher, once described this process very openly after he had succeeded in practising it in his own country of Hungary. He called it "Salami" tactics. First join with four parties to destroy the fifth, then get the other three to join you in destroying the fourth, then get the two remaining ones to join you in destroying the third. Then only two suckers will be left, get one on your side and destroy the second. Then you eat up the survivor and nobody is left but yourself. And he said that is how the Communists came to power in Hungary. It seems to me very much as if our Communist parties think that they should try this game. They have offered support to the Chief Ministers of Punjab, U.P., Bihar and Bengal.

Now when Communists offer support, it has a special meaning. Many years ago, when the Labour Party was in power, on the eve of coming to power in 1924 in England, the British Communist Party asked Moscow for guidance, should they support Mr. Henderson or shouldn't they? And the answer was "Yes, we shall support Mr. Henderson as the rope supports the hanged man".

It appears to me that my good friends Sardar Gurnam Singh, Chaudhri Charan Singh, Mr. Mahamaya Prasad and Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee are enjoying support of exactly that kind. Let us take West Bengal as an example, and consider what is happening there.

Common Border

Unfortunately we have now a common border with Communist China, we didn't have it while Tibet was

there, but Mr. Nehru made a present of Tibet to the Communists, and today we have a common border with Communist China—2,400 miles of a common border and particularly with Bengal and Assam. The Communists, particularly the Left Communists in Bengal, are resorting today to various techniques. One of them is the Gherao. Now if you want to see the classic example of the Gherao, you saw it in Peking when the Indian Embassy was gheraoed there. You surround a building with men and women inside it and you use loudspeakers all around to issue threats, to wage a war of nerves day and night till the victim's will to resist is softened and he succumbs and surrenders to your demands. The classic gherao was a Gherao of the Indian Embassy in Peking. And this is the technique that our Communist friends in Bengal are today practising on employers of Labour, on Government officials, on members of the Opposition Party, on Ministers and so on. You all read the horrible story of the Congress M.P. Mr. Ghosh and the way he was brutally assaulted and humiliated in public for daring to address a meeting criticising the present Bengal Government and the Left Communists. Now the gherao is not a trade union technique as it is said to be made out. The gherao is an instrument of coercion and violence, which is designed, among other things, to bring industrial production to a stop. Industrial production should be brought to a stop in Calcutta and the vital belt in Bihar and Bengal because that way the theory of increasing misery will get a chance to come into operation, people will starve, people will be unemployed, people will be out of jobs, and they will turn to the Communists and listen to their message.

The other expedient is an agrarian revolt and Naxalbari has become the symbol of that technique. 1

am very glad that the leaders of the two Socialist parties and the Congress Party are all agreed that there is nothing agrarian about the Naxalbari revolt, that this is not a land reform problem, but that this is sheer political exploitation of an economic situation. In fact the Peking press and the Peking Radio have made no secret of it. They have very proudly claimed that Naxalbari is the front of the Chinese Communist advance into India. This is the initial base from which the Chinese Communists propose to operate in our territory and, of course, it is intended as one of many bases they must be building up in Bengal, Assam and that part of the country.

Naxalbari

Today there is a lull, today it looks as if Naxalbari has been solved by the intervention of the police force which has been sent there. I think it would be a grave mistake to come to that conclusion, and I am very glad that Mr. Dandekar, who went to Calcutta and studied this matter a few days back, has in his report given a very clear and perceptive picture of what has really happened. As he points out, the Communists are lying low for the moment, they are lying low because their extremists went a little too fast and got out of step, and this has caused embarrassment to the Left Communist Ministers who are bamboozling Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee into believing that they are his loyal colleagues. They have been shown up and they are feeling very embarrassed and angry. The plan has gone out of action because the vanguard ran ahead too fast and so they have drawn in their horns for the moment and are lying low. But I think Mr. Dandekar is perfectly right in his forecast that before three months

are over, the crisis will recur with more violence and with a bigger threat, that the gheraos will start again in Calcutta city on the one side and the agrarian revolt will start on the other.

And this is where Vietnam comes in, because this is exactly how Vietnam started in 1956. In 1956, after the Geneva Convention, when North and South Vietnam were separated, the North under a Communist regime of Ho Chi Minh and the South under a democratic non-communist government of President Diem, a very great leader of his people. The Communists started in Vietnam exactly what they are doing in Naxalbari. They established small guerilla bases, inciting the local people, enrolling them on their side and preparing them for a Civil War and when they had done enough of it by about 1960, they came out in the open. That is where the Naxalbari rebels went wrong, they were too impatient. That is why the Left Communist Party is embarrassed today. Luckily they have shown their hand too quickly.

In Vietnam the same things happened and the Vietnamese Government and their American allies took it very lightly. They thought this was a local problem and they could deal with it, but like us, they had a common border. When people talk about Telangana, they do not know what they are talking about. Telangana was safe, Kerala was safe, because there was no common frontier. They could be isolated from the country's enemies. Malaysia was saved because the Malaysian guerillas could be destroyed without communist China or Ho Chi Minh being able to come to their rescue, because there was no common border. But Vietnam has a common frontier and we see what is

happening today and unfortunately for us we have a common frontier now. So we are like Vietnam. We are not like Indonesia or Malaysia, which had distance and water between them. The first thing to do in such a situation is to remove the Communists from the West Bengal Government and to ban at least the Left Communist Party throughout the country.

Now what are the essential aspects of the Vietnam phenomenon. There are two aspects: One is the establishment of guerilla bases in one's territory, operated from across the frontier, instructed, directed and armed from across the frontier. That is the first fundamental aspect of Vietnam. The second is the absence of a broad-based democratic government which can rally the people in fighting this threat. These are the two evils from which South Vietnam is suffering today.

The Chinese Communists and their Fifth Column here are trying to create these conditions. They are creating the first condition of establishing guerilla bases in India. Today Naxalbari, may be tomorrow the 24 Parganas and other districts in other parts of Bengal, all adjoining the Pakistan/China border so that a common frontier is there through which arms, instructions and guerillas can be siphoned. That is why the question arises: Are we going to allow this to happen? Are we going to allow a development which, in two years, might produce a condition where there are two India's, a democratic India and a Communist India, as in Vietnam today? Or are we determined that this shall not happen to our country, that we shall not become the scene of another bloody Civil War of the kind that the poor people of Vietnam are having to endure today.

I saw an interesting article in a leading paper

called 'The Brighter side of Naxalbari'. I read it with great interest because I wanted to be cheered up too, like all the rest of us. But after I read the article, it struck me that it was not a very profound analysis. The theory was that the Left Communist party was becoming a nice democratic party because of being given office in Bengal and that it was only these wild boys in Naxalbari that had gone out of hand. Mr. Jyoti Basu and Mr. Konar had become very civilised democrats and they would no doubt assert themselves in due course and this nonsense would end. I wish I could agree with this but, unfortunately, I happen to be a historian of the Communist Party of India and I would commend to that writer a little reading of history, particularly my *History of the Indian Communist Party*. So I turned to my library and got out my old book to find out where Naxalbari had been anticipated in Communist Documents. I found that in 1951, a small group of communists had gone to Moscow, led, not accidentally, by Mr. Sunderayya, the extreme leader of the Left Communist Party.

The Tactical Line

They had come back with a document supplied by Moscow called 'The Tactical Line', the tactical line for the Indian Communist Party. That document, which was a secret document, was then reproduced in edited form to take in the gullible and passed at an All India conference of the Communist Party of India in October, 1951. It was called "Not Peaceful but Revolutionary Path". The title is very clear. It dropped certain interesting passages from the Moscow document which were thought to be too hot for publication at that time, in case they fell into the hands of the non-communists.

But the document from Moscow is to be found in the Appendix to my book, the History of the Communist Party. I would like to read to you a few sentences from the document and you will immediately recognise the parentage of Naxalbari. This is not the doing of Mr. Sanyal and other people on the spot, this is something that Moscow and Peking planned over the last decade and more. This is what Moscow dictated to its Party, the Communist Party, 16 years ago :

"India is a vast country with a backward and basically colonial economy and 80% of its people depend on agriculture. In such a country partisan warfare as the experience of China has shown, is one of the most powerful weapons in the armoury of the revolutionary movement and the weapon will have to be wielded by the Communist Party in their fight for internal liberation".

Then at another place, it goes on : "Partisan areas will inevitably arise in various parts of the country as the crisis deepens and as the mass peasant movement rises to the revolutionary seizure of land and food grains, paralysing and wiping off local forces of the enemy with hundreds of streams of partisan struggles merging with general strikes and the uprising of the workers in the cities (that is Calcutta) the enemy will find it impossible to concentrate his forces anywhere and defeat the revolutionary forces but will himself face defeat and annihilation. Even inside the armed forces of the Government the crisis will grow and big sections will join the forces of revolution".

Here is the programme which the Communist Party has been carrying out quietly and thoroughly over the last 16 years and Naxalbari is only the

first open symptom of the fruits of their efforts. The inspiration came, in this case, not from Peking, because there was no centre at that time functioning there, but Moscow, which was then the spearhead of the World Revolution.

It is not therefore alarmist, as some of you might think, or premature, to ask the question: "Must India go the Vietnam Way?" My answer is "No". There is no earthly reason why India should go the Vietnam way. We have been warned, we can see Vietnam already although our Government has tried to make us see it in a different and wrong light. Vietnam is a fight between a country fighting for its survival against Chinese Communist expansionism, through the satellite North Vietnamese Regime. So far our Government has stopped the Indian people from sympathising with this fight. Are we to go through the same horrible experience for us to realise how wrong we have been on Vietnam? I hope not. I, for one, believe in the intelligence of our people. I believe that those who think about this will come to the conclusion that we shall not allow a Vietnam to come to our country, that India will remain one, that there won't be two Indias, that there will only be one India, and that is a democratic India under our present Constitution.

But in order to do that, we shall have to consider the steps that are to be taken from now on. Before I come to those steps and the concluding part of my talk, may I very briefly say why I do not think it would be right or wise to distinguish between the two Communist parties, as some members of our Government and others are apt to do? It is true that today the foreign policy line of Moscow is not as hostile as that of Peking. It is

also true that internal changes in the Soviet Union are perhaps making it a more mellow Communist state. All the same, I do not think that a Fifth Column organised from one foreign capital is to be preferred to another.

If you read a recent preview of the fourth General Elections published by the Right Communist Party, you will find, interesting enough, echoes of the Tactical Line from which I read to you just now. There are phrases which are lifted from the fundamental document on which the Indian Communist Party has worked for the last 16 years.

Radio, Peace and Progress has made the Soviet attitude to India very clear. The Soviet attitude to India as explained by *Radio, Peace and Progress* and *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, is that there is a civil war going on inside India. There are progressive revolutionaries on one side, reactionaries on the other. The progressives of course are the two Communist Parties and their friends. The reactionaries are the Jan Sangh, the Swatantra Party, the P. S. P. and the Congress Party. But not the whole Congress Party. Congressmen are divided into Sheep and Goats, some are progressive and some are reactionary. According to *Radio, Peace and Progress* which broadcasts from the city of peace, Tashkent, I am quoting now from one of their broadcasts:

"Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. S. K. Patil act as if they are not Indians, as if they are not born of Indian mothers."

Since the Soviet Embassy is believed to have told our Government that *Radio, Peace and Progress* is a private enterprise within the Soviet Union and they do

not take responsibility for these broadcasts, it may interest us to know what *Pravda* and *Izvestia* had to say. *Pravda*, as you know, is the paper of the Communist Party and *Izvestia* is the paper of the Soviet Government. They have described Mr. S. K. Patil "unashamed lackey of American Imperialism" and Mr. Moraji Desai as a "puppet of Indian monopolies." So *Radio, Peace and Progress* was not such private enterprise after all. But *Radio, Peace and Progress* found progressives to back within the Congress during the elections. They campaigned for the election of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and of Mr. Kamaraj Nadar, where they failed, and of Mr. Krishna Menon. It is amusing that on the 7th of January when they were campaigning for Mr. Krishna Menon, they thought he was such an eminent person that they compared him to Mahatma Gandhi. So if anyone thinks that the Soviet Dictatorship is a benevolent friend which wishes well to our Democratic Government, or even to the Congress Party, they must think again.

Moscow's Hand in India

And then there is a book which had recently been published in India which I would like to recommend to you—*Moscow's Hand in India* by Peter Sagar, a Swiss Scholar. It has been published by Lalwanis in India, the price is ten rupees. I would advise you to get this book quickly, those of you who are really interested, for two reasons: It reads like a James Bond thriller because it deals with Soviet espionage and subversive activities in our country. But there is another reason why you should get it and that is because the Soviet Embassy is pressing our Foreign Ministry to ban this book, because it is damaging to the Soviet Embassy and its activities

Why do they want the book banned? Because it says that they spend so many million roubles in our country every year, because it shows that the largest owner of newspapers in India is their fifth column, the Right Communist Party. They are the biggest press monopolists in India, they own 18 dailies, 20 weeklies, 12 fortnightly and one quarterly and the money comes, we know from where, if you read this book.

Now the final reason why they want it banned is because the Soviet Embassy was caught red-handed violating its diplomatic privileges in Delhi. During the fighting with Pakistan, for some technical complications, which we do not know, the typewriters in the Soviet Embassy were used by a publicity agency called the *New Age News Agency* for stencilling the Communist material in the Soviet Embassy and then releasing it through the *New Age News Agency*. In other words the Soviet Embassy was the place where material hostile to others who are friendly to India was duplicated, stencilled and then carried to *New Age News Agency* who duplicated it and then put it out as Communist Party propaganda. Mr. Sagar has done a wonderful job. He has a series of photostats which show that the material put out by the Communist agency was actually typed and stencilled on the typewriters in the Soviet Embassy because material put out by the Soviet Embassy has the same "finger prints" as the material put out by the Indian Communists. This was sent to the Zurich Police Bureau for investigation by Mr. Sagar who lives in Berne and there is a report in this book by the Police Bureau to certify that the Communist propaganda and the Soviet Embassy output were typed on the same typewriters. Now this is a violation of the "third country" rule

according to which foreign diplomats are not allowed on a country's territory to carry on hostile propaganda against other countries friendly to this country and they violated that rule in many instances.

This question was raised in the Rajya Sabha by some well-intentioned member who thought he would do a public service. Mr. Chagla was replying to the question and he gave a very peculiar reply. He said he asked the Soviet Embassy if it was true and they denied it, so they have dropped the matter. It is as if I was putting my hand into Mr. Gautam Khanna's pocket and he gets hold of my hand and calls a policeman and says: "Look he is picking my pocket". The policeman asks: "Mr. Masani, are you picking his pocket?" and I say: "Of course not". The policeman says: "You can go".

So, after this, you will see that there is not very much to choose between the Right Communists and the Left Communists or between Moscow and Peking, when it comes to subverting our own democratic government. Now what do we do in this situation. How do we stop India going the Vietnamese way?

Democrat's Dilemma

I find that we are in a dilemma. I call it the "Democrat's Dilemma." On the one hand, we have the Congress Government in office, such as it is. Its economic and other policies are disastrous and take the country nearer collapse, economic collapse, political collapse, play into the hands of the Communist theory of increasing misery. Therefore it is quite clear to me that we must remove this Congress Government from office the very first day possible, that we cannot tolerate the

continuance in office of the present Congress Government in Delhi, because they are playing the Communist game of creating increasing hunger, rising prices, discontent and misery. If on the other hand you throw them out today, you could only replace them with a non-Congress Government of the kind that has been tried out in Punjab, U.P., Bihar and Bengal, and I think I have said enough earlier to suggest that those Governments are not anything to which one can look with much hope. Whenever the Communists are in them, they become a spawning ground for subversion, for administrative jobs and key sensitive points to be filled by Communist agents. We simply cannot afford this at the present. A State is less dangerous because there is always the President and the Indian Army but if we do it at the Centre, we will never be able to get out of their clutches, as the history of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland and other countries has shown. So we simply cannot have a coalition of all parties, including the Communists, at the Centre. Except for Orissa and Madras, these Governments are not a shining success even otherwise. Most of them have not been able to carry out the promises that they have made and many of them will be going down because the people will turn against them and get disillusioned.

There are some who say that, because this is a non-Congress Government, we should keep quiet, we should adopt a double standard of morality, we should go on condemning Congress Governments when wrong things happen but keep our mouths shut in a guilty silence because some non-Congress Government is doing it. This must stop. I for one am not prepared to be gagged even if I am in Opposition today. What is this animal called 'non-Congress'? What kind of animal

is this? Are we to be described by a negative? Just because I am not a Congressman, am I to keep company with thugs and murderers? What have we of the Swatantra Party, who are democrats, got in common with these Fifth Column traitors who follow Mao Tse Tung and are trying to destroy our country? We have nothing in common with them., Yet I have been told: 'You are part of non-Congress.' I refuse to belong to this kind of conglomeration which has nothing in common. And that is why I say it is time that this non-Congress nonsense must stop. Let us call things by their proper names. Let us not connive at wrong doing because a non-Congress government or a non-Congress Party does them.

What then are we to do? We can't have a Congress Government to any purpose and we can't have a non-Congress Government which will be any better. This is what I call the Democrat's Dilemma. If you ask me if there is an answer to it, I think there is. And my answer is very clear, and that is the answer of the Swatantra Party, and that is that we want to get rid of this Government and we want to replace it with a better Government, not a worse one, and that better Government I would describe using Western jargon as a Government of Democratic Unity.

Government of Democratic Unity

Now what does a Government of Democratic Unity mean? It means a union of all democratic parties that leaves out the two Communist parties but leaves the door wide open to all others. It means that there is room in such a Government for the P.S.P., the S.S.P., Jan Sangh, Swatantra Party, D.M.K. and also for Congressmen who would like to turn their backs on the

discredited economic and international policies of the past twenty years, who are prepared to admit that the path that Jawaharlal Nehru has shown to India has proved to be a disastrously wrong path and that India must turn in a different direction, the path of Liberal Democracy in place of the path of Marxist State Socialists. Now Congressmen can join that with others in forming such a Government, which can be formed on a pragmatic programme of honest and clean administration devoid of dogma. I can see no reason why Congressmen, Swatantra, Jan Sangh and Socialists should not work together to save the country. They will have two things in common, one is Nationalism, Patriotism, a desire to protect the country from external peril and the other is their common faith in Democracy in the Constitution which we have given ourselves. I think these two things, Nationalism and Democracy, should be a broad enough platform for the coming into existence of a Government of that nature.

When I say that, my sceptical friends say, but where are the Congressmen? I think it is a valid question. They are difficult to find. They are not difficult to find in the lobbies but they are extremely difficult to find on the floor of parliament. In a way our Congressmen are backward children in the educational process to which all of us are being subjected, but I am not prepared to write them off as some of my colleagues would do. I believe that there is intelligence and patriotism in the Congress Party, as in others, which will come to the top some day, that some day they will put country before party and that even my good friend Mr. Morarji Desai might live to see the day when he might say that the country comes first. I am not prepared to say that will never happen and therefore

my alternative, my solution to this Democrat's Dilemma, would be that we want a new Government in which all Democrats, Congress or non-congress, can come together - a National Government minus the communists minus the totalitarians. Now this may take time, but the process of education has to be quick, it has to be accelerated. We cannot afford the backward children holding back the class too long. Otherwise disaster might overtake us and there will be chaos and the destruction of democracy. When a vacuum takes place, it has to be filled. Nature abhors a vacuum.

People say that the Army does not want to take power, so don't worry about Military Dictatorship. I can see that the Army does not want to take power, the Army is made up of loyal and disciplined officers who would like to do their duty by the President and the Constitution, but loyal and disciplined armies have been known in Latin America, in Asia, in our own part of the world, to take power because there is no one else to hold power, because there is no one else to hold the country together, because chaos and disruption of the country is the only alternative and that is why they are sucked into power against their will, against their wishes. This happened in Pakistan, it happened in Burma, it happened recently in Ghana and it happened even more recently in Indonesia. These generals never wanted to make a dictatorship or to drive out the politicians, but, when the people lost faith, when there was cynicism, when there was disgust with Parliamentary talk, Parliamentary futility and the country was chaotic, rioting took place, the country was breaking up, the leaders of the Armed Forces felt it their patriotic duty to come and step in to hold the country together. I am not suspecting the motives of our Generals and our Colonels, but

I am suspecting the motives of our politicians. What I am doubting is whether they will develop the intelligence to move in time to prevent our Constitution being destroyed and a Military Dictatorship or some other dictatorship taking over.

It is a race between the intelligence and patriotism of our people on one side and the forces of chaos and disruption from within and outside on the other. If you ask me what my guess is, I am an optimist, I would say that the chances are even. It is an even question whether three or four years from now we will be functioning in the kind of parliamentary democracy we have known or whether we shall have gone under and meetings like this may no longer take place.