

HAFPOO GARDENS SPEECH - M.R. MASANI - OCTOBER 31, 1962.

Ladies and Gentlemen

In the next few days, on November 6th and 7th, the Parliamentary Board of the Swatantra Party will meet in Delhi to define the stand of the Party in regard to the grave developments which have been mentioned by the Chairman and by my friend, Mr. R.V. Murthy. I do not therefore wish to prejudge anything that the Swatantra Party as a Party may decide to be the correct policy for itself and for the country. Anything I say here today is purely personal point of view, of what I would like my Party to do and of what I would like my country to do.

This is a very difficult time for the world as a whole. At this very moment there are two crises acutely erupting - one on our own frontiers and one around Cuba. If a proper cure for a situation needs a good diagnosis, then it is very important that our Government and our people understand the relationship in what is happening in different parts of the world. At this point I will only make the remark, that what is happening in Cuba today, the situation in Berlin, the fight for the defence of Viet Namese freedom and the fight for the defence of Indian freedom are different sectors of the same world fight. There is only one war on - that is the international war between international Communism on the one side and the security and defence of the free countries of the world on the other. Anyone who thinks that the fight in NEPA is isolated from what is happening in Cuba or Viet Nam or Berlin has not begun to understand the significance of what is happening within our own country. In this context, perhaps it is just as

well that the position of the Soviet Government has been made clear. There are people in our country who have been misguided enough to hope that the Soviet Government was going to come to our aid against their Chinese allies. For such, it will be news that the Soviet official paper Pravda, which is the mouthpiece of the Soviet Government, has praised as constructive the Chinese proposals, made and rejected immediately by our Government and Prime Minister, as being worthy of praise for a settlement between the two countries. From the Soviet support of this attempt at dictating a humiliating surrender on this country we can judge of the impartiality and the good-will for us of the Soviet dictatorship.

The second thing that I would like to say is that this is a moment for national unity and solidarity and for discipline. We of the Swatantra Party have stood and continue to stand for freedom of enterprise of the people, for the people producing things to serve their needs, and for the Government doing its proper task of police or umpire activities. In this context, the need for discipline has to be stressed on the economic plane. In a democracy, discipline is not something enforced by law or by controls but discipline in something that the people of a country exercise on themselves. In so far as economic activities are concerned, I think that this is the time when our business and industrial class, our labor class and all sections of society will have to exercise voluntary discipline. Last July in Ahmedabad I made the suggestion that Indian business might do well to consider the appointment of a non-official Ombudsman on Scandinavian lines. Since the Government of India would not subject themselves to that scrutiny, let Indian businessmen subject themselves to a person appointed by themselves of high repute and integrity who would exercise a role of vigilance against anti-social activities

on the part of any business or industrial enterprise. If that was a good idea in peace time today, when the country needs to be given the confidence that its business class will play fair by the people, I would venture to suggest it might be a still better idea for our Party to consider the possibility of taking the initiative in inviting business and trade associations and other voluntary and social associations to set up a non-official vigilance machinery which will keep its eyes open, investigate and if necessary expose anti-social practices like blackmarketing, profiteering, hoarding and otherwise exploiting the present shortages and the situations that arise. That is my view in the democratic way and not governmental controls that might otherwise have to be imposed.

I would now like to discuss with you in the abstract, quite apart from our position in India at the moment, is as to the kind of national unity and the kind of political life there should be in a democracy during a war. This is a major issue on which public opinion needs to be educated. There are two kinds of national unity during war-time: the national unity of a totalitarian dictatorship, such as Hitler and Stalin and Mao-tee Tung enforce on their miserable people, and the national unity of a democracy, of a free people fighting the war as free men. That is the kind of national unity we would like to see in our country under our democratic Constitution, and that is the kind of unity that is alone worth having.

There is no country in the world with a better tradition of unity in wartime than Britain. If you will recall what happened during the last World War, when Britain faced a challenge and a threat perhaps in a way even more grave than what our country faces today - the threat of utter annihilation by the Nazi dictatorship. You will remember that in 1939 the Conservative Party was in office and the Labour Party was in Opposition. What was the attitude adopted by the British Labour Party? The Labour Party, as a patriotic

opposition, supported the war effort against Hitler. They gave full support to the armed forces and to measures for the defence of the country, but they said they would have nothing to do with the Conservative Government or its policies as long as Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the guilty man who was responsible for Munich, for the appeasement of Hitler and thus for launching the World War on Britain and the world. So long as that man sat as Prime Minister in the House of Commons, the British Labour Party refused to go into any kind of coalition or alliance with the Conservative Government. This situation lasted for one year. It was only after a year, when the correctness of the Labour Party's demand that the war against Hitler could not be won by somebody who had appeased Hitler was accepted by the Conservative Party and Neville Chamberlain was removed from office and replaced by that great leader, Winston Churchill, that the Labour Party joined the Conservative Party in forming a National Coalition Government. That is how unity is achieved in a free country on the basis of policies and principles. What happened even after the coalition was formed? Opposition did not come to an end. The Government realised that in a free country opposition is a vital necessity for the success of the war effort and for victory over the enemy. And so, contrary to all normal procedure, Mr. Arthur Greenwood, a senior member of the Labour Party, whom I had the pleasure of knowing in my student days, was requested to function as the Leader of the Opposition and a large number of Labour MPs were allowed to sit in Opposition and to criticise the Government and the policies that they did not approve of right till the end of the war. This will show you how the idea that all opposition should cease during wartime, that everyone should blindly or unconditionally support the government of the day is not a democratic one.

Much more would this be so where a government does not even have the support of the majority of the electorate. The Conservative Government in 1939 had been returned to Parliament by a clear majority of the people. Today, in India, we do not have a government which enjoys the confidence of the majority of the electorate. Only as recently as February this year, the Indian electorate voted, and only 45% of the electorate voted for Mr. Nehru and the Congress Party. 55% voted against them. It is because the Opposition was so divided that the Congress Party enjoys a fictitious majority in the House of the People today. That is why, with a minority government in office, the parties that together represent the majority of the people have a higher responsibility than even the British Labour Party had in 1939. I have undertaken this discussion on how a free country fights a war in order to meet the confusion that prevails on this subject among many good people in our country.

Now when we come to our own situation in India. We find that today we are facing the consequence of ten years of misguided policies of centralism, and appeasement of Chinese Communist expansionism, the failure to join the U.N. forces in Korea, our refusal to take a stand on Indo-China and finally our cruel betrayal of the friendly and defenceless people of Tibet, these are the chickens that have today come to roost. This is how nature takes its retribution on those who do not act honourably by their neighbours. We left our neighbours in Tibet defenceless. We even told the Security Council of the United Nations not to listen to the Dalai Lama's call for help in 1950. For that today we are suffering with the lives of our own people and the danger of the ravaging of our own country.

It was not as if warnings were not given. I remember a debate in Parliament in 1951 in which many of us participated. I have in my hand a little pamphlet which contains six speeches which were made in the Provisional Parliament in November 1951. These were six speeches warning the Prime Minister that if we did not rush to the defence of Tibet, if he stood by and saw Tibet overrun by the Chinese Communist troops, our turn would come next. The members who gave the warning were members of different parties - Pandit Hridaynath Kunzru, Dr. Shyam Prasad Mukherjee, my colleague Prof. Ranga, Mr. Frank Anthony, Mr. P.Y. Deshpande and myself. We were brushed aside at that time as alarmists and we are told that the occupation of Tibet had nothing to do with India. This was all false alarmism. Today we see who were the alarmists and who were the escapists.

I am very glad that our Prime Minister has in the last few days appeared to have awakened from the dreamland in which he lived. On the 25th of this month, Prime Minister Nehru, I am reading from the newspaper report, said in Delhi, "The Chinese invasion has given the whole nation the greatest shock. This had made India realise that we were getting out of touch with reality in the modern world, and were living in an artificial atmosphere of our own making creation." Coming from someone who thought he was very modern and who has been accusing Rajaji and some of us of being two centuries out of date, this is refreshing frankness. I welcome the candour of this remark. India realised that we are getting out of touch with reality in the modern world. If this is the beginning of a more realistic, more patriotic, more national policy, it is easier for all of us to give the Prime Minister and the Government the support that we would like to give, provided they have made up their minds to fight this war to see it through to final victory, to eschew all

thought of negotiation, any kind of compromise with the Chinese Communists.

Now, how is one to get out of this dream world? What are the consequences of getting in touch with reality? There are many things which could be done. And the rest of my remarks will be directed to suggesting the concrete measures that need to be taken if we are to win this war, if we are to drive the Chinese aggressors out from our soil.

And here let me give you some very good news. It is not as good as it might have been, but still it is good news. I am told that this evening it has been broadcast from Delhi that Mr. V.K. Krishna Menon had ceased to be Defence Minister and that the Prime Minister has taken charge of the Defence portfolio (loud and prolonged applause). On the other hand, I am also sorry to disclose to you that the same report has it that Mr. Krishna Menon unfortunately continues in the Cabinet as Minister for Defence Production. What he can produce is beyond one's imagination. The only thing he has produced so far is mischief and disaster for this country. I think, however, this is the first step in the right direction and may all look forward to similar happy developments from now on. However, Mr. Krishna Menon's removal at this late stage after all the damage has been done, after the Himalayan passes have been lost, after our men have been subjected to brutal slaughter is not a cause for sufficient gratification or satisfaction. One obstacle to victory appears at last to have been removed. We must all be grateful for small mercies and rejoice in this event. But a great deal more needs to be done.

Now, what are the things that need to be done? First of all I would suggest that the Indian people be treated as grown up people, adults, not as children. I say this because there has been an attempt on the part of our Government in the last few days to hide

the facts from the Indian people. It is only this morning that at last some rough figures of casualties have been released for the first time. It is normal practice during a war for democratic governments to issue daily reports of the casualties of the day. I hope that that normal practice will be brought into play. Similarly war correspondents have been kept from going to the front. Our patriotic journalists who wanted to go to the front line to share the risk of the soldiers, to risk their lives, have been told to keep away. As you know, during the last World War, every front was covered by war correspondents including many correspondents from our own country. I remind you that Col. Unni Nayar, a very fine officer whom I had the pleasure of knowing, lost his life in Korea. Though our own army was not fighting there, our war correspondents were at the Korean front. So I say 'Treat the Indian people as grown up people. They have a great sense of responsibility, greater perhaps than that of the Government. They know how to face the facts even if they are grim. It is only an intelligent, aware people who know the facts that can put up the effort to win a war. You cannot keep people in the dark, treat them like children, and then expect from them the support of a full grown man.'

The second thing that needs to be done is to unite the heads of our soldiers which, under Mr. Krishna Menon's leadership, have been tied behind their backs. There are many ways in which this can be done. As we all know, our soldiers today at the front lack equipment, they lack woollen clothing, adequate rations.

We have not got automatic weapons, automatic rifles. We are being outclassed outflanked. The firepower on the other side is stronger. I read in today's Indian Express: "Sources in Washington said that India rejected an offer by a Western firm to set up a factory for the manufacture of automatic weapons. The reason given for the rejection of the offer, it was stated, was that those who were responsible

argued, firstly that 303. the present weapon which is proving inadequate, was adequate for the Indian Army and secondly that the automatic weapons of the type used by the NATO, acceptance of these weapons would go counter to the Indian policy of non-alignment." If these automatic weapons had been in our hands today, our soldiers would not have been driven back by the Chinese. They would not have been butchered as they are being butchered today. But because of that fatuous argument, this offer was rejected.

This is a disgrace that must be brought to an end immediately. The finest arms are not too good for our men. The best equipment that the world can supply, that can come from any part of the world must be placed in the hands of our men at the front. Now, this means that since we are a poor country, since we cannot afford to buy equipment at high prices, it is necessary for us to accept military assistance from friendly governments. As we know, friendly countries are offering us military aid. So long, we have been bickering, being cocky and saying, "Oh no, we won't accept any arms unless we can pay for them. This is an attitude that is difficult to understand. It is said that to accept military assistance will be inconsistent with the policy of non-alignment. If I may say so, this is complete nonsense. The policy of non-alignment has nothing to do with the acceptance of military assistance. I will remind you of at least three Governments that are non-aligned, as non-aligned as Mr. Nehru, who have been cheerfully accepting military assistance from various countries. Marshal Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, has for the last five or six years been accepting military assistance from the United States without paying for it and has remained non-aligned to this very day. President Nasser has done the same, President Soekarno is doing the same. If they can accept military assistance, surely our Government, without even giving up its policy of non-alignment, can accept military assistance.

The second thing that needs to be done is to make it possible for the bulk of the Indian Army to be thrown against the Chinese invaders. Today, because a great part of our armed forces are grouped around Kashmir for the defence of Kashmir against Pakistan, it is not possible for us to fight with all our force against the Chinese invaders. Only four days ago, President Ayub told the British Parliamentary delegation that 80 per cent of the Indian Armed Forces were deployed in or around Kashmir. Now I do not know whether these figures are correct. Let us assume that only sixty per cent of the Indian Army is deployed around Kashmir. It is impossible that we should allow sixty per cent of our troops to be tied down when they are required to defend the whole Himalayan region from Ladakh right up to Burma against the Chinese invaders. What should be done? What should be done is to have an understanding with the Government of Pakistan that, while our emergency lasts, Pakistan will not injure India in any way, will not move against Kashmir and that we can safely withdraw our forces from that region and throw them against the Chinese. Now, you will remember that two years ago, President Ayub offered to our Government to enter into talks for the common defence of the sub-Continent. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister rejected that offer out of hand, without even going into it. At that time, Rajaji and the Swatantra Party publicly said that this was a mistake, that President Ayub's offer should have been examined and talks should have taken place on the issues of common defence of the sub-continent. If that had been done, today sixty or seventy per cent of our troops would not today be frozen on the Kashmir border. However, better late than never. Let us even now move in the matter. I am still hopeful that, if a proper approach is made, perhaps President Ayub in an act of far-sighted statesmanship could be persuaded to make a declaration that, so long as the

emergency is on, Pakistan will not take advantage of our troubles and that we can safely withdraw our armies on the Kashmir border and point them against the enemy in Ladakh and in NEFA. Another thing that has to be done is to learn to distinguish our friends from our enemies. So far we have shown a surprising kind of colour blindness. We have not been able to tell grey from black, white from red. We thought that the non-aligned countries were our friends. We thought that Khrushchev's Russia was our friend, and that America and Britain, and Germany and Japan, these were the aligned countries, this was the Western bloc who did not appreciate the beauties of the policy of non-alignment. Now, I ask you to look round the world and to say who are our friends, today in the hour of our need, and who have proved to be false friends? Which are the countries that have offered to come to our help? Which today are the Governments that have offered to send us military arms, without expecting a rupee in payment. Which are the countries which have said India is right and China is wrong? Unfortunately, they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. I will try to count them and you supplement the list if I forget somebody. The United States of America, Britain, West Germany, Malaya, Canada and Australia, six, New Zealand seven, France eight, Cyprus nine. Not Egypt. Oh No. Not Egypt. Ireland too. Gentlemen, I ask you to consider what is the character of these countries? How many of these are "non-aligned". Not one. All of them are members of NATO or SEATO or one of those hated pacts against which our Prime Minister and Mr. Krishna Menon have been railing for ten years. What has happened to our non-aligned friends, the Afro-Asian bloc? Except for Yunku Abdul Rahman, except for this one brave Asian and today, President Bourguiba of Tunisia, another so-called stooge of the West, Ethiopia, another pro-Western country, everyone of the non-aligned countries is sitting on the fence today. They are non-aligned against us. Our policy of non-alignment is today being thrown in our face by President

Nasser, President Soekarno and Marshal Tito. We thought them to be non-aligned. How do we like that medicine now that it is administered to us ?

There is a classical Hindu doctrine which you read in Jaiswal's HINDU POLITY and other old books of those times. When a Hindu Raja was involved in diplomacy, his principle was: 'My enemy's enemy is my friend'. There was another principle: When Kingdom A was fighting kingdom B then kingdom A made an alliance with kingdom C, on the other side of kingdom B. Why ? Because kingdom B, caught between two fires, it had to fight what we call a 'two front' war. This is classical Hindu diplomacy. What would a good Indian Government do today ? A good Indian Government would look around and say: How can we force a two front war on our enemy ? An ally is not lacking. The ally exists, but we have treated that ally so badly, we have treated him so shamefully in the last ten years that some atonement is required<sup>on</sup> our part to that ally. That potential ally is the Nationalist Government of China driven off the mainland of China by the Soviet-backed Communist Army, just as our troops today are being driven out of NEPA by the Chinese Communist Army. During the last World War, of the four great war leaders, there was only one who stood up publicly and supported India's immediate demand for Independence, during the war. It was not Winston Churchill who was fighting us. He sent us to prison for the Quit India campaign. It was not Stalin who could not care less about us, and whose agents here were preaching the "People's War" against the independence of India. It was not even President Roosevelt. All he did was to tell privately to Churchill that after the War India must be independent. There was only one great war leader of the Big Four who publicly remonstrated with his allies in Britain that India must be given freedom now so that India should fight with us on the

same side. That was Marshal Chiang Kai Shek, a great friend of Pandit Nehru. Unfortunately, when Mao tse Tung's army, armed by the Soviets as the present Chinese Army is armed by the Soviets, pressed Chiang Kai Shek back, our Government rushed forward to turn back General Chiang Kai Shek and the Chinese people and to throw their arms round these Communist bandits. We betrayed our Chinese nationalist friends. Today they are our potential allies. If we had any sense, we would break off diplomatic relations with Communist China and ask General Chiang Kai Shek to become our friend again, to launch an attack on the mainland from the other side, so that the Chinese people may be liberated from their horrible, cruel dictatorship that has driven them to starvation. Instead of that, what do we do? We went to the U.S. yesterday and we voted for a resolution to remove the Nationalist Government of China from the Security Council and to put these Chinese bandits in their place, so that there may be two vetoes against us - the Soviet veto and now a Chinese Communist veto! If this was a patient, one would say that the patient was suffering from suicidal mania, wanting to kill himself by helping his enemies and hurting his friends.

I talked about the need for friendship with Pakistan. Why do I say that it is important for India and Pakistan, equally important for both, that they should make friends immediately? Our armies are defending Ladakh on this side. If the Chinese forces break through Ladakh, they may attack us today but tomorrow they may attack that part of Kashmir which is occupied by Pakistan itself. The Chinese armies are coming down over <sup>here in</sup> NEFA. You see the tiny narrow strip of territory the Chinese are trying to break in at that point, south of Tawang and Tezpur. Supposing for one moment our forces were unable to stop that particular drive, they can cut across that narrow strip and isolate Assam from the rest of India. We cannot send troops

and supplies to the forces and our people in Assam, except through East Pakistan. And what happens if we lose Assam? What price East Pakistan, infiltrated by the Communists of East Pakistan? Obviously, Pakistan would lose East Pakistan as we would lose Assam.

I am saying this to show that we are today, whether we know it or not and whether General Ayub knows it or not, defending not only our own borders, we are defending the borders of Pakistan also. We should also know that we cannot do this singlehandedly. Just as we are defending the Pakistan borders, we have an obligation to ask the Pakistani people to help us in defending the borders of both countries. After all it was only two years ago that General Ayub had offered to secure the common defence of the Sub-Continent. It is upto us now after having rejected that, to go to General Ayub and say, "All right, we now accept your idea, let's talk, let's find out whether even today, in this crisis, you and we cannot defend the joint frontiers together. Or, at least, if you won't do that, tell us, assure us, that if we pull our troops away from your front, you will not take advantage of it. After the emergency is over, you can press your claim on Kashmir in the Security Council or anywhere you like. But, for the emergency, promise us that you will leave both our hands free. This is what statesmanship would demand of our Prime Minister on the one side and of General Ayub on the other. I would like to think that even today this statesmanship is not beyond either of them and that, even now, now that mischievous element has been removed, who was constantly attacking Pakistan and has been creating bad blood between us and our Pakistani friends, this may not become impossible in the coming days and weeks.

Finally, a word about the situation at home. During the last World War when Hitler was overrunning one country of Eastern Europe after another, and of Western Europe also, there was a resistance movement in each of these countries. And in that resistance movement in France, in Holland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Poland, in Rumania, in Bulgaria, there were Conservatives, there were Liberals

there were Social Democrats and there were Communists. When the Nazi armies were thrown out by the allied war effort, the Communists who infiltrated into these resistance movements, into these united fronts against Hitler, utilised in each case their position in the resistance movement with the help of the Soviet Army to grab power for themselves and physically to destroy the Conservatives, Liberals and Socialists, with whom they had allied under the pretence of being fighters against Nazi tyranny. We have seen in the last week an attempt by treacherous elements and treacherous journals in our city and elsewhere to try and get on the war bandwagon, to try and pretend that they too are against Communist China. I am very glad that the Chief Minister of Bombay was persuaded to see through this mischievous move of infiltrating this patriotic front by the Fifth Columnists and refused to put them on the Citizens Committee or invite them to that big rally the day before yesterday. In West Bengal, in Kerala, in Gujarat and in Maharashtra, and who knows in so many other States, the Government of the State have told the Communists: "You keep out, you keep your so-called patriotism to yourself, we will not let you infiltrate into the national war effort." While today they may be pretending to support the war effort, take it from me that if we are unwise enough to let them infiltrate, at a certain moment when it suits the enemy, this fifth column will utilise the opportunity to stab us in the back. Therefore, the last constructive suggestion I make is, Isolate the Communist Fifth Column, keep them at arm's length and indeed if our Prime Minister can be so persuaded, ban the Communist Party and outlaw it from political life.

These are policies on the basis of which real solid national unity of a dynamic kind is possible. We donot want a policy of unity that will lose us the war. That will do India no good. We want unity that will win India the war and our slogan is Total Victory. Our slogan for the Chinese today is the same slogan that some of us gave in 1942 and that slogan is, "Quit India".