

223

Swatantra Answer
to
Chinese Communist
Challenge



C. Rajagopalachari

N. G. Ranga

K. M. Munshi

M. R. Masani

H. P. Mody

N. Dandekar

Introduction

This booklet is an attempt to present the Swatantra Party's point of view in regard to the Offensive launched against India by Communist China. As the title indicates, various spokesmen of the Party suggest how this challenge should be met.

While the contributions themselves are based on public speeches and articles by leading members of the Party, the "Statement on the Current Emergency" and the three Resolutions on different aspects of the defence effort are official documents of the Party.

Events have been moving with such rapidity that, even while this booklet was under print, it was found necessary to add a postscript in regard to the unilateral cease-fire declaration by Communist China consisting of a joint statement signed by some Opposition Leaders in Parliament including Prof. N. G. Ranga and articles by Rajaji and Mr. M. R. Masani.

Price. 30 nP.

Statement on the Current Emergency

(The following is the text of a statement on the current emergency unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Parliamentary Board of the Party in New Delhi on November 6, 1962.)

1. The Parliamentary Board of the Swatantra Party has taken stock of the developments of the past few weeks and of the situation which the Indian people face as a result of the intensified offensive launched by China. This dangerous threat to the territorial integrity of the country and indeed to its independence has to be met. In this task, every patriotic Indian is ready to make any necessary sacrifice and give of his best, as has been demonstrated by spontaneous upsurge for the defence of the country.

2. The Swatantra Party is convinced that the initiative should not be left to the enemy. A defence strategy should now be adopted which will help to snatch and retain the initiative in our own hands. There is no half-way house in this conflict. Victory in this struggle has to be achieved by the adoption of sound military, political and international policies pursued with determination and singleness of purpose.

3. A Defence Council of senior serving and retired Generals should be constituted to assist the Defence Ministry.

4. Our men at the front have fought with unrivalled heroism. They should be armed with the best weapons and equipment and supported by aircraft procured from friendly countries throughout the world. The insistence on maintaining the appearance of non-alignment when receiving this vital aid is altogether unrealistic and would cripple the defence effort, besides ruining the economy. Great countries like Britain and West Germany have accepted military aid without surrendering their sovereignty or independence of action.

5. Anti-aircraft defences should be set up at all vulnerable points and civil defence measures organized in adequate measure.

6. The Third Five-Year Plan should give way to a Victory Plan geared to the immediate purpose. A Ministry of Supply should be constituted for the period of the emergency with over-riding powers of direction over the Ministries of Industry and Commerce, Steel and Heavy Industries, Railways, Communications, Oil, Fuel and Gas, and the Department of Defence Production in the Defence Ministry.

7. When our country is attacked by a Communist power, the concept of non-alignment has little meaning, as the Swatantra Party has been pointing out since the beginning of 1960. If the Prime Minister's admission of a new awareness of realities is to have any meaning, our entire foreign policy has to be revised and brought into close relation with the requirements of the present critical situation.

8. Urgent efforts should be made to establish friendlier relations with Pakistan. President Ayub's offer of co-operation in the formation of a common defence of this sub-continent made two years ago, should be taken up and worked out. All disputes between India and Pakistan should be frozen by agreement for the duration of the emergency, so as to enable the release of substantial Indian armed forces for repelling the Chinese attack.

9. Completely friendly relations should be re-established with Nepal.

10. The Swatantra Party records its grateful appreciation of the spontaneous, prompt and generous manner in which the U.S.A., Britain, Canada and other countries have come to India's assistance by way of military equipment and otherwise.

11. The declaration of a state of emergency should not be made into a charter for winding up parliamentary government. The Opposition should carry out its responsibility of free and frank criticism whenever it is necessary. There has been a commendable shift in the attitude and policies of Government. The Prime Minister's admissions in particular have given rise to consider-

able hope of change. On the other hand, there are disturbing signs that some old illusions still persist and that the dead hand of these illusions and out-moded policies still lies heavily on the present Government. The Press and the statesmen of the country should not hesitate to speak and write as they feel and advise the Government and guide the people from time to time for furtherance of the country's defence.

12. The Defence of India Ordinance, Bill and Regulations should be closely scrutinised and their administration watched so as to ensure that these do not involve a greater curtailment of fundamental rights, democratic processes and the Rule of Law than is strictly necessary in furtherance of the defence effort.

13. Consistent with the needs of security, the fullest information should be made available to the public, and the Press should be given facilities for accrediting correspondents at the front.

14. Steps should be taken for bringing the Chinese aggression before the U.N. for securing the assistance of the world organization and of world opinion in our defence.

BANNING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Parliamentary Board of the Swatantra Party is of the opinion that, despite the hypocritical resolution of its National Council, the Communist Party of India must by its nature function as a Fifth Column of communist imperialism in this country. It is therefore necessary that the Party should be banned under the Defence of India Ordinance and Regulations.

—Resolution adopted by the Parliamentary Board of the Party at its meeting in New Delhi on November 6 & 7 1962

C. Rajagopalachari

(The following comments by Rajaji on the Chinese Offensive are from an exclusive interview the "Hindustan Times" had with him on November 8, 1962).

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari said that Mr. Krishna Menon's exit was a triumph for democracy but the battle with China was not over with that. "The nation would do well to remember this."

"The Prime Minister thinks Mr. Menon is worth his weight in gold, but sometimes in critical times like these, gold has to be buried in the earth," he said.

The elder statesman was glad that two of our best ex-Generals had been called in, but suggested that a "dynamic personality" should be put in charge of the Defence Department at once.

There was a general feeling in the country that the Prime Minister had "too much weight on his shoulders. This is not mere commiseration for the PM's plight; it is something that should be taken into account in framing the future policy and reorganizing the administration to meet the situation," he said.

Rajaji touched briefly on all the vital issues facing the country, from Pakistan to the Communist Party and the attitudes of the two world blocs to India in its hour of trial.

The two former Generals Thimayya and Thorat, he commented, would be more useful in the intimate consultation that will have to take place in connection with our strategy at the front than in the general consultations in the "so-called" Defence Council.

(Certain questions that were then put to Rajaji by the "Hindustan Times" Correspondent elicited the following replies)

Q: What specific duties would you like these two Generals to perform?

A: We will have to plan, in consultation with them, the wresting of the initiative from the Chinese and we must attack their military bases behind the front. Of course we must have a lot of things to do this."

Q: Who would you suggest for the job of Defence Minister?

A: A political figure who has dynamism in him and also the talent for quick decision. There should also be a Minister of Cabinet rank to take overall charge of supplies, military as well as civil, production as well as procurement.

"I have no doubt that the Prime Minister can find these two personalities out of his present Cabinet without disturbing the Finance Minister's all important function," he added.

Russian Attitude

Q: Do you believe that Russia is a restraining influence on China in the present situation on our borders?

A: It may appear that China is softening. Russia too may now appear to be more inclined to intervene than hitherto. This, however, is entirely due to the promptness of America and Britain to help India in its hour of need. The Communist countries do not relish the way in which the nation as well as the Government have given up non-alignment in effect and have turned to the West as "friends in need" and friends who will be able and willing to help.

It was very likely that Russia and China might wish to stop this process of change in Indian policy. "We should, however, not be misled to put our trust once again in the Communist Governments," he added.

Mr. Rajagopalachari was of the view that India must continue to welcome Western aid and develop "active friendship" between them and India.

Q: Do you think that non-alignment is tenable in the present crisis facing the country?

A: Our alignment with the West must be strengthened not only for the present crisis but for our future advantage. We must stop distrusting the West or being afraid of it.

"Even if somehow we reach a solution for our present troubles with China, we must learn from what has happened and beware of China," Rajaji warned.

Relations with Pakistan

Q: In view of Pakistan's present mood India may be forced to fight on two fronts. What could be done to keep Pakistan out of the way?

A: We must stir up our imagination and our good sense to

create a joint front with Pakistan. We must devise measures to freeze our dispute with her if not solve them. This is for our immediate as well as ultimate advantage.

In this connection he suggested that the Government should choose a "high grade" special ambassador to be sent there to work up this new friendship.

Q: Have you anyone in particular in mind?

A: There are people in India who can do this job, persons who are persona grata with Pakistan and are also respected in our own country.

"What I have said in this connection may not be palatable to some, but we cannot fight on two fronts and we must remember that the destinies of Pakistan and India are identical in the long run. Neither of us wants to be dominated by the Communists," he said.

The Indian Communists

Q: Would you advise the country to trust its Communists after their National Council resolution denouncing the Chinese?

A: The Communist Party is like the curate's egg: it cannot be good if it is good only in parts. It is no use dealing with the CPI on the basis of difference of opinion among them. We must deal with them as a whole.

"I note," he confirmed, "that action has begun to be taken against some Communists. During this crisis, we should take note of the Party's difficulties as a whole and relieve them of their embarrassment," he said. "Their activities should be put in cold storage as India could not now afford to take risks." Rajaji added.

"We should not offer a temptation to the Chinese by keeping the Communist Party going in India," he concluded.

(On his return to Madras Rajaji addressed a public meeting on November 15, where he again referred to the Chinese Offensive).

Rajaji declared that India should now strongly, firmly and openly align itself with the Western bloc.

The policy of non-alignment would be effective only during the period of a cold war; but when there was a shooting war, this policy would inevitably help the enemy, he added.

Commending Mr. Nehru's reply to the debate on the Chinese invasion in the Lok Sabha, Rajaji said that Mr. Nehru had

spoken with great dignity and poise. Particularly so, when he referred to Gandhiji's message and expressed his hatred for that aspect of a cold or hot war which led to the dislike of a whole people and looking upon them as something below normal.

He, however, felt that Mr. Nehru should have been a little more generous in conveying the nation's gratitude to the United States and the United Kingdom for their arms aid and should not have "adulterated" that gratitude with the remark that aiding India at this moment of crisis was also in the interest of those nations.

Arms Supply

While India needed arms imperatively, Mr. Rajagopalachari warned against obtaining them from sources "we cannot trust." He cited in this context the reverses suffered by Russia in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904 when they found they had been supplied with defective weapons.

Safeguarding Democracy

Mr. Rajagopalachari said that the defence effort of the people should be two-pronged at this period of crisis. While every effort should be mobilised to fight the invader and push him out of Indian soil, equal attention should be given to preserve democracy inside the country. Invariably, in any war the first casualty would be democracy. That should not be allowed.

Already, in India, he pointed out, a state of emergency had been proclaimed and the Government had assumed wide powers. Suspension of the operation of certain constitutional protections to the people had also been ordered. The parliamentary system was gradually disappearing. This was nothing abnormal or unusual in a war. But the wiser democracies of the West had followed up these war measures with the formation of an all-party government. That had not been done here. Perhaps the ruling party had thought it proper to "lie in the bed it had made," he said.

While in her hour of crisis, Britain had formed an all-party Government, the ruling party in India, because it had a majority, perhaps did not think in similar terms. Opposition parties had, therefore, to unite in showing up the Government's shortcomings and in safeguarding democracy in the land, he added.

Defence Strategy

He also called for a few changes in the defence strategy to meet the new trends in a modern war. Defence or the conduct of a war could not, and should not, be governed by precedents. The Nehru Government should not blindly copy the measures taken by the British rulers during the second World War.

The Indian troops should push forward and should not constantly resort to withdrawals. The military bases of China should be attacked from the air. Such an action, of course, would result in attempts by the enemy at attacking our own bases. But then, a war should be fought with courage and imagination and the strategy should not be governed by the fear of consequences.

He also said that India should condescend to agree to peace talks only after driving the Chinese out of Indian soil. Loud statements about peace talks now should be eschewed as they would bring down the morale of the fighting troops.

No Communists in Joint Committees

Rajaji was critical of the Madras Government's decision to take Communists in the State Defence Aid Committee and said Communists the world over belonged to the same "tribe." In the present emergency in particular to trust them was a gamble.

DEFENCE EFFORT

Taking note of the appointment and the constitution of the National Defence Council, the Parliamentary Board is of the view that there is still the need for a similar body consisting of senior serving and retired Generals and others to be in continual touch with, advise and assist, the Defence Ministry.

—Resolution adopted by the Parliamentary Board of Party at its meeting in New Delhi on November 6 & 7, 1962.

N. G. Ranga, M.P.

(A speech in the Lok Sabha during the China debate on November 8).

I wish to thank you (the Speaker) for having taken the initiative and giving a lead to the House in expressing our gratitude and also paying homage to all those thousands of our brave and patriotic Jawans who died fighting for the freedom of our Country. We all deeply mourn their deaths. We also wish to express our gratitude to all those Jawans and officers who are associated with them at the front, who are today risking their lives and doing their best and offering their all in the service of our motherland.

At the same time, this is also the time to mourn or regret the number of might-have-beens or mistakes or omissions that had gone into our recent history which have resulted in the present miserable plight of our Country. I do not wish to go into detail in regard to these things. I would content myself with referring only to some of them. I wish to say that we deeply mourn the loss of freedom and national autonomy of Tibet and I express my sympathy for all those millions of Tibetans who are today groaning under Communist imperialist oppression.

Panchsheel is Dead

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, made a reference to Panchsheel. My friend, Acharya Kripalani, who was a leader and President of the Congress, whose absence from this House on this occasion I very much regret and deplore, once said in this House—and very many people were shocked at it at the time—that Panchsheel was born out of the rape of Tibet. It is that Panchsheel that my hon. friend wants us even today to hug, even after the Prime Minister has said that Panchsheel has gone overboard, *(An Hon. Member: No.)*, even after the Chinese have not only disowned but also violated the basic principles which led our Prime Minister to accept it and call it Panchsheel. It is not so much because it was a part of Indian culture and

tradition that Panchsheel came to be accepted by the Chinese. If any of our friends would care to look into *Window on China* written by one who is very close to our Prime Minister, many years before Panchsheel was even talked about, he would find what Mao tse Tung was talking about these things. Mao tse Tung was clever enough to get these things incorporated into the India-China treaty over Tibet and leave our Prime Minister and various other people also under the impression that it was being presented to the World as a contribution of India's Statesmanship.

Unpreparedness

There is also the question of the notice that Chinese themselves have given to us for so many years about their intentions, and yet our Government thought that it would be wise on its part to consider it to be of not much significance. It treated their aggression merely as incursions and thought that it could negotiate with the tiger and try to make it behave like Lord Buddha. No wonder we find ourselves unprepared today. No wonder the Prime Minister himself was obliged to say that they were not prepared for the Chinese Divisions coming down to our plains from their heights on that fateful day, October 20.

Then the Prime Minister said that he sent out these letters of his to various heads of State and Prime Ministers in different parts of the World. But that was done only last month. Action on some such lines should have been taken again and again all these years in order to inform them and win their goodwill and support for our cause. Yes, it is true that we have our embassies, but we know how inefficiently these embassies have been working. The Prime Minister should have done this much earlier and many more times, and prepared the mind of all these friends in different parts of the World.

Then there is the question of supplies. The Prime Minister has said that it is true that our troops have not been adequately provisioned. Whose fault is it? Surely, it is not because we do not have ordnance factories or a military supply department, or that we never had any kind of notice from the Chinese. We have had it and we were sending these troops up those snowy heights which freeze people—their limbs are bitten by frost. We

should have prepared ourselves for this. But we failed in that elementary duty.

Relations with Afro-Asian Countries

Then there is the question of Nepal. Are we going to say that we did not do anything to irritate the Nepal Government? Was there nothing at all that we could have done in order to preserve the wholehearted friendship of Nepal? Did we do everything possible on that front?

There is also the question of the South-East Asian Countries, and also African nations for the achievement of whose freedom we did so much in so many spheres of World politics. How is it that so large a number of them are not able to associate themselves, line up with us in their sympathy and in their preparedness to give us support today? There must be some reason for this. Somewhere there must be some failure.

Welcome Shift in Policy

Nevertheless, there are certain rays of hope in this otherwise very gloomy atmosphere. At long last we have evidence of the triumph of democracy over the personality cult. It was this personality cult which did a lot of damage in Bombay not so long ago. Fortunately for us, we have become witness to the triumph of democracy, so that we can hope to have better leadership in the Defence Ministry from now on.

The Prime Minister has also been good enough to make a number of admissions in regard to the failure of his dreams. We all dream, and our dreams do not come true, that is also true, but at the same time it is very dangerous to go on dreaming and dreaming for years and years even over such a terrific crisis and problem as this, with the result that not only our people but also people abroad have had to wonder how this country's leadership has been guiding our people in this atmosphere of dreaming.

I am very glad that this emergency has been declared at long last. Only during the last session, I think, my hon. friend Shri P. K. Deo, who acted as our leader, asked the Prime Minister to send away the Chinese Embassy and consider that there is a state of war between India and China, and was told—I speak subject to correction—that the Prime Minister taunted him whether he wanted India to declare War, and even went to the

extent of saying that his attitude was bordering on war-mongering. I am glad that although wise counsels on our side have failed, the Chinese have brought these things home to our Prime Minister, and he has been obliged to agree with the President in declaring this national emergency and taking the necessary steps in that direction.

What Kind of Peace?

I am also glad that the Prime Minister as well as the Government are inviting our public to cooperate with them in conducting this war to a successful end, and they are giving also the assurance that they are determined and bent upon conducting this war campaign until we achieve success. But at the same time, there is also this other threat which stares in our faces which my hon. friend Shri Mukerjee wants to take advantage of and therefore wants to go on pinning it down by his repeated assertions and reminders to the Prime Minister that he is so very keen on peace, therefore he should not forget peace and the need for peace. Certainly, after the war is over and we achieve our objectives, peace always comes. It is not necessary at this juncture to begin to talk about it, and yet my hon. friend wants us to remember that. Yes, peace has come to China after the Japanese defeat, not only then, but after the defeat of Nationalist China and after the Communists had gained complete control over the whole of so-called people's China. Is that the kind of peace that we want in our Country? I certainly do not want that kind of peace, and I hope my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, does not wish to stand for that kind of peace.

No Negotiations

Then, they talk about negotiations. Negotiations on what basis? For the time being they say 8th September. Where is it guaranteed that it is not likely to be 20th October, and some time later 8th November because this session has begun today? There must be some certainty about these things. We must be very clear as to what we want to achieve as a result of this war. We want the Chinese to go back again to the positions from which they had begun aggression on our country five years ago, four, three, two years or one year ago, or do you want them to be content with all areas that they had already gobbled up and then begin to negotiate with us in regard to only the latest in-

cursions which they now prefer to call aggression? We must be very clear in regard to these things. I for one wish to make it very clear that in this country there are people, hundreds of millions of people who certainly would not be content so long as the Chinese are allowed to remain in possession of even one inch of our sacred soil. Let the Government take due note of this, because otherwise afterwards we would not like any misunderstandings in regard to this matter.

Shri Tyagi: (Dehra Dun): Every body agrees to this.

Need for War-Time Leadership

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend the Prime Minister says we are a people not attuned to War, we are men of peace. This is not the time for it when my friends the Communists who, not so long ago, were not so much in love with our Prime Minister, have suddenly fallen so much in love with him that they make not only Members like me but also my hon. friends here on the other side to my left blush.

In England there is what is known as a wartime leadership and a peacetime leadership. Today we are at war. We have been forced into war by the Chinese. Are we having just that leadership that we really deserve, that we need, that the people really demand. It is for the party in power to think about it. All I can say is that we must begin to think about the War, talk about it and go and exhort our people in the manner in which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used to do when the British were here and Mahatma Gandhi was alive and addressing us from the Congress forum and the AICC. I have not found that fibre in the Prime Minister's speech today. I do not find that sense of urgency and drive, feeling and power, that I used to find in those days which used to inspire us all. Many of us were proud in those days to place ourselves not only at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi but also to call ourselves the supporters and followers of Nehru. I am sorry I have to confess that I do not find that atmosphere as yet.

They say we were not strong enough; they are 60 crores, we are 40 crores, therefore we need time in order to prepare ourselves, that is what the Ministers told us. We wanted them to make brisker, more effective preparations, and know what preparations had been made by the death of so many thousands

of our own people for want of ordinary, elementary weapons which the Chinese had in plenty, which our people did not have.

Scrap Non-alignment

I do not wish to say anything more, but it must be remembered by all our friends on every side of the House that we have to become strong. How are we to become strong if we hang on to this non-alignment policy? Yes, there is a voice, and a powerful voice, not only from Shri Mukerjee, but all those people who are behind him. They say it is built into our culture. Non-attachment is certainly built into our culture, thanks to Lord Krishna. But even that non-attachment has been put to very effective use by Mahatma Gandhi in order to help our Country and achieve freedom. But this non-alignment, I do not know from where my friend comes to the conclusion that it is built into our culture; I do not know whether he can give any kind of a quotation because he is a Sanskrit pandit. Non-alignment has not served us; does not serve any longer. The sooner we get rid of it, the better; the sooner we turn our back to it, the better. That does not mean that we should go and place ourselves at the feet of any other country. This Government has been trying to make friends with the ally of China, Soviet Russia. We know the results now. Pakistan and ourselves have been kept apart. Beyond that, what is the gain? We know now what services we have got from them in this crisis. On the other hand, I am glad that the Prime Minister had told this House that all those democratic countries, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Canada, France and so many other countries have been noble, decent and democratic enough to offer unconditional support in an unstinting manner, respecting the Prime Minister's long-felt attachment to this non-alignment. They do not wish to upset him. All credit to them. But that is not a compliment to our Prime Minister or to his non-alignment policy. I wish to express my gratitude to all those countries and also those other countries which have gone with our Prime Minister in support of his suggestion that the Chinese should be asked to withdraw to where they were on the 8th of September. As I said earlier, I do not agree with this proposition. We need their massive support from outside; otherwise it would not be possible to carry on.

War Strategy

I have had some talks with some friends, not only old

Generals but some very young people who know a little more than I do. My hon. friend the Prime Minister said that we did not know much about defence and fighting on those heights. He himself was frank enough to say that when he was talking to the Generals and other people he had to be guided mostly by the Generals because he himself did not know. But we do know that until and unless we take the initiative and go over to the other side and then begin to attack just those areas and those spheres where they are keeping their armament dumps, training their own people and keeping their own troops, the area from where they are launching these offensives, and begin to destroy and disable the enemy in their own basis, it would not be possible for us to defend our country by remaining simply on the defensive all the time. We cannot do it now because we do not have the necessary equipment either in divisions or in armaments or, especially, in aircraft. So, we have to go and approach other countries.

Massive Aid

The other countries are good enough to come and offer their support. They are speeding their support to us by their Spitfires and so on. Should we not speed our request to these people and say: for God's sake come to our rescue. It is not in a humble manner that we need do this because, after all they all belong to the democratic part of the World with an avowal to democratic causes, not the Soviet democracy, not the people's democracy but to the parliamentary kind of democracy that we know or the presidential democracy that we have read about. That is a cause to which they are all wedded. Should we not, therefore, speed up our request to these nations and say: please come to our rescue and if you do come, we will welcome you with both our arms. We heard today the Prime Minister himself saying that it is no longer India's need but it is the need of the world, especially of the need of all the democratic peoples all over the World wherever they may be, either under a dictatorship or in a democracy. In this need, when the blow is coming down on us it should be recognised by all the rest of the World that this blow is equally as hard and harsh and cruel on them as it is on us. Therefore, we should request them to give us this massive support. Without it I am afraid it would not be possible for us to save our country at this juncture.

The supplies department has got to be organised properly. That Ministry ought to be given the powers so that it may give priority for the production, distribution, conveyance and utilisation of all those commodities and materials that are needed in these circumstances for the purpose of war. Special steps will have to be taken to utilise the retired Generals. It means no observation on their character or their ability, to say that it is not enough to depend upon Generals in service. We have many Generals in our country who have retired not so long ago and whose experiences are still fresh and who are capable of giving us assistance. Should we not call them to our rescue? Is it proper for us to dump them into a big council of 30 or 40 people to simply air their views and go back home scratching their heads and wonder what happens? It is necessary that a smaller committee should be formed where the Generals would be able to play a more effective role. In that committee they should be given enough of responsibility as well as power so that they may help the Generals who are at work and in service as also the Ministry or the Ministers concerned.

A Victory Plan

The Hon. Prime Minister talked about the Plan. We also want a Plan but that should be a Victory Plan. When Mr. Churchill was asked about his war aims from time to time, as also about his peace aims, he said his aim was to win the war. That was what inspired them. Let us win. That is what we have got to think about. By all means Plan in order to achieve Victory and direct all your resources to that end. But why do you have this Planning Commission any longer? Even ordinarily it was useless and now it becomes much more useless; indeed it can even be a nuisance. Therefore, it is time for the Government to begin to plan for Victory and I hope the Government will take concerted measures in that direction.

Opposition's Role

We stand here as an Opposition Party, and we have been sent here to play the role of a responsible opposition in our Parliamentary democracy. The moment we give up this role, the moment we follow the advice now so suddenly tendered, for their own reasons, by our friends of the Communist party, we cease to be a Parliamentary democracy. To the Communists,

Parliamentary democracy has no fascination. Therefore they find it easy now, when it is so very convenient to them on this occasion, to give us advice that we should not say anything which is likely to upset the peace of mind of the great men on the other side. I cannot agree with them. We are here to play our role as an opposition, as a responsible opposition, as a co-operative link in our total democracy, democracy in which it should be possible for the Government to gain from the criticisms that are made from time to time by the opposition. It is true that some of my brave friends within the Congress have been trying to play quite an inspiring role in the recent past in order to tune up their own party and try to see that it lines up with the people. But that is not enough. I have had experiences of that role, and I have known its limitations. Therefore it is very necessary indeed that there should be effective opposition in this country; and that oppositional role we shall continue to play now and serve the country.

But that does not mean that we do not line up with all the rest of the country in strengthening and in maximising the defence effort, in promoting the national will of resistance against aggression. We are with the government, and we are with all the other political parties which are sincerely bent upon supporting this national effort. And it is there that I wish to pay my tribute to the people at large in this Country. Indeed, I wish to express my gratitude to them for the spontaneous manner in which they have shown the way to the leaders themselves—leaders of all political parties, including the leaders of the ruling party. This is a national upsurge, and I am glad that the Prime Minister has recognised it as such and has incorporated it in this resolution. It is in tune with this national upsurge that all of us have to behave and conduct ourselves in the months and years to come. And let us hope that we shall deserve well of our people and that the people would be able to say that their leaders have behaved well indeed in this time of crisis.

K. M. Munshi

Writing in the "Bhavan's Journal" of November 11, Mr. Munshi stated among other things:

"An unscrupulous and ruthless foe has sought to disrupt our stability and our plans for peaceful progress; he has also posed a threat to our freedom and our democratic institutions; all of Asia is in danger too.

Our national existence, our way of life, the values which we cherish—moral, religious and spiritual—are in jeopardy.

We have to pass through a fiery ordeal of war and come out victorious.

We have proved ourselves inadequate to face the task, the gravity or the magnitude of which some of our leaders could never realise so far. We lived in an artificial atmosphere of our own creation, auto-intoxicated by our own eloquence, induced by self-righteousness and self-complacency.

Reality has taken a revenge on us.

The Chinese have overrun a part of NEFA. They are progressively digging in in Ladakh.

The military crisis, about which many well-meaning friends forewarned, but which those in power sought to minimise, has found us "outnumbered" and "out-weaponed"—in plain words, utterly unprepared and unequipped.

However, out of the debris of our policies, promises and hopes, has emerged a nation, resolute and united as it never was before. The truth of the Shakespearean phrase "words without deeds never to Heaven go" has been brought home to us.

We must realise that many of our policies have been fatuous. Our pathetic faith in Russia has been belied. Somehow, our conduct has irritated Nepal. Towards the United States and United Kingdom, we have often been ungenerous."

(Later, addressing the Press Guild of India, Mr. Munshi reiterated his demand for a reappraisal of Government's policies. The following is based on a report in the "Sunday Standard" of November 18).

Mr. Munshi said that any lingering mental reservation to take

"full-scale help" from the Free World would lead the country to irreparable disaster.

India should promptly and unhesitatingly ask for all aid from the Free World, he added.

The Chinese aggression was the first step in their plan to occupy parts of India, East Pakistan and Burma and was aimed at the ultimate conquest of South-East Asia.

Mr Munshi said, the claim of Communist powers that they stood for co-existence had been exposed, with the Soviet hesitation in condemning the Chinese unequivocally and helping India.

The national situation demanded a revolutionary re-appraisal of "all our plans, policies and programmes."

Mr. Munshi, while endorsing the steps taken by the Government to meet the emergency, was unequivocal in his view that Communists should be kept out of any national platform for defence.

JOINT COMMITTEES

In order to prevent party politics entering into the Defence effort, it is desirable that the President of the Indian Union and the Governors of the States should, as far as possible, preside over all joint committees concerning the Defence effort.

—Resolution adopted by the Parliamentary Board of the Party at its meeting in New Delhi on November 6 and 7, 1962.

M. R. Masani

(Based on a speech delivered under the joint auspices of the Bombay and Maharashtra Units of the Party at Napoo Gardens, Bombay, on October 31).

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 a purely personal point of view, of what I would like my Party to do and of what I would like my country to do.

International Civil War

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 to 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 Nameese 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 NEFA 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 goodwill for us of the Soviet dictatorship.

Non-Official Ombudsman

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 is 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 labour 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 situation that arise.

That in my view is 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, 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-tse 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.

The British Experience

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, remained in office. So long as that man sat as Prime Minister in the House of Commons, the Labour Party refused to go into any kind of coalition or alliance with the Conservative Government. This situation lasted for several months. It was only 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, 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.

Warnings not Heeded

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 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 is 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 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 were 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.

Awakening to Reality

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 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. If this is the beginning of a more realistic, more patriotic, more national policy, it will be 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 we 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.

Treat Indians as Adults

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.'

Arms for Jawans

The second thing that needs to be done is to unite the hands 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 the 303, the present weapon which is proving inadequate, was adequate for the Indian Army and secondly that as automatic weapons were 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.

Concentration of Forces

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.

Distinguish Friends from Enemies

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 Tunku Abdul Rehman, 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 taught them to be non-aligned. How do we like that medicine now that it is administered to us?

A Two-Front War

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, 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 on 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 NEFA 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 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 them 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 their back on 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.N. 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.

Relations with Pakistan

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 the part of Kashmir which is occupied by Pakistan itself. The Chinese armies are coming down over here in 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.

Isolate Fifth Column

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 do not 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".

H. P. Mody

(Based on a speech delivered under the joint auspices of the Bombay and Maharashtra Units of the Party at Cama Hall, Bombay, on October 25, 1962).

The situation that many of us feared would come about is at last upon us, and today, inspite of all the tall talk about not surrendering one further inch of territory, the enemy has been able to occupy hundreds of miles of our borders. I agree that this is no time for recriminations; they do not help, and there is no question but that, so far as we of the Swatantra Party are concerned, we shall not be behind any other party or section of the people in our determination to fight the aggression. But, and it is an important but, we must remember that the same people who are responsible for the present situation are in power, and no one will question our bonafides or our patriotism, nobody possibly can, if we ask for certain assurances about the conduct of the war in the future. The policy apparently has remained the same; and it would appear as if we have learned nothing from past mistakes. I do not know what you feel about it, but I have been dismayed by some of the utterances from the highest quarters in the land in the course of the last few days, even after this break-through on the NEFA border. We still talk of negotiations. That sickening word has been repeatedly heard for the last seven years, and even with the enemy pushing forward, killing our boys, advancing into our territory, we still talk of negotiations. We have seen the latest offer that has come from the Chinese; it has been very properly rejected. But I want you to consider whether the statement which has been issued in reply does not constitute a retreat on our part on a position which we took up only a couple of months ago. On August 22nd, the Government stated, in reply to a Chinese offer that negotiations could not start unless the 'status quo' on the boundary in this region, which had been altered by force since 1957, was restored and the current tensions removed. This was in August. Yet, in less than two months,

I find from a little digging up of records that I have done, there is another Note which says that negotiations can proceed if the Chinese retreat to the position which they occupied on the 8th of September. Our previous insistence was on the 1957 line. Does this mean that the further the Chinese advance into our territory the further we retreat politically? I can understand our present military difficulties on account of our past follies. But why should we be continually on the run in the political field as well?

Abandon Ideological Commitments

To pass on to another matter, the Prime Minister, in a statement made four or five days ago, after telling the country what needed to be done and emphasising the necessity for a national front and an all-out effort, has thought fit to re-affirm his ideological stance. He still talks of non-alignment, and that, too, at a time when he is wanting foreign aid, without appearing to seek it. I do not know what Western nations must be thinking about us. This sort of talk might be all very well for a Church assembly, but when events have taken such a serious turn, it makes no sense. Our so-called neutrality has brought us very few friends, and it is time the Prime Minister stopped airing his concepts of international diplomacy which have landed us in so many difficulties.

There is yet another obsession. The Plan will not be altered, says our rulers, no matter what happens. It is a deity they must keep on worshipping, no matter how serious the economic situation may have turned, how deeply we get involved in debt and what little of foreign assistance we can now look forward to in the furtherance of our projects. Our defence requirements may call for an urgent recasting of our industrial structure, our ordnance factories may need to be put to better uses than the manufacture of coffee machines and ice-cream freezers, but our Planners must continue to regard their handiwork as inviolate.

Mr. Krishna Menon, speaking at Chowpatty a little while ago, has declared that India's position on the question of China's admission to the United Nations will be unaffected by recent events. No matter how grossly she has betrayed us and how ruthlessly she has seized large areas of what is undoubtedly Indian territory, the U.N.O. must throw its doors

open to Communist China. The new-comer should certainly prove an acquisition to the world organisation for peace!

What does all this amount to? Does it mean that our policy-makers lay claim to a sort of papal infallibility, or does it just amount to a stubborn refusal to face facts, admit mistakes and retrace steps? Whichever way one looks at it, such blind persistence in mistakes and miscalculations is indefensible.

What are the immediate requirements of the situation? The first thing we must do is to break off diplomatic relations with China. What do we get out of maintaining them? Our diplomats in Peking, anyway, are virtual prisoners in their Chancery and their houses. Perhaps, our Government's thinking has been influenced by the naive consideration that no war has been declared. My answer is that if this is not a war, it is a damned good imitation of one.

Change of Leadership

In the situation that has developed, some change of leadership is certainly imperative. Our Defence Minister enjoys the confidence of no one except a handful of Partymen and henchmen. So long as he is there, what sort of confidence can we have that the war will be fought as it needs to be fought? What can we expect from a Defence Minister who, despite the complete failure of his policy and his criminal neglect in the preparation of our defences, keeps on attitudinising the way Mr. Krishna Menon has been doing?

Among other things, a National Defence Council ought to be soon set up; there was one during the last War. I happen to know something about its activities, but in spite of all its limitations, it did good work, and I think it is essential that if there is to be a national, and not a Party, effort, representatives of all schools of thought and interests owing allegiance to the country and its Government, should be brought into an organisation which would give the war effort a national character. How, otherwise, can we mobilise effectively the present enthusiasm all over the country. You cannot do that by saying to the people the effort is yours, the money is yours, the enlistment is yours, but we shall run the war as we think fit. As for the

funds that are being collected, I hope a proper machinery will be set up for their right distribution.

Don't Negotiate

Above all, a pledge must be given by those in power that an all-out effort will be made to repel the aggressor, and that they will not enter into any negotiations in the circumstances which prevail today. How can the people put out their best with the constant fear gripping them, that one of these days, our Government may, on some plausible pretext, accept the Chinese offer to negotiate. We have just seen how in a matter of less than two months, they have changed their front in regard to the conditions essential for opening negotiations.

One word about the governmental machinery. It needs to be in top gear and there is yet no sign that it has been put on a war footing. Ministers still go about the country preaching homilies and performing opening ceremonies, instead of getting down to a job of work. The war is all over our Northern frontier, and it is not to be fought by orations on the sands of Chowpatty. Let us have less of rhetoric and excuses for inaction and incompetence, and let there be an assurance that the mistakes of the past will not be repeated. Finally, let there be an end to the provocative statements which are still being made by Ministers and others in high places. That is not the way to mobilise public opinion. The Prime Minister struck the right note in this connection when he said that all petty squabbles must vanish.

Waste and corruption, of which we have had such ample evidence in the last few years, must be eliminated. So also must the chronic shortages of so many things that go to maintain the life of the community. Let Government remember that this is not their war nor of the party which has put them into power. This is the war of the people, and if it is to be fought as such, let there be the fullest confidence in the people, in their patriotism and in their determination to maintain the integrity and independence of the country.

N. Dandekar

(Based on a speech delivered under the joint auspices of the Bombay and Maharashtra Units of the Party at Cama Hall on October 25, 1962).

I am new to the political game and haven't yet reached that stage of maturity at which I could be called a "politician". And I am therefore somewhat inclined to be blunt.

The speakers before me, specially Sir Rama Rau, said that this is not the time for saying "I told you so", nor is this the time for *post mortems*. I think that's quite right. But I do like to say that this is the time to point the finger at the *Guilty Men*.

Complacency or Treachery?

Over the last ten years of Indian foreign policy, and in particular over the last seven or eight years of Indian policy vis-a-vis China, there are clear evidences of stupidity and complacency; and in fact, I suspect treachery. I use these words very deliberately. Complacency, because in season and out of season we had thought that merely by mouthing doctrines about world peace and about Panchashila we were safe, because we were the holy of holies who would never be attacked by anybody. Panchashila now is no more than the name of a road in New Delhi. Stupidity, because in the name of neutralism, non-involvement and non-alignment we have gone along toeing the communist line, reinforcing the communist position, in Korea, in Indo-China, in Laos and Cambodia, all over the eastern world; reinforcing the communist position also in Poland, in Berlin and East Germany, in Hungary, all over the western world, also, I am afraid, in some of the South American countries and the African countries. Either this was crass stupidity or treachery. And I suspect it was in fact treachery. I think it was deliberate treachery of the highest order, at the highest level, and let me say that quite bluntly. And let me say also that it was plainly a part of that pattern, that we signed off Tibet, as if the Tibetans

were a bunch of cattle, and the land of the Tibetans was our patrimony,—Baap ka Mall,—that we signed it away overnight and we said to the Chinese "Take it. You claim it? It was taken away from you by the British? Take it, it's yours". And then in defense we said, and this was said in Parliament, that we had not recognised the "sovereignty" of China over Tibet; we had merely recognised its "suzerainty". There is no separate word in the Chinese language to distinguish suzerainty from sovereignty, to them it was the same thing. And in no time at all they invaded and raped and devastated Tibet, so that Tibet is now a ruthlessly exploited colonial territory of China as well as a base of operations against India. Let us be quite clear about these blunt facts.

And so, with this sort of background, with the endless negotiations and mountains of notes and reports about the frontiers between India and China, and with the latest disclosures about the utter unpreparedness of India in its defence and the failure to arm our Jawans with automatic weapons, the tale of treachery is complete. I may add that I personally feel pretty strongly about this last point. Over the last thirty years I have been responsible for persuading a large number of young men to join the armed forces, because I have always held the belief that no country can be independent unless its young men go cheerfully to its defense. I am horrified to be now told that they have not got automatic weapons; that they have to fight with bolt-action rifles against automatic weapons of all kinds on the other side. Over the last five years, too, our army has been denuded of the most able General Staff. General Thimayya who wanted to get tough on the NEFA front some four years ago, because he, the soldier, knew what was coming, because he was in a position to know what was being built up on the other side, — he had to resign. Or he threatened to resign, was tricked into continuing and finally retired. Several other Generals, I could name them, I know them as competent men, felt compelled to give up their career in disgust, not because they were not loyal or competent but because they could see before their very eyes what was happening, the ground that was being cut under their feet and the reasons why it was being cut, and their helplessness to do anything about it.

Guilt Men

And so, while I too do not want *post mortems*, I do want to

point the finger at the "guilty men"; and above all to name one guilty man. The first answer to the Chinese challenge, it is the first step we must take because you will never be able to get any other answers until you accept the first answer, is this: get Mr. Krishna Menon out of the Cabinet. Let him go where he belongs. He doesn't belong here. He and a number of communists in this country brand themselves into three categories: those who think their country lies north of the so-called McMahon line; others who suspect India is their country but are not sure; and there is a middle lot who don't know which way to look, sitting on the fence, ready to jump on either side when the real crisis comes. We shall take care of all of them later, but let us throw out the one man among them, Krishna Menon, who is at the helm of affairs, right in the centre of our affairs. He is controlling our defence policy, defence organisation, all defence activities such as production, supply and equipment, the whole lot in fact. And he is the principal adviser of the Prime Minister on foreign affairs. That is the first answer. And until you have the courage to give and take and accept that answer, the rest of the answers you can put down on paper but will not be effective.

The second answer, quite obviously, is let's shut shop in China. We must break off diplomatic relations with China. We don't want an embassy there; or if we must have an embassy, let's send Mr. Krishna Menon there as *Chargé d'affaires*. Let him sit there while we write long notes from here which he can convey to the Chinese Foreign Ministry; and they can write long notes which he can send on to us. It will keep him busy because they are pretty long.

Real Friends

The third thing is this,—again I say quite bluntly that even if the Government today doesn't like it, it is still the one thing they have got to do after taking the other two steps,—let us look round for friends. Let's not be ashamed of looking round for friends. There are people and nations eager to be friendly with us. They have helped us generously in the past. They have helped us even when we insulted them. They have helped us even when we have abused them, run them down in their own countries, in the UNO, in this country, all over the world. Yet they are eager to be friendly. I don't say they are merely,

magnanimously, wanting to do something for us, just by way of a good turn. They are also concerned about their own interests; and quite properly so. Indeed, it's about time we were concerned with our interests. And, therefore, the most important next step is to look round for friends, clasp their hands and say "look boys, we want help". We don't have to crawl. You can get your automatic arms, your supplies and equipment, you can get all the assistance you need. There are plenty of resources there to give you all the assistance you require and more, provided you have the will and you have at last seen the right way and say to them: "gentlemen, we want to be friends".

These are some of the principal answers to the Chinese Challenge. There are, of course, many more. Certainly there must be set up a Defence Council, jointly organised. But the one group of people I would exclude from it, because I would not sit with them, would be the communists, of any brand. Let's be quite clear and blunt about this also. Our country is in grave danger. This is no time for mere politenesses. This is no time for finessé. This is just the time for plain and blunt speaking. I doubt their patriotism. In fact I suspect many of them of positive disloyalty, if not worse. And so I say by all means let us have a joint Defence Council, Local Defence Committees, etc.; but let us keep the Commies rigorously out of them all. Let's also bury the hatchet on a whole number of unnecessary internal issues and disputes at this time; many of them unnecessary even during ordinary times, but certainly unnecessary now. Let's get on with the job. Let's look round for friends. Let's throw out the traitors.

I have only one more thing to say. The present crisis reminds me of a stirring song from a film called *Kismet*, which I saw perhaps eighteen years ago in Calcutta. Adapting that little song and just taking three lines of it, I would like to recite it here. It goes like this:

DOOR HATO! DOOR HATO, hé Chiniwalo, Hindustan
Hamara Hail!

Aaj Himalaya ké Choti sé fir hamné Lalkara Hai,

DOOR HATO! DOOR HATO, hé Chiniwalo, Hindustan
Hamara Hail!

Postscript

Cease-fire

While this booklet was under print, fresh developments in the situation created as a result of the unilateral Cease-fire declaration by the Communist Chinese on 21st November necessitated the addition of this Postscript.

Joint Statement issued by Opposition Leaders in the Lok Sabha on November 21

We are convinced that this Chinese offer of unilateral cease-fire is only another of their notorious manoeuvres, calculated to cause confusion and disruption in our national front, gain time for consolidation and build up for another infamous offensive and prevent us from mobilising the resources from inside and outside and create doubts in the minds of our friends in World Democracy. We trust that the Prime Minister and Government would not allow themselves to be taken in, and weaken our resolve to strengthen our Armed Forces. We want the Government to assure the nation that they stand firmly by the policy clearly enunciated by Parliament in the resolutions unanimously adopted and with redoubled vigour, so that the spirit of National Resistance would not at all allowed to be weakened by the latest Chinese tactical manoeuvres.

We hope that Parliament will be kept in Session and be informed at every stage.

We also hope that the friendly Countries which have so readily and generously offered help would continue to speed up their assistance on a massive scale.

(Sd) N. G. Ranga

(Sd) M. S. Aney

(Sd) Ram Sevak Yadav

(Sd) Atal Bihari Vajpayee

(Sd) H. V. Kamath

No Time To Lose

C. Rajagopalachari

A Chinese minister or official, speaking with ostensible authority to speak on behalf of his Government, declared the other day that China will not take an inch of Indian territory. These words have now come to mean even less than the little they signified at the time. The Prime Minister is standing up bravely to the

reverses we have had to suffer. God bless him and give him strength.

Apart from physical losses and gains does China think that she can go against all world opinion? She may not be a member of the United Nations and may now be feeling the liberty of an outlaw. No nation, however big numerically or otherwise, can long hold out against world opinion. We may not be able to prove exactly how any nation or individual can be forced to yield to mere opinion when one has physical power enough to disregard it. Deductive proof may be unavailable but experience through the ages has shown—and no chapter from Marx can refute it—that men must ultimately yield to opinion. Dharma rules whether you believe in it or deny it, or take no notice of it. Dharma is nature, not dogma. The evolution of the mind of man has fixed his subordination and obedience to opinion around him. Consider the false propaganda indulged in by Hitler's operators during his time and of all their tribe up to date. Their very lying is a sneaking acceptance of the force of public opinion. China cannot retain any part of India which does not belong to China.

I have been pleading for a more dynamic military policy, for strategy that will wrest the initiative from the enemy, even if it carries with it many dangers. Otherwise we must wait for the enemy to strike with strength where and when he chooses and find ourselves outnumbered at one place after another. But military strategy apart, China should know the play of moral forces. It is written on the wall that China must stand defeated of her purpose ultimately, whatever the pomp and vanity-show of her present career may be. The whole world is against her and will presently be even more definitely unanimous against her.

It must be clear now that Soviet Russia cannot help us out. Khrushchev is neither willing nor prepared to try. Any rivalries and rifts between the two communist Powers will actually prevent either of them appearing to hinder the other. If China today calls Khrushchev a revisionist, she would find worse names if Soviet Russia did anything in the slightest degree to help us. The chapter of wistful glances towards Russia must be closed for the very reason that China is not getting on very well with Moscow. The possibility might have been the other way if China had some reverses. Russia could then intervene for a settlement. Providence decreed successes for China and reverses for India, and in such a juncture Moscow cannot intervene ex-

cept in a manner ostensibly to consolidate communist successes. It is necessary to brush aside distracting hopes and the Government should hasten to put forth its full energy and thinking power in the right direction.

There is a silly argument going about that as the Western Powers do not ask for anything more than non-alignment on our part, we had better stay where we were in that regard. We had moral power once and the West much desired our alignment. No one need now expect any Western Power to take the initiative and ask for our alliance or any other form of alignment. It is great of them to act unilaterally and give us prompt assistance. They are not worried like us about dogmas. Almost unasked they have come forward to help, because they are intelligent and farsighted as well as good. But we should at the same time act farsightedly and intelligently. We cannot thrive on isolation and coldness towards friends. We should react like good human beings with live emotions. We should not be afraid of giving up our old posture and behaving as allies and friends.

Neither Pakistan nor India can ever tolerate attempts to absorb the southern sub-continent in a Chinese empire in Asia to rival Soviet Russia in Europe. Our destinies, the fixed goals of India and Pakistan are democratic. We must resist the expanding forces of communism in Asia. We must go together and the sooner we realize this and the need for a united policy, the better for both of us. Neither of us separately is strong enough to contain the monster, specially if we spend our resources on each other. India and Pakistan must save the South of Asia from being swallowed up. It would be shortsighted policy to seek advantage out of India's present trouble. Shortsighted policies can make no appeal to the world or ever succeed.

Non-alignment has no meaning any longer. The major partner of the communist world is fighting us and the other partner has been immobilized as far as the Sino-Indian conflict is concerned. In addition to this, we are getting aid and assistance from the West. What is there left for non-alignment? Unless South Asia acts in time, holds on together and joins up with the West well beforehand, for offense and defence, the way will be paved for its absorption into China the same way as Hungary and Czechoslovakia were absorbed in the Soviet empire. There are enemies enough inside to help the communist invaders and make it look like a revolution. Let us take care and act betimes.

It would not be wise to accept the unilateral declaration of a

cease-fire by China at face value. By no means should it result in the slackening of our defensive and offensive efforts. It should not be allowed to become a vacation for the enemy to consolidate his newly acquired position without any impediment offered by us. Our preparations to recover positions lost in the recent days should not be suspended or relaxed, even though there may be no firing on either side. Genuine steps towards peace must be welcomed. But often in war, strategy and deception may put on the cloak of a gesture of peace. The Government is right in being wary.

Let us not thoughtlessly befool ourselves thinking China is a temporary trouble. Today it is a border affair and possibly nothing more. But the future posture of affairs as now disclosed clearly demands a great and drastic change of policy in order to build up a balance of power to preserve Peace—and the independence of nations—in Asia. We must have a positive alliance with the Western Powers. It may be inconsistent with past postures and statements to seek such an alliance. But after what has been disclosed neither pride nor consistency should stand in the way of prudence. A nation may bend; it may be necessary to do so sometimes in the course of events. Bending is not always yielding. We take a step back to leap forward. The bow bends to gain force thereby. Getting weapons from the West is not enough. We must get from them, and give to them friendship and counsel and moral companionship and power. On this rests the future of democracy in Asia.

—Reproduced from "Stearhys", Madras, of December 1, 1962.

The Time to Fight -- Now or Never

M. R. Masani

The hot and cold treatment is an old established and well-known form of torture practised by the dreaded Soviet Secret Service, the N.K.V.D., in breaking down the resistance of its victims in order to extort concessions. The same technique is adopted by Communist Powers when dealing with the victims of their actual or intended aggression. The cease-fire unilaterally declared by the Chinese Communist regime is only the latest example of the use of this technique. As the Pan-Mun-Jon

negotiations with the UN forces in Korea had shown, negotiations are for the Communists a carrying on of war by other means.

What are the likely objectives of the present Chinese move? Politically, the intention is clearly to counter the splendid solidarity shown by the Indian people by confusing and dividing the country through an appeal to the weaker and less determined elements among our Government and people, as also to prevent massive Western aid and friendly forces from supplementing our own defence effort. Militarily, the motivation is to extricate the Chinese forces, which are dangerously extended, from their present untenable and vulnerable positions.

Impudent Missile

Indian public opinion has, with striking unanimity, seen through the Chinese move and rejected it. The nature of the arrogant and impudent missile, which has properly been described as an 'ultimatum' has been correctly understood by the Indian people and the Press. The fact has also been understood that it is at least as objectionable as, if not worse than, the October 24 proposals of the Chinese Communists, which were turned down out of hand by our Government, a rejection that was repeated in the Prime Minister's letter to Chou En-lai of November 14, which characterized them as 'preposterous demands,' and again on November 20, only a few hours before the Chinese ultimatum, when the Prime Minister told both Houses of Parliament that "India will not accept any compromise on Chinese terms and will fight on to victory." The treacherous nature of the trap set by the Chinese Communists to lure us from this high resolve has been seen through.

The Chinese ultimatum has made it clear that they are not interested in our verbal acceptance or rejection of their dictates. They will judge us by whether or not we comply with the demands they have made as to what we may and may not do. The Chinese Communists, the world and our own people will judge whether we have accepted or rejected the ultimatum by whether or not in action we submit to those dictates. Let us not deceive ourselves. If we do not contravene any of the demands sought to be imposed on us, then, whatever we may say or whatever diplomatic evasions we may indulge in, we shall have accepted military defeat in the eyes of the enemy and the world.

The implications of such a possibility are fearful. Our armed forces, who are keen to have an opportunity of retrieving their honour by giving the enemy, in service terminology, a blood nose, would be cheated of that opportunity and left cruelly demoralized. Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan will draw their own conclusions and act accordingly. The Chinese aggressors will be left to choose the time and mode of their next onslaught on this country from the points of vantage in which we shall have permitted them to be lodged.

How then should the national will that the Chinese ultimatum be rejected be carried into effect? The enemy, who has advanced along a front extending from Ladakh to NEFA over difficult mountainous terrain, maintaining around 100,000 men in the process, must inevitably have extended himself dangerously. He has spread himself very thin. His logistic problems rule out any immediate further advance. He may find it difficult even to maintain himself against a determined attack.

The question that arises is whether we on our side are in a position to launch a massive counter-attack. Here any non-official is at a disadvantage in that the full facts are not available but, on the best information available, the answer appears to be a positive one. Man for man, the Indian soldier, with a long tradition of warfare, is unquestionably superior to the Chinese, who has never been particularly known for martial qualities.

Political Interference

The recent setbacks may fairly be ascribed to special reasons such as political interference impairing *esprit de corps* and dictating a false order of strategic priorities by which Pakistan was made into enemy number one. Surely, the Indian army is not going to be judged on the basis of these temporary reverses?

There is no reason why, given certain essentials, the Indian army should not be capable, now that the fighting takes place on our own terrain, of pushing back the Chinese vanguard. The first of these essentials is numerical superiority, which can be established if around a lakh of troops reported to be in and around Kashmir and on the frontiers of West Pakistan are moved to the NEFA front.

Even if, by way of abundant caution, it is felt that the Kashmir front cannot be disturbed, there is no reason whatsoever why troops in neighbouring areas cannot be so redeployed. The second essential is parity of fire-power which, with the

appropriate equipment which is available and can now be brought in, also be established. The third is air support and the capacity to bomb enemy bases and lines of supply.

The British and U.S. Governments have indicated that there is no limitation to aid in men and material being made available if only we ask for it. Whether this situation can be achieved before November 30 or soon after is not of crucial importance. What is important is to reserve our freedom of action to strike back through our Government announcing officially before November 30 our outright rejection of the Chinese ultimatum, leaving our military commanders the freedom to attack the Chinese either in their present positions or to harry and maul them should they seek to withdraw. If the Chinese terms are not categorically rejected by November 30 we shall in fact have submitted to the Chinese ultimatum.

No Second Round

There are some who think it would be clever to observe the cease-fire till November 30, allow the Chinese to withdraw to the line they have indicated and then to ignore their other demands and reoccupy the points held by us on September 8 in defiance of their ultimatum. On examination, this will be found to be a line of action not at all to our advantage, since it would allow the Chinese to get away from their present exposed position while the going is good and allow them to place themselves in a well-entrenched position as on September 8, with the additional handicap to our forces that they would be attacked before they even have the opportunity to consolidate their position. It will prove to be a deceptive mirage covering up an abject surrender.

As has been well put, "there will be no second round if the Chinese ultimatum is accepted. For the result will be complete demoralization in the people as well as the armed forces and natural misgivings among our friends in committing more support to us."

Wars are not won by craven calculations. Can we imagine Winston Churchill agreeing to a cease-fire immediately after Dunkirk? The honour and manhood of India are at stake. Shall we not assert them? The time to fight is now or never.

—Reproduced from the "Hindustan Times", Delhi, of November 25, 1962.

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON CHINA

While the Party has yet to formulate its policy in regard to the various aspects of India's international relations, the aggression committed by Communist China against our country and the occupation of many thousands of square miles of Indian territory by a foreign power create a crisis in the field of national defence. The Swatantra Party urges that a firm and vigilant policy should be followed at least from now on in dealing with the Chinese Communist aggression against India. When our territorial integrity has been violated and our soil occupied by a communist power, the concept of non-alignment has little meaning. Our policy therefore now needs to be reviewed and brought into closer relation to the realities of the international situation. In the Party's view, this is not the time for ideological adventures in domestic policy. The measures necessary for ensuring the country's security and defence include; the settlement of outstanding issues with Pakistan and serious consideration of the offer made by Pakistan for collaboration in the defence of the sub-continent; collaboration with the countries of South and South-East Asia with a view to concerted measures for the security of the region; and vigilance against infiltration and fifth column activities.

-Extract from the Statement of Policy adopted at the first National Convention in Patna on March 1960.