

MRM's speech at the
University of Taiwan
on 23/10/63

(710)

President Chien, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very grateful to the President of your University for having invited me to visit Taiwan and ~~to~~ deliver this address under the distinguish auspices of your institution. I happen to be a writer, but I am also a member of Parliament, and before I come to my subject, I would like to stress the fact that I am an opposition member of Parliament, being secretary of one of our principal opposition parties or groups. Now, this itself illustrates that we in India have a system of parliamentary democracy under which we believe that it is good for our country to have a freely functioning opposition which enjoys the right of freedom of discussion and criticism of the government of today, and which also want to displace the government of today by bringing into existence a new representative government. We believe that our country benefits from this system and we are very proud, that in our country we have accepted that system and developed it in the last 16 or 17 years of our national independence. Although I am a member of an opposition and a very severe critic of my government's policies, I have to pay a tribute to the Prime Minister and the government of India for having preserved over the last 15 years, this very great heritage which we have inherited from the British of being able to sustain free discussion without any limitation at all, of encouraging and fostering of free press where the editors can write as freely as members of Parliament can talk, and upkeeping a climate of free discussion from which we are convinced our country benefits in the long run. And it is the pursuit or exercise of this right, and defense that I can afford to come to you today and give and candid picture of what happened in India during the Chinese Communists and what has been happen- in this academic setting in which we not only relevant but also essential. Forces attacked India last October great shock to the Government of India. It is looked upon as a kind another friend. There were only a few, who understood the real

picture of international communism and to whom this attack did not come as a surprise but something which we have been fearing would come some time or other. But for most people this was a shock. In a way we in India had been living, in our political life since 1947, when we became free from the British rule, in a kind of dreamland; we have been living in the clouds, clouds of illusion - of self illusion - and we came suddenly to earth with a bang, with a thug, and dropped like blues in the process. Our Prime Minister himself said, in Parliament on October 25 last year, that we were getting out of touch with reality in the modern world, and that we were living in an artificial atmosphere of our own creation. I do not think that he overstated the case when he made this admission.

Now in October when the Chinese army attacked, from October 20 to about November 21, the Indian army suffered a decisive defeat. Not a single prisoner was taken by our army from the Chinese communist side, while we had lost a lot of men and suffered also many casualties in the way of prisoners. Let me say that this was the first defeat the Indian army had experienced for over a century. They have fought under British officers - foreign officers - not in defense of their own country but in defense of the British empire in all parts of the world from the Far East to Burma, to North Africa, against -- Germany, Italy, and in every case they have had a record of great courage and victory. This battle that took place for the first time that the Indian army went to battle for the defense of his own free country, they took a very bad defeat. How did this come about? How do you explain the troops that fought so well under foreign command did not fight, were not able to fight with the same efficiency when they were defending their own free motherland. The reasons for this have not yet been made available. The reports (have been made) of investigations have not been published and made available yet to Parliament. We are presently engaged in trying to secure the publication of this report so that the people may know the whole truth of what happened.

There are many reasons generally advanced for what has happened. One is the fact that we had a defense minister at that time Mr. Krishna Menon whom I described last Monday in Parliament as a fictitious communist - that was a communist who would not admit that he is one. With this

gentleman as defense minister, it is not surprising when the attack came from the communist fire, we were found unprepared. Mr. Menon whose strategy was to pretend that the only enemy India had was our neighbor Pakistan and that the Chinese communist regime was a peace-loving neighbor which could never do us any harm. So our whole planning and strategy was faced on the wrong front. So when the Chinese communist attack came from the north, our troops were found in the Pakistan border and not where they should have been to stop the communist's advance. That was certainly a major factor. The second thing was Mr. Krishna Menon, our Defense Minister, had demoralized the army by creating trouble and introducing politics among the generals and the officers of the army and the wonderful esprit d'coup Indian army particularly had been happy, had been destroyed by him during his 2-3 years as defense minister. The third thing was that our armed forces did not have the arms and equipment necessary to fight this particular war at very great heights in the Himalayas. We were not ready for mountain warfare. Not only did we not have the weapons but even the shoes and clothes, the warm clothes that were necessary to enable soldiers to fight at great height in cold weather were lacking, and our men went into battle shivering from the cold, unable to hold their own. Finally, there was the failure on the part of the Indian government to use the air force which could have been used to bomb the Chinese communist bases in Tibet and to bomb the troops as they advanced across the passes. Mr. Nehru argued that this would lead to a big war and world peace demanded that we withhold ourselves from using an air force - an argument which most Indians did not find very convincing. So this was the picture of the military reverse.

When the military situation was going against us, the political situation improved. Maybe the communists across the frontier expected the Indian people had no will to fight and would capitulate, finally the victory that the communists wanted. This did not happen. On the contrary, as the Indian army retreated in defeat, the temper of the Indian people became more and more aggressive and militant. There was a great upsurge of patriotism which we had not known since we have been fighting the British imperialist rule. This created a national unity, but it was not a unity of a static kind,

it was a unity for action to drive out the invaders. The government was paralyzed but the people had become active and activated. People like me who had taken an anti-communist position for ten years in the building of wilderness suddenly found the big majority of Indian people were behind them, that we fought for India, no longer the government. This did not last very long. This lasted till the fighting was gone and a little while after. during the fighting, some gains were made. The major gain was that Mr. Krishna Menon had to be dropped from the government under pressure from public opinion and from members of the ruling party itself, and a patriotic defense minister was appointed in his place. The Indian Parliament met on 10th of November and passed a solemn resolution saying that the war must be carried on to the bitter end till "every inch of Indian territory had been recovered. The last sentence of the resolution which was passed unanimously in a parliament of 500 members said, "With hope and faith this House affirms the pious resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressors from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be." That was on the 10th of November. On the 20th of November, the communist government of Peking offered unilateral cease fire to India. They said they would stop fighting provided the Indian army also stop fighting and if, by November 30, the armistice was accepted by our government and the armistice became complete. The cease fire became operative. It was as if Mr. Winston Churchill had accepted Hitler's offer of an armistice the day after Dunkirk.

Now during October and November certain other interesting things happened. The British and the Americans offered us unconditional military assistance. Their envoy in New Delhi, Mr. Harriman from the United States and Mr. Duncan Sandys from Britain, came there to find out in what way they could help, and this help came in the form of transport planes that flew in every two hours from Frankfurt and from other military bases carrying arms and ammunitions and other equipment for the use of our troops at the front. It was all round the clock, and it went on for several weeks. The Indian people res- in a normal decent way our newspaper editorial said and we all said tion, "Now we know who our friends are." Because up to then they d that the Chinese Communists were our friends, that the Soviet

communist.

Russians were our friends and that the British and Americans were imperialists. So the Indian people said unanimously now they know who our friends are. We were grateful. We found that as opposed to the western democracies and that not only Britain and America, but Canada, West Germany, Australia, New Zealand, and so many other countries came to our help. In Asia, Malaya was, I am sorry to say, the only country that came down on our side. But we found the strange contrast about what others did. Mr. Krushchev said that "The Chinese communists are our brothers. You are only our friends and we prefer our brothers to our friends. It was a fairly accurate description of the situation. And other Asian countries like Ceylon, Egypt, Indonesia, what did they do? They said, "We are not allies. We are neutral. We cannot tell who is attacking whom. We cannot tell who is the aggressor." In other words, they practice non-alignment against us. Now we have taught them on alignment that Mr. Nehru was a great leader of the non-alignment world and we have made no ally; but Mr. Nehru and others concerned were very angry and hurt when they found somebody else practicing non alignment against them as we have been practicing non alignment against the United States in its quarrel with Russia or Cuba and a few of the other countries. So non alignment came home to us. It was a very unpleasant medicine that the Indian people had to swallow.

The effect of this on the political parties of India was interesting. On the one hand the communist party, of course, was in great difficulty. It wanted to support the Chinese, but it did not dare to do so because it would have been outlawed in the press. So they met on November 1 during the fighting and passed what was called the Nationalist Resolution. They declared the Indian government was right and that Peking was wrong, and they were behind the Indian government in opposing communist aggression. This was only a tactical resolution. It was not meant to be taken seriously except by our government who took it seriously; nobody else took it seriously because it was understood to be a resolution tone in check. Because it is a fundamental dogma of communist theory that when a communist army attack your country, it is a liberating army which you must go to receive with flowers and garlands and that no person defending your country against the communist invasion can possibly be accepted by any to guard communist. However, very soon this attitude changed as it was bound to

change after securing a kind of freedom of action from our government by this dishonest and hypocritical resolution of nationalism, the communist party started moving back to its legitimate role. In the month of February already they were neutral already between India and communist China. They said India was to be blamed; Communist China was to be blamed; both sides were equally to be blamed; somehow they must make peace. So already they got back to a neutral position. From that they have been shifting every month more and more to approach the Peking position which was the position that Peking wanted them to take. And now they are threatening the Indian government with insurrection if the economic dislocation of the people is not elevated. So we have learned how the communist party behaved when their own country is attacked by a communist power. Our own party has benefitted from this attack. Because our party has warned, many of our leaders have warned for many years, that this is exactly what was going to happen, if the policy of coexistence with the communist power was practiced. So people said these are the people who understand what is happening have given us great support. We have won common election. We have been stronger than we were a year ago and our popularity is stronger and we are listened to with more respect than we were two years ago or even one year ago. This broadly is the picture of what happened immediately during and immediately after the Chinese communist attack.

Now, I would like to draw a balance sheet of India's gains and losses as a result of the communist attack of last year. Where do we stand today? To what extent are we better off and to what extent are we worse off? To give the debit side of the balance sheet first, we have three losses. We have suffered a military defeat and we are doing nothing to avenge it. That is the first loss. The second is that we have lost territory. We have lost about 14,000 square miles of our territory to the communist aggressors. The third loss is, that as a result of this situation and the added needs of defense, we are placing excessive economic burdens on our people. Our last budget was of an oppressive nature. The taxes are beyond the capacity of the people to bear. This has become necessary because our government today does not feel like taking arms and equipment from the democracies without the inhibitions that go with the policy of what is described as non-alignment. Since we do not accept arms free and

insist on paying on them, paying for them to our friends, we have to impose tremendous economic burden on our people which is certainly a bad thing from the point of view of morale in this recent communist aggressive. These are our three losses.

Against that there is the gain. It is a major gain, and that is a gain of education. The communist attack has been a great thing of education for our people. It has improved their awareness and understanding of reality which was lacking before, and this takes many forms. The political maturity, that India has now achieved as a result of this blow, is taking many forms. Let me give you an example of three or four of these aspects. The first is in regard to the nature of communism and in particular of the Chinese communist regime. It has been said by some wise persons, "You cannot fight what you do not understand." Up to now our government and many of our people did not understand the nature of communism. They imagine that they were normal people who would behave in a normal decent ways, and so they went in for a policy of what is called coexistence or pancha sheila, the five principles of non-intervention or non-aggression. Now this was completely misleading of Mao Tze-Tung and his group who had meant no reason for what they believe about coexistence. Just to quote two sentences from Mao Tze Tung who have said as far back as 1938, "Political power grows out of the battle of the guns," and in practice he has shown that he meant it. On July 1, 1949 Mao Tze Tung again wrote, "Neutrality is mere camouflage, and the third road does not exist." And he has gone on to describe Mr. Nehru in those days as a running dog of Anglo-American imperialism in exactly the same way that your great leaders were maligned and reviled by Mao Tze Tung and his gang, and yet we went forward rushing to embrace this regime. We gave it recognition, second in the whole world, and we also pleaded its case in the United Nations year after year. Even today there are in India some people who ask, "What is wrong with coexistence? It is a very good thing. Should we not want to coexist with our neighbors?" That is quite true. The principle of coexistence is a very valid one, which all should practice. But the wisdom of the man who wants coexistence with a neighbor is one thing and of a man who wants to coexist with an armed bandit is another, and in this case we are up against

a bandit regime and not a peaceful neighbor. That is what was wrong with our pancha sheila treaty and our attempt to coexist with the communist party in China. So this big piece of education that we cannot simply co-exist with this kind of regime has at last gone into the consciousness of our people.

The second piece of education is that our people has learned to distinguish between the Chinese people and the Chinese communist dictatorship. Up to now this was not understood. When our communists shouted India-Sino Bai Bai, and Mr. Nehru encouraged that slogan, it was not intended that we should be the brothers of the Chinese people and the enemies of the oppressors. What was intended was that we were the brothers of Mao Tze-Tung, Chou En-Lai, and the Chinese people. The fact that the Chinese communist dictatorship was at war with the Chinese people was not understood in India. We identified the people and the government. Now we have learned that we can be friends of the Chinese people, but we cannot be friends with the Chinese communist government. And this is a great thing of education. May I sincerely say here, Mr. President, that even during the day of fighting, when the communist troops were advancing into our territory, there was no feeling of anger against the Chinese people as such. We all love Chinese food and even through the days of fighting, people like me who are bitterly opposed to the Chinese aggression, used to go to our Chinese restaurants and eat with our Chinese friends there without any feeling that we were at war with the Chinese people. We began to understand that the war was with the dictatorial regime and not with the people of China, and I think this is a very important thing that we have learned with great possibilities for the future. All opposition parties in India immediately demanded the severance of diplomatic relations with the Peking regime. All democratic Indian opposition parties are even today opposed to diplomatic relations; they are opposed to the seating of communist China in the United Nations, and I join you in rejoicing at the vote of the United Nations earlier this week we decisively rejected that proposal.

The third piece of education was in regard to Tibet. We now learned it is not good to betray a helpless neighbor. When Tibet was invaded by

the communist forces in November and December 1950, we had a debate in our Parliament on 5th and 7th December of that year. There were 19 people who spoke in that debate. Ten of us and I was then one of the supporters of the Congress party of Mr. Nehru, ten of us out of the 19, warned our government that if Tibet was not helped to defend itself against communist aggression, the next country to be attacked would be India herself. At that time our warning was dismissed as those of alarmists. We were told the communist occupation of Tibet had nothing to do with our own national security. Now we have learned that if we allow our neighbors to be overrun without going to their assistance, some day we are also in danger of being overrun ourselves. And so now the people of India have understood the whole thing; the people of India today believe that the people of Tibet should be free; they believe in the rights of the people of Tibet, to full national self-determination, and to choose their own destiny and whatever way they want to do it, whether to complete national independence or otherwise. We have now learned we have let down our neighbor, the peace-loving people of Tibet. We are now suffering for our betrayal, and we are now to make good by helping them to become free as soon as this may be possible.

And finally there was gain also in education about the Republic of China base in Taiwan. It was interesting to know, and glad to know that during the months of October and November, in a very big mass meeting in New Dehli and Bombay, there was great response and applause to my proposition that the Indian government could now turn to the Republic of China, make friends with it again as we were friends before and asked the Republic of China to become our friends and allies in the war in which we were engaged. This was a sentiment which was met with great response from the Indian people, particularly when I reminded them that among all the great war leaders of World War II, there is only one, your present President Chiang Kai-shek, who have been a friend of India and who have advocated immediate independence for India during the war. That was done at a great sacrifice because it annoyed the British ally in doing so. This was a friend whom we could now turn and say, "Let us be friends again."

There were others also who said the same thing in India. On the 3rd April in a literary article in the Indian Express, Mr. Dia Mongica, one of our leading journalists, demanded that the Chinese maneuver could

be checkmated through collaboration with Formosa, I am quoting his words. On 30 March the Fort Magazine of New Delhi, a very fine freedom loving magazine, which is a high class political literary magazine said, "Our thoughts should naturally go to the Nationalist Chinese government in Taiwan. Far too long have we neglected it in our own security. Once Peking is described with the feeling that it can have no checking counter-acting its rear, it might learn to behave. Now largely for political reasons the US government has not permitted the Nationalist Chinese the freedom and resources they need to pay back the communist deservers on the mainland in their own coin. Washington has persuaded and inhibited for want of full understanding of the Nationalist Chinese case and its own position in Asia, particularly India. The political decisions we expect from New Delhi must take this fact into account. Let us hit the enemy where it hurts him most. This is not only a political understanding with the Nationalist Chinese but try to have it endorsed by Washington, and similarly Parliament, early in September, only last month, a leading member of the upper house or Senate, the Council of State, suggested that the Indian government should make friends with the Chinese government in Formosa and that they should work together in the United Nations and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, this plea was not listened to. Mr. Ademanny was not listened to. Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister, replying on 3rd September said, "Mr. Ademanny had made a very remarkable proposal when he said that India should support Formosa in the United Nations. This meant not merely supporting Formosa but upsetting everything India has said and done during the last 13 years. This quiet proposal would make fools of us in international affairs - no policy, no views of our own and generally drifting about from place to place." It is really a pity that this very sensible suggestion made by Mr. Ademanny on the Senate was not responded to more positively by the leaders of our government. But it shows that there are many voices in India now demanding a more rational policy of making friends with our friends and not continuing to make friends with our enemies. However, this is a subject which I will not elaborate on now because I am meeting your press tomorrow afternoon at 4 o'clock, I shall discuss this matter further with them.

Now I come to the end. To summarize, I would say that India is like a patient that has been half cured or, if you like, it is like a patient who has

gone through half an operation. But the operation is not yet completed. The surgeon has gone away half way through, and so the patient is half cured and half uncured. There are still some people in India who, as a result, would like the Bhrumens, people who learn nothing and who forgot nothing. They still continue to talk of non alignment, as if a country can be not aligned when it is at war itself. Non alignment has no meaning in such a country. But the Indian people as a whole has certainly marked a big step forward in their consciousness and in their understanding. In the four by-elections that took place in April and May this year, the government party was decisively defeated in constituencies where it was majority till that year. I myself was one of the candidates and in my own constituencies, it was very strong majority for the ruling parties where the majority one year ago had been 41,000 for the Congress party and was able to defeat the Congress candidate by a majority of 14,000 votes. This meant that 55,000 people had changed their mind in one year. This was all because of the communist attack last October and November. As a result of these four by elections which the opposition won, we were able to stable a motion of non confidence in our government. It is true that the motion was defeated, but we were able to get party votes in support of that motion which represented 39% of the electorate in last year's election as against 45% which is the vote enjoyed by the Congress Party of Mr. Nehru. So we see from this that the Chinese communist attack of last year has unfrozen the political situation in India. Everything is in a state of flux. People's thoughts are moving. People's minds are changing. I look upon this with great hope because now the people are beginning to think for themselves. Now the people are applying their minds to this problem. I believe that they are moving in a direction which would make possible the coming closer together of the people of China and the people of India. I believe that I am fortunate in having this opportunity to address you in this university, this great university in Taiwan, where the spirit of China, safely flourishes without negligence. I think it is good that things are developing in a way, that before very long it may be possible for the people of China and the people of India with freedom on both sides to come together and to work together for freedom and peace in this continent of Asia of ours. Thank you.