

freedom first

5870
91

DECEMBER 1959

An End To Appeasement

by M. R. Masani

THIS morning, I read in one of our national dailies the thought that:

"The Government is heading towards the greatest failure in that on an issue which should so easily compel solidarity, it is incapable of an appeal that the nation will hearken to as the authentic call to united action."

I came to this House, hoping against hope that the lead given by the Prime Minister would be such that this pessimistic thought would be disproved. But as the Prime Minister's speech unfolded, I felt more and more depressed, not because he seemed to be more angry with my quiet, innocent smile than even with the entire aggression of the Chinese and their murder of our people, but because his whole speech was a divisive speech which antagonised different opinions in this House that, if he had wanted them to go along with him, would have gone along with him very happily. He has in fact provoked those of us who came to offer our support to go into Opposition against him even our broader policies with which we are in agreement. I will not imitate the Prime Minister in his prejudice and his passion. I do not think this is the time when we can retaliate at that level. I want to say nobody in this House questions the patriotism or the integrity of the Prime Minister. Not even those whose integrity he takes the liberty to question. But we do question his soundness of judgement, and in whatever is going to be said now, it is not the Prime Minister's *bona fides*, it is not his desire to save the country and serve it, which we all accept, but the lack of wisdom which has been shown by Government policies to which attention will be sought to be drawn.

The Prime Minister's speech has won him the support of the Communist Party. I hope he enjoys it. I am reminded of a similar situation in 1924 when the first British Labour Government came to power. Then the British Communist Party asked Moscow—in a fashion that still prevails—"What shall we do? What is our attitude to the MacDonald Government?" And the answer is historic: "We shall support Mr. MacDonald", he wrote back, "as the rope supports the hanged man". That is the value of Shri S. A. Dange's support to the Prime Minister's policy, and I

am quite sure that my hon. friends over there know what value to attach to that support.

Another thing I would like to make clear definitely is that I do not wish to open here an academic discussion, despite the Prime Minister's provocation, on the principles of foreign policy. On those we are all agreed, and in spite of his attempt to draw a red-herring across the trail, let me read only one sentence from the only speech I made in this House on this matter in a very similar situation on December 6 and 7, 1950, when we were discussing the brutal Chinese attempt to conquer and occupy Tibet when I said: "I believe that the foreign policy of India based on independence of judgement is a sound one." I repeat that sentiment today. I part company with the Prime Minister—and many of us in an increasing number in this country are doing so today—in the way that policy is being implemented or carried out. So there is no question of questioning the non-alignment policy. The question is whether non-alignment, as Acharya Kripalani has rightly pointed out, is being correctly and detachedly carried out.

Now, going through the White Papers and the correspondence, three or four impressions are left on one's mind, which I am sure many hon. Members must have shared. The first is that the Chinese actions right from 1954 onwards, almost from the time that we signed the *Panchsheel* agreement, have shown a grand design. They are all facets of the same mind at work. There is nothing erratic, playful or irresponsible about it. It is a consistent mind running like a thread right through their entire conduct.

On the other hand, on our side, we find a sad failure to react to this consistent policy of probing and trying to find out how much nonsense we would stand. We went on giving in, as Acharya Kripalani has said, we wrote apologetic notes, always asking: "Do you really know what your people are doing?" as if after the first or second incident there was any doubt on the subject as to what the Chinese Government was telling its troops to do. The Chinese, on their part, accused us of aggression, of planning military action against them from "land, sea and air". That is the second impression one gets. It is a desire to avoid a clash, putting that above even the defence of India's territory.

The third impression I got was a sad one about the suppression of facts from this House over a period of as long as two years. Acharya Kripalani also dealt with that. The Prime Minister has written to Mr. Chou En-lai that he did it because he hoped to settle this without letting the people know so that they did not get excited. Whatever the intention, the result

was exactly the opposite. Mr. Chou En-lai was very encouraged when he found that Shri Nehru was not taking the people into confidence. He was encouraged when he found that the Parliament of India was being denied facts to which it was entitled from the Prime Minister. The result was exactly the reverse, and Shri Nehru should have known it, considering the party with whom he was dealing. This suppression is a grave act. I do not know if the full consciousness of its implications has sunk into the mind of our country yet, but I do say this in all humility that the Prime Minister will have a heavy responsibility before the Bar of history for this action of which he has been guilty.

The fourth thing that comes out of the White Papers is our neglect to raise the boundary issue in time. Mr. Chou En-lai explains in his letter to Shri Nehru on January 23 of this year why they did not raise it. It makes very good sense. He says that conditions were not "ripe" for China to raise the boundary issue with us. Certain proper preparations had to be carried out first. He said: 'We are now proceeding to take certain steps in making preparations.' We know what those 'preparations' were—to lull us into a false sense of security and then to nibble at our territory, to bring their forces up to the frontier armed in a way superior to our own. Those preparations were made all the time. We understand their tactics. What about ours? Why did we not from 1950 onwards raise the matter of our frontiers? In 1954, we signed a treaty selling out the independence of Tibet. We cheerfully allowed a buffer State, a valuable buffer State, that separated us from China to disappear. In fact, we did that in 1950, in 1954, we put our signature to that deed. What kind of diplomacy was it that, when you agreed to a buffer State being removed between an expansionist Power and yourself, you did not take the elementary precaution of saying, 'All right, we will give you Tibet. But you agree to the line that now divides you from us'?

No Quid Pro Quo

I say it was criminal negligence on the part of our Government at least not to get a *quid pro quo*. I will not argue on moral grounds. There was a time when our Prime Minister was fond of saying that freedom and peace are indivisible. He said it about Czechoslovakia, but he forgot to say it in the case of Tibet. Let that pass. But on the point of sheer national interest and cold-blooded foreign policy, when you sold out Tibet, should you not have asked in return for a guarantee of the McMahon Line and Ladakh frontiers before you accepted the conquest of Tibet, thereby removing a valuable buffer? Why was that not done? I do not want to be uncharitable. I hope it is not too unkind to suggest that it was not done because the people of India would not have tolerated this policy of appeasement any longer if they had known the facts. In other words, the Prime Minister put a particular policy to which he was wedded above the vital interests of this country, and he has not served it well in that regard. If they had

known in 1956 or 1957 about the aggression that was already perpetrated, *Panchsheel* would have "lost its lustre" in the eyes of the Indian people earlier—here Shri Nehru's words may be quoted—and that would have done the country a great deal of good. We would have been fore-warned; we would have been fore-armed; we would have deployed our troops and equipped them. All this we were not able to do because, instead of drawing our attention to the real menace which they knew was there, our Government turned our attentions to the frontiers of Pakistan rather than the frontiers of China, and let our troops be caught off guard.

The story goes back to 1950. Ever since the Chinese Communist revolution, a policy of sentimental misreading of history has been inflicted on this country. For ten long years we were told that China was always a peace-loving country. Now the Prime Minister says, 'No, for 2000 years they have been expansionists'. Why did he not say it earlier? Surely the Chinese have not changed their history in the last few months? Chinese history and communist history is always expansionist; it is always imperialist. We should have known this from the time that Mao Tse-Tung seized power in China. But we ignored all the warnings.

Warnings Ignored

In this very House in the debate on December 6 and 7, 1950, to which I referred at the beginning, 19 hon. Members spoke. Out of them 10 hon. Members warned the Prime Minister that the invasion of Tibet was the first step to the invasion of India. Among those who gave this warning were Acharya Kripalani, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Ranga, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, our Speaker, Shri M. A. Ayyangar and myself. There were ten hon. Members who warned the Government that the attack on Tibet was only the first step to the attempt to dominate India. The Prime Minister called us alarmists and brushed us aside. If we were alarmists, he was an escapist. He refused to face a fact which has now become recorded in history—that the invasion of Tibet was only one step towards domination of this country on which the Chinese communist regime is set.

There was another warning. We were humble people, Sir, but Mao Tse-Tung warned him and said in 1948, soon after taking power: "To talk of neutrality is a fraud. . . . There is no third force." Still Shri Nehru persisted in being neutral and being a third force. Our Prime Minister was called the 'running dog of the Anglo-American imperialists' in the official Press agency of the Chinese Government, the *New China News Agency*. That agency again issued a statement saying that the "Chinese Peoples' Liberation Army will hoist the Red Flag over the Himalayas". Mao sent a message of greetings to Ranadive, the then General Secretary of the Communist Party. He sent a message to the Party after the Calcutta Resolution when the communists

(Continued on page 9)

(AN END TO APPEASEMENT—Continued from page 2)

were in arms against our own Government in Telen-gana. In that message, he said:

"Relying on the brave Communist Party of India... India will certainly not remain long under the yoke of imperialism and its collaborators"—(that is Mr. Nehru)—and India, "like free China will one day emerge in the socialist and People's democratic family."

If that is not a blue-print of Chinese conquest of India, I do not know what it is and what more proof we want. Yet all these warnings were blatantly ignored by the Prime Minister who kept on telling the Indian people that there were 2000 years of Indo-Chinese friendship. I have never heard a bigger untruth. There has been neither friendship nor enmity between the Indian and the Chinese people because there was no contact. Somebody has rightly said that, by the same token, there has been unbroken friendship between the Indian and the Eskimo people for the last 2000 years because we never went to war! That is not friendship.

Lesson Learnt?

Lenin also gave us another warning. He said that "the road from Moscow to Paris lies through Shanghai and Calcutta". When Shanghai fell to Moscow, instead of welcoming the regime, instead of welcoming Russian expansion and instead of being its salesman in the United Nations and introducing it to the Bandung Club, we could have taken the lesson. We did all this without realising that Calcutta was the next. I say here again that one of the purposes of the present Chinese activities is that it has an eye on Calcutta and the fact that there was a demonstration there to which the Prime Minister referred this morning is not an accident.

I would never have gone into all these if there had been any evidence from the speech of the Prime Minister today that he has learnt his lesson. If I may say so, all the arrogance and the intolerance is still there. Instead of coming to the House and admitting that he has made a blunder, which is both Himalayan in its location and magnitude, he comes and starts throwing stones at others even before they open their mouths. It is time, therefore, we faced the question: Has the Prime Minister learnt the lesson? Judging from his speech this morning, I wish I could say that.

Anyway, on 21st October, the Prime Minister said at Calcutta that he did not think there was any "major idea" behind the Chinese incursions on our territory. Does this show any greater awareness as a result of the last nine years of harsh experience? If there is no major idea, what are the Chinese doing? What is it? Whims and fancies of Mr. Chou En-lai? Or is it like the British who occupied India in a fit of absence of mind that the Chinese want to occupy us in another fit of absence of mind? I do not care what it is, but one fit of absence of mind was enough for us. Along with Mr. Nehru, many of us here went

to prison in the Quit India movement and took part in many campaigns to end that fit of absence of mind by which Britain had conquered India. Are we, after ten years, to surrender our freedom to a more ruthless, more brutal gang of people?

May I now come to the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Chou En-lai? The Opposition amendment which has been moved by Acharya Kripalani and others, which we support, has already given the grounds why we are opposing the acceptance of the letter. But since this amendment was drafted, giving fresh thought to the matter, it appears to me that there is an even more important ground which was not mentioned in the amendment. There is a proposal for mutual withdrawal of forces and negotiations. Negotiations take place between two parties who have faith in each other's *bona fides*. They can only take place where one party believes that the other will carry out his word. Let us consider what is to happen in Akasai Chin. The Chinese are supposed to withdraw 100 miles and we about 20 or whatever it may be. How do we know that the Chinese will withdraw? How do we know that they will not break one more agreement like all the agreements they have broken in the past? Our own offer is: no patrols. We will not try to find out. How are we to find out? In this House the Prime Minister, about a week ago, was not in a position to tell us whether an air-field has or has not been built in that area. Many good reports are there that say that it has been built. Assuming he does not know, how is he going to know a month or two from now whether or not these people have withdrawn to the line he has demarcated? Suppose we withdraw and they do not. Are we then going to make ourselves a laughing stock for another time? Is the Chinese Communist Government a Government whose word is worth anything? Let us go back to history and our own experience. Let us forget Korea, Indo-China and all the rest.

Breach of Faith

In 1950, after assuring our ambassador and our Government that the Chinese forces would not enter Tibet, the Chinese forces entered Tibet. Our Government sent diplomatic notes of protest against that breach of faith. In 1959, Tibetan autonomy was violated although we were promised that it would be respected—a second breach of faith. The White Paper shows a consistent course of breach of faith of every one of the Five Principles of Panchsheel. Are we, after all this, going to accept the path of a diplomacy that starts by an assumption of the good faith of the Chinese Government? What kind of realism will that be? I am not saying that there should be no agreement with the Chinese Government, but an agreement with the Communist Government is worth anything only to the extent that you are able to enforce it by physical force. First occupy the line and then agree to the line. To agree to a line which you have not occupied will invite repeated breaches of

faith. Are you going to continue that illusion and continue with that faith which by now must be abandoned?

There are people who say—I think the hon. Defence Minister said at the United Nations—that the Chinese were stupid. I do not know. Perhaps we have been stupid in not understanding what they are about. The international communist movement has a very definite objective of world domination about which they make no bones at all. The domination of Tibet was the first step to the domination of India and the present activity is to get into a position from which the domination of India can commence.

Now, Mao is not, like our Prime Minister, a lover of peace. Let me quote one sentence from him—one pronouncement of Mao. He says: "Political power grows out of the barrel of the gun". That gun has come across the Himalayas. There is a Fifth Column in India ready to help those on the other side, and to link up with them is the first objective of the Chinese communists' presence on our frontiers and across the border. They want to occupy dominating heights from which they can threaten to invade this country, from which they can give moral aid and material aid and also arms to the guerilla forces fighting against our own Government.

Consider the contrast between Malaya on one side and Viet Nam on the other. Why is it that in Malaya the guerilla warfare conducted by the communists had been defeated after several years of fighting? Why is it that in North Viet Nam, we have a satellite Government of the Chinese communists and why is it that that country is divided? The one and the only reason that makes for the distinction is that there is a common frontier in the case of Viet Nam and there is no common frontier in the case of Malaya. After giving the Chinese on a platter a common frontier with ourselves by the betrayal of Tibetan freedom, now let us realise that any further encroachment, any occupation of points of vantage is a dagger planted at the heart of Indian security and that this is the first objective of the communist Chinese armies in what they are doing.

Psychological Warfare

There are other objectives: the destruction of the morale of the Indian armed forces. That is another objective. Slap the Indian armed forces and make them realise that they could not stop the Chinese and thus destroy their self-confidence in defending the country. That is by itself a moral and psychological victory for the Chinese and the Chinese know all about psychological warfare.

The third objective is the destruction of the morale of our small neighbours in the Himalayas: the Governments and the peoples of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. If these people find that we are not able to defend our own frontier, what faith are they going to place on our assurance that we will defend theirs? Even today you will find in the attitude of the Nepalese Government undertones which do not make us very

happy. Just as we have been neutral between different peoples, they are neutral between the Chinese and us. And we feel hurt. Have we any right to be hurt? If we are not able to defend our own soil, why should all the people of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim believe us when we say that we will go and defend theirs?

Finally, the Chinese attack on India is a beginning and an attempt at demoralising the countries of South and South-East Asia. Let me quote from a very valuable report from Professor Samar Guha of Calcutta, who is a member of the Praja Socialist Party, and who recently visited these countries. The report says:

"Prof. Guha has been frankly told by many highly placed leaders of these countries that they look upon the Himalayas as not the frontier of India only, but of the whole of the free and democratic Asia."

'Ship Without Compass'

It goes on to say that they do not understand why Shri Nehru is not defending this strategic frontier:

"A few very important leaders of the neutral countries felt compelled to compare, rather in a mood of dismay, the leadership of Shri Nehru to that of a captain of a ship without a compass."

Therefore, this is not a small matter. There is a very definite major thought behind it in spite of what the Prime Minister may say. This attack on our frontiers is one step in the Chinese communist attempt to dominate the whole of South and South-East Asia. They have chosen us, India, because, we are the strongest. When the strongest cannot fight, everyone else capitulates. They have also chosen us because for four years now we have encouraged their aggression by the pusillanimous and supine attitude which we have shown in not resisting their activities, a thing Acharya Kripalani has very well described.

I have not suggested anything now which is inconsistent with the policy of non-alignment. Let us remain non-aligned. But what does non-alignment mean? Acharya Kripalani quite rightly answered the charge of war-mongering. To defend your own territory is not to wage a war. I have never known of this suggestion before, that if you throw out bandits from your territory, you are engaged in an act of war! It is not an act of war. It is just police action in your own territory. Let us certainly abide by non-alignment. I do not for a moment suggest anything against it.

But by non-alignment, is it meant that we cannot repel any attack on our own territory? Is it non-alignment against ourselves also? Are we neutral against India? What is the meaning of non-alignment when we are being attacked by another power? Non-alignment certainly involves defence of one's own territory, if you like, by oneself.

Secondly, non-alignment does not mean that we cannot equip our forces adequately. Shri Nehru said many years ago in Washington that when aggression was there, "we can not and shall not be neutral". He

said: "We have to meet aggression and resist it; and the force employed must be adequate to the purpose". Can anyone who has read the White Paper say that at any moment in the last four years the force employed has been adequate to the purpose of defeating aggression? Every time, we were outnumbered and outmanoeuvred and captured and humiliated by superior detachments. So, equipping our army with arms obtained from other countries is completely consistent with non-alignment.

Acharya Kripalani rightly gave the example of Yugoslavia. I give two more examples—Sweden and Switzerland. Both these countries are neutral and non-aligned. But among the countries of western Europe, theirs are the biggest and the best-equipped land armies. Why? Because they realise that, since they are non-aligned, they will have to fight for their territories themselves.

Thirdly, non-alignment is not inconsistent with the capacity to recognise a dangerous neighbour. I know how, for nine years, a Government which lacked the character of a peace-loving and orderly Government has been glorified and made respectable in our own country and how we have received Mr. Chou En-lai, a man with blood on his hands, and held him up to our people as a lover of peace.

Non-alignment does not mean that we keep our own people in the dark.

Finally, non-alignment does not mean that when our people show some patriotism, the Prime Minister should advise otherwise; he has been scolding our people. Instead of leading them in a crusade, he has been attacking them instead of attacking the outside aggressor. The only crime that some of our people here have committed is that we have reacted more passionately, more emotionally if you like, or less responsibly if you like, than the Prime Minister. But is it fair that the biggest anger of the Prime Minister should be reserved not for those who are trespassing on our soil and killing our people, but for those who want to give more power to his elbow? I want to tell him that the country will be behind him and he can move faster in facing the enemy.

What People Want

There are three definite things our people want. I know that this House, and those who know, will in their bones feel that what I am saying is true. There are three things consistent with the policy of non-alignment. The great mass of the people demand the appointment of a Defence Minister in whom the armed forces and the country have confidence. Secondly, the need is for the construction of roads and air-fields, and the obtaining of equipment wherever it can be found to put our forces on a parity with the Chinese communist army. The third is, if the Chinese do not withdraw in the next few weeks, the third and final step is the removal of all restraints on our armed forces to do their duty of making them withdraw and ejecting from our territory those who have their feet on it and to see that the flag of India flies once again

on the Himalayas and not the flag of the "Chinese People's Liberation Army".

Many of us have worked together in the past. As Acharya Kripalani said, we may be a motley crowd today, but in a democracy we should be a motley crowd. We have pulled together during the great struggle for Independence in which we all participated. In 1942, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Acharya Kripalani and I and many others took part in the "Quit India" campaign to eject from this country the British who had been here for many years. If, today, the Prime Minister will start a 'Quit India' campaign against the Chinese, I can assure him that the whole country, barring the China Lobby, will be behind him.

Speech delivered in the Lok Sabha on November 25, 1959 in the course of the debate on China.

(COMMUNIST VULNERABILITY — from page 7)

uses today against all peoples, governments and institutions, could easily be turned by a determined opponent, in tune with our age and ready to use revolutionary strategy, into weapons in our hands.

We, not they, are today the advocates of genuine agrarian reform and the right of each man to till his own land. There is no country in the world more badly in need of agrarian reform than the USSR itself.

We, not they, are the champions of the rights and freedoms of working men, the freedom of movement, the freedom to change jobs, the freedom to build organizations of their own choosing under their own control, the right to elect their own officials, to formulate and negotiate their own demands, the right to strike, the right to vote for a party and a program and candidates of their own choice.

We, not they, are able to call the armies to "fraternize across the trenches," for it is they who must cut off their armies from the news of what is happening in the West, and we who must make our armies and theirs understand what is happening in their land.

We, not they, are the champions of the freedom of the human spirit, of the freedom of the arts and sciences, freedom of conscience, freedom of belief and worship, freedom from scarcity and want, and from the tyranny of irresponsible and omnipotent officials. Though in all these things the free world has its own imperfections and lapses, these are the things that the free world stands for and in good measure realizes, and these are the things which totalitarianism completely destroys and makes high treason even to think upon.

In the battle for the future shape of the world, all the creative and explosive weapons are in our hands if we have the wit and the understanding to take them up. If we do not, then there are no psychological or ideological vulnerabilities of communism. If we do, the communists are vulnerable on every front and at every moment and in every layer of their society. Whether the answer to this question is Yes or No will determine the outcome of the protracted war that is likely to occupy the rest of our lives and the rest of our century.

—Condensed from *The New Leader*

faith. Are you going to continue that illusion and continue with that faith which by now must be abandoned?

There are people who say—I think the hon. Defence Minister said at the United Nations—that the Chinese were stupid. I do not know. Perhaps we have been stupid in not understanding what they are about. The international communist movement has a very definite objective of world domination about which they make no bones at all. The domination of Tibet was the first step to the domination of India and the present activity is to get into a position from which the domination of India can commence.

Now, Mao is not, like our Prime Minister, a lover of peace. Let me quote one sentence from him—one pronouncement of Mao. He says: "Political power grows out of the barrel of the gun". That gun has come across the Himalayas. There is a Fifth Column in India ready to help those on the other side, and to link up with them is the first objective of the Chinese communists' presence on our frontiers and across the border. They want to occupy dominating heights from which they can threaten to invade this country, from which they can give moral aid and material aid and also arms to the guerilla forces fighting against our own Government.

Consider the contrast between Malaya on one side and Viet Nam on the other. Why is it that in Malaya the guerilla warfare conducted by the communists had been defeated after several years of fighting? Why is it that in North Viet Nam, we have a satellite Government of the Chinese communists and why is it that that country is divided? The one and the only reason that makes for the distinction is that there is a common frontier in the case of Viet Nam and there is no common frontier in the case of Malaya. After giving the Chinese on a platter a common frontier with ourselves by the betrayal of Tibetan freedom, now let us realise that any further encroachment, any occupation of points of vantage is a dagger planted at the heart of Indian security and that this is the first objective of the communist Chinese armies in what they are doing.

Psychological Warfare

There are other objectives: the destruction of the morale of the Indian armed forces. That is another objective. Slap the Indian armed forces and make them realise that they could not stop the Chinese and thus destroy their self-confidence in defending the country. That is by itself a moral and psychological victory for the Chinese and the Chinese know all about psychological warfare.

The third objective is the destruction of the morale of our small neighbours in the Himalayas: the Governments and the peoples of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. If these people find that we are not able to defend our own frontier, what faith are they going to place on our assurance that we will defend theirs? Even today you will find in the attitude of the Nepalese Government undertones which do not make us very

happy. Just as we have been neutral between different peoples, they are neutral between the Chinese and us. And we feel hurt. Have we any right to be hurt? If we are not able to defend our own soil, why should all the people of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim believe us when we say that we will go and defend theirs?

Finally, the Chinese attack on India is a beginning and an attempt at demoralising the countries of South and South-East Asia. Let me quote from a very valuable report from Professor Samar Guha of Calcutta, who is a member of the Praja Socialist Party, and who recently visited these countries. The report says:

"Prof. Guha has been frankly told by many highly placed leaders of these countries that they look upon the Himalayas as not the frontier of India only, but of the whole of the free and democratic Asia."

'Ship Without Compass'

It goes on to say that they do not understand why Shri Nehru is not defending this strategic frontier:

"A few very important leaders of the neutral countries felt compelled to compare, rather in a mood of dismay, the leadership of Shri Nehru to that of a captain of a ship without a compass."

Therefore, this is not a small matter. There is a very definite major thought behind it in spite of what the Prime Minister may say. This attack on our frontiers is one step in the Chinese communist attempt to dominate the whole of South and South-East Asia. They have chosen us, India, because, we are the strongest. When the strongest cannot fight, everyone else capitulates. They have also chosen us because for four years now we have encouraged their aggression by the pusillanimous and supine attitude which we have shown in not resisting their activities, a thing Acharya Kripalani has very well described.

I have not suggested anything now which is inconsistent with the policy of non-alignment. Let us remain non-aligned. But what does non-alignment mean? Acharya Kripalani quite rightly answered the charge of war-mongering. To defend your own territory is not to wage a war. I have never known of this suggestion before, that if you throw out bandits from your territory, you are engaged in an act of war! It is not an act of war. It is just police action in your own territory. Let us certainly abide by non-alignment. I do not for a moment suggest anything against it.

But by non-alignment, is it meant that we cannot repel any attack on our own territory? Is it non-alignment against ourselves also? Are we neutral against India? What is the meaning of non-alignment when we are being attacked by another power? Non-alignment certainly involves defence of one's own territory, if you like, by oneself.

Secondly, non-alignment does not mean that we cannot equip our forces adequately. Shri Nehru said many years ago in Washington that when aggression was there, "we can not and shall not be neutral". He

With Many Voices

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

—Tennyson.

In the process of winning the Nehru Line, India stands in danger of losing the McMahon Line.

—*Indian Express*, November 19.

There is no meaning in discussing India's non-alignment between East and West any longer. It has automatically been terminated by the East.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Hindu*, November 15

Is there a country in the world whose frontier has not been violated at some time or another?

—V. K. Krishna Menon, *Current*, November 25.

China has opened our eyes by attacking our territory.

—G. B. Pant, Minister for Home Affairs,
Hindustan Times, November 23.

There is no room for non-alignment any longer. It would only be another name for preferring peace at any price.

—C. Rajagopalachari, *Hindu*, November 15

For 2,500 years, no Chinese had come across the Himalayas except to understand our country.

—V. K. Krishna Menon, *Current*, November 25.

The fact of our cultural relationship with all Asian countries, including China, should not be stressed too much to create the belief that there was a tradition of amity between China and India through the ages. On the contrary, the real history is that China has always been aggressive towards her neighbours whenever she had some power.

—Dr. Harekrishna Malitab, Chief Minister of Orissa, *Indian Express*, November 24.

The only vested interest in the country today is that of politicians in office and the bureaucrats and businessmen who hang on to the coat-tails of the Government.

—M. R. Masani, M.P., *Times of India*, November 24.

In fact, Nehru has adopted Marxism to the latest nuclear epoch.

—R. K. Karanjia, *Blitz*, November 14.

The Chinese communists are Chinese and the Russians are Russians, but I do not know if the Indian communists are Indians.

—Mrs. Indira Gandhi, *Indian Express*, November 10.

In the event of an organised military operation by a communist country against India, it is very likely that the Indian communists would be on the side of our enemy.

—G. B. Pant, Minister for Home Affairs, *Indian Express*, November 23.

Mr. Nehru has occasionally castigated communists, but we have yet to hear Mr. Krishna Menon denounce them.

—*Indian Express*, November 26.

The Delhi State Communist Party is reported to have decided not to hold any public meeting in the capital "in view of the people's mood" on the Himalayan border troubles with China, according to a source close to the Party.

—News item in *Hindustan Times*, November 15.

Surely, Nehru must appreciate the emergence of nationalist-socialists like Nambudiripad and Dange as his ideological colleagues.

—R. K. Karanjia, *Blitz*, November 14.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

Editors: STEPHEN SPENDER & MELVIN J. LASKY

THE LEGEND OF KRISHNA

Marguerite Yourcenar

THE GERMANS AND THE ENGLISH

Terence Prithic

JACOB BURCKHARDT

C. V. Wedgwood

December 1959

75

Annual Rs. 12

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