

# CRY LUMUMBA!

★ by KRISHAN

CHANDAR  
APR 18 1961  
Cont. Cont.

So Lumumba is dead. Along with his two compatriots Okito and Mpolo, he lies dead, hacked to pieces, in an unknown grave.

The Katanga Government has given an award of eight thousand dollars to the murderers of Lumumba, Okito and Mpolo. Who are these murderers? Mr. Munongo, Tshombe's Minister for the Interior, will not tell us. They will remain unknown. Not only their names but the village to which they belonged will also remain undisclosed, unknown.

AND yet I think we know the name of the murderer, the village where this crime was perpetrated, and the grave where the remains of these African patriots lie buried.

The murderer is Belgian imperialism. The village is called NATO and the grave is known as UNO. I could almost delineate for you the faces of the grave-diggers, but Brutus is an honourable man!

Munongo the Minister for Interior in the Government of President Moïse Tshombe of Katanga, is a very learned guy. He cannot understand our resentment at Lumumba's murder. After all, he asks in righteous anger, if the US could kill Sacco and Vanzetti, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, why can't we, he asks, kill a few trouble-makers like Lumumba, Okito and Mpolo. Just like that! "But some persons," he walls, "would like to deny us this right because we are black and a young nation."

## Black Heart

No! Munongo, we do not accuse you because you are black in the face. We accuse you because you are black in the heart. You have a black, putrid, foul heart. You are not young. You are as old as fascism itself. We know your face and we know your heart, we saw its hideous face in the last war in huge Swastikas over unknown crematoriums, concentration camps and ghettos.

Do not be ashamed of your black face. Only men have faces. You are not a man but a mask. Just a black mask of the Belgian imperialists and their allies carrying death and destruction amongst the innocent people of Congo, so that Brussels may continue to exploit and loot the wealth of this African nation; its cotton, copper, uranium ore and other natural resources under its black folds. Go on Munongo, uttering brave lies put into your mouth by your masters. We know what you are. Just a Minister of Interior. Decoration and Exterior Fabrication!

Lumumba had started to die a long time back. He was quite hale and hearty, but he had started to die. It all happened many months ago, let me recall, when the Belgian imperialists, after having promised independence to Congo,

New Age greets the 15th Anniversary of the heroic RIN uprising on February 21, 1946, which dealt a heavy blow to the British enslavers and made a decisive contribution to the attainment of independence.

after having elected a Parliament in Congo and Lumumba as its legally-elected Prime Minister, when after having done that, the Belgians refused to quit, the innocent Lumumba, believing in freedom and democracy and having a pathetic faith in the UN Charter, called for the intervention of the UN in his country.

That was the time when hangmen started to gather round him. They streamed in large numbers into his country under the sacred cloak of the UN. The first thing that they did was to take away his



army from him. One cannot forget that General Mobutu's men were first paid by the UN over the head of and against the orders of Patrice Lumumba. Then they took away his airfields. Then the Parliament was closed.

And when Lumumba who had called in the UN to strengthen the frontiers of Congolese freedom, protested, Hammarskjöld went to Katanga and shook hands with Tshombe. It was a fateful hand-shake. Let us remember. Memory is a good thing. Sometimes it can convey certain things with frightening clarity. Today all of us remember that incident with agony, but at that time only the Soviet Government protested vigorously against it, laying bare the treacherous machinations of the Belgian imperialists and their NATO allies, backed in his most suave and gentle manner, by Hammarskjöld.

## Soviet Stand

Let us also remember that when the Soviet delegate at the Security Council sessions on Congo spoke so sharply and clearly against these machinations, as if almost with a sense of foreboding, most of our Asian delegates and some African delegates with the exception of a few were vying with each other to give a clean chit to Mr. Hammarskjöld. Little did they know that by giving a clean chit to Mr. Hammarskjöld, they were signing the death warrant of Lumumba

and hanging a noose round Congo's freedom.

At that time, firm and united action by Asian and African delegates was required to repel the onslaught of the imperialists. Instead we observed discord, disunity and dismal lack of foresight. In this plethora of pusillanimity, weak-kneed wavering and treacherous double-talk, the case of Congo went by default and the doom of Lumumba was sealed.

## Sense Of Shame

I do not say it with any sense of pride but with great shame and sorrow that the sleeves of many Asian and African delegates are also stained with the blood of this great African martyr.

Imperialism may be dying, but it is not dead yet. It has to be kicked out of existence. It cannot be killed by words or empty threats alone. Unfortunately, in this matter, where the urgent need was to safeguard the newly-won freedom of the Congolese nation, we had nothing else but words and empty threats, backed by inaction and confusion.

When the Congolese Parliament was closed, we took a grave view of it. When Lumumba was detained by Mobutu's men, we took a grave view of it. When he was sold over to Tshombe, we took a grave view of it. Unfortunately, a system like imperialism, fighting for its existence, cannot be cowed down by mere grave views of it. It has to be fought at every step and hounded out of every position of vantage by the resolute efforts of all anti-colonial people who love freedom, dignity and peace.

The course of events at the UN, too, must be changed and the guilty brought to book. As for Hammarskjöld I do not want to say anything against him, for Brutus is an honourable man! But may we ask him why he went at all to Congo? To sit there like a yogi and contemplate the navel?

The Belgian imperialists are back in the saddle. They are fanning the flames of civil war. They have destroyed the Congolese army. They have killed the democratically-elected Prime Minister of Congo, and all that Hammarskjöld does is to shrug his shoulders in utter helplessness. "I am helpless. I cannot do anything. The UN cannot interfere in the internal affairs of a country". Has Hammarskjöld suddenly gone non-violent? One wonders.

But a closer look at current affairs would reveal that the leopard has not changed its spots. Hammarskjöld's masterly inactivity has not helped to strengthen the freedom of Congo, or its legally-constituted

# NEW AGE

## COMMUNIST PARTY WEEKLY

VOL. IX, NO. 8 FEBRUARY 19, 1961 25 nP.

# India Act!

## Editorial

THE DISCREDITED AND hated puppets of the Kasavubu-Mobutu-Tshombe gang have murdered Lumumba

and his two comrades. The outraged conscience of humanity has not only expressed shock and horror but cried out aloud for the prompt punishment of the murderers.

The guilt of the Belgian colonialists, aided and abetted by the Western imperialist Powers who helped to overthrow the independent democratically-elected legal Congolese Government headed by Lumumba, who sought to impose the brutal puppet regime of murderer-monsters, who used the U.N. flag for their nefarious neo-colonialist aims, who paralysed effective U.N. action, stands fully revealed.

Prime Minister Nehru has expressed the gravity and urgency of the issues involved in Congo in clear and firm words. "There has been quite enough of putting up with these people and the time has come when strong and effective action to punish those who are guilty must be taken. Unless this is done with the speed and the entire situation in the Congo pulled up, the consequences are going to be far-reaching. It will become increasingly difficult for countries to associate themselves with an attitude and a policy which tolerate murder and brutality."

Speaking for the USSR, Zorin said that Lumumba's death "deprives of all significance the continuance of discussions on the Congo on the basis of the former facts. The really peace-loving peoples and particularly those of Africa and Asia must now review their positions on all the questions submitted to the Security Council and the U.N."

Lumumba's martyrdom has transformed the situation inside Congo, among world opinion, and the heavy shock it has delivered to the U.N. has led to the Security Council discussions being indefinitely postponed.

In India, a national mourning rally is being planned in the capital city with the cooperation of all patriotic parties, Congress, Communists and others. India's national conscience has been stirred as it has never been before in recent times and demands immediate and effective action to ensure the victory of the noble cause for which Lumumba died. The only way to achieve it and for India to heighten its contribution is for the Indian Government to join its efforts with those of the independent African Governments and the representatives of the Socialist camp headed by the USSR.

Lumumba's martyrdom will stand immortalised in world history as the symbol of Congolese liberation, as the purifier of the U.N. from colonialists' manipulations and the inspirer of new and unbreakable bonds of solidarity among all civilised nations who love and cherish freedom and who seek to fight for peace.

Lumumba's martyrdom will not go in vain. It has exposed the brutal bestiality of colonialism and inspired the forces struggling to end it with new determination and strength.

The representatives of the colonialist Powers are stammering with shock and are being heaped over with ignominious shame. They stand isolated and paralysed for the time being but they are not going to easily leave the Congo to the Congolese people themselves nor stop thinking out new moves to misuse the U.N. as before.

We have no doubt India will join hands with other freedom-loving peaceful States and ensure that the future of Congo, Africa, the U.N. and the world will not remain the same after Lumumba's death.

The words of wrath of the Indian people must activate the Indian Government to unfold new and effective initiatives unitedly with other anti-imperialist Afro-Asian, Latin American and Socialist States to avenge Lumumba's death and ensure a new triumph against the colonialists and for world peace.

★ SEE PAGE 13





















# PARLIAMENT'S SHOCK AT CONGO KILLING

★ by Ziaul Haq

When Parliament convened on Tuesday to meet in joint session to hear the President's Address the thing upper-most in people's minds was the murder of Lumumba. The day before's radio and the morning's papers had carried the statements of Tshombe's men proudly proclaiming their achievement. It was the hope and prayer of everybody that the President's Address would at least take note of the event and voice the Indian people's unanimous indignation over the crime and sympathy for the Congolese and African peoples.

IN vain one strained one's ears to catch some words to that effect in the President's Address. They were just not there. The address talked of "my Government" having "consistently urged the withdrawal of the Belgians, the release of political personalities and more particularly those who have parliamentary immunities." This while the whole world stood aghast and in mourning at the cold-blooded murder of the leader of the Congolese Parliament, one who was supposed to have enjoyed the greatest amount of those parliamentary immunities.

Could this lapse be ascribed simply to the fact that the event was too recent to have been included in the President's Address which is necessarily finalised some time in advance?

Advancing such an explanation or remaining satisfied with it would only amount to an admission that those who bear responsibility for the Address either do not grasp the enormity of the crime that has been committed or deliberately want to play it down. Otherwise they would have seen the absolute necessity of making that last minute change in the prepared text of the Address.

When the two Houses re-assembled separately immediately after the President's address, there was still some hope that they would find some appropriate means of voicing the popular sentiment on the issue. Nothing however happened in the Lok Sabha, and in the Rajya Sabha as soon as Bhupesh Gupta had raised the issue the Chairman in his wisdom announced adjournment for the day.

## Nehru's Speech

It was only on the second day that the situation was retrieved by the Prime Minister making a statement. He was obviously speaking with very deliberate restraint. What Lumumba meant to the Congolese people was brought out by him very simply and effectively. Lumumba was the foremost leader of the Congolese national movement, Nehru said. More than that—Tshombe's regime had openly declared that it was afraid Lumumba's place of burial, if disclosed, would become a centre of pilgrimage for the people of the Congo.

Nehru highlighted the "audaciousness" with which the Katanga regime had announced their crime and said it was the Belgians who ran the show there and a Belgian officer had been directly in charge of Lumumba's captivity.

Why the Belgians and their stooges had decided to carry

out such a grave and dastardly crime at this stage? It was Nehru's feeling that they perhaps feel that the balance of forces was turning against them and under the new dispensation even the U.S. might shift its policy. Hence they thought they must do away with Lumumba.

Prime Minister Nehru solemnly declared amidst cheers that there was no question of India acceding to the U.N. request for combatant troops unless India felt assured that they would not be used against the Congolese people to suppress their aspiration for freedom.

He, however went out of his way to emphasise that India's capacity to help the Congolese people was limited. The full picture was not clear as yet and it would take four or five days more to decide. Nevertheless, he felt that the U.N. operation should continue and should not be called off, because that would mean greater bloodshed.

Waiting perhaps for the picture to become clearer he observed a studied silence on Hammarskjöld's role and did not commit himself as to whether the operation could continue with such a person at its head.

## BORDER REPORT

THE opening of Parliament was looked forward to especially because the report of the officials of the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China which had been signed in Rangoon on December 12, 1960 was to be made available.

As the Prime Minister had stated in the concluding days of the previous session the report actually comprised two separate reports—one Indian and the other Chinese. This, as explained by the leader of the Indian official team to the Press after the Report had been laid on the table of the two Houses, was inherent in the very nature of the assignment. The Prime Ministers of India and the People's Republic of China in their directive to the officials had asked them to study relevant material "on which each side relied in support of its stand."

Summing up the outcome of their official talks the President's Address said that China's "intransigence" was still continuing. India on her part firmly held that "the frontiers between India and China have been for long well established by treaties, customs and usage."

"In spite of present unwillingness, or even intransigence" said the President, "my

Government hope that sooner than later, China will persuade herself to come to a satisfactory agreement with our country in regard to our common frontiers.

"Friendly relations with our great neighbour," he went on to say, "can then become a reality which will endure and contribute to our common good and to stability in Asia and the world."

The Chinese officials in the conclusion of their report charge the Indian side with the responsibility for the continuing "basic differences between the two sides." They say that it is due "to the refusal of the Indian side to recognise basic facts concerning the boundary" which, according to them, "have again been proven" (in these negotiations) "by different kinds of documentary material" produced by them.

## Differing Stands

They nevertheless say, "still the Chinese side hopes that by this exchange and examination of the materials in the possession of the respective sides and the explanation of the respective points of view, the two Governments would gain a further understanding of the real situation of the boundary and thus conduce to their continued search for avenues to a fair and reasonable settlement of the boundary question."

The Chinese officials reiterated in these talks that the Sino-Indian boundary had never been delimited. "The Indian side," according to the official summary of the report released by the Indian External Affairs Ministry, "had no difficulty in demonstrating that the statements made by the Chinese side, the practice of the Chinese Government in the past and since the establishment of the People's Republic, and International Boundary Law precedents all fully establish that a traditional boundary which conforms to natural features, and has been accepted in tradition and custom, does not require formal delimitation to establish its sanctity."

As for the boundary between India and the People's Republic of China, the same summary says:

"The majestic arc of the Kven Lun and the great Himalayan ranges forms the most impressive natural boundary in the world, has been recognised in tradition and custom for centuries, has determined the limits of administration on both sides and has received confirmation, for different sectors at different times, during the last 300 years in valid international agreements."

The Chinese side disputed the watershed principle which they charged the Indian side of making "the only or decisive factor" in the formation of a traditional customary border. They disputed the validity of the international agreements cited by the Indian side and reiterated the demand for "overall negotiations."

Explaining their refusal to discuss the boundary in the

Western part of Kashmir and that with Sikkim and Bhutan the Chinese report says in its conclusion:

"With regard to the boundary between China's Sinkiang and Kashmir west of the Kara-Koram Pass and the boundaries between China and Sikkim and between China and Bhutan as repeatedly raised by the Indian side in the discussion, they do not, in accordance with the talks and the joint communique of the Prime Ministers of the two countries and the past statements of the Chinese Government, fall within the scope of the Sino-Indian boundary question and are irrelevant to the task of the officials of the two countries."

This casts doubt on Kashmir's accession to India and on India's relations with Sikkim and Bhutan. The above-mentioned Indian Summary of the Report says, "China has now come out openly on the Kashmir issue, and declined to recognise the accession of Kashmir to India. She had also gone back on the acceptance as recently as April 1960 by Premier Chou En-lai of India's relations with Bhutan and Sikkim."

The Indian side strongly objected to the charge made against them by the other side that "India regarded Tibet as an independent country."

"The Indian side pointed out that this was a most objectionable distortion of the well-known and clearly established policies of the Government of India," says the official Indian summary in relation to this charge.

The closing para of the conclusion of the Chinese Report recalls the profound friendship between the peoples of China and India and states:

"Far from conflicting in their fundamental interests, they have every reason to call for cooperation in their common cause of building their respective countries and defending world peace."

It expresses the hope that through friendly consultations in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation the boundary issue between India and China would be speedily settled.

Meanwhile the dispute persists and hardens and gets more complicated.

## National Council Calls

# AVENGE LUMUMBA!

The National Council of the Communist Party of India began its Session in New Delhi on February 15 with the adoption of a resolution on the foul murder of Patrice Lumumba and his comrades. The Council stood in silence to mourn the death of the Congolese leaders. The following is the text of the resolution.

THE meeting of the National Council of the CPI notes with shock and revulsion, the premeditated and dastardly murder of Mr. Patrice Lumumba and his colleagues, Mr. Joseph Okito and Mr. Mpolo. The Council pays its homage to the memory of these brave martyrs of the cause of Congolese independence, and sends its profound condolences to the families of the departed leaders and to the entire Congolese people.

The assassination of Mr. Lumumba and his colleagues climaxes a whole series of bloody crimes, the Belgians and their hirelings directly aided and abetted by the U.S. imperialists and the NATO Powers have been perpetrating over the past few months to drown the Congolese independence in the blood of the people. The murder of the Congolese leaders and all these crimes would not have been possible, but for the treacherous role the Secretary-General of the U. N., Mr. Hammarskjöld played in the interests of the colonialists and the Mobutu-Tshombe-Kasavubu hooligans. For this crime against humanity and the U. N. charter itself, Mr. Hammarskjöld must be made to own his responsibility and to answer.

The National Council of

the Communist Party joins with all freedom-loving Afro-Asian people and all men of goodwill throughout the world in demanding that the Mobutu gangs and the armed forces which have been let loose on the Congolese people must be disarmed and disbanded at once and those responsible for the murder of Mr. Lumumba and his friends be given exemplary punishment. The Republic of Congo must be cleansed of all imperialists and their local agents so that the independence of that country is assured.

The National Council urges upon the Government of India to do everything in its power, diplomatically and otherwise, to save the independence of the Congo from the calculated crimes of U. S., Belgian and other imperialists. In this connection the recognition of the legal Government of the Congo at Stanleyville headed by Mr. Gizenga is an imperative step. The Council hopes the Government would now realise what a vile role the U. N. Secretary-General has been playing and would demand his removal.

The Council appeals to all patriotic forces in the country to raise their voice unitedly in support of these demands and rally to the cause of the freedom and dignity of the Congolese people. The Council appeals to all popular organisations, to the members and friends of our Party and to all lovers of freedom to immediately organise demonstrations all over the country in protest against this latest crime and express solidarity with the Congolese people.