

INDIA AND THE INDIA-CHINA BORDER CONFLICT

The Chinese leadership's reading of India and the situation in the country is so fantastic and topsy-turvy that it is hardly possible to think that the Chinese leaders themselves believe it. A more rational explanation is that having developed a chauvinistic outlook and taken the path of an aggressive policy towards India, it had to invent a justification for it which is sought to be done by its amazing reading of India.

Proof of this contention can be adduced by reference to China's own earlier evaluations and policies towards India. The Nehru-Chou Declaration of 1954, which enunciated the Panch Sheel, was clearly based on China's acceptance of India as an independent, peaceloving country. At the historic Bandung Conference, which followed, China and India cooperated in forging Afro-Asian unity on the basis of an anti-imperialist, anti-colonial, peaceloving policy.

In 1954, India renounced the extra-territorial rights in respect of Tibet which juridically it had inherited from the previous British rulers. Though the Nehru government resented the manner of China's later handling of the Tibetan question, and gave asylum to the Dalai Lama, it also rejected the demand of the reactionary parties in India to raise the question in the UNO.

In this context, the *People's Daily* wrote in its issue of May 6, 1959, that

In international affairs, the Indian government, headed by Prime Minister Nehru, has been reflecting generally the will of the Indian people and playing an important and praiseworthy role in opposing war and colonialism, and safeguarding peace, in carrying out a foreign policy

of friendship with China, with the Soviet Union and with the other socialist countries, and not joining in the military blocs of US imperialism. (p. 286—*The Great Debate*)

No reasonable person can argue that between 1959 and 1962, the character and policies of the Nehru government underwent a complete transformation. But that is precisely what the *People's Daily* article of October 27, 1962 would have us believe. In fact, worse. For this article does not even care to refer to the *People's Daily's* own reading of India as given in the earlier article of May 1959. It traces its new evaluation of the Indian government to Nehru's ideas and views dating back to the pre-independence period. It is made out that the "reactionary, expansionist and pro-imperialist" policies of the Indian government are but a continuation of Nehru's pre-independence aims and ambitions.

To begin with, the *People's Daily* article of October 27, 1962 tells us

After India's proclamation of independence, the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru inherited and have tried their best to preserve the bequests of the British imperialist rulers.

One can surely ask the question: Was this the opinion of the Chinese leaders when they signed the Panch Sheel agreement with India and cooperated with it at Bandung in 1954? Further, if that was so, why did the *People's Daily* article of May 6, 1959, quoted above, express an opposite opinion?

Further,

the British colonialists reached a compromise with the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India and turned over their rule to the latter on conditions which basically kept the economic interests of the British colonialists intact.

Shades of our Second Party Congress thesis quoted above, "fake independence", "satellite state" and so on!

Still further,

the class nature and economic status of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords determine that the Nehru government depends on and serves imperialism more and more.

A *Mirror for Revisionists*, of course, carries these characterisations still further. It speaks of Nehru as "the representative of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords," of the Nehru government as "hiring itself to imperialism at the cost of national independence", and as "a state which is under the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords." (*Mirror*, pp. 2, 5 and 8)

About the public sector in India, the *People's Daily* article of October 27, 1962 has to say the following:

The Nehru government has established a number of state-run enterprises in India which are nothing but state-capitalist enterprises dominated by the big bourgeoisie and big landlords and actually dependent on foreign monopoly capital. Such enterprises serve the interests of both the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords and of foreign monopoly capital. They are in essence Indian bureaucratic-monopoly capital.

All these evaluations and characterisations really need no refutation so far as our Party members are concerned. For they were debated on and disposed of long ago, at the Palghat Congress of our Party, as pointed out in the preceding section. But the question may be raised that subsequent shifts and modifications in the policy of the government of India, perhaps justify them. So let us see how the Vijayawada Congress of the Party evaluated them in 1961.

The Vijayawada resolution says

The public sector has grown despite every effort by

imperialists and certain monopoly circles inside our country to thwart its growth. (p. 3)

The government of India has successfully resisted the pressure of imperialists and their friends who wanted our country to abandon the policy of building heavy industries and to weaken the public sector. (p. 6)

The resolution does not hesitate in pinpointing the various concessions given by the government of India and compromises made by it with foreign and internal monopoly capital, and states that "these are dangerous developments."

At the same time, it warns that

From all this, it would, of course, be erroneous to draw the conclusion that the government of India is becoming more and more subservient to imperialists or that our independence is being bartered away. A considerable part of the rise in foreign private investments is due to re-investment of profits earned in India. Moreover, Indian capital has grown at a much faster rate. The public sector has become a major factor in our economy. (pp. 7 & 8)

Further,

Growth of the state sector, embracing strategic industries such as iron and steel, machine building, coal, oil, etc., has been one of the most welcome developments of the recent period. (p. 8)

The Chinese leadership has a way of picking up all the negative features of Indian economy and politics, piecing them together and then presenting an entirely exaggerated and distorted picture of reality taken as a whole.

Comrade Dange in his pamphlet *Neither Revisionism Nor Dogmatism Is Our Guide* in reply to the *Mirror* has clearly exposed this whole technique and the amazing con-

clusions drawn therefrom. He says:

The Communist Party of India has not only differed with such *conclusions* drawn by the Chinese Party. It has serious differences with the statement of the facts also. Each fact by itself is correct but it is incomplete and, as such, it gives an incorrect picture of the totality. To state facts *incompletely*, to study a phenomenon *one-sidedly*, is surely not a Marxist-Leninist method. Need we say that to the experienced Chinese leaders, who can teach us a lot on how to study 'contradictions' in all their aspects?

Has foreign capital doubled and has American capital increased? It has. But *something else also has happened to Indian economy, namely:*

(a) Side by side with Anglo-American or imperialist capital, India has accepted loans and aid from the socialist countries as well. The aid from socialist countries has gone in to build such vital and strategic industries in India that the economic dependence of India on imperialist aid has been reduced. India's independence has become stronger, though it does not mean that the presence of Anglo-American capital is not a threat to our independence.

(b) The relative strength and volume of Indian capital, taken together with capital from socialist countries, has grown *more* than American capital as such. In a newly-liberated non-aligned country, this fact has profound significance.

(c) Along with the private sector of capital, there has grown a state sector of capital in India. This sector is state-capitalist by its nature. But in a backward economy *it can play a progressive role under democratic pressure.*

These three most vital facts of the industrial growth of

Indian economy are absent in the Chinese picture. They mention the state sector but condemn it as mere bureaucratic monopoly capital in the service of monopoly groups. The *new technical base* of Indian industry, which imperialism dislikes, and, the new working class and intelligentsia, which reaction fears, are nowhere in the Chinese picture.

It is true that the land problem is not solved and the peasant is discontented. But feudalism does not remain intact. It has been curbed to a large extent, though not eradicated. A greater push to land reforms is surely necessary—and is possible.

The struggle to combat concentration of wealth and protect the rights and liberties of the people has been gathering strength despite the rise and growth of right reaction. The establishment of a communist-led government in Kerala in 1957 was a pointer.

The government does suppress the strike struggles. But workers also secure successes and realise their demands. Even during the emergency and the regime of the Defence of India Rules, Wage Boards have declared wage increases and recalcitrant employers had to face workers' demands and strikes.

'The dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and landlords' has not given up its parliamentary form and bourgeois democratic content, with elections on the basis of adult franchise. These facts, too, are absent from the Chinese picture.

Besides, in India, the Communist Party exists and functions along with other democratic forces and is the main opposition party to the ruling Congress party.

The foreign policy of the government is basically one of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism. At the same time, it is true that it vacillates and weakens under reactionary pressure.

On December 7, 1961, the Chinese leadership wrote that

'the foreign policy of the Indian ruling clique in recent years has received increasingly open approval and praise from Washington'. Just then, on December 18, the Indian army marched into Goa and liberated it from four hundred years of Portuguese rule. Washington and London were furious with Nehru and wanted the UNO to intervene but the Soviet Union's veto stopped them. There is not a word about it in the Chinese picture. (pp. 290-292)

The results of the Chinese leaders' wrong understanding of the Indian situation are most glaringly expressed in the fact that they utterly fail to see or notice the forces of right reaction in India. In fact, they glorify many of the attacks and gains of right reaction against Nehru and his policies as though they were the victories of a popular revolutionary upsurge against the government.

Making out that Nehru and the government of India are themselves the agents of Anglo-American imperialism and arch-reaction in India, the agents of an expansionist, aggressive and provocative policy towards China, the Chinese writings have not even once taken cognisance of the Swatantra Party, the Jana Saugh, the rightwing inside the PSP, etc., or made any distinction between the rightists and the progressives inside the Indian National Congress. The Chinese leaders never raise the question as to which classes these parties and elements represent. They totally ignore their slogans and policies, despite the fact that on the India-China question itself they call for provocative and adventurist actions which the government of India has rejected.

During the last parliamentary elections, the PSP-Jana Saugh-Swatantra combine, backed by the Dalmia-Jain-Goenka press, labelled Krishna Menon as "China's, not India's, Defence Minister." And yet, the Chinese did not attack Kripalani, the candidate of the reactionary combine

as a China-baiter. They attacked Krishna Menon as a bellicose expansionist. They did not evince the remotest regret when later, Krishna Menon had to resign from Defence Ministership under the pressure of the very elements who were vociferously demanding an all-out Anglo-American military intervention in the border dispute and an adventurist, military counter-offensive against China.

Right reaction opposed the Colombo Proposals when they were first put forth and has consistently demanded that the government of India should declare them as having lapsed. They oppose any new initiative, consistent with India's dignity, to bring about an agreed ceasefire and open out the prospect of a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the border dispute. They reject any solution of the problem except through force of arms. Lohia calls for the pushing of the Indian border up to the East-flowing Brahmaputra beyond the Himalayas.

The Chinese leadership is blind to all these happenings in India, to all these realities of the situation.

On the contrary, the Chinese leadership gets a tongue as soon as reaction scores an advance or a victory in India. It becomes eloquent in the praise of such victories.

The Peking Radio made appreciative references to the electoral victory of Masani and Kripalani in the parliamentary by-elections, treating them as a defeat of the anti-people policies of the government by popular forces, not as the diversion of popular discontent into dangerous reactionary channels.

Everyone remembers the situation in India at the height of the India-China crisis in October-November, 1962. On the one hand, the people were rallying in a very broad unity behind Nehru, and the government for national defence. On the other, the darkest, pro-Western forces of Indian reaction were doing their utmost, taking advantage of India's conflict with a communist country, to attack and smash up the Communist Party of India, the trade-union

movement and the other progressive forces of India, to work up a mass frenzy against them, and also to dislodge Nehru from the position of Prime Minister of the country. General Cariappa, the Jana Sangh, the Swatantra, and others were so emboldened as to openly incite mass rallies to murder communists in the streets and to demand the installation of a government of army leaders and rightwing politicians. At the end of November 1962, they were within an inch of success.

In this situation, how did the *People's Daily* article of October 27, 1962 read the situation in India and what did it call on the Indian people to do?

These are its very words:

Large numbers of Indian progressives, large numbers of politically conscious workers, peasants, intellectuals and fair-minded people have not been deceived by the reactionary propaganda of the Indian ruling circles, nor have they knuckled under to their attack. In the interests of the Indian people, they have, under extremely difficult conditions, waged unflinching struggles. History will prove that it is they who really represent the interests of the great Indian nation and people.

And then, citing an experience of 1927, from Chinese history, when the Kuomintang government of Chiang Kai-shek had attacked the Soviet Union, the article advises the Indian people to oppose Nehru as the CPC had then opposed Chiang Kai-shek.

Well, since the only "struggle" in October-November, 1962 which was being organised in India against the government of India was the one led by Cariappa and Co., the objective of the Chinese leaders and Indian reaction at that time was the same, viz., dislodging the Nehru government from power. According to Chinese logic, it would have led to a revolutionary capture of power by the Indian people. According to every person of ordinary common

sense, whether in India or abroad, it would have meant the unquestioned victory of the Anglo-Americans and their stooges in the country.

The contrast is still further heightened by the fact that, the Chinese papers and radio totally ignore genuine popular struggles which are led by the CPI or in which it takes an active part. The *Mirror* accuses the CPI of "betraying the revolutionary cause of the Indian proletariat and the Indian people." (p. 1) But the *People's Daily* and *Hongqi* do not have a word to say about the great Delhi march of September 13, 1963 or of the innumerable worker-peasant struggles organised by the Party, the trade unions under its leadership, the kisan sabhas, etc. The Kerala land struggles are nowhere mentioned. And to top all we were accused of betraying the Bombai Bandh action of August 20, 1963, in which we played such a vital role.

It is an old and recognised experience of all progressive movements that the blind left and the extreme right find themselves in the same boat, which, of course, the blind left refuses to see.

All the same, a few questions may be put to the Chinese leadership.

If the CPI has betrayed the Indian people and sold them to Nehru, and Nehru has sold India to the USA, then how and why was it that at the time of the India-China crisis, it was precisely the veteran pro-Westerners in India, outside and inside the Indian government, who led the attack on the CPI by imprisoning its members, physically assaulting them in the streets, breaking up their meetings and burning our Party Offices?

If Nehru and Krishna Menon were American agents, then why was it that the China-baiters threw Krishna Menon out of office and moved heaven and earth to throw out Nehru?

If the state sector of Indian economy represents bureaucratic capital, and is dominated by big business and big landlords subservient to imperialism, then why does the

Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry and the Masanis and Gayatri Devis howl against it and demand its disbanding?

And if foreign capital is in love with the Indian state sector, then why did the foreign oil monopolists and their Indian collaborators push out Shri Keshav Deo Malaviya from the Oil Ministry?

The Chinese analysis of the economic and political forces operating in India is incapable of replying these and similar questions.

When one equates the national bourgeoisie, with all their vacillations and compromising policies, with all their anti-popular policies, with pro-imperialist, monopoly and feudal reaction, these questions of real life are bound to become unanswerable. What is worse, with such an identification, far from helping to unite all progressive, democratic and national forces against reaction and imperialism, one is bound to assist, consciously or unconsciously, imperialism and reaction against progress. No amount of revolutionary phrasemongering can save one from such a fate.

Precisely for this reason, though the CPI has not hesitated to criticise Nehru and the government of India when necessary, even on the India-China issue, what to speak of their other policies of making concessions to imperialism and reaction and attacking the people, though the CPI has consistently led popular struggles against the anti-people policies of the government, it cannot accept the Chinese thesis that the India-China border conflict is the result of "Nehru's expansionist" policy towards China. We cannot accept that Nehru has raked up the border conflict "to curry favour with US imperialism and get more US dollars." We cannot accept that "US aid to India is the barometer of the Nehru government's foreign policy, and particularly its policy towards China." This is what is called in logic, the fallacy of "reductio ad absurdum."

The resolution of our CEC on "Certain Questions Before

the International Communist Movement," adopted on September 7, 1960, after mentioning "the notable contribution that the Republic of India has made to the building of the peace zone" and after referring to the positive assessment of India's foreign policy made at the Palghat and Amritsar Congresses of the Party, reiterates that "it is an independent foreign policy, a policy of peace, a policy of opposition to colonialism, an anti-imperialist policy."

Further, the same resolution, after asserting that "it is this basic assessment that must determine the attitude of all socialist countries towards India," categorically states that "this is not how the Chinese leaders approach the question. They have made a basically wrong assessment of the Indian situation."

In fact, it goes further and enumerates the harmful results of the Chinese policy towards India that had already come about by 1960, long before China's massive assault on India two years later.

What were these results? We quote from the text of the resolution:

- (1) Frittering away of the mass sentiment of friendship for China and its replacement by sentiments of suspicion and hostility among big sections of the people;
- (2) Supplying a powerful weapon to the ruling circles with which they can divert mass attention, disrupt popular struggles and confuse the people;
- (3) A blow to the democratic and communist movement in India;
- (4) A further strengthening of rightist elements inside the government and demoralisation of the middle elements;
- (5) Strengthening of the extreme right in every sphere.

In his speech at the 81-Parties' Conference in 1960, Comrade Ajoy Ghosh had to speak at length on the India-China border conflict. In that speech, he traced in detail the development of the dispute. It is an extremely balanced

and, in fact, a very moderately worded and persuasive speech. He did not hesitate to point out the mistakes on the Indian side with regard to the Tibetan development of May 1959. He emphasised the sinister motives of Indian reaction. At the same time, he clearly pointed out, on the basis of our CEC resolution of September 1960, how the Chinese reading of the Indian situation was basically wrong and how its policy and actions on the border question were not such as a socialist country should follow. Then he narrated at length on how many occasions the CPI had tried, through correspondence and orally, to explain their mistakes to the Chinese leadership, to which they had turned a deaf ear. Finally, he appealed to the Chinese leaders, from the rostrum of the world communist conference, to change their understanding and policy towards India.

All this has to be recapitulated to point out how the Chinese theory of "India pursuing an expansionist policy towards China" is wrong and how the Chinese leaders have doggedly stuck to it despite all the facts and arguments to the contrary, placed before them times without number.

That is why we have to search for other reasons to understand a policy which finally ended in a massive military attack on India between September and November, 1962, and the adoption of the resolution by our National Council calling on the Indian people to defend our motherland against China's open aggression. The opening part of the resolution, adopted on November 2, 1962 states as under:

The National Council of the CPI, meeting in New Delhi in the present grave period of national emergency, appeals to all sections of the Indian people to unite in defence of the motherland against Chinese aggression. The Communist Party joins hands with all our patriotic people who stand behind the Prime Minister's stirring appeal for national unity in defence of the country.

It has to be stated without mincing words, that the entire

approach of the Chinese leaders towards the question of its borders is basically wrong and chauvinistic.

Both from the standpoint of principle and practice Lenin gave the clearest exposition of what the approach of socialist states towards the question of border differences with their neighbours should be. This he did in his explanation of the Russian Peace Treaty with Estonia. It must be noted that this treaty conceded what was actually a contiguous Russian speaking territory to Estonia, and that when the Estonian government was a military-fascist dictatorship openly hostile to Russia. In his explanation of the treaty, Lenin wrote:

The terms of the peace treaty provide for a number of territorial concessions on our part which do not completely correspond to the strict observance of the principle of self-determination of nations, and prove in practice that the question of frontiers is of secondary importance for us, while the question of peaceful relations, the question of our capacity for watching the development of the conditions of life of each nation, is not only an important question of principle, it is also a matter in which we have succeeded in winning the confidence of nations hostile to us. (*Report on Peace*, p. 118)

Here is the clearest verdict that, whether the Chinese leaders consider the India-China border conflict as arising out of the "hostile" attitude of the Nehru government or because of their "historical rights based on the principle of self-determination," or perhaps because they want "to prod" the Indian people's revolution—in any and all of these cases their border policy is wrong. There is no excuse for carrying their differences with India to the point of armed conflict. The supreme consideration, according to Lenin, had to be the maintenance of "peaceful relations" with India, "to win the confidence" of India. Lenin calls for such a policy even where the neighbouring nation is

"hostile." In India's case, China was dealing with a peaceful and friendly nation, a nation without whose friendship with China Afro-Asian unity and solidarity fall to the ground.

With the tempestuous advance of modern science, technique and the velocity of transport; with the imperialists and reactionaries in various countries always wanting to fish in troubled waters in pursuit of their cold war policies; when the world has shrunk in size and the danger of local territorial conflicts escalating into a nuclear holocaust has grown; under such conditions, the explosive nature of border conflicts has been enhanced many times over. The question of territorial and border conflicts has become a world problem for the proper settlement of which the acceptance of certain principles and a modus operandi by all the states of the world irrespective of their social systems have become an extremely pressing necessity. Either such disputes are now going to be settled on the basis of such principles through peaceful negotiations or they hold out the threat of escalating into a major war.

Bearing this situation in mind, Comrade Khrushchov, as Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, addressed a message to all Heads of State on December 31, 1963. The message also included a proposal for concluding an international treaty under which all states would renounce the use of force in settling territorial and boundary disputes. It specified the key provisions of such a treaty. The message is a model application of Lenin's policy of peace and peaceful coexistence to the settlement of border and territorial disputes in the nuclear age.

At the outset, the message clearly distinguishes between national liberation struggles and border and territorial disputes. It states that the ruling imperialists have to quit the countries under their rule. If they do not, the subject people have a right to fight for their freedom by peaceful or non-peaceful methods as they may decide. Questions like

Goa or Taiwan are considered a part of national liberation and not included in territorial disputes.

The message then states that singly, territorial and border disputes, more than any other issues, lead to dangerous frictions in various parts of the world. World powers, besides the states directly concerned, also get involved in them.

Further, arguments and considerations relating to history, ethnography, blood affinity, religion and so on, are advanced in justification of territorial or border claims. This inflames passions and aggravates mutual enmity. The establishment of who is right and who is wrong in such claims, whose position is justified and whose not, is extremely difficult because existing boundaries have been shaped under the influence of many factors. It is difficult to find one's bearing in the labyrinth of evidence and counter-evidence produced by the contending states.

Border disputes are particularly harmful for the newly independent states, since they divert national resources to defence when they are most urgently needed for building industry and improving agriculture, and raising the living standards of the people whom centuries of colonial exploitation has reduced to extreme poverty.

Proceeding, Comrade Khrushchov says, "I really do not know what words to choose to make it absolutely clear that in our day there are not and cannot be, territorial disputes or unsettled boundary issues between existing states that would justify the use of armed force. No, that must not be allowed, and everything must be done to rule out the very possibility of events taking such a course."

Comrade Khrushchov does not deny that "a number of countries have justifiable grounds for their claims." But he insists that the contending states "have to closely analyse the situation in order to achieve a settlement." He states that "experience has clearly demonstrated the feasibility of

peaceful means of settling territorial disputes."

We now have a situation when we can approach and solve in a practical way the problem of banishing from international life the employment of force in territorial disputes. (emphasis in original)

He refers to a wide range of procedures for a peaceful settlement of territorial and boundary disputes, e.g., direct negotiation between the countries concerned, recourse to good offices, assistance by international organisations etc. The UNO can make a contribution "if it takes an objective approach, though in its present form, I am far from regarding it as an ideal instrument."

Then follow the provisions of the proposed treaty or agreement to be accepted by all the states of the world. The provisions are as under:

First, a solemn undertaking by all the treaty powers not to resort to force to alter existing boundaries;

Second, recognition that the territory of a state should not, even temporarily, be the object of invasion in any form, attack, military occupation, or of any other coercive measure directly or indirectly undertaken by other states out of political, economic, strategic, boundary or any other considerations;

Third, a firm declaration that neither difference in social and political system, nor non-recognition, nor absence of diplomatic relations, nor any other pretext shall justify violation by one state of the territorial integrity of another;

Fourth, an undertaking to resolve all territorial disputes exclusively by peaceful means, such as negotiations, mediation, conciliatory procedures, and also other peaceful methods at the choice of the parties concerned in conformity with the United Nations Charter.

Could one think of a more sane, sober and fair proposal

for the settlement of territorial and border disputes between states? And does the message deviate an iota from Lenin's ideas about peace and peaceful coexistence? And yet, the Chinese leaders have rejected the message including the agreement proposed by it.

As for the historical claims to the border territory demanded by China, the evidence produced by India is more convincing than that produced by China. But that is not the crux of the matter here. Given a friendly and cooperative approach, nations have adjusted their borders in the past and will do so in the course of future history. The heavens do not come down if reasonable border adjustments are made between friendly countries in mutual interest.

But on this point also, while China, in a self-righteous manner, claims all the territory conquered by its past emperors as a matter of right, as though their conquests were based on the democratic principle of self-determination, it vehemently attacks the claims of its neighbours as being based on the legacy of imperialist expansionism. Imperialism was certainly neither democratic nor peaceful, but nor were the medieval emperors known for their love of self-determination, democracy or peace.

Between the socialist countries at least, it is clearly understood that it is totally wrong and unnecessary to raise the question of border territories. Since all are under socialist rule, the question can be left to future generations when, in the context of the deep-rooted consciousness of the brotherhood of mankind, border questions will lose their present significance and will be solved without the slightest bitterness or controversy. Even that the Chinese leaders will not accept. They have made substantial border claims to Soviet territory as well.

Much has been made by the Chinese leaders of the fact that they have arrived at border agreements with Burma, Nepal and Afghanistan through negotiations. They have

arrived at an illegal agreement with Pakistan on the borders of occupied Kashmir. That is given as a proof of China's conciliatory attitude and India's intransigence.

But that again is attempting to have the best of both the worlds. India, it is asserted, refuses to settle the border question peacefully because it is under American dictation. In that case, are Pakistan and Nepal under less American influence or more? Then how has settlement with them been possible? One cannot have it both ways.

Besides, here is another evidence which demolishes the Chinese claim to a friendly spirit of give and take. The Sino-Nepalese border is based on the principle behind the McMahon line, the principle of the watershed formed by the highest crests of the Himalayas. The same principle has been accepted by China in settling its border with Burma. Then how does that principle become an expression of imperialist expansionism in NEFA, which is sandwiched between Nepal and Burma?

It is unnecessary to go into more recent history of how Chinese border-guards (not the regular army, of course) found themselves (in sheer self-defence, not for aggression, by any chance) at Foothills, within a stone's throw from Assam.

Nor is it necessary to refer to China's continued quibbling over the Colombo proposals, the very essence of which is that they have been made, neither by China nor by India, but by powers which are friendly to both and desire a peaceful settlement in the interest of both and of Afro-Asian solidarity and peace.

According to the strange logic of China's leaders, the acceptance of the Colombo proposals by them amounts to the acceptance of a dictated arbitration, which their self-respect and the sovereignty of China precludes them from doing. India's acceptance of the Chinese terms for an agreed cease-fire line, however, does not raise the question of any dictated terms for India. For those terms are supposed

to be the unchallengeable proof of China's readiness for unconditional negotiations and a peaceful settlement with India.

And with all this, if the Soviet Union states that the India-China border conflict is unnecessary and stupid, the *People's Daily* and *Hongqi* accuse it of siding with American imperialism and its "agent" Nehru, to oppose China. And if the CPI declares its support to national defence while supporting the Colombo proposals for opening the perspective of a negotiated settlement, it of course becomes the "Dange clique that has betrayed the Indian people and embarked on the road of national chauvinism and class capitulationism."

The CPC leadership had started publicly attacking the CPI on the questions arising out of the border conflict long before the massive Chinese attack on India in October-November, 1962. But, of course, our National Council resolution of November 1, 1962, made it wild and it is since then that it has gone all out to attack us most rabidly and has attempted to interfere in the internal affairs of our Party, now going to the length of openly calling for a split in our Party.

And why all this attack on our Party? For the reason that we gave clear support to national defence when our country was attacked by China and called on the people of our country to rally behind the Prime Minister for national defence. Well, in the given circumstances, we were not only right in issuing such a call, but a thousand times right in issuing it.

At the same time, it is not only a crying injustice to our Party but a distortion of our November 1 resolution to make out as though it spoke of nothing but defence, or that the content and phraseology of the resolution were tinged with national chauvinism.

Even at the height of India-China crisis, when whole divisions of the Chinese army were pounding away with

all their might in NEFA and Ladakh, when our public meetings were being broken up and our offices attacked in many parts of the country—even in such an ordeal our November 1 resolution gave a clear warning against every attempt of imperialism and Indian reaction to exploit the India-China conflict for their own nefarious purposes. Even in that situation, while correctly giving an unambiguous support to the military defence of the country, our November 1 resolution called for the mobilisation of all the national and international forces, the forces of the socialist countries and the peaceloving, anti-imperialist Afro-Asian countries, to help India to bring about a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the border conflict.

The November 1 resolution says, "The reactionary forces seek to take advantage of the situation created by the Chinese aggression to make India give up its policy of non-alignment, foment war hysteria and drag India into the imperialist camp." Further to this end, they are openly accusing the government and Prime Minister of "appeasement" and "vacillation and calling for a total reversal of foreign policies." Still further, "the National Council draws the attention of all to the warnings given in the Prime Minister's appeal against anti-national vested interests who will try to profit by raising prices or hoarding, etc. The Council hopes that the central and state governments will take stern measures against the vested interests, and that those unpopular measures which have been on the anvil of the legislature are set aside."

Supporting the government proposal to reopen negotiations on the basis of the withdrawal of the Chinese forces to their positions of the September 8, 1962, (at that time the Colombo proposals had not yet come) the resolution stated,

The National Council of the CPI appreciates the efforts of friendly governments and countries to end the present conflict and pave the way to negotiations. It appeals to

them and to all progressive and peace-loving forces in all parts of the world to throw their weight in favour of stopping of hostilities... so that an atmosphere for negotiations is created.

The operative part of the resolution called on the people to strengthen national defence. Seven slogans were issued among which, the following four are also prominently mentioned:

To mobilise public opinion against price rises, black-marketing and profiteering and other anti-social activities which hit the working people and the nation;

To campaign tirelessly against those groups, parties and elements which seek narrow political advantage out of the present crisis;

To oppose attempts to force India to give up her foreign policy of non-alignment and peace and thereby put her at the mercy of the imperialist camp and involve India in a prolonged full-scale war;

To support all moves taken by the government of India to bring about a peaceful settlement, consistent with the honour and dignity of the country.

Such was the content of the National Council resolution of November 1, taken as a whole. If this was national chauvinism and allying with Anglo-American imperialism, what is patriotism called? And if it brought us into open conflict with the Chinese armed forces, who was to blame if not the Chinese leaders themselves? To tear proletarian internationalism to pieces, to tear the principles of peaceful coexistence and the unity of the peace camp to pieces, to tear up Afro-Asian unity, to do everything possible to drive India into the arms of Anglo-American imperialism and internal reaction, and then to turn round and accuse the CPI of chauvinism and betrayal of proletarian internationalism for the simple "crime" of defending its country, is a most amazing thing indeed.

It is also known that from December 1962 itself, our National Council and CEC gradually began to shift their emphasis more and more from the question of armed defence to negotiations on the basis of the Colombo proposals, to the exposure of Anglo-American intrigues and to resisting the economic burdens being placed by the government on the common people in the name of defence. The emphasis has been shifted more and more, throughout 1963 and 1964, and that not merely in propaganda and agitation but in the sphere of direct mass actions. Such is the nature, understood in its integrated entirety, of our policy since November 1962.