

efforts to see that disputes are settled by reason and discussion, not by war; that nuclear weapons and nuclear tests are ended as a first step to general and complete disarmament.

A particular duty rests on the peoples of Latin America, Africa and Asia in regard to our brothers in Cuba, who were but a few years ago, like ourselves, under the heel of colonialism. We must raise our hundreds of millions of voices as one, in a mighty shout loud enough to be heard in Washington and New York: **HANDS OFF CUBA!**

---

## **China and India**

---

The freedom-loving people of South Africa, like all other African and Asian peoples, are deeply disturbed at the fighting that has taken place over the border between China and India.

There is no well-defined borderline between these two countries. The so-called MacMahon line was merely drawn on a map by the British imperialists, during their occupation of India, without consulting either the Indian or the Chinese people.

It is clear that the only sane way to arrive at a fair boundary is by means of friendly discussion and agreement between the leaders of these two great countries, in terms of the Five Principles of peaceful co-existence announced by Nehru and Chou En-Lai before the Afro-Asian Bandung Conference. Similar discussions and agreements have already been reached between China, on the one hand, and Burma and Nepal respectively.

To attempt to solve this problem by means of an armed clash can only benefit the enemies of both the Chinese and Indian people. It is a serious setback to the cause of Afro-Asian unity and to the freedom and independence of our people.

Already the American and British imperialists are joyfully seizing upon this rift between two Asian peoples with age-old ties of brotherhood, pouring arms into India, and doing their utmost to widen and extend the dispute and to fish in troubled waters.

We do not believe that the leaders of the People's Republic of China have any aggressive designs against India. Aggression and conquest are opposed to their principles as Communists. Striking proof of the sincerity of these principles is the dramatic decision of the Chinese Government to stop fighting—at a time when their forces had completely routed the Indian troops—and withdraw

voluntarily to positions behind the line they occupied in 1959. At the same time they renewed their offer to the Indian Government of friendly negotiations to establish a permanent and mutually agreed boundary.

Mr. Nehru had previously declared that he was not prepared to negotiate under pressure. This remarkable offer gave him an outstanding opportunity to enter negotiations with honour and dignity, and thus to earn the gratitude of India, of Asia and the world. Instead he dismissed China's offer as "a trick", refused it, and made a warlike speech declaring India's readiness to carry on fighting for years.

We consider this to be an indefensible position on Mr. Nehru's part, laying him and his Government open to grave charges of wantonly continuing a senseless military operation against a friendly socialist country, disrupting Afro-Asian solidarity, and playing the game of the imperialists and colonialists.

The Indian Government claims that by agreeing to the Chinese "cease fire" proposals they would be leaving the Chinese in occupation of "Indian territory". But the Chinese Government is not proposing a withdrawal to permanent positions, but a cease fire to enable peaceful discussions on precisely the issue of which is and which is not to be Indian territory. Refusal to accept this proposal is tantamount to an insistence by Mr. Nehru and his colleagues on settling the dispute by military means.

It is with deep regret and reluctance that we have been driven to these conclusions. Mr. Nehru and the Government of India have in the past proved staunch friends of African, and particularly South African, freedom. They were the first to bring the case for the oppressed people of this country before the United Nations and to impose economic sanctions against the South African white colonialists.

How can we explain this failure of statesmanship on the part of Mr. Nehru? It is plain that he has now become the puppet of the most reactionary forces in India—of the powerful industrialists, financiers and landlords who are interlinked with British imperialism; which, all these years after independence, still controls important sectors of India's economy. For these classes are the only sections in India which can benefit from continued hostilities against China.

They benefit because under the banner of a "patriotic war effort" they can divert the attention of the masses from the terrible sufferings and hardships of capitalist India. They seek to profit from the inevitable inflation, scarcities and scope for black-marketeering

which always accompany a capitalist society during wartime. They expect to get huge windfalls from the flood of dollar aid which they now confidently expect from the United States, all of which invariably finds itself into the pockets of the rich, with nothing but inflation for the people.

Above all, they hope to benefit politically and economically by using the nationwide flood of patriotic and nationalistic sentiment as a weapon against their opponents—the Communists, trade unionists and militant peasant leaders of India. Every strike will be branded as treason, people who complain about poverty, high prices and taxes, landlessness and profiteering will be persecuted as “enemy agents”. The most powerful opposition Party in India, the Communist Party, will be outlawed and persecuted as it (like the Congress Party, too, for that matter) was in the days of the British Raj, on the grounds that they are “pro-Chinese”.

Already the process has started. Hundreds of leading Communists have been rounded up and jailed—and this in spite of the fact that the Communist Party of India has criticised China and declared its support for the Nehru Government.

However, these selfish and petty calculations of a section of the Indian bourgeoisie cannot for a moment be weighed against the permanent and long-term interests of the great masses of the Indian people, which are wholly in favour of a peaceful settlement of the border dispute and a resumption and strengthening of Chinese-Indian friendship.

Continued attempts to resolve the frontier dispute by force cannot succeed. They can only result in further bloodshed and suffering for both the Indian and the Chinese people. From the point of view of the legitimate patriotic aspirations of the Indian people, continued intransigence and refusal to negotiate can only have the effect of driving the country into the imperialist camp, strengthening not only British colonialism but also the insidious neo-colonialism of the United States, and endangering the hard-won independence of India, bought by the blood and sacrifice of generations of patriots.

The African people cannot be indifferent to this tragic quarrel. Already many African statesmen have urged both parties to negotiate and end this dangerous rift in Afro-Asian solidarity. These efforts should be continued and intensified, for this is a struggle in which Africans cannot but be the losers.

To no section of our population do these considerations apply more forcefully than to the minorities of Indian origin who live in many countries of East and Southern Africa. It is natural that these

communities should feel the deepest sympathy with the people of India at this difficult time. The most practical and wise way to express that sympathy is not by giving way to nationalistic and militaristic tendencies, but by throwing their full weight into the scale for a negotiated settlement now.

---

## Dictatorship run mad

---

Following its serious defeat at the United Nations on the issue of sanctions and South-West Africa (on the latter they did not get a single vote) the Verwoerd dictatorship has unloosed a wave of repression against freedom-fighters and opponents of apartheid. Without any pretence of legal proceedings Balthazar Vorster, Verwoerd's sinister Minister of "Justice" (he was interned during the war as a leader of the pro-Nazi "Ossewa Brandwag") has, within a few weeks:

- ★ Placed Moses Kotane and a number of others—African, White and Indian—under "house arrest";
- ★ Closed down the outspoken democratic weekly newspaper *New Age*;
- ★ Published a "black-list" of 437 "named Communists" and launched a wave of hysterical anti-Communist propaganda from the political platform, in the Nationalist press and over Radio South Africa.

Moses Kotane, former secretary-general of the Communist Party of South Africa and member of the executive committee of the African National Congress, has been ordered by Vorster not to "absent himself" from his two-roomed house in Alexandra Township for the next five years, or to "receive any visitors"—on pain of a heavy prison sentence. A number of others have received similar 24-hours-a-day confinement orders; and still others, including Mrs. Helen Joseph, a leader of the Federation of Women, Adv. Duma Nokwe, former ANC secretary-general, and Mr. Brian Bunting, editor of *New Age*, have been ordered to stay at home from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. and over weekends and also denied the right to receive visitors. These sadistic punishments are imposed by means of an order signed by the Minister without any trial or opportunity of defence—without, indeed, the victims even being informed what they are supposed to be undergoing punishment for. A request from one of the victims, Mr. Ahmed Kathrada, for