

SINGAPORE GOVERNMENT PRESS STATEMENT MC SE 60/61/TKC

EMBARGOED: NOT FOR PUBLICATION BEFORE 1900 HOURS,  
29TH SEPTEMBER, 1961.

IMPORTANT: PLEASE CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

TEXT OF PRIME MINISTER'S BROADCAST

ON 29TH SEPTEMBER, 1961 AT 7.30 P.M.

I want to explain this paradox, that the Communists prefer Singapore still under British control but with the Internal Security Council abolished, to a Singapore independent together with the rest of Malaya.

The most important reason why the Communists prefer a Singapore still under British control to a Singapore as part of Malaya, is that with the British in control, their struggle for a Communist Malaya can be camouflaged as an anti-colonial struggle. But if they continue their struggle in a Singapore which is independent with the rest of Malaya, it is quite clearly a struggle not against colonialism, but against an independent elected government. Their object will then be obvious, i.e. to destroy an independent national government and to set up

a Communist Government. Moreover, when they are dealt with by the government, as they have been from time to time, it is far better for them to have a British colonial government take action against them than an independent elected Malayan Government.

To be imprisoned by the British colonialists is to be a martyr, in the company of Mr. Nehru, Dr. Nkrumah, Dr. Banda and many other anti-colonial nationalists. But to be locked up by Mr. Nehru, Dr. Nkrumah or Colonel Nasser or the Tunku is an entirely different matter. Mr. Nehru, Dr. Nkrumah, Colonel Nasser and the Tunku do not lock up nationalists, who are the real anti-colonialists. In fact they welcome anti-colonial fighters who are nationalists to their ranks. It is only those who are out to destroy the independence won by the nationalists and to supplant it with a totalitarian or Communist Government who are locked up by the nationalist leaders like Nehru, Nkrumah, Nasser and Tunku.

## National Archives of Singapore

There is this added consideration. If a Communist is detained by the British, questions can be asked in the House of Commons in England, resolutions passed in anti-colonial conferences all over the world and speeches made by friendly delegates in the United Nations. But if a Communist is locked up by an independent nationalist government, there can not be much noise or propaganda made out of it either here in Malaya, or in London, or in the United Nations, or in

Belgrade and the other meeting places of the Afro-Asian nations. The Afro-Asian nations are concerned with protecting nationalists and not Communists. A man who is locked up by an independent nationalist government is not going to get the support of the Afro-Asian nations.

The Communists have therefore decided that a separate British controlled Singapore under a democratic government in sole charge of security is an excellent situation from which to build up their strength, establish their base, and eventually "liberate" the Federation to their Communist cause. They have seen during the four years since the Federation got its independence in August 1957 the steady decline of Communist strength and organisation in the Federation as they were dislocated, broken up and pushed further and further into the jungle and over the Thai border. As they tried to penetrate the political parties and the trade unions and win influence and power in the Federation by stealthy methods of infiltration and penetration, the Federation Government has from time to time smacked them down and purged them. Their room for expansion and growth is considerably limited in the Federation.

So the Communists prefer no merger and a separate Singapore. And in a separate Singapore the Communists want the Internal Security Council abolished

so that there will be no overall control over Communist subversive activities and greater expansion of Communist activities.

Why did we accept the Internal Security Council, its powers and composition in the last constitutional talks in 1957? Because the decisive vote in the Internal Security Council is that of the Federation representative. We have not called for the abolition of the Internal Security Council because we believed the next step is independence through merger and with merger the Internal Security Council will go. Until there is independence through merger, the Internal Security Council has to be accepted, not because we want to protect British interests in Singapore, but because we must agree to allow the Federation to protect itself from being undermined from Singapore. Those who call for the abolition of the Internal Security Council in which the Federation and Singapore representatives jointly hold the majority vote are those who do not believe in merger. If we agree to merger as the 12th State of the Federation, then surely we must agree that all the states in the Federation must control security matters for all Malaya, including Singapore. Let me recall what I said in October 1958 in the Legislative Assembly on the debate on the Preservation of Public Security Ordinance nearly 3 years ago:

"Next year, we are to be only internally self-governing, and in all security matters which affect defence upon which the Singapore and the British Government disagree, the Federation Government is to be the arbiter. We accepted that position because we accepted merger as the only way to independence. If we are prepared to accept the Federation and join it as a member state, then it means that we are prepared to allow the Government representing the 11 states in the Federation to have a decisive voice in the affairs of Singapore.."

How can it be consistent to say that we want merger and at the same time object to the Federation representative having a decisive vote on the security position in Singapore through the Internal Security Council? For if one agrees to merger, then one is agreeing to the Pan-Malayan Government having control over the security position in Singapore. But these are the contradictions and hyprocrisies the Communists are led into in trying to conceal their true position as Communists.

The Communists and their supporters tried both at the Hong Lim and Anson by-elections to make the people excited about the workings of the Internal Security Council. Lim Chin Siong and Fong Swee Suan made speeches in Hong Lim trying to show that the abolition of the Internal Security Council would solve

all our problems. Unemployment, the need for rapid economic development, housing and all other social and economic problems will be solved if the Internal Security Council is abolished, so they argue. They talked of more democratic rights, by which they meant the rights of the Communists to free and unfettered expansion. In both Hong Lim and Anson they struck no responsive chords in the hearts of the people.

What the people were discontented with was not the 30 Communist activists who were still under detention because of the Internal Security Council. They were discontented because they had no jobs, no houses at low rents, because they had trouble in getting immigration permits for their relatives from China, India, or difficulty in obtaining citizenship for their relatives already here.

I ask you: How can the abolition of the Internal Security bring about economic expansion, stability, more jobs, more houses, more trade and more prosperity? The Communists always condemn colonialism for our economic and social backwardness. The abolition of the Internal Security Council still leaves Singapore a semi-colony. So how can the abolition of the Internal Security Council remove our economic and social backwardness when the root cause i.e. colonialism, is still here.

What the abolition of the Internal Security Council will definitely bring is more Communist expansion and with it more unrest and political uncertainty. More unrest and uncertainty will mean less factories and less jobs. Less jobs means more unemployment and discontent which the Communists can exploit. In the end after a great deal of strife and trouble, the Communists hope the British will give up Singapore, and an independent Singapore will be established from which they hope to be able to undermine and capture the Federation.

But what is more likely to happen is that a great deal of strife will lead to riots and the suspension of the constitution, economic chaos and suffering for the people.

You will notice that the Barisan Sosialis is the only party in the Legislative Assembly to have called for the abolition of the Internal Security Council. First they repeated Lim Chin Siong's call for abolition of the Internal Security Council in the constitutional talks in 1963. Then at their meeting on 17th September, they called for its abolition immediately.

If a Communist front group like the Barisan Sosialis could become the government either by themselves or in a coalition, what are the consequences that will follow? What if Lord Selkirk really allows Lim Chin Siong and his friends

to carry on, if they play it constitutionally with the British, as he had lead them to believe. Being what they are, just a front for the Communists, they will increase their activities to undermine the Federation to the Communist cause. They will do this by propaganda from here. But more important as a government they can extend massive aid to the Communists in the Federation to bring the Federation down from within. There will be growing conflict and hostility between the two governments. Eventually it will be the people of the two territories who will pay for this growing hostility.

When conflicts start each side will use every weapon and every advantage it has against the other. It is no use being sentimental and saying that the Tunku will not be so inhuman as to shut off the water. Let us be realistic and understand that in a conflict between a hostile Singapore government and the Alliance Federation government, neither side will hesitate to use all weapons to force the other to its knees. Water is only one of the decisive weapons. There are also economic sanctions which can be imposed on Singapore.

Forty per cent of Singapore's economy depends on imports and exports with the Federation. If the Federation is prepared to injure itself by importing and exporting at a higher cost through its own port of Penang and Port Swettenham, then that 40% of our economic life could come to a grinding halt.



This will cause mass unemployment and misery. Singapore will retaliate. Finally the conflict will be resolved by one side asserting its will over the other by force.

You will remember the immediate effect on our farmers' livelihood when the Federation early this year was about to impose a ban on pigs from Singapore and had already put a tax of one cent on every egg from Singapore. Again, several of our soap factories had to close down when the Federation imposed a tax on soap from Singapore, until finally the Singapore government had to impose a counter tax to save our soap factories. Such economic conflicts could easily be increased a hundred times, with hostile governments in Kuala Lumpur and Singapore.

We have maintained the best of relations with the Federation in your interests, not in our personal interests. It is not sentimental friendship that determines our constant policy of co-operation for mutual benefit with the Federation government. It is the hard economic facts of life. If we allow these young and inexperienced open-front workers of the Communists to have their way -- abolish the Internal Security Council and try to subvert the Federation from Singapore, a whole host of dangerous and unpleasant consequences will follow for which not only the, but you the workers, hawkers, farmers, businessmen, clerks and other ordinary people will pay a heavy price.

The danger of this conflict is very real. There are some young men in Singapore as determined and nearly as able as the Plen who are prepared to do these things. Let me read to you what they have said in the latest Nanyang University magazine, the University Tribune, September No.12, which was published a few days ago under the title "Merger, As I see it" by an anonymous Ma Chao Tong :

"Thus the right path towards a genuine unification of Malaya and Singapore is to launch a more determined and intensified anti-colonial struggle, which can be done by relying on the masses and its mobility; to strive for full self-determination, greater democratic rights and freedom, and demanding the total withdrawal of colonial control over our internal affairs; to expand the left-wing forces throughout the two countries and spread its influence among the people especially the Malay peasantry."

In the Chinese original of this article published by them in the "political science" magazine, there are no words "especially the Malay peasantry". Perhaps they added these words in the English version for the benefit of English-speaking Malay readers.

The Tunku knows all about this, for he has an intelligence organisation to keep him well informed of all the changes in the Communist line and tactics of the Communist United Front. He has very definite views on this matter.

In my first official discussions on merger with the Tunku on the 23rd of August he made it clear that the Federation Central Government had to control security to ensure the safety of the whole Federation and the happiness and welfare of the people.

He said that he had always wanted to do his best to help the people of Singapore prosper. Because of this he had never blocked the Causeway, but on the other hand had allowed free flow and movement of people and goods between Singapore and the Federation. But the Tunku said if the Communists in

Singapore in the unions and in the political parties, like Barisan Sosialis, try to make trouble and upset things, it is bound to affect the peace of the Federation.

Then he will have to go all out, to use all his forces and powers to counter them and to stop them from injuring the happiness and welfare of the people of the Federation.

I think you must know the Federation Government's view of this.

If Lim and his Communist friends are allowed to upset things, it is not just they who will suffer, but also you and I the people of Singapore. The rash statements and actions of the open-front Communist leaders are threatening our welfare and happiness. They are prepared to risk these troubles between us and the Federation, but should we allow them to do this when we have to pay for it?

The real objective of the Communists now echoed and espoused by the Barisan Sosialis is obvious. What they want is to abolish the Internal Security Council in Singapore and from here undermine the Federation. They are desperate and reckless enough to believe that they can do this and get away with it. You have to ask yourself whether you should allow these people to mess up our country's economy and our lives.

You may ask first: "Why did we work with these Communists?" Second :  
"Now that we know they are up to no good, why don't we take immediate steps to deal with them?" I shall answer these two questions in my next talk.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1961.

(Time issued 1200 hours)