

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको उसकी सूचना  
पहुँचाई जाएगी ।

---

RE: SECRET SESSION

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur):** Mr. Speaker, I had suggested that this House go into a secret sitting to consider the National Emergency. I understand that a large number of Opposition leaders also concurred in the view. Although the Prime Minister earlier said that this was not the opportune time for this purpose, I understand the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs had undertaken or indicated that he would convey this to the Government and convey to us the decision of the Government finally on this matter.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Defence and Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Sir, I received a request to that effect from some Members. I gave careful consideration to it. I think that, at the present moment, it would not be desirable to have a secret session. If it is desirable in future, I shall make my submission to you. The issues before the House are of high interest to the whole country. Right at the beginning to ask for a secret session would have a bad effect on the country. I am sure hon. Members would agree.

**Mr. Speaker:** He may kindly move the Resolutions also.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There are two Resolutions standing to my name. I should like your guidance as to whether I should take them together.

**Mr. Speaker:** They might be moved one after the other. Both would be placed before the House. He can make one speech. Discussion also would be simultaneous.

---

12.25 hrs.

RESOLUTIONS RE: PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY AND AGGRESSION BY CHINA

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Defence and Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th of October, 1962, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution."

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall place it before the House.

Resolution moved:

"This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th of October, 1962, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution."

The hon. Prime Minister may move the other resolution also.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I beg to move:

"This House notes with deep regret that in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful coexistence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces.

This House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers...

**Several Hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:**

...and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honours and integrity of our Motherland.

This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all-out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.

This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall place this Resolution also before the House.

Resolution moved:

"This House notes with deep regret that, in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful coexistence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel

which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces.

This House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our Motherland.

This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all-out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.

This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, we meet in Parliament today earlier than was intended, because of a grave crisis that has arisen. This House, and everybody in India, and the greater part of the world know that the People's Republic of China has invaded India with massive forces,

and there have been some bloody battles resulting in considerable casualties on both sides.

For five years, we have been the victims of Chinese aggression across our frontiers in the north. That aggression was, to begin with, rather furtive. Occasionally there were some incidents and conflicts. These conflicts might well be termed frontier incidents. Today, we are facing a regular and massive invasion of our territory by very large forces.

China, which has claimed and still claims to be anti-imperialist, is pursuing a course today for which comparisons can only be sought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In those past days, the European Powers in the full flood of imperialist aggression and with strength and weapons given to them by the Industrial Revolution took possession of large parts of Asia and Africa by force. That imperialism has abated now, and many of the colonies of European countries have been freed and are independent countries. But, curiously, the very champions of anti-imperialism, that is, the People's Government of China, are now following the course of aggression and imperialist expansion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Shame!

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): Down with China.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is sad to think that we in India, who have pleaded for peace all over the world, and who have sought the friendship of China and treated them with courtesy and consideration and pleaded their cause in the councils of the world should now ourselves be victims of new imperialism and expansionism by a country which says that it is against all imperialism. This strange twist of history has brought us face to face with something that we have not experienced in this way for over a hundred years or more. We had taken it almost for granted that despite some lapses in recent years, as in the Suez

affair, we had taken it for granted that this type of aggression was almost a thing of the past. Even the Chinese aggression on our borders during the last five years, bad as it was, and indicative of an expansionist tendency, though it troubled us greatly, hardly led us to the conclusion that China would indulge in a massive invasion of India. Now, we have seen and experienced this very invasion and it has shocked us, as it has shocked a large number of countries.

History has taken a new turn in Asia and perhaps the world, and we have to bear the brunt of it, to fight with all our might this menace to our freedom and integrity. Not only are we threatened by it, but all the standards of international behaviour have been upset and so all the world is affected by it, apart from the immediate consequences. No self-respecting country which loves its freedom and its integrity can possibly submit to this challenge. Certainly, India, this dear land of ours, will never submit to it whatever the consequences. We accept the challenge in all its consequences, whatever they may be.

It may be that this challenge is also an opportunity for us. Indeed, the people of India in their millions have demonstrated that they accept this challenge and have shown a unity and an enthusiasm such as has been very seldom in evidence. A crisis has come and we have stood up to face it and meet that crisis.

I have moved a Resolution seeking the approval of this House to the state of emergency that has been declared by the President. That was inevitable when foreign legions invaded India and our Constitution wisely provided for such a course to be followed by us in any serious crisis. I have no doubt that this House will approve of this declaration by the President and subsequently I hope also of the Defence of India Ordinance and the other steps that are being taken to face this crisis.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I should like this House for a moment to look at this matter in some perspective. We stand, I do believe, at a turning point not only in the history of India but of Asia and possibly even of the world, because what happens in this conflict will affect it obviously. It will affect Asia, of which two of the biggest countries are China and India. But it will affect the world also and, therefore, this conflict has very wide-reaching consequences. We should try to look at it from this point of view. For the moment, we are shocked at this cruel and crude invasion of another country. The world has also witnessed the response of the people of the country invaded, that is, our country, and the world will yet witness the way the people of India act when their freedom is threatened and their dear liberty is imperilled.

So, we are shocked and in a state of high excitement. That is inevitable, and not surprising, but we have to remember that this turning point in history is not going to end soon. We may have to face this for a long period, for a number of years, I do not know how long, and we must train ourselves and the nation to be prepared to face it, however long the crisis may last. It is in the mood, in that mentality, that I seek this House to give a lead to the country.

Chinese aggression on our frontiers is five years old and during these years this House has discussed this matter repeatedly. On the last occasion this discussion took place on the 12th August, 1962. Many White Papers have been issued, giving the long-drawn-out correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of China. Only today I have placed another bunch of these papers contained in White Paper No. 7. On the 22nd August, 1962 we sent a note to China. A reply was sent to this on the 13th September last. But before the reply was sent or received by us, even on the 8th September,

China's forces crossed the international boundary in the northwest corner of NEFA across the Thagla ridge and began to threaten the Indian post at Dhola. We had a number of posts near the northern frontier of NEFA adequate enough to meet any minor or normal incursion. We hoped that we would be able to meet this new aggression and immediately we took steps to strengthen our forces in that area.

Five days after this new aggression, on the 13th September the Chinese Government sent us a threatening reply, asking for discussions on the boundary question. We have previously demonstrated by a mass of evidence that our boundary is what has been called the MacMahon Line, but the boundary was not laid down even by Mr. MacMahon, whoever is responsible for it. It was a recognition of the long-standing frontier on the high ridge of the Himalayas which divided the two countries at the watershed. To some extent, though indirectly, the Chinese accepted this. Certainly they accepted the continuation of this line in Burma. But, apart from the constitutional or legal aspects, it is undoubted and cannot be challenged that no Chinese has ever been in that part on this side of the line, excepting, as the House knows, in a little border village called Longju.

Even the MacMahon Line which the Chinese have called illegal was laid down 48 years ago, in 1914, and that was a confirmation of what was believed in then. Legal or not, it has been a part of India for a long number of years and certainly let us say for 50 years or so, apart from its previous history which is also in our favour. Here then is a boundary which for nearly 50 years has been shown to be our northern frontier. I am limiting what I say to 50 years for the sake of argument; really it was even before that. Even if the Chinese did not accept it—and I would like

to say that the objection they raised in 1913 to this treaty was not based on their objection to the MacMahon Line; it was based on their objection to another part of the treaty which divided Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet, the MacMahon Line did not come in that; however, it is a fact that they objected to the whole treaty because of that other objection—even if the Chinese did not accept it then, this has been in existence now in our maps, in our practice, in our Constitution, in our organisation, administration etc., for nearly 50 years. Even the non-acceptance of it, can it entitle them to undertake an armed invasion to upset it? Even the Chinese know and say that independent India has been in possession of this territory right up to the Himalayan watershed. It is rather difficult for me to say what they say. Because, if any person takes the trouble to read through this vast correspondence, he will notice that their alleged frontier is a very mobile one; it changes. It is wherever they have laid the frontier and in this matter too they have stated many contradictory things. They have laid stress sometimes on the fact that we have occupied this area of NEFA or a large part of it since we became independent. That is a curious statement since, as I have said all along, it was fully recognised in 1913-14. Apart from that, when we became independent, we did one thing. We naturally wanted these tribal people in the frontier areas to share our independence. The British largely left them to their own resources and interfered only when there was some trouble. But there is no doubt that the British considered their frontier to be the MacMahon Line. They did not have a full-fledged administrative apparatus there. On gaining independence, we were naturally anxious to develop these areas as we were trying to develop other areas of India. We tried, therefore, not only to introduce our administration there but schools, hospitals, roads, etc. It is this which the Chinese say represents our occupying that. Any person

who sees these papers and the history behind them would easily say that we have occupied it in every sense, legally, constitutionally, administratively, practically for a large number of years.

Now, the point is that whatever the legal and constitutional aspect of their claim might be we think there is no force whatever—does that justify a sudden invasion of this kind? The House will remember that we have discussed this matter many times previously; we discussed it largely in relation to their aggression in Ladakh because nothing had happened here except with the sole exception of the little frontier village Longju. Repeatedly, in the course of talks sometimes they are reflected in these papers too—we were given to understand something not absolutely, not clearly; as has now been discovered, always their phrases had a double meaning attached to them which could be interpreted any way, to assure us of something and later to deny that they had assured us. I remember the long talk I had with the Chinese Prime Minister, specially about the MacMahon Line. I forget the exact date; it was five years ago or six years ago; I do not remember exactly. That was when he came to India. We had a long talk and immediately after the talk I put down in a note I prepared the contents of our talk so that I might not forget it. That note is here in our office. Much later I sent an extract of my note of that talk to the Chinese Government and they denied the truth of it! I was very much surprised and hurt because I was quite certain. When we were talking it was not once I asked; I asked the same question two or three times and definitely the answer was given to me. He gave me to understand that although the Chinese Government considered the McMahon line an illegal line and a British imperialist line, nevertheless because of the large number of facts, because of their desire to be friendly with us, they would be prepared to do this. That was the clearest impression that I got.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

He denied it later on. So, it becomes a little difficult to say what they stood by at a particular time.

Anyhow, my point is that whether they acknowledge the McMahon line or not undoubtedly it has been, till a few weeks ago, completely in our possession; the area on this side was completely in our possession; for generations past it has been in our possession; if you like it I can put a later date, 1913-14 and I may say that it was a recording of what had been happening previously. How does it justify the Chinese Government to carry on an invasion of it, by any law, international standards of behaviour or for any other reason?

The House may have noticed a very peculiar approach that the Chinese Government has made to what has happened recently in NEFA. They go on saying that India attacked them and their frontier guards as they are called are merely defending themselves. I must confess that this complete perversion of facts and the attempt to make falsehood appear to be the truth, and the truth to be the falsehood has amazed me because nothing can be more utterly baseless than what they have been saying. Here is a single fact. We have been up to the McMahon line all these years; we have not gone one inch beyond nor have we covered another's territory. They have come. Let us for the moment assume their case that there is some doubt about where the McMahon line is. But the point is that they have invaded an area which has not been in their possession ever, ever in the history of the last 10,000 years. After all the present Chinese Government came into existence 12 years ago or thereabouts. Any claim that they may directly make to this territory can only be made either in these 12 years or possibly previously through Tibet. So, it becomes a question of what they can claim through Tibet or through their domination over Tibet.

It is true that for a long time past there were some frontier questions between Tibet and India, even in British times. But all these questions were about little pockets or little frontier areas, small areas. Nobody has ever put forward, no Tibetan Government has ever put forward previously these large claims to what tantamounts to two thirds of NEFA, apart from the vast area in Ladakh.

So, we arrive at one firm conclusion which is not capable of argument or denial; that is, the Chinese have come to this territory with a massive force, territory which for a long time at least has been included in India, and administered in a vague way and a little fully administered by India. If they had and claim they could have discussed it and talked about it and adopted various means of peaceful settlement, appointed arbitrators or gone to the Hague Court or whatever it was.

Here, I may say, it has been unfortunate, in this as in so many other cases, that the present Government of China is not represented in the United Nations. Hon. Members are surprised when we have supported the Chinese representation—the representation of the People's Government of China—in the United Nations. We have supported it in spite of this present invasion, because we have to look at it this way: it is not a question of likes or dislikes. It is a question, which will facilitate Chinese aggression; it will facilitate its misbehaviour in the future. It will make disarmament impossible in the world. You might disarm the whole world and leave China, a great, powerful country, fully armed to the teeth. It is inconceivable. Therefore, in spite of our great resentment at what they have done, the great irritation and anger, still, I am glad to say that we kept some perspective about things and supported that even now. The difficulty is one cannot call

them up before any tribunal or world court or anywhere. They are just wholly an irresponsible country believing, I believe, in war as the only way of settling anything, having no love of peace and stating almost that, and with great power at their disposal. That is the dangerous state of affairs not only for India but for the rest of the world. I am not going into the question, as some people do, of communism or anti-Communism. I do not believe that that is a major issue in this matter or any other. Communism may help; but the major issue is, an expansionist, imperialist minded country deliberately invading into a new country.... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** With a slave army.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know what the hon. Member has said. I am not entering into that argument. I am laying stress on this fact, because as some countries do, they explain everything in terms of communism and anti-communism. I think the result is that they are unable to see many of the basic facts of the question. Communism may help or communism may hinder. Communism may give them a certain strength or weakness, whatever it may be. But today we are facing a naked aggression, just the type of aggression which we saw in the 18th and 19th centuries; there was then no communism anywhere.

**Shri Ranga (Chittoor):** This is the 20th century.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** So, we have to face this new type of imperialism on our borders. Asia is facing this new type, and the whole world is concerned with that. For the moment, we are most concerned with it, and we have to face it and bear the burden ourselves, although some of our friendly countries are certainly helping us and we are grateful to them for that help.

To say that we are committing all this aggression on Chinese territory is a kind of double talk which is very difficult for a man of my simple mind to understand. "We commit aggression on ourselves; we commit aggression on the soil of our own country and they defend it by coming over the mountains into our territory". It is really extraordinary to what length people can go to justify their misdeeds.

It is true that when we heard on the 8th September of their coming over the Thagla pass into our territory in some forces, we had quite adequate forces in our posts. We had no doubt some forces there to meet any incursion, but if large forces come over, an ordinary military post can hardly resist them. We took immediate steps to send further forces to reinforce our posts. We sent them immediately as we had to, in the circumstances; yet there was one unfortunate factor which normally should be remembered. That was, if we send our forces, who are tough, young and strong, nevertheless, we send them from the plains of India suddenly to 14,000 ft. high. For any person; however strong he may be, it requires time to be acclimatised to these heights. But they went there. When they went there, then began a process; we sent some further forces and thought that they would be adequate to meet the Shinese menace in so far as it was feasible. The Chinese also started increasing their forces there. Now, for them, it was a relatively easy matter, because they have vast forces in Tibet. I do not know how much they have. They used to have 11 divisions, and I am told they now have 13 or 14 divisions in Tibet. Just imagine the very vast armies they are having in Tibet alone.

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल):** अब तो आपको चाइनीज की मनोवृत्ति का पता चल गया होगा . .

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I think, if the hon. Member feels keenly about

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

it, we will send him to the frontier! Perhaps the speeches may convince the Chinese. So, first of all, the Chinese armies were fully acclimatised, living for long on the high plateau of Tibet. It was just not in the line with the ridge but only a little below the ridge.

Secondly, the whole of Tibet has been covered in the last few years by roads, and the roads there, in that extremely severe climate, mean simply levelling the ground, removing boulders, etc., because you do not require cement or anything at that height. The ground itself is so very hard. So, this is covered by roads, and they can travel perhaps at quick notice from one part to another in Tibet.

So, they could bring large forces to the other side of the Thagla ridge. They would not be immediately visible to us, because on the other side—and that is what we believe happened—although some forces were being added on by the Chinese crossing the Thagla ridge they could not be seen. They were adding large numbers of forces on the other side nearby and in the last few days of this battle that occurred there on the 20th, they poured in masses of the people. I do not know how much: six, seven and eight times the number of troops that we had. They have thus logistic advantage not only of bringing troops but supplying everything that could be brought immediately on the other side of the Thagla ridge and send them. We had a certain disadvantage. I am merely mentioning the facts—the logistic disadvantage of the people having been suddenly sent to those heights. Everything that they require has to be sent by air, and our Air Force has done a very fine piece of work there, in taking everything by air in spite, sometimes, of enemy fire and the difficulties that always occur in those high mountains. So, this went on.

May I add that there has been a great deal of attack about our unpreparedness. I think most of it is based on ignorance. (*Interruption*).

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** We do not want to interrupt; you may go on replying in your own way.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am glad of this generosity in not interrupting me. I say most of this talk is based on ignorance of facts. Some of them is true: first of all, it is perfectly true that we were not prepared to face two or three divisions of the Chinese army descending upon the forces there.

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक आप क्या कर रहे थे (*Interruptions*).

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप मुन तो लीजिये आराम से, इस तरह इंटरप्शन करने से कैसे काम चलेगा ?

13 hrs.

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** यह दुराग्रह में आज तक फंसे रहे और अब हमारी बात सुनना भी नहीं पसन्द करते ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप मुन तो लें आराम से ।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** मैं तो यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह क्या कर रहे थे ? वह लोग हमला कर रहे थे तब यह क्या कर रहे थे ?

**श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) :** जब स्वामी जी ने कुछ कहा तो हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि उनको फ्रंटियर को भज दो । फ्रंटियर में जायेंगे हमारे बच्चे, वह बहादुर हैं । वह चीन तक जायेंगे और जीत कर आयेंगे । (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Swamiji, I am afraid, has not acquired....



**श्री रामसेवक यादव** (बाराबंकी) :  
 स्वामी जी की परेशानी यह है कि व इस बोली  
 को समझते नहीं हैं, आप उनको समझाइये ।

**श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू** : यही मैं कह  
 रहा था कि मुश्किल यह है कि स्वामी जी  
 कुछ भी नहीं समझते ।

**श्री रामसेवक यादव** : स्वामी जी सब  
 कुछ समझते हैं . . . . . (*Interruptions*).

**श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू** : यह बोली की  
 बात नहीं है ।

**श्री रामसेवक यादव** : अध्यक्ष महोदय,  
 किसी माननीय सदस्य के लिये यह कहना कि  
 वह कुछ समझते नहीं हैं, यह ठीक नहीं है ।  
 (*Interruptions*).

**अध्यक्ष महोदय** : आप मेरी तकलीफ  
 को भी समझें । अगर स्वामी जी इस बोली  
 को नहीं समझते और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब  
 दूसरी बोली में बोलें तो कई और माननीय  
 सदस्य नहीं समझेंगे । इसलिये यह तो सुन  
 लीजिये । उसके बाद हम देखेंगे कि स्वामी  
 जी को कैसे समझाया जाय ।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव** : प्रधान मंत्री जी  
 ने एक बार यह भी किया था कि इस देश की  
 बोली में यहाँ बोले थे । अब यह अंग्रेजी में  
 बोल रहे हैं । यदि इस प्रश्न पर हिन्दी में  
 बोलते तो अच्छा होता ।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द** : आप मने लः मन्तीने  
 पहले कहा था तो आप ने कहा था कि वह सब  
 भाषण छपे हुए हैं हिन्दी में ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय** : यह तो कोई अज्ञब  
 बात नहीं कि स्वामी जी को इलाहाम हो  
 जाय पहले से लेकिन इम समय तो  
 हमको सुनने दीजिय । (*Interruptions*).

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द** : हमको हुआ है  
 यही हम कहते हैं ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय** : अब स्वामी जी  
 आराम से बैठेंगे ।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I am sorry  
 not to be able to oblige the Swamiji.  
 I would have been glad to oblige him,  
 but my difficulty is, as you yourself  
 have been pleased to remark, in a  
 matter of this kind, there are many  
 Members of this House who might not  
 understand me otherwise.

I was talking about unprepared-  
 ness. It is perfectly true, as I said,  
 that we were unprepared to meet a  
 massive invasion of two or three  
 divisions. But the other things that  
 are said about roads, about blankets,  
 etc. are very largely incorrect. . . .  
 (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Mohan Swarup** (Pilibhit):  
 What about arms?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: It is really  
 extraordinary that many persons here  
 who know nothing about arms talk  
 about arms. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker**: Let us hear the hon.  
 Prime Minister. All sections shall  
 have their opportunity to express  
 themselves. We are now listening to  
 the Prime Minister.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I do not  
 wish to go into details. I merely  
 wanted to indicate that the criticisms  
 that are made, partly justified, are  
 largely not justified. About arms, it  
 is not a thing which one normally  
 talks about in Parliament openly.  
 But I would be glad to explain what  
 we have done, what we have not  
 done and the difficulties that we had  
 to face.

The hon. House will remember that  
 till independence, our defence de-  
 partment was entirely under the war  
 office, and the war office not only  
 laid down the policy, but insisted that  
 everything as far as possible should  
 be acquired through Whitehall.  
 During the last great war, because of  
 the difficulties of acquiring war mate-  
 rial from abroad, from the United

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Kingdom, some of our ordnance factories grew up, but still they were rather elementary. The first problem we had to solve, therefore, was to get out of this Whiehail atmosphere and the practice of our acquiring everything from there, determining our own policy and all that. I think we have done rather well to build up in these years this industry.

There is always a choice and there has been a choice in this and other matters for us to buy arms from abroad or to make them ourselves. Obviously it is infinitely better to make them ourselves, because that strengthens the country, industrially and otherwise and secondly, you cannot altogether rely on outside supplies; any moment they may fail you and economically it is bad to get them from outside. So, our practice has been to try to build up our arms, the industry and the like in the country and we have done fairly well. We might have done better; I do not know. All kinds of difficulties arise, because development of one industry depends on the whole industrial background of the country. We have laid stress on that. I would not go into that.

A great deal was said about arms, automatic rifles and the rest. For the last three or four years, we have been trying to make them and various difficulties arose about patents, this, that and the other and sometimes about our own difficulties in finding enough foreign exchange. This has been a continuing difficulty, as to how much we should spend in the shape of foreign exchange. Ultimately, we got over these difficulties and we started their manufacture, I forget the date, but some time this year and we are now making them.

The only alternative was previously for us to get a large number of those weapons from abroad. We hesitated; we wanted to make them ourselves. Undoubtedly, we could have got them, but remember this. If we have tried to get all those weapons

from abroad in what might be called relatively peace time, we will have to spend enormous sums of money. Our whole planning, etc. will have gone, because when you talk of weapons in terms of war, you talk in terms of thousands of crores. It is not a question of a few crores, but thousands of crores and it would have smashed our economy. It is a different matter when we have to face this tremendous crisis, which both our people feel so much and the world sees; we can get better terms to get the things and our people are prepared to spend much more.

I am merely pointing out some things; they may not be adequate explanation, but I want you to appreciate that every attempt has been made and continually being made to build up industry—an aircraft industry, an arms industry, etc., an up-to-date one. Obviously we cannot be up-to-date in the sense of competing, let us say, with America or the Soviet Union or England. It is just not possible for us to advance our basic industries and science so much. But we have made good advance scientifically. One of the most important features is that the defence science department that we have built up is a high-class affair, employing about 2,000 scientists.

Anyhow, if there were mistakes committed or delays committed, it is not for me to go into that now. It is not a good thing for us to apportion blame and say that such and such officer or such and such Minister, etc. is to blame. We are all to blame in a sense. (*Interruptions*).

It is a fact that ever since 1st October, when I returned from abroad every day I have been connected—previously I was connected through the Defence Ministry, but from the 1st October, I have been there every day. We, the Chiefs of Staff and others sat together and discussed the matters. And, naturally, it is for the

experts, the Chiefs of Staff and their advisers to determine the tactics, the strategy etc., of fighting, and not for me; I do not know enough about it. I can only put questions to them, make suggestions to them, leaving the final carrying out of it to their hands.

We took several steps. On the very next day, on 2nd October, we called back the Chief of the General Staff, General Kaul, who was on leave then. I want to mention his name specially because, quite extraordinarily unjust things have been said about him. We sent for him and we changed the method of command, separating Naga Hills etc., from NEFA. He went there practically within 24 hours. Some people say he had not had any experience of fighting. That is not correct. He had the experience of fighting in Burma. He was our Military Attache in Washington when the trouble occurred in Kashmir, but he begged us to send him there. We sent him there and he was there. I doubt, knowing a good many of our officers and others,—many of them are good—in sheer courage and initiative and hard work, if we can find anybody to beat him. Anyhow, it is very unfair for our officers who are bearing heavy burden, whether it be Kaul or anybody else, to be criticised in this way, criticised by foreign correspondents sending messages abroad. That is a highly improper, highly irresponsible thing to be done when they are bearing such heavy burden.

Then, General Kaul, as soon as he went over there—he went there suddenly from here—14,000 feet—daily walked 16 to 20 miles from post to post over highly precipitous mountain area. He fell ill and he came here to report after 4 or 5 days.

श्री र.मेश्वरानन्द : जो मारे गये उनका क्या बना जी ? क्या उनका वहां लाज नहीं हुआ ?

1962(Ai) LSD—6.

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं स्वामी जी से एक प्रार्थना करूंगा। हम इस वक्त हंसी मजाक नहीं कर रहे हैं। हम बहुत ग्रहम बातों पर गौर कर रहे हैं जिनसे भारत का भविष्य बंधा हुआ है। वह समझते हैं कि हम हंसी मजाक कर रहे।

श्री र.मेश्वरानन्द : हम आपके साथ हैं . . . . (Interruptions).

हम आपके साथ हैं। देश के लिए मरने के लिए तैयार हैं। हमारी सुनो तो सही।

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I would first ask the hon. Members on these benches, on the Congress side, not to interfere or take into their own hands the right to silence any other hon. Member. I think I am competent enough. I will deal with any hon. Member who interrupts or who says things like that. Whenever I need the help of all those hon. Members I will request them. But I think I would not need that. I hope hon. Members on this side would not compel me to go to that extent. They will have ample opportunity to have their say. I will allow them as much as they want. Now they should listen patiently. When their turn comes and when they speak, if they are interrupted in this manner they would not like that. Therefore, we should listen to the Prime Minister in order to be able to criticise what he has said. If they do not listen to him, how shall the hon. Members on this side criticise those facts that he is giving. Let him have his say. When their opportunity comes they can criticise him.

श्री र.मेश्वरानन्द : आप हमें समझाने लगे हैं तो दो शब्द हिन्दी में बोल दें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने यही कहा कि आप अभी खामोश रहें, आप की भी बारी आएगी और उस वक्त आप खूब कहें जितना आपका जी चाहे।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I would like to point out to the House a fact, which is no doubt known, that this invasion by the Chinese did not merely take place in NEFA on the 20th October. On that very day it was a co-ordinated attack all along the line from Ladakh to NEFA. Therefore, to say that because we had attacked them—we are perfectly justified in pushing them and attacking them—in NEFA, to make that an excuse and say that we had attacked them in NEFA and therefore they are attacking us on that day all along the line of Ladakh is a thing which is manifestly a false statement, a made-up thing.

Now, a few days after the 20th October—I think it was 24th—a message was sent to the heads of Governments or heads of States in cases where it may be so, almost all of them, pointing out the background of Chinese invasion and stating our firm resolve to resist it—a copy of it I have placed on the Table of the House. We have received many replies, not from all yet but from many of them, extending their sympathy and support at the present crisis.

Just soon after, four or five days after this massive attack, the Chinese Prime Minister came out with, what is called, a "three-point proposal" on which a ceasefire might be arrived. This was very vague. It was not quite clear what he meant. But what appeared to us and what appeared later on to us with further elucidation was that it meant our not only acknowledging or partly acknowledging their right to be where they were on our territory, but our force retiring still further, some 20 kilometres or so; that is to say, although the Chinese armies would retire a little on our territory we would retire further and they would have an opportunity to build up their strength on our territory to attack us further later. It is an impossible thing for us to agree to. There has been some confusion about this in the countries, not only here

but in other countries too, but as we have explained it most people have understood it—I am talking about other countries.

We, in reply or independently or, rather, proposed that they should retire to the line prior to the 8th September, that is, behind the McMahon Line there and they should also retire the advances they had made since the 8th September in Ladakh. Some of our friends have said that this was a weak proposal, we should have asked them to go out completely. Well, it is for the House to judge our weakness and strength, and the proposals must have some realities, because we have not only to abide by it but we have to convince all our friends elsewhere that we are making something, a proposal which is reasonable and which can be given effect to. The proposal was that they should retire to that line as it stood on 8th September both in NEFA and Ladakh. Then we were prepared to meet their representatives to consider what further steps should be taken to lessen tension etc. Once that was agreed to, then would come as a third step our meeting together to consider the merits of the question. We have made that proposal and we stand by it. I think it is a reasonable proposal and certainly not in any sense a dishonourable or a weak one.

Then, meanwhile, many of our friends abroad, well-intentioned countries, made various efforts to bring about cease-fire, stoppage of fighting and a consideration of the matter on the merits. Their efforts, or rather their desire, to help in stopping this fighting is very laudable, and we welcome their desire. But, not knowing all the detailed facts, sometimes they made some proposals which had no great relevance to the situation.

I shall refer only to one of them and that was the reference made by President Nasser of the UAR. I must pay my tribute to President Nasser in

this matter because he did not make a vague proposal in the air. People advise us to be good and peaceful, as if we are inclined to war. In fact, if we are anything, as the House well knows, we do not possess the war-like mentality and that is why for the purpose of war there is weakness. We may have developed it, but that is a different matter, I am talking of the past. So, people talking to us to be good boys and make it up has no particular meaning, unless they come to grips with the particular issues involved. Now, President Nasser took the trouble to understand the facts and, thereafter, issued a presidential decree or communique issued by the President-in-Council of the UAR in which he made certain proposals. These proposals were not exactly on the lines we had suggested but were largely in conformity with our proposals. They laid special stress on troops withdrawing to their lines where they stood prior to the 8th of September. That was a major thing. That fitted in with our proposal. China has rejected this proposal, made by President Nasser.

Now, this crisis is none of our making or seeking. It is China which has sought to enforce its so-called territorial claims by military might. Indeed, she has advanced beyond the line of her territorial claims. As I said, their frontier is a mobile one; anything they could grasp becomes their frontier.

In his task, in defending our frontiers and our motherland, we have sought help from all friendly countries. I wish to express my gratitude for the prompt response to our appeal for sympathy and support which have been given to us by various countries. This help that is given is unconditional and without any strings. It does not therefore, affect directly our policy of non-alignment which we value. Those countries, which have helped us have themselves recognised this and made it clear that they do not expect us to

leave that policy. Help has been given to us swiftly by the United States, by the United Kingdom and by some other friendly countries. We are in touch with many others. We have also made approaches to other friendly countries like the Soviet Union and France for supply of equipment.

We have often declared that we do not covet any territory of anyone else; we are quite satisfied with our own territory such as it is. But there is another aspect of that. We do not submit to anyone else coveting our territory and although the aggressor in this instance has gained some initial successes—I do not know what they have in mind, whether they want to use it as a bargaining counter or they have some other evil designs—as I have said we cannot submit to it, whatever the consequences.

There is one other aspect which I should like to mention, which is not indirectly connected with this matter but directly connected, and that is our development plans and the Five Year Plan. Some people have said "let us give up these Plans so that we may concentrate on the war effort". What is the war effort? People think of the soldiers in the front, which is perfectly right. They are bearing the brunt of the heat and danger. But in this matter, in the kind of struggle that we are involved in, every peasant in the field is a soldier, every worker in a factory is a soldier. Our work, our war effort essentially, apart from the actual fighting done, is in ever greater production in the field and factory. We must remember that. It is an effort which depends greatly on our development. Today we are much more in a position to make that kind of effort in field and factory than, let us say, ten or twelve years ago; there is no doubt about that. We are not still adequately developed. I hope this very crisis will make us always to be remembered that an

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

army today, a modern army, fights with modern weapons which it has to manufacture itself in that country. It is based on the development of industry, and that industry must have an agricultural base if it is to succeed. Therefore, we have to develop all round, apart from agriculture and industry, which are the basic things in our Five Year Plan. Then there is power, which is essential from the point of view of war effort, from the point of view of industry, from the point of view of even agriculture. So that, to talk of scrapping the Five Year Plan is not to understand the real springs of our strength. We have to carry the Five Year Plan and go beyond it in many respects. It may be, in some matters which are considered non-essential, we may tone down or leave them but in the major things of the Five Year Plan we have to make the fullest effort. Among the major things agriculture is highly important. How can a country fight when it is lacking in food? But I do not think we will be. We have to grow more and more, which is a difficult thing. We have laid down the targets for our agricultural produce in our Five Year Plan, but in the last year or two, this year especially, we have fallen behind because of floods and all kinds of things.

Now, although we have fallen behind, I take it that we have to aim at higher targets than we have laid down even in the Third Plan, and I am sure we shall get that. I am not talking vaguely. I think we can get that. We cannot get it so easily if we laid down certain targets in the office here in the Food Ministry. We must go down to the peasant, to the agriculturist, and transform his present enthusiasm, his present energy into greater production. Nothing is more cheering and heartening than the reaction amongst the people, amongst the peasants who have given their little mite. Let them transform

them into greater production. I am sure they can, if we approach them rightly. So also with industry; so also with many other things like education etc. We must look upon all of them as part of the war effort that we have to make. In this process I hope we shall not only build up our nation more swiftly but will make it stronger, make it more social-minded and lay the base of the socialist structure that we aim at.

This peril we have to face is a grave menace. This challenge may be converted into opportunity for us to grow and to change the dark cloud that envelops our frontiers into the bright sun not only of freedom but of welfare in this country.

In effect we have to look at this matter as an effort of the whole nation. We may say—some people say—we want an armed people. That is true in a sense. But what we really want is the whole people mobilised for this effort doing their separate jobs whether it is in the field, the factory or the battlefield thus combining together and strengthening the nation and bringing success to us. We have to be armed, therefore, not only by weapons of warfare but by weapons of agriculture, industry and all those as well.

We do not minimise our task. Let no man minimise it or have any illusions about it. It is not a thing which we can deal with by momentary enthusiasm, enthusiasm of the moment or lasting a month or two. It is a long effort that we require—a difficult effort—and we shall have to go out to do our utmost. It is not merely enough to pay something to the Defence Fund or to do something else. That is good in its own way. It is very welcome how people are paying them by straining every nerve to the utmost. We have to keep up our strength and our determination to the end. And that end may not be near. Therefore we have to prepare in every way to strengthen the nation

not only for today and tomorrow but for the day after also to meet this menace. If we do that, I have no doubt that we shall be able to show the determination and fortitude that is required of our people. We have had a glimpse of it in their present enthusiasm which has been a most moving sight. To see our people come, not only the young but the old—old men and old women—and the young little children and their enthusiasm has been a sight to gladden any heart.

Now before I end I should like to say a word about our soldiers and airmen who are working under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. I want to send on your behalf our greetings and assurance of our full assistance. To those who have fallen in defence of the country we pay our homage. They will not be forgotten by us or by those who follow us. I am confident that all sides of this House will stand united in this great venture and will demonstrate to the world that free India which has stood for peace and will always stand for peace and friendship with other countries can never tolerate aggression and invasion. If we have worked for peace as we have done and we shall continue to do so, we can also work for war effectively if we are attacked as we have been.

Sir, I commend these Resolutions to the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have placed both these Resolutions before the House. Now I have to take up the substitute motions and amendments that I have received notice of. The first is by Dr. Singhvi. Does he want to move it?

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur):** Yes, Sir; I wish to move my substitute motion (Serial No. 1).

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** I wish to move the amendment to the Resolution (No. 2, List No. 2).

**श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :**  
चूँकि मेरा उद्देश्य पूरा हो गया है, इसलिए मैं अपना संशोधन संख्या ३ को वापस लेता हूँ।

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** I wish to move amendment No. 4.

**Shri K. Pattaayak (Sambalpur):** I wish to move amendments No. 5 and 6.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur):** I wish to move amendments No. 7 and No. 8.

**Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians):** My amendment No. 9 has become unnecessary by the resignation of the former Defence Minister but I wish to move my amendment No. 10.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon):** I wish to move amendment No. 11.

**Shri Ram Ratan Gupta (Gonda):** I wish to move amendment No. 12.

**श्री राम सेवक य.दव :** मैं अपना संशोधन संख्या १३ प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

**Shri Parashar (Shivpuri):** I wish to move my amendment No. 14.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then I have received notices of two amendments from Shri N. G. Ranga and some other hon. Members. Does he wish to move them?

**Shri Ranga (Chittoor):** Yes, Sir.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore):** Why were they circulated so late?

**Mr. Speaker:** Probably they were received late but I have allowed them. Then, there is one by Shri Sivamurthi Swami.

**Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Koppal):** I wish to move it.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It has not been circulated.

**Mr. Speaker:** He gave notice of it late but I have allowed him. Then, there is another by Shri Thirumala Rao.

**Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada):** I would like to move it.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It will help the discussion if you will read them out.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will try to circulate them just now. Then there is one again by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri and some other hon. Members.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैं मूव करता

हूँ :

**Mr. Speaker:** There is one also by Shri Bibhuti Mishra.

**Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Motihari):** I move it.

**Mr. Speaker:** These amendments and substitute motions will be taken as moved.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House notes with deep regret that in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by Indian Towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression, equality and mutual benefit, non-interference, and peaceful co-existence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed naked and unabashed aggression, having initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces.

“This House, therefore, calls upon the Government of India

immediately to sever India's diplomatic relations with the People's Government of China, to take all necessary steps to have the People's Government of China branded as an aggressor by the United Nations to invoke the aid of the United Nations to defend India's territorial integrity and to halt and repulse the Chinese aggression on our northern frontiers.

“This House further calls upon the Government of India to desist from supporting or endorsing any move for the admission of the People's Governments of China to the United Nations and any other international organisation.

“This House welcomes the assumption of the defence portfolio by the Prime Minister at this critical juncture of our national history and pledges its full and unflinching support to him in the hour of this national emergency for the defence and safety of our country, at the same time calling upon him and the Government of India that the entire defence responsibility including that of defence production should be taken over by the Prime Minister himself.

“This House expresses regret over the Government of India's indiscriminate and excessive reliance on the professions of peace by the People's Government of China during the last decade and deplors the utter inadequacy of our arrangements and preparations for the defence and safety of our northern frontiers against enemy whose calculated cruelty and cunning is unsurpassed in the history of international relations.

“This House places on record its high appreciation of the heroic struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending



our frontiers and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our Motherland.

"This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.

"This House is of the definite view that compulsory military training should be imparted to all able-bodied male citizens of India to achieve national preparedness to meet any foreign aggression from any quarter.

"This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

"With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** I beg to move:

That in the second paragraph of the resolution,—

after "This House" insert—

"apologises to the nation for the unpreparedness on the part of the Government to defend

our frontier resulting from the policy of trust reposed in communist China in total disregard of even the then prevailing facts and realities,"(2).

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the last paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and to achieve this following task is placed before this House—

(a) to form a second line of defence with workers, peasants and youth,

(b) compulsory military training to all within the age group of 17 years to 50 years,

(c) to reorganise the Cabinet."(4).

**Shri Kishen Pattnayak:** I beg to move:

That after the first paragraph of the resolution, the following new paragraph be inserted, namely:—

"This House takes note of the shortcomings of our foreign policy as a result of which the country finds itself in the present situation, and resolves that mistakes committed hitherto will be rectified and steps will be taken to reorient our policy on a more realistic and creative basis."(5).

That at the end of the last paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and not lay down arms till every inch of our territory occupied by the Chinese is vacated"(6)

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the fourth paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and believes that the same graceful sympathy and co-operation will continue till the aim of

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

India of driving out the Chinese has been achieved".(7).

That at the end of the last paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and to refuse to negotiate any terms with the aggressor till this end has been achieved"(8).

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the last paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and to this end concentrate on mobilising the Nation for a total war against the Chinese with immediate massive aid from the democracies".(10).

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** I beg to move:

That in the third paragraph of the resolution,—

after "cause of India's freedom" insert—"socialist objective". (11).

**Shri Ram Ratan Gupta:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the last paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and not to enter in any negotiations with the invader till the aggression is completely vacated from Indian soil".(12).

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** I beg to move:

That for the last paragraph of the resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House declares with hope, confidence and its resolve that India would adopt an independent, effective, constructive policy of neutrality instead of illusory, unprincipled policy of appeasement. India would secure arms

at any terms from any country and would continue this war with China till the last inch of Indian territory is cleared of Chinese invaders. This House deems it necessary to declare that India is engaged in a holy war to recover its own territory from the Chinese hordes after driving them back". (13).

**Shri V. C. Parashar:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the last paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"Without inviting foreign soldiers to fight on the soil of India from any foreign Powers". (14).

**Shri N. G. Ranga:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the second paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and regrets the unpreparedness of the Government to defend the frontiers of India against aggression and invasion".(15).

That for the fourth paragraph of the resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

This House gratefully acknowledges and welcomes the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries, notably U.S.A., U.K. and Canada in this grim hour of struggle against aggression and massive invasion, and trusts that Government will take steps to secure massive support from all friendly countries".(16).

**Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the first paragraph of the resolution the following be added, namely:—

"This unprovoked attack should

serve to bring home to us the need for—

(i) reorientation of our foreign policy, and

(ii) greater watchfulness and more accurate knowledge of the moves of our bordering countries."(17).

**Shri Sivamurthi Swami:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added namely:—

"This House is of the opinion that the Prime Minister should take the confidence of the whole House and then form a strong National Government to defend our Motherland during the period of emergency."(18).

**Shri M. Thirumala Rao:** I beg to move:

That after the first paragraph of the resolution, the following new paragraph be inserted, namely:—

"In view of the pronouncements made by the Chinese Leaders regarding the ideas and practical aims of their leadership to establish World Communism, this House views the invasion of India, the biggest democratic country in Asia, as their first major step in subjugating the whole of Asia. To resist effectively such a sinister move, this House is of opinion that preparations have to be made by the Government and people of India on the basis of a prolonged and all out war to defend the freedom of India." (19)

**Shri Bibhuti Mishra:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"This House also resolves that until the Chinese invaders are driven out completely from Indian

territory there should be no negotiations by any body for the settlement of the dispute."(20).

**Mr. Speaker:** All these amendments and the two Resolutions that have been moved are before the House. They will be discussed together.

May we put some time-limit on the discussion? I hope the leaders of groups will require 20 to 30 minutes.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Minimum of 30 minutes. You may increase it to 45 minutes.

**श्री बागड़ी :** स्पीकर साहब, मैं यह दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि टाइम लिमिट चाहे कम रखी जाय, लेकिन ज्यादा से ज्यादा ग्रानरेबिल मेम्बरों को बोलने का मौका दिया जाय, ताकि सारे देश के खयालात हाउस के सामने आ सकें। आप लीडर्ज को जरूर ज्यादा टाइम दें, लेकिन ज्यादा से ज्यादा मेम्बरज को अपने विचार रखने का मौका दें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आज बिजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी बैठगी, जिसमें लीडर्ज आऊंगे अपनी राय दे सकते हैं। उस वक्त हम फंसला करेंगे कि इस पर कुल कितना वक्त खर्च हो। जब तक यह कमेटी फंसला नहीं करती, तब तक इस बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता है।

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedi:** Have you fixed the time for the meeting of Party leaders about which you mentioned just now?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will request them to come. Probably we may meet together today and fix the time. Would it not be better if we sat together and fixed the time for discussion?

**श्री हरि विष्णु कामत :** मेरी तजवीज है कि आज चार बजे बिजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी की बैठक हो।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** ठीक है । इसी को उस का नोटिस समझ लिया जाये । लीडर्ज़ आफ़् ग्रुप्स आज चार बजे उस कमेटी की मीटिंग में तशरीफ़ लायें । म उन का मशकूर हूंगा । उस में हम इस बारे में फ़ैसला कर लेंगे ।

इस वक्त टाइम लिमिट आधा घंटा होगी ।

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my party, in the unavoidable absence.....

**Some Hon. Members:** Which party? (interruptions).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** In the unavoidable absence of the leader of our Group, who is indisposed, it has devolved on me to speak on behalf of our party on the Resolutions placed before the House by the Prime Minister and I would begin by saying that we are offering unqualified support to the Resolutions which he has placed before the House.

**Shri Manaen** (Darjeeling): Is it from your lips or from your heart?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** It is for you..... (Interruption).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I feel that the greater the determination in our country for defeating the menace which threatens to overtake us, the greater should be a display of collective responsibility as far as discussions in this House are concerned. I beg of this House to give an example to the country in trying to understand the gravity of the situation with which we are confronted today.

The Prime Minister has tried to place the events of today in the perspective of world history and he has made certain observations which

are not observations which can be dismissed just like that and which, therefore, should be received in that receptive mood which the country has a right to expect of our Parliament. As far as we are concerned, it may be that we take a certain amount of time in exercising whatever grey matter Providence has given us; but once we come to a decision, we proclaim it unreservedly without any kind of qualification and here are two Resolutions to which we can give absolutely categorical support.

I say this because, I need not repeat, but it is a fact which smites us in the eye so to say, that we live at a time much more grim than we have ever faced since our Independence. The Prime Minister has told us, and it does not need his telling because his whole life is witness to that, that our country has tried to pursue the ways of peace, our people are conditioned to peace, our Government has tried to preach the evangel of peace to all the world, sometimes at the cost of being misunderstood, and yet, on account of what the Prime Minister said the other day, was a quirk of destiny, on account of a quirk of destiny, we are confronted with aggression by our neighbour China, which has openly violated our borders and invaded our territory. This is a situation which can only be answered by determination—determination to unite in defence of our motherland and this, whatever differences we may have in certain regards, is a categorical imperative. That is why on behalf of our party, in the highest forum of our country, we reiterate our resolve and we join hands with all who are behind the Prime Minister and we give support to the policies that he is pursuing at this juncture of our history.

Before I proceed, I must also be permitted to pay my tribute to the heroism of our magnificent soldiers who have already, fighting against heavy odds, shown something of the glory of our people's character. Let us salute the memory of those who

have given their lives for our country. Let us even more assure the fighters at the front that those of us who are at the rear are determined not to fail them. We are members of one another, the front and the rear and together we shall succeed in our efforts.

I recall how we have discussed this question previously in this House and on many occasions, I remember, I have tried to think aloud in order to discover if there was any sense in the kind of thing which was being done by China on our border. We have been trying to find out what possibly could have been the motives; what madness has seized the People's Government of China today, I do not know. I cannot even hope to be able to fathom. What we have discovered, however, is that our country's patriotic pride has been hurt and our people's sentiments have not been respected. Nothing in the world can justify armed invasion of the type which China, according to the reports presented to us by the Prime Minister, has perpetrated on our borders. No ideological or other kind of sophistry, no jugglery of geographical or political claims on China's part can justify this invasion. They have hurt us and they have hurt us in a manner which would go against the interests of the people not only of these two countries but the people of all the world. Therefore, at the moment, the only thing which we can do is to be determined to be ready for the worst. We are determined to face whatever is happening. But, at the same time, at the same time as we get ready for the worst, I would like to say this that we still have a hope that the world's conscience will be roused in a strong and effective enough manner in regard to this matter. Full scale war between two countries which comprise more than a third of humanity is something which cannot even be contemplated without a shudder to the deepest roots of our understanding. That is a kind of perspective which threatens to open.

That is why our country's Government even now lays this stress on peace, peace with honour: never at the cost of honour. That stress is always there. That stress is being put by the Prime Minister even today. That is why we can say that while we proclaim to all the world our determination that we shall not stomach the kind of thing which has been perpetrated on our borders, while we shall say that we shall resist to the uttermost and while we shall say that we will defend the sacred soil of our motherland, while we say that between the rear and the front, we shall forge a kind of unity which shall be the true test and the proclamation of the glory of Indian character, at the same time, we keep on our stress on peace and we keep on with hope—a hope that over and over again may come to disillusionment, but even so, that hope is the stuff of something without which humanity cannot endure. Here is our country and here is our Prime Minister who has always unreservedly expressed that hope. We do hope that something will happen, something will be done, something which will reflect the reactions of the people and the determination of our people not to stomach humiliation.

**Shri M. P. Mishra (Begusarai):**  
This is a piece of your double talk.

**Shri R. N. Mukerjee:** I come now to the policy which the Prime Minister is to pursue. I have a feeling that here in this Parliament, it is necessary for us to say and to proclaim to all the world how our people stand united behind the policies of the Prime Minister. We happen to have a Prime Minister who has the trust and affection of his people. We happen to have a Prime Minister whom we can trust without any kind of reservation. He can be trusted to do the right thing. *(Interruption)*. I know certain people would object to that. But, at least at this moment of crisis, something like national conscience should assert itself. We can leave it to the Prime Minister

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

to conduct the day to day operations and bring about whatever kind of ~~changes in the structural organisation of things~~ ~~changes in the structural organisation of things~~ of things is found to be necessary. And that is why I, on behalf of our party, would say that the way the Prime Minister has proceeded has our complete support. The way the Prime Minister has proceeded in order to give a chance to the other side to come to an agreement has our complete support. The date-line which is given, namely September, 8, 1962 as the date-line which could be observed by either side in order that necessary withdrawals might take place and then negotiations would happen, is a date-line which we certainly support with all our enthusiasm. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: I expect that if greater seriousness is manifested here, it would add to the dignity of the whole debate. We should interfere very little, and we should listen patiently. And everyone shall have an opportunity to express himself. It would also look dignified if patience is manifested.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Prime Minister has very correctly laid emphasis on the necessity of increase in production, industrial as well as agricultural, in order that our efforts can be successfully prosecuted. Regarding production, as far as we are concerned, we have given the undertaking that we can deliver the goods. The working people of this country will certainly deliver the goods. The working people of this country realise the gravity of the situation. The working people on their side will never repudiate their responsibilities. But, at the same time, it is very necessary that the other people who queer the pitch, the profiteers, the hoarders, the black-marketeers, and the big money interests who have the run of the land also are brought to a frame of mind and of action where it will be possible for the working people whether in the fields or in the factories, to work to the maximum amount possible. Therefore, on our behalf, we are

ready; we have already in our resolution said openly that we are ready to help in every possible way in the increase of production. We are ready for all kinds of understandings which would be necessary in order to achieve that increase in production, but we have to be sure that Government exercises its influence over big money interests and over the hoarders and profiteers and blackmarketeers, and sees that after all, they are not able to damage the interests of this country at this most crucial situation.

The price-line, for example, has got to be held, and it is so important that things are done, and people are reassured that the price-line is really and truly going to be held.

The committee headed by Professor Mahalanobis, for instance, is working still there, and we hope that its work will be expedited quickly enough so that certain policies can be formulated again as rapidly as that is ever possible.

On behalf of the working people, therefore, there might be a very clear assurance given to Government that every co-operation would be forthcoming for the increase of production. But that is only contingent upon a proper understanding of the situation. That is contingent upon the Government's exercising its influence over big money interests and seeing that they do not go astray and that they do not damage the interests of the country.

Already, some very important people have talked about the inequality of sacrifice which is happening in this country even in the face of the present crisis. That inequality of sacrifice has got to be eliminated. War is a testing time for the people's character. As far as the working people are concerned, they are the salt of the earth. They bear the burden of life. They are ready to do their share, but on the other hand, there are other interests, the anti-social interests, who have got to be looked after, whose conduct has got to

be regulated, and those exactly are the people who are trying in subtle and not so subtle ways to bring about changes in the structure, to bring about a change even in the policy of non-alignment, which in spite of every difficulty, in spite of the present set of incidents, the invasion of this country and that sort of thing, is still cherished by the Government of this day.

That was why I was very glad to notice that the Prime Minister reiterated his resolution that whatever happens, this country would be pursuing its policy of non-alignment. I said that attacks are being made in subtle ways and in not so subtle ways also, on the policy of non-alignment. Efforts are being made to see that we break away from it. I am not going into any detail over it. But I am sure that the country will agree that we cannot be at the mercy of any one camp. We cannot be involved in full-scale cold war policies, whichever camp might be responsible at a particular moment of time for fanning it up. And non-alignment is something which has not dropped from the skies; non-alignment is not something which has been thought out by the Prime Minister. Non-alignment is an ideal which has gripped us, because it has been implicit in the best aspects of our history. Non-alignment has been implicit in the way in which we conducted our struggle for freedom. Non-alignment has been implicit in the way in which after freedom we have been trying to build our country. Non-alignment is implicit in the way in which we are planning for a socialist society.

Panchsheel is a word which might be mocked at by certain people. It might be easy and fashionable to do so. But, whatever China might have done in regard to Panchsheel, Panchsheel is something which is redolent of the very spirit of Indian history at its best. Panchsheel is something which will cure the world's ills. This is the principle on the basis of which

our people have fought in the past and they are fighting in the present. Therefore, I feel that our country adheres essentially and truly to the policy of non-alignment, but it has the job which is now forced upon her, that is, the job of defending the country.

I have noticed with regret and a certain amount of perturbation the report that a substantial number of members of our party have been arrested, presumably in pursuance of the present operations. I say I am very sorry about this, and I am very deeply perturbed also about it, but I want in this House to tell Government that I do not understand what the idea is. If there are suggestions that the Communist Party does not mean what it says, well, after all, history will give you the answer. Our behaviour will be the answer. There is the resolution which we have passed, the resolution which we have passed at our National Council. Copies of this resolution would be available to whoever wants it, and they have been published openly in the press. There, we arrive at these decisions after a whole lot of discussion. It may be that some of you might object to the kind of prolonged discussion we have over things. We believe in discussion before decision. We believe in exercising whatever grey matter we have got, but after doing that, we come to certain decisions, and whatever you say, we are a disciplined lot; the members of our party, everyone of them is bound by them unless he chooses to walk out. Everyone is bound by the discipline of this resolution, and in letter and in spirit, they would observe this resolution.

If, in spite of that we are pushed out of things, I cannot stop Government doing so. I am not asking to be included in a committee of this or a committee of that; I hate the idea of it; that is not the point at all. The point is that here is a call by the Prime Minister himself in the most stirring manner for the unity of the whole country. Behind that call, we are all trying to mobilise our people,

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

and yet we discover the phenomena of certain steps being taken against us. I cannot stop Government going on and taking whatever steps it chooses to take, but here are our cards. We put them on the table. We do not shilly-shally about things. We do not hide things. Whatever we have to say, we say that straightway. And here are the *bona fides* of the determination which we have made; here is a formulation which in letter and in spirit, it is our job, however Government's behaviour might be, to pursue, and to bring into some kind of action. Therefore, I feel that this sort of thing which is happening at this particular moment is entirely undesirable, and that is why I have expressed my perturbation over it.

On this occasion, as you said earlier, it is necessary for us to keep a sense of balance and of proportion, and to behave with dignity, with the kind of effective dignity which would give something like a declaration to the world of the real solidity of our determination.

Therefore, I appeal to the House, let no discordant voices be raised; if there are matters of detail on which the critics of Government and its military and political direction lay a great deal of importance, let those matters of detail be conveyed to the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister and their colleagues. Let them not be shouted about, not only in the market-place but also in Parliament. Let not such details, the noising about of which would not help anybody, least of all, ourselves, be raised here; let not that be done in this House. In this House, at any rate, let us discuss matters of principle; where details amount to something, where principle; where principles are yet to be evolved, surely, we are discussing that sort of thing. But let not matters of military and political detail, which had better be conveyed to Government, be noised about in this House which I fear sometimes, judging from the kind of

scene which we have noticed this morning already. As you have said, let us conduct ourselves so that the country may move as one man and the world outside will learn a lesson.

14 hrs.

We are meeting at a time of very great crisis and these testing periods really bring about an examination of our character. We recall only when crisis overtakes us how deeply attached we are to the land of our birth. We belong, all of us, to this emerald country and it is only when a crisis of the sort which has overtaken us today takes place that we realise how dearly and deeply we love this land, how we love every blade of Indian grass. That is the sort of feeling which comes to us when this kind of crisis overtakes us in the manner in which it has done on this occasion. Let that love of our country lead to the fulfilling of our deepest ideals and our deepest desires. Let us soar—at least let us try to—soar above all petty calculations. We can do nothing better than do our duty, and that duty is patent. If we do our duty and leave the rest to whatever happens in the future, that would be the finest way of showing how the Indian character can repel attacks made upon it, humiliations sought to be imposed upon it. And surely if we behave in that fashion in conformity with the finest traditions of our country, then we shall not only repel whatever danger has appeared to overtake us today, but we shall also lay down soundly and truly the foundations of a really good life to be built on the soil of our hoary land.

**Shri Ranga:** I wish to thank you for having taken the initiative and giving a lead to the House in expressing our gratitude and also paying homage to all those thousands of our brave and patriotic jawans who died fighting for the freedom of our country. We all deeply mourn their deaths. We also wish to express our



gratitude to all those jawans, and officers who are associated with them at the front, who are today risking their lives and doing their best and offering their all in the service of our motherland.

At the same time, this is also the time to mourn or regret the number of might-have-beens or mistakes or omissions that had gone into our recent history which have resulted in the present miserable plight of our country. I do not wish to go into detail in regard to these things. I would content myself with referring only to some of them. I wish to say that we deeply mourn the loss of freedom and national autonomy of Tibet and I express my sympathy for all those millions of Tibetans who are today groaning under communist and imperialist oppression.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, made a reference to *panchsheel*. My friend, Acharya Kripalani, who was a leader and President of the Congress, whose absence from this House on this occasion I very much regret and deplore, once said in this House—and very many people were shocked at it at the time—that *panchsheel* was born out of the rape of Tibet. It is that *panchsheel* that my hon. friend wants us even today to hug, even after the Prime Minister has said that *panchsheel* has gone overboard, (*An Hon. Member*: No.), even after the Chinese have not only disowned but also violated the basic principles which led our Prime Minister to accept it and call it *panchsheel*. It is not so much because it was a part of Indian culture and tradition that *panchsheel* came to be accepted by the Chinese. If any of our friends would care to look into *Window on China* written by one who is very close to our Prime Minister, many years before *panchsheel* was even talked about, he would find that Mao Tse Tung was talking about these things. Mao Tse Tung was clever enough to get these things incorporated into the India-China treaty over Tibet and leave our Prime Minister

and various other people also under the impression that it was being presented to the world as a contribution of India's statesmanship. So *panchsheel* has already gone.

There is also the question of the notice that Chinese themselves have given to us for so many years about their intentions, and yet our Government thought that it would be wise on its part to consider it to be of not much significance. It treated their aggression merely as incursions and thought that it could negotiate with the tiger and try to make it behave like Lord Buddha. No wonder we find ourselves unprepared today. No wonder the Prime Minister himself was obliged to say that they were not prepared for the Chinese divisions coming down to our plains from their heights on that fateful day, October 20.

Then the Prime Minister said that he sent out these letters of his to various heads of State and Prime Ministers in different parts of the world. But that was done only last month. Action on some such lines should have been taken again and again all these years in order to inform and win their goodwill and support for our cause. Yes, it is true that we have our embassies, but we know how inefficiently these embassies have been working. The Prime Minister should have done this much earlier and many more times, and prepared the mind of all these friends in different parts of the world.

Then there is the question of supplies. The Prime Minister has said that it is true that our troops have not been adequately provisioned. Whose fault is it? Surely, it is not because we do not have ordnance factories or a military supply department, or that we never had any kind of notice from the Chinese. We have had it and we were sending these troops up those snowy heights to which freeze people—their limbs are

[Shri Ranga]

bitten by frost. We should have prepared ourselves for this. But we failed in that elementary duty.

Then there is the question of Nepal. Are we going to say that we did not do anything to irritate the Nepal Government? Was there nothing at all that we could have done in order to preserve the wholehearted friendship of Nepal? Did we do everything possible on that front?

There is also the question of the South-East Asian countries, and also African nations in whose freedom we took so much interest, for the achievement of whose freedom we did so much in so many spheres of world politics. How is it that so large a number of them are not able to associate themselves, line up with us in their sympathy and in their preparedness to give us support today? There must be some reason for this. Somewhere there must be some failure.

Nevertheless, there are certain rays of hope in this otherwise very gloomy atmosphere. At long last we have evidence of the triumph of democracy over the personality cult. It was this personality cult which did a lot of damage in Bombay not so long ago. Fortunately for us, we have become witness to the triumph of democracy, so that we can hope to have better leadership in the Defence Ministry from now on.

The Prime Minister has also been good enough to make a number of admissions in regard to the failure of his dreams. We all dream, true, and our dreams do not come true, that is also true, but at the same time it is very dangerous to go on dreaming and dreaming for years and years even over such a terrific crisis and problem as this, with the result that not only our people but also people abroad have had to wonder how this country's leadership has been guiding our people with all this atmosphere of dreamings.

I am very glad that this emergency has been declared at long last. Only during the last session, I think, my hon. friend Shri P. K. Deo, who acted as our leader, asked the Prime Minister to send away the Chinese Embassy and consider that there is a state of war between India and China, and I was told—I speak subject to correction—that the Prime Minister taunted him whether he wanted India to declare war, and even went to the extent of saying that his attitude was bordering on war-mongering. I am glad that although wise counsels on our side have failed, the Chinese have brought these things home to our Prime Minister, and he has been obliged to agree with the President in declaring this national emergency and taking the necessary steps in that direction.

I am also glad that the Prime Minister as well as the Government are inviting our public to co-operate with them in conducting this war to a successful end, and they are giving also the assurance that they are determined and bent upon conducting this war campaign until we achieve success. But at the same time, there is also this other threat which stares in our faces which my hon. friend Shri Mukerjee wants to take advantage of and therefore wants to go on pinning it down by his repeated assertions and reminders to the Prime Minister that he is so very keen on peace, therefore he should not forget peace and the need for peace. Certainly, after the war is over and we achieve our objectives, peace always comes. It is not necessary at this juncture to begin to talk about it, and yet my hon. friend wants us to remember that. Yes, peace has come to China after the Japanese defeat; not only then, but after the defeat of Nationalist China and after communist friends have gained complete control over the whole of so-called people's China. Is that the kind of peace that we want in our country? I certainly do not want that kind of peace, and I hope my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, does not wish to stand for that kind of peace. Peace would certainly come.

Then they talk about negotiations. Negotiations on what basis? For the time being they say 8th September. Where is it guaranteed that it is not likely to be 20th October, and some time later 8th November because this session has begun today? There must be some certainty about these things. We must be very clear indeed as to what we want to achieve as a result of this war. We want the Chinese to go back again to the positions from which they had begun aggression on our country five years ago, four, three, two years or one year ago, or do you want them to be content with all areas that they had already gobbled up and then begin to negotiate with us in regard to only the latest incursions which they now prefer to call aggression? We must be very clear in regard to these things. I for one wish to make it very clear indeed that in this country there are people, millions and tens and hundreds of millions of people who certainly would not be content so long as the Chinese are allowed to remain in possession of even one inch of our sacred soil. Let the Government take due note of this, because otherwise afterwards we would not like any misunderstandings in regard to this matter.

**Siri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** Everybody agrees to this.

**Shri Ranga:** My hon. friend the Prime Minister says we are a people not attuned to war, we are men of peace. This is not the time for it when my friends the Communists who, not so long ago, were not so much in love with our Prime Minister, have suddenly fallen so much in love with him that they make not only Members like me but also my hon. friends here on the other side to my left blush.

**Shri Tyagi:** I do not know if it is parliamentary.

**Shri Ranga:** I dare not say anything now lest I should commit an impropriety. All that I need say is this. In England there is what is known as a wartime leadership and a peacetime leadership. Today we are at war. We 1962 (Ai) LSD.—7.

have been forced into war by the Chinese. Are we having just that leadership that we really deserve, that we need, that the people really demand? It is for the party in power to think about it.

All I can say is that we must begin to think about war, talk about it and go and exhort our people in the manner in which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used to do when the British were here and Mahatma Gandhi was alive and addressing us from the Congress forum and the AICC. I have not found that fibre in the Prime Minister's speech today. I do not find that sense of urgency and drive, feeling and power, that I used to find in those days which used to inspire us all. Many of us were proud in those days to place ourselves not only at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi but also to call ourselves the supporters and followers of Nehru. I am sorry I have to confess that I do not find that atmosphere as yet.

They say we were not strong enough; they are 60 crores, we are 40 crores, therefore we need time in order to prepare ourselves, that is what the Ministers told us. We wanted them to make brisker preparations, more urgent preparations, more effective preparations, and we know what preparations had been made by the death of so many thousands of our own people for want of ordinary, elementary weapons which the Chinese had in plenty, which our people did not have.

I do not wish to say anything more, but it must be remembered by all our friends on every side of the House that we have to become strong. How are we to become strong if we hang on to this non-alignment policy? Yes, there is a voice, and powerful voice, not only from Shri Mukerjee, but all those people who are behind him. They say it is built into our culture.

Non-attachment is certainly built into in our culture, thanks to Lord Krishna. But even that non-attachment has been put to very effective

[Shri Ranga]

use by Mahatma Gandhi in order to help our country and achieve freedom. But this non-alignment, I do not know from where my friend comes to the conclusion that it is built in in our culture; I do not know whether he can give any kind of a quotation because he is a Sanskrit Pandit. Non-alignment has not served us; does not serve any longer. The sooner we get rid of it, the better, the sooner we turn our back to it, the better. That does not mean that we should go and place ourselves at the feet of any other country. This Government has been trying to make friends with the ally of China, that is, Soviet Russia. We know the results now. Pakistan and ourselves have been kept apart. Beyond that, what is the gain? We know now what services we have got from them in this crisis. On the other hand, I am glad that the Prime Minister had told the House that all those democratic countries, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Canada, France and so many other countries have been noble enough and decent enough and democratic enough to offer unconditional support in an unstinting manner respecting the Prime Minister's long-felt attachment to this non-alignment. They do not wish to upset him. All credit to them. But that is not a compliment to our Prime Minister or to his non-alignment policy. I wish to express my gratitude to all those countries and also those other countries which have gone with our Prime Minister in support of his suggestion that the Chinese should be asked to withdraw to where they were on the 8th of September. As I said earlier, I do not agree with this proposition. We need their massive support from outside; otherwise it would not be possible to carry on. I have had some talks with some friends, not only old generals but some very young people who know a little more than I do. My hon. friend the Prime Minister said that we did not know so much about defence and fighting on those heights.

He himself was frank enough to say that when he was talking to the generals and other people he had to be guided mostly by the generals because he himself did not know. But we do know that until and unless we take the initiative and go over to the other side and then begin to attack just those areas and those spheres where they are keeping their armament dumps, training their own people and keeping their own troops, the area from where they are launching these offensives and we begin to destroy and disable the enemy, it would not be possible for us to defend our country really by remaining simply on the defensive all the time. We cannot do it because we do not have the necessary equipment either in divisions or in armaments or, especially, in aircraft. So, we have to go and approach other countries. The other countries are good enough to come and offer their support. They are supporting us by their spitfires and so on. Should we not speed our request to these people and say: for God's sake come to our rescue. It is not in a humble manner that we need do this because, after all they all belong to the democratic part of the world with an avowal to democratic cause—not the Soviet democracy, not the people's democracy but to the parliamentary kind of democracy that we know or the presidential democracy that we have read about. That is a cause to which they are all wedded. Should we not, therefore, speed up our request to these nations and say: please come to our rescue and if you do come, we will welcome you with both our arms. We heard today the Prime Minister himself saying that it is no longer India's need but it is the need of the world, especially the need of all the democratic peoples all over the world wherever they may be, either under a dictatorship or in a democracy.

In this need, when the blow is coming down on us it should be recog-

nised by all the rest of the world that this blow is equally as hard and harsh and cruel on them as it is on us. Therefore, we should request them to give us this massive support. Without it I am afraid it would not be possible for us to save our country at this juncture.

The supplies department has got to be organised properly. That Ministry ought to be given the powers so that it may give priority for the production, distribution and conveyance and utilisation of all those commodities and materials that are needed in these circumstances for the purpose of war. Special steps will have to be taken to utilise the retired generals. It means no observation on their character or their ability. We have many generals in our country who have retired not so long ago and whose experiences are still fresh and who are capable of giving us assistance. Should we not call them to our rescue? Is it proper for us to dump them into a big council of 30 or 40 people to simply air their views and go back home scratching their heads and wonder what happens. It is necessary that a smaller committee should be formed where the generals would be able to play a more effective role. In that committee they should be given enough of responsibility as well as power so that they may help the generals who are at work and in service as also the Ministry or the Ministries concerned.

The hon. Prime Minister talked about the Plan. We also want a Plan but that should be a Victory Plan. When Mr. Churchill was asked about his war aims from time to time, as also about his peace aims, he said his aim was to win the war. That was what inspired them. Let us win. That is what we have got to think about. By all means plan in order to achieve Victory and direct all your resources to that end. But why do you have this Planning Commission any longer?

Even ordinarily it was useless and now it becomes much more useless; indeed it can even be a nuisance. Therefore, it is time for the Government to begin to plan for a victory and I hope the Government will take concerted measures in that direction. There is Pakistan. True, in recent days and weeks the leaders of Pakistan have been behaving and talking in a manner which is not helpful to the progress and cause of world democracy. They have been behaving and talking in a manner as to irritate and incite and force us into wrong positions. But it was not so long ago that the Prime Minister of Pakistan was good enough to offer the possibility of forming a common defence council for these two great countries. We did not think it wise at that time to give it proper consideration and reach some kind of an agreement. I do not say that the leaders of Pakistan are today likely to repeat that offer or to behave in a wise and sensible manner as could be expected by persons having the memories of our comradeship when we were all together in our common Bharathavarsha. But at the same time, sincere efforts will have to be made from our side in order to make them see reason and reach some kind of an agreement so that the disputes between us can come to be frozen and we can at least have peace from that side. It is very dangerous to have to fight a war on two fronts. The Pakistani leaders are trying to imitate the Chinese and are trying to make hay while we are in trouble.

We stand here as an opposition party, and we have been sent here to play the role of a responsible opposition in our parliamentary democracy. The moment we give up this role, the moment we follow the advice now so suddenly tendered, for their own reasons, by our friends of the communist party, we cease to be a parliamentary democracy. To them, to the communists, parliamentary democracy has no fascination. Therefore they find it easy now, when it is so very

[Shri Ranga]

convenient to them on this occasion, to give us advice that we should not say anything which is likely to upset the peace of mind of the great men on the other side. I cannot agree with them. We are here to play our role as an opposition, as a responsible opposition, as a co-operative link in our total democracy, a democracy in which it should be possible for the Government to gain from the criticisms that are made from time to time by the opposition. It is true that some of my brave friends within the Congress have been trying to play quite an inspiring role, in the recent past in order to tune up their own party and try to see that it lines up with the people. But that is not enough. I have had experiences of that role, and I have known its limitations. Therefore it is very necessary indeed that there should be effective opposition in this country; and that oppositional role we shall continue to play now and serve the country.

But that does not mean that we do not line up with all the rest of the country in strengthening and in maximising the defence effort, in promoting the national will of resistance against aggression. We are with the government, and we are with all the other political parties which are sincerely bent upon supporting this national effort. And it is there that I wish to pay my tribute to the people at large in this country. Indeed, I wish to express my gratitude to them for the spontaneous manner in which they have shown the way to the leaders themselves—leaders of all political parties, including the leaders of the ruling party. This is a national upsurge, and I am glad that the Prime Minister has recognised it as such and has incorporated it in this resolution. It is in tune with this national upsurge that all of us have to behave and conduct ourselves in the months and years to come. And let us hope that we shall deserve well of our people and that the people would be able to say that their leaders have

behaved well indeed in this time of crisis.

**Shri U. N. Dhebar (Rajkot):** In the first place, Sir, let me thank you for giving me this opportunity of placing before the House my reaction to the great crisis which is facing the nation. I do not think that this House has ever been faced by, or has met under, such a crisis as it is today.

14-35 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]: The problem is grave, and the moment in our history is also grave. So much is at stake which defies definition.

Just now I was hearing my hon. friend Shri Ranga speaking about the role of the opposition. I do not dispute the fact that the opposition has a role to play in a democratic country even during crisis like this. But that role has got to be tempered with the knowledge that everything that we say ultimately goes out and can be exploited to the detriment of the country. I am deeply sorry, therefore, Sir, that an hon. Member in this House should have risen to cast a doubt upon the capacity of the Prime Minister to give a lead to this country in this hour of crisis. I do not know what service he has rendered to his party, to this House or to the country by questioning the capacity of the only person who is the rallying point of the national will and determination today and who can continue to be the only person that can inspire this country and lead it to the final destination of complete victory. If he was keen on victory—and he spoke so much, eulogizing what happened in England—if he was keen on victory, let him understand the lessons of Indian history. It was a frail man who led us, and the Indian masses reposed their confidence in their lifetime in one person, unshakably and forever. And in the history of this country we have found another man in whom the masses of India have chosen to place their confidence. I was surprised that a responsible person, claiming the right of an opposition leader,

should on the eighteenth day of this national crisis come up before the House and claim to speak as a responsible opposition leader, questioning the very fulcrum, the very pivot on which this machine has to be built, the pivot on which we have to rally the masses of the country ultimately to the final victory. I do not doubt his right: I doubt his wisdom. And that is so not only in relation to what he has said about the Prime Minister, but that is so in relation to everything that has come from his mouth. I am sorry I have to speak in a manner that is foreign to me. But I would have failed in my duty to the country if I did not do so. At this critical juncture when we need unity, when we need a symbol that expresses the unity of the country, when we need hope, somebody who symbolises the hope of this country, I am sorry that anybody should come up here and try to weaken the Prime Minister. There are occasions and occasions; we have had our differences, but there is a limit.

Another thing he said, and that has hurt, I think, everybody in this country, is this. He said that our *Panchsheel* has gone. What is *Panchsheel*? *Panchsheel* is not the monopoly of India. *Panchsheel* is the need, if I may say so, of all the countries in the world if the world is to survive. We are today opposing China because it has violated *Panchsheel*. But when the people in the world forget the first response or reaction of the mad action that China has plunged this country, India, into—that is something which can tomorrow result in a world will flagration—I might tell my hon. friends what will remain of the world will be something which will have no relation to what we see today.

Only the other day, his leader was in America, arguing with the President of the United States of America proposing to him the abandonment of the nuclear tests. What was the foundation of his plea? The foundation of the plea was not merely abandonment of the use of nuclear weapons but a new orientation of mind which is be-

hind the nuclear weapons. But India has to fight and India will fight, but will fight from a different outlook from the one which the imperialists have fought in the past and from the one from which China is fighting today. It is a different kind of fight for India.

Two questions were raised. We are men of peace. What is this peace? Did we believe that being men of peace we are accustomed to surrender and submit. In the whole history of his life, the Prime Minister is one person who has never surrendered at any time on any occasion. We have learnt these lessons at his feet and the feet of his master who has given his blessings to him. Whether we believe in non-violent opposition or whether we believe in violent opposition, India is one country which will not surrender in the name of peace. Peace is not a cloak for us to surrender. That lesson is being reflected throughout the country and on the battle field also. The jawans who are fighting are imbued with one zeal and the people who think they cannot go to the frontier are also imbued with one zeal; and that is to protect the honour of this country and to reach ultimately that destination, namely, the victory for the cause of justice against might.

The battle that we are fighting is a peculiar type of battle. My hon. friend said we were unprepared. Yes; partially so. This is the first time in the history of India that we are fighting around the Himalayan frontiers against those who have an evil eye on India. We were not prepared so far, because the Himalayas were considered to be the bastion of India. For the first time in our history, we have been called upon to guard the frontiers about 1,500 miles and it is not possible, I think, to expect the Government of India to locate in every place three or four battalions to guard that frontier. We shall have to be prepared for surprise attacks. We shall have to be prepared for some kind of repetitions because it is in the nature of things impossible for us to guard all the 1,500 miles of the line on a uniform basis.

[Shri U. N. Dhebar]

We are called upon for the first time in our history to meet the challenge of the most populated country itself in the grip of a clique, most perfidious, most brutal and most ruthless. I sympathise with the people of China also. It is poverty being driven to fight poverty, simply because the men at the helm of affairs think that it is necessary in the interests of their ideological expansion to lead them into a fight. With violence as its creed, as the Prime Minister just now said, to attain its so-called classless society, China has come out with a challenge.

The first thing is to realise the objectives behind this aggression. China is not likely to place all its cards before the world because it does not suit it. But we have a duty to find out what is the real intention of China. Whatever it maybe it is no exaggeration to say that it is a limited war but yet a war. Let us not be under any complacent belief that they are thinking in terms of seizing a few hundred square miles of area. If I am not speculating, it is first of all to establish a pincer around three buffer States, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, and at any convenient moment, to march into them as they marched into Tibet. Let the people of Nepal also understand this.

Let me read to this House the words in the treaty of 1954 which are again and again being repeated in their conversations by them to the rulers of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim: "Tibet should enjoy regional autonomy and the Chinese Central Government would not interfere with its political institutions and internal administration. China would recognise and maintain Dalai Lama's position." These are the very words. And today, this is the objective. It is the second stage in their long-term plan to spread a totalitarian type of dictatorship with the object of establishing communism. I have no doubt in my mind about that. It may not be the communism of a certain type, but China really believes in the inevitability of war and therefore

China will go ahead. This is the second stage of their campaign.

Then, the second objective is to humiliate India in the eyes of the South-East Asian countries. They want to isolate India. The third objective is to dislocate the Indian economy so that there will be economic unrest in India and would provide a flourishing ground for their friends here in this country. And there do exist friends even in spite of what my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee has said—I do not question the *bona fides* of Shri H. N. Mukerjee himself. In the communist party, there are people who believe that ultimately nationalism or no nationalism, their party's interests lie with China and not with India. We must think in terms of basing our policies, both military strategy and political policies, to combat not the present danger only, but the danger that is likely to develop. There is no reason to believe that the thrust on the left shoulder of India will go only skin deep; it may penetrate up to the heart of India. Similarly, there is no reason to believe that not only we may not be politically isolated from the south-east Asiatic countries, but a stage may come when they may be put up against us. There is no reason to believe that in the midst of operations and even after the operations, a stage may not come when they may not flame up the little or the big difficulties from which the masses of India will be suffering and incite them to discontent and unrest. Our policies, therefore, must take into account not only what is happening on NEFA border or Ladakh border, but this long-term possible objectives of China.

Reading the resolution of the communist party in that light, I think the communist party should do well along with this resolution to make its attitude clear on the question of strikes. INTUC has already passed a resolution, but AITUC has still to pass a resolution agreeing to undertake no strikes whatsoever during the period



of this conflict and not only during the period, but thereafter for some time.

Secondly, what is necessary in my opinion is, so far as the communist party is concerned, they should not exploit the question of price-line. Today the Planning Minister was replying to the question about the Mahalanobis Committee's report. I have no objection if the Planning Minister wants to publish it. But we are living in a moment when all that is published is not merely confined to India, but it ultimately goes to our enemy and he exploits it. We should be on guard even when we speak in this House or when we publish anything; we have to be on guard that the enemy may not have an opportunity to exploit it. I do not want to stand in the way of his right to plead before the House and outside regarding the question of price-line and so on. But let it not take the character of an agitation. India cannot afford any agitation either on political or on economic grounds at this moment.

The next question, in my opinion, on which we have to be clear is the question of resources, both for the purpose of fighting on the front and to sustain our economy. I have no plan at the moment ready. But I feel that a stage has come when the Government of India should think about the character or pattern of spending at the governmental level and curtail all kinds of expenditure which is not warranted at the present moment.

**Dr. M. S. Aney** (Nagpur): Hear, hear!

**Shri U. N. Dhebar**: I have carefully gone through the proceedings of the National Development Council and I have no doubt they have taken a big step in that direction. But this House may have suggestions to offer and we will be grateful to the Prime Minister if he will give us an opportunity to discuss where the governmental spending can be cut. There are many a department in the Government which we can afford to suspend at this

moment. They are not so very necessary. In other departments also, there are many conveniences which you can afford to take away at the moment. I have in mind the convenience of jeeps in the community development blocks I think in 3,000 blocks, there must be at least about 6,000 jeeps. The first sacrifice the community development department can afford to make is the sacrifice of the 6,000 jeeps. I have got plenty of suggestions to make, but I do not want to side-track the debate at the moment on that issue. I would only urge on the Prime Minister to give us an opportunity, if he thinks it otherwise fit, to discuss this important matter.

It is so very necessary to think about the pattern of national spending. I toured during the last 15 days in my part of the country. I had been to Orissa and to Hyderabad. I do not know what difference we find in the life of Delhi, between what it was on 20th October and what it is today on 8th November. Delhi is functioning to day as if it is the privilege of Delhi to continue to function as ever. It is very necessary, in my opinion that, if we have to create a climate of earnestness—the people are in earnest and they are ready to respond to any decision Government may take—if we have to create that climate of earnestness and keep before the people the sacrifices the broad masses of the country are making and our jawans are making on the front, then this demonstrational aspect of the country's life also requires to be considered.

We also must think of reviewing our relations with the three border States of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim and with the south-east Asiatic countries also. If there are any mistakes or misunderstandings, this is the time when we should make an effort. We have got so many men in India who possess that stature and personality and who would be prepared to go out and remove those misunderstandings and see how those mistakes can be remedied.

[Shri U. N. Dhebar]

There are one or two things which require to be understood. We are fighting a long-term war; maybe a limited war, but it is going to be a long-term war. Peace-time economy cannot function during a period of crisis like this and deliberate steps will have to be taken to reorient that peace-time economy, so that without any great difficulty, our country can go over to war-time economy. In that connection, I would request the Prime Minister to consider several suggestions made by Vinobaji. I know basically his approach is different, but two of the suggestions that he has made are, in my opinion, so very relevant, whether it is a non-violent struggle or a violent struggle.

One suggestion is to create in the leadership at the village level the responsibility for looking after the employment and the livelihood of the people in that village. That means not only a self-sufficient village but a responsible village responsible for providing employment and responsible for providing the wherewithals of livelihood to the poorer and weaker sections in that village.

15 hrs.

The other suggestion that he has made is a suggestion about Shanti Sena. We shall not be able to fight on two fronts. Here is the old Gandhian approach. Let us not feel that that approach has no relevance in the present context. I am sure these two suggestions would be considered, contacts established with Vinobhaji and schemes and plans formulated so that it may be possible to utilise his great influence with the masses of India in the cause of sustaining rural economy and the cause of maintaining rural peace.

Finally, so far as some of us are concerned, we have always been thinking in terms of peace and non-violence. And, some of us would like, even in the midst of this crisis, that

the governing sentiment of the country may still remain to be the same, a peaceful approach, a non-violent approach. That does not mean that the step taken by the Government of India in giving a call to the country, the step taken by the Prime Minister in giving a call to the country to mobilise all their energies for a successful struggle to throw out the enemy from the country is not right.

Sir, in lending my support I can assure him that, whether the people believe in non-violence or any other philosophy, the whole country is behind him in this great effort, for the whole nation has already given its verdict that the Chinese must be thrown out from this land. I am sure that nobody who styles himself an Indian will ever bend his knee before a foreign power or hold his hand in salute to a foreign power. We are a generation which has been baptised with struggle from birth. We hope we shall live down to the last day fighting so that India's freedom, India's liberty and India's integrity are passed on to our future generation intact as we received them in 1947.

डा० गोविन्द वास (जबलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक हम कांग्रेस वालों का सम्बन्ध है वहाँ तक हम तो अपनी सरकार और प्रधान मंत्री जी के साथ हैं ही परन्तु आज सारा देश उन के साथ है। जो समर्थन उन को इस समस्त देश से प्राप्त हुआ है वह एक एतिहासिक समर्थन है। मैं तो यहाँ तक कहने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि वैसे समर्थन जिस समय हम अंग्रेज सरकार से लड़ते थे और इस देश में स्वराज्य की स्थापना करने का प्रयत्न करते थे उस समय भी नहीं मिला जैसा समर्थन कि आज उन्हें और उन की सरकार को मिल रहा है।

श्री ही० ना० मुकर्जी ने अपने साम्यवादी दल की ओर से भी उन के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन

किया है। परन्तु उस समर्थन में उन्होंने जो भाषण दिया उस भाषण को थोड़ा ध्यानपूर्वक पढ़ना चाहिए। एक बात जो उन्होंने उस भाषण में कही उस से उन का समर्थन बहुत दूर तक घुल जाता है। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहा कि चीन के मोटिक्स चाहे कुछ भी हों, यही तो सब से बड़ा झगड़ा इन वर्षों में रहा है कि हम सदा कहते रहे हैं कि चीन ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया है जिसे कि साम्यवादी दल ने नहीं माना और आज इस स्थिति के होने के बाद भी श्री मुकर्जी और उन का दल चीन के क्या मोटिक्स हैं इस सम्बन्ध में कोई जिक्र नहीं करना चाहते। बात यह है कि उन का दल कुछ ऐसा दल है जो कभी भी इस भूमि को अपनी मातृभूमि नहीं मानता रहा है और जिसकी कि दृष्टि हमेशा मास्को और पेंकिंग की ओर रही है। गत स्वतंत्र्य युद्ध के समय भी इस दल ने क्या किया था यह हमारे सामने है। इस दल का इतिहास ही कुछ देशप्रेम का इतिहास नहीं रहा है बल्कि इसका इतिहास देशद्रोह का इतिहास कहा जा सकता है। इसलिए मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन के समर्थन के बावजूद भी उन का दल क्या करता है उस पर हमें कड़ी नजर रखनी होगी।

आज इस देश के समस्त दलों ने हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का सर्वसम्मति से समर्थन किया है। लेकिन साम्यवादी दल में जब इस सम्बन्ध में मत लिये गये तो आप जानते हैं कि एक तिहाई मत विरुद्ध थे। हमारे ऊपर जो आक्रमण हुआ है उस सम्बन्ध में स्पष्ट घोषणा करने के बारे में जब मत लिये गये तो मैंने यह पढ़ा कि ६० उस के पक्ष में थे और ३० उस के विरुद्ध थे। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत सतर्क रहने की आवश्यकता है।

श्री रंगा का भाषण भी मैंने बड़े ध्यान से सुना। जहाँ तक पंचशील का सम्बन्ध है श्री देबर भाई ने उस का बड़ा सुन्दर उत्तर दे दिया है। पंचशील एक ऐसा सिद्धान्त है

जो केवल हमारे देश से ही सम्बन्ध नहीं रखता वरन् सारे संसार से सम्बन्ध रखता है। जब इस प्रकार की आपत्तियाँ आयें और उन आपत्तियों के काल में भी हम अपने सिद्धान्तों पर डटे रहें तभी उन सिद्धान्तों की कुछ कीमत रहती है। रंगा जी ने कहा कि जवाहरलाल जी उन्हें आज स्फूर्ति नहीं देते। उन्होंने कहा कि गांधी जी के समय गांधी जी से ही नहीं वरन जवाहरलाल जी से भी उन्हें स्फूर्ति मिलती थी। मुझे उन की यह बात सुन कर आश्चर्य हुआ। जवाहरलाल जी आज समूचे देश को किस प्रकार की स्फूर्ति दे रहे हैं वह आज देश की परिस्थिति में एक भ्रंशा आदमी भी जान सकता है। आज यदि जवाहरलाल जी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री न हों तो हमारे देश की क्या दशा हो इसकी कल्पना उचित करनी चाहिए।

नौन एलाइनमैट की पालिसी के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने एक बड़ी विचित्र बात कही। उन्होंने कहा कि नौन एलाइनमैट की पालिसी हमारी संस्कृति के विरुद्ध है। मेरी समझ में इन की यह बात नहीं आई। कम से कम संस्कृति के सम्बन्ध में मैं एक छोटा सा विद्यार्थी रहा हूँ। प्रोफेसर रंगा यहाँ इस समय मौजूद नहीं हैं। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सम्पूर्ण इतिहास में एक दृष्टान्त भी वह इस बात का बतला दें कि हम ने किसी दूसरे देश पर किसी दूसरे देश के साथ रह कर आक्रमण किया हो, या किसी भी मामले में हम ने सत्य और न्याय को छोड़ कर किसी एक देश के समर्थन में किसी दूसरे देश का विरोध किया हो। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इतिहास का एक छोटा सा विद्यार्थी हूँ। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा सारा इतिहास नान-एलाइनमैट पालिसी का इतिहास है।

माननीय सदस्य, प्रोफेसर रंगा, ने हमारी योजना के सम्बन्ध में जो बात कही है, उस से मैं बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ। मैं उन से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ कि इस वक्त हमारी योजनायें इस प्रकार की बननी चाहिए कि जो हमारी विजय की योजनायें हों, आज चारों तरफ से हम जिन शत्रुओं से घिरे हुए हैं, उन से

## [डा० गोविन्द दास]

इस देश के बचाव की योजनायें हों। माननीय सदस्य, श्री डेबर, ने इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव रखे हैं। मैंने अभी आप से निवेदन किया है कि मैं इतिहास का एक छोटा सा विद्यार्थी रहा हूँ। जहाँ तक भारत का जनता का सम्बन्ध है, वह सदा बड़ी स्वातंत्र्य-प्रेमी जनता रही है। सब से पहले इस देश पर आक्रमण हुआ ईरान से काइरस का और काइरस को धराशायी होना पड़ा भारत की सीमा पर। उस को धराशायी किया दरबिकी और मसगेत नामक आदिवासी जातियों ने। उस के बाद यूनान का आक्रमण हुआ और अभी इतिहास के सम्बन्ध में जो चीजें हुई हैं, उन से प्रकट होता है—केवल हमारे इतिहास से ही नहीं, बल्कि यूनान के इतिहास से भी यह बात सिद्ध होती है—कि सिकन्दर यहाँ जीतकर नहीं, हार कर गया था।

उस के बाद सैल्यूकस का आक्रमण हुआ और यह एक सर्वमान्य बात है कि सैल्यूकस को चंद्रगुप्त के सामने हारना पड़ा और उस को चंद्रगुप्त के साथ अपनी कन्या का विवाह करना पड़ा। उस के बाद शक और हूण आए और वे भी इस देश में तब रह सके, जब वे इस देश में पच सके। उस के बाद मुसलमानों का आक्रमण हुआ। मुसलमानों का राज्य भी इस देश का राज्य हो गया था। जैसे ही औरंगजेब ने अकबर की नीति के विरोध में अपना शासन चलाया, वैसे ही मुसलमानी राज्य खत्म हो गया। फिर अंग्रेज यहाँ प आए। १८५७ में हम ने उन से युद्ध किया। उस में हम असफल हुए, लेकिन उस के एक वर्ष बाद ही इस देश में कांग्रेस की स्थापना हुई। गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में हम ने अंग्रेजों के विरुद्ध १९२० से १९४७ तक शान्तिपूर्ण युद्ध किया। सारी प्रजा ने वह युद्ध किया और इस देश में प्रजातंत्र की स्थापना की। चाहे हम शताब्दियों तक पराधीन रहे हों, लेकिन हम ने देखा है कि भारत की प्रजा सदा स्वातंत्र्य-प्रेमी रही है, उस को स्वतंत्रता सदा प्रिय रही है। हजारों वर्षों के

इतिहास में जो स्वातंत्र्य-प्रेम हम को दृष्टि-गोचर होता है, वही स्वातंत्र्य-प्रेम हम को आज दृष्टिगोचर हो रहा है।

चीन से हमारा २१०० वर्ष का सम्बन्ध रहा है, अच्छे से अच्छा सम्बन्ध रहा है। इतिहास साक्षी है कि हमारे और चीन के बीच कभी कोई लड़ाई नहीं हुई। आधुनिक काल में भी हम ने चीन का इतना समर्थन किया। साम्यवादी देशों को छोड़ कर शायद भारत-वर्ष हूँ पहला देश था, जिस ने चीन की साम्यवादी सरकार को मान्यता दी। हम ने राष्ट्र संघ में भी चीन के प्रवेश के लिए प्रयत्न किया। इतने पर भी चीन ने हमारे साथ विश्वासघात किया। उस ने हमारी पीठ में छुरा भौंका है और एक शर्मनाक ऐतिहासिक कार्यवाही की है।

आज चीन मैकमाहन लाइन को स्वीकार करने को तैयार नहीं है। जब से चीन का झगड़ा उठा है, मैं ने कई बार इस सदन में कहा है कि अगर उस को मैकमाहन लाइन स्वीकार नहीं है, तो हमें भी उसी स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहिए। हमारे रामायण, महाभारत, पुराणों और काव्यों आदि में मानसरोवर और कैलाश का भारत के अंग के रूप में उल्लेख आया है। हम को कहना चाहिए कि हम को भी मैकमाहन लाइन स्वीकार नहीं है और हम भी आज मानसरोवर और कैलाश को अपने देश में लाना चाहते हैं।

गांधी जी अगर कोई गलती करते थे, तो वह उस को हिमालयन ब्लैंडर कह कर स्वीकार करते थे। जहाँ तक तिब्बत का सम्बन्ध है, हम ने एक गलती की कि हम ने तिब्बत पर चीन का आधिपत्य स्वीकार कर लिया। मैं उस को सदा गलती मानता रहा हूँ। जब तिब्बत पर उस का आधिपत्य स्वीकार किया गया, तब भी मैं ने उस का विरोध किया था। तिब्बत पर चीनियों का आधिपत्य होने

के बाद वे तिब्बत के साथ इस प्रकार का व्यवहार करेंगे और वहां पर खून की नदियां बहाई जायेंगी, यह हमने कभी आशा नहीं की थी। उस के बाद चीन ने हमारे साथ जो व्यवहार किया, उस की भी हमें उम्मीद नहीं थी। इस बात पर आज हम को विचार करना है। अपने समर्थन में मैं इस देश के भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति, राजेन्द्र बाबू, का भी मत रखना चाहता हूँ, जो कि एक विचारशील और दूर-अंदेश व्यक्ति हैं। उन्होंने यह मत व्यक्त किया है कि बिना तिब्बत के स्वतंत्र हुए भारतीय स्वतंत्रता को हमेशा एक न एक दिन थक्का लगने का खतरा बना रहेगा।

अन्त में मैं फिर यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज सरकार को सारे देश का समर्थन प्राप्त है और प्रधान मंत्री, श्री जवाहरलाल, को सारे देश का समर्थन प्राप्त है। यह हमारे सौभाग्य की बात है कि आज हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जवाहरलाल जी सदृश व्यक्ति हैं। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि जो व्यक्ति स्वतंत्रता के युद्ध में हमेशा गांधी जी का दाहिना हाथ रहा है, उसी व्यक्ति के नेतृत्व में हम इस लड़ाई में भी जीत कर रहेंगे। इस समय हम कुछ हट रहे हैं। वह एक स्वाभाविक बात है। १९१४ और १९३६ की लड़ाई में भी जर्मनी पहले आगे बढ़ा था। उस की तैयारी थी, लेकिन अन्त में उस को हारना पड़ा। मुझे विश्वास है कि पंडित जी के नेतृत्व में अन्त में हम जीतेंगे और चीन को हटा सकेंगे।

पंडित जी ने जो प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किये हैं, मैं उन का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have very consciously and carefully read the resolutions moved by the Prime Minister. I have felt in all humbleness that something is missing from these resolutions. Therefore, I feel that what has been dropped out of this resolution, inadvertently probably, is being supplied by my amendment.

It is really a very strange thing for us that our government has found itself unprepared. Our Prime Minister did not like the idea of admitting unpreparedness. Opinions may differ but for the last five years this aggression against us, which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was pleased to call misbehaviour in the beginning, aggression at some later stage and now he is pleased to call invasion, has been in progress. Knowing all these things and knowing the unpredictability of the Chinese nature, if we have not prepared ourselves for all these five years, I do not think that anything more can be said about this; I certainly do say that it is unpreparedness.

Our kindness, our goodness, our humanitarian outlook, our desire to be peace-loving—we have always been peace-loving—has been interpreted as the manifestation of our weakness and those who believe only in brute force have come down as tyrants of the old upon us, as wolves upon us. Upon whom? Upon a people who admittedly, all over the world, except for Pakistan, are known as a peace-loving nation. It is upon them that these aggressors have come down.

Although our Prime Minister has made several mistakes, I shall not recapitulate them. We have agreed to forget our differences and finding faults, one way or the other. Just recapitulating them cannot put us in the solid position and solid front when we want to fight against the aggressors. However, the fact cannot be forgotten that what our Prime Minister has called misbehaviour in the beginning has now become an invasion. That cannot be forgotten, and it shall not be possible for us to continue to play only a defensive game. We will have to hit back and hit hard and thrash the enemy relentlessly and mercilessly before we can drive him out from the sacred soil of our country.

[Shri U. M. Privedi]

It appears that at the back of our mind we are still having a feeling that some sort of an amicable settlement by negotiations with China will come as a miracle and save us from all that war brings in its wake. None of us likes war, yet we cannot be complacent on that account. We cannot always go on thinking in these terms, namely, that negotiations will come through. They may come and you may welcome them when they do come, but for God's sake do not exert yourself in the direction of these negotiations. Exert yourself to drive out the invaders and the intruders of our land. Drive them out. We do not want any piece of their land but put them where they belong to. That would be enough for them. Negotiations will come then and there will be honourable negotiations. Nobody will stand in the way of negotiations but the negotiations must be the negotiations of the *bahadur*, that is, of the brave and not the negotiations of the weak. It should be the negotiation of the *shoorveer* and not the negotiation of the coward. I submit that it is high time that we gave up this feeling. We will get ample opportunity to negotiate after the Chinese have been driven out from our sacred soil.

The atrocity of this invasion is all the more apparent when we remember that we were the one and the only friendly nation so far as China was concerned. We took up China's cause. We always pressed for it. Chou En-lai came here and we set up a mass hysteria. We welcomed him as we welcomed none else. We went about setting up clubs and societies. We set up the India-China Cultural Society and we had all along the saying "Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai". All the time when this *bhai-bhai* business was being carried on by us the man was manoeuvring to stab us in the back. It was during that period that he did stab us in the back.

We have been carrying on a solitary fight in the United Nations to get China recognised and to get it into the organisation. This friend who was thus treated with love and respect by us always has turned out to be our deadliest foe. Nobody has ever tried to invade us in this manner coming across the Himalayas from where nobody ever dared to come and unprovoked at that.

This morning I was reading a book which had a quotation from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He says about the Himalayas:

"The Himalayas are not only near to us but also very dear; for they have always been part of our history and tradition, our thinking and our poetry; our worship and our devotion and mythologically the abode of our gods."

It is these Himalayas that have been transgressed upon by the Chinese and it is these Chinese whom we want to throw back. It is therefore meet and proper for us to consider only in these terms, namely, that those people who have committed this defilement of the Himalayas and who have polluted the sanctity of our country by trodding upon it as murderers have got to be driven out before we think of talking with them.

I do not know how the change occurred in our hon. Prime Minister. We do remember that when he went over to Italy he refused to shake hands with Mussolini only on the ground that Mussolini's hands were full of blood—blood was on his hands. Yet, I do not know why the same sentiments did not strike him and deter him from shaking hands with Chou En-lai. Mistakes do occur but some of the mistakes are such that they cannot be easily forgotten. When I repeat this I do say that I do not say this with any desire at criticism.

*Emergency and Aggression  
by China*

I and my Party have determined to offer its full co-operation to the Government in this struggle but we must not forget the wrongs that we have done and the mistakes that we have committed. My hon. friend, Seth Govind Das was bold enough to admit and say on the floor of the House that we did commit a Himalayan blunder when we allowed this Chinese monster to capture the Tibetans and to commit the genocide of the giant Khampas. None of us have seen the Khampas but those of us who have seen them know that to kill them was a great task for the Chinese. One Khampa, of massive hands, was able to kill 20 Chinese. These people killed him outright and destroyed him completely from the soil of Tibet. We could show our anger about Algeria but we did not show sufficient anger when Tibet was subjugated and was liquidated. However, we must forget this.

The country is solidly standing behind Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We have divided on many points. We do not see eye to eye, from group to group, party to party and State to State. The fissures of State against State, language against language, religion against religion, caste against caste, class against class and leanings towards money grabbing, power seeking, nepotism and the obnoxious corruption have been our banes. Yet, this invasion on our territory has enthused us to fight as one man and throw all differences deep down the well. Of course, I must say, the credit for this enthusiasm and for this oneness and singularity does not go to the Government but it goes to the people at large. It is the people who have rallied round, who have forgotten the differences, who have felt the oneness, who have felt the upsurge and who are now standing shoulder to shoulder to fight and throw back the Chinese. A great fellow-feeling arising from common culture and heritage has suddenly catapulted the nation to a sense of responsibility and the urgent desire to

maintain the hard-won freedom and has fettered the nation into one solid whole.

Our dissensions were thus merely superficial except that petty leaders thought in terms divisive. People are one and were one at all times. There was nothing wrong with the people except that they were being led in six different directions at once. The imminent danger and the emergency have wiped out those feelings and the nation stands today as one man to fight the unholy invasion in our sacred territory.

But, with all that, we have still to face one factor amidst us. This has been referred to by Shri Ranga. This has been referred to by Shri U. N. Dhebar and Dr. Govind Das. This disturbing factor is the new international cult of communism. It has also got its tentacles in our country. The Russian paper Pravda has called upon the so-called progressive, meaning communist elements to support the Chinese offer of negotiation. Who is Pravda to dictate these terms? What are the progressive groups that are there? May I ask my friends who believe in this international picture, have they not received a jolt? Have they not yet realised that their sense of communism and their sense of internationalism is incompatible with Indian nationalism and with patriotism to the country? The Communist party and the fellow travellers do not seem to realise that patriotism and love of one's own country are really incompatible with the conception of a foreign land being one's fatherland, and particularly that fatherland which is out to destroy our kith and kin and which has already succeeded in destroying a very large number of our young men at the front. With them, do we shake hands?

The Communist party always proclaims itself to be a party of the poor, and the Jawans are not poor. There is no feeling for the Jawans. They talk in terms of liberation. Whose

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

liberation? I am not a slave. Nobody, none in my country is a slave. From whom do I seek liberation? I am already liberated. I am free. I do not want any further liberation. God save me from those liberators. It is in this perspective that we should try to remember and not forget in the future, who are our friends and who are not.

Shri U. N. Dhebar, in his remarks about Shri Ranga, said that we should be very careful in the choice of our words, particularly in these days. I agree with him. But, I request him to carry his advice to the Prime Minister. He should be equally careful about the choice of his words. It might be very true that Swami Rameshwaranand may not be a very intelligent person. The Prime Minister is an intelligent person, is a very big man, is a great man. But, I would request him not to lose temper about Swami Rameshwaranand. He is a very simple man. He is an honest man. He is a great patriot. I would request that this should not be done again. (*Interruption*).

Dr. Nkrumah, President of Ghana, in writing to Mr. MacMillan, Prime Minister of England, says—Dr. Nkrumah is a person who was very recently visited by our Prime Minister—he says: “What has distressed me is your statement that the British Government would give India every help.” Why should this statement of Mr. MacMillan distress Dr. Nkrumah? He is in the Commonwealth. We are in the Commonwealth. Our Prime Minister is in good terms with him and he wants to talk with us as if he is our friend. We feel friendly with him. Help given by one friend to another friend should distress another friend? Is that logic? Is it a thing which is expected from such a man? We must become very cautious about who are our friends. It is a very serious utterance coming from this so-called friend.

Then, there is Khrwaja Nazimuddin who comes forward with the threat that we must accept his four conditions: (i) hold a plebiscite in Kashmir, (ii) remove our forces and put Kashmir in charge of United Nations forces, (iii) stop the imaginary persecution of the Mohammedans in India and (iv) stop other imaginary evictions of Muslims from India. Why does this man still go on talking like this? Shri Ranga, with all his wisdom wants to tell us that we must try to remove our differences with Pakistan. With whom can we remove differences? Are there differences? Where are the differences? We are just like a lamb. We have not done anything. But, the wolf says, you are spoiling the water although the water is coming from that side to this side. From this Pakistan, what do we expect? Let us have friendship with those who have extended friendship to us, whose hands are there to shake with us. The *Dawn* of Pakistan reports in its issue of 4th November, 1962 that large-scale shipments of armaments from Russia, Czechoslovakia and other communist powers have been arriving in China. I do not believe the *Dawn*. I never believe in that paper knowing that it writes falsehood so far as India is concerned. We need not believe the *Dawn*. But, what hits me is the bold headlines given to this news which appears to gladden the heart of *Dawn*. We must not forget our relations with Pakistan all along, born of hatred and enmity, call it whichever way you like; always holding out enmity against us always preaching enmity against the Hindus, driving them out and here we are in a majority. I will say that we must always be careful about those who cannot see eye to eye in this matter. Recent history would clearly indicate where we stand *vis-a-vis* Pakistan and its relations with China. We are only thankful to America that with the way it has manoeuvred to keep military stations in Pakistan, Pakistan dare not do any harm.



*Emergency and Aggression  
by China*

The question, therefore, for us to consider is who will give us support, moral, diplomatic and material. Our Prime Minister, in the Resolutions, has asked for moral and material support. I said diplomatic support also is necessary in this world. Non-aligned people have already shown us our place and clearly indicated how they stand in relation to us. Russia is apathetic to us and decidedly sympathetic with China. Pakistan has been and is openly hostile. Ghana and Indonesia have given their own indication. The Prime Minister has conveyed to us that he is thankful to President Nasser for what he has done. We on this side and the public in general do not feel the same way about President Nasser. We wanted stronger words from President Nasser in our help. However, if the Prime Minister so feels, let him feel that way. We endorse his views for the present and we will watch things. With all the provocations that we gave to the United Kingdom by our petty differences with it on the question of Goa, Nagaland, SEATO, Katanga, Central America, the Suez etc., it has clearly put all those things in oblivion. Thus, the spontaneous helps rendered by the U.K. and by the United States of America and all other friendly nations including France and Germany are heartening pieces of news.

The resolution of the Prime Minister really expresses the sense of gratitude felt by the whole nation. My amendment merely expresses a further desire of the country that these bonds of friendship be continued. I may read out my amendment at this stage. It is very simple. I do not know whether the Prime Minister will agree to accept it. It is in the following terms:

“That at the end of the fourth paragraph of the resolution, the following be added, namely:—

‘and believes that the same graceful sympathy and co-operation will continue till the aim of

India of driving out the Chinese has been achieved.’”

I do hope that the help that these nations have extended to us would grow in volume and will increase in capacity, and will continue for all such times to come till we have achieved the aim of driving out the invader.

Britain has clearly put all those differences into oblivion, and the spontaneous helps rendered by the United Kingdom and by the U.S.A. and all other friendly nations including France and Germany are heartening pieces of news.

We are in the British Commonwealth, and today we have to accept the wisdom of remaining in the Commonwealth, and that in the United Kingdom a great fellowship of nations has suddenly stirred the United Kingdom to a sense of responsibility for the security and freedom of one of its members.

Our Prime Minister, on the occasion of the reception given to Mr. Makarios, President of Cyprus has asserted that he rules out the possibility of negotiations with the Chinese as long as they are in aggressive occupation. I think I understand him rightly when he says that there shall not be any negotiations till that aim has been achieved. When he says this and means that he shall refuse to negotiate, in other words, it means that the nation shall refuse to negotiate till the Chinese have been put behind the McMahon line in the NEFA and behind the recognised borders in Ladakh also as recognised by law and history.

However great the initial mistakes might have been,—and as I said before, they cannot now be remedied; no useful purpose can be served by me or by anybody else by recapitulating all of them or any of them before the House—yet it will not be safe to

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

disregard them or to ignore the lesson which these lapses have taught us.

My party and myself have spared no words on all occasions about the seriousness of the situation; and unequivocal language has already been used by me on several occasions that on this particular issue we can have no truck with the Communist Party or the fellow-travellers. It is good that Shri Krishna Menon has chosen to walk out of the Cabinet, which ought to have been done much earlier. The unpreparedness in which we have been caught has cost us much life and much money, and it has hurt our pride and prestige. We have the whole unhappy episode commencing from the end of July, 1962 and going up to the 4th November, 1962, of rabbit-fashion complacency and idiotic unpreparedness, a very sad commentary on our right to rule ourselves. I am told that we have been making tubs, bath-tubs and coffee percolators in our Defence ordnance factories when we ought to have been improving our mortars and rifles.

The whole nation has arisen with a singleness of purpose to drive out the Chinese; yet, it saddens my heart to tell you that the day before yesterday when I passed by the recruiting office, I found more than two thousand young men awaiting their turn to be examined by the recruiting officer, and some of them were so waiting since 5 A.M. in the morning. Such a callous behaviour, and particularly, at this juncture calls for very strong action against the offending officer or officers concerned, and any Minister who tolerates this or has tolerated it deserves the strongest condemnation in the strongest language from us.

May I make one suggestion here that recruitment must be carried out on a large-scale and trained officers or people chosen from amongst even the Members of Parliament be sent out to the villages, and daily recruit-

ment of not less than 500 should be imposed as a minimum quota for recruitment upon such recruiting officers or persons, and this task must be undertaken in the villages rather than in the cities, to guard against the infiltration of personnel of questionable loyalty?

I say so because I cannot forget what Mr. Kumaramangalam, a communist leader has said, as reported in *The Statesman* of the 5th November, 1962, namely that:

"The defence production and mobilisation efforts would be hampered if Communists were not included in the various committees formed to organise the country's defence."

Who is this man to threaten us like this? Are we going to tolerate this threat that comes from Mr. Kumaramangalam? May I, Sir, in all seriousness, ask Government what delays the Government from taking action against persons who make such utterances and publish them to the detriment of the nation's effort and virtually threaten to sabotage the country's efforts to drive out the aggressors.

As one very fond of democratic rule, rather enamoured of democracy of the parliamentary type, I never agreed, and even today do not agree that in peace-times we can have an act like the Preventive Detention Act. But, in this eventuality and in this emergency, I will call upon the Government not to hesitate in doing its duty by the nation without any consideration of personalities.

Finally, I would like to say a few more things before I resume my seat. Decency, dignity and self-respect require that we negotiate only after the barbarians are driven out from the soil, and, therefore, again, I respectfully commend my amendment to the House. My amendment is in the fol-

lowing terms, and each one of us has felt the same thing, namely:

"and to refuse to negotiate any terms with the aggressor till this end has been achieved."

So, I commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

The Assam Rifles and the Central Reserve Police are included in the Armed Forces of the Union, as defined in the Constitution of India. The present strength of the Central Reserve Police is likely to give a whole division to the Army. I had thought of conveying my ideas to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, when he was expected at Neemuch on the 31st of last month, but he could not come, and, therefore, I have not met him. I had intended then to convey to him my whole project. However, I shall take the opportunity of meeting him and conveying to him more and better information about the Central Reserve Police.

We have not yet taken up the issue before us in all seriousness, and the full gravity of the situation has not dawned upon us. Let us give up all thoughts of the calamity suddenly coming to an end by the benevolent Mr. Chou En-lai offering to cry a halt at the places to which he has already advanced. This miracle is not desirable even if it happens, and the nation must be prepared for a long-drawn-out war. The civil defences must be immediately organised. The striking distance to Chandigarh and Delhi from Chusul must be visualised. The unpredictability of the Chinese mind must be digested, the enmity of Pakistan must not be forgotten, and the distance from which we are likely to get our help must be kept in view, and the nation's machinery be geared accordingly.

Let me repeat that I have purposely refrained from enumerating the various blunders committed by Govern-

ment, and I do not want to dwell upon them. Let us now forget our differences, and in doing so, let us not forget to thank those friends who have rushed to our help in our hour of need. We express our deep sense of gratitude and our thanks for this act of kindness. Let us not also forget our jawans who have laid down their lives.

In conclusion, I would say one last sentence. On behalf of my party, I assure the Government that every effort which the Government wants my party to put in for the successful termination of the hostilities against China will be made by my party jointly and severally by each one of the Members, and it will not consider any effort too great to secure the victory of our nation against the dark forces of invasion from China.

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, we have met today as representatives of a nation in arms. Inevitably, understandably, every right-thinking Indian has been deeply moved by China's cynical and wanton aggression on India. And yet, however strong the urge may be in each one of us to speak with indignation or even with anger, we have to try and remember our capacity in this House and we have to try, therefore, to speak with restraint and a sense of responsibility.

As speaker after speaker has emphasised, we are facing an enemy that is not only unprincipled but, we have also to remember, tough and resourceful, an enemy that has been hardened in war, an enemy that is ruthless and barbarous in that ruthlessness. The Prime Minister has rightly underlined that this is going to be a protracted war when our stamina and our character as a nation, and indeed our stamina and character as individuals, will be put to the uttermost test. I agree with the Prime Minister that however ghastly the con-

**Emergency and Aggression  
by China**

[Shri Frank Anthony]

sequences of this war may be—and the consequences of any war must be ghastly—in the final analysis history may record that it was in a way a good thing that India went through the tempering furnace of the ordeal of war. It is axiomatic—it has been expressed by every section of the House—that we must subordinate everything to the supreme end of throwing out the Chinese aggressors.

In this time of national crisis. I have no doubt that we will forget party considerations or party advantage. I have no doubt that we will forget the many parochial, narrow issues which concerned us till yesterday. Speaking as an Independent, may I say this that I have no doubt that in this critical challenging juncture, the Prime Minister not as Prime Minister but as Jawaharlal Nehru represents the rallying point of our national life—I have no doubt about that whatsoever. The Prime Minister, if we say anything that may seem critical, must remember that we say it subject to this assurance that we regard him as the lodestone of our national leadership.

He has asked us not to indulge in *post mortems*. I have given the matter deep anxious thought. In the past, sometimes when the Prime Minister has castigated us, when he has used instead of reasoned argument, a barrage of invective, I have accepted it. But today I feel that we also owe a responsibility through this House to the country and if whatever the crisis we tend to surrender our judgement, if we tend to accept meekly what has been proven to be mistakes of policy followed, mistakes which have cost us dearly and which could be avoided, we will be betraying our trust and then the very reason for our being here will no longer exist.

I told you, so I do not want to say this to the Prime Minister. But many years ago,—I think it was in

1950—I warned in this House that as soon as the Chinese wolf was ready, it would unhesitatingly bury its fangs and its claws in the throat and body of India. Unfortunately, at that time or shortly after—I say this because I believe the Prime Minister is big enough to acknowledge his mistakes and to profit by them—we saw a rather egregious exercise in an illusion, the ecstasies of *Hindi-Chini bhai bhai*. When people like myself warned about the inevitability of a Chinese attack on this country, we were met with an ill-concealed sneer. We were told implied at least, if not expressly, that we were nothing but ignorant war-mongers. As recently as August this year, I made a speech which some of my friends have said was not only prophetic but tragically prophetic. I said then that we were facing the threat of communism. I join issue with the Prime Minister here. I say that is the threat which inheres in communism. I say that the threat inheres in the Leninist theory of the inevitability of war, that was is the necessary instrument for securing a communist revolution. The Prime Minister does not seem to agree with it.

I said in 1950 and I repeated it in August this year, that it is part of a premeditated plan of communist expansionism to 'liberate' South and South-East Asia with India as the principal prize and objective. I said that in 1950 and I said it again in 1962. I pointed out, despite what some persons have said about Ladakh that it was inhospitable, that a blade of grass could not grow there, that the Chinese are not morons. They are anything but morons; they went to Ladakh not because it is inhospitable, not because it is destitute without even a blade of grass, but they went there in order to be able to control some of the principal passes into India.

I said something which has proved even more tragically prophetic. I referred to NEFA along with Nepal,

Bhutan and Sikkim. I said that it is the most vulnerable of our frontiers. I referred to it—and I reproduce my words—as the soft under-belly of India. I said that if the Chinese moved—and I expected them to move—they would move against the soft under-belly of India, because that would secure them bridgeheads into India, bridgeheads through which they could subvert or infiltrate into India or push forward with their military expansionism. To that the Prime Minister replied—I resented it at that time but I say it without resentment now—accusing me of being neurotic. He said that I was suffering from nerves. He said that I was conjuring up bogeys of heads rolling in NEFA. Today what has happened? The heads, and indeed, the bodies, of our jawans are rolling. But let that go.

I posed several other issues. I said that the only menace we face—here I join issue with my hon. friend, Shri U. M. Trivedi—is the menace from China. I do not consider Pakistan a menace, not the menace that China is and will continue to be. I posed certain issues. I said historically and culturally we are close—though today we are estranged with Pakistan—so there must be somehow a *detente* with Pakistan. We must come to an agreement with Nepal. We must establish an emigre government with the Dalai Lama at its head because—immediately it will give heart to Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. But I got no reply. All that I got was a barrage of invective. And I say this today. So far as our foreign policy is concerned, I have no quarrel with it. The Prime Minister has accused me of impliedly at least advocating a policy of alignment. I have not done it. I do not quarrel with the expression “non-alignment”, and, as a matter of fact, I believe that countries that are mature in diplomacy do not bother about giving their policies any specific designations, but to countries that are comparatively young—and we are a young country in many ways; we are still building

our traditions of diplomacy—words and designations have a certain fascination. Non-alignment, I am prepared to concede, may express the spirit, if you like, the ethos of India and Asia and even of Africa. I have no quarrel with the expression “non-alignment”, but I say this that even if your policy was conceived in Heaven and evolved on earth, whatever name you give it, it must stand up, if it is to be a worthwhile policy, to the supreme test of ensuring the security of the country.

16 hrs.

And I say this too. It is not non-alignment that I have quarrelled with; it is the way that we have oriented it. The orientation has been wrong. And I say this with a great deal of respect. I know today the Prime Minister must be a deeply unhappy man, but I say with great respect that non-alignment, under the orientation we have given it, has proved, under the impact of war, to be an illusion, and I say it advisedly, an illusion, if I may mix my metaphors, which has been dissipated by the first gust of the breath of war.

I ask if I may what tests are orientation of non-alignment? I am not questioning non-alignment. What are the fruits that it has borne under the first impact of the grim reality of war? We see it around us. Pakistan, our immediate neighbour, is hostile, Nepal unfriendly, Ceylon and Burma indifferent, and the Afro-Asian countries, which we flattered ourselves were following our fine example, have also, in their own peculiar way, subscribed to non-alignment, they have given their own orientation. I do not want in any way to detract from what the Prime Minister has said about President Nasser—he is undoubtedly helping us. He said he did not want to commit himself with regard to stigmatising China as an aggressor because—perhaps he is right—he wanted to play an effective role as some kind of mediator. Dr. Nkrumah interprets non-alignment in his own way and is distressed because the aid

[Shri Frank Anthony]

we so desperately needed was sent to us by a fellow-member of the Commonwealth. Indeed, the only country in Asia or South East Asia that has unequivocally condemned China has been Malaya. Tenku Abdul Rahman, while he condemned China, has underlined a certain lesson for us, if you like he has pointed out that our orientation was wrong, that we were living in a world of illusion. I have got his exact words here as reported by the press:

"We knew what was going to happen when China took Tibet. They had their eyes on India, and wanted to get nearer to the Indian borders."

Then he goes on:

"The attack on India did not surprise us."

He is the only person who has unequivocally condemned China's aggression. They knew the Chinese motives in taking over Tibet. This complete surprise with which this attack has taken us would appear to show that we never at any time were aware of the palpable motives of China which were obviously clear even to a person like Tenku Abdul Rahman. He says the attack on India did not surprise them. We alone seem to have been surprised by the motives of the Chinese in taking over Tibet; we alone seem to have been surprised by their attack.

Then Tenku thought it fit, while supporting us, to remind us of our shame. This is what he said:

"Twice Malaya raised the Tibetan question in the United Nations Organisation and twice India refused to support them."

And he said further that this year they wanted again to raise the Tibetan question, but they did not raise it because they were afraid that no one, including India, would second it.

I say this that, as in the lives of individuals, so in the lives of nations, sometimes, not always, our sins overtake us. And I say this with a great deal of respect that our double sin,

our sin in the acquiescence of the rape of Tibet, and our sin against ourselves, because in acquiescing in the rape of Tibet, and our sin against ourselves, because in acquiescing in the rape of Tibet we gave, handed over to the Chinese a natural base—without that natural base this invasion of India could not have been even remotely possible—has overtaken us, and we are paying today for that double sin.

I do not wish to question non-alignment. It is the only policy which perhaps would be acceptable to the spirit of India and to the spirit of Asia, but what I quarrel with is the orientation we have given it; and what I quarrel with even more is the orientation that we continue to give it. For the last twelve years we have repeatedly and repeatedly given hostages to a proven, faithless, treacherous enemy, and we are prepared even today—and that is what I am afraid of because of this peculiar orientation that we have given to non-alignment—to give hostages to Chinese good faith. I just do not understand it. I join issue in my humble way with the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister or the Government has said that if the Chinese go back to the line they held before the 8th September—the difference between President Nasser and ourselves is slight; he has said on the 8th September: just before that they took a little area in NEFA—we are prepared to negotiate. That is precisely what we have said. The whole time we keep advertising to the Chinese that we will endorse the fruits of their aggression. Our original policy was that we would not attempt to negotiate until they went back to the 1956 line. In the last debate there was consternation in the House, which the Prime Minister ridiculed,—he said he never meant it—because we felt he said that even if they went back to the 1959 line we would be prepared to negotiate. Today, we are prepared if they go back to the line before 8th September. What does it mean in effect? It means that we are prepared to endorse the

fruits of blatant Chinese aggression. If they go back to the line of 8th September, it means that they do not go back one inch from the 16,000 square miles of territory they have taken in Ladakh, because they had taken over not only 14,000 square miles but before the 8th September another 1,800 square miles, totalling almost 16,000 square miles of our territory. We should never say to the Chinese, with all their duplicity, with all their determination to aggress and to expand, that we will negotiate, that we will endorse the fruits of their aggression if they go back to the 8th September line, and that they may keep 16,000 square miles of our territory. We cannot negotiate or attempt to negotiate with them on those terms, and unless the Chinese know it, they will want to negotiate on those terms because they will be terms entirely in their favour.

And I say this. Again there is this orientation of non-alignment which refuses to face facts, which refuses to put on them the obvious interpretation. Today we refuse to face facts about Russia. I know that we should not, we must not, do anything gratuitously to antagonise Russia, but in the final analysis what kind of interpretation or conclusion can we draw from the facts? And what are the facts? Russia has a military pact with China. Since 1959 Russia has affirmed the Chinese maps showing Bhutan and Sikkim as independent. Since 1959 Russia's greatest reaction has been to stigmatise the MacMahon Line as a rotten line drawn by British imperialism. We do not want to antagonise Russia. Let us hope at least they will retain some semblance of neutrality but as I said last time, in the final crisis between us and the Chinese, the Russians must, because the Chinese are their greatest and only major ally in terms of world communism, pull the carpet from under us. I do not say about the MIG deal although I could have. I was opposed to it not because the MIGs are not much good.

My information is that this particular MIG has been tried out by nobody. The Chinese have a different kind of MIG—MIG 15 and 19; and we were going to have 21. Nobody has used it; that was my information. But I was pleading that the Russians in times of crisis would pull the carpet from under us. I want to know this much. What has happened to the 16 or so MIGs that we were going to get and which had created so much resentment against us in the democratic world. I want to know what has happened to the AN-12s which were greatly advertised. Fortunately we did not buy many of them. I am told by knowledgeable people that they are ineffective as transport planes because they have very little capacity. My information as a layman is that most of the AN-12s—fortunately we had very few of them—have been grounded because the Russians would not give us the spare parts. Let us by all means cultivate the Russians. But let us also remember that the Chinese who have been slaughtering our troops have been largely equipped with Russian modern arms. Let us remember this that in any final accounting between India and China I have no doubt that the final accounting must come sooner or later. Russia is bound, if it can, to pull the carpet from under us. Let us also remember this, with a great deal of gratitude to those countries whom this particular orientation sought to estrange. I refer to the non-alignment. We were accused in the UN that we were non-aligned only in name because of our performance in the UN and we had a definite pro-communist orientation. What was our voting record? Rather shameful with regard to the massacres in Hungary and with regard to the rape of Tibet, where our own interest was concerned. Did they not show that our non-alignment had a pro-communist orientation? Of course, it did; there was no other explanation for it. That is what I am quarrelling with. There has been this pro-communist orientation to our own mortal danger. I believe this too, that the compulsion of

[Shri Frank Anthony]

events will correct this wrong orientation. Fortunately, we had not so estranged the democracies that they have rushed, as the Prime Minister said, aid without strings, today. Who knows with this sort of decimation that we suffered in NEFA, there might have been a debacle but for this aid that has been rushed to us without strings. It is true to say this that the democracies have rushed to our aid because of India, not only because of our strategic and vital position of importance but because we are a democracy because they realise that in the final analysis we are the bastion of democracy in Asia and if this final bastion disappears democracy not only in Asia but perhaps in the world will disappear.

Sir, I will finish in five minutes. I had given an amendment asking that we concentrate on mobilising the nation for a total war against the Chinese immediately with massive aid from the democracies. I have done this advisedly. The Prime Minister may not agree with me but at least to this extent he did agree with me that total war in one sense means the total mobilisation of all our manpower, our civilians, our workers in the fields as much as our soldiers who are fighting. That is what I meant.

In another way, I have underlined this. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, there has been this amazing upsurge of national fervour from every section of the people. That will not be enough. It will have to be canalised; it will have to be forged into the ultimate and the decisive instrument of winning this war. And our people will have to be taught. Fervour is one thing, but they have to be taught. We have not suffered a protracted war. None of us knows the horrors of it. But our people will have to learn to endure and to suffer. I say this also with great respect. Our leaders will have to develop a total war mentality. I can understand almost the sort of personal and almost spiritual crisis for Jawaharlal Nehru. I saw it when

Dhebarji spoke. The whole approach is opposed to the necessary war approach. It is a contrary condition—a condition of peace and non-violence. But yet today we are called upon to meet a nation led by whom? I say this with a sense of responsibility. It is led by thugs and bandits hardened to war and led by Mao Tse-tung with his supreme dictum that politics comes out of the barrel of a gun. That is the leadership that we are facing, and our leadership if we are to be mobilised for a total war must be able to answer Mao Tse-tung with his own dictum that politics comes out of the barrel of a gun.

What I say is this; we dare not show any softness or indecision at this time. The people have been so moved that they would not accept it. I believe that the people will not accept any negotiations with the Chinese and because it will come as an anti-climax, there will be such a tremendous revulsion of feeling that whoever may be here will sweep away this House, the people will not accept this because they have been deeply moved; they will not accept any semblance of negotiations with the Chinese until the Chinese go back to their 1956 line. That is what I believe the people would want and want us to do.

What I say is this; I cannot understand any alternative to a total war. My hon. friend Dhebarji said we will fight a limited war. That is the whole issue. This is the inhibition that we find in the wrong orientation of non-alignment. Non-alignment, oriented and interpreted in this way, means vitiating the national spirit for war. It is not a limited war. We cannot fight a limited war. I know the Prime Minister does not agree with me in this respect. If in spring we are to mount an offensive, what should we do? We are not fighting an ordinary foe. The Americans got tired of killing the Chinese; fortunately, they had a navy to vacate them. We are fighting one of the



toughest and most hardened, battle-hardened people in the world. As I said, they have been led by thugs and bandits who have been able to condition them to all the brutality of war. The nation today unfortunately has unreturned a contrary way—our whole heritage, if you like, has been of peace and non-violence. The nation has now to go through a process of brutalising. War is a process of brutalising. The nation has unfortunately to be brutalised if it is to be mobilised for a total war. People like Shri Jawaharlal Nehru have unfortunately to undergo a certain brutalising if they are able to meet the leadership that Mao Tse-tung has given.

How can we have a limited war? Assuming that we inflict some reverses on the Chinese in the NEFA and Ladakh areas, do you think that the Chinese will stay quiet? They will commit their air force, and it is common knowledge because they spend four times more than we do on defence, their air force is at least above ten times larger than ours. What can we do? We could not do very much. And we cannot wait. And that is the trouble. We keep waiting for the Chinese to move. Today, we take the offensive. I am not preaching hysterical war-mongering. As I said, you must prepare our people for a total war.

This aid that has come, thank God, and has stopped and stabilised the line. But it is only a trickle of what we need. What we need need is massive aid; we need immediate aid. Here again, I say the orientation that we have given to non-alignment should not come in the way. We must not say to the allies, those who are helping us, that we will pay, because we cannot pay.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I shall finish in one minute. We cannot pay. Why should we pay? They would not want us to pay; because in the final analysis, we are not fighting a battle;

we are fighting a war. We are not fighting a war only on behalf of India. We are fighting a war of democracy, for world democracy. We are fighting it here. I say this: Let us say to the democracies, we are fighting a world war on behalf of democracy—we are not only fighting India's war. I am quite certain that we should say to them, we want not only the aid you are giving us, but massive, immediate aid. I do not know whether the Prime Minister would be prepared to say to them the words of a great democratic war-time leader; "Give us the tools and we will do the job."

**Shrimati Eenuka Ray (Malda):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we have assembled here today under the grim shadow of naked aggression by communist China, who had at one time pretended friendship, though later we found to our cost that they stabbed us more than once in the back, before this final ruthless aggression in the NEFA area. There are some persons who say that China being a socialist country—they use the word "socialist" China cannot be imperialist. But the word socialism is traduced by such persons. It is true that a socialist country could not be expansionist, but China is a communist country and not a socialist country which its very nature must be democratic. In spite of knowing about Chinese designs, having seen what had happened in Ladakh, it is true we were unprepared for what has recently taken place in NEFA, because for some reason believed that they wanted only the Ladakh area, we did not yet fully believe that she would go in for naked aggression and enter into our territory in this manner. The harrowing struggle of those jawans without adequate arms who fought at the beginning at Dhola will go down in golden letters in the annals of Indian history; for, it could be said about them: "someone has blundered." It was not for them to reason why. It was for them only to "do and die" and that they did. The finest jawans fought

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

and died at the outposts because they were not only out-numbered but did not possess modern arms.

Today the position has changed in the NEFA area. Our jawans have the wherewithal with which, in spite of the tough enemy about whom Shri Frank Anthony was talking, they are able to check their advance. I hope the time will come, at least after the winter season is over, when we shall send them back from our territories. There were, of course, certain mistakes and blunders at the outset. I do not think our Prime Minister said there were not. He only said that the mistakes were exaggerated. This is hardly the time for *post mortems*. At a time when we have to mobilise for a total war in the country, should we deviate our energies now into *post mortems*? I think I have to say this, because the Jana Sangh leader spoke about our former Defence Minister. The former Defence Minister has resigned, according to parliamentary convention, because the Defence Minister must take the blame for whatever has happened. I do not think it is a wise thing or good thing now to go into the past in this manner when the Defence Minister has resigned himself. It is not true to say that he sent in his resignation only now, because as the Prime Minister has told us, the resignation came earlier and was accepted later. After that, I do not think there is any question of trying to blame people or to find any more scapegoats.

Freedom's battle, as the Prime Minister said, is fought not only on the battle front, but also in the rear. It is a heartening thing that there is this splendid response from the people of India. It has been something wonderful. Overnight we have achieved that national integration which all the meetings and all the resolutions could not bring about. There is no doubt about it. I come from West Bengal. There I have watched long queues of

people who have come to give their blood for the jawans, their gold for the jawans. They stand in long queues struggling to reach the Chief Minister, as the people here have done to reach the Prime Minister and the people all over the States of India have done. Everyone is asking, what can I do to help. Everyone is ready to do anything. It is for us to utilise this offer in the best manner possible. I know that the Government has been applying its mind as to how best to utilise the offer of all the people of this land. The enemy may have superiority in numbers and arms, but I am sure when the total mobilisation of this country takes place, when the home guards are there—every day we find boys and girls coming up to become home guards—we will be able to win. In any way and every way everyone wants to help, and it is for us to utilise that help in the best manner possible.

Shri Dhebar said something which I should like to endorse. I think it is time that demonstrably we should cut down our expenditure. I entirely agree with the Prime Minister that it is wrong for some people to say that we should give up our Plans. We should not give up our Plans. We should try to keep them to the extent possible. These Plans themselves will help our war effort. But, at the same time, there are lots of expenditure which we can cut down and which could be a demonstration to the country that it is not only the people but the Government also is trying to cut down wasteful expenditure. Everyone in this country, from the highest to the lowest is trying to save and is avoiding wasteful expenditure. I think the National Development Council has probably considered this question. It is very important that wasteful expenditure in administrative departments is checked. It is being checked, we are told, but it has not been checked and reduced to gear it to a war effort. During this time we must see that all wasteful expen-

dition in Government is avoided. It is no use going round every home and telling the people that they must save and they should not waste money in any way. The Government must see that it is done here in Delhi. If they see that it is done here in Delhi, throughout the country there will be enthusiasm to save and not go in for any wasteful expenditure. In that way we will be able to accomplish what we want.

As I said, public response is a very great thing. A magnificent offer has been put forward without being canalised properly. Once it is canalised, I am sure the response will be very great and we shall be able to get the Chinese vacated from our territory.

There are one or two things which I would like to mention. I come from a State which is a border State. Kalimpong is in our State. Darjeeling District is in our State. I want to tell this House—the Prime Minister probably knows it already—that in the District of Darjeeling all types of anti-Indian propaganda is still going on. I am glad this Emergency Ordinance has come and it will soon become law. We must utilise it in such a way that we can stop this anti-Indian propaganda in war time for it is treachery. That leads me to the question of Communists. Shri Mukerjee has spoken on the subject. I do not doubt the sincerity of what he says, or what Shrimati Renu Chakravartty says in regard to their support in the defence of India. But I am sure they will understand when I say, as they and I both come from West Bengal, something about the West Bengal Communists. How many of them are behind them? How many of them believe in what they believe or in the resolution that has been passed by the Communist Party? It is in West Bengal which is a border State, it is in Kalimpong where such activities take place in Assam also. It is not only by Communists. It would be wrong to say that. There are others.

There are traitors in this land. We should deal with these traitors properly. I do not believe in witch-hunting. I do not say that the members of the Communist Party as such are all to be blamed. That would be wrong. It is a party which has itself come forward with a resolution saying unreservedly that it is behind the war effort. If anybody says that all these people are bad, they are traitors and they are doing something wrong, then he is wrong. All of them are not traitors. There are traitors amongst them. Those who go in for blackmarketing, for profiteering, at such a time, they are also traitors. Let all of us who are here and the people behind us say that we will fight war-profiteering with all our resources. It is true that we have passed some Ordinances, but Ordinances and laws cannot always be implemented unless the citizens are behind them. Every citizen should refuse to pay for a commodity at war-profiteering prices; every citizen should refuse to take things from the black-market. If we are prepared to give that evidence against offenders as in England, in India also, the citizens would be able to effectively help in implementing this Ordinance and this law in a proper and satisfactory manner.

Then I want to say a word about our propaganda. I feel that it is absolutely a failure. I do not think there is anybody who will support our present propaganda, whether it is external publicity or the All India Radio. It is one of the tragedies that we have to face that when the Peking Radio ably present their side of the case and their lying propaganda, the All India Radio does nothing to refute them adequately before its listeners. How is it that the All India Radio has no facts to place before the country? What about the report of the Officers' Committee? Can it not counter the arguments of Peking? How is it that so many South East Asian countries were taken in by the propaganda of

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

China? It may be that China is telling blatant lies, but should we not counter them? We cannot take the attitude that everybody in the world knows all about it.

Everybody tunes the All India Radio to get news about the frontier, about our jawans. I do not say there is news every day but surely our people want to know how our jawans are fighting to defend our mother land. Is it the time to tell only about the fact that people are coming forward, Ministers and their wives and prominent personalities are giving their gold, jewels and ornaments? It is a very good thing and those people are setting a very good example. But that does not mean that we should hear so much about that in the radio. Should we not like to hear how our jawans are fighting ably to repulse the attacks of the invaders? Is it not one of the ways to mobilise the sympathies of the people for the war effort? Why is it that so many ministers and others are allowed to speak and their speeches are recorded in a national emergency like this when only the speeches of the leader should be given on the defence effort? Why should we hear every other person speaking on the radio? And yet we do not get any real news. We have to switch on Radio Australia at quarter to eleven at night to get the true facts summarised. Here I am not exaggerating things. Many people seem to hold the same view.

So far as external publicity is concerned, I wonder whether it exists at all. Is it meant only to send circulars to embassies of other countries? Is it not necessary for us to tell the people of those countries also what is happening? Even in China the people may not perhaps be behind the expansionist policy of that country. But they hear only what the Peking Radio tells them. Can they ever hear our viewpoint? No, because we are jammed by

China; even in India perhaps that takes place.

So, it is very necessary to take some effective steps in this matter and take them soon. We have to see that the All India Radio competes with the radios of other countries in giving correct news in time which is essential in a time of war. Perhaps it would be a good idea—I do not know how far it would be feasible—if we ask some of our jawans to come and speak over the Radio because this would be interesting in arousing the people's effort in the rear. There are hundred and one other ways in which we can mobilise support of the people for the war effort over the radio.

Then I come to another point which is more or less similar. Rosy pictures are painted in this country about the progress made by China. Though China is facing a famine today, there the still people in this country who feel that they have gone ahead of us. So, it is time that we through our radio and other means of propoganda tell the people what the truth is. The people must know the true position so that they can be proud of this country. Instead of giving them long lectures you can tell them in a few simple words what is happening there. As I said before exaggeration of blunders do not help at all. There are lots of blunders that have been committed about which I do not speak in detail but what is required is to see that they do not happen again.

I want to say about the Jana Sangh leader whose speech I heard that I do feel that at a time like this he has not come to a proper realisation yet of the fact that it is the entire people who are behind the war. It is no use saying in words and giving lip service by saying that the total mobilisation of the people must be behind it. You must believe in it and that belief must be found in your words when you are speaking

Then I come to the question of non-alignment which Shri Frank Anthony also spoke about. It is quite true that non-alignment might be used in many ways, but there is no doubt that this country stands for non-alignment and even in our danger we do not give up our principles. We are extremely grateful to every country, the USA, the UK, Canada, France and any other country that has come to our rescue, but nevertheless they have recognised, which surely our own people should recognise, that we are a non-aligned country and they have given us help in spite of that.

About negotiations Shri Frank Anthony has stated that the hon. Prime Minister has said that negotiations can take place if the Chinese go back to the line before the 8th September 1962 but the Chinese invasion has come before and that by saying this we are giving up the land that they had invaded and taken in Ladakh before. But that is not what the hon. Prime Minister said. He merely says that he wants to create an atmosphere to remove the present tension to be able to negotiate. This does not mean that he will negotiate giving away the honour and the integrity of this country. I do not think that it was a fair remark to make about the hon. Prime Minister. It may be that mistakes have been made and blunder after blunder has been committed. But today we are trying to get over those blunders; we are trying to go ahead in a proper manner. The hon. Prime Minister is the only leader in this country behind whom the people will rally. Let everyone who speaks realise that it is not the hon. Prime Minister but Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru whom every body in this country from the highest to the lowest supports. The educated and the uneducated, the man in the cities, in the suburbs and in the remotest villages support him and will support the war effort behind Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

In the face of the danger we must try to be as calm as possible. We must not get panicky. We will yet face many trials and tribulations. Maybe, we shall have more reverses in NEFA. We do not know what the future holds for us, but whatever it holds, ultimately we shall win through for our cause is a just one. We are all behind that cause and no matter what happens to the last man and to the last woman, we are behind this effort through which we shall get the aggression on our border vacated from our land through which the honour of our motherland will be vindicated.

With these words I support the Resolutions.

**Shri Dasappa** (Bangalore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I must join with all the hon. friends here who have not only realised the gravity of the situation but have also given ample and abundant expression to the grave crisis that the country has been overtaken with. We have had the invasion from China on a massive scale which has shaken the whole of the country. India has not been unaccustomed to these invasions in the past. There have been these invasions for many centuries in the past but then at no period of our history has the entire country been shaken to its very foundations as it has been because of this invasion. The consequent upsurge is a matter which is not only a special feature of this invasion of China but is a most heartening feature, one which augurs well for the future of our country.

The response has been referred by the hon. Prime Minister. It has been such as has never been witnessed in this country. More has been achieved by way of national and emotional integration by this invasion than has been achieved all these years before and after freedom. Therefore, it might be that we have something of

*Emergency and Aggression  
by China*

[Shri Dasappa]

good in what apparently is an obvious evil. Shakespeare has said:

"There is some soul of goodness  
in things evil would men  
observingly distil it out."

I think, after freedom, there was a certain amount of softness developing, I do not say in which section of the people, but in certain noticeable quarters. Today, it has been given a rude and a very desirable shock. Let us hope that we will make use of this occasion to rebuild this nation into a strong and solid one with which it will be difficult for any power to meddle.

It is possible that the whole policy of the Government, as indeed of Parliament and the people, was not modulated correctly, because during the years of our freedom struggle, we had a great leader who gave us a new technique of struggle, a technique which met with wonderful success with our adversary, the Britishers. I doubt very much whether, if we had attempted the same technique against people like China or any of those countries of the same persuasion, that technique would have succeeded. Conditioned, trained, built up as we were under Mahatma Gandhi's leadership in the technique of Non-violence, we had no other go but to follow the same technique in our external policy also. Therefore, now that this mishap has happened, when we are faced with this grave aggression and danger, let us not try to probe into the past and feel that some of us were wiser than the Government. That, I do not think is a thing which pays anybody. It is an ill-wind that blows.

This has been a naked, premediated aggression. I do not think anybody would have expected at that moment when the two nations subscribed to the principles of Panch Sheel China would resort to betrayal of our very friendly relationship and our contribution to their cause in the U.N.O.

The reversion to the law of the jungle makes as strongly reminiscent of what we have seen in the history of the Chinese own mediaeval deprivations. It is true that the civilised nations then fell a victim to the Chinese hordes, and the barbarians were able to sweep everything across Eastern Europe and went far west. But, happily, the times have changed. Today, we find a solid and united nation facing them, for one thing, and for another, we are accustomed to these initial setbacks, as the previous wars have shown, and what is more, we have had the great support and assistance of other powerful nations on whose help I think we can rely upon not only to resist the onslaughts of the Chinese but also to beat them back. This is a war where it is not merely the hordes that count, but it is the determination and firm decision of a people which counts. So, it is difficult for the Chinese to ever think of trying to beat India down and secure a victory against us. That is another point which is a very heartening and hopeful thing.

My hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee, in an otherwise very useful contribution to the debate—I must say that I like the attitude and approach of Shri H. N. Mukerjee—somehow omitted a certain aspect, which I wish he had referred to. Welcoming as he did the resolution and assuring whole-hearted co-operation with Government, my hon. friend made no reference to the assistance that we could secure from abroad. I am sure that he realises, as much as any Member on the floor of this House, that today, situated as we are, India cannot face Chinese aggression all by itself without foreign help. I could have been very grateful to him if he had said a word about it, as to what he thinks of the foreign assistance that we are having, and from what quarters we can expect such assistance. I am glad that he has said unequivocally and categorically that he stands by the resolution.

The resolution makes special mention of the assistance that we are having from other foreign countries, and we have expressed our gratefulness and our thankfulness to those countries. I take it that when he says that he is wholeheartedly behind the resolution, he equally welcomes the foreign aid that we are receiving from the USA, the UK and other Commonwealth countries and others. If he thinks that that is a position which is a correct position with which he has no quarrel, I ask, would it be too much for him to bring to bear such influence as he has got—he has got beautiful expression, his ideas are very good—in certain quarters to see that similar aid flows into our country from his own other comrades and brothers abroad.

Let it be narrowed down to one thing, namely that it is a quarrel or a dispute or a fight between China and India, not between Communists and India. Since he agrees to this resolution *in toto*, does he not think that it should not be the policy of communists in countries other than China, and to support China, especially when as my hon. friend himself has said, that it is a wrong thing on the part of China to have committed aggression on India? I leave it to him to do what is best in the circumstances.

Shri Ranga referred to the question of non-alignment. I have already said at the beginning of my speech that under the conditions which prevail our policy has stood well. It is rather strange that Shri Ranga should now be thinking that that policy needs a certain change or orientation. I believe in years past he had not taken such a stand. But I suppose now his newer associations have made him change his mind. But the point is that even the nations which are giving us assistance do not want India to change her policy of non-alignment in the least. That is what I would like to point out to Shri Ranga. That being so, I do not know why Shri Ranga

is thinking of the need for a change in our foreign policy.

**Shri Ranga:** Because that time has come for it.

**Shri Dasappa:** He does not seem to understand the implications of such a change. I believe the repercussions will be tremendous, if ever we try to change our policy at this stage.

I must also pay my meed of tribute to the jawans for their magnificent job they have done and pay my homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lines.

If on the debit side there was unpreparedness on our part and our having trusted the enemy too much, on the credit side we have this magnificent response and a leader in whom the whole country has the fullest confidence. What is more, we have a righteous cause. I hope the House will appreciate this point.

My hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, was saying that we should have taken up a more aggressive attitude much earlier. But today I think because of our attitude, we have virtually secured a moral victory. I do not think we need be afraid of the future. We have experienced Generals who have seen more than one war. If we harness their services, we will be able to beat the enemy back without our getting men from abroad.

In conclusion, I would only stress that we must bring home to the nation as a whole a feeling of austerity. We know how the UK faced a similar situation and how they denied themselves during and even sometime after the war so many things.

Shrimati Renaka Ray spoke about the considerable lack of publicity both her and abroad. I agree with that. I think we have got to increase the

[Shri Dasappa]

tempo of publicity. Here I may also make an appeal to the Press. We very much depend upon them for support in such a grave crisis. I hope the Press will help in this critical situation. We have got so many things to do like training men and so on; there is a lot to do by way of mobilising all the various forces within the country for this effort.

In the end I assure the hon. Prime Minister that the whole country is behind him in this grave crisis. We will see to it that in this crisis there is no question of any sacrifice lacking in this country, and that it rules to a man to win the victory.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon):** Let me associate myself with the feelings expressed by the Prime Minister and other speakers in the House regarding our deep sense of gratitude to the jawans who have put up a glorious fight for the motherland. They were fighting in a very difficult situation, ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-equipped, but they did really do a wonderful job, and we are really proud of them. But in this hour of need when the whole nation is being geared up to an all-out fight, let us not forget that there are enemies in the country both supposedly to the left and to the right, especially enemies to the country who are very reactionary, who want to take us back to the camp of capitalist reaction. Let us not forget that we have declared our objective as a socialist goal. We must stick to it even in this dire hour of necessity.

At the same time, we should not forget that we have made lapses, that there have been certain mistakes committed, as admitted by the Prime Minister and others, both by the General Staff and the Ministries. But I do not understand this Menon-baiting. Menon was only a tool of this Parliament and the Prime Minister and the Ministry. I do not understand why he is being

singled out as a scapegoat. We all believe in having friendly relations with the rest of the world.

**Shri Gahmari (Ghazipur):** The less talk about Menon the better.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** Anyhow, he has gone. I am not sorry about it, though he is the only Member from Kerala in the Cabinet.

**Shri Gahmari:** It is a question of India.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** But we must understand that this is not the time for recrimination. We have all made mistakes. We must try to take all people who really want to be friendly and join us in national defence. The Communist Party have after deliberations come to a decision. I have not been a friend of the Communists. I have fought them in 1942 when they went against nationalism. In 1959 when they were ruling in Kerala, it was my friends who shed the first blood against the Communists, it was my friends whom they shot down. But I say they are people with initiative and energy, and if they honestly desire to help us in the war effort, it is to the good of the country to allow them to do so.

Those who are our enemies must be put down at any cost, whether they are Communists or pretend to be Congressmen. The country must be prepared for an all-out fight, in which the workers of India have really rallied round the Government and the Prime Minister and our war effort. All trade union leaders including the INTUC, AITUC, HMS and the UTU—  
—I am sorry Shri Dhebar did not know about it—have signed a truce not to go on strike or create any disturbances during the war period.

**Shri Dhebar:** I knew about it, that is not sufficient.



**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** On the other side there are profiteers, employers who want to victimise the workers. Government must come forward to see they are protected, that the prices are stabilised. The real wages of the workers have come down very much, and if they go down still further, what will they do? So, it is the holy duty of the Government, I would say, to protect the workers who have rallied round the Government.

Finally, I would only make a request. Many of us are very good shouters at least in our own languages, though not in Hindi or English. We want to be allowed to help in the recruitment. Secondly, many of us who have got some health still remaining—we have lost much of it in the national struggle—can go to the front in batches to encourage our jawans and see what they are ailing from or what is deficient there, whether the country can do anything more to them. We will certainly report to this House and to the National Defence Council as to what the real facts are. We can also by this gesture show the jawans that Members of Parliament which is supposed to be ruling the country are not afraid of bombs or facing bullets. I would request the hon. Prime Minister and the Government to consider ways and means of utilising Parliament and those people who stand for solidarity of India and for the defence of India so that it can be a cooperative and co-ordinated effort.

hrs.

Finally, it is wrong assumption to say that we are receiving all this help for nothing. As has been pointed out,

those people who give us help realise what we stand for. They have not asked for return. But the reactionaries in our country are more loyal than the king and they want the country to align with the imperialist bloc. I say honestly and with pride that when India entered into this undeclared war on the 20th of October it has tilted the entire balance of the world. When 500 million people stood up to stem the tide and onslaught of the Chinese communists and when we gave our lifeblood, it is no wonder that America and England have come forward with military aid. This is an equitable return for the service we are rendering in the fight against the Chinese onslaught. We should recruit men who are willing to come forward for the war effort and utilise them to the maximum extent to derive out the Chinese.....

(Interruptions.)

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha):** Should we take the aid or not?

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** We must take the aid without strings.

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj:** The Prime Minister has assured us that it is so.....  
 (Interruptions.)

## BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### SEVENTH REPORT

**Shri Rane (Buldana):** Sir, I beg to present the Seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

17.02 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday November 9, 1962/Kartika 18, 1884 (Saka).*