

12. 15½ hrs.

**MOTION RE: BORDER SITUATION  
RESULTING FROM THE INVASION  
OF INDIA BY CHINA**

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

"That the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China be taken into consideration."

About a month ago, on the 8th November, I placed a Resolution before this House on the Proclamation of Emergency resulting from the aggression and invasion by China. This was followed by another Resolution dealing with this aggression and invasion and how China had betrayed the friendship and goodwill of India as well as the principles of *Panchsheel* which had been agreed between the two countries. After recording the high appreciation of the House of the valiant struggle of the men and officers of our armed forces and paying its respectful homage to the martyrs who had laid down their lives in defending the integrity of the motherland, this House recorded its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that had arisen. The House affirmed the firm resolve of the Indian people to rid the sacred soil of India of the aggressor, however long and hard the struggle may be. There was a long discussion on this Resolution and a very large and record number of hon. Members spoke on it. On the 14th of November, this Resolution was passed not only unanimously, but in an unusual manner, by all Members standing and pledging themselves to what it contained. By that pledge we stand.

Two or three days later, the Chinese forces mounted a massive attack on our position at the Sela Pass as also at Walong. This resulted, on the 18th

November in our forces having to withdraw from Sela and Walong, and somewhat later from Bomdi La.

On the 21st November, the Chinese Government issued a statement making a unilateral announcement of cease-fire as from the midnight of November 21st-22nd, and a withdrawal of their forces from December 1st. On the 23rd we asked for some clarifications, and received a reply on the 26th November. On the 30th we sought further clarifications.

On the 22nd November, the Government of Ceylon announced that they had called a conference of six non-aligned countries in Colombo. The date for this was subsequently changed, and it is due to begin, or rather has begun, in Colombo today.

On the 28th November, a letter was received from Premier Chou En-lai, urging the Prime Minister of India to give a positive response, that is to accept the Chinese offer of cease-fire and withdrawal, with all the other provisos contained in it. I replied to this on the 1st December. These letters have been given in full, together with some maps in the pamphlet issued by the External Affairs Ministry entitled "Chinese Aggression in War and Peace".

The cease-fire took effect as stated, though there were a number of breaches of it on the Chinese side in the first few days. It is not yet quite clear how far the withdrawals of the Chinese forces have been effected. To some extent this has been done, but considerable Chinese forces are apparently still in some forward positions.

On the 5th of December, the Chinese Red Cross handed over 64 wounded and sick prisoners of war to the Indian Red Cross Society at Bomdi La. They have stated that they will hand over more such wounded prisoners within the next few days.

Soon after the Chinese attack on the 20th October, a three-point proposal was made by the Chinese, sug-

gesting a cease-fire and withdrawal of their forces, provided India agreed to these proposals; otherwise, the fighting may restart. On the 22nd October, stated that we were unable to accept this proposal and that our proposal about the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September was a simple and straightforward one. This was the only way of undoing at least part of the great damage done by the latest Chinese aggression. The Chinese proposal made on the 21st November for cease-fire and withdrawal was a repetition of their proposal of the 24th October with the addition of a unilateral declaration of a cease-fire and withdrawal.

I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai on December 1, indicating that the three-point proposal made by the Chinese violated the principles that the Chinese had themselves been advocating in their documents and correspondence. We could not compromise with this further aggression nor can we permit the aggressor to retain the position he had acquired by force by the further aggression since 8th September, 1962, as this would mean not only letting him have what he wanted but exposing our country to further inroads and demands in the future.

To this letter, no direct answer has been received from Premier Chou En-lai. But the Peking Radio has broadcast yesterday a long statement rejecting our proposal about the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. There was a further broadcast later yesterday which stated that our Charge d' affairs in Peking had been given a note asking the Government of India three questions. These questions are: (1) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree to a cease-fire? (2) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the 7th November, 1959 line of actual control, and (3) Does the Indian Gov-

ernment agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two sides should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of the armed forces of each party to form a demilitarised zone, establishment of check-posts as well as the return of captured personnel?

Before I answer these questions, I should like to remind the House of the past history of these incursions and aggressions. I shall not go back five years or more when these aggressions started in Ladakh. That has been repeatedly stated in this House, but I should like to remind the House that before the 8th September, 1962, there was no active aggressions on the NEFA frontier by the Chinese except in regard to the small frontier village, Longji. Not only was no further aggression there but in the past repeated assurances were given that the so-called MacMahon line would not be crossed by the Chinese and that although they considered this line an illegal one and imposed by the then British Government, they would acknowledge it as indeed they acknowledged the continuation of this line in Burma. Thus, the aggression across this line near the Thagla pass on the 8th September, 1962 was not only at variance with these assurances but constituted a major crossing over of their frontier for the first time in history.

This was a clear case of imperialist aggression and expansion. The Chinese forces continued to cross the frontier in large numbers and on the 20th October they delivered a massive attacks on the Indian positions and overpowered them by superior numbers. In the five-year long story of Chinese aggression, this was the first instance when massive attacks were made by large forces and a regular invasion of the Indian territory took place.

No longer were these mere frontier incidents as previously in Ladakh. A well-organised and well-prepared invasion on a big scale had been mounted by China.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

On the same day, a similar invasion took place in the western sector in Ladakh. Thus, it was obvious that this was a fully coordinated attack along various parts of our frontier. Soon after, that is, on the 24th October, the Chinese made their three-point proposal which, if agreed to, would have given them the benefit of their recent invasion and placed them in an advantageous and dominating position for further aggression in the future. We could not possibly accept this and consequently we rejected it.

I would like to repeat that these invasions, which took massive shape on the 20th October can only be described as imperialist aggression. It has to be noted that the Chinese Government, which often states that it is against imperialism has itself committed one of the grossest acts of imperialist aggression. The fact that the Chinese had never entered into NEFA territory previously is very relevant. But, for the moment, we may set aside the question of the merits of their claim. Even according to them, the McMahon line was indicated about 50 years ago. This was not a line drawn by McMahon, but a recognition of a previous fact, that is, the watershed was the frontier. Ever since then and in fact long before that, it is clear that the Chinese were not there.

Since our independence, we have tried to develop this area of NEFA and build schools, roads, hospitals, etc. Suddenly the Chinese break through our frontier and deliver massive attacks. Is this the way of peaceful negotiation and settlement by peaceful methods? I repeat that whatever the claims may be, this well-prepared invasion was at variance with the Chinese professions and can only be described as blatantly imperialist expansionism and aggression.

In answer to this, was stated that we could not proceed to any talks

with them until at least this latest aggression was vacated and the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 restored both in NEFA and in Ladakh. This was the least we could do and that is the position we have consistently held during the last few months. Anxious for peace as we are, we suggested this minimum condition which might lead to a peaceful approach. They have rejected our proposal. The result is that at present, there is no meeting ground between us. We have repeatedly laid stress on our considering this matter by peaceful methods. But it is not possible to do so when aggression continues and we are asked to accept it as a fact.

As for the three questions that had been asked on behalf of the Chinese Government, the first one is whether we agree or do not agree to a cease-fire. The declaration by the Government of China was a unilateral one. But in so far as the cease-fire is concerned, we accepted it and nothing has been done on our behalf to impede the implementation of the cease-fire declaration.

The second question is, do we agree or not that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the November 7, 1959 line of actual control. We are in favour of the disengagement of the forces on the two sides on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement. But such an arrangement can only be on the basis of undoing the further aggression committed by the Government of China on Indian territory on the 8th September, 1962. If the Government of China disputes that this was Indian territory, this is a matter for a judicial or like decision. The fact, however, is that it has long been under Indian occupation and this cannot be disputed. The Government of India have given their understanding of the so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959. They do not agree

with the Chinese interpretation, which is not in accordance with actual facts. It should be easy to determine the facts even from the correspondence between the two Governments during the last five years. The Government of China cannot expect us to agree to a so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959, which is manifestly not in accordance with the facts. What we had suggested is a simple and straightforward proposal, that of restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 when further aggression began. This is clearly factual and is based on the definite principle that the aggression must be undone before an agreement for a peaceful consideration can be arrived at. We have dealt with this matter fully in the correspondence which has taken place with Premier Chou En-lai and which, I take it, Members of the House have read.

The third question is "Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two States should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of armed forces of each party to form a demilitarized zone, etc?" It is obvious if the officials are to meet they must have clear and precise instructions as to the ceasefire and withdrawal arrangements which they are supposed to implement. Unless they receive these instructions, which must be as the result of an agreement between the Governments of India and China, they will be unable to function. Therefore, it has to be determined previously which line is to be implemented. Between the line of actual control immediately prior to 8th September 1962, and that of 7th November, 1959 as defined by China, there is a great difference of about 2,500 square miles of Indian territory which China occupied as a result of invasion and massive attacks during the last three months. The Chinese Government by defining this line in its own way wants to retain the ad-

vantages secured by the latest invasion.

Any person who studies the painful history of the last few years, more particularly of the recent months, will come to the conclusion that Chinese interpretation of various lines changes with circumstances and they accept the line which is more advantageous to them. Sometimes they accept part of a line and not the rest of it which is disadvantageous to them. It is perhaps not easy in the course of a discussion in this House to go into the many and changing factors which have governed the situation during the last five years. Nevertheless, the major facts are quite clear and, apart from any claims that the Chinese may have, it is on these facts that any temporary arrangement can be made and not on changing lines which the Chinese put forward as the lines of actual control.

There has been, the House must have, no doubt, noticed, an amazing cynicism and duplicity on the Chinese side on these developments and these discussions. They accuse us of being aggressors. We are supposed to aggress on our own territory and they come as defenders on our territory. They come to a place where they have never been, so far as I know of history, at any time of history. And, they preach against imperialism and act themselves in the old imperialist and expansionist way. Altogether, their policy seems to be one of unabashed chauvinism. They have referred, as hon. Members may have noticed, to their frontier guards being attacked by Indian forces and acting in self-defence. It is curious that acting in self-defence they have occupied another 20,000 square miles of Indian territory. The whole thing is so manifestly and so outrageously, what shall I say, improper and wrong, and utter misuse of words that it is a little difficult to deal with persons who use words with different meanings, what we may call, double talk. I regret to say that I have been forced

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

to the conclusion that the word of the Chinese Government cannot be relied upon.

The Chinese threat against India is a long-term one and the last five years, and even more to the last three months, have brought out the basic expansionist and imperialist attitude of China. This is a continuing threat to the independence and territorial integrity of India. We cannot submit to this challenge and must face it with all the consequences that it may bring.

As the world knows, we are a peaceful people and have always tried to adhere to peaceful methods. It is not any choice of ours that we have been driven to war-like activities. But the defence of our motherland is the first essential duty for every Indian, and imperialist and expansionist challenge to that is not only a challenge to us but to the world, as it is a flagrant violation of international law and practice. If this aggression is tolerated and acquiesced in today, it will continue to be a threat not only to India but also to other countries in Asia and will be a bad precedent for the world. We will, therefore, endeavour to the utmost of our ability to face this challenge and to protect our motherland. But, at the same time, we shall always seek peaceful methods to resolve and dispute but conditions for a peaceful approach have to be created if this is to yield any fruit.

What China has done is an insult to the conscience of the world. That is clear from the great response that we have received from a large number of countries. We still hope that our peaceful and reasonable approaches will be agreed to. Otherwise, this conflict may spread and bring disaster on a wide-spread scale, not only to India and China but to the world. Once these preliminary conditions that we have suggested are met, we can consider further the

peaceful methods that should be used for resolving the basic disputes.

Hon. Members may have read the pleas which we have repeated several times in our communications to the Chinese Government or the Chinese Premier that we should explore avenues of peaceful approach; apart from meeting each other, explore other avenues of settling these questions peacefully. I am prepared when the time comes, provided there is approval of Parliament, even to refer the basic dispute of the claims on the frontier to an international body like the International Court of Justice at The Hague. I submit that there is no fairer and more reasonable approach than what I have indicated. But that also can only come when the aggression is vacated and the position as it was before the 8th September is restored.

The Colombo Conference which is meeting today is considering what recommendations honourable to both sides it might make to resolve the differences between India and China. We recognise their friendly feelings and their well meant attempts to solve, or at any rate to lessen, this crisis. I trust, however, that they will appreciate that there can be no compromise with aggression and an expanding imperialism and that the gains of aggression must be given up before both the parties try to resolve their disputes.

We have long followed a policy of non-alignment, and, I believe firmly that this was a right policy. It means our not joining any military bloc or military purpose. I think that policy should continue. But we must take all necessary measures to defend our motherland and take the help of our friendly countries who are willing to assist us in this sacred task.

We are very grateful to the countries which have come to our aid at this moment of crisis and have extended their full sympathy and support to us. I believe that even they

appreciate that it would be wrong for us to abandon the policy of non-alignment. It is odd—it is well to remember—that the one country that does not approve of non-alignment for us or for anybody is China; they take some satisfaction in that. They go on repeating that by circumstances they will compel us to abandon it and so we have abandoned it. So, it is clear and hon. Members can themselves realise how the Chinese outlook in this matter is utterly different not only from ours but from that of most countries in the world.

All of us in this House and in the country, naturally, and, if I may say so, rightly feel strongly on this subject. Nevertheless, I have endeavoured to speak in a moderate language because I have felt that the issues are grave and cannot be dealt with lightly or merely by abuse. The future of our country is at stake. We have to rise to the occasion to consider the mighty problems that face us. They have many aspects—military, economic, the future relations of two of the greatest countries in Asia and the future of world peace. Though we may feel passionately about these problems, we may not allow our passions to run away with us and lead us to wrong courses. But it is clear that the future for us is a hard one and our people must therefore prepare themselves in every way to meet it. We shall have to strengthen ourselves in every way and mobilise our country for it. We are trying to do that.

Even though there is no actual fighting at present, the emergency and the danger continue and will continue so long as China's present policy and military postures continue to be a threat to our independence and integrity. Let us, therefore, give all our strength to meeting this threat and, at the same time, not forget that we have to win the peace and further the cause of peace.

Soon after the Chinese invasion of the 20th October, the House may remember, I indicated that this struggle or war, whatever shape it might take, will be a long one. It may even last five years or more. I think, the country and all of us should bear this in mind. It is a long and big effort that we have to make. I feel, and I speak in all honesty.

I feel confident that we shall win in the struggle. But it will require our hardest effort and many sacrifices and a refusal, whatever happens, to bow down to these imperialist tactics of China. We have to remember above all that we fight not for fighting's sake but to save our country. It is a matter of survival of freedom and a free society in India, and to further the cause of peace in the world, because it would be a poor thing if in attempting to save our country we somehow helped in the process of converting this into a terrible world war. We have to keep all this in mind. But, for the moment, the major thing before us is to protect our country and our freedom which we achieved after so long, after so many difficulties and sacrifices. This House has already expressed itself in the Resolution which it passed on the 14th of November and clearly stated what it is determined to do and taken the pledge. By that pledge we shall stand and I hope we shall honour it in full.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh** (Parbhani): One, minute, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. Let me put the Motion.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** Let us accept this motion unanimously without any further debate. I would request hon. Members to withdraw their amendments.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member has not read the motion. What can we accept here? It is only to be considered.

[Mr. Speaker]

Motion moved:

"That the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China be taken into consideration."

There are certain substitution motions moved. No. 1 is by Shri P. K. Deo and some others of the Swatantra party. Is it moved?

**Shri P. K. Deo** (Kalahandi): I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second, by Shri Ram Sewak Yadav.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव** (बाराबंकी) :

इस की जगह मुझे दूसरा प्रस्तुत करना है।

**Mr. Speaker:** No. 3. By Shri Sivamurthi Swamy.

**Shri Sivamurthi Swamy:** (Koppal): I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. 4. By Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

**Shri Prakash Vir Shastri** (Bijnor): I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. 5. Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. 6. Ram Sewak Yadav.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** Nos. 7 and 8, not moved. No. 9.

**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla** (Mahasamund): I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. 10, Shri A. S. Saigal.

**Shri A. S. Saigal** (Janjgir): I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** These Motions also are deemed to have been moved if they are admissible and otherwise in order.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from

the invasion of India by China, is of the opinion that not enough is being done to give practical shape to the marvellous spirit of sacrifice and patriotic fervour displayed spontaneously by our masses and to develop our national defence to vacate Chinese aggression, and that the country and the world should be informed that the treacherous Chinese cease-fire proposal only seeks to keep the Chinese on Indian soil and prevent India from properly fortifying and guarding all the strategic passes and places, which had been desecrated by the Chinese aggression and to keep out of India's control Tawang, Longju, Walong, Dhipula and other strategic mountain passes in the NEFA region, Barahoti, Niti and Mana passes in U.P., Shipkela in Punjab and Chusul, Daulat Beg Oldi airfields and 43 check posts in the Ladakh region, though nominally kept within the area covered by this cease-fire offer and under dispute and that Government should proceed to take all necessary and unflagging steps calculated to vacate the country from Chinese aggression, and therefore urges that—

(i) no negotiations should be entered into with the aggressor until and unless the Chinese Government agrees and takes effective steps to withdraw her forces and check-posts to the actual and customary traditional and lawful boundaries;

(ii) in view of the solemn resolution passed unaniously by the House on the 14th November, 1962, the Chinese proposals should be rejected and defence and other forces and equipment should be developed rapidly and at the appropriate time, notice should be given that if the Chinese aggression is not fully vacated, India should

not be held responsible for the military consequences following from India's just and honourable attempts to vacate aggression;

(iii) The Government should refer this unprovoked Chinese aggression to the U.N. Assembly and seek the goodwill and active support of the U.N. in this sacred task of freeing India from Chinese aggression;

(iv) India should break off diplomatic relations with China;

(v) the Government should seek and obtain massive military assistance and aid of all kinds from all friendly nations by calling them into association with us in this defence of world democracy as against such Communist and imperialist aggression;

(vi) the Government should take sincere and active steps to reach an effective settlement with Pakistan; and

(vii) the Government should give facilities to Dalai Lama to act freely on political plane." (1)

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

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

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, pledges to the Nation to continue the fight as a life and death struggle till complete victory is won and is of the opinion that—

(i) tortuous actions of the Chinese for twelve years should serve as a warning to the Government of India that India must clearly understand the trick behind the cease-fire proposal to bring about a cold war situation in the country which will be a greater course to the Nation than an active war, if we ac-

cepted any line other than what it was on the 15th August, 1947;

(ii) aggression can only be resisted if India builds up political and military strength;

(iii) the Government of India should not relax their efforts at any moment hereafter to drive out the Chinese from our sacred soil; and

(iv) the present defence policy of the Government of India to meet the challenge of Chinese invasion is satisfactory." (3)

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

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

"This House having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, is of the opinion that—

(i) in view of the unprecedented spirit of selfless sacrifice and unity displayed by the people in the country in the moments of the present national emergency, no negotiations or talks should be held with China so long as the Chinese troops are not totally withdrawn from the Indian soil;

(ii) the anti-national activities in the border areas of India and the increasing activities of spies having sympathies with the enemy should be curbed strictly; and

(iii) such political parties and organisations as have sympathy with the Community China should be banned." (4)

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

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

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from



[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

the invasion of India by China reaffirms the resolution passed unanimously on the 14th November, 1962, and is firmly of opinion that the Chinese proposals of 21st November, 1962 be rejected, and preparations for building up our military strength with all possible speed, in particular reinforcing our agricultural and industrial base with a view to gearing our economy to the needs of the national emergency, and securing military and economic assistance from all friendly countries, be continued vigorously with firm determination to clear every inch of our territory now occupied by the enemy." (5)

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

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

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, is of opinion that the policy of the Government of India to start negotiations on the condition of withdrawal by the Chinese aggressors to the line of control as on the 8th September, 1962 should be rejected, and no negotiations should be undertaken till the Chinese aggressors withdraw to the Indian boundary as it existed on the 15th August, 1947." (6)

**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:** I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, approves of the measures and policy adopted by the Government to meet it." (9)

**Shri A. S. Saigal:** I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, approves of the policy of the Government of India with regard thereto." (10)

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, the original motion as well as these substitute motions are before the House.

We have the whole of today for this discussion. I have only to repeat this and remind hon. Members, after listening to the statement of the Prime Minister, that the situation is grave. The issues involved are very grave. The matter is delicate to be dealt with. In my opinion, the situation does not demand that there should be long speeches. Hon. Members may kindly keep that in mind and they would speak only those things that are relevant to this Motion and also be conscious of the responsibility that they have got. This is only what I have got to say.

About the time, I think the Leaders might take 15 to 20 minutes. Would that be all right?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:**  
Twenty-five minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** For the Congress Members 10 minutes. I will have to accommodate a larger number. They ought not to take more than 10 minutes. Hon. Members of the Opposition require more than that though I would request them also to be very brief. No long speeches are required. They can give their view points within 10 minutes. I will give them up to twenty minutes, if they want.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:**  
Twenty-five minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will be calling the hon. Prime Minister at 4.30.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:**  
(Hoshangabad): He may reply tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. I will give the Opposition Members as much time as I can.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Why not at 5 o'clock?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will give more concession to the Opposition today, I assure them.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** May I ask whether the full text of the Chinese note of yesterday or midnight has been received and, if so whether a copy can be made available in the Library?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It has not been received from any formal channels. Some notes by monitoring their broadcasts have been obtained.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central): I am sure the House welcomes this opportunity of reiterating the pledge, as the Prime Minister put it, which was implicit in the resolution which we passed unanimously and with acclamation on the 14th of November. It was the day that we met for the first time in this session that we started discussion of that resolution, and then we adopted it, and as now we are on the eve of going into recess, we reiterate that pledge. India stands united and solidly determined behind the Prime Minister and his policies, in so far as repelling the danger which the Chinese invasion of this country represents.

Today, at Colombo, as the Prime Minister also has informed the House, the conference of non-aligned countries has begun. These countries which have met at Colombo may not be very rich like ourselves in the world's goods, but they are our friends, and we welcome their meeting; we cherish whatever assistance can be given to us by friendly nations, if they can contribute to the ending of hostilities and the beginning of settlement on a basis which is consistent with the honour and dignity of our country, on

a basis which does not condone aggression.

In this regard, I associate myself with what has fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister in regard to the Colombo conference.

The latest Chinese statements and questions put to our Government suggest bellicosity of spirit and demonstrate that China counts on its physical strength, and just as it imposed a fighting upon an India which never wanted this fight, now it wishes to impose on us a settlement on its own terms, that we cannot agree to. The questions which the Chinese Government have put to the Indian Government are couched in a manner which is almost reminiscent of the law court where somebody is in the dock as a prisoner and he is asked certain questions as if by way of cross-examination one sovereign State can get answers from another sovereign State.

Even so, the Prime Minister has given answers, answers which perhaps he might not have given, but he has given those answers, and in the spirit which has already been reiterated by this House. This country does not believe in horse-trading. This country does not go about saying one thing now and another thing a little later only because of opportunistic circumstances. We have already made our statement, a united national formulation of this country that the minimum corrective action which China has to adopt is to go back to the *status quo* before 8th September, 1962, and that remains the position which the Prime Minister has reiterated today.

It is good also, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, that morally today China is isolated. Even in these dark days when moral power does not seem to be so very effective, when physical power seems to be ruling the roost, let us not forget that, after all, in moral strength there is something which physical power as such can never hope to attain. In this coun-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

try, we know of the sages saying:

एकेन ब्रह्मदेवेन सर्वास्त्राणि हतानि मे

श्री प्रिय गुप्त (कटिहार) : मैट्रिय-  
लिज्म छोड़ दिया है ?

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** All weapons would be destroyed by only one instrument of moral force, and that moral force today, let us not forget it, is working in favour of the legitimate stand which India has taken up. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Moral force should not be so offensive as to provoke talk.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** More than 60 countries of the world have already given their categorical support to the cause of India. As far as the socialist world is concerned, I do not know if apart from the People's Republic of China and Albania, any other socialist country really and truly has pulled its weight in favour of China. It is exactly the contrary. The International Communist Movement, in so far as the meetings of the Communist Party of Italy or of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia are any indications, has very definitely told China that her behaviour is absolutely out of conformity with the canons of the communist ideology which China professes to further.

It is very clear that China in her pseudo-revolutionary arrogance has spurned some of the basic tenets of communism. It is not unusual in the history of revolution that degeneration of this sort takes place. In the French Revolution, we noticed not only the reaction of Thermidor but the appearance of Bonapartism. But China should know that communist Bonapartism is a contradiction in terms. Communism is not a matter of export. If communism is to grow in this country, it has to grow from within. It cannot, and must not, come in the baggage of an army, to whichever country that army might belong. These are the lessons of revolution, the lessons of international communism, and it is for China which in her

arrogance today has forgotten those lessons, to learn those lessons over again. The reason why the country stands today solidly and in a determined fashion united behind the Prime Minister is that today he represents the spirit of our country. Whatever differences we might have had, and which we may still continue to have with him, we know that in his spirit of resistance to the Chinese aggression, he represents whatever is most pertinent and most memorable in the traditions of our country. We have got to mobilise all those traditions today if we are going really and truly to be strong to face the world with the appearance of not only physical capability but of moral splendour. That is exactly what has been sought to be done, and that is why I welcome heartily the reiteration by the Prime Minister of India's devotion to peace and to the principle of non-alignment, the reiteration by the Prime Minister of India's readiness to have this aggression vacated after the *status quo ante* before the 8th September 1962 is restored. The readiness is even there to refer this matter to the International Court of Justice. There can be no further example of the readiness of India to settle a matter which has gone out of its hands only because of the intransigence of a country which has forgotten its fundamental socialist principles and has launched on a career of expansionism, which the world's conscience has certainly condemned, and that is why today it is so good that we are remembering these things.

13 hrs.

We shall take all necessary measures, we shall do our duty. Our duty is to defend our country. That comes first. I know that our wishes are certainly that we do not let the world be convulsed in a conflagration. The Prime Minister said himself that it would be a tragic thing, if in order to do our duty, in order to defend the integrity of our country, we help certain things to happen which may



[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

ween communism and the deepest patriotism, there is not the slightest discrepancy, and I have tried to nurture myself on whatever is best in the traditions of my country, and I always try to link my thoughts with the thought in my own country. When I was thinking of the difficult times through which we are going these days, I recalled the words in the *Kathopanishad*:

उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्तवराग्निबोधत

क्षुस्य धारा निशिता दुस्त्यया

दुर्गपथस्तत् कवयो वदन्ति ।

Let us rise, let us be conscious of our duty today, let us really reach, let us attain our success, but the ways are razor sharp, difficulties are there, they have to be removed. They can be removed by a combination of moral strength and physical preparedness. That is something which India is now ready to do, and that is why today, when China has been cornered, isolated morally, when China has been found to have betrayed the principles of international communism, it is only right and proper that here in India we take up a principled stand, namely that we want peace, we cherish peace.

प्रियानां त्वा प्रियतमं हवामहे

निधीनां त्वा निधितमं हवामहे

It is peace that we cherish, there is no doubt about it, but for the sake of peace, we are not going to barter away our honour. We love our country because we love honour more. That is why peace with honour is something which is the objective of our country. That objective has been placed before the House. That objective has been taken to his heart by every one of our people, and that is why in Parliament here today we have only the duty, the responsibility, the bounden obligation to reiterate the pledge that we have taken for fighting for peace; we shall

at the same time defend the honour and integrity of our country. Come what may, whatever the provocations from China, from any other side, whoever might like to fish in troubled waters, whatever happens, let us try to maintain and develop this unity which has taken place; maintain it as the apple of our eye and cherish it as something more worth-while than any expression in words. Then, and then alone, shall we not only overcome this present difficulty, shall we not only be victorious over the kind of challenge which China has thrown to us, but we shall build a new India nearer the heart's desire of our people. That is the idea and that is the perspective with which we should face the resolution today.

**Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, even though the substitute motion of mine on the 14th August last could not be put to the voice-vote even, through by the brute majority of the House, I congratulate the Government for having risen to the occasion and for having implemented those points raised in my substitute motion by re-shuffling the Defence Ministry, by taking aid from friendly countries and by streamlining our defence production.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat. Some hon. Members are not attending at all. They do not know that the proceedings have stopped; but they contribute their own proceedings!

**Shri P. K. Deo:** We have no doubt that the 20th October, 1962 is a turning-point in our history. It has seen the end of a chapter on disillusion. It has seen the end of a chapter of ing point in our history. It has seen platitude, a chapter of complacency. It has brought about a great change in our attitude and in our approach to the problem which is so vital to our country. The whole nation has risen as one man with a determination to

pay any price to save the honour and integrity of this country. As the aggressor always gets an initial advantage, we had to face some reverses at the beginning, but we have no doubt that the final outcome will be in our favour. It cannot be otherwise, when a nation like India fights for freedom, fights to preserve the territorial integrity and dignity and the honour of the country.

I do not wish to go into the question of our unpreparedness in view of the Prime Minister's promised enquiry to be held at the appropriate stage, but I would like to point out that the catastrophe at Sela and Bomdila has generated a new enthusiasm and a new determination in the minds of Indians to save this country till the nation sheds its last drop of blood.

At this psychological moment, we get a peace offensive, so to say, of China. The first offensive came with the three-point proposal which was duly rejected by our Government and now, within 30 hours, of the Prime Minister's pledge to the nation that we will fight to the last, comes the second offensive, by which they claim that they will withdraw even behind the 8th September line which has been the suggestion from our Government as the basis for further talk. They say that they will go even behind the 8th September line; that they are prepared to go back to the 7th November, 1959 line, but the attitude and the action of the Chinese have clearly unfolded their intention and their mind. Just now, the Prime Minister has quoted the Don Quixotic rejection of the Chinese radio announcement last night: that they do not like even to talk on the basis of the 8th September line.

In this connection, I beg to submit that most of us on this side of the House do not subscribe to the stand of our Government regarding the 8th September, 1962 line, because it is contrary to the very pledge we have taken on the floor of this House in

a solemn way. It is contrary to the very aspirations and to the hopes raised in this country by the various pronouncements that we are not prepared to talk to the aggressor so long as they occupied one inch of our sacred soil. By the 8th September, 1962 line the Chinese will be still in occupation of 14,000 square miles of Indian soil.

Let us examine why these peace proposals came from the Chinese. I would like to analyse in my own way these peace proposals. The Chinese in a short period had marched in such a speed that they must have spread themselves and thinned-out and it is very difficult for them to keep the logistic line in this mountainous terrain which will be snowbound very soon and impassable and it will be difficult for them to keep the supply line to their advance posts. That might have prompted them to come out with this proposal. Secondly, they selected a time which they thought will synchronise with the highly inflammable situation in the Carribeans. They thought that the United States might get involved with the situation in Cuba and may not be in a position to come to the military aid of this country. But they were completely disillusioned in this regard. I praise the statesmanship of Mr. Khrushchev in pulling out the various missile installations in Cuba and the Russian Army from the Carribean so that a peaceful situation has developed there and it is now possible for the United States to come with all help to this country. They never expected that timely and magnificent response will come from the west i.e. U.S.A. and U.K. for which we are so grateful in this House. Hardly did they also expect that the Russians will maintain the attitude of neutrality which they have exhibited so far. China never expected that Russia will go on honouring its various commitments so far as military supply to this country is concerned. As pointed out by the previous speaker, the entire world opinion is in our favour. I had the privilege to represent this country

[Shri P. K. Deo]

in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference and I could say that all the Commonwealth countries have got their tremendous goodwill towards India. They expressed their concern as India became a victim of this cold-blooded and unprovoked aggression of the Chinese. Even though in its endeavour for a peaceful settlement, Ghana raised a controversy regarding the U.K.'s supply of arms to this country Mr. Casely Hayford, a senior member their Government and Leader of the Ghana delegation, expressed his full sympathy towards India when all the facts were made known to him and he said that there should be an early peaceful settlement regarding our border. In this regard I beg to submit that the entire world opinion has been in our favour. The Chinese saw a more determined and efficient Defence Minister who has been assisted by a General as Chief of Staff, who has the battle experience of the modern warfare and who has many victories to his laurel. Last but not the least, the reverses at Sela, Bomdila and in the NEFA area, instead of demoralising our people, have bound them together with a determination to fight till complete victory is won. To China war may mean to divert the attention of the people from the home front, from their failures in their so-called 'leap forward', from their frustration and dissatisfaction. But to us it means the upholding of the honour, dignity, independence and integrity of the motherland. All these factors influenced China to come out with this proposal. There is nothing new about it. If you will read the various writings of Mao Tse Tung, you will find that he says: "In military terms our war consists in alternate adoption of the defensive and the offensive". It is the same hot and cold treatment which is used by the communists as the technique of torture to break down the morale of their victims and their resistance power in extracting about that confession. There is nothing new

Let us examine all the implications of this proposal. Firstly, in the NEFA they do not recognise the Thag La ridge as the MacMahon line. They say the line is further sought of the Nam Ka Chu river which they call as Kechilang. If we accept the offer we will have to forego Tawang, Dhola, Longju, Walong, Dhipula and other mountain passes which are of strategic importance to us. In the middle sector we will have to dismantle our defence build up in our border and we will have to withdraw to an area of 2,500 square miles including Bara Hoti, Niti and Mana passes in U.P., Shipki La in Punjab. It further bars us from our re-establishing the 43 checkposts in the Ladakh region and the Daulat Beg Oldie and the Chushul airstrip which we have still held against heavy odds and against incessant Chinese attacks and heavy casualties. The acceptance of the proposal will have far-reaching military and political repercussions. Militarily it will extricate the Chinese from dangerously exposed positions which are not adequately supported by the line of logistics. Further it will demoralise our forces who are anxious to have an opportunity to retrieve their honour because they are now better equipped. They want that a fighting chance should be given to them so that they can get back the honour. Politically it is a deceptive mirage, to lure the Indian people from the high resolve, to counter the splendid solidarity and fortitude of this country and to damper the spontaneous upsurge that has been seen in this country. Further, it will have a very bad effect in the case of our neighbours who bank so much on our retaliatory powers. It will also create confusion in the minds of our friends who have been so good to supply us arms regarding our sincerity of purpose.

Taking into consideration all these factors, I beg to submit with all humility that it is a treacherous trap to humiliate us. They want that India

should eat a humble pie but it is not possible. The entire proposal should forthwith be rejected. The proper place for this proposal is in the waste paper basket. Even after the cease-fire the Chinese have been firing at our soldiers who had been retreating. We have also seen that at Tenga Valley between Bomdila and Foot-hills they have erected a sort of a check gate. We have learnt that they are leaving these areas heavily mined and leaving behind cells of espionage and sabotage about which we should be careful. There is a saying "once bitten, twice shy". So, I beg to submit that no useful purpose would be served in pursuing these talks. Could we ever expect that Churchill could be asking for negotiation after Dunkirk? This proposal is a challenge to the manhood and to the honour of this country and should be rejected forthwith.

I have two suggestions. Our relationship with Pakistan should improve. We are all anxious for it. We hope that the mission which is being headed by Shri Swaran Singh would be crowned with success, not, of course, at the concession of our Indian territory. We expect that Gen. Ayub, as a real statesman and soldier, will not create such impediments in the progress of our friendly talks.

Secondly, I beg to submit that it is high time for us to re-appraise our non-alignment policy. Our Prime Minister has spoken here that so far as China is concerned, non-alignment is meaningless. I also subscribe to his view. We should join some defensive bloc, so that we can get arms aid free and we need not have to pay for this arms supply, because we need our foreign exchange for our development purposes. We cannot afford to win the war and lose the peace. There must be a strong economic background to help our war efforts.

Then, I beg to submit that the matter should be referred to the United Nations, as pointed out by the

Prime Minister. We are prepared to go to the International Court of Justice because ours is a just cause. Even when it is referred to the United Nations, I feel that if the question of veto comes in the present context, USSR would definitely support India's cause and will not exercise its veto power in favour of China.

How we miss Sardar Patel at this hour of need! There are men of talent in this country. In this connection, I would draw the attention of the House to the statement of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, which has come out this morning. He has called for a broadbased Government of talents at the centre. The defence of the country should be viewed from a nationalist viewpoint. It should not be viewed from a party angle or from a group perspective. Now that Mr. Krishna Menon has gone, for balance of groups, Mr. Bijoy Patnaik has to be called here and given a separate room in the External Affairs Ministry....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. He is going into personalities. I would not allow that.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** With these words, I support the amendment.

**Shri U. N. Dhebar (Rajkot):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you first of all for giving me this opportunity to express a few thoughts on this motion moved by the Prime Minister. The latest statement of the Chinese Government is an ultimatum to India and I am looking at the present motion in the background of that ultimatum. You will remember that the cease-fire proposal was suggested by China to the world at large, before it was forwarded to the Government of India. Now that China has come out with a statement and a declaration, putting three questions to the Government of India, it becomes our duty to point out to the world some of the inescapable conclusions which the present cease-fire proposals demonstrate.



[Shri U. N. Dhebar]

What was the purpose of the cease-fire proposal? It was a unilateral proposal. At that time an appearance was sought to be made that the Chinese Government keen on peace did not expect anything from the Government of India. But now the cat is out of the bag, and we know what was the content, what was the implication behind the Chinese proposal. They want—what was a unilateral proposal—that proposal to be conceded in its vital aspects by the Government of India as the proposal is to be operated. It does not strike anybody who is prepared to consider this aspect, what was then the meaning in making a unilateral proposal at all. If the Government of India was not expected anything to contribute in the bringing about of the peace which the Chinese Government pretended it was so keen upon, how does a question now arise of the Government of India giving answers to these three questions? Obviously, the whole idea behind it was propaganda, propaganda to secure time, propaganda to put India into a wrong position.

Let us, at this juncture, understand the real motive behind the whole aggressive attitude of China. It was not merely to gain a few square miles, as I said on the last occasion. The motive of China can best be understood if we know the real nature of Chinese policies and the preparations China is making in order to enforce those policies.

Asia, I do not think, has ever seen a country so armed to the teeth as we see China today. My hon. friend, Shri Ram Sewak Yadav made a complaint against me. May be he is right; I do not want to quarrel with him. But I want to emphasise once again before this House that we have got to understand the motives of a man from the actions of that man, not merely from the words he uses. Man intends the natural consequences of his act, and China, I have no doubt in my mind, intends upon rearing a giant

army of that size to do something more than merely defending its own frontiers. And, that is slowly coming out bit by bit.

The second thing that we have to realise as a part of the Chinese policy is this. Unlike the other Communist parties of the world, China has accepted as a policy, rather than building up communism from below even by subversive activities, to dismember country after country in Asia. China is trying to do that. There is, for instance, Korea. There are, for instance, French Indo-China, Laos and Cambodia. The whole purpose of this move is to dismember this sub-continent by lulling one country, by over-awing another country and by threatening another country. It is just to disintegrate, dismember limb by limb this part of the sub-continent.

The third thing is, it is necessary we understand why China is running this game. It is for the simple reason that in Asia there exists a country of 45 crores of people which has undertaken a scheme of development which promises to give to the people of the under-developed world quite an alternative on the basis of human freedom and on the basis of peace. That China is not in a position to bear. These are the three purposes lying behind this aggression of the 8th of September.

It is necessary that India and the world at large understand the true motives because it appears to me that some of the countries, while they express great sympathy for us and are prepared to lend support to us, they still do not realise that what is happening to India is going to happen to other parts of the world tomorrow, specifically Asia and Africa. The threat that China presents to the world through threat to their frontiers with India is not confined to India alone; it will extend tomorrow to other parts of Asia and other parts of Africa. So, in dealing with the Sino-Indian question, it is necessary

not only for India but for the Afro-Asian countries, the non-aligned countries and the world at large to understand the true nature and the true implications of this move on the part of China.

Secondly, what is the dispute? China says: you accept the 7th November line. What is the sacredness of the 7th November line? India has not committed aggression upon China; it is China that has committed aggression upon India. And India is attaching importance to the 8th September line simply because it is that line which symbolises the real motive behind the present move on the part of China.

We object not only to the unilateral alteration of boundaries but to unilateral alteration of boundaries by force. The question between India and China today is whether in Asia, whether in the world, we shall submit to this unilateral alteration of boundaries by force. That is the issue before us.

Thirdly, as yesterday's broadcast or the statement shows, China has made up its mind. This House and the country have made up their mind as well. How shall we follow it up? Vast masses of people are ready to help in the war effort with men, with money, with anything that is required in order to protect the integrity of this country. The question is of channelising this vast popular upsurge, natural and spontaneous. Two things strike me. One is the vast labour force. India has a reserve of labour force, semi-used or unused, and that labour power is the capital of India. Can we utilise this labour power in constructive channels which would not only help the country in its development but also help the war effort? The Government of India, specially the Planning Commission, have made a suggestion that the vast man-power may be utilized for constructive purposes in building up irrigation works, channels especially.

There is one item before us. Can we at this juncture, when an ultimatum has come to us in concrete form, while we have taken this pledge, decide simultaneously to concentrate all our energies as soon as we leave from this House to this task? There are other tasks also which are awaiting us. Every minute counts, every day counts, and if this vast manpower is used, it can not only give us the resources but can sustain the present spirit of resistance that has developed in the country, and can also lend support, both direct and indirect to the forces that are fighting on the front.

I would urge upon the House that before we pledge ourselves, as we have pledged ourselves on the previous occasion, we really feel that our duty is to perform by the country and to give our maximum support to the Government in these tasks, for ultimately in a military conflict what counts are the physical resources as well and we have got to provide the physical resources to the Government.

**Shri Dasappa (Bangalore):** Sir, I join in welcoming the very firm and patriotic stand taken by our beloved leader, a stand which, I am sure, mirrors the throbbing of the hearts of millions in India, a stand which finds an echo in the hearts of the entire nation. It is very rarely that in the history of a nation a moment like this arrives when it gives every opportunity for the best in that nation to manifest itself. It is a great hour of trial for this nation. Are we going to rise equal to the task or because of any weakness in us of which there has been ample evidence in the centuries past will we go under? That is the great issue that is before the country. If we could read the signs of the times and gauge the kind and extent of response that we have had. I think, we could very well find the answer on this occasion. A nation of 430 millions determined to meet and face the opposition and prepared for any sacrifice that may be called for can never be defeated. I am glad that

[Shri U. N. Dhebar]

on this occasion there is not a single dissentient voice in the country, here on the floor of the House or elsewhere, which will sound a discordant note so far as the stand taken by the hon. Prime Minister is concerned.

13.38 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

It is in perfect keeping with the honour and self-respect of this nation. It is a stand which, I am sure, enhances the prestige of this nation in the eyes of the world. Anything little less qualifying or less definite than the firm stand that has been taken would certainly have affected the prestige of this nation. This is the reason why I say that what this stand of the hon. Prime Minister has given to the country is a great clarion call to the nation. It is upto us to respond to it in a suitable manner. But I would say that there are certain snags in the proposals that have been made and that we have got to be guarded against those things. The Chinese have only followed one of their old practices of trying to take attack and then sue for peace. This is a very old practice of Mao Tse-tung. Therefore if they have adopted that same practice today, we need not be taken by surprise. It is a strange thing that in spite of the history of Chinese revolutions and the various institutions we have had, there are still people in our land who are a little gullible and who fall victims to these machinations.

Mr. Chou En-lai, Prime Minister of China, is supposed to be a most resilient and a most gifted negotiator the world has ever seen. This is a thing which is well known. When Kuomintang's Chiang Kai-shek wanted the co-operation of the communists as against the Japanese, it is he who represented the communists. And there he was able to score. Again, when the communists became stronger in China and when Manchuria was at their feet and Peking fell, in the flush

of victory what did Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai do? They offered the olive branch of peace to the Kuomintang forces. This is the kind of strategy that they have developed.

We should beware even now of these tactics. Their propaganda machinery will be infinitely stronger than anything that we imagine today. I would suggest to the Government and to everybody, and I would like to remind the House also, that this is not the last of their strategies so far as propaganda is concerned: they will make it much stronger, and pervasive. As honourable friends have already said, here are fifty or sixty nations which have already sympathised with the position in which we find ourselves today. Yet, with all that against them, and with very little of open support from their own socialist brothers, they still have taken up a stand like this. I am rather surprised that they should have done so and whether after all they have been wise in trying to land their own country in such a predicament as this.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, made a very eloquent appeal on this occasion. I want to take him at his word. Whatever some of my other friends may feel, I want to take him at his word. And I am sure the stand that he took up is a thing which will be welcomed by the Government as well as the people of this country, as also by the rest of the world. Take, also the attitude of the other socialist countries so far as Chinese invasion of India is concerned. We have had the conference in Italy. As was stated, except Albania, a small little tiny country, China could not muster any other friend even among the communist countries to support the stand that it has taken. Evidently, I believe—I can only guess it—they want the hegemony of the world; they want to see that even Russia takes a secondary place.

Therefore we must be very careful with regard to the propaganda engine

that they may forge hereafter in order to win over some of the Asian and African countries.

Then, my hon. friend, Shri P. K. Deo of the Swatantra Party, referred to the question of the need for a reorientation of our non-alignment policy. I think the Prime Minister made it amply clear that even those who are very eager to assist us and who have helped us at this hour of crisis, they themselves do not want us to change our policy of non-alignment. They want us to keep up the policy of non-alignment. Only the other day Mr. Averell Harriman said that they would like India to pursue the policy of non-alignment and be friendly to Russia. I feel, therefore, that it would be wholly unwise on our part to think of changing this policy of non-alignment. They are willing to give us all the help that we need, and I see no reason why we should now change the policy which pays us ample dividends.

Sir, I will only say a word before I sit down. The relationship between China and Russia is not the same today as it was some time back. And I consider that this behaviour of China towards India has largely contributed to this relationship of somewhat of an estrangement between Russia and China. Russia is a real lover of peace, as I consider, and wants to be on friendly terms with India. And yet we find its brother nation attacking India. Russia has characterised India as a friendly nation and China as a brother nation. Sir, a friendly nation can be expected to be friendly, but we cannot say the same thing of a brother nation. I feel that the Chinese have done a great harm to themselves.

We may have to undergo a great deal of hardship. But, as they say, patience is bitter but the fruit is sweet. And he laughs best who laughs last. So, in conclusion, I say that we must steel our hearts, offer the

greatest amount of co-operation to the Government and sound no discordant voice of any kind; and then I am sure the Goddess of Victory will be on our side.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are today discussing the question of cease-fire here. This cease-fire in the present instance appears to me to be a question of object surrender on our part, and I do not think that we should mince words in describing what this unilateral cease-fire means. For studying this question we have to study the life of Mao Tse-tung. Studying it, we come to this one and single conclusion that, just like Hitler, he has written down in so many words, in black and white, what his game is and how he wants to achieve it.

The story of the Chinese aggression, in China itself and in other places also, wherever they have done it, is: attack, pause, placate, attack. The technique is: attack, pause, placate and attack. This is a continuous process for them which they are following to a pattern in our country. Therefore, we should not be taken in by the words of unilateral cease-fire. We have accepted this. In a way, we have accepted this. The statement by our Prime Minister on Friday has indicated to us that we can draw this inference that we have accepted this cease-fire which has been imposed upon us, so to say. If that is so, then, I should say there is no other word but abject surrender for that.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** I hope it is not so. I wish it is not so. The country wishes it should not be so.

**An Hon. Member:** It is not so.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** That is all right. Why are you worried?

**Shri Bade:** He has said so.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** The Chinese Republic, as we have read, was declared in 1911. Since then, China was a Republic. Again, in October, 1949, another republic, the People's Republic of China was declared. We are also a Republic. But, the pattern is not suitable to the Chinese. What they want is a People's Republic of India of their own pattern. We do not want that pattern of Republic. We want to have our own pattern of Republic which the country as a whole, by the Constitution, has imposed upon itself. We must remain on the guard about what the Chinese are doing to us.

Those of us who have ever had to deal with the Chinaman must remember that we committed a great mistake in taking the notoriously crooked Chinaman at his face value. When China committed the rape of Tibet, we thought that the boundary between Tibet and India will remain inviolate. The mistake or blunder, call it by any name, that you like, has let us down into many pitfalls. It is a sad story of humiliating treatment by the Chinese. We were treated as small boobies, nincompoops, simpletons, and our diplomats as demagogues of no value. This culminated in the onslaught of September, 1962.

Members in this House have been told often, again and again, after the aggression began that we are giving a brave fight. But, what has come as a shock to me and must have come as a shock to many others like me is that out of 20,000 men that we had matched against 3 lakhs of Chinese, only 4,000 of our forces were made to fight and 16,000 were out-flanked. These 14,000 men, with rifles and bayonets, soldiers and sturdy men, had no chance to fight. Yet, the House was being continuously informed about our brave retreat. Sixteen thousand men were out-flanked. We must hang down our heads in shame that the crooked and the cunning have scored over the brave and intelligent.

What is most astonishing is that the Chinese knew about the topography of the land which we claimed to be ours and we were treated as ignorant fools. Who is responsible for this sorry state of affairs? I cannot and do not lay the blame at the doors of those brave soldiers of my country who braved ill-winds, weather and rain to save the soil and poured their blood for it. But, I cannot refrain from expressing my feeling of amazement and disgust about those who guided or ought to have guided them.

Often, we were told that the Chinese were superior in logistics. They were not superior in logistics. There was nothing of logistics there. What they were superior in was greater and better knowledge of the topograph of the country. To the world at large, we have been proved as non-entities as compared to the Chinese. Frustration appears writ large on our mind. Let us have no more of it. Let us consider how we should rehabilitate ourselves in the eyes of the world and not get ourselves dubbed as supine people. Should this calumny be wiped out or should we swallow the insult?

The country has magnificently responded to the call and will continue to do so. Should we damp the enthusiasm of the people and allow the Chinese to call the tune which they are doing? It is they who are now saying to us. This is what very recently, in his letter, Chou En-lai has said on the 28th November, 1962:

"On the contrary, in case the Indian side should refuse to cooperate, even the cease-fire which has been effected is liable to be upset."

The threat is again very patent in today's radio broadcast which has been published in the press. Are we going to swallow this threat?

Our Prime Minister has answered the three questions which have been posed therein. I would not refer to his answers. I would not rather com-

ment upon them. But, one thing that strikes me is that the Prime Minister was ill-advised today in making the statement about approach to The Hague Court. The International Court at The Hague is only approachable when there is a dispute between the parties. Here, there is a question of aggression upon us. The International Court does not decide on aggression.

**Some Hon. Members:** After vacation.

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

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** The hon. Member has not heard him fully. There is a qualifying clause in his statement.

**Shri Bade:** Not taking the 8th September line to The Hague Court; it should be 1957 line.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** I have heard the Prime Minister. My contention is this. My submission is this. The International Court at The Hague may be only approached after the Resolution which we solemnly declared passed on the 14th of November, this year, is fulfilled in word and spirit. It is only then and then alone that an approach to The Hague Court is possible: not otherwise. I am not satisfied with the 7th September position. I am not satisfied even with the position of November 1959.

We are not going to show to the world that it was only an Army of 4,000 which was matched against 3 lakhs of Chinese. If the 16,000 had not been miserably cheated from joining the battle, this story of our today's position would have been entirely different. Our forces are mighty forces. They could have fought well, but they were cheated. The ceasefire and its aftermath has emboldened our partitioned brother Pakistani to somehow blackmail us. I will not go further. Some friends have requested me not to speak more on this ques-

tion. But, I will remind the House that just as Mr. Bhutto says:

"In view of past experience we must move with the greatest caution."

I would also request our Prime Minister and those of us who go to negotiate there that they must always try to move with the greatest caution possible in negotiating any terms with them. Often and often, we have seen the words in which Mr. Zaffrullah Khan has put us in the wrong in the United Nations. We have not matched in any manner the colourable lies that they can utter. We have not yet been able to match the wit of Zaffrullah Khan in telling those stories in a very colourful manner. Therefore, I would say that we must be very careful about this.

14 hrs.

I would, therefore, remind the Prime Minister of his oft-repeated words in this House and outside that we will never give up an inch of our territory and will not negotiate till such time as the aggressors have vacated the aggression. I endorse these words and these views. For the satisfaction of those friends who were very impatient with hearing my remarks while raising the question of the reference to The Hague Court, I would say that my contention is also the same except that I do not rely upon this position that we should stick to the 7th September line or the November, 1959 line. It is the McMahon line and the McMahon line alone to which we should adhere, and till that is achieved, we should have no further negotiations.

In Gauhati, in a passing remark, the Prime Minister had made an assertion that there was some sort of secret pact between Pakistan and China. I would implore him that he should bring this secret pact to the notice of those friends of ours who are out to help us.

**Shri U. N. Dhebar (Rajkot):** I do not think he said so.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** My hon. friend may read it.

**Shri Brij Raj Singh (Bareilly):** There is no question of thinking. He has said so.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** I would say that I and my party very emphatically stand against any such thing. There is no need to be panicky, just because a goonda commits a murder in a town, there is no reason for the townsmen to flee from the town. The country is behind the Prime Minister, or for the matter of that, behind anyone who is going to stand firmly against the aggressor, and the country is not going to brook any nonsense from any source, from whichever source it may come.

The country has to keep up its pride and prestige. I do not use these words in just a spirit of bravado, but these are my thoughtful expressions of the sentiments which I hear daily expressed in the ordinary trains and buses and on the roads. This is a sentiment of the man in the street; this is a sentiment of the common man.

While we are indeed, and we should be, thankful to the friends who have spontaneously rushed to our help, they must also be assured by us that we are worthy of that trust. And how can we do that? Not by kowtowing to the Chinese, nor by saying *Al-salam-Alekam* to the Pakistanis but by refusing to yield to goondaism and blackmail.

Time does not permit me to elaborate upon all the arguments for discarding the unilateral offer of cease-fire, which is no cease-fire, and which, therefore, should not be accepted, that does not mean that arguments are lacking. There are scores of them but the greatest of them is the mighty wish of the people that the country shall not be humiliated further by an abject surrender, and that no cease-fire shall take place till the McMahon line has been reached.

There is one thing more, and I have done. Several times, while talking

with foreigners, especially those coming from the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, Germany and the United States, I have found that a sort of gross ignorance exists in the minds of those friends of ours about our relations *vis-a-vis* Pakistan on the question of Kashmir. It would not be too much to ask that at least a batch of 50 men, from Parliament or from wherever else you may like, may be chosen to go out to these countries to dispel the ignorance that exists in those countries regarding our relations with Pakistan. That is most essential. It is very unfortunate that well-placed Ministers of State, coming from the USA and the UK have shown their gross ignorance on the question between us, and the blame is tried to be put on our heads in view of their own ignorance. We are all at one in this respect, and the country is at one; it is not a question of the Prime Minister or this Minister or that Minister. It is a question of the country as a whole, and the country refuses to yield on this question of the cease-fire and there shall not be cease-fire and there shall not be any abject surrender.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** The events that followed after we took the pledge on 14th November were rather disturbing. At one time, it was thought as if the Chinese had not only succeeded in aggression but had perhaps succeeded in winning their political game by creating confusion not only in the minds of the wide world but to some extent by being able to introduce a certain amount of hesitation in the minds of the people who had taken upon themselves the responsibility to lead this battle and to implement the pledge to drive out the aggressor from our land.

We are happy at the motion that has been brought forward today, and I say this because if we see the wording of the very motion which we are discussing today, we find the words:

"The border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China".

I would humbly submit that it is not border situation but it is actually war situation that we have to discuss. I am happy that just as the Chinese shook the entire world by their aggression of October 20th, they shook us out of our complacency also, and in fact, the Prime Minister himself, while moving the resolution the other day, thanked the Chinese for bringing about this unity in our land; so also, I think that by the Peking radio broadcast late yesterday night the Chinese have removed from our mind that suspicion, that doubt and that hesitation that at any time we can hope for any peaceful negotiations with the Chinese.

**Shri Tyagi:** What did they say on the radio?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** In their broadcast they have issued an ultimatum, saying either you accept this, either you come and talk on their terms or do not; they are not prepared to accept any of our terms, which the Prime Minister has explained this morning, and rightly, after analysing every point that was mentioned in the radio broadcast, he has said categorically, and we are happy that he has uttered these words, that the Chinese can no longer be relied upon; there is no meeting-ground; it is an imperialist aggression, and the Chinese have started all this in a planned manner; it is not a sudden thing, it is a well-organised, well-planned, and co-ordinated attack. Therefore, we are happy today that any element of hesitation that was there in anybody's mind has been removed, and we are all one today; the nation is one today; the Parliament is one today, and the country is one today, united under the Government to see that our land is freed from the Chinese aggressors. I have again to say that so far as China is concerned, I hope, and trust, that our attitude would henceforward not be changed in any manner or to any extent either in its implementation or in our perorations to the country or in

our appeal to the country, and that it would be unequivocal. There can be only one attitude to the Chinese. That is, we have to fight. I may quote here the words which Churchill used. 'What is our policy? It is to wage war by sea, land and air with all our might, with all the strength that God can give us, to wage war against a monstrous tyranny never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime. Without victory, there is no survival; no survival for the urge and impulse of the ages that mankind will move towards the goal'.

I echo these sentiments and I feel that the time has come when we should devote our entire attention to the supreme task bestowed upon us.

For years we have run after the mirage of peaceful negotiations. Even the very proposal of October 24 and the second peace offensive of November 21 made after the mass attack between November 15 and 19, was nothing different actually from what the Chinese Prime Minister proposed on November 7, 1959, which they want us to accept. This is the background given by Government in the document which has been circulated to us where it has been stated that on the 7th November 1959, Mr. Chou En-lai proposed a meeting of the Prime Ministers and withdrawal of the armed forces of each country 20 kilometres from the McMahon Line in the north-east and from the line of actual control in Ladakh. You know the history. I do not want to repeat all that. Even after the meeting of the two Prime Ministers, when they discussed this matter thoroughly for six days, it was not possible to come to any peaceful solution of the problem. Therefore, there was nothing to seek clarification. The Chinese have correctly analysed and probably known our intentions. With contempt they have said: 'You want clarification. It is all clear. There was no ambiguity in it. Under the guise of clarification, you only want to bide time to prepare yourself for a greater offensive'.



[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

I do not think there was any reason for us to wait. Even a moment's thought should not have been given to this. Forthright, we should have rejected the proposal. Our humiliation has been complete. Our brave army has been defeated and butchered. Thousands of miles of territory are lost and crores worth of civil and military property have been lost. They say it is to the tune of Rs. 150 crores.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** It is impossible.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It may be impossible.

**Shri Tyagi:** I am afraid such figures only go to create misunderstanding.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It may be less. It may not be so much. I will be happy if that is the position.

**Shri Tyagi:** How can it be Rs. 150 crores?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** If he wants figures in detail, I may be able to give to him privately whatever information I have. But as he himself has said that it is likely to lead to misunderstanding, I do not want to dilate on that point any more.

**An Hon. Member:** It may be Rs. 150 crores.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** We have to realise that militarily we are not in a stronger position perhaps today than we were when we met the Chinese onslaught in October. It has been stated by no less a person than Averell Harriman that whatever help they have given to us till today is not that much which we have lost to the Chinese.

**Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana):** Is the hon. Member speaking on China's behalf or on India's behalf?

**An Hon. Member:** On your behalf.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It is our duty to build up our strength as

much as possible through help and assistance from all friendly countries even on lend and lease basis which have so graciously, so speedily and so spontaneously come to our aid. The entire attention of the country today should be devoted only to this task of building our unity and military strength.

Therefore, I again emphasise the point that today there is no question of the problem being solved through diplomatic channels. That stage has passed. If anything remains, if any policy is to be carried out, it is that we must reoccupy our lost territory. When I say 'reoccupy', I do not mean that you go tomorrow and occupy those areas. Nobody would suggest that. That depends upon our military strength and on what our strategists tell us as to when we will be able to reoccupy those areas. But it must not be forgotten that when such a situation arose in Britain and other countries, it was not that immediately they reoccupied those territories, but they resolutely stood firm in their determination that there can be no talk, no negotiations, no compromise, so long as we have not been able to win back our territory. Even Hitler, after the conquest of Austria and Czechoslovakia, made a peace offer which Britain rejected with contempt. That should be our attitude. We must learn this lesson. We should have no other concern now except only to see how, when and by what strength we will be able to drive out the aggressor from our land.

When I say this, I have in mind the picture of our country which has so splendidly responded to the call at this juncture. There has been no voice of discord. Everybody is united. It is for us to utilise this vigour, this enthusiasm and spontaneous response of our people.

Here I have to say one thing. I did not like the very idea when the Prime Minister again said that we still stand on our proposition that

if they vacated and withdrew to the 8th September 1962 line, we were prepared to talk. Sir, that position has changed. After the Chinese have refused to consider it and, and rejected it, I do not think we should go on repeating that stand. There is no sense in repeating that. I also did not like another suggestion of the Prime Minister. Of course, as a peace-loving person, he is suggesting one thing after the other with a view to see how this entire question can be solved peacefully. Today he came forward with a new proposal, that this matter may be referred to the International Court of Justice, if possible. I was not very clear in my mind as to what he said, but it is said that he suggested that he would refer this matter to the International Court of Justice, if possible, after the Chinese withdrew beyond the 8th September 1962 line. I beg to say that even after the Chinese withdraw beyond the 8th September line, large portions of our territory will be under Chinese occupation. Are you going to argue, to talk, in the International Court about the areas under Chinese occupation as to whether they belong to us or not? The Chinese are no lovers of international standards and behaviour. In this war, we are accusing them, that the Chinese really do not observe any international standards of behaviour and conduct. The Prime Minister has made this proposal with very good motives. But the cease-fire has a tendency to become permanent in our land. We have seen what is our fate in Kashmir. It was a cease-fire proposal we carried to the United Nations. There is a suggestion here also to take it to the United Nations. For years and years, Kashmir has become a problem with us. The entire world is now seized with the problem and today there is another move. I welcome the move.

I welcome the move for talks between India and Pakistan. Our differences should be settled, and we should have better and friendly rela-

tions, there can be no dispute about that. But my point was about the cease-fire. If the Chinese go beyond the 8th September line, what happens? They will be in occupation of our land, and there will be a cease-fire again in that portion of the land, because we are not going to reoccupy, neither are they going to fire on anybody because we will not be there. So, I think the Prime Minister should have thought seriously before making any proposal at this time to an enemy like the Chinese.

I have two more points. I am happy that the Prime Minister has stated that the Chinese today want us to give up our non-alignment policy. We now realise how really sincere our Panchsheel friend was towards our policy of non-alignment. And here is a voice raised in this House to join some defence bloc. That shows there are tendencies working even now, at this hour of crisis, against our policy of non-alignment which has proved that even at a time of crisis it has not become a hindrance in our struggle, in our war, as we are getting aid. We should get aid from any country which is prepared to help us, whether it is Russia or any other country, our policy does not debar us from it. We do not stand on prestige. The policy does not prevent us from getting help from Russia and America and other countries that want to help us. It does not stand in our way. So, why is it that today China wants us to give up this policy? Therefore, I would suggest that we should not even for a moment think that we will at any time change our policy of non-alignment which has stood the test of time.

The last thing I would say is that we are now making this war effort, a concerted effort. We are happy that some countries are meeting to find out, to see in what way they can contribute towards a settlement of this question between India and China. We sent our delegations who have very successfully carried our message at the diplomatic level. But is it proper or necessary that when the

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

Afro-Asian countries are meeting in Ceylon, a non-official delegation of some people in this country—they are known friends of China, they are fellow-travellers, and represent a particular section of opinion in this country which has always sided with China, and have acted as the China lobby in this country . . .

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** Absolute nonsense.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It was improper, it was not fitting the spirit of the nation, that such a delegation should have been sent, when our own officers and our own diplomatic persons are there to take up our case. Such persons should not have been permitted to visit Ceylon at this time.

**Shri Hem Barua:** On a point of order, Sir. While Shri Dwivedy was speaking about certain people being permitted to go to Ceylon who do not represent Indian sentiments, a remark was heard from an hon. Member that it was absolute nonsense. May I know whether it is permissible.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order. Nonsense is not unparliamentary.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** That should be expunged.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Nonsense has been held not to be unparliamentary.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** The Prime Minister used it last time.

**Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur):** The hon. leader of the Jana Sangh, Shri Trivedi, referred to the cease-fire and said that cease-fire meant surrender. This cease-fire has a little history. At zero hour on the night between 21st and 22nd November, China declared a unilateral cease-fire. In our turn, we also stopped firing. It does not mean that the cease-fire unilaterally proclaimed by China, would lead to any negotiations. I therefore, fail to understand what really Shri Trivedi meant

when he made those observations about cease-fire.

Sir, the Prime Minister this morning referred to the three questions which China has addressed to India, and to his replies to those questions. One of those questions was: does India agree or not to Indian troops retreating 20 kilometres behind what China calls the line of actual control? And the Prime Minister's answer was that while India is in favour of disengagement, it can be done only on the basis of the Prime Minister's offer of 27th October, that is, the parties re-establish the *status quo* as of 8th September. After this reply, there was hardly any question of starting negotiations because China has declared a unilateral cease-fire on a particular date.

Then, both the hon. Members who preceded me, referred to the Prime Minister's offer this morning that he was prepared to refer the question of the frontier dispute to the International Court of Justice at The Hague. His announcement was qualified by a condition, and the condition was that China should first restore the *status quo* as of 8th September, 1962. The proposals of the 8th September have been before the House for a long time. On the 14th of the last month, when we took a solemn pledge, all standing in the House, to vacate the Chinese aggression, we passed the resolution in the background of the offer which the Prime Minister made on 27th October with regard to the 8th September line.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It was not in the resolution.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I did not say it was in the resolution.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** He is not speaking the truth.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** It was not mentioned in the resolution, but it was in the background of the 8th September offer that the resolution was passed.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** There are many things in the background. Look to the foreground.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Therefore, what the Prime Minister has said is perfectly in consonance with the policy which has been followed by the Government, and of which this House has full knowledge. The criticism of the reference of The Hague Court from the two members who preceded me is somewhat strange.

**Shri Ranga:** Why?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** The rejection by the Chinese of the Indian proposal of the 27th October suggesting that the Chinese forces retire to the position held by them prior to 8th September, coming as it does on the eve of the six neutral nations conference at Colombo, is a proof clear, if any proof were needed, that the Chinese are not prepared to forgo the fruits of their successive aggressions to date in the western and in the middle sectors. They want a military decision, they do not want negotiations. Their attitude is dictatorial. The three questions which have been addressed to the Prime Minister of India by China are more in the nature of an ultimatum, and they are more of a challenge. I am glad that the Prime Minister has replied to those questions in a language of restraint. But behind that language of restraint there is a steel determination. I would refer you to page 43 of the Note on Chinese Aggression in war and peace. In his letter of November 28th, Premier Chou En-Lai had claimed that according to the Chinese Government's decision, "the Chinese frontier guards will withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control of November 7, 1959. That is to say, they will not only evacuate the areas they reached in their recent

2405 (A1) LSD—3.

fight in self-defence, but withdraw to positions far behind those they held on September 8." If that is correct, why do they object to evacuate a smaller area under our proposals? We shall take up positions which we had on the 7th of September, 1962 and we can also talk about matters which would lead to a lessening of the tension.

The Chinese would, however, not have anything except their three point proposals of October 24th which we have already rejected for good reasons. It is clear that the Chinese have no desire for peace. They are not prepared to leave any area which they have occupied in Ladakh. No self-respecting nation can accept that position.

I would also like to make a few remarks about the Chinese statement of November 21 which is only another attempt to enforce the three-point Chinese proposals of October 24. It says that the "Chinese Government's three proposals are most fair and reasonable; they are the only proposals capable of averting border clashes, etc." It also says that the "Chinese Government perseveres in those proposals... The Chinese Government have decided to take initiative measures in order to promote the realization of those proposals." Then follow the two unilateral decisions: cease-fire and 20 km withdrawal. After China has withdrawn 20 km, if India does not reciprocate it by withdrawing its forces 20 km to the south of the line of actual control in the western or middle sector or the Indian forces come back to the McMahon line in the eastern sector, Chinese hold out the threat of starting fight again. The statement also says that Chinese would start fighting if we are to reoccupy Dhola which had been in our possession upto September 8 or we reoccupy Longju or Barahoti, which they call Wu Je and which were militarily unoccupied till September 8 or

[Shri A. P. Jain.]

we build our 43 posts in the Chip Chap river valley or Galwan river valley or in the Pangong lake area or the Damchoke area. This threat is nothing but a dictatorial order to India.

Going back a little into history, in 1958 the Chinese Government had assured us that they had no territorial claim against India; those maps which had shown parts of Indian territory as Chinese were old maps and would be revised in time. Any minor border adjustment which existed would be solved by peaceful negotiations. But while the Chinese were professing friendship with us, they were continuously eating into our territory until November 1959 when they had occupied about 5000 or 6000 square miles of our territory. Answering India's charge that Chinese had occupied Aksai Chin area only from 1957, Chou En-lai could cite only two examples of prior occupation, one of which was just an incursion. In his letter dated November 4, he says: "It was through this area that back in 1950, the Chinese liberation army entered the Ari district of Tibet from Sinkiang. Again it was through this area that from 1956-57, the Chinese Government constructed the Sinkiang Tibet highway involving gigantic engineering works." Knowin as....

**Shri Banga:** What were we doing then?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Knowing as the world does that the Aksai Chin area is barren and uninhabited; does the passage of troops in a barren and uninhabited area amount to occupation? Again it is the construction of Aksai Chin road which has started the trouble. How could it be a proof of occupation?

The Chinese made clear their intention of claiming about 50,000 square miles of Indian territory for the first time in January 1959 but

they did not define its geographical location. Later when the officials of India and China met at Delhi, Peking and Rangoon, to discuss the location of Indo-Chinese boundaries, the Chinese officials claimed the four divisions of NEFA and the whole area of Ladakh to the east of what they called the traditional customary line which is the line upto which the Chinese have advanced now. The present line of Chinese occupation has been built by: (a) nibbling of Indian territory from 1957-59 November, (b) continuation of the process of nibbling between November 1959 and 7th September 1962 (c) seven attacks from September 8 to October 20, 1962 and (d) massive attacks from October 20 to October 24, 1962. There can be no greater falsehood than to say that the territory which the Chinese are occupying now, was also controlled by them in November, 1957.

In 1959, the Chinese had built some military posts such as those at Spanggur, Khurnak Fort, Kongle and along the Aksai Chin Road. The area occupied by the Chinese in 1959 was only 5000 or 6000 square miles as against 13000 or 14000 square miles occupied now. In 1959, the Chinese had no posts of any kind either at Qizil Jilga, Dehra, Sanzungling or any area to the west of these locations, nor had the Chinese any posts to the south or west of Spanggur. Something between 8000 to 9000 square miles of Ladakh area within Indian territory has been occupied by the Chinese since 1959. In the middle sector the Chinese have occupied Barahoti and in the eastern sector after September 8, they have gone to the south of the highest watershed and occupied large areas of NEFA right down to the south of Bomdi La and Walong.

The result of the three-point proposals of the Chinese is that in the western sector Chinese would continue to be in full possession of 11000 to 12000 square miles of our land and

create a non-military but civil police controlled zone of about 2000 square miles east of their line of control which is really our land but which they claim as theirs—while our troops will have to vacate 2000 square miles of territory which is undisputably our own, 20 km to the east and south of the territory occupied by China after prolonged aggression. Places like Daulet Beg Oldi, Murgo or Chushul which are undoubtedly ours will have to be vacated by the Army. In the middle sector we are called upon not to reoccupy Barahotj (Wu Je) and in the eastern sector Dhola and Longju. These terms are humiliating. We cannot accept them and therefore, the Prime Minister has rightly rejected them. Today, the position, roughly speaking is that we affirm the rejection of the Chinese three-point proposal of October 24. We keep to our offer of 27th October for the restoration of the 8th September position. We reaffirm our determination to get our land vacated from the Chinese. Matters relating to the army action and disposition, what preparations are to be made when and where to fight, what type of administrative control to exercise in the areas vacated by the Chinese, etc., are the responsibility of Government and the military. Justice is on our side.

**Shri Tyagi:** Have they actually vacated any area?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** The Asia-African nations have declared their sympathy with us. The democracies have given us help. The communist countries, except Albania, have not taken sides with China. We shall succeed in our effort to throw out the Chinese; we are determined to do it and we shall do it.

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf** (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, much has been said already about our past relations with China and therefore, the time has come now when we should close the chapter on past relations with China altogether. I think that if we de-

pend upon nations like China we may be lulled into complacency and with the result that perhaps in certain respects we might follow the ostrich-like policy which is no good. As far as China is concerned, it is absolutely clear that it has ideological designs as well as expansionist designs upon India. Therefore, we as a nation have made up our mind to stand together as one man and fight China to the last. So, in making up our attitude, and to be firmer as well, we must be cautious about a few things in relation to the USSR, the USA and the United Kingdom. As far as the USSR is concerned, we must not forget their friendship. They have come to our help on a number of occasions, when there was none to give help to us in international councils and elsewhere. At the same time, we are also thankful and very grateful to the attitude that has been adopted by the United States and the United Kingdom at a time when we need their help. But we have to be cautious about galvanising world opinion in our favour, more particularly towards the Afro-Asian countries whose cause India has advocated from time to time, especially the cause of freedom. Today, when we are at this stage, we have to be very cautious in protecting freedom of the country and we must also see that our enemy cannot be depended upon. We are fully convinced, as has been very rightly said by the Prime Minister this morning, that China's word cannot be depended upon. They have been shifting ground from time to time and from circumstances to circumstances.

As far as the position on the three sectors is concerned—the western sector, the central sector and the eastern sector—it is very clearly laid down in the correspondence and more particularly in the papers that were circulated by the Government yesterday. Our Prime Minister has rightly taken this position: that is, we would warn the Chinese to take the position

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

as it was prior to 8th September, 1962. When we stick to that, it means that there is no difference left with regard to the eastern sector and the central sector. But as far as the western sector is concerned, there is some difference.

May I, with your permission, Sir, say a little more and throw a little more light, as I understand it, on the western sector of the country? As far as the central and the eastern sectors are concerned, we have got what is popularly known as the MacMahon line; we have got our historical and traditional border very well defined, ever since 1914. But with regard to the western sector known as Ladakh, our borders have not been so well defined. I make bold to say that. Of course, there has been something like a traditional border, but the importance of that area was only for one or two reasons in the past. Firstly, as I have said, once,—I spoke perhaps in the month of August last about it—the importance is due to the fact that there was a Central Asian trade route with India along that area in those days; there was a caravan route passing through Aksai Chin and going to Turkestan. So, that area had some importance. Secondly, people from Ladakh used to go across the border for exchanging or bartering necessities of life with neighbouring Tibet. They got Pashmina wool etc. and in exchange gave some other goods. That was how they were carrying on barter trade.

Two things have since happened. Firstly, since the Russians have occupied Turkestan, Uzbekistan and Tadzhikistan, they have altogether stopped that central Asian trade with India along that route which used to be there till about 1930. After the occupation of Tibet by the Chinese, they have altogether stopped trade between that part of the country and Tibet. Therefore, that being the position, I would like to place before you the topography and the geography of that area. Right from the traditional

borders, for hundreds of miles, there is no habitation; there is no vegetation. So, the people very seldom get a chance of getting on to that side. Then, naturally, the question will arise: what are the boundaries on that side? I may venture to say that as far as history is concerned, our borders have not been fully decided or defined in that area. They have not been fully described; they have not been fully known. As I have said, in the past, during the Britishers' time, during the reign of the Maharajas of Kashmir, there were certain treaties, which had been signed with the rulers of Tibet. In one of the treaties the then ruler of China had put in his signature and they had accepted an area to be the border and that is supposed to be a traditional one between Tibet and India. Therefore, as one hon. Member has said, just now, we must speak with our eyes open. I must say that we have to speak, must speak, with eyes open on our traditional borders, about our well-defined borders on the eastern and the central sector. But, as far as Ladakh is concerned, I should say, and I venture to say, that there are certain, or there may be certain, negotiations which may follow. As has been very well said, I must also repeat that the entire House is behind this—it has been declared many times—namely, once China goes back to the position prior to 8th September 1962 we may be able to start some negotiations as to what would be our exact boundaries in all the sectors, and perhaps only minor things may be left in regard to which there may be some difference here and there. Keeping this in view, I wish to enlighten the House, to the extent that I can, what our position should be in regard to the western sector and the western border. I may say that there may be slight differences, and there may be certain things where certain negotiations might help us in order to arrive at a decision as to what should be the acceptable border which is honourable to us.

The position has been made clear, namely, we as a nation will be the last to accept the Chinese stand. In no case shall we be prepared to leave our frontiers once again vulnerable. We have tasted once how China has behaved towards us. Therefore, in times to come, we shall have to be very cautious and careful, whether it is the eastern sector or the central sector or the western sector, and we cannot leave our borders vulnerable. We will have to be very careful and cautious about it.

My hon. friend Shri Trivedi has just mentioned Kashmir also. There too, our borders have been disturbed, on one side, there is Pakistan and on the other, there is China. I would not speak much on Pakistan, but I feel I must say a few words about that also. As far as Pakistan is concerned, we wish them well; I wish them well; we wish that we live as good neighbours. But, unfortunately, from time to time, their behaviour has not been good. I know the position is very delicate. At the moment, I would not dilate upon this subject in detail, but I will mention one or two things. Voices have been raised: why not have a plebiscite in regard to Kashmir. But apart from other things, about which much has been said, I would like to enlighten the House on one point, Kashmir has acceded to India and the accession has been accepted by all and sundry. That is perfectly legal and constitutional, according to the instrument of accession that was executed by the ruler when the Britishers left. Later, Pakistan organised an invasion upon Kashmir and through the United Nations Organisation, a cease-fire was accepted. In the meantime, when the cease-fire line was drawn, there is a very important incident, which I want to place before this House, so that hon. Members may know what the position is and what the position has been.

At that time, the officers and Generals from our country and from Pakistan together drew that cease-fire line.

In between the two valleys—Valleys of Gurez and Tilel, two biggest villages of that area—Kilchie and Tavbhat—actually fell upon that cease-fire line and when the line was drawn, half went to that side and half to this side. Therefore, a decision had to be taken on the spot by the officers. The inhabitants of those two villages numbering over 2000 or more were asked to vote whether they will go to India or Pakistan. I may tell you that the entire population, which was cent per cent Muslim, every man, woman and grown up child voted for India. They came to this side and they are settled today far away from that area in very beautiful surroundings. What I mean to say is, if a plebiscite had been held at that time, the result is obvious. Today much water has flowed down the bridges. You must not forget the mentality that has been stirred up in Pakistan and the approach that has been there. In the minds of ignorant and unsophisticated masses, the feeling has been inculcated that the *farman* according to the Muslim *Sheriat* will come from that place only and not India. Therefore, one has to imagine seriously what it means to the ordinary Muslim and how he will react to it. We have seen that at every stage the cry of *jehad* has been raised.

Therefore, apart from other things, as far as India is concerned, the cornerstone of our Constitution is secular democracy. We have fought the two-nation theory. I may submit in all humility that if India was put to test as far as successfully fighting the two-nation theory was concerned, it was in Kashmir. I am happy that we have succeeded in fighting it. We must not forget, if we disturb the present condition, what will follow from that. We must not forget that if we today somehow withdraw from the position we have taken all these years, it will mean going against the very basis of our Constitution and against the stand that we have taken so far. It will also go against the promise we have given to the people



[Shri Sham Lal Saraf.]

of a State who, long before the Britishers left the shores of this country, have followed the Congress, have followed Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru and not Jinnah and Muslim League. We must not forget those millions of people who have followed them, in spite of the fact that a predominant majority of them were then and are today Muslims. We should keep that in view. I am not in a position to go into details, because I know the position is very delicate.

I can speak on behalf of the millions of my State: We have unflinching faith in the hon. Prime Minister and in his leadership. We know he has stood by us, by the country and by all that we hold dear.

With these words, I again submit that we have to be very firm against the aggressor. We have to turn him out of the country and have to have world opinion with us in whatever manner possible. We should also see that we succeed in maintaining the one-nation theory in the country and let the two-nation theory be buried once and for all.

**Shri Yajnik** (Ahmedabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I support wholeheartedly the statesmanlike statement of the Prime Minister this morning. Since the Chinese aggression took place and especially since the cease-fire unilaterally was proclaimed by China, there have been all kinds of doubts and difficulties being expressed on all sides, both in Parliament and in the country. There were people who thought that the cease-fire would be accepted. Nervousness was expressed on all sides. We are very happy to see that the Prime Minister has cleared the air. He has not accepted, the Government has not accepted, the cease-fire. It has also expressed its firm determination to carry on preparations for war till the last inch of Indian territory is wrested from the Chinese forces. This is all very heartening.

The events that took place within one month of Chinese aggression have certainly created a great sense of frustration in the country and among the thinking people. I do not want to apportion blame to anybody. But the Prime Minister himself has expressed his desire to see that an enquiry being made into all the relevant circumstances leading to the great pullback, withdrawal of our army. Our military intelligence probably failed. We knew less perhaps of our topography in NEFA than the Chinese knew. We were outflanked, outmanned and outweaponed. How this could happen and how the Chinese could know the NEFA people and the topography better than we could do are questions that face us. Therefore, naturally, criticism is heard all round about the policy of the Government. There have been some political pandits who have stated that our Government might be good for peace time, but would have to be supplanted by more warlike people to serve in wartime. Anyhow, we cannot get away with the feeling of frustration and I would request the Prime Minister to see that an inquiry is made into all the relevant circumstances as soon as possible.

So far as the cease-fire is concerned, the way that they proclaimed it puts us on trial. It is not only the Government that is on trial; it is the people, the State Governments and all the political parties that are on trial today. The cease-fire is very craftily contrived. They have ceased firing on the 21st night. What are we to do? Are we to continue firing on

15 hrs.  
our side? The Government have definitely taken the stand that they could not continue firing on our side when the firing has ceased on that side. But that does not mean that we have accepted the cease-fire. The cease-fire is limited by all kinds of conditions which are not acceptable to us, and the Prime Minister has definitely

proclaimed often, and again in this House today, and the whole country is very glad certainly to hear it, that nothing short of Chinese withdrawal to the 8th September line will enable us to sit around a conference table with the Chinese representatives. Therefore, so far as a step towards negotiations and discussions is concerned, we do not accept the cease-fire proposals.

On the other hand, while we have ceased firing at the moment we have expressed our dire determination to strengthen our war machinery, our fire power, our arms and ammunitions, organise the second, third and fourth line of defence, and to strengthen our entire national force so as to compel the Chinese ultimately to withdraw from the last inch of Indian soil. This determination has been expressed again here, and I am sure it will warm the hearts of all the people in this country who have responded to the Prime Minister's or the Government's call in a most befitting manner.

But now the question is this. We do not fire now. What are we to do? They are giving the ultimatum: "You withdraw 20 kilometres or we will start trouble again". There was a question put some days ago in this House on the McMahon line front. They say that they will withdraw 20 kilometres on that side and we have to withdraw 20 kilometres on this side. Whether we will withdraw or not is also a question because if there is no agreement on the Ladakh front how shall we make an agreement on the McMahon Line? The two lines are different. There is also Bara Hoti. Are we to vacate Bara Hoti? Are we to vacate or not to occupy again Longju? What are we to do? Again, on that side, are we going to vacate the Chusul air strip? These questions face us. The Chinese are putting up threats saying that if we do not come to a quick decision they will start firing.

Sir, the noble words of the Prime Minister have to be carried into action.

How they will be carried into action, how they will be given a practical shape is a thing that should be explained by the Prime Minister. The question was posed, supposing we withdraw 20 kilometres from the McMahon Line are we to occupy it, are we to go with flags flying and drums beating with all the military equipment and military force into that area and re-occupy it as if the cease-fire does not exist? We may not cross the McMahon Line on that side, but are we entitled or are we not entitled to do that? Are we going to occupy this area that they may even vacate temporarily? And, how are we going to occupy it? Are we going to merely locate some civil administration there, are we going to have a police force or are we going to have military occupation of that area? Are we going to do the same at Bara Hoti and at Chusul or are we to leave the airstrip? What shall we do? Well, that is a question that was not properly answered some days ago, and that requires a clear answer.

But I say, Sir, that if the main points are settled, if the 8th September point is clearly followed by the country—and I am sure it has been supported by thousands and thousands of meetings throughout the country—there should be no compromise till the 8th September line is reached. That is a point that has been over and over again emphasised both in this House as well as elsewhere. Well, if that point is settled that we are not going to the conference table till the 8th September line is reached and, secondly, we are developing our strength physically, militarily, organisationally, educationally and in the matter of propaganda and in other directions to compel the Chinese to vacate the last inch of our territory, if both these points are clearly enunciated and generally supported throughout the country, the point that remains is how far we are going to vacate the territory which we are occupying today and, secondly, if we vacate it, how we are going to occupy it, whether it will be

[Shri Yajnik]

by putting some administrative posts to run the administration there or by putting in some police force or we will occupy it with full military force. That is the question that remains.

Here comes the question of confidence. I say, with all humility, that in spite of all kinds of criticism that has emanated from high and low about this Government and its policies, I believe that this Government and the Prime Minister himself are the greatest bastions of strength for this country in this hour of trial. There are croakings, whimperings and whinings which I hear in several quarters. Some people suggest that this Government should be reorganised, that the cabinet should be removed, that some talented people should be brought into this Government and so on. All these suggestions are welcome and I am sure the Prime Minister will welcome suggestions to improve the capacity of the Government from whatever quarter they come. But let nobody imagine that we can change horses in mid-stream. This Government has operated to the best of its ability, and this Government is tackling this question. The whole House and the entire country is generally in agreement with the policy that has been enunciated by the Government, and there is no sense now in calling in very urgent terms, in very hectoring tones about the reshaping or re-manning of this Government. I would request all friends on my side, who might have some doubts on this matter, to refrain from any criticism so far as the whole structure of the Government is concerned. Any criticism of this kind does not help. It is destructive criticism which depresses the morale of the country.

There is another point, and that is the policy of non-alignment. Again and again this question has been raised. I do not want to say much because the policy of non-alignment has been practically appreciated by the whole world except China—and per-

haps that does not matter. The whole world has appreciated us. If the United States, if the United Kingdom, if the Federal Republic of Germany, if all these western countries appreciate our policy and if they give fully the aid that they can possibly give, I do not think it behoves anybody in this country at this juncture, at this hour of peril and trial, to call for any fundamental change in this policy of non-alignment which has paid excellent dividends to this country. But when we place great faith, when we repose great trust in this Government, we must also tell them that they carry a very heavy load of responsibility. They stand responsible for carrying out their words.

This country has to be strengthened, not only from the military point of view but from all points of view. The military personnel has to be increased. Today a question was raised about the INA personnel. May I state that many sections of opinion in the country are very profoundly sympathetic towards the INA cause? I think Government would lose nothing, and Government would gain a lot, if they sought and secured the support and solidarity of the INA personnel that exists in this country. That is my suggestion. But it is not sufficient to have the men. It is necessary to have arms and ammunitions, especially arms that can match the arms of our enemies. We might import them, or we might produce them, but these arms have to be produced in sufficient quantities so as to keep our army moving and going and winning its way to victory. But merely army cannot do much I submit that a new spirit of dynamic energy has to be infused into the governmental ranks from top to bottom. It is no disparagement of the Government to say that its ways, its methods, its systems leave much to be desired. I would request the Prime Minister and all the Ministers, not only of the Centre but also of the States, to see that the entire administrative apparatus is infused with a new energy.

Lastly, I must speak about the people. The people's response has been magnificent. I have not seen such response in this country after the attainment of independence. It reminds us of the great days of Gandhiji and our fight for freedom. People have given more than perhaps we have expected; the common people have given more than the plutocrats and the capitalists. Now, in these circumstances, it behoves the Government to see that it stands by them and it protects the labour as against the capitalist who should not be allowed to get away with the fruits of the present truce. The truce should not be abused in the interests of the capitalists. The production has to be on a level so as to support and strengthen the people who have sacrificed so much for the Government.

I submit that if the Government, the military ranks and the people, if they are all fused together into an indissoluble unit and if they work together in a spirit of new war time socialism, or equality and fraternity, I am sure we shall be prepared, earlier than we imagine, for the final war with China and for winning the ultimate victory.

**Shri Khadilkar (Khed):** Mr Deputy-Speaker, the unprovoked Chinese invasion of our territory has brought a new awakening in this country and brought to the forefront certain basic and fundamental issues which are involved in this conflict. Some people imagine that because on the border in one small battle the Indian army was defeated, therefore, in a way, we have been defeated in this war. I do not share this sense of defeatism in the minds of people who are clamouring for certain fundamental changes in our policy, taking advantage of the situation.

Let us take stock of the situation as to what we have won or the Chinese have lost. The broadcast that was referred to by the Prime Minister clearly indicates that China has more or less been cornered and in case we remain

firm in the position that we have adopted, China would find it difficult to implement the unilateral withdrawal after the Chinese warlords have started the invasion. They want India to submit to their will and go to the negotiating table at the point of the bayonet. China believes in this type of blackmail, encourages our neighbour and feels that we are in difficulties and, therefore, it can be taken advantage of. Our military strength, according to the Chinese understanding, was not equal or matching on the front in a particular battle. Therefore, they feel that India could be blackmailed into submission. Let China understand that the Indian democracy now, after fifteen years, has attained majority and has a certain sense of maturity and mature judgment.

What are the issues involved? I sometimes feel puzzled that Shri Ranga and his party people clamour for a change of leadership. They do not seem to understand the implications of change in leadership in the present context of a conflict on the front with China. What are the issues involved? Here I will just give a summary of an authoritative statement by a Chinese theoretical spokesman about the present world situation. Let us not imagine that India is just fighting for a few hundred square miles of territory; certainly, we are fighting for it also because we have to protect our honour and sovereignty; that is true; but I feel, we are fighting for a bigger cause, a much bigger cause, in which not only armed conflict and other means of war but ideological conflict is also going on. I am proud that we have taken a firm stand in this matter. I will quote a few lines to show what China now says in the name of revisionism. The Chinese spokesman said:

"The modern revisionists are panic-stricken by the imperialist policy of nuclear war blackmail. They develop from fear of war to fear of revolution and proceed

[Shri Khadilhar.]

from not wanting revolution themselves to opposing other people's carrying out revolution... If you believe in revolution, you must believe in war that is the basic approach of China today."

So, in the international arena China is passing as a revolutionary focal point, as a spearhead of the Communist revolution that has to be carried on at the point of the bayonet. So, there is military might on one side and there is the Soviet Union and their leadership on the other side, which the Chinese call as revisionists, because they have come to another conclusion.

15.19 hrs.

✓ [MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

What is that conclusion? The Soviet leadership has stated that in the modern world with technological advance the old military method of advancing an ideology or philosophy is out-dated. We have eschewed and are prepared to eschew war and take the contest on a political plane. Through economic competition between the two social systems we would like to have co-existence and a certain durable and lasting understanding with the leadership of the capitalist world. In this conflict, therefore, as the hon. Prime Minister, initiating this debate, stated, fundamental issues of war and peace in this country and in the world are involved. It is not just territory or just India and China that are involved in this conflict. I am glad to say that the Indian leadership is not at all isolated; on the contrary, it is being backed in this conflict by several other countries. Are co-existence and non-alignment to continue? Is a new world order on the basis of higher development of science and possibly of friendly neighbourly relationship between the nations of the world to subsist? Or, is China in the name of revolution with military might to be allowed to disturb the peace of the world?

If this aspect of the conflict is taken into consideration, we have taken the lead in the enunciation of this policy. Students of 15 years of Indian Politics will take pride, and very rightly, that we enunciated this and we brought China to Bandung where China joined in this policy of broad enunciation of Afro-Asian solidarity. Today China stands isolated and is prepared to turn back. China has opened a propaganda barrage. If China has come out victorious, as the Swatantra Party and some people would like to say, where is the necessity for China to send a message to the Colombo Conference and to send emissaries all over the world and try to win over the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa?

Unfortunately, in this House some people just think in terms of power blocs. They ignore the newly emerged nations who have just been freed from the old colonial order and have yet to find their own moorings. Nonetheless they are a force. It is a brotherhood. That brotherhood might not have that military strength; in terms of number of divisions, they might not be quite powerful matching to China. But there are other forces in the world today that China has to reckon with. They have realised it now. Therefore this is a peace ultimatum and we are not going to submit.

Some people in this country unfortunately feel that after 15 years of freedom India should go in search and find out if any big power is going to underwrite our security, sovereignty and freedom. What an honourable course! I would like to appeal to men like Shri Ranga and to his Party people not to advocate in their patriotic ardour such a course which may put us under an umbrella. They ought to have been ashamed to say this in this country after 15 years of freedom, namely, that we would like to have some big power to underwrite and ensure our sovereignty and our security; then we shall be free. What a funny

thing to say taking advantage of this conflict?

As I said earlier, there is a new awakening. Our basic policy is being tested. In this contest, I am confident, India is going to come out victorious because never in the last 15 years such basic unity and a patriotic upsurge was demonstrated. But we must understand the implications of unity. I was talking to an ordinary peasant in my constituency about this war. I told him, "For the last so many years nobody cared for your education; nobody looked to it whether you had means of communication; nobody saw whether you had some medical aid or not. Now war has come and perhaps certain things will be curtailed." What did he say? He showed a bigger and a deeper understanding of this conflict. He told me, "We can wait for 10 or 15 years till they are defeated, but we must feel assured that all these programmes that were followed in the last 15 years will not be given up, that they will stand firmly and will be implemented in the years to come." That shows the understanding of a common voter, an ordinary peasant in this country. Therefore I would like to appeal to those who, while supporting, want to undermine the leadership because in war leadership is very important. In this case it is not simply a war leadership, it is an ideological leadership; it is a leadership for peace. It is not a question of a few divisions that are fighting there. What we are fighting for is equally important.

Therefore I say: Let this House after this debate give a certain impression to the powers which are meeting at Colombo in which Egypt has taken a lead and a very right lead—I am proud of it—enunciating the five principles, as the hon. Prime Minister has said in his correspondence, to settle the dispute on principle. You cannot settle it just on might and keep the gains. That position was taken with a slight variation. I hope this House gives an

unanimous call that we stand firm and are not going to be cowed down by blackmail nor are we going to shift our policy this way or that, because the soldiers will fight but the masses will fight more and with greater enthusiasm as was seen during the last world war in Britain. All the people in Britain realised after five years that during the course of the war all class distinctions were removed more or less and the common man's lot was much better after the war. In this emergency in which we are mobilising all the resources for the war let the people realise, workers or peasants or ordinary people in this country, that they are fighting to improve their lot and that we are not going to give up our socialist objective and our democracy because if we give them up, what are we fighting for? A few miles of territory is not the objective. Therefore I say that the voice of this House must reach Colombo in this spirit.

With these words, I conclude.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :  
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कालिदास के एक श्लोक से शुरु करूंगा ।

Shrimati Vimla Devi (Eluru): Sir,  
 please ask him to speak in English.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अस्त्युन्नरस्या दिशि  
 देवतात्मा हिमालयोनामनगाधिराज :

पूर्वाप्ररो तोय निधि वेगाहयः

स्थितः पृथिव्यां इव मानदण्डः ॥

हमारी पूर्वोत्तर सीमा पर हिमालय राज पूर्व के समुद्र का अवगाहन करता हुआ पृथ्वी के मानदंड की भांति स्थित है । आज वही हिमालय चीनी आक्रमण के अपमान से पीड़ित और घायल पुकार रहा है और कह रहा है कि हमें वचाओ, हमें बचाओ ।

हर्ष की बात है कि देश ने उसकी पुकार सुन ली । पर साथ ही दुःख भी है कि अभी

[श्री राम सेवक याव]

सरकार के कान पर जू नहीं रेंगी। हिमालय की रक्षा बगैर देश की रक्षा सम्भव नहीं है।

(Interruption)

हैं हैं उधर कीजिए।

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member must realise that he is addressing Parliament; he is not addressing the public galleries. These interruptions are a part of the debate. He should continue to address me.

श्री राम सेवक याव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने उनको चेतावनी दी थी कि वे सोचें। जब मैं हिमालय की बात करता हूँ, हिमालय की रक्षा की बात करता हूँ तो इसलिए करता हूँ कि हिमालय की रक्षा के साथ साथ इस देश की रक्षा जुड़ी हुई है। अगर हिमालय सुरक्षित नहीं है तो शायद हम अपने देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकेंगे। देश की रक्षा तिब्बत, भूतान, मिक्किम आदि के साथ जुड़ी हुई है। मैंने जो कहा कि मुझे दुःख है वह इसलिए कहा कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी, जिनकी मैं बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ और जो इस समय बैठे हुए हैं, जब भी तिब्बत का प्रश्न आता है तो कह देते हैं कि तिब्बत की बात करना "मैनीफैस्ट नानसेंस" है। वह कहते हैं कि हजारों वर्षों से तिब्बत चीन का हिस्सा रहा है। जब ऐसी बात होती है, तो बहुत दुःख होता है और पता चलता है कि सरकार शायद हिमालय की रक्षा नहीं करने जा रही है—अगर वह करे, तो अच्छा है—, इसीलिए मैं इसको दोहरा रहा हूँ। इस बात में कितना दम है, यह इस से प्रकट है कि इस देश के भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति, डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद, ने तो कहा है कि हमने तिब्बत की आजादी को खोया, हमें उस का प्रायश्चित्त करना है और वह प्रायश्चित्त भी हो सकता है कि हम अपनी रक्षा करें, हिमालय की रक्षा करें और तिब्बत को आजाद करायें। मैं प्रधान मंत्री से विनम्र निवेदन करूँगा कि अगर वह ऐसा नहीं कह सकते कि हम तिब्बत को आजाद करायेंगे, तो अगर

वह कम से कम अब खानोरा रहें, तो ज्यादा अच्छा है।

भारत सरकार आज कल तिथियों में उलझा हुआ है। चीनी आक्रमण आरम्भ हुआ और हमारे काफी भूमि चीन के कब्जे में चली गई लेकिन हम ७ नवम्बर, १९५९ और ८ सितम्बर, १९६२, इन तिथियों को लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं कि अगर चीन ८ सितम्बर १९६२ को स्थिति पर चला जाये, तो चीन से बात चोत करेंगे। चीन कहता है कि नहीं, ७ नवम्बर, १९५९ की स्थिति के आधार पर बात चोत की जाये। वह इस हद तक कहता है कि ७ नवम्बर, १९५९ को लाइन हिन्दुस्तान के लिये ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की लाइन से बेहतर है, क्यों कि वह इस से पीछे की रेखा है। समझ में नहीं आता कि जब चीन ७ नवम्बर, १९५९ को लाइन को अश्वेतया पीछे की लाइन समझता है, तो फिर मंत्री द्वारा प्रस्तुत ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की लाइन को स्वीकार करने में उसे कौन सी अड़बट पड़ रही है। इस से साफ जाहिर है कि उस का युद्ध-विराम प्रस्ताव केवल धोखा-मात्र है और वह अपने उस पुराने नीति पर चल रहा है कि अपने-आप को मजबूत करने के लिये कुछ समय हासिल किया जाये। इस के साथ ही वह दुनिया को यह बताना चाहता है कि चीन तो शांतिपूर्ण रास्ते पर चलना चाहता है, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान आक्रमणकारी है और वह चीन पर चढ़ आया है। हिन्दुस्तान को बड़े देशों से मौके पर जो सहायता मिली है और इस देश में जो जागरण उत्पन्न हुआ है, चीन अपने युद्ध-विराम के प्रस्ताव से उनको भी धक्का लगाना चाहता है।

मैं प्रधान मंत्री से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस युद्ध-विराम प्रस्ताव को बिल्कुल अस्वीकार किया जाना चाहिये। अब तो ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ वाला लाइन को भी भल जाना चाहिये और केवल एक ही लाइन

को याद रखना चाहिये । और वह कौन सी रेखा है ? मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि १५ अगस्त, १९४७ को हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बंटवारे के बाद जो भूमि हम को अंग्रेजों से मिली, दरअसल वही हमारी सीमा-रेखा है, क्यों कि उस लाइन के बारे में कोई झगड़ा नहीं है, उस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है । अगर हम ७ नवम्बर, १९५६ और ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की रेखाओं पर चलें तो कौन फंसला करेगा कि ७ नवम्बर, १९५६ की कौन सी लाइन है और ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की कौन सी लाइन है । चीनी कहीं भी उन लाइनों को बता सकते हैं । उन लाइनों का कोई हिसाब नहीं है । जंगल, पहाड़, नदी नाले आदि का प्रश्न उन के सम्बन्ध में उठता है । इन लाइनों में सब गड़बड़, सन्देह, दुविधा और भ्रम है । इस लिये इस भ्रम को दूर करने के लिये भारत सरकार और खास तौर से प्रधान मंत्री को जम कर, हिम्मत के साथ, विश्वास के साथ और दृढ़ निश्चय के साथ कहना चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान की रेखा १५ अगस्त, १९४७ वाली रेखा है, इस के अलावा और कोई रेखा नहीं है । वह निश्चित रेखा है ।

श्री ह्यागी : पांडीचेरी और गोवा वगैरह को क्या पोजीशन होगी ?

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप के जरिये इस सदन को बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की जनता ने भी उस रेखा को स्वीकार किया है और यह जान कर स्वीकार किया है कि जब हम १५ अगस्त, १९४७ की रेखा की बात करेंगे, तो फिर हम को पूर्ण रूप से युद्ध के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये, इस बात के लिये भी तैयार रहना चाहिये कि हमारे बड़े बड़े शहरों में बमबारी हो सकती है, हम विनाश की ओर जा सकते हैं, हमारी आबादी की बहुत बड़ी संख्या मर सकती है और शायद अस्पतालों में घायलों के लिये जगह भी न मिले । यह बात अपने दिमाग में रख कर ही जनता ने १५ अगस्त, १९४७

की लाइन की बोली को बोलना शुरू किया है ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : उन दोनों लाइनों में फर्क क्या है ?

श्री राम सेवक यादव : माननीय सदस्य यह तो प्रधान मंत्री से पूछें । इस लिये सम्पूर्ण युद्ध की घोषणा चाहे न हो, लेकिन सम्पूर्ण युद्ध के स्तर पर हम को तैयार होना है ।

आज भी एक दुविधा की स्थिति है । आज हम लड़ भी रहे हैं और नहीं भी लड़ रहे हैं । हम युद्ध विराम को माने भी नहीं हैं, लेकिन वास्तव में उस को स्वीकार भी किये हुये हैं और हमारी तरफ से कुछ नहीं हो रहा है । यह दुविधा की स्थिति है । चीन के मुकाबिले में शुरू में हमारी जो हार हुई उस को एम्प्लेनेशन और गफार्डि के रूप में सरकार की ओर से यह कहा जाता है कि हम लड़ाई के लिये तैयार नहीं थे । अगर ऐसी बात है, तो मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री से पूछना यह चाहता हूँ कि जब वह कोन्सो तशरीफ ले जा रहे थे, तो कौन सी तैयारी के आधार पर उन्होंने कह दिया कि हम ने अपनी फौज को हथकड़ा दे दिया है कि वह चीन को हमारी सीमा के बाहर खड़े दे ।

अभी प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि चीन कहता है कि वह अपने को बचा रहा है, अपनी रक्षा कर रहा है और ऐसा कहते कहते वह हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा करता चला जा रहा है । प्रधान मंत्री जो कहते हैं कि हम अपनी जमीन ले रहे हैं । लेकिन अपनी जमीन लेने के हमारे इरादे और अपने को बचाने के चीन के इरादे का नतीजा तो मैं यह देखता हूँ कि चीन हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा करता चला जा रहा है । उस में हम कोई फर्क नहीं पाते हैं ।

फिर यह भी कहा जाता है कि चूँकि हम शांति का रास्ता अपनाये हुये थे, इस लिये हम ने लड़ाई को कोई तैयारी नहीं की ।



[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

में बताना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने कश्मीर की लड़ाई लड़ी, गोआ की लड़ाई लड़ी और उन में शक्ति का इस्तेमाल किया। इस लिये यह दलील भी गलत है।

फिर कहते हैं कि चीन की पल्टनें ज्यादा हैं, उस की तैयारी ज्यादा है और उस के मुकाबले में हम कमजोर पड़ गये। ये सारी बातें गलत हैं। हो सकता है कि अंशतः कहीं के वे सही हों। सब से सही बात तो यह है कि हम में दुविधा रही और हम ने कभी भी सफाई के साथ यह नहीं कहा कि हम लड़ेंगे। हम बराबर यह बात सोचते रहे कि हम मुलह करेंगे, समझौता करेंगे। यह बात हमारी सरकार और अधिकारियों के मन में और सीमा पर लड़ने वाले हमारे जवानों के दिमाग में भी रही और इसी लिये हम को चोट और हार खानी पड़ी।

असल में इस बात की सफाई देने में आज सरकार, सरकारी पार्टी, कांग्रेस, के बहुत से लोगों और इधर बैठने वाली कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी, इन तीनों का इरादा एक है। ये तीनों एक साथ मिल गये हैं और अपनी कमजोरी को छिपाने के लिये यह सफाई देते हैं कि चीन की ताकत ज्यादा है, इस लिये हम हारे। अधिकारी भी यही दलील देते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार की बातों से देश का मनोबल गिरता है और जनता में भ्रम तथा घबराहट पैदा होती है।

आज सरकार कहती है कि जो लोग युद्ध की तैयारी में अड़चन डालेंगे, हम उन को जेल भेजेंगे। मैं सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उन के कई ऐसे मित्र और दोस्त हैं, उन के अपने दल के ऐसे लोग हैं, जो यह कहते हैं कि चीन की पल्टन चार करोड़ है और उस के पास तीन हजार वायुयान मौजूद है। इस की सफाई दी जाती है कि यह नीयत का सवाल है, नीयत से पता

लगाना चाहिये। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस प्रकार की बातों से जनता का मनोबल नहीं गिरता है, जनता का हौसला नहीं टूटता है, जनता का आत्म-विश्वास नहीं खत्म ही जाता है। अगर ऐसा होता है, तो मैं गृह-मंत्री से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ— जिन्होंने बड़ी तेजी से कहा था कि जो लोग लड़ाई की तैयारियों में कमजोरी दिखायेंगे, हम उन को जेल भेज देंगे— कि ऐसे लोगों के साथ क्या किया जा रहा है।

आज प्रधान मंत्री जी कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के प्रस्ताव के बारे में कहते हैं कि वह बहुत ठीक है। मैं भी कहता हूँ कि ठीक है। लेकिन अगर वह ठीक है, तो उन की गिरफ्तारियों का क्या मतलब है? अगर उन लोगों को गिरफ्तार किया जा रहा है, तो इस का मतलब यह है कि उन के प्रस्ताव और कर्म में फर्क है—प्रस्ताव कुछ है और कर्म कुछ और हैं। हम तुलसी-कृत रामायण में राक्षसों की कहानियां पढ़ते हैं। राक्षस की क्या परिभाषा है? जो अपने आप को बदलते रहें, अभी जमीन के नीचे चले जायें, कभी जमीन के ऊपर चले जायें, कभी आसमान में चले जायें और कभी हम में और आप में चले जायें और किसी को भी उन का पता न चले। यहां पर भी ऐसे लोगों से बहुत सचेत रहने की जरूरत है। बहुत से ऐसे लोक टहलते हुये नजर आयेंगे, जिन को हम पहचान न सकें, जिन को हम बहुत अच्छे और भले समझें। लेकिन वे सब उसी तरह के लोग हैं, जो कि सूरत-शकल बदल कर हम को धोखा देते आ रहे हैं।

मैं प्रधान मंत्री से कहूंगा कि इस दुविधा की स्थिति को अब समाप्त किया जाय। अब दुविधा से काम नहीं चलने वाला है। आज जनता का धीरज टूट रहा है, इस लिये नहीं कि वह लड़ना नहीं चाहती, इस लिये नहीं कि उस में सहास या धन की कमी है, बल्कि इस लिये कि उस के सामन कोई साफ

बात नहीं रखी जा रही है और उस के सामने एक दुविधा की स्थिति है ।

संकट-कालीन स्थिति की घोषणा हो चुकी है, लेकिन अगर संकट-कालीन स्थिति का मतलब वही है, जैसेकि आज काम चल रहा है, तो हम समझते हैं कि संकट-कालीन स्थिति की घोषणा गलत हुई और हमें देखना है कि कहीं अपने विरोधियों को दबाने के लिये संकट-कालीन स्थिति का फयदा न उठाया जाये । हम संकट-कालीन स्थिति की घोषणा करने के लायक सरकार को तब समझते, अगर वह इस स्थिति का मुकाबिला करने के लिये विरोधी-पक्ष के लोगों के साथ भी विचार-विमर्श करती । लेकिन आज तक प्रधान मंत्री ने विरोधी-पक्ष के किसी भी नेता को, किसी भी सदस्य को, नहीं बुलाया है । हां, यह जरूर हुआ है कि विरोधियों ने कहा है कि जरा हमारी भी सुन लीजिये । क्या मैं समझूँ कि यह युद्ध-स्तर की तैयारी है ? क्या इस संकट-कालीन स्थिति का सही रूप में मुकाबिला किया जा रहा है ?

**Shri Ansar Harvani:** Meetings were called, and my hon. friend was also invited to them.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** इसी तरह से यह जो राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद् बनः, उस राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद् के गठन को भी आप देखिये तो वही परिवार की बात, वही आपसदारी की बात । उस ओर भी किसी तरह का ध्यान नहीं दिया गया । इसी तरह जब हम कहते हैं कि मितव्ययिता बरती जाये, वार कैबिनेट अर्थात् युद्धकालीन मंत्रिमंडल बनाया जाय तो प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि इतने बड़े मंत्रिमंडल के बिना काम नहीं चल सकता । हमारे राजेन्द्र बाबू ने भी उस ओर इशारा किया, लेकिन उस के लिये भी कोई प्रयास नहीं किया जा रहा है । आज राज्यों में और केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल इतने बड़े हैं कि उन में बहुत काट छांट करने की आवश्यकता है, लेकिन इस को भी कोई सुनने के लिये तैयार

नहीं है । जब तक आप महाराणा प्रताप नहीं बनते, तब तक काम नहीं चल सकता है । अब आज हमारे जवान पहाड़ों पर और नेफा में जा कर लड़ सकते हैं तो क्या हमारे मंत्रिगण और हमारी सरकार के अफसर अपनी तख्त्वाहों और भत्तों में, खर्चों में कमी नहीं कर सकते ? उन को थोड़ी तकलीफ जरूर हो सकती है, लेकिन वह भी नहीं किया जा रहा है । आज क्या हो रहा है, इस को मैं आप को मिसाल दूँ । अभी हम ने सुना कि वाराणसी में एक नहर के बड़े अफसर के लिये नहर की पट्टी पर पानी का छिड़काव हो रहा था । यह युद्ध काल है लेकिन विकास खंडों में आज भी उन लोगों की जीपें चल रही हैं । वह जीपें फीज के लिये नहीं ली जा रही हैं । आज जो देशभक्त नहीं, देशद्रोही हैं, जो तेजपुर का पुराना जिलाधीश है, जिस को मुअत्तल किया हुआ है, सुना जाता है उस को वहाँ और नीकरी मिल रही है । उस को जेल जाना चाहिये क्योंकि वह देश का द्रोही है । आज देश भर में चीजों के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं । बढ़ते हुए दामों को रोकने के लिये कोई प्रयास नहीं ।

अन्त में कुछ प्रश्न पूछना चाहूँगा । जो हमारा नेफा है, पूर्वी उत्तरी सीमांचल प्रदेश, जिस का क्षेत्रफल ३५ हजार वर्ग मील है और जहाँ पर पांच या छः लाख लोग रहते हैं, वहाँ के रहने वाले कौन हैं ? वे हैं आम्भार, आहोर, दपला, मिस्मी, मिकिर आदि । आज भी उन लोगों को अपने से अलग रखा गया है । आज भी शायद यह नियम है कि कोई हिन्दुस्तान का आदमी अगर उस भाग में जाना चाहे तो उस को परमिट की जरूरत होगी । क्योंकि उन लोगों के मामलात में किसी को दखल देने की जरूरत नहीं है, उन की सभ्यता वैसे ही बनी रहे, वे आधुनिक न बनें और नई दुनियाँ के लिये तैयार न हों । आज भी वहाँ पर जाने के लिये आप ने प्रतिबन्ध लगा रखा है । जब डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया गये तो उनको

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

पकड़ा गया। लेकिन आइन्दा ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। अगर हिन्दुस्तान का कोई नागरिक उर्खीयाम यथात् नेफा जाना चाहे तो उस पर कोई प्रतिबन्ध नहीं होना चाहिये।

इसी के साथ साथ अन्त में मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा कि वे लोक सेना के निर्माण के लिये तत्काल तैयारी करें और साथ ही साथ गुरोवा वायफेपर की तैयारी भी की जाये। जहाँ जहाँ युद्ध हो वहाँ की जनता को हम हटाये नहीं, बच्चों, बूढ़ों और बीमारों को छोड़ कर, और वहाँ की जनता को आखिरी दम तक एक एक इंच जमीन के लिये लड़ाई लड़ने के लिये हथियार दें। तभी जाकर फिर उद्देश्य की घोषणा हुई है उस की पूर्ति होगी। यदि ऐसा नहीं करते तो मैं कहूंगा कि संविधानगत स्थिति की घोषणा कर के जो अधिकार लिये गये वे बेमतलब हैं।

यह कहना कि प्रधान मंत्री की नुकता-चीनी जो है वह देशद्रोह है, यह गलत चीज है। आज स्वाभाविक है कि हमारे अन्दर भाव उत्पन्न हों। हम दुखी हैं कि हमारी जमीन चली गई है और सरकार के हाथ से चली गई है। आखिर हम कैसे रात दिन इस स्थिति को भूल सकते हैं, और इसी लिये पञ्चदश हम को नुकताचीनी लगना पड़ती है।

इस के बाद मैं सिर्फ पाकिस्तान के बारे में ही कहना चाहता हूँ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप तो अभी दो बार अपनी अन्तिम बात कह चुके हैं।

**Shri Raghunath Singh :** Pakistan is not going to be discussed here.

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** पाकिस्तान का मामला हमारे सामने नहीं है।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** यह बहुत ताजुक बात है इस लिये कहना चाहता हूँ। पाकिस्तान के बारे में मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से विवेदन करूंगा कि हम दो दरवाजे खोल कर नहीं चले सकते। चीन का दरवाजा खुला हुआ है और हम चीन

से मुकाबला कर रहे हैं इस लिये पाकिस्तान के दरवाजे को जरूर बन्द रखना होगा और हमें पाकिस्तान से मुल्ह समझौता कर के रास्ता निकालना होगा। अच्छा होता कि प्रधान मंत्री अपनी तरफ से हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का एक संघ बनाने की कोशिश करते।

**Shri Frank Anthony :** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Some days back, when this so-called Chinese cease-fire was mooted in this House, there was a spontaneous unanimous action which, I believe, expressed the heart and the mind of the people of India. And some of us expressed it in different ways. My reaction to the Chinese so-called cease-fire was that it was a typical calculated piece of Chinese trickery.

When I was asked recently to do a broadcast over the BBC one of the questions that I was asked was, this, namely what my opinion of the acquiescence of our Government in the cease-fire proposal was. My answer was—it was an *extempore* one—that the promise was not clear. There was no official affirmation of Government having accepted the cease-fire proposal, but assuming for the sake of argument that our Government had in effect acquiesced in the cease-fire proposal, in the context of realities, I did not consider it an unwise step, provided we did not allow it in any way to inhibit our policies and did not allow it in any way to inhibit our pursuing our policy of building up our defensive strength with massive aid from the democracies. So far as specific acceptance of the Chinese cease-fire proposals was concerned, I said categorically that whatever Government may feel, public opinion would not allow acceptance of abject humiliating terms which in fact were an insulting ultimatum to this country.

I do not agree with some Members on this side of the House when they say that we must take this kind of action and that kind of action. I feel

that this is not the time for unrealistic suggestions, theatrical suggestions. I can understand the deep feeling among large sections of people of the country. They want to know why we are not chasing the Chinese out of NEFA. They want to avenge our reverses in NEFA. I am one of those who believe that in the final analysis, in fact, not only in the final analysis, but even immediately, whatever we do today must be conditioned strictly by a military approach. While it is necessary for us not to be precipitate, it is equally necessary for us not to over-estimate the Chinese enemy. And I feel that—I have talked to members of this House, and I have talked to people outside—there is a tendency to be unduly impressed by these Chinese performances, particularly in the NEFA area. There was a suggestion at one time that the so-called cease-fire proposal was not only supremely reasonable, but it was on the whole a magnanimous gesture on their part, I say it with regret that I have heard members of the ruling party canvassing this position that this is a magnanimous gesture...

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I do not want to mention names, but it is sufficient for me to say that there are cells in this country not only in a particular party which has probably canvassed this ultimatum at large as being some kind of a magnanimous gesture. What I feel is this that today the motives have to be seen. The Prime Minister sometimes is a little resentful, and he takes resentment sometimes, I think, a little too easily. But I have just read his statement, and I was heartened by it, because I believe that as a man of peace like my hon. friend to my left, it is not easy for people of peace to adapt themselves rapidly to the conditions and the mentality of war; but that statement today was a heartening statement, because the Prime Minister today, perhaps a little late, is left in no doubt as to the cynicism and the duplicity of the Chinese

enemy; he is left in no doubt that this Chinese action, this aggression is an insult not only to India but it is an insult to the conscience of the world. What I feel today is necessary to our own people is to unmask the Chinese motives, to unmask the real reason for their withdrawal.

I feel that there is a myth which is still current in Asia, even in India, of Chinese military prowess, almost of Chinese military superiority. But some of us who have taken a little trouble to read something about China know that recent history has shown that the individual Chinaman as a soldier basically has been not so good. I feel this too that like us—and I would like some of our political leaders to remember this—China also had a tradition of pacifism. It was a tradition which enervated her as a military power. And once that tradition of pacifism was substituted by the unabashed militarist mind of communism. It has not been completely innovated; still that basic weakness is there. It is the basic weakness of the Chinaman as an individual soldier. We have to see it, we have to read it, in Communist Chinese actions recently. Communist China has never committed her armies, has never committed her forces unless she had overwhelming, and ultra-overwhelming, superiority—10 to 1, 5 to 1 and 6 to 1. Communist China has never had the courage to commit her forces even where she was 2 to 1. Communist China, whenever she has fought, has fought after long and careful preparation.

We must tell this to our people. Our publicity perhaps today is on its way. But it still fumbles. That pattern has been repeated both in NEFA and in Ladakh. What was the story? I believe we have not underlined this reason. What was the basic reason for the Chinese withdrawal. We have given varying interpretations. But my own humble, respectful interpretation is that the Chinese retreated. It was a calculated retreat, inspired by fear. Those of us who know a little about

[Shri Frank Anthony]

our defence arrangements know that our real defensive line was on the foothills. The Chinese would not—they dare not—come up against our real defensive line. They did not have the courage. They were not prepared to meet the Indian jawans on reasonably equal terms. That is my reading of the Chinese withdrawal. It was a deliberate and calculated retreat basically inspired by fear.

There is another thing we must tell our people. And it requires a little courage, because it is an admission of failure, an admission of failure in the NEFA area. But let us make it very clear to our people. Leaders of groups on this side when they speak are not very clear. Let us make it clear to our people that the reverses in the NEFA area were not the reverses of our fighting men. The reverses in the NEFA area were the reverses of inexperienced, bad generalship. It was a mistake. But let us admit that mistake. Let us put the blame clearly. There is no shame in admitting it. Other democracies, caught unprepared, have also had to dispense with their doddering Generals; they also have had to dispense with their arm-chair Generals; they also had to dispense with their politician-Generals who had broken under the grim reality of war. Thank God, we have repaired that mistake.

I say this advisedly. I do not think I am giving away any secret. Mr. Averell Harriman is known to be a hard-headed negotiator, but some of us who met him also realised that he is extremely clear-headed. One of the things I made to him when I met him was this: 'I hope after their survey by the Military Mission in the NEFA area, there would be no misinterpreting which would lend itself to a tarnishing of the image of India's jawan.' Because, as we all know, it is a shining image. It is an image, an imperishable image, an image inscribed in blood and valour over the battle-fields

of the world. Mr. Harriman said spontaneously—he did not pause to think—'Our Survey Mission came back convinced of the supreme fighting qualities of the Indian jawan.' He said equally—and I do not think he intended it to be a secret—'Your reverses in NEFA were tactical blunders.' He was polite. He did not want to say that they were blunders of bad generalship.

Sir, I feel that is something which we must accept, that our reverses in the Dhola area, our reverses in Se La, our reverses at Bomdila which came almost as a shock to us, were not reverses of our fighting men, but were reverses which sometimes occurred inevitably, reverses of inexperienced, bad generalship. Thank God, we have had the courage to recognise that and we have in the picture fighting Generals who will command their troops and inspire their jawans with the necessary confidence.

As I said, our publicity on the military and civilian side has been wanting. We have to tell our people what really happened in Ladakh, that the fighting in Ladakh has, if anything, added lustre to the shining image of the Indian jawan.

**Shri Tyagi:** It was a feat.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** What happened? Yes, we lost posts, but under what conditions? How many people did we have? It is not an open secret. We put posts there, whatever the reasons were, with 20 men, 30 men. What were they fighting against? They were lucky they were fighting at odds of 10 to 1. And how did they fight? We have not played this up. Some of them withdrew, not many. They fought, they killed many many times their number. We do not know the reasons, but apparently they had limited supplies of ammunition. But

when those limited supplies were exhausted, they did not withdraw. They fought with cold steel. There is the Param Vir Chakra award to testify to the fact that they fought with the butt end of their rifles, and they fought and they died.

That is a story which has not been told adequately to our people, the story of Ladakh. We are overborne by the reverses in NEFA. The story of Ladakh has not been told. I have heard it from officers who have come back. It was a story in the finest tradition of Indian valour, a story of grim courage, of fierce, unyielding tenacity. Yes, that is the picture that I feel we must draw for our people. We must place it on record. It is the least that we owe to our fighting jawans.

**Mr. Speaker:** His time is up.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** May I have a few more minutes?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am hard-pressed.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** We also owe it to our own people. We must proclaim to our people the real reason for the Chinese withdrawal. It was a retreat, a calculated retreat, but camouflaged with typical Chinese cunning. They tried to make the most out of this retreat and they offered us terms in the insolent, arrogant language of would-be conquerors.

Here I just want to say a few words, if you will permit me five minutes more, about the offer of the 21st November. I think it has been sufficiently analysed. Not very much more need be said about it. When it first came to this House, I said, 'What does it mean?'. They have said that this so-called offer of the 21st was an offer to promote realisation of their three-point proposal of the 24th October. That had already been rejected by this House; it had already been rejected by the Prime Minister. Then what happened? We in turn were prepared to accept withdrawal to the

line before the 8th September 1962. Many of us in this House felt that that was an unnecessary concession. Many of us here felt that that was almost a retreat. But let that go. It was an offer—if you like, a concession, which was not acceptable to certain sections in this House. But it was an offer. Even that offer which was a concession—almost a retreat—was arrogantly rejected.

16 hrs.

And then what happened? The calculated insult to this country has never been underlined. In his letter of the 28th November, Chou En-lai, emulating his master Mao Tse-tung, living his dictum that policies come out of the barrel of a gun, what did he say? I have got his exact words here. His exact words, written then to the Prime Minister, were:

"In case the Indian side should refuse to co-operate, then the cease-fire which has been effected is liable to be set aside."

Here, Sir, is an ultimatum, with all its humiliating terms, presented out of the barrel of a gun, an insult to the manhood of India. Thank God our people and the Government have realised this.

I just want to end by underlining a few urgent tasks to follow. My hon. friend Dhebarji has said that we have no time to lose. I agree with him. Let us have no illusions about the Chinese. If we are working throughout the day, they are working day and night. And there are certain vital tasks to which we have to address ourselves, and I hope we have learnt the lessons already. I have no doubt that the Chinese are using this lull to consolidate their advance bases.

**Shri Tyagi:** It is a camouflage.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I saw an item of news in one of the leading papers today saying that contrary to, giving a direct lie to, their offer of with-

[Shri Frank Anthony]

drawing from 1st December, they are massing their troops in the Tanga Valley. They are fortifying, reinforcing their positions north and south of Bomdila. What is going to happen? After this ultimatum which the Prime Minister referred to today, do you believe that these Chinamen, with all their calculated treachery, with their calculated policies of expansionism, are not going to attack us; they are going to allow us to go on preparing without any attack from them? We will be lucky if they do not mount an offensive against us in the spring.

There is another lesson which I hope we have learnt, and that is the lesson of this espionage network which they set up in NEFA. They used their knowledge in NEFA to tremendous military advantage. I have no doubt today that that network is being elaborated, fortified, and I say this advisedly, with active assistance from the large quisling elements that are available unfortunately in India today.

I would say this to the civil Government. I feel that there is need for a much greater sense of urgency. I do not want to point a finger, but there is a feeling even among Members of this House that except perhaps for the Prime Minister and one or two other Members of the Cabinet, there is no sign of any sense of emergency even among the Members of the Cabinet. We do not want them to put on uniforms and walk with some kind of military precision, but there are definite signs of continuing flabbiness, flaccidness, even in the Central Government. The Education Minister is here. I hope he will not resent it. I asked him for an NCC troop for a school with which my name is associated, and one of the largest schools in this country. One of his Babu administrators replied and told me: we cannot give you the NCC....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Why does he say Babu?

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Babu-minded administration.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** It is a very bad word. He must withdraw it. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I can understand the hidden resentment of my communist friends wanting me to withdraw it. (*Interruptions*). I am sorry. I withdraw that term. May I put it this way, that one of his officials with a typical flaccid, feet-dragging mentality, wrote to me and said: Government have not got the money. He was told: you may not have the money, but the school will underwrite that NCC troop.

All our young men are rearing to go. I have not got the courtesy of a reply from the Education Minister. I can understand the Defence Minister not replying to me. I wrote to him. I said: there are all your fine young men in the sainik schools, in the navy schools, rearing to go. I got no reply, perhaps he is extremely busy, but I want to know what the Education Minister is about. Here we are wanting to set up an NCC troop, we cannot get a reply from the Government.

I will end on this last note. I would say this to the Prime Minister. There is a necessary veil of secrecy which has been drawn across all military preparations. In the past I was one of the bitterest critics of the veil being used as a cloak for concealing continuing unpreparedness and inefficiency, but I would say this to the Prime Minister. Let this sense of participation spread in the country. Let it start in this House. Some people in this House may want to snipe at him.

**Mr. Speaker:** He has exceeded five minutes.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I will conclude in 30 seconds. Some people in this House may want to snipe at him, but not all of us want to. We want not to talk at him, we want to talk with him. And may I say finally this.

to him, that I do not want to enter here into any kind of philosophical debate on brutalisation, but may I say this with all due respect? Today one of the phrases he used was that we must still remember the cause of peace, we are still dedicated to the cause of peace, but may I say with great respect: let us first try to win the war, and to win this war, there can be no compromise. In a war, in a war-mentality if you like, there can be no conditioning of ahimsa or any kindred doctrine. War today is a total war. Victory today, when it comes, can come only through total mobilisation, and total mobilisation can only come if you have a total commitment to the necessary war effort.

**श्री मुर्याल राव (महबूबनगर) :**

अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्राइम मिनिस्टर महोदय ने आज अपने मोशन को पेश करते हुए जो विचार प्रकट किये हैं, मैं उन की पुरजोर तारीफ करता हूँ ।

अभी हमारे किसी दोस्त ने कहा कि यहां से मेम्बरों को इस देश का दृष्टिकोण समझाने के लिये हर मुल्क में जाना चाहिये । मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि मैं और मेरे चन्द साथी हाल ही में युनाइटेड नेशन्स से वापिस आये हैं । आज युनाइटेड नेशन्स में हिन्दुस्तान की बहुत इज्जत है । सिर्फ चन्द ही मुल्कों ने हमारी क्रिटिसिज्म की है और बाकी सब मुल्कों की तारीफ हम लोगों को हासिल है और इस बात को भुलाया नहीं जा सकता है ।

मैं हाउस को बताना चाहता हूँ कि कल मेरी मुलाकात प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से हुई थी । १९५३ में जब मैं हैदराबाद स्टेट में एम० एल० ए० था, तो मैंने एन० सी० सी०, जिसको लोक महायक सेना कहते हैं, की ट्रेनिंग पाई थी और ५०० लड़कों में बेस्ट आया । १९५६ में दिल्ली में हम लोगों को ट्रेनिंग दी गई, उस में भी मैं बेस्ट आया मैंने वह ट्रेनिंग इसलिये ली थी कि मुल्क के

काम आऊं । आज वह दिन आ गया है और इस लिए मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की इजाजत चाहता हूँ कि अपने मुल्क की खिदमत करने के लिए मैं सोल्जर बन कर फ्रंट पर जाऊं । अगर मेरे सोल्जर बनने में कोई कानूनी दिक्कत है, तो मैं अपनी पार्लियामेंट की सीट से भी रेजाइन करने के लिये तैयार हूँ । इससे बढ़ कर मैं और कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता । अगर मेरे पास धन होता, तो मैं धन भी देता । लेकिन मैं एक गरीब आदमी हूँ और मेरे आठ बच्चे भी हैं । (Interruptions) एक बहुत बड़ी जिम्मेदारी मुझ पर है । प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह मोशन पेश करते हुए बड़े इमानदाराना ढंग से अपने विचार हाउस के सामने रखे हैं ।

इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे साथी जितने भी कांग्रेस के मेम्बर हों या दूसरी पार्टी के मेम्बर हों, जितने भी नौवजान मेम्बरस पार्लियामेंट के हों, वह भी हमारे साथ ज्वाइन हों और मुल्क की खिदमत करें ।

**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund):** Sir, today on our northern borders we have been called upon to make unique preparations.... (Interruptions.)

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

आठ बच्चों से आप इतने हैरान हो रहे हैं । आराम से मुनिये ।

**Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:** Never anywhere in the war in the whole world one has been called upon to fight such a vile enemy. In such a difficult terrain our Armed Forces have given a tremendous account of themselves and many speakers referred to it and so I do not want to go into them. Events have moved so fast in India since the 20th of October that the whole world has been roused. Our people's response to these events has been so magnificent. This huge upsurge of our people has definitely forced the Chinese to have second thoughts about their ill-com-



[Shri Vdiya Charan Shukla]

ceived mis-adventure into our country. The statement of the Prime Minister today is the most welcome and it explains our position in this war in a very firm and definite manner. This proposal of ours to take the maps to the World Court at the Hague shows how confident we are in the righteousness of our case. I am sure the Chinese cannot simply accept this proposal because they know that they will lose the case. I must also compliment the Government on the peace offensive they have launched on the diplomatic front although the Chinese are not particularly sensitive to the World opinion. The uniform reaction of the world against aggression on our country will definitely have its own effect in the long run. Our Law Minister Shri Sen and Shrimati Lakshmi Menon have done a very good job and I am sure that it will be very well reflected in the Colombo Conference that is currently taking place. We have been attuned to peace till now. We are attuning ourselves to war just now. I hope we will teach the world and show the world how people devoted to peaceful ways can be roused to heroic fights when subjected to wanton treachery and aggression.

About some of the substitute motions that have been made I may say this. The less said about the motion moved by the Socialist and Jan Sangh members, the better. They seem to have a blissful ignorance of the world complexities. They live in a dreamland of their own. One Socialist Member here was pleased to say that we should accept the 1947 line, that is the line when the British left India. He hardly realises that on 15th August 1947, Kashmir was not in the Indian Union and so Ladakh was out of India. There are several other things of an unreal nature that have been said by the hon. Members. Prof. Mukerjee has today made a very nice speech. As Shri Dasappa said, we would like to take them at their words. He is a sincere person and

we hope his partymen will follow what he has said here. The Prime Minister's clear speech today will definitely help us to tell our people in our constituencies what is happening here. With these words, I commend my substitute motion to the acceptance of the House.

श्री प्रकाशवीर दास्त्री (बिजनौर)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, संकट के इन एतिहासिक क्षणों में जहाँ हमको फूंक फूंक कर कदम रखने की आवश्यकता है और अपनी वाणी से एक एक शब्द तोल कर बोलने की आवश्यकता है वहाँ उतनी ही आवश्यकता हमें बात की है कि हम निर्णय भी उतनी ही समझदारी और दूरदर्शिता से लें। और फिर जिस देश के साथ हमारे निर्णय लेने का प्रश्न हम समय उपस्थित है, पिछला इतिहास हमें बातें या साक्षी है कि वह पंचशील के पवित्र स्तम्भों पर हस्ताक्षर करने के बाद वह देश हमारे कंधे पर ग टिक सका। अब उन देश की ओर से हमारे सामने युद्ध विराम का प्रस्ताव आया है। इस युद्ध विराम के प्रस्ताव पर तो परराष्ट्र मंत्रालय के प्रवक्ता ने कई बातें सरकार की नीति स्पष्ट करने का यत्न किया परन्तु ज्यों ज्यों उन्होंने स्थिति को स्पष्ट करने का यत्न किया, उतनी ही स्थिति अस्पष्ट होती चली गई। आज पहली बार प्रधान मंत्री ने इस सम्बन्ध में एक वक्तव्य दिया है।

मुझे विषयगत है कि कोलम्बो के अन्दर जो कुछ तटस्थ देशों का सम्मेलन हो रहा है, उसमें वह सारे राष्ट्र बुद्धिमत्ता और दूरदर्शिता के साथ निर्णय लेंगे, विशेषकर वे राष्ट्र जिनको विपत्ति के क्षणों में भारतवर्ष ने अपना कंधा लगाया है। उदाहरण के लिये इंडोनेशिया जैसा देश है, जिसके स्वातन्त्र्य युद्ध में भारतवर्ष का भी बहुत बड़ा हाथ रहा था, वहाँ, जिनको विपत्ति में हमने हथियार दिये थे, वैसा। जिनको राणाओं

के मुंह से निकालने के लिये हमारी सरकार ने मदद भेजी थी, और लंका, जिसके प्रधान मंत्री की हत्या के पश्चात् जब वहाँ जनतंत्र हाँवाडोल होने लगा था ऐसे समय में भारतवर्ष ने उसकी कमर पर हाथ रखा और चाहन बंधाया था। उसी प्रकार थातान और कम्बोडिया आदि देशों के साथ भी हमारे सम्बन्ध रहे हैं। लेकिन चीन से भयभीत होकर अगर उनके मन में किसी देश का मन किसी प्रकार की हाँवाडोल स्थिति में हो तो भारत सरकार को उसे देख कर कोई निर्णय न लेना चाहिये। आपसु जब कभी हम चीन के साथ निर्णय लेने के लिये जायें तो हमारे मस्तिष्कों में उन देश का पुराना इतिहास, इसके साथ साथ इस देश की जनता का, जिनसे आज की राष्ट्रीय सरकार के साथ एक मन हो कर अपने सहयोग का आश्वासन दिया है, हमारे देश के वह पवित्र प्रहरी, हमारी सेना के सैनिक, जो उस समय मोर्चों पर लड़ रहे हैं और साथ ही वे ६० देश हों जिन्होंने उन विपत्ति में हमें अपने सहयोग का आश्वासन दिया है। हम कोई भी इस प्रकार का कसजोर निर्णय न लें जिस निर्णय का प्रभाव हमारे मनोबल पर विपरीत पड़े। इसीलिये इस प्रकार का निर्णय लेने समय हमें इन तमाम बातों के साथ बड़ी दूरदर्शिता को भी आवश्यकता होगी।

इस के साथ ही साथ हम एक बात और भी ध्यान में रखें आज ही प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने प्रातःकाल के भाषण में विश्व न्यायालय की चर्चा की थी। मुझे अच्छी तरह याद है कि कुछ दिन पहले इस देश के एक दूरदर्शी नेता श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण ने भी ऐसा सुझाव दिया था। लेकिन परराष्ट्र मंत्रालय के प्रवक्ता ने उस समय श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण के सुझाव का यह कह कर विरोध किया था कि जब एक देश हमारी धरती पर आक्रामक की स्थिति में बैठा हुआ है उस समय हम किसी के सामने समझौते के लिये अपना प्रस्ताव या

समझौते के लिये अपना केम कैमे पेश कर सकते हैं? यह बात तो समझ में आ सकती थी कि अगर चीन हमारी धरती को छोड़ कर हमारी सीमा से पार चला जाये, और हमारी सीमा से पार जाने के बाद उस के पाम कुछ सीमा सम्बन्धी दस्तावेज इस प्रकार के हों जिन के बल पर वह कहे कि इतना हिस्सा हमारा है और हम कहे कि नहीं इतना हिस्सा हमारा है, तो उस झगड़े को निपटारे के लिये विश्व न्यायालय को माँप दिया जाय। यह बात तो बुद्धिमत्ता की कही जा सकती थी। लेकिन जब तक हमारी धरती पर आक्रामक बैठा हुआ है और वहाँ से उस की मिलिटरी और सैनिक हलचलें जारी हैं, तब तक विश्व न्यायालय की चर्चा करना, मैं समझता हूँ कोई दूरदर्शिता की बात नहीं कही जायेगी। वह भी ऐसे समय में जबकि सुरक्षा परिषद् में कश्मीर के केम को दे कर हम एक कड़वा अनुभव कर चुके हैं। इसलिये इसी प्रकार का कोई नया निर्णय लेते समय भी पुराने अनुभवों को ध्यान में रखें।

दूसरी बात जो मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि इस आक्रमण से हमें थोड़ी चेतावनी भी मिली है, और वह चेतावनी यह कि हम अपने सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों के संबंध में सावधान रहें। विशेष कर उन देशों से जिन के साथ हमारे सीमा सम्बन्धी झगड़े हैं, सावधान रहें हम उन देशों से जिन की राष्ट्र नीति और हमारी राष्ट्र नीति में कुछ भेद है, चाहे वह कम्युनिस्ट हों चाहे कम्युनिस्ट हों। कोई भी हों उन से सतर्क रहने की आवश्यकता है।

मैं चाहूँगा कि इस बाद विवाद का उत्तर देते समय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री एक बात का स्पष्टीकरण और भी करें। यह तो मैं नहीं कह सकता कि इस बात की कहीं तक सही जांच कर पाया हूँ, लेकिन जब गौहाटी में प्रधान मंत्री जी गये थे तब उन्होंने ने एक वक्तव्य दिया था। उस में उन से पूछा गया कि

## [श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

क्या यह बात सही है कि पाकिस्तान और चीन का आपस में इस प्रकार का समझौता हुआ है कि असम को लेने के पश्चात् चीन उस का कुछ हिस्सा पाकिस्तान को देना चाहता है ? इस सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मंत्री के जो शब्द मैं ने पढ़े हैं वे इस प्रकार हैं :

“मैं नहीं कह सकता कि चीन ने पाकिस्तान को असम का कुछ भाग देने की बात की है या नहीं।”

इन शब्दों ने मुझे कुछ ऐसी ध्वनि आती दिखाई दी, कि भारत सरकार के पास कुछ डाकुमेंटरी प्रूफ इस प्रकार के हैं जिन के द्वारा यह बात सिद्ध होती है कि कोई अन्दरूनी समझौता हुआ जरूर है। अगर कोई इस प्रकार की बात हो तो इस मदन को वे अपने विद्वाम में ग्रवण्य लें।

अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए एक बात अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब से हमारे पूर्व प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री अपने स्थान से हटे हैं और एक सुयोग्य व्यक्ति के हाथों में प्रधान मंत्री ने वह कमान दी है, तब से इस देश में छः मात व्यक्ति इस प्रकार के हैं जिन्होंने एक आन्दोलन (कम्पेन) शुरू किया हुआ है, और वे व्यक्ति भाषणों और समाचारपत्रों में कहते फिरते हैं कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की प्रतिष्ठा भी खतरे में है। लेकिन सचार्ई यह है वह पंडित जी की आड़ में अपने खतरे में पड़े व्यक्तित्व को बचाना चाहते हैं और पंडित जी का नाम लेते हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस विपत्ति काल में माग देश उन के पीछे है और सारा देश आज उन के आदेश को उसी प्रकार मानने के लिये तैयार है जिस प्रकार एक सैनिक अपने सेनापति के आदेश को मानने के लिये तैयार रहता है।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने फिलासफर स्टेट्समैन से आज सोल्जर स्टेट्समन का रूप

धारण कर लिया है हमें प्रमन्नता है और यह देश के लिये सौभाग्य की बात है। परन्तु इसके साथ ही साथ मैं उन का ध्यान अपने देश की एक विशेष परम्परा की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिस का हमारा इतिहास भी साक्षी है। महा कवि कालिदास ने रघुवंश में लिखा है कि रघुकुल की यह परम्परा थी कि उन का जो निर्णय होता था जब तक उस की कार्य रूप में परिणति नहीं हो जाती थी उस समय तक किसी को उस का पता नहीं चलता था। गीता में भी भगवान् कृष्ण ने कहा है :

मोनोस्मि गृहयानाम्

अर्थात् जितने भी रहस्य हैं उन में सर्वोत्तम रहस्य जो मोन है वह मैं हूँ। तो मैं चाहूँगा कि इन विपत्ति के क्षणों में अधिक वक्तव्य देने की अपनी परम्परा को वह कुछ कम करें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप को भी अधिक वक्तव्य नहीं देना चाहिये।

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :** इतना कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

**श्री जीय (अलीगढ़) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, २१ नवम्बर की तूफानी रात को जब पीकिंग से सीज फायर की सूचना मिली उस सीज फायर की सूचना को भारत वर्ष के राजनीतिज्ञों ने किसी भी रूप में लिया हो, पर मैं ने उसको एक इंटरवैल की तरह समझा। मुझे उसमें कोई वास्तविकता या असलियत नहीं नजर आती। सीज फायर के बारे में बहुत से विद्वानों के बहुत से मत हैं। कुछ का कहना है कि मास्को के दबाव के कारण यह हुआ। कुछ का कहना है कि जो हमको अमरीका, इंग्लैंड, कनाडा आदि मित्र राष्ट्रों से सहायता आयी उसके भय के कारण यह हुआ। कुछ राजनीतिज्ञों का कहना है कि न्यूबा की परिस्थिति को

चीन सरकार ने जैसा समझा था वह उसके विपरीत निकली इसलिये यह सीज फायर हुआ। कुछ लोगों का विचार है कि भारत कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से चीन सरकार की जो आशा थी वह निराशा में परिणत हो गयी, इसलिये यह सीज फायर हुआ। कुछ लोगों का कहना है कि भारतीय राष्ट्र की भावनाओं ने अपना बल दिखाया और जनता जातिवाद, प्रान्त वाद और भाषावाद को भुलाकर राष्ट्र के बचाव के कार्य में एक हो कर पूरी शक्ति के साथ जुट गयी, इससे चीन को बहुत गहरी चोट पहुंची इसलिये सीज फायर किया गया। कुछ लोगों का खयाल है कि चीन बहुत दिनों तक लम्बी लड़ाई नहीं लड़ सकता, इसलिए सीज फायर हुआ, कुछ लोग यह भी कहते हैं कि जाड़े में कुछ दिनों के लिये संग्राम को रोक देना चाहता है, इसलिए सीज फायर किया गया है। कुछ लोग यह कहते हैं कि भारत वर्ष को आज विदेशों से सहायता मिल रही है उसको दूसरा रूप देने के लिये चीन ने ऐसा किया है। ये तमाम चीजें अपनी अपनी जगह पर हैं, पर मैं सोचता हूँ कि इसमें सबसे ज्यादा वास्तविकता यह है कि कम्युनिस्ट लोगों की तरह चीन का भी यह विश्वास है कि लड़ो, रुको, उसके बाद मजबूत बनो, दुश्मन को धोखा दो, सेना को तैयार करो और फिर आगे बढ़ो, इसलिये यह सीज फायर हुआ है। सीज फायर का कोई भी कारण हो सकता है लेकिन मैं उसका यही कारण समझा हूँ। दूसरी एक बात और भी हो सकती है कि चीन ने भारत का जो कुछ भी हिस्सा ले लिया है उसमें यातायात के साधन कम हैं जिसकी वजह से चीन को आगे बढ़ना रोकना पड़ा है और उसने सीज फायर किया है। भारत वर्ष के प्रति भाईचारे की भावना से चीन ने सीज फायर नहीं किया है। भारत वर्ष ने चीन को हर तरह से सहायता दी। चीन सरकार को सबसे पहले रिकॉगनीशन दिया। यू० एन० ओ० में उसका मान्यता दिलाने

की बहुत कोशिश की। और अपने पांच हजार नौजवानों की आहुति दी। उसका चीन ने यह जवाब दिया कि उसने हमारे देश की भूमि पर कब्जा कर लिया। इस से स्पष्ट है कि हमारे प्रति मित्रता की भावना से प्रेरित हो कर चीन सरकार ने ऐसा नहीं किया। इस सीज फायर में कोई भी वास्तविकता नहीं है और न इससे दोस्ती का कोई ताल्लुक है। जो ऐसा समझता है वह धोखा खाएगा। हमारा पुराना तजरबा इस बात का साक्षी है। और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू को हम सब से इसका ज्यादा तजरबा है। उन्होंने चीन की दोस्ती पर बहुत भरोसा किया था।

हम ने चीन पर तो इतना भरोसा किया, जिससे हमारी संस्कृति नहीं मिलती, पर हमने उन लोगों का विश्वास नहीं किया जिनके और हमारे बाप दादा एक थे लेकिन आज जो हम से अलाहिदा हो गये हैं। पाकिस्तान के लोग जो आज हमसे अलग हो गये हैं, उनकी सीमा पर हमने फौजें रखी, ठीक है, रखना चाहिये था, लेकिन चीन की सीमा पर हमने ऐसा नहीं किया, उस चीन की सीमा पर जिसका हमारा कल्चर एक नहीं है, जिसकी हमारी सम्म्यता एक नहीं रहा। चीन की तरफ हमने दोस्ती का हाथ कितने विश्वास के साथ बढ़ाया, जिसका आज यह नतीजा हमें देखने को मिला।

मैं एक और बात कहना चाहूंगा। आज इस सीज फायर की आड़ में चीन एक मुंसिफ की हैसियत में बैठ कर हम से इस प्रकार सवाल करता है जैसे कि हम मुल्जिम हों। भारत सरकार ने इन सवालों का जवाब दे दिया है लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि उनका जवाब देना भारत वर्ष के लिये अपमानजनक है। आज चीन हमसे इस तरह सवाल करता है जैसे एक जज एक मुल्जिम से सवाल करता है कि हां या ना में जवाब दो।

[श्री मोदी]

मैं अन्त में यही कहना चाहूंगा कि हमको चाहिये कि हम चीन की इस चुनौती को, जो भारत वर्ष के लिये ही नहीं संसार के सारे शान्तिप्रिय राष्ट्रों के लिये एक चुनौती है, स्वीकार करें और उसका सामना करें। आज देश की ४१ करोड़ जनता अपने तमाम मतभेदों को भुलाकर देश की रक्षा करने के लिये तैयार हैं। आज सरकार को भी चाहिये कि वह कम से कम खर्च करके और भी अधिक जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त करें। आज देश में जो भावना है उससे चीन तो क्या चीन में दसगुना बड़ा शक्ति का मोहम मुकाबला कर सकते हैं। यह देश के सम्मान का सवाल है, हमको चीन की इस चुनौती का पूरी शक्ति के साथ मुकाबला करना चाहिये। यदि ऐसा करने में हमारे देश के एक दो करोड़ लोग काम भी आ जायें तो कोई चिन्ता की बात नहीं। फिर भी ४० करोड़ लोग बाकी बचे रहेंगे। पर इससे देश के सम्मान की रक्षा हो जायेगी, नहीं तो हमारी आगे आने वाली पीढ़ियाँ मदा चीन से डरती रहेंगी। हमको इस समय जरा भी बूजदिली नहीं दिखानी चाहिये।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जो कहते हैं कि यह लड़ाई लम्बी चलेगी। जब ऐसी स्थिति है तो मेरा मुझाव है कि हमको अपने स्कूल और कालिजों में पढ़ने वाले विद्यार्थियों को, जो १७ साल से १९ साल तक की उम्र के हों, अनिवार्य मिलिटरी शिक्षा देनी चाहिए। हम शान्ति प्रेमी लोग रहे हैं और हमने शान्ति का पाठ सीखा है लेकिन अब हमको भारत माता की रक्षा का पाठ सीखना है। हमको उसके लिए हर प्रकार का प्रयत्न करना पड़ेगा।

आज पंडित नेहरू और भारत इन दो शब्दों में कोई फर्क नहीं है क्योंकि पंडित नेहरू ही भारत है और भारत पंडित नेहरू है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री नेहरू का नहीं भारत का, भारत का नहीं श्री नेहरू का, क्योंकि आज इन शब्दों में कोई फर्क नहीं है, अपनी पूरी शक्ति के साथ समर्थन करता हूँ।

**Shri M. Ismail (Manjeri):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the bellicose attitude that has been adopted by the Chinese once again is not a matter of surprise to most of us. When they put forward their .

**Mr. Speaker:** Please speak more loudly.

**Shri M. Ismail:** When the Chinese put forward their so-called cease-fire offer, we were not convinced of their sincerity. In wanting peace with India we were of the firm opinion that it was only a strategy, a propaganda stunt on their part that led them to make that offer. Now, that has been more than proved. What is it that they are asking us to do in the name of cease-fire? They had not the courtesy to ask us what should be our condition from our side about the cease-fire. They dictated certain conditions and said that we must accept them.

Now, the language they are speaking is not a language that one nation speaks to another. It is not even the language that a severe teacher adopts towards a school-boy. We know the Chinese have been emboldened perhaps by the thought of their man-power. What their man-power is has been described by more than one speaker in the past. We know the sterling quality of our jawans and of our population. Man for man, one Indian jawan is equal to three or four on the other side. Our jawans are any day equal to any fighting force in the world, not only against the Chinese, but against any other nation in the world. But the Chinese think that they have succeeded in their ruse or trickery to deceive our Government and the people here.

Their offer is that a no man's land of 40 kilometres must be constituted all along our border. Whether any portion which has not been occupied by them is to be excluded from that no man's land is not clear. They ask us to clear out from our own territory, which had been admitted even

by them as being our territory. In the western and central sectors, they want us to give up even Daulatbeg Oldi, Chushul and Barahoti. In the east, not to speak of Longju which was in dispute from the very beginning of the aggression, they are asking us to give up even Walong, Jang and Tawang. This means two things. For one thing they want to establish that we had no border at all on the northern side from east to west. Secondly, they want us to be deprived of the Himalayan watersheds being any more our border. These two things will vitally affect the economy of our country not only at present, but in future also.

These Himalayan watersheds have been our border, our sentinel, standing guard over our country for ages. The Chinese know the value of these borders. They want for the present at least to destroy those borders and throw them in doubt, so that they may play with our freedom and economy as they please in future. We should be very careful that do not succeed in this strategy of theirs.

So far as the conduct of war from our side is concerned, there may be criticism about the Government, but the Parliament so far as one can see, does not want to enter into a *post mortem* of what has been and what ought to have been done. This clearly shows that Parliament has got the fullest confidence in the Prime Minister and his Government and it expects him to carry on the war with the united support of all the sections of the people of the country. Therefore if the Parliament asks for any information, it does not mean that it is asking for that information in a criticising spirit. What the Parliament is at pains to do is to understand the broad outline of the conduct of war, so that the Members may go to the people, who elected them, and make them keep up their enthusiasm and also intensify their enthusiasm for the conduct of war. It is for this purpose that Members of Parliament ask for more information about the war.

With the strength, determination and united support of the people, we are going to win the war not sometime in future, but very very soon, we shall, God willing, be blessed with success. There is one more point. The gun that is shooting us is trained and directed towards our immediate neighbour, Pakistan. It is a pity that she is not able to understand it. If she understands it and if she also understands that in the present situation, her own self-interest lies in an alignment with us, well and good. If she is not willing to do that, we the people of India are prepared to go it alone and we will succeed. Therefore, whatever attitude they may adopt, the people of India, all put together as one man have arisen and they cannot be put down by the Chinese or any other aggressor.

श्री विशानचन्द्र सेठ (एटा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस सदन का बहुत थोड़ा समय लूंगा, क्योंकि अभी आवश्यक प्रारंभ मिनिसटर साहब ने बोलना है।

सब से पहले मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि १४ नवम्बर को इस हाउस में आप के आदेश पर हम सब ने खड़े हो कर चीनी आक्रमण के बारे में अपनी भावना को प्रकट किया था। हम ने यह दृढ़ निश्चय किया था कि चाइना ने भारत की जो भी टैरीटरी दबाई है, निश्चित रूप से वह सारी की सारी उस से वापिस ली जायगी। यदि अब सरकार उस प्रस्ताव के साथ कोई शर्त जोड़ती है, तो उस का परिणाम यह होगा कि आज जिस प्रकार टेम्पो देश में बना हुआ है जिस प्रकार की सद्भावना आज सरकार के साथ है, उन के लिए एक भारी अन्देश पैदा हो जायगा। सरकार का बार-बार यह सोचना यह सन्देश प्रकट करना कि हम चाइना या संसार की किसी भी शक्ति के साथ लड़ नहीं सकते, हम में कोई कमजोरी है, मैं समझता हूँ इस भावना को आना ही बड़ी भारी कमजोरी है। मैं विश्वास दिलाता चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम डेटरमिनेशन निश्चित भावना के साथ खड़े

## [श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ]

हो जायें, तो भारत की इतनी बड़ी जन-संख्या का इतना बड़ा मनोबल आज सरकार के साथ है, उस के द्वारा हम संसार की किसी भी शक्ति को पीछे धकेल देने में समर्थ हैं।

एंग्लो-ऐमेरिकन ने जिस प्रकार के वातावरण का आरम्भ में निर्माण किया था उस के लिए मैंने उन्हें इसी मदन में धन्यवाद दिया था। पर उस के खिलाफ आज मैं उन को यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कोई सौदा नहीं है, अथवा कोई रोज़गार भी नहीं है, बल्कि आज सारे संसार की शक्तियाँ दो भागों में विभाजित हैं—एक ओर तो कम्युनिस्ट भावना के देश हैं और दूसरी ओर वे देश हैं, जो कि प्रजातांत्रिक शासन में विश्वास करते हैं। अतः अमरीका, इंग्लैंड और उन के दूसरे एलाइड कंट्रीज़ का यह नैतिक कर्तव्य है कि वे हमारे देश के साथ आर्ये और कंधे से कंधा लगा कर मदद करें, अगर वे अपनी सुरक्षा चाहते हैं। आज यह सोचना गलत होगा कि यह लड़ाई चाइना और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच है। यह लड़ाई संसार की दो विचार-धाराओं में चल रही है। ऐसी स्थिति में उन का यह नैतिक कर्तव्य है कि वे किसी प्रकार का सौदा न करें मैं किसी चीज़ का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता और न कोई ऐसी शर्त लगायें कि पहले यह तय करो, फिर हम मदद करेंगे। ईमानदारी की बात यह है कि अगर वे संसार में प्रजा-तांत्रिक शासन को जीवित रखना चाहते हैं, तो उन्हें भारत को अनकन्डीशनल सपोर्ट देना चाहिए।

**एन माननीय सदस्य :** उन्होंने ऐसा ही किया है।

**श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ :** नहीं, नहीं। माननीय सदस्य कागज़ की बात न कहें। मैं अन्दर की बात बता रहा हूँ।

मैं पहले भी माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह अपील कर चुका हूँ—जिस की ओर उन्होंने

अभी तक ध्यान नहीं दिया है। आज फिर उस को दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि दिलाई लामा की सरकार को फ़ौरन मान्यता दी जाये और उन के केस को यू० एन० ओ० में भेजा जाये। चाइना के लिए इस समय हमें भी एक नया खतरा पैदा करना चाहिए। लेकिन हमारा सरकार ऐसे ही बैठी है। इस से क्या होगा। हमारी सरकार की यह भावना होनी चाहिए कि ऐसी नीति अपनाई जाये कि चाइना को भी पता चले कि कोई उस के मुकाबले पर हूँ सरकार मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे जिस तरह से भी हो तिब्बत के लोग जब चाइनीज़ के साथ नहीं हैं। वहाँ की जन भावना चाइनीज़ के साथ नहीं है, तो आप के पास इस से ज्यादा सुनहरा मौका और कौन सा होगा? इसलिये समय का इस से लाभ उठाना चाहिये।

अन्त में केवल एक ही चीज़ क्यूबा की मिमाल देना चाहता हूँ। अगर अमरीका ने एकदम सारे क्यूबा की एरिया को घेर न लिया होता तो निश्चित रूप से आज संसार के सामने यह परिस्थिति न होती। अमरीका ने संसार के सामने एक बड़ी भारी एग्जाम्पल पैदा की है, जो आज से कुछ ही दिन पहले की बात है। ठीक उसी तरह हमारे देश को भी चाइना का मुकाबला करना चाहिये। इस मामले में बार बार अजीब अजीब बातें सोचने से हमारे देश के मोराल पर बुरा असर पड़ता है।

**Shri Ranga (Chittoor):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been hoping against hope that since at long last the Chinese have come out with their clear and unequivocal ultimatum to us, the Prime Minister would have gone to the last limit of his patience and given his clarion call to our country that since China has forced us into war we are at war and therefore we must be prepared now to think in terms of war and act up to our responsibilities in this state of war and

not be bothered about all these various peace offensives which the Chinese have been placing before us. I am disappointed, Sir, with his speech this morning. At the same time, I am living in the hope that a day will come, and I am prepared to be patiently waiting for that day, when the Prime Minister will be able to give that clarion call which is needed in order to inspire our people to redouble their efforts and help them to go with him in implementing the hope and faith expressed by this House, that the House has affirmed the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India however long and hard that struggle may be. The Prime Minister said that it might take possibly five years. The country I am sure will be ready to back the leadership of the country and the Parliament with the effort that the people would be making through their Government in order to drive away the aggressor from our territory.

But, at the same time, it is necessary for us, for our Government to seek plain massive military assistance and aid of all kinds from all friendly nations by calling them into association—we are not calling it alliance or pact or anything like it—with us in this defence of world democracy as against this communist and imperialist aggression. This morning, I was wondering why the Prime Minister was avoiding the expression "Communist China", and he himself has said about China in one of his speeches: "I must confess that the Chinese attempt to make falsehood appear to be the truth and the truth to be the falsehood has amazed me". Then he said: "To say that we are committing aggression on Chinese territory is a kind of double talk which is very difficult for a man of my simple mind to understand". That is because he happens to be a liberal, and a famous liberal too. He happens to be a man who is wedded to truth, to certain decencies and honesty. But, unfortunately, we are faced with

this fight which is brought up in the communist ways, ideology and methods, and it is no wonder that he is amazed and perplexed with their amazing capacity for double talk (*Interruption*). That is why it is high time that he realised that this is a way inflicted upon us by China because China is imperialistic and also communistic. It is no use keeping our eyes blind-folded in this manner.

Sir, I cannot congratulate him on his new suggestion that he has made. He seems to be coming forward with a new suggestion every time he speaks in this House. The suggestion is that we would go to the Hague Court. It is either too late or too early. It is too late because in those days before 1959 we should have thought of it and we should have demanded that those people should go to that court. There was an instance in the past. When there was a dispute between Norway and Denmark over Greenland, the Hague Court decided that matter. If we go through the details of that court decision, we will find that we would certainly be able to get a decision in our favour in the Hague Court. Why is it that the Government did not go there then? Why is it that they think of it now when we are forced into war and we are at war now. But he was saying: "at the end of the war". Certainly, at the end of the war, are they to be defeated? They need not be defeated, but we would certainly drive them out of the country just as the Chinese were driven out in Korea, just as the Americans were kept on this side of the 38th Parallel. So also, there would come a time when the Chinese would be kept out of our country. Then we would be able, in order to settle how we should live in peace regard to our broad border, to go to the Hague Court.

Sir, it is a pity that even now we have not thought of giving freedom to Dalaj Lama to function here as a free man as the head of his own people as he had been. We do not seem to be willing to learn anything from China. While she has been carrying



[Shri Ranga]

on struggle with us, she arranged a special friendship with NEFA, with Pakistan and with Burma. What have we been doing? Therefore, the time has come when we should give this opportunity to Dalai Lama to function freely. We ourselves have placed all these restraints on him. It is a sin, according to me, that we have allowed that country to be swallowed up by China. Sir, I will only refer to one simple sentence from the Prime Minister's own speech. He said, it is a very happy idea if Tibet is liberated. I hope we will live to that day to see that Tibet is liberated not only with the efforts of their own people but also with the moral, material support of all those people who love democracy, peace and decency.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Speaker Sir, ever since we had been involved in war and war-like operations, there is no lack of experts on military strategy in this country. I know I receive large numbers of letters telling me what should be done on the military line. I am not referring to hon. Members here—of course, they are presumed to be experts in everything.

**Shri Ranga:** We take our cue from the Prime Minister.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not pretend to be an expert in military matters though I have naturally read something about it, followed the course of the last few wars and so on. I offer them, but in the ultimate military matters, if I have any ideas to offer, I offer them, but in the ultimate analysis in purely military matters it is the judgment of our experts, our military advisers, that must prevail. That is obvious. Of course, one can discuss it. Then, everybody is a judge in political and diplomatic matters and, naturally, all of us here are more used to think, more concerned about them and have some experience of them. I venture to say, first of all, that war cannot be considered in a vacuum, saying it is war. Some hon. Members, some leading members of

some leading parties suggested: it is war and nothing else. That is an extraordinary statement. It is one thing that one should be strong, one should be determined, and it is quite another thing to consider it in a vacuum. Nobody has ever done it in the past and nobody will ever do it in the future. A war, a famous German writer on military matters, Clausewitz said, is a continuation of politics. War has a great deal to do with propaganda, with publicity, apart from military. What is that? Why is China today sending people all over Africa and Asia to tell them what her case is? It is something other than war, though connected with war. Because, China attaches a great deal of importance to what they may say, what they may feel.

Somebody asked me: why have you allowed the sending of a deputation, from here to Colombo? I have not sent any deputation, but I am very glad they went. They asked me, and I said "certainly, it is up to you to go there", because I knew, because I was sure, even though it might do no good, certainly it could do no harm; and, possibly, it could do some good. Also, there was no question of foreign exchange involved or anything, and I definitely think they would do possibly more good than many others who might be, in the opinion of some hon. Members, perhaps more stouter champions of our cause. But the whole point is, who can approach a certain party with some effect. Suppose I have to send a person, wherever it may be, say, to some region in Africa, I shall choose some one, not because of his brilliance in the knowledge of history of India, past or present, but because of his knowledge of how to approach the African people and their country. If I have to send a person to the Soviet Union, I will send a person.....

**An Hon. Member:** A Communist.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:**... a person whose approach, whose voice counts there. It is no good sending Professor

Ranga to the Soviet Union. There can be no doubt, I say so with all respect to Shri Ranga, that his going there will ruin our cause, so far as the Soviet Union is concerned.

**Shri Ranga:** I perfectly agree with you.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** He is prepared to agree with me. Therefore, one has to think of what is good in the given circumstances and who is good in a particular context of a particular country. You have always to think even when you are warring in terms of politics and diplomacy. That is an essential part of it. In the biggest war, in the most fatal war, the second world war, diplomacy and politics always played their role in publicity, propoganda etc. I say all this because this idea that we must go like a bull in a China shop, destroy everything and win the war has no meaning at all. One should always think of the consequences of every action that one takes; the consequences may be not only hurting the enemy but, may be, hurting us in a round about way, and may even hurt the peace that we are after. All these are well-known maxims of approach.

I think Mr. Winston Churchill was quoted. He was a big leader, a fine leader in war time. It is his strength that you admire. But behind that strength lay a great deal of experience in diplomacy, politics and all that. You must remember that too.

I am afraid, there is some confusion in the minds of hon. Members with reference to the Sino-Indian dispute because of the spate of correspondence. Thick printed volumes are full of it. And the Chinese Government is particularly adept at producing enormously long statements. This very statement which came, which they issued yesterday and which, I believe, has been received sometime today, by midday today or this afternoon, copies of which have probably been placed in the library of Parliament, contains ten or twelve fully-typed foolscap

pages. By the time we have read it, we are confused as to what we have read, unless we analyse it carefully.

**An Hon. Member:** That is their object.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Because of this trouble that we have had with these long statements, most of which have been seen by hon. Members, a certain confusion is created. And I regret to say that our replies to them were, though not that long, still fairly long.

We have to deal with this matter with diplomacy because while we are telling them something we are telling the world something. There is such a thing as the world, as other nations in Africa, in Asia, in Europe and in America. Hon. Members seem to think that because they and we are convinced of the fact, the world must necessarily be convinced of the fact and all that we have to do is to tell them. That is not correct. We have to tell them the particular context, explain to them and tell them that we are adopting an attitude that is right and reasonable. Because, nobody in the wide world is going to go through all the statement made by us to China or by China to us. They go by broad facts. It may be that they are ill-disposed to China and so they may accept what we say; not because of the argument. Or, it may be that they are well-disposed to us and so they will accept what we say. But most people are neither ill-disposed to one party or the other. They have to be convinced by reasonableness, by strength, by all these factors. That is where the political approach and the diplomatic approach come in. I am not for the moment saying that our approach has been perfectly political or diplomatic, but I am suggesting for the consideration of the House that these factors have always to be considered. The bull-in-the-China-shop attitude does not pay anywhere. Even the strongest countries in the world, if they adopt that attitude, will be laughed at by others.

**Shri Tyagi:** Why do you bother if it is a China shop?

**Shri Jawahar'lal Nehru:** I am sorry, I was not thinking in that connection.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** China shop, not China's shop.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is obvious that we have to deal with an extraordinarily difficult situation. When you are in war or on the verge of war, when you are going to war with a country like China, whatever your feelings may be about China, quite apart from that, China is one of the greatest, biggest and most powerful countries of the world. Let us realise that. Everybody knows that. So, it is not, as some hon. Members mention, like taking some step as in Goa or something. Apparently, in his mind the two were connected. It is a difficult matter.

As I said this morning, in my mind I have tried to analyse this objectively and passively and I am convinced that China cannot have her way in this matter and we will have our way in this matter. Why? Because of various factors; apart from the strength that we may have built up, because China is functioning across our frontiers. If we, with the same strength, wanted to function across the Chinese frontier, we will be in a weak position and they would be in a much stronger position. It is not a question of our being stronger than China or China being stronger than us. It is a question of how and where they function and for what reason.

**Shri Ranga:** She is an aggressor.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Quite right, because she is an aggressor. Also, the realisation of this fact is coming more and more to people in other parts of the world. As Shri Khadilkar has stated, this is something infinitely more than a dispute a controversy or struggle for some territory; territory, of course there is, but it is something infinitely more important. China has approached this ques-

tion, shall I say, in a perverted and insidious manner? I put it to you: suppose they had suggested at an earlier stage, some four or five years ago, "our claim line is this, this is our territory" and so on and we had said

17 hrs.

"No". They said, "All right". Apart from war how do we decide it? Could we have told them, "No, we will not talk to you about it"? Obviously, if this kind of thing happens and there are two countries disputing about some territories, it has to be decided with peaceful methods, whatever the peaceful methods may be. But normally one does not go to war, sometimes one may. But they, without raising this question in that way, misled us to begin with because of their maps and then gradually built the Aksai Chin Road and gradually nibbled away little bits of Tibet and so on. That was a thing which was, if I may say so, a highly improper procedure. Apart from the thing itself, the procedure was wrong and showed a bad mentality.

So, I was saying that this is a question far greater and bigger than the territories which China has aggressed upon, although that is important enough for us. That itself will be quite important and strong enough an argument for us to resist it with all our might. But there is something infinitely more in it. Even the question of territory is important for us. Why? Hon. Members have quoted some slokas from the *Raghuvamsa* and other places. The Himalayas, as every Indian knows and ought to know, is a part of the bone and blood of India. It is not just a bit of territory thrown out. For thousands of years all our ancient books, all our medieval books, all our literature and all our classical books are full of the Himalayas. Our gods are supposed to live in the Himalayas. Our culture is there. Everything is there. So, it is a much more intimate part of us than just a bit of territory. But let that be; that is for us. But there is something more to it.

The rest of the world is not concerned with our sentimental attachment with the Himalayas. But they are concerned very much with the attitude that China has taken up in various matters. It is well known. It is not for me to say what it is. But in the Communist ranks, between the biggest Communist countries, that is, the Soviet Union and China, there is not much love lost. That is a well known fact.

**Shri Ranga:** As between England and America. They are together. They are together here also.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** My difficulty is that Professor Ranga pretends to be an expert about things he knows nothing about . . . . . (Interruption). I am sorry.

**Shrimati Gayatri Devi (Jaipur):** If the hon. Prime Minister had known anything about anything, we would not have got into this mess today.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I could not catch what the hon. Member said.

**Mr. Speaker:** That was nothing very important.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am sorry, I did not catch what the hon. Member said. It is a patent fact. . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** What we cannot hear is not important at all.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** But we heard it.

**Shrimati Gayatri Devi:** I might repeat it.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Maharani Sahiba need not worry. Professor Ranga is strong enough. He can answer. . . . . (Interruption).

**Shrimati Gayatri Devi:** After all, if the hon. Prime Minister and the Government had a knowledge of all these things, they would not have got us into this mess.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I cannot bandy words with a lady Member. . . . (Interruption).

**Shri Hem Barua:** Chivalry.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was venturing to point out that there are big questions in the world. One of the biggest—it is not often said in public but I shall say it—is the future of the relations of the Soviet Union with China. This is a world question in which every Chancery in the world is deeply interested, whether it is the United States, England, France, Germany, Yugoslavia or any other country.

**Shri Ranga:** Another dream!

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is. So, if one dabbles in politics or diplomacy, one has to keep this picture before one. If one dabbles in war, one has to keep very much this picture before one and not take a line or an attitude which may be harmful and which sometimes is bound to be harmful. What Professor Ranga says or the attitude that he suggests is not only likely to be harmful but it is patently harmful. Anybody with a little knowledge of these things will see that. He will know it. But he has not grasped the point yet and it is my misfortune that I cannot explain it to him. . . . . (Interruption).

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore):** Quote Harriman.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** He asked me as to why I did not say that I referred to China as Communist China. China is Communist, of course. We all know that. But China is developing a peculiar form of Communism which is considered dangerous and harmful by even the other Communist countries and if you bunch them all together and needlessly increase the animosity and opposition to you, it is not the path of wisdom. I am stating it very frankly. I could go very much deeper into it, but I hope with his acute intelligence, he

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

would grasp the point.... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Ranga:** Unfortunately, he is living in a fool's paradise. There is no question whatsoever.... (*Interruption*). It is all right; you are 370, so you can shout. But you cannot out-shout sense.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Right in the beginning I referred to what Shri Anthony said about our soldiers and our jawans and about their courage etc. Surely, there is no one here who doubts that. May I add that unfortunately because of the way it occurred and all that an impression has been created of a terrible disaster falling on the Indian Army. I do not think that is a correct impression. Undoubtedly, there were defeats. We need not hide the fact. But they were defeats due to a variety of causes. One hon. Member wanted an inquiry into it. No doubt, we are departmentally inquiring into it. We may inquire into it and more and more will come out. But the facts are fairly clear.

One minor fact but having an important bearing is that we had to send our soldiers rather hurriedly from somewhere near sea-level to 14,000 feet height. Normally, it takes several weeks, three weeks at least, to acclimatise; otherwise, if a person is suddenly transported, only about 30 per cent energy he has got; he has not got the rest, he might have even less. Whether it was a mistake of somebody because we had to do it owing to pressure of events I cannot say. But this was one factor. All this talk about weapons, clothing and food is just wrong, if I may say so. Of course, if they had better weapons, they would have done better. Now that have given them somewhat better weapons, many of them prefer their older weapons because they are used to it. They are lighter and the new weapons are heavier. The experts have said that the older weapons, the .303 rifles are as good as any in those

conditions. Opinions may vary. Let them have the best weapons. But they have been fighting with these other weapons throughout their careers.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): May we ask which expert gave this opinion? Can the hon. Prime Minister disclose this, which expert said this, namely, that .303 rifles are good enough for this.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not going to mention names, but eminent people from outside have given this opinion. I say so because Shri Kamath, like Professor Ranga, probably values the opinions of outsiders more than that of insiders.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** We have taken a cue from the hon. Prime Minister who summons foreigners for advising him. Always it has been so. Even for matters for which they were not wanted, for roads, for administration, for everything foreigners come here. Expertitis is the disease, expertise they want everything. We are blamed every time. When we raised the matter in the past we were branded as war-mongers. Now, when war has come because of peace mongers.  
(*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** There was no cause for such an excitement.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It is hardly fair. He wants to twist us.

**Mr. Speaker:** Where is the cause for such an excitement?

**Shri Hem Barua:** On the 22nd October the BBC, quoting some of our Army officers, said that the guns that were used by our jawans in NEFA were guns that were left over from the Second World War.

**Mr. Speaker:** Some officers might have said one thing and others the second thing. That is just possible.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is quite right. I am merely pointing out....

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Order an enquiry. Many things.....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Are we shifting the shooting source from one corner to the other?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Does the hon. Member want me to answer?

**Mr. Speaker:** No.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I really do not understand why some hon. Members get rather warmed up by my very polite and friendly references. (*Laughter*).

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** We are also polite. (*Interruptions*). If that is politeness, we return the compliment. (*Interruption*).

**Shri Priya Gupta:** On a point of order, Sir, in this national emergency, we expect the Prime Minister to be more serious. What is all this laughing?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Is he sure that he is serious when he is interrupting? Everybody has to be serious. (*Interruptions*). Order, order.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** Ask these musketeers to be silent.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** That is frivolous.

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

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am sorry that the hon. Members' conscience pricks them. If something is pointed out, they get very angry. It is amazing. I cannot go on speaking to everybody.

**Shri Ranga:** You have a guilty conscience on your side. You have a bad conscience.....

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

**Shri Ranga:** Why does he invoke conscience? It is the Government that suffers from a guilty conscience. Had

it been any other country, they would have been dismissed. Unfortunately, we have it here in this country. In any other country, they would have been dismissed.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** The Prime Minister is not fair to the House.

**Shri Ranga:** Bad conscience is there on their head and on their chest.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Should we hear the Prime Minister.....

**Shri Ranga:** Why should he invoke conscience?

**Mr. Speaker:** Every one had his own say. Now, we have to listen to the reply.

**Shri Ranga:** There is a limit. I got up to answer. All these gentlemen began to shout. You allow it. They got up. Cannot they be.....

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not necessary to cast aspersions on the Chair as well. I have never encouraged or condoned anybody's behaviour on that side.

**Shri Ranga:** When we get up to answer, they shout. Is that the way? He took the cue and he began to say conscience. That is why I say, bad conscience is on their chest.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would he kindly resume his seat?

**Shri Ranga:** They failed miserably at this crucial hour, not once: many times. Yet, they still continue to shout! Should this continue?

**Mr. Speaker:** Would he kindly resume his seat? Shall I ask the Prime Minister to sit down and allow Shri Ranga to make another speech?

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** Let Prof. Ranga be sent to the front.

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

**Shri Ranga:** Yes, Sir. It is high time that the Communist party should have been banned. It is because

[Shri Ranga]

of the bad conscience of this Government and the Prime Minister that these gentlemen are still carrying on the show here. The Communist Party should have been banned. (*Interruptions*).

**An Hon. Member:** He is already in the front.

**Mr. Speaker:** He is of course in the front. But, all attacks are being directed towards the Chair. That is the only difficulty. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Ranga:** This is peoples war. (*Interruption*).

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** I will accompany him.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order, Mr. Chatterjee also. I think Members have had enough. Let us listen to him patiently.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Shri H. P. Chatterjee is a fellow traveller of the Prime Minister.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** Certainly. It is a great thing.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was mentioning that probably one of the important factors which led to our reverses was the special training and tactics of the Chinese army which we saw some years ago in the Korean war where very fine soldiers from the United States, large numbers of them—certainly, they had no complaint about the weapons; they had the latest weapons—were swept away simply by people who had very poor weapons but who followed a different tactics. It may be asked, and quite rightly, why we were not prepared for that Chinese tactics.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** Yes.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It may be said so, certainly, but I do not wish to enter into that argument. But it is not easy to change the whole Army's training rather quickly in a matter of this kind. We have naturally profited by that, and we will train, if not the

whole Army, batches of the Army in this particular tactics.

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I know how is it that the Chinese troops..... (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. How is it possible to conduct proceedings in this manner?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** It is the right of every Member to interrupt, and if my hon. friends shout us down as usual, how can we function in this House?

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I seek a clarification? I am very polite.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** On a point of order.....

**Mr. Speaker:** Point of order about my standing?

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** आज मारे लोग न जाने कहां से आ गये हैं ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप का प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर पीछे होगा, यह दूसरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर था । लेकिन आप ने जो कहा क्या वह आप के लिये उचित था ?

**श्री प्रकाश बीर शास्त्री :** यह बात में बड़ी नफ़्तना म कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हाउस किन कठिन परिस्थितियों में यहाँ पर विचार कर रहा है ? जरा सोचिय तो ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** उन को बन्द करने की आप इजाजत तो दें । मैं क्या कहूँ । अगर हर एक मेम्बर उपाँ में शामिल हो जाय तो किस को बन्द किया जा सकता है ?

**श्री प्रकाश बीर शास्त्री :** कल आप ही ने कहा था कि श्री मनी राम बागड़ी को इन तरह से हंस कर एनकरेजमेंट नहीं देना चाहिये आप स्वयं सोचिय कि हम कितनी बड़ी संकटपूर्ण स्थिति से गुजर रहे हैं । उसमें यह हंसी कहां तक ठीक है ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं ने उतरो कहा, किसी और से तो नहीं कहा ?

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** यहां सब क सब एक साथ बोल उठते हैं ।

**Mr. Speaker:** Every Member has a right to interrupt, but certainly only if the hon. Minister gives in. If he does not yield the floor, then probably the hon. Member has to sit down, and I shall allow him or give him permission at the end to put a question.

**श्री श्रीरं (अलीगढ़) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां यह परधानी आती है । आज देश पर जो संकट है, आज जो हम इन परिस्थितियों में हैं, उन परिस्थितियों में ला कर डालने वाला कौन है ? किस ने ला कर डाला है ? आज की सरकार ने । आज इस गवर्नर के लिये जिम्मेदार कौन है ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आर्डर, आर्डर ।

**श्री श्रीरं :** कम से कम सरकार के लोगों को जिम्मेदारी से जवाब देना चाहिये हम लोगों को । खाम कर इस मीके पर जब कि दुनियां भर की आंखें हमारी तरफ लगी हुई हैं । हम जानना चाहते हैं कि कौन जिम्मेदार है इस परिस्थिति के लिये ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** जो आप कह रहे हैं । उसको भी दुनियां के लोग देख रहे हैं । आप की और हर एक को चाहिये, किसी तरफ भी वह बैठा हो, कि हम जिम्मेदारी को महसूस करें ।

**श्री श्रीरं :** हम उस जिम्मेदारी को समझ कर ही बोलना चाहते हैं, हम इन परिस्थितियों को समझ रहे हैं ।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I continue speaking? (*Interruptions*).

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

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I seek a clarification?.....

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** On a point of order. Would the hon. Prime Minister resume his seat? I had sought to raise a point of order earlier. But I have not been given an opportunity.

**Mr. Speaker:** What is that point of order?

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** जब बार-बार इधर से कोई सवाल पूछा जाता है, कोई भी इंटरप्शन हो सकता है, कोई भवाल पूछा जा सकता है, तब आखिर यह क्या तरीका है कि "नहीं" "नहीं" । अगर आप इस को नहीं रोक सकते तो कैसे कार्रवाई चलेगी ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब मैं इस प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर का क्या जवाब दूँ ?

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इसके सम्बन्ध में आप की व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह व्यवस्था आप को भी मालूम है और मुझे भी मालूम है । अगर आप ने कोई प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर नहीं उठाया है । अब आप आराम से सुनिये ।

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I know from the Prime Minister how it is that the Chinese troops in NEFA displayed such an extraordinary knowledge of the difficult terrain there and the unmapped routes? That is the clarification which I want.

**Mr. Speaker:** I hope now the hon. Prime Minister would be allowed to proceed uninterrupted.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is rather difficult to continue speaking about any subject when some hon. Members are constantly interrupting, getting excited and generally preventing me from continuing.

I ventured to put before the House a reason which is considered by all the experts that I know of, Indian or



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

foreign, the major reason, that is, a reason which has been proved. The American Army had a bad time in Korea in spite of its best of arms, best of good men and all that, because of the peculiar tactics, half guerilla, half army, which the other side showed. Books have been written about it. I said that the British Army had an equally bad time against the Japanese in Malaya etc. with different tactics. Our Army, unfortunately, has not been trained in that particular tactics. It can be trained, it would be trained.

I mentioned that. It is not a controversial point; it is a simple thing which is believed. My point was to say ditto to what Shri Frank Anthony said, namely, let nobody think that our Army or our fighting jawans are lacking in courage or ability or steadfastness. I am sure they are the best of their kind in the world. I am quite sure of it. It is not my opinion only. People who come from outside with some knowledge of armies elsewhere have also held that opinion and hold that opinion.

I went the other day to Tezpur, to the front areas. I saw these people in their trenches or wherever they were. They are a fine lot of men, not at all frustrated. The word 'frustrated' has been used here several times. But those people I saw were not frustrated, though some people here might be frustrated at things happening.

So I want this House to realise that both in Ladakh and NEFA, our armies have a very sound heart. I agree with Shri Frank Anthony also that in Ladakh they fought very well indeed. Even in NEFA, not altogether, there were some parts where they fought very well.

Some reference was made to Intelligence. It is difficult to judge Intelligence but I think that on the whole our Intelligence has been first-class. (Laughter). It is no good Prof. Ranga laughing.

**Shri Ranga:** What about Se La? We have had that bitter experience. We did not know how they came over.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am sorry. I happen to know a little better about what happened at Se La. How could I go on with ignorant people making ignorant remarks?

**Shri Ranga:** All right. Have your own way.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** You can say anything you like. I am speaking from my experience which happens to be better about this matter. Of course, we do not compare our Intelligence system with those of great countries with vast networks all over. Naturally, they spend more on their Intelligence than the whole of the annual revenue of India. We cannot do that, we do not wish to do that, spend all our money in that way. But considering our resources, our Intelligence is good. I ventured to say that from such experience as I have. You may not agree with it.

**Shri Ranga:** All right. We do not agree.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Now it can be better. It ought to be better. That is a different matter.

I am glad one hon. Member, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, laid great stress on the fact that we must not change our policy of non-alignment at all. But perhaps one Member of his own Party said the opposite.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Only one Member has spoken from our Group.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I apologise. It was a member of the Swatantra Party. He opposed this and wanted us to join military blocs etc. which can bring us no particular good and which I think—I gather Shri Dwivedy also thinks—would do us some harm. It is never good to change a policy in which you believe under stress of

circumstances, especially when that other policy, as you can conceive very well, does not lead to very better results. I am convinced of that, and I am glad that Shri Dwivedy is also convinced of it.

Shri Dwivedy talked something, I could not catch, about Rs. 150 crores of loss. I cannot understand where this Rs. 150 crores came in or any crores at all.

**Shri Surendranath Rwivedy:** If it is not a fact, I am glad to be corrected.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have never heard of it.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** I got the information from responsible persons, both civil and military, that we lost materials worth Rs. 150 crores.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I think there must be some mistake in somebody's understanding, because this figure is inconceivable.

There are two or three major points. One is that some hon. Members did not agree with our proposal about the 8th September line, that date being adopted. The House may remember that this date has been put forward for the last two months or so repeatedly. It has been mentioned in this House previously, and I think that it is a right thing to say, a right thing to give. What hon. Members suggest is, some one suggested, that the date should be 15th August, 1947. As a matter of fact, that date does not help very much. Of course, the point is what the line was on that date, the question arises, not that you took a firm, fixed line and you stuck to it.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** On a point of clarification, because the Prime Minister is referring to me. I had referred to 15th August, 1947. The maps are there. Everything is quite clear, but this 8th September, 1962 or 7th November, 1957 is not clear. You might not have been in possession of

them, but on maps everything is quite clear.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not wish to enter into an argument, but I wish to say that is the very thing that is challenged, that map of 1947 is not accepted by everybody. My point is we may be right, I think we are right, that is not the point, but it is not a universally accepted thing.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Excepting China.

**Shri Tyagi:** Kashmir and Ladakh were not with us on that date.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am sorry I am unable to explain something which seems to me to be very obvious. If two countries challenge each other's interpretation of a frontier, the challenge may be a frivolous one, a futile one, but it is challenged, it has to be decided either by personal contacts, by negotiations or by arbitration or by war. There is no fourth way.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** How could you say not universally accepted?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. He cannot contain himself. I am requesting all hon. Members to be patient.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** An hon. Member from Kashmir, talking about Ladakh, said some things. Perhaps he did not listen to me. He knows something about Ladakh and about the Kashmir border, but I am not going into that.

What I am suggesting is, it is no good saying that we shall talk to you when you have been completely beaten down, then we will dictate terms to you. That is not a practical attitude. You have to mix the military steps that you may take with steps in politics which strengthen you to take the next step. If you want to take the last step to begin with, you may not be able to jump all that gap, and you may slip, not go further at all. It is obviously desirable to aim at a step forward, a major step, which

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

strengthens your position, without giving up anything. We decided long ago, two or three months ago, to suggest this 8th September line because, if accepted by the Chinese Government, it shows that all that has happened since then has been their aggression. It is a very big thing for them to accept, and they have not accepted it. It is an obvious thing that it will be a great gain for us to do that politically, diplomatically, psychologically and militarily. But, instead of our merely saying that you must do something much more which they are not likely to do—there is little chance of it now, later they may do it—I submit that what we have suggested, what we have struck to, has not changed in the last two months. We have repeated that, I do not know how many times in our letters and statements as hon. Members will see. It is a right procedure. This has created some impression on many of the neutral countries that are meeting in Colombo or elsewhere.

I mentioned rather casually about the International Court of Justice at the Hague. What I said was that if and when the time came for it, if the House agrees, if the Parliament agrees, we might perhaps think of it. There is no question of being too late or too early. It is not too late or too early; it is the right time, when the right time comes. I am merely saying that we will not do things contrary to the accepted notions in the world today. Maybe the other party may not agree; that is a different matter. But for us to say that we will not and cannot agree to send a thing which should be accepted as legitimate by most countries of the world.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** You said something more—provided we regain our position of 8th September. That is what you said.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** You are quite right, Dr. Aney, I said that this is preliminary—this business of the 8th September, etc. The others follow

that, that is, when we reach a stage of discussion of the merits of the question.

Prof. Ranga referred to the Dalai Lama. The Dalai Lama is completely free to say what he likes and to do what he does. It is true that we have not accepted or allowed him to start an emigre Government here and I think we were quite right and we will still be right....

**Shri Ranga:** Question.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is a different matter. I am merely saying that he is free to say and do what he likes. We do not muzzle him in any way.

**Shri Ranga:** What about our advice?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There is no question of advice. We will not permit a Government to be established in our country. It is a political matter of high importance. If he starts a rival Government here which I think would be harmful to us in many ways....

**Shri Ranga:** Question.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is a different matter. That would mean not only our undertaking to rid the aggressor from our territory but also undertaking to free the whole of Tibet. It is a large undertaking. If it comes about, it comes about. But for us to undertake it, to hold up the banner of doing it would be, to say the least, not wise. What is more, it would give a justification to the Chinese to say that much that they have said about us in the past has been correct.

**Shri Ranga:** What did he say? I did not follow.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I said that it would give justification to the Chinese to say that what they have been accusing us in the past is correct.

**Shri Ranga:** It is a very unwise thing for us to say, despite it comes from the Prime Minister. I am sorry he has said it. He accuses us of giving points to somebody else but he goes on giving points to the other party.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** China is our enemy now.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Shri Prakash Vir Shastri referred to my Gauhati speech. He himself quoted it. I have no recollection. The question was put to me and my answer was "I do not know." What more can I say? He seems to think that I have some secret information, secret paper, and yet I answered like that. I do not know. I have no knowledge of it. I have never heard of it before, when the question was put to me. Obviously, it was a question about some secret understanding with Pakistan and China about Assam. I have never heard of it before. So, I said so. I know nothing about it.

I think Shri Frank Anthony referred to a sense of participation which people should have. I entirely agree with him. Perhaps the hon. Members may have noticed the step that we are taking, that is, converting the whole community development and panchayati raj movement in a particular way so as to help in war work. It is a mighty movement which directly covers the executive committee, the panches, each a million in number. Imagine, it covers the whole of rural India and indirectly it affects roughly about 200 million people, if not 300 million, directing them in whatever they do, whether it is in agricultural work, small industries or other, and raising volunteers and all that, towards war work. It is a mighty effort, mobilising the nation much more than any separate efforts might lead to.

I am sorry I may have missed some of the points raised, but I hope I have dealt with the major issues involved and I hope the House will appreciate that in spite of some differences about minor approaches or minor matters,

in fact, the whole of this discussion has shown a considerable unanimity about major issues in the House. I grateful to hon. Members who have spoken and expressed their sense of unanimity.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** (Hoshangabad): By your leave, I want to have just one clarification. In the course of his interesting speech, I heard the Prime Minister say that among the contributory causes that led to the fortunate reverses in NEFA was the sudden deployment on the Himalayan heights of troops which were used to service in the plains. Is the House to understand—that when the Prime Minister, on 12th October, on the eve of his departure to Ceylon, said that he had ordered the army to throw the Chinese out from NEFA, he had no idea as to what experience and training those troops had had previously? (*Interruption*). There were press reports about this statement.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I did not go into the personal record of each regiment and battalion.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** That the army as a whole had been ordered to throw the Chinese out of NEFA.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Take for instance, the army in Ladakh which has been there for sometime and had acclimatized itself to live at 14,000 ft. But here they were there for about two weeks or less, sometimes even one week or ten days, when they were suddenly thrown into action. They had not acclimatized themselves. I mentioned that as a factor—not justifying anything—which affected the people for sometime.

**Mr. Speaker:** Amendment No. 1 of Shri P. K. Deo and others. Have I to put it?

**Shri Ranga:** Yes.

*ing from the invasion  
of India by China*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted namely:

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, is of the opinion that not enough is being done to give practical shape to the marvellous spirit of sacrifice and patriotic fervour displayed so spontaneously by our masses and to develop our national defence to vacate Chinese aggression, and that the country and the world should be informed that the treacherous Chinese cease-fire proposal only seeks to keep the Chinese on Indian soil and prevent India from properly fortifying and guarding all the strategic passes and places, which had been desecrated by the Chinese aggression and to keep out of India's control, **Tawang, Longju, Walong, Dhipula** and other strategic mountain passes in the NEFA region, Barahoti, Niti and Mana passes in U.P., Shipkela in Punjab and Chusul, Daulat Beg Oldi airfield and 43 check posts in the Ladakh region, though nominally kept within the area covered by this cease-fire offer and under dispute and that Government should proceed to take all necessary and unflagging steps calculated to vacate the country from Chinese aggression, and therefore urges that—

- (i) no negotiations should be entered into with the aggressor until and unless the Chinese Government agrees and takes effective steps to withdraw her forces and check-posts to the actual and customary, traditional and lawful boundaries;
- (ii) in view of the solemn resolution passed unanimously by the House on the 14th November, 1962, the Chinese proposals should be rejected and defence and other forces

and equipment should be developed rapidly and at the appropriate time, notice should be given that if the Chinese aggression is not fully vacated, India should not be held responsible for the military consequences following from India's just and honourable attempts to vacate aggression;

- (iii) the Government should refer this unprovoked Chinese aggression to the U.N. Assembly and seek the goodwill and active support of the U.N. in this sacred task of freeing India from Chinese aggression;
- (iv) India should break off diplomatic relations with China;
- (v) the Government should seek and obtain massive military assistance and aid of all kinds from all friendly nations by calling them into association with us in this defence of world democracy as against such Communist and imperialist aggression;
- (vi) the Government should take sincere and active steps to reach an effective settlement with Pakistan and Nepal; and
- (vii) the Government should give facilities to Dalai Lama to act freely on political plane."(1)

Those in favour will please say "Aye".

**Some Hon. Members:** Aye.

**Mr. Speaker:** Those against will please say "No".

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** The 'Noes' have it.

**Shri Ranga:** The 'Ayes' have it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let the lobbies be cleared.—Now, I shall put the amendment to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall now put amendment No. 3 to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 3 was put and negatived.*

**Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:** I withdraw my amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the hon. Member have the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

*The Amendment No. 4 was, by leave, withdrawn*

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Sir, I expect the Prime Minister to accept my amendment, because it is in line with what he has said. I shall read it.

**Mr. Speaker:** If it is in line with what the Prime Minister said, why should he read it?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** The main motion only says that the border situation be taken into consideration. My amendment says:

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

“This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, reaffirms the resolution passed unanimously on the 14th November, 1962, and is firmly of opinion that the Chinese proposals of 21st November, 1962 be rejected, and preparations for building up our military strength with all possible speed, in particular reinforcing our agricultural and industrial base with a view to gearing our economy to the needs of the na-

tional emergency, and securing military and economic assistance from all friendly countries, be continued vigorously with firm determination to clear every inch of our territory now occupied by the enemy.”(5)

I think he will have no objection to it.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** They cannot possibly vote against this.

**Mr. Speaker:** What is the reaction of the hon. Prime Minister?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am sorry I cannot find that amendment in my papers. If I may say so with all respect, there is nothing radically wrong in the amendment, but nevertheless, I would prefer to accept Mr. Vidya Charan Shukla's amendment.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Where is it? We have not got it.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is only for the approval of the policy.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Kindly read it, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** For the present, I am concerned with this amendment No. 5.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** If he does not agree to it, it may be put to the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall now put amendment No. 5 to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 5 was put and negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall now put amendment No. 6 to the vote of the House. The question is:

“That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by

[Mr. Speaker]

China, is of opinion that the policy of the Government of India to start negotiations on the condition of withdrawal by the Chinese aggressors to the line of control as on the 8th September, 1962 should be rejected, and no negotiations

should be undertaken till the Chinese aggressors withdraw to the Indian boundary as it existed on the 15th August, 1947."(6)

*The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes 13;*  
*Noes 288.*

## Division No. 14]

## AYES

[17.46 hrs.

Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri  
Deo, Shri P.K.  
Dharmalingam, Shri  
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati  
Gulshan, Shri

Himmatsinhji, Shri  
Kapoor Singh, Shri  
Mate, Shri  
Raju, Shri D.B.

Ranga, Shri N.G.  
Shishank Manjari, Shrimati  
Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak  
Yashpal Singh, Shri

## NOES

Abdul Rashid, Bakshi  
Achal Singh, Shri  
Achuthan, Shri  
Akkamma Devi, Shrimati  
Alagesan, Shri  
Alva, Shri oachim  
Aney, Dr. M.S.  
Arunachalam, Shri  
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bakliwal, Shri  
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri  
Balakrishnan, Shri  
Balmuki, Shri  
Banerjee, Shri S.M.  
Banerjee, Dr. R.  
Birkotaki, Shrimati Renuka  
Barrow, Shri  
Barupal, Shri P.L.  
Basasant Kunwari, Shrimati  
Basappa, Shri  
Basumatari, Shri  
Baswant, Shri  
Besra, Shri  
Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
Bhanja Deo, Shri L.N.  
Bhatkar, Shri  
Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.  
Bhattacharya, Shri Dinen  
Bhawani, Shri Lakhmu  
Biren Dutta, Shri  
Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri  
Bist, Shri J.B.S.  
Borooh, Shri P.C.  
Brahm Prakash, Shri  
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri  
Brij Basi Lal, Shri  
Braj Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri  
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu  
Chakraverti, Shri P.R.

Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
Chandak, Shri  
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati  
Chatter Singh, Shri  
Chatterjee, Shri H.P.  
Chaturvedi, Shri S.N.  
Chaudhry, Shri C.L.  
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala  
Chavan, Shri D.R.  
Chavda, Shrimati  
Chettiar, Shri Ramanathan  
Chuni Lal, Shri  
Dafle, Shri  
Das, Dr. M.M.  
Das, Shri B.K.  
Das, Shri N.T.  
Das, Shri S.B.  
Dasappa, Shri  
Dasaratha Deb, Shri  
Dass, Shri C.  
Datar, Shri  
Dessi, Shri Moratji  
Deshmukh, Dr. P.S.  
Deshmukh, Shri B.D.  
Deshpande, Shri  
Dhebar, Shri U.N.  
Dighe, Shri  
Dinesh Singh, Shri  
Dube, Shri Mulchand  
Dubey, Shri R.G.  
Elayaperumal, Shri  
Elias, Shri Mohammed  
Ering, Shri D.  
Firodia, Shri  
Gahmati, Shri  
Gairei Singh, Rao  
Gaitonde, Dr.  
Ganapati Ram, Shri  
Gauri Shanker, Shri  
Goni, Shri Abdul Ghani  
Gopal Datt, Shri

Guha, Shri A.C.  
Gupta, Shri Badshah  
Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
Gupta, Shri K.R.  
Gupta, Shri Ram Ratan  
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan  
Hajarnavis, Shri  
Hanumanthaiya, Shri  
Haq, Shri  
Harvani, Shri Ansar  
Hazarika, Shri J. N.  
Hem Raj, Shri  
Iqbal Singh, Shri  
Ismail, Shri M.  
Jadhav, Shri M.L.  
Jadhav, Shri Tulcidas  
Jaggiwan Ram, Shri  
Jain, Shri A.P.  
Jamunadevi, Shrimati  
Jedhe, Shri  
Jena, Shri  
Joshi, Shri A.C.  
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra  
Jyotishi, Shri J.P.  
Kadadi, Shri  
Kajrolkar, Shri  
Kamble, Shri  
Kar, Shri Prabhat  
Karni Singhji, Shri  
Kedatia, Shri C.M.  
Khadilkar, Shri  
Khan, Dr. P.N.  
Khan, Shri Shahnawaz  
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand  
Kindar Lal, Shri  
Kisan Veer, Shri  
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar  
Koya, Shri  
Kripa Shanker, Shri  
Krishna, Shri M.R.

Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.	Patel, Shri Chhotubhai	Sharma, Shri K. C.
Kumaran, Shri M. K.	Patel, Shri P. R.	Shaahank Manjari, Shrimati
Kuteel, Shri B. N.	Patel, Shri Rajeshwar	Shahi Rajnan, Shri
Lakhan Des, Shri	Patel, Shri. D. S.	Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur
LakshmiKanthamm, Shrimati	Patil, Shri J. S.	Sheo Natam, Shri
Lalit Sen, Shri	Patil, Shri M. B.	Shinde, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. R.	Patil, Shri. B.	Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati	Patil, Shri S. K.	Sbrimali, Dr. K. L.
Mahadeo Prasad, Shri	Patil, Shri T. A.	Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.	Patil, Shri Vasantao	Siddananiappa, Shri
Mahatab, Shri	Patnaik, Shri B. C.	Siddiah, Shri
Mahishi, Shrimati Safoini	Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.	Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
Malaichami, Shri	Pillai, Shri Nataraja	Singh, Shri D. N.
Malaviya, Shri K. D.	Pottakkatt, Shri	Singh, Shri J. B.
Mandal, Dr. Pashuati	Prabhakar, Shri Naval	Singh, Shri K. K.
Mandal, Shri J.	Pratap Singh, Shri	Singh, Shri R. P.
Maniyangada, Shri	Raghunath Singh, Shri	Singha, Shri G. K.
Mantri, Shri	Raghuramaiah, Shri	Sinha, Shri Satya Naraiyan
Marandi, Shri	Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai	Sinhasun Singh, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri	Raj Bahadur, Shri	Sonavane, Shri
Matcharaju, Shri	Raja, Shri C. R.	Subramaniam, Shri C.
Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra	Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.	Subramanyam, Shri T.
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari	Ram Swarup, Shri	Sumat Prasad, Shri
Mirimata, Shrimati	Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.	Swamy, Shri M. P.
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali	Ramaswamy, Shri V. K.	Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Ramdhani Das, Shri	Swaran Singh, Shri
Misra, Shri Bibudhendra	Rampure, Shri M.	Thomas, Shri A. M.
Misra, Dr. U.	Ramanjai Singh, Shri	Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Misra, Shri Shyam Dhar	Rane, Shri	Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Mohsin, Shri	Rao, Dr. K. L.	Tombi, Shri
Morarka, Shri J.	Rao, Shri Hanmanth	Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
More, Shri K. L.	Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy	Tula Ram, Shri
Mukane, Shri	Rao, Shri E. Madhusudan	Tulmohan Ram, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.	Rao, Shri Ranapathi	Tyagi, Shri
Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda	Rao, Shri Rama S	Uikey, Shri
Munzni, Shri	Ray, Shrimati Renuka	Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutta
Murmu, Shri Sarkar	Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala	Valvi, Shri
Murti, Shri M. S.	Reddiar, Shri	Varma, Shri M. L.
Musafir, Shri G. S.	Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda	Varma, Shri Ravindra
Muzaffar Husain, Shri	Roy, Dr. Saradiash	Veerabasappa, Shri
Naik, Shri D. J.	Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Venkatasubbaiah, Shri
Naik, Shri Maheswar	Saha, Dr. S. K.	Verma, Shri B.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan	Sahu, Shri Rameshwar	Verma, Shri K. K.
Nanda, Shri	Saigal, Shri A. S.	Vidyalankar, Shri A. N.
Naskar, Shri P. S.	Samanta, Shri S. C.	Vimla Devi, Shrimati
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal	Sannani, Shri	Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Nigam, Shrimati Savitri	Saraf, Shri Sham Lal	Vyas, Shri Radhelal
Niranjana Lal, Shri	Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati	Wadiwa, Shri
Oza, Shri	Scindia, Shrimati Vijaya Raje	Warick, Shri
Paliwal, Shri	Sen, Dr. Ranen	Yada, Shri N. P.
Pande, Shri K. N.	Sen, Shri P. G.	Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak
Pandey, Shri R. S.	Shah, Shrimati Jayaben	Yadava, Shri B. P.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo	Sham Nath, Shri	Yusuf, Shri Mohammad
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath	Shankaraiya, Shri	
Panna Lal, Shri	Sharma, Shri A. P.	
Pant, Shri K. C.	Sharma, Shri D. C.	
Parasur, Shri		

The motion was negatived.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla. The question is:

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put amendment No. 9 standing in the name of

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



[Mr. Speaker]

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, approves of the measures and policy adopted by the Government to meet it."(9)

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Amendment No. 10 standing in the name of Shri A. S.

Saigal need not be put now because the House has adopted the earlier substitute motion.

**17.48 hrs.**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till twelve of the Clock on Tuesday, the 11th Devember, 1962|Agrahayana 20, 1884 (Saka).*