

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

problem is one of international co-operation in meeting an emergency and assisting economic and scientific development, it deserves to be supported.

12.20 hrs.

# STATEMENT RE: GOLD CONTROL SCHEME

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Sir, the statement is six pages long.

**Mr. Speaker:** He may lay it on the Table.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I lay it on the Table. [Placed in the Library, See No. LT-734/63].

**Shri Daji (Indore):** As the statement is a very important one, I request that it may be circulated to Members.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. We will see. Now, we shall take up the next business.

12.21 hrs.

# MOTION RE: COLOMBO CONFERENCE PROPOSALS—contd.

**Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar):** Sir, on a point of order.... (Interruptions).

**Mr. Speaker:** Because so many Members rise at the same time?

**Shri Priya Gupta:** The point is whether this motion can go on since there is this news item. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the statement dated the 24th that China has rejected the Colombo proposals as a whole? In view of this, can the motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, be placed here for discussion?

**श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने हैं और उन पर जो स्पष्टीकरण दिये गये हैं वे उनका हिस्सा है। उन क्लैरीफिकेशंस के भाग (१) में यह कहा गया है :—

“The withdrawal of Chinese forces proposed by the Colombo Conference will be 20 kilometres as proposed by Prime Minister Chou En-Lai to Prime Minister Nehru in the statement of the Chinese Government dated 21st November and in Prime Minister Chou En-lai's letter of 28th November, 1962, i.e., from the line of actual control between the two sides as of November 7, 1959, as defined in maps III and V circulated by the Government of China.”

तो यह मैप्स कौन हैं और उनकी क्या स्थिति है और यदि यह उनके हिस्से हैं...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब आप बैठ जाइये। आप उस समय सदन में हाज़िर नहीं थे। सदन में यह प्वाएंटे पहले उठ चुका है और जवाब भी आ चुका है। अब दुबारा इसको उठाने की ज़रूरत नहीं है।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब अगर यह प्वाएंटे पहले एक मेम्बर साहब उठा चुके हैं और उसका जवाब आ चुका है तो क्या मैं फिर तबे सिर से उन्हें उठाने दूँ। कल को कोई दूसरा मेम्बर जो आज हाज़िर नहीं है वह इसी को उठा सकता है, तो क्या यह रोज इसी तरह चला करेगा ? इस तरह सदन की कार्यवाही कैसे चल सकेगी ?

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Nath Pal.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** May I request you to extend the time for this? It is an important matter. The Prime Minister may reply tomorrow. That is all I am suggesting.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will try and see.

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): **Mr. Speaker,** may I with your permission raise a matter which I feel is not unimportant with reference to this debate? We seek information—I would like a denial of it—it seems the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs met the representatives of the Press and made a specific request, almost a direction, that they should play down, if not black out, all critical speeches from this side of the House. That, I feel, if there is any truth in it, is a serious matter and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs should tell us if there is any truth in it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I cannot take any action on such oral observations. If the hon. Member has got something, he may write to me and I will see it.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): I also feel that since this matter has been raised in this House, you should take up this matter. It has been raised by a responsible Member (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** If he wants, he may write to me. I will also inform the hon. Member.

**Shri Hem Barua:** That is my information also from a very authentic source. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs wanted speeches of the Opposition Members to be played down.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Nath Pai.

**Shri Nath Pai** rose—

**Shri Hem Barua:** In view of his health and all that, may I suggest that he may be allowed to speak sitting?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have no objection.

**Shri Nath Pai:** In deference to the House and the Speaker of this august House, I will speak, standing. If I feel at any time any difficulty, I shall sit.

**Mr. Speaker:** He can sit even now; I will allow him even now, if he wants.

**Shri Nath Pai** (Rajapur): **Mr. Speaker** in this innocuous Resolution like principles which are linked up with the destiny of this country.

At the very outset, I would like to state that what has been introduced here as the Colombo proposals are basically Peking proposals which, instead of taking the direct route from Peking to New Delhi, chose to take a circuitous route of Cambodia, Rangoon, Colombo and New Delhi. But, if we tear away the label, meaning Colombo, we see the original product, the genuine Chinese!

**Mr. Speaker,** what we submit is, there is the danger that we will be charged with wanting to endanger what is called Afro-Asian solidarity. This is a very delicate and very dangerous matter. Even to mention it, one runs the risk of being misunderstood. It is a very strange thing—this Afro-Asian solidarity. China can commit aggression and still continue to be a pillar of Afro-Asian solidarity, but for Indians to say that we shall not bow down under that aggression is to invite a charge of endangering!

At the outset, therefore, I would like to say that if India begins to disintegrate and if we are asked to succumb to this kind of proposals, that will begin or mark the disintegration of this country. And if India disintegrates, there may not be much left of Afro-Asia. Let us also remember that in China's conception there is no such thing as Asia. It is "larger" China.

Yesterday, the three main arguments advanced on behalf of those who supported the proposals were these: first,

[Shri Nath Pai]

that these proposals are somehow more advantageous to India than our own demand. Secondly, that this is only a basis for further negotiations, this is not the final settlement; and thirdly—it is very important—that we have not given up any principle which we have adumbrated earlier. In all humility, I should like to deal with all these points and say how fallacious they are. Let me take point No. 1. Shri Dhebar made much plea as to how actually we have gained. Listening to him, one felt almost that the best thing in the world today is to be a victim of aggression because there are so many other advantages, according to him, of being a victim to aggression. Your position improves by being a victim to aggression rather than by resisting it! He was saying how in the common corridor, barring some 30 or 35 miles, we have gained.

In the first place, the Chinese are not so foolish or inept as to accept something that runs counter to their basic interests. The truth of the matter is that the line we draw for the Chinese forces coincides with their 1956 claim line. It is true, of course, that if we go down to Spanggur and Rezangla, it coincides with the international border. But if we travel north from Samzungling, then we find that the aggressor has benefited. But it is not a question of a mile here or there. We thought, when the Prime Minister said that the position or the *status quo* of the 7th September line must be restored, the whole idea was that the aggressor withdraws to the line and we also march to those posts which we held, we go to the line.

What is the position today, when these advantages are being drummed into the ears of this country? The Chinese will remain where they were by the proposals of the 7th September; the Indians, the masters of the soil and the victims of this aggression, will be 20 kilometres from the 7th September line, and as charity, we are of course being asked, "you can maintain civil posts on your own soil."

What a tremendous advantage indeed it is? I think the language of the bard of Stratford-on-Avon, in the crucible of Delhi, is undergoing some basic transformation. It is called advantage. The basic thing is we are losing land. It is not a question of how many inches of land we lose.

I would like to draw the Prime Minister's attention to some guiding principles which he adumbrated or enunciated in this House. He said:

"It is not a question of an inch here or an inch there; it hardly matters. Certainly not an inch of our territory or anything, if somebody forces or compels, because we must never submit to compulsion or to force in a matter of this kind."

It is not a question of how many kilometres or square miles are involved, as Shri Dhebar said. It is the surrender of principle and not merely a piece of territory that hurts us, that makes us resist this. It is this that is making us to take up this stand.

What was that principle? That principle was that the aggressor shall not be allowed the benefit or the fruits of his aggression. But that is precisely what he will be doing. He will be remaining after the so-called withdrawal, on the land where he was before he started the aggression. We will be 20 kilometres behind in our own soil. But, of course, a concession is made to us that we will be allowed to maintain civil posts. Generosity indeed incarnate! We will be allowed to put up civil posts on what is absolutely Indian territory and this, the House and this country is called upon to treat as a benefit and advantage!

I shall now take the basic issues involved here. One wonders if the Government has made up its mind with regard to the Chinese conflict once and for all. It seems to me that

the Government's mind seems to be vacillating like a pendulum from one end to the other. In the Rajya Sabha, the Prime Minister describes the conflict as a border dispute. By the time he has travelled to Shantiniketan, it is a major conflict and not a border issue. I would like that once and for all we make up our mind as to what is its true nature.

I would here like to draw attention to the long-term aims of China. The Chinese have a long memory and they look ahead, far into the future. The ground for their present attack on India was laid in 1950 when the first salvo was fired towards India and the Prime Minister and the Government of this country were described in such choice terms as running dogs of British and American imperialism. They had their aims, but they did not state them, because in the words of Mr. Chou En-lai, the time was not yet ripe. What is the long-term strategy of China? It is not just a piece of territory here or there. It is the ideological and political domination of what is called the whole of Asia. We shall not understand their peace motive, we shall fail to grasp the true significance of their withdrawals and their advances, unless we take into consideration their long-term objective, the adequate strategy that has been evolved and the tactics which they employ from day to day. Only then these strange-looking pieces will be fitted in like in a mosaic with a grand pattern. It is this that the Government is refusing to do and therefore, we evolve a policy from hand to mouth.

The Indian challenge came to the Chinese, because when China began to look and cast its nets for the conquest and domination of Asia, it was India which stood as a challenge and therefore, India had to be humiliated. The defeat was only a preliminary humiliation and then would come the gradual elimination of India. These were the long-term objectives of China.

We are told, of course, by Shri Dhebar, repeating what the Prime Minister has said that when we do it, we are taking a military posture. It is an extraordinary type of casuistry, sophisticated as it is, but nonetheless casuistry. Who is taking a military posture towards whom? He accuses us of following in the footsteps of China. The truth of the matter is that by accepting these proposals, we shall be introducing a most dangerous and pernicious principle in the relations between nation and nation. It will be that might is right and that force shall prevail. We will be accepting the rule of the jungle and it is this that makes us take this stand that these proposals must be completely and firmly rejected.

I should like to say a few words about this peaceful negotiation. We are reminded of what Clausewitz, the arch-priest of German military science has written: "A good conqueror always loves peace, peace on the part of his potential victims." It has suited China eminently that we have been chanting peace, peace and peace. It is this wrong interpretation of the word 'peace' by the Government of India and the Prime Minister that is the root cause of all the troubles into which we have been landed. Is it necessary for this country to be certified for its peaceful methods—this land of Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi? We have fallen so low, we have come to such a pass that the ex-President of the Congress wants to be certified as a peaceful gentleman belonging to a peaceful nation, by whom? By Peking. How very conscious we are of our heritage.

The truth of the matter is, this Government is paralysed by a fear, fear of the military might of China. Its will has been paralysed and its vision has been clouded by the fear of the military might of China and by an equally dangerous fear of being called bellicose and intransigent, the fear of being accused of departing from the path of peace. I think we are also heirs to the same culture

[Shri Nath Pai]

from which the Prime Minister and Mr. Dhebar draw their inspiration. May I quote something, which is part and parcel of our life? I think Mr. Dhebar is a good student of the Gita. Avoid war; but you cannot always do that and a time comes when it does not help to go on chanting peace, peace, peace.

अथ चेत्त्वमिमं धर्मं सग्रामं न करिष्यसि  
तताः स्वधर्मं कीर्ति च हित्वा पापमवाप्स्यसि ॥

I hope he knows. There are certain battles, certain wars, which cannot be avoided. Otherwise you lose both principles and territory; you lose both *swarga* and *prithvi*. If those who are humiliated and insulted still chant peace, peace, they lose the respect of both their friends and their foes. But nonetheless the House is subjected to some sermons on peaceful methods. Listening to this, one would feel that if posterity, completely forgetting some other things, were to read the speeches of the Prime Minister and some recent speeches of Mr. Dhebar, one would get the impression that this was a nation armed to its teeth, threatening the peace of whole of Asia, with armies on the border, waiting for the signal to march into Burma, Pakistan and China. Such is the picture of India that is depicted. One wonders, if Mr. Dhebar was incidentally to meet Sita, he will not be constrained to advise her to be chaste; if he meets Rama, he will not be constrained to advise him to be honest and if he meets Karna, he will not hesitate to advise him to be generous. To advise India to be peaceful and to follow the path of peaceful methods is just like that. What have we been doing all these years, since 1950, except to talk, to negotiate, to plead, to cajole and coax the aggressor? That has been precisely what we have been doing.

Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to point out that while verbally chant-

ing peace, we have been proving to the world the superiority of the ways, of the means, of the path of China, by accepting China's bullying. Then, he goes on and says, we are not submitting—not by words, but in practice. The main contention of the Government and their supporters yesterday was this. And, the patriots in the Congress should ponder who are their most ardent supporters—the right wing of the communist party and the wanderers in their own party; these are the two prominent advocates of this policy. The main thing was that we shall not be losing anything substantially and there is nothing which should excite us; we should sit down at the table, because what we will be negotiating is not the permanent settlement, but only the basis. May I ask him, does he forget the lesson of Kashmir? Has he forgotten what happened in Korea, in Vietnam and in Palestine? All these were ceasefires, temporary borders. But they have now become permanent and nobody can venture to change them. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind—the Chinese know it, the world knows it and there is every reason to suspect that the Government also knows it. They know it very well that the border which is to be the basis of a temporary settlement will be the permanent border between India and China, and it is for this reason that we must resist it and break it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, supposing the negotiations fail—this is how I will submit it for their consideration—what will happen! What makes them say that the negotiations will succeed? What new arguments will they be advancing which in the past have failed to persuade the adversary but which will be bringing him into the path of reason today? What new evidence, what new maps have we produced that you base your hopes that the Chinese will be giving up the territory which they have seized

by the force of their arms? I think this is a very gullible type of faith that is being placed on the success of the negotiations.

Secondly, there is something to be said, of course, about negotiations and peaceful methods. Nobody here in this House and in this country is opposed to peaceful negotiations and peaceful methods. What we are opposed to is peaceful surrender in the name of peaceful negotiations. That is what we are opposed to, and that is what precisely will be happening. That is what is destined to happen once you sit there with the Chinese with the moral sanction of the six non-aligned powers. Not one of whom was able enough, courageous enough, honest enough to condemn the aggression. Let me ask—I will be accused that we are unfair to the nonaligned powers—how did you behave when Egypt was the victim of aggression? Did we indulge in this casuistry, did we mince words, did we quibble with words? We called Great Britain, France and Israel aggressors and then asked for complete, total withdrawal before talks were resumed. We did not suggest to Israel: "You stop on the north bank of Suez Canal and the Egyptians will be on the south bank of the canal". We did not tell the Anglo-French forces: "You stop in Port Said and the Egyptians will be in Alexandria and Cairo, and you come to the table". This was the basic policy the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, had given to this country.

May I, with your indulgence, say this. This is a claim which is quite impossible. It was said in this very august House on 12th September, 1959. I know the reply that comes is that things have changed since we adumbrated the principle—that is the argument and I will deal with it. Let me quote their earlier stand. I am anticipating their argument: "Yes, my dear friends, we said that but things have changed and these things, therefore, do not hold any water any longer". But this was the original principle. This is a claim which it

is quite impossible for anybody or almost any Indian ever to admit, whatever the consequences. This is quite clear. There is no question of mediation, conciliation, arbitration about that, because that is absurd. This is a very extra-ordinary claim from China. This is a thing whether India exists or does not exist and therefore cannot be agreed to be made a subject of negotiation. Therefore, the matter ends there. I wish the matter ought to have ended then and there. We ought to have completely confronted China saying: "You may have forces. We would not be mind-ing what happens to us, but we shall not be bullied by you to come to the negotiating table." What was the stand that we took on 21st August? It was reiterated on 26th September and again reproduced verbatim. It is not normally that a Government reproduces verbatim its note unless it is an article of faith with the Government unless it is the sheet-anchor of its policy, and we had thought that the Prime Minister in the note of 22nd August told the Chinese that "unless the *status quo* changed by you unilaterally by the use of force is changed there is no question of starting negotiations". We thought that was a thing to be inscribed on the portals of the Ministry of External Affairs, that was a thing to be carried like a badge on the lapels of our coats, that was to be the beacon for posterity and inspiration for all the Prime Ministers of India. But hardly had the echoes of that inspiring call died down before we began to withdraw, to abdicate, to give up this policy. Why? Because, it was said, things have changed. What has happened? The Chinese will be drawing the pernicious, sinister meaning of this, that so long as they were nibbling stealthily, secretly, fraudulently, at our frontiers we were not willing to talk to them, but the moment they came with their hammer blows, of course, we were ready with bended knees to go to the table.

In September we were telling that we would not go to the negotiating

[Shri Nath Pai]

table. But in December here we are with all our persuasive terms ready to go and sit down at the table. But there is no table. I am prepared to go to a table and talk and argue our case. But there is no table. The Chinese are sitting on the chest of this country and asking us to negotiate. They must be pushed and dislodged and then only readiness must be shown that we will be negotiating with the enemy.

The stock argument of the Government is—not openly said, not publicly said, but surreptitiously put into the ears of the people—this. They say: "What shall we do; the Chinese are mighty; they have the biggest land army in the world and it is very difficult to defeat them". What a pity that the one man who was supposed to be roaring like a lion should be giving expression to this kind of fear psychosis. It pains us and I particularly feel very constrained to give expression to this kind of remarks regarding the Prime Minister. But the conclusion is inevitable. We cannot escape this conclusion. What else? What has changed except the fact of Chinese aggression and except the fact that we have suffered some military reverses? But the tragedy of it is by this kind of pusillanimous attitude towards the aggressor we are converting temporary reverses into permanent disabilities and into lasting defeat. Of course, Shri Dhebar says: "Look at the tremendous advantage we have got. China has been isolated." We are asked to have consolation in the supposed Chinese isolation and to completely ignore our own humiliation in the eyes of the whole world.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** National humiliation.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Yes, national humiliation in the eyes of the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by thanking you for your indulgence. In

conclusion, I will be pleading this with this House. Let us remember that when the Nazi hordes of Hitler were knocking at the doors of Moscow the brave Russians refused even to think of peace when peace was offered in return for a piece of Ukraine. Let us not forget that hardly had they recovered from the stunning impact of a cruel and sudden blow the American had received at the hands of the Japanese at Pearl Harbour before they proclaimed their resolve to repulse the aggressor. Let us not for one moment be unmindful that when Hitler after having subdued the whole of the continent of Europe turned to Britain and offered peace the British contemptuously spurned the hand of peace and chose the only path which is given to those who want to stand for their honour, their decency and their self-respect. Let it not be said, Mr. Speaker, that the heir of Mahatma Gandhi, the one Indian who to millions of his countrymen became a symbol of their self-respect, was to be seen suing on bended knees at the feet of Peking. We must spare this humiliation and in that lies the salvation of this country.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** (Barackpore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, after the speech of Shri Nath Pai where, I must say, he has used polemics to great advantage and he has used all his powers of felicity of expression to drive home, sometimes in vituperative terms, rubbing into us the humiliation which we have felt at the Chinese aggression on to our territory within 100 miles of Tezpur, what I feel is that this House has been called upon to take a momentous decision not on the basis of either vituperation or polemics, because one false step which we may take today may cost not only India but Asia and the world much for what we stand for. There is no doubt about it that even when we discuss the Colombo proposals none of us can hide in our hearts that there has been a crisis of confidence created by the aggression

by China upon India. We cannot forget it, and yet we have to realise that diplomacy is also part of politics. As Shri Dhebar has pointed out very clearly and correctly, though Shri Nath Pai made an attack on his speech, there was no question of giving up any claims and it was only a question of settling those claims. In this context it is very important to realise that there is a world outside and that world counts. Nobody can forget, not even the Chinese, not even the strongest in the world, that there is a world outside. We have to get friends and we have to convince them about the justness of our claims; we have also to convince them of our reasonableness. There is nothing to be ashamed of if we put it that way and we have to show that when some efforts have been made by some well-meaning friends we respond to them.

To the Colombo Powers we are beholden. There have been speeches in this House where it has been stated in the most vituperative language that the Colombo Powers are doing nothing else but prostrating themselves before the Chinese proposals. They have said that the Colombo Proposals are acrobatics of non-alignment. It is amazing how some people revel in making a demonstration that India has few friends and that most of the friends are on the side of China. It is an amazing attitude of mind which I cannot understand. What is the aim of such parties as the Swatantra, Jan Sangh and even Praja Socialist and Socialist? They try to demoralise India. They want us to join the Western alliance. They want us to show our gratefulness to the United States and United Kingdom by joining the western alliance. Even the statesmen from United Kingdom and United States do not say, like our friends here, that we should join their military alliance. We find a letter by Rajaji in the Times of India of yesterday where he says:

"We cannot, it must be obvious to the meanest intelligence, meet a premanent menace across the border of this nature by temporary measures, be it the receiving of arms now from America or elsewhere or even by intimidating and scraping together all the gold and brass in the country and putting it in the Treasury."

So, according to him, we have to go in for permanent measures by entering into military alliances with the west.

**Shri Ranga:** It is obvious.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** May I say that when Shri Ranga was speaking yesterday he did not make his suggestion in very clear terms in the House? Rajaji has been more clear about it.

**Shri Ranga:** I am endorsing it now.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I also recommended to him what Mr. Galbraith says in this connection because that may carry some weight with him. Mr. Galbraith also favours India-China negotiations. I suppose that may carry more weight for him.

The Colombo Powers represent a powerful group of nations. They represent a group with powerful impact even in the United Nations which neither the West nor the East can so easily brush aside. Mr. Khrushchev and the Communist countries of the world have referred to and praised the role of the non-aligned group of nations, and said that they stand for peace and, therefore, there should be the friendliest relations between the Socialist countries and the non-aligned nations. The Colombo Powers are non-aligned like us. They are not members of any military pact or bloc. They seek to be friends with all, as we have been and as we seek to be. They all have experienced the evil effects of imperialism. Some have experienced the ways of



[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

British imperialism, some of the Dutch, French or American. Now they stand for Afro-Asian solidarity. They may not have called China as aggressor but many of them know the tremendous harm that China has done by bringing non-alignment into disrepute and creating a situation that strengthens such forces who want to drag us into military alliances.

We are deeply grateful to the Colombo Powers. It is a matter of shame that some Members have showered abuse on them. I would like to point out that even the press, about whom we have heard so much, the *Anandabazar Patrika*, which has the largest circulation in my country, has pointed out . . .

**Shri Ranga:** In your country?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I am sorry; in my State. That is the Bengali way of referring to the State. We, Bengalis, do not know English so well.

The *Anandabazar Patrika* talks about the talks Mrs. Bandaranaike had with our Prime Minister. Look at the language they use. They say:

"We know our Prime Minister loves to talk too much. In place and out of place, in necessity and also unnecessarily he rains torrents of talk—that is his nature. This time there is added significance since the talks are going on with Mrs. Bandaranaike. However much she may be a politician, she is, after all, a woman. Therefore, she should not find overmuch talking distasteful. May be, she is also not averse to sitting and weaving a network of words. So, if only for these reasons, a flood of talk is released on the Nehru-Bandaranaike meetings then that is not something that is incomprehensible."

This is the type of language that is constantly used in the press. Also, this is the type of language which we have seen reflected in this House. What is the type of language that Shri Anthony used yesterday? He talked about prostrating before the Chinese. He talked about acrobatics of non-alignment. All these things have caused great harm to us. When Mr. Ali Sabri held a press conference, he was heckled. As has been brought to our notice by *The Hindu* even the one friend that we have has been heckled. I say that these things should be taken notice of. *The Hindustan Times* has adopted the same language. Shri Nath Pai also said the same thing. They say: "The Colombo proposals are, by and large, the Chinese proposals; only they differ in two small respects". What are those two small respects? One is that we do not have to withdraw. Is that a very small thing? The other one is that we have joint control of the area. Are these small things? The Colombo powers have differentiated between the aggressor and the aggressed by the fact that we are not asked to withdraw in our own territory—that is what we do not want to do and we have not to do it now—whereas the Chinese have to withdraw from their present positions. Regarding joint control of Ladakh as a demilitarised zone, let us see what our Prime Minister said regarding the 8th September line. We in our resolution have referred to the restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September. The Colombo Powers call for a 20-kilometre withdrawal by the Chinese from their present position; whatever that may be, we have to see whether it comes to the 8th September line. This brings us, by and large, to the 8th September line. But what I want this House to consider is this. What was the status quo before the 8th September? The area was dotted by our checkpoints around which we exercised control. The Chinese also had numerous

## Proposals

checkposts around which they exercised control. I remember that when we were called by the Prime Minister he explained to us the situation in the beginning of August. It was very clear that some checkposts were right in front of us and some right behind us. So, even on the 8th September there was dual control in that area, whether we like it or not. It may be a bitter pill to swallow but that was a fact. In that area the Chinese had their checkposts and they controlled certain areas. We had our checkposts and we controlled certain areas.

Now, to my mind, the Colombo proposals give us some advantages. Most of the Chinese posts outmanned us in numbers. If the parity principle is accepted, it is advantageous to us. Some people say in this House that we have not accepted the 8th September line. I have gone through the debates and I find that this House while debating the border situation on the 8th December not only heard Government enunciate to China and Colombo Powers the three point reply to Chinese questions but we heard the Prime Minister stating that we stand by the 8th September line. We have passed the Resolution:

"This House approves of the measures and policies adopted by the Government to meet it."

**Shri Ranga:** I had made it very clear and told the House then that we do not accept that particular date, 8th September, with all its consequences.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I never said Shri Ranga approved it. I said that the House approved it.

13 hrs.

Therefore I would certainly suggest, as we had suggested earlier to the hon. Prime Minister, that we should have a Resolution and that Resolution should be passed by this House; other-  
2549 (A1) LSD—5.

wise, there will be hon. Members who will pose that they reflect the opinion of this House. This time we will find that in the Opposition there will not only be the Communists but other hon. Members also who will support the Government on this matter whatever the press may say and try to show to the country that it is only the Congressman and the Communists who support it. There is no united opposition of this issue.

**Shri Ranga:** There are some fellow-travellers also.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Everybody is a fellow-traveller. But, in any case, the Opposition is not opposed to it.

I also want to make it clear that this 8th September line is not the line of final settlement. Our claims with all the juridical and other proofs which we have gathered remain and we are in duty bound to fight for them.

I was listening to Shri Trivedi. He said one thing which stunned me. He said that we shall fight with a sword and not with words. I wondered what world he was living in. If a world war is to come, will it be fought with the sword? Are we living in the feudal times or are we living in the modern world? Even the strongest of nations and the bitterest of enemies have begun to realise the futility of wars. Only the other day Mr. Khrushchov said that not only millions will be killed in the country of battle but also in countries far away from the field of battle and that there will hardly be a big city which will live. If that is the story, can we just say that we shall fight with the swords? We must realise what the consequences are. It is in that background also that we have to make our momentous decision. Let it not be forgotten that if we follow Rajai's advice the Third World War will be fought on India's soil.

## Proposals

**Shri Ranga:** The country will be saved and there will be world peace.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I would like Shri Ranga to realise that the underestimates the consequences of war. This exactly is one of the quarrels in the Communist world with the Chinese Communist Party and it is exactly on that point that Shri Ranga agree somewhat with the Chinese.

**Shri Daji (Indore):** Opposites meet.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** We, Communists, stand for peace, but for peace with honour. It has to be peace with honour and the Colombo proposals provide a basis for it. The inherent strength of our cause is reflected in it and China's partial acceptance gives the lie to the propaganda that India is belligerent.

I do not underestimate the difficulties that will lie in our path. Only today I was a little perturbed on seeing what has been stated in the joint communique issued from China on behalf of Mr. Ofroi-Atta and Premier Chou En-lai, namely, that it is not necessary for us to meet on the basis even of clarifications. It said that we need not accept the clarification and that we might even differ on interpretation; but still we can meet. It is clear that anybody can meet at any time. That is not the main point. The main point which we would like to know is that we do not want protracted negotiations. We want the negotiations to be successful in keeping with the dignity and honour of our country. On that basis it is only right that with the Colombo proposals, the clarifications that have come to us from eminent friends must also be accepted by both sides. It is on that basis that we should go to the conference table. Such statements as I referred to just now really create difficulties in the way.

I do not underestimate the difficulty because I think that it is as difficult to win peace as it is to win in

war. We want to make it known that while we will fight for our border claims, we are also not going to give up Kashmir. We also want to make that clear. There is no question on that point. We entirely agree that reliance only on foreign countries for our arms supply threatens our independence. We have to go on strengthening ourselves. We have to strengthen ourselves and our defence potential. We must strengthen our defence factories. There is the Ishapore Rifle Factory in my constituency. I know, the Ordnance factories are working overtime. They are working even on holidays and are producing arms for the defence of our country. We should be grateful to them. We know that the enthusiasm of the workers will not flag. We must strengthen further our heavy industries, that is, heavy engineering, power, oil, transport etc., and the public sector must not be corroded in these important bases of our defence.

Our cause is just and our policies are strong. We shall never enter into military pacts. We have proved the strength of non-alignment. It may be difficult for us even at the negotiating table, but we shall accept the Colombo proposals and their clarifications in toto, as stated by the hon. Prime Minister, as a basis for consolidating the ceasefire. As our country was united in facing China in war, let us be united to win the battle of diplomacy by wresting the initiative from China who has not accepted these proposals. Let us, this wise policy of strength and restraint, go forward to victory.

**Shri Mahtab (Angul):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will remember that when you asked us to stand and solemnly accept the Resolution, you also decided that this House should meet now and then to be in touch with the efforts which are being made to meet the situation that has arisen as a result of the Chinese invasion. In consequence of your decision we have met this time. So, it is for the Government to place before us as a matter of course what

## Proposals

has happened in the meanwhile with regard to that particular matter, namely, the Chinese invasion.

From the criticism which has been made of the proposals which have been put forth by the Colombo Powers it appears as if we are discussing a peace treaty with China. I think, more importance has been given to this subject than is due to it because these proposals have come as a matter of course and we are discussing the step which the Government have taken by accepting these proposals in principle.

I would remind the House the sequence of events. While China had been nibbling for some time past at our frontiers and while India was protesting against the Chinese incursion, India was also preparing to strengthen the military outposts at the frontier. That process was going on. In the meanwhile the Chinese started a massive invasion and there were some reverses. Just at that time China offered to have talks with India and India, naturally, refused to have any talks unless the *bona fides* of China were proved. Unless there is evidence of *bona fides* on the part of China, no useful purpose can be served by having talks with the Chinese. In that connection it was announced that if the Chinese went back to the 7th September line then alone there would be the test or evidence of the Chinese *bona fides*. They did not agree. In the meanwhile preparations were going on here to strengthen our army and our economic resources. All the steps were being taken. In the meanwhile some powers came forward and made some proposals to start talks on some basis and it is for us to consider as to how to deal with these proposals. We are not here to consider the situation as to what relationship has to be established with China later on. We are here only for the definite purpose of dealing with these proposals which have been made to India by some powers. We need not cast aspersions on those powers. We do not know their motives. Even assuming that

they have been motivated by some interest of their own to make these proposals, we are not concerned with that. Here are some powers which have nothing to do with the invasion by China or with the defence of India directly. They have come forward and made some proposals which have to be considered by us.

From what point of view are these proposals to be considered? Are they to be considered from the point of view of the ultimate treaty which will be arrived at with China or from what point of view have these to be considered? According to me, the only point for consideration will be whether these proposals contain something which would test the *bona fides* of the Chinese. That is the main point. There is no doubt that these proposals contain the test of China's *bona fides*. Whether China accepts them or not will show whether their intention is clear or not. As it appears, they do not accept the clarifications which have been given by the Colombo powers. That clearly shows that China's intention is not clear. So far so good for us. If we reject straightway the proposals which contain that test, I think that we would be considered unreasonable even by our own people, in view of the propaganda and the strategy which the Chinese have adopted so far. First of all, they withdraw. That was a strategic withdrawal. Many people may interpret that withdrawal from various points of view. So far as I am concerned, I interpret it in the light of what Mao has said some time ago. His theory of war is 'three steps forward' two steps backward' He has all along gone on those lines. whatever that be, we are not in a position to know actually what Chinese intended by withdrawal. But, anyway, that step, along with the propaganda which China made of peace created an impression not only outside India but even inside India. Even a person like Acharya Vinoba Bhave suggested that India should not refuse to talk in the present circumstances, that is, in the circumstances the Chinese withdrawal

*Proposals*

[Shri Mahatab]

has created. That being the opinion created by the steps taken by China, we have to see whether these proposals contain something which would prove China's *bona fides*. If it be that these proposals do not contain that kind of test, then we would have been reasonable in saying that we do not trust China, and, therefore, we are not going to accept them. Since we know clearly that these proposals contain something which is not acceptable to China, as is proved now, but which will clearly prove the *bona fides* of China I think that reasonably we cannot straightway reject these proposals.

We are dealing with only these proposals now. Assuming that these proposals are accepted by China, then there will be some indication that China really wants peace. Then, the discussions will start. It may be that the discussion may not succeed, or it may be that ultimately the discussion may succeed.

13.13 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

The policy of not only this country, but, for the matter of that, of all countries is to protect the rights and the territories of the country by peaceful means if possible and by force if necessary. Therefore, that point is not given up, that aggression should be vacated completely. There is no indication that Government are changing their minds on that. Why should we attribute motives to Government when there is no definite indication of that? The preparations are going on. I would have been very glad if the critics had raised the question of preparation and elicited some information from Government as to how the preparations are going on.

I think that in the present context, the consideration of these proposals is a very small matter, as it appears to me. We should be prepared for the situation that the Chinese would not accept these proposals or even if the

discussion starts, the Chinese will not accept India's position and they will insist upon staying on somewhere. We should be prepared for that kind of situation. That is the main and important question with which Members of Parliament should concern themselves.

Apart from that, it was the goodness of the Prime Minister, and it was the goodness of Government that they placed this matter before us. Otherwise, these discussions could have been carried on without the knowledge of the House, as a matter of course. The Prime Minister gave importance to this House, and he considered it necessary to place this matter before us. Otherwise, there was no necessity. These discussions or these talks usually go on in a routine manner.

The suggestion that these proposals should have been straightway rejected does not stand to reason. We have to prove to our own people also and to the public opinion outside that whatever we say stands to reason. We have to argue out our case.

When I was listening to the speeches of the critics, I noticed that that they were going out of these proposals in order to prove their own contention. They did not confine themselves to the terms of these proposals. I am not here to compare these proposals with the stand or rather the suggestion which was made that the Chinese should withdraw to the 7th September line. I have not cared to study the maps to find out whether it exactly coincides with this line or that line; I do not know. But I am convinced that the proposals contain something which if accepted by China will prove their *bona fides*. That is the main point. Here, it is not a question of miles. The area is such that I do not think anybody exactly knows the extent of it in terms of miles or kilometres.

Leaving aside that point, since we are convinced that these proposals if accepted by China would prove their *bona fides* that they really want peace, we cannot straightway reject them. And there the matter ends. This is a very small thing in the context of the Chinese invasion. We have to be prepared for the ultimate victory for ourselves. India must have the necessary strength to protect its own territory and its own interests. Time and again, reference has been made to the assistance to be asked for from other countries. This insistence has gone so far as to suggest that India should approach some countries to underwrite her defence. This is a strange proposal. I do not know how it will build up our morale or the morale of the Army or the morale of the general civil population. No independent country can ask any other country to underwrite her defence. Here we are and we have to defend our own country. I do not admit that the Chinese are more powerful than we. I have a belief in myself, based on reason, that we can defeat China and we will defeat China. There is no doubt about that. We have the necessary strength. The only difference which was there in October last was our state of unpreparedness. We did not expect invasion at that particular time and from that particular quarter. That was our trouble. That happens in the case of all democracies. Now that we have known these things, now that we have known the intentions of China, I am sure that the situation which arose in October last will never be repeated.

That being the position, it is no use always insisting upon foreign assistance. Of course, when one goes to fight, necessarily one seeks assistance from all quarters. That is inevitable. That goes without saying. That is a secondary matter. Our primary interest should be to build up our own morale, to build up our own strength, and to build up our own resources. Concentration should be made on that, not on the foreign assistance which we shall receive or which we are re-

ceiving. If we go on insisting on foreign assistance then I think that we are not preparing this country for the eventuality and we are not preparing the minds of our youth also properly. We should keep in view the posterity. What will they think of us if we always go on saying that we have to take foreign assistance in order to defend ourselves. I do not think that we shall be creating a good generation after us by that kind of propaganda. That is my humble submission to those who always insist upon foreign assistance.

With regard to the question of non-alignment, that has become a subject-matter which has unfortunately been raised in this connection. Somehow or other, the momentum of the past controversy goes on. This controversy was acute when actually that problem was a problem for the whole world some years back. Today, that situation also is changing, in the whole world. So far as we are concerned, non-alignment at one time used to refer to non-alignment with the two main blocs, the Russian bloc and the American bloc. Today, we are up against China. Therefore, we are to seek friends now. Whoever is against China is our friend. This new kind of alignment has to grow and is growing. That being so, we have to try to make as many friends as possible on this basis and not on the old basis. If Russia helps us or even if Russia remains neutral, so far so good, and Russia is a friend of ours thereby. We are concerned only with China now. Therefore, we need not mix up other things.

Reference was made to the intention of China. We need not mix up the ideology here. As far as my study of the Chinese history goes, I think that China's intention is political domination of as many countries as possible. I do not think that they are interested in the ideological domination here or there. As I said on some other occasion, China is making use of communism for her own interests; that is a dishonest way of dealing with

[Shri Mahtab]

the ideology which she professes. That being so, we have to take into account the very fact that we are up against China as a country. Therefore, we have to make as many friends as possible, and we have to prove ourselves to be reasonable to those who care to be our friends or who are expected to be our friends. We have to prove ourselves to be reasonable to our own people also, to the thinking people here and abroad. From all these points of view, I think that the acceptance of the Colombo proposals with their clarifications in principle has been a wise step. Otherwise, I think that we would have thrown ourselves open to all kinds of criticism from all quarters. This is not the time to compare, and I also think that it is not necessary to do so, and I feel that the acceptance of these proposals will add strength to our cause. It is not necessary to compare and say whether these proposals are inferior or superior to the proposals which we once made. We are satisfied, and I am satisfied, and I think that all hon. Members, if they think over this matter a little, will be convinced that the Colombo proposals contain something which if accepted by China will prove their *bona fides*. Therefore, acceptance of the proposals in principle has been a wise step; otherwise, it would have been bad.

In conclusion—and coming back to the preparations stage—I do not think that India can afford to remain in the old mind, that is to say, taking things easy. That has been our heritage so long. We have now to pray in the words of Rabindranath. He said:

Oh God, I prayed to Thee for peace and I have got shame. Now I pray 'Help us to wear our armour' ”.

This should be our slogan all through.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Sir, the House has been asked to consider

the Colombo proposals. It is the privilege and prerogative of the Government to enter into any negotiation and to come to any agreement with any foreign power. It is not necessary for Government to have previous consultation with Parliament. Rather Government comes sometimes to Parliament for ratification after the agreement has been effected. But here in pursuance of the democratic principle followed by our Government, these proposals have been placed before this House for consideration, so that Government may take some guidance from the general trend of discussion in the House. There has not been any amendment giving a sort of directive to Government to act this way or that. That should be left to the Government's own discretion.

During these few months, high passion has been roused and rightly, there has been indignation all through the country about the intention of the Chinese. So any proposal to have a sort of conciliation or negotiation with China will arouse some bitter opposition. The Government and this House should take cognisance of this fact that whatever may be the issue or settlement after the Colombo Conference, the opinion of the public has to be taken into account and the public has to be satisfied and educated in the right way. For that purpose, the Government should be very careful. It should not allow public opinion to go to either extreme.

The proposals put forward by the Colombo Conference may not wholly accord with our minimum demand, that is the Chinese retreating up to the 7th September 1962 line. To a great extent, the proposals would tally with our minimum demand and as such they can be taken as a satisfactory ground for starting any negotiations. Some Members have pointed out that China has rejected them. I think that has placed our Government and our country in a better position. If China has rejected them, that

## Proposals

would put us in a less embarrassing position and we can go forward considering the proposals in a dispassionate way—apart from whether China will accept them or not.

Shri Nath Pai has made a very eloquent and impassioned speech. He is a very effective speaker. He quoted certain slokas from the Gita in which Shri Krishna exhorted Arjun about the inevitability of war in certain circumstances. But only he forgot to mention that before Shri Krishna gave that advice to Arjun, he himself tried to negotiate with the Kauravas not for the whole kingdom, not for half of it, but only for five small villages for the five brothers. (Shri Yashpal Singh: *Seven villages*). Only when that modest proposal of Shri Krishna was rejected, did he advise Arjun about the inevitability of the war. So that advice in the Gita should be taken in the context in which it was given to Arjun. In the present proposals, I do not think we have been faced with such an extreme situation. Rather, as was stated by the Prime Minister yesterday, in some points, the Colombo proposals are more favourable than our minimum demand, that is, Chinese retreat up to the 7th September 1962 line. In some points, of course, we have not got what we stipulated in our minimum demand. Two main points in our favour in the proposals are that we have not to withdraw anywhere. We shall remain where we are in our territory. The withdrawal will be only of the Chinese forces. In the vacated territory, there would be joint control.

But there is also the risk of the frontier along that line being frozen, which was very eloquently mentioned by Shri Nath Pai. But if we have got joint civil control of that territory, that risk is, to some extent, obviated. Anyhow, we should be careful about the danger of freezing the borders along the line now temporarily settled, if of course, China accepts the proposals. I think while negotiating, Government should try to fix a time-

limit of six months, one year or something like that, after which Government would be free to act according to its own light. We stand by the pledge we took here on the 14th November to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India. By accepting the Colombo proposals, we are not accepting any settlement with China. We are only accepting certain conditions for starting negotiations. That is a very important factor to be borne in mind when considering these proposals.

It may be mentioned that yet we have not reoccupied the entire territory which we claim as our own and, in a way, it is a sort of withdrawal from our main contention, a sort of retreat. In the present world context, I think such a retreat, if at all it is a retreat, is not very unusual or very undignified. The other day a very big power, the USSR, had a sort of withdrawal or retreat from Cuba. Before that, the U.K. had a sort of retreat or withdrawal from Suez and the USA had a sort of retreat or withdrawal from Korea. So even if it is considered that the acceptance of the Colombo proposals for starting negotiations with China would mean a sort of withdrawal or retreat from our original claim, I do not think that would much hurt the dignity and prestige of the nation. We can withdraw also from our strength, we can make a gesture also out of our own understanding of the situation.

What is the alternative to accepting the Colombo proposals? Shri Nath Pai has ridiculed the idea of political isolation. He is a student of politics, and he ought to know that it is the most dangerous thing in politics for a nation to be isolated. During the last two world wars, the greatest factor operating against Germany was her isolation in world politics. If today China does not accept the Colombo proposals, surely she will be isolated in world politics. If we do not accept the Colombo



## Proposals

[Shri A. C. Guha]

proposals, we lose the sympathy and support of the non-aligned Powers. Some may say we have not yet got any support from them. Anyhow, if we reject their proposals we shall lose the sympathy and goodwill of the non-aligned Powers, who form about 50 per cent of the total membership of the UNO. We also lose the sympathy and goodwill of the communist bloc. I think we should take note of the discussion that took place very recently in East Berlin on the occasion of the East German Communist Party Conference. There, China was almost isolated, not solely on the issue of India, but surely also on the issue of India as of Cuba. In the whole communist bloc, China was isolated except for Albania, and anybody can understand that Albania counts little in world opinion. So, if we reject the Colombo proposals, we shall lose the support of the non-aligned countries as also the communist bloc and will have to depend only on the support of the Anglo-American bloc.

I know and the House also knows the great help that we have received all these years from the USA and also from some other democratic countries for our development work, for the implementation of our Plans. I also feel that we have not been quite outspoken in acknowledging that aid. In the present emergency, only the USA and the UK came forward immediately with some massive aid for our military defence. In spite of all these things, I would say that it would be a dangerous thing for India to depend only on the support of the Anglo-American bloc. It would amount to practically aligning India with the American bloc. This House is committed to the policy of non-alignment, and this emergency has not revealed any reasons to revise that policy. We still stand by the policy of non-alignment and in view of that, it would be a dangerous thing to alienate the support of all other

nations, and simply depend on the support and sympathy of American and UK. That is also a reason why we should not reject the proposals.

We know that it has been very difficult for us to depend on the *bona fides* or the proclaimed words of China. China's designs are known not only to India, but also the other countries. China has been building up her military strength for the implementation of her political ambitions. She wants to be the supreme nation in Asia and Africa, and to that India is the only challenge. So, she wants to humiliate India, and she will find some consolation that she has been able to inflict some humiliation on us through this military defeat in NEFA and Ladakh, but we should not take it as such. As a peaceful nation, we were not prepared for the invasion. So, in the first onslaught we might have suffered some defeat yet for that we should not suffer from a sense of false prestige. We should take a realistic view of the whole situation.

Knowing the Chinese designs, knowing the military strength of China, it is our imperative duty to build up our military strength. The acceptance of the Colombo proposals does not mean the end of hostilities with China or the end of the emergency conditions created in India. We should continue to build up our military strength from our own resources and the aid that we can get from friendly nations. In that there should not be any inhibition, and I hope that the democratic countries of the world will also realise that by accepting the Colombo proposals for making the ground ready for some discussion with China, we are not making any surrender of our democratic rights, that we are not making any surrender of our national integrity and dignity to the aggressive designs of China. On that issue we should be clear and I hope that realising this, the demo-

cratic countries will continue to render us the necessary aid for strengthening ourselves militarily and for the implementation of our Third Plan. There should not be any inhibitions on our part in accepting such help

**Shri P. K. Deo** (Kalahandi): It is a tribute to Indian democracy that Parliament is being consulted at every stage of the development of this vital issue which affects the honour and integrity of this country. It would be worth while if these deliberations are going to guide the Government policy, but our impression is that we are asked to put our seal of approval on a *fait accompli*, that we are simply asked to endorse what has already been accepted by Government. If that is so, with all humility I beg to say that this debate is going to be reduced to a mockery.

The last time we discussed this subject was on 10th December, 1962, and the three words used by the Prime Minister then, namely dignity, decency and self-respect, are still ringing in my ears. He said: peace and peaceful settlement can ever be pursued only on the basis of dignity, decency and self-respect, and it would be fatal to compromise with aggression. We have already rejected the three-point proposal of the Chinese, inviting us to the conference table, and their proposal of mutual withdrawal of 20 KM from the actual line of control. Though the Government have offered to talk on the restoration of the status quo of 7th September, there are many in this House, both in the Opposition and in the Treasury Benches, who would never reconcile themselves to that decision, except probably a few communist friends on this side of the House and some crypto-communists in the Treasury Benches.

**Shrimati Yashoda Reddy** (Kurnool): We object to that statement.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** In the meantime, 45 eventful days have passed. Now we meet again to scratch our heads to find a solution.

Even though the Government have utilised this period of 45 days for clapping down many a patriot for his *bona fide* criticism of Government complacency, as a political vendetta and in further eroding the democratic process by suspending by-elections and abrogating the appellate rights of the victims of the Defence of India Act, nothing has been done so far to carry into execution the nation's determination to recover the territory lost by Chinese aggression. We have reoccupied a few areas and that too only when and where the enemy had withdrawn and with the enemy's permission. This clearly indicates our passive acceptance of the Chinese unilateral ceasefire and our unwillingness to take the offensive to repel the aggression and to fulfil the very promise that has been given to the nation by the solemn resolution of November 14th, 1962. Sir, what we have done so far has been inconsistent with that solemn promise. It is a pity that the Government have not fully utilised the spontaneous upsurge that has been seen in this country when the entire nation stood like a rock behind the Prime Minister. None of this nation has been asked at last to eat the humble pie. We would not be a party to that.

Let us discuss the merits of the six non-aligned nations. If the proposal had already been accepted, it would be like flogging a dead horse. Still, I would like to give my comments on these proposals. At the outset, I express sincere thanks for these friends who have made an endeavour to find a peaceful settlement, but they failed to call a spade a spade. But I must say with all humility that these proposals have fallen far short of the expectations of all patriotic Indians. They are conspicuous by the absence of any

[Shri P. K. Deo]

condemnation or even a reference to Chinese aggression, even though we all know that naked and unprovoked aggression has been committed on India and 14,000 square miles had been occupied by show of sheer might. Probably it is the fear of China that has cast a heavy shadow on the proceedings of the Conference and that had inhibited a truly non-aligned and objective approach to this vital question. It seems to me that they were guided by two motives: not to offend China and to save the face of India. They place the aggressor and the aggressed on parity they call this a border dispute; they say it is adjustment of a few square miles of territory either this side or that side.

I beg to submit that either it is a fear complex or they were not fully briefed. My friend Shri Dwivedy yesterday quoted a passage from the UAR magazine to show how backward we are in our diplomatic approach, how we failed miserably in convincing our friends about the rightness of our stand.

According to our Prime Minister the Colombo proposals are more or less akin to the Government proposal—restoration of the *status quo ante* of the 8th September, 1962. But to us, it seems to be more identical to the three point proposal of China, except that we are not asked to withdraw further 20 kilo metres in our side. They did not advance uniformly 20 kilometres in all sectors. From map No. V you will find that in the Galwan valley they had advanced much more and even if they withdraw 20 kilometres backward, still they will be in possession of large chunks of Indian territory and enjoy the fruits of their aggression. Three or four Indian check posts which recently fell would be in their possession. Further more, we would not be restored the 42 check posts in the Ladakh sector and two in the Eastern Sector which we had to leave due to Chinese aggression. The

acceptance of the buffer zone to me is an abdication of our sovereign right of movement of troops in our own area. We cannot be a party to it.

Now, let us see what we gain. We will be dragged to a conference table. This is not, Sir, the first time we are going to the conference table. Everytime we had gone to the conference table, China presented us with Chinese maps claiming larger chunks of Indian territory. That is our experience. What effect will it have even if there is an agreement? We have burnt our fingers very badly, by signing the agreement in 1954. Time has proved that the 1954 agreement is not worth the paper on which it was subscribed. Taking all these factors into consideration, I feel it is futile to go to the conference table for a talk again, especially when the Chinese mind is so clear.

Have we not learnt that there has been increasingly massive concentration of Chinese troops across the Indian border? Have we forgotten that for the sake of her aggressive designs China could afford to pick quarrels even with her brotherly countries in the communist camp? The intentions of China are quite clear. These Colombo proposals militarily amount to a complete surrender on our part; it would be denying our gallant soldiers a chance to retrieve India's lost honour. Are we to remain a defeated nation for all time to come? We are told that we may gain time as if China will not gain time in the meanwhile. Our past performance has been very poor. In this regard I do not want to repeat the unpalatable story of our unpreparedness. Since 1954, we have been a victim of aggression. What have we done? It will rather be a diplomatic blunder because it will adversely affect our relationship with our friends who have ungrudgingly supplied us with the latest equipment at our hour of need.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member's time is up. He has taken 15 minutes.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** Others have taken 25 minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Your leader has taken 25 minutes. Please wind up.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** I am concluding, Sir. It will create doubts in the minds of our sincere friends in this crisis regarding our bona fides. We still stand by the statement of Rajaji and his suggestion to the Government and the country in this regard. It is high time that we shall have to revise our non-aligned policy and come to an understanding and have an alignment with the friends in our crisis so that we can keep the security and the integrity of this country in tact. Now, Sir, politically the Colombo proposals will amount to secession of Indian territory. Only day before yesterday we referred to the Joint Select Committee a Bill making it a crime to talk even the secession of territory. Today we are asking the House to secede part of this country! Are we not blowing hot and cold in the same breath? Now, psychologically, it will dampen the spontaneous enthusiasm of the people, the unprecedented determination and unity that have been manifested so far, which once gone no amount of brave words from any platform or even the M.P.s' parade on the Republic Day is going to revive.

We are told that the refusal of talks at this stage may be misunderstood. I beg to ask why it should be misunderstood if our friends would be properly told about it. We failed in our most fundamental duty to convince our friends that we stand on the right; and it is due to our inability in educating our friends that we fear that the world will misunderstand us. I do not find any ground in that argument.

Lastly, I submit with all humility, that we on this side of the House cannot be a party to lower the flag of this country by accepting the Colombo proposals which are inconsistent with our earlier stand. Even though we have moved an amendment, it does not mean that we endorse the proposals. We fully oppose the motion if this House accepts the Government's stand regarding the Colombo proposals.

**श्री कमल नयन बजाज (वर्धा) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब से चाइना का आक्रमण हुआ है, तब से हम देखते हैं कि जब उसकी मर्जी में आया उसने आक्रमण किया और जब उसकी मर्जी में आया तो उसने उसको स्थगित भी किया।

आज हमारे सामने कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव विचाराधीन हैं। कुछ लोगों का ऐसा विचार मालूम होता है कि उनको इस बात का अन्देश है कि चाइना क्या कर रहा है और उसका परिणाम हमारे ऊपर क्या होगा इसको सोच कर हमको कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव पर विचार करना चाहिये।

जब तक कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव हमारे सामने हैं हमको यह सोचने का कोई कारण ही नहीं कि चाइना क्या करेगा। हमारे देश के ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ। इसका प्रभाव कुछ तटस्थ देशों के ऊपर हुआ। दुनिया के अन्दर जो देश आजादी के मानने वाले हैं, जो जनता की स्वतंत्रता को मानने वाले हैं और जो मानव कल्याण तथा विश्व शांति में विश्वास रखते हैं, वे सच्चे दिल से यह चाहते हैं कि किसी भी तरह से यह युद्ध बन्द हो और शांति कायम हो। और इस प्रयत्न में अपनी सदिच्छा से, सद्भावना से, जो कुछ प्रयास कोलम्बो के मित्र राष्ट्रों ने किया है वह सराहनीय है, उनके इरादों के लिये हमें आदर तथा सम्मान है। उन्होंने जो प्रयत्न किया है उसके लिये हम अनुग्रहीत हैं। इसलिये इस देश के सम्मान

### [श्री कमल नयन वजाज]

तथा स्वाभिमान को कायम रखते हुये हमें उनके प्रस्ताव पर इन दृष्टि से विचार करना चाहिये कि उस दिशा में कहां तक जा सकते हैं।

हमें इस बात की खुशी है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने तथा सरकार ने जो ८ सितम्बर की लाइन का प्रोजेजल दिया था वह कम से कम ऐसा है कि जिसकी स्वीकार करने में दूसरे पक्ष को दिक्कत न हो और साथ में हमारे स्वाभिमान का भी रक्षा हो सके और सम्मान के साथ हम बातचीत के टेबिल पर जाकर बातचीत कर सकें। हमारे प्रोजेजल में और कोलम्बो राष्ट्रों के प्रस्ताव में यहां वहां कुछ थोड़ा बहुत अन्तर हो सकता है। तो उसमें, जब वह हमारे सामने पेश हों, अगर कुछ कमी की या अड़बट की बात हो तो उसका स्पष्टीकरण कर लिया जाये। कोलम्बो राष्ट्र अपना जो कुछ स्पष्टीकरण दें उसके साथ में उनके प्रस्ताव को मंजूर करने या नामंजूर करने का अधिकार वास्तव में सरकार को होना चाहिये और इन मंजूरी या नामंजूरी के लिये इनको पार्लियामेंट के सामने लाने की आवश्यकता नहीं। यह अधिकार तो हमें सरकार का ही देना चाहिये और उसे है ही। हम यहां मुख्य सिद्धांतों की चर्चा यहां कर सकते हैं और उसके अनुसार अपनी नीति निर्धारित करके सरकार अपना कार्य कर सकती है।

कोलम्बो के प्रस्ताव को मंजूर करना एक अहमियत रखता है। हम उसको रिजेक्ट भी करें तो उसकी भी अहमियत है। पर असली बात यह है कि हम उसको मंजूर करें या उसको नामंजूर करें, जो कुछ हम करें हमें मजबूती से करना चाहिये। अगर हम उसको मंजूर करें तो मंजूर भी मजबूती से करना चाहिये और अगर नामंजूर करें तो वह भी मजबूती से करना चाहिये। जब तक हमारे दिलों में इस बात का दृढ़ संकल्प है कि हम

किसी भी तरह चीन से दब कर अपने देश की आजादी या स्वाभिमान को कम्प्रोमाइज नहीं करेंगे, तब तक अगर हम उस प्रस्ताव को मान कर शांति स्थापित होने की इच्छा विचार विनिमय करें तो हम कुछ खोने वाले नहीं हैं। यदि हम डर से वहां जाकर बातचीत करेंगे तो उसका बुरा परिणाम होगा। यदि डर के मारे हम इसको रिजेक्ट करते हैं तो भी बुरा परिणाम होने वाला है। हम जो भी करें हिम्मत से करें तो परिणाम बुरा होने वाला नहीं है।

सही बात यह है कि हमारे देश में अभी तैयारी की कमी है और हम तैयारी का करने में लगे हैं। यह मुख्य बीज है। वह तैयारी हमको पूरी ताकत के साथ और अच्छी तरह से करनी चाहिये। देश ने जो उम्माह दिखाया है उसका किस प्रकार हम सक्रिय रूप से उपयोग कर सकते हैं इसके ऊपर भी हमको विचार करना चाहिये।

आज हमको पश्चिमी देशों ने दस्तकों की ओर हमारी मदद बढ़ा उठावता के साथ दो है। इसका एक प्रधान कारण है। आज चीन का जो भारत पर आक्रमण है वह वास्तव में भारत पर आक्रमण नहीं है, वह दुनिया को आजादी पर आक्रमण है। दुनिया में जो स्वतंत्रता को मानने वाले लोग हैं उन पर यह आक्रमण है। आज उन्ने भारत पर आक्रमण किया है, हो सकता है कि कल पाकिस्तान पर करे, बर्मा पर करे, नेपाल पर करे, भूटान पर करे। वह श्याम, कम्बोडिया वियतनाम आदि पर भी कल आक्रमण कर सकता है। आज पश्चिमी देश जानते हैं कि जब वह भारत को चीनी आक्रमण के खिलाफ मदद दे रहे हैं तो उसका मतलब क्या है। मान लीजिये उन्ने भारत को पूरी मदद देकर इतना सुसज्जित कर दिया कि चीन यह समझ कि हम भारत पर

आक्रमण न करें। तो हो सकता है कि कल वह श्याम पर या अन्य किसी राष्ट्र पर आक्रमण करे। तो क्या हम उस अवस्था में यह कहेंगे कि उसने हम पर आक्रमण नहीं किया है, इसलिये हम उस देश की मदद क्यों करें ?

मान लीजिये कि चीन के पास तीन या साढ़े तीन हजार हवाई जहाज हैं, मुझे ठीक पता नहीं कि हैं या नहीं। और हमको उतने हवाई जहाजों की चीन का मुकाबला करने के लिये जरूरत है। अगर अमरीका हमको उतने हवाई जहाज दे देता है तो चीन सोच सकता है कि अब उसको हिन्दुस्तान से नहीं लड़ना है क्योंकि भारत के पास भी हमारे जितने साधन हो गये हैं। उस अवस्था में अगर उसने बर्मा पर या पाकिस्तान पर या और किसी देश पर आक्रमण किया तो क्या पश्चिमी देश हर एक देश को इतना सामान दे सकेंगे कि वह पूरे तौर से चीन का मुकाबला कर सके। हमको इस दृष्टि से सोचना होगा कि जहाँ पर भी आजादी पर आक्रमण होगा हमको मदद करनी होगी और इस बात की तैयारी करनी पड़ेगी कि खाली भारत की सीमाओं की सुरक्षा की जिम्मेदारी हमारी नहीं है, बल्कि सब का सहयोग लेकर और सब को सद्भावना लेकर हम उस राष्ट्र की मदद करेंगे जिसकी आजादी पर आक्रमण हो। हमको यह विचार रखना होगा कि हम में से जिस की भी आजादी पर चीन हमला करेगा हम उसके खिलाफ एक दूसरे की मदद करेंगे।

अभी जब हमारे ऊपर चीन का आक्रमण हुआ तो अमरीका के जो शस्त्रास्त्र जर्मनी में पड़े थे उनको हमारी सहायता के लिये भेजा गया। इसी तरह से मान लीजिये कि हमको अमरीका से हवाई जहाज और दूसरे शस्त्रास्त्र मिल जाते हैं और कल को श्याम पर या किसी अन्य राष्ट्र पर चीन का आक्रमण होता है और अमरीका हमसे कहता है कि तुम उन हथियारों आदि को वहाँ

भेजो, तो हम भेजेंगे या नहीं इस बात का स्पष्टीकरण हम करें और फिर व्यवस्थित रूप से इस प्रश्न पर विचार करें। एशिया के सारे राष्ट्रों की स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा की जिम्मेवारी चीन के खिलाफ हमको अपने गिर पर समझनी होगी। हमको इसके लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये कि उनकी आजादी पर यदि किसी भी तरफ से आक्रमण हो—और इन समय तो केवल चीन का ही आक्रमण हो सकता है—तो हम उसका मुकाबला कर सकें। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि जो छोटे छोटे देश हैं वे आज चीन से घबराये हुये हैं और उनको भय है कि उनकी आजादी पर आक्रमण हो सकता है। मैं इनमें से कुछ देशों में गया तो मैंने देखा कि उनमें से कुछ की आजादी पर तो चीन का आक्रमण हो चुका है। वह वहाँ डरते हैं और अगर इस मौके पर उनको पूरा सहयोग नहीं मिलता है तो उनका जो डर है वह कायम रहता है। इसलिये यदि सब आपस में मिल कर उस का बाजाबते से ईतजाम किया जाय तो हम काफी कुछ कर सकते हैं।

14 hrs.

कोलम्बो राष्ट्रों के प्रपोजल्स के विषय में अपने प्रार्थना प्रवचन में आचार्य विनोबा भावे ने १६ तारीख को कुछ अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। चूँकि उनका सीधा संबंध कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों से आता है इसलिये मैं उनमें से कुछ थोड़े से चुने, चुने हिस्से यहाँ सदन में आपकी रजामंदी से पढ़े देता हूँ :-

“दुनिया के कुछ तटस्थ देशों ने तय किया है कि इन दो देशों के बीच समायान हो। इसलिये हम अपील करेंगे कि जो सुझाव पेश किया गया हो वह भले सोलह आने रुचिकर न हो तब भी हमारे देश को उसे मान लेना चाहिये। उसमें थोड़ा फर्क करना हो तो करवाना चाहिये। लेकिन सामान्य तौर पर उन का प्रस्ताव मान्य करना चाहिये।

## [श्री कमल नयन वजाज]

इस प्रस्ताव पर पालियामेंट विचार करेगी, उसके बाद भारत अपना विचार जाहिर करेगा। हम बोल रहे हैं—क्योंकि हमारे देश में कुछ लोग ऐसे हैं जो सोलह आना अपनी बात पर अड़े हुये हैं—चीन में भी ऐसे लोग होंगे। हम समझते हैं कि ऐसा करके वे विश्व के हित की ओर ध्यान नहीं रखते। विश्व के हित की दृष्टि से देखा जाये। विश्वशांति की दृष्टि से दोनों देशों का भला सोचा जाय तो इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये। हम अपने देशवासियों से अपील करेंगे कि अपनी बात सोलह आना मंजूर कराने की जिद न रखें। जो जिद रखता है वह कमजोर होता है। जो बलवान होता है वह जिद नहीं करता। वह जानता है कि हम शक्तिशाली हैं। हम समझते कि हम कमजोर नहीं हैं। इन महीने—दो महीने में हम काफी मजबूत हुये हैं। हमारी ताकत बहुत बढ़ी है और भी हम बढ़ाते रहेंगे।”

यह विचार श्री बिनोवा भावे ने १९-१-६३ को अपनी प्रार्थना सभा में कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के बारे में प्रकट किये हैं। इस तरह के विचार, जो किसी भी तरह के पक्ष या प्रभाव से परे हैं। और खाना भारत के ही नहीं अपितु जा समस्त मानव कल्याण की दृष्टि से सोचने वाले हैं उनका जब इस तरह का मत है तो हमें उन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों पर अवश्य विचार कर लेना चाहिये। अलबत्ता देश को सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से सुदृढ़ और हर मामले में आत्मनिर्भर बनाने के हमारे प्रयासों में किसी तरह की कमी न आने पावे और देश को हर खतरे का कामयाबी के साथ सामना करने के लिये पूरी तरह से तैयार करें। हम अपनी तैयारियों में किसी तरह की शील न आने दें। कॉफ़ेस की टेबल पर हम चहे किसी नतीजे पर आ सकें या न आ सकें परन्तु हम अपनी फ़ैक्टरियों और खेतों में निरन्तर उत्पादन बढ़ाते रहेंगे।

हमारी सेना की शक्ति यदि बढ़ गयी तो वह काफी हो जायेगा और उससे शांति से जो कुछ समझौता होना है वह उसके बल पर हो जायेगा। बस इतना कह कर मैं अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

**Shri Basumatari (Goalpara):** Sir, I have been listening with rapt attention to the speeches of Mr. Ranga and Mr. Nath Pai. I could not follow the eloquent speech of Mr. Nath Pai and his cry of war. I could not also follow the speech of Mr. Ranga. He was a Congressman and now he has joined the other party. Because he is in the other party, that is why he is criticising the Prime Minister. Therefore, I could not follow him also.

The motion moved by the Prime Minister is a motion for acceptance in toto and for discussion. The Prime Minister has said already that it is difficult to trust the Chinese and at the same time, he has also said that we are not submitting to any military aggression. When he has already said that we are not submitting to military aggression, I do not know why the other parties—the Swatantra Party and the PSP—are criticising him like that.

There are certain Members who want war. War nowadays is not confined to two or three countries in an isolated manner. If war breaks out, are we strong enough to fight warmongers like China, who have been fighting for ages with their neighbouring countries like Japan, Mongolia and so on and so forth? Their characteristic is to fight their neighbours. We have won our independence through negotiations and discussions. Therefore, should we not follow the same method here also? The example of Gita has been quoted. Lord Krishna did not say in the Gita that we should all the time follow peace. While Dr. P. C. Ghosh was Chief Minister of Bengal, in a prayer meeting, Mahatma Gandhi was asked, “Why is there fighting and shooting the students in

a country of non-violence?" Gandhiji said, "If you have to take the life of somebody in order to protect the country, it is not violence; it is non-violence". Therefore, the Prime Minister has also said that we have to strengthen ourselves. All the time, he has been saying that China has opened our eyes. Now the only thing we should remember is that we should always keep our eyes open and strengthen our country militarily.

Coming to the villages, we are mobilising the public opinion and one and all are standing behind the Prime Minister. If we analyse the speeches of Shri Nath Pai and Prof. Ranga, suppose war breaks out, are we strong enough to fight China, which is militarily strong? I am not saying it myself; the Prime Minister also agrees that they are very strong. If we go into the history of the People's Republic of China since 1949, we find that they have been discussing and negotiating with us, but during and after the discussions, they have been increasing their might just to fight and disturb our peace. So, we should also strengthen ourselves, so that we may not again see what we have seen in NEFA and Assam.

Whenever some friends meet me, they ask me often about the morale of the people of Assam. Their morale has been kept very high. When the Prime Minister said in this House, "My heart goes out to the people of Assam", people misunderstood him that they have been left to their own fate. But once it was explained to them that they have not been left alone in the fight, their doubts have been cleared. If you go to NEFA side, you will find the people are very strong-minded and they are all out to face any eventualities in the fight against China.

So far as our policy of non-alignment is concerned, we have won the sympathy of the whole world only through that policy. I do not find anything wrong in Shri Dhebar say-

ing that we are following a policy of peace and non-alignment. The six non-aligned countries have taken pains to go into the question and their proposal is for acceptance in toto and for discussion. The six non-aligned countries, who want peace, have taken the pains to go to China and also to come to India to explain the Colombo proposals and we must pay tribute to them. There is nothing wrong in discussing the matter. I do not understand why so much heat was brought in by Shri Ranga and Shri Anthony in their speeches. Supposing war breaks out and we get some help from some country, can we eschew such a help? No country has benefited by war. A country like Germany was divided into two. Many countries had bitter experience of war. I do not understand the meaning of this cry of the Swatantra Party. It is a newly born party. It does not have any policy or principle. Its policy is to raise such a cry and criticise whether a thing is right or wrong. I hope our Prime Minister and this Parliament will not pay any heed to such criticisms. They are only speaking in the air.

As regards Shri Frank Anthony, the other day also his group supported the proposal of the Prime Minister but they were surreptitiously saying something else all the time. Everybody knows what Shri Anthony is, how they are thinking of their own ways and how they love India. Everybody knows it and therefore I do not want to go into the details.

Sir, I support this motion. This is the most opportune time for us to prepare ourselves for the future. With these words, Sir, I wholeheartedly support the motion.

श्री बृजराज सिंह (बरेली) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, वर्तमान विषय पर बोलने से पहले मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि यह समय में नहीं आता है कि इस की जरूरत क्यों उत्पन्न हुई कि सदन के सामने



[श्री बृजराज सिंह]

इस को रखा जाये। श्रीमती भंडारनायके चीन गई और चीन से कुछ मस्बुरा कर के वह हिन्दुस्तान आई। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने उन्हें खुला आशवासन दिया कि जहाँ प्रिंसिपल में मैं आप के प्रोपोज़ल्स को मानता हूँ, वहाँ उनके सम्बन्ध में "हाँ" या "न" कहने की बात पार्लियामेंट के अधिकार में है। इस पर हम लोगों ने सोचा कि ठीक है, शायद पार्लियामेंट का अधिकार प्राइम मिनिस्टर के अधिकार से ऊँचा होगा और पार्लियामेंट की बात को प्राइम मिनिस्टर को मानना पड़ेगा। परन्तु जिस दिन यहाँ इस मामले पर डीबेट शुरू होने वाली थी, उस के एक दिन पूर्व ही उसका निर्णय मालूम हो गया। अखबारों में खबर छप गई कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने उन बातों को, उन उमूलों को, मान लिया है। फिर पार्लियामेंट में क्या होगा? पार्लियामेंट में कनसिडरेशन होगा। कनसिडरेशन का अर्थ क्या है, यह समझ में नहीं आया। मैं समझता हूँ कि जितने भी माननीय सदस्य अब तक बोले हैं, उन में से हर एक के हृदय में यही परेशानी रही है कि कनसिडरेशन का मतलब क्या है, क्या इसका कोई नतीजा निकलने वाला है, क्या इससे हमें कोई मार्ग मिलेगा, क्या हम किसी निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचेंगे।

**श्री कमल नयन बजाज :** माननीय सदस्य कोई सुझाव दें।

**श्री बृजराज सिंह :** सुझाव ही आ रहे हैं बराबर, सरकार उन को माने या न माने, उन को समझे या न समझे। सुझाव तो मैं दे दूँगा लेकिन उन का समझने के लिये बुद्धि देना सम्भव नहीं है।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस कनसिडरेशन के द्वारा क्या होने वाला है, यह स्पष्ट नहीं है।

मैं आप का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि चाइना ने १९५४ में ही धीरे-धीरे भारत वर्ष के ऊपर बढ़ात शुरु कर दिया था। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं तो उसे हमला ही कहूँगा, सरकार की ओर से चाहे किसी भी शब्द का प्रयोग किया जाये। इस वर्ष के अक्टूबर में पहली बार यह घोषणा की गई कि चाइना ने हमला कर दिया है। चाइना धीरे धीरे हमारी जमीन दबाता चला गया और अपनी पोस्ट्स वहाँ पर बनाता चला गया। उस को सरकार क्या मानती रही यह पता नहीं है। हमें तो केवल अक्टूबर में बताया गया कि हमला हो गया है।

उस हमले के बाद हम लोगों ने पिछले नवम्बर, में यहाँ पर हाउस में एक प्लेज लिया, एक कसम खाई। उस कसम में हम ने कहा कि चाहे कितनी भी लम्बी लड़ाई चले, चाहे कितनी भी देर लगे, चाहे कितने भी हमारे जवान मारे जायें, परन्तु अपने देश से आक्रमणकारियों को भगाने के लिये हम अन्त तक लड़ेंगे और उस अन्त का केवल एक अर्थ होगा—हमारी विजय। जिस प्रस्ताव को पास कर के हम ने वह कसम खाई थी, उस में एक बार भी यह शब्द नहीं आया कि अगर चाइना ८ सितम्बर की लाइन तक हट गया, तो हम नहीं लड़ेंगे या उसको अपने देश से भगाने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे।

**श्री रामसेवक यादव (वाराणसी) :** यह तो सरेंडर है, लड़ाई कहाँ है?

**श्री बृजराज सिंह :** उस प्रस्ताव को पास करने और वह कसम खाने के बाद देश में क्या प्रतिक्रिया हुई, मैं समझता हूँ कि उस को हर एक आँख वाले ने देखा होगा। एक मजबूत कदम उठाने पर देश की जो प्रतिक्रिया हुई, उससे कोई आँखें मोड़ नहीं

सकता है। जहाँ एक बूंद खून मांगा गया, वहाँ हमारा देश और हमारी जनता एक मन खून देने के लिये तैयार हुई। जहाँ एक व्यक्ति मांगा गया, वहाँ सहस्रों मांगों के लाल निकल कर सामने आ गए और प्रधान मंत्री जी के पीछे चलने के लिये तैयार हो गए। यह तो भावना की बात है। जब सही भावना उत्पन्न की जाती है, जब सही भावना जाग्रत की जाती है, तब देश पीछे चलने के लिये तैयार हो जाता है।

उस प्रस्ताव को उलट-पटल कर आज दूसरा रूप दे दिया गया है और यह कहा जा रहा है कि कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल तो ८ सितम्बर की स्थिति से भी अच्छी हैं, लिहाजा हमें उन को मान लेना चाहिये। इस का अर्थ क्या होगा? इसका अर्थ यह होगा कि जिस भावना को ले कर हमारा देश एक आदमी की तरह, एक नेशन की तरह, खड़ा हो गया था, उस भावना को बड़ी ठोकर लगेगी और उस के परिणाम क्या होंगे, डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूलज के कारण मैं यह कहते हुए डर रहा हूँ।

**श्री कमल नयन बजाज :** वह माननीय सदस्य पर लागू नहीं होगा। माननीय सदस्य अपने विचारों को प्रकट करने में डरते क्यों हैं?

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** यहाँ पर उस का डर नहीं है।

**श्री बृजराज सिंह :** आप जानते हैं कि उस का कितना भयंकर दुष्परिणाम होने जा रहा है। इस देश की यह शक्ति, शैटर हो जायेगी, बिखर जायेगी। जो यूनिटी, जो एकता, हमने अभी उस रेजोल्यूशन को पास करने के बाद कायम की थी, उस भावना को ठोकर लगने से वह नीचे चली जायेगी।

2549 (A) L.S.D.—6.

**श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह (अमरेली) :**  
क्या हमारी एकता इतनी कच्ची है?

**श्री बृजराज सिंह :** सरकार ने उस को कच्चा बनाया हुआ है, उस को कच्चे घागे से बांध कर रखा है।

एक ही चीज को दो प्रकार से देखा जा सकता है। जब लड़ाई शुरू हुई, तो हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री, श्री चट्टान, ने हाथ में तलवार ले कर सौगंध खाई। उस वक्त वह तलवार सुन्दर थी, बहादुरी का प्रतीक थी। परन्तु कल जब माननीय सदस्य, श्री त्रिवेदी, ने तलवार का जिक्र किया और कहा कि हम तलवार से लड़ेंगे, तो माननीय सदस्या, श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती, बड़ी चिन्तित और परेशान हो गईं। उन्होंने कहा कि इस युग में क्या तलवार से लड़ाई की जायेगी। जैसा कि मैं ने निवेदन किया है, एक ही चीज को देखने के दो तरीके हैं। वह तलवार उस समय सिम्बल थी बहादुरी की और जब किसी विपरीत दल की ओर से तलवार की बात की जाती है, तो वह सिम्बल हो जाती है पागलपन की। तब यह कहा जाता है, “क्या यह तलवार का युद्ध है? हमारे त्रिवेदी जी कौन सी दुनिया में रह रहे हैं?”

जब राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा कोष स्थापित किया गया, तो जब कभी रेडियो से एनाउन्स किया जाता कि अमुक अंधे भिखमंगे ने तीन आने राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा कोष में दिये, तो हम कहते थे, “वाह, वाह” और बड़े प्रसन्न होते थे। जब रूलिंग पार्टी की तरफ से, गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से, वह एनाउन्समेंट होती है, तो वह भिखमंग का वह दान कर्ण का दान बन जाता है। यदि वह हमारी तरफ से हो तो उसके लिये डफली बजाई जाती है और कहा जाता है कि क्या विखमंगों के दान से लड़ा जाएगा, क्या उनसे पैसा ले कर लड़ा जाएगा, क्या भीख मांग कर लड़ा जाएगा। यह भावना की बात है। जितनी बार भी

[श्री बृजराज सिंह]

मैं बोला हूँ, मैंने इस भावना की कमी के ऊपर ही जोर दिया है।

आज सवाल, कोलम्बो कान्फ्रेंस ने हमारे सामने जो सुझाव रखे हैं, उनको मानने या न मानने का है। ठीक है, कि हमें उनको देखना पड़ेगा। लेकिन केवल आज उनके सुझाव आ जाने से और उनको कुछ अन्दर ही अन्दर मंजूर कर लिये जाने से, क्या हम यह समझ बैठ हैं कि वे ही हमारे दोस्त रह गए हैं? उनकी दोस्ती के ताब में और चूंकि उन्होंने हमारे मन की बात कही है कि लड़ाई न हो, शान्ति से काम चले, क्या हम इस बात को भूल जायें कि इस संसार भर में हमारे और भी मित्र हैं? उन सभी को हम भूल जायें? क्या वें सभी हमारे लिये बेकार हो गए हैं? जिस वक्त लड़ाई चल रही थी, वैंस्टन पावरज़ हमारी मदद के लिये आई तो हमारा नज़रिया शायद कुछ दूसरा था। और आज जिस वक्त कि कोलम्बो प्रोपोजलज़ हमारे सामने हैं, हमारा नज़रिया बदलता हुआ दिखाई दे रहा है। जिस वक्त हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस बात का आश्वासन दिया था कि इन प्रोपोजलज़ को मंजूर करना या मंजूर न कराना पार्लियामेंट का काम है, और पार्लियामेंट ही कोई अश्रिक्त निर्णय ले सकती है, और मैं इनके बारे में कुछ नहीं कह सकता हूँ, तो उस समय तीन चार प्रकार की प्रतिक्रियों के असर तीन चार जगह हमें होंगे, चीन के ऊपर भी उसकी प्रतिक्रिया हुई होगी, कोलम्बो कान्फ्रेंस के जो पार्टिसिपेंट्स थे, उनके ऊपर भी उसकी प्रतिक्रिया हुई होगी और पाश्चात्य देशों के ऊपर भी हुई होगी और इन सब के साथ साथ देश के ऊपर भी उसकी प्रतिक्रिया हुई। इन सारी प्रतिक्रियाओं की चिन्ता किये बगैर हमने एक प्रकार से आज़ाद छोड़ दिया कि चाहे जो कोई जिघर जाए और हमारे प्राइम

मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी बात को गिरा दिया। न तो वह ऐसा मोशन लाए कि कोलम्बो कान्फ्रेंस के प्रोपोजलज़ पास किए जाएं और न ही उन्होंने ऐसी स्थिति इस हाउस के सामने रखी कि वह उनको आउट-राइट रिजैक्ट कर सकता है। लाए नहीं, यह तो एक बात हुई। इसका नतीजा यह है कि रिजैक्ट यह हाउस नहीं कर सकता है क्योंकि मैजोरिटी उनके हाथ में है, द्विप चलता है। दोनों स्थितियों में क्या होगा।

श्री कमल नयन बजाज : द्विप नहीं चला है।

श्री बृजराज सिंह : उसका सवाल नहीं है। आपको चाहिये था कि उस मोशन को लाते और इसको सदस्यों पर छोड़ देते और कोई द्विप न चलाते और तब देखते कि हाउस क्या कहता है। हाउस का आदेश ही आपको मानना चाहिये था। लेकिन वह स्थिति नहीं आने दी गई। अब तो कंसिड्रेशन के लिये ही इसको सिर्फ रखा गया है और सोचा गया है कि कोई पाज़ेटिव मोशन न लाई जाए क्योंकि पाज़ेटिव मोशन आएगी तो द्विप विरोध होगा और द्विप इशू करके दबाना पड़ेगा। यह जो सारी स्थिति थी, इसको बचा दिया गया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक आखिरी बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ। गीता की चर्चा यहां की गई है। नवम्बर, में जो कसम हमने खाई थी, उसमें कहा गया था कि देश के स्वाभिमान और सम्मान को ठेस न लगे और अगर लगती है तो वैसा कुछ हम नहीं करेंगे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हो भी तो।

## Proposals

श्री बृजराज सिंह : हमारे सामने के एक मित्र ने कहा है कि नाथपाई जी ने जो गीता की बार बार बात कही है, यह उनकी समझ में नहीं आता है । उन्होंने कहा है कि गीता की ग्रहमियत समझ में आ सकती है, लेकिन क्या गीता हर जगह लाई जा सकती है और हर जगह लगाई जा सकती है ? मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या केवल इसलिये नहीं लगाई जा सकती है क्योंकि अपोजीशन बेंचों पर बैठने वाले किसी माननीय सदस्य ने उसका हवाला दे दिया है या उसके बारे में कह दिया है ? और क्या अहिंसा हर जगह लगाई जा सकती है । गीता के सबसे बड़े पुजारी गांधी जी थे । उनकी अहिंसा जो उन्होंने गीता से ही निकाली थी क्या वह हर जगह लगाई जा सकती है, क्या वीर में भी अहिंसा चल सकती है, उधर वार के लिये प्रैपरेशन की बात हो, तो क्या अहिंसा की बात को हम यहाँ सोच सकते हैं ? और अगर नहीं सोच सकते हैं तो गीता जिस में कहा गया है कि सम्मान रहित आज्ञा दी तो क्या जीवन भी व्यर्थ है और उसके जो कोई माने हैं, उसका रेफ्रेंस जब दिया जाता है तो कहा जाता है कि गीता हर जगह फिट नहीं होती है ।

मेरा इतना ही निवेदन है कि नवम्बर में जो हमने कसम खाई थी, उस कसम से एक इंच भी कहीं हम विचलित होते हों या किसी को शुद्ध भी होता हो कि हम उससे विचलित हो रहे हैं, तो वैसे प्रस्ताव को हमें कभी नहीं मानना चाहिये ।

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur** (Jalore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we have listened with rapt attention to the speeches made from this side of the House, particularly of those who have opposed this proposal of the Colombo Powers. It was really a treat to listen to Shri Nath Pai, whom we welcome to this House after his

unfortunate illness. His flow of speech, his fluency, his sweet reasonableness, had their impact on this House. He appealed to the pride and passion of this House and the nation. If only we permit the effervescence of the beverage which he poured on this House to settle down and try to examine the real contents, I think we will be able to understand what course of action we should adopt.

I think he was more than unfair when he said that we are paralysed under the pressure and it was only under the fear complex that this decision to accept Colombo proposals was taken. I do not understand whether it is now that we are working under the fear and pressure or it was in the month of October when the Chinese launched their massive aggression on this country and were coming forward and threatening the integrity of this country. What was the reaction which was aroused in this House, in the minds of the ruling party, in the mind of every hon. Member in this House at that time? If we were to react to fear, if we were to be afraid of China, then we would have accepted the cease-fire proposal then and there. Therefore, let us not be carried away by these sentiments and say that anybody sitting on this side or that side now succumbed to any fear or we have felt paralysed. It is a very wrong impression which is being created inside this House and outside the country. There is no question of any fear. We took the challenge, this country took the challenge, and the entire country stood united to meet the challenge, which was posed by China. Therefore, it would be more than unfair to say that it was the *ahimsa* of Mahatma Gandhi which was being misinterpreted or that we are not quite alive to the preachings of the Gita. We had taken a decision and we stick to that decision. When the hon. Prime Minister moved the Resolution, which was passed unanimously by this House in the month of November, he made it perfectly clear that we stand

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

by every word of that Resolution. There is no question of any fear coming in the way. We are absolutely dauntless. We know where we stand and we have never cared for the mighty invasion of China or for its might, so far our stand on this question is concerned. If there was any weakness, that weakness would have been exhibited at that time. Today is it the retreating China which is threatening us? Is it the retreating forces of China that are vacating their occupation which paralyse us and threaten us? Is it which is creating fear psychosis in our minds? I think this is the worst distortion of facts that one can ever make.

We have to take notice of the entire situation. I can understand quite clearly that every Member of this House has got a certain feeling which was aroused entirely by the behaviour of the present Chinese Government, the manner in which it has behaved for the last so many years, culminating in the mighty invasion; that has naturally left its impact on every Indian and it is only natural that there is a crisis of faith. It is only natural that people speak rather harshly, influenced by that behaviour and by that attack of the Chinese. When we talk about negotiations, when we talk about sitting round a table with these people who have been marauders in our country, naturally we are swayed by this feeling and by this sentiment. Let us now take into account what has happened since then.

Is it the brave speeches made by the Opposition Members which has forced the Chinese to retreat? I do not know if there is any instance in the history of the entire world where a victor, who has been marching forward, who had claimed a particular territory to be his as the Chinese claim, who occupied that territory,—that mighty victor, that mighty power—will retreat back. Has it ever happened in history? Let any Members of the Opposition first analyse and tell it to the House first. This

mighty country of China had, realised that force would not pay, and that they cannot stay here and that they cannot digest what they had got. That dawned upon them clearly. They had miscalculated. Never did they realise that this country will rise so united. They never realised that the communist allies of theirs will never be able to stand by them. They never realised that the intrigue which they had hatched with Pakistan will permit the western powers to rush to our assistance. All that happened. These miscalculations of the Chinese forced China to retreat and go back. Let us take note of that fact. Not that China had developed any generosity to us; not that China had developed any friendliness to us; not that it was prepared to give up what it had acquired through this invasion. They realised the madness in which they had indulged. When I say this, I do not wish to give the impression to the House that this madness will not be repeated. Because, China has a definite interest in humiliating this country. China has a definite interest in bringing about an influence and creating an atmosphere where every South Asian country more particularly will succumb to this influence. Therefore, it is not only the defence of this country which we have to take into consideration. We have a much larger issue at stake. Therefore, we must examine the whole thing in this context.

Our friends asked, who supported you among the non-aligned countries. It is really surprising. I think the Chinese attack was against non-alignment. China wanted to destroy non-alignment by this big invasion. China has miserably failed in destroying the policy of non-alignment which this Government has followed persistently with success. I do not think this non-alignment which China could not destroy will be destroyed by the leader of the Swatantra party by the speeches made here. This non-alignment is going to be adopted by the entire world. This should be obvious. It is

## Proposals

written on the wall. Did the U.S.A support France and England in their trouble with Egypt? They could not do it. We have got to examine every case on merits. We speak of alignment when the U.S.S.R. is not able to support China. These are the two mighty blocs. One is the Communist bloc. Has the U.S.S.R. supported China in this big invasion of India? One of the main objectives of China could have been only to embarrass the position of the U.S.S.R. I must say. I say this not only now when things have settled down. I said in my first speech, even when we were faced with the big invasion that it would be indiscreet to say anything against the U.S.S.R. because the U.S.S.R. has conducted itself in a most commendable manner and has given us support. It could not have done better than by the implied support which was given by it. We are deeply grateful to the western countries which were placed in a very difficult position by Pakistan. In spite of what Pakistan said and what Pakistan did and all the intrigues of China, the western countries realised the justness of our cause and the importance of the issues at stake and they came to our assistance as quickly as they possibly can. What has happened to those pacts? This is the greatest triumph of non-alignment. We must understand that. I hope my friends will realise it sooner than later. My friend Shri Ranga was talking of Marshal Tito in the context of non-alignment. I think Marshal Tito has proved from the other end that he is one of the staunchest supporters of non-alignment. When we talk of non-alignment, we do not mean that we should have a slant in our non-alignment. When we say this, we do not mean that we should not be as friendly with one side as with the other. We are deeply grateful and we want to give expression to this feeling of gratitude for the assistance which was offered to us by them.

It is in this context that we have to take a decision on the limited issue

which is now before us. Personally speaking, I do not attach very great importance to any of these proposals. I would have attached very great importance to these Colombo proposals if I knew that there was a country on the other side which understood reason, which will be able to appreciate what we are going to talk. Though it is quite true that we were humiliated, definitely China has been defeated in its exercise of the mighty force. The second front on which China wanted to fight is the peace offensive. I wish to remind my friends who are sitting here, when China made these peace offers, everybody here in this House stated that this peace offensive of China is more dangerous than its invasion. I wish them to be reminded of this because, now, it is to this peace offensive of China that we are succumbing, that we want to give in. We want to give the better of it to China. China will have to be defeated on the peace offensive also. We have taken a wise decision because we have accepted in principle the Colombo proposals and this acceptance of the Colombo proposals in principle will mean the defeat of China also in their attempt in the peace offensive. They will realise it soon. China will never accept this in essence. They may say, yes, everything is acceptable to them. When it comes to brasstacks, nothing will be acceptable to them. Because, they have a set objective and that set objective will be defeated if they accept. Therefore, let us not break the unity of this country by these attempts on the other side. These are insidious attempts from the Chinese side only to break the unity of this country, only to cool down the great enthusiasm which has been aroused in this country. Let us understand the treacherous enemy that is at the other end.

I, therefore, think that this is not so important. Let us say, we accept these proposals in principle. Nothing is going to come out of these. What is much more important is the preparedness of this country. We must all be

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

united. Nothing will pay us better dividend than following the absolutely sound policy which we have followed so far regarding non-alignment. I said it at that time. Let us not be disturbed and let us not be shaken off from that sound policy. It is the implementation of that policy which is very important. Much more important than that is the preparedness of this country. We must understand that we will have to do a mighty job. Here, we have to take a lesson from China, China the enemy, China about whom we have all the hard words to talk about, China could build roads in the N.E.F.A. area—within a fortnight 25 miles road. On this side, we have not been able to give any good account of ourselves. Questions are asked on the floor of the House about the Tusker, this and that. That is our weakness: nothing else. Therefore, what is much more important is this. I would certainly appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to take note that he has got to gear up his administration, that he has got to wipe out corruption in the administration, the rottenness which has crept into the administration all over. That is the most important thing in this country. You will be able to enthuse the country if you gear up the administration and if you just let the country know that relentless efforts are going to be made to strengthen the country. Let there be no slackening; let there be nothing of that kind. Let us not confuse the issues. We must stand with strength and we must never give up our moral attitude.

We had, as a matter of fact, stipulated the 8th September line. Now let us examine to what extent these Colombo proposals approximate to the 8th September line. It was not acceptable to China at that time. If we were to read the letters which have come from Premier Chou En-lai, we will find that he has very clearly asked in those letters as to how the Chinese could accept the

8th September line and that it was so disadvantageous to them, this and that. So, it is not acceptable to him and we are absolutely free to go ahead.

So far as the NEFA area is concerned, it should be obvious to everyone that there is absolutely no difference between our stand and the Colombo proposals. The Chinese must go on the other side of the ridges and the watersheds. It is entirely different from the earlier proposal which China had made. Now our troops are entitled to go right up to the MacMahon Line and occupy those places. In the middle sector also there is no trouble for our troops.

So far as the most vital sector is concerned, it should be obvious, if we just cast aside our prejudices which are natural—I can understand our indignation against China—that these proposals are definitely worth a consideration. I have not the least doubt about that. The country looks up to this House which had given a proper lead to the country and to the people. I do not want to impute any motives and I do not know if there is any party or any hon. Member of any party who has tried to make a political gain out of these discussions. I do not have the least intention of saying that. But I think, we owe a very great responsibility. We, sitting in this House to whatever party we may belong should create a proper atmosphere in the country. The country has taken the lead and, as a matter of fact, has given an exceedingly good account of itself. I do hope that the politicians will not fail the country.

**Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma** (Khammam): Sir, Shri Nath Pai, when he quoted the *Bhagvad Gita*, forgot that the *Gita* came at a later stage when all negotiations failed. He was just passing remarks about

## Proposals

Shri Dhebar's speech. Hon. Members of the Opposition also talk of lack of courage. While talking of this giant of the freedom struggle, of this giant builder of a new India, of this giant who is wedded to the emancipation of the millions of people of this country, of this giant who is determined to wipe out poverty from the face of this country, of whom even the rulers of China are afraid, while talking of him and saying that he is lacking in courage, hon. Members of the Opposition are not even afraid of what the people will think of them when they pass such remarks. It looks as though the military power of China has put so much of fear in the minds of the hon. Members in the Opposition that it is not in keeping with our tradition and culture of fearlessness.

It is not we who are suffering from a fear complex. It is China that is suffering from a fear complex of this great country of ours. China is afraid of our economic development, of our Prime Minister's personality, of our neutrality, of our friendship with the world and of our leadership. It is not just I who is saying these things as a Member of the Congress Benches. The foreign press has said it. Here is a report from the leading Arabic daily of Morocco and the mouthpiece of the ruling party, namely, *Al-Alam* which, in an editorial, has drawn attention to China's duplicity in professing all along that she wanted to settle the border difficulties with India in a peaceful manner and suddenly launching massive aggression. Hon. Members said that nobody has said that it is aggression. Here is a foreign paper which is the mouthpiece of the ruling party which has said that it is aggression. The paper also said that by attacking India which is a non-aligned country . . .

"China wants to prove that it has become a military power to which respect is due. Moreover, China wants to compel India to have recourse to American aid to

defend itself, thus proving that India is not really a non-aligned country, in which case it will become impossible to the Indian Government to obtain any aid from Russia".

If we follow Shri Ranga's advice, we will be doing exactly what China wants us to do. The paper further said:

"They are upset to see the economic success achieved by India which surpasses the progress of their economic policy. China's intention, consequently, is to compel India to dedicate a major part of its production to equip its Army and, thus, to slow down its economic plan".

The same paper, *Al-Alam*, has said about Shri Nehru's personality. *Al-Alam* added:

"There is also the question of personality such as that of Mr. Nehru himself, which is not agreeable to the Chinese. His prestige in the United States, the Soviet Union, the non-aligned countries and in India itself, is a cause of worry to the Chinese. They consider Mr. Nehru as one of the factors which contribute to the extermination of the Communist doctrine in India. The Chinese believe that, were Mr. Nehru not present, they would be able to proclaim their authority over the Asian continent and all non-aligned States".

This is what the foreign press has said.

The thinking of the Opposition seems to be outmoded and not in keeping with the times. I congratulate Mrs. Bandaranaike and her non-aligned colleagues for the creditable job that they have done. It is not proper to doubt the intentions of these six non-aligned nations. Our friends in the Opposition seem to be doubting everything and I am not



[Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma]

surprised because more than the toll of human life that the Chinese aggression has taken it has taken a toll of human faith. Our hon. friends go on doubting everything including our Prime Minister. They go on doubting everything beside them and behind them and all that.

Sir, a man's character as to whether he does not lose his heart or whether he is firm in determination and all these things are tested only at such times of Test. So, just because one country has behaved in a treacherous manner, it is not good to doubt each and everyone of our friends.

The fact that the Chinese rejected the proposals indicates that China does not want the dispute to be settled. By accepting the proposals which are very close to our terms India would prove to the world her faith in the peaceful settlement of the dispute. This would isolate China from the rest of the world. Any further change in China's attitude is only a sequel to India's stand. The acceptance of the proposals would not commit India to any compromise on her claims on the territory illegally occupied by China.

The Chinese rejected the Colombo proposals to discredit the Afro-Asian effort. The Chinese expected that Shri Nehru would reject the proposals and that would once again prove the Chinese thesis of Shri Nehru having gone over to the West. This is the main reason why the Chinese broadly accepted the proposals but withheld their final okay.

I would not go into details about the different sectors because of the time factor. The Chinese still deny the setting-up of checkpoints by India. All this, apart from India's acceptance of the broad principles of the proposals is also conditioned by the need to buy time. We need breathing time to strengthen our defence. On the diplomatic front we are also

watching the relations between Moscow and Peking.

Shri Ranga had been saying about China's victory and all that. Actually, it is not China that has won but it is India that has won. Why are our hon. friends of the Opposition, including Shri Ranga, who have talked so much of courage, afraid even to join in the march past I do not know that. Perhaps they feel it below their dignity. But we are going to march past with or without them and march ahead until the aggressor vacates the land that is occupied by him in this country. This is a people's war, and the people of this country have amply proved that. I do not know the efforts made by the leader of the Swatantra Party and his friends and their contributions towards the war effort. It is the poor people that have been paying huge amounts, and willingly and voluntarily, they have given their everything to the war effort. As our Prime Minister has said, it is a people's war. It is not the war of a few rich people or a few people who might be presenting something here and there, but it is the people's war. So, whether these friends co-operate or not—we do not know what they intend to do; when they criticise us, they must be knowing it in their own hearts what they intend to do—the country will march fast.

Our Prime Minister has made it clear in so many terms that the Chinese have to go back to the 14 September, 1962 position, that some preliminary matters will be discussed, and that we shall maintain the freedom and integrity of this country, that we shall stand by the resolution passed by this Parliament, and that we shall continue to strengthen our defence.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member should now try to conclude.

**Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma:** Then, I shall read out a few points to save time.

**Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma:** I am concluding my speech. Colombo proposals or no proposals, India is not the same India as she was before. This war that has been thrust on us has gripped our minds with war psychosis. It will take a long time and a great effort for the Indian people to resist the on-laught of anger. There has been a barter of faith to strength, an exchange of ingenuous belief with perpetual vigil, an accent

[Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma]

on physical preparedness instead of spiritual preoccupation. The change is good for India, though the world cannot afford to lose India for peace.

**Shri Sivasankaran (Sriperumbudur):** \*\*\*Mr. Speaker, we have come to a stage where proposals by the Colombo Conference for the possibilities of finding out how best India and China could come nearer and sit around the table to discuss, after the heavy bitterness and fiery exchanges, are being discussed well, we are glad about it.

At the outset, let me pay my glowing tribute to the Colombo Powers for their sincere endeavour to find out a way for peace between India and China and thereby in the world. It is clear that the Colombo proposals are intended not for the settlement of issue at stake, but for paving a way to reach a peaceful settlement if possible. The Colombo proposals, I am convinced, do not enter into the domain of the merits and demerits of the case. It is none of their business. It is the business of the two countries to decide.

Any proposal for peace is welcome. Any proposal for peaceful settlement of things cannot and should not be dismissed. The Colombo proposals may or may not be agreeable to us that might be so. But we cannot question the *bona fides* behind them. Cool and calm consideration of any proposal is necessary. Emotion should be eschewed and reason should be allowed to dominate.

Before entering into the Colombo proposals proper, I want to recall something that has happened in this House. Our Prime Minister had moved a resolution on Chinese aggression. More than 169 Members took part in that discussion. Thereby, the nerve of Parliament has been shown to the world. The interest, anxiety, emotion, strong determina-

tion and resolute will of the entire country have been reflected through Parliament. I am happy to note that the resolution of our Prime Minister has been fully endorsed by Parliament. Parliament thereby naturally assured the Prime Minister that the country was behind him. Time and again, our Prime Minister has talked out that there would not be any compromise with China at the cost of India's honour and self-respect.

He has described China as a crocodile in the pond of Asia to devour small nations. Thereby he has proved to the world the nature of our enemy. Our Prime Minister has been and still is very emphatic that the Government of China should not be relied upon. Double dealing and double-talk is the political profession of the Peking Government.

The Colombo proposals seek to establish the possibility of meeting between the two nations, one represented by double-talk profession, that is, China, and another represented by noble democratic traditions, that is, India. Let us boldly meet the situation, because we are for justice. Initial setbacks in which justice and fairplay suffer should not be construed as an eternal triumph of political hypocrisy.

But, allow me, Sir, to register one protest against the way in which things are conducted. While the resolution on Chinese aggression, moved by the Prime Minister, was discussed, Parliament was taken into confidence. Our Prime Minister reacted as though he was rightly guided by Parliament. An impression also was there that the last word for anything was that of the all-powerful Parliament itself. Our Prime Minister himself stated that he has left the Colombo proposals for Parliament to decide. Democracy smiled. Parliamentary institutions got new strength and stamina.

---

\*\*\*English translation of the speech originally delivered in Tamil

## Proposals

With your permission, Sir, I want to quote a paragraph from the joint communique issued at the end of the two-day talks between Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the one side and the representatives of Ceylon, UAR and Ghana on the other. In the communique it is stated that:

“The Prime Minister of India informed the leaders of the three visiting delegations that the Government of India welcomed the initiative of the Colombo Conference countries and will be placing the Colombo Conference proposals and the clarifications given before the Indian Parliament at its next session for consideration and will indicate their final response to the Colombo Conference proposals after these have been considered by the Indian Parliament.”

This is exactly what our Prime Minister has suggested. What do we see today? Parliament is presented with a proposal already accepted in principle by the Prime Minister. Without having any discussion in Parliament, our Prime Minister, contrary to his earlier stand, accepted the Colombo proposals in principle and now he wants Parliament to consider them, an unhappy and illogical position.

On behalf of the DMK I want to say, let us consider the Colombo proposals in the hope that the Government of India will not let down the honour, prestige and noble traditions of this country.

15 hrs.

**Shrinati Yashada Reddy (Kurnool):** I want to know whether the DMK are accepting the proposals or not.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They are accepting.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** We have had a detailed discussion and all

arguments have already been put before the House. My hon. friends in the Opposition have spoken out with zeal and enthusiasm. I welcome their speeches because they are helpful in raising the morale of the people as also of the army.

I for one would not mind any criticism of these Colombo proposals, for after all, we are a patriotic nation, and all criticism which comes against these proposals is biased by patriotic considerations and even if there is an over-burst of patriotism, there is no harm. Therefore, as far as expression of their sentiments is concerned, I welcome all those speeches and I do not think they would in any way weaken the hands of the Prime Minister. It always strengthens his hands if the world knows under what circumstances he is negotiating. Let the people know that after all, though negotiations are there, people's sentiments are also there. There is a unilateral cease fire. We have not accepted it. Our country has been violated. We have not forgiven the enemy. China is still practically our enemy because it has committed aggression and we are not friendly with it. These negotiations do not mean any commitment.

My hon. friend opposite complained and asked why a definite proposal was not moved, why an amendment in positive terms was not moved. This was in keeping with the sentiments of the Opposition as well. In fact, we could come forward with a proposal right now approving the proposal. Any such thing could be done. But we did not do it for the simple reason, which my hon. friends of the Opposition will appreciate, that this Parliament stands pledged to one thing. Let me quote from the pledge we took on the 14th November:

“With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of

[Shri Tyagi]

India, however long and hard the struggle may be”.

This was the unanimous view not only of this House but of the people as a whole from end to end. India has spoken thus. I do not want that that unanimity should be disturbed by the acceptance or non-acceptance of these proposals. Our goal is there. Every government functionary, every individual, every citizen is bound by this pledge we have taken.

This being so, let these proposals not be considered as a sort of treaty or settlement. After all, there is some misunderstanding created which has to be cleared. These Colombo proposals are a means of talking to achieve our objective to which we are pledged. Even when two armies are fighting, the General's need not consult Parliament or even the Government. They have their topography and strategy. They can start negotiations saying 'All right. You give up this position. We give up that position. Then we can come to a halt'. This is a temporary settlement for a temporary period. In war, it is done.

Therefore, these Colombo proposals may be taken only as a basis for negotiations. We are still in the midst of a war, though undeclared. We have not accepted their unilateral cease fire. We are just biding time. We cannot go on fighting like a bull. After all, our army is experienced. It knows the strategy of war.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** If you accept, cease fire will be violated.

**Shri Tyagi:** We do not want to get this through like that. After all, we could get it passed by Parliament as well, but we do not want to do it because even for a single minute we do not want to recognise the presence of the enemy in our land; we do not

want his presence in the neutral zone to be legalised by this Parliament. If we get this through, it would mean that Parliament agrees to their existence in our soil even for a few days when the negotiations are in progress. Even that little commitment we want to avoid on the part of Parliament. That is why we have avoided any positive proposal. Otherwise, it would mean our recognising their presence, even a little stay of a month or two months or whatever time the negotiations take. This is what will happen if we approve of it. Therefore, we do not want in so many words to give the approval of this Parliament. I must congratulate the Prime Minister on the accommodation he has given. After all, as far as negotiations are concerned, on what terms negotiations are taken up, that is a prerogative of the Government. Government have been good enough to put these proposals before us for consultation and comments.

As far as opposition to these proposals is concerned, I do not take it on party lines.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** We also do not take it on a party basis.

**Shri Tyagi:** The Opposition are simply expressing their sentiments. This is not a matter for consideration from party point of view. There is no whip issued. We are all considering this matter independently, talking as representatives of the people, just to give the Prime Minister the benefit of the views and reactions of the country. That is all very well done.

I personally welcome opposition because at least it gives me a feeling that after all, even the Opposition is positively so patriotic. What does it matter? Let the world know. These proposals are only temporary proposals for the purpose of talking with the enemy as to how we can dislodge him. If he does not withdraw, surely

we shall fight it out. It does not mean that we will not fight. If there is no agreement, there must be a war. Of course, I for one, party or no party, cannot agree to any settlement whereby the enemy sits in our territory or we give away our territory. We cannot barter away our land. Our party will not do it. After all, our party has also a stake in this. Let the Opposition give us also a little credit of being biased by some patriotic considerations. How can we barter away our territory? It is not possible.

So it is only for the purpose of negotiations for a little period that this is being done. Parliament must express its thanks to the six non-aligned powers, friends of ours, who have, not only come to our rescue, but have also become conscious of the danger. They have also come to realise the situation. I am quite convinced about it. It is not only a mere matter of territorial occupation. I do not know what the Prime Minister might think about it, but I think it is a definite gain in this sense that other countries now know that the Chinese want expansion. This is a simple question of *lebensraum*, the theory of living space, which Hitler was pursuing, and which the Chinese are now following. They are imperialist; they are expansionist. Even with Russia, this is their policy. Every day, we listen to it on the radio. They are not even communists. They are a separate thing in themselves, whatever type of revolutionaries they call themselves, peasant or proletarian or whatever it may be. They are definitely expansionist and, therefore, they cannot be relied upon. The world knows today that the Chinese, even the highest in authority among them, cannot be relied upon in their words or in their writing; we cannot rely upon their signatures or oral commitments. This is the treacherous attitude of the Chinese of which everyone in this country is now conscious.

15.09 hrs.

[SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY in the Chair]

So much for the justification for these Colombo proposals. But my support to these proposals is also conditional. I am not a whole-hogger in support of these. The first condition which I would like to emphasise is that the acceptance of these proposals or negotiations should not in the least damp the enthusiasm of the people for war, nor should it in any way cause any demoralisation in our army. These have to be maintained. Our war preparedness, our defensive efforts, must be redoubled, increased tenfold. My grouse is that during this period also the Government has not acted to my satisfaction at least. There are many people who are not satisfied with the manner in which the preparation is going on. Whatever time the negotiations take, this time is the most valuable for us. We know it for a fact that the Chinese would never agree to vacate. In the meantime, our preparedness must go on at a much bigger speed than it has been up to now. It has been slack and slow. I do not know whether Parliament will tolerate this speed of defence preparedness with which the Government is going about.

An Hon. Member: Never, never.

Shri T. Jagi: Therefore, I suggest that some better efforts must be made in this direction.

As far as the External Affairs Ministry is concerned, I must say that I have got quite a lot of grouse against their propaganda machinery and their publicity, but I must congratulate the Prime Minister and his Ministry on the manner in which they have conducted themselves in their diplomatic relations with other countries during this period of crisis. It is in a crisis that the trial comes actually, and they have successfully come through it. For instance, a lot of pressure was brought on us to give up our policy of

[Shri Tyagi]

non-alignment, but we have maintained it with courage and grace and without causing any annoyance to any party. I do not know what magic was practised, for even countries with alliances were prepared to help us. The communist countries like Russia were also not annoyed at our getting arms and ammunition from the USA, which we are doing openly. I must congratulate the Prime Minister on his playing his cards so well. Russia is not annoyed at our getting arms from USA, and USA is not annoyed at our getting MIGS from Russia. Such a favourable situation has been created for us in the world.

The only thing is that our information and publicity service has not been adequate. Though government circles in foreign countries are well aware of our stand, the people there are not very well acquainted with our case. I would therefore request the Prime Minister to give more attention to his propaganda and the publicity of our case in foreign countries.

15.12 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Chinese withdrawal is unilateral, and it is well known that it is not an act of grace on their part. They did it obviously for logistic reasons, because they had to bring quite a lot of petrol over a long route of about 2,000 miles or so, and there were some difficulties in their homeland also. There is no guarantee that they will continue to respect this unilateral cease-fire because there are quite a number of documents in which it is clearly shown that China went back on her written word, her maps etc. So, we know what this unilateral withdrawal means and we must not allow ourselves to be misled.

I agree with Shri Bajaj when he said that it has been our policy to frankly stand up and condemn aggression wherever it may take place,

and we went to their help also. If it is a case of Asian countries which are small, surely as their big brother, it is our duty to go to their help. I know of the old days when some countries were in distress and Pandit Nehru was approached as the leader of Asia. He was always sympathetic. In future also, if there is aggression against a neighbour like Burma or Ceylon and if they want our help, shall we say "No"? We cannot, because when we are in trouble, we are asking our friends to help us. Surely, all these countries of Asia are friendly to us, and we shall help them whenever they are in distress.

I want to get one thing clarified. Dhebarbhai and the Prime Minister might be a little annoyed with me,...

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** You are so close!

**Shri Tyagi:** ...but somehow or other, I have changed my views. I do not believe in this peace-loving policy now. My feeling is that a peace-loving policy is all right as a basis, but we must now be war-minded; if not war-minded, at least fully prepared for war. Even if the whole of our people are armed and everything is done, it is not possible to watch the border which is thousands of miles, from end to end.

When I was associated with the Ministry of Defence—it is not much of a secret now—a neighbour attacked us. My General enquired from me at about 10 O'clock in the night what to do. He talked to me direct. I asked what was the trouble, and he said that the instructions were that they could not go into the territory of the enemy and shoot them. I replied: I take the responsibility to allow you to go deep into their territory, tens of miles, I would not mind. He thanked me and said he was very proud of me. He promised to show results, and he did show results.

Therefore, let this be clarified absolutely. We are a peaceful country and we believe in peace, but when there is aggression, we cannot be defensive alone. On account of our slogan of being defensive, we have not gone in for submarines, because they are offensive weapons. We must have all possible offensive weapons with us, otherwise we cannot defend ourselves. With such a long border, our defence strategy depends on our attitude of offensive defence. It should not be defensive defence, it is no use. It should not be that we shall use our rifles only when we are attacked, because you will find from books on the subject that defence is more successful if you have the option to attack the enemy. If they are attacking us in NEFA, I must have the privilege of attacking them somewhere else. I do it there because they are doing it here. Howsoever big their army, after all, they cannot maintain a wall of their army from end to end. If they have the choice of deciding where they will attack today and where tomorrow, I must have an equally good choice to attack them where and when I want. Unless that is so, I cannot defend this border. Everybody may know that so long our military authorities have been able to keep the Pakistan border safe because the Pakistanis know that if they attack, we will also attack. That should be the policy here also. The best thing is the sanction of strength. Unless we build up our strength, we cannot defend ourselves. It is not necessary that we should shoot the enemy. What is needed is that the enemy must know that we have the military strength, and that if there is any danger, we shall crush the enemy. That threat will save us, and so I want the Government to be prepared. They are slackening their efforts. My appeal to them is that they may negotiate making it clear to the countries from which we are getting arms that these negotiations do not mean any slackness in war. Generally, the question from these countries is: we are prepared to go a

long way, but will you fight?— So, we must assure them. Let these countries know that so long as we do not regain our land, we shall fight, and that we are not peaceful to the extent made out by many people. We shall fight and take the offensive also. Let our friends not slacken their efforts in helping us. And our non-alignment must be maintained at all costs.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :**

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, देश में परिस्थितियाँ अनुकूल हों या प्रतिकूल हों, हर स्थिति में लड़ना ही चाहिये, कोई मध्य का मार्ग और नहीं हो सकता है, मैं उस नीति से सहमत नहीं हूँ। परन्तु साथ ही साथ शान्ति चाहे कैसे और कितनी ही महंगी कीमत पर खरेदनी पड़े, वह लेनी ही चाहिये, उस नाति से भी मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। मेरा तो अपना विश्वास है कि शक्ति और नाति जब दोनों साथ साथ मिल कर चलती हैं, तो हाँ विजय प्राप्त होती है। उपहार या भेंट में मिली हुई शान्ति किसी भी देश में टिकाऊ या स्थायी नहीं हो सकता है। पर शक्ति और नीति के आधार पर जब विजय प्राप्त की जाती है, तो उससे टिकाऊपन होता है, स्थायित्व होता है।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कुछ समय पहले इस बात की घोषणा की थी कि जब तक चाँदा आक्रान्ता आठ सितम्बर को लाइन से पार नहीं जाता तब तक उसके साथ बातचीत का कोई प्रश्न ही पैदा नहीं होता। पंडित जी की इस घोषणा के पश्चात् जो कि उन्होंने कई द्वार इस सदन में और इस सदन से बाहर भी की, गवर्नमेंट के जिम्मेदार नेताओं ने, रेडियो ने, समाचार पत्रों ने और पार्लियामेंट के मैम्बरों ने भी इसी बात को स्थान स्थान पर जा कर दोहराया। इससे देश के मस्तिष्क में यह बात बैठ गई कि ८ सितम्बर को प्रधान मंत्री की घोषणा अंगद का पैर है, इसे अब कोई नहीं हिला सकता, यह एक झंझा हमारे



## [श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

स्वाभिमान का है जो कि हम ने गाढ़ दिया है, और इससे पोंछे हटने का कोई सवाल हो अब पैदा नहीं होता। लेकिन जब ८ सितम्बर के इस प्रस्ताव से हट कर प्रधान मंत्री कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को वार्ता का आधार सिद्धान्त मानते हैं, तो उससे देश में यह सन्देह पैदा होने लगा है कि कहीं जो झंडा हम ने गाड़ा था या अंगद के पैर की तरह जो हम ने घोषणा की थी, उस में इस वार्ता के आधार पर कोई कमजोरी तो नहीं आ जायेगी, यह झंडा हिलने तो नहीं लगेगा।

परन्तु मैं तो इस से भी आगे बढ़ कर एक और बात प्रधान मंत्री जी के शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ। यह गवर्नमेंट का ही पब्लिकेशन है; “चान का चुनो तो हमें स्वाकार है”। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री के शब्दों को मैं आज स्वयम् पढ़ूँ और उन्हें सुनाऊँ। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में यह कहा था :

“कोई भी स्वाभिमान देश, जो अपनी स्वतन्त्रता और अखण्डता से प्रेम करता है, इस चुनौती के आगे घुटने नहीं टेक सकता। निस्सन्देह हमारा यह प्यारा देश भारत भी अपना निर कभी नहीं झुकायेगा, चाहे कुछ भी हो। हम इस चुनौती को इसके सारे नेताओं के साथ स्वीकार करते हैं।”

प्रधान मंत्री जी यह शब्द आपके हैं और इन शब्दों के पश्चात् जब ८ सितम्बर का बात से हट कर कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को आधार मान कर आप बात-बात का एक नया पृष्ठ खोलते हैं तो हमारे मस्तिष्कों में सन्देह होता है कि देश में जो एकता और बलिदान

की भावना आई है कहीं वह हिल न जाय या उस में कोई कमी न आ जाये।

दूसरी बात जो मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि पहले तो चान इन सारे कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को ज्यों का त्यों स्वीकार कर लेगा या नहीं इसके सम्बन्ध में हो अभी कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता। लेकिन इस से भी आगे बढ़ कर मैं जो अगली बात कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह जो कुछ आपने इन प्रस्तावों के सम्बन्ध में कहा वह चार राजनीतिज्ञों का काम नहीं हुआ। माननीय त्यागो जी अभी कह रहे थे कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने कार्ड्स अच्छी तरह से दूसरे देशों के सामने पेश किये हैं। लेकिन मैं बड़ी नम्रता से उन के सम्मान और उनका सुझाव को सराहना करने हुए कहना चाहता हूँ कि चतुर खिलाड़ियों का यह काम भी नहीं है कि वह अपने कार्ड पढ़ने हों खोल कर रख दें। चतुर खिलाड़ियों का काम तो यह होता है कि दूसरों के कार्ड्स पहले खुलवायें उसके पश्चात् अपने कार्ड्स खोल कर रखें। हमने जो घोषणायें समय-समय पर की हैं कि हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय न्यायालय में जाना चाहते हैं, कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को वार्ता का आधार मान लेंगे। यह ठीक नहीं। मुझे तो यह भी डर है कि यही ८ सितम्बर की बात पर ही चान जा कर टिक न जायेगा और वहाँ फिर वार्ता का आधार और अन्तिम रेखा न बन जाये।

आज स्थिति यह है कि अभी तो चान इन प्रस्तावों को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, लेकिन अगर वह उन को मान भी लेता है तो हमें उनको लाल डिक्शनरी पर भरोसा नहीं करना चाहिये पता नहीं वह कल शब्दों के दूसरे अर्थ क्या लगायेगा? लाल डिक्शनरी वालों की ही बात यह देखिये

कि जब चीन ने हमारे देश के ऊपर आक्रमण किया तो उस ने उसी डिक्शनरी से बग़लिया बह को कि चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण नहीं किया है, बल्कि पंचशाल का उल्लंघन भारत को और से हो किया गया, और भारत ने ही चीन के ऊपर आक्रमण किया है। आज अगर चाइना इन प्रस्तावों पर टिक भी जायेगा तो कल वह उस का बग़लिया क्या करेगा इस के ऊपर किस प्रकार विश्वास किया जा सकता है।

दूसरी सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि जिन छः राष्ट्रों ने इन प्रस्तावों को हमारे सामने उपस्थित किया है उन की बात को आज यदि चीन मान भी लेता है और उसके आधार पर वार्ता भी आरम्भ हो जाता है, लेकिन दूसरे दिन ही अगर वह इन प्रस्तावों से मुकर जाता है तो इन छः राष्ट्रों के पास कितनी शक्ति है जिस से कि वे उसको विवश कर सकें। हां, यदि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को और से मध्यस्थता हुई होती, रशिया का और से मध्यस्थता हुई होती या अमरीका का और से मध्यस्थता हुई होती, जिन के पास मनवाने का शक्ति है, तो बात समझ में भी आ सकती था। लेकिन यह तो ऐसे राष्ट्रों का बात है जो कि अभी तक चीन को आक्रान्ता भी घोषित नहीं कर सके, प्रस्तावों के एक-एक शब्द के लिये उन्होंने चीन का मुंह देखा है। वे छः राष्ट्र इस बात को मनवाने के लिये चीन को विवश कर सकेंगे, मुझे इस में सन्देह दिखाई देता है।।

एक और इससे भी बड़ी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि हम अपना आदर्श स्वरूप दुनिया के सामने उपस्थित तो करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन प्रमाण मंशो जो मैं बड़ी नम्रता से कहना चाहता हूं कि दुर्लभ आदर्शवाद कभी हानि का कारण भी हो जाता है। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इस आदर्शवाद के चक्कर में आकर हम अपने

पुराने मित्रों से भी हाथ धो बैठें। हमारे दो मित्र हमारे सम्पर्क में आये। एक तो वह मित्र थे जिन्होंने आज हमारी विपत्ति की बात सुनी और कल अपनी मदद लेकर हमारी धरती पर पहुंच गया, दूसरा वह मित्र है जिन्होंने हमारी विपत्ति की बात सुनी और पहले दिये आश्वासनों की परवाह किये बिना यह ही कहते रहे कि हम भी सहयोग देने आ रहे हैं पर युद्ध विराम हो गया और उन का सहयोग भारत नहीं पहुंच पाया।

अब जिन्होंने हमको सहयोग दिया उनके सहयोग की बात भी मैं कहना चाहता हूं। कल जिस समय कश्मीर का सवाल आया तो हम ने यह सुना, और इसकी समाचार पत्रों में चर्चा भी थी, कि अमरीका और ब्रिटेन की ओर से प्रेशर डाला जा रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान को कश्मीर की समस्या पाकिस्तान के साथ सुलझा लेनी चाहिये, और शायद वे इसी शर्त पर हमें शस्त्र और हथियार भी देना चाहते हैं। मैं उन व्यक्तियों में से हूं जिन्होंने इस सदन के बाहर भी इस बात की घोषणा की, और आज यहां भी यह कहना चाहता हूं, कि अगर अमरीका और ब्रिटेन बायें हाथ से हमें हथियार दें और दायें हाथ से कश्मीर को लेकर जनरल अय्यूब की जेब में डालना चाहें, तो हिन्दुस्तान अपनी मौत मरना पसन्द करेगा, लेकिन उनके हथियार लेना पसन्द नहीं करेगा।

लेकिन जहां मैं यह कहना हूं वहां साथ ही साथ दूसरी बात भी कहता हूं। रूस जिस आधार पर सहयोग का आश्वासन हमें दे रहा है, उसके लिए ईस्ट जर्मनी का मि० ख्रुश्चेव का कम्युनिस्ट कांफ्रेंस का वह भाग क्या हमारी आंख खोलने के लिये पर्याप्त नहीं है, जोकि उन्होंने लाल चीन के प्रतिनिधि को संकेत करते हुए दिया था। मि० ख्रुश्चेव ने कहा कि चीन ने इस समय हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करके गन्ती की है ऐसा करके अपने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्युनिज्म को हानि पहुंचाई है। मैं प्रस्ताव चाहता हूं

## [श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

कि क्या मि० खुश्चेव वा यह अभिप्राय है कि हमला तो करना चाहिये था लेकिन इस समय नहीं करना चाहिये था ? क्या मि० खुश्चेव का यह अभिप्राय है कि इस समय हमला करके चीन ने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्यूनिज्म को नुकसान पहुंचाया है ? जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्यूनिज्म हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर पनप रहा था या फल रहा था, मि० खुश्चेव को लगा कि चीन के इस आक्रमण से उस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्यूनिज्म को फलने में नुकसान हुआ है ? प्रधान मंत्री जी जहाँ इस बात से सहमत हैं और उसका हृदय से समर्थन करते हैं कि भारत को किसी सैनिक गूट में नहीं मिलना चाहिये, वहाँ साथ ही साथ हम यह भी विश्वास करते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की धरती पर, चाहे माऊ त्सै तूंग हो चाहे खुश्चेव हों, या फिर हिन्दुस्तान का कोई बड़े से बड़ा नेता हों, अगर वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्यूनिस्ट संगठन को पर फलने का संवा देंगे तो भारत की जनता उसे कभी स्वीकार नहीं कर सकती। खुश्चेव का यह भाषण हमारी आंख खोलने वाला है।

इसके बाद मैं यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों में पहली बमजोर बात तो यह है कि जो चीवियाँ हमारी रही हैं उनमें से कुछ चीवियाँ हमें अब छोड़नी पड़ेगी जोकि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महात्वाकांक्षी दृष्टि के और सैनिक दृष्टि से भी महत्वपूर्ण हैं। दूसरी बात यह कि वह सब जो हम यह करते आये हैं कि भारत की एच एच ईच धरती भी चीन को नहीं देगे, लेकिन अगर यह मान लिया जाय, चाहे थोड़ा रबर के लिये ही सही हम कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को आधार मान कर बात चर्चा आरम्भ करते हैं और इस बात को भी मान लेते हैं कि उत्तर ईशान्य चीन में एक एरिया बँटेगी और शेष ईशान्य चीन में एक एरिया बँटेगी, तो क्या यह राष्ट्र की प्रतिष्ठा के

अनुकूल होगा ? लेकिन इससे भी बड़ी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि जहाँ पर भी युद्ध विराम अब तक हुआ है, क्या उस युद्ध विराम की रेखा को किसी ने पार किया है ? कोरिया में युद्ध विराम हुआ, हमारे देश में युद्ध विराम हुआ, कश्मीर में इजिप्ट और वियतनाम में युद्ध विराम हुआ। कहीं पर भी ऐसा नहीं हुआ है। हमें सन्देह है कि कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के आधार पर जो रेखा खींची जायेगी, वही वह रेखा ही अन्तिम न बन जाय। ऐसा न हो कि आगे चल कर फिर लक्ष्मण रेखा को लांघा ही न जा सके। क्योंकि हमारी जो वर्तमान सरकार है वह लड़ाई में तो विश्वास करती नहीं है। वह तो चाहती है कि शांति से ही समस्याओं को सुलझाया जाय। क्या हम यह विश्वास करें कि जिस चीन ने अबसाई चिन जैसे सैनिक महात्वाकांक्षी का भाग हमारा ले रखा है, जो नेफा में लोभजू और थागला इन दो चीवियों को छोड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, वह वह इन प्रस्तावों से हमारी बातों को स्वीकार कर लेगा ? क्या वह कोई और हमारे अनुकूल वातावरण बन जायेगा। उससे भी बड़ी बात यह है कि पूर्वी क्षेत्र के दो भागों के संबंध में अभी स्थिति अस्पष्ट है, लेकिन मध्य क्षेत्र के संबंध में ही क्या हुआ ? हमारी सरकार को पता नहीं क्या हो गया है कि गलत या सही जब किसी भी बात को मनवाना चाहती है तो उसके लिये वातावरण बनाना शुरू कर देती है। अभी दो तीन दिन से आल इंडिया रेडियो की पालिसी भी कुछ बदल गई है। बड़ाहोती के संबंध में सरकार ने कहना शुरू कर दिया है कि वहाँ तो जाड़ों में हम रहते ही नहीं थे। झगड़ा पहले से ही चला आ रहा है। आश्चर्य है हम स्वयं इन बातों को वह रें हैं। वह जब कि फिर इन ही बातों को लेकर चीन अपने क्लेम रखेगा उस समय हम उसको क्या उत्तर दे सकेंगे ? भारत सरकार की नीति यह है कि वह पहले से अपने अनुकूल वातावरण बनाती है

रेडियो से घोषणायें करके और भाषणों में भी बार बार कहने चले जाते हैं। इस समय हमारी एक ही नीति होनी चाहिये जैसा कि कुछ समय पहले हमारे नये प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण ने कहा था। जिस समय श्री चव्हाण प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री बनाये गये उसी दिन चीन के साथ युद्ध विराम भी हुआ। प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री से एक सार्वजनिक सभा में चीन के युद्ध विराम के संबंध में पूछा गया कि उनका उसके संबंध में क्या कहना है तो उन्होंने बहुत ही दूरदर्शितापूर्ण भाषा में उत्तर दिया... कि चीन के युद्ध विराम के पीछे उसका क्या भाव, या क्या रहस्य है, इसके संबंध में मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता। लेकिन इस बात को मैं जिम्मेवारी के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि हमारा भाव यह है कि हम अपनी धरती पर चीन को नहीं रहने देंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यही हमारे हर नेता के सोचने का ढंग बन होना चाहिये।

मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने संसद के कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्यों की एक मीटिंग में भाषण दिया। मैंने समाचारपत्रों में उसे पढ़ा। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्यों को कहा कि आज हमें गम्भीरता से निर्णय लेना है, हमें जहाँ वर्तमान को देखना चाहिए वहाँ हमें भविष्य को भी देखना चाहिए। पर मैं प्रधान मंत्री से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज वर्तमान को देखना तो ठीक ही है, भविष्य को भी देखना चाहिए, लेकिन उसके साथ साथ अतीत को भी जरूर देखना चाहिए, आप जिस प्रस्ताव को वार्ता का आधार बनाने के लिए जा रहे हैं। क्या आपने स्वयं चीन के नेताओं से पहले बातचीत नहीं की थी? चाऊ एन लाई के साथ बैठ कर सीमा विवाद पर अनेकों बार क्या चर्चाएँ नहीं हुई? इसी प्रकार क्या आपके अधिकारी भी बार बार उनसे बातचीत करने के लिए नहीं गए?

पाँच लाख से ज्यादा शब्दों के विरोध पत्र आपने चीन को भेजे, लेकिन उनका भी क्या कोई परिणाम निकला? न आपकी बातचीत का ही कोई परिणाम निकला। फिर आप यह कैसे विश्वास करते हैं कि कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करने के बाद जो वार्ता होगी उसका कोई अच्छा परिणाम निकलेगा? इसीसे मेरा निवेदन है कि आपको भूतकाल को भी न भूलना चाहिए।

२० अक्टूबर को चीन ने हम पर हमला करके हमें अपने शक्ति जाल में फँसना चाहा, युद्ध विराम की घोषणा करके फिर उसने हमको अपने नीति जाल में फँसाना चाहा, कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के बाद अब वह हमको अपने शब्द जाल में फँसाना चाहता है। लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि इस शक्ति जाल, नीति जाल तथा शब्द जाल से भी बढ़कर चीन के पास एक जाल और है वह है माया जाल। वह इस बातचीत के बहाने फरवरी के अन्त तक समय टालना चाहता है। उसके बाद धीरे-धीरे गन्मी आ जाएगी। चीन यह समझता है कि हमारी बातचीत का नतीजा यह होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकारी तैयारियों में भी ठंडक आ जाएगी और जनता में भी उदासी आ जाएगी। सरकार के बारे में तो मैं नहीं कह सकता लेकिन जनता में इस बातचीत की चर्चा से ठंडक आनी आरम्भ हो गई है। इस प्रकार चीन अपने उद्देश्य में कुछ हद तक कामयाब हो गया है।

इस अवसर पर मैं सरकार का ध्यान एक सिपाही के शब्दों की ओर भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ। गढ़वाल का एक सिपाही अपने भतीजे को बरेली फौज में भरती करवाने लाया था। उस सिपाही की आयु सतर बहत्तर साल की होगी। मैंने उससे प्रश्न किया कि तुम इतनी दूर

## [श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

इस लड़के को भरती करवाने क्यों लाए हो, तुम इसको लेंसडाउन में भरती करवा सकते थे। उसने कहा कि मैं इसको यहां इसलिए लाया हूँ कि वहां मेरे घर वाले रोते क्योंकि इस लड़के के पिता का नेफा में देहान्त हो चुका है। मैंने उस वीर सैनिक को ऊपर से नीचे तक देखा, उसका भाई नेफा में मारा जा चुका है, और उस भाई की परती विधवा होकर घर में बैठी भी है और यह उसके पुत्र को फिर फोज में दाखिल कराने लाया है। मैंने उससे प्रश्न किया कि तुम्हारा भाई मारा गया, उसकी पत्नी विधवा हो गयी, पर तुम्हारे चेहरे पर कोई दुःख का चिन्ह नहीं दिखायी देता। उसने कहा कि मेरा भाई मारा गया इसका मुझे दुःख नहीं क्योंकि वह कोई चोरी डकैती में तो नहीं मारा गया, वह देश की रक्षा के लिए ही तो मारा गया है पर उसने मुझसे कहा कि आप प्रधान मंत्री से भी जाकर मेरी तरफ से कह दें कि मुझे इस बात का दुःख नहीं कि मेरा भाई मारा गया, उसकी पत्नी विधवा हो गयी। और अगर मेरा यह भतीजा भी देश की रक्षा के लिए शहीद हो जाएगा तो मुझे दुःख नहीं होगा, लेकिन मुझे दुःख तब होगा जब हिन्दुस्तान को सरकार शत्रु के नामने जूट कर कोइ समझौता करेगा। यह उस सेवानिवृत्त वृद्ध को भी भावना है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस भावना को रियलाइज करें। हमारे जो जवान नेफा में शहीद हुए हैं आज उबड़ते, आत्माएं आकाश से आती और दब रही हैं। नेफा को पहाड़ियां पर शहीद हुए सैनिकों के खून से वहां की पहाड़ियां अभी भी लाल हैं। जिन भावनाओं के अश्रुत उन्होंने अपना बलिदान किया उनको रशन मंत्री जो की कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करते समय अपने ध्यान में रखा होता।

पहले भी विभाजन का इतिहास हमारे देश के लिए बड़ा अहितकर रहा है। एक समय ऐसा आया कि हमने अपने देश से पंजब और बंगाल के भागों को छोड़ा। फिर कश्मीर का एक तिहाई भाग और हमारे हाथों से निकल गया। हमने पाकिस्तान को खुश करने के लिए ५५ करोड़ रुपये पहले दिया और ८४ करोड़ रुपए देने का अब लिखित वादा किया, नदियों का पानी दिया, बिजली घरों की बिजली दी। लेकिन आज फिर वह जनमत के नाम पर अड़ा है और कश्मीर पर अपना जन्म सिद्ध अधिकार बताता है। मुझे खतरा है कि कहीं हमारी इसी नीति के कारण वह लाइन जो कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों में है स्थायी रेखा न बन जाए और भारत के दुर्भाग्य से वह दिन फिर न देखना पड़े। मैं यह इसलिए कहता हूँ कि दूध का जला छाछ को भी फूंक फूंक कर पीता है।

एक अन्तिम बात कह कर मैं अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस बात का ध्यान अवश्य रखें कि जिन मित्र राष्ट्रों ने विपत्ति के समय हमको सहयोग दिया उनकी इन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के प्रति क्या प्रतिक्रिया है जानी जाय। जो विपत्ति में हमारे साथी रहे हैं, यह नैतिकता का भी तकाजा है और यह नीति का भी कि हम उनसे इस मामले में राय लें।

यहां गीता की भी कई बार चर्चा हुई। मैं जहां उन शब्दों की तो नहीं दुहराना चाहता जिनको कह कर भगवान् कृष्ण ने अर्जुन के मोह को दूर करके उनसे गांडीव उठवाया था। मैं तो केवल एक बात को और आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। जिस समय अर्जुन

ने मोह में आकर यह कहा कि भले ही ये लोग मुझे मार द तो भी अच्छा है, मैं तो पाप का भागी नहीं बनूंगा, आने वाली पीढ़ियां या संसार मुझे क्या कहेंगी, यह कह कर अर्जुन ने गांडीब रख दिया। उस समय भगवान् कृष्ण ने अर्जुन से सबसे पहली ही बात यह कही कि कुतस्त्वा कश्मलमिदं विषमे समुपस्थितम्

इसमें आप जरा "विष में" शब्द पर ध्यान दें। उन्होंने अर्जुन से कहा कि इस गलत स्थान पर तेरे मस्तिष्क में यह कमजोरी कैसे पैदा हो गयी? यदि तुझ यही करना था तो युद्ध से पहले बताता। जब युद्ध की चर्चाएं चल रही थीं उस समय तुझे यह बात बतानी थी। तो मैं वह ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जब हमारे हजारों जवान मारे जा चुके हैं, जब नेफा की पहाड़ियां हमारे जवानों के खून से रंगी जा चुकी हैं और गंगा यमुना उनके खून से लाल हो कर आ रही हैं, उस समय कोई भी दुर्बलता की बात करना परिस्थितियों के प्रतिकूल होगा और उसका अच्छा प्रभाव नहीं होगा।

**Shri Inder J. Malhotra** (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was listening to Shri Prakash Vir Shastri's speech which just ended with great attention. There is no doubt that by narrating the story of a soldier, as he did, certainly one can arouse the sentiments of every patriotic Indian. He also pleaded that today our military strategy, our foreign policy and our diplomacy should be based according to the minutest detail written in the Gita. The Gita is a great religious book. It tells us the glory of the past and in certain respects it can certainly guide the future of our country. But to say that unless and until we follow the way in which the Mahabharata war was fought, word by word, we are not true Indians, does not and cannot appeal at least to my mind.

I am not surprised at all at the criticism which has come from the

Swatantra party and the Jansangh party. I am only surprised that they have criticised these proposals as if these proposals came from the Chinese. To my mind, the criticisms about the details of the proposals are also not as harmful as the criticisms about the nations which prepared these proposals to end the Sino-Indian border dispute. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri has asked, suppose China does not agree to the Colombo proposals, what authority, what capacity and what capability have these six nations got to make China accept these proposals. And in the world today, we have seen it practically that the mere military power is not a great power in this world. There is some moral power also; there is some political force also and there is some basic ideology to maintain human dignity. That is also there. These six nations may not have great military power, but I can certainly say that their motive, their sincere intentions with which they called the conference and prepared these proposals are a great force; it is a great force even for China so that she may see the effect of this force.

In this morning's newspapers I read a news item which directly concerns the area from which I come. This is the real, basic ideology of the Jansangh regarding these Colombo proposals. Their political puppet, the chief of the Praja Parishad in Jammu, has outrightly rejected these proposals. He said a very interesting thing. He appeals to the country. It is reported in the papers. He said:

• "Mr. Nehru's reported view has shocked self-respecting patriotic people of Jammu and Kashmir, whose forefathers had laid down their lives for Ladakh".

I also come from the same region to which Mr. Dogra belongs. I am also proud of the fact that our forefathers brought Ladakh to India. But I am one of those who would like at this moment to think, when my forefathers were alive, what were the conditions

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

of the world, what were the means of communications and what were the political forces existing at that time. After so many years, we have to fight again the same battle which our forefathers fought in Ladakh, but with difference in all other practical things—difference in means of communications, difference in arms, weapons and political forces. I have to sit down and rationally analyse all these factors in the fight in Ladakh today with the Chinese. Merely saying that because our forefathers did like this, we should also do like this is an argument which does not appeal to my mind today.

It has also been said that if we accept these proposals, a general impression will be created that India has lost her battle to the Chinese. As far as the common man of this country is concerned, he knows that India will never submit even an inch of her territory to any foreign aggressor. At the same time he knows that he has to work for his living; he wants to improve his economic condition in this country. He wants to establish a socialist pattern of society in the country. He knows it very well that unless the engagement of the armies is ended, unless the fear of war is wiped out from the future, all these things cannot happen. That is why there is a clear difference in the understanding and approach to this problem between the Swatantra Party and common patriotic Indian.

Regarding the Ladakh sector, looking to our practical position, as we stand today, my appeal to the critics who put the maps before them and study the lines which have been drawn there—they try to draw their own lines also—is this. Whatever commonsense I have tells me that everybody in this country cannot become experts in military strategy. Prof. Ranga says, if we accept these proposals, what would happen to this post or that post which is in the corner? I would appeal to him that such minor details of the establishment of

these posts from the point of view of military strategy, may be left entirely to our army command. We cannot just by studying the maps and with superficial knowledge based only on our enthusiasm guide or suggest what changes should be made in the establishment of the check-posts or in the basic policy of our military strategy.

In the end, Sir, I would like to say that this country in a way is very thankful to our six friendly countries who have taken a bold step with great courage and put forward these proposals before a friendly country like India and a country like China who absolutely believes in military opportunism.

Sir, a word was said about the role of UAR. I happened to listen to the speech of the Prime Minister of UAR, Mr. Ali Sabry when he was in India during his last visit. I remember his two or three words which he said in the end of his speech. He said that UAR is very much desirous of a settlement between India and China but based on "justice, dignity and honourable settlement".

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened with a great deal of patience to the speeches from the Opposition. Professor Ranga and Shri Frank Anthony consider these Colombo proposals as not honourable. Shri Anthony had many adjectives to apply. He considered the whole thing as "odious" and so on. He also stated that we are dealing in horse-trading. He quoted the Prime Minister as saying that no part of the Indian territory will be subjected to horse-trading, and then he said that the Ceylon proposals are nothing but horse-trading. What have we given away? What piece of land of India has gone to the Chinese by these proposals? Where is the horse and where is the trading? These are certain simple proposals made by some friendly countries. It is for you to accept them or not to accept them. It is not right to cast doubts on the motives of

those countries, to examine their foreign policies, and examine what they say and what they should say. Why should every country in the world come out and say that China is an aggressor? Many things in the diplomatic world are not said, because when a thing is said they examine whether it is worthwhile doing so. So this idea that the Colombo powers are just pawns in the hands of China is simply ridiculous. In fact, Shri Nath Pai said that it is because of the dictation from China that these Colombo powers have brought these proposals. If that is a dictation from China, why does China reject it? I must say there is this contradiction and it is quite obvious.

Professor Ranga wanted us to fight with the help of our allies. I do not know who the allies are. But Shri P. K. Deo of the Swatantra Party made it clear when he said that we should align ourselves with the United States. So the real crux of the problem is that the Swatantra Party and also our friends of the PSP will be very very happy if we join the American bloc.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** No, no. We have never suggested that we should join the American bloc. We must withdraw it.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It is a gross misrepresentation of facts.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** After hearing all the foreign affairs debates has he come to that conclusion?

**Mr. Speaker:** There is nothing in his remark to which such strong exception should be taken.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** He should correct himself.

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:** The Swatantra Party asks us to join the American bloc. The United States itself has admitted that non-alignment is the best policy. The Swatantra Party wants us to go to war not only with China but with the entire Communist world. The United States, on whom they rely for the defence of this

country, says that India did well in accepting MIGs from the USSR.

**Shri Ranga:** Do you not want their help?

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:** I want the help of all countries, including Soviet Russia.

**Shri Ranga:** We have no objection to Soviet Russia helping us.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. There should not be a running commentary like this.

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:** I want all the help. But if I do not get help I will fight alone. Do you not want to defend your country?

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. Member addresses the Chair, perhaps there will be less difficulty.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** He is accusing you.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** He is bringing you into the picture.

**Mr. Speaker:** I cannot get out of that picture.

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:** We have listened with great patience to the attacks and to the fulminations of the opposition parties. Why should they feel so perturbed or disturbed when I put forward some arguments to rebut their arguments? We appreciate the speed with which the United Kingdom and the United States came to our aid and offered it unconditionally for defending our country against China. At the same time, the USSR also promised to deliver the MIGs according to schedule. That itself shows the success of our non-alignment. Instead of that suppose we had been aligned to the United States. Then, this border dispute would have resulted in a global war. There is no doubt about that. This policy of non-alignment has brought us friends, brought us help and also guaranteed our frontiers.



## Proposals

**An Hon. Member:** Endangered our frontier.

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:** I said "guaranteed", and I will give you the reason.

**Mr. Speaker:** He should give the reasons to me; not to anybody else.

**Shri Baghwat Jha Azad:** But when somebody asks for it, how can it be denied?

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:** Both United States and Russia know that fire arm alone is not sufficient to be the master of this world. Man-power is also equally important. This was the lesson of the last war. Germany got defeated, not because she lacked fire power but because she lacked man-power. China today has got a population larger than that of both Russia and America put together. The fire power you can develop in a few years but, as every person who is interested in animal husbandry knows, that man-power cannot be increased at that speed. Therefore, China today is a potential danger not only to the United States but also to the Soviet Union. That is the reason why they do not tolerate any expansion of China's frontiers so that it may not become a greater danger. That is the reason why both the United States and the Soviet Union were so keen and so quick in coming to our aid. There was some reason for that.

What does Rajaji advise us? He advises us to gain one friend, who is already a friend and to make an enemy of one who is a friend. What logic is it? What statesmanship or diplomacy is it?

The feeling expressed on the other side is that we should fight. Which Indian is there in the country who does not want to fight? That is an emotional reaction. They say that we should go and kill the Chinese or drive them out from our land. Naturally, my heart responds and says, "Yes, let us go". But before doing that, we have to pause and consider whether

the step that we are taking is in the larger interests of the country and whether there are other ways which are better and wiser ways.

Shri Nath Pai has quoted the Gita. But the very first words, at least of the translation that he gave us, are "Avoid war". But for your honour and so on you must fight to the last. The first advice is to avoid war because war is an evil thing. It raises our passions and feeds on hate. It can make us unlearn within a fortnight what we have learnt during the last 50 years at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi. If we try to avoid war, it does not mean that we are afraid of war. If that is the case, we have to see whether war will actually help our country in the long run.

After the fall of the Moghul Empire there were small States which were fighting with each other. Ultimately it resulted in slavery. Do you want to repeat the same thing on a bigger scale in the case of the Asiatic peoples? If China and India keep on fighting, if there is war between India and China, both the countries will suffer, the clock will be put back 50 years and we will not be able to rise and build to be strong enough so as to be a match to the other countries in the world.

What is there disgraceful or to be ashamed of in talking to a person? That is not a final thing. You talk and if the terms are not agreeable, you leave the table and carry on. Why should this particular step be considered unwise? I do not see that.

Then, arguments were given that the 8th September line deviates here and there. Somebody has said that the whole idea behind it is to be sure of the *bona fide* of China. Naturally, when you offer a term for negotiation, you cannot make it an ultimatum or a challenge. So, if a little alteration here and there will satisfy the pride of China and if it is not material, what is the harm because you

are not bartering away your country or you are not giving away anything? In fact, by this proposal, the MacMahon Line has been accepted as final because they have only objected to Longju and Thagla. That means that they have no objection to the whole of the MacMahon Line. That itself is a great gain.

So, I submit, in all humility that the path that we have chosen is a difficult path. It is easy to make war speeches and to get excited. The war psychosis is already developed in the country. Let it not be turned into war hysteria because war is not going to be profitable either to China or to India.

With these few words, I plead for the acceptance of the proposal.

श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ (एटा): आदरणीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपना व्याख्यान शुरू करने से पहले आपके सामने एक उपमा रखना चाहता हूँ। गीता का तो बहुत जिक्र आया है, लेकिन मैं रामायण की एक बात की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

भगवान् राम जंगल में बैठे हैं और भगवती राजरानी सीता पास में बैठी हैं। इंद्र का पुत्र, जयंत, कोए के रूप में आता है और भगवती राजरानी के पैरों में अपनी चोंच मारता है। अगर आज के कानून की नजर से यह बात देखी जाए, तो इसका मुकदमा चलना चाहिए और बहुत मुमकिन है कि उसको एक हफ्ते की सजा हो जाए। परन्तु भगवान् राम ने जो कि हमारे देश कि परम्परा के प्रतीक हैं, जब उसका अजमेन्ट दिया, तो यह कहा कि इसने जो अपराध किया है, उसके लिए तो इसको मृत्यु-दंड देना चाहिए, इसको मौत की सजा मिलनी चाहिए। मैं इस विषय में बहुत ज्यादा तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता, केवल इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब जयंत

की सारी खतायें माफ की गईं, तब भी उसको यह सजा दी गई कि भगवान् ने अपने तीर से उसकी एक आंख निकाल दी। मैं इस उपमा में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह की स्पीजिंग कांग्रेस बेंचिंग की तरफ से हुई है, दुर्भाग्य से मुझे कहना पड़ता है, कि ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि बहुत से सज्जनों ने अपनी आत्मा की बात को अन्दर ही अन्दर दबा लिया है, उस पर पर्दा डाल कर कुछ और ही बोलने की चेष्टा की है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि चीन जिस समय हटा तो हमारे देश और सारे संसार ने अनुभव किया कि आक्रमण करने के बाद वह हटा इसके अन्दर कुछ भारी राज है। आज चीन से समझौते के बारे में भी जो चीख सामने आती है, उसे देखकर आश्चर्य होता है। ऐसा क्यों है? अभी श्री वाकर अली मिर्जा साहब कह रहे थे कि मकमोहन लाइन के बिल्कुल पेरैलल वह चला जाएगा। नेफा में यह ठीक हो सकता है। लेकिन लद्दाख को शायद वह भूल गए। वहां पर सोलह हजार वर्ग मील हमारी भूमि आज भी उसके कब्जे में है।

सारी चर्चा जो इस समय चल रही है उस का बहुत साफ यह अर्थ मालम पड़ता है कि इस सारे झमेले इस सारी बार्ता के बाद जो जमीन चीन ने दबा ली है, वह आप को वापिस नहीं आएगी और चर्चा खत्म हो जायेगी। श्री नाथपाई जी के भाषण को पढ़ कर कहा गया है कि उन्होंने ने पहला फेज ही यह इस्तेमाल किया कि हम शान्ति से निगोसिएशन करना चाहते हैं मैं चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी कायदे का इंसान इस दुनिया में नहीं होगा जो कि चाहता हो कि लड़ाई हो या लड़ाई की जाए। अपनी आजादी कायम रखने के लिये जो आदमी बार बार यह कहे, हर बात के पहले फेज में ही कहे कि हमें लड़ाई नहीं लड़नी है हम शान्ति को मान्यता देंगे तो मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस को कायर ही कहा

## [श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ]

जायेगा। आज हमारे सामने बड़ी क्लियर पोजीशन है। दुनिया देख रही है कि अगर हम ने इस तरह की किसी भी परिस्थिति को मान्य किया, तो देश के अन्दर, जैसा हमारे एक पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा है, उत्साह में कमी आ जाएगी। सारे देश के अन्दर जो लहर पैदा हुई थी सारा देश जो एक सूत्र में बंध गया था, छिन्न भिन्न हो जायेगा, वह एकता खंडित हो जायेगी। जब देश में मजबूती नहीं होगी तो चाइना की लड़ाई नहीं लड़ी जा सकती है। वह तो बहुत बड़ी लड़ाई है। मैं कांग्रेस वालों से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस की महत्ता को ध्यान में रखें और देश के उत्साह में कमी न आने दें, देश में एकता को बनाये रखें।

मैं एक और निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। जो बेरूबाड़ी के सम्बन्ध में है बेरूबाड़ी पाकिस्तान को दे दिया गया है। ऐसा प्रतीत होता था कि बहुत से लोग, विशेषतः जो हमारे बंगाल के भाई हैं, वे इस का पूरा विरोध करेंगे। विरोध हुआ भी इस का विरोध बंगाल लेजिस्लेचर में भी किया गया। परन्तु अन्त में क्या हुआ। बेरूबाड़ी दे दिया गया। बेरूबाड़ी दे देने के बाद भी क्या हुआ, यह मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूं। अभी एक दो दिन हुए एक प्रश्न मैं ने यहां पर किया उस का उत्तर मेरे पास है। यह प्रश्न INDIAN POLICE PERSONNEL KIDNAPPED BY PAKISTAN के सम्बन्ध में है? इस का जवाब जो दिया गया उस का एक पार्ट में पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूं। Ten police personnel and seven civilians were arrested by Pakistan when the Indian party went in pursuit of Pak Raiders.

एक माननीय सदस्य : इस का कोलबो कांग्रेस के प्रस्ताव से क्या सम्बन्ध है?

श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ : मैं सीधे उसी पर आ रहा हूं, इधर उधर नहीं जा रहा हूं।

यह चीज बताती है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ जितनी भी मुलामियत हम कर सकते थे, की लेकिन उस का फल बताता है कि किस तरह से हमें अपनी हंसाई याहूगिअियेशन बरदाश्त

करनी पड़ती है। सारी बातें होने के बाद भी आज पाकिस्तान किस तरह का बरताव हमारे साथ कर रहा है, हर रोज हमारी टैरि-टरी पर, हमारे आदमियों पर हमला कर रहा है, वह आप के सामने है; कोई न कोई बात रोज होती है। किसी भी दिन के अखबार को आप देख लीजिये, कुछ न कुछ निकल ही जायगा। अब कैसे यकीन कर लिया जाये कि जिस चीन ने इस तरह का व्यवहार हमारे साथ किया, वह आगे ऐसा व्यवहार नहीं करेगा। आदरणीय पंडित जवाहर लाल जो नेहरू कैसे तसल्लो कर रहे हैं कि आगे इस के बाद कुछ नहीं होने वाला है।

कालम्बो प्रॉपोजलज दुशाले में चढ़ा कर लाई गई हैं। इस के बारे में जो स्गेविज हुई हैं, उन से जाहिर होता है कि उन को मानने के लिये सरकार तैयार बैठी है। कुछ सज्जनों ने कहा है कि सिर्फ डिस्कशन करना है। मुझे माफ किया जाय अगर मैं यह कहूं कि आप भी पार्लियामेंट में चुन कर आये हैं और हम भी चुन कर आये हैं हमें पता है कि जिस चीज को आप करना चाहते हैं करते हैं। उस को देखते हुए कैसे यकीन कर लिया जाये कि सी फोवर्दो आप उन को कबूल नहीं करेंगे। उस को आप ने कबूल करने की शकल में पार्लियामेंट के सामने रखा है।

मैं त्यागी जी से एक बात कहना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने बड़ी हिम्मत के साथ और ईमानदारी के साथ प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से एक बात कही है...

एक माननीय सदस्य : महाबीरी के साथ कही है।

श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ : जी हां। मैं ने आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के सामने एक बात कही थी। वहां पर हमारे जनरल्स भी बैठे हुए थे। वहां मेरी बात को उन्होंने ने लगने नहीं दिया। मैं अपनी आंखों से देख कर आया हूं कि सीमा पर जो हमारी पुलिस है

वह मुंतजिर है, हुक्म की। उन्हें बताना पड़ता है कि क्यों उन्होंने ने बन्दूक चलाई। त्यागी जी ने ठीक बात कही कि जब एक जनरल ने उन को टेलीफोन किया और पूछा कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की क्या पालिसी है, तो जो जवाब उन का था मिनिस्टर की हैसियत से और इंडिविजुअल की हैसियत से भी, वह इस बात का सबूत है . . .

**श्री श्याम लाल सराफ (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) :** मिनिस्टर का जवाब था।

**श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ :** मिनिस्टर तो थे ही, मगर इंडिविजुअल कैपेसिटी में भी था।

एक और बात मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। इस को कहते हुए मुझे बड़ी शर्म आती है। बार बार यह कहा गया है कि हमारा मुल्क तैयार नहीं था। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हुक्मत करने की जिम्मेदारी अगर आपने ली है तो यह जिम्मेदारी कौन लेगा कि मुल्क तैयार था या नहीं, क्या यह जिम्मेदारी बिशनचन्द्र सेठ लेगा? मुल्क पर शासन करने की जिम्मेदारी आप ने ली तो इस चीज को देखना भी आप का ही फर्ज था कि मुल्क तैयार है या नहीं। अगर यह कहा जाये कि पता नहीं लगा, तो यह भी गलत है। मैं ने सैरुडों स्पीचिज हिन्दुस्तान में घूम घूम कर दो हैं और उन में मैं ने कहा है कि आंखें खोल कर बैठो, यह मौका इस तरह का नहीं है कि चैन से बैठ जायें। हमारे देश के सामने खतरा है जो ज्वालामुखी के समान है। आप का आंखों के सामने क्या चाज था? इतनों स्पीचिज के बाद भी क्या यह बात आप का समझ में नहीं आई। सी० आई० डी० वाले रक्षा करने के लिये मेरे साथ चलते हैं . . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** सेठ जी बड़ी अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं कि उन को स्पेशल मेरी समझ में तो आ गई है, मगर गवर्नमेंट की समझ में नहीं आई। वह मुझे मुखातिब कर के बात कहें।

**श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ :** गवर्नमेंट के लिये यह कहना कि तैयार नहीं था, मुनासिब नहीं है। अगर तैयार नहीं था तो इस का सारा जिम्मेदारी सरकार पर है। मैं बड़े अदब के साथ आप के द्वारा कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर किस दूसरे देश में जिस का नकल हम करते हैं, इस तरह का बात हो गई होत, इस तरह की गलती वहां की गवर्नमेंट से हो गई होती तो शायद वहां की गवर्नमेंट अपने आप, खुद हां सेंटें छेड़ देतां। परन्तु यहां का स्थिति इस के बिल्कुल विपरीत है। हमारा देश शक्ति पूजक रहा है। ऐसा परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हो जाने के बाद भी आज किस का दिमाग में नहीं आता कि जिन्होंने ने इतना बड़ा गलत का है उन को हटा कर दूसरे आदमियों को भी मौका देना चाहिये।

मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ। कैनेडो का नाम इस से पहले किस ने सुना था। उन का नाम किस ने भी नहीं सुना था। मगर आज वह वहां पर गवर्नमेंट का सेंट पर हैं और उन के बारे में दुनिया कह रह है कि हं। इज ए वैर। कम्पेटेंट प्रेजिडेंट आफ अमरिका। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ . . . .

**श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर) :** आज लड़ कर केवल दो आये हैं, अधिक नहीं।

**श्री बिशन चन्द्र सेठ :** भाख मांग कर नहीं आया हूँ, लड़ कर आया हूँ। नार्मिनेट हो कर भी नहीं आया हूँ।

हमारी गवर्नमेंट अपने वार्दों में सोलह आने फेल हो चुकी है। उसे इस बात का क्या अधिकार है कि देश का भावना के विपरीत जा कर वह इस तरह का प्रोपोजल्स को मान्यता दे। कहा जाता है कि चान बहुत तकड़ा है और उस पर चढ़ाई की तो मुमकिन है कि हम नाकामयाब हो जायें। मैं एक छोटा सा जवाब देना चाहता हूँ . . . .

**श्री राधेलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) :** किस ने कहा है?

**श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ :** मैं नहीं कहता हूँ कि किसी ने कहा है। मैं ने कहा है कि कहा जाता है। आप का नाम मैं ने नहीं लिया है।

अगर आप लड़ाई की बात को देखें तो हमारी फौज किसी से कम नहीं है, हम किसी से कम नहीं हैं। हमारी मिलिटरी की शूरवीरता की बात एक माननीय सदस्य अभी बता रहे थे। मैं तफसोल में नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं इतना ही बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि चार हजार हिन्दुस्तान के जवान खड़े थे, और उन्होंने ने अनगिनत चीनियों के छक्के छड़ा दिये। आप देश की भावना पर विश्वास तो करें, लेकिन आप देश के बारे में विश्वास करना नहीं चाहते हैं। आप के दिल में एक रट आ गई है कि हम कमजोर हैं, और उसी रट के कारण आप सारे देश को कमजोर करना चाहते हैं।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** दुबारा आप मुझे नहीं मुखातिब कर रहे हैं। क्या रट मेरे दिल में आ गई है ?

**श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ :** आप का मतलब है गवर्नमेंट। आप के जरिये से मैं सारी गवर्नमेंट को मुखातिब कर रहा हूँ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप गवर्नमेंट का नाम लीजिये, मेरा नाम नहीं।

**Shri Tyagi:** I hope you are not seriously objecting to the word, because sometimes we are accustomed to say "you" but we mean the Government and not you.

**Mr. Speaker:** But when the records are read by those who come after us, by posterity, what would they understand?

**श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ :** कोलम्बो प्रोजेक्ट्स के सम्बन्ध में जिस तरह से हमारी सरकार ने प्रस्ताव को रखा, मैं यही अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि अन्दर की भावनाओं को बड़ी सफाई से ढकने की चेष्टा की गई है। इस का कारण क्या है ? सवाल

इस बात का है कि हमें लड़ाई लड़नी ही है। हम ने १४ तारीख को खड़े हो कर यह तय किया है। मैं बड़ा आश्चर्य करता हूँ कि यहां पर किस तरह की चीजें की जाती हैं। अगर किसी एक आदमी से गलती हो जाती है तो सारा मोहल्ला, सारा समाज उसे बुरी नजर से देखता है, लेकिन यह जो सुप्रीम बाडी है देश की, चुने हुए नमाइन्दों के बीच में आप ने खड़े हो कर कसम दी थी कि हम अपने देश की एक एक इंच भूमि से चाइना को हटायेंगे। क्या इस प्रोजेक्ट को मानने के बाद हमारी सरकार उम्मीद करती है कि हम अपने उद्देश्य में सफल हो सकेंगे। यहां कोलम्बो प्रोजेक्ट की बात हो रही है, कारोडोर की बात हो रही है। पर हमारा सवाल २०, ३० या ५० हजार वर्ग मील वापस लेने का है, मैं इस की तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता।

**श्री त्यागी :** पचास हजार वर्ग मील जमीन को वापस लेने के लिये नेगोशियेशन करने के वास्ते यह प्रोजेक्ट है।

**श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ :** हमने पाकिस्तान के साथ बहुत से प्रोजेक्ट किये, पाकिस्तान से हमने बहुत से समझौते किये, लेकिन जो कुछ हमको वापस मिला वह हमारी आंखों के सामने है। पिछले रेकार्ड के मातहत, जिसके आधार पर हमने आपको जांचा है और समझा है, साफ मालूम होता है कि आपको कुछ करना बरना नहीं है। जो कुछ होने वाला है वह यह है कि यह जमीन उनके पास चली जायेगी।

**कुछ माननीय सदस्य :** आप अध्यक्ष महोदय को न कहें।

**श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ :** "आप" से मेरा मतलब गवर्नमेंट से है, माननीय सदस्यों को यही समझना चाहिये।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब आप मुझे बहुत कोस चुके। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब मैं कह दूँ कि आपका समय समाप्त हो गया।

**श्री विशनचन्द्र सेठ :** मैं आपकी सेवा में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। आज अगर ऐसा मान लिया जाये कि पंडित नेहरू जी ने यह प्रस्ताव पार्लियामेंट में पेश नहीं किया होता तो क्या होता। बड़ी साफ सी बात है कि सरकार के सामने अपोजीशन एक तिनके के बराबर है, जिस तरह से वह चाहे मजाक कर सकती है, लेकिन प्रैक्टिकल साइड तो आपको देखनी पड़ेगी। अगर सरकार नें अपोजीशन की भावना को मान्यता नहीं दी और सरकार ने यह समझा कि उसकी संख्या साढ़े तीन सौ है, और विरोधी संख्या डेढ़ सौ है, तो इसका नतीजा देश पर क्या पड़ेगा? यह विचार करने की बात है आज यहां पर इस चीज को न लाने का एक विशेष कारण है और वह यह कि इस भ्रम जाल को रख कर सारे देश के सामने, सरकार चाहती है ताकि उपमा उपस्थित की जा सके कि उसने सारी पार्लियामेंट की भावना के अन्तर्गत इस रेजोल्यूशन को पास किया। साथ ही हमने १४ नवम्बर के रेजोल्यूशन की सच्ची भावना के साथ इनको पास किया। लेकिन यह नहीं हो सकता है कि डिप्रेस्ड मेन्टेलिटी के साथ हम इस भावना को मंजूर कर लें जिससे कि हमारे सारे सपने और सारा कार्यक्रम दूषित हो जायें।

मैं यहां पर चीन के सम्बन्ध में एक बात कह कर समाप्त कर दूंगा। सीज फायर के उग्रान्त त्रिगेड होशियार सिंह के साथ साथ हमारे अनेकों सैनिक मारे गये। मैं यहां उनकी तफ़्तील में नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन प्रश्न यह पैदा होता है कि हमारी फौज भी गई थी लड़ने के लिये और चाइना की फौज भी आई थी। तो क्या हमारी फौज अहिंसा का सिद्धान्त लेकर भेजी गई थी कि एक भी चाइनीज प्रिजनर नहीं बनाया गया। यही बहादुरी की आपने और हमारे हजारों लोग पकड़े गये। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ सरकार से कि आखिर इसका मतलब क्या है? केवल यह है कि हमारी सरकार आन्तरिक भावना से लड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। मौका निकाल

कर कोई न कोई समझौता करना उसका लक्ष्य ई और इसी लक्ष्य के कारण हमारे हजारों आदमी मारे गये। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब चाइना ने सीज फायर किया तो क्या किस्मत से कोई नियामत हमको मिल गई? सीज फायर के बाद हमारे फौजों को आगे मार्च करना चाहिये था नहीं? सीज फायर का मौका मिल गया और हम खुद खिसक कर पीछे आ गये। जान बची लाखों पाये। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ सरकार से कि इस तरह की परिस्थिति में अगर मोरल के लड़ाई नहीं लड़ी जा सकती। अगर आज बहादुरी के साथ हम अपने देश को इन लायक बताये रखें कि हम लड़ाई लड़ सकें तो चाइना के साथ कोई समझौता होगा अन्यथा कोई समझौता होने वाला नहीं।

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj):**  
I shall make only certain references..

**Mr. Speaker:** It would be better if the hon. Members from the Government side refer only to points so that a larger number might be accommodated.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** The reactions to the Colombo proposals that we find today are in a certain way the result of a crisis of confidence to which the hon. Prime Minister himself referred in his letter to the Chinese Prime Minister. Otherwise, the proposals would have been looked at from a very different angle and vision and with a different attitude even by the Opposition themselves. It is our experience repeatedly that the diplomacy pursued by the Chinese authorities does not follow the paths of honesty and truthfulness. That creates in the minds of the people a doubt whether in dealing with the Colombo proposals we are moving on very sure ground. That is what has come out from the speeches, whether on this side or on that side. It is on this point that we have got to be very careful.

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya]

When dealing with China the Prime Minister has referred a number of times to the attitude; the attitude to the people should be different from the attitude to the ruling authorities of China. He said so here; he also repeated it at Visvabharati. But on this point I would request the Government to remember how the Chinese Government has regimented the minds of the people in their own way and whether at the present moment there is any difference between the minds of the Chinese Government and the minds of the people themselves. I may here refer to a speech of Shri Maitra, our ambassador in Philippines to the Congress Party Member here—where he quoted how the educational system of the Chinese in South-east Asia was training the young students. Anyone who refers to his speech will find that there is a song which the young students in the schools are made to repeat every day; it says: we are Chinese and we are the masters of the south seas? That is one of the lines in that song which I saw when I went through his speech. This is how the younger minds are being trained by the Chinese authorities and regimented.

There was also another thing that came to my notice. It was circulated by the All India Radio—a summary of a book known as the *Hundred Flowers*. The book was summarised. It shows how the Chinese mind was being trained up so that a young Chinese student even in a foreign land, in Russia, conducted himself in this way. I believe the hon. Members may have received and might have gone through that article. That is my fear. The entire mind of the people is regimented in a way that the Chinese are the masters of the entire south and south-east Asia. If that is the way the Chinese mind is being trained and regimented I am not sure how we will fare with them when we deal with them, whether on the Colombo proposals or any other

proposals. That is where I want that we should take care about.

There is another thing. Before this, we had certain negotiations with China from time to time and it is a very tragic coincidence that everyone of those negotiations has been followed by attempts to extend the Chinese occupation of our land. Even when the Chou En-lai-Nehru negotiations were continuing in 1954, and also later, the letters from our side showed us that the Chinese had already begun the occupation of Indian territory while the pact of Panch sheel was being signed. That is the way they moved and that is my apprehension about these Colombo negotiations and proceedings.

Then, for the time being, China is isolated completely. We should consider whether our agreeing to have negotiations with China will rescue her from this isolation. I believe from the the comments that have been published on the Colombo proposals and the Chinese Government's communique which came out after the meeting of Mrs. Bandaranaike with the Chinese Premier there, the Chinese are more eager than ourselves to come to the table of negotiation. It is they who are in greater eagerness to get India to the table of negotiation to talk with them. That, I believe, is due to the fact that unless India agrees to talk with China, the isolation in which China finds herself now will not cease. That isolation will break only if we rejoin the table with them and come to an agreement.

We find that we have secured certain interpretations of the Colombo proposals from our side. From the Chinese side it has come out in the papers that they will have their own interpretation and these interpretations do not tally. The whole thing may break over the difference in interpretations before we proceed to the actual Colombo proposals themselves. The thing may break over interpretations. That is the position now, and

I believe the speech the Prime Minister made in the House yesterday hinted at some such possibility.

One of the interpretations that we secured from the Colombo power representatives who came to meet the Prime Minister in India is that in NEFA we are allowed to proceed up to the MacMahon line. But it is to be noted that the proposals themselves do not mention the MacMahon line. The proposals themselves, in referring to the eastern sector, do not say that we are allowed to proceed to the MacMahon line. They say we are allowed to proceed to the line of actual control. If we follow the communications that our Prime Minister had with the Prime Minister of China, we shall find that our Prime Minister has repeatedly accused the Prime Minister of China that this line of actual control which they speak of begins to be projected to suit their interests. As they advance, the line of actual control advances. In more than one letter from our Prime Minister, this has been mentioned: what is the actual interpretation of the line of actual control according to China? On that depends whether they are going to allow us to proceed to the MacMahon line or not.

So far as our side is concerned, we have learnt from Mrs. Bandaranaike that we are allowed to proceed to the MacMahon line, but is China committed to it—that we are allowed to proceed there—and do they recognise the MacMahon line as the line of actual control between India and China? That is the question that will have to be answered. There have been questions about moving in this matter diplomatically. Diplomacy is accepted only when it is backed by power. Diplomacy, without power, is absolutely ineffective and may be a matter of even ridicule by States which have the real might to impose their will on others. So, unless our diplomacy is backed by power, our diplomacy may not succeed. So, I believe the emphasis in the present discussion ought to be more on our preparation than on

the Colombo proposals. I would have been happy if the motion had been brought in to take into consideration our preparation to meet the present contingency and the Colombo proposals coming along with that, rather than the Colombo proposals coming in for discussion and other things coming as incidental to the Colombo proposals. The emphasis ought to be on our preparation rather than on the Colombo proposals, because it is our preparations that will make the acceptance of the Colombo proposals effective. If we are not prepared, the Colombo proposals, even after our acceptance, may be ineffective.

There have been many references to *Gita* and *Mahabharata*. These are not only religious books, but also political books. Political lessons have been given and I shall quote only one. That advice was given when the possibility of war was being considered. The advice was from Vidura, the wisest of men of the age:

एतः क्षमावताम दोषः द्वितीयो नोपपद्यते

For the person who goes on tolerating, there is only one defect and no second. The defect is:

यदेन क्षमया युक्तम् दुर्बलं मन्यते जनाः

The person who goes on tolerating is regarded as weak by the others.

**Shri P. C. Borooah (Sibsagar):** Sir, at the outset, I offer my tribute to the six Colombo powers, who have met and made an earnest attempt to bring India and China together and settle their dispute, round a conference table. Having said that, I would like to give a little bit of background to make out the point I want to impress in this debate.

The Prime Minister issued orders to the Army on the eve of his departure for Colombo. The people were emboldened and thought that the aggressors will be pushed back beyond the borders. Then came the massive attack of the Chinese on 20th of October. People took up the challenge and rose as one man to save the



[Shri P. C. Borooah]

honour and prestige of the motherland. Then there was a little bit of set-back when it was learnt over the BBC that we had to go begging to the world for even small arms on the sixth day of the attack. This set-back was, however, overcome when Parliament passed the solemn resolution to the effect that we would not rest content until the aggression was vacated. Since then, the situation began to deteriorate and it came to a climax by the middle of November when one after another of our posts began to fall to the Chinese, thousands of lives were lost, thousands were injured, maimed and crippled for life and thousands were taken captive by the Chinese against none by our side.

We, coming from Assam, spent sleepless nights, thinking violently as to what should be done and what advice we should give to our people. On the 19th November the Prime Minister broadcast a speech. The situation was so tense that the Prime Minister's speech was misunderstood and was taken to be a farewell speech to the people of Assam. It was in such circumstances that the Prime Minister called a meeting of the Congress Members on the 20th November. In that meeting I put forward two suggestions. The first suggestion I made was that we should make some of our friendly countries influence the Chinese to accept a cease-fire proposal and negotiate for a settlement. I did so because that would give us some respite during which we could get ourselves prepared to fight the Chinese, if necessary. This was in perfect accord with the basic principles of *Panchsheel* which we are wedded to. Failing that, my second proposal, was that we should take full scale help in all forms, including men, material and money from the country or countries which want to come to our rescue and fight the Chinese. Of course, that will mean ultimately a global war and that global war will mean letting the last battle of the world fought on this land of Budha and Gandhi.

Although I was shouted down in that meeting, I was gladdened to find next morning cease-fire proposals coming from the Chinese themselves. This, in a way, was the realisation of my first proposal.

I might be misunderstood as one going back on our pledge that we took on 14th November. But I would like to recall those days when the Chinese troops were advancing towards Assam, practically without encountering any resistance, in two prongs, that is, Bomdila from the north and Walong from the east, and it was considered to be a matter of days only for the Chinese to over-run the whole State of Assam. The suggestion was made in full realisation of the situation and to my judgment, had the cease-fire not come about, we the Members from Assam, NEFA and Nagaland, including Manipur and Tripura, would not have been here today.

I hold the same view even today, and being a sponsor of the idea of a cease-fire, I heartily welcome the Colombo proposals, which have provided us the opportunity to discuss and decide, failing which we have to exploit the last avenue available, namely to come out with full force to fight out the aggressor, the Chinese. It is heartening to note that both India and China have accepted the Colombo proposals, in principle, though in details they are still far off. But the good atmosphere created by these proposals should not be allowed to deteriorate.

Having said so, I want to stress that there should be no complacency allowed to creep in and slacken our defence preparations, for strength is the only thing that will save our independence and help us uphold the prestige and honour of the motherland.

It is paining to note when we find Government agencies going slow in their defence efforts. It is gathered that some 3000 and odd Northern Railway experienced employees belonging

to the territorial army were withdrawn from their work to be posted in the Railways in Assam. It is about three months that these personnel have not been sent to their assigned jobs so far and are sitting idle for reasons not known.

So far as recruitment to the army is concerned, I feel it is not going on at the pace the situation demands. There should be more recruitment centres opened throughout the country so that the aspirants can get themselves recruited easily. It would be in the fitness of things if more centres are opened and spread evenly over country.

So far as production of defence material is concerned, all the engineering industries in the country which can be gainfully engaged in production of defence articles should be commissioned for that purpose.

It is shocking to find that defective roads are built in the border regions. A lot has been said about Tusker organization. I need not elaborate it. I feel that such lapses should be strictly dealt with and the persons responsible held for treason.

Then, there is no co-ordination between the administration of NEFA and the administration of Assam. They are going in different ways. The NEFA administration was separated from Assam with the object that the area should be specially developed and gradually integrated with the State of Assam. Now a Chinese wall has been built and the two administrations are kept separately. I wonder when that wall will be demolished, because NEFA has to be strengthened as it is vulnerable to Chinese attacks.

Last but not the least, I will refer to the floods in Assam. Flood is an annual feature, so far as Assam is concerned. No defence preparation on a permanent basis will be possible to be set up if the flood is not controlled in this border State. So, I  
2549(Ai) LS—8.

would request the hon. Prime Minister to give this matter top priority so that we can go on with our defence preparations alright. I feel that the flood control measures should be tackled right from the Centre because it is a gigantic task much beyond the capacity of the State Government.

With these few words, I commend the proposals of the Colombo Powers for the acceptance of the House.

श्री सौर्य (अलीगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय,  
मदन में ग्राह्य जॉन कौलन्डो प्रोगेजल्स  
के बारे में चर्चा

**Mr. Speaker:** We will have to sit today at least till 6.30 P.M. The Prime Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** There should be some system by which we can be told whether we may get a chance at some time or the other instead of sitting here from 11 to 5 which it is physically impossible to do. The whip of the party and the Chair must devise some way of calling Members. This is not the first time this has happened. We demand some kind of human sympathy and human treatment. I may be forgiven for saying so.

**Shri Yashpal Singh:** Why not we sit till midnight?

**Shri Joachim Alva:** We miss our lunch, we miss our tea, and we go on sitting here. We demand some kind of fairness on your part.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry, I have no remedy against that. If it is physically impossible for the Member to wait, it is equally physically impossible for me to tell beforehand whom I shall be able to call.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** We are prepared to sit till midnight, provided we are told that we are going to be called at midnight.

**Mr. Speaker:** I cannot say that.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** You must have some consideration for us.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I cannot say beforehand whom I will be able to call by midnight.

**श्री मौर्य :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, कोलम्बो प्रपोज़ल्स जो सदन के सामने आये हैं उनके ऊपर बोलते हुए

**श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैंगना) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी इजाजत से एक सैंकंड के लिए इंटरप्ट करते हुए कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह क्या बात है कि जो यहां पर बोलना चाहते हैं उनको बोलने का कोई समय नहीं मिलता है। कम से कम १२ बजे रात तक आज हमें यहां पर बैठना चाहिए। जब सब जगह काम के घंटे बढ़ रहे हैं तो फिर यहां क्यों न बढें ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब अपोजीशन ग्रुप के लीडर्स बोलने वालों के जो नाम देते हैं उन को जितना समय मिल सकता है बोलने के लिए दे दिया जाता है। आप के ग्रुप से दो से ज्यादा को चांस नहीं मिल सकता। जो आपके ग्रुप के लीडर ने दो नाम दिये थे वह दोनों बोल लिये। मैंने उन दोनों को बुला लिया। इस पर भी मालूम नहीं अपोजीशन ग्रुप वालों को क्या शिकायत है ?

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** उधर का टाइम वज़ीर लोग पी जाते हैं और इधर का पार्टी लीडर्स पी जाते हैं। बीच के मेम्बर बेचारे बेकार मुह ताकते रह जाते हैं।

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Maurya may continue his speech.

**श्री मौर्य :** श्रीमन्, २६ अगस्त, १९५४ को आदरणीय बाबा साहब डा० अम्बेदकर ने राज्य सभा में हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश-नीति पर भाषण करते हुए यह भविष्यवाणी की थी

"Is India not exposed to aggression?.....by allowing the

Chinese to take possession of Lhasa, the Prime Minister has practically helped the Chinese to bring their border down to the Indian border. Looking at all these things, it seems to me that it would be an act of levity not to believe that India, if it is not exposed to aggression right now, is exposed to aggression and that aggression might well be committed by people who always are in the habit of committing an aggression."

इस उद्धरण को इस सदन के सामने रखने का तात्पर्य यह है कि जिस राष्ट्र के बारे में कोलम्बो-प्रपोज़ल्स की चर्चा है, उसकी नीति को, उसके रोज़ाना के कयनों को और आज तक उसने जो कदम उठाए हैं, उनको सामने रखना पड़ेगा। अगर हम उनको अपने सामने रखेंगे, तो मेरा विश्वास है कि जो गलतियां अब तक हुई हैं, जिनके लिए एकमात्र आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, जिम्मेदार हैं, वे भविष्य में नहीं हो पायेंगी।

यह बात १९५४ में कही गई थी कि चाइना हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करेगा और आज वह बात पूरी हुई। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उस समय उसका जो जवाब दिया था और जो अन्य बहुत सी बात कहीं थीं, उनकी चर्चा मैं नहीं करना चाहता। इस सदन के १४ नवम्बर, १९६२ को जो पवित्र प्रस्ताव निर्विरोध रूप से पास किया था, इस समय मैं उसकी भावनाओं को लेकर कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। उस प्रस्ताव के अन्तिम शब्द ये थे :

"With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people...."

It is the Indian people.

"to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

यह प्रस्ताव अपनी जगह पर अद्वितीय था और इतिहास में अपनी जगह अंकित किया जाने वाला था। आज जब कि हम कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल्ज की चर्चा कर रहे हैं, क्या हमने इस प्रस्ताव की भावनाओं को अपने सामने रखा है? उस समय इस सदन की ही नहीं, बल्कि पूरे राष्ट्र की यह भावना थी कि हम चाइनीज को अपने देश से निकाल देंगे। क्या हम ऐसा कर पाये हैं? मैं केवल यही कहूंगा कि उन भावनाओं को पीछे छोड़ कर आज हम किसी राष्ट्र की शक्ति और उसकी क्षमकियों से, उसके खूनी हाथों से डर कर, दब कर, एक सहमी हुई आवाज में बोल रहे हैं। १४ नवम्बर, १९६२ को जो भावना इस सदन में थी, उसमें और आज की भावना में जमीन आसमान का फर्क है। वह भावना भारतीय भावना थी और यह भावना भारतीय भावना नहीं कही जा सकती।

आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री ने इसी सदन में कहा था कि जब तक हम दुश्मन को अपनी भूमि से बाहर नहीं निकाल देते, तब तक हम उस से कोई भी बात नहीं करेंगे। ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की रेखा का आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री की भावनाओं से बड़ा ताल्लुक है। क्या वे भावनायें पूरी हुई हैं। आज वह उसके दूसरे मययने इस सदन के सामने रख सकते हैं, लेकिन वह भावना पूरी नहीं हुई है। अगर हम ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की स्थिति और कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल्ज को सामने रख कर उनकी तुलना करें और उनको एनालाइज करें, तो हम पाते हैं कि ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की भावनायें पूरी नहीं हुई—विरोधी दल के अनुसार, और कम से कम भारतीय रिपब्लिकन दल के अनुसार, वे भावनायें पूरी नहीं हुई हैं। वह तो सरकार की कम से कम मांग थी, लेकिन वह भी पूरी नहीं हो पाई। वह मांग यह थी कि दुश्मन की फौजें ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की लाइन पर चली जायें। उसमें इस बात का कोई जिक्र नहीं था—जैसा कि कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल्ज में डीमिलिटराइज्ड

जोन सम्बन्धी सुझाव दिया गया है—कि दुश्मन की फौजें जिस क्षेत्र से पीछे हटेंगी, वहां पर दोनों देशों का निज़ाम रहेगा, दोनों की सिविल पोस्ट्स रहेंगी। इस सुझाव को यदि ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की स्थिति वाले सुझाव से मिलाया जाये, तो दोनों में टकराव मिलता है।

आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जो कहते हैं, ये दोनों सुझाव एक दूसरे से बहुत नज़दीक हैं, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि वे एक दूसरे से बहुत ज्यादा दूर हैं और उनका एक दूसरे से कोई लगाव नहीं है। हाँ, यह जरूर है कि इस संकट से बहुत से लोगों की गदियाँ छिन जाने का जो डर है, उसकी वजह से ये दोनों सुझाव एक दूसरे से बहुत ज्यादा नज़दीक नज़र होंगे।

16.45 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

मैं अपनी कोई बात यहां पर ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ, बल्कि मैं स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री के शब्दों को आपके सामने रखना चाहूंगा। उन्होंने कहा था :

"...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."

आगे अपनी इन्हीं भावनाओं को व्यक्त करते हुए, उन्होंने इस सदन में कहा था :

"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."

## [श्री मोर्य]

तो क्या यह बात आज कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल में पूरी हो रही है ? ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ वाली मांग में ऐसा कहीं नहीं आया था । कम से कम इस सदन में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक शब्द भी इस बारे में एक शब्द भी नहीं कहा था कि चीन ने हमला करके जो क्षेत्र लिया है, वहां से वापस जाते वक्त वहां पर उनकी गिविल पोस्ट्स रहेंगी । डीमिलिटराइज्ड जोन का जो सुझाव कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल में दिया गया है, वह ८ सितम्बर १९६२ वाले सुझाव से मेल नहीं खाता है । प्रधान मंत्री ने बहुत सी ऐसी चर्चा की थी । मैं ज्यादा जोर देकर सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आज प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं अपने शब्दों से पीछे जा रहे हैं ।

उन्होंने ने बड़े विश्वास के साथ कहा था :

“इसे हम मंजूर नहीं कर सकते कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी पर हमला हो, हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन पर हमला हो और दुश्मन आ कर उस पर कब्जा करे और हम सर झुकायें उस के सामने । यह नामुमकिन बात है, चाहे जो कुछ हो । मैं समझता हूं कि इस मामले में यह कोई मेरी राय नहीं है, न किसी और की राय है । यह लोक-सभा और पार्लियामेंट के एक एक मेम्बर की राय है, यह हिन्दुस्तान के हर मर्द, औरत और बच्चे तक की राय है ।”

क्या आज आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री को लोगों की भावनाओं का पता है ? क्या उन की भावनाओं को उन्होंने ने जाना है ? क्या इस सदन के हर एक माननीय सदस्य की यह भावना है कि हम कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल को

मान कर खूनी और हत्यारे लोगों से दब कर बात-चीत करें, खूनी हाथों से शान्ति के हाथों को मिलवायें और उन से शान्ति-पूर्वक बातें करें ? क्या यह इस सदन की भावना है ? क्या इस देश के नौजवानों, स्त्री-पुरुषों और बच्चों की यह भावना है ? वास्तव में राष्ट्र की यह भावना नहीं है । अगर यह भावना होती, तो कम से कम मैं यहां पर ऐसा नहीं कहता । आज प्रधान मंत्री देश की भावनाओं को ठेस पहुंचा रहे हैं ।

मैं चीन के बारे में ज्यादा लम्बी बातें नहीं कहना चाहता । मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हम ने हमेशा चीन को अपना मित्र माना और हम ने हमेशा चीन की मित्रता के लिए कुर्बानियां दीं । क्या चीन की कम्युनिस्ट सरकार को भारत ने तुरन्त ही मान्यता नहीं दी ? क्या चीन के लिए भारत ने यू० एन० ओ० में लड़ाई नहीं लड़ी ? क्या चीन की भावनाओं का भारत ने सदा ध्यान नहीं रखा ? क्या भारत ने चीन की मित्रता की बंदी पर तिब्बत की आहुति नहीं दी ? फिर भी लाल चीन ने भारत के दामन को क्यों चाक किया ? क्या इस का कोई भी उत्तर यहां पर मिल सकेगा ? मैं इन बातों को ज्यादा विस्तार-पूर्वक नहीं कहना चाहता हूं । मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आज कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल में तो हम हर तरह से दबे हुए हैं ।

अगर हम कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल का ऐने-लेसिज करें, एक एक प्रोपोजल को देखें, तो हम पाते हैं कि भारत के हितों की बहुत उपेक्षा की गई है । पहले आप पूर्वी खंड पर झाड़िये । पूर्वी खंड में ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की लाइन और उस के अलावा इन्टरनेशनल सीमा, उन दोनों के हिसाब से अगर हम नक्शे को देखें, जोकि भारत सरकार और सारे संसार के नक्शे हैं, तो उन के अनुसार थागला

रिज, ढोला और लांगजू, ये भारत की सरहद में हैं। क्या कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल ने इस बात का ध्यान रखा है? उनमें इस बात का ध्यान नहीं रखा गया है, बल्कि जिस के लिए लड़ाई लड़ी गई, जिस के ऊपर झगड़ा हुआ, जिस के लिए हजारों बच्चे यतीम हो गए, उस का ज्यों का त्यों रहने दिया गया है। "पंचों का कहना सिर माथे पर, लेकिन पतनाला इधर से ही बहेगा।" यह भावना वहां पर है। मैं पश्चिमी खंड को लेता हूं। चीन की जो लाइन उन्होंने वहां दिखाई है, उस को आप देखें तो आप को पता चलेगा कि अक्सर चिन के अन्दर जहां अक्सर रोड बनी थी वहां दिखाई है।

सारा विश्व जानता है कि यदि कोई कम्युनिस्ट राष्ट्र अपनी सड़क सरहद पर बनाता है, तो अपनी सरहद का अन्त देखते हुए ही बनाता है। हमारी सरकार ने इस पर आपत्ति की। अक्सर चिन की रेखा को छोड़, वहां पर उस सड़क की बात को छोड़ आप देखिए कि बहुत सी जगहें जहां पर चीन ने कभी खाब में भी नहीं मोचा था कि वे उस की हो सकती हैं, उस को मिल रही हैं। डेरा एक ऐसी ही जगह है। इस तरह की और भी जगहें हैं। आज कोलम्बो-प्रस्तावों के कारण वे जगहें भी खटाई में पड़ रही हैं। आप मिडल सैक्टर को लें जो उत्तर प्रदेश में आता है। वहां पर बाराहोती की बात है। १९५४ में इस का झगड़ा शुरू हुआ था, लिखा-पढ़ी हुई थी, बड़े लम्बे लम्बे पत्र लिखे गये थे। अगर मैं भूल नहीं करता हूं तो व्हाइट पेपर का सब से पहला पन्ना ही बाराहोती के ऊपर लिखा हुआ है। बाराहोती के बारे में झगड़े का अंकन किया गया है। आज बाराहोती को और भी ज्यादा खटाई में डाल दिया गया है। इस तरह से देश की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती है, राष्ट्र का सम्मान नहीं हो सकता है।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि चीन ने सीज़ फ़ायर क्यों किया। जब वह जीतता था

जा रहा था तो क्यों उस ने ऐसा किया, क्यों अपनी फ़ौजें पीछे हटाई। सीज़ फ़ायर किसी बहुत बड़े महत्वपूर्ण कारण से हुआ है और जो वह पीछे हट रहा है उस के पीछे भी एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण कारण है। इन कारणों को अगर हम समझ लें तो हमारे लिए डरने की कोई बात नहीं है। जब कभी भी प्रधान मंत्री जी से बातें हुई हैं तो उन्होंने ने हमें ऐसे बताया है कि हम आज लड़ने को तैयार नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर आप लड़ने को तैयार नहीं हैं तो आज हम गुलाम बनने का भी तैयार नहीं हैं, दबने को तैयार नहीं हैं, किसी भी कीमत पर हम गुलाम बनना बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते हैं। मुल्क का एक ऐसा हिस्सा, मुल्क का ऐसा भाग जोकि हमारे साथ रहने को तैयार नहीं है बावजूद हमारे अगवों रपया खर्च कर चुकने के बाद भी उस के लिए तो हम खूबरेखी करने के लिए तैयार हैं लेकिन जहां के लोग भारतीय हैं, जो भारतीय सभ्यता को मानते हैं, जो लाल झंडे के नीचे रहने को तैयार नहीं हैं, जो भारत के गुण गान करते हैं, तलवार के नीचे बैठ कर भी भारतीय सभ्यता को छोड़ने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं, उन की खातिर क्या हम दब कर बात करें, यह कैसे हो सकता है? यह बात बड़े राज की है। जहां तक प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू की कंसिस्टेंसी का सम्बन्ध है, मैं उस बात को नहीं कहूंगा, उस को मैं वापिस लेता हूं, यह ठीक नहीं होगा, बहुत ज्यादा सख्त बात हो जायगी। लेकिन एक बात मैं अवश्य कहूंगा। एक बात पर वह टिके हुए हैं कि किसी भी तरह से उन की अपनी भावना को ठेस न पहुंचे, चाहे पूरा राष्ट्र संकट में पड़ जाये। यहां पर एक शायर ने जो कुछ कहा है, वह मैं कहना चाहूंगा:

रहेंगी अगर यों ही हवायें जमाने की  
न खैर होगी चमन की न आशियाने की।

अगर इसी तरह से हम दुश्मन के सामने दबते चले गए, अगर इसी तरह से हम

## [श्री मौर्य]

तिव्रत से लहासा और लहासा के बाद अक्सार्ड चिन और अक्सार्ड चिन के बाद तमाम राष्ट्र की बाऊंडरी को देते चले गये तो कोई हद नहीं होगी। महाराजा अशोक को आप जानते हैं, इस सदन के सभी माननीय सदस्य जानते हैं। उन के समय हमारे देश की सीमायें कहां थीं और आज कहां हैं और आज के बाद वे कहां पहुंच जायेंगी, इस पर आप विचार करें। हम अपनी ही लाइन पर चलते जा रहे हैं। हमें इन सब बातों को समझने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये। हम एक कम्युनिस्ट देश से डर करके, उस की फौज से डर करके, उस से दब करके, राष्ट्र को ज्यादा दिनों तक जिन्दा नहीं रख सकते हैं।

मैं अन्त में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारी इस तरह की भावनाओं को अगर दबाया गया, अगर दब कर के बात की गई, अगर देश की सीमाओं के साथ, देश की सरहद के साथ सौदागिरी की गई तो इस सदन में और बाहर हम बगावत करेंगे। हम मजदूर हैं, मजलूम हैं, शोषित वर्ग के लोग हैं, हम कटना जानते हैं, दबना नहीं जानते हैं। अगर हम को दबाने की कोशिश की गई, हमें दबने के लिए मजबूर किया गया तो हम बगावत करेंगे और बगावत में कानून शिकनी करने की जरूरत होगी तो कानून शिकनी करना भी अपना फ़र्ज समझेंगे। मैं पूरी शक्ति से भारतीय रिपब्लिक पार्टी के बिहाफ पर यह बात कहता हूं। ये जो कोलम्बो-प्रोपोजल हैं, ये रूस के दबाव से चीन के द्वारा एक विशेष मुन्क, एक विशेष राष्ट्र के जरिए श्रीमती भण्डारनायके के पर्दे में आये हैं, जो एक बहुत बड़ा राज है। इस का हम पूरी शक्ति के साथ विरोध करते हैं।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम (बांदा) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कोलम्बो-प्रस्ताव सदन

के सम्मुख है और आज भी उस पर विचार विमर्श हो रहा है। सब से पहले तो मैं श्रीमती भण्डारनायके और अन्य नान-एलाइन्ड पावर्ज को उन की कूटनीतिज्ञता तथा दूरदर्शिता और स्टेट्समैनशिप के लिए बधाई देना चाहती हूं। मैं समझती हूं कि श्रीमती भण्डारनायके ने आज सारे संसार के स्त्रीवर्ग का सिर ऊंचा कर दिया है।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इन प्रस्तावों की उपयोगिता और प्रस्तावकर्ताओं की नीयत पर सन्देह प्रकट किया है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि चाइनीज एग्जेशन का इन लोगों ने खुल कर क्यों विरोध नहीं किया है और क्यों उस को एग्जेंसर घोषित नहीं किया है। श्रीमन्, वैसे तो सन्देह और शुबहा का कोई इलाज नहीं है। यदि शक का भूत उन की आत्मा में घुस कर न बैठ गया होता, तो उन्होंने ने इस प्रस्ताव के टेक्स्ट को पढ़ने के बाद इस प्रकार का शक और शुबहा न उठाया होता। श्रीमन्, इस प्रस्ताव का एक एक शब्द प्रमाणित करता है कि कोलम्बो-पावर्ज ने अपने प्रोपोजल के एक एक शब्द के द्वारा, चीनी आक्रमण को एग्जेशन कहा है।

मुझे खेद है कि इस प्रस्ताव का कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने समर्थन करने के बाद भी इस को ठीक तरह से नहीं समझा है। बड़े अफसोस की बात है कि विरोधी दल के कुछ माननीय सदस्य इस नाजुक समय में भी अपने व्यक्तिगत तथा पार्टीगत लाभ को छोड़ने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। आज मैंने विरोधी दलों के माननीय सदस्यों की स्पीचिज पढ़ी हैं। मैं समझती हूं कि उन में से तीन चौथाई स्पीचिज के टेक्स्ट में केवल आम-प्रशंसा ही देखने को मिली है और साथ ही साथ शको और शुबहों का इजहार ही देखने को मिलता है। इस के अतिरिक्त उन्होंने ने वही पुरानी सरकार की निन्दा से भरी हुई घिसी

पिटी दलों में दो दो हैं जोकि वे हमेशा दिया करते हैं ।

श्रीमन्, यह डिबेट काफी दिलचस्प रही है । लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस सारी डिबेट का सब से बड़ा लैंडमार्क इरेलेवंस रहा है । हमारे एक कांग्रेसी भाई ने इस प्रस्ताव को अपना कंडिशनल स्पॉट दिया है । उन्होंने कहा है कि कम से कम वह इस कंडिशन पर स्पॉट दे सकते हैं कि लोगों का उत्साह कम न होने दिया जाये । मैं बड़े ही विनम्र शब्दों में कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव का देश के वातावरण या उत्साह को बढ़ाने के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है । यह प्रस्ताव तो केवल ऐसा वातावरण और ऐसा स्थिति पैदा करता है कि जो निर्णय हम ने लिया है इस सदन में प्रधान मंत्री जी की प्रेरणा से लिया था कि जब तक इस देश की एक एक इंच भूमि को हम चीनियों के चंगुल से नहीं छड़ा लेंगे, तब तक दम नहीं लेंगे, चैन नहीं लेंगे, उसको आगे बढ़ायें, मजबूत बनायें, उसको पूरा करें । हमें ऐसी स्थिति पैदा करनी होगी जिस में हम अपने निश्चय को शान्तिपूर्ण ढंग से पूरा कर सकें । मैं समझती हूँ कि जो इरेलेवंट बातें कही गई हैं, जो कंडिशन लगाई गई हैं वे बिल्कुल भी यहां पर वाजिब नहीं हैं । इस प्रस्ताव में कहीं भी चर्चा नहीं की गई है कि हम लोग युद्ध की तैयारी न करें, हम लोगों का उत्साह न बढ़ायें या अपनी शक्ति को दिन-दुगुना और रात-चोगुना न बढ़ायें । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बहुत ही ज़रूरत शब्दों में कह दिया है कि हम लोग बराबर युद्ध की तैयारी करेंगे और जब तक एक एक इंच भूमि चीन के चंगुल से नहीं छड़ा लेंगे, उनको अपनी भूमि से नहीं खदेड़ देंगे, तब तक चैन नहीं लेंगे । मुझे खेद है कि कुछ विरोधी दलों के सदस्यों ने अपनी दलीलों में हर स्थान पर इस नाजुक स्थिति का बेजा फायदा उठाने की कोशिश की है ।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने नान-एलाइनमेंट

की पालिसी की भी निन्दा की है । श्रीमन्, कभी भी आज तक नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी ने इतने जबरदस्त टेस्ट बरदाश्त नहीं किए हैं, जितने इस बार किये हैं । इस टेस्ट में हमारी नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी और भी निखर आई है और यह साबित हो गया है कि हमारे लिए हो नहीं, भारत के लिए हो नहीं बल्कि आगे आने वाली पीढ़ियों के लिए भी और संसार की शान्ति के लिए भी, संसार को विश्वयुद्ध के खतरों से बचाने के लिए भी अगर कोई नीति सब से ज्यादा सफल साबित हो सकती है तो वह नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति ही हो सकती है, दूसरी कोई नीति नहीं ।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने बावजूद उन तमाम क्लेरिफिकेशंस के जिन के बाद ही हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन किया है, अब भी शक का इजहार किया है और कहा है कि इन प्रस्तावों के पीछे कोई गलत नीयत है या कोई गलत कदम उठाने की चेष्टा की गई है । एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी चतुर खिलाड़ी नहीं हैं क्योंकि वह अपनी बात को पहले रख देते हैं । मैं समझती हूँ कि आज भी प्रधान मंत्री जी के शान्ति और सच्चाई की नीति अपनाने के कारण उसकी प्रतिष्ठा कराने के कारण, संसार में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का तथा इस देश का नाम ऊंचा हुआ है । मैं चाहती हूँ कि हमेशा वह ऐसे हो भोले-भाले खिलाड़ी बने रहें और अपने पते पहले ही रख दिया करें क्योंकि इस में हमारे देश का ही नहीं पूरे संसार का कल्याण है ।

मुझे खेद है कि श्री नाथ पाई आज बीसवां सदी में रहते हुए भी चौदहवीं सदी की विचार-धारा रखते हैं । उन्होंने कहा कि हिटलर ने जब ब्रिटेन और रूस के सामने शान्ति प्रस्ताव रखे तो उन्होंने ठुकरा दिया । यह भी उन्होंने कहा कि कोई स्थिति बदली



## [श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

नहीं है और नेगोशिएशन टेबल पर बैठने के माने घुटने टेकना है। मझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि वह आज भी हिटलर के प्रेत के इतने नजदीक हैं लेकिन वास्तविकता से बहुत दूर है। उन्हें आज मालूम नहीं है पिछली सदी में १०० वर्षों में कंट्रीज में जितने परिवर्तन नहीं हुए उतने आज एक एक दिन में हो रहे हैं। जिस तरह से क्यूबा की क्राइमिस टली है, जिस तरह से चाइना का आइसोलेशन कम्युनिस्ट कंट्रीज ने किया है चाइना के कम्युनिस्ट होने के बावजूद क्या यह इस बात का सबूत नहीं है कि आज स्थिति हिटलर के जमाने से बहुत बदल चुकी है? मैं उन से यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि वह अपने ककून से निकलें। आज स्थिति परिवर्तित हो चुकी है। जमाने की मांग यह है, आज युग की पुकार यह है कि हम लोग अपनी नीति को बदलें, और उस नीति की पुकार को मुन कर आज प्रधान मंत्री ने कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव के सिद्धान्तों को स्वीकार किया है, और उन सिद्धान्तों को स्वीकार कर के संसार के सामने यह प्रमाणित कर दिया है कि आज तमाम दबावों के बावजूद, आज की भयानक स्थिति के बावजूद, हम ने अपनी शांति की नीति को नहीं छोड़ा, और भारत आज भी, बावजूद इस के कि उस को कुछ रिवर्मोज उठानी पड़ी है, शांति का अभद्रूत कहलाने का अधिकारी संसार के सामने है। उन्होंने कहा कि यह शर्मनाक बात है कि हम नेगोशिएटिंग टेबल पर बैठें, दूसरी ओर वह सब से शर्मनाक बात की खद सिफारिश करते हैं। वह चाहते हैं कि हम वैस्टर्न ब्लॉक में चले जायें, बावजूद इसके कि वैस्टर्न पावर्स ने, जिन्होंने हमारी मदद की, साफ कहा कि हम नानअलाइनमेंट की पालिसी को न छोड़ें। हम से कहा जा रहा है कि हम बैंगिंग बाउल ले कर जायें और वैस्टर्न पावर्स से कहें कि हम तुम्हारे ब्लॉक में शामिल होना चाहते हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि इस से ज्यादा शर्मनाक बात और कोई नहीं हो सकती है कि हम कोई ब्लॉक ज्वाइन करें,

इस से बड़ी घुटने टेकने की बात हमारे लिये और कोई नहीं हो सकती है। मैं निश्चय इतना कहना चाहती हूँ कि बड़ा अफसोस है कि आज भी, इस बीसवीं सदी में संकोपान्जा और डान क्विगजोट हमारे हाउस में मौजूद हैं और उन्होंने तलवार से चाइना का सामना करने की कोशिश की। अगर हम डान क्विगजोट और संकोपान्जा की बात को मान भी लें तो यह तो होगा ही कि हम अपने को खत्म कर देंगे, साथ में यह भी होगा कि हम सारे संसार को तृतीय विश्व युद्ध के भयंकर मुह में झोंक देंगे। आज यह चीज समझ ली जानी चाहिये कि संसार इस समय दोगधे पर खड़ा हुआ है। दुनिया के एक ओर शान्ति है और दूसरी ओर प्रलय है। हालांकि हम कह चुके हैं कि आज हमें भले ही प्रलय के मुह में अपने को और सारे संसार को झोकना पड़े लेकिन हम चाइना को देश से बाहर जरूर निकालेंगे। मगर इस के लिये हम शान्तिपूर्ण तरीका क्यों न अपनायें?

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि हम लोग उसी निश्चय के साथ, जो कि हम ने इस सदन में लिखा था, कि जब तक हम लोग एक एक इंच भूमि को चाइनीज से नहीं ले लेंगे तब तक दम नहीं लेंगे, इन प्रस्तावों पर विचार करें और जो सरकार ने नीति अपनाई है कि वह इस को सिद्धान्ततः स्वीकार करती है, मैं उस का हार्दिक समर्थन करती हूँ और साथ ही साथ मैं इन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के लिये कोलम्बो-पावर्स को और वैस्टर्न पावर्स को धन्यवाद देती हूँ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Alva.

श्री गु० सि० मुसाफिर (अमृतसर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री आल्वा की तरह मेरी भी यह प्रोटेस्ट है कि यह प्रोसीजर गलत है कि अगर कोई मेम्बर एक दफा बुलाया जाय और इत्फाक से वह मौजूद न हो तो फिर उसका नाम ही काट दिया जाय क्योंकि

कभी कभी उठा कर जाना तो पड़ता ही है, कोई बाय रूम चला गया या खाना खाने चला गया तो उस का नाम ही फहरिस्त से निकाल दिया जाय यह ठीक नहीं है ।

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** Out of my respect for Sardarji I am prepared to be called after him. I am prepared to give up my right. As I participate in this discussion in regard to the Colombo negotiations, I am reminded of a speech by a village lad in my vast constituency only last week. It was in the town of Anko'la, made famous during the Quit India campaign in the freedom movement, a town named in the pages of *Young India* by Mahatma Gandhi. The speaker was a village boy. But he uttered three words; he put three questions and I was amazed that he uttered them in English also. I would mention them for the benefit of this House.

The first question was, "What can patriotism do for me if I have a hungry stomach? Where can my patriotism stand if my stomach is hungry and empty?" Then he passed on to the second question. The second question was: "What can patriotism do for me if I have not got a square yard of land as my own?" Then he passed on to the third question: "What is the use of my patriotism if my land is invaded?" In these three questions, a poor village boy who knew only three questions and put them both in Kanada and in English languages has summed up the questions posed before the Nehru Government from 1947, from the day of Independence, to this day when China has invaded us. The Government of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has heroically fought to solve the first two questions through the mighty plans. There have been great plans, which the Government have framed right from the day of the great Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, assisted by that great patriot, my friend Shri Kamath in the Planning Commission.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Planning Committee. (*Interruption*).

**Shri Joachim Alva:** Two great ICS men; they flung away their careers unlike some other ICS men who ask for jobs after retirement,—I want to pay my tribute to them. Now, the first two questions which were posed by the village boy have been heroically answered by the Nehru Government. The third question has been answered by you and me, by the masses of India, by the poor women of India who have thrown away their jewellery and have given away everything. Even ordinary school-boys have sacrificed their pocket money. But yet, today we have got some paper tigers in this Parliament. There are some paper tigers who wanted adventurist policies, who do not know the strength of the army, who do not know the strength with which we can fight the enemy. Is Britain ready to serve unto the last ditch towards the defence of India against China? Is the United States of America, which has been demanding peace with the USSR ready to serve unto the last in India's fight against China? These are stark facts. But yet, I am glad a woman Member referred to one thing. I must also pay my tribute to that great woman, Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, an ordinary woman who came out from the home, when her distinguished husband was assassinated and fell a victim. The late Mr. Bandaranaike came here and spoke to the Parliament of India. He tremendously impressed us. I was in China in 1959 and I got a shudder when I learnt that he was assassinated. I went and told the Ceylonese Ambassador there, who is now the Governor-General of Ceylon how deeply distressed we were on the assassination of Mr. Bandaranaike. This woman, and her late husband, are the products of Hindu and Buddhist culture—the culture of Hindustan. South India has links with Ceylon, and Mrs. Bandaranaike has taken the lead. Let us not blow down this moral, political bridge at the Colombo conference. If we blow down that bridge, all the connections will be wiped off.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Mr. Chester Bowles, gave a testimony before the Congress of the United States last year. He is an authority on the subject of China. He was here—one of the most popular US Ambassadors. He presided over the Democratic Convention by which Jack Kennedy became the President of the U.S.A. Bowles was put to a gruelling test when he became Assistant Secretary of the United States Government, and he was asked about China before the Senatorial Committee of the Congress. There was one golden observation that he made. I wrote to him: "What is the meaning of two Chinas?" He sent me the text of the evidence he rendered before the United States Congress,—of over 24 printed pages. I had to rifle out my papers, but I could not get them testimony today. But there is one golden sentence in it which I remember: "The United States of America and China will have to come to an eventual agreement in the long run" That is the testimony of a man who has dabbled with the question of two Chinas. That is the testimony of a great adviser of President Kennedy—that the United States and China will have to seek agreement with India amongst themselves in the future.

Now, we are puzzled. We have got our mighty plans. Are we going to throw them away? We are not cowards. We are not paralysed with fear. We were not paralysed with fear when China came down to Assam. We will and we have to stick on to the terrain even if the mountains fall. Who says we are cowed down with fear? The paper tigers are cowed down with fear.

My hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony referred to a great fighter for freedom—Shri Indulal Yagnik. But I am sorry Shri Frank Anthony has not surveyed and participated in the great battles of freedom in which my hon. friend Shri Indulal Yagnik participated. Shri Indulal Yagnik was associated with Mahatma Gandhi and Sadrar Vallabhbhai Patel; he went to jail and

he had also taken part in the great agitation of Maha Gujarat. These are words of men who have really taken part in battle. We shall not laugh at people who have not suffered any wound. We shall not jest at people who have not had any injury.

Coming down to brass-tacks, India shall enter the negotiating table on two conditions. The first condition is this. I will describe China as the foe of Asian nationalism. China wants to devour the whole of South-East Asia. This year I travelled from Australia right up to Calcutta and all the countries from Calcutta to Canberra, may I say in all humility—they are all seized with fear. They dare not speak. What is the strength of this population? It is about 82 million: Laos 1 million, Thailand 25 million, North Viet Nam 13 million, South Viet Nam 12 million, Burma 20 million, Cambodia 4 million, Malaya 6 million, Singapore 1 million—the total comes to about 85 million plus about 100 million people of Indonesia.

So, we must speak from a position of strength. It is true that our army has to be completely reorganised. We have to reorganise our defence forces. We shall talk from a position of strength today, tomorrow and the day after. Peace plus strength should be our policy. We cannot afford our armed forces to be let loose, to be taken by surprise any more, so that the enemy may kick us. Chinese communism is in an expanding mood. It wants to destroy our culture. What the British left untouched, China may destroy and that is why we have to be guarded.

I want the Government of India to enter the conference table on two conditions. Everything that China agrees to, before entering the Colombo conference, shall be written in black and white. We can no more trust China for her plighted word. We have thrown all our eggs in one basket. We have cast the pearls before the swine—

to use a Biblical phrase—in the matter of advocacy of China's entry into the United Nations and their contemptuous disregard for all those services. So, everything to which China agrees will have to be written on paper before we enter the conference table.

The second condition shall be the location and exact description of those posts in the western sector. We should lay down the condition only to discuss the location and noting of these posts. Then only we can perhaps start negotiations. These two are simple conditions and we can go on these lines.

My friend, Shri Gopalan, says "Why do you want to become strong?" Why not? Does he want us to remain weak and be quite, so that China may walk over our bodies next time? We must have a massive reorganisation of our armed forces.

I would like to pay my tribute of praise to my friend, the late Shri Uma Charan Pantnaik. Whenever he spoke in this House on the defence subjects he spoke with authority. I miss him very much, though he belonged to the Independent Party. I would like to read a few words which he wrote on his return from China as a member of the Indian Parliamentary Delegation. As I told you in the beginning, we have to note the strength of the enemy and not merely show our fist. If we show our fist, we must be ready to fight until the last ditch. That means total war, complete war and complete destruction. If you are ready for that, all of us shall be ready. But we do not want all the things that we have built up in the last sixteen years to be destroyed and sent down the gutter. It is good for us to know what Mr. U. C. Patnaik said:

"In India, following the British model, the defence forces are being kept segregated from the rest of the nation, except during floods, famines and other emergencies when their services are requisitioned.

From the Generals down to the soldiers, every Officer and other rank has to do his share of voluntary labour. They remove their badges and uniforms and work together shoulder to shoulder.

It is a code of honour among the P.L.A. men that when they go out to do voluntary labour for the peasantry, they do not even drink a cup of tea or accept a cigarette from the persons whom they assist.

The pay of officers is also not high. "But the amenities provided are such that with their meagre salaries, they are able to live handsomely and save something from the salary.

China recognises that the country should utilise the services of its retired military personnel with their training and discipline."

They he says:

"China has no Territorial Army but has a very large Militia which is a country-wide second line of defence."

"China's Defence Organisation is very efficient both as a fighting force as well as a production machinery."

Now, Sir, this is the enemy we are fighting. We have to build our army. As I said, we have to completely reorganise it. We have to train them in guerilla warfare. 20,000 guerillas in Malaya stood against a lakh of people. The French lost 27,000 and at another time 1,41,000 people because of guerilla warfare that was raging in Indo-China. I shall not say more. But I shall mention that there is no gratitude in politics or in personal life. Dharma is that in ordinary life you go on doing good expecting no reward, no benefit. So also in international politics we go on doing good. It was India's strong protest to the Dutch and the prevention of the Dutch planes flying over India going to the assistance of the Dutch colonialists in Indonesia that hastened

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Indonesia becoming free. It was Jawaharlal Nehru's voice added to Khrushchev's, Eisenhower's and the Labour Party's which compelled the Israelites, the French and the British to go out of Egypt. We did so many other things. If nobody has acknowledged it, it does not matter. But China has shown us the worst example. We rendered them service and we have been given a blow. So, as I said, there is no gratitude in international politics or any politics.

Sir, as I said, there shall be two conditions before we enter the conference table. This is a very critical situation. It is a pity that voices of dissension are raised in this House. But we have the strength of the nation behind us. We shall not be paralysed, we shall have no fear and we shall fight if things break down.

Shri M. Ismail (Manjeri): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, while considering the Colombo proposals as we are doing now, we should not forget the fact that the cease-fire proposals did not emanate from the Colombo conference powers. It is the Chinese, for their own reasons, when they were at the top of their victory who have come out with these proposals. What the Colombo powers did was to take hold of them and they wanted to stabilise the unilateral cease-fire that has been imposed upon the situation by the Chinese. Now, there are friends who say that the proposals that have resulted out of this stabilisation that was carried on by the Colombo powers are as near or almost as near as our 8th September line.

With regard to this 8th September line I do not want to go into the question as to whether Parliament agreed to it or not. The Government of India, under whose leadership the people decided to fight the Chinese aggression, have for their own reasons put forward the 8th September line proposals. Now, they say that these Colombo proposals are almost the same as the 8th Sep-

tember line proposal of the Government of India. The Government of India, we must know, put forward this proposal not as a final settlement but as a condition for the negotiations which were meant for the final settlement of the dispute between India and China. Now, what is it that the Government of India want? They want that before they sit at the conference table with the Chinese, at least the latest phase of the Chinese aggression must be vacated. That was the minimum requirement which the Government of India wanted to enable them to have talks and discussions with the Chinese on the question of aggression. I do not know whether the Colombo Powers claim that their proposals contain what India wanted, but there are friends on our side who say that they are the same as what we wanted. Are they really the same as we wanted?

The 8th September line was put forward as a test of the token of Chinese *bona fides*, as a token of the evacuation or liquidation of the aggression committed by the Chinese so as to enable India to go to them for discussions. What we wanted was the restoration of our territory at least up to the 8th September line. That was our demand as a minimum conditions for discussion, for negotiations.

Now what the Chinese offer us is a different thing. The proposals which the Colombo Powers have made are not in essence much different from the Chinese proposals. Why did the Government of India want the Chinese to withdraw to the 8th September line? Because, they wanted to know that the Chinese are really earnest and are desirous of having talks with India. That is the crux of the whole problem.

I am not very much concerned about the little differences here or there. The real question is that at least that much of territory that lies between the present line of control and the 8th September line must be

## Proposals

to us. That territory must be restored to our position to show the goodwill, the *bona fides*, the earnestness and the sincerity of the Chinese in wanting to have negotiations with us on this question of aggression.

The Colombo proposals say that the portion between the present line of control and the 8th September line will be under dual control. They are not willing to say that it must be ceded to the Government of India. What we really wanted was that at least the last phase of the Chinese aggression must be liquidated before we can have any talks with the Chinese. That was the whole point. Now the Chinese refuse to agree to such a proposal, and the Colombo Powers have acquiesced in it. They speak of dual control. I do not know what dual control means. However, that territory which we wanted to enable us to have talks with the Chinese is not forthcoming. That is the main point.

It may be said that in the eastern sector they are prepared to go beyond the Macmahon line excepting in two places, Longju and Thag La and in the middle sector, except for Bara Hoti they are prepared to go to the north of the middle sector line.

It is only with reference to the Western sector that this trouble is there. But the Western sector is the most important sector. Most of the time the Chinese have been speaking of the MacMahon Line being an illegal line. They were saying so many things so as to throw us off the real smell of the track. Now we know their real motive. They attach very great importance to the Western sector. There is their Aksai Chin Road running through our territory. Moverover, it is there that there has been the bulk of aggression by the Chinese. We are prepared to leave it in their possession until the negotiations are ended, but they are not prepared to restore to our possession even a sixth of the territory which we are prepared to leave in their posses-

sion for the duration of the negotiations. How does this show any sincerity of the other side for talks?

If we agree to the Colombo proposals of going to the talks with the Chinese, it will be taken as a defeated nation going to a victorious nation for suing for peace. What effect will it have upon our people and upon the world where some countries are coming to our help? What effect will it create upon the Chinese? How will the Chinese take this attitude of ours? Will they take it as a bold attitude on our part or as a pusillanimous attitude on our part? They wanted to relax our preparations and to dampen the enthusiasm of the people in the country who have risen to face this menace. It will also cool down the enthusiasm and efforts of our foreign allies. If we accept the Colombo proposals, it will mean that the Chinese are winning right through in their peace offensive as well.

When our minimum proposal was put forward by the Government only a few weeks ago, what was the attitude of our Government? I do not want to say that in my words. I would say that in the words of the Government or the Government agency. They say:

"National dignity and self-respect demanded that there could be no talks with the Chinese unless the positions of the two sides before 8th September had been restored. If China is really sincere about the solution of this question the least she could do is to agree to the restoration of the *status quo* prior to her latest aggression."

Now, what has happened since then to change the attitude of the Government of India?

Then again in another pamphlet issued by the Government's Publications Division, the hon. Prime Minister is stated to have said in his letter to the Heads of States of the world this thing, namely:—

"The issue involved is not one of small territorial gains, one way

[Shri M. Ismail]

or the other, but of standards of international behaviour between neighbouring countries and whether the world will allow the principle of 'Might is Right' to prevail in international relations. Bearing this in mind, India will continue to resist aggression....".

He said that only a few weeks ago, that is, on the 27th October, 1962.

He says further:

"India will continue to resist aggression, both to preserve her honour and integrity and to prevent international standards from deteriorating into the jungle law of 'Might is Right'. When aggression is continuously taking place and vast Chinese armies are moving further into our territory, how can we discuss or talk about a peaceful settlement? The first essential is that the Chinese forces along the India-China border should go back at least to where they were prior to the 8th September 1962."

The Prime Minister of India says that India will continue to resist aggression. This was what he stated towards the close of October, 1962.

And what are the things which have marked Chinese Government's policy towards India? The pamphlet says:

"Falsehood and deception marked the Chinese Government's policy towards India till it culminated in the full-scale invasion of India's northern frontier, from Ladakh in the west to the North East Frontier Agency in the east, on October 20, 1962.

Falsehood and deception, it is now clear, are the warp and woof of the peace offensive which China launched a month later, on November 21.

On that day the Chinese Government came out with a declaration which was trumpeted as a truce

offer but which was in fact a cleverly disguised invitation to India to surrender."

Then, at the end of the pamphlet, the writer goes on to say:

What China has indicated so far does not offer the basis for that peace consistent with honour which India seeks....

What this amounts to is an attempt at imposing a dictated settlement. It is an offer to India of the kind of peace that is available to the vanquished who surrender.

India is not vanquished, and will never surrender."

And what are we to do? I would once again quote from the Government pamphlet.

"The task is heavy; the trial may be severe. But let us prove that we are a people who will not flinch from or weary of the struggle. Victory may not be so far away if we try, each one of us, to do our duty. 'A nation which forgets its duty in a crisis loses its independence.' reminded the Prime Minister. No, we will not forget our duty. We will defend and preserve our independence. For freedom is life itself."

These are the words of the Government, and these are the words of the Prime Minister of India. I say that let us stand by these words. If we lose honour and freedom then everything is lost. Therefore, everyone in India should try hard to maintain the freedom and integrity of the country.

**Shri Subbaraman** (Madurai): I thank you for the opportunity you have given me to speak on the motion moved by the Prime Minister. We solemnly passed a unanimous resolution on the 14th November, 1962 that we would not go to talk with China unless they vacated their aggression and withdraw at least to the 8th September, 1962 position. Many things

*Proposals*

have happened since then. The Chinese have unilaterally decided to cease fire and actually withdrew to some extent. Six non-aligned nations met at Colombo, dislussed among themselves and drew up a proposal to bring both India and China together round the table so that they can talk and negotiate together and settle the dispute between them.

The text of the Colombo proposals with clarifications are now before us. We have to see how far they satisfy the terms of our resolution. We have to admit that they do so to a great extent. Such being the case, it is out right that we accept the Colombo proposals and proceed further.

It is said that the Colombo proposals do not fully satisfy our terms. But they are almost satisfying and so it is but right that we agree to the proposals. It is also argued that as per the Colombo proposals the Chinese would not completely vacate the land occupied by them and that it is dishonourable to us to accept them. We should remind ourselves of the date we fixed in respect of the line, namely, September 8. The difference in the eastern sector and the middle sector except in one or two places is nothing. When almost the whole of those areas are vacated, the case of one or two places, and those too small places, can be taken up for discussion and talks. Even in the western sector, there have been some posts of the Chinese west of the September 8 line. So there should be no reluctance now on our part in agreeing to joint control of the area to be vacated by the Chinese. By this it does not mean that we have agreed to give up our claim to those areas. We retain our claim. Only we agree to meet and talk across the table and settle the dispute among us.

One cannot have any faith or confidence in the Chinese if we look into the record of their conduct and behaviour in the past. Still we should

not lose even a single chance or opportunity to talk and negotiate, though we have been deceived several times before by them. It will be well and good if the whole matter or conflict is solved and the Chinese aggression is vacated as a result of the talks. If, on the other hand, the Chinese do not see reason and do not vacate the aggression they have committed, it is no additional loss to us. We will get more moral support from the world. We would also feel and get still stronger for the attempts we made.

Of course, we should always keep bright before us one thing. That is, we should never depend upon the talks with China alone. We should not slacken our efforts or defence and economic uplift. Our production in fields and factories should be steadily and continuously increased. Everyone of us, in whatever position or field or job or status he is, must work hard, sincerely, efficiently and with great devotion and patriotic spirit. In that alone lies our unflinching strength.

What is the alternative if we refuse to accept the Colombo proposals? It is total war. If we imagine its implications and consequences, we will surely think many many times before we go in for it. We will certainly try to avoid it. We should not depend upon Russia or even the western bloc including USA and UK alone for our defence. Of course, they will give us all support they can, for they will also be affected if we lose. But though they may support us now, a time may come when they may stop giving us any help.

Some friends from the other side quoted Gita in support of their views. Gita does not ask people to fight all at once. One should fight only when one has exhausted all avenues of settling the dispute. That is how Krishna advised. Krishna himself went on an errand many times to Duryodana and tried to settle the dispute but he failed. The last demand was for only five villages. Our demand for the withdrawal of the Chinese to the Sep-



[Shri Subbaraman]

tember 8 line may be compared to that demand for five villages.

Mahatma Gandhi was also quoted. Every one of us should think within ourselves as to what Mahatma Gandhi would advise us in this position if he were with us today. I am quite sure that he will support the measure taken by our Prime Minister and Government. Mahatma Gandhi is nothing other than truth. Every one has Truth in his own heart. If he sincerely follows the dictates of Truth, he will find the path quite clear.

We are wedded to peaceful methods. If it were not so we may adopt other methods. The only way to solve problems is the peaceful one. That is what we have been preaching to the whole world, and wise men throughout the world are coming to the same conclusion. Such being the case, we have no other go in the present circumstances except to accept the Colombo proposals.

Rightly or wrongly, we passed a resolution stating that the Chinese should withdraw to the 8th September line before any talks take place. Now if we do not agree to the Colombo proposals, it may mean that we go back on our own words and resolution, for the Colombo proposals more or less stipulate the terms which we put forward. It appears that we should have raised our demand, but after long deliberations, wisely or unwisely, we fixed the 8th September line. Having fixed it, it is but proper that we accept the Colombo proposals, which come nearer to our terms.

With these words, I support the Government move to accept the proposals.

**Shri Bhannu Prakash Singh** (Rajgarh): Dr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to express my views.

Much has been said about the Colombo proposals here in the last two days, and I have nothing much to

add but lot of mess and confusion has been created by these proposals. I do not know how we are going to extricate ourselves out from between Mao and Sirimavo and yet maintain our dignity, prestige and honour.

This aggression has got two aspects, national and international. The national aspect has been that we have suffered humiliation, defeat, militarily and otherwise; the international aspect is that this fight is not between China and India, but between communism and democracy.

Sir, I would like to say something about national aspect. People have risen like one man. They stood solidly behind the Government even under this humiliation and dishonour. That has been the pride of the country. I do not know whether the people have done this for negotiations or to fight. As far as I could understand the feeling of the people of my constituency and elsewhere also where I had been, I got only one impression. The contribution they give for the National Defence Fund and the way they have risen like one man standing behind the Government is to fight and to retrieve the honour of the country. So, before we reject or accept these proposals, it is vital and important to look to the will to fight and the determination of the people. It is a very important thing in a democracy. Whether the same determination and the same will be exhibited a second time in such a crisis is a doubtful proposition. I can understand that today the practical position is that we have been defeated and dishonoured.... (Interruptions) Hon. friends may not agree. There are times in the lives of the people and in the history of the nation when temporary advantages have to be sacrificed for future advantages. Let history and posterity not say that the present generation could not stand up to the challenge.

Coming to the other point, the international impact, the whole thing

## Proposals

has been weighed by the mighty powers of America and Russia, on the balance of power in the world. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether we are fighting China or the Communist China: whether we are fighting the Chinese or communism also along with them. Because, in the international affairs when we think of the third world war, the point to be considered is whether it is democracy or communism and not whether Russia will not come to our aid or America will not come to our aid or Russia will not go to the aid of China. The way of thinking and the way of living on the lines of communism and democracy are involved. We have to be careful in that. There has been general disapproval of the communists in the country, in the Congress Party, in the Opposition and among the people also. They have shown no sympathy for them and have not agreed to sit with the communists at this time. I would dilate upon a point about communism. There have been instances in history when loyalty has been put to test. But this is the first time in the history of the world when treachery has also been put to test. If the Communist Party of India voted with the country, they were traitors to the international communism. If they sided with international communism they were traitors to the country. Treachery and loyalty are two diametrically opposite things, like east and west. A person who is a traitor can never be a loyalist. He cannot be a loyalist. This is a fundamental thing that we must always bear in mind. This is a simple and pure thing: because, the communists want to survive, they want to exist. There is the idea of self-existence that has allowed these people to behave in that way. At times I hear vociferous speeches and loud support to the Government from my hon. friends on this side. I wonder whether the Treasury Benches are here or there. One does not know. It is so difficult. At times I feel whether the Prime Minister is the leader of the

Congress Party or the leader of the communist party: I do not know. This is such a thing.

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** He is the leader of the country.\*

**Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:** He is the Prime Minister. Anyway, the point is, the people have a tremendous love and affection for the Prime Minister. There is no doubt there is a general feeling prevailing in the country, among the common men, that it is only because of the benign protection of the Prime Minister that the communist party is here to day. I think this is too much of a premium on the love and affection of the people. I hope our beloved Prime Minister would consider this.

The second thing that I would like to put before the House is this. What I felt from the Prime Minister's speech yesterday the impression that I could gather was that he probably wanted to throw the onus of the 8th September proposals on Parliament. As far as I remember correctly, the Parliament did not approve them in its resolution of 14th November. As far as I remember, the country is under the impression that the Prime Minister has pledged himself to the nation on the radio that every inch of our territory will be evacuated from the Chinese and that the 8th September proposals are only for the Government: that the people and Parliament are not responsible, it is only the Government that is responsible, and as such, I would like him to make it very clear: Parliament may not have opposed it. There are many things which are said in Parliament.

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

**Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh:** I would crave your indulgence for a few more minutes. Another important point that I would like to make is about the aggression. This is the first time in the annals of world history when aggression has been divided. What is

[Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh]

the 8th September proposal? Before that, has there been no aggression? Was it incursion or was it nibbling? What was that? Our main emphasis is on the 8th September proposal I think aggression should be taken as a whole. Aggression cannot be divided. There can never be any division of aggression. Aggression is complete. Aggression is one.

Before I conclude, I would like to have an assurance from the hon. Prime Minister. I request him to be kind enough to say that aggression is indivisible. Secondly, before the Prime Minister takes any decision in favour of the proposals or rejecting the proposals, I hope that he would definitely consider the honour and prestige of the country *vis-a-vis* our policy and the world opinion, because this is an important factor.

In the end, I would like to thank the Six non-aligned countries for the interest they had taken.

Before I resume my seat, I would like to quote a *sher*:

कुछ लोग तो अपनी हिम्मत में  
तूफ़ान की ज़द से बच निकले,  
कुछ लोग मगर मल्लाहों की  
हिम्मत के सहारे डूब गये ।

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North):  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are debating a most important matter in the history of our Parliament. That is why it is all the more necessary that in debating over this matter we should not be guided by emotions, however laudable they may be. But we must take what we call the objective view. This morning we heard two speeches which were full of emotions and noble patriotic instincts. They are highly appreciable instincts, because we are bound to be affected by such noble patriotic instincts. There is nothing wrong in

that, because even in a communist country like Russia, the patriotic instinct plays a great part, as we see from recent history. But all the same, when we decide the fate of a nation, we should not be merely guided by emotional approach, but by hard facts. It is obvious that the Prime Minister repeatedly made the statement before this House and by and large we accepted that in case China was to restore the position which prevailed before 8th September, we would like to go to the negotiating table. The issue is not an issue of major policy, but merely a matter of tactics—whether we agree to negotiate with the Chinese at this juncture of time.

The Chinese have behaved in such a bad and strange manner towards us that it is very difficult for us psychologically to get over that complex. It is obvious that the Indian army is going to reach up to the McMahon line. The only problem is regarding Ladakh. There, of course, the Chinese are going to the position which prevailed prior to 8th September. The question is whether in the demilitarised zone, our army could go or not. That is the problem and there we have to agree to joint administration of that area. Now, in deciding issues which affect the international situation or the situation in a nation, merely because in Ladakh over a certain matter we cannot agree with the Chinese, can we say we cannot go and negotiate with the Chinese? Then we will be ruled out of court, so far as public opinion is concerned. That is a matter which we cannot overlook.

I have to say one or two things about the various aspects of the problem that have cropped up, for example, peace, non-alignment, consolidation of cease-fire, etc. I personally believe it should be left to the Prime Minister of the country to make high policy statements. What has happened is, each one of us, however small or big,

goes to the press and makes a statement, creating confusion over this matter. The Prime Minister, the other day, appealed to the country that we should not suffer from a sense of complacency and that we should be ready to fight. But what is happening is, the various statements made by important spokesmen are causing confusion in the public mind whether we really mean business against the Chinese or not.

Take, for instance, Afro-Asian solidarity. This slogan was conceived in times when most parts of Africa and Asia suffered from the imperialism of the west. Now it is a thing of the past. Today most of the countries in Africa and Asia have been freed from the imperialism of the west. Today, in the present context, a new danger is the imperialism which China is trying to practice in its relationship with Asia. Whether it is territorial imperialism or expansion of their hegemony, whatever it is, we have that new danger. Therefore, repeatedly saying that we should look to Afro-Asian solidarity, consolidation of cease-fire, etc., sometimes creates an impression as if we are more concerned about the preservation of cease-fire, preservation of solidarity, preservation of non-alignment, etc., at the cost of our freedom. That is a wrong impression to create in the public mind. We should warn some of our friends not to make such statements.

We are wedded to the United Nations Charter. If we logically try to pursue too much this conception about Afro-Asian solidarity, that will mean that we are trying to hate what we call the white races. Why should we hate them? It is England and America that came to our rescue. It is obvious. Whatever may be their motives behind it, they have given timely help to us. Two important and glaring factors which bring joy to us are firstly the timely Anglo-American aid and secondly, Soviet Russia's consistent stand. They may not have sent us arms, but they have obviously taken an attitude which has helped us in this crisis.

I think somebody said this morning that the Government and the Prime Minister are developing cold feet.

18 hrs.

My opinion is just the other way. On the contrary, I say, it does not require any courage to reject the Colombo proposals as they are. It is very easy. But to give a sympathetic consideration to the Colombo proposals and to agree to negotiate requires more courage, more statesmanship. That would be a practical approach. I would remind the House what Gandhiji said, that the nation is safe in the hands of the Prime Minister. We should not forget. He cannot place all his cards before us and say that he will do this and do that. That is against India's culture, India's genius. If there is any person in this country who represents the real strength of India, it is the Prime Minister. Maybe there are mistakes or he commits mistakes. But he has a right to commit mistakes and he is capable of correcting those mistakes. Let us not confuse the situation which is already confused.

I would only say—and today I am inclined to agree with Shri Harish Chandra Mathur—that the more important question is not whether the Government agree to negotiate with China or not, but the question is whether the Government of India are going on in the way they should regarding armed preparation of the country. That is the relevant point where I want to be satisfied. The Prime Minister said, intervening during the question hour the other day, that defence matters should not be discussed like that. I agree. The Government need not place all their cards before us on the table. But I feel that in a democratic country the Parliament should not be kept in darkness about what is happening. After what has happened in NEFA, we are anxious to know what is happening.

About the Chinese, recently a retired British General, one Mr.

[Shri R. G. Dube]

Oblans, said that the the Chinese possess a large army but a very small proportion of that army is well equipped and well trained. Therefore, we need not make much of the Chinese army. If you consider the Chinese problems from the point of view of Formosa, the possibility of an attack on the main land of China, their relations with Russia and Mongolia and all those things, I do not think that China can bring all their 5 million army, even if it is good, on the Indian frontier. They will bring a million at the most. I do not think India is not in a position to muster strength and fight them.

With all that, I do agree, looking to what Kennedy and Khurushchev are doing to solve the world problem in a spirit of co-operation, that if we talk of peace nobody respects us because we have received serious defeats in NEFA and our strength has gone down. We should talk of peace only when people will respect us. I do not mean to say that we should insist on fighting and take revenge even if China agrees to go beyond Ladakh. That position also would not be very reasonable. All the same, we must build up strength and then only we will have honourable peace.

With these few words, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी)**

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी हमारे जो माननीय मित्र बोले, उन्होंने कहा कि इस प्रश्न को भावनाओं के साथ हम तय न करें, बल्कि ठंडे दिल में उस पर विचार करें। उन से मेरा विनम्र निवेदन है कि आजादी और राष्ट्रियता जैसे प्रश्न भावनाओं के साथ ही तय किये जाते हैं और आजादी की रक्षा उसी से की जा सकती है और इस तरह ठंडे दिल में बैठ कर लेन-देन से नहीं हो सकती है।

कल से कोलम्बो-प्रस्तावों पर बहस हो रही है। प्रधान मंत्री ने तो कल ही गरज

दिया था कि हम ने उस को मान लिया और उस गरज को उन्होंने राज्य सभा में दूनी आवाज से सुना दिया। माननीय सदस्य, श्री त्यागी, और ऐसे ही हमारे माननीय सदस्य अगर यह समझते हों कि इस प्रस्ताव पर केवल बहस हो कर समाप्त हो जायगी और उस का निर्णय नहीं माना जायगा, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने बयान से इस बात को साफ़ कर दिया है। इस देश के निवासियों और इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों को इस बारे में कोई श्रुद्धा और धोखा नहीं रहना चाहिए और उन को अपने मन में अच्छी तरह से इस को समझ लेना चाहिए।

१५ अगस्त, १९४७ से पहले इसी कांग्रेस के बड़े नेताओं ने, जिन का धीरज बूढ़ी उम्र के कारण टूट चुका था, चाहे फूटा ही ताज मिले, उस को पहनने की लालसा से, देश का बंटवारा कुबूल कर लिया था और उस बंटवारे का अभिशाप आज तक हम लोग भुगत रहे हैं। उस से विरासत में जो समस्याएँ हम को मिली, आज तक हम उन का कोई निदान नहीं कर सके। और आज हम कोलम्बो-प्रस्तावों को मान कर हिन्दुस्तान की हज़ारों वर्ग मील पवित्र भूमि दे रहे हैं। यह दूसरा अभिशाप है और इस के लिए हम आने वाली पीढ़ियों के लिए दोषी रहेंगे ?

**श्री त्यागी :** दे कहा रहे हैं ?

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** दे रहे हैं। दे दिया, इस में शक नहीं है।

श्रीमती भंडारनायके के जो कोलम्बो-प्रस्ताव हैं, उन में सब बातों का छिद्र है। जिस छोट से कारीबार में बिना-प्लटनी इन्तज़ाम रहेगा और जहाँ हिन्दुस्तान और चीन की राय से चौकियाँ स्थापित होंगी, उस के बारे में भी अभी उन की ओर से अन्तिम निर्णय नहीं आया है। वह उस को बुरा मानते हैं। लद्दाख के बारह, चौद

हजार वर्ग-मील क्षेत्र के बारे में तो कहीं कोई जिक्र ही नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री जी कल इस बहस का जवाब देंगे। मैं उन से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यदि कहीं किसी तरह से भूल में, या बहुत दोस्ती में फंस कर, उस को दे दिया हो, तो वता दें मुल्क को। उस के लिए क्यों इतनी जानें मरवाई जाती हैं।

श्री त्यागी : उसी को लेने के लिए नेगोशिएशन हो रही है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : काश्मीर में हम आठ बरस से नेगोशिएशन कर रहे हैं। आजादी के पन्द्रह सालों का हमारा कारनामा क्या है ? गांधी जी के त्याग, तपस्या, सदाचार और कुर्बानी को छोड़ कर हमने भ्रष्टाचार को बढ़ाया, कुनबापग्वरी को बढ़ाया।

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Is he not going off the track? He is not speaking about the Colombo proposals?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He must speak on the Resolution.

Shri Pam Sewak Yadav: I am speaking on the Resolution. You must understand that.

Shri K. C. Sharma: He is not relevant but is abusive.

Shri A. N. Vidyalkar: Yesterday the speaker has given a ruling that this word should not be used. Still, that word is being used.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Sir, I raised a point of order about that yesterday and that word was expunged.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विनम्र निवेदन करूंगा कि इस बारे में आप जो निर्णय देंगे, मैं उस को स्वीकार करूंगा, लेकिन दुनिया के इतिहास में यह

जायगा कि यह शब्द अनपार्लियामेंटरी नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Yesterday, the Speaker ruled that it was unparliamentary and it was expunged. So you please withdraw that word. Otherwise, I will have it expunged.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: I do not consider it unparliamentary. It is up to you to get it expunged, if you so desire.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कराना) : स्पीकर साहब ने उस को इस लिए अनपार्लियामेंटरी कहा था कि वह किसी खास शरूम के लिए कहा गया था। आज माननीय सदस्य सारे समाज के लिए कह रहे हैं।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : आज जब कि चीन का हमला हुआ है, मौज-मस्ती में पड़े रहना।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That word is expunged. Whatever the hon. Member says must be dignified.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: I am quite dignified in my speech. Here it is a case of the honour of the nation.

जिस मौज-मस्ती में हम पंद्रह साल रहे, आज भी उस को छोड़ने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं, क्योंकि अगर हम यह फ़ैसला करते हैं कि हम अपनी एक एक इंच जमीन वापस लेंगे, तो हमें कुर्बानी और कठिन जिन्दगी के लिए तैयार होना पड़ेगा।

कोलम्बो-प्रस्तावों का आधार चीन की एक-तरफ़ा युद्ध-बन्दी योजना है। भारत सरकार और प्रधान मंत्री यह कहते रहे हैं कि चीनी सेना को कम से कम ८ मिनट्स, १९६२ की लाइन पर वापस चले जाना चाहिए। लेकिन कोलम्बो-प्रस्तावों में ७ नवम्बर, १९५६ की स्थिति का हवाला है,

### [श्री राम सेवक यादव]

जिम का जिक्र चीनी प्रधान मंत्री के पत्र में पाया जाता है। इस का अर्थ यह है कि प्रधान मंत्री जिम बात का अभी तक विरोध कर रहे थे, आज वह उसी को स्वीकार करने जा रहे हैं। यह स्पष्ट है कि कोलम्बो-प्रस्ताव उन की भी ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की स्थिति वाली मांग को पूरा नहीं करते हैं। जहाँ तक हम लोगों का मवाल है, हम तो ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ की रेखा को ही नहीं मानते। १४ नवम्बर, १९६२ को इस सदन ने जो निश्चय लिया, ये प्रस्ताव बिन्कुल उस के प्रतिकूल है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी हमेशा परम्परा-विरोधी बातें कहते रहे हैं और अक्सर एक ही भाषण में। उन्होंने ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ का हवाला दिया और यह कहने की जुरत की कि हम ने इस सदन की मन्जूरी ले ली है। लेकिन यह बात गलत है और इसके लिए मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने ८ सितम्बर की बात कही है और बातें भी कहीं हैं। उनके प्रति उनका वफादार होना चाहिए। १३ मार्च मन् १९६२ के सरकारी नोट में, जो कि ड्वेन पत्र नम्बर ६ में है, यह कहा गया है :

"Such a restoration of the status quo through the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Indian territory, into which they have intruded since 1957, is an essential step for the creation of a favourable climate for any negotiations between the two Governments regarding the boundary".

इन शब्दों को प्रधान मंत्री भूल रहे हैं जैसे कहा ही नहीं।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप अंग्रेजी में बोल सकते हैं, अंग्रेजी में बोलिए जिससे मैं भी समझ सकूँ।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** अगर सब अपनी देशी भाषा में बोलते तो शायद आज यह चीनी खतरा हमारे ऊपर न आता।

अंग्रेजी कोई चीनियों से लड़ने वाला हथियार नहीं है।

दूसरा उदाहरण मैं आपको मन् १९५७ की यथास्थिति का देना चाहता हूँ। वह वही स्थिति थी जो कि १५ जून मन् १९४७ की थी। लद्दाख में अक्सार्ड चिन में चीनी मन् १९५७ में सर्व प्रथम आए, मन् १९५१ या १९५० में नहीं आए यह उस नोट में स्वीकार किया गया है।

आखिरी उदाहरण मैं २२ अगस्त मन् १९६२ का देना चाहता हूँ, जिसमें विदेश मंत्रालय ने कहा है :

"If the Government of China are genuinely desirous of resolving differences between the two Governments on the boundary by further discussions and negotiations, they must realise that these discussions cannot start unless the status quo of the boundary in this region (i.e., Ladakh) which has been altered by force since 1957 is restored and the current tensions are removed". (White Paper VII, page 37).

मैं ये उदाहरण उनकी याद दहानी के लिए सदन के सामने रख रहा हूँ। यह शब्द उनके ही हैं लेकिन आज उनको वे भूल रहे हैं।

जब चीन का भारी आक्रमण २१ नवम्बर मन् १९६२ को हुआ तो घबराकर ८ सितम्बर मन् १९६२ की बात करने लगे। इससे हमें भय लगता है कि अगर चीन ने और भारी आक्रमण किया, जैसा कि वह कर सकता है, उसका कोई भरोसा नहीं तो कहीं प्रधान मंत्री जी घबराहट में २१ नवम्बर १९६२ को भी आधार बना कर दोस्ती की

बात कर सकते हैं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आज जब मैं सोचता हूँ तो प्रधान मंत्री जी की इन सब बातों को अपने सामने रखता हूँ। जब मैं ऐसा करता हूँ तो मुझे भय लगता है।

प्रधान मंत्री ने लद्दाख के बारे में कहा कि वह ऊपर और बंजर है, मंसूर का लगान खर्च में बहुत कम है। नवम्बर १९५९ और सितम्बर १९६० में केवल दो ढाई हजार का अन्तर है। क्या इस मामली अन्तर के लिए बड़ी भारी लड़ाई लड़ना उचित होगा।

फिर कुछ राष्ट्रप्रेमी लोगों ने प्रधान मंत्री को मुझाव दिए जिस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया।

सन् १९५० में डा० लाहिया ने तिब्बत के चीनी कब्जे के बारे में कहा कि यह शिशु हत्या के समान है तो उन से कहा गया कि वह हमारी दोस्ती में खलल डालना चाहते हैं।

उसके बाद डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद ने श्री लक्ष्मी मैतन ने कहा कि तिब्बत के मामले में भूल हुई है उसका प्रायश्चित्त करना पड़ेगा तो कहा गया कि यह जाहिर बेवकूफी है, मैनीफेस्ट तानमेंस है।

हमें याद है कि सरकार के एक मंत्री ने सन् १९५९ में कहा था कि लद्दाख में मड़कों बनानी चाहिए। शिक्षा की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए और बहा थोड़ा सा उद्योग धन्धे का काम शुरू करना चाहिए और दस्तकारी शुरू करनी चाहिए, तो बिगड़ गए प्रधान मंत्री और कहा यह असम्भव बातें हैं, यह कैसे हो सकता है और उनकी हमी उड़ायी और कहा कि राम सुभग सिंह यह कहता क्यों भूल गए कि लद्दाख में एक समुद्री बंदरगाह बनाया जाए। लेकिन चीन ने इकमाई चिन में मड़कों का जाल बिछा कर दिखा दिया कि वहा सब कुछ हो सकता है। जब इन सारी चीजों को अपने सामने रखता हूँ तो भय

होता है कि इस कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव का क्या मतलब होता है।

मेरा विनम्र निवेदन है कि इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार न किया जाए।

नान एलाइनमेंट की बात कही जाती है। मैं भी उसका हामी हूँ अगर वह सजनात्मक हो। लेकिन इस प्रश्न पर हमारी सरकार दो भागों में बंट गयी है। एक भाग अमरीका की तरफ चला जा रहा है तो दूसरा भाग रूस और चीन की तरफ चला जा रहा है। यह कैसा नान एलाइनमेंट है। सरकारी स्तर पर एक दूसरे की तुक्ता चीनी होने लगी और अफसरों को दोष दिया जाने लगा।

फिर कहा जाता है कि चीन आइसोलेट हो गया। मैं बनाना चाहता हूँ कि चीन आइसोलेट नहीं हुआ बल्कि वह रंगीन दुनिया का नेता बन रहा है हमारी कमजोरी की वजह से। उसके दुनिया में तो आइसोलेट होने की बात तो अगर हम उसको अपने मुल्क में आइसोलेट नहीं कर सके, और देश में एक चाइना लाबी मौजूद है। आप अपनी पार्टी में चीन को आइसोलेट नहीं कर सके, आपकी पार्टी में चाइना लाबी मौजूद है, अपने मंत्रिमंडल में उसको आइसोलेट नहीं कर सके, उसमें भी चाइना लाबी मौजूद है। तो यह आइसोलेशन की बात है।

अन्त में मैं कहता चाहूंगा कि दुनिया की संसदीय परम्परा के इतिहास में यह अजीब बात है कि लोक सभा बैठ रही हो और प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा हो कि जब तक हम लोक सभा की अनुमति नहीं ले लेंगे कोई निर्णय नहीं करेंगे, लेकिन लोक सभा के बैठने के पहले और लोक सभा में कोई पोजिटिव प्रस्ताव लाने के पहले ही उन्होंने एक दमखे घोषित कर दिया कि हम इस प्रस्ताव को मानने को तैयार हैं। इससे ज्यादा अविश्वास प्रधान मंत्री में और किसी बात से नहीं हो सकता। प्रधान मंत्री को अगर जरा भी



## [श्री राम सबक यादव]

पार्लियामेंटरी पद्धति का ज्ञान है और अगर उनमें थोड़ा भी देश प्रेम है तो उनको स्वयं इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिए क्योंकि उनकी हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी कि वह ऐसा प्रस्ताव लाते ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इन प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ । हिन्दुस्तान के लोक तंत्र के इतिहास में ऐसा कभी नहीं हुआ जैसा कि आज सरकार कर रही है । हम विरोधी दल वाले इस देश के राष्ट्र में भी लोगों से और कांग्रेस में भी जो राष्ट्र प्रेमी और देश भक्त हैं उनसे निवेदन करते हैं कि इस तरह की चर्चाओं को बन्द करें और उनका सख्त विरोध कर ।

**Shri A. N. Vidyalankar** (Hoshiarpur): The question that we are considering since yesterday is very delicate one and really the whole thing should have been examined in a cool and calm manner. We ought to have examined this question in objective manner. But from the speeches that I have listened to from the Opposition Benches, I find that they have attempted to side-track the issue, to confuse the issues. They have taken the stand and they have tried to create an impression in the country that our country is divided in two wings; here is a wing that wants to fight the aggression of the Chinese, and here is another wing that does not want to fight. They have accused the Congress Benches as if we are paralysed by fear and we do not want to fight. I think that this is the impression sought to be created in whole debate by the speeches that have been delivered from the side of the Opposition.

The matter is simple. What is the main issue? The main issue is this. At present, we are not considering what ought to be the final terms of settlement. If it had been said that on the basis of the Colombo proposals we should make a final settlement with the Chinese, then it would have been different, and every Mem-

ber of the Congress Party would have said that we do not want a settlement on those terms. But now the question is this. What ought to be the terms of armistice or cease-fire? We have not yet accepted the unilateral cease-fire which has been announced by the Chinese. After the armistice or cease-fire we have to go to the negotiating table and there the final settlement is to be made. These two issues have been confused, and the Opposition has tried to create an impression as if we seek to accept any final settlement in the form of the Colombo Powers' proposals. Now, the question is: What should be the terms for armistice or cease-fire?

The Prime Minister had declared and he had never concealed from the House, his intention that we were prepared to go to the negotiating table, if the Chinese accepted the position that prevailed on 7th September, 1962. We ought to have compared the terms that have been offered by the Colombo Powers with the condition that we had laid down, and judged whether the terms that have now been offered to us by Colombo Powers were the same or were substantially the same, as the condition that we had laid down namely, that the Chinese should go to the position that was prevailing on 7th September, 1962. Shri Nath Pai tried to compare the two, but he failed to convince us that the Colombo proposals did not satisfy the condition that we had laid down about the Chinese going back to the 7th September, 1962 position.

They say that unless the aggression was vacated, unless the Chinese gave up the advantages of aggression, we should not talk with them, we should not go to the negotiating table. Will the Opposition take the same stand with regard to Pakistan? In fact, in regard to Pakistan, they say we should negotiate with Pakistan and we should come to some terms with her. In the case of Pakis-

tan also, a cease-fire was agreed to and since the last 14 years Pakistan is enjoying the advantages of her aggression. They are in the same place. Does the Opposition want that we should ask Mr. Bhutto not to come to India unless the aggression was vacated? Should we request Shri Swaran Singh not to go to Karachi because Pakistan has not vacated the aggression and given up the advantages thereof which she is still enjoying? Our position should be consistent. Nowhere in the world at the time of a cease-fire are terms framed in a manner that the whole disputed land should be vacated, that the whole aggression should be vacated. If that position is taken, there is no question of negotiations because our object is attained.

The present position is that we are not discussing the final terms. We are only discussing what are the conditions on which we should go to the negotiating table. In this matter, the Prime Minister is consistent. He never concealed from this House his position that he will go to the negotiating table when the 8th September line is restored. It has been made clear by the Prime Minister in his speech and in the other speeches made here that under the Colombo proposals that position has been substantially conceded and, therefore, I see no reason why we should reject those proposals.

It has been stated that India's honour must be restored. Everyone here is of that view. We want our land to be restored to us. But when we talk of physical possession, we should also remember that India's honour consists also in keeping our word. India is committed to the 8th September position. At present, we should consider the consequences of rejection. The answer that this House has to give today is not to the Chinese but to the Colombo Powers, our friends. Do we say to them, 'No, we are not prepared to accept the proposals'? Do we back on our word and say that we are not prepared to

accept that position, but we will lay down certain other conditions? That is not our position.

It has been contended that this House never accepted that position. I can understand Shri Ram Sewak Yadav saying that. In the earlier part of this session, he moved an amendment saying that the 8th September position should not be accepted. That amendment was rejected by an overwhelming majority in this House, implying that this House has accepted the position that our Prime Minister stated. As I said, it is possible Shri Yadav or his party may say that they did not accept that position. But this House cannot say that. This House by rejecting his amendment, by implication accepted that position, and today we cannot go back on it.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** On a point of clarification. Does the hon. Member mean that if I say that one man is wise, the other is foolish?

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** You had no courage to bring a positive motion

**Shri A. N. Vidyalkankar:** Shri Nath Pai this morning quoted the Gita and tried to show that there was only one way to achieve the end, and that is fight. In the last session I quoted from the Maha Bharata where Dronacharya says that there are two ways of achieving our ends: One is peace and negotiation, and the other is through war. When he was confronted with a similar situation, he said:

“पुरतश्चतुरो वेदाः पृष्ठतः मशरं धनुः  
इदं द्रोणस्य सामर्थ्यं शापादपि शरादपि ।”

We can fight the Chinese by both means. If we say we are not going to accept the Colombo proposals this will mean our defeat in the diplomatic field. We should not be defeated. Let us take a consistent stand.

Somebody said we had been defeated. No, we are not defeated. The

[Shri A. N. Vidaylankar]

Chinese struck us and ran away. This was not fight. Had the Chinese stayed there, they would have received crushing blows. They did not stay to receive the blows. It was not a war, and I am quite sure that if the Chinese had advanced further, they would have received a mortal blow.

There is no frustration or defeatism in our mind, but some of the Opposition Members have created the impression on our minds that they are suffering from a sense of defeat, defeatism and fear complex. We should consider these proposals with a sense of power, not with a sense of fear or defeat.

We should accept the proposals. I know the Chinese are not going to accept them. If they do not, our position will be vindicated, our position would become strong before the world, and we would be able to show to the world that we are consistent in our stand. We stand for humanity,

for human values. We cannot give them up. That is why we are fighting China, and therefore, in order to preserve those values we should accept peace, but peace with honour, and we should be prepared for war when we see that our honour cannot be vindicated or protected without war.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does the House want to sit further?

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** No. We are all tired. There are only 48 Members. There is no quorum also.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Prime Minister will reply tomorrow. The House now stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

12.30 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday the 25th January, 1963 | Magha 5, 1884 (Saka).*