

year. Only 31 crimes have been reported as against 43 of last year. Similarly, there are only 482 cases of theft as against 5993 of last year and 989 cases of burglary as against 1429 cases in 1958. Of the 17 cases of stabbing reported in recent weeks, arrests have already been made in 13 cases. Along with the progressive increase in the number of police stations and police posts, three flying squads have been established for rendering prompt police aid to those who may be in need of it. Certain other types of squads such as the missing persons' squad, explosive squad, Narcotics Squad, Anti-smuggling Squad and Anti-cheating Squad had been organised to deal with crimes requiring specialised investigation. These measures have greatly improved reporting facilities. In spite of these the crime figures have shown a decline.

The police have taken energetic action to curb the activities of anti-social elements and have intensified their campaign against bad characters. They are continuing to take all possible measures to reduce crime to the extent possible.

12.16½ hrs.

DELHI LAND HOLDINGS (CEILING) BILL*

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the imposition of a ceiling on land holdings in the Union Territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the imposition of a ceiling on land holdings in the Union territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

12.17 hrs.

MOTION RE: INDIA-CHINA RELATIONS

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959 and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in September last, about 2½ months ago this House debated this question of Sino-Indian relations, more especially in regard to our border and the developments which have taken place there. We went into, at that time, some past history and the House was concerned about the various developments. Since then, other events have taken place and other developments also and I have placed on the Table of the House various papers, correspondence, etc. which had occurred since our last debate.

The House knows the background of all that has happened and I do not propose to go into that except perhaps to fill in some details here and there because it is important that this House and Parliament should have every aspect of the question before it. A great responsibility rests on us in Government but that responsibility can only be discharged if the House itself shoulders it in a very large measure, as representing the country. Therefore, it is my intention to keep the House informed of every development in this situation and take counsel with Members as to what policy we should adopt.

For the present, we have specially to deal with certain recent developments, the proposals made by Premier

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Chou En-Lai and my reply to Premier Chou En-Lai containing certain other and alternative proposals, and the House will no doubt consider them and express its views in regard to them. But behind those proposals lie certain basic approaches and basic principles; because we cannot act merely in a haphazard or spasmodic way reacting to events that happen. Naturally we have to react to them but that reaction has to be conditioned and controlled by the basic policies that we pursue and the objectives that we have. If we forget it or if we have no anchorage in basic policies and objectives, then our reactions sometimes may take us in the wrong direction or lead us in a direction not of our choice. Therefore, I think it is important that these basic policies should be kept in mind.

Naturally, even basic policies have to be implemented in the light of conditions that arise; and in this changing world and changing situations we cannot ignore what happens, but we have to measure what happens and respond to it in the light of any basic policy that we might have. Therefore, I should like this House to consider in all earnestness those basic policies which have governed us and which, I hope and trust, will govern us in the near future.

If there is a vital difference in regard to those basic policies, then of course, the steps we may think of taking may be different and may vary. It is necessary that that should be done more particularly now and not merely taken for granted. We have accepted certain basic policies in the past and the Government, under the directions of this Parliament, has functioned in accordance with those basic policies. In the old days, perhaps, as I said, they were taken for granted and not put to the test of experience and danger. They are being put to the test now and it is necessary, therefore, that we should not merely take them for granted but ac-

cept them or reject them as this House chooses. There should be no half-way house about our thinking when matters of such importance are at issue.

We are faced with grave problems. I do not mean to say that there is some immediate danger of any magnitude, but the gravity of the problems lies certainly in the present but even more so in the future, and any step that we might take will therefore be pregnant with future possibilities. It is a problem obviously of a much greater, much wider significance than what might be called party problem. It transcends all party issues; it comprises the whole country and, if I may say so, to some extent, it comprises the issues beyond our country, that is, the issues of war and peace in the world.

Now, it is a tremendous responsibility for any individual or group like our Government to have to shoulder and face these questions and decide wisely and firmly about that policy and about the steps we should take. No individual and, if I may say so, no Government even is good enough by itself to shoulder this grave responsibility, because the consequences that flow from it do not flow to the Government only; they flow to the country and to some extent to the world. Therefore, I would beg this House to shoulder that responsibility and tell us what we should do about it. If we can do it, carry out its directions, well and good for us. If we cannot, then, let others carry those directions out. But let the directions be clear. We cannot deal with these matters in a half-hearted way, in a destructive way, in a party way, because, as I said, the issues before us are grave and vital, and every step that we may take, by that, we sow certain seeds for the future which may bear good fruit or ill fruit.

It is in this mood and with this feeling of a certain humility before these grave issues which affect the

future of our country that I approach this hon. House and seek its indulgence if I say what I feel about these matters frankly because frankness is desirable.

Now, I shall discuss in the course of my speech the particular matters which are before us, but as I have referred to the basic issues, I shall begin by saying something about them. We have stood for a policy of peace, for a policy of friendship with all nations even though we differ from them, for a policy of non-alignment with power blocs and avoidance of military pacts and the like. It is not for us to judge what others do about it. Circumstances may be different or difficult for them. The other countries have to judge about their policies and their alliances as they think best. Certainly I do not feel myself competent to criticise them or to offer them advice, but certainly I feel that so far as our country is concerned, it is we who should judge, and we have followed this policy.

Now, recently a cry has arisen in this country from some sources, some people, criticising and condemning that policy of non-alignment, that policy which has been sometimes referred to as one of *Panchsheel* or five principles and the like. It has been said that that has collapsed because of what has happened *vis a vis* China. Some people have even allowed themselves the pleasure of being humorous about it. It was not particularly happy being satirical or humorous on issues of this character.

As I said, this policy has been our consistent policy for the last ten years and indeed, even before; when the words *Panchsheel* came into use they just described the policy that we were pursuing. Some years ago, other great countries in the world also spoke rather lightly and casually about our policy, imagining or thinking that it was a policy of weakness, of sitting on the fence and the like. But as the years have gone by, wisdom has come to other countries, not to all, but to

many and the biggest of them, and today it is one of the bright features of the developments that take place before us that basically, that very policy has not only been appreciated in so far as India is concerned but is colouring and conditioning the activities of great nations. Let us not forget that, it is an important fact. That policy was against cold war and the like, because cold war necessarily leads in the direction of hot war and people came to realise that war of that type in the present age was a disaster, which could not be even imagined and therefore, steps must be taken to avoid it. Fear, apprehension and suspicions came in the way, but ultimately an effort is being made, which has met with some success already and which holds promise of greater success in the future, that we must put an end to this cold war and we must come to some kind of settlement, which removes these fears and suspicions.

There are innumerable hurdles and difficulties in the way, but I think we would be justified in a measure of optimism when the greatest nations of the world today, greatest nations not only in peace but in war, are thinking on these lines and are trying to come together, and I should like this House, even though we are entangled in our own problems and difficulties, to send its good wishes to the efforts of the great leaders of these nations who are working for peace.

During the last few years, we find the world has been on the brink of danger most of the time, because cold war is the brink of danger. On two or three occasions, it came very near toppling over the brink. There were talks of brinkmanship too as a policy. But the world as a whole has moved away somewhat from that dangerous edge of a precipice, but it is a strange turn of fate or circumstance that we in India, who stood for this policy of peace and worked for it with all our might, should suddenly be drawn into this dangerous situation which we face

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

today. I am not for the moment saying whose fault it is. If hon. Members or any Member wants to say that we are partly at fault, it may be, although I firmly believe that right policy is right and rightness should not be judged by the wrongness of other people's actions and that right conduct inevitably has right results. If you like, you may call me an idealist, but I have been conditioned to believe in that throughout my life and I am not going to change at the age of seventy years. It is true that some hon. Members may smile at this and may think it a sign, perhaps, of senility in me. Whatever it may be, the fact is that by a strange turn of fortune's wheel, fate or circumstance, we, who stood for peace, are faced by the possibility even of war.

I do not think war will come. I am merely talking about possibilities. I do not think that the world or any country is foolish enough to jump over the precipice into war. But I say that these possibilities come into our minds and that is certainly strange. Those people who may imagine that this is due to our policy of Panchsheel or non-alignment seem to me to think in a somewhat distorted and upside-down way. I really do not understand that. I would say that any other policy will have brought infinitely greater dangers and brought them sooner and brought them when we would not have had the prestige we undoubtedly possess in the world today because of our policies and the wide friendship that we possess in the world today.

Some hon. Members sometimes talk of our not having any friends. Apparently their idea of friendship is some kind of iron chain that binds in a military alliance. That is their idea of friendship. It is feeble; that iron chain breaks often enough. It is not a chain of friendship, but a chain of compulsion of events. We do not want such chains to bind us. But we have the friendship of great nations

and small nations with whom we do not agree in many matters and yet we are friendly.

When people talk lightly, casually and scornfully of Panchsheel, I should like them to tell which of those five principles they disapprove of, which of them they think is bad and which of them they think should not be acted upon. I should like them to tell me that, because nobody has yet told me that. I say those five principles are right principles, inevitable principles, for right-thinking people, right-thinking individual, or right-thinking world. If you move away from them, you move into a world of conflict and a world of conflict today is a world of doom. Therefore, I should like that to be considered. Let it not be said merely that this is silly. That is not good enough. We are dealing with various matters in a serious way and it is just not good enough—not that I mind it—for some kind of party advantage to be taken, because the country faces a grievous situation.

I have mentioned all this because I want this basic issue to be considered by this House in this debate and for a firm and clear opinion to be given on that issue, which will govern the activities of this Government. Naturally we have to act according to the directions of Parliament, which means according to the wishes of our country and countrymen, who are represented in Parliament. On this matter there should be no quibbling, no doubt. A straightforward direction must be given that this is the basic policy that the country must follow. In a matter of this kind, I repeat again, whatever one's internal difficulties might be, whatever the internal controversies might be, which influence the action of parties, normally a country does not function in a party way when such problems are raised and the Parliament of that country decides something.

So, we have this curious situation that when in the western world, which

means a large part of the world, there is a sort of improvement in their relations,—although there are doubts, still, but nevertheless there is a basic, definite, deliberate and earnest desire to improve them—we have to face this situation. In a sense the danger zone shifts from other countries to our own borders.

I should like to add a little to the information I gave previously filling some gaps as to how this border situation arose. There is nothing new in what I am going to say. Nevertheless, I think hon. Members should know it. The Government of India recognized the Central People's Government of China in December, 1949. Eight months later, the latter, i.e. the Chinese Government, expressed their gratification over the Government of India's desire "to stabilise the Chinese-Indian border" and the Govt. of India replied that "the recognised boundary between India and Tibet should remain inviolate". Then, some time later, in an informal conversation with the Indian Ambassador, on the 27th September, 1951, Premier Chou En-lai expressed his anxiety to safeguard in every way Indian interests in Tibet on which matter "there was no territorial dispute or controversy between India and China".

He added:

"The question of stabilisation of the Tibetan frontier was a matter of common interest to India, Nepal and China and could best be done by discussions between the three countries."

I am quoting still:

"Since the Chinese army entered Lhasa" (i.e. in 1951) "in pursuance of the Sino-Indian agreement of 1951 to take up frontier posts, it was necessary to settle the matter as early as possible."

Now, this was in September 1951. On October 4th, 1951, the Indian

Ambassador in Peking, under instructions from the Government of India, informed the Chinese Premier, that the Government of India would welcome negotiations on the subjects mentioned by Premier Chou En-lai. This was previous to the agreement, which came later, about Tibet. In February 1952 the Indian Ambassador gave a statement of the existing Indian rights in Tibet and reiterated India's willingness to arrive at a mutually satisfactory settlement. Premier Chou En-lai replied that there was "no difficulty in safeguarding the economic and cultural interests of India in Tibet". He did not refer to the frontier question in his reply; nor did the Indian Ambassador raise this question specifically then. It was our belief that since our frontier was clear, there was no question of raising this issue by us.

When discussions took place for the Sino-India agreement on Tibet, seven subjects were dealt with—our mission at Lhasa, trade agencies at Gyantse and Yatung, a trade agency at Gartok, the right to carry on trade other than trade marks, postal and telegraphic installations, military escorts to Gyantse and the right of pilgrimage. These were indicated to the Chinese Government as subjects for negotiation and ultimately an agreement was arrived at in regard to these matters. Our clear impression was that we had settled all matters relating to Tibet and India and that no frontier issue remained except some minor ones. The question of the frontier did not arise at all at any other time, except later in relation to some maps published in China to which we took exception. The reply of the Chinese Government to us was that those were old maps and their revision would be taken up later when they had leisure to do so. This objection was raised by us several times and the reply also was the same every time.

In March last, that is, this year, there was the Tibet revolution. In fact, there had been uprising in the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

eastern part of Tibet for several years previously. In March this revolt took place in Lhasa and spread. This resulted in large numbers of refugees coming to India and the Chinese forces pursuing them, or trying to cut them off, and they also reached our eastern frontier, that is, what is called the McMahon line. Later they spread out to some other frontiers on the west. The story of subsequent events is clearly stated in the correspondence in the White Paper.

It was for the first time on the 8th September 1959, that is, about 2½ months ago, that Premier Chou En-lai, in a letter addressed to me, claimed the areas in India which had been included in the Chinese maps. Up till now there had only been this reference to maps and their telling us that they would be revised, in what manner of course, they did not say. But, for the first time, in this letter in September last, Premier Chou En-lai made the claim on the basis of those maps, though he did certainly express his willingness to discuss the boundary disputes with us, presumably such disputes being of a minor character.

Now, in this brief account, I have left out Aksai Chin developments. I shall now say something about them. In September 1957 we learnt of an announcement by the Chinese Government that a road had been made from Yencheng to Gartok in Tibet and that this would be open to traffic in October. As there were two alternative routes from Sinkiang to Western Tibet, we enquired from our Embassy as to where this road was. They could not send any precise information, but they sent us a copy of the announcement which had been published in the *People's Daily* of Peking which also contained a sketch on a very rough and small scale. In view of this uncertainty about the exact alignment, it was decided that before we send the protest to the Chinese authorities, we should have more reliable information about the alignment of the

road. Two reconnaissance parties were sent to the areas in the summer of 1958, an army party towards the north and a police party towards the southern extremity of this road. It took some time for the police party to return as the journey was a long and arduous one. The army party did not return, and it was suspected by us that they might have been arrested by the Chinese authorities. In fact, they had been arrested and they were released somewhat later. From the police party we learnt that there was a part of this road in Indian territory. This was a year ago, round about the end of September of last year when we knew with some definiteness that there was this road which had crossed our territory in Aksai Chin. On the 18th October, 1958 a little more than a year ago, we sent a formal protest note to the Chinese Government regarding this road and repeating that the road passed through Indian territory and asking for an early reply. No reply was received then or later to this note of ours. On the 14th December, 1958, I wrote a long letter to Premier Chou En-lai about the incorrect delineation of the Sino-Indian boundary in Chinese maps and the circulation of those maps. There was no specific mention in this letter of Aksai Chin as this matter had been referred to in the earlier letter. Premier Chou En-lai replied to this letter on the 23rd January 1959. These letters are given in the White Paper. I then sent another letter on the 22nd of March 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai. This letter dealt in detail with the boundary in all sectors, including Ladakh. This brings us to March of this year when we were trying diplomatically, through correspondence with the Chinese Government, for a settlement over this issue.

It has been stated—and the charge may be justified—that we failed in informing Parliament of this. As the House will appreciate, the matter came precisely to our knowledge in October, that is, a year ago. And we took

immediate steps to enquire from the Chinese Government and we were corresponding with them for the next three or four months.

We felt, rightly or wrongly, that we should clear this up with them and then place the matter before the House. Now, in about the middle of March something else happened. The Tibetan Rebellion took place and a large number of other issues, border issues and other issues, arose, with which we have dealt in all this correspondence. That is in so far as this Aksai Chin matter or road is concerned.

Another complaint has been made that we were not swift or quick enough to inform the country or this House—the House was not sitting—about the recent incident in Ladakh. That, I think, is based on a complete misapprehension. The incident took place on the 21st October. We gave the information to the Press etc. on the 23rd October, that is, two days later. We heard of it for the first time on the 22nd October evening or late afternoon. It so happened that I was in Calcutta then. So was our Foreign Secretary. We heard or we were told that a brief message had come, that there had been this conflict and that some of our persons had died. Further particulars did not come by then. We got it there. We returned early next morning. We got some other messages and we gave the matter about midday, maybe in the afternoon, of that day to the Press. There was absolutely no delay there.

People complained as to how did the Chinese send a protest note to us a little before, a few hours before. The reason is fairly obvious, namely, that our party had to return from the scene of accident or incident to its own base and then send the message while the Chinese got the message from their outpost or check-post, or whatever it was, there. So this involved a few hours' delay, nothing great. The message came to us via Srinagar. So there was absolutely no delay in that.

In dealing with these matters, I do not know how far the hon. Members have felt this, but it is important that we should realise an inherent difficulty in dealings between India and China. Maybe, to some extent that difficulty arises in dealings between any two countries, more particularly when they are rather unlike each other. All of us are apt to think or look at the world or look at any problem, naturally, from our point of view. The other person looks at it from his. Even geography becomes different, whether you are at the North Pole or at the Equator looking at the world. But that, to some extent, has to be faced. But in regard to China, I feel that we have to deal with, what might be called, a one-track mind, very much so. We all have to some extent one-track minds, of course, although I believe that we in India perhaps suffer from it a little less than other countries—not all of us anyhow. I was not excluding the Opposition from my remarks, although sometimes I begin to doubt whether they do not have one-track minds. However, it seemed to me in discussing these matters that one comes up against this wall of a one-track mind apart from other things. What is more,—I am not saying this as criticism but as some kind of appraisal, right or wrong—this is all a national trait which has existed for considerable time past because China was a great, advanced and powerful country at various stages of history. It spread—and, of course, it spread by the normal Imperialist methods—by war and conquest and built up a great empire repeatedly.

Anyhow, from fairly early in history they had a sensation of greatness of the Middle Kingdom as they called themselves, all the fringes belonging to lesser developed countries and human beings who paid tribute to them. It seemed natural to them that other countries should pay tribute to them. Then I think—I forget the exact date, but long ago—about 150 years ago or thereabout when

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the British came, they sent an ambassador or an envoy with some gifts to them. The reply of the then Chinese Emperor makes interesting reading. He addresses them. He thanks them for their loyalty and subservience to him and he appreciates their gifts as from some country of which, in a sense, they were suzerain powers almost. Their thinking was that the rest of the world occupies a lower grade. Whenever any gifts were sent,—even in Tibetan history you come across cases where these gifts were sent—they always treated that as if it became a sign of their sovereignty and suzerainty. That was 200 or 300 years ago.

Now that has made it difficult for us to understand the working of their minds, and, what is more to the point, for them to understand the working of our minds. It has been very difficult for me to explain to them that in this country our structure of Government is, what we consider, democratic, there are civil liberties and that civil liberties include the civil liberty or the right to misbehave, the right even to say highly objectionable things—that is part of civil liberty—that there are parties here which function in their own way, rightly or wrongly, and that Government here cannot control them and cannot inhibit these activities unless they go beyond the pale of the law. They (the Chinese Government) cannot understand it.

Now take an incident that happened some months back—an incident when Chairman Mao Tse-tung's picture was set up and insulted and some tomatoes were thrown for about half a minute or for a minute when the Police intervened. Now this incident created a depth of anger in China, which it is difficult for the people to understand because Chairman Mao was symbol to them. The picture did not count. The symbols are more to them than even to us although we believe more in symbols. It was a symbol to them of every-

thing and that anybody should insult Chairman Mao's picture made them livid with rage.

Now I want the House to realise what effect some things that we say or do unthinkingly or casually have. Therefore I have been venturing to say that in these matters we should weigh the words we use, the language we use as well as the actions we take. I am not talking of China only now but of any country. It is a wrong and dangerous thing to deal with individuals there. What I mean to say is that to condemn individuals and Government, more especially to condemn heads of governments, heads of States, because they are symbols, is bad because you create an unnecessary passion on the other side, which comes in the way of calm consideration of any matter, just as, you can well imagine the strength of feeling in India if in some country insults were hurled at our revered President. We would resent it, because he is the symbol of the dignity of our State. Therefore, we should avoid this. But this basic fact remains. I only mention this to help us to understand the situation. It does not solve it, of course.

13 hrs.

We now face a situation which is partly a political situation, but partly also a military one; not military in the sense of war coming, but military in the sense that we have to take military steps to meet it and be prepared for all contingencies; in that sense it is a military situation. Now, obviously, this House will not expect me to tell it what arrangements, military and defence arrangements, we are making. That kind of thing is not publicized. But I can tell this House that at no time since our independence, and of course before it, were our defence forces in better condition, in finer fettle and with the background of far greater industrial production in the country to help them than today. I am not boasting about them or comparing them to

other countries, but I am quite confident that our defence forces are well capable of looking after our security.

It is easy to say, but does the House realize that we have 9,000 miles of frontier? It is a pretty big link—not the frontier with China; that is 2,600 miles, a little over 2,600 miles—but all the various frontiers that we have running to 9,000 miles. Some people seem to imagine that our forces should stand at guard along all our frontiers, nine thousand miles.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Not all; nobody says that. Only where they are threatened.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Quite so, quite so; I accept the amendment. So they rush to guard that place; then the other party goes to some other place; then we rush to that place; our time is spent in rushing to all manner of places at the bidding and command of others! Any person with the least acquaintance with military matters, of war and other things, would not make such a suggestion, I can assure this House. It has no meaning, running about like this, dispersing your forces over wide areas and getting entangled here and there and reducing your capacity to hit out wherever you want to. The main thing is to hit out when you want to, not to stand in a row like in the streets of Delhi when some procession goes by.

Shri Nath Pai: The best thing is not to guard anywhere so that we can concentrate!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is a matter in which I cannot express an opinion, because I do not consider myself an expert in it. I have to take the advice of the experts who advise me or our Government; naturally, discussing it with them, naturally, putting one's own view-point, but in the final analysis accepting their advice as to how to use the resources at our disposal? Obviously, the resources are not infinite, are not just that you can draw upon them;

there is a certain limitation upon those resources; and we have to use them to the best advantage.

But, apart from these border conflicts, the real strength of an army or defence forces, it is well known, is the industrial background of the country. If you think in terms of war, it is the industrial background that counts. If the last Great War, the Second World War, was won by a certain group of nations, of course many factors counted, but it was the enormous industrial productive capacity that counted most. If some powers today, like the United States or the Soviet Union, are very great powers, super powers, it is because of the industrial and scientific progress that they have made. It is obvious: their scientific and industrial progress have made them such tremendous powers. We have a greater population than either of them. Population does not make it, or merely giving a rifle to every individual. It may help in some matters.

And, therefore, the whole question of defence has to be considered in all these various aspects, and among them the basic aspect is the growth of industry, industrialisation; and, industrialisation not meaning merely some kind of defence industries—that is important, of course—but you have to create a background to industrialisation all over the place, and more particularly in matters relating to industry; but you cannot separate these things.

In the past we have discussed our defence estimates here, and this House has seldom wanted them to be lowered much. Sometimes some criticism has come. At the same time we have resisted—I want to be quite frank with you—we have resisted the normal tendency of our defence apparatus to spend more and more. In every country there is that tendency. We have resisted it. Last year we reduced our estimates, not because we wanted our defence to be weak, but because we knew that the strength of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

defence is the development, the Five Year Plan, and this and that. That is the real strength of the defence. It is true that when we are certainly faced with a dangerous position, well, you have to make the best of it with whatever you have. But if you are always making the best of it at the moment, that means that you are never preparing for the morrow with greater strength.

Coming to these letters, Premier Chou En-lai's letter to me and my reply to him they are both before the House and hon. Members must have read both of them. It is not my purpose to go into details, and I should not. But I do feel that the approach that we have made in our letter to Premier Chou En-lai is a fair and a reasonable one. It is an honourable one. It is an honourable one certainly for our country, and I would repeat that it is an honourable one for China too. Because, unless you are bent on war and you merely want drum-beating all the time and strong language—well, that is a different matter. I regret to say that I do not agree with that, and I think it is a wrong policy and a dangerous policy. War is a dangerous policy. But if war is thrust upon one, one has to defend it. If war is thrust upon us, we shall fight, and fight with all our strength. That is a different matter. But I shall avoid war, try to prevent it with every means in our power, because it is a bad thing, it is a dangerous thing. Shri Masani smiles, because he evidently thinks differently; he likes war, or he may think that some of his friends from other countries will come and help if there is war here. If that is the view of any person that we should become just a weak nation, shouting loudly and expecting others to come to our defence. I hope India will never degrade herself in this way.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi—East): Will the Prime Minister not jump to conclusions on no basis at all? Hon. Members have every right to smile at a foolish argument.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am a reader sometimes—not always—of Shri M. R. Masani's speeches. I came to that conclusion from the broad outlook that he possesses.

You have to be logical. Either you have to have a bellicose, warlike mentality, a sort of what is normally associated, let us say, with Hitler or Nazism. Then you definitely work for war. Of course, Hitler had the strength to do so although he was defeated ultimately. I find here people exhibiting a strange situation: not having the strength and yet talking like Hitlers. It was a most amazing phenomenon. It was bad enough for Hitler who had the strength to do so. Without strength, for a person to talk like Hitler seems quite extraordinary. However, my point was, if you do not aim at war, you have to face a dangerous situation from what you do.

Naturally, inevitably, you take every step to protect your country, because, war does not come or come because of your wishes. Only you may help or prevent the process. It is the other party that may bring it about in spite of you. Therefore, you have to keep that in mind and therefore you have to prepare for it to the best of your ability. That is admitted. If it comes, you have to fight to the best of your ability. Nevertheless, you have to work for avoiding it. If you are working for avoiding it, the preliminary steps that you take should also keep that in view. Because, if you talk in too loud a voice about these matters, if you go on denouncing everybody, if you create an atmosphere which must inevitably lead to warlike thinking, exciting people in your own country and irritating beyond measure people in the other country, whether you want or not, you are taking that country step by step to that position. That is inevitable.

I do not myself see why the strength of a country should be asso-

ciated with the beating of drums. I have heard of this being done in the old days. Nowadays, strength is represented not by drum-beating or slogans, but by whatever it is, your army, your industrial apparatus or morale—all these things. Build them up certainly and stand firmly before any intruder. I can understand that. But, keep the facts of life in view. Do not ignore life as it is, the world as it is, everything as it is.

I can recognise one thing. There are some things which no nation can tolerate. Any attack on its honour, on its integrity, on the integrity of its territory, no nation tolerates, and it takes risks, grave risks even, to protect all that. Because, you cannot barter these things, your self-respect and honour. One has to stand for them, whatever the consequences. That is all right. But, in standing for them, if one takes some action which puts the same dilemma before the other country and the other country thinks that its honour is being attacked and its self-respect brought down, you shut all the doors to any kind of approach or talk. I should like the House to appreciate this distinction. Firmness and building up of strength is obviously necessary and right and inevitable when we have to face a crisis of this kind. But, firmness and building up of strength does not mean doing so in a manner which may worsen a situation and which may shut all possible doors to a peaceful settlement. I think, whatever the circumstances, whatever the conditions that might arise, always there should be an attempt at a peaceful settlement, provided always again that we are not going to barter our honour, our self-respect, our territory. That proviso always remains. Otherwise, we are talking childishly—I hope you will forgive me for using this word—in this world, talking without understanding the consequences of our words or what action we are apparently suggesting. It becomes then something, the defence of the country

being put on the level of, let us say, a demonstration in Delhi city. Defence of a country is something different: not a speech in the Ramlila ground or drum-beating somewhere or slogans somewhere. It is far too serious a matter to be treated in this casual way.

So, I have endeavoured in my reply to Premier Chou Er-lai, in all my letters that I have sent to him, to state our case with as much clarity as I could command, but always with politeness, always with a view that I might help in solving this problem however difficult it might be. If it is beyond solution, we face that. But, we shall always go on trying to solve it.

Some people come to me and say, "Why don't you eject everybody from Indian territory?" Occasions may arise in war when one tries to do so. But, one does not do so except in war. If it is war, then, of course, one tries it. In peace, one tries other means. Otherwise, it is war. People seem to think that we need not go to war, but we may have some kind of petty campaigns here and there. I do confess that this is beyond my understanding.

Shri Nath Pai: But, if the other fellow does not go about peacefully?

An Hon. Member: It is all peace so far.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): On a point of order, Sir, if you had said only of world federation, world government, world army and world court, there would have been no talks about these things.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are one or two matters that I should like to mention specially. One is the treatment of people of Kashmiri or, more particularly, Ladakhi origin in Tibet by the Chinese authorities. This has been very harsh and unreasonable. Our trade representatives in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Gyantse and Yatung, etc. also have had any amount of pin-pricks and difficulties from day to day. It is interesting to contrast this with the Chinese claim to the Indonesian Government for the treatment of people of Chinese origin in Indonesia, because there is a very great difference between that and the treatment they are giving to these people of Kashmiri or Ladakhi origin.

Also we have been much disturbed by the treatment received by these prisoners taken by the Chinese in the Ladakh incident. According to the accounts that we have received, it is bad treatment. Some of these people have got frost-bitten toes and all that, chiefly because of that. Also, it appears from these reports, and indeed from the whole account given to us even by the Chinese Government that these people were subjected to repeated and constant interrogation. Now, there are rules and conventions about these matters. Of course, there are no special rules relating to people captured in this way. The rules and conventions apply to prisoners of war. We are not at war with China, but I take it that it is in our favour. My colleague, the Defence Minister, tells me that they apply in civil commotion also. My point was...

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur): But have the Chinese signed that convention, because, according to us, they do not observe them?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was telling the House that the conventions and rules of war lay down certain ways of treating prisoners. They lay down specifically that prisoners should only be asked their names, parentage, association or the unit to which they belong, some specific details about themselves, not about any other question. They should not be interrogated

in this way. I merely wish to bring this to the notice of the House. I do not know, but I suppose they have not signed that convention very probably, but these people were treated badly.

Now, there is one thing. I was talking about one-track mind and the like, and I was not understanding the Chinese attitude and they are not understanding ours. But it often happens. But there is one aspect of the question which I wish the Chinese Government and indeed other countries might try to understand. Any border trouble, any border dispute raises passions in any country. It is so everywhere. But there is a peculiar feature of this particular matter to us, because it deals with the Himalayas. Now, the Himalayas are high mountains, of course, but they are something much more to us, and more intimately tied up with India's history, tradition, faith, religion, beliefs, literature, and culture, than, to my knowledge, any other mountain anywhere, whatever the other mountains may be. The Himalayas are something much more than mountains to us; they are part of ourselves. And I want the other people to realise how intimately this question affects our innermost being, quite apart even from a pure question of border.

Now, I do not wish to deal further with it, but I see that some amendments are proposed to be moved. I should hope that after listening to me, hon. Members who want to move amendments might see the path of wisdom and not move them, (interruptions) because apart from other odd amendments, there is one coming from a motley group with motley ideas....

Shri Asoka Mehta: Not as far as national defence is concerned. There is nothing motley in it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In national defence, Shri Asoka Mehta does not obviously stand on a separate footing outside India, as if nobody else wants national defence. It is a most amazing attitude to take up for any Member, that they stand for national defence and others do not. I hope Shri Asoka Mehta....

Shri M. E. Masani: It is not your monopoly either.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: will learn better about national defence. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Asoka Mehta: We may differ in internal problems, not in this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If Shri Asoka Mehta will interrupt me, I shall answer his interruption.

I say that these amendments of that motley group, socialist, anti-socialist, Jan Sangh, this, that and the other coming together, all for national self-defence.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): What is wrong about it? There is nothing wrong about it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is nothing wrong, there is absolutely nothing wrong except that I say that the amendment has not a single constructive proposal. They just want to take party advantage of a national situation. (*Interruptions*).

Some Hon. Members: We have not done so.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I repeat that it is an amazing thing to me that this kind of exploitation by all the odd and sundry groups in this House meeting together.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nath Pai: It is most unfair on his part to accuse us of exploiting a national situation, when all that we say is that we stand behind him in the defence of the country. This is most unfair of him.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Sir, I rise to a point of order . . .

Shri Goray (Poona): We can say that they are exploiting the situation.

Some Hon. Members: No, you are exploiting the situation. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But that is exactly what they have been saying all the time.

Shri Nath Pai: Is it fair to smother all criticism by saying that we are exploiting a national situation?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not. I welcome criticism. (*Interruptions*). I do not give in.

Shri Mahanty: I rise to a point of order. My point of order in this.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): The Prime Minister has himself said that in this matter we should be united. Therefore, he should not get angry if certain parties are united.

Shri Nath Pai: I do not want to interrupt the Prime Minister, but let him be gallant enough and give in, because he has accused us. Let him be gallant and give in. We do not want to accuse him. You gave us the right. This is not China where the right of disagreement and criticism does not exist; that is a country with one-track mind. This is a free country, and we shall disagree and criticise. That does not mean exploiting the situation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I entirely agree with what Acharya Kripalani has said....

Shri Mahanty: On a point of order. My point of order is this, namely whether before an amendment is moved, when it is not the property of the House as yet, it is open to the Leader of the House....

Some Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Shri Mahanty: I am not going to be shouted down like this. Let not hon. Members shout me down. This is not a Congress Party meeting. This is the Parliament. (*Interruptions*). I have risen to a point of order, and you will give me the protection. Let it be remembered that this is not a Congress Party meeting. This is Parliament, where I have the inherent right to rise to a point of order. Let those gentlemen who want to shout me down hold their patience.

My point of order is this. Before an amendment is moved, it does not become the property of the House. Is it open to the Leader of the House to pass comments on it, to talk on it, and to attribute motives that we are trying to do something which is not in our minds? I take strong exception to this fact, and I want that you should give us a ruling on the matter whether it is open to the Leader of the House to comment on an amendment before it has been moved.

An Hon. Member: He should withdraw these remarks. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have heard the point of order. (*Interruptions*) I am afraid the hon. Member is going away from the point of order to point of disorder. Once he has raised the point of order, he must keep quiet, and he must allow me to give a ruling on the point of order. Instead of trying to interrupt me. I have heard the point of order.

There is nothing new that is being done in this House. We have circulated in the Order Paper all the amendments that have been tabled; it is not as if they have been moved now. But it is not as if any Member who moves a resolution or a motion to which a number of amendments have been tabled, ought not to refer to them and answer them in advance but wait until all those amendments are moved and then take a last chance only at the end. That is not the practice in the House. In some cases, a number

of amendments are also accepted. Even in the original speech, while moving the motion, the mover says, that he finds those amendments reasonable and he is going to accept them. Possibly, if the amendments are accepted, those exceptions may not be taken. If the amendments are accepted, Shri Mahanty himself would not raise this point. If the Prime Minister had said that he would accept the amendment, then, possibly, he would not raise this point. (*Interruptions*). Order, order. There cannot be one rule if the amendment is accepted, and another rule if the amendment is criticised. Therefore, it is open to the hon. Mover to refer to these amendments and say in advance that he does not accept these amendments, and that these amendments are not in our best interests and so on. The hon. Member will have his turn to reply, and then the hon. Minister will have another opportunity to reply to whatever is moved on the floor of the House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I continue?....

Shri Vajpayee: There is one more point of order. Is it open to the Prime Minister to attribute motives to the Members?

Mr. Speaker: No, there is no point of order.

Shri Vajpayee: He has attributed motives to the Members.

Mr. Speaker: He has not attributed motives. He says that it is not in the best interests of the country.

Shri Nath Pal: It was most unlike of him.

Mr. Speaker: Absolutely not. The hon. Member will have an opportunity later on. Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very sorry that any words of mine should have hurt any hon. Members. I really did not intend doing that. But what

I was venturing to point out was—and I entirely agree with what Acharya Kripalani has said—that these matters should not be discussed in anger or excitement. But when we deal with these matters, I think whatever I said—I am prepared to say, I should not have said—I was perfectly entitled to say; there was nothing wrong about it, because I was laying stress, if I may say so, on a constructive approach to this problem and not a merely destructive approach. We are facing grave issues, grave issues not for today only but for the tomorrows to come. And obviously, when we talk of defence and all that, the greatest defence is a united country. It is patent, and I am sure we have that united country.

But there is one matter I should like to refer to, while I am talking about unity. The other day there was a public demonstration in Calcutta which amazed me, and ashamed me. What am I to say to people who reject in effect the soil from which they spring, the nationality which they possess and which gives them protection? What am I to say to them? (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): If the Prime Minister is referring to the *Indian Express* version, I would respectfully tell him that it is an absolute untruth that has appeared there. He should see what has appeared in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, not a pro-Communist newspaper. I was there myself and I can tell you that the slogans raised were not the slogans that are given there.

Shrimati Ha Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip): I was there. I heard the slogans.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish to pursue this matter. I hope, at no time I have tried to suppress criticism. But there are certain limits in a national crisis, and—I am not for the moment referring to any

particular person or group; I am laying down a principle—when any person or group behaves in a national crisis anti-nationally, anti-patriotically, then the time comes to deal with that individual or group. I hope this will not happen. I am laying down a proposition.

I am grateful to you and to the House for listening to me with such goodwill all this time. I would again repeat that a tremendous responsibility rests on this House at the present moment, because it is this House which shall give the lead to the country, and the responsibility is not limited to some step that we might take today but to see the perspective of the future and how we are to deal with it, because, as I said, a step today may have good consequences or bad consequences.

Therefore, I hope that this House will consider this matter and discuss it, keeping this perspective in view and remembering the grave issues that are involved and remembering also what this country has stood for not only in the recent past but even in the distant past.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): On a point of information. The hon. Prime Minister has referred to certain correspondence between India and China regarding Tibet in 1949 and 1951 to give the background to the White Paper No. II and the further correspondence. May I point out to him that there are two letters written by India on the 26th and 31st October, 1950, to the Chinese Government relating to Tibet? May we know why the Government of India climbed down from the position taken up in those two letters to China? My reference is to *Keesing's Contemporary Archives*.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member is talking about. There is no climb-down anywhere.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister will wait until it is elaborated.

Shri Nath Pal: The Prime Minister himself asked:

"Whom are they liberating in Tibet, and from whom?"

These are his own words.

Mr. Speaker: Let us wait. The hon. Prime Minister will reply to it at the end after Members have spoken.

Motion moved:

"That the Write Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959, be taken into consideration".

Now, I shall take up amendments to the motion.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 strongly condemns the Chinese aggression and occupation of our territories, and is of opinion,—

- (a) that Government has been taking a complacent view of the Chinese aggression; and
- (b) that strong and effective measures should be taken by Government to have the Chinese occupation of our territories vacated and to ensure that our frontiers are properly protected." (1)

Shri Naldurgkar (Osmanabad) beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 agree with the policy of the Government in respect of all frontier matters and endorses the firm stand taken by them to safeguard India's sovereignty and territorial integrity and appreciates the exemplary restraint and attitude to solve, by negotiation wherever necessary, all matters and problems connected with India-China border." (2)

I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 agrees with the policy of the Government in respect of all frontier problems and endorses the firm stand taken by the Government to safeguard India's sovereignty and territorial integrity and fully appreciates the exemplary restraint and attitude to solve, by negotiations, wherever necessary, all matters and problems connected with India-China border and relations and concurs with the view and

policy enunciated by the Government in Prime Minister's letter dated the 16th November, 1959 addressed to Chou En-Lai, the Prime Minister of China."

(6).

Acharya Kripalani: I beg to move:

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

This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 regrets the failure of the Government to secure India's frontiers and to safeguard her territorial integrity. In particular, the House regrets—

- (a) the suppression over a period of years from Parliament and the people of the fact of Chinese aggression,
- (b) the absence of measures to ensure the defence of the Himalayan frontiers such as suitable deployment of troops, adequate equipment of our forces, and the construction of necessary roads and air-fields,
- (c) the fact that the latest letter of the Prime Minister to the Chinese Premier does not maintain the stand that negotiations between the two countries can take place only on the basis of prior acceptance by China of our frontiers and the immediate vacating of territories forcibly and wrongfully occupied by them,

- (b) the fact that in their eagerness for a negotiated settlement Government have suggested that India would

withdraw from what has always been India territory, in return for the Chinese withdrawing from areas which also are ours, and

- (e) that the Government have announced no clear plans to make the Chinese vacate Indian territories within a reasonable period." (7)

Shri Kaaliwal (Kota): I beg to move:

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

This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and the recent developments on the frontier, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 approves of and endorses the policy of the Government in this regard." (8)

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: I beg to move:

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

This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and the recent developments on the frontier, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 approves of and endorses the policy of the Government in this regard, and is further of the opinion that,—

- (a) in order to enable the people of the country to learn, the use of arms, rifle clubs should be opened in every city, and in the border areas of India

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri]

and all able-bodied persons between the ages of 20 to 40 should be asked to join these clubs;

(b) military training should be immediately introduced in schools and colleges as a compulsory subject from 8th class onwards;

(c) joining of Territorial Army should be made compulsory for all persons between the ages of 20 and 40 years." (9)

Shrimati Benuka Ray (Malda): I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and the subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 endorses the latest terms for agreement as suggested by our Prime Minister in his letter of November 16, to the Prime Minister of China." (10)

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 regrets the failure of the Gov-

ernment to secure India's frontiers and to safeguard the territorial integrity, in particular for not having demanded the independence of Tibet from China and appealed to the Chinese people to agree to the independent status of Tibet and in the alternative to demand Tsangpo (Brahmaputra) River as the natural frontier between India and China so as to closely integrate Kailash and Mansarovar with us." (11)

Dr. Samantsinhar (Bhubaneswar): I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 strongly condemns the Chinese aggression and forcible occupation of our territories and while approving the measures taken by the Government in this regard, appeals to our countrymen to stand united in a disciplined manner behind the Government in their action to safeguard the territorial integrity of our dear motherland." (12)

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between

the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 is of the opinion that stern action should be taken by Government of India to remove the Chinese aggressors from Indian soil and to recover the occupied territory; and that on no account should India withdraw from her own territory.' (14)

Shri U. L. Patil (Dhulia): I beg to move:

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

This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 regrets the lack of realism and boldness betrayed by Government in its dealings with Communist China, and the Indian Government's consequential failure to safeguard the country's territorial integrity. It is particularly regretful that even after the earlier incursions made by the Chinese, the Government should have failed to take effective steps to protect the Ladakh area thus resulting in a fresh Chinese thrust causing the death of nine Indian police men.

The House feels it essential to emphasise that any action that may tend to compromise with China's blatant aggression on Indian territory, apart from being derogatory to India's dignity and self-respect would only whet China's expansionist appetite and thus defeat the very objective of mutual peace and goodwill that India's China policy aims at.

This House, therefore, suggests that, *inter alia*, the following steps should be taken to meet the situation:—

- (a) China should be asked to vacate the occupied areas by a particular date-line and in case of its failure to do so, the Government should resort to all means necessary to compel them to quit Indian territory;
- (b) early steps should be taken to strengthen India's defence and security arrangements, and, as an immediate measure to reassure the nation in respect of the Government's determination to face the situation adequately, the Defence portfolio should be transferred forthwith to some one who cannot only devote full attention to it, but who is free from the controversies that surround the present incumbent of this office;
- (c) an effective curb be imposed on the activities of groups which have been by word or deed trying to justify Chinese aggression and which have thus been behaving as potential fifth-columnists in the country;
- (d) the Chinese Embassy and the Chinese Trade Agencies in India should be treated on a basis of reciprocity and the same restrictions and curbs must be imposed upon their activity here as have been placed on their Indian counterparts in China;
- (e) the dissemination of anti-Indian propaganda by the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi must be stopped; and
- (f) to indicate our strong reaction on the China's violation of India's frontiers, we should

[Shri U. L. Patil]

announce our withdrawal of support to China's case for admission to the U.N.O.' (18)

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): I beg to move:

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

This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 emphatically condemns Chinese aggression on the entire Himalayan frontier of our country;

This House further deeply regrets the failure of the Government to keep the Parliament and the people of India continuously informed of the threatening developments on our border, to take timely measures to ensure the defence and security of the country's frontiers and to safeguard the territorial integrity of our country and their failure to invoke the sanction of world public opinion against Chinese aggression;

This House while giving full support to all constructive measures of the Government to make Chinese forces vacate all territories forcibly occupied by them within our frontiers further calls upon the Government to adopt adequate measures to secure complete re-occupation by India of all our lost territories without the least delay.' (16)

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री (मुम्बई) :
बै प्रस्तुत करता हूँ :

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

This House having considered the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959, and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959 is of the opinion that China should be asked to withdraw her forces from the Indian border within a specified period failing which necessary action should be taken in that regard.' (17)

Mr. Speaker: All these amendments and the original motion are now before the House.

The hon. Members who are leaders of groups will have half an hour and the others will have fifteen minutes each.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Sir, I have also asked you to give me time so that I may also speak.

Mr. Speaker: Of what group is he leader?..... (Interruptions.)

Raja Mahendra Pratap: World Federation and World Government.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): This House has before it the correspondence as printed in the second volume of the White Paper but the matter for consideration of the House is naturally the subject of the letter written by the Prime Minister Nehru in reply to Prime Minister Chou En-Lai. We are considering the subject now in an atmosphere which did not exist two months ago both in the good sense of the term and in the bad sense of the term. For example, the incident in Ladakh which was a shocking incident rightly evoked resentment in the country and

spoiled the atmosphere for friendly and peaceful approach and negotiations. But that was soon amended to a certain extent by the letter of the Prime Minister Chou En-Lai and the country certainly wanted to know what our Government was going to do in the matter. It is happy to note that the reply which Prime Minister Nehru has given to the reply of the Chinese Government is a welcome reply and I support the proposals contained therein. I support the proposals as well as the reply mainly on the ground that they stick to the approach of peaceful negotiations which has been so ably explained by the Prime Minister in today's speech. When the whole world is smashing cold war we should certainly not detract from our position of contributing to the lessening of tension, whatever others may do.

Therefore, the position which he has taken on this question in that letter is consistent with the basic approach and policies in the matter of foreign relations as pursued by Prime Minister Nehru and the Government of India together. Therefore, on these questions, I have very little to say. For instance, I do not consider myself competent to judge the practicability or the impracticability of the different proposals and I would certainly take the word of the Prime Minister when he says that certain proposals are impracticable and then if he makes counter-proposals, they should certainly be taken into consideration. Because for a layman, however enlightened or learned he may be, to discuss on the basis of maps the particular lay-out of a particular border and the effect of the proposals would be rather impudent.

Shri Nath Pai: Not when thousands of miles are involved.

Shri S. A. Dange: Especially when thousands of miles are involved and when people who only know how to conduct satyagraha on the Goa border are involved. Where military officers and military leadership finds it difficult to find the border, not because

they are as ignorant or as simple as those who perhaps were going to see where the MacMahon line was drawn by chalk but found curio shops of Chinese in the villages, I do not think, however enlightened we are, we can give a concrete opinion on concrete proposals. That is why I had endorsed the spirit and also the proposals contained in our Government's reply. That is the first point which I want to make very clear.

Then comes the question of how to begin negotiations and on that the Prime Minister has taken a stand that certain preliminary arrangement is required in the matter of digesting the data and a large number of details and certain steps should be taken in order that this may be done by a meeting of the officials of the two Ministries in the two countries. Then it would be fruitful for the two Prime Ministers to meet. Therein I have no criticism to offer except to suggest that even in the matter of digesting this data perhaps a meeting may be more fruitful between the two Prime Ministers than an immediate meeting between the officials of the concerned Ministries because it would be a difficult situation for the officials of the two Ministries unless a certain atmosphere and approach is defined by the two Prime Ministers not only through letters but perhaps by a meeting. It may resolve the approach to the data and the details more quickly. But that is only a suggestion for his consideration. That does not mean that I object to the details being digested by the officials at the diplomatic level or the meeting of the two Prime Ministers following such digestion. But my impression is that even that matter at a diplomatic level would be facilitated by a short meeting to discuss that very problem also, if possible. That is a second point in the matter which deserves consideration from the House as well as the whole country.

This debate is not of course limited, as was made clear from the Prime Minister's speech, to the proposals in the letter alone. This debate has raked up many other questions. But

[Shri S. A. Dange.]

The central question, as he has put it, is whether the country and the Parliament approve the basic policies of the Government in the matter of foreign relations or not. It is this very policy that is under fire. It may be as a by-product of their moves by those who want to get this policy changed that we may come under fire or we may be stoned. That is not the main point. The main point is very clear. Is the basic policy going to remain as it is—the policy of peace and *Panch sheel* or is it going to be sidetracked and become a policy of war or, if not actual war, talk of war and war psychosis. There are certain people who would like, if not actual war, at least war psychosis because under the cover of war psychosis, certain other things can be achieved. It may be a very fundamental requisite to certain political parties in the matter of blowing up *Panch sheel*, in the matter of the Five Year Plans and in the matter of the Government of the country. There is such a tendency and we see it. It was visible here at the beginning of the debate. That war psychosis comes up under cover of what is supposed to be—it may or may not be—a threat to the country. Some people even go to the extent of saying that war had already started and, therefore, measures should be taken not only in the military sphere but in the civil sphere also which would meet that situation.

I am certainly obliged to the Government for making it very clear that war has not started. Certainly incursions have taken place; some firing has taken place but that is not war nor is it yet a condition of war. We are not speculating about future possibilities. Still I personally hold the opinion that these two countries will never go to war with each other so long as Prime Minister Nehru guides the policy of this country and not Mr. Masani or Kripalani or any Jan Sangh leader. There is no question of India going to war with any country—not only with China—I am not saying this because it is socialist China—even with Pakistan or any other country which might

displease us at certain points or which may irritate us on certain matters.

Acharya Kripalani: Teek hai!

Shri S. A. Dange: Aasab Arj; thank you. I find for once he is agreeing with me. Very good. We must condition the whole country to an atmosphere of peace and not condition it to an atmosphere of war. The first victim of war psychosis or actual war in a country is democracy and the development of its economy, because the whole of the economy has got then to be militarised. The militarisation of economy means the end of the development of the country's economy in favour of the people....

Shri Asoka Mehta: As in China.

Shri S. A. Dange: He had better listen to me. He was the chairman of the Food Committee and he cannot understand the food position of this country: yet he is talking of China! The point is that some policies are being propagated by some people with the idea of challenging the authority and bringing about changes in the political power in this country. Of course, it is legitimate to do so, but it would be legitimate to do so on the basis of a direct programme for changing the Government rather than hiding behind a war psychosis and trying to get a change of Government. Therefore, it was not surprising to me at least that when this situation arose for some people it was not, so to say, the question of integrity of the country. Everybody was agreed on it, namely, that the country's integrity must be upheld.

Shri Nath Pal: Not through the Meerut session.

Shri S. A. Dange: The first thing that the Communist Party of India talked about was the defence of the country's integrity and if others do not remember it or if they wish to forget it, I am sorry. But what I say is true.

Shri Nath Pal: It was on line with the policy of the Government!

Shri S. A. Dange: You may accuse us of many things, but do not misquote facts. As regards this question, as soon as the situation or the atmosphere arose, you know what slogans were spread. Maybe some parties are now retreating from those slogans. What were the slogans? They were: *Panchsheel* is a failure; the Defence Minister is a failure; later on, quietly perhaps, the Prime Minister is a failure and the Government as a whole is a failure in relation to the integrity of the country. Therefore, they said: "Change the Defence Minister; change the Prime Minister; change the *Panchsheel* policy and adopt a policy of war"—a war, the consequences of which the Prime Minister has already outlined. If a country like ours begins to talk in this way, then its fate will not be very good. Therefore, a certain policy, a certain type of party politics, a fight for party power, came into the forefront under the guise of defending the country and its integrity. I hope those parties who are doing that will give up that attitude. If they want unity of the country, as they say they want it, then, that unity must be based on this aspect: "that the foreign policy of the Government, as a policy, is correct and we support it; that *Panchsheel* is correct and we support it; that there has been no failure on the part of the Prime Minister or the Defence Minister on the question of defending the integrity of the country" because the integrity of the country is not involved yet in a war.

An Hon. Member: *Panchsheel* is not unilateral.

एक माननीय सदस्य : पंचशील दोस्त के लिए है दुश्मन के लिए नहीं है ।

Shri S. A. Dange: Therefore, I would certainly like these parties to make their standpoint clear. Their standpoint is not very clear so far as the amendments are concerned, which are worded in a different language, different from the speeches that they make outside this House though a

reference to the speech of Shri M. R. Masani caused a furore here. (Inter-ruption.)

Now, what is supposed to be the main victim of this war psychosis? The main victim is not the Communist party. We are too small; it does not require much to beat us. What is the major victim? The major victim is the policy of peace and non-alignment. They want alignment with certain blocs. The victim they refer to is non-alignment and also the foreign policy, and of course, if possible, the Government which is functioning today. It is not a very practicable proposition. So, on this question, I am totally with the Government, though we differ on many things. We differ on many things and there is no doubt about that. But on this point, we are agreed.

An Hon. Member: God save you!

Shri S. A. Dange: God may save you or the devil may save you. That is another matter, but since they are in need of a saviour, that is enough. The policies that they have got are not strictly on the question of defending the integrity of the country. If that were the thing, I would repeat that we are fully in agreement with the Government, but we are not going to be in agreement with those who want to develop a war psychosis. I am sure the Prime Minister is not a person who will support such a line of conduct either on behalf of the Congressmen, if he can control some of them, or on behalf of the other parties.

There has been a question about groups or parties taking up an anti-national stand or anti-patriotic stand. If any group or party takes up an anti-national stand or an anti-patriotic stand, certainly the country must take note of it and the Government must take note of it. Well, indirectly,—I do not know—if such a reference was hinted at my party, I am not in a hurry to pick up a cap and have it on my head.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): You want to step into the shoes!

Shri S. A. Dange: If it was meant like that, I would like to repudiate the suggestion that we are taking any anti-national step.

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Shri S. A. Dange: Certainly my friends on the Congress Benches—if they do not mind my calling them 'my friends'—may have some justification for being irritated with us. I admit it. Maybe they are irritated because we are slow in coming to decisions. Maybe some other people are very quick in their intelligence and in their methods, but we certainly like to follow certain....

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Democratic methods.

Shri S. A. Dange: That is right. Shri Frank Anthony has found the right word. Ours is not that type of democracy or democratic method in which they agree with the Prime Minister in the party and outside they go and canvass against it. On the question of democracy, there is one more thing to point out. When their walk-out takes place, their one leader remains inside and some others go outside; that is democracy according to their conception. According to us, that is not democracy. According to us, a decision must be taken collectively. It may be that sometimes a decision that is taken is wrong, but decisions are taken after mature consideration and debate in which the lowest man in the party has a right to have his own say.

Shri Nath Pai: And then apologise for having a different view.

Shri S. A. Dange: Surely, it is only in our party that leaders can apologise and carry on. Let them try that method in their parties and have discipline. We are proud of the discipline and the solidarity which is shown. You try that with Acharya Kripalani and Shri Asoka Mehta and see the result. They tried with one censure on Dr. Lohia and they split into two, and now there are three or four splits. Do not have a battle with me on that,

or with the Communist party. It would be better if they imitated us on that also.

So, the point is, we have taken a decision which is not anti-national. We have taken a decision which is perfectly patriotic, and if the Prime Minister can tell me....

Shri Nath Pai: Which decision are you defending now? Is it the Calcutta decision or the Meerut decision?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: What about the slogan in Calcutta maidan, "नेहरू गद्दी छोड़ो" "Nehru, vacate your seat".

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It was never said. This is an absolute lie. (Interruption.)

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri was there and she heard it.

Shri Tyagi: There are two ladies on our side and there is only one on the other side!

Mr. Speaker: There are more Bengali ladies on this side than there are on the other side.

Shri S. A. Dange: As I was saying, our decision is a correct one. Our decision is a patriotic one. Our decision is a national one. It is not anti-national in its essentials. I am talking of essentials, the essential approach and the fundamentals. Perhaps on details, this detail or that detail, we may differ, but a detail does not make a policy. A detail does not make a fundamental disagreement, in which the whole policy is massacred from one of peace to one of war. From that point of view, the communist party has taken a decision which by no means can be described as anti-national or anti-patriotic. We are not the people who deserve that description of us, if it is suggested in that manner.

14 hrs.

I do not think there are many other points to discuss. The main question, therefore is, whether we support the basic policy. We do. The next question is whether we want the Five-Year Plan to be side-tracked. The first victim of this war hysteria is made out to be the Five Year Plan. Therefore, it is a correct approach on the part of the Prime Minister, viz., if you want to have defence, then the best way for it is to build heavy industries. Which nation has not defended itself in this way? It is only the country which can build heavy industries that can defend itself and that is why those who want to weaken the defence attack the Defence Ministry on its production line, because they know that the production wing of the defence department is the real key to the defence of the country. Some gentlemen do not want our country to be strong that way; they want it to be strong only in words. So far as wordy warfare is concerned, I will leave it to them; they are experts in that.

My proposition is that the Five Year Plan must not be side-tracked, whoever else might try to do it. The democratic regime of the country must not be side-tracked; the question of civil liberty must not be side-tracked. The foreign policy of the Prime Minister as represented in his present speech, mainly in the early part of it, certainly must be supported by the Parliament and the country. That is all I have got to say.

Acharya Kripalani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House knows that I have never spoken as a partyman. It gives me no pleasure to criticise the policies of a dear friend. We have worked together in public life for more than 30 years. Further, it looks ungracious for me to criticise the pet of the nation, in whom people place their confidence and trust and their hopes for a brighter future. But the call of duty, as I conceive it, cannot be denied. I would not be true to my friend, to the nation and to myself if I do not frankly speak out my mind at this critical time.

The Prime Minister was gracious to say that there should be no sarcastic remarks. I entirely agree with him and if any such remarks creep into my speech, it will be in response to his sarcasm which induces clapping in this House. So, if there is any such thing, I hope he will excuse me and what I say I say in all humility.

Before I discuss the Government's attitude to the border issue, I should like to clear certain misconceptions. I am afraid these misconceptions are created either to cloud the real issue or to gain some point in an argument. But if the interests of the country are paramount, as they ought to be, every effort should be made to find out the issues involved. Our Prime Minister has repeatedly said, and also the communist party, that some people thoughtlessly talk of war with China, without realising the consequences to India, China and the whole world. If this were so, I would whole-heartedly agree with him. But the fact is, I have yet to know of any responsible public man who has talked of war with China. All that has ever been said is that the Chinese aggression must be stopped and the pockets occupied cleared. Any action to assert our sovereign rights to our own territory does not amount to war. Our Prime Minister and now the communist party leader also have said that this is not the invasion of India, but what have happened are border incidents. The Prime Minister of China has said that this is only an episode in a thousand-year-old friendship. If that is so, I hold that our recovery of what is our own will be only an accident and an episode in a two thousand-year-old friendship. Therefore, it is not the critics of the Government who have raised the scare of war, but the authorities themselves. I say they do so to silence the criticism of a policy which has been confined up till now to sending lengthy protest notes, which remain unanswered for months together and sometimes are not answered at all.

The second misconception created is that any suggestion of effective action will mean the extension of the cold war to India and the end of our

[Acharya Kripalani.]

neutrality. But has Chinese aggression, I ask, anything to do with the cold war? The principal parties to the cold war are the United States and Russia. If they have taken no sides, the question of extension of cold war does not arise. For instance, the action taken by England, France and Israel against Egypt did not extend the area of cold war. Why? Because U.S.A. was opposed to it.

Our Prime Minister himself has repudiated the idea that Chinese aggression is in pursuance of a world communist conspiracy. He said that this action is the result of chauvinistic nationalism of China that is intoxicated with its recent successes. That being so, any resistance to the lust for power, by a country which is merely defending its own borders and homelands, is not aggression at all. It does not extend, therefore, the cold war. Russia has not blessed Chinese aggression. Rather, the Prime Minister's utterances would indicate the hope that it may help to mediate or moderate the misguided zeal of China. Recently, America through its State Secretary has chosen to be unaware of the merits of our case. How then does this question of cold war arise at all, when these two big nations, Russia and America, have taken no sides? So, this is just to cloud the issue.

Also, there is today some thawing of the cold war, as the Prime Minister himself told us. In many quarters, it is held that Chinese aggression on our borders is due to a desire to counter this tendency, and to sabotage the possibility of the Summit Conference. Such a conference, under the present circumstances, will be held without China, and if Russia and the United States come to an agreement, China will be left alone without a friend. Therefore, the talk of extension of cold war to India is meant intentionally, or unintentionally, to cloud the clear issue of effective action against a country with whom we have always tried to be friendly and whose legitimate and even illegi-

itimate claims we have supported. We have gone so far in this that those who are against our policy of non-alignment today say, "serves them right" for having put their trust in a communist and totalitarian State. So, the question of cold war does not arise.

There is yet another misconception, a mischievous misconception that is sought to be created against those who criticise the non-alliance and non-resistance policy of the Government. It is said that the critics want to end our non-alignment policy and substitute for it an alliance with the West. So far as I know, no responsible leader of any party has suggested the idea of abandonment of our neutrality and joining the Western bloc. Even Shri Munshi of the Swatantra Party, speaking the other day in Bombay, said that his party did not want India to abandon its neutrality and non-alignment. Today even the West would not welcome our joining the Western bloc, because they are carrying on negotiations with Russia and our alignment with the Western bloc would hamper these negotiations. What the critics want is not the abandonment of neutrality but the abandonment of passivity. We are not against neutrality; we are against passivity. We want an assurance that the defence of our borders will no more be neglected.

Our military strength should be sufficient to defend our borders and to clear the pockets. The Prime Minister has asserted even today that our army is competent for this task. But it is quite possible that any effective action against the Chinese may increase the area of conflict. In that case, it is felt that India, with its present military and industrial resources, and the lack of certain types of modern weapons, may not be able to meet the new danger. As a matter of fact, no country in the world today can hope successfully to resist foreign aggression single handed, neither Russia nor America.

Therefore, the critics want the authorities to make our position clear. It is that India will not hesitate to get military aid from any quarter, to defend the country. As the Chinese aggression has nothing to do with world communism, we shall be entitled to seek help in a military emergency, both from the East and the West and, of course, from neutral countries, as we got economic aid from every quarter. Help may be had on lend and lease or any other honourable basis, not impairing our sovereignty or independence. In 1948, when threatened by Russia, Yugoslavia did not hesitate to take military aid from the United States, a capitalist country. It did not, because of this, give up its Marxist faith. Nobody here has suggested that India should allow foreign military bases in India. A declaration of readiness to accept foreign military aid in an emergency, I feel, will be very helpful. It does not, in any way, minimise our present strength to deal with the limited problem that has arisen. It only provides for a contingency, for an emergency, which we hope, will never arise.

Further, such a declaration will convince the Chinese that we have no intention to stand alone if our country is threatened, or if the area of conflict is enlarged by their perversity. No nation can afford to resist foreign aggression till its industrial potential is increased through Five Year Plans. Moreover, a Government that has employed ordnance factories for the manufacture of consumer goods for civilian production in the midst of aggression cannot talk about industrial potential in terms of the defence of the country. As the Hindi proverb says:

जब नौ मन घी भावेगा तब राधा नाचैगी

We cannot wait for these nine maunds of ghee when Radha begins to dance.

England did not wait till its potential became as great as that of Germany while accepting the challenge of Germany. The potential of a

country, as also its moral strength rises in answering the challenge that is thrown to it. No nation can afford to be so rigid and narrow in the interpretation of its international policy as to abandon the ideas of foreign military aid in a national emergency. So far we have not even tried to explain our case to nations that are friendly to us. This is isolation and not non-alignment in a world that is interdependent.

There is yet another misconception that is sought to be created by the authorities to justify inaction. They say that those who talk of resisting Chinese aggression, have developed cold feet and they are creating fear complex. For this both the opposition parties and the press are blamed. It is strange to accuse those who advocate strong action of having developed cold feet. The Prime Minister, in one of his speeches—I hope he will excuse me—is reported to have taunted his critics that none of those who are criticising the Government will be found anywhere near the 17,000 high region in Ladakh, if any resistance is offered.

Shri P. S. Daulta: (Jhajjar): It is true.

Acharya Kripalani: It is a strange way of arguing.

Shri Nath Pai: That applies to him.

Acharya Kripalani: Of course, none of us will be there. But, I am afraid, that none of the members of the Cabinet will be found there. This is not because most of them are old and ailing people, not because they lack courage, but because their presence would be considered as an unmitigated nuisance by the military. It is not just going to the Kumbh Mela.

If the Opposition parties were really creating a sense of fear to gain a political advantage over the ruling party at a time of national trouble, it would be reprehensible. Equally reprehensible will be the conduct of the Press if it gave currency to alarming news. But I am afraid the boot

[Acharya Kripalani]

is on the other leg. It is not the political parties or the Press, urging effective action, which create whatever fear there is, but the acts of omission and commission of our Government and its various vacillating, uncertain and confusing utterances which give advantage to our enemies inside and outside the country. Also, such utterances confuse our friends in other countries. This has been so since China sent its so-called Liberation Army to Tibet. At that time our hon. Prime Minister had asked in wonder "from whom were the Chinese forces liberating Tibet." His first instinct was correct. But he soon changed his attitude and recognised the military fact of Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. Even after this aggression the authorities failed to see the true character of the Chinese totalitarian and military regime. There were exchange of visits of the two Prime Ministers and these were duly boosted as establishing perpetual friendship. A treaty was signed in 1954 by which, among other things, we gave up all our rights in Tibet, not in favour of free Tibet but in favour of China.

Further, there was a mutual acceptance of the *Panchsheel*. It was said that this *Panchsheel* will usher in perpetual peace and that everybody will live happily ever after. I have nothing to say about the *Panchsheel*. I only indicate that it does not incorporate moral imperative. It implies mutuality. You cannot co-exist with yourself. I take only one instance of co-existence between nations. Can a nation co-exist with itself? It is already co-existing with itself. It makes no meaning. A nation co-exists with another nation. If the other nation does not want to co-exist with it, how can there be co-existence? I submit that the *Panchsheel* principles congeal the status quo at its present level, however inequitous, and unjust. I am afraid, in spite of what the hon. Prime Minister has said—that this *Panchsheel* makes no meaning in the international world if it is to be unilaterally observed.

Three months after that treaty and also the acceptance of the *Panchsheel* there was aggression and the peace treaty was violated. For years this aggression was kept hidden from the people and their representatives. Today the hon. Prime Minister says, "I will do what the Parliament wants me to do." But the representatives of the people were never informed. Of course, he can do what the Parliament wants him to do. He has an overwhelming majority. While aggression was going on there were exchanges of cultural and economic delegations. While the Chinese delegations were silent about the progress made in India, our delegations, officers, Communists and fellow-travellers, whoever went to China, boosted the Chinese accomplishments. The people were encouraged to keep shouting "*Hindi-Chini bhai bha.*", when in fact aggression was taking place. The Chinese must have laughed in their sleeves at this strange and infantile exhibition of childish sentimentality. Today the people feel humiliated and they look ridiculous. Nobody wants to look ridiculous, excepting our present Government.

The Government had all along information through its own agents that important roads were being built not only to connect Peking with Tibet but also directed towards our Himalayan borders. But our communications with our own borders were so neglected that the authorities now declare—may I say without feeling any guilt—that our own territories are not easy of approach to our people. But they are easy of approach to the Chinese armies! This I hold as culpable negligence of the security of the country. These may appear hard words, but a nation's defence is a sacred thing.

Further, whenever through questions in this and in the other House information was sought to be elicited about border troubles, the answers were evasive. Nay, often they sought to minimise the danger by telling the

Parliament that the land occupied was barren, where not a blade of grass could grow and no people could live. It was even said that some of the borders were not properly marked. When things could no longer be concealed because of persistent aggression in spite of the protest notes, the Government issued its White Papers. They make very painful reading for any patriotic person. The Chinese notes are arrogant, bullying and aggressive. Our notes are apologetic, or mildly protesting. This is called the polite and dignified language of a civilised and a mature nation! The Chinese are new and are raw people who do not know the language of polite intercourse! It is also repeatedly asserted that the Chinese are angry at our offering political asylum to the Tibetans. But aggression commenced years earlier.

Even up-to-date after the debates in the Houses last August the authorities misconceived the Chinese designs. As late as the 21st October the hon. Prime Minister, speaking in Calcutta, said that he did not expect any fresh aggression. The very same day nine of our Police guards were shot dead and ten kidnapped. The country knew of this two days later. Did Delhi get the news from somewhere else? The kidnapped men and the bodies of the dead were returned to us after more than three weeks.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): On the birthday of the hon. Prime Minister.

Acharya Kripalani: The men were detained to extort the so-called confession of the Communist type, under third degree methods which the hon. Prime Minister has himself admitted. These people, remember, were taken from our territory.

I submit that an estimate made of the character of the Chinese Revolution and rule was incorrect. Our attitude to their aggression has been one of appeasement. Even after the last debate in the House the Government

did not put the Ladakh area under military control, though a motor road had been constructed there and thousands of miles of our territory were occupied. How many thousands, even the Government does know today. It is a very pathetic case.

It should have been clear to the authorities that the Chinese would one day claim almost the whole of Ladakh when earlier they had refused to allow the Ladakhis in Lhasa to register as Indian citizens. This was known. It was said in this House. But no warnings can disturb the sound slumber of our authorities, except to repeat from day to day that not an inch of our soil will be yielded and if need be, we shall fight with lathi. This may be very heroic talk, but it does not convince the people of our earnestness to see that aggression is wiped away from our land.

People also feel apprehensive when they see that our policy of masterly inactivity is supported by the Communist Party here. The Communist party supports it. In this respect they are out to strengthen the hands, as they just now said, of the Prime Minister, on the plea of saving Indo-Chinese friendship, for which the Chinese care two hoots. The Communist party support is given in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister, in recent days, has denounced it of being unpatriotic and having extra-territorial loyalty. Let us remember, Sir, that the Communists cannot endorse a policy that is unfavourable to China.

Then I come to a very delicate point about which the Prime Minister is very sensitive. It is that people are apprehensive that the defence of our country is not in proper hands. The Defence Minister—I have nothing personally against him—may be a very clever man. He may be an eminently amiable person. There may be no doubt about his patriotism. But unfortunately he lacks the supreme virtue that should characterize a

[Acharya Kripalani]

Defence Minister, whether in a totalitarian State or in a democracy, namely of enjoying public trust and confidence. His silence about Chinese aggression did not increase public confidence. Even in America when he spoke of Chinese aggression he called it 'foolish' or 'silly'. For our wise and venerable politicians, the Chinese aggression is merely the silly antics of a spoilt urchin.

The Prime Minister is reported to have said that the Defence Minister carries out his instructions. But, Sir, we also know that if a Minister is so inclined, he can give such a twist to the instructions received that they may be put out of shape. That little power every Minister has.

For further loss of confidence the Defence Minister must thank his Communist friends who always support him. Even just now Shri Dange was doing so. For instance, they still persist in maintaining that the conflict between the Defence Minister and the Chief of the Staff was on the issue whether the civil or the military authority should be supreme in the country. If that were so, Sir, if that were the real issue, neither would the resignation have been given to the highest civil authority, nor would it have been withdrawn at his instance. Those who aspire for supremacy in the State do not submit resignations; they do certain other things.

By these tactics, I am afraid, the Communist party which wants to defend the Defence Minister is not only maligning our brave soldiers but doing no good to the reputation of the Defence Minister. In a democracy, I say, a Minister should not only enjoy the confidence of his chief but of the country also.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: And the party.

Acharya Kripalani: I do not say 'party', because that is the party's own affair.

Sir, to add to the country's misfortune—the Prime Minister will excuse me if I say that—every criticism or any suggestion for effective action irritates him. I wish he would extend at least as much courtesy to his countrymen as he extends to foreign aggressors. In this House, when a Congress Member suggested the bombing of the road built in our territory, the Prime Minister was annoyed and he said that the Member did not realise the consequences of his suggestion. The Member had not suggested using atomic and hydrogen bombs, of which fortunately we have none. Ordinary bombs, Sir, today are conventional weapons. But I suppose the Member's suggestion was dangerous. Why? Because, if carried into action it would spread the area of conflict, and India and China will be at war with each other, and if two such big countries are at war with each other there will be global conflagration, and this will be fought with nuclear weapons, and the world will be destroyed, and the responsibility will be ours. So runs the argument.

Sir, again, when an independent Member had the temerity to suggest that, considering the similarity of ideology we should be more friendly to democratic than to totalitarian nations, the Prime Minister was annoyed and he said that we should be more friendly to those from whom we differ than those with whom we agree. Such sentiments are no doubt very noble. They are on a par with loving one's enemies. I remember, after independence, at a conference of constructive workers presided over by Gandhiji, when a complaint was made that Congressmen were fighting among themselves, I got up and said: "Bapu, this is very natural, for like every great prophet, in the world, you have taught us to love our enemies but not our friends".

Sir, may I suggest that in international affairs at least, we should

love our friends and be not unjust to our enemies. To attempt more may be left to the prophets who live and work not in time but in eternity. But they maintain no armies, nor do they talk of keeping the powder dry—though our powder is lying in the cold storage.

Recently, our ex-Commander-in-Chief expressed his opinion about the defence of the country and came in for discourteous criticism. I do not know the official etiquette, whether an ex-military officer who after retirement has held an important civilian post is entitled to express an opinion as a free citizen on an issue on which the country feels very much. This apart, the ex-Commander-in-Chief's suggestions must be judged on their own merits. I fully endorse his view that if Chinese aggression is not immediately halted and occupied pockets cleared, the task will be much more difficult in the future. I feel, if in 1954 we had taken effective action, today the problem of pushing back the Chinese would not be difficult.

In such matters, Sir, may I humbly suggest, that a nation can never be over-cautious? It is better to err on the side of prompt action than unawareness and complacency.

I also see nothing very foolish in the suggestion of joint defence with Pakistan, of our Eastern borders. Pakistan has seen the common danger and made the offer. It has not been made by us. The ex-Commander-in-Chief could not have expected that the joint defence would materialise immediately, at the present level of suspicion and difference in the foreign and other policies of the two countries. There will have to be preliminary talks before the idea can materialise. But the suggestion, whether we adopt it or not, is not so foolish as to merit indignation. Joint defence is nothing new in history. Against Hitler, there was joint de-

fence, first between England and France, and afterwards with America and then with Russia. There was joint defence of the Allies with China against Japan. Even differences in ideology and past enmities did not count. If anything less had been done, there would have been disaster in the world. However the slightest disagreement with the Prime Minister's policy, unfortunately, irritates him and makes him use against his critics language which is far from polite. The Prime Minister should know that if he is so intolerant of any suggestion, however innocent, he will get only conformity. Few in India would care to earn his displeasure, considering his position in the Government and in the affections of the people. He has got to be more careful than we ordinary human beings.

I, therefore have to congratulate myself that my dear friend has treated my slight criticism of his foreign policy a little more leniently. In an article in an independent journal in the U.S.A., I have discussed the foreign policy of India. Many distinguished politicians, including Mr. Khrushchev, have some time or the other contributed to this journal. I wonder if our Prime Minister has not sometimes contributed to this journal. When such a journal publishes an article by a humble person like myself, may I submit, it cannot be so hopelessly wrong. I fail to see how an assessment of our foreign policy, which endorses its basic principles and also commends the policy of non-alignment as consonant with the genius of our people and in conformity with our recent non-violent struggle for independence, can be so hopelessly wrong. Here is what I have said:—

"Whatever may have been the failings of the Congress party Government in internal affairs, it can always, with some justification, claim that it had added to the prestige and standing of India in the international world."

[Acharya Kripalani]

Again, I have said;

"There are good reasons for neutrality as between the two power blocs, and they appeal to India. Therefore, the policy of the Indian Government in this respect is generally accepted by the nation."

My conclusion in the article is:—

"The principles upon which the Indian foreign policy of non-alignment is based are correct. They are generally accepted by the nation and are in keeping with the genius of our people. If more nations accept the same attitude, there will be a definite lessening of international tension. It is in the details of diplomacy that our foreign policy has been weak and has sometimes gone wrong. Our mistakes have to some extent impaired our moral standing as a neutral nation and often injured our interests. But, after all, India is new to diplomacy and the world situation is extremely complicated."

This is what I have said and this is 99.9 per cent wrong!

In this very article, I have criticised the American policy of military pacts, filling vacuums, supporting reactionary regimes and posing as the saviour of the free world. I suppose somebody in the Prime Minister's office marked out the critical portions and left out all this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, I have not read any part of the article from beginning to end. I will read it, now that the hon. Member has drawn my attention to it.

Acharya Kripalani: It was reported that in answer to a question at the last Press conference, the Prime Minister said, I do not agree with Acharya Kripalani, what he has

written is 99.9 per cent wrong." I suppose even Congressmen must have read it because some of them have come and told me.

Of course, it will be unfair of me to ask the Prime Minister to specify all the 99.9 items in which I have gone wrong. But, it will surely be not unfair for me to ask him to point out the tiny bit of an item in which I am right. May I suggest that point? It is that our diplomacy had failed, not in helping to bring about peace and goodwill in the world, but in safeguarding the vital interests of our country and diminishing tensions on our borders. This, of course, may be an insignificant point in a global strategy, in a world threatened by nuclear weapons. But, it is of supreme importance to humbler persons like myself and, I venture to think, to the bulk of my countrymen. We may be excused for being so narrow and parochial. But, we were taught that, it is good to make good in one's own country what one wants to place before the world. Let us, therefore, address ourselves to the task of defending our country and safeguarding its honour and integrity. Only a free, strong and self-respecting India can serve the larger interests of the world. This is what we were taught.

Our information and publicity in the foreign department has generally been very poor. In the matter of Chinese aggression, this has greatly harmed our cause. Reports of the happenings on our border sometimes reach us via Peking. The latest was the estimate of the killed and the kidnapped in the Ladakh area. We had to accept Chinese figures. Such inaccurate information throws a doubt upon what we put out. In the last session, I spoke about the aerodrome built in our territory. This was vehemently denied. Today, it has become a matter of doubt. About the public road, we became suspicious only when it was announced by the Peking Radio as a very great engineering

feat. Then, it took us a year to know where it was built, and whether it was built in our territory. How can our people believe that effective action will be taken when there is no accurate information about the happenings.

Our people were 'arrested.' The Prime Minister did not say that they were 'kidnapped', but not that they were arrested. They were arrested in our own territory. How can a foreign power arrest our people in our own territory? This passes my comprehension. They can be only kidnapped; they cannot be arrested. I wish the Prime Minister used the proper phraseology.

It would also appear that we have not supplied to the foreign countries, through our embassies, our version of the case, with necessary materials and maps. It is rather bewildering to countries friendly to us. What has happened recently in the U.N.O. Elections shows our estrangement from even the non-committed Asia-African countries, who were traditionally friendly to us. We find ourselves more and more isolated. I say this, in spite of the assertion of the Prime Minister, we find ourselves isolated in the international field.

We, for long, seem to be unaware of the poisonous propaganda that is being carried on in our border areas both by the Chinese and our good patriots, the Communists. If there is a nest of spies, it is located in the office of the Chinese Trade Agent in Kalimpong, our foreign office has come to know about the activities of the Chinese Ambassador, so to say, only yesterday. While we tolerate all this, we also know the treatment that is meted out to our trade agents and to our Ambassador at Peking.

In some quarters, it is said that the Chinese have dug themselves now for the winter in the positions they have already occupied, and they are not going to move from there. This

may or may not be necessarily true. They have centrally-heated jeeps and are otherwise equipped for a winter campaign. We may as well expect further advance and be prepared for it. We must remember the usual communist tactics of keeping up constant tension and constant irritation, to create uncertainty and confusion. One day it is aggression, another day talk of negotiations. May I humbly suggest that we must be vigilant both in defence and also in negotiations, if they ever materialise?

I have very little say about the counter-proposals made by our Prime Minister in his latest communication. I appreciate his anxiety to arrive at a peaceful solution. Nobody in this country wants anything else. Let there be no doubt about it. However, in whatever words couched, our new proposals amount to this that we tell the Chinese, 'We are leaving our territory, provided you also leave our territory.' This is strange reciprocity and maintenance of the *status quo*. We retired from Longju, undoubtedly our territory, but we have yet to see if the Chinese are doing so. However, we shall await the Chinese response. But, so far, they have not kept their word. We must remember that.

If there is no just and honourable solution of this problem through negotiations, then we must consider Chinese aggression as a serious challenge to our country. Individuals and nations must accept life's challenges or they go under. I hope the Prime Minister will agree with me in this.

I remember that in 1932, when Gandhiji returned from the Second Round Table Conference, the country was faced with a grave situation. The British Government had violated the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. Our present Prime Minister was thrown in jail, and so was Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. There was a wave of indignation. There was a wave of repression. Gandhiji proposed to accept the challenge and restart the civil disobedience movement. Wiser people shook

[Acharya Kripalani]

their heads in doubt. They said that the country was exhausted and was not prepared for a fresh movement so soon. But Gandhiji said, "Prepared, or not prepared, the challenge, though not of our seeking, must be accepted—if not, the country will be demoralised." The movement was started, and it failed, but the nation was able to maintain its dignity and its morale.

Again, in 1942, there was a challenge to the country. The British had abandoned Malaya and Burma to their fate, before the Japanese advance. They fell without resistance, without striking a blow. As the Japanese forces advanced to our borders, the British prepared to quit those territories. Further, they adopted the scorch-the-earth policy, not to resist Japanese advance, but merely to delay it. They burnt the standing crops, confiscated all means of transport, cycles, cars, boats etc. They deprived the people of their means of livelihood. This made Gandhiji to realise that like Burma and Malaya, India would also surrender to the enemy without resistance. This was a challenge to Indian manhood. He, therefore, advised resistance. Some of us in the Working Committee pointed out that almost the whole world was with the British against Germany and Japan. The armies of several countries were stationed in our country. What hope was there for a non-violent struggle in the midst of this colossal violence! It would merely infuriate the authorities to use Hitlerian methods of repression and crush the nation. Moreover, India would lose the sympathy of America and China, who favoured the cause of Indian independence. But all these arguments did not weigh with Gandhiji. He said that the challenge must be met, or there was no hope for Indian independence. He, however, said that if a great and responsible organisation like the Congress was unwilling to enter into what appeared to be a hopeless venture,

he would go it alone, with all those who were willing to volunteer themselves. But the Congress fortunately accepted the advice and initiated the Quit India Movement. The movement failed to dislodge the British. But the British were convinced that such a brave and determined nation could be kept in bondage only at the expense of perpetual revolt. They felt that under these circumstances, the imperial game was not worth the candle. Therefore, after the war, they quit India.

Gandhiji met these challenges non-violently. Today, we cannot do so. But because we cannot do so, we cannot run away from the challenge. It is not for us, it is not for a nation that keeps an Army to talk, of non-violence. And I do know that even if there were people to organise a non-violent movement, Government would stand in their way, as it did in the case of Goa.

Today, the challenge has been thrown by an expansionist China. The question is this. Will free India accept the gauntlet as did slave India, slave in body but not in soul, because the soul of India was living then? Does his spirit work in those who are heirs to the free India he helped to create? This is the question. Before this question, all other questions pale into insignificance. It is a challenge to our faith, faith in ourselves, faith in our country, faith in our past, and faith in our future. May the old spirit guide us to accept this new challenge and save the integrity and honour of our country?

Mr. Speaker: Now. Shri M. R. Masani.

Shri M. R. Masani: This morning...

श्री बजराम सिंह : श्रीमान्, मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। इसी प्रश्न पर हिन्दुस्तान के कम से कम पचास हजार जनता अपनी राय हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान

धनी को बताने के लिये सदन के बाहर झाड़ू हुई है। मैं आप से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि पन्द्रह मिनट के लिये सदन की कार्यवाही को बन्द करके प्रबान मन्त्री श्रीर इस सदन के सदस्यों को शोका हैं कि वे उन से जा कर बातचीत करें और उनकी बातों को सुनें।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member can go and see what is happening.

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इससे पहले भी सरदार पटेल के जमाने में यहाँ ऐसा हो चुका है। तब सदन स्थगित होकर प्रदर्शनकारियों से बातचीत करने गया था।

Mr. Speaker: Very well. Now Shri M. R. Masani.

Shri M. R. Masani: On behalf of...

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : तो कम से कम मैं श्री मेरे ग्रुप के सदस्य बाहर जाकर उन से बातचीत करेंगे।

14:59 hrs.

(*Shri Braj Raj Singh, Shri Jagdish Awasthi and some other hon. Members then left the House*)

Shri M. R. Masani: On behalf of the Independent Parliamentary Group, I rise to support the amendment moved by Acharya Kripalani and also to support in general the magnificent speech in which he has spoken not only for the signatories to the amendment but, I make bold to say, for the country.

This morning, I read in one of our national dailies the thought that:

"The Government is heading towards the greatest failure in that on an issue which should so easily compel solidarity, it is incapable of an appeal that the nation will hearken to as the authentic call to united action."

An Hon. Member: Which is that paper?

15 hrs.

Shri M. R. Masani: It was in the *Hindustan Times* of this morning.

This morning, I came to this House, hoping against hope that the lead given by the Prime Minister would be such that this pessimistic thought would be disproved. But as the Prime Minister's speech unfolded, I felt more and more depressed, not because he seemed to be more angry with my quiet, innocent smile than even with the entire aggression of the Chinese and their murder of our people, but because his whole speech was a derisive speech, which antagonised different opinions in this House that, if he had wanted them to go along with him, they would have gone, along with him very happily. He has in fact provoked those of us who came to offer our support to go into Opposition against him even on broader policies with which we are in agreement. I will not imitate the Prime Minister in his prejudice and his passion. I do not think this is the time when we can retaliate at that level. I want to say that nobody in this House questions the patriotism or the integrity of the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Thank you.

Shri M. R. Masani: Not even those whose integrity he takes the liberty to question. But we do question his soundness of judgment, and in whatever is going to be said now, it is not the Prime Minister's *bona fides*, it is not his desire to save the country and serve it, which we all accept, but the lack of wisdom which has been shown by Government policies to which attention will be sought to be drawn.

The Prime Minister's speech has won him the support of the Communist Party. I hope he enjoys it. I am reminded of a similar situation

[Shri M. R. Masani]

in 1924 when the first British Labour Government came to power.

15-02 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then the British Communist Party asked Moscow—in a fashion that still prevails—“what shall we do? What is our attitude to the MacDonal Government?” And Lenin’s answer is historic:

“We shall support Mr. Mac-Donald”,—

he wrote back,—

“as the rope supports the hanging man”.

That, Sir, is the value of Shri S. A. Dange’s support to the Prime Minister’s policy, and I am quite sure that my hon. friends over there know what value to attach to that support.

Another thing I would like to make clear definitely is that I do not wish to open here an academic discussion, despite the Prime Minister’s provocation, on the principles of foreign policy. On those we are all agreed, and in spite of his attempt to draw a red-herring across the trail, let me read only one sentence from the only speech I made in this House on this matter in a very similar situation on December 6 and 7, 1950, when we were discussing the brutal attempt to conquer and occupy Tibet, when I said:

“I believe that the foreign policy of India based on independence of judgment is a sound one”.

I repeat that sentiment today. I part company with the Prime Minister—and many of us in an increasing number in this country are doing so today—in the way that policy is being implemented or carried out. So there is no question of questioning the non-alignment policy. The question is whether non-alignment, as

Acharya Kripalani, has rightly pointed out, is being correctly and detachedly carried out.

Now, going through the White Papers and the correspondence, three or four impressions are left on one’s mind, which I am sure many hon. Members must have shared. The first is that the Chinese actions right from 1954 onwards, almost from the time that we signed the *Panchsheel* agreement, have shown a grand design. They are all facets of the same mind at work. There is nothing erratic, playful or irresponsible about it. It is a consistent mind running like a thread right through their entire conduct.

On the other hand, on our side, we find a sad failure to react to this consistent policy of probing and trying to find out how much nonsense we would stand. We went on giving, in; as Acharya Kripalani has said, we wrote apologetic notes, always asking: ‘Do you really know what your people are doing?’, as if after the first or second incident there was any doubt on the subject as to what the Chinese Government was telling its troops to do. The Chinese, on their part, accused us of aggression, of planning military action against them “from land, sea and air.” That is the second impression one gets. It is a desire to avoid a clash, putting that above even the defence of India’s territory.

The third impression I got was a sad one about the suppression of facts from this House over a period of as long as two years. Acharya Kripalani also dealt with that. The Prime Minister has written to Mr. Chou En-lai, that he did it because he hoped to settle this without letting the people know so that they did not get excited. Whatever the intention, the result was exactly the opposite. Mr. Chou En-lai was very encouraged when he found that Shri Nehru was not taking the people into confidence. He was encouraged when he found that the

Parliament of India was being denied facts to which it was entitled from the Prime Minister. The result was exactly the reverse, and Shri Nehru should have known it, considering the party with whom he was dealing. This suppression is a grave act. I do not know if the full consciousness of its implications has sunk into the mind of our country yet, but I do say this in all humility that the Prime Minister will have a heavy responsibility before the Bar of history for this action of which he has been guilty.

The fourth thing that comes out of the White Papers is our neglect to raise the boundary issue in time. Mr. Chou En-lai explains in his letter to Shri Nehru on January 23 of this year why they did not raise it. It makes very good sense. He says that conditions were not "ripe" for China to raise the boundary issue with us. Certain proper preparations had to be carried out first. He said—'We are now proceeding to take certain steps in making preparations'. We know what those 'preparations, were—to lull us into a false sense of security and then to nibble at our territory, to bring their forces up to the frontier armed in a way superior to our own. Those preparations were made all the time. We understand their tactics. What about ours? Why did we not from 1950 onwards raise the matter of our frontiers? In 1954, we signed a treaty selling out the independence of Tibet. We cheerfully allowed a buffer State, a valuable buffer State, that separated us from China to disappear. In fact, we did that in 1950. In 1954, we put our signature to that deed. What kind of diplomacy was it that when you agreed to a buffer State being removed between an expansionist Power and yourself, you did not take the elementary precaution of saying, 'All right; we will give you Tibet. But you agree to the line that now divides you from us'?

I say it was criminal negligence on the part of our Government at least

not to get a *quid pro quo*. I will not argue on moral grounds. There was a time when our Prime Minister was fond of saying that freedom and peace are indivisible. He said it about Czechoslovakia, but he forgot to say it in the case of Tibet. Let that pass. But on the point of sheer national interest and cold-blooded foreign policy, when you sold out Tibet, should you not have asked in return for a guarantee of the MacMahon and Ladakh frontiers before you accepted the conquest of Tibet, thereby removing a valuable buffer? Why was that not done? I do not want to be uncharitable. I hope it is not too unkind to suggest that it was not done because the people of India would not have tolerated this policy of appeasement any longer if they had known the facts. In other words, the Prime Minister put a particular policy to which he was wedded above the vital interests of this country, and he has not served it well in that regard. If they had known in 1956 or 1957 about the aggression that was already perpetrated, *Panchsheel* would have "lost its lustre" in the eyes of the Indian people earlier,—here Shri Nehru's words may be quoted—and that would have done the country a great deal of good. We would have been fore-warned; we would have been fore-armed; we would have been fore-equipped and equipped them'. All this we were not able to do because, instead of drawing our attention to the real menace which they knew was there, our Government turned our attentions to the frontiers of Pakistan rather than the frontiers of China, and let our troops be caught off guard.

The story goes back to 1950. Even since the Chinese Communist revolution, a policy of sentimental misreading of history has been inflicted on this country. For ten long years we were told that China was always a peace-loving country. Now the Prime Minister say, 'No, for 2000 years they have been expansionist'.

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Why did he not say it earlier? Surely the Chinese have not changed their history in the last few months? Chinese history and Communist history is always expansionist; it is always imperialist. We should have known this from the time that Mao Tse Tung seized power in China. But we ignored all the warnings.

In this very House in the debate on December 6 and 7, 1950, to which I referred at the beginning, 19 hon. Members spoke. Out of them, 10 hon. Members warned the Prime Minister that the invasion of Tibet was the first step to the invasion of India. Among those who gave this warning were Acharya Kripalani, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Ranga, Dr. Shayama Prasad Mookerjee, our Speaker, Shri M. A. Ayyangar, and myself.

Shri Asoka Mehta: A motley crowd.

Shri M. R. Masani: There were ten hon. Members who warned Government that the attack on Tibet was only the first step to the attempt to dominate India. The Prime Minister called us alarmists and brushed us aside. If we were alarmists, he was an escapist. He refused to face a fact which has now become recorded in history—that the invasion of Tibet was only one step towards domination of this country on which the Chinese Communist regime is set.

There was another warning. We were humble people, Sir, but Mao Tse-Tung warned him and said in 1948, soon after taking power:

"To talk of neutrality is a fraud.....There is no third force."

Still Shri Nehru persisted in being neutral and being a third force. Our Prime Minister was called the 'running dog of the Anglo-American imperialists' in the official Press agency of the Chinese Government, the *New China News Agency*. That agency again issued a statement saying that "the Chinese Peoples Liberation Army

will hoist the Red Flag over the Himalayas." Mao sent a message of greetings to Ranadive, the then General Secretary of the Communist Party. He sent a message to the Party after the Calcutta Resolution when the Communists were in arms against our own Government in Telangana. In that message he said:

"Relying on the brave Communist Party of India.....India will certainly not remain long under the yoke of imperialism and its collaborators" (that is Mr. Nehru)—and India, "like free China will one day emerge in the socialist and People's democratic family."

If that is not a blue-print of Chinese conquest of India, I do not know what is and what more proof we want. Yet all these warnings were blatantly ignored by the Prime Minister who kept on telling the Indian people that there were 2,000 years of Indo-Chinese friendship. I have never heard a bigger untruth. There has been neither friendship nor enmity between the Indian and the Chinese people because there was no contact. Somebody has rightly said that, by the same token, there has been unbroken friendship between the Indian and the Eskimo people for the last 2,000 years because we never went to war! That is not friendship.

Lenin also gave us another warning. He said that "the road from Moscow to Paris lies through Shanghai and Calcutta." When Shanghai fell to Moscow, instead of welcoming the regime, instead of welcoming Russian expansion and instead of being its salesman in the United Nations and introducing it to the Bandung Club, we could have taken the lesson. We did all this without realising that Calcutta was the next. I say here again that one of the purposes of the present Chinese activities is that it has an eye on Calcutta and the fact that there was a demonstration there to which the Prime Minister referred this morning is not an accident.

I would never have gone into all these if there had been any evidence from the speech of the Prime Minister today that he has learnt his lesson. If I may say so, all the arrogance and the intolerance is still there. Instead of coming to the House and admitting that he has made a blunder, which is both Himalayan in its location and magnitude, he comes and starts throwing stones at others even before they open their mouths. It is time, therefore, we faced this question. Has the Prime Minister learnt the lesson. Judging by his speech this morning, I wish I could say that.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): You learnt many thing at Nehru's feet.

Shri M. E. Masani: I did until he stopped thinking for himself and did not move with the times... (Interruptions.) Anyway, I never was any one's stooge.

Anyway, on 21st October, the Prime Minister said at Calcutta that he did not think there was any "major idea" behind the Chinese incursions on our territory. Does this show any greater awareness as a result of the last nine years of harsh experience? If there is no major idea, what are the Chinese doing? What is it? Whims and fancies of Mr. Chou En-Lai? Or is it like the British who occupied India in a fit of absence of mind that the Chinese want to occupy is in another fit of absence of mind? I do not care what it is, but one fit of absence of mind was enough for us. Along with Mr. Nehru, many of us here went to prison in the Quit India movement and took part in many campaigns to end that fit of absence of mind by which Britain had conquered India. Are we, after ten years, to surrender our freedom to a more ruthless, more brutal gang of people?..... (Interruptions.)

Shri Joachim Alva: You have enjoyed all the sweets of office.

Shri M. E. Masani: Shri Alva always shows his loyalty in a mis-

guided way... (Interruptions.) May I now come to the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Chou En-Lai? The Opposition Amendment which has been moved by Acharya Kripalani and others, which we support, has already given the grounds why we are opposing the acceptance of the letter. But since this amendment was drafted, giving fresh thought to the matter, it appears to me that there is an even more important ground which was not mentioned in the amendment. There is a proposal for mutual withdrawal of forces and negotiations. Negotiations take place between two parties who have faith in each other's *bona fides*. They can only take place where one party believes that the other will carry out his word. Let us consider what is to happen in Aksai Chin. The Chinese are supposed to withdraw 100 miles and we about 20 or whatever it may be. How do we know that the Chinese will withdraw? How do we know that they will not break one more agreement, like all the agreements they have broken in the past? Our own offer is: no patrols. We will not try to find out. How are we to find out? In this House the Prime Minister, about a week ago, was not in a position to tell us whether an airfield has or has not been built in that area. Many good reports are there that say that it has been built. Assuming he does not know, how is he going to know a month or two from now whether or not these people have withdrawn to the line he has demarcated? Suppose we withdraw and they do not. Are we then going to make ourselves a laughing stock for another time? Is the Chinese Communist Government a Government whose word is worth anything? Let us go back to history and our own experience. Let us forget Korea, Indo-China and all the rest.

In 1950, after assuring our ambassador and our Government that the Chinese forces would not enter Tibet, the Chinese forces entered Tibet. Our Government sent diplomatic notes of protest against that breach-

[Shri M. R. Masani.]

of faith. In 1959, Tibetan autonomy was violated although we were promised that it would be respected—a second breach of faith. The White Paper shows a consistent course of breach of faith of every one of the Five Principles of Panchsheel. Are we, after all this, going to accept the path of a diplomacy that starts by an assumption of the good faith of the Chinese Government? What kind of realism will that be? I am not saying that there should be no agreement with the Chinese Government but an agreement with the Communist Government is worth anything only to the extent that you are able to enforce it by physical force. First occupy the line and then agree to the line. To agree to a line which you have not occupied will invite repeated breaches of faith. Are you going to continue that illusion and continue with that faith which by now must be abandoned?

There are people who say—I think the hon. Defence Minister said at the United Nations—that the Chinese were stupid. I do not know. Perhaps we have been stupid in not understanding what they are about. The international communist movement has a very definite objective of world domination about which they make no bones at all. The domination of Tibet was the first step to the domination of India and the present activity is to get into a position from which the domination of India can commence.

Now, Mao is not, like our Prime Minister, a lover of peace. Let me quote one sentence from him—one pronouncement of Mao. He says: "Political power grows out of the barrel of the gun". That gun has come across the Himalayas. There is a Fifth Column in India ready to help those on the other side, and to link up with them is the first objective of the Chinese Communists' presence on our frontiers and across the border. They want to occupy dominating heights from which they can

threaten to invade this country, from which they can give moral aid and material aid and also arms to the guerilla forces fighting against our own Government.

Consider the contrast between Malaya on one side and Viet Nam on the other. Why is it that in Malaya the guerilla warfare conducted by the communists had been defeated after several years of fighting? Why is it that in North Viet Nam we have a satellite Government of the Chinese Communists and why is it that that country is divided? The one and the only reason that makes for the distinction is that there is a common frontier in the case of Viet Nam and there is no common frontier in the case of Malaya. After giving the Chinese on a platter a common frontier with ourselves by the betrayal of Tibetan freedom, now let us realise that any further encroachment, any occupation of points of vantage is a dagger planted at the heart of Indian security and that this is the first objective of the Communist Chinese armies in what they are doing.

There are other objectives: the destruction of the morale of the Indian armed forces. That is another objective. Slap the Indian Armed Forces and make them realise that they could not stop the Chinese and thus destroy their self-confidence in defending the country. That is by itself a moral and psychological victory for the Chinese and the Chinese know all about psychological warfare.

The third objective is the destruction of the morale of our small neighbours in the Himalayas: the Governments and the peoples of Nepal, Bhutan, and Sikkim. If these people find that we are not able to defend our own frontier, what faith are they going to place on our assurance that we will defend theirs? Even today you will find in the attitude of the Nepalese Government unedrtones

which do not make us very happy. Just as we have been neutral between different people, they are neutral between the Chinese and us. And we feel hurt. Have we any right to be hurt? If we are not able to defend our own soil, why should all the people of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim believe us when we say that we will go and defend theirs?

Finally, the Chinese attack on India is a beginning and an attempt at demoralising the countries of South and South-east Asia. Let me quote from a very valuable report from Professor Samar Guha of Calcutta, who is a member of the Praja-Socialist Party, and who recently visited these countries. The report says:

"Prof. Guha has been frankly told by many highly placed leaders of these countries that they look upon the Himalayas as not the frontiers of India only, but of the whole of the free and democratic Asia."

It goes on to say that they do not understand why Shri Nehru is not defending this strategic frontier.

"A few very important leaders of the neutral countries felt compelled to compare, rather in a mood of dismay, the leadership of Shri Nehru to that of a captain of a ship without a compass."

Therefore, Sir, this is not a small matter. There is a very definite major thought behind it in spite of what the Prime Minister may say. This attack on our frontiers is one step in the Chinese communist attempt to dominate the whole of South and South-east Asia. They have chosen us, India, because we are the strongest. When the strongest cannot fight, everyone else capitulates. They have also chosen us because for four years now we have encouraged their aggression by the pusillanimous and supine attitude which we have shown in not resisting their activities, a thing which Acharya Kripalani has very well described.

I want to conclude. I have not suggested anything now which is inconsistent with the policy of non-alignment. Let us remain non-aligned. But what does non-alignment mean? Acharya Kripalani quite rightly answered the charge on war-mongering. To defend your own territory is not to wage a war. I have never known of this suggestion before: that if you throw out bandits from your territory you are engaged in an act of war! It is not an act of war. It is just police action in your own territory. Let us certainly abide by non-alignment. I do not for a moment suggest anything against it.

An Hon Member: What about Azad Kashmir?

Shri M. R. Masani: But by non-alignment, is it meant that we cannot repel any attack on our own territory? Is it non-alignment against ourselves also? Are we neutral against India? What is the meaning of non-alignment when we are being attacked by another power? Non-alignment certainly involves defence of one's own territory, if you like, by oneself.

Secondly, non-alignment does not mean that we cannot equip our forces adequately. Shri Nehru said many years ago in Washington that when aggression was there, "we can not and shall not be neutral". He said:

"We have to meet aggression and resist it; and the force employed must be adequate to the purpose".

Can anyone who has read the White Paper say that at any moment in the last four years the force employed has been adequate to the purpose of defeating aggression? Everytime, we were outnumbered and out-maneuvred and captured and humiliated by superior detachments. So, equipping our army with arms obtained from other countries is completely consistent with non-alignment.

Acharya Kripalani rightly gave the example of Yugoslavia. I give two

[Shri M. R. Masani]

more examples—Sweden and Switzerland. Both these countries are neutral and non-aligned. But among the countries of western Europe, theirs are the biggest and the best-equipped land armies. Why? Because they realise that, since they are non-aligned, they will have to fight for their territories themselves.

Thirdly, non-alignment is not inconsistent with the capacity to recognise a dangerous neighbour. I know how, for nine years, a Government which lacked the character of a peace-loving and orderly Government has been glorified and made respectable in our own country and how we have received Mr. Chou En-lai, a man with blood on his hands, and held him up to our people as a lover of peace. Non-alignment does not mean that we keep our own people in the dark.

Finally, non-alignment does not mean that when our people show some patriotism, the Prime Minister should advise otherwise: he has been scolding our people. Instead of leading them in a crusade he has been attacking them, instead of attacking the outside aggressor. The only crime that some of our people here have committed is that we have reacted more passionately, more emotionally, if you like, or less responsibly, if you like, than the Prime Minister. But is it fair that the biggest anger of the Prime Minister should be reserved not for those who are trespassing on our soil and killing our people, but for those who want to give more power to his elbow? I want to tell him that the country will be behind him and he can move faster in facing the enemy.

There are three definite things our people want. I know that this House, and those who know, will in their bones feel that what I am saying is true. There are three things consistent with the policy of non-alignment. The great mass of the people demand the appointment of a Defence Minister in whom the armed forces and the

country have confidence. Secondly, the need is for the construction of roads and air-fields, and the obtaining of equipment wherever it can be found to put our forces on a parity with the Chinese Communist army. The third is, if the Chinese do not withdraw in the next few weeks, the third and final step is, the removal of all restraints on our armed forces to do their duty of making them withdraw and ejecting from our territory those who have their feet on it and to see that the flag of India flies once again on the Himalayas and not the flag of the Chinese People's Liberation Army.

Many of us have worked together in the past. As Acharya Kripalani said, we may be a motley crowd today, but in a democracy we should be a motley crowd. We have pulled together during the great struggle for Independence in which we all participated. In 1942, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Acharya Kripalani and I and many others took part in the "Quit India" campaign to eject from this country the British who had been here for many years. If, today, the Prime Minister will start a "Quit India" campaign against the Chinese, I can assure him that the whole country, barring the China Lobby, will be behind him.

Shri Kasliwal: To-day, there has been a Niagara of words on the question of India-China border relations. Shri S. A. Dange, in his opening speech said—(Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let this quit-House movement be over soon.

Shri Kasliwal: He said that we are discussing this motion in an atmosphere which has changed at least when compared to the position which existed a few months ago. I feel it is the contrary. The atmosphere has not changed because the aggression over our territory remains. China has not at all vacated her aggression.

Sir, on the 26th September, the Prime Minister wrote a long and

detailed letter to the Prime Minister of China and that letter really sets out our whole case. That letter stated that we are prepared to withdraw from Tamadem. We withdrew from Tamadem. In that letter we had said that the Chinese should withdraw from Longju, but they have not yet withdrawn from Longju. Even today, in spite of two reminders, they have not yet withdrawn from there. Not only that. Something more has happened. On the 28th October, a dastardly outrage took place in Ladakh in which nine of our men were killed and ten were kidnapped. It is a matter of surprise that the first information report was given to us by the Chinese. It was completely distorted, and the subsequent correspondence and letters which were exchanged between the two Governments completely expose the Chinese perfidy over the incident. On account of this incident, a great wave of anger and anxiety has swept over the country. I say that the nation, as a whole, which is faced with this aggression and is torn with anxiety and a feeling of rancour and emotion, is prepared to defend every inch of the territory of our land.

I go further and say that we accept whatever Acharya Kripalani had said: that we are prepared to defend in every possible way every inch of our territory. The nation as a whole stands behind the Prime Minister to defend every inch of the territory of our country. But, today,—there are parties—at least there is one party which refuses to recognise that there is Chinese aggression on our territory. The Prime Minister referred to a procession of the Communist party in Calcutta. He need not have gone so far.

I want to refer to the resolution of the Communist party, the resolution which they made recently at a meeting of their national council. What does the resolution say? In the first instance, they 'whipped up a war psychosis raised a false cry of Chinese aggr-

ession and threat to India's territorial integrity. May I ask what they mean by such a thing? It was suggested that the cry of Chinese aggression on our territory is a fake cry. If so let them make their stand clear. I am glad Shri Dange was speaking today in a slightly different tone. I want to know where they stand in this respect. I hope when their other spokesmen speak, they will make their position clear. They went further, praised the letter of Mr. Chou En-lai of 8th November and said it had constructive proposals. It is true it was a respectful letter, but what were the constructive proposals in that letter, I want to know. The constructive proposals were that we should withdraw 20 kilometers from our borders. Why should we withdraw? Mr. Chou En-lai's proposals were in favour of the Chinese and not in our favour. That is how they say it contains constructive proposals.

That letter has been replied to in great detail by our Prime Minister and he has said that the proposal of the Chinese with regard to withdrawal by 20 kilometers cannot be accepted, as it is completely impracticable. May I congratulate the Government and the Prime Minister on the brilliant letter which they have sent in reply to the Chinese letter? Not only is it a brilliant letter, but it is also a firm letter, couched in restrained language. I may say this letter epitomises our foreign policy; it contains in a nut-shell what is our foreign policy.

There is an amendment on which both Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani have spoken in great detail; I mean amendment No. 7. I want also to confine my remarks primarily to that amendment. I will read sub-clause (c) and (d) of that amendment, because they have clearly said that the letter of the Prime Minister is not acceptable to them. They say:

“(c) the fact that the latest letter of the Prime Minister to the Chinese Premier does not maintain

[Shri Kasliwal]

the stand that negotiations between the two countries can take place only on the basis of prior acceptance by China of our frontier and the immediate vacation of territories forcibly and wrongfully occupied by them".

If this was going to be our stand, there was no question of negotiations whatsoever. The Chinese would automatically withdraw. Where is the question of negotiation? But now both Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani have changed their stand a little and have said, "We are prepared for negotiation and peaceful settlement".

What is the object of this letter? It is to create an atmosphere of calmness, to lay the foundation for discussion and for a peaceful settlement. The object of the letter is to avoid border clashes. I am soory to say that neither Acharya Kripalani nor Shri Masani said anything, not a single word, about avoidance of border clashes. May I be permitted to point out that this is a very important letter, which contains the main question of avoidance of border clashes? Para 3 of the letter says:

"It is only recently that conflicts and difficulties have arisen in regard to the frontier... In the immediate present, we think it is important to avoid all border clashes so as to assure tranquility in the border regions and thereby create an atmosphere favourable for friendly settlement".

Again, the same thing is repeated in para 8:

"The risk of border clashes will be completely eliminated if our suggestion is accepted by your Government".

I want to ask, if the border clashes continue, where is the possibility of negotiated settlement? That is why

this letter was sent for the avoidance primarily of border clashes and certainly for laying the foundation for a peaceful and negotiated settlement.

There are other amendments, and I want to deal with them also. In this amendment itself what does part (b) say? It says:

"the absence of measures to ensure the defence of the Himalayan frontiers such as suitable deployment of troops, adequate equipment of our forces and the construction of necessary roads and airfields."

I must say with all humility that it is an amazingly irresponsible statement. Does he mean to say, do these people who have given this amendment mean to say, that they are to be told about the dispositions of our military forces? Do they mean to say that they are to be told that now we are going to construct an air field in such a place? Do they mean to say that they are to be told that now we are going to have such and such equipment and so on? That is why I say that this amendment is completely irresponsible in every way.

Then again, this amendment contains five different thoughts. The first point says:

"the suppression over a period of years from Parliament and the people of the fact of Chinese aggression".

I wish that these members who have given this amendment could have read the letter of the Prime Minister of 26th September, where he has made the position clear. He has taken this House into confidence and he has told the world why he suppressed this fact. I will only refer to paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 says:

"We did not release to the public the information which we had about the various border intrusions into our territory by

Chinese personnel since 1954, the construction of a road across the Indian territory of Ladakh and the arrest of our personnel in Aksai Chin in 1958 and their detention. We did not give publicity to this with the hope that peaceful solution of the dispute could be found by agreement by the two countries without public excitement on both sides."

I am glad that the cogent reason which the Prime Minister has given is valid even today. If only those hon. Members had read this letter carefully, I believe those amendments would not have come in the shape in which they have come.

I would like to say only this more about those amendments. Whatever might have been their views at the time of moving the amendment, I find that Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani, who supported him, have changed their stand. There is a shift in their argument. The amendment clearly says that they are attacking our policy of non-alignment. But what did they say? Acharya Kripalani read out his article in which he has praised non-alignment.

An Hon. Member: He has read out his whole speech.

Shri Kasliwal: Let them make constructive suggestions. Let them come forward and say: these are the steps to be taken. It is no use merely criticising that the Government has not done this or that. I need not repeat our policy, because the Prime Minister himself, in his speech, took a lot of time in explaining our policy of non-alignment. I am glad that this policy of non-alignment is a policy which today is well-recognized, which today is well-respected and I may say that even in the United Nations there are countries who recognize and say that this is the only policy which not only will destroy cold war but will prevent a hot war coming in.

I am really surprised that Acharya Kripalani says that in the United Nations even the Afro-Asian bloc is going against us and that we are getting isolated. I wish he had given certain facts. I want to say that all the things he has said, so far as United Nations are concerned, are completely wrong. I challenge him to prove a single statement. I challenge him to give a single fact, in what position are we there and in what way we have remained isolated, or in what way the Afro-Asian bloc—I go further and include even the Latin American bloc—has not supported our stand?

I will not refer any more to those amendments, or what Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani have said. They have said a great deal and my papers are full of notes of their speeches and it will be difficult for me to reply to all. But, at the same time, I want to refer to one thing.

The White Paper says certain things. It says that our nationals have been insulted and our traders and trade agents were beaten down and given uncivilised and inhuman treatment. I am really surprised to know all that—that a country, which has been well-known for its politeness, a country with which in the past we had very friendly relations, should behave with our trade agents in such a manner, that they should prevent the construction of our buildings in Gyantse. When one hears all these things one's heart burns. But I want to say this. Let us not lose our self-composure. Let us remain calm, cool and collected. Let us not be hurried, curried and stampeded into action which may later on turn out to be unfortunate. I am confident that if we remain calm, if we remain solidly behind our leader, the yellow clouds which have gathered on our horizon will fritter away soon.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that everybody

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

in this House and in this country barring a few abnormal people are united in the one idea that the integrity of India shall be preserved and that the borders of India will be defended. I do not for a moment think that our Government or our hon. Prime Minister can ever think in terms of conceding the unreasonable demands of the Chinese.

The hon. Leader of the Praja Socialist Party, Acharya Kripalani, who has been a leader of the Congress for many, many years, has known the hon. Prime Minister very well and he knows that the hon. Prime Minister is incapable of bending before arrogance or the type of tactics that the Chinese have adopted across our borders. True, the two White Papers make a very, very painful reading. We did not take the Chinese seriously in the beginning. The hon. Prime Minister in his speech has told us that he did not come to the Parliament in the early days because he was hopeful that the whole thing will be settled and he would then report it to the Parliament. He was confident that the Chinese, in view of the long-standing friendship between India and China and in view of the support that new China has received from India all along, will not do anything which amounts to deliberate aggression against our country. However, sometimes in life we live to learn and as was explained by the hon. Prime Minister it was only about two months back that they came out openly with their intentions and declared that they really have made a claim to our territory according to those maps which, they had earlier repeatedly said, they would revise at their leisure.

In view of this it is understandable that we should have placed our confidence in the long-standing Sino-Indian friendship and hoped for settling things amicably. Even today,

the attitude taken up by our Government of India is the same. We are polite to them but we have left no doubt whatsoever that we do not accept their claims. We shall never accept their claims. There might be some minor adjustments on the border that might be made through peaceful negotiations. We are prepared to consider it. But the general position has been made completely clear.

It has been stated by both Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani that we should declare that we are going to accept arms aid from any country as may be necessary. Where is the need to make such a declaration, Sir? If, God forbid, all efforts at peaceful settlement fail and a war becomes inevitable, the Prime Minister himself has said that that war shall not merely remain a war between India and China, that war will be a world war. It is this danger which makes him hesitant, makes us all hesitant about going to war. Apart from that, India has always stood for a policy of peace. Our policy which, as was explained by the Prime Minister this morning, has affected and influenced the thinking of the whole world, the thinking of the two big powers, the United States and U.S.S.R., that policy today we want to adhere to so long as we can. And it is in view of this that the Prime Minister has sent the counter-proposals to the Chinese Prime Minister.

It should be noted that while some of the letters from the Chinese have been arrogant, the last letter does not have a tone of arrogance. However, I do not build too much on the tone of that last letter. The fact is that the Chinese Prime Minister has made certain proposals to avoid border clashes in the future. Now, after that, our Prime Minister has made certain counter-proposals which in all fairness should be accepted by the Chinese Prime Minister if he is serious about stopping the border

clashes. The advantage of the proposals made by our Prime Minister is that it gives the Chinese a reasonable chance to keep their face and withdraw from our territory. In politics, as in personal life, one should give the opponent a chance to save his face if it is at all possible to do so. And the Prime Minister's proposals are giving the Chinese that chance. They have advanced on our territory. We did not have military patrols over there. So we are asking them that they should withdraw to their borders and we shall not also have our military patrol in that area. And that is not a permanent feature. That is the first step in which we have virtually asked them to vacate the aggression, and then we shall sit with them to decide on the details of the border, where discussions on such details are necessary.

Now, I must say that all the doubts and misgivings about our policy and attitude with regard to our border question seem to be mostly amongst our own people. I do not think the other countries have regarded our attitude at all weak or supine or in any way a policy which amount to appeasement. I do not think India and India's Prime Minister will ever resort to a policy of appeasement at the cost of national honour and national integrity; and I do not for a moment understand how any one can entertain such misgivings. We have made some mistakes to the extent of trusting the Chinese too much. We may have misjudged their intentions in the earlier stages, but today they are clear; and having understood the situation and the dangers as they are, we are naturally taking the steps that are open to us to preserve our integrity and our national honour.

There is a big difference between the history of China and that of India. China has been an imperialist and an expansionist country and they have had many military conquests, whereas in the five thousand years

of the history of India, never has India invaded another country, never has India gone and conquered another country. All our conquests, if they may be called conquests, were cultural conquests. Asoka sent his son and his daughter. Other teachers have gone out of India. They have taken a message of knowledge, a message of goodwill, a message of culture and friendship. We have never gone to conquer other countries. It was, therefore, natural for us to judge others according to our own standards and to think that China also would not think in terms of committing aggression and coming into our country with forces as they have done. It has given us a rude shock.

Having come to realise that our Himalayan border is no longer inviolable as we thought and the heights of the Himalayas are not enough to defend us by themselves, we have to think in terms of defences in the usual sense of the term. For that there are two things that are absolutely necessary. One is, we must not have areas that are just lying open where the Chinese can walk in. On the eastern border, we had our military outposts. The Chinese came to Longju and they entered into a conflict with us and they occupied Longju. There, they held themselves. They did not proceed further because, I think, even the Chinese are aware that a world war is not going to be to their benefit either. It may be a disastrous thing for us. It is not going to be any the less disastrous for them or for the rest of the world. Therefore, they have withheld themselves on the eastern border.

On the northern border, our area was vacant. They have moved further. According to the newspapers, the Pakistanis have sealed their northern border in Ladakh completely in view of what has happened on our side. We may have been wiser a little earlier. Now that wisdom has come to us, we have to adapt the rest of our Second Plan and

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

our Third Plan to the development of these hill areas as rapidly as possible. Countries like Sweden and Norway have certain parts of their territory covered with snow for eight months in the year. In those areas, they have made living conditions comfortable, attractive and very good. There is no reason why we cannot develop these hill areas of our country and make them attractive. With our growing population, we need all the areas. We must concentrate all our efforts on making our people live there and live as comfortably as possible with central help. Whatever facilities are necessary, such as heating and other things must be provided. It cannot be done overnight, of course. But we must make a beginning.

If the Chinese do not respond—I hope they will respond—to the Prime Minister's letter and a conflict becomes necessary, the challenge will have to be taken up. The Prime Minister has said that we shall take it up and I am confident that he will be backed by every man, woman and child in this country if that contingency arises. However, as a believer in peace, I think that we must do everything possible, as is being done by our Government to avoid such a contingency, consistent with national honour and national integrity.

The second point which is very necessary for the defence of our country is a neutral or buffer State on our border. We have Nepal, we have Sikkim and Bhutan and we have entered into certain understanding, certain arrangements with them, by which we are responsible for their defence and security and any attack on these territories will be considered an attack on India, as has been declared by our Government. The buffer State of Tibet was a great asset to us. The Prime Minister told us in this House that

Mr. Chou En-lai had told him that Tibet will continue to remain autonomous. His words were, "China has suzerainty over Tibet, but Tibet is not China". I am rather surprised that in our own maps published in our own country, north of the Himalayas, we show as China. We do not mention Tibet at all. I do not see why the fact of Chinese suzerainty over Tibet for 200 years over Tibet should mean that Tibet has no right to nationhood or to independence. Did we lose our right to independence because of the suzerainty of the British over us for 200 years? China had agreed with us on certain principles with regard to Tibet which they have violated. Is it not time for us to do something about it to tell the Chinese that we must have a buffer State in the north which the British had established, from where we withdrew all our extra-territorial rights out of idealism. I approve of the idealism. We do not want to expand into another country. We stand by our own principles, and, therefore, it was alright that we withdrew. But so should the others have adhered to their agreements. We must see to it that just as we took a stand with regard to Algeria and with regard to several other countries where the Western Powers were exercising suzerainty, likewise, we should have the same yard-stick with regard to our next-door neighbours, whose integrity and security is so intimately connected with our own security and with our own defence.

Some people have criticised our stand on the question of entry of China into the United Nations, after their recent behaviour. I do not agree with that point of view at all. If China had been in the United Nations, that would have exercised a check upon her with regard to her wrong actions, whether it be with regard to Tibet, or whether it be with regard to ourselves, that is, India. Therefore, our pleading the cause of China's entry into the

United Nations, in spite of what has happened, is fully justified, as the Prime Minister has said. We cannot give up our right policies because of the wrong actions of others. We fully stand behind the Prime Minister in the stand that he has taken, in the proposals that he has made, which are most honourable both for ourselves, and I think, for China also, because it gives her an honourable way to withdraw from the position it has taken and undo the wrong that they have done against this country.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): It has been sufficiently made clear by the speech of the Prime Minister and those of others, that India is facing a great crisis, and a real danger. In fact, since our Independence, there has not been any danger of this magnitude, which we have to face now. In her aggressive hostilities towards India, China has violated all the conventions, and all the treaty obligations in respect to Tibet, in respect of Indian nationals residing in Tibet and other places and so on. Even the courier privileges that were granted in the 1954 agreement to our trade agents have been withdrawn. Indian traders there have been reduced to paupers, and they have practically lost everything there. Now, they are not even in a position to repatriate their accumulated wealth from Tibet to India. They have been asked to send their wealth or their accumulated money by drafts through the Bank of China. That is an impracticable suggestion. These merchants are not very big merchants. They are residing in far-off areas. The Bank of China has got only one branch in India, and that is in Calcutta. So, in effect, this will mean that all these thousands of traders who have been doing business in Tibet for about a century or more would lose everything, all their wealth, all their trade and all their stock-in-trade.

Here, I should refer a little to the working of the Bank of China. As

far as I am aware, there must be some kind of reciprocity between India and other countries about foreign banks operating in India and about Indian banks also getting similar privileges for operation in those countries. But I think there is no Indian bank operating in the Chinese State now. I do not know why the Bank of China is being allowed to operate in India. I would humbly suggest that the Reserve Bank should make a careful scrutiny into the working of the Bank of China. I think it is not merely doing banking business, it is doing something more than that. There is a general feeling in Calcutta, and I think that that feeling is quite justified, that this Bank has been serving as an agent for transferring foreign money into India for subversive and anti-national activities. So I would suggest that the Reserve Bank should make a careful scrutiny of the working of the Bank of China in Calcutta and how its business is being conducted, whether it is not really used as an agent for transferring foreign money to India for fostering anti-Government and subversive activities. The allegation I am making is a serious one, and I hope the Reserve Bank will look into this matter.

16 hrs.

Moreover, thousands of Indians, are being denied their traditional trade facilities in Tibet. I do not know why the Chinese are being accorded business facilities in Calcutta and other places, particularly near about the border areas. I think during the last two or three years about 500 to 600 laundry shops have cropped up in Calcutta. They are luxuriously furnished. Practically in all the important street crossings, you will find one Chinese laundry shop. The business that these shops are doing would not justify such a luxurious establishment. I would suggest that the Intelligence section of the Government of India should

[Shri A. C. Guha]

look into the working of these laundry shops. When Indian businessmen in Tibet are being deprived of their traditional business facilities in Tibet, I do not know why this new entry by the Chinese into Indian business should be allowed. They are doing something more than laundry business, because the business would not justify such a huge establishment and the style in which those shops are being run.

Under the treaty of 1954, our pilgrims were assured certain facilities to visit Manasarover and Kailash. That treaty is being violated by China. I feel that Manasarover and Kailash are traditionally parts of India and they should be included within the Indian border. If ever there is any settlement about the boundary between India and China, the Government of India should see that these two places remain within the Indian border. These are the sources of the Ganges, Brahmaputra and Indus rivers and they are famous places of Indian pilgrimage. So they should be within the boundary of India.

From the White Paper, we find that a number of Indian nationals residing in Tibet and other places have been detained and they are being harassed and persecuted under detention. Even those who were kidnapped from the Ladakh area were being subjected to third-degree methods. We can understand the nature of interrogation in a totalitarian country. Even veteran revolutionary leaders broke down before interrogation in a totalitarian country. So I think we should take steps to see that any national of India, whether kidnapped from India or who is residing in Tibet, should not be subjected to such interrogation and third-degree methods under Chinese detention. I do not know what has happened to these persons who were

detained in Tibet, who were doing business and who have been residing there, whether they have been released or not. From the information available in the White Paper, they have not yet been released. What is the fate of these Indian nationals?

In today's papers there is a Government Notification saying that in Kalimpong no foreigner will be allowed to stay more than 7 days, and beyond 7 days, any foreigner, even a member of another Commonwealth country, would have to take a permit from Government. I do not know why even for 7 days free entry should be allowed to all categories of foreigners. The Government should make some distinction between foreigner and foreigner;—nationals of certain countries should be prohibited from entering Kalimpong and near-by areas. Kalimpong has acquired notoriety by being the centre of espionage against India. The notification issued yesterday or the day before is rather on the side of leniency. Certain foreign nationals should be definitely banned any entry into Kalimpong and near-about areas for even seven days or less than that.

It is astounding that even in India, the Chinese embassy has been carrying on Anti-Indian propaganda. I cannot understand any embassy situated in a particular country can engage in a propaganda against that country itself. Any country would consider it completely futile to do propaganda against a country in which it is situated. But here unfortunately, there is a section of people for whose consumption and benefit the Chinese Embassy finds it useful to publish the anti-Indian stuff.

The hon. Prime Minister referred to some demonstration in Calcutta. These

was a famous slogan given by Lenin in the early years of the Communist revolution that the shortest road from Moscow to London would be via Peking and Calcutta. They have got Peking and now they would be trying to get Calcutta. I cannot say whether they have got any particular intention of capturing West Bengal but that would depend upon the strength of the party functioning within India on behalf of another communist country. There is a suspicion in Bengal that it may be created as a sort of North Korea in the near future. That is a danger against which the Government should guard. There may be a surreptitious move to create a North Korea in West Bengal and I think the Government should not be too complacent about such a danger.

About the latest offer of the Prime Minister, certain amendments have been moved. It is quite easy to take objection to certain things and feel unhappy about them. There may be reason to feel unhappy about the latest offer of the Prime Minister. But it is difficult to suggest any practical alternative. The alternative suggested in the joint amendment is not constructive and it does not give any practical suggestion as to how to implement their desire. When we come to the practicability of a problem, we have to be satisfied with many things which we may not like by themselves. Personally speaking, I may not like the 1954 Treaty with China about Tibet but that was perhaps forced by the circumstances then prevailing. That might be considered to be the original mistake that the Government of India committed. That 1954 treaty practically liquidated the important buffer State of Tibet and then the other things followed.

It has been said that for 2000 years there have been friendly relations between India and China but they were due not to any friendly or peaceful intentions of China but to the protecting wings of the Himalayas. Now

those wings are going to be clipped if we allow the Chinese army to be posted at about 14,000 or 20,000 feet height on the Himalayan peaks. The House appreciates the emphatic declaration made last session by the Prime Minister that we could not make a gift of the Himalayas to the Chinese or to any other nation.

Today also he was quite eloquent about the importance of Himalayas not only for our defence or strategy but also for our culture, for our tradition and for the history of India, for the Himalayas are the part of history and tradition of India. Therefore, any encroachment on the Himalayas in any small portion there, should be resisted and must be resisted by this Government.

China has never been a peaceable country. We have been accused by the Chinese Government or by Chinese publicists and publicity agents that we have imitated the imperialists and have tried to be successor of the British imperialists.

16-11 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sir, the present China is the successor of party imperialists. China proper is confined within the Great Wall of China which would come to a little over one-third of the present China. The whole of China today is the result of the conquest of various emperors who dominated over China; Manchuria, Mongolia, Sinkian, Tibet and Yunnan, were never parts of China proper. After these conquests by Chinese emperors and conquerors, they went on integrating the country. Once they consolidate their borders on the southern part of China according to their own liking, i.e. the borders of India, I am sure they will also turn to the north and try to have their share of territory from the USSR. So, it is not unlikely that in the near future

[Shri A. C. Guha]

the friendly relations between China and the USSR will also be disrupted. Foreign policy or the policy of strategy does not follow always on the ideological lines. It follows on national lines. The present policy of Russia is the same policy that was laid down by Peter the Great. He tried to extend his territory to the Black Sea, with control over the Baltic ports and access to the Pacific also. That was the foreign policy laid down by Peter the Great and that is the foreign policy that has been followed by Russia even today. So, China also may some day follow the old policy of expansion and she is sure to try to make her position as supreme as it was once during the heyday of her glory in the past. That is why China has started this crusade against India.

It has been said that China became aggressive and angry at us because of our giving asylum to the Dalai Lama. But, in fact, the Chinese aggression started even long before that. The Chinese designs started even earlier than that. Now, what have we done in regard to the Dalai Lama? Dalai Lama has been given political asylum. The giving of political asylum is just an obligation of any civilised nation. Marx took asylum in England though England did not share the political theories of Marx. Lenin and Sun Yat-sen and others took asylum in other countries. Those countries might not have had great sympathies with the views held by Marx, Lenin or Sun Yat-sen. Similarly, if we have given shelter to the Dalai Lama, that is only as an obligation of a civilised nation, particularly under article 14 of the Charter of Human Rights laid down by the United Nations. In the charter it has been said that everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from oppression; and can stay in that country if it gives asylum. We have only followed that procedure; it is the obligation of a civilised nation and in fulfilment of the provisions of the Charter of Human Rights.

We have been behaving in a decent manner. We have not violated any of the international conventions or any of the treaty obligations, whereas China has been violating the international conventions and treaty obligations almost in every respect. And that is quite befitting us as a nation. Yet, I am sure, the Government will take necessary precautions to see that the areas already under the occupation of the Chinese will be vacated by the Chinese.

I am not suggesting any definite or easy course to achieve our goal. I think the House will accept the policy of the Government and endorse the views mentioned in the latest letter of our Prime Minister, because we cannot suggest any other alternative. 1,000 million persons are involved in this. It is not an easy thing to go to war. It is not possible for India or for any other country to leap into war in a light-hearted manner. We have to think carefully, because it will mean a global war. So, India has to behave with all the responsibility of a civilised nation and as a member of the United Nations.

Shri D. S. Raju (Rajahmundry):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you very much for giving me a chance to make a few observations on this most important and vital problem, which is agitating the minds of our countrymen today. It is a very vital question, because it involves the safety and territorial integrity of our country. It involves and vitally affects the relationship between our two great countries, India and China. Also, it might create a permanent state of tension between the two countries possibly leading to a major conflict, which if it develops unfortunately, will be fatal for both the countries.

However big and great China may be, it cannot get away lightly in a major conflict with India. It is bad

for Asia and deep darkness might descend upon both countries. But I am certain that China will not take any further steps towards aggression of the Indian frontier, because China has had a revolution; they have had enough experience and they know fully well that India also has become a strong country after independence. In this atomic age, no leader, however great he might be, will be foolish enough to launch his country in war against a neighbouring equally big country; and, China knows that.

I heartily support the statement of our Prime Minister. I heartily agree with the basic policy he has been all along pursuing and which he will pursue in future also. So far as the resolution of this conflict is concerned, we must make every effort to resolve it peacefully. There is still a chance and a possibility. This conflict might have been due to a misunderstanding on the part of China. It is possible that a solution might be found through talks between the two Prime Ministers; if any chance is available for the two Prime Ministers to meet and discuss this question, I think that is the best way of solving this problem. At least this is a warning shock for us. We cannot ignore these developments. Whatever the future might have in store for us, at least we must be prepared for any eventuality. We must get ready and take stock of the situation. We are 400 million people. In this atomic age, land force still plays an important part in the defence of our country. So, we must increase our land forces and put up the morale of our country. I do not think there is any Indian who will hesitate to sacrifice his life for the defence of the country. I think almost all the parties of our country are united under our Prime Minister for the defence of our country. I say that every effort must be made to strengthen our defence. Not only should we increase our land forces but, if necessary, we must be able to buy aeroplanes and tanks from whichever sources they are available. We had been doing that all along. We have

bought so many tanks from America and so many aeroplanes from the United Kingdom. So, we should not hesitate to get all the necessary equipment which we need for the defence of our country. Under no circumstances should we take any risk so far as the defence of our country is concerned.

Now the whole country is agitated over this problem, and there is righteous indignation in the nation. All the same, we are all still behind the Prime Minister in whatever he said today. We completely endorse his second reply to Premier Chou En-lai. We believe there is still scope for peaceful settlement across the table, and I hope that Chinese leaders and Chinese people will be reasonable enough to come to a settlement with us on this issue.

Now not only our country but almost all the countries of the world have expressed their opinion on this issue. They have unanimously said that China has trespassed into our frontier. Their occupation of Longju and the portion of Ladakh are obvious; nobody can deny them. Now how to keep the Chinese away from the frontiers? What is the solution? First of all, we must try all peaceful methods. If these methods fail, we will, of course, have to use force, if necessary, as that is the last resort.

The basic question, as has been pointed out by others, is our foreign policy. I feel that there is no necessity to effect any change in our foreign policy. It has paid us good dividends before and I am sure, as our Prime Minister said, there is a lot of truth in that. There is still a possibility that China might regret and get back to her original frontiers. The latest offer of our Prime Minister to vacate the frontier areas before a settlement is finally reached is, I think, a very good offer. It is in keeping with the dignity of both the countries. I hope it will be accepted by China. After all, we are two neighbouring countries and we cannot afford to be perma-

{Shri D. S. Raju}

nently in a hostile condition, because it may affect the progress of both the countries. There was no strife between these two great nations for over 2,000 years and there is no reason why there should be any quarrel on these incidents. Our relations with Pakistan have improved lately though we did not expect them to improve so soon. In the same way, I hope we might be able to arrive at a peaceful settlement with our neighbour China also.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I have been content with bringing in a substitute motion only calling upon the country for national unity, or national awakening, and national re-organisation in the face of this Chinese menace. But then there are certain matters that we cannot keep back from the country. We want it to go also into our record that there have been certain failings on our part which should be taken into account and remedied. There is need for re-orienting our approach.

I bring in this substitute motion for condemning the Chinese aggression and atrocities, for disapproving Government's complacency in relation to Chinese matters and for urging upon Government to take very strong and determined measures to evict the Chinese from our territory and to see that our frontiers are not easily violated by any outside nation.

Regarding the aggression and atrocities we have been reading in the White Papers, we have been reading in the newspapers and we have been told, though reluctantly, by Government now and then about the atrocities committed by the Chinese on Indian personnel and about their aggression against Indian frontiers. It is not, as the hon. Prime Minister put it this morning, an ordinary border dispute between one nation and another. He, of course, has referred to it as also of India's sentimental attachment to the Himalayas. But I put it from another point of view. It is something more than an ordinary

border dispute because it is a stab in the back by China while assuming the mask of friendship. It is under the outward cloak of friendship. It is under the cloak of *Panchsheel* that all this aggression has been going on against our borders. It is due to that very name of friendship that we have been yielding now and then and adopting an appeasing policy. It is a stab in the back and it cannot but be condemned in the strongest language. I would put it in the Shakespearian language. "It is the most unkindest cut of all" coming as it does, from one who has been calling himself as our best friend, ally or partner in *Panchsheel* and so on.

Then, *Panchsheel* has been used by the Chinese not in an honest way, but we can put it—as a sort of military camouflage or political strategy to expand itself and to extend its population to this side of the border and to occupy strategic positions on our side. That is unfortunately the manner in which China has understood *Panchsheel*. While enunciating our foreign policy, national organisation and our military disposition we have got to bear in mind this approach of China and the implication of *Panchsheel* to them, our so-called friends and partners.

China has not yet dared to attack Pakistan though it has intentions on Pakistan territories. It is probably because China is afraid that Pakistan will give the kick back with some interest or that America will come to the aid of Pakistan. China has also similar disputes, or at least intentions, against Russian territory. But it dare not go against Russia. It has found us very convenient with our professions of *Panchsheel* to deceive us. It has also been returning our compliments in words but actually it is extending its stranglehold over our territories wherever possible.

In this connection I would point out that from the newspapers a lot of things have been elicited. There are

many other things also that have got to be appreciated by Government. We are told that not only the military highway has been constructed from Sinkiang to Tibet, but that branch roads from that highway have been constructed into our own territory to the south and west of the highway. I would like the Government to enlighten us on this matter because it is a very vital issue. It is not merely a line of communication between Sinkiang and Tibet, but it is also intended for future aggression against Indian territories. The same thing is there on the eastern side also. There are highways. They have got a number of airfields. They have got their army bases at Yatung and Sinkiang. They have their aerodromes at Lhasa, Gantok and Rudok. They have a landing ground at Gyantse. They have an airfield near Chushul and another between Ladakh and Leh. Then among other roads is a military road from Yatung leading to our frontiers. China is preparing itself for another "protracted war" against us. You may remember that Mao Tse-tung is the author of that famous book *Protracted War*. He has been preparing his country for protracted wars, and now the protracted war against the Indian frontiers has commenced. It is not bombing here and there, but quietly, silently, slowly and steadily they are moving on into our territory, quietly occupying it and facing India with a fait accompli while talking outwardly of friendship, *Panchsheel* and all soft and friendly language. We have got to remember these things and we have got to remember that they are trying to pursue the old idea of the Himalayan Federation. They are trying, and I am afraid that one day, or other our Himalayan friends, the buffer States between us and China will be gradually liquidated or absorbed in Chinese hegemony.

Tibet has been liquidated. And by whom? It is by the connivance or the concurrence or help of India. I will remind the House of what I had referred to in the morning. The hon. the Prime Minister was telling this

House, and through this House the country, about the correspondence between India and China, relating to Tibet in 1949 and 1951. He unfortunately passed over two letters, very strong and very well-worded letters, emanating from our Indian Government to the Chinese Government, on the 26th October, 1950 and on the 31st October, 1950. They were very strong letters. They drew a line of distinction between the suzerainty of China over Tibet and the autonomy of certain portions of Tibet. At that time the Government of India was very strong and determined in those letters to China. The reply of China refers to our Ambassador in Peking at that time, who was said to have been given certain information by the Chinese Government. But obviously that information was not communicated to the Government of India. More than once there is the reference to our "then Ambassador" in Peking, and then this soft-peddalling began in 1951.

Sometimes, reading between the lines of these letters we cannot but feel that there has been a change, a major change in our foreign policy and in our attitude to China after 1950. It was during 1950 that those two letters referred to by me were written. It is in 1950 that we have got the statement of our Prime Minister while referring to the maps, it was on 20th November, 1950. I shall just read it presently.

Pandit Nehru, in reply to the questions in the Parliament regarding the Himalayan border, regarding the maps circulated by China about the Himalayan border, stated, in his usual, strong and determined way, 'Maps or no maps'—I remember, those lines were reverberating in the minds of everybody—"Map or no map, that is our frontier, the water-shed of the Himalayas, that well-recognised frontier, that is our frontier, and we will not allow anyone to cross it".

That was what Pandit Nehru, the Prime Minister had stated in the Parliament on the 20th November, 1950. As I said some time back, those two letters written in October 1950 and the strong, determined way in which

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

the Prime Minister put it in the House in November, 1950 make us feel that we then had a Prime Minister who was strong enough to lead us against the Chinese or any other aggressor nation. But, then, from 1951, we have adopted a sort of weaker policy towards China; may be in the interests of *Panch Sheel*, may be in the interests of world peace, may be in the interests of not having a cold-war. There is no doubt in our mind about that. If we go through the correspondence from 1949 to 1954, we find that we have been yielding and China has been misunderstanding our friendship. China has been misunderstanding our concessions to her. It has been thinking that we are either weak or we are prepared to yield in order to have Chinese friendship. In the Agreement of 1954, we have conceded everything that the Britishers had secured for us. We have given up everything that in 1950 we asserted to be our position and our view. What did we do? We gave up our rights there. We withdrew our military escorts from there. We had a right to keep two-thirds of the number that the Chinese kept there. We conceded certain other things. Ultimately, we have made a present of the lines of communications and all the dak bungalows. Everything we have made a free gift of. I do not say that we should not, I do not say that we should be mercenary in our dealings with other nations. But, I say, all these concessions made China feel that we are either weak or we wanted to placate her by being patted on the back and being told that they are our partners in *Panch Sheel*. After 1950, we yielded.

One of the most peculiar features of the 1954 Agreement is that in every clause you have it repeated from time to time that "Tibet is a province of China." In all the other agreements, it was not so. It was always there that there was some sort of autonomy for Tibet or at least Outer Tibet. That is the first Agreement where in every clause, we have put it down that

Tibet is a part of China. As my hon. friend who just preceded me has told us, we have practically liquidated Tibet by the Agreement of 1954.

Now that it is admitted that so much of our territory has been occupied, a few pertinent questions arise. Why was not the country and Parliament taken into confidence all these years? You remember, Sir, you led our delegation to China. Even at that time, when we were briefed by the Prime Minister, I do not think either you or any of us were told anything about the Chinese intentions, designs and operations in our own country. But, that road was being constructed, air-fields were being constructed and fortifications were being constructed and so on.

This morning, when one of our friends was telling about how China must be laughing in their sleeves, I felt when some of us were given that corresponding slogan to *Hindi Chini bhai bhai* how they must have been laughing in their sleeves that we did not know that our own country had been invaded and that a portion of the Ladakh military highroad had been constructed.

We remember also that during 1949 and 1950, we had entered into several agreements with Afghanistan, Sikkim, Bhutan, Nepal, etc. All that was before the end of 1950. That was when we were firm, but friendly in our approach. We had treated these buffer states as our friends. We were prepared to go out and help them. After 1950, as I find from all the recorded correspondence, we have begun yielding, we have begun appeasing.

Another question that arises is, why was no step taken to defend our borders? Our borders have got to be defended. Why did we leave our borders undefended? Another question is, why the Foreign Affairs Ministry did not take the help of Defence and Home Ministries and the State Governments concerned in order to

safeguard the borders? The External Affairs Ministry, as you know, Sir, is a Ministry to decide policies, particularly foreign policies. It has no machinery to implement its decisions regarding defence except our Defence organisation. It is true that we were told about Defence production. I was a Member always shouting from this side of the House that Defence production should be accelerated. But, that does not mean that defence of the borders should be ignored and should be totally left in the lurch simply in the interests of defence production. That is a wrong way to put it. They are not mutually exclusive things. Defence production can go on and defence of the borders should also be ensured.

There is another more important question. Even you did have a large army to defend all your borders, why did not our military intelligence cooperate and co-ordinate with the civilian intelligence of the Home Ministry or of the State Governments in order to locate people coming from outside? How is it that we did not know all these things? Then, what is the use of having an Intelligence Department at the Centre and Intelligence Departments in the States and the Military Intelligence Department? These are all working and functioning but an enemy country is approaching hundreds of miles into our own territory, occupying our territory, and yet nobody is taking notice of them.

Another thing we are told is that the Chinese are able to get information much earlier because they have means of communication such as radar, telephone and all those things. If they could import all these things into our side of the Himalayan frontier, how is it that our forces are going there without all these necessary equipments? Now, I would go a step further. What we are informed is that our forces do not have the required wearing apparel, the required food, the required type of weapons for the Himalayan terrain, for the high altitude, and for the snow-clad regions.

Now, that this question has come up,....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Who informed the hon. Member about this? Who gave this latest information to him?

An Hon. Member: By studying.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member said that our soldiers have not got enough food, enough wearing apparel, enough equipment and so on. I want to know how he had got that information.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): Figurement of imagination.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: We are not bound to disclose the source of information, but there are two methods by which we get information. The first is that we get information from books and other literature. The second is this. We get information through some sort of anonymous correspondence, which we cannot ignore. It is true that Government may ignore them; and Government may depend upon their legalised machinery. But we have our own machinery for information, and we give the information that we get.

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): But my hon. friend should place that anonymous letter on the Table of the House.

Shri Nath Pai: No, why should he?

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Then, we have got to look into the question as to our defence. We read in the papers today that our Defence Forces have taken over the NEFA area or are going to take it over. Although it was decided several weeks ago that our Defence Forces should take over the overall defence of the NEFA area, yet, till now, only plans are being prepared by an officer deputed by the Army Headquarters, by the Army Commander of the Eastern Command and by the Governor of Assam. We are told that they are planning for the Defence

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

Forces taking over, and then the Defence Forces would take over. I do not know what is true, but that is what has appeared in the newspaper report.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. The Defence Forces took over this some months back. They are planning for future work, future operations. They have been controlling this completely, since, I forget, July or August or September.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: That is the newspaper report which has appeared this morning.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: These anonymous reports need not always be correct.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: The report which appeared this morning says that although the Defence Forces were said to have taken over the NEFA area, at present three gentlemen have been authorised to formulate plans as to how that is to be implemented. I may be wrong, because Government do not take us into confidence....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I assure the hon. Member that what I say is correct. I speak with authority, because I know. The Defence Forces took over this, as far as I remember, about three months ago. The Army Headquarters requested the Assam Rifles to remain where they were, and they changed them about; they are under control. The Assam Rifles were considered by our Army Headquarters as peculiarly suited for that terrain. They said that they would keep them. I do not want to disclose where they are kept, but they have got them too round about. Now, they are conferring with each other. I do not know how the hon. Member has arrived at the conclusion that something was decided six months ago but that three people are meeting now only. The three people and four people will be meeting all the time, today, tomorrow and the day after.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Thanks for the information and assurance given by the Prime Minister. But we read in the newspapers, and we cannot help believing some of the reports, because there is no contradiction from Government side, and, therefore, we are forced to believe them. And believing them really feel worried as to whether our Defence Forces have really taken over. That is the newspaper report, I am just repeating it.

Now that we have the assurance, I go over to another point, and that is, to tell this House that in an emergency of this kind, it is natural for certain people to try to take advantage of it. I hope they will not, but I remember in 1948, when there was a war emergency and when there was an invasion by Pakistan, I told this House more than once the various items which we had to purchase. Many of them were useless and many were not required. So I would request Government to kindly bear this in mind, and if there are proposals coming to purchase this thing and that thing at a very heavy cost, they will try to scream them well. Secondly, I hope they will also try to supply our people with all sorts of necessities required for high altitude, for snowy terrain, hilly regions etc., like wearing apparel, hot water bottles, tents and other things. These should be given high priority.

With regard to weapons, it is possible that the weapons our people carry are too heavy and too cumbersome for these regions. If it is possible to substitute certain weapons at least for a few battalions, it will be a good thing. Of course, I will not go into further details in the House. I have given them in writing to Government—the various items that they could do. I may be wrong, but still they should examine those things.

I may not present at the time of reply tomorrow. With your permission, I would withdraw the amendment standing in my name.

Shri Khadilkar: (Ahmednagar): Fortunately, I do not belong to the so-called motley crowd on this side of the House....

Shri Nath Pal: But to the more motley crowd on the other side.

Shri Khadilkar:..nor do I share the honour or privilege of belonging to another motley crowd on the other side which our Prime Minister is leading in the name of the Congress Party, because the issues raised are of a fundamental nature. Though Shri M. R. Masani has declared from one side that he fully shares the view expressed by our Prime Minister and that he supports the non-alignment policy, equally on this side, Shri S. A. Dange said the same thing. I must admit—and those who know politics must realise—that both of them have psychological bonds with centres outside this country. There are centres of inspiration from where...

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Speaker, I must protest against this kind of remark. I have no psychological or other bond outside this country. Nothing that I have said warrants this kind of imputation. I would request the hon. Member to withdraw it.

Shri Khadilkar: I said that our politics is not free from world influence.

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Speaker, I seek your protection. The Member has made a statement which is a libel. He must withdraw it.

Shri Khadilkar: If his mind is insulated, I will withdraw it. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri M. R. Masani: The hon. Member has asked me whether I am insulated. I am not insulated. I am open to all kinds of influences. I object to the remark made by him and request that it should be withdrawn.

Shri Khadilkar: Then my remark stands.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member does not want to withdraw it, let it stand.

Hon. Members can support their contentions by adducing valid arguments instead of trying to attribute motives to any hon. Member.

Shri M. R. Masani: I demand that this remark should be withdrawn by the hon. Member.

Mr. Speaker: God alone knows what psychology is.

Shri Khadilkar: I will not withdraw it.

Shri M. R. Masani: I would like to know whether this is a phrase which an hon. Member can use against another.

Shri Joachim Alva: When I said that he worshipped at the Nehru shrine he called me a 'stooge'. Yet I never protested.

Mr. Speaker: I am not able to follow. Psychological bonds are different from pecuniary, economic or financial bounds. Nobody need quarrel with another on that score. One may have one ideology, another may have a different ideology. I am not able to take exception to psychological bonds. There are ideologies in the world. We all belong to various religions and so on. If my guru is somewhere outside this country, I owe allegiance to him.

Shri M. R. Masani: I have no guru outside this country. I submit the hon. Member must withdraw his remark.

Shri Khadilkar: I would not like to do injustice to my hon. friend. He is very intelligent and with his sweet reasonableness in this House, I expect of him some rational approach... (*Interruption*) Let him hear

[Shri Khadilkar]

me and then if I find that it is derogatory, I will withdraw the remark against him as well as Shri Dange.

Shri M. E. Masani: I refuse to allow myself to be put on the same level as Shri Dange... (Interruptions).

Shri Khadilkar: Before coming to the threats that are facing the country, I would like to remind the Prime Minister about one thing. Since perhaps the French Revolution, there are ideological considerations in every nation's foreign policy and in our country during our struggle for freedom the only mind that influenced Indian nationalism with some foreign outlook was that of Pandit Nehru. Even now there is such a wide gulf between the leader and the followers. When he said that there were so many people on this side who exploit the situation, it is most tragic. But I find that many of the people sitting opposite talking loudly that they have no faith in this basic policy and they have a sneaking sympathy with Masani and Kripalani. (Interruptions.) I know it from their utterances. Therefore, at this hour of crisis, he must also discipline the minds of these peoples... (Interruptions.)

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): Sir, he has no right to say what our attitude is. He is completely mistaken if he thinks that what he has said is our attitude.

Shri Khadilkar: Today, Chinese aggression, everybody admits, has really put to test our foreign policy which we were so long following without deeper understanding. There are amateurish suggestions about going to the battle, about diplomacy, about our foreign policy. Those who live in the old world ideas can very well advance those suggestions. Today the world has much advanced. Therefore, when we think in terms of defence and foreign po-

licy, we have to live with the current elsewhere. We cannot cut away from the world current. By doing so, we can advance certain plausible arguments and say: we have failed here or we have failed there and thus create a certain amount of defeatism in the country. That process is already there. I would like to warn the people of this country from this platform... (Interruptions). I say this from this House that they must understand the implications of our policy and how we are going to implement it.

The Prime Minister said about the one track mind. There is nothing wrong in the policy. But our diplomacy is of one track nature and it is a diplomatic failure because when I study the history of diplomacy in the Soviet Union as well as China, I find there is a certain amount of dialectical dualism in it. The Prime Minister, as a true Gandhian, got through that tradition in the national struggle and trusted to a large degree the professions of Chinese leadership. It is not a question of importance whether a mile of territory is occupied by the Chinese. The basic issue is that our neighbour is such that he never keeps the plighted word. You cannot live in peace and good neighbourliness and friendship with a neighbour which breaks every agreement on some pretext or the other. This is the gravest issue before the nation. When I discuss this matter, I want to bring to the notice of the House: what are the objectives of the Chinese foreign policy since the Communists have come to power? I have given some thought to it. Some eminent writers about the Soviet developments and Chinese developments have pointed this out. There is a certain force of tradition. Ultimately Marxism is getting deeper roots and is overcome by tradition. Of all the communist countries, China has greater and deeper traditions and roots in the traditions.

[Shri Khadilkar]

fear of war, either cold war or as some people in this House are advocating, keeping before them the jealous ideal 'brinkmanship of politics' to be followed in this country. All these people and all these statesmen who have advocated it have been defeated because the world forces have come to such a stage where a certain understanding is absolutely necessary and war has become prohibitory at the present juncture.

17 hrs.

Therefore, when such a healthy atmosphere of peace, of dispelling suspicion, lessening cold war tension, is prevailing there, should we hope that the same atmosphere will be kept on our frontier? That is the main issue, the basic issue, the fundamental issue of non-alignment and peace policy. We find China has not simply occupied a few square miles of territory. It might be 1,000; it does not matter for me for the time being, because graver issues are involved. It has knocked down the bottom of peaceful co-existence. It has threatened the outside democratic world. I am sorry that except for the statement of Mr. Khrushchev, no other socialist country in the world has openly criticised this breach of peace policy by China nor our communist friends have that courage to condemn it.

An Hon. Member: They never had it.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, I would like to state on this occasion that when we subscribe to this policy, we must subscribe to all its implications. When Mr. Masani says "I subscribe to it", then all the implications are there. On the economic front, he cannot advocate a policy of no further industrialisation and more of agriculture. That is a contradiction. He must study the theory of contradictions from Mao at least, if nothing else. In his own logical argument, he should not allow such a contradiction to creep in.

The non-alignment policy that we have adopted in my opinion, is the

only policy which can develop the country, put us forward, prepare us for better defence on our own strength, and without looking to help from this side or that side. If at all we want to stand on our own feet and stand up to China, we cannot just think in terms of deployment of troops; we will have to think in terms of creating a mighty industrial base that will sustain the army. Without such a base, talk of war or taking a posture of war has no meaning.

Therefore, when I support the non-alignment policy. I support it fundamentally. But at the same time, so far as the northern frontier is concerned, we will have to assess the past mistakes that we have committed and come to some real conclusion before we advocate any policy of a practical nature. At the northern frontier, the first great mistake that we committed was that we just overlooked foresight of our former rulers; when the Britishers were ruling here, they had certain ideas about the defence of our country.

Here I would like to remind the House of a small extract of the so-called Simla Conference. In the Simla Conference agreement one paragraph is really of some significance to us even at the present moment. I will only read article 3, omitting everything else. It says:

"Recognising the special interest of Great Britain, in virtue of the geographical position of Tibet, in the existence of an effective Tibetan Government, and in the maintenance of peace and order in the neighbourhood of the frontiers of India and adjoining States, the Government of China engages except as provided in the article 4 of this Convention not to send troops into Outer Tibet, nor to station civil or military officers not to establish Chinese colonies in the country."

Here every word is important.

"Should any such troops or officers remain in Outer Tibet at the date of the signature of this Convention, they shall be withdrawn within a period not exceeding three months."

Now, if we go through the whole document, we find that for the defence of the northern borders Tibetan position had a very vital significance and the British statesmen then had given very serious thought to it and they have entered into a Convention, the Simla Convention that in no case should the military occupy Outer Tibet and that it should remain an autonomous and completely independent State—it is in other paragraphs which I am not reading. Because, it is very difficult for two big nations, like India and China, to live in peace without a small territory like Tibet having autonomy. Even if suzerainty is exercised by the Chinese, it does not matter—but there is autonomy which would be effective in a real sense. This is one part.

I would like to refer to another matter, which is of very great significance. In 1895 there was a general agreement between the Britishers, Russians, Chinese and Afghanistan—I hope the External Affairs Ministry will take note of it; I do not know whether they have come across this document. At that time they laid down certain convention, certain rule of guidance for determining the boundaries. I would like to read that rule, because even after revolution when the demarcation of boundaries between Afghanistan and Russia was undertaken, that rule has been followed. I will just quote a small part of it. It is from the preface to the Report of the Proceedings of the Pamir Boundary Commission in 1895, which demarcated frontiers at the Wakkan corridor to the extreme north-east of Afghanistan where the Russian empire in Asia, Afghanistan, China and British India met. The text of it says:

"Geographically, politically and ethnographically watersheds... are

the only true and stable boundaries in these regions; and whether in the higher valleys for nomad grazing, or in the lower where cultivation is dependent on irrigation, the possession up to the headwaters of each system by one people constitutes the only frontier that has survived the lapse of time.

"The demarcation was carried out by an agreement between Britain and Russia; China did not participate. Quotation taken from 'Afghanistan' by one of the authors."

If at all we are going to settle our northern border, this is a precedent which has been followed while demarcating the border between Russia and Afghanistan. If this is followed, what happens? If you study the geography you will find that all the portion below Brahmputra, that is, the whole Indian boundary, is not on the southern part of the Himalayas, as they are pushing us down, but it will be on the northern part of the Himalayas. The important thing is that the old places of pilgrimage, like Kailash and Mansarovar....

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

Shri Khadilkar: Are we not sitting longer?

An Hon. Member: You should conclude.

Mr. Speaker: Three minutes more.

Shri Khadilkar: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: All right, five minutes.

Shri Khadilkar: Because these places of worship.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is going into ancient history. What is to be done now?

Shri Khadilkar: If this convention is accepted, which has been accepted

[Shri Khadilkar]

by Russia, while dealing with Afghanistan, then the northern range of the Himalayas will be our border and Brahmaputra will be the dividing line. When they are claiming on their side that for their convenience a certain road from Sinkiang to Tibet is necessary and that they would like to occupy certain territory, then why should the Chinese statesmen not simultaneously consider our sentiments, our desires and our strategic position if they want to live in peace—and peace of a durable nature—on the same border? Why should this convention not be accepted? If this convention is accepted then a few miles here or there, as I said have no significance.

Leaving behind all this ancient history, when I come to my own country at this hour of crisis what do I find? I said about Shri Masani, but everybody equally feels that in this country the Communist Party of India has, since its birth, accepted some tutelage from outside. During the British regime, till 1947, they were under the tutelage of the British Communist Party. You know what is their strength. After that, that tutelage has been transferred. But even now, no member of the Communist Party or the Communist Party as a whole is prepared to consider, "My country is not small. Why can I not take equal pride? It can develop and I can stand up to China and say as a party"—because it is called a brother party on the other side—"that you have committed aggression and you have demolished India-China friendship." They have failed to do that. While dealing with the border they are discussing the situation on a metaphysical plane. They are giving an impression and are showing to the people, "Oh! we are with you." I can understand a friendly approach. But it must be on a level of equality, consistent with national honour. If once in their history they could have stood up and said, "We, as the Communist Party of India, cannot draw a particular line and accept guidance from outside on this issue; we stand on our own and we condemn

this unequivocally" then we would have got some confidence. But today it is very dubious. If you go through the Resolution that they have carried at Meerut and their writings, you will find that there is more defence of the Chinese Communists' position than of the position taken up by our Government. The last letter of Shri Nehru to Mr. Chou En-lai is a well-worded letter. It is quite firm. But we will have to remain firm while demarcating this boundary if we want to sustain our policy. And we will have to tell China that "if you want to live at peace with us and with the Asiatic world and the Arab world, you should stop this aggression." Some people think that we are friendless. They are wrong. China today is more isolated than India. The sympathies of the whole Asiatic world, the sympathies of the whole African world and of the whole western world are with us. Only, China can perhaps expect, and that too to a limited extent after the recent utterances of Khrushchev, support and sympathy from the Soviet Union. Therefore, in the international field, those who argue that our policy has failed do not appreciate the significance of world opinion. No country today can take the law into its own hands, even a country which for the time being is outside the pale of international world opinion like China, and commit aggression which would lead ultimately to war because it is afraid of the consequences.

Therefore, regarding the defence matters, without going into the army and other questions, I want to suggest one or two things for the consideration of the Government. My first suggestion is that in this season people from the hills come down. It would be far better if we approach them on a non-political level and if Government requests a man like Shri Vinoba Bhave to send his Sarvodaya people on the border region from Kashmir . . . (Interruption) Please hear, you have not studied the problem . . . from Kashmir to the Naga

area; because there is a feeling, there is a wide gulf between the people of the hills who come down seasonally and the other population. The people of the hills feel that the people of the plains are their exploiters. There is necessity of building roads and bringing them together. But when on the Tibetan side certain rapid development is taking place and prices have come down—I am telling you from my information—when prices of daily necessities on the other side have come down much below the level on this side, naturally people on this side would feel what is wrong if these things happen on that side.

Therefore, for the sake of defence, a certain amount of emotional integration with the people on the border is absolutely essential. You can construct roads and give them their daily necessities; their employment problem could be solved; a higher-region agricultural project could be undertaken. But it should be the part of defence to develop this area and enthuse people that we are one with them and that there is no gulf between their living, their habits of life, their economic circumstances and the people who are living in the plains. If this is carried out I feel we will strengthen our border much more than thinking in other terms.

One word in conclusion and I have finished. There is a talk, and generally I have heard from outside also, just when I came in, "Nehru sarkar ko hatado"—there was a slogan like that outside. I was just laughing. There was a small demonstration. (An Hon. Member: By whom?) By some socialists. Now it is the hour of crisis. Are we going to create a better atmosphere of unity by running down the Government for whatever acts of commission and omission, or for not acting correctly? As I said, on the foreign policy level, we are definitely on a sound footing, but on a diplomatic level our failure is deplorable. Our machinery of gathering information is very, very backward. That has

been proved in this conflict. Unless these things are set right, whatever we might say in this House or outside, it will fail to carry conviction.

Therefore, in conclusion I would appeal to every Member of this House to look at this problem not from a partisan angle but from a national angle and show what way we should go, and go unitedly so that with the united might of the people, with the support of world public opinion which is a great moral support—I attach great value to it—with the great moral support of world public opinion we can face the Chinese and compel them to admit—because geo-politics dictates it—that the northern frontiers under no circumstances should have a military might on the other side.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Mr. Speaker, Sir, since last we discussed these matters in this House two months back events have occurred that have certainly worsened the position between India and China. If there was any lingering doubt in our minds at that time that China might understand and change her policy again, such hopes have been entirely shattered today.

I do not want to recapitulate all that has been said. Our Prime Minister himself has laid the present position before us. There is no doubt that on October 21st and 22nd the events occurred and suddenly the Government and the country realised that in the Ladakh region, there was a further incursion, our police party had been attacked, numbers killed and others taken away as prisoners. It was something that shattered any doubt, as I said, that still might have lingered amongst any of us that China might come to her senses about these matters. We see that in Longju, the Chinese aggressor is still there. In Bara Hoti, the dispute remains. So far as Ladakh is concerned, we know what the position is.

Turning to another aspect, that is the position in regard to trade relations, our Prime Minister mentioned,—

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

and other Members have also referred to that,—the manner in which the treaty obligations with us and the pledges made by China were broken one after another and the indignities to which our own people, who are representatives of this country as Trade Agents and Consul General at Lhasa have been subjected. We also notice a much more subtle thing that is happening, a far more dangerous thing to my mind, and that is the propaganda that is going on—the fifth columnist activities. About these, I shall speak a moment later. I should say in spite of all these things, that all that is happening does not mean that we have to be panicky in any way or that we should give up our policy of non-alignment in any way. I do not think the people of this country as a whole wish to give up the policy of non-alignment which has been built up all these years according to the wishes of the people. It is not a statement of the facts in proper position to say that it is a policy merely that has been enunciated by our Prime Minister or even by this party. It is a policy that has been accepted by the whole country as the best policy. It is a policy that other countries which mistook and misunderstood us in earlier days, have now understood. It is rather unfortunate that in spite of all that, there are Members both in this House, and more especially outside the country, who rather look down on this policy. I do not think that it brings any credit or could have brought any credit to us or to the country or the Government if we had suddenly changed our policy because such a policy, at the moment, is difficult for us to pursue. Ours is a country which won its freedom through non-violence, through the Gandhian technique. It is natural for this country to wish to adhere to such policies. It does not mean for a moment that, if our territories are attacked, we should not defend them and it does not mean for a minute that we are willing to give them up. It does not also mean for a moment that we are willing to give up the

beliefs that uphold and sustain the nation, just because they are difficult today. We must recognise these things and understand them first of all.

Then, I come to the recent events. The Prime Minister has written a letter to Mr. Chou En-lai in which he has suggested a method by which agreement might be reached. This has been criticised by certain people. I think the majority in this country and in this House support it, because even to the last, we must try to bring about a settlement by peaceful means, because that is the objective for which we stand. But that does not mean that we are willing to allow our territories to be taken away. It does not mean that. Now, what has the Prime Minister said? The Prime Minister has not accepted the Chinese Prime Minister's suggestions, which obviously were not only impracticable but impossible for India to accept. But he has stated: 'You please vacate the aggression; although Longju is our territory, and although that portion of Ladakh is our territory, yet, as an interim measure only, we are willing not to reoccupy it until we have come to an agreement.' You may scoff at this, but I personally think that there is nothing wrong in it. In fact, that is the only way. We must still search for a peaceful settlement, if a peaceful settlement is at all possible. It may be that China may not understand our language, but I hope she will understand our language, for, as the Prime Minister said in an earlier debate, that may be, she does not understand the gentleness with which we speak, but she should by now understand that gentleness does not mean that we are not firm. It was Gandhiji who said that although he would believe in non-violence—in fact, it was due to him that the policy of non-violence and the technique of non-violence came into our country—yet he would go in violence rather than that our honour should be violated. That is something which China must understand.

that when we still make an offer, we mean it because we are making that offer in all good faith, because we still want that agreement should be reached. We do not want a war. And I dare say that in the long run, China too would understand that a war at this juncture will not help her either. And I do hope that the points that the Prime Minister has urged in his latest letter will be accepted by China.

There is one point on which I want to lay particular stress, because although we must be concerned over the defence of our frontiers—that is important, of course—and although we must be concerned about our defence industry and about how it can be built up, which is also important, there is something else to which that much of attention has not been paid as yet. It is true that we are not a country that is at war, but fifth columnist activities are taking place in this country in many ways. I do not say that every fifth columnist belongs to any one party. I do say, however, it is difficult for those whose loyalties are extra-territorial to conform to any national ideas. In spite of what the Communist Party has said in its resolution, there are many communists who do not even follow today what they are saying. Earlier today, somethings happened on the floor of this House, and I said, and I repeat what I said, that during the Calcutta demonstrations by the Communist Party recently, some things were said by the followers of our erstwhile friends here which perhaps they do not want to do, but which they taught them to do yesterday, and as a result of which they continue to raise those slogans. They said in Bengali that 'Unless you have immediate arrangements with Chou and meet him, you, as the Prime Minister, may vacate your chair'. That was what they said. (*An Hon. Member: Shame*). And what else did they say? They said that 'China believes in a peace policy.' They said '*Cheen Shan-ti Chahé*' but they did not say '*Bharat Shanti Chahé*'. That is the point.

Those of us who live in Northern India or more especially near Delhi may think that the Opposition parties here are of a different nature. May be they are reactionary—I do not say that. But the point is that in West Bengal, it is not the Swatantra Party, it is not the Jan Sangh, which holds sway in the Darjeeling district. It is not the Chinese either. There was a news item today to the effect that the number of Chinese in Darjeeling in Kalimpong, have not increased. I am sure that it is true. That propaganda is not done by people outside India. It is done by people who are citizens of this country.

Shri Nath Pai: From Calcutta.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: They may not necessarily be in Calcutta. Even what they do in Calcutta may be of a nuisance value, because the intelligentsia of the country, which may have been caught napping, before, is not going to be caught napping today. But let us not forget that the people on the border are different. Every word of what Shri Khadilkar uttered just now on this point is true. I entirely endorse what he said. It is the emotional integrity of the people on the border that we have to think of. There are minorities of different descriptions among the border people and if these people are told that a 'liberation army' is coming to put them in power, they believe it. They do not know everything. The only thing against this propaganda is the fact that the Tibetan refugees have also come and tell them about what is happening in Tibet. But the Tibetan refugees have now stopped coming, and we have to be very careful as to what is happening. Amongst the Tibetan refugees also are sometimes people of a different point of view. They are also doing a certain amount of harm. It is particularly these aspects that I would like to bring to the notice of the House.

I know that the Prime Minister is aware of it. I do not think, like some

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

of our hon. friends, that the Government are not aware of things, that they will not take action. They are aware of these things. I do not think that you can question the integrity of the Prime Minister, not because he is the Prime Minister of India but because he is Jawaharlal Nehru who has led this country in India's battle for freedom in the past. Do you mean to say that his integrity can be questioned by any party? If there are such parties in this country who believe that they can better their position by questioning the integrity of the Prime Minister, let them realise that today national solidarity is of paramount importance. It is not good to weaken the position of those in whose hands the country has placed the power to look after our defences. To question the leader himself today is to question India. I think we must all be united solidly and say that we stand behind the Prime Minister. And China must realise and understand that India may speak in a soft and gentle voice, but she is not going to allow her territories to be taken away. But along with this, it must be said that we shall also keep inviolate the policies we have followed in the past. To the extent possible, we shall do so, and if our honour demands that we have to go beyond it, we shall go beyond it. But let us leave it to the Prime Minister, who is the leader of this country because he will take the right action. Of that I am certain.

I do not want to take more time of the House. I would merely reiterate this: let us be as careful about infiltration in this country as encroachments from outside. Of course, encroachments are bad, but they are before the public gaze. Infiltration is very subtle and that infiltration must be stopped.

Shri Nath Pal: Hear hear.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I would like to say, however, to the hon. Member who said 'Hear, hear' that though I

am very thankful to him, I would tell him that fifth column activities can also come from those who do not stand solidly behind this country. Let it not be said today that we were all for the party and none for the State. This is an hour of crisis when it is absolutely essential that we stand together except for those whose loyalties may be outside India. From them of course we cannot expect so much.

Shri Nath Pal: May I assure her that so far as the Members are concerned, we will stand behind our Prime Minister only when he is marching but not when he is withdrawing?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Since he has said something let me answer it.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Joachim Alva.. (Interruptions).

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I have tried to explain the stand of our Prime Minister. We have written to him so that a peaceful settlement may come. If it fails, the whole of our country will be kept inviolate and it is not the Prime Minister who will let her down.

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir, in the first place, I must pay a tribute to the Members of the External Affairs Ministry for producing two white papers on the Indo-China crisis. The first white paper was produced within no time and it has been sold out and eagerly read all over the world. The second volume—though it may have a few blemishes—makes up the whole volume. Both the volumes will constitute important documents in our national archives. (An Hon. Member: You mean White Papers?) Yes, White Papers. When I first came into this Parliament in 1950, I went up to the Palam aerodrome when the late Liaquat Ali Khan arrived. That was the period of Indo-Pakistan crisis which was just starting. Since then I have been there for every Prime

Minister who has come from Pakistan. I have made it a point to be present on such occasions. I then watched a man behind the Prime Minister, quietly and in an unassuming manner assisting the Prime Minister and ten years after I see the same quiet-mannered and unassuming man. He is one of the most unassuming men of the former Indian Civil Service. I mean Shri Dutt, the Commonwealth Secretary then and now he is the Foreign Secretary. I want to pay him this tribute because I have been attacking men in the External Affairs Ministry in the past.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is not usual to pay any tribute to any member of the Civil Service or the Secretariat for the simple reason that another Member will get up and attack him. One hon. Member may be pleased with him—I am not referring to this particular case; all hon. Members may be pleased with him—and another may not. God himself is not revered all through by all men; there may be some people attacking him. Therefore, all hon. Members will try not to refer to the qualities of any particular officer working in the Secretariat.

Shri Joachim Alva: I was criticised for mentioning two officers in the Ministry of External Affairs. I want to be constructive.

Mr. Speaker: We have not come to the point. What is to be done with respect to this?... (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Nath Pal: He is only repeating the same mistake. The number of mistakes is increasing.

Shri Joachim Alva: The letter which the Prime Minister has written to Mr. Chou En-Lai is a sincerely-worded letter and it would depend upon the statesmanship of Mr. Chou En-Lai to reply in similar terms. It may be that he may not accept it substantially. One does not know what kind of a reply will come from the Prime Minister of China. It is possi-

ble that he may make alternative proposals and these are the proposals that we should keep going and we should not snap the bond of negotiations. We may make a full-fledged offer and the other side may accept lesser proposals... (*Laughter.*) Sir, I sat without my lunch to make my speech and this is the first time that I take a glass of water as a Member of Parliament inside the House.

Shri Nath Pal: Please. We do not deny you that.

Shri Joachim Alva: I hope that Mr. Chou En-Lai may substantially accept these proposals which the hon. Prime Minister has made. When I was in China, I referred to the Ladakh incident in my talks with the leaders there. The leaders were very keen on having a friendly negotiation. I saw Mr. Chou En-Lai on the 9th October, and was sitting with him for 2½ hours. He explained the background of our troubles, and they were very keen on a settlement of the Sino-Indian border trouble. But it seemed that after Ladakh everything has changed. The Ladakh incident has changed all that. They mentioned to me about the Ladakh incident. I said that a man who is angry must keep quiet, lest any undesirable thing should happen, till the questions are settled. I said nothing else. When an act of aggression is committed and another man's land is trespassed, it is a thing to be settled calmly. You do not talk of war immediately.

I make bold to say, after meeting the leaders in China, Chairman Mao and Mr. Chou En-Lai, that the leaders there could not have had any direct hand or knowledge of the incident in Ladakh, because it was a high terrain. But once having come to know of the Ladakh incident, it would have been graceful on their part to have acknowledged that they had made a mistake, and then release our prisoners. But, on the other hand, they were not graceful enough. They said: "You committed aggression" and that is where these negotiations were jolted.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Our territory in fact has been unjustly occupied. When today Shri M. R. Masani says, "eject the Chinese", he forgets that we must have the same power to eject Pakistan from Azad Kashmir. If we were to eject Pakistan from Azad Kashmir there would be a war tomorrow morning. If we take our troops and march along, what will happen? My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai might suggest that. If we take the troops and march them along, on these territories in dispute, it will be nothing short of a war. There will be grave consequences. Are we ready and strong for an immediate war.

Let us not cast reflections on the Defence Minister. I do not hold a brief for him, but let us not forget our army. Let us pay our tribute and give our praise to our defence forces. Our army is in first class form. Our men in the army are great patriots, and they are watching and even dying in the snow in Kashmir, watching for your and my security. Our Air Force boys are able, and some of them are ace pilots. One ace pilot took me round at the Farnborough air show in London. He said "I cannot get married". I asked him why. He replied, "If I die tomorrow there will be no one to support my wife". Thus our boys in the Army, Navy and Air Force are making sacrifices for our motherland.

When talking about our fight for freedom, I might refer to this aspect. Shri M. R. Masani, in the course of his speech, said that he participated in the struggle for freedom. Well, Shri Masani has had the best fruits of office. He was the Mayor of Bombay and then he was the Indian Ambassador in Brazil. It is the most horrible thing when he says that.....

Mr. Speaker: Why is the hon. Member carrying on the China fight inside Parliament here? Why should he speak about Shri Masani? Let him not refer to any individual.

Shri Joachim Alva: You were not in the Chair Sir, when Shri Masani spoke. He cast aspersions on the Prime Minister and cast aspersions on everybody, and it is my duty to reply to him.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know if one wrong could make the other wrong right.

Shri Nath Pai: Even two wrongs cannot make one right. If Shri Masani has made a mistake, compel him to withdraw his remark. That would not justify any personal expression of explanation from the hon. Member.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rae Bareilly): What Shri Joachim Alva meant to say was that Shri Masani reconsidered socialism in time!

Shri Joachim Alva: I have spoken about the background of our quarrel. We cannot afford to have talks of war from the people. I would like our people to go to London and see the ruins there. I would like them to go and see the German Democratic Republic or Berlin. I did not even see a single cat or dog in some of the ruined streets. Very criminal and inhuman things have occurred there due to bombing. Berlin is the place where Hitler died. I think I was there in 1957, and I am sure that in 1959 there is not even a single man, woman or child in those ruins of war.

I had been to Stalingrad. I reached there at 2 O'clock in the morning. The earth seemed to cry out. The whole ground at Stalingrad had been white and desolate. It has seen such a tragic history. They told me that it was in Stalingrad that Messrs. Khrushchev and Mikoyan did yeoman work in the war and lost their eldest sons.

The Prime Minister has kept control within his hands. Mahatma Gandhi had declared that our Prime Minister

was his political successor. The man who liberated India, Mahatma Gandhi, had a right to say who would be his successor. Mahatma Gandhi interfered only when the Japanese invaded India and while Hitler rained his bombs on London. Otherwise, he never interfered in the policy-making of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and that man, has not yet deserted his golden policies—I would not like the hon. Deputy Minister of External Affairs to be laughing when I talk of Mahatma Gandhi. I would like her to be more serious. We are not bred in foreign traditions.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): The hon. Member is referring to irrelevant things.

Shri Joachim Alva: You are not bred in the tradition of Mahatma Gandhi. You should be more serious.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is not speaking on the subject before us.

Shri Joachim Alva: I am speaking on the foreign policy. Today there is a double-pronged drive on our foreign policy and on our internal policy by the Swatantra Party and the Opposition. And, it is right and beholden on my part to ask when our internal policies and foreign policies have been attacked, what does the Forum of Free Enterprise do?

Mr. Speaker: I must inform all hon. Members that this is not a general discussion on foreign policy. The specific problem is the matter of aggression by China and what ought to be done.

Shri Joachim Alva: My friend started by saying...

Mr. Speaker: He might have started with anything. I cannot allow the hon. Member to go on digressing like this. Let him come to the point. It is wrong to have allowed him to say all that. Has he anything more to say on this subject?

Shri Joachim Alva: I speak on behalf of my country. It is time he showed us on behalf of which country Shri Masani is speaking. We talk of war. We have got a first class army, navy and air force and we can march on. But this is not the time for talking of war.

I would like to give in two minutes the background of China. It is but right that we should know what is happening about the population of China, about their resources and about their men in their relation to India. They perhaps are not in a mood to acknowledge what India has done. Russia also has helped them unreservedly. Perhaps China wants to forget her ancient friend, India and remember a new friend, Russia, Today they have unjustly occupied our territory. It is a big psychological problem, because the Americans are sitting on their heads in Formosa. They feel frustrated and angry because they are not admitted into the UNO. They do not care now if they are not admitted into the UNO, though you and I may champion their cause for admission into the UNO. They are hitting out with a population of 600 million, feeling like strong people. I have a feeling that they will take their population to 1000 million and then they may cry a halt. They feel the big difference between the old Kuomintang and the present rule. These are the points we have to consider when we deal with China.

That man is rash indeed who does not concede the strength of the opponent. Let us conserve our energy. This border problem cannot be settled even if we sit round a table tomorrow. It will take one year to settle it, because there are so many intricacies. Let us keep the atmosphere cool and carry along in this fashion. It is easy to break friendships. Every man from the West asks, "What are you going to do with China?" If you meet any European or American, he asks, "What is going to happen? What are you going to do with China? It looks as if they are more interested than we are in this matter.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

My hon. friend, Acharya Kripalani, ten years ago inside the closed doors of the party said—I do not mind saying it now—we must take action against Pakistan. Today by keeping quiet and not taking action in the sense he wanted, the whole scene has changed with regard to Pakistan. Out of evil cometh good. Our differences with Pakistan have changed overnight and that is a silver-lining in the cloud.

However, we are not going to fall in the trap when President Ayub says that. The Russians and the Chinese will reach the Indian Ocean and that they are marching. These are very great times and we must be behind our Prime Minister in a national crisis like this. Shri Masani's first demand was that the Defence Minister should resign and his last demand was that the Chinese must be ejected. First he said that the Defence Minister must go. Then he will come and say that the Prime Minister should go.

An Hon. Member: He has not said that.

Shri Joachim Alva: If he has not said that today, he will say that tomorrow. So, these are important things. How can we eject the Chinese army except at the cost of war? It is easy to talk of war. Remember, Mahatma Gandhi was murdered after an agitation over the Rs. 50 crores due to Pakistan. Mahatma Gandhi was killed by a person who did not belong to our party. Today the propaganda is that Pandit Nehru is selling away the border to China. At the same time, you collect people and have demonstrations in front of the house of the Prime Minister, Defence Minister and the Chinese Embassy. Here I again emphasize that it was at the hands of an assassin that Mahatma Gandhi was killed. It is with the help of those people that you want to serve your ends.

Mr Speaker: The hon. Member should now conclude.

Shri Joachim Alva: I will conclude in a minute. Now they are having demonstrations in front of the Chinese Embassy. As the hon. Prime Minister explained, people in China are very touchy in such matters. So, it is our bounden duty to prevent such things. Let there be an Act of Parliament that no demonstrations will be allowed in front of any Embassy. Our friendship of ten years will be wiped out if you start spitting on the pictures of greatest leaders of China like Mao and Chou En-lai. Why should the friendship of ten years be threatened by a simple demonstration? These are some of the points I wanted to refer and I challenge Shri Masani's right to say that he is speaking on behalf of our country.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Chingleput): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, in his opening speech, this morning wanted us to be constructive in our approach to make constructive proposals and suggest amendments to policy. I feel that it would be a grievous error to consider what is happening at the Sino-Indian border as a border dispute between two nations. For one thing, Mr. Speaker, the area involved is so large that to term it as a border dispute would be to stretch that term too far. But even more important is the fact that the whole course and pattern of recent development, has underlined the need for re-assessing our political attitudes and relationships in regard to China. The truth of the matter is that, for a variety of reasons there was a tendency to take it for granted that the Chinese border posed no problem, that the friendship between India and China was such that whatever the expansionist history of China, it was not likely to be repeated in respect of India's territory. There were no doubt some amongst us who questioned this assumption even when it was formulated. But the most important single consequence of the recent exchange of notes between India and China has been to show quite clearly and unambiguously the problems involved in

dealing with a resurgent nation whose system of Government is radically and basically different from ours. It is not without significance that while the Government of India was most reluctant to make public certain developments on the India-China borders since 1954,—and indeed laid itself open to the charge of keeping Parliament in the dark, the Chinese Government seemed to be in a position to make known to their people and to their representative bodies only that which they wanted to be made known. It would be futile indeed on our part to forget that diplomatic exchanges have entirely different consequences for our two countries. Since Chinese incursions date back to 1954, it would be unrealistic on our part to attribute them to our attitude on the question of asylum to Dalai Lama. It is certainly true that our action has been disliked by Peking but that has little or nothing to do with the various issues which recent developments have thrown up.

What are the issues that face us? The first is the status of the McMahon line, and generally the traditional and ancient boundaries between our two countries; the second is the working arrangements to be evolved for maintaining the integrity of these borders; the third is the larger issue of foreign advance, which would need an immediate re-appraisal. The nature of the re-appraisal would depend upon the manner in which the question of the McMahon line and the working arrangements for ensuring the sanctity of our borders are settled.

It is in this background that we have to examine the notes exchanged between our Prime Minister and Mr. Chou En-lai and more particularly the Prime Minister's offer of an interim arrangement. It is clear that our Prime Minister has gone as far as it is possible to go, indeed according to many even beyond the reasonable limit. But even he has made it clear that no discussion about the boundaries is possible unless the McMahon line

and the customary and ancient borders between Ladakh and Sinkiang are accepted. Let us reaffirm this position. Let Parliament reaffirm it because there can be no question at this stage or in the future of our re-opening the question of borders which have been settled by ancient custom and traditions and which, until recently, were adhered to so scrupulously and for so long that even the normal stationing of border troops was not considered necessary.

Even assuming that the McMahon line is accepted, what are the interim and long-term arrangements for ensuring that there are no further incidents? Longju, as our Government has pointed out, as an interim measure, is not to be garrisoned provided the Chinese quit it. The note speaks of tension being lowered. But one has to realise that the tension was created precisely because of the illegal and forcible occupation of our territory by the Chinese. However, this step may be justified on the ground that an issue has been raised as to whether Longju is on the northern or the southern side of the McMahon line. For our part, Longju falls on the southern side and is indisputably part of India.

As regards Ladakh, if both parties agree to withdraw—the Chinese to the East and we to the West—there would be a vast expanse of no-man's land. Now, it is precisely on this matter that we have grave doubts. How is it to be ensured that there would in reality be a no-man's land? Secondly, how long is it to be a no-man's land? After all, let us realise that it is a vast expanse of nearly 9000 miles. There is a serious objection to permitting it to be no-man's land for any length of time, particularly, since it borders on the area inhabited by Buddhists; and the Chinese record of treatment of the Buddhists is bound to create very grave misgiving, certainly among the population of Ladakh.

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

If these proposals are not accepted—and probably they will not be accepted—then it would be necessary in my judgment to employ force and our military might to eject trespassers from our soil. It is a point which we have to face up to because ultimately after certain proposals are made and there is no chance of their being reasonably accepted and implemented, necessarily military might or force will have to be employed to eject trespassers and aggressors from our soil.

The Prime Minister pointed out this morning that he had complete faith in a policy of non-alignment. Now it is time we spoke out our minds on this policy because I feel a more rational approach to this question is called for. It is time we told our people precisely as to why we call upon them to support non-alignment. Non-alignment is certainly a most desirable policy. It helps to keep you free of entanglements and I certainly think that it is a very good aim, to keep out of entanglements. Only we have to remember that keeping out of entanglements is not dependent on ourselves only but on others as well. If the chap across the border entangles us surely we cannot still maintain that we are opposed to being entangled. But, just as non-alignment does not mean mere neutrality, it must not also be allowed to become a dogma which prevents appropriate national action. In recent times some of the expositions of non-alignment have given us this unfortunate impression and I should like this House to carefully consider the need for following appropriate national policies. The alternative to non-alignment, let me point out to my hon. friends, is not necessarily alignment with one bloc or another bloc. It should be our aim, in the present circumstances, to evolve a workable arrangement with other powers without sacrificing our principles or giving up our stand on international issues. That ought to be possible, and it certainly is feasible.

18 hrs.

Hon. Members referred to the recent growth of understanding between Pakistan and India. We for our part welcome an increasing understanding between the two countries, and it is only my hope that sooner rather than later we should evolve some technique whereby some of the major problems that divide our two countries would be settled to our mutual satisfaction, and if this should happen we would have achieved something highly satisfactory. I only wish that a settlement could be achieved as quickly as possible. If this could happen—I am not thinking of a common defence arrangement—it would be a very positive gain to both our countries from two points of view. Firstly, it would happen that the need for resources to be diverted to defence arrangements on the Indian-Pakistan border would be considerably less, and that itself would help us to devote more for purposes of development in our country. Secondly, I feel that this very arrangement should promote and give a sensation of our strength to the outside world, and particularly to the Chinese who are aggressing on our territory. It is necessary that the major problems that divide our two countries should be settled, and for this purpose positive steps should be taken by the statesmen of both our countries.

I now pass to long-term considerations. Even if the border dispute is settled, China will have to be accepted no longer as a good neighbour with whom we can have a fair amount of identity in political and economic objectives, but as an emerging power whose attitude and actions, especially in South and South-East Asia, will have to be watched very carefully. In one sense this is a repetition, Mr. Speaker, of the historic pattern, of what occurred from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries when India and China were the two major contending influences governing the history and culture of the land mass of Asia.

These two influences, the Indian and the Chinese, have quarrelsomely co-existed and mingled in different proportions, and together or separately left their indelible mark on the South-East Asian countries of today. One lesson for the future is that we will have to devote much greater attention, diplomatically, politically and economically, to the areas which border on China and in which we have a major interest through history and tradition as well as in the context of our own economic needs. In certain respects we must welcome the recent events that have taken place. They have done a positive service to our nation in this sense: they have given us a jolt. The nation has been awakened to its sense of responsibility.

An Hon. Member: Sir, it is past six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: How long does the hon. Member propose to take?

Dr. Krishnaswami: Another five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: If the House is prepared to sit for a few minutes more we can conclude.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, yes.

Dr. Krishnaswami: Until these events had occurred there was a ten-

gency, if I may say without any disrespect to the Prime Minister, for a large number of people to feel that because we were adhering to *Panchsheel*, every one also interpreted *Panchsheel* in the same way. The one important consequence of these developments should be, at least in the near future, to create a greater awareness of the realities of the international situation and a greater emphasis on the defence needs of the nation. In a time of emergency a country is not defended only by its standing militia; it is defended by the solidarity of its people and the willingness of all to make sacrifices in the common interest.

18-05 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FORTY-FIFTH REPORT

Shri Rane (Buldana): Sir, I beg to present the Forty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, November 26, 1959/Agrahayana 5, 1881 (Saka).