

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: We do not understand the land freezing. Under the present law of land acquisition, there is no question of freezing the land. The notification is issued first and the compensation or the price is decided later on. It is not a question of forward market trading.

Mr. Speaker: Anyhow, that was the procedure that was intended. There was no intention to ignore the House and make an announcement elsewhere. I have been noticing for a number of years that that principle has been followed ever since I made this observation when it was pointed out to me three or four years ago. Since then I have been seeing that no hon. Minister makes a statement outside when the Parliament is sitting.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It has not been done previously either. I do not understand this charge.

Mr. Speaker: That is what exactly I am saying. I am saying that for the past four or five years I have been consistently seeing that when the Parliament is in session, no hon. Minister has made a statement outside before it was made in this House. Therefore it is only a question of interpretation as to how it ought to be done. If some people gather some information when a notification is issued, it is not a violation of any convention here.

12.24 hrs.

MOTION RE: INDIA-CHINA RELATIONS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: We shall now proceed with the Motion re: India-China Relations. The original motion along with the amendments is before the House.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): May we know as to when the hon. Prime Minister is going to reply to the debate?

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Today or tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: I see a number of hon. Members wishing to take part in the debate. The hon. Prime Minister is pleased to say that he will reply only tomorrow. The whole of this day will be available for hon. Members. But I would request hon. Members not to force me to ring the bell too often. More than 15 minutes will not be allowed to any hon. Member today. Leaders of Parties have spoken.

Some Hon. Members: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: These are leaders of small parties who will restrict their speeches to 15 minutes.

श्री गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर): अध्यक्ष जी, हमारी स्वतंत्रता के बाद शायद यह पहला खतरा है जब हमारी स्वतंत्रता के ऊपर एक खतरा हुआ है और हम जिस प्रकार अपनी स्वतंत्रता की प्रति के समय अपना सर्वस्व बलिदान करने के लिए तैयार थे उसी प्रकार इस समय भी हमें तैयार होना होगा।

माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी के इस मत में मैं सर्वथा सहमत हूँ कि यह एक ऐसा अवसर है जिस अवसर पर कि इग देश की सर्व-प्रधान प्रतिनिधि संस्था जो यह लोक सभा है, उसे इस सम्बन्ध में अपनी स्पष्ट राय देनी है और उस राय को देने के बाद हमें उस राय के अनुसार सरकार जो भी कार्रवाई करे उसमें सरकार को पूरा पूरा सहयोग भी देना है। प्रजातंत्र में प्रजा के पूर्ण सहयोग के बिना काम नहीं चल सकता चाहे वह कोई भी काम हो, बड़ा काम हो, छोटा काम हो। फिर यह तो हमारी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा का प्रश्न है और ऐसे अवसर पर प्रजातंत्रवादी राष्ट्र को, उसकी समूची प्रजा को, सरकार के साथ सहयोग करने के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिए।

मैंने यह बात कई बार कही है और फिर उसे मैं दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे-जैसे बातें ऐसी हैं कि जिन में निम्न निम्न राजनैतिक दलों के रहते हुए भी सब राजनैतिक दल

इकट्ठा हो कर काम कर सकते हैं। यह एक ठीक इसी प्रकार का अवसर है। मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी की वैदेशिक नीति का बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ और कल इस सदन में इस सम्बन्ध में जो बहस हुई उससे भी यह पूर्ण निश्चय निकाला जा सकता है कि जहाँ तक हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के सिद्धान्तों का सम्बन्ध है वहाँ तक इस सदन का कोई दल, इस सदन का कोई भी सदस्य, उन सिद्धान्तों के विरुद्ध नहीं है।

कल मैंने बड़े ध्यान से हमारे साम्यवादी दल के नेता श्री डांगे जी का भाषण सुना। उन्होंने यह बात सही कही कि मूल प्रश्न हमारी मूल नीति के समर्थन का है। यह ठीक है। किन्तु यह समर्थन जो मूल नीति का है उनमें ही इसी समर्थन के साथ उतना ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय है, भावनाओं का। हम अपनी वैदेशिक नीति का पूर्ण समर्थन और इस समय हमारी सरकार जो कर रही है, उसका समर्थन किन भावनाओं से करते हैं, इसका उत्तर देना ही बात है। कांग्रेसदल का, प्रजा समाजवादी दल का और साम्यवादी दल का उत्तर पर दूसरे दलों का जहाँ तक सम्बन्ध है, उन उत्तरों पर सरकार का समर्थन करते हैं उन भावना की भावनाओं से और साम्यवादी दल और श्री डांगे साहब इस नीति का समर्थन कर रहे हैं, चीन की भक्ति की भावनाओं से। अन्तर यह है कि हमारा समर्थन है इस देश की भक्ति की भावनाओं से और उनका समर्थन है चीन की भक्ति की भावनाओं से। यही सब से बड़ा अन्तर पड़ जाता है।

फिर जहाँ तक नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति का सम्बन्ध है, डांगे साहब और उनके दल वाले जरा धरने मन की सूक्ष्म भावनाओं का अध्ययन करे और जरा देखे कि वे इस नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति का समर्थन सच्चे तौर से कर रहे हैं या नहीं।

आज एक साम्यवादी देश में और हम में झगड़ा है इस लिये वे नान-एलाइनमेंट की बात करते हैं। यदि आज यह झगड़ा अमरीका और हमारे बीच में होता, अगर आज यह झगड़ा इंग्लैंड और हमारे बीच होता तो वे नान-एलाइनमेंट की बात और हमारी मूल नीति के समर्थन की बात इस प्रकार से न करते जिस प्रकार वे कर रहे हैं। हमें इस बात का पूर्ण विश्वास है कि जहाँ तक कांग्रेस दल और दूसरे दलों का सम्बन्ध है, हम चीन को अपने देश पर आक्रमणकारी मानते हैं। मैं डांगे साहब यहाँ नहीं हूँ उन के दल के जो भी प्रतिनिधि हैं उन से, एक ही प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ कि वे चीन को आक्रामक मानते हैं या नहीं। मेरा प्रश्न मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बात पर अदलम्बित है कि अब तक उन के दल ने, उन के किसी सदस्य ने, सदन के बाहर या सदन के भीतर चीन को आक्रमणकारी नहीं माना है। जहाँ तक इस देश की प्रजा का सम्बन्ध है, मेरा एक छोटे से इतिहास के विद्यार्थी जानते, यह मत रहा है कि इस देश की प्रजा बड़ी देशभक्त प्रजा नहीं है। लेकिन हमारा इतिहास एक बात को और बताता है और वह यह कि इस देश की प्रजा के देशभक्त रहने पर भी हम ने इस देश में कुछ देशद्रोहियों को भी जन्म दिया है। सिकन्दर के आक्रमण को आप देखिये। सिकन्दर के आक्रमण के समय इसी देश के पश्चिमोत्तर में एक अग्नि नाम का राजा था जिसने सिकन्दर को अवतार मान कर उस का इस देश में स्वागत किया था। जब मुसलमानों को यहाँ पर आक्रमण हुआ उस समय यहाँ पर जयचन्द मद्दा व्यक्ति निकला जिसने मुसलमानों को यहाँ पर स्वागत किया। जब अंग्रेजों का आक्रमण हुआ तब उस समय भी मीर जाफर के सद्दुश व्यक्ति निकला जिसने यहाँ पर अंग्रेजों का स्वागत किया। मुझे इस बात का भय है कि आज जो कुछ साम्यवादी और उन के नेता कर रहे हैं वह सब की सब कार्रवाई उसी नीति से हो रही है, जिस नीति से अग्नि ने यहाँ पर सिकन्दर का स्वागत किया था और जयचन्द

[सेंस गोबिन्द दास]

मैं यहाँ मुसलमानों का स्वागत किया था तथा मीर जाफर ने यहाँ पर भंडेड़ों का स्वागत किया था। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी की इस बोधना से बहुत प्रसन्न हुआ जो उन्होंने यहाँ की कि यदि इस देश में कोई व्यक्ति कोई अराष्ट्रीय कार्य करता है या कोई दल करता है तो उस पर पूरा ध्यान रखा जायेगा। मैं उन से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि ध्यान रखते रखते ही कहीं बहुत देर न ही जाय। यदि इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत विलम्ब हुआ तो फिर ध्यान रखने से कोई लाभ हीने वाला नहीं है। इस लिये जो बात का ध्यान है वह ती बिल्कुल ठीक है, लेकिन उस ध्यान के अनुसार कुछ न कुछ कार्रवाई शीघ्र होनी चाहिये।

जहाँ तक कृपालानो जी के भाषण का सम्बन्ध है, वह ५० मिनट तक चला। मैं उन्हें अपने बड़े में बड़े नेताओं में से एक मानता हूँ। उस भाषण के अधिकांश अंश का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। एक बात जो उन्होंने कही वह जरूर विचार की बात है। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी नानअलाइनमेंट की नीति रहते हुए भी हमें इस बात पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है कि हम अपनी सुरक्षा के लिये नानअलाइनमेंट की नीति को रखते हुए भी बाहर से सहायता लें या न लें। जिस प्रकार अधिक और दूसरी सहायतायें बाहर से लेते हैं उसी प्रकार इस समय हमें इस प्रकार की सहायता लेनी चाहिये या नहीं लेनी चाहिये, इस पर प्रधान मंत्री जी और सरकार को ध्यानपूर्वक विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। इस में हमारे आत्मसम्मान का भी प्रश्न है। जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा, मैं उन से सहमत हूँ। लेकिन इसी के साथ साथ हमें इस पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

जहाँ तक यू० एन० धो० का सम्बन्ध है, हम यू० एन० धो० के सदस्य हैं, चीन यू० एन० धो० का सदस्य नहीं है। चीन ने हम पर आक्रमण किया है। जो देश यू० एन० धो० का सदस्य नहीं है वह हम पर आक्रमण

करता है, हम जो यू० एन० धो० के एक सदस्य हैं। कोरिया में यू० एन० धो० को सेनायें गई थीं, कोरिया की रक्षा करने के लिये। हमारे साथ ही साथ राष्ट्र संघ को, यू० एन० धो० को भी इस बात पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है कि इस समय यू० एन० धो० का क्या कर्तव्य है, राष्ट्र संघ का क्या कर्तव्य है। जब यू० एन० धो० के एक सर्वस्व राष्ट्र पर एक ऐसे राष्ट्र ने आक्रमण किया है जो कि यू० एन० धो० का सदस्य नहीं है उस समय मेरा यह मत है कि यू० एन० धो० बिना हमारे बुलाये हुए ही हम को सहायता करने के लिये तैयार होना चाहिये।

कल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक और बात कही कि दो गलत बातें मिल कर एक सही बात नहीं ही सकती। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि दो गलत बातें मिल कर एक सही बात नहीं ही सकती। लेकिन कभी कभी ऐसा होता है कि सही बात करते करते एक स्थान पर वही सही बात एक गलत बात हो जाती है। इतिहास इस का प्रमाण है। मैं ने धाप से निवेदन किया कि इतिहास का मैं एक छोटा सा विद्यार्थी रहा हूँ हम ने देखा है कि हम ने बड़े बड़े काम किये, ऐतिहासिक काम किये। मुहम्मद ग़ोरी की अनेक बार यहाँ से हार कर जाना पड़ा और हम ने उसे छोड़ दिया। छोड़ देना चाहिये, सही बात थी। एक नैतिक दृष्टि से, एक उच्च भावनात्मक दृष्टि से सही बात थी, लेकिन सही बात होते हुए भी एक ऐसी स्थिति आई जिस स्थिति में वह सही बात गलत हो गई। हम को यह सोचना है कि चीन वाले गलत काम कर रहे हैं इस लिये हम कोई गलत काम न करें, लेकिन हमें इस बात पर भी ध्यान रखना आवश्यक है कि हमारा सही काम या सही बात किसी एक स्थिति पर जा कर गलत सिद्ध हो जाय। ऐसे नाजुक अवसरों पर हमें इस बात का ध्यान सदा रखना पड़ता है।

प्रश्न में कुछ बातें सरकार के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। मैंने शुरू में इस बात को कहा था कि, यह सदन इस बात को जानता है कि मैं ३६ वर्षों से इस सदन में रहा हूँ, इतना पुराना तो घायब कोई भी सदस्य यहाँ नहीं आया, लेकिन स्वतंत्रता के पहले भी कांग्रेस में हम जिस प्रकार की विदेश नीति का प्रबलम्बन करते थे और स्वतंत्रता के बाद भी उस नीति का मैं बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ। वह नीति हमारी जो संस्कृति है उस की परम्परा के अनुसार है। वह नीति, महात्मा गांधी ने हमारे सामने जिन सिद्धान्तों को रक्खा, उन सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार है। मैं उस का समर्थक हूँ। लेकिन समर्थन करते हुए भी सरकार कोकल कृपालानी जी ने जो एक बात कही बाह्य सहायता की उस पर अधिक से अधिक विचार करने की आवश्यकता है, विशेषकर जहाँ तक यू० एन० ओ० या राष्ट्र संघ का सम्बन्ध है।

मुझे, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो यह कहा कि हम सब तरह से तैयार हैं, उसे सुन कर बड़ा हर्ष हुआ। लेकिन कभी कभी इतना अधिक आत्म विश्वास भी हमें किसी गड़ड़े में डाल सकता है। ऐसे अवसरों पर आत्म विश्वास रखना चाहिये, लेकिन उस आत्म विश्वास के कारण हम कोई गलत तख्तीना न कर बैठें, इस का भी हमें ध्यान रखना चाहिये। साथ ही साथ अपने आत्म सम्मान की रक्षा करते हुए कृपालानी जी ने जो सुझाव दिया उस पर हमें सोचने और विचारने की आवश्यकता है। लेकिन इस मामले में मैं सारा विषय प्रधान मंत्री जी के हाथों में सौंपना चाहता हूँ। यह ऐसे मामले हैं, ऐसे नाजुक मामले हैं, कि जिस पर बहुत बहस प्रशस्ती चीज नहीं होती। हमारा नेतृत्व, हमारे देश के भीतर का और हमारे देश के बाहर का, पंडित जवाहरलाल जी के हाथों में सुरक्षित है इसका मुझे विश्वास है। मैं ज. कुछ कह रहा हूँ वह केवल उनके विचार की दृष्टि से कह रहा हूँ।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह हमारे साम्यवादियों के प्रति क्या कार्रवाई होनी चाहिए इस पर कहने की है। मैंने अभी कहा भी था कि हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने यह बात तो सही कही कि इस प्रकार के अराष्ट्रीय विचार रखने वाले व्यक्तियों और दलों के प्रति उदासी ध्यान है, लेकिन जो कार्रवाई वे करना चाहते हैं उसमें कहीं बहुत देर न हो जाए इस पर ध्यान रखने की आवश्यकता है।

अन्त में मैं यह कहूँगा—प्रधानमंत्री जी भी इस बात को कह चुके हैं—कि हिमालय हमारा सिरताज है। हमारे देश की जो संस्कृति है, उसका हिमालय ही स्थान है। हमारी आर्थिक उन्नति का हिमालय ही साधन है जहाँ से गंगा और यमुना निकली हैं। मुझे हिमालय में घूमने का बहुत प्रवसर मिला है। इस बार और अधिक प्रवसर मिला है। इस बार मैं यमनोत्री भी गया, गंगोत्री भी गया, केदारनाथ और बद्रीनाथ भी गया। हिमालय के प्रति, ऐसा कोई भारतीय नहीं है, जिसका सिर श्रद्धा से और भक्ति से न झुकता हो। आज प्रश्न उत हिमालय की रक्षा का है। हिमालय, प्रधानमंत्री जी के शब्दों में, हमारा ताज है, हमारा मुकुट है और अगर हम उसकी रक्षा न कर सकें, हमारा सिर ताज और मुकुट के विहीन हो गया तो इतने अधिक खेद की हमारे लिए दूसरी बात नहीं होगी। दूसरी सरकार की वैदेशिक नीति का पूर्ण समर्थन करते हुए भी मैं आशा करता हूँ कि सरकार इन बातों पर विचार करेगी और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री करेंगे, जिनके हाथों में, जैसा कि मैंने अभी आपसे कहा, हमारा नेतृत्व सुरक्षित है।

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was disappointed with the speech that the Prime Minister made yesterday. I was disappointed because I expected from him a different lead and I expected him to show confidence at this juncture. I hoped that he would be addressing himself to those millions and millions

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

of his countrymen who are wholly with him as far as foreign policy is concerned and not bother himself about a few, very few, if there be any, in the country who have at any time opposed or challenged in any decisive manner the basic formulations of the foreign policy. Instead, he thought that he should spend his time in trying to make the core of his speech the question of non-alignment.

As my leader Acharya Kripalani pointed out yesterday, it is the natural policy of India. The Prime Minister himself has told us that before very often. It is the natural and inescapable policy of India. It is widely accepted in the country. Today, the super-powers would be embarrassed if we tried to change the policy. What is most important is, when we are ourselves the victim of aggression, would anybody be foolish enough to throw away the possible support of some countries by saying that we join one bloc. When we are getting support today from countries belonging to both the blocs, when today, both these blocs are in the process of slow disintegration, would any one be foolish enough to come forward and suggest that we should, at such a moment of history, at such a moment of crisis, deliberately align ourselves with a particular bloc? I think it is wrong on the part of the Prime Minister to make in this debate this particular thing the main issue. Because, this is not in doubt. This is not in dispute. Only foolish people, I would agree with him, would be interested in saying that we line up with one bloc or the other.

But, the question is, are we going to allow ourselves to get isolated, or are we going to isolate China. We have noticed that leaders in Indonesia, Nepal, Burma are coming forward saying—they have got the courage to say these things today—that the Chinese authorities are behaving in an arrogant manner and that the Government of China is throwing its weight about. Is this not time that

we try to rally these countries together? Is this not the time when we say to the countries in South East Asia that they have nothing to worry about and we are there to see that the legitimate rights and interests of the legitimate rights of the people or the Asian nations, whether they be large or small, are going to be protected and looked after?

It is not a question and nobody is here suggesting that we become satellite of a super-power. I hope, in India, no one at least on this side of the House, barring a small fringe, no one would ever think of making this country a satellite of any power, however great it might be. But, the point is this. We would like China to be isolated because China is indulging in arrogance, in aggressive tactics against all the Asian countries. China cannot behave as a bull in Asia today.

Secondly, we do not understand, but we would like to know whether the Prime Minister recognises that in one particular direction, his policy needs to be revised. He is a student of history. He knows that by nature China is expansionist. He knows it better than anybody else. But, he deliberately thought that by befriending China, by making overtures of friendliness, perhaps, China could be prevented, could be helped to overcome its instinctive expansionism. The Prime Minister, I hope, realises that the instinctive expansionism of China has been further aggravated by the fact that China is today ruled by the Communists, because, it is the communist power in that country that has made it possible for them to achieve total mobilisation of the energies of the people in a desirable or undesirable manner and built up industrial and military power, which under other circumstances would not have been possible. It is this combination of certain characteristics of China which are ruthlessly and cynically exploited by the communist rulers there. That situation has to be met.

The Prime Minister tried to meet it in a particular way in the last ten years. It may have helped us in the last ten years, I do not know. I have no desire to go into the past. In the coming years, can we meet it in the same manner or have we to realise that that old policy towards China cannot continue? It has to be a realistic policy. Perhaps, that too was a realistic policy. Perhaps, the Prime Minister wanted us to concentrate on the smiling portrait of Dorian Gray and ignore and forget the other portrait that was in the closet. Now that the other portrait that was in the closet has come out, now that it is there in our frontier, menacing and threatening us, we would like to know whether even now, the Prime Minister would like the people of India to be guided by, and our understanding of the whole situation should be guided by that smiling portrait that China would like to create for itself.

I do not know if the Defence Minister has been properly reported. If he has been properly reported, in a speech that he made in his constituency the other day, he said,—this is what the newspaper says—

"He said that he had taken up many unpopular causes before. He would say that what had happened on the northern frontier was not a mighty invasion of our land frontier. Is there any country in the world whose frontiers had not been violated?"

I would like to know, is this an occasion when the Prime Minister or the Defence Minister should take an unpopular cause. Should we not be with the people to build up their morale and tell them that this country is strong enough?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I am sorry to intervene, could he not read all that the Defence Minister has said?

Shri Asoka Mehta: I am coming to that if the Prime Minister will have a little patience with me.

I hope that we are not going to take up an unpopular position on this occasion and that we are going to take up a popular position, because we have to build the morale of our people and carry our people with us. We cannot afford to be unpopular on this occasion. That may be or may not be; he may not have said that word; I do not know. He says there that this is not a great invasion of our frontier. Maybe it is not a great invasion of our frontier. The fact remains that it is an invasion. What is more important is when he says, "is there any country in the world whose frontiers had not been violated." Is this a routine matter—in a routine way every nation has its frontiers and in a routine way the frontiers get violated from time to time? Are we approaching this whole development in a routine way? We think that this is a crisis which we have to face and for the next 10 years, we shall be confronted with this menace which is going to be increasingly more and more difficult and deliberate. That is where we want the Prime Minister to give us an answer; it is this attitude of coucism at its best, a cavalier attitude at its worst, of saying, let us be nice, let us not call a spade a spade. That was believed and probably that was considered in the past to be the best way of solving the situation. It may be that it is now believed that this is a trivial, petty matter. Is this a petty matter, or behind it forces are mounting up which want to challenge and menace the independence, the territorial integrity and the chosen way of life of our people? If this is so,—that is what we feel on this side of this House,—we would appeal to the Prime Minister to rally the entire national opinion behind him. We know he can rally it provided he steps forward to create that national consciousness and solidarity in the country to meet the crisis. That can be created only by accepting the fact that the situation has radically changed.

What happens when a country is menaced and threatened? Not only is there an effort at closing the ranks.

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

There is in the administration a new urgency in the whole effort, in the whole approach. Every one would be ashamed of doing anything which is not proper. To be corrupt, to be inefficient, to be indifferent, all these would become unpatriotic, would become anti-national. We would expect the Prime Minister today to give that kind of ringing, challenging leadership to the country where any weakness in our country, any hesitation in our country appears to each one of us as something that is unpatriotic, anti-national, detrimental to the interests and independence of our country.

Instead of that, the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues want to feel as if we are jingoistic. We are not jingoistic, but we believe that this nation is faced today with a terrible menace, and this menace can be met only by rousing the nation. The Defence Minister seems to think that nationalism is an obsolete emotion. Maybe. He is a modernist, he is a man of outstanding intelligence and ability, and he probably considers that—at least that is the impression I have got—national feelings are something which should be kept in check. But India is never like that, that is my impression. Maybe my impression is wrong, but I would be wrong if at this time I do not point out that certain emotions are created.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rai Bareilly): Come to positive suggestions, what to do.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I am asked whether I have a positive suggestion. The first thing we would like to know positively is this. The Defence Minister said in a speech . . .

Shri Feroze Gandhi: What is your suggestion?

Shri Asoka Mehta: Will you please listen to what I have to say?

The Defence Minister said that India had made necessary adjustments to ensure that further penetration was adequately checked. We are very happy about it. We hope that any further penetration will be decisively

checked. But I would like to know if arrangements have been made to check further penetration. Why are we not prepared to check the penetration that has already taken place? If it is purely for the purposes of diplomatic discussion just now, we can understand, but I hope that you will be ready for it if necessary. In case China does not accept the traditional frontiers of India and in case the discussions are not confined to matters of minor rectifications only, there can be no alternative except to make every effort to see that the area that is occupied by the Chinese forces is vacated. On that we would like to have a clear and unequivocal expression from the Prime Minister.

We do not want to enter their territory. We do not want to counter aggression by aggression. We do not want to build up any kind of jingoism in this country. We do not want to say any harsh things about the Chinese, but in India the necessary strength has to be built up. The Prime Minister has been talking about heavy industries. Yes, we know in China heavy industries have been developing at the rate of over 20 per cent per year. The rate of growth of heavy industry has been very high. Chinese industrial potential has been increasing at the rate of 100 per cent every five years. If this growing potential is to be met, with what kind of approach, with what kind of consolidation of forces, will we be able to meet this challenge? There, we feel that an appeal is necessary to Indian nationalism, an appeal to the urge in the Indian people today to get united, an appeal that Acharya Kripalani tried to make, to make this a challenge that has to be accepted because our very manhood is being challenged. Are the Indian people so stirred today that they get mobilised to meet this challenge not only today but for the coming five or ten years, is the question?

Our positive suggestion, therefore, is this. This is not the time when the Prime Minister should try to debate

us all the time. The Prime Minister should come forward as the leader of the Indian people, and warn the Chinese in clear and unequivocal terms,—not by withdrawing our forces. The Defence Minister himself said that we cannot create a corridor, but a corridor of 11,000 sq. miles is being created. In his speech he said that the withdrawal of Indian forces would create a corridor. If a corridor cannot be created in the Macmahon line, I cannot understand why a corridor of 11,000 miles should be created in Ladakh. Our amendment only says that we are not going to withdraw in our own territory. Why should we withdraw? That was what the Defence Minister also said. Why should we be asked to withdraw in our own territory? We agree with him. It is not that we disagree with him always. Very often we agree with him also. We agree with him and ask: why is it we are asked to withdraw, why is it being suggested?

What will happen in the corridor which is being created, in that vacuum which is being deliberately created? Will the Chinese move in or not? What is the guarantee that they will not. If they move in, what will we do? The interim proposals are there, but if China accepts them, we must be sure—I am not saying that not an inch will be given up—that the traditional frontiers of India will be maintained under all circumstances, and any rectification by discussions or negotiations will be only of a minor character. That must be made clear.

To recognise the danger of China today is not to create any kind of a ghost of cold war, it is not an invitation to join up with this bloc or that bloc, but to face the realities, to remove the frustration that has settled down on our people today, to revive the flame of confidence of national hope and national endeavour that burnt so bright from 1920 to 1947. It is to rekindle that flame of national hope and national endeavour that we would like our Prime Minister to step forward, not to denounce us by calling us a motley crowd here.

Yes, we are a motley crowd. We are a motley crowd because this country is made up like that; as the Prime Minister has said very often, it is a motley country. We have all to be together. We have to be together on this occasion, and the only group about which we have to be careful are our Communist friends.

I say so because see what has happened in Indonesia. In Indonesia the Communists have come out and said that the Government of China has the right to protect the Chinese citizens. They have come forward and issued a statement which has been released from Peking first, in favour of the Chinese Government. Maybe there are many good Communists who will probably break with the Communist Party. We must create a crisis of conscience for the Communist. I am not attacking any single Communist colleague of mine. I know many of them ultimately will be on the side of the patriotic forces. But as far as the Communist Party is concerned, as the leopard cannot change its spots, and as the Chinese, in spite of their sweet words, have remained expansionist, we must realise that the characteristics of the Communist Party will remain that they are. It is no use feeling that our progressivism gets tarnished, that we are compromising in any way with our progressive approach and attitude if we are going to be critical of the character of the Communist movement, that only by remaining silent on the integral liberations of the Communists that we can see ourselves to be progressive. That is not our view. We may be old-fashioned. We believe in being frank on this matter.

The Prime Minister is worried about my hon. friend Shri Masani. He knows very well that I believe Shri Masani's economic policies are wholly wrong, and I believe if the Prime Minister steps forward and moves forward, Shri Masani and men like him will either be dragged together or will be consigned to the dust bin of history. Shri Masani is not going to be the menace of tomorrow if resurgent nationalism is going to move for-

[Shri Asoka Menla]

ward in the direction of economic channels and social change. It is these friends here who are likely to be the real danger. The danger from Shri Masani's side will come if you the Prime Minister of India remain at the helm of forces of stagnation rather than forces that are moving forward. This is the historic opportunity that has been given to us, an opportunity when the Prime Minister of India can rise to the occasion, which we expect him to do, an opportunity where every part, every section of this country and every group in this Parliament and outside can offer its allegiance to him in the common task of national defence, national reconstruction and national renaissance.

13 hrs.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Yesterday, the Prime Minister rightly observed that the issue that we are discussing is of the gravest magnitude. He said that it affects not only the security of India, but it is a question which transcends the security of India, because it has in it the potentiality of a world conflagration. The Prime Minister also made an observation, which I heartily endorse, and that is that it will be extremely reprehensible in a time of crisis like this for any party to attempt to secure some kind of political advantage. But, I believe, with the Prime Minister, that on this question, there is a certain essential basic unity in the country, that instinctively, every Indian feels basically the same; I am advisedly excluding known and obvious fifth columnists.

Because of this supreme need for unity at this time of crisis, I do not propose to emulate some of my friends who have criticised the Prime Minister for acts of omission or commission in the past. It is axiomatic that one can be wise after the event, and this maxim applies equally to international affairs, as it does to other fields of human activity.

I was prepared to accept the explanation of the Prime Minister. What did he say? He said this that this issue in respect of the question of India's frontier only emerged or only took definite shape as recently as September, 1959, because it was only in September, 1959, that for the first time, Prime Minister Chou En-lai—that was what I heard the Prime Minister to say—made claims on Indian territory as against the so-called Chinese maps. And the Prime Minister proposes the thesis, and I think he was right in proposing it, that at that time we had to look at India's reactions in the light of India's basic policy. No one has questioned and no one today purports to question that policy, that it is a policy which involves a peaceful approach; it is a policy which seeks to resolve international disputes, and international questions by the approach of peace. At that stage, I do not think anyone would blame the Prime Minister for having given every conceivable hostage to the *bona fides* of the Chinese. I think the Prime Minister said in effect, 'There may be a border incident, but do we interpret every border incident as a potential *casus belli*? Do we, because of some border incident, immediately inflame our people and generate some kind of war psychosis?'. I feel that that explanation of the Prime Minister is one which we should all accept.

But, may I say this? I do not know whether my reading of the Prime Minister's speech is the correct one, but I have read very carefully the various letters which have been written by the Prime Minister, and I see in these letters a basic reappraisal of the mind and the attitude of Government, a basic reappraisal of the mind and the attitude of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I do not say that there has been a change in the basic policy, but I see in these letters definitely a basic reappraisal of the attitude and the mind of the Government of India as interpreted by the Prime Minister.

If you read those letters, you will see that in the first series of letters, the language is amiable; every conceivable concession is being made to China's good faith, and to professions of Chinese friendship. And, when I read the last letter, I was happy about it. The Prime Minister has said, and I think he was very right in saying that the last letter which he has written offers an honourable course not only for India, but an honourable course to China. But what I was particularly impressed with in this letter representing a change in the basic appraisal of the situation was the expression in that letter that no amount of expressions of friendship on the part of China can heal the breach that has now been created. And I was even more pleased when I read in so many words, the notice to China that India cannot, even as an interim measure, accept an arrangement which will confirm the Chinese in their present aggression. And I feel that that basic policy is there. As my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani has pointed out, and as my hon. friend who has just spoken before me, Shri Asoka Mehta, has pointed out, no responsible person has suggested remotely that there should be a change in India's basic policy, the policy of peace and policy of non-alignment.

I am quite prepared to confirm what the Prime Minister has claimed, if it means anything, that India's basic policy has contributed in not a little measure to the easing of world tension, because India has adhered to it—it has not been an easy matter—India has been the subject of suspicion, even of hostility, because of this basic policy. But because of these basic policies, India has provided, in times of crisis, a bridge between two hostile and often near-warring blocs.

I feel that the Prime Minister spoke in a manner which suggested that he was hurt and resentful. He seemed to suggest—and perhaps, he was not fair, I think; he spoke, as I said, under a sense of resentment,—that there are certain sections which are seeking to

take advantage of the present situation in order to upset India's basic policy. I do not think that that is the position. As Shri Asoka Mehta has pointed out, the people of India will not accept a reversal of India's basic policy. Conditioned and nurtured essentially in Gandhian concepts, we would not allow, if any Government even wanted it, a reversal of these basic policies.

What I am seeking to underline is this that in the speech of the Prime Minister and in the speech of Acharya Kripalani, I saw a basic and essential unity of approach, and that, I think, is very important for us in this time of crisis.

What did the Prime Minister in effect say? He has said this, that we shall not tolerate, we shall not accept, any violation of Indian territory; he said so in so many words. That is precisely what Acharya Kripalani has also said; that is precisely what every democratic party in this country also says, that under no circumstances, shall we accept or tolerate violation of Indian territory. I am trying to underline the unity of attitude that we have arrived at, and I believe that the Prime Minister has arrived at an attitude at which we have all arrived.

The Prime Minister has enumerated a series of breaches of faith on the part of the Chinese—the overrunning of Tibet in spite of the assurance of Prime Minister Chou En-lai, that Tibet's autonomy would be respected, the tearing to pieces of the 1954 agreement with India, the rubbing of salt into the wounds which the Chinese have deliberately inflicted on Indian feeling by murdering Indian policemen, by treating harshly our Indian nationals of Ladakhi origin, and last but not least, what I would describe as adding cynical insult to calculated injury by delivering probably the decomposed bodies of murdered Indian policemen to the Indian party on the Prime Minister's birthday. I could read into the Prime Minister's speech a sense not only of deep but of bitter disillusionment, and I think that is the attitude which every decent person in

[Shri Frank Anthony]

India has arrived at. Today there is this sense of bitter disillusionment that in spite of all the gestures that India has gone out of her way to make to China, the only answers to these gestures have been breaches of faith, duplicity and calculated aggression.

Acharya Kripalani said that he did not, for one moment, suggest that we should abandon our basic policy of peace, seeking to solve international problems by peaceful methods. But he went on to add that we should make it clear that in a time of emergency we would be prepared to accept aid from outside. Now, I listened to the Prime Minister carefully. I do not believe that the Prime Minister in his speech has ever excluded that contingency—that we will accept aid in a time of crisis. The Prime Minister said this, that he believed that we have friends among large nations, friends among small nations, but he also believed that friendship is not symbolised by the iron chains of military alliances. And I agree with him there. I agree with him in this final analysis that in this context of international living today, if China is ever mad enough—I do not think China would be—if China is ever mad enough to mount a frontal military assault on this country, then India would get all the military aid that she may need.

But I do feel that Acharya Kripalani expressed one doubt. His doubt may be summed up in this way, that in the future we may continue to give dangerous hostages to professions of Chinese good faith. That is the doubt which I think he expressed. My hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, says that the Prime Minister knows history. He perhaps knows it better than most of us in this House. And anyone who knows history knows that consistently throughout history, appeasement has never been the answer to an aggressor or an expansionist. Appeasement has inevitably whetted the appetite of the expansionist and the imperialist. I think every one in this House, except a very small fringe, as Shri Asoka

Mehta said, is convinced that China today is expansionist, China today is imperialist.

I believe that the Indian people themselves would not tolerate any policy of appeasement of China today. I believe this, that one more calculated act of aggression on the part of the Chinese will inflame the whole Indian people to resist Chinese aggression. I also feel that the Chinese would be committing a fatal blunder if they do not understand this mood in India today.

The Prime Minister has said, quite rightly, that in the final analysis the defensive strength of a country depends upon its industrial development. But I say—and I believe the Prime Minister will agree with me—that nobody, no country with any self-respect will wait for its industrial development in order to resist aggression. I say this—and I think I speak for every Indian—that however ghastly the consequences may be—and we know that the consequences of a war between us and China would be ghastly not only for us and for China, but for the whole world—if, in the final analysis, there is no other answer to Chinese aggression, however ghastly the consequences may be, the Indian people would not hesitate to face those consequences.

Finally, I want to end on this note. My own assessment is that the Chinese are not a stupid people. They understand that we have given them notice that we will not accept any further act of aggression; and I myself do not expect any overt acts of aggression on the part of the Chinese. But this is my own interpretation. I believe that the Chinese today are not acting in any haphazard manner. I believe the Chinese actions are conditioned by a deep and carefully calculated plan. And I say this with all respect to my Communist friends—although I do not know why I should have any feelings of respect in this matter—that there is a carefully calculated Plan of expansion.

sionism concerted with the Indian Communists. The Chinese know, the Indian Communists know, that on their own strength the Indian Communists have no political future in this country. That is why China now feels—she has entrenched herself in her territory; China is now one vast slave labour camp—that she can embark on a policy of overall expansionism in Asia, and the biggest prize for Communism today is India. That is the prize for which they are playing in concert with the Indian Communists. That is why they broke faith with Tibet, they broke faith with India over Tibet. They destroyed Tibet so that this buffer—age-old buffer—between India and China would be effaced.

There is, as I submitted with great respect, this overall plan for the ultimate subversion of India. The attempt is to see if they can get toe-holds on the Indian frontier—they have a few of them—and if India does not resist, to get footholds on the Indian frontier. I believe that this is the much-greater threat that we are faced with today.

I do not wish to say anything here about my hon. friend, Shri S. A. Dange. But I feel that the Government must have been somewhat embarrassed by his alleged concern for the policies of Government. He has tried with blandishments and other means to seduce the Government into believing in the good faith not only of the Chinese but of the Indian Communists. And he asked us to believe—this is the consistent theme of the Communists—that China is not an aggressor, that China can never be an aggressor. That, I submit with great respect, is the role par excellence of the fifth columnists, to induce a false sense of security in this country. That is precisely the game that the Communists are playing. In the guise of supporting the next Five Year Plan, they ask: 'Why divert the resources of the plan to increasing our military strength?' They want to confuse, they want to discourage any attempts at strengthening our security measures in this country.

I believe that this carefully-prepared plan, concerted between Chinese Communists and their Indian counterparts in this country is going to be multi-pronged. One prong is going to be directed—it is going to be the lesser prong—against the mountain principalities of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. I know that the Prime Minister has stated repeatedly that we have made it clear that any attack on Bhutan will be interpreted as an attack on India. But the Chinese and the Indian Communists are not so stupid as to mount an attack on Bhutan. What they will do is to train a few credulous, poor Bhutanese in all the techniques of Communist violence, subversion and guerilla warfare, and they will take over Bhutan because we have no military forces there. They will say, 'This is an internal, domestic affair' and then the Chinese sponsored Communist Government will repudiate all arrangements with India.

So far as Sikkim is concerned, we are somewhat in a stronger position, because we have got our own armed forces there.

Nepal is an independent country. But I do not know what the Nepalese are feeling. I read an article the other day saying that there is increasing penetration of Chinese into Nepal in various civilian guises. That is going to be one prong of this concerted Communist expansionist scheme, but the much greater prong is going to be along our whole border. We know that we have had trouble with the Nagas. I am quite certain that we are going to have much greater trouble with the Nagas, trouble which is going to be deliberately and in a sustained way aggravated by Chinese Communism on the one side and Indian Communists aided by Chinese arms on the other. They will dupe them with the lure which is rather powerful of a Naga Homeland. We know that our tribals are somewhat cut off from us. We have done a great deal for them. But still there is a feeling of estrangement between the tribals and the plains people. My own feeling is that in the next two or three years we will

[Shri Frank Anthony]

see along our whole border a sustained campaign of subversion of tens of thousands of Indians because they are poor, they are credulous and can easily be misled. They will be trained as communist cadres for the purpose of subversion and violent guerilla activity in this country. Already, I am told by reliable sources, our people along our whole border are being treated to the theory that they have much more in common with the Tibetans and the Chinese because they are of Mangoloid extraction than with the so-called Aryan Indians. The Government has today to arrive at an awareness of the military threat to this country. I believe that we have taken measures and that we will take measures increasingly to contain that military threat. But I do not know whether the Government has today fully realised what I regard as a much greater threat to this country, a threat which will be focussed through the Indian communists working in concert with the Chinese in order to create increasingly cadres of Indians to subvert the country.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (अम्बाला) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सदन के सामने जितना गम्भीर विषय है, उससे आज हम लोगों में से कई लोग धर्म-संकट में पड़े हुए हैं। कल कृपलानी जी ने कहा कि जो उनके पुराने साथी हैं श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी उन के प्रति विरोध प्रकट करते हुए उनको बड़ा दुख होता है, क्योंकि वह उनके पुराने साथी हैं। आज मुझ पर यह बड़ा भारी कर्तव्य आ गया है कि कृपलानी जी के, जो हमेशा से हमारे नेता और पूज्य रहे हैं, विचारों का विरोध करूं। वह हमेशा से बड़े रहे हैं और हमने उनका आदर किया है। आज सियासत के इतिहास ने हमको उनके बराबर लाकर खड़ा कर दिया है। उन्होंने जितनी बातें कहीं, मुझे उन सब पर बड़ा ताज्जुब है। उन्होंने कहा कि वह हमारी गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी से, जवाहरलाल की पालिसी से बिल्कुल मत्तिफिक है, वह पंचशील भी हक में है, वह नान-ए लाइनमेंट

के भी हक में है। पर उन्होंने जो आगे कहा, उस सबसे मालूम पड़ा कि वह बेसिकली इस पालिसी के खिलाफ है। जिस तरह जो बातें कृपलानी जी ने कहीं, जिस तरह उन्होंने कहा कि हमको बाहर से मिलिटरी एड भी ले लेनी चाहिए, जिस तरह से उन्होंने कहा कि चीनियों से पुरानी जगह वापस ले लेनी चाहिए, जिस तरह उन्होंने कई दूसरी बातें कहीं, जो कि मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहती हूं, उनसे ऐसा मालूम नहीं होता कि जो हमारी बेसिक पालिसी है नान-एलाइनमेंट की और पंचशील की, उसके वह हक में थे।

उन्होंने फरमाया कि हम नान-एलाइनमेंट के खिलाफ नहीं हैं, पर हम यह समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान का डिफेन्स नेगलेट किया गया। उन्होंने कहा कि जो डिप्लोमेसी हमने अख्तियार की, वह फ़ेल हो गई। उन्होंने कहा कि मिलिटरी एड भी बाहर से ले लेनी चाहिए। उन्होंने कहा कि आज पंचशील का कुछ मतलब नहीं निकलता। उन्होंने कहा कि हमने जो नोट्स चाइनीज हुकूमत को लिखे हैं, वे एपॉलेजेटिक हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी जो नीति है, वह नान-रिसिस्टेंस की नीति है। उन्होंने यह भी फरमाया कि मुझ को डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ कुछ परसन्ल नहीं कहना है, पर यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में उनकी जो पालिसी है, वह उसका विरोध करते हैं, क्योंकि उनका ख्याल है कि हमारे मिनिस्टर हमारी पालिसी को टविस्ट करने की काबलियत रखते हैं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हमारे डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर को कम्युनिस्ट सर्वोट करते हैं, इससे शक होता है। उनकी बातों से यह भी मालूम हुआ कि डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर के तो वह खिलाफ है, उनकी पालिसी के खिलाफ है, पर वह हमारे मिलिटरी आफिसर्स के बड़े भारी प्रशंसक हैं। यह तो खैर अच्छी बात है। यह भी मालूम हुआ कि वह करियप्पा साहब के विचारों से मत्तिफिक है, उनके बड़े भारी एडमायरर हैं।

12-25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR]

मसानी प्रार्थुमेंट्स में उन्होंने बार बार मसानी साहब को भी क्वोट किया, क्योंकि उन्होंने कहा कि नान-एलाइमिंटेड पालिसी के वह खिलाफ नहीं हैं, पर बाकी प्रागे जो बातें कहीं, उसका वह विरोध करते हैं। स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के मसानी साहब को उन्होंने बार बार क्वोट किया और मसानी साहब ने बार बार उनकी क्वोट किया, क्योंकि दोनों ने जो एक बात बहुत.....

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): I do not want to interrupt the speaker but I think she does not understand English properly. I have not quoted Masani.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मालूम ऐसा हुआ कि कृपालानी जी...

श्री नाथ पाई : जब भ्रमशा नहीं, तो मालूम कैसे हुआ ?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मालूम ऐसा हुआ कि आचार्य कृपालानी जी और मसानी साहब नान-एलाइमिंटेड के और पंचशाल के खिलाफ तो नहीं हैं, पर वे चाहते हैं कि उनकी इण्टरप्रेंटेशन उनकी मरजी की हो। उनका क्याल है कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर ने जो हमारी पालिसी को इण्टरप्रेंट किया, वह ट्विस्ट करके किया।

Acharya Kripalani: I think I will have again to interrupt her. I never attacked what he did in the UNO.

Shrimati Subhadra Joshi: He said that he could twist... (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. She may be allowed to proceed.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मो, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मालूम यह हुआ कि वह पालिसी में तो मुक्तिफिक हैं, पर यह चाहते हैं कि वह

पालिसी उनकी मरजी के मुताबिक इण्टरप्रेंट होनी चाहिए। उनका कहना यह है कि हमारे डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर जो वहां जाकर हमारी फ़ारिन पालिसी को इण्टरप्रेंट करते हैं वह इण्टरप्रेंटेशन अच्छी नहीं है। यह तो बहुत प्राइमरी की बात है। मैं जानती हूँ कि जो डीटेल की बात है, प्राइम मिनिस्टर उसका उत्तर देंगे। मैं हाउस का समय नन् जानों के लिए नहीं लेना चाहती।

श्री ब्रज राज सिंह (फ़िरोजाबाद) : तो रहने दीजिए।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : पर मालूम यह होता है कि चाहते तो वह यह है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर वहां रहे, सूरत तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर की रहे, क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान के लोग उस सूरत को पहचानते हैं। दिन भी उनका ही रहे, क्योंकि उनके दिल की ईमानदारी पर हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को भरोसा है। दिमाग भी उनका रहे। पर वे चाहते हैं कि हाथ-पैर स्वतन्त्र पार्टी या प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के वह लगा कर बैठें, ताकि मुह में तो पीस की पालिसी रहे और हाथ में चुपके से छुरा पकड़ लें, ताकि मौका मिलने पर वह जो चाहें, कर सकें। पर मैं सफ़ाई में कहना चाहती हूँ कि हम या देश के लोग इन बातों में नहीं आयेंगे कि हम प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पालिसी से तो मुक्तिफिक हैं और बातों और प्रार्थुमेंट्स में वे तमाम बातें कहे, जो कि हमारी पालिसी के बेसिकली प्रग्रेस्ट जाती हैं।

उन्होंने और मसानी साहब ने यह भी कहा कि हम परमंन्ती डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ नहीं है। पर मैं सदन से और बाकी लोगों में सिर्फ इतना सा निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि जो हमारी नीति है, जो हमारी वैदेशिक नीति है, या जो डिफेन्स की नीति है, उसके जिम्मेदार सिर्फ डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर ही नहीं हैं—उसकी जिम्मेदार पूरी कॅबिनेट है, उसके जिम्मेदार प्राइम मिनिस्टर है, उसकी जिम्मेदार फ़ारिन पार्टी है, और उसके

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

बाद जब हाउस उस को एडॉप्ट कर लेता है, तो उसकी जिम्मेदार सारी पार्लियामेंट है। ऐसा कहके, एक एक बहाने से एक एक मिनिस्टर को टारगेट बना कर घोर लोगों को डरा कर वह हमारी पार्लियमी को टबिस्ट करने में कभी कामयाब नहीं होंगे। जो जवाहरलाल के साथ हैं, वह उनकी नीति के साथ हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के लोग उन पर भरोसा करते हैं, वे उनकी नीति के साथ हैं, मिरफ उनके साथ नहीं हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोग स चीज को देख रहे हैं कि जो मुम्बई की घटा हिन्दुस्तान पर आई है, किस तरह मुम्बई के काले बादल हिन्दुस्तान पर आए हैं, वे उम्मीद करते हैं कि हमारे नेता श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू हमको उन मुम्बई से छूटकारा दिलायेंगे, वह हमारे जहाज को उभी तरह किनारे पर लगायेंगे, जिस तरह उन्होंने हमेशा लगीया है और बिना टकराये हुए, बिना नुकसान पहुंचाए लगायेंगे।

आज कहते हैं कि हम वार की बात नहीं करते हैं। कहते हैं कि हम इधर उधर मिलने की बात नहीं करते हैं। तो क्या आचार्य कृपानानी और मसानी साहब यह समझते हैं कि जब हम जवदस्ती अपनी पाकेट खीनने के लिए जायेंगे, तो चाइनीज फॉसिज चारुके से पीछे हट जायेंगी? वे कहते हैं कि डिफेन्स को नैगलेक्ट किया। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बार बार यह कहा कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के हर इंच के लिए पूरी कोशिश करेंगे और अगर चैन और अमन से ऐसा नहीं हुआ, तो फोर्स भी इस्तेमाल की जायगी। यह बड़ी सफ़ाई से कहा गया है। वह क्या कर रहे हैं? वह कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि जहां तक हो सके, फीसफुजी, अमन से, बिना लड़ाई लड़े इम कामले को तय कर लिया जाये। मुझे समझ नहीं आता कि इसमें क्या ऐतराज है। कल से बार बार यह कहा गया है—और पहले भी कहा गया—कि हम से सबरें छिपाई गईं। सबरें बनाई गईं, वह हम से छिपाया गया।

आपोजीशन के तमाम लोगों ने यह कहा। हमारी तरफ से हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने बार बार इस बात का जवाब दे दिया कि कोई छिपाने की कोशिश नहीं की गई। पर मैं एक बात आपोजीशन के सदस्यों से पूछना चाहती हूँ।

श्री नाथ पाई : सायद आप से कहा था। हम से नहीं कहा था। मंसूर ने नहीं कहा था।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मैं कृपानानी जी से पूछना चाहती हूँ, मसानी साहब से पूछना चाहती हूँ, और लोगों से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि समझ लीजिए कि हुकमत ने छिपा लिखा, तो आप कौनसी सबर ले आवें कि कहां से।

श्री नाथ पाई : यह हमारा काम नहीं है। मल्लनत का काम है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

श्री बाबुरायी : वह पूछ रही है तो जवाब देने दीजिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह तो मुझ से पूछ रही है।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : उनके तो बड़े बड़े रीनोमिज है। कृपानानी जी की बुद्धिमत्ता, मसानी साहब की बुद्धिमत्ता—जो कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर को विजडम मिलाने का दावा करते थे, जो भविष्य भी देख लेते हैं और प्राचीन भी देख लेते हैं,—ने क्या किया? स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के सारे रीनोमिज किस काम आये? वह कौनसी सबर ले आवें कि कहां सबर बन रही है।

श्री राज राव सिंह : कांग्रेस पार्टी भी तो है।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : क्या मैं यह समझ लूँ कि क्या वह सिर्फ़ सूझी सबरें लाने में ही विहाल हो गए हैं; एक्स्पर्ट हो गए हैं और सबरें सबरें लाने को किमती ही नहीं

हूँ ? इसलिए मैं भ्रम करना चाहती हूँ कि इतना ही कहें देने से कि हमने इसको निर्गलकृत किया है, हमने लापरवाही की है, धर्म नहीं बन सकता है, इससे कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है । जितनी कोशिश की गई है वह हाउस के सामने बार बार रखी गई है ।

एक और बात जिस को मैं बहुत ज्यादा आवश्यक मानती हूँ आपके सामने, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, रखना चाहती हूँ । कम इम सदन में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लीडर श्री डांग ने भाषण किया था । मैं उस भाषण की सराहना करती हूँ ।

श्री नाथ पाई : आपको बहुत पसन्द आया ।

श्री सुभाषा घोषी : बहुत पसन्द है ।

लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूँ कि दिक्कत सिर्फ यही है कि जब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता बोल कर जाते हैं तो उनके दूसरे साथी कहते हैं कि उनका भाषण परमनल केसेटी में दिया गया था । जो भाषण दिया गया वह अच्छा दिया गया, फिर चाहे वह दिल से दिया गया हो या ऊपर से दिया गया हो । कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि ऊपर से दिया गया है । लेकिन मैं इस बहस में पड़ना नहीं चाहती हूँ । जैसे भी उन्होंने भाषण दिया लेकिन जब उन्होंने यह कहा कि वह गवर्नमेंट की नीति को सपोर्ट करते हैं, उसको मैं मानती हूँ, उसका मैं स्वागत करती हूँ । मुझे इतना ही कहना है कि उनकी या उनकी पार्टी की जो नीति है वह मुबारिक है अगर कल वह उनकी पार्टी की पालिसी नहीं थी तो आज वह हो सकती है कल भी हो सकती है । लेकिन मुझे केवल इतना ही कहना है कि अगर कोई ट्रेडर है, चाहे वह पूरी पार्टी हो, चाहे पार्टी का कोई आदमी हो, चाहे कोई आदमी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में हो चाहे किसी और पार्टी में हो, उसे भी ट्रेडर या ट्रेडर्स हों, उनके साथ मिल करके इन्फुल का काम है, उनके खिलाफ उनका पक्षक लोगों का काम नहीं है । मैं

बड़े अदब से धर्म करना चाहती हूँ कि कम्युनिस्टों को हवा की देवना होगा । इस सदन के अन्दर और इस सदन के बाहर भी आज चीन हमले के कारण हिन्दुस्तान की और चीन की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को जो एक समझा जा रहा है इसकी पूरी जिम्मेवारी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पर है । उसी को पता है कि लोग उनकी एक कैसे समझते हैं । पर अगर उनको एक समझ कर, एक दिशा कर अगर कोई हमारी नीति पर, हमारी पांच साला योजनाओं पर, हमारी राष्ट्रीयकरण की नीति पर हमारी इकोनॉमिक पालिसी पर हमला करता है, तो मैं साफ साफ कह देना चाहती हूँ कि अगर हम लैपट की डिक्टेटरशिप से कतराते हैं उसको पसन्द नहीं करते हैं, तो हम हिन्दुस्तान में राइट की डिक्टेटरशिप भी नहीं होने देंगे, उसका भी हम मुकाबला करेंगे । ऐसी सूरत में मैं कहना चाहती हूँ और सराई के साथ कहना चाहती हूँ कि आज कम्युनिस्टों का डेफिनिशन कोई कर सकता है या अगर कोई अनरैट्रिब्युटिव हो सकता है या अनरैट्रिब्युटिव काम करता है, तो उसकी भी डेफिनिशन होम मिनिस्ट्री करेगी, एक्सटरनल अफेयर्स की मिनिस्ट्री करेगी, गवर्नमेंट करेगी । आज उनकी डेफिनिशन पर ट्रेडर हिन्दुस्तान में होगा । इन लोगों के कहने के मुताबिक जिनको मोटले क्राउड प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा है आज जो लेंड रिफार्म्स की बात करते हैं, वे कम्युनिस्ट हैं, आज जो न्यूट्रैलिटी की बात करते हैं, वे कम्युनिस्ट हैं, आज जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर को सपोर्ट करते हैं दिल्ली की गलियों में उनको भी कम्युनिस्ट कहा जाता है आज जो हमारे मिनिस्टर प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पालिसी को इंटरप्रेट करते हैं यू० एन० प्रो० में, उनको भी कम्युनिस्ट कहा जाता है, उनके मुताबिक कम्युनिस्टों की डेफिनिशन नहीं की जा सकती है ।

श्री बाबुदेवी : आपको तो नहीं कहना है ।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना चाहती हूँ कि मुल्क की डिफेंस के लिये जहाँ यह जरूरी है कि हमारी मिलिटरी मजबूत हो वहाँ यह भी उतना ही जरूरी है कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्लानर डिस्पांडर किसी भी बहाने, किसी भी हालत में फेलने न दिया जाए। किसी भी कारण से पोलिटिकल पार्टीज को डिस्पांडर फेलाने का मौका नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये। मैंने सुना है कि हमारे जनसंघ के नेताओं ने कहा है कि चीन का फैसला यहाँ के कम्युनिस्टों से गलियों में और गाजियाबाद, मेरठ पता नहीं कहाँ होगा.....

श्री बाबूदेवी : आपको पता नहीं तो क्यों इसका उल्लेख कर रही हैं।

श्री ४० नु० तारिक : आपको जोश क्यों आ रहा है।

شون اے ایم طارق - آپ کو
جوش کہوں آ رہا ہے -

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मैं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कहना चाहती हूँ कि जो कोई कांग्रेस की तमाम नीतियों के खिलाफ है, वंदेगिक, सामाजिक, इकोनॉमिक आदि वे पार्टियों के ट्रेडम की डेफिनिशन नहीं कर सकती है। इन पार्टियों के लीडर्स द्वारा की गई डेफिनिशन हम हिन्दुस्तान में हजार बार देख चुके हैं। किसी वक़्त उनकी लाटियां मुसलमानों के खिलाफ उठी थी, उनकी लाटियां सिखों के खिलाफ उठी थी। और आज अगर वे किसी बहाने में राइट की डिक्लेरेशन लाना चाहते हैं, तो इसकी कमी भी बरदाश्त नहीं किया जा सकता है। हुकूमत को देश की इससे हिफाजत करनी चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक आखिरी बात कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करती हूँ। मैं राइट डिक्लेरेशन की बात इसलिये ही नहीं कर रही हूँ कि उनकी आबाज कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के खिलाफ या किसी ट्रेटर के खिलाफ उठती है बल्कि इसलिये कहती हूँ

कि आज हमारी वंदेगिक नीति जिसके लिये हमारी हुकूमत जिम्मेदार है, उसकी बात बंध होती है, तब मिनिस्टर को कंठ में घोर आक्सिस की बात कहते हैं। मैंने अपने भाषण में पहले उसका जिक्र किया है। यहाँ पर इस सदन में जो भाषण हुए तिरमैया साहब के रजिगनेशन पर उसकी तरफ मैं आपका इसी सम्बन्ध में ध्यान दिलाना चाहती हूँ। साथ ही साथ मुझे धकलौस है और हमारे मुल्क की यह बदकिस्मती है कि जब भी कमी कोई काइसिस का बकल आता है, तो मॅल्क-एग्वाइटिड एम्बेडम चले जाते हैं हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर बात करने के लिए। कोई आहूत पैकिंग जाता है, कोई रजिया जाता है, दूसरे साहब पाकिस्तान चला जाते हैं, कोई अमेरिका चला जाता है और कोई आहूत जाने के पोग्राम बनाते हैं। करिअप्पा साहब बड़े बहादुर थे लेकिन पाकिस्तान के बागे में वह किस आथोरिटी में वह बात कर रहे हैं। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के लोग किसने ही बरगों से कह रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान पर हमला कर दिया जाना चाहिए.....

श्री बबू राज सिंह : क्या कह रही है ? जो कुछ कह रही है, समझ रही है उसे ?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मैं यह कह रही हूँ कि सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के लोग जब श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण जी उनके नेता थे, तभी मैं उन्होंने कहना शुरू कर दिया था कि पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ वार डिक्लेरेशन कर दी जाए, पाकिस्तान पर हमला कर दिया जाए। हम पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती से रहना चाहते हैं और पाकिस्तान ही नहीं सभी पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ दोस्ती से रहना चाहते हैं। हम सभी के साथ हमेशा दोस्ती रखने के हक में हैं। लेकिन कुछ लोग हैं जो हमेशा ही लड़ाई की बात करते हैं। आज पाकिस्तान में मिलिटरी डिक्लेरेशन है और वह उनको मुबारिक हो। लेकिन हमारे यहाँ मिलिटरी के आक्सिस में, मिलि-

दूरी के अन्तराल में जिस तरह से डिस्कॉर्टमेंट
बैमाने की कोशिश की जा रही है, उसकी
तरफ़ भी मैं गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान दिलाना
चाहती हूँ और कहना चाहती हूँ कि डिफेंस
मुल्क का इस तरह से मजबूत नहीं हो सकता है
हाउस को डिवाइड नहीं होना चाहिए,
गवर्नमेंट को डिवाइड नहीं होना चाहिये
और इस तरफ़ गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान जाना
चाहिए ।

इतना ही मुझे निवेदन करना है ।

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty is re-
marking that I am going to be the next
Minister!

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty
(Basirhat): I did not say that; that
is wishful thinking.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West
Dinajpur): Did she mention the port-
folio? (Interruption).

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Well, Sir,
I stand corrected. I am sorry.

We had a debate on this subject on
the 12th September last, and had there
been any improvement in the situation
there would not have been any neces-
sity of discussing the matter today in
this House. But as the situation had
deteriorated, and deteriorated very
considerably, every section of the
House thought it better that this
matter should be discussed here.
It has deteriorated in the sense that
the Chinese troops went on penetrat-
ing into our territory. On 26th August,
they had killed perhaps only 1 patrol
personnel of India at Longju. But on
the 21st they succeeded in killing 9
and arresting many more. The Prime
Minister said the other day that Shri
Karam Singh has got frost-bitten and
Dr. Baliga from Hongkong announced
that the Chinese troops have extorted
some sort of confession from Shri
Karam Singh. I send my salute to all
the officers, soldiers and patrol person-

nel who were killed by the Chinese
on the 21st and 26th August.

I would like to know how Shri
Karam Singh got frost-bitten, because
the day he went to patrol that area,
he must have been quite fit. What
was the time taken, by the time he
was belaboured by the Chinese and he
was actually put in detention or arrest
or whatever may be the confinement
there, by the Chinese troops: I want
to know if he was put by the Chinese
on snow or made to sit somewhere
near the Chinese trenches during the
night-time on the snow. If that was
the treatment meted out to Shri Karam
Singh, I think that is very inhuman.
Dr. Baliga is an eminent doctor of our
country, who has been enjoying all
amenities in the city of Bombay and
who might be the conscience-
keeper of a very eminent person. How
did he go to China and on what autho-
rity? As a free citizen of India,
everybody has a right to go to Peking
or anywhere he likes. But if he dis-
cussed with the Chinese Prime Minis-
ter any delicate issue, it should have
been his first duty to report that mat-
ter to the Prime Minister of India.
Rather than doing that, he made a
public announcement in Hongkong
that the Chinese had obtained a con-
fession from Shri Karam Singh. I
think it is dishonourable for any free
citizen of this country to make such
an announcement against a person who
was under confinement at that very
moment. What will be the feeling of
Shri Karam Singh and all his friends
who are alive? I can even think of
the feelings of those who laid down
their lives for protecting Shri Karam
Singh or Dr. Baliga, because we are
here at the cost of persons who are
protecting our boundary.

In this context, I think of the state-
ment which appeared in the papers
yesterday that it is impossible to build
a Maginot line throughout our bound-
ary of 9,000 miles. Of this 9,000
about 4,000 miles is sea-coast and it is
necessary that we should take all pre-
cautions; and, we are already taking

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

all adequate precautions in defending our sea-coast. For this I give all credit to the Prime Minister and his Government. But I am not convinced of the statement that it is not possible to protect the remaining 5,000 miles, because it is the first duty of any Government to take care of the boundary.

Even if I leave out 2,500 miles, which is our boundary with Pakistan, the remaining 2,500 miles is our common boundary with the Tibetan region of China. I am using the words 'Tibetan region' purposely, because in our negotiation with China, in our treaty in 1954, we agreed to recognise Tibet as a region of China, under the suzerainty of China, with all the implications that the word connotes. But I do not like that we should give anything more to anybody or we should ask anything more for ourselves than what is contained in this treaty of 1954. But we have gone beyond that. Now we are mentioning Kailas and Mansarovar in China and not in Tibetan region of China. That is the one grouse I am pointing out in this context.

If we think of defending or properly patrolling those 2,500 miles of our border, it means on a rough estimate 100 checkposts will be enough to patrol that area. I do not mean to say that 100 checkposts will be enough to counteract the advance of the Chinese troops concentrated there in lakhs. But for patrolling purposes, 100 checkposts will be quite adequate. Nowhere in Himalayas is there a mountain where there is no water resource, at a distance of 50 miles. Even if it is not possible to open checkposts at distances of 25 miles each, it should be feasible to have checkposts at distances of 50 miles where water resources are available.

When people say that at 17,000 or 18,000 feet not even a blade of grass grows, I concede that, but everywhere there is a valley or dale and then a steep mountain. In the valley people can stay and upto 9,000 feet you can grow gardens. Beyond that, it may not be possible to grow. So, when I

talk of proper protection of the border or setting up adequate checkposts, I am giving a concrete suggestion. I may even suggest full industrialisation of those areas, not industrialisation of Calcutta, Bangalore, Poona or Bombay, but industrialisation of NEFA and Ladakh including Spiti and Himachal, because no factory in Calcutta or Bombay can work if those areas are not protected.

There are immense resources in those areas. You can easily set up a paper factory in the NEFA area. Mica is available in plenty in Ladakh. You can make further investigation and probe about this industrialisation.

Regarding setting up of checkposts, Rs. 1 lakh will be enough for 1 checkpost per month—I do not say unconnected checkposts, that there should be one checkpost at Haji Langar and another at Khurnak—but everywhere a chain of checkposts and all of them must be supported by supply-lines. So, the expenditure would not go beyond Rs. 1 crore for maintaining 100 checkposts. If you set up 100 more checkposts as a second line, it will cost you another Rs. 1 crore. So, roughly Rs. 25 crores will be enough in a year to support these checkposts. So, I do not agree with the suggestion that it is not possible to maintain the checkposts. When we are keen on industrialisation of the country, we must be keen also that development programmes should be carried on with much more enthusiasm and zeal. We must be thorough in implementing those programmes. I think it is unnecessary to worry about this additional expenditure. The Prime Minister yesterday was kind enough to refer to Chairman Mao Tse-tung and every one of us has the highest regard for him. We are having regard and respect for our Prime Minister. The country has reverence for him and if he wants Rs. 25 crores, every person will contribute. For the defence and protection of the nation an ordinary appeal from the Prime Minister will be enough to bring Rs. 100 crores or Rs. 60 crores. In that way, without curtailing our

development expenditure, we can easily strengthen our patrol posts in those areas.

In this context, I would humbly submit to the Prime Minister one thing—and here I agree with Shrimati Subhadra Joshi—and that is that if anybody wants to go to any place, particularly during a period of crisis like this, he should invariably obtain the permission of the Government. He should not manoeuvre to go there without any permit through some Embassy or some such thing; and this applies to everybody, irrespective of party affiliations.

Now I think I should say something about the points raised by Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani. Two points were raised by Acharya Kripalani, of which one was about taking military aid from foreign countries. He referred to Yugoslavia and said that when Yugoslavia's relationship with Russia was strained, General Tito did not hesitate to take help. Here I fully endorse the policy of our Prime Minister, the policy of non-alignment, which has done immense good to our country. Even if it has not done anything to our country, it is not good to give up this policy at this moment of crisis, because this will unnecessarily create confusion; I warn everybody. Yesterday, Shri Dange said about war psychosis. I do not want to elaborate that point, but I think that nobody, particularly Shri Dange, should talk about war psychosis and attribute motives to others. If they do so, then I would say that persons who talk of others as creating war psychosis, they are responsible for creating surrender psychosis in this country, and this surrender psychosis must be resisted at all costs, because we should stand by the Prime Minister as one united nation, a solid and strong nation, at this moment of crisis.

Acharya Kripalani said that there is nothing wrong in taking military aid. I say that we need not take any military aid because, as I said, an ordinary simple appeal from the Prime Minister to the nation will be enough

to meet this contingency. Then the Chinese would not indulge in making further aggression into our territory.

In this context, I support the recent stand taken by the Prime Minister. I think there is no harm in carrying negotiations, even at the cost of something. But there must be honest effort to give full opportunity to everybody to explain the stand. Premier Chou En-lai had written to our Prime Minister on 7th and on 16th he replied, that is, after a lapse of 9 days. Now, ten days have passed and still he has not received any reply. This shows that they are not very keen on negotiation. The next call from the Prime Minister to China should be to vacate all the areas which have been occupied by the Chinese, because we must be firm on our boundary which we have declared.

Shri Masani said that we must take arms from other countries. I think there is a serious danger in that, because a banker is a man who advances money. Another, his brother, is a manufacturer of arms. His third brother is an exporter or importer. So, I do not want that our country should get entangled in such things by getting arms from other countries in that way.

Then, we must gear up our ordnance factories to meet our requirements. If we require anything today, it should be our effort to meet that contingency, rather than appealing to any foreign country. Our primary effort should be to develop NEFA, Ladakh, Spiti and other Himalayan areas and build up our lines of communication. It is a good thing that we are developing all big establishments in the plains where all the facilities are available. But, as far as smaller institutions are concerned, according to me, it would be wiser to establish them in Mussoorie, Leh and other places in the hills. Therefore, I would suggest that schools for officers etc., should be set up in the hills. There is another reason for this suggestion. The personnel of the armed services should get themselves acclimatised to the conditions prevailing

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

in the hill areas, in our boundaries. Finally I say that we must show firmness and keenness to stand by our leader and to oust the aggressor from our territory.

Sbri Manaan (Darjeeling): I rather agree with Dr. Ram Subhag Singh that the situation, instead of improving, is deteriorating. The problem created by the Chinese incursion is becoming acute and the people in our country are getting more and more confused. What we fail to understand is why should Communist China do something which, to an average individual, would appear to be utter foolhardy? The Chinese have disgracefully betrayed the friendship which we had held as a time-honoured sacred obligation. The slogan "Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai" and the conception of centuries-old friendship between these two great countries have been exploded, and exploded not because of us, but because of the rash, foolish, chauvinistic and adventurous brigandry and incursions by the Chinese.

There should have been no border dispute in the first place and even if there had been one, it could have been settled, solved, in a more civilised manner. There was no justification, nor reason, to take recourse to violent incursions, killing our people. The Chinese are forcibly occupying our territory and they have also killed nine of our dear countrymen. And here I may say that five of these people belonged to my part of the country. Worst of all is that all along the borders the Chinese have entrenched their troops with the most modern weapons. We would like to know why are they there, armed to the teeth? Are they afraid that we will invade their country? Or, do they want to invade us? The whole thing appears to be absolutely inexplicable.

Coming as I do from the north eastern frontier of our country, I am more concerned with this region. What is going on in Kalimpong, for example, is neither looked at in its correct pers-

pective, nor is it understood in all its proper bearings. As we all know, Kalimpong does not immediately border with China. It has on the north Sikkim and on the east Bhutan. It is very glibly said that Kalimpong is a nest of spies and that a large number of Chinese curio shops have been opened in the villages at Kalimpong. I can claim some personal knowledge of the situation there. In fact, I was in Kalimpong, going round that area only on the 22nd and 23rd of this month. I tried to study the situation in my own way. As far as the question of Chinese shops are concerned, I could gather that the number has come down.

Last year there were 35 Chinese shoe shops and 29 hotels and restaurants. The present figures seem to be 27 and 21 respectively. The figures which could be considered official are even lower. There has not been any addition to curio shops, of which there were already very few, and I could not see a single Chinese shop anywhere in the villages in Kalimpong.

14 hrs.

Therefore it appears that we are running after the shadow and the substance is lost sight of. There are spies and propagandists in Kalimpong. Some are spying for international Communism, some are spying for China and some for the Western countries. The hon. Prime Minister says that Kalimpong is a nest of spies. Why should we then not take proper steps to expose this nest, pick out all the spies from Kalimpong and throw them out? But in order that the nest could be blown up, I am sure the Intelligence Bureau and other security measures in Kalimpong will have to be tightened up. There is enough damaging propaganda being done by Red China. I am sure the House will be amused, if not intrigued, if I say that the volume of espionage done by K.M.T. in Kalimpong is not less. Surely, just because we have a breach with Communist China at present, it

does not mean that we would allow or encourage K.M.T. propaganda in Kalimpong. I have in my possession a large number of Urdu, Chinese and Tibetan leaflets distributed by K.M.T. among the Tibetans, refugees, Chinese and others. It has got to be stopped by all means and immediately.

This leads me to the question of encouraging or permitting heavy concentration of Tibetan refugees in and around Sikkim, Kalimpong and even in Bhutan. At present there are about one thousand Tibetan refugees in Kalimpong. In Sikkim there are about eight to ten thousand refugees. Strangely enough, most of these Tibetan refugees are working very near the northern border of Sikkim. The consequence of permitting heavy concentration of Tibetan refugees in border areas can very easily be conjectured, particularly in view of the large-scale propaganda carried out in this area.

Another very intriguing aspect of the situation is the continuance of Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong. We all know that trade in that part is absolutely in slump and yet I could notice that the Chinese trade agency there was vibrating with life. We have trade agencies in Gyantse and Lhasa. If our trade agencies are not doing any trade now or they are not likely to do any trade in the foreseeable future, they should be withdrawn. Then the Chinese trade agencies in Kalimpong and Calcutta would also be withdrawn.

Mere accusation that espionage is done in a large scale should not satisfy us. We must have the boldness to remove all possible agencies, which may be suspected as spy or agent provocateur. I personally feel—and feel very strongly—that if you really do mean business, the Chinese trade agency in Kalimpong should at least be withdrawn from there. I do not think there will be any difficulty because we have Consulates and Embassies who can maintain the normal diplomatic relations.

During my tours of this area I had also reason to feel strongly that the Tibetan refugees will have to be very, very strictly screened. It is only the strict screening that can give some sort of a guarantee against the infiltration of agents provocateur and saboteurs into Kalimpong in the garb of Tibetan refugees. I am not one of those who believe that just because the Chinese have occupied Longju or have done other excesses, we should go into a war or sever all our diplomatic relations. Whatever land they might have occupied, whatever excesses they might have done, we must seek remedy in negotiations. But then our policy now should be one of thus far and no further. We shall not allow another inch of our territory to be occupied by the Chinese nor shall we allow another of our countrymen to be murdered by the Chinese brigands. Let us fortify our borders properly and strongly. Let us not, as we seem to be doing sometimes, dismiss certain parts of the Himalayan borders by saying that the terrain is difficult, mountainous, snowy and so on and so forth. I do not think that the youth of this country is dead. Our youngmen are prepared to hazard any risks and brave any difficulties to protect the sanctity of our borders.

I am confident that the borders in Sikkim are very, very strongly guarded and fortification is in progress. But with regard to Bhutan I am inclined to agree with what Shri Frank Anthony said. In regard to Bhutan we have got to have a definite policy. We entirely endorse the view of the hon. Prime Minister that any attack on Bhutan would be considered as an attack of India. I am sure the progressive Prime Minister and the Maharajah of Bhutan also endorse this view of our revered Panditji. But some practical steps will have to be taken before it is too late. What can be these practical steps? Government should be more liberal in the grant of funds for the overall development of Bhutan and the roads to and

[Shri Mansan]

within Bhutan should be speedily improved. I am sure, whatever be our treaties, they have got to be changed. Some alterations will have to be brought about if need be. I am sure the Prime Minister and the Maharajah of Bhutan will welcome the idea of stationing a few contingents of the Indian Army in the northern border of Bhutan. If necessary, we might also send a military mission to Bhutan to re-organise and modernise the Bhutanese Army. Unpredictable as Red China has proved herself to be, any development may occur in this region at any time. It is better to take precautions when there is time. If we do not take precautions in time, I can warn this House and the country that Bhutan may be the Achilles' heel in the North Eastern defence of our country. Let Government take heed of this.

The hon. Prime Minister has rightly said that the strength of the nation lay in the unity of the people. People living in the north eastern frontier of India will defend the borders with the last drop of blood in their veins. The Gorkhas, living there, with their great military tradition, will stand to the last man to defend the integrity of the country. But then Government also have certain responsibility. Who can deny the significance of keeping the border people contented and in a happy frame of mind? Agents provocateur and fifth columnists very often exploit the poverty and the ignorance of the people. Our Communist friends brazenly extol Red China and defend the incursions in our country. Day in and day out they preach discontent and violence. In my part of the country I once challenged the Communist Party to have the boldness to say that if Premier Chou En-lai attacked our country, they will fight against him. They could not answer me. I hope my Communist friends opposite will have the boldness to say that if Red China will attack us they will fight to the last man and defend the

motherland. My motherland let them understand India and not some other country.

As Hon. Member: They are keeping mum.

Shri Mansan: I appeal to the Communist friends opposite to give the lead to the rank and file not to betray the country. We saw in the papers that we have about one lakh Communists in this country. I shudder to think if these one lakh Communists should turn fifth columnists in the moment of crisis in this country. But I am certain that if these one lakh Communists should turn fifth columnists, they will be consumed in the fire of patriotism of millions of our countrymen.

I was speaking about Sikkim and Darjeeling. Some hon. Members of the West Bengal Assembly are reported to have said that disloyalty against Government is being spread in Darjeeling and Kalimpong to create a situation of open rebellion against the Government. I went to Darjeeling, Kalimpong, Siliguri and to other places. I could not find anywhere such propaganda for rebellion being made. Some propaganda is carried out but it will not, in the least, be able to disturb the deep sense of loyalty and patriotism of my people living there. I do not see any reason to complain about the failure of the West Bengal Government to take effective steps to stop such propaganda when there is no such propaganda. What I think the State Government and the Government of India ought to do is to take adequate steps to stabilise the rapidly deteriorating economic conditions of the people and remove all reasonable grounds of grievance and mistrust. Small things here and there seem to irritate and the least cause for irritation should be removed. In order to create a healthy psychological and emotional atmosphere, the publicity of the State Government and the Government of India should be geared up....

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

Shri Manasen: I want just one more minute.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh happily touched this point. All strategic roads in Darjeeling and Kalimpong have got to be improved and extended. I need not go into the details as to where we have such roads, but I would appeal to the Government of India to have a map of Darjeeling on their table and study as to how vulnerable are different roads and how important it is to extend certain roads. I would also appeal that some of the existing roads should be made national highways. I appeal to Panditji to focus his personal attention to the internal matters of Sikkim. I have no time now to discuss the internal matters of Sikkim, and I would not wish to do it now. But if the Prime Minister will focus his attention he will see the malady, and he has the remedy for it.

I could not understand the logic of the proposed restrictions on foreigners going into Kalimpong. I wonder whether the proposed restriction is in order to eliminate the possibility of infiltration of spies. After all, what interests will the foreigners have, most of whom are tourists? If you look upon every foreigner as a potential spy, then God alone can help us. This unwise policy, I am sure, will disturb the tourist traffic in my part of the country. I appeal to the Government to review the policy in this regard. What they ought to do is to tighten up the intelligence machinery and other security measures and not get panicky. We do not want our people to get panicky, least of all our Government.

Shri Dinesh Singh (Banda): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the problem which we are discussing today is not a mere problem of a border violation but a much deeper problem of conflict of ideologies. For the first time we have

on our borders another big country following an entirely different ideology, and this conflict of ideology will not be resolved so easily.

On this vast border of 2,600 miles that we have, we have suddenly seen a new situation. This situation has to be studied deeply. To be able to understand what is really happening there and what is likely to happen there we must try to understand what the motives of the Chinese are on that side.

Many of us here have been told and there are interested parties who want us to believe that all this is happening because the Chinese are angry with us for having given asylum to the Dalai Lama or to some Tibetan refugees. That is not the case. It is an over-simplification of the matter and, if I may say so, a rather naive one. Because, all this trouble had started much before the Dalai Lama ever thought of coming here or any Tibetan refugee came here.

The coming of the Chinese has already raised many problems. They may have come there to claim the territory which they consider to be legitimately their own, or they may have come there to extend their occupation of Tibet, or they may have come there and created this trouble to give some sort of force to their economic reforms. We all know that there has been a considerable leap backward from the leap forward that they are supposed to have taken. Whatever may be the reason, there can be no doubt that in the minds of the Chinese there is a definite feeling of expansionism, and we shall have learn to live with it.

Now, Sir, we have seen what has happened on our borders, and I am sure that the Chinese, as soon as they are able to consolidate themselves there, would turn their attention to Bhutan, to other Himalayan States, and in fact over the whole of South Asia and South-East Asia. How are

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

we going to meet this challenge? It is not a question of meeting a few border incidents; it is a much deeper problem and we need a more serious remedy for it. Now, there has been much criticism of our policy about guarding these borders. I feel that there has not been enough realisation in this House of the difficulties that the Government face in defending this border. Twelve years ago, before we achieved our independence, there was no problem of defence of this border. There were no check-posts, no communications, not even an administration in those areas. All that the British used to do was to keep some forces at the foot-hills and send punitive expeditions whenever they thought it necessary. Therefore within twelve years we had to build this vast machinery for defending this border. This was not the only concern we had. We had other borders, and a lot of trouble on those borders too. It was therefore a question of apportioning priority. And those hon. Members who had been here in the last Lok Sabha will realise how from the beginning the emphasis has always been on other borders. That was the mandate of this House also. It is easy now to sit here and blame the Government that they should have done something. But where did they have the resources to do it? Where was the time to do it?

So, whenever we think of these criticisms we must bear in mind the geographical situation also. In some places there are small jeepable roads, in others there are mule tracks, and in some places like N.E.F.A. there is practically no road at all; one has to walk, and sometimes on all fours to get to places. It is not a very easy matter.

But because of that there is no reason to panic, no reason to feel that the Chinese will come in and that we shall not be able to defend ourselves. As the Prime Minister has already stated, we are in a position to defend

ourselves if there is an invasion. And I am quite sure that any of us who have been there or who may go there will realize this when we are there that there is no question of any sort of mass invasion taking place without being checked. I am sure that we are in a position to defend our borders should there be a mass invasion.

There has been some criticism here yesterday that the Government is not doing anything to defend the border. I am afraid I do not understand what this really means. How does one defend the border? By sending the armed forces. That is what we have done. Government has handed over the security of the border to the armed forces. They will certainly defend it.

But we must bear this in mind that it is not possible to defend every inch of that territory. Just as the Chinese have come into our territory we can also go into their territory if we so choose. But that is not a solution and therefore we have not done it.

There has been much criticism of our foreign policy and also of our policy of *Panchsheel* and I am very glad that Shri Asoka Mehta clarified the position today. It is therefore very important for us to consider what we are going to do in the future. Our policy of *Panchsheel* is a policy which has won universal acclaim. There was a time when that policy was being rejected, not only rejected but ridiculed. Today that policy is being followed not only by uncommitted countries but also by the countries which are deeply involved in the cold war. So, now, when our policy is bearing its fruit and is leading to the relaxation of tension all over the world, if there are some people who feel that we should abandon it, I am sorry, Sir, that I am unable to agree with them.

There has been some suggestion made today that all the tribal people living along our border feel that they

have a certain affinity with China because they belong to the Indo-Mongoloid races. I am glad that is not true. The tribals who live on our side of the border consider themselves Indians, and with the extension of administration that is taking place there, they feel very much part of India; and I am sure that should there be any conflict they will be with us. There is no doubt about it.

I was referring to this great conflict that is taking place. Acharya Kripalani yesterday referred to the challenge that we are facing and he asked us to pick up the gauntlet and accept that challenge. I would say in all humility that this challenge has already been accepted. This challenge is not a challenge of fighting on the border. Decisive battles in our country will not be fought at Longju or Aksai Chin, along thousands of small villages and check posts along our northern frontier. The battles will be fought here in this House, and in the thousands of these development centres that we are building. That is the main struggle. If I may do so, I should like to read a brief passage from an article by an eminent economist that appeared in the *New York Times*. It says:

"Behind the struggle of battalions and frontier posts, of claims and counter-claims to sovereignty and territory, the real contest goes on—in tons of steel and food-grains, in kilowatt hours of electricity and acre-feet of irrigation, in savings mobilised and manpower set to work. Here are the true indices of success or failure in Asia...."

It further says:

"In spite of the alarms and excursions along the frontiers, the fundamental duel is still what it has always been from that day on which both India and China launched their development plans. China cannot press forward as a conqueror or claim infallibility for Communist methods if its

economic foundations are crumbling. India cannot either defend itself or vindicate its free methods of persuasion and inducement if its economy fails to achieve self-sustaining growth."

This is the real challenge and it is for us now to meet the challenge. I am very glad that all sections of the House have raised this question of meeting the challenge. I am quite sure that if they join with us in meeting this challenge, we shall come out as the victor in this great struggle of ideology.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister asked this House for a direction. He asked us to tell him what he should do. I should like to say that we are with him and that we appreciate, not only appreciate, but we fully support his direction of our foreign policy and our policy with regard to these border areas. The direction that he has asked is not necessary. Direction, that he has been giving is sufficient and we are with him. Today, it is not time to discuss these small matters in this way. Any of us, who may have certain difficulties, who may want to put our point of view, are certainly free to do it and we should bring it to the notice of the Prime Minister. What we need today is unity to show to the world that in adversity we can stand together and meet any challenge that may come.

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved—Scheduled Castes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, at the meeting of its working committee held in Ahmedabad on the 9th of November, the Republican Party has passed the following resolution, *inter alia*, referring to this matter:

"The Indian Government should take stern action to remove the Chinese aggressors from the Indian soil and to recover the occupied territory. The Committee pledges its full support to the Government in any move that the Government may take in this matter."

[Shri Siva Raj]

It is in pursuance of that resolution that we here moved this amendment which reads thus:

"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."

If the Prime Minister had carefully considered our amendment in relation to the other amendments that have been moved to this Resolution, he could easily have noticed that we have taken a realistic view of the situation and moved this amendment without going into the pros and cons of how the situation has come about. It is not that we charge the Government with failure to take the people of India into confidence in relation to this matter, nor that we charge the Government that they were careless or callous in this matter. That shows that we do not want to make political capital out of the national crisis. That is the first assurance that I could give to the Prime Minister in this matter.

Secondly, our Resolution at Ahmedabad says that in any step that the Government of India takes to resolve this problem, we will assist them. We may not be of great assistance in the matter of financial or other resources. But, I may assure the Prime Minister and promise him all support in the matter of sweat, toil and blood whenever it comes to a question of the Government demanding it of us.

When anybody reads or even cursorily glances at the White Paper and the notes exchanged between the

Prime Minister of China and our Prime Minister, he is forced, in a way, to come to the conclusion that the dragon does not care for the protests of the cow, but on the other hand, it tests the sharpness of its teeth on our Himalayan frontier. That seems to be the trend and tone of the correspondence and the notes written by China.

It is very important for us to remember that for a long time, the history of India has shown that she had been subjected to so many invasions; I suppose it is one of the countries in the world which has been subjected to the greatest number of invasions. More particularly, the people of the Gangetic plains and these Himalayan borders have got in their blood this fear of invasion. This impact of China upon India has got a different effect on their minds than our other people coming from the far south of India. It is very natural for them to get into a feeling of indignation at the Union Government. One can understand that. That probably explains the nature of the amendments given by our friends of the P.S.P. and other gentlemen from the north of India.

The Prime Minister referred to the basic policies that underlie his foreign policy with regard to any country. I wonder whether these basic policies could be permanent, and would they not at some time or other be amended or changed to suit the changing circumstances and fluctuating times. I feel that, no doubt, our principles seem to have been accepted by the world at large—the principle of non-alignment and the principle of neutrality. We may claim credit that India has made this contribution towards world peace. It is not certain whether it is due to fear of war or love of peace that the big nations have accepted this principle. I do hope that it is on account of the policy that India wanted to preach to other nations that it has been accepted by the bigger nations. Even so, it is not certain that by the adoption of this policy, we will be able to convert others who do not

believe in it. For instance, China has itself given the go-by to *Panch sheel*. Nobody can be held responsible if China has committed a breach of faith so far as India is concerned: not even the Prime Minister or the Government of India or even the Defence Minister, for that matter. What I wish to say is, even if we believe in *Panch sheel* and its application as far as possible in every aspect of external affairs the fact remains that we must be always prepared for a contingency. What is to come is still unsure. So, in that contingency, as the old English saying goes, if you seek for peace, be prepared for war. And I think the Prime Minister has also come round to that view, because I read somewhere that he used Cromwell's old expression in support of the new line of action that he is going to adopt with regard to China, namely "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry".

The Prime Minister in his speech mentioned the possibilities of war or the probabilities of war, but modern wars have got a knack of jumping from probabilities into realities, and this is a matter which I want to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister. Consequently, he must see that the nation is strengthened against any such contingency. It is the duty of the Government, does not matter what policy it follows, to see that it affords adequate protection against external aggression. Whatever may be the strength of our defence forces today, every attempt must be made by the Government to strengthen them and to bring them up to such a powerful position that they can ultimately gain victory if it comes to a question of war.

The Prime Minister also mentioned about industrial potential. Along with efficiency and equipment of our defence forces, industrial potential is necessary to present the full force of the country in a case of crisis. I will go further and say that it is not sufficient that the defence forces are efficient, that we have got enough equipment and that there is enough industrial potential. What is more neces-

sary in all these things is the will of the people to win, their unity and their determination; that is more important. I find in these eleven or twelve years of independence, the Congress Governments, both at the Centre and in the States, have not been able to bring about that state of mind amongst the people of the country. I wonder whether the people have got the will to win in any war, or have got the discipline to win. As it is I see that on the student front, there is lack of discipline. There is amongst the people lack of faith in law and order. They seem to have lost faith in the maintenance of law and order. These are conditions which militate against the strength of a nation in a crisis.

However, there is one bright feature. In spite of the difficult situation created by these Chinese attacks on our frontier, it seems to have had some wholesome effect in certain respects on our people. In the first place, at any rate it has brought the Prime Minister to consider things on *terra firma*. I thought he was all the time talking in the air about *Panch sheel*. In the second place, I find it has had another wholesome effect, to inject nationalism into our internationally-minded Communist friends.

An Hon. Member: Are you sure?

Shri Siva Raj: Thirdly, I find it has also brought about a change in the very non-violent disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, Acharya Kripalani. While the Prime Minister takes care to see that he would rather go slow in the matter of meeting this aggression, Acharya Kripalani would egg him on to take immediate action and even very violent action, if necessary, with foreign military assistance. In that way, I find this Chinese aggression has had some wholesome effect.

Whatever preparations any Government may make, it cannot be certain that it can always succeed in giving the necessary protection against foreign enemies. Any Government can fail. Take the case of Britain during the Second World War, in 1939. England was then very nearly lost. She had very inferior resources com-

[Shri Siva Raj]

pared to Germany, but what won the war was the morale of the people of Britain. Well, that is the thing that I am seeking to establish and trying to remind our Prime Minister that his efforts in the future ought to be able to see that the people of India get that morale and get that unity to withstand any aggression.

After all, war is a game. It is a matter of chance. Anybody might win or anybody might lose, but it is up to the Government to make its people realise the immensity of war, the immensity of the effort that every individual should make in furtherance of the defence of the country, and ultimately to protect the honour and prestige of the land. In this respect, I am sure the Government of India under the leadership of our Prime Minister, is taking every step, but I would really like to see that the Prime Minister and his Government satisfy the people of India on some of the following points.

Firstly, I should like to know whether there is a state of emergency or near-emergency. In the second place, if it comes to a question of peace or settlement with China, is it peace at any price, or is it peace with honour? Thirdly, would he make what I might call a sacrifice of a bit of our territory for the sake of peace and for the sake of world peace? It is these things that the people ought to know. Then they will be in a position to state what exactly the Government of India has done.

In the history of India, there is a lesson which has been drawn by historians, and that is that India is prepared for such foreign invasions, it is prepared to submit to these invasions. This is what a poet said after the Mohammedan invasion:

"The East bowed low before the
blast

In patient, deep disdain;
She let the legions thunder past
And plunged in thought again."

This is what is said of the India of the past. I wish to know whether modern India under Nehru's rule is the India that is pictured in this stanza. I only wish that the Government takes steps to see that this kind of picture is no more true of our modern India.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): I may perhaps at the outset reiterate that so far as we are concerned, we stand solidly behind the policy of non-alignment enunciated by the Prime Minister. I may perhaps assure him that we respond most heartily to his call for unity at this hour of national crisis. I can further assure him that we do not wish to make any political capital out of this national danger.

Having said that, I might say that if we have been signatories to that motley amendment, it is merely because we wish to point out certain inconsistencies in the action of the External Affairs Ministry, inconsistencies between the principles which have been enunciated in the White Paper and the action which has followed subsequently. If I have taken my stand here this afternoon, it is merely to point out these inconsistencies, and I believe there is nothing offensive in it, and the Prime Minister should not have been scared of it in the beginning.

The debate on this White Paper II, by a strange turn, has been entirely misdirected. It is only the genius of the Prime Minister who can confuse issues from a very high pedestal. That is what he has done in this debate on White Paper II. I ask him in all seriousness: Is the issue today between non-alignment and alignment? Is the issue today between war psychosis and peaceful development?

Shri Nath Pai: May I make one request? Shri Brajeshwar Prasad is the propounder of a profound theory like the Peking-Delhi axis. We are very eager to hear him. He may be given a chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can hear him somewhere else, but I can give him a turn only when I think he can be given.

Shri Nath Pal: It will be of great interest to us.

Shri Mahanty: Before I was most unfortunately interrupted, I was trying to submit this. The issue today is not between non-alignment and alignment. The issue today is not between war psychosis and peaceful development. The issue today is not what the targets of the Third Five Year Plan should be, but the issue today is to meet the aggression which has been committed.

This White Paper II is a unique document. It is a wonderfully conceived mosaic of epic, of poetry, of history, of geography, of diplomacy, and of firm and courteous words, but if one were to look for firm actions, one was sure to be disappointed. Therefore, I would like to invite the attention of this House not to those vague abstract concepts about which nobody had any difference, but to certain questions of the hour, and I believe the Prime Minister will be doing justice to his office as well as to this House if he cares only to answer those questions.

Now, I come to the question of Tamadem. The House will remember that when a check-post at Tamadem was established by India, it was said that it might be somewhere slightly further north of the MacMahon line, in the north-east. But then, in our note that was sent to China on the subject on 28th June, 1959, we said that we were prepared to examine this question of Tamadem but the Chinese were asked not to disturb the status quo by force. This advice was good. This advice was also in respect of Longju and Khinzemane. We had repeated this in our note of the 10th September, 1959. We also reiterated this position in our note on the 27th September 1959, wherein we said that we were prepared to consider vacation

of Tamadem, if it was on the north of the MacMahon line, provided the Chinese also withdrew from Longju and Khinzemane. I would like to know from the Prime Minister who gave him the authority to withdraw that check-post from Tamadem without arriving at an overall settlement.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: We gave that. The House gave him that authority.

Shri Mahanty: When?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member might address the House.

Shri Mahanty: He is addressing me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member might address the Chair. I shall ask the interrupter also to address the Chair.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): I did so; I did not use the second person at all.

Shri Mahanty: If the hon. Member says that the House gave the authority, I would like him to say when and on what occasion the House gave the authority to the Prime Minister to withdraw the Indian check-post at Tamadem. If somebody is saying today that non-alignment is abject surrender, let us have honest difference of opinion on that point. I have not much time at my disposal. So, I now come to Bara Hoti. Bara Hoti on any map looks quite insignificant. It is a botanist's paradise, where you find only flowers, and where mule bells can be heard from miles. But the fact has to be remembered that on this plateau which might not be more than 30 acres in extent and area, many important passes converge, leading from India to Tibet and from Tibet to India. Therefore, it assumes a strategic importance on any map, be it Chinese or Indian.

On the 13th of September, 1959, we sent a heroic note to Peking wherein we stated:

[Shri Mahanty]

"If the Government of China are not agreeable to this suggestion, the Government of India will continue as in previous years to send its civil personnel to exercise jurisdiction over an area which the Government of India have always considered as part of Indian territory."

This note was sent on 13th September, 1959, but on the 17th of this month, the Prime Minister made an announcement in this House that the Government of India had withdrawn their civil personnel. It is no good giving us a homily on non-alignment or *Panch sheel*; these have been reduced to *Panch Shilas*, five pieces of stone, by his friends. But we would like to have an answer from the External Affairs Ministry as to who authorised the Prime Minister to withdraw our civil personnel from Bara Hoti, even though in our note, dated the 13th September, 1959, we had emphasised and reiterated that we were not going to withdraw our civil personnel, because Bara Hoti was ours. Therefore, this is another instance where in the name of India-China friendship, where under the facade of non-alignment and under the facade of *Panch sheel*, we have been appeasing the aggressor.

I may perhaps come to Longju now. Much has been said about it.

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): It was a seasonal withdrawal.

Shri Mahanty: Seasonal withdrawal? Are the civil personnel of the Government of India made of butter? Why can they not stand the rigours of winter, if others are able to stand it?

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip): Butter hardens in winter; if they were made of butter, they would withstand the winter, but they are made of sterner stuff.

Shri Mahanty: What I am trying to submit is this. If one were to analyse this White Paper item by item, one

will find that behind the facade of this kind of talks, the most indefensible appeasement has gone on.

Now, I might perhaps come to Longju. In the latest note of the Prime Minister, it has been said 'You withdraw from Longju, we shall not reoccupy it.' We are all humble students of the English language. Longju is our territory. What does it mean when it is said that we shall not reoccupy it? I do not know who has been advising the Prime Minister in all these matters. But I only venture to say that he has been very wrongly advised.

Then, I come to Ladakh. I might give you the background of the latest note about Ladakh. We had said in our note, dated the 4th November, 1959:

"But where aggression takes place, the people of India inevitably have to resist by all means available to them. The independence and integrity of India are what the Indian people laboured for during their long struggle for freedom, and they cannot permit any injury to or infringement of them."

This was our stand on the 4th November, 1959, when we had left no manner of doubt in the minds of the Chinese that we were going to defend the integrity of our country by all means. We had also reiterated it further. We had also said that the vacation of aggression should be unconditional. I do not find that reference at the moment, but that was what we had said. That was our stand. We had said that there could be no negotiation with the Chinese, so long as the Chinese insisted on the maps that they had drawn and on the basis of which they had committed aggression. That was our stand. Now, I would like to know in all humility, who advised the Prime Minister now to send his latest note to Mr. Chou En-Lai, wherein he has accepted the Chinese frontier as it has been drawn on the Chinese maps.

Therefore, I venture to think, even though we accept his policy of non-alignment, even though we yield to none in our admiration for the principles of Panch sheel; we feel that there has been some detraction from the principles and the policies which we had laid down for ourselves.

Shri Kalika Singh: Where is the acceptance by the Prime Minister of the Chinese frontier as drawn in their maps?

Shri Mahanty: I am sorry the hon. Member is so innocent as not to have read this document.

Shri Kalika Singh: I have read it.

Shri Mahanty: If he will turn to page 6, paragraph 14 of our Prime Minister's letter of the 16th November, he will find as follows:

"The Government of India should withdraw all personnel to the west of the line which the Chinese Government have shown as the international boundary in their 1956 maps, which, so far as we are aware, are their latest maps....

Shri Kalika Singh: Continue reading.

Shri Mahanty: I am continuing.

"Similarly, the Chinese Government should withdraw their personnel to the east of the international boundary which has been described by the Government of India in their earlier notes and correspondence and shown in their official maps."

The position is that we withdraw to the west of the Chinese line as shown in their maps and we request the Chinese to withdraw east of the Indian line as has been shown on our maps.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): It is conditional.

Shri Mahanty: True. But I ask: who gave the authority to the External Affairs Ministry to acknowledge the

Chinese maps, to acknowledge the international frontier as shown in Chinese maps? At least that was not the position we had taken up in the various notes, heroic notes, that we had sent to Peking.

In this connection, I might invite the attention of the House to paragraph 12, page 23 of White Paper II, the note that was sent by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of China in India on 4th November, 1959. That, I believe, will set all doubts at rest. The paragraph reads:

"The Government of India have always been willing to respect the traditional frontier between India and China and have indeed done so. They cannot, however, recognise any boundary in the Ladakh region or elsewhere, which includes in China areas on the Indian side of the traditional frontier".

In the Note of 4th November, we had stated that we were not going to recognise the international line drawn on Chinese maps at any rate. But in the subsequent correspondence, in the letter of 16th November 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai, we have accepted, though conditionally, the international line on the Chinese maps. Who authorised the External Affairs Ministry, who authorised the Prime Minister to acknowledge these Chinese maps. Whether it is conditional or unconditional is immaterial for the purpose. Therefore, I venture to think that even though we may be speaking brave words, at least our actions have not reflected that bravery.

In this connection, I would like to touch on a very delicate point. I am sorry that I should have the occasion to have brought it before this House. But I believe, however humble we may be, we have a duty to perform, though painful it may be. This relates to the Defence Minister who should have rightly spear-headed the defence of this country today. Unfortunately, he is a toy Defence Mi-

[Shri Mahanty]

nister, because the Prime Minister says, 'It is my defence policy'. If it is his defence policy, what do we have a Defence Minister for? If it is for production of ordnance, let us have a Minister for Military Production.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member want a Defence Minister who should have a defence policy different from that of the Prime Minister?

Shri Mahanty: No, Sir, That is not my intention.

Ch. Ranbir Singh: It comes to that.

Shri Mahanty: If the Prime Minister is also to have a defence policy, what is the need of a Defence Minister for?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Member. But he is quoting me. I do not know where he got those statements from. The policy of defence or any other policy is decided by Government, neither by the Prime Minister nor by the Defence Minister. Implementation is done by various Ministers. Basic policies are decided by Government. We broadly lay down the broad policy accepted by Parliament.

Shri Mahanty: I crave his forgiveness. Of course, I have no statement here immediately. But I have noticed any number of statements—I can forward them to him—wherein at least the Press had reported his statement saying, 'This is my policy which the Defence Minister has been implementing'. I am sorry the Press has misquoted him.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Fathepur): It is not his policy but Government policy.

Shri Mahanty: I am coming to that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Can he disown responsibility for what the Defence Minister might have done, when he says that it is his policy and he takes up responsibility for it?

Shri Mahanty: I submit that even though the Cabinet may determine some policy which is the national policy, it is for the Defence Minister to execute it. Therefore, it is no good saying that the 'Defence Minister has been executing my policy'. After all, the policy is laid down by the Government. Therefore, he should not hesitate to withdraw if the implementation of that policy has been a failure, and criticisms have been levelled against that failure.

The other day Shri A. P. Jain had to resign. Why? Because the policy of State Trading in foodgrains, a policy not only of the Prime Minister but of the Cabinet, resulted in relative failure, and when there was criticism both inside the House and outside, the Minister had to resign and the Prime Minister had to accept his resignation. I do not say that the Defence Minister should resign, which he should have done long ago, because I have no personal axe to grind, nor have I the ambition to step into his shoes. I do not think I can ever come within a measurable distance of his eminence.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: May I interrupt for a minute?

Shri Mahanty: I am not yielding.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: A request came from the other side of the House that he should not resign....

Shri Mahanty: I am not yielding.

If the Defence Minister goes about Bombay and says that no aggression has been committed, I would like to know if it is the Government's attitude that no aggression has been committed.

Shri Ansar Harvani: He never said that.

Shri Mahanty: This was reported in the Press and no contradiction was issued.

Shri Anwar Harvani: He has not read it carefully.

Shri Mahanty: The hon. Member need not tell me in my 40th year how to read newspaper. I myself publish newspapers. I know how to read newspapers. After all, he must concede to me at least the intelligence to read newspapers.

If anybody goes through his speeches at the UNO, I would like to ask him how they compare with the speeches the Prime Minister had made on the floor of the House in regard to Tibet. True, I yield to none in my admiration for the Government's policy of restraint. But my point is more fundamental. A Defence Minister is not merely a Minister. A Defence Minister is really the spearhead around whom the national morale will concentrate. But when we find our Defence Minister saying in important place like Bombay from a responsible pedestal that no aggression has taken place, that it was merely silly antics on the part of the Chinese. I think there must be some propriety to be observed: either the Defence Minister should not have opened his lips, if he felt like that, or he should not have misled the country. When a fifth column is taking its shape in this country, if our attention is directed towards an imaginary Right dictatorship or Right reaction and if Defence Ministers go about saying that no aggression has taken place, I would like to say that here we are abetting aggression being in responsible places—which I do not like. The Defence Minister should have the courage to say on the floor of this House, 'I was misreported'. If somebody has misreported, I am sure there are any number of laws in our country to deal with such newspapers which have been misreporting responsible persons and creating this confusion in the country. I would not like to stress this point further.

15 hrs.

Lastly, I would say this. Regarding the latest letter of our Prime Minister

to the Chinese Premier, I do realise the sincerity of the Prime Minister's proposals. I do realise that a war will serve no purpose and that we need not go into those conflicts if we can settle matters peacefully. But I would like to ask the Prime Minister one question. He has been proposing, in Ladakh there should be a strip of territory whose maximum depth will be about 100 miles at particular points and that it should be a neutralised area. In all humility, I would like to ask him this question: What machinery has he got to supervise the neutralisation of that territory? We know how these neutralised territories have fared. In Bara Hoti, we withdrew and they stepped in. We know what happened at Longju. So, he must tell us what machinery he has got to supervise that neutrality. Can he guarantee us that the neutrality will not be violated by the Chinese? I have to ask another simple question. Who authorised the Government or the Parliament to create a no man's land on our own territory? We know what happened in Kashmir. Then also our Prime Minister similarly said: It is my Government's policy. Naturally, as we symbolise in him the nation, we accepted it. We know what is the fate of Kashmir. Similarly, we want to know what is going to be the fate of this neutralised territory which he has been proposing. Can he assure us that this neutralised territory at no point of time will ever be conceded to the Chinese demands and aggressions?

It is no question of supporting or opposing the motion. It is absolutely immaterial for our purpose. We all want unanimity and we all want unity. If we have voiced these criticisms that is merely to invite the attention of the Government to certain basic issues and certain doubts and questions which have been agitating our minds. Let there be no doubt that the Prime Minister is the tallest among us. Whatever be the opinions or differences, nobody will ever resist responding to his call for what it is worth. With these words, I say

[Shri Mahanty]

that I respond fully to the sentiments those he had expressed earlier in bringing this motion.

Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, our country is facing a great crisis and I am sure that I will be voicing the feelings of everybody in this country when I say that each and every loyal citizen of this country stands now with the Prime Minister to defend our land. I am sure I also voicing the sentiments of the Members of the Independent Parliamentary Group of which I am a Member that we shall support the Prime Minister through thick or thin. The only proviso is that we want a definite assurance that the Chinese will be pushed out of our territories and that next time no secrets will be kept from Parliament. While we do not wish to embarrass the Government with too many criticisms at this juncture, I think that I will be failing in my duty if I do not make a passing reference to the failings of the Ministry of Defence, particularly with regard to our Himalayan Frontiers. As far back as April 1959, when I spoke on the Defence Budget, I had mentioned that the cold war had been brought to India's door step and that we should pay more attention to defend our borders. Unfortunately, we were lulled into security with our Panchsheel. Nobody in India ever thought that China would play such a trick on us and, therefore, for all these months, the Defence Ministry did not pay adequate attention to protecting our borders. We have been lulled once more into a false sense of security due to our 2,000 year old history which shows that China had maintained friendly relations with India. But we did not count on the fact that the Government of China had since changed and to recall the Prime Minister's phrase, that Chinese Government today was of one-track mind. Speaking on the China Debate last session, I had made a passing reference to the absence of aerial reconnaissance being done on

the border by our aircraft and the Prime Minister had replied "that the mere act of taking pictures would have endangered that plane which took them and would have endangered it not only from the physical features point of view but would have endangered it from the point of view of action by the other party shooting it down, whatever the risks." With all due respect to the Prime Minister, I say that I do not know why we have an Air Force if we could not risk an aeroplane or two. Further more, in modern times aircraft reconnaissance is most important and aircraft are made to go and photograph such areas. I am sure that if they flew within our territory, we could still be able to photograph the roads and other communications built by the Chinese Government with the use of special telephoto cameras. We also have aircraft which can fly at these altitudes. For instance, there is the Canberra which I believe is equipped with the latest photo equipment. Furthermore, we have a landing strip at Ladakh and we also operate a regular airline there which supports my point. Obviously, that was not a very convincing answer from the Prime Minister which I may say so with due humility.

I hope that we will not make this mistake again and whatever may be the outcome of our negotiations with the Chinese, we will patrol these borders from the air and see that they are regularly photographed. Unfortunately, our trust in the Chinese Government was misplaced. We did not realise what type of people we were dealing with. The Chinese Government, as we all know, is ruthless. They are also an expansionists country. A great deal has been said about the Chinese expansionism but I would make only a brief reference to Korea, and Viet Nam. In each of these cases, the only way in which the Chinese Government could be taught a lesson was through strength.

15.27 hrs.

(MR. SPEAKER in the Chair)

The only language that a communist country understands is that of strength. Unfortunately, our Prime Minister's hand-shake of friendship was misunderstood by them for weakness. If you study the plan of Chinese expansionism you will see how perfectly it is planned. They plan their communications and they build their roads. Everything is done methodically and then they strike. They first struck at Tibet and now they go further and strike India. Everybody in this country will I hope now wake up and see that we defend our borders gallantly. The Chinese assurances of autonomy to Tibet and also their make-believe in the theory of Panchsheel lulled India into a false sense of security and I hope that the Prime Minister and everybody will now wake up to reality and see that no matter what happens we will not make the same mistake again.

The question now is this. Can a neutral India like us withstand cold war and—God forbid—even a hot war, entirely on our own strength. As a soldier, I would say: 'yes'. As a practical man, I am not so sure. If the answer of the Prime Minister is 'yes', well and good. If the answer is 'no', India may not be quite so strong to face this colossus of China with her 600 and odd million population, all ruthless and armed. Then any answer to that is that we should consider in terms of looking out to find friends who think like us, other countries who are prepared to help us in our time of emergency if a show-down became imminent, with arms, men and material, provided no strings were attached to such aid. I support the Prime Minister's policy of non-alignment and I also believe that India should not go into any power blocs, but as practical men we are going to defend our country. We should not lose our territory just because we are stubbornly following a

particular theory or are refusing all help. The practical aspect of this question cannot be denied. While I am subject to correction about the exact number of forces that China has, I may mention the following. I am told that they have anything from 30 lakh to 50 lakh men under arms and approximately a crore of men or more as home guards. As against that, India has an army of approximately 7 lakhs to ten lakhs. Of course, I am again subject to correction about the figure.

An Hon. Member: How can he get that figure?

Shri Nath Pal: Who can correct it? We do not have any Chinese authority here!

Shri Karni Singhji: Therefore, it is all the more important that we start preparing for our defence and go in, if necessary, for conscription and get our country prepared to meet this Chinese colossus and drive it out of our country.

The question comes about other countries. One thing is quite certain: in the event of a show-down, would a country like Russia help us? Personally I have grave doubts if any Communist country could help India to fight against the Chinese. And that makes it all the more important that we should do some soul-searching to find out the possible countries which might stand by us in such an emergency.

Pakistan was given aid by countries before and that strained our economy to the very limit. Now, we are facing even a bigger threat than that, and, therefore, we have got to raise our economy and our industrial potential and do everything possible to meet this emergency, and I suggest this as a positive measure. Of course now, the Ministry of Defence having woken up has already taken sufficient steps to see that our borders are protected, and the proper deployment of troops, aerial reconnaissance and the

[Shri Karni Singhji]

preparing of mountain fighting troops have already been taken on hand. I believe that we already have schools of this type to train our troops to fight at high altitudes, but we require many more of them because we have a very long border. We must also improve our roads and go in for helicopter because some of these places are extremely inaccessible, and the use of helicopters would come in very use of helicopters would come in very handy.

In passing, I shall say a few words about the failure of the Ministry of Defence. As we know, our country has a parliamentary democracy and the responsibility of the Cabinet is a joint one. Therefore, it is not correct for anybody to single out any one minister for criticism. The responsibility must be shared by the whole Cabinet and must therefore rest fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Prime Minister for whatever good or bad has been done. I am proud to say that our Prime Minister has had the strength to accept that stand. But still, I have an apprehension in my mind that unless we are very firm about this business of getting the Chinese out of our territories we may repeat what we did in Kashmir against Pakistan. If we study the latest reply of our Prime Minister to the Chinese Prime Minister in his letter dated 16th November, 1959, we will see that our Prime Minister has made a suggestion that our troops should move back west and the Chinese should move back to the east. That means there is a no-man's-land going to be created on Indian territory, and if some settlement is arrived at on this particular point, it means that we have to surrender a part of our Indian territory. Therefore, we would urge upon the Prime Minister to stick to his original suggestion, namely, of asking the Chinese to withdraw to the international border. We cannot negotiate for losing our own territory.

I would not like to take much more time. I would only appeal to the

Prime Minister. He has asked for unity among the nation. We are prepared to shed our blood for him and the country, but I would very humbly request him to remember this: when he makes an appeal for unity, let him please make that appeal in such a way that he does not make people angry against him. Yesterday, the entire House was assembled here with only one purpose, that is, to support him through thick or thin, no matter what happened. But one uncharitable remark was made by him and he has had a complete flood of questions put at him.

Of course, the hon. Prime Minister is old enough to be my grandfather and I am hardly fit to give him any advice. But as a loyal citizen I am sure that his call for unity will be answered, but I would humbly request him to try and win the support of the country by proper approach by which he can achieve that unity.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister will be replying to the debate tomorrow and therefore it is neither necessary and proper for me to traverse the whole ground of the arguments in this debate on various points nor it is my intention to make any debating points on a matter of this kind.

We are discussing the issue of the integrity of this country and the threat that has been immediately posed to it by an attitude and action on the part of a neighbour with whom we have not only professed but practised friendly and neighbourly relations. Much has been said about the defencelessness of our frontiers and that the Defence Ministry is going to sleep about it and so on. As a member of the Government, and recognising collective responsibility, the Defence Minister, like every other Minister, accepts full responsibility for whatever that policy was, and so does Parliament. Because, times

without number, it has been stated in this House, and in public—perhaps there was not any contradiction from anyone—that we have no military deployment anywhere on our international frontiers.

It is one thing suddenly to wake up to the facts when a new situation arises and another just not to accept the position that this was the policy of the country. The policy of the country was not to deploy military troops on our international frontiers, whether the frontier is with Goa, with Pakistan or Burma or China as the case may be.

So far as China is concerned my knowledge of history may be imperfect, but even in the British days, apart from leading punitive expeditions across the Himalayas, I have no knowledge of any military action in that area; so, that frontier has been left not to police protection as some people make out, but has been very much like the frontier between Canada and the United States in the hope that neighbourly relations will prevail and no cause for military action would arise. There have been checkpoints on this frontier but those checkpoints were not of a defensive or a military character. Their main purpose was to guard the trade routes, protect the merchants and probably deal with the customs and other matters. I have no doubt that they would have been used also as a means to gain such information as they could. Therefore, to regard them as positions inadvertently left weak would be an error in fact.

Incidentally, reference has been made to the fact that I said there was no aggression on this country. First of all, I have no recollection of using the term 'aggression'. But it is in use, and the United Nations have been sitting for seven years trying to define what aggression is! Each year they postpone it to the next year. All I said was, this country was not invaded. It may be wrong, at a meeting where about a hundred thousand people are present, to say anything

else. The invasion of the country is very different from incursions upon the border even though casualties are inflicted and military action has to be taken.

So, when this new situation arose both in regard to Pakistan some time last year and now in regard to China, Government came to the decision that with its limited resources, what could be done at that time was to take over what was called over-all control of the border, viz., to see that such police action by police—State police or Central police—that was taken was not of a character that would be wasteful in fire-power, would be in the wrong places and perhaps taken without knowledge of consequences. So, we did that in regard to Assam some twelve months ago, when there was serious trouble.

I want the House to be aware of the fact that taking over border control does not mean displacement of all the bodies. It simply means over-all directions, because the displacement of all the bodies and placing them on a war footing would require resources of a character far different from what it is now. The House will not expect me I am sure, and it will not be consistent with one's responsibility, to go into the details of deployment of troops, their numbers, etc. The previous speaker referred to the size of the Indian army. I have no desire either to affirm it or contradict it. Many people have been trying to find out what it is. We have not given the figures.

At any rate, when this situation arose nearly in September, the Government decided that the Armed Forces of India should take over over-all control of this border. Now that has been done, but it is a progressive position. It is not as though overnight something can be done or should be done, because India has other frontiers as well. Moving the army just done not mean, as hon. Members very well know, moving a few people over there. The ballistics and the logistics connected with this has to be taken into account.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

It has been the concern of my Ministry, recently at any rate, to recognise the fact that a modern army, even an army as modern as ours, can only effectively function with the necessary equipment. Our army has been based in the past upon the United Kingdom; that is to say, the resources in the way of equipment came from the War Office. If it was not here, we could indent on it. The same applies to our coastal defence and what not. Therefore, a considerable amount of energy had to be devoted to that purpose, not at the expense of, as someone suggested, forgetting other matters, but one thing could not go without the other. So far as border defences are concerned, all I can say in the House, consistent, as I said, with my own responsibility and what the House will expect, and not to give unnecessary information to those who should not have it, is that the necessary adjustments are being made. I cannot say whether the best way of defence of this frontier is by checkposts or in some other form. Equally it would not be possible for me to affirm or deny whether their number should be 100, as the previous speaker said, or less or more. All one can say is that the necessary troop movements consistent with our resources have taken place.

If I may say so with great respect, I have no desire and I do not intend to answer anything of a character of personal reference or the question of one's integrity or patriotism. When the time comes when I have to carry the card of patriotism, it would not be worth carrying it, though other people think it necessary to proclaim it. At any rate, the movement of troops is a matter in which even the newspapers should not be allowed to publish full information; I mean it should not be given to them, when I say they should not be allowed to publish it. What I said in Bombay was that the necessary adjustment, in this matter was being made. I

feel sure, Mr. Speaker, responsible Members of Parliament would appreciate that is as far as one can go.

Now, it is not the policy of the Government either to surrender territory or to take action which in the short run and in the long run it cannot defend. We cannot lock up too many troops in places where they may be wasteful; equally we cannot be too conscious or what you call too concerned about not taking some risks. So, a balance has to be struck between these and that is what is being done.

Reference has also been made to the position at the United Nations. I think it was said yesterday that we lost a number of votes and that shows our lack of prestige. If you contest an election only on the certainty that you win, there will be no parliamentary contest at all. Somebody must fail for us to come in here.

Shri Ferose Gandhi: That is why we leave some seats uncontested, so that some friends may come in!

Shri Krishna Menon: But equally, I hope, those who say this would study the other votes at the United Nations, not so much where we get a plate or we do not, but where matters of policy are concerned; and then probably they will get a different picture. In any case, that is not particularly relevant to the present issue.

So far as the position of the Government calling for the discussion of the subject of the representation of China in the United Nations is concerned, it would be a mistake to regard this as though we were oblivious of the new circumstances or doing something arising merely from our special relations with China. Our China policy in the United Nations and the world is governed by world considerations and the United Nations could not command the strength and could not achieve the purposes of the

Charter, unless, as the former Secretary of State of the United Nations said, the world as it is, and not the world as some would like it to be, is represented in it.

It is not possible, for example, to disarm the world or take any steps towards it unless China is equally committed. Otherwise, it would be as though those who abide by the law would be deprived of the arms and those who would not would have the arms. It would be an unfortunate state of affairs. So, our attitude towards China's representation in the United Nations has been governed by just considerations. I beg to submit that if, as a result of the recent position on our frontier, we resiled from it, we would have been regarded as acting wrongly and would have lost very much the position and the prestige we had. I do not use the word 'prestige' in the wrong sense. It would be an entirely wrong act, because, year after year, we have told other countries, including the western group of countries, that irrespective of their attitude to the internal system in China, we are not asking them to be friendly with them; but, we have to strengthen the United Nations and, therefore, they should be allowed to come in. Recognition should not mean approval; it simply means, they ought to be there.

Secondly, looking from a narrow point of view, whether in regard to the situation about Tibet however it is interpreted, or in regard to their attitude towards us or breaking of any Conventions—whether the Geneva Conventions or the Charter of the United Nations—we would be in a far better position to deal with it, if China were there as a member of the United Nations and be amenable to world opinion on the one hand and answerable for her conduct to a certain extent. That has come into this debate, because I represent this country in the United Nations and also because China is the issue involved.

Reference has been made to one of the speeches I made in Bombay. There about a hundred thousand people were present and they did not take this view. First of all, I did not make any reference to aggression. I did say that the frontiers of countries have been violated, but the speech must be read as a whole. The frontiers of other countries, by and large, are violated, our frontiers have been violated and, therefore, we must take action against it.

Our position is that we should not in any way be intimidated by the Chinese, either by their size, or their capacity for quick movement, being a country with a different form of Government. It is possible that they have, in the short time, achieved results quicker than we can. But we are not to be intimidated by this position. We would maintain the sovereignty and integrity of our territory. The Defence Minister, or anybody else, would be either a fool, or a knave, or both, if he were to guarantee what would be the results of any military action. All that he could do is to say that all the resources would be put into it and as wisely as people concerned understand them. The results of deployment of military troops, even in the case of large countries, are judged by a number of circumstances. So far as we can judge at present, it is possible for us with the limited accentuation on our resources, within the time, as progressively as possible, to take on this limited task, and to that task the armed forces are applying themselves. But it would be very difficult for any Defence Minister, this one or any other, to come and say to this House "this and this is being done."

Yesterday, some hon. Member asked: why did not we bomb the road? I can answer it. But it is not wise to answer. Therefore, that is the position in regard to the frontier, and there is no question of our running away from any resistance that is required.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

The Indian defence forces have been conditioned, not for the purpose of a foreign adventure, or of marching into other peoples' territories, but for the defence of our frontiers, and that task they will seek to perform as best as possible. If the hon. Members were to consider the kind of concern—not concern but feeling, I think—that they expressed, that is not likely to improve the morale of the armed forces.

Now three things required in defence in our context are material, men and morale. So far as material is concerned, we, both on account of our economic circumstances, our national policy and, what is more, the deficiencies created by our past history, could not concentrate on this. So, we have gone into production on a comparatively large scale, improving somewhere from about Rs. 14 crores of production in 1956-57 to Rs. 26 crores this year. So, in a gap of 28 months or so, this has been achieved and, what is more, this has not been done by any increase in the staff of the personnel, or the total commitment in regard to ordnance factories. Furthermore, I would like the House to know that today it is estimated to the satisfaction of the correct authorities that for every hundred units in money of products we are getting 130 in value, because of the re-organisation in this way. Now, especially because of the present circumstances, by a certain modification of our procedures, and the recognition of urgencies, we would probably be able to improve it better.

Acharya Kripalani yesterday referred to the fact that ordnance factories—I may be mistaken; I stand corrected if I am mistaken—were being turned on to civilian production, while they can be used for something else. I would like to make two observations in regard to that. If it were possible to us in normal times to turn ordnance factories on to civilian production, it is good for defence because if there were a larger

capacity it can at once be adapted for defence purposes. But, unfortunately we have not got that capacity. We have absorbed all idle capacity that existed and all that we have now is in terms of money, Rs. 9 lakhs worth of idle capacity. But in those years I am speaking about, in the ordnance factories, as production has gone up to Rs. 20 crores, out of that the civilian production has been Rs. 3½ crores and that Rs. 3½ crores includes metals for the Commerce and Industry Ministry, brass and various other things. Then there is a certain amount of bye products which can only be used by civilian industries explosive factories or otherwise. Equally, in the last 12 months we have moved away from dependence on other countries for the vital elements of production and have concentrated on our own. Then, while it may not be strictly relevant to the more colourful part of this debate it would be impossible for our armies, our fighting forces, to function with any confidence if they were not sure of replacements. Then, I think we have to face the fact that this is a very hostile terrain, where it is impossible, where it is very difficult—do not think I should say impossible—to plan in terms of war position and, what is more, the lines of supply necessarily must be long, even though they are not as long as the cross-fies, because, length can only be measured in this sense, not by the length in the sky but by the time taken to cover the distance. I will not go into greater details in regard to this. And no army can afford to lengthen its line of supply more than its resources would permit. These are the positions one has to accept, even though they may not be colourful in many ways.

I have nothing to apologize for in the speeches made in Bombay, or America, or anywhere else, and I have, to the best of my ability, reflected the policies of the Government, and those policies our Prime Minister expounded yesterday and so many times before.

Acharya Kripalani asked whether non-alignment meant non-alignment with ourselves, on the one hand—now I have no desire to split hairs on that—and whether it also meant that we may not take equipments from elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, it must be within the knowledge of this House, from the numerous questions asked and numerous replies given, that the military supplies—by military I mean all the defence forces in this country—have been received from several places. The only thing is that we do not seek aid in a particular way. There is nothing wrong in our policy, there is nothing wrong in our conviction, to prevent us from getting defence equipments, or weapons, or whatever it may be, from wherever we choose at whatever time, whether it be the east or the west. The only thing is that we would like to pay for it, and not come under the internal legislation of those countries. It is probably not understood that the receiving of aid is covered by certain domestic legislation in that particular land, because their legislatures have to pass them. Therefore, while on the one hand our defence may not be dependent, either upon the capacity of any other country to shut off supplies, or, on the other hand, by the conditions that they may impose in regard to procurement, we have done everything we can to obtain them from wherever they can be obtained, at the most economic prices or, what we call, conditions best to ourselves. Therefore, there is no question of our saying that we shall not touch such and such equipments because they come from somewhere else. And what is more, it should be recognized that the Indian army—I think I will take the army, because that is the latest form of our fighting forces—was not born yesterday, or after independence. It has its equipments and its standardisation, and it is committed to a certain pattern, and without considerable expense and the passage of a fair amount of time, it would be impossible to alter that situation. Therefore, that alteration takes place gradually without impairment of our defence.

I think it will be a mistake, if I may say so, to convey the impression to our fighting forces that there is some lack of confidence on the civil side of the administration, apart from the armed forces. I have no desire to go into the question which has implications in that direction. So long as there is a parliamentary system, the policy of defence would be decided by the Government, and just as the civil service carries on the civil side, the defence services will carry them on the other side. That is the only way we can do it now.

Then, in spite of whatever may be said, whatever you may hear and whatever you may read, with great respect I would like to repeat what the Prime Minister said—I believe he said that yesterday here and in other places too—that the morale of the services has never been higher at any other time. The question of emoluments, their hope of security and the prospect that belongs to those who are prepared to make this supreme sacrifice, they have been consolidated very much more than ever before, because of the changing conditions of the world.

It would not be in my province, specially when the hon. Prime Minister is winding up this debate, to go into the question of higher policy as to how to resolve these disputes. But I hope I may be permitted to say that the frontiers of a country can only be settled in two ways, either by conquest by one party or the other or by negotiation. There is no other way of doing that. Either you conquer them or they conquer you.

Shri Nath Pal: Conquer or defend? I think you mean defend. How can we conquer our own land?

Shri Krishna Menon: I was speaking sufficiently loudly to be heard. I said that the frontiers of a country can only be settled in this way. We have never said that these frontiers are not known. We have said that they are determined by history, as Shri Asoka

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Mehta said this morning I believe, by convention, by practice and by our own experience of what we see. We are quite conscious as to what are our frontiers. We have not said that they are not unknown. We have said that it is wrong to say that it is not delimited. It is not demarcated. They are two different things. Demarcation has to be carried on by a process of negotiation and it must be left to the wisdom of the Government, if you accept it, as to what is the best way of establishing that negotiation. Negotiation, on the one hand, cannot be brought about by an attitude of undue aggressiveness nor on the other hand by an attitude of surrender. I believe the Government is following, what the hon. Prime Minister a couple of months ago said here, what is called the dual policy. A dual policy is not a double policy or a double-faced policy. Dual policy is a policy with two aspects. Both aspects are equally important and one corroborates the other.

That is all I have to say. I think very few other matters have been raised in this connection. But some reference has been made to the qualifications required for a Defence Minister. In a Parliamentary system of Government, ministers, rightly or wrongly, are not appointed by the Opposition and none of us can be so sure at any time that they command complete public confidence. As far as I am concerned, Government policy in our system is one and unified. Any suggestion. . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): You have at least the support of one Opposition party!

Shri Krishna Menon: On the one hand the Opposition pleads for the unity of the country and on the other hand if either by error or by mistake or by opportunism one party offers its support on a particular issue we are called upon to reject it. We either rejected it or accepted it. We are following a policy. If that policy

appeals to right people then they should join in that. Anyway, this is a matter for the hon. Prime Minister to deal with.

At any rate so far as I am concerned there has been no difficulty from the working people in the factories and while production—that I have mentioned a little while ago—may to a certain extent be due to the drive given to it by the administration generally, it is in more than a small measure due to the enthusiasm and the understanding of the men who work in these factories. I think we should all be conscious of the fact that they realise that that production is not for the purposes of private profit but for the defence of this country.

That is all I have to say.

Shri Vajpayee: May I ask a question of the hon. Defence Minister?

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Nath Pal: You must take Shri Feroze Gandhi's permission first.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: Sometimes you are with us; sometimes the Communists are with us. What are we to do?

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Aney.

Shri Nath Pal: When we do it we do it openly. (Interruption)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The House is still sitting. Dr. Aney.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): I do not know whether the hon. Defence Minister was referring to what I said about the Defence Minister as to what he ought to be. I never said that he should be selected by the Opposition. (Interruption).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Who are you to interrupt?

Acharya Kripalani: What I have said is that it is not enough in a democracy for the hon. Minister to enjoy

the confidence only of his Chief but also of the public. I hold that this is the correct position.

Shri Ferose Gandhi: How does one define that?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know how the hon. Member has got up to explain in the middle of a debate. I have a lot to say as to how public confidence is to be judged.

Acharya Kripalani: But I submit it has nothing to do with a point made by the Opposition. It is only perverse argument in order to . . . (Interruption). That is why I say that whether you are right or the public is right is a question to be judged by others and not by you, nor by me. (Interruption).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is needlessly getting excited when it is said that the Opposition does not appoint him . . . (Interruption). Nobody thought that the Opposition did it. But that was a gentle way of pointing out the place that Government occupies and the Opposition occupies in a democratic system. Presumably a Government functions because Parliament approves of that Government and presumably the people approve of that Government because Parliament is being elected by the people. Presumably in a Government the Prime Minister is appointed because he has a certain measure of confidence of the people through the Parliament. These are normal things which sometimes require pointing out when they are forgotten.

Shri Nath Pal: The Opposition never appoints a Minister, but in a democracy it can always succeed in compelling the Government to resign or the President to dismiss that ministry. It does happen . . . (Interruption).

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I submit that this is irrelevant. It is not a matter for discussion now . . . (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. (Interruption). Order, please.

Shri Ferose Gandhi: What is this? If you want some more, we can give more to you. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members talk of democracy . . . (Interruption). I am afraid, while they are talking about the principles of democracy, they are not practising it here. Dr. Aney.

Acharya Kripalani: I had only raised a question that there might be a misconception. I take it that the hon. Prime Minister had admitted the proposition that every Minister must enjoy public confidence. Now, he makes himself the measure of that confidence. I have no objection to that. But my proposition is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right. Dr. Aney.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved yesterday by the hon. Prime Minister.

While recommending the White Paper II and the correspondence between the Governments of India and China for consideration of the hon. Members of this House, I wish to make a few observations to express what I feel on reading those papers.

The first thing that must strike the reader of this correspondence is that one of the two corresponding nations cannot be recognised as believers in and adherers to the principles of co-existence, one of the cardinal tenets in what is now popularly known as the doctrine of Panchsheel. Co-existence implies that both the countries recognise the boundaries of each other and respect the geographical integrity of the nation. Violation of the boundary of the one by the other deliberately and not an accidental trespass is aggression and a crime by one nation against the other.

The Papers themselves contain proof of deliberate violation by the Chinese of certain territories in Ladakh which are undoubtedly inside the traditional and international boundary of India.

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

The attack on the Indian men at Longju by the Chinese Army resulting in the death of several Indians and also the arrest of a large number to which reference is made in the letter of Premier Chou En-lai of the 8th September, 1959, and the letter of the Indian Prime Minister to the Chinese Prime Minister dated the 26th September, 1959 will convince anybody that the Chinese army men attacked and killed the Indian men deliberately. The attackers stated that they had orders to attack and stop the Indian personnel from going further. Is that a proof of settling matters of difference by negotiations and in a peaceful manner?

The elaborate reply which our Prime Minister has given to the letter of the Chinese Premier of the 8th September is simply left unreplyed. How can there be any negotiations where one party does not even show any willingness to listen, read or consider?

Though more than once the Chinese Premier has referred to our Prime Minister as the author of *Panchsheel* and described himself as strictly observing the tenets of *Panchsheel*, the correspondence leaves the reader in no doubt that the writer is not keen in ascertaining the truth about the boundaries and his loyalty to *Panchsheel* is only some kind of lip-service. I am not at all surprised at this. My surprise is that it took the Government of India so much time, nay, so many years, to find it out.

Sir, this leads me to another important point. We became an independent nation in the year 1947. In August last we have finished twelve years and celebrated the twelfth anniversary of our Indian Independence Day. Soon after our independence we announced our recognition of the Communist Chinese Government as the *de facto* government of China, and since then we have been cham-

ping the cause of that nation and pressing on the U.N. the urgency of its recognition by that body as a nation and its admission as a member of the U.N. In all this we have been following the path of justice, equity and international fairness. But we have done something more than that for China. We have recognized China's suzerainty over Tibet, our immediate neighbour in the north. By this recognition we have in a way invited China to be our next-door neighbour. In doing that we tried to get an assurance from China that this suzerainty over Tibet was not to interfere with the autonomous status of Tibet and its Lamaik Buddhist culture. But we find that the Chinese Government, for reasons best known to them, have occupied Tibet and virtually ended the rule of the Lamas in that State. The hospitality which we have shown to the Dalai Lama and the people of Tibet who migrated from Tibet to India has infuriated the Chinese Government and the Chinese people also. The various incidents of aggression on Indian territory in the Himalayas as well as the anti-Indian propaganda of a very virulent nature that is being carried on in China are indicative of an attitude of active hostility of China to India.

On reading the notes I feel convinced that the Government of India never suspected till very recently that there would be such a terrible change in the attitude of China towards India. It treated all symptoms of this change as insignificant. The publication of maps by the Chinese Government showing large tracts of our country as Chinese territory elicited only a mild protest from us. And any explanation of the cock-and-bull story type given by the Chinese Government was thought of by us, for the time being at least, as satisfactory.

As against this conduct of the Chinese Government, our Government has tried to be consistent in its attitude towards China. One example of this is that in the map of India and

China which has been published and circulated to the Members along with the White Paper, we have shown the whole territory to the north of India beyond the Himalayas as China, omitting all reference to the existence of Tibet. We have taken up this attitude.

Apart from the solicitude we are showing to the feelings and susceptibilities of the Chinese nation, there is another mistake which we have committed in all these twelve years of our independence. We were not able to take a proper view of our frontiers from the point of view of our defence. Let me say here that the Defence Minister just now made a statement, and I heard the explanation given by him. I think there is good reason in what he has stated. But notwithstanding that, the remarks which I propose to make still hold good. It is admitted and clearly seen from the White Papers that we did not regard our northern frontier as a matter of any concern at all. And that is what he has stated also. A few outposts for patrols in aid of the pilgrims and traders were all that was thought to be necessary. That was probably the arrangement in the British days. And our Independent India simply continued the same arrangement.

I am told—and I speak subject to correction—that the part of Ladakh in occupation of the Pakistan Government bordering on the Chinese borders is well protected. I do not know whether this information is correct or not. But that our border was not at all protected is clear from the white papers themselves.

During the British rule China had not the courage even to assert its suzerainty over Tibet, much less to invade that territory. Therefore they had never cared to make any effective arrangements for protection of that border. But Independent India should have been able to foresee the consequences of leaving the border altogether unprotected, particularly in view of the several changes that have

been taking place during this period. That means a danger to India. An unprotected border of India means a danger not only to India but to Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim.

Vigilance is the price of liberty, they say. Non-vigilance is likely to endanger liberty itself. In this connection I do say that the reduction of our military budget by Rs. 25 crores last year is certainly an indication of the fact that our Defence Ministry was not sufficiently vigilant in pressing its claims and demonstrating the urgency of making our border outposts sufficiently strong to meet the menace to India which has arisen by the eradication of Tibet and bringing China closer and making it our next-door neighbour.

16 hrs.

In considering the last letter which our Prime Minister has sent, I can certainly say that he has shown an admirable spirit of firmness and self-restraint, properly combined, in making his proposals. But, there is one point to which I wish to invite the attention of the Prime Minister in all humility. In his desire to put an end to interminable discussions of *status quo*, he has suggested that in the Longju region, the Chinese should withdraw their men and we, as an interim arrangement, will not send our own patrols to occupy the same. There will be a no man's land between the two borders. The Prime Minister has given his reasons for making this proposal and they deserve consideration. In this connection, I wish to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister and also of the Members of this House and the Defence Minister, what Shri Cariappa the ex-Commander-in-Chief has to say. He said that if the Chinese would not be ousted from the occupied positions now, it would be very difficult to do so later on. In the White Paper, we have an instance where a post which we vacated was immediately occupied by the Chinese army—the instance that my hon.

{Dr. M. S. Aney}

friend referred to. Can this thing not take place here? What is the guarantee that the Chinese, having vacated it for some days, would not later occupy it, making it impossible for us again to recover it? I am confident that this is a point which the Prime Minister will take into consideration.

The second point is, that this portion is a part of the Jammu and Kashmir State. What effect our conduct in withdrawing our patrols from Longju will make on the minds of the people of Kashmir? Will they feel that we are strong enough to protect the Kashmir people, if it becomes necessary to fight at all? Or, will it have an adverse effect on their mind? Will they not also try to make a contrast between the conduct of Pakistan Government and our own Government as regards making effort to preserve the territories within their respective boundaries in spite of the claims made by the Chinese in their maps for themselves? These are the points that I wanted specially to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister and the Government of India, before they make up their mind to hand over the territory, in case they agree to accept the proposal.

I am reminded of a verse in Sanskrit:

समर्षं क्षुब्धेन जनस्य जन्तूना न जात हर्षेन न
विदिवन्नादरः ।

It means, a person who is void of indignation is neither honoured by friend nor by his enemy. I hope that my apprehension will prove groundless. Whatever might be the differences about certain steps taken or not taken before, about the commissions and omissions, there is undoubtedly one strong point in favour of the Government and that is, that the whole country has faith in the leadership of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and people of all shades of

opinion will stand firmly by him and behind him and support him in his policy and the measures that he will take in defence of the honour of this country and preservation of its geographical integrity.

I support the motion.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):
Just a minute; may I say a few words, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: I shall call him later.
Shri J. B. S. Bist.

Shrimati Masida Ahmed (Jorhat):
What about us, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: No hon. Member can force herself or himself on the Speaker and force him to call her or him.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: It is open to all hon. Members to go on standing until they catch my eye.

Shri J. B. S. Bist (Almora): The Prime Minister's counter-proposals conveyed to Mr. Chou En-Lai in his letter of the 16th November are practical and realistic. I, however, particularly welcome his statement that as far as the Himalayan border is concerned, there is no dispute about it in the central area where it touches U.P., Himachal Pradesh and Punjab. This would be welcome to the inhabitants of that area which I have the privilege to represent. This would be welcome to them also because they had been apprehensive that the Chinese might indulge in aggressive activity similar to those in NEFA or Ladakh.

While the initiative now rests with the Chinese, I would call the attention of the Government to the need for a complete reorientation in the border policy. During the British days, the then Government of India was not particularly perturbed about the security of the border for two

reasons. Firstly, Tibet formed a kind of buffer State, and secondly they thought that the bleak and inaccessible mountains which separate Tibet and India were the best protection. Despite this, from the administrative point of view, they kept a close watch on border developments.

After independence, our Government, taking into consideration the traditional friendship between the two countries, gave up the concessions it enjoyed in Tibet, and believing in the friendly intentions of the Chinese, did not strengthen its borders. Thus, while the Chinese, even in the old Dalai Lama regime, were constructing a network of roadways on their side of the border and building up their defence potential, we on our side did not pay any particular or special attention to this area, and proceeded in the ordinary way.

Take my own district of Almora which is lying quite contiguous to our boundary with Tibet. Three passes in that district, namely the Lipulake, Kungri-Bingri and Darma, provide access to India. While the Chinese in their part of the border have constructed motorable roads up to Takulakote and Gyanimandi, our villages in the border are still difficult to reach. This not only creates a defence problem, but also hampers the growth of this area whose economy was so far dependant on trade with Tibet. With the establishment of Communist rule in Tibet, unless the economic development of the border people is promoted, the Chinese agents will find good ground for sowing seeds of disaffection.

I may also suggest that since road construction has now essentially become a defence requirement in the border areas, this may be entrusted to the military authorities. We have a plan to construct roadways there, that is, motorable roads, but this work has been taking years and years, and the progress is very slow, and I at least do not know when they

will reach any important village on the border.

I would also take this opportunity to inform Government—possibly they have the information already—that Garbyang is the last village towards the Lipulake pass. It is a flat piece of land which is fit for an airfield. It would be for the military authorities to enquire into this matter and see whether it could be put to any use for any purpose, and I have nothing to say on that; I do know that the village has a flat stretch of land, and aeroplanes could land there very easily, but it is for the military authorities to see the site and consider whether it is in their interest and in the interest of the nation to use that area.

As revival of trade with Tibet is a remote possibility, Government would have to consider alternative means of livelihood for the people in these areas. Sheep-rearing and wool industry on a scientific basis would be a success, and I think that is a genuine need, for, in these areas, every family is connected with wool; as the hon. Members of this House possibly know, the Pashmina and similar kinds of wool are manufactured by the Bhotias who live on the frontiers and who trade with Tibet. Also, other avenues of livelihood will have to be explored. I would suggest that an economic survey should be carried out, and I think, just as some speakers have remarked before, that this survey will provide Government with many facilities which they might need; of course, I might say here that Government will have to improve communications, if these facilities are to be enjoyed. The time has come now when these matters cannot be delayed any longer. I think a sound economy and a good economy is a good defence.

Now, I would like to touch on a delicate issue. It is being stated that the areas where incursions are taking place are inaccessible, without habitation and of no economic consequence.

[Shri J. B. S. Bist]

I would like to say that it is this very inaccessibility which provides the greatest security and protection. Once these areas are not with us, the feeling of safety which the border people have, will disappear, and this must affect the defence of the whole of India also.

In regard to administration, I have to say that the State Government treat these border districts on similar lines as other districts, though these border districts have their own special peculiar features. I do not blame the State Government for this. They do not have the resources and to incur an expenditure out of proportion to the population and area causes heart-burning in other areas, while there is a comparatively small return on the investment made. The remedy lies in special subsidies from the Centre ear-marked for these areas. This money should be not only ear-marked for specific areas but should be for specific purposes and for the benefit of those areas.

I regret to say that I have noticed that officers posted to the border areas treat themselves as having been penalised. There may be some exceptions to this. Therefore, I would suggest that officers of the Indian Frontier Political Service formed for administering the NEFA and Naga areas should be posted to these areas, and the district officers should be asked to tour those areas and come into contact with the people there. My impression is that they do not tour as frequently as was thought essential even in the British times.

Ever since the Chinese activities on the border started, I have been thinking as to what precisely they have in mind. I am neither a politician nor an expert, but a man from the border areas having a stake in what is happening there. Personally, I think the Chinese game is to deprive us of the security which the H'malayas provide us and to place themselves in a position of vantage which will be a permanent threat to our security.

Anyway, I was glad to hear the Prime Minister say yesterday that he was trying, in the first place, to settle things by peace. I appreciate this line of his, for after all, war has its horrors, and possibly many of us may not be able to imagine those horrors. I pray God that he becomes successful through these peaceful means. But the Prime Minister has also said—and I think everyone of us will agree with him when he says it—that India is not going to stand any aggression. I am certain that Government are taking all matters into consideration. There is no need to think that nothing is being done by Government. After all, these are matters which cannot be clearly exposed in public in the interest of the country.

Mr. Speaker: Shri A. M. Tariq.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I do not want to catch your eye, but if your eyes catch me better.

Mr. Speaker: My eye always catches the hon. Member.

श्री अ० मु० तारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : मिस्टर स्पीकर, कल जो वजीर आज़म ने इस एंवान में तहरीक रखी और उस तहरीक में जिस पालिसी को पेश किया उसकी मैं पूरी ताईद करता हूँ ।

जनाब वाला, जब से यह सरहदी तनाजा शुरू हुआ है हमारे मुल्क के कुछ कोनों से कुछ लोगों ने अपनी तरफ से इस तनाजे की अपनी सियासी पालिसी के लिये एक्सप्लाइट करने के लिये जंग के नारे लगाए । जंग का नारा लगाना बहुत आसान है । यह मेरी खुशकिस्मती समझिए या बदकिस्मती समझिए कि मैं हिन्दुस्तान के उस हिस्से से आया हूँ जिसने आजादी के पहले दिन से जंग को देखा, सरहदी हमले को देखा, और आज भी सरहदी तनाजे का शिकार है । जनाब वाला,

यही प्रकृता चाहता हूँ उन लोगों से जो आज जंग का तारा लगा रहे हैं, काश्मीर के जंगी बखले को हल करने के लिये, उस वक्त यह कहाँ थे। इस वक्त जबकि हमारे मुल्क को अक्रूरत है सिर्फ इस बात की कि हम मुनजिम हों और अपने वजीर आजम को, उनकी हकूमत को और अपनी फौज को इस्लामकी मदद करें, हम कोशिश करते हैं तख्तीबी बातों को करने की। हम कोशिश करते हैं इस मुल्क में अफरा तफरी पैदा करने की। यही कोशिश उस वक्त भी मुखालिफ जमायतों ने की जबकि काश्मीर पर पाकिस्तानी हमला हुआ। स्व० क्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी हिन्दू महासभा के झण्डे के तले काश्मीर में एक अपना आन्दोलन कर गए। हमारी दूसरी जमायतों के कुछ नेताओं ने उस वक्त हमारे वजीर आजम के हाथ मजबूत करने के बजाए कमजोर करने की कोशिश की।

श्री अखतराज सिंह : उनके हाथ तो मजबूत रहे, कमजोर कहाँ हूँ।

श्री अ० सु० तरिख : मजबूत हैं, मजबूत रहेंगे, और मैं आपकी यकीन दिखाना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी तमाम कोशिशों बेकार होंगी।

जनाब वाला, मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ लोगों ने अहाँ इस तरह की बातों की कि लद्दाख में हेवी इंडस्ट्री कायम की जाए। मुझे ताज्जुब है कि उन्होंने यह क्यों नहीं कहा कि लद्दाख में एक शिपयार्ड खोला जाए जहाँ कि जहाज बनाए जा सकें। उनको यह भी नहीं मालूम कि लद्दाख कहाँ है और लद्दाख को कैसे जाते हैं। यहाँ बैठ कर हवाई बातें करना आसान है।

जनाब वाला, यह कहना कि हमारे मुल्क के डिफेंस मिनिस्टर नाकाबिल है एक इन्तिहाई अफसोसनाक बात है। जंग के खतरे में हमें देना कि बरतानिया ने किस इस्तिमिये जंग खीटी कि अहाँ की तमाम

सियासी जमायतों उस वक्त बरतानिया के बंगी सीडर सिस्टर बचिल के शीखे थीं। उन जमायतों ने उनकी पालिसी से इस्तिफाक किया और इसी वजह से जर्मनी पर बरतानिया ने फतह हासिल की। यह कहा गया कि हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर इतने मकबूल नहीं हैं जितने अपोजीशन के नेता हैं। मैं इसके बारे में इससे ज्यादा और कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता कि अगर अपोजीशन के नेता इतने मकबूल हैं तो उनको कांग्रेस के रहमों करम से इस हम्ले में नहीं आना चाहिए था बल्कि सीधे प्रथम की वोट से आना चाहिए था। श्री कृष्णा मेनन की नाकाबिलियत यह है कि उसने दुनिया के उन लोगों से जो हिन्दुस्तान की आजादानी पालिसी के मुखालिफ थे, जो चाहते थे कि काश्मीर के मामले में हिन्दुस्तान की शिकस्त दी जाए, यह मनवा दिया कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है और रहेगा। यही मिस्टर कृष्णा मेनन की नाकाब-नियत है।

बजाए इसके कि इस वक्त हम अपनी फौजों का इस्लाम बलन्द करें, हम सिविल सर्विस और फौजी सर्विस के दरम्यान एक इस्तिलाफ पैदा करना चाहते हैं। जनाब वाला, मैं दरख्वास्त करना चाहता हूँ मुल्क के रहने वालों से कि यह इस वक्त ऐसी बातों को भूल कर बाकय की सीरियसनेस को सम्भों कि यह सरहदी तनाजा किसी वक्त भी जंग की सूरत प्रक्षिपार कर सकता है गो कि हमारे वजीर आजम की पालिसी के होते हुए यह चीज नाकाबिले कानून खिलायी देती है। इस वक्त अक्रूरत इस बात की है कि हम अपने वजीर आजम की, अपने फौजियों की और अपने लोगों के अजायब बलन्द रहें।

जनाब वाला, यह कहना अश्लील लगता है कि हमें वजीर आजम की पालिसी से इस्तिफाक है लेकिन मिस्टर ए० से वा मिस्टर बी० से इस्तिफाक है। दरअसल यह कोई बड़ी हुई बात नहीं है कि यह एक बात है,

[श्री श्री ० मु० सार्विक]

एक शक्ति है हमारे वजीर राजम को कमजोर करने की। उन लोगों से यह नहीं देखा जाता कि एक फर्द कामयाब हो।

हमारे वजीर राजम की यह पालिसी है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का कामन डिफेंस नहीं होगा। लेकिन एक फर्द— वह चाहे कितना भी धर्मीमउल्लवान क्यों न हो— कराची में जाकर जनरल धर्यूस मिल कर कामन डिफेंस की बात तै करना चाहता है और हमारे धीरे धीरे कामोश रहते हैं। एक फर्द को यह हक दिया जाता है कि वह मुल्क के बाहर जाकर दूसरे मुल्कों में वजीर राजम की पालिसी के खिलाफ प्रोपेगेंडा करे और अपनी पालिसी बनवाने की कोशिश करे। ऐसा फर्द तो मुहिबे बतान हुआ और वजीर राजम और उनके साथी मुहिबे बतान नहीं हैं। मैं प्रजं करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के रहने वाले वजीर राजम को आज से नहीं पिछले ५० साल से जानते हैं, पहचानते हैं और उन पर भरोसा करते हैं हमारा भरोसा है पंडित जवाहरलाल पर और जिन पर उनको भरोसा है उन पर हमको भी भरोसा है।

जनाब वाला, हमारे मुल्क को इस वक्त हमारी वफादारी की जरूरत है, वफादारी किसी फर्द के साथ नहीं बल्कि हम अपनी वफादारी को इसी तरह पेश कर सकते हैं कि हम इस मुल्क को, इस मुल्क के वजीर राजम को मजबूत करें। उनकी मजबूतियत के बारे में कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती। मुल्क के लोग उनको जानते हैं। इस ऐवाम में बखान और चित्त न से कोई मजबूत नहीं हो सकता।

जनाब वाला, यहा यह भी कहा गया कि हमें बाहर के मुल्कों से इमदाद लेनी चाहिए। बाहर के मुल्कों से इमदाद लेने के मानी यह हमें कि हम अपनी आजाद सरजमीन पर, जिहाद करने दुर्दानियों से, बगैर हथकार के

मुल्क के बाहर निकाला, उसी को हम फिर दाबत दें कि वह अपनी फौजों और हथियारों के साथ हमारे मुल्क में धाये। हिन्दुस्तान किसी मुल्क से जंग नहीं करना चाहता और अगर हिन्दुस्तान को इस बात की जरूरत पड़ी भी तो हम अपनी कुम्बत से, अपनी धमन से उसका मुकाबला करेंगे। हम किसी बाहर के मुल्क की इमदाद नहीं लेना चाहते। हम हिन्दुस्तान की तामीर किसी दूसरे के कर्बों पर नहीं रखना चाहते। हम हिन्दुस्तान को बुसहाल बनाना चाहते हैं और मैं फिर एक बार वजीर राजम की उस पालिसी से इति-फाक करता हूँ कि हम अपने सरहद्दी त-नाजे को चाहे वह पाकिस्तानी हमला हो या चीन का मामला हो मसलिहत से और पुरधमन गुफतगू से तै करेंगे। मैं इस पालिसी की पूरी ताईद करता हूँ।

شہری لہ - اوم طارق - (جسوں اور
کھنڈ) - مسٹر اسمتھر - کل جو وزیر
اعظم نے اس ایوان میں تحریک
دکھی اور اس تحریک میں جس
پالہسی کو یہی کہا - اس کو میں
پوری تائید کرتا ہوں -

جنا ب والا - جب سے یہ موجدی
تذاع شروع ہوا ہے ہمارے ملک کے
کچھ کونوں سے کچھ لوگوں نے ایسی
طرف سے اس تذاع کو ایسی سیاسی
پالہسی کے لئے ایکسپلنٹ کرنے کے
لئے جنگ کے نعرے لگائے - جنگ کا
نعرہ لگانا بہت آسان ہے - یہ مہوی
خوش گستی سمجھنے یا بدگستی
سمجھنے کہ میں ہندوستان کے اس
حصے سے آیا ہوں جس نے آزادی
کے بعد ہی سے جنگ کو دیکھا -

سرحدی حملہ کو دیکھا۔ اور آج بھی سرحدی تنازع کا شکر ہے۔ چناب والا۔ میں پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں ان لوگوں سے جو آج چنگ کا نمبر لگا رہے ہیں۔ کشمیر کے جنگی مسئلہ کو حل کرنے کے لئے اس وقت وہ کہاں تھے۔ اس وقت جب کہ ہمارے ملک کو ضرورت ہے صرف اس بات کی کہ ہم منظم ہوں۔ اور اپنے وزیر اعظم کو۔ ان کی حکومت کو۔ اور اہلی نوج کی اخلاقی مدد کریں۔ ہم کوشش کرتے ہیں تشریحی باتوں کو کرنے کی۔ ہم کوشش کرتے ہیں ملک میں انفرادی پیدا کرنے کی۔ یہی کوشش اس وقت بھی مختلف جماعتوں نے کی جب کہ کشمیر پر پاکستانی حملہ ہوا۔ سرولہ شہاما پرشاد مگرچی ہندو سہاسہا کے چھلنے کے تھے کشمیر میں اپنا اندولن کرنے گئے۔ ہماری دوسری جماعتوں کے کچھ نیتاؤں نے اس وقت ہمارے وزیر اعظم کے ہاتھ مضبوط کرنے کے بجائے کمزور کرنے کی کوشش کی۔

چناب والا۔ میں آپ سے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کچھ لوگوں نے یہاں اس طرح کی باتیں کیں کہ لدانج میں ہوسٹی انڈسٹری قائم کی جائے۔ مجھے تعجب ہے کہ انہوں نے یہ کہیں نہیں کہا کہ لدانج میں شپ پارک کھولا جائے جہاں کہ جہاز بنائے جاسکتے۔ ان کو یہ بھی نہیں معلوم کہ لدانج کہاں ہے اور لدانج کو کسے جاتے ہیں۔ یہاں ہیٹھ کر ہوائی پاتھن کرنا آسان ہے۔

چناب والا۔ یہ کہنا کہ ہمارے ملک کے کفیلس ماسٹر ناقابل ہیں ایک انتہائی انسوس ناک بات ہے۔ چنگ کے زمانے میں ہم نے دیکھا کہ برطانیہ نے صرف اس لئے جنگ جیتی کہ وہاں کی تمام سیاسی جماعتوں اس وقت برطانیہ کے جنگی لہتو مسٹر چوچل نے پیچھے تھیں۔ ان جماعتوں نے ان کی پالہسی سے اتدقی کیا۔ اور اسی وجہ سے جرمنی پر برطانیہ نے فتح حاصل کی۔ یہ کہا گیا کہ ہمارے کفیلس ماسٹر اتلے مقبول نہیں ہیں جتنے ایوزیشن کے ہوتا ہیں۔ میں اس کے بارے میں اس سے زیادہ اور کچھ نہیں کہنا چاہتا کہ گو ایوزیشن کے ہوتا اتلے مقبول ہیں تو ان کو کانگریس کے رحم و کرم سے اس ہاؤس میں نہیں آنا چاہیے تھا۔ بلکہ سہدے عوام کی روٹ سے آنا چاہئے تھا۔ ہری کرشنا سہین کی ناقابلیت یہ ہے کہ اس نے دنیا کے ان لوگوں سے جو ہندوستان کی آزاد نہ پالہسی کے

श्री बजरत्न सिंह : उनके हाथ वो सबूत है, कमजोर कहाँ है ?

श्री अ. - हम طارق : مضبوط हैं - مضبوط रहें गे और मैं आप को यहाँ दलाना चाहता हूँ कि आप की تمام कहشें बेकार हों گی -

[شہری اے - ایم طارق]

سہائف تھے - جو چاہتے تھے کہ کشمیر کے معاملے میں ہندوستان کو شکست دی جائے - یہ ملوا دیا کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے اور رہے گا - یہی مسٹر کرشنا مہلی کی ناقابلہست ہے -

بجائے اس کے اس وقت ہم اپنی فوجوں کا اخلاق بلند کریں - ہم سب سروس اور فوجی سروس کے درمیان اختلاف پیدا کرنا چاہتے ہیں - جناب والا - میں درخواست کرنا چاہتا ہوں ملک کے رہنے والوں سے کہ وہ اس وقت ایسی باتوں کو بھول کر واقعہ کی سوریس نسیس کو سمجھیں کہ یہ سرحدی تنازع کسی وقت بھی جنگ کی صورت اختیار کر سکتا ہے - گو کہ ہمارے وزیر اعظم کی پالیسی کے ہوتے یہ چیز ناقابل قبول دکھائی دیتی ہے - اس وقت ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ ہم اپنے وزیر اعظم کی - اچے فوجوں کی - اور اچے لوگوں کے - عزیمت بلند رکھیں -

جناب والا - یہ کہنا صحیح لگتا ہے کہ میں وزیر اعظم کی پالیسی سے اتفاق ہے - لیکن مستر اے سے ہا مسٹر میں سے اختلاف ہے دراصل یہ کوئی چھٹی ہوئی بات نہیں ہے کہ یہ لوگ جال ہے - ایک ساڑھی ہے ہمارے وزیر اعظم کو کمزور کرنے کی - اس لوگوں سے یہ نہیں دیکھا جاتا کہ ایک لوگ کسوت ہو -

ہمارے وزیر اعظم کی یہ پالیسی ہے کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کا گمن قہقہاس نہیں ہوگا - لیکن ایک فرد - وہ چاہے کتنا بھی عظیم الشان کہوں نہ ہو - کراچی میں جا کر جنرل ایوب سے ملکر گمن قہقہاس کی بات طے کرنا چاہتا ہے - اور ہمارے دوست خاموش رہتے ہیں - ایک فرد کو [یہ حق دیا جاتا ہے کہ وہ ملک کے باہر جا کر دوسرے ملکوں میں وزیر اعظم کی پالیسی کے خلاف پروپیگنڈا کرے اور اپنی پالیسی - موافق کی کوشش کرے - ایسا فرد تو محض وطن ہوا اور وزیر اعظم اور ان کے ساتھی محض وطن نہیں ہیں - میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان کے رہنے والے وزیر اعظم کو آج سے نہیں پچھلے پچاس سال سے جانتے ہیں - اور ان پر بھروسہ کرتے ہیں - ہمارا بھروسہ ہے پلنگھ جواہر لال پر اور جن پر ان کو بھروسہ ہے ان پر ہم کو بھی بھروسہ ہے - جناب والا - ہمارے ملک کو اس وقت ہمدردی وفاداری کی ضرورت ہے - وفاداری کسی فرد کے ساتھ نہیں بلکہ ہم اپنی وفاداری کو اس طرح پیش کر سکتے ہیں کہ ہم اس ملک کو - اس ملک کے وزیر اعظم کو مضبوط کریں - ان کی مقبولیت کے بارے میں کوئی دو رائے نہیں ہو سکتی - ملک کے لوگ اس کو چاہتے ہیں - اس لیے ان میں چوبیسے اور چالیس سے کوئی مبالغہ نہیں ہو سکتا -

جنگ والے - یہاں یہ بھی کہا گیا کہ ہمیں ہمارے ملکوں سے امداد لینی چاہئے۔ ہمارے ملکوں سے امداد لینے کے سہلی یہ ہیں کہ ہم اپنی آزاد سرزمین پر جس کو ہم نے قربان کیا ہے بنگھڑ ہتھیار کے ملک کے ہمارے دوستوں سے اس کو ہم پورے دوستوں کے ساتھ ساتھ ہمارے ملک میں آئے۔ ہندوستان کسی ملک سے جنگ نہیں کرنا چاہتا اور اگر ہندوستان کو اس بات کی ضرورت پڑی بھی تو ہم اپنی قوت سے۔ اپنی اس سے اس کا مقابلہ کریں گے۔ کسی ہمارے ملک کی امداد نہیں لینا چاہتے۔ ہم ہندوستان کی تعمیر کسی دوسرے کے کندھوں پر نہیں رکھنا چاہتے۔ ہم ہندوستان کو خوش حال بلانا چاہتے ہیں اور میں پھر ایک بار وزیراعظم کی اس پالیسی سے اتفاق کرتا ہوں کہ ہم اپنی سرحدی تنازع کو چاہے وہ پاکستانی حملہ ہو یا چین کا معاملہ ہو۔ مصالح سے اور ہر اس گٹنگو سے طے کریں کہ۔ میں اس پالیسی کی پوری تائید کرتا ہوں۔

Sri P. C. Boroah (Sibsagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I venture to take part in this debate because I and the people of my State, Assam are vitally connected with this problem. I have been requesting the Government to give a serious thought to this question even on some earlier occasions, specially with reference to the Indo-Pakistan borders and the disruptive activities of the Naga hostiles.

Of the 9,000 miles of frontier that India has got to maintain, nearly one-

third of it goes to the account of Assam alone. Bounded on the north by Tibet or China, on the east by Burma and on the south and west by Pakistan, her entire boundary is a frontier except for a small stretch of land, measuring about 40 miles, through which Assam today is keeping connection with the rest of India. As such, Assam's importance from the defence point of view needs no emphasis.

The constituency which I come from is contiguous to the Subansiri division of the North East Frontier Agency in which lies the now famous Longju, the little village. The Chinese are reported to be strengthening their occupation forces at Longju and are consolidating their position by building a new road from Longju to their base in the Tibetan plateau only 15 miles from Longju. They have also bridged a river which runs across this road about a mile north of Longju.

I do not want to take the time of this House by repeating the violations which the Chinese have committed on our borders and the many incursions that have been made into our territory. But, in spite of all this, I would like to make it clear that this question of Sino-Indian relations should be viewed in a dispassionate and realistic manner. Whatever we decide to do in this matter must be guided by our main objective, the adherence to the policy of non-alignment, the greatest gift our Prime Minister has given to the nation. It is not an idealistic policy as is supposed by some people. It is a policy which is feasible and practicable in the present circumstances and in the foreseeable future.

The question of the safety and security of our borders, whether related to Pakistan border or to the Chinese border, must be dealt with in its true perspective. For instance, the Pakistan authorities are in a reasonable frame of mind just at the moment. But it does not mean that

[Shri P. C. Bosech]

we should be less vigilant in regard to our Indo-Pakistan border. Protection of our frontiers is our national duty and it should be discharged ceaselessly. Similarly, if the Chinese Government is adopting a hostile attitude towards our country, it should not be taken to mean that we should be vigilant in regard to the safety of our borders only now and do nothing later on. As a matter of fact, the safety of the border is a permanent obligation of any Government that may be there. Hence I would request the Government to split up this question into two parts: Firstly, the immediate steps that are required to be taken for meeting the challenge of the Chinese aggression and secondly, the long-term arrangements that should be made for the protection of our borders as a whole.

As for the immediate steps, much would depend on the attitude of the Chinese Government to the proposals made by our Prime Minister. But all the same, the initiative remains in our hands and we should meanwhile remain prepared for the worst that may happen in the immediate future. India is a peace-loving country, but it is also a land of patriots, who would not hesitate to lay down their lives for the safety of their motherland. So, we hope that better counsels would prevail on the Chinese Premier and he would accept the path of peace as suggested by our Prime Minister.

As for the long-term steps for the protection of our borders, it may be suggested that an efficient machinery to keep contact with the border areas be set up, communications to and from the borders improved, roads and bridges constructed, railways right up to the foot-hills extended, air-fields and air-strips built, military forces armed with the modern weapons, Territorial Army, NCC and ACC units enlarged, proper facilities for developing the economy of the people living in the border areas offered and

last but not the least, strict vigilance kept on those having extra-territorial allegiance and combing out those who want to break our national solidarity.

I would also like to say that we should not rest content merely with expressing satisfaction at the steps taken by the Government and remain unconcerned. We have to strengthen the hands of our Government. We have to make our Prime Minister feel that the country is behind him and is prepared to stake everything for the step he may choose to take.

I also feel that we are a bit too much repeating that we are the originators of Panchsheel, we are wedded to non-violence, we shall not go to war, etc. Who in the world today does not know that we are not so? Yes; we are opposed to war, above all with a country like China, with whom we were in friendship for the last two thousand years. But too much repetition of these principles, I am afraid, may be misconstrued by others as our cowardice.

We give our whole-hearted support for what the Government under the dynamic personality of our Prime Minister have done so far in this matter. But, Sir, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not mention about the doubt and the distress which the people, particularly those in my part of country, are feeling in one matter, viz., the question of our declaring China's suzerainty over Tibet, which we feel has brought all these troubles for us. If the early history is gone into, it will be found that in 741 A.D. China used to pay tribute to Tibet. In 1244, Tibet was ruled completely independent of China. Of course, there were occasions when supremacy was exercised over one another amongst the Mongolians, Manchurians, Tibetans and the Chinese at different times. Though Tibet was long free from Chinese domination, the rising of the communist Government in China, reversed the situation. The Tibetans fearing the expansionist

urge of China, wanted to send missions to England, America, India and Nepal. This the Tibetans could not do for fear of the Chinese. The Indian Government advised the Tibetan Government to send their mission to Peking. The day the Tibetan mission left for Peking, the Chinese liberation army marched into Tibet.

In November, 1949, our Prime Minister declared in a Press Conference in England that India recognises Chinese suzerainty on Tibet. Two days after, the Chinese Government declared the liberation of Tibet by 1950. So, the liberation of Tibet has taken place and we have seen the suzerainty in action in the killing of 80,000 Lamas, indoctrination and naming Lord Budha as a reactionary. Having brought 'all quiet in Tibetan front', the Chinese are now indulging in violation of the Indian border. I may be permitted to mention here, Sir, that the then Chairman Mao Tse Tung, in one of his communications to Shri Ranadive, the then Secretary of the Communist Party of India, wrote that the Chinese liberation forces are always ready to liberate the people of India. This was in the year 1948, and now in the year 1959 we have seen what is going on in our Himalaya borders.

Concluding my speech, I would like to state that we know Chinese are a great nation of 600 million of people against ours of 400 million. They have an army of 2.8 million against ours of .4 million; of course, I stand to be corrected. Chinese are, therefore, militarily superior to us. But, Sir, as our Prime Minister has said on many occasions, in these days of scientific warfare and nuclear weapons, supremacy in number will not matter. If in going to defend our borders we are to get ourselves involved in a war with China, let us not fall back, though we know very well that such a war at the present moment will not be confined to China and India alone; it will be a global war, and a global war of today means

destruction of the world. But, then, it will yield place to the birth of a new world. Then where is the fear? We will all die together, and that will be dying for truth, dying for non-violence and dying for Panch-sheel.

With these words I want to express my feeling and that of the people of my constituency and thereby I want to strengthen the hands of our Prime Minister. Let him go ahead in the path he has laid and principles he has followed, with the great teachings that he has received from his great Guru in mind, fearlessly and fearfully, not only until there is peace in the Himalayan region but also in the world at large. Victory will be ours.

श्री अग्रहायण सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बार फिर इस सदन में श्रीर मुत्क में यह घोषणा उठाई जाने लगी है कि प्रधान मन्त्री के हाथ मजबूत किये जायें। किस काम के लिये प्रधान मन्त्री के हाथ मजबूत किये जायें, यह कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्यों ने स्पष्ट नहीं किया है। हमें तो लगता है कि प्रधान मन्त्री के हाथ वैसे ही काफ़ी मजबूत हैं, कम से कम उन लोगों के लिये, जो मुत्क में उनके खिलाफ़, या उनकी नीति के खिलाफ़, कुछ करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन जो विदेश के लोग हमारे देश की सुरक्षा के खिलाफ़ कुछ करना चाहते हैं, हमारी सुरक्षा का उत्तम बन करना चाहते हैं, उनके खिलाफ़ तो वाकई उनके हाथ कुछ कमजोर लगते हैं और जब उन हाथों को मजबूत करने का सवाल उठता है, तो इस सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मन्त्री की जो नीति रही है उस पर विवेचन करना पड़ेगा। आखिर आज चीन की तरफ़ से जो कुछ हो रहा है, उसके पीछे एक इतिहास है और वह इतिहास यह है कि हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री ने जान-बूझ कर तिब्बत की आजादी की हत्या की, जिसका एक नतीजा आज यह है कि हमारे श्रीर चीन के बीच में जो एक मुत्क बीवार की तरह खड़ा था, उसको हटा देने के बाद ६५ करोड़

[श्री बजरत्न सिंह]

का इतना बड़ा मुल्क हमारी २६०० मील की सीमा पर आ जाता है, लेकिन फिर भी नीति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है। कम से कम जो उन को खुश करने की नीति थी, जिसको एपीएमेंट की पालिसी कहा जाता है, उसमें कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है। जहां तक मुल्क की सुरक्षा का सवाल है, देश की रक्षा का सवाल है, हम कहना चाहते हैं कि हमें "जननी जन्म भूमिश्च स्वर्गादपि गरीयसी" भाव रहना चाहिये। हर एक हिन्दुस्तानी को—उन को छोड़ कर, जो हिन्दुस्तान में अपनी जड़ें नहीं मानते हैं—हिन्दुस्तान प्यारा होगा और उसकी रक्षा के लिये वह सदा तत्पर रहेगा। हो सकता है कि हमारे आपस में मतभेद हों, लेकिन इस देश की रक्षा के लिये देश के हर एक नागरिक को कुर्बानी करने के लिये तैयार रहना पड़ेगा। कम से कम हम तैयार हैं। लेकिन प्रश्न तो यह उठता है कि किस के लिये हाथ मजबूत किये जायें। हम देखते हैं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि हम एक मुडुल भाषा का प्रयोग करें—एक मीठी भाषा का प्रयोग करें। मीठी भाषा के प्रयोग में हमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं है, लेकिन अगर दोनों ब्लाइट पेजमें में छपे दानों तरफ के पत्रों और प्रधान मंत्री के आखिरी पत्र को पढ़ा जाये, तो पता लगेगा कि चीन की तरफ से कुछ मूल बातें कही गई हैं, लेकिन हमारी तरफ से बहुत ही अस्पष्ट बंग से बात कही गई—ऐसे तरीके से कही गई, जो कि स्पष्ट नहीं थी। कभी यह नहीं कहा गया कि हमारा सीमान्त, हमारी हद यहां पर है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से कि जब तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में चीन से एपीएमेंट हुआ उस वक्त ही इस प्रश्न को क्यों नहीं साफ कर लिया गया। इतने साल गुजर गए और सरकार की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि पीटी फ्रन्टियर डिस्प्यूट्स हैं। सरकार के विभाग में ये पीटी फ्रन्टियर डिस्प्यूट्स हैं, लेकिन उन के विभाग में ये पीटी फ्रन्टियर डिस्प्यूट्स नहीं हैं। यह हजारों मील का इलाका है जिस को वे कब्जे में लेना चाहते हैं। इस में जल्दी से जल्दी कोसिज करनी चाहिए थी। कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्यों की तरफ जिन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ मजबूत करने का नारा उठाया है, यह बार बार कहा गया है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने पार्लियामेंट से कितनी रहस्य को छिपाया नहीं है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सिंधिकांग-तिब्बत रोड सितम्बर, १९५७ में बनी और उस के बनने की सूचना हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को मिली और उस के बारे में इनफार्मल नोट भेजा गया १८ अक्टूबर, १९५८ को। अर्थात् एक साल के बाद नोट जाता है और उस के बाद हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट को उस के बारे में बताने के लिए एक साल और लग गया। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस से ज्यादा छिपाने की और क्या बात हो सकती है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में सारी की सारी नीति गलत रही है। जहां तक हमारी मूल नीति नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी का सम्बन्ध है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह सही है, लेकिन उस से और आगे जाना चाहिए था। यही नहीं कि कभी एक ब्लाक के साथ जुड़ गए और कभी दूसरे ब्लाक के साथ—कभी अमरीकन ब्लाक के साथ जुड़ गए और कभी चाइनीज, रशियन ब्लाक के साथ जुड़ गए। इस तरह से हमने अपनी नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी खलाई। हमें दुनिया में एक तृतीय शक्ति का निर्माण करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए थी। हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री के लिए यह एक सुझाव था। उन के हाथ काफ़ी मजबूत थे—कम से कम कांग्रेस पार्टी में उन के हाथ बहुत मजबूत थे। यह दूसरी बात है कि डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर बम्बई में दो हजार की मीटिंग में भाषण दें और यहां यह कहें कि एक साल का कब्जा था और इस तरह दूसरा प्राइम मिनिस्टर बनने की कोशिश की जाये।

श्री कालिका सिंह (प्रायमगढ़) : जैसे माननीय सदस्य ने कल पचास हजार कहा था ।

श्री बृजराज सिंह : उस के लिए तो सरकार का इन्फॉर्मेशन डिपार्टमेंट मौजूद है, कांग्रेस पार्टी मौजूद है, सरकार की पुलिस मौजूद है । मैं उस प्रश्न में भ्रम नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ ।

मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक हाथों को मजबूत करने का सवाल है, उन को कमजोर कौन कर रहा है । आज स्थिति यह है कि देश के एक निरीह नागरिक को देश के ही एक हिस्से में जाने से रोक दिया जाता है । डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया आज नेफा में नहीं जा सकते हैं । कोई और नहीं जा सकता है । उन के लिए हाथ मजबूत रखे जाते हैं, लेकिन चीन के सामने हाथ जोड़े जाते हैं । हम हाथ जोड़ने के खिलाफ नहीं हैं, लेकिन जहाँ तक टेर्राटरी का सवाल है, उसको देने का सवाल है, हम उसके सख्त खिलाफ हैं । श्री डिकेंस मिनिस्टर महोदय ने कहा कि हमारी सीमा डीलिमिट तो हुई है, लेकिन उस की डेली-निएशन नहीं हुई, उस की हदबन्दी नहीं हुई, लेकिन अगर उस की हदबन्दी करनी है, तो क्या उसके लिए प्रधान मंत्री महोदय को आवश्यकता पड़ जाती है कि नौ हजार वर्ग मील के क्षेत्र को डीमिलिटराइज्ड ज़ोन बना दिया जाये, जिस से न उन के चंकपोस्ट होंगे और न हमारे होंगे । मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि हिन्दुस्तान लड़ाई चाहता है, या उस का कोई नागरिक लड़ाई चाहता है । हम एक शान्तिप्रिय देश हैं । हम शान्ति चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम कबर की शान्ति नहीं चाहते हैं, जिस से देश के एक हिस्से पर किसी विदेशी शक्ति काबिज बनी रहे ।

जहाँ तक डेप्लायमेंट आफ फोर्सिज का सवाल है, हमें यह देख कर ताज़ुब हुआ कि श्री डिकेंस मिनिस्टर ने अपने भाषण

में कुछ ऐसी चर्चाएँ कर दीं, जिन से डिफेंस के सम्बन्ध में कुछ ऐसी बातों का पता लगता है, जो कि सम्भवतः नहीं कही जानी चाहिए थीं । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अब समय आ गया है, जब हमें यह देखना पड़ेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की नीति में क्या मूल गलतियाँ हैं और क्या उन गलतियों को सुधारा जा सकता है या नहीं । आज हम जिस नतीजे पर पहुँचे हैं, वह उन मूल गलतियों की वजह से पहुँचे हैं । अगर हम उन गलतियों को नहीं सुधारते हैं, तो बार बार कहना कि प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ मजबूत करो कोई अर्थ नहीं रखता है और उम से काम बनने वाला नहीं है । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक देश की सुरक्षा का सवाल होगा, चाहे प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ हों और चाहे किसी और के हाथ हों, चाहे उस से हमारा कितना ही मत-भेद हो, हम उन हाथों को लोहे का हाथ बनायेंगे और उन को ऐसा मजबूत करेंगे कि हमारे देश की तरफ कोई देख भी न सके, चाहे दूसरी बातों में हमारा उम से सहयोग हो या न हो । प्रश्न यह है कि क्या हमारे हिमालयन बाडर को रखा करने की, जिस में लद्दाख और नेफा आते हैं, सिक्किम और भूटान आते हैं और एक हद तक नेपाल भी आता है—क्योंकि वह एक स्वतंत्र मुल्क है और हम उस की विदेश नीति में दखल नहीं देंगे—उसको मजबूत बनाने की, वहाँ की जनता को ऊंचा उठाने की, उसका प्राधुनिककरण करने की कोशिश की गई है । कोई कोशिश नहीं की गई है । नेफा का क्षेत्र आज भी ऐसा है, जहाँ हिन्दुस्तान की दूसरी जनता नहीं जा सकती है । किस तरह हम मुल्क को मजबूत बना सकते हैं ? नेफा में हमारे बाडर विदेशी बैठे रहे, लेकिन हम नहीं जा सकते । हमारी इस नीति में पूरा परिवर्तन होना चाहिए । उस बाडर को मजबूत बनाने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि वहाँ के रहने वालों को अपने साथ मिलाने की पालिसी अपनाई जाये, ऐसी व्यवस्था की जाये कि उत्तरी सीमान्त के सारे के सारे

[श्री बजरंग सिंह]

क्षेत्र की जनता को संतुष्ट किया जाये, उन की जरूरतों को पूरा करने की कोशिश की जाये, उन का आधुनिकीकरण किया जाये, सबके बनाई जायें, शिक्षा का प्रसार किया जाये और इस तरह उन को इस लायक बनाया जाये कि वे महसूस कर सकें कि वे किसी तरह भी हिन्दुस्तान से अलग कटे हुए नहीं हैं, वे हिन्दुस्तान के अभिन्न अंग हैं और उन की रक्षा के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की दूसरी जनता तैयार है। मैं बड़े अफसोस के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने आज तक की अपनी नीति से इस काम में बहुत बुरी तरह विफलता पाई है और आज उस विफलता को छिपाने के लिए दूसरी बातें कही जाती हैं, लेकिन उन से कोई काम बनने वाला नहीं है। जब हाथ मजबूत करने की बात कही जाये, तो अपनी नीति को भी दुबस्त किया जाये। लेकिन नीति को दुबस्त करने के ये मानी कतई नहीं हैं कि हम किसी ब्लाक के साथ मिल जायें। जो लोग कहते हैं कि हम अमरीकन ब्लाक के साथ मिल जायें या किसी और ब्लाक के साथ मिल जायें, मैं मानता हूँ कि वे गलती करते हैं। उस से देश का भला नहीं होने वाला है। हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास बताता है कि जब भी हम ने दूसरों की फौजों की मदद लेने की कोशिश की, हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी खतरों में पड़ गई। हम को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना पड़ेगा और इस प्रकार देश की रक्षा करने की कोशिश करनी होगी। लेकिन अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होने के लिए भी एक नीति की जरूरत होगी। मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रश्न से हमारी बुद्धि-नीति का प्रश्न भी जुड़ा हुआ है। जहाँ तक गृह-नीति की विफलता का प्रश्न है, इस समय मैं उस में नहीं जाऊंगा लेकिन उस की विफलता और हमारी सीमान्त सम्बन्धी नीति की विफलता के सीधे परिणाम यह हैं कि हमारे बार्डर पर विदेशी मौजूद

हैं और हम उन को हटा नहीं सकते हैं। जहाँ तक उन को शक्ति से हटाने का प्रश्न है, हम यह नहीं कहते कि हमें अपनी तरफ से शक्ति का इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए। बात-चीत जरूर की जानी चाहिए, लेकिन उस बात-चीत का एक आधार जरूर हो।

आज हम देखते हैं कि उत्तर हमारा कुछ बदलता जा रहा है। पहले हमारा स्टैंड यह था कि एक दो मील इलाके को इधर उधर करने की बातचीत हो सकती है, एक दो मील इधर उधर हटा जा सकता है। लेकिन अब हम आगे बढ़ गए हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की बढ़ा चढ़ी की बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। बार बार यह भी कहा जाता है कि एक प्राय घटना की वजह से जो किंगडम्वर्ड में हो गई है, चीन का दृष्टिकोण बदल गया है। इस तरह की बात फार फाम हिस्टरी है। जो चीन की हिस्टरी है, उसका इस तरह से अध्ययन सही अध्ययन नहीं हो सकता है और न है। एक प्राय इस तरह की घटना से, एक प्राय इस तरह के इंसिडेंट में विचार नहीं बदला करते हैं, उसके लिए तो पूरी की पूरी परम्परा होती है, पूरी की पूरी पृष्ठभूमि होती है, बैकग्राउंड होती है, और उन्हीं को सर्वापरि मान कर चला जाता है। इस वास्ते मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह उधर ध्यान दें। उनकी जो बैकग्राउंड है, वह एक्सपेंशनिस्ट है, विस्तारवादी है। हमारी विस्तारवादी नीति नहीं है और हम उनकी विस्तारवादी नीति को चलने नहीं दे सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम लद्दाख की नौ हजार मील के क्षम को डिमिलिटराइज करने के और उसके बारे में फिर से बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार हो गए हैं तब फिर बातचीत का विस्तार भी होना चाहिए, उसका क्षेत्र भी बढ़ना चाहिए। अब सबाल यह पैदा होता है कि वह क्षेत्र किस प्रकार से बढ़े। मैं

चाहता हूँ कि बातचीत में यह प्राए कि तिब्बत सवियों से आजाद रहा है, बीच बीच में इस तरह की बात हुई हो सकती है कि चीन का कभी कभी उसके साथ सम्बन्ध रहा हो, चीन की कभी कभी उस पर सुजुरेनटी रही हो लेकिन तिब्बत की भी सुजुरेनटी चीन पर, इतिहास में रखी है। चीन ने जो दावा तिब्बत पर किया है, उसको हमें बदलवाना होगा, उसकी उस नीति को बदलवाना होगा। तिब्बत स्वतंत्र रहे, हम उसे अपने साथ नहीं मिलाना चाहते हैं। तिब्बत की स्वतंत्रता का प्रयत्न किया जाए, चाहे यह बातचीत से ही हो। मैं नहीं कहता कि इसके लिए फौज भेज दें या लड़ाई शुरू कर दें, युद्ध की घोषणा कर दें। लेकिन अगर यह किसी तरह से सम्भव होता नहीं है तब फिर हमें हमारी जो पूर्वी सीमाएं हैं, उनके बारे में भी पुनर्विचार करना पड़ेगा कि क्या हम उसी सीमा को रख सकते हैं जिस को कि मैकमोहन रेखा कहा जाता है। चीन ने कहा है और हम भी कहना चाहते हैं कि मैकमोहन रेखा को साम्राज्यवादी तरीके से बनाया गया है। हमारी जनता की राय से उसे बनाया नहीं गया है, हमारी अपनी सरकार की सहमति से उसे बनाया नहीं गया है, इसे उस समय बनाया गया है जब हम आजाद नहीं थे। ऐसी हालत में हम उसे क्यों मानें। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि नैफा के सवाल पर हम फिर से विचार करें। तिब्बत की आजादी के लिए अगर चीन तैयार नहीं होता है बातचीत के जरिए तो हम इसके लिए भी तैयार हों कि जहां मानसरोवर और कैलाश हैं, जहां से सैंगपो नदी बलती है, कम से कम उस हिस्से को जिसकी परम्परायें, जिस की संस्कृति, जिस की भाषा, जिसका इतिहास हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है उसको हम डिमांड करें, उसकी हम मांग करें और कहें कि उत्तर पूर्वी मैकमोहन रेखा नहीं है बल्कि सैचपो नदी है, ब्रह्मपुत्र रिबर है। इन इलाकों की मांग करना कोई माझाई

करना नहीं है। इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम वहां अपनी फौजें तैनात कर दें या वहां हम लड़ाई शुरू कर दें। मैं मानता हूँ कि लड़ाई हमारे लिए हानिकार चीज होगी, उससे हमारे देश को कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। हमारा मुल्क पिछड़ा हुआ मुल्क है, हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा विकास हो।

इस संदर्भ में जो लोग कहते हैं कि हम अपनी पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं का सारा रूपया अपने फंडियस पर लगा दें, मैं उनसे सहमत नहीं हूँ। यह एक अच्छी बात नहीं होगी। लेकिन साथ साथ इस बात की भी ज़रूरत है कि देश में इस तरह का वातावरण तैयार किया जाए जिससे देश में उत्साह पैदा हो, जिससे लोग तैयार रहें अपने देश की रक्षा करने के लिए, अपनी आजादी की रक्षा करने के लिए। यह बहुत आवश्यक है। इस बास्ते में कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सीमा रेखा को तय करने के लिए हम चीनियों से कई घोर में समझता हूँ कि आज नहीं तो कल कभी न कभी वे इस बात के लिए तैयार हो जाएंगे। हमें शान्तिपूर्ण वार्ता चला कर उन्हें इसके लिए तैयार करना होगा, अपनी सीमा तय करवाने के लिए बराबर प्रयत्न करना होगा।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि वह अन-इनहेबिटिड एरिया है, रहने लायक नहीं है, उसमें आबादी नहीं है। इसके साथ ही साथ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री देश में एकता स्थापित करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। लेकिन यह कह कर कि वह अन-इनहेबिटिड एरिया है वह सेना के हाथ कमजोर करने की कोशिश करते हैं। वह हमारे लिए अन-इनहेबिटिड एरिया है, हमारे लिए वहां आबादी नहीं है लेकिन चीनियों के लिए नहीं है, इसके क्या मानी हैं।

अन्त में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें कोई निश्चित नीति अपनानी होगी। मैं नहीं कहता कि कोई लड़ाई की तैयारी हो। हमें चाहिए कि हम बास्त-

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

चीत के जरिये इस मसले को हल करें। नान-एलाइनमेंट की जो पालिसी है उसको छोड़ने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। उसमें और मजबूती लाने की आवश्यकता है। तीसरी शक्ति निर्माण करने की आवश्यकता है जिससे राक्षसी ब्लाकों का सामना किया जा सके, उनके खिलाफ खड़ा रहा जा सके, अपनी तटस्थता की नीति को कायम रख सकें। जब हम इस तरह की नीति पर चलेंगे तभी हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की रक्षा होगी और हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी बरकरार रह सकेगी और विश्व में शान्ति रह सकेगी।

श्री बाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तरी सीमा पर चीनी आक्रमण के फलस्वरूप देश में राष्ट्रीय संकट उत्पन्न हो गया है। आवश्यक है कि इस संकट के निराकरण के लिए राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से विचार हो। लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि कल प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कुछ ऐसी बातें कहीं जिन से इस प्रश्न के ऊपर देश में जो राष्ट्रीय एकता उत्पन्न हो रही थी उसको अनजाने में ही ठेस पहुंची है। देश में कोई दल ऐसा नहीं है जो इस राष्ट्रीय संकट का अपनी पार्टी के लाभ के लिए उपयोग करना चाहता हो।

लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार से जो हमारे मतभेद हैं, प्रामाणिक मतभेद हैं, उन्हें हम बलपूर्वक देश के सामने रखेंगे और मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से आग्रह करूंगा कि उन मतभेदों के आधार पर वह यह न समझे कि हम इस राष्ट्रीय संकट का पार्टी के लाभ के लिए उपयोग करना चाहते हैं।

कल उन्होंने माटले क्राउड जिसे कहा उस माटले क्राउड ने जब केन्द्रीय सरकार ने केरल में कम्युनिस्टों के शासन को हटाया तब भी प्रधान मंत्री जी का समर्थन किया था। उस समय तो उन्होंने हमें माटले क्राउड नहीं कहा। उस समय अगर हमारा समर्थन ठीक था तो आज हमारी आलोचना भी ठीक है और उन्हें शान्ति के साथ उस पर विचार

करना चाहिए। हमने जब केरल में केन्द्रीय सरकार की कार्रवाई का समर्थन किया तो कम्युनिस्टों ने हमारे ऊपर आरोप लगाया था कि हम पार्टीबन्दी से विचार करते हैं। लेकिन हमारे सामने पार्टी का सवाल नहीं था। केरल में लोकतंत्र पर संकट था, इसलिए आपस के मतभेदों को भुलाकर हम उस संकट के विरुद्ध खड़े हुए। और चीनी आक्रमण के कारण आज देश पर संकट है इसलिए हम आपस के मतभेद भुला कर खड़े हुए हैं।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि हमें ऐसे मामलों में एक आवाज से बोलना चाहिए। मुझे अफसोस है कि जब हम एक आवाज से बोलने को कोशिश करते हैं तो वह नाराज हो जाते हैं। मैं नहीं समझ सका हूँ कि वह कल क्यों नाराज हो गए। क्या इसलिए नाराज हो गए.....

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं बिल्कुल नाराज नहीं हुआ।

श्री बाजपेयी : मुझे यह जानकर बड़ी खुशी है कि आप नाराज नहीं हुए। लेकिन हम चाहेंगे कि जो अब हमारा दृष्टिकोण है उस पर आप विचार करें।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि वह इस संसद् की राय जानना चाहते हैं। इस संसद् से निर्देश चाहते हैं। मुझे उनसे एक शिकायत है। मि० चाऊ एन-लाई का पत्र ७ नवम्बर को आया और उसका जवाब दिया गया १६ नवम्बर को और १६ नवम्बर से ही लोक सभा की बैठक आरम्भ हुई। अगर वह संसद् का विचार जानना चाहते थे मि० चाऊ एन-लाई के मुझावों के बारे में तो वह जवाब दो दिन बाद भी भेज सकते थे। अगर उनके देहरादून जाने के कारण दो दिन बाद उत्तर जा सकता है तो लोक सभा की बैठक के कारण भी दो दिन बाद उत्तर जा सकता

था। उस दिन जब हमने एडजोर्नमेंट मोशन मूव किए तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने कहा मैंने उत्तर भेज दिया है, जब वह पहुंच जाएगा तब विचार किया जाएगा। मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर लोक सभा को उसी दिन चीनी प्रधान मंत्री के सुझावों पर विचार करने का अवसर दिया जाता तो अपने पत्र में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो आल्टरनेटिव प्रोपोज़ल्स रखी हैं उनका रूप कुछ दूसरा होता। आज तक हमारी सरकार इस सीमा के विवाद में इस बात पर बल देती रही है कि हमारी सीमा तय है, यह संधियों से तय है, परम्परा से तय है, प्रयोग से तय है, और सीमा को नए सिरे से तय करने का कोई सवाल पैदा नहीं होता। सारे देश ने सरकार के इस मत का समर्थन किया है। प्रधान मंत्री जी इस बात पर भी बल देते आ रहे हैं कि हम तब तक कोई बात नहीं करेंगे जब तक कि भारत की भूमि पर चीनी आक्रमण कायम है। देश ने इसका भी समर्थन किया है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह भी कहा है कि समझौते की बात हो सकती है अगर वह छोटे मोट मामलों के बारे में ही हो सकती है, सारी सीमा को नए सिरे से विवाद का विषय नहीं बनाया जा सकता। इसको भी माना गया है। लेकिन मुझे शिकायत है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो नई चिट्ठी लिखी है उसमें इस सिद्धान्त से जरा नीचे वह उतर कर चले आए हैं। अब उन्होंने मान लिया है कि अगर चीनी सेनाएं हमारी भूमि से हट जाएं तो हम भी अपनी भूमि में अपने आदमी नहीं भेजेंगे। ऐसा क्यों माना गया है। अपनी भूमि में हम अपने आदमी क्यों न भेजें? क्या यह चीन को आक्रमण शुरू करने के लिए कीमत दी जा रही है? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह गलत बात है, देश की सार्वभौम सत्ता के खिलाफ है। चीनी आक्रमण के विरुद्ध अगर दृढ़ता की नीति नहीं अपनाई गई तो फिर चीनियों को हमारे साथ सही व्यवहार करने के लिये विवश नहीं किया जा सकता। चीन के आक्रमण की भी

एक योजना दिखाई देती है। उन्हें छुट्टे पुट हमले कह कर नहीं टाला जा सकता। चीन की आकांक्षा विस्तारवादी है। मुझे खेद है कि हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री ने अभी कांग्रेस पार्टी की बैठक में कहा कि चीन से हमारे २००० साल के पुराने मित्रता के सम्बन्ध थे। लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि चीन तो शुरू से विस्तारवादी रहा है। किस की बात पर विश्वास किया जाय यह समझ में नहीं आता। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस चीन से हमारे २,००० वर्ष के सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध थे वह चीन मर गया, वह चीन समाप्त हो गया, जिस चीन को हमारे उपदेशक बौद्ध भगवान बुद्ध का सन्देश ले कर गये थे उस चीन को कम्प्यूनिस्टों ने खत्म कर दिया। जहां से ह्वैन्सांग और फाहियान आये थे मित्रता का सन्देश ले कर, वह चीन मर गया और उस चीन की चिता भस्म के ऊपर एक नया चीन खड़ा है, साम्राज्यवादी चीन खड़ा है, विस्तारवादी चीन खड़ा है। पिछले वर्षों में चीन ने अपनी सीमा कितनी बढ़ाई है इस का हमें विचार करना चाहिये। जो मंचूरिया १९११ तक चीन पर राज्य करता था आज कहीं उस का नाम निशान तक बाकी नहीं है। वह चीन का उत्तर पूर्वी भाग भर रह गया है। जो अभी तुर्किस्तान था वह सिकियांग बन गया है। इनर मंगोलिया अपना अस्तित्व खो बैठा है। धर्मप्राण तिब्बत भी चीन की सर्वग्रासी क्षुधा का शिकार हो चुका है। चीन का अपना भू भाग केवल १४ लाख वर्ग मील है, किन्तु मंचूरिया, इनर मंगोलिया, कांसू, चिबाई, सिकियांग तथा तिब्बत की २२ लाख वर्ग मील भूमि पर चीन ने अपना अधिकार जमा लिया है। अब उसकी गृद्ध दृष्टि भारत की ४८ हजार वर्ग मील भूमि पर लगी है।

एक शरणार्थी लामा ने यह सनसनी पूर्ण रहस्योद्घाटन किया है कि चीनी यह प्रचार कर रहे हैं, कि तिब्बत चीन के हाथ की हथेली है और लद्दाख, भूटान, सिक्किम, नेपाल और आसाम उस की पांच उंगलियाँ

[श्री बाजपे

हैं। स्पष्ट है कि यदि लद्दाख और लॉन्ग में चीन का आक्रमणारम्भ कार्रवाइयों का शीघ्र प्रति उत्तर नहीं दिया गया तो फिर चीन को बढ़ावा मिलेगा और हमारी सुरक्षा संकट में पड़ जायेगी।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अलबार वालों से बोलते हुए कहीं पर कहा कि चीन ने जो आक्सार्ड-चिन की सड़क बनाई है अगर वह असैनिक काम के लिये प्रयोग में लाई जाय तो हम उस की इजाजत देंगे। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सड़क पर जो भारत का खेम है उस का क्या होगा? और सड़क सैनिक काम के लिये प्रयोग में लाई जा रही है या असैनिक काम के लिये प्रयोग में लाई जा रही है इस का निर्णय कैसे होगा? कौन करेगा? आज तो टोटल वार होती है। यह कहना कि यह असैनिक काम है या सैनिक, ऐसा कोई भेद करना सम्भव नहीं।

16 hrs.

मैं ने एबेत पत्र को बहुत ध्यान से पढ़ा है। मैं ने उस में इस प्रश्न का उत्तर सौजने की कोशिश की है कि क्या चीन सचमुच भारत से मैत्री चाहता है। और मुझे उत्तर मिला है कि नहीं। चीन भारत से मैत्री नहीं चाहता। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में सदन का ध्यान १६ मई, १९५६ को चीन के दूतावास द्वारा हमारे फारेन सेक्रेटरी को दिये गये एक नोट की तरफ आँचना चाहूँगा। उस में लिखा है :
China will not be so foolish as to antagonise the United States in the east and again to antagonise India in the west. We cannot have two centres of attention, nor can we take friends for foe. This is our State policy.

माने क्या क्या है :

..... Friends, it seems to us that you too cannot have two fronts. Is it not so? If it is, here then lies the meeting point of our two sides.

चीन ने यह नहीं कहा कि शांति आवश्यक है विश्व के लिए। शांति आवश्यक है १०० करोड़ जनता के विकास के लिये, शांति आवश्यक है भारत और चीन की प्रगति के लिये। चीन के लिये भारत की शांति रणनीति का एक हिस्सा है। क्योंकि चीन दो मोर्चों पर लड़ना नहीं चाहता इस लिये भारत से मित्रता चाहता है और हमें भी समझाने की कोशिश कर रहा है कि क्योंकि भारत दो मोर्चों पर नहीं लड़ सकता इस लिये तुम हमारे साथ मैत्री रखो, यह तुम्हारे फायदे की बात है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूँगा कि क्या यह भारत और चीन की मैत्री का रचनात्मक, भावात्मक और विधात्मक आधार है? उन के लिये मित्रता एक अवसर की चीज है। सन १९५४ में उन्होंने जो पंचशील का समझौता किया, सहप्रतिस्त्व का नारा लगाया, उस का एक ही उद्देश्य था कि हम तिब्बत के मामले में दखल न दें तथा तिब्बत की आजादी को समाप्त हो जाने दें। और शायद हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने समझा कि अगर तिब्बत की बलि चढ़ा दी गई तो चीनी दैत्य की भूल मिट जायेगी और हमारे ऊपर कोई संकट नहीं आयेगा। मगर उन्होंने इतिहास की सीख को भुला दिया। आक्रमण के सामने घुटने टेकने से आक्रामक की भूल मिटती नहीं है, और भी बढ़ जाती है। शायद तिब्बत के विनाश का यह परिणाम हुआ कि आज हमारी सीमायें चीन के द्वारा आक्रमित की जा रही है। भारत के मान मर्यादा को मिट्टी में मिला कर जो लोग चीनी गणराज्य विकास उत्सव में भाग लेने के लिये पीकिंग गये वे मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या थॉम्सों में हमारे ट्रेड एजेंट के विरुद्ध जो ब्यबहार किया जा रहा है, अमानवीय ब्यबहार किया जा रहा है, अपमानजनक ब्यबहार किया जा रहा है, वह चीन का भारत के प्रति मित्रता का सबूत बिकाना है? एक और तो वह अपने कल के सभ्य अमेरिका से ब्यपार के सम्बन्धों को धाँसू कर रहा है और

दूसरी ओर चीन तिब्बत के हमारे पुराने व्यापार सम्बन्ध को हंसिये से काट कर उस पर हथौड़े की चोट कर रहा है। यह इस बात का परिचायक है कि चीन हमारे साथ मैत्री नहीं चाहता। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इस संकट का सामना करने के लिये हमें इस संकट की वास्तविकता को समझना चाहिये। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने २५ अगस्त, १९५६ को केरल सम्बन्धी विवाद में भाषण करते हुए कहा था कि अगर भारत की जनता कभी कम्युनिस्ट हो गई तो भारत भारत नहीं रहेगा। यही बात चीन पर भी लागू होती है। चीन पुराना चीन नहीं है। हमारे सामने साम्राज्यवादी का रूप खड़ा है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी इतिहास के जानकार हैं, उन्होंने इतिहास लिखा है, वह इतिहास बना रहे हैं और आगे आने वाला इतिहास गौरव के साथ उन का उल्लेख करेगा। लेकिन चीन विस्तारवादी है क्या इस का रहस्योद्घाटन अभी हुआ है? क्या हम इस बात का पता दस साल पहले नहीं लगा सकते थे? क्या हम अपनी सीमा की रक्षा की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकते थे? मुझे यह खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हम ने असावधानी से काम लिया। हम ने अपनी शक्ति पर भरोसा करने के बजाय चीन की मित्रता पर ज्यादा भरोसा किया और आज हमें निराशा का सामना करना पड़ रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री ने भाषण दिया है। सुरक्षा मंत्री ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिन का इतिहास सन्देशजनक है, जिन का वर्तमान आचरण आपत्तिकारक है। न वे जनता में प्रिय हैं और न कांग्रेस पार्टी में उन को कोई साख है। स्वभाव से वह कम्युनिस्टों की तरफ झुके हुए हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस लिये वे प्रधान मंत्री की दोनों गुटों से अलग रहने की नीति को सही ढंग से कार्यान्वित नहीं कर सकते। प्रादेशिक सेना दिवस पर उन्होंने जो सन्देश दिया उस में एक विचित्र बात कही। उन्होंने कहा कि भारत बड़ी सेना न रखे क्योंकि बड़ी सेना रखना हमारी

मोरैलिटी के अनुसार नहीं है, बड़ी सेना हमारे लिये नैतिक नहीं है। अगर वह समझते हैं कि बड़ी सेना का रखना अनैतिक है तो उस बड़ी सेना का संचालन करना तो वह और बड़ा अनैतिक काम समझते होंगे। अगर सुरक्षा मंत्री कोई ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जो बड़ी सेना रखना अनैतिक समझते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि देश की सुरक्षा के लिये संकट है। अगर सचमुच वह इसे अनैतिक समझते हैं तो फिर उन्हें सुरक्षा मंत्री के पद से त्यागपत्र दे कर भारत साधु समाज में सम्मिलित होना चाहिये और नैतिक जागरण का काम अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये। बड़ी सेना रखना कोई अनैतिक काम नहीं है। जब दुश्मन हमारी सीमाओं को खटखटा रहा है तब देश में बड़ी सेना रखना अनैतिक काम है और हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री इस के दोषी हैं।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि जो भी बातें हैं साफ साफ कही जायें। मैं सुरक्षा मंत्री से एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता था, मगर अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने इजाजत नहीं दी। मेरा प्रश्न यह था कि जिस दिन लोक सभा में जनरल यिमेंया के त्यागपत्र के ऊपर यहां बवंडर खड़ा हुआ और दूसरे दिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के हस्तक्षेप से वह बवंडर दब गया, क्या यह बात सही है कि उस दिन शाम को हमारी सेना के एक कर्नल ने जा कर सुरक्षा मंत्री के बंगले पर उन की विजय के लिये उन को बधाई दी थी?

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज रक्षा मंत्री के खिलाफ अगर देश में भावना है तो उसके मूल में यह आशंका है कि सुरक्षा मंत्री हमारी डिफेंस फोर्सों में अपने प्रति निष्ठा रखने वाले अफसर तैयार कर रहे हैं। यह भी आशंका है कि सुरक्षा मंत्री ऐसी तैयारी कर रहे हैं कि जब प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू यहां पर नहीं होंगे तब अपने विश्वस्त अफसरों के आधार पर देश की सत्ता पर कब्जा कर लेंगे। हो सकता है कि यह आशंका गलत हूँ और मैं चाहूंगा कि यह गलत निकले, किन्तु यह आशंका है जरूर

[श्री वाकपेयी]

और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री इस घाशंका को यह कहकर न टालें कि मैं तो अभी ७० वर्ष का जवान हूँ। हम चाहते हैं कि उनकी उम्र बढ़े, मगर यह घाशंका है और इस घाशंका का निराकरण करना चाहिए। सुरक्षा मंत्री एक ईश्वरस्त व्यक्ति नहीं है और आज जब देश पर विदेशी आक्रमण हो रहा है इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि सुरक्षा मंत्रालय ऐसे व्यक्ति के हाथों में सौंपा जाए जो सीजर की पत्नी की तरह से सन्देश से परे हों और जो सारे देश को बड़े से बड़ा बलिदान करने के लिए प्रेरित कर सकें। यह काम हमारे वर्तमान सुरक्षा मंत्री नहीं कर सकते। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री व्यक्तिगत निश्चिन्ता को राष्ट्र के हित के मार्ग में बाधक नहीं बनने देंगे।

इस विवाद में विदेश नीति का प्रश्न भी खड़ा किया गया है। मैं नहीं समझता कि हम दोनों गुटों में से किसी से मिलें या न मिलें यह सवाल आज सदन के सामने है। आज जो हमारी सीमा पर आक्रमण हो रहे हैं उनसे विदेश नीति का कोई बड़ा सम्बन्ध नहीं है। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को छोड़कर सारा देश प्रधान मंत्री की इस नीति से सहमत है कि हमको किसी गुट में नहीं शामिल होना चाहिए। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का नाम मैंने इसलिए लिया कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी हमें सोवियत गुट में शामिल करने की हरदम कोशिश करती रहनी है। ये लोग जो किसी समय हमारी विदेश नीति के विरोधी रहे हैं आज उसके सबसे बड़े समर्थक बन गए हैं और जो सबसे बड़े समर्थक रहे हैं उनका प्रधान मंत्री विरोधी समझने लगे हैं। मैं इस बात को स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ कि कोई विवेकशील व्यक्ति यह नहीं चाहेगा कि हम किसी गुट के साथ मिल जाएँ। यह हमारे देश के हित में नहीं है। यह हमारे आत्म सम्मान के खिलाफ है कि हम किसी गुट में मिल जाएँ, किसी से सैनिक सहायता लें और कोई विदेशी फौज हमारी ज़मीन पर आ जाए।

इससे हमारी राष्ट्रीयता कमजोर होगी, और अखिर में तो हमें अपनी राष्ट्रीयता के आधार पर ही आगे बढ़ना होगा और अपनी रक्षा के लिए लड़ना होगा। इसलिए हमारे किसी से सैनिक मददगार करने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। हम किसी गुट में शामिल हों इसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन हम किसी गुट में शामिल हों या न हों, हमारे मन में एक विचार उत्पन्न होता है और देश की जनता प्रधान मंत्री से इस बात का जवाब चाहेगी। देश की जनता प्रधान मंत्री के अपेक्षा करती है कि इस आक्रमण को हटाया जाए और इसको हटाने के लिए शक्ति एकत्र की जाए, और अगर शक्ति नहीं है तो देश की शक्ति का आह्वान किया जाए और प्रधान मंत्री ही यह आह्वान करें तो देश उनका साथ देगा, मगर वह आह्वान आक्रमण का मुकाबला करने के लिए होना चाहिए चीनी आक्रमण के सामने घुटने टेकने के लिए नहीं होना चाहिए।

हम चाहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के हाथ मजबूत हों। सारा देश यह चाहता है। मतभेद का प्रश्न इसमें पैदा नहीं होता। लेकिन हमारे आत्म सम्मान की रक्षा होनी चाहिए, देश की सीमा की रक्षा होनी चाहिए। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूँगा कि अगर मिस्टर वाऊ एन-नाई ने उनके सुझावों को स्वीकार न किया तो सरकार क्या करेगी। वह उनके सुझावों को पूरी तरह से मारने में इसमें तो श्री नेहरू जी को भी शंका है क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने प्रेस क्लब में यह कहा था कि शायद वह बिल्कुल तो स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे लेकिन कुछ बातचीत चलती रहेगी। प्रधान मंत्री को यह शंका है और अगर यह शंका सही हो गयी तो सरकार क्या करेगी। चीन में हमारे सुझावों को न माना तब क्या होगा। अगर चीन यह घोषणा करे कि वह हमारे सुझावों को नहीं मारेंगा, और अगर समझौता वार्ता से भी समस्या हल न हुई तो क्या सैनिक कार्रवाई की जाएगी। जब अपनी भूमि की

साकारण से मुक्त करना चाहते हैं और इसलिए इस सम्बन्ध में देश प्रवान मंत्री से स्पष्ट उत्तर चाहता है। यही मेरा निवेदन है।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Mr. Speaker, during the last 7½ years I have often participated in debates on foreign policy but I cannot recall one occasion when a graver responsibility had been cast on this House. I say this because we have just listened to two very vehemently eloquent but completely misdirected speeches on the subject under discussion.

Shri Nath Pai: We shall now hear a third one.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: As far as we are concerned, we have already expressed ourselves in agreement generally and basically with the Prime Minister's foreign policy. The policy of non-alignment and co-existence which in the name of Panchsheel is redolent of India's history has won the plaudits of the world. I feel it is necessary on an occasion like this to reiterate it in this House because openly and even more, in varying disguises, voices have been raised here in Parliament and outside in the country asking not only for a re-appraisal of our foreign policy but for a basic change over in that policy. There is no getting away from it if we read the amendments of which notices have been given and which have been moved. Many of them seek to reverse the independent foreign policy of the Prime Minister and the principles of the Panchsheel and some of them, whom my old-time friend Shri Masani will readily recognise, have gone so far as to raise the slogan of a new foreign policy, a new Defence Minister and a new Prime Minister. (Interruptions). That is reported in the papers. I am not saying anything about Shri Masani. All that I say is that he would recognise this kind of expression.

I have noted to see here and outside the petty-minded man-hunt which has been conducted against the Defence Minister of this country. I have had occasion from time to time to express myself in disagreement with the Defence Minister. I recall even having said that I am not particularly fervent admirer of the Defence Minister. But today, when he spoke and made an uncommonly capable speech, I think he injected a great deal of sanity and seriousness into the discussion which has led into ways which I can only regret as extremely deplorable, by some people for whom I still have a modicum of respect. More than this man-hunt against the Defence Minister I have detested the not so courageous but perhaps more pernicious attack on the Prime Minister himself. I know the Prime Minister can look after himself, but we ought to have our say in regard to this matter.

I noticed in the *Eastern Economist*, a very influential journal, of the 20th November, the first editorial leader entitled "Jawaharlal Nehru". I am quoting the words. This is what it says:

"Since the Prime Minister has been so wrong on China and so reluctant to share his judgments and choose advisers outside his own immediate circle, the belief has grown that he is no longer capable of taking, what is conveniently left undefined as a strong line against China or a radically new line so far as foreign policy is concerned. Like every great man of our time he is in fact heavily handicapped by his own past".

That is a very recondite observation of the *Eastern Economist*.

This kind of propaganda has gone so far that I find in the *Economist Weekly* of Bombay, a very responsible journal which is by no means

sympathetic to Communism, a special article from which I quote. It is dated 14th November. This is what it says:

"Why this clamour for Nehru's overthrow? One can understand a District President of the Jan Sangh calling upon the Prime Minister to carry out military operations against the Chinese immediately or even to declare a war on China. But responsible leaders of the Opposition should not allow anger to get the better of reason".

I have listened, and I have had the mortification of having listened, to the speeches made on the floor of this House which really say good-bye to all reason.

As the leader of our party, Shri Dange, said yesterday, we welcome the proposals which have been made by the Prime Minister in his latest letter to Premier Chou En-lai of China. The Prime Minister has laid down an approach that is reasonable and honourable, and it is aimed above all at the avoidance of war and the kind of psychosis which is being readily exploited by certain elements in the country.

The test of a policy, particularly the policy of the Prime Minister in regard to foreign affairs, is in times such as these. There is no doubt that India-China relations have received a bad jolt, but that is exactly the reason why we should not lose our balance but put first things first and seek a reasonable and honourable solution as the Prime Minister has sought to do.

I recall how in 1952 and 1953 there was a call raised by some of our left parties as well as by the communal leaders for the application of sanctions—which is the same thing as war—on Pakistan. Even lately, over Tuktargram and other places where

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Pakistan had transgressed repeatedly and seriously into Indian territory, there was a demand for military action. In spite of our, I mean the Communist party's detestation of Pakistan's membership of the western war bloc we raised our voice most emphatically against it and we were of course slandered in the usual way as agents of Pakistan. The Prime Minister happily took a very correct and reasonable view and in spite of the recurring pinpricks, India pursued a dignified and, in the end, as far as we can see up to now, a largely successful policy in regard to this matter.

Surely the lessons to be drawn from these incidents which continued for a very long time and which have not been liquidated have to be applied as far as our relations with China are concerned. Much more stridently and dangerously now on this question has right reaction, assisted by all manner of people—we find representatives here as well as outside—raised its head at this present moment.

Acharya Kripalani spoke yesterday. Shri M. R. Masani and his Swatantrists on their own, I am afraid, are of very little account. But Acharya Kripalani who still has a certain following I expect in this country....

Shri Nath Pai: It is a substantial following (*Interruption*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: He said that the Prime Minister follows a policy of appeasement, an ugly word which we should pronounce after a great deal of very careful thought. He said that the Prime Minister follows a policy of appeasement. He said that the latest letter of the Prime Minister was wrong. He said that the Defence Minister should go. He said Pakistan's proposal of joint defence was welcome. He said, negotiations with China were no good, because the Chinese had never kept their word. If this is the sound diplomacy and

wisdom, which is to fall from the lips of a person like Acharya Kripalani, I am very sorry; but, that is their own business. All this adds up and the sum total is too ugly for words.

Even in the Congress ranks, I am very sorry I have to say this, there are dangerous symptoms. While the Prime Minister in his latest letter to Mr. Chou En-lai has said very clearly and rightly:

"I am always ready to meet and discuss with Your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore avenues of friendly settlement",

when the Prime Minister was writing this, the *de facto* leader of the Congress in my State of West Bengal, Shri Atulya Ghosh, was making a speech at Howrah near Calcutta. I am quoting from the editorial article in *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* of the 24th of this month, where there is a quotation from Shri Ghosh's speech, Shri Ghosh said:

"With China continuing her aggressive activities, no man of self-respect would entertain this proposal of a meeting between the Prime Ministers of India and China".

It makes no sense, but that is the kind of thing which goes on.

I can understand, if Shri Ghosh and some of his friends who appeared here yesterday, if they wish to have the head of the communists on a charger or that sort of thing, if you wish to do so, do it straight like Shri Masani or my good friend, Shri Anthony; he does it. Do it straight and go ahead with it and see the result. If the country throws us out we go; there is no point in our trying to cling to the country if the country does not want us. If you want to have the heads of the communists on a charger, proceed honestly and in a

straightforward manner, as some of these friends here are trying to do.

But even subterfuges work; they have a certain effect. That is why yesterday, I was very mortified to find the Prime Minister referring to a report, an unmitigated falsehood, about a communist-sponsored meeting and procession in Calcutta. The *Amrita Bazaar Patrika*, the Congress newspaper to which I referred a little while ago, reported this meeting and this procession, with this heading on the first page:

"Jyoti Basu, (who is the leader of the communist party in West Bengal) hails last note of Nenru".

On the seventh page, the speech of Shri Jyoti Basu, the communist leader, is reported in this Congress newspaper. It says:

"Shri Jyoti Basu has challenged the contention that the communists were not patriotic. He said, if—let it not happen—India was attacked by any power, he doubted whether those who were clamouring for war now would then stand by the side of the communists to defend the country".

This was the speech made by the leader of the communist party and this is the headline in a Congress newspaper.

Here is my friend, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, who said yesterday to the Prime Minister that she was actually present at the meeting and in the procession, and what happened was reported in this newspaper. I can quite understand the Prime Minister being very upset by what he was shown as having appeared in the *Indian Express*. Is it that amongst the Prime Minister's entourage there are people who show him the *Indian Express* when it contains something damaging to the communists, but they

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

do not show things which appear even in one of the leading newspapers in the country? If inside the Prime Minister's entourage there is this kind of discrimination in regard to the supply of information to the Prime Minister, then surely it is a very bad sign and something ought to be done about it

I have heard some cheap jibes at the patriotism of the communists. Such jibes are vulgar, completely unworthy and completely useless. We are here not for the possession of any magic formula we have got to secure the support of the people. We are here because wherever we have worked, we are secure in the affections of the country. You may condemn Calcutta as a perverse city. But you know it is not so easy as all that to dismiss a whole phenomenon in our country. I have come to this House twice after having been elected. I did not bask in the sunshine of the support of the higher-up people in Delhi or elsewhere but twice I got exactly double the votes the Congress candidate got. I am sorry, I have to say this kind of thing, but reflections on our patriotism provoked me. I did not need such taunts to know what I feel, and what every Communist feels, in his bones, and that is that we love our people, that we love our emerald country which is crowned by the Himalayas and engirdled by the sea, and nothing that we hear by way of slander in this House or outside is going to deflect us from that patriotism. And it is because of our being impelled by patriotic motives of the highest water that in this time of crisis, when the cry has been raised for something like a war with China, when the cry has been raised for a complete change and reversal of the independent foreign policy of our country, we stand by the Prime Minister, whether he relishes it or not, and we say that we support him entirely, and we are going to vote in favour of the amendment

which has been given notice of and moved in this House by Shri Kasiwal.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ansar Harvani.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: May I say a few words? So far, Mathura has not got an opportunity to have its say.

Mr. Speaker: Mathura is far south of the Himalayas.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Mr. Speaker whenever a country is threatened with some foreign aggression, it is customary in every country that all the political parties forget their domestic differences and they unite for the defence of the country. But it has been a pathetic sight in this country that when this country is threatened with foreign aggression, the political parties in the opposition are taking revenge on the domestic differences. This morning I was glad when Shri Asoka Mehta made an appeal to the hon. Prime Minister that he should issue an appeal to the people to unite and rally and to get up. But his appeal has a different interpretation. While he makes his appeal on the floor of this House, the small processions that his party, in collaboration with the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra party, and in Delhi, has been taking in Bombay, has been taking out in other places, are photographed by the cameraman of the United States of America who have been showing these things on television and films in America to show that India is not united behind Jawaharlal Nehru. Today in this House, in this atmosphere, Shri Asoka Mehta made a different type of speech. But if the speeches of the leaders of the Jan Sangh, if the speeches of the leaders of the PSP outside this House, are to be believed, then we have to believe that our Prime Minister is completely sleeping. Then we have to believe that our Defence Minister is standing in front of the various passes in Himalayas

with garlands in his hands to garland the Chinese aggressor. Is that the way to create morale in this country? Is that the way to arouse the people, as Shri Asoka Mehta has been asking the Prime Minister here today? We have seen that ever since in Nagpur we adopted socialism as our creed, ever since the Nagpur session in which the Indian National Congress decided....

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Avadi. You seem to be too distant a Congressman.

Shri Ansar Harvani:to implement the socialistic pattern and socialist programme, the big businessmen in this country became jittery. It is a pathetic sight to read everyday in the newspapers owned by three of the big capitalists in this country screaming headlines that India is going to....

Shri Nath Pai: They contribute very substantially to the election fund of your party.

Shri Ansar Harvani: You also get their contribution.

Shri Nath Pai: Some of your Members are connected with those papers. We never do.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: Shri Haridas Mundra is one of the biggest shareholders in a publication of your party. The shares are owned by Richardson Cruddas, and you know.

Shri Nath Pai: I did not know that we owned shares in Richardson Cruddas.

Mr. Speaker: We are discussing the defence of this country, and not LIC.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Shri Sodhani plays host to one of the top leaders of P.S.P. whenever he visits Delhi.

As the hon. Defence Minister pointed out, when there are border incidents there are only two ways of settling it, either by conquest or by

negotiation. I will say that there are three alternatives. They are either surrender, or war or negotiation. As long as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is the leader of this country, is there any man or woman in the country who would believe that he is going to surrender? The man, who led us to the freedom of the country; the man who has fought for 50 years inch by inch the British aggressors; the man who threw out the mighty empire of the British from this country; the man who stood like a rock against all imperial designs will surrender to aggression against this country? When some of these big capitalists and some of these big financiers of this country used to ridicule him that he was not going to hobnob with Hitler and Mussolini, it was he who in company of Shri Krishna Menon, went and watched the activities of the international brigade in Spain. When some of our capitalists here were supplying war material to the forces of Mussolini, he stood for the freedom of Abyssinia. When during the war days many of our hon. friends here were making big capital, it was he who started the cry of 'Quit India' and went to jail and many of our friends, under his guidance, went to the gallows.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Not to the gallows.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Do you think that he would surrender to the border aggression? As long as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is our leader, as long as he is at the head of affairs, India can be and sure that surrender cannot take place. As far as war is concerned, if it is forced naturally anybody will go to it. But no country in the world, specially in the world of today will go to war willingly. If it is forced, it is a different thing. Therefore, the only alternative is negotiations and our great Prime Minister has in his own way started negotiations. We remember it very well that when he negotiated with

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

the British and Cropps came here and the Cabinet Mission came here, there were many hon. friends of that side of the House who ridiculed him, specially some of those who are in the PSP today. But we found that through those negotiations, Lord Mountbatten came and we succeeded in getting our freedom.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: And the partition of the country!

Shri Ansar Harvani: You helped in it.

So, when he has taken to the path of negotiations, it is the duty of every man and woman of this country to give full support to him. If we demonstrate to the world that we are not united, if we take out processions and if we hold demonstrations asking for the head of the hon. Defence Minister and tell people that people in this country are not united then negotiated terms will be very difficult to get. If China is assured that India to a man, woman and child is united behind Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, I am sure Mr. Chou En-lai will surrender his claims and will accept the claims of our Prime Minister.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: For the defence of the country we are all united.

पंडित ब्रजनारायण 'ब्रजेश' (शिवपुरी):

कृष्णम् वन्दे जगद्गुरु ।

माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रयत्न यहां देख रहा हूँ कि मेरे पीछे जितनी अच्छी बैरिंग होगी चाहिए उतनी न होने के कारण कल से मैं बोलने के लिए लटका हुआ हूँ। राजनीति में जब तक शक्ति नहीं होती है, ताकत नहीं होती, चाहे किसी भी प्रकार की शक्ति हो, चाहे वह धन की शक्ति हो, चाहे जन शक्ति हो, चाहे बुद्धि शक्ति हो और चाहे शस्त्र शक्ति हो, काम नहीं चल सकता है। बिना शक्ति के संसार में कोई भी लड़ा नहीं रह सकता है। मैं स्वयं अनुभव नहीं कर रहा हूँ आप भी देख रहे हैं।

हमने इस समय जिस नीति को अपनाया है, हमारे प्रधानमंत्री महोदय ने संसार के सामने जिस भावसंगी की उपस्थिति किया है, वह भावसंगी सौजन्यता का भावसंगी है और एक मले मनुष्य के द्वारा मले राष्ट्र के द्वारा जो कहा जा सकता है वह कहा गया है। परन्तु हमारे सामने सब से बड़ी दुःखद बात है कि जिन को हम यह बात कहते हैं उनके पास उतना परिष्कृत मस्तिष्क नहीं है, उतना सुदृढ़ हृदय नहीं है जो हमारी बात को वह समझ सकें। उनके पास शक्ति के कारण प्रमाद धारणा है और बाहर इस पायबन्द। जहां शक्ति की आवश्यकता भी होती है वहां शक्ति जब प्रविकता धारण कर लेती है तब वह शक्ति विष का कारण भी हो जाती है। अभी चार दिन नहीं हुए चीन को साम्यवादी बने हुए। उसके पास ताकत आई है रशिया के द्वारा। इसके कारण वह भंगड़ाई ले कर खड़ा हो गया है और भारत की पंचशील की नीति भारत के पंचशील के नारे के कारण, शान्त का नारा लगाने के कारण, उसको दुर्बल समझ कर उस पर पद-प्रहार कर रहा है। इसके विनाय और कुछ नहीं है। आप जानते हैं और यह स्पष्ट रूप से घोषित भी किया गया है कि जो बलि चढ़ाने वाले लोग हैं, देवी के सामने जो बलि चढ़ाते हैं, उनको हमने कभी नहीं देखा है कि किसी सिंह को पकड़ कर ले जाए और देवी के सामने उसकी बलि चढ़ा दें।

सिहम् नैव गजम् नैव, अश्वम् नैव च नैवम् ।

अजर पुत्रम् बलिम् वचात् देवीपि दुर्बल पातकः ॥

यह देव भी दुर्बल का ही घात करता है, दुर्बल का कोई साथी नहीं होता। सिंह कोई यदि बलि चढ़ाने के लिए ले जाए तो चार छः की पहले सिंह बलि चढ़ा देगा तब वहाँ उसकी बारी आएगी। इसलिए बकरिया को काब पकड़ कर बलि चढ़ाने के लिए ले जाते हैं।

भारतवर्ष ने सौजन्यता, सज्जनता, सहृदयता और महानता का संदेश संसार को दिया है। लेकिन जिन की भेड़िया मनोवृत्ति हो गई है, जो दूसरों को खा लेना चाहते हैं, पद-प्रहार करके हम को झुकाना चाहते हैं, हमको दबाना चाहते हैं, वैसे हम नहीं होने देंगे।

मैं इस बात को पूर्ण-रूपेण स्वीकार करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो आइडियोलोजी, जो आदर्श संसार के सामने रखा है, वह भारत-वर्ष की संस्कृति के अनुरूप है, भारत की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ाने वाला है और भारतवर्ष का जिस प्रकार का स्वरूप रहा है संसार के सामने, उमी को प्रदर्शित करने वाला है। लेकिन मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे सामने उनको रूट या तुष्ट करने का प्रश्न नहीं है, पुष्ट करने का अवश्य है। यदि वह पुष्ट रहेंगे तो तुष्ट अपने आप हो जाएंगे, रूट होने का प्रश्न तब नहीं रहता है। मैं यह बात भी मानता हूँ :

नचिव बंध गुरु तीन जो प्रिय बोलहि
भय आश ।

राज धर्म तन तीन कर होय वेग ही
नाश ॥

इस समय हमारे सामने राष्ट्र का प्रश्न है, इसलिए प्रियता और अप्रियता का प्रश्न नहीं है। मैं केवल इतना नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मिहावलोकन के रूप में कि जैसे सिंह चलता हुआ पीछे देखता है, वैसे ही मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि हमने इस नीति को कोई ४०-५० साल बगबर अपना कर देना है। हमने सब से प्रथम भारत में नारा लगाया "हिन्दू मुसलिम भाई भाई"। परिणाम यह हुआ कि पाकिस्तान बन गया। पाकिस्तान के निर्माण के बाद हम ने उस में कुछ और जोड़ दिया कि "हिन्दू मुसलिम और ईसाई आपस में सब भाई भाई"। तो यहाँ दबा दब क्रिश्चियन बनाये जा रहे हैं

और आज यहाँ राष्ट्रान्तर हो रहे हैं। उस के बाद हम ने दूसरी बात और जोड़ दी कि "हिन्दू मुसलिम चीनी ईसाई, आपस में सब भाई भाई" तो चीन हमारे ऊपर आ गया। मैं समझता हूँ कि ज्यों ही यह भाई शब्द का उद्घोष हम करते हैं वैसे ही हम पर आपत्ति आ कर खड़ी हो जाती है। वैसे ही वह भाई न बन कर शत्रु बन कर हमारे सामने आ पहुँचता है। पता नहीं हमारे भाई कहने में क्या अपराध होता है कि जिस को हम ने कहा भाई, उस ने हमारे घर में आग लगाई। इस का कारण क्या है यह हमें सोचना चाहिये। इस का एकमात्र कारण यह है कि हम जो उद्घोष करते हैं, वह हमारा शास्त्र तो अच्छा है, हमारे शास्त्र में कोई दोष नहीं, हमारा मन बिल्कुल पवित्र है क्योंकि हम ने ही तो घोषणा की सब से पहले कि हम चीन से झगड़ा क्या करेंगे? वह तो विस्तारवादी है? हमारी हमेशा यह भावना रही है :

"अयं निजः परोबेति गणना लघु चेतसाम् ।
उदार चरितानां तु वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् ॥"

हमारा वर्ल्ड फेडरेशन भी है, वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् का नारा भी हम ने ही लगाया। लेकिन वसुधा को कुटुम्ब मान कर हम क्या करें? चीन को हिमालय सुपुर्द कर दें, उस के पश्चात नेपाल कर दें और उस के बाद उत्तर प्रदेश दें और फिर कहें कि दिल्ली में, महाराज, आप राज्य कीजिये? और पंडित जी से कहें कि नेहरू साहब आप बद्रिकाश्रम जा कर तपस्चर्या कीजिये? यह कभी स्वीकार नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। चीन को यह समझ लेना चाहिये कि हम संसार के साथ बन्धुता का उद्घोष करते हैं, चीन के लिये हम में सम्मान है, एक पड़ोसी के लिये अच्छी भावना होनी चाहिये। वह हमारे मन में है और हम उसे आदर बुद्धि से देखते हैं, और उस का सत्कार करते हैं। इस से ज्यादा और क्या सत्कार होगा कि वह बनाता रहे सड़क और

[पंडित राज नारायण "बजेश"]

हम ने भाषा भी नहीं रखी कड़क से ज्यादा और क्या हो सकता है? एक साल बराबर वहां काम चलता रहा और हम को पता नहीं लगा। हम ने समझा चलो ठीक है, मित्रता का भाव है, हिमालय की तरफ से आते हैं तो ब्रिककाश्रम के दशन के लिये आ रहे होंगे। इस लिय हम ने कुछ कहा नहीं। लेकिन सड़क बनाने के बाद उन्होंने तिब्बत को हजम कर लिया और उस के बाद सुरसा की तरह बदन बढ़ाता चला जा रहा है। मैं ने ग्लाइट पेपर को पढ़ा है। वहां सिवा राज नीतिक भाषा के सच्चाई का पता नहीं है। सोच समझ कर शब्दावली डाली गई है जिस में यह फंस न जाय और हम को फांसे जाये और धीरे धीरे खाते जायें। वह समझते हैं कि भारतवर्ष दुर्बल है। कल हमें पाकिस्तान मारता था, हवाई जहाज पटकता था, कहीं तुकेरग्राम खाता था। अब जब चीन आ गया तो पाकिस्तान सद्भावना की बातें करने लगा है। वह कहते हैं कि बहुत ठाक है। हम लोक सभा में भी देखते हैं कि विचित्र मनोवृत्ति है। इस से पहले मैं ने डांगे साहब और आचार्य जी के भाषण को सुना। जब पाकिस्तान का विवाद चलता था तो डांगे साहब भारकत नेत्र रहते थे, लाल नत्रों से ऐसे देखते थे जैसे उन से बढ़ कर कोई दूसरा देशभक्त नहीं है पाकिस्तान के मामले में। जब हमारे आचार्य जी बोलते थे कि फौज कम करना चाहिये, पाकिस्तान के साथ सद्भावना का व्यवहार करना चाहिये। अब जब चीन का मामला आ गया तो आचार्य जी कहते हैं नेहरू साहब से कि तुम ही जाओ सब से पहले हमला करने के लिये। डांगे साहब कहते हैं कि नहीं, बात चीत करनी चाहिये, सद्भावना के साथ मामला निपटा लेना चाहिये। यह क्या बात है। उधर का मामला आता है तो यह डीले है, उधर का मामला आता है तो वह डीले हैं। इसी से भालूम पड़ता है कि देश के प्रति जो जागरूकता होनी चाहिये वह नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री से हमारा कई बातों में मतभेद हो सकता

है लेकिन जहां तक देश का प्रश्न है, जहाँ तक राष्ट्र का प्रश्न है, इस देश की सुरक्षा का प्रश्न है, हम कहते हैं कि जिस प्रकार कौरव और पांडवों की आपस में लड़ाई हुई थी वैसी लड़ाई आपस में चल सकती है, लेकिन कोई दूसरा आकर हमारी आपस की लड़ाई की जांच करना चाहे तो हम १०० नहीं १०५ रहेंगे।

जहां तक है आपस की जांच,

वहां यह सी है, हम पांच।

किन्तु यदि करे चीन अब जांच,

तो गिन लो हमें एक भी पांच।

हम मिल कर १०५ हो जायेंगे। उस में हम अलग नहीं रह सकते हैं। यह बात निश्चित है कि जहां पर विचार धारा एकदम विभिन्न होती है, जहां पर आपस में पृथ्वी और आकाश का अन्तर, हो, भले ही हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग की बात करें, लेकिन वहां मेल जोल की आशा नहीं करनी चाहिये राजनीति में।

“वारांगनेव नृपनीतिरनेकरूपा :”

राजनीति का रूप वारांगना का सा होता है जिस का रूप सदा बदलता रहता है। पहले चीन ने हमारे साथ मैत्री की। लेकिन उस के बाद उस ने देखा कि पाकिस्तान के मामले में देश ठंडा है, कश्मीर के मामले में देश ठंडा है, यह तो पिटने का आदी है, चलो हम भी कुछ लूट लें। आज सब तरफ लूट मची हुई है। लेकिन यह तुष्टीकरण भ्रष्टा नहीं है। थोड़ा डीलेपन से चलना हमारा स्वभाव है। उसका ही जो क्रूर वृत्ति के लोग हैं वे लाभ उठाते हैं। उन्होंने यह समझा कि हम में सज्जनता नहीं दुर्बलता है। हम को सज्जनता के साथ दुर्बलता नहीं दिखलानी चाहिये। सज्जनता होनी चाहिये लेकिन साथ म कीरता भी होनी चाहिये, कीरता भी होनी चाहिये। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पर देश को विश्वास है, इस लिये कि उन्होंने भारत

की लम्बी सेवा की है, जागरूकता, सतर्कता और सावधानी के साथ उन्होंने देश को ऊपर उठाया है और संग्राम किया है। आज हमारे सामने कोई छोटी मोटी भूमि का प्रश्न नहीं, जब सारे देश में गुलामी थी, पूरा का पूरा देश शत्रुओं के जाल में फंसा हुआ था, अगर किसी ने थोड़ी बहुत भूमि छीन झपट ली या थोड़ी सी भूमि कहीं चली गई तो इस में कोई भारी हानि नहीं है। लेकिन यहां तो देश की सम्पत्ति का सवाल है, उस के साथ साथ यह हमारे सम्मान का सब से बड़ा प्रश्न है। स्पष्ट है कि यदि देश में स्वाभिमान नहीं जागा, अपनी वस्तु के लिये लड़ने की भावना नहीं उत्पन्न हुई तो देश ठंडा होता जायगा, और डिमारलाइज हो जायगा। इस लिये प्रधान मंत्री को देश को डिमारलाइज होने से बचाना चाहिये। उस में नैतिक पतन होने की स्थिति उत्पन्न न हो जाय इस के लिये हमें जागरूक होना चाहिये और देश को यह बतलाना चाहिये कि चीन ने जो आक्रमण किया है उस के सम्बन्ध में हम उस से बात चीत कर रहे हैं। हमारा विश्वास है कि बात चीत के द्वारा वह राजी हो जायगा, पीछे हट जायगा। यदि नहीं हटता है तो किसी भी कीमत पर, किसी मूल्य पर हम हिमालय को झुकने नहीं देंगे। इस लिये हमारा संसार में मस्तिष्क ऊंचा रहा है और रहेगा। चीन को यह अधिकार नहीं हो सकता कि वह हमारी भूमि को छीन सके। दूसरे लोग जो छिपी भाषा में उस का समर्थन करते हैं कि हां, हां हम आप के साथ हैं, इधर भी डरते हैं और उधर भी डरते हैं, उधर नहीं डरते तो बल कहां से पायेंगे और इधर से नहीं डरने तो रह कैसे पायेंगे यह बात नहीं होनी चाहिये। स्पष्ट रूप से सब बात सामने आनी चाहिये।

यह बात तो अब बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है, मैं प्रधान मंत्री की बात को बिल्कुल धरम्य नहीं कह सकता हूं कि देश में दुर्बलता आई है, हमारे चरित्र में गिरावट आ चुकी है। इसके कारण जब कोई मुसीबत आती है तो

पार्टियां सोचती हैं कि मौका अच्छा है, लगे हाथ कुछ पोपुलैरिटी, कुछ लोकप्रियता प्राप्त करी, और कुछ नहीं होगा तो चुनाव जीत कर पालियामेंट में तो आ जायेंगे। यह भावना नहीं होनी चाहिये। भाव यह होना चाहिये कि चाहे हम भिट जायें, हम बरबाद हो जायें, लेकिन हमारा देश सुरक्षित रहना चाहिये। प्रधान मंत्री महोदय एक नहीं, हजार सालों तक यहां बैठ कर इसी प्रकार से राज्य करें, इसमें मुझे कोई बुराई नहीं दीखती है। मैं चाहे पालियामेंट में झाऊं या न झाऊं, लेकिन जहां तक देश का प्रश्न है, हम कंधे से कंधा भिड़ा कर प्रधान मंत्री के साथ रहेंगे। उसकी सुरक्षा के लिये सर्वस्व को अर्पण करके भी, उस की मान भर्पादा की रक्षा करेंगे। इस भावना के साथ देश खड़ा है। चीन को, रशिया को और अमरीका को हर एक को यह समझ लेना चाहिये कि न हम अमरीका के सामने भीख मांगने जायेंगे न रशिया के सामने जायेंगे। हमें अपने चरित्र पर विश्वास है और हमें अपने गौरव और गरिमा पर विश्वास है। हमें भगवान् पर विश्वास है। जब भी हम पर आपत्ति आई है तो हमने चर्खों से इंग्लैण्ड को हटा दिया, हमारी एक हुंकार से चीन भी भाग जायेगा। भगवान् हमारे साथ है इस लिये हमें किसी से दबना नहीं चाहिये। हम किसी को भारना नहीं चाहते, हम किसी को भिटाना नहीं चाहते।

“वीर न अपना देते हैं, न वे और का लेते हैं” हम वीर हैं। हम दूसरे से कुछ छीनेंगे नहीं, लेकिन अपना देगे भी नहीं। हमारे देश पर कोई हाथ सगायेगा तो हम उसे बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे, और अगर दूसरे ने हम से छीना झपटी की तो हम चुप भी नहीं बैठेंगे। हमारे प्रभाव मंत्री बोलते हैं तो आप लोग कहते हैं कि वह बहुत ज्यादा बोलते हैं। हमारी छीना झपटी नहीं होनी चाहिये, इसी के लिये बोलते हैं। आज कोई दूसरे का छीन रहा है तो कन हमारा छीनेगा। इसी के लिये बोलते हैं,

[पंडित राज नारायण "ब्रजेश"]

इसके सिवा कोई दूसरा कारण नहीं है। छोटी छोटी बातों के विवाद देश में नहीं उठाने चाहिए कि इस मंत्री को हटाया जाना चाहिये, उसे हटा देना चाहिये। अगर प्रधान मंत्री खड़े हैं, वह ठीक आदमी नहीं हैं, उनकी हुकूमत ठीक नहीं है तो सीधे बोलो कि नहरू जी को हटाना चाहिये। यह क्या कि कलेक्टर से कहा जाय कि चपरासी को हटाया जाना चाहिये क्योंकि वहाँ का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन खराब है। कलेक्टर से कहो कि उसको हटाना चाहिये। यहाँ पर एक साधारण आदमी के हटाने का प्रश्न नहीं है। हम सभा में यह नारा लगायें कि इस पार्टी पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाओ, उस पार्टी पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाओ तो यह तो अनडिमाक्रेटिक है, अप्रजातान्त्रिक है। जो पाप के रास्ते पर चलेगा वह अपने आप खड़े में आयेगा, पतन की ओर बढ़ेगा। रूस्सिंग पार्टी के लोगों से भी मैं यह प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप बहुत बड़ी संख्या में हैं। देश में किसी में यह ताकत नहीं कि देश को एक साथ ले चल सके। आप को पार्टियों को बढ़ने का मौका देना चाहिये, वह बढ़ें। लेकिन आप को अपने भीतर शक्ति संचय करनी चाहिये। आप में जो आपस के झगड़े चलते हैं उनको बदौलत भारत को बढ़ा खतरा है। उस को निकालना चाहिये और जिस चरित्र के साथ, जिस भावना के साथ आप अब तक खड़े रहे हैं, उसी भावना के साथ आगे भी खड़े रहना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shrimati Masida Ahmed: You gave us hope.

Mr. Speaker: I never gave hope to anybody.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I have some important points to say.

I beg to say here that we have been talking of peace, but we have been

fighting here in the House. If we are fighting here, how can we make peace in the world? I beg to say that we show to the world some very good example of our behaviour.

Today we are discussing about letter which the hon. Prime Minister sent in reply to the letter which Mr. Chou En-lai sent. I beg to bring to the notice of the House what I wrote to the hon. Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, and what he replied in this connection.

I wrote to him sending an express letter on the 6th November, as follows:

"Hon. friend Pandit Jawaharlal Nehruji,

I did not want to trouble you. You do not seem to value my opinions. But I felt obliged this morning reading your war-like statement at the press conference yesterday.

Your attitude towards China needs complete overhauling. I beg you in your interest and in the interest of our country.

Chinese people are very stubborn. Your war-like statements will make them furious. They will create more incidents. We will find it difficult to resist their further aggression. A situation may develop when you may be forced to seek Anglo-American aid. Things will slip out of your hands.

I am prepared to go to China to propose a treaty among China, India and Japan to send out our overflowing population to vacant southern island and thinly populated Africa. Believe me, it will be a master stroke. Tibetan problem will automatically disappear.

If you like to discuss the matter I am prepared to run to you at your leisure.

Yours sincerely,

M. Pratap "

This was my letter. I am very thankful that the hon. Prime Minister immediately replied, and sent it by a special courier with quite a big seal.

This is how the letter reads:

New Delhi,
November 7, 1959.

Dear Raja Sahib,

I have your letter of the 6th November. I am sorry I am not in agreement with you about various policies. I do not think it will serve any useful purpose for you to go to China at this stage.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/JAWAHARLAL NEHRU."

Since we are having a discussion on the correspondence between the two Prime Ministers, I thought it right to bring this also to your notice.

I beg to say that neither Panchsheel nor the declarations for peace will establish peace in this world. The only way is world federation, world government, world army and world court of justice. If we insist on this programme, you will find very soon that the world follows you. Some people think that I am a rival to Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I am nothing of the kind. The other day, that is, the day before yesterday, in Moradabad, there was a huge meeting of world federation . . .

Mr. Speaker: All that is not relevant. Now, Shri Brajeswar Prasad,

Raja Mahendra Pratap: The day before yesterday, there was a huge meeting of world federation at Moradabad, and I addressed about three thousand people; I said that even if the military made me the dictator of India, I would still insist that our Shri Jawaharlal Nehru should remain our Prime Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Brajeswar Prasad.

Shri Brajeswar Prasad (Gaya): I rise to support the motion moved and the stand taken by the Prime Minister on the border dispute with China.

I am in favour of a negotiated settlement of the border dispute, for, a war between India and China may drag all the black and the coloured nations into war, the consequence of which is difficult to visualise at the present moment.

In the event of a war between India and China, both Russia and America may remain neutral, or Russia may join hands with China, or both Russia and America may join hands with India. Russia and America cannot fight on opposite sides, because the result will be the destruction of the globe. If Russia and America remain neutral, both India and China will be weakened. Then, Russia and America will intervene and divide both India and China into two spheres of influence.

It is wrong to think that hostilities between India and China will come to an end, once the Chinese are driven out of the Aksai Chin area. Either Indian troops will enter Peking or Chinese troops will enter New Delhi.

A war between India and China, in which both Russia and America are neutral may last for a period of one hundred years, if we are as strong as America vis-a-vis China. There were schools of military thought during the time of the Korean war. One school held the view that a war between China and America will continue for a period of one hundred years. The second school held the view that it will continue for a period of thirty years. America will remain neutral, if the Sino-Soviet Pact comes into operation, in the event of a war between India and China. If the Sino-Soviet Pact comes into operation, the whole of the Afro-Asian land mass

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

will be divided into two spheres of influence, Chinese and Russian.

Both India and China will be divided into two spheres of influence, American and Russian, if in the event of a war between India and China, both Russia and America join hands with India. China will be wiped out in no time, if this eventuality comes to pass. But, after the subjugation of China, the turn of India will come next.

Hence I support the Prime Minister's stand that on our border dispute with China no foreign help will be sought by us and that the method of peaceful negotiation will be pursued.

China wants to fill the vacuum in South-East Asia by resurrecting the Sino-Soviet Pact. By attacking India, China is strengthening those elements in the Kremlin which are opposed to a political settlement between Russia and America. The Sino-Soviet Pact will come into operation if this group comes into power in the event of a war between India and China. When Mr. Herter says that neither India nor China has approached America, he gives a hint to China to parley with the USA. The USA is prepared to support Chinese claims on our territory, if a Sino-American agreement is arrived at. This is the only inference which one can draw from Mr. Herter's statement that the United States is not in a position to uphold the stand taken by India on the border dispute.

The inner meaning of Mr. Herter's statement is that in the event of a war between India and China, America will remain neutral. America will remain neutral because a political settlement between Russia and America has been arrived at.

I am in favour of a political settlement between Russia and America if it leads to the liquidation of all American bases throughout the Afro-Asian land mass, the liquidation of the CENTO and the SEATO, the

liquidation of western imperialism from Africa, the integration of Goa with India, the integration of the Arab world into one political unit, the integration of the Soviet Union with the Afro-Asian land mass, the recognition of China by the USA, the induction of China into the Security Council, and the integration of Formosa with China.

I stand for a peaceful settlement of the border dispute because there is identity of interests between India and China. The menace of white hegemony confronts both India and China. A peaceful settlement of the border dispute is inevitable because power politics, war, armaments and nation states have become obsolete.

China cannot launch a war against India because here offensive power is very weak. India is very strong in her defensive power. Hence I believe that a peaceful settlement of the border dispute is inevitable.

If the method of negotiation fails, the dispute should be referred to arbitration by the Soviet Union, for no other Power can be acceptable to both and further because Russia is the only Power which is interested in the welfare of both India and China in equal measure.

The dynamics of the situation will compel the Soviet Union to adopt an impartial attitude towards both India and China.

Two separate offers of a federal union and of disarmament should be made to China. Any rejection of the offer of a federal union or of disarmament will rally the nation states of the whole of the Afro-Asian land mass in general and of S. E. Asia in particular round the banner of India.

If China accepts the offer of a federal union or of disarmament, the Afro-Asian land mass will be integrated into one political unit. Disarmament by India and China will

facilitate disarmament by Russia and America, Russia can never disarm, America can never disarm, if China does not agree to do so.

Disarmament does not mean disarmament

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): What is this?

Shri Brajeswar Prasad: It means that the defence forces should be brought under the supervision, direction and control of the UNO, Disarmament connotes the transformation of the UNO into a World Government.

It is in this sense that I plead for a unilateral disarmament by India. Unilateral disarmament is the culmination of the policy of *Panch-sheel*.

There can never be either Russo-American or Sino-Soviet hegemony

over the Afro-Asian land mass if India disarms herself. Socialism alone can save India from the danger of the establishment of foreign hegemony. The choice is between socialism and hegemony. The pull of India will become stronger than that of China if we combine socialism with democracy.

It will be a suicidal folly on our part to suggest to the Government to ban the Communist Party, for by doing so we shall be transforming the nature of the dispute between India and China. The dispute between India and China will at once be transformed into an ideological crusade at a time when Russia is likely to be more useful to us than any other country.

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, November 27, 1959, Agrahayana 6, 1881 (Saka).