

[Secretary]

(2) The Foreign Awards (Recognition and Enforcement) Bill, 1961.

12.23 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF
MEMBERS FROM THE SITTINGS
OF THE HOUSE

TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad): I beg to present the Twenty-sixth Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House.

I also lay on the Table a copy of the Statement showing names of Members who have been continuously absent from the sittings of the House for 15 days or more during the Fourteenth Session.

12.23½ hrs.

APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS)
No. 4 BILL*

The Minister of Railways (Shri Jagjivan Ram): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1961-62 for the purposes of Railways.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1961-62 for the purpose of Railways."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I introduce the Bill.

12.24 hrs.

VISVABHARATI (AMENDMENT)
BILL*

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Visva-Bharati Act, 1951.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Visva-Bharati Act, 1951."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I introduce the Bill.

12.25 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SIXTH-SEVENTH REPORT

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with Sixty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 2nd December, 1961".

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with Sixty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 2nd December, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

12.26 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: CHINESE
INCURSIONS

Mr. Speaker: Discussion on matter of urgent public importance, Shri Vajpayee.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I seek your indulgence and the indulgence of the House in one matter, I do not know how long this discussion will continue.

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II Section 2, Dated 4-12-61.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

Mr. Speaker: For a couple of hours.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would beg of you to permit me to reply to what is said tomorrow morning, because I have to go to Palam, as the President of the Argentine Republic is arriving early this afternoon. That is all I wish to submit.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): In any case, there is a general feeling that the subject that we will be discussing being most important, the time allotted by you at present is very inadequate. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister will be absent, the debate can be continued for the whole of the day.

Mr. Speaker: There is also other business—Supplementary Demands for Grants. Let us see.

Shri Goray (Poona): Mr. Speaker, you were kind enough to say the other day that a map will be put up here showing where the Chinese were in 1956 and where they are today. No such map has been put up yet.

Mr. Speaker: I did not say that it will be put up. To enable hon. Members to understand the position correctly, one hon. Member suggested that maps showing the lines may be put up here or in the library. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was here and I thought he would carry that request . . .

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): It was put to the proper quarters. The hon. Prime Minister will say what he has to say.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Perhaps the House will remember that sometime back we placed in the Library of the House, and it was available to Members too, an atlas of this frontier. It is rather a good atlas showing all these places in the north-east and northern frontier. That is available in the Library still. May be some hon. Members have it too. That is a much

better map. The so-called military posts and the rest—some places like Daulatbeg Oldi near the Karakoram Pass—are marked there. Some other places are not marked, but it is generally indicated in the correspondence in the possession of hon. Members.

I have a certain difficulty in this matter, because if I mark such of the posts that we have there, it may not be very secret, but nevertheless, it is not normally done for the information not of this House, but others who may be interested from the other side in knowing where our posts are. As for the rest, almost every information is available in that map and the correspondence I have given. Those maps in the atlas that we have placed are very good.

Mr. Speaker: I understood the request to be that there may be several stages when the various incursions or aggressions took place, and maps may be supplied showing the first at a particular time, the second some time later and the third still later and so on, so that hon. Members may have an idea as to how step by step they have been encroaching upon our territory. That was the request.

Shri Goray: That day the Prime Minister referred to three new check-posts put up by the Chinese. We would like to know whether they are to the west of the line in 1959.

Mr. Speaker: They want to know when the Chinese started the incursions, in the first year they did this, in the second year they did this, in the third year, they did this, etc.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member referred to what I said the other day. I was dealing with the period of the last, I might say, 18 months, because we had discussed the previous incursions adequately in the House. I said, as he has repeated, that according to our information, three posts have been put up, two of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

them near the international frontier, according to our information just on this side of the frontier, and one in the north nearer the Karakorum Pass which is definitely beyond the 1959 line That was the important thing. I referred also to Daulatbeg Oldi. It is our post, not far from that, near the Karakorum. So far as these three posts are concerned, it is our belief, it is our information that they have been put up in the course of the last summer. These posts, as a rule, do not suddenly appear in their full shape. There may be a slight beginning, something which is not visible and then gradually built up. Then they become more obvious and they are found by our reconnaissance party during their reconnaissance. So our impression is that these three posts—two a little near the international border or a little beyond the international border and the one in the north—were put up in the last summer. Our first information came to us about them in September last.

Shri Goray: Will you, Sir, then request the Prime Minister to show these places on the map? Otherwise, how can we know?

Shri Nath Pai: There is no demand to disclose our posts. That misunderstanding must be removed. We cannot request you, and we never requested you, to show any of our posts. That was never the suggestion. We only wanted to have a map showing their posts.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not mind. If some hon. Members come to my room, I shall show them. Some of the leaders of the parties can come to my room. I have got maps of these posts here.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): This is a matter in which the entire country is interested. "

Mr. Speaker: If there is a map, it would be possible to mark them. It

may be placed in the Central Hall so that hon. Members can look into it, instead of the hon. Members going to the Prime Minister's room.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member wants me to produce a large-scale map. I can try to put up a map but it will have to be, obviously, just in outlines only.

Shri Goray: I requested the Speaker because a map has been already published in the *Times of India* showing the westward movement of Chinese troops. I want to know from the Government whether that map is correct or whether there is some difference between the map produced by this paper and the map they have in their possession.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I saw the map in the *Times of India* only this morning—I was not here yesterday morning and I came back only yesterday afternoon. The shading given seems to me to be not based on any fact, largely, because they have joined up two points to give a fat curve to that. There is no justification for that. But the map itself, apart from the shading, is presumably correct. The places are marked there and they are helpful, but the shading does not appear to me to be correct.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Vajpayee . . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On this matter?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Yes, of course. Sir, on 20th November last I tabled an adjournment motion to be discussed in this House and on that some discussion took place. I have before me the proceedings of that date. You did not disallow that adjournment motion. My point is that this discussion which we are going to have just now should have been on that adjournment motion. Now, you have admitted this motion under Rule 193 relating to matters of urgent public importance. This rule says that there

shall be no formal motion before the House or voting. My difficulty is this. Essentially, this matter is one in which the Government can be censured. This is a matter of policy. On an adjournment motion the Government can be censured. Because you have allowed this discussion under Rule 193, there shall be no formal motion nor can there be any voting. Therefore, the House will not get any opportunity to censure the Government.

My submission is that since you did not disallow my adjournment motion on that day, this discussion should be allowed on that adjournment motion. During these five years when we have been here, our experience has been that whenever you have been pleased to disallow a motion you always stated that you did not give your consent to the motion. I have the proceedings before me and throughout the proceedings you never said that you were disallowing the adjournment motion. Therefore, my submission is that this discussion should be on the adjournment motion and not under Rule 193 under which we shall not get any opportunity to vote.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard the point. The other day, I fully remember, I said that I was not treating this as a censure motion. An adjournment motion means a censure motion. However, having regard to the importance of the matter I said that I would allow a discussion. That is what I said both with respect to the question of Col. Bhattacharya and also with respect to Chinese aggression.

Then, I am told that under my orders it has also been incorporated in the Bulletin.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Not in the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: If it is a mistake, I correct it now.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It cannot be corrected today.

Mr. Speaker: I correct it with retrospective effect.

Now, let us proceed. Shri Vajpayee. The hon. Member will have 20 minutes and other hon. Members will have 15 minutes each.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): I should have 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Let us see.

श्री वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 1883 पर चीन के नये आक्रमण और उस आ मण को रोकने में सरकार की विफलता से एक नयी और अन्यन्त गम्भीर परिस्थिति पैदा हो गई है। इन घोषणाओं के बावजूद कि यदि चीन आगे बढ़ा, तो उस को मुकाबला किया जायगा, चीन ने एक भी गोली चलाये बिना, रक्त की एक भी बूंद बहाए बिना भारत की और अधिक जमीन पर कब्जा कर लिया है। यह जमीन कितनी है, यह विवाद का विषय बना हुआ है। प्रधान मंत्री जी यह मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं कि चीन ने किसी नये इलाके पर कब्जा कर लिया है। उस दिन उन्होंने कहा था —

“There is no question of occupation of territory”.

लेकिन उन का यह कथन श्वेतपत्र में दिये गये तथ्यों से मेल नहीं खाता। भारत सरकार द्वारा १० नवम्बर को चीन को जो नोट भेजा गया है, उस में यह बात साफ कही गई है —

“As the Chinese Government know there is intensive military activities on the Chinese side and India has recently lost some more territory to the Chinese intruders.”

यह “सम मोर टेरीटरी” कौन सी है। क्या “सम मोर टेरीटरी” से वही मतलब निकलता है, जो प्रधान मंत्री जी के इन शब्दों से निकलता है कि चीन ने किसी एक पयांट पर अपनी चौकी बना ली है और जिस पायन्ट पर चौकी बनाई गई है, उतनी ही जमीन चीन के कब्जे में है? प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था —

[श्री वाजपेयी]

"The Chinese had not occupied any territory except for the point where they had set up a post in the Karadorum area."

मुझे डर है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के इस भाषण के आधार पर चीन कहीं १० नवम्बर के हमारे नोट को अस्वीकार न कर दे। इस से पहले भी इस सदन में और दूसरे सदन में प्रधान मंत्री जी तथा सुरक्षा मंत्री जी द्वारा ऐसी बातें कही जाती रही हैं, जिन्हें चीन ने आगे चल कर हमारे खिलाफ प्रयोग में लाया है।

इस श्वेतपत्र से यह प्रकट होता है कि चीन ने दो नई चौकियां बनाई हैं, एक दाम्बुगह में और दूसरी न्यांगजू में। अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में कहा कि ये चौकियां कहां हैं, यह कहना शायद मुश्किल है, यद्यपि आज का उन का कथन २८ नवम्बर के उन के कथन से थोड़ा भिन्न और अधिक स्पष्ट है। उस दिन उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा था, वह मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा था:—

"We are not quite certain whether they are a mile or two on this side or on that side because it is rather difficult in these high mountain regions to be precise about the actual line."

12.39 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

इस प्रकार की बातें रोष पैदा करने वाली हैं। एक ओर तो भारत सरकार के ३१ अक्टूबर के नोट में इन चौकियों की स्थापना को चीन का आक्रमण बताया गया है और दूसरी ओर प्रधान मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि ये चौकियां सीमा के इधर हैं या उधर हैं, यह स्पष्ट नहीं है। मैं नहीं कह सकता कि यह कहां तक ठीक है, लेकिन जानकार लोगों का कहना है कि अब हवाई-जहाज से तीस हजार फीट

की ऊंचाई से एंटी-तस्वीरें ली जा सकती हैं जिन से इस का पता लगाया जा सके कि धरती पर बैठा हुआ आदमी सिगार पी रहा है, या सिगरेट पी रहा है। क्या आप सीमा के सम्बन्ध में यह भी दावे से नहीं कह सकते हैं कि चौकियां किधर बनी हैं? प्रधान मंत्री जी के मन में सन्देह क्यों पैदा होता है? ऐसी बातें क्यों कही जाती हैं? जो चीन को सहायता दे सकती हैं। यह भी प्रश्न पूछा जा सकता है कि हमारी इंटेलिजेंस सर्विस क्या कर रही है?

प्राचार्य कृपालानी (सीतामढ़ी)
है ही नहीं।

श्री वाजपेयी : कभी कभी मुझे शक होता है कि चीन को जो नोट भेजे जाते हैं उन नोटों को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और सुरक्षा मंत्री पढ़ते भी हैं या नहीं पढ़ते हैं? उस दिन यहां लांगजू के बारे में कहा गया कि सैनिक दृष्टि से उसका कोई महत्व नहीं है। यह एक नई खोज थी। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने केवल इतना ही नहीं कहा कि उसका हमारे लिये कोई महत्व नहीं है उन्होंने चीनियों की तरफ से भी कह दिया कि चीन के लिये भी उसका कोई सैनिक दृष्टि से महत्व नहीं है। लेकिन लोक सभा से वह राज्य सभा में पहुंचेंगे तो लांगजू किधर है और इस बारे में उन के मन में सन्देह पैदा हो गया। यहां तो वह सैनिक दृष्टि से महत्वपूर्ण नहीं था, महत्वहीन बन गया था लेकिन यहां से दो कदम पर राज्य सभा में जब वह गये तो उन्होंने क्या कह दिया यह मैं उन के शब्दों को ही कोट कर के आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ:—

"Longju was situated almost dead plum on the border and there was argument as to whether it was on this side of the border or the other and the Chinese occupied it."

अभी तक हम ने जो भी विरोध-रत्न भेजे हैं या श्वेतपत्र छापे हैं उन में हर बार

हम ने इस बात पर जोर दिया है कि लांगजू हमारे क्षेत्र में है और हम ने कभी भी यह नहीं कहा है कि वह सीमा पर है। लांगजू सीमा से दो मील दूर स्थित है। लांगजू भारत का है और भारतीय सीमा का क्षेत्र है, इस बात को हम बलपूर्वक कहते रहे हैं। मगर पता नहीं उस दिन राज्य सभा में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ऐसा वक्तव्य कैसे दे दिया।

समंद ने कुछ ही दिन पहले एक कानून बनाया है कि अगर भारत की सीमाओं के बारे में कोई सन्देह व्यक्त करे, उन्हें चुनौती दे तो यह एक दण्डनीय अपराध है। लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ही सीमा की असंदिग्धता के बारे में विश्वास नहीं रखते हैं और ऐसी भाषा का प्रयोग करते हैं, ऐसे शब्दों का प्रयोग करते हैं जिन से सीमा कहाँ है, इस के बारे में सन्देह दा होता है, तो इस प्रकार के कानून बनाने का कोई अर्थ नहीं रह जाता है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बड़े विनम्र शब्दों में प्रधान मंत्री जी से एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि लिखे हुए नोटों में और कहे हुए शब्दों में परस्पर विरोधी बातों को टालना हो तो इस का एक ही रास्ता है कि इस प्रकार के प्रश्नों पर तथा ऐसे गम्भीर मौकों पर जब देश की सुरक्षा संकट में है और हम अपनी सीमाओं के बारे में विचार करते हैं तो प्रधान मंत्री जी लिख कर अपना भाषण दिया करें। क्योंकि वह लिख कर नहीं लाते हैं इसलिये कभी कभी उतेजना में आ जाते हैं, इधर से भी उतेजना दी जाती है और उस उतेजना में ऐसी बातें कह दी जाती हैं जो चीन हमारे खिलाफ काम में लाता है।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहूँगा कि जहाँ तक चीनी आक्रमण का सवाल है, हमें परिस्थिति को छोटा कर के नहीं दिखाना चाहिये। लेकिन अभी तक इसी बात की कोशिश की जाती रही है। १९५९ से जब से चीनी आक्रमण

का पहली बार रहस्योद्घाटन किया गया है, सरकार की ओर से नहीं, बल्कि समाचार-पत्रों की ओर से, जिस के लिए वे बर्बाई के पात्र हैं, तथा विरोधी दलों द्वारा रखे गये स्थगन प्रस्तावों के रूप में जब यह तथ्य सामने आया कि चीन भारत के विशाल भूभाग पर कब्जा जमा कर बैठा है तब से लेकर आज तक इस बात की कोशिश की जाती रही है कि चीनियों द्वारा उपस्थित किये गये संकट को कम कर के दिखाया जाये, तथ्यों को पूरा सामने न आने दिया जाये, उन्हें तोड़ मरोड़ कर पेश किया जाय। मेरा निवेदन है कि शब्दों के किसी छल से या कानून की कलाबाजी से इस कटु सत्य को नहीं छिपाया जा सकता है कि चीन ने बहुत बड़े इलाके पर नया कब्जा किया है। १९५६ के नक्शे में जो क्षेत्र दिखाया गया था और १९६० के नक्शे में जिस नए क्षेत्र को दिखाया गया है दोनों के बीच का अन्तर दो हजार वर्गमील का है। ३१ अक्टूबर के नोट में जिन अतिक्रमणों की घटनाओं का उल्लेख किया गया है उन से यह साफ है कि इस दो हजार वर्गमील में, थोड़े से इलाके को छोड़ कर, चीनियों ने सारे लाके पर नया कब्जा जमा लिया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि जब चीन नई चौकियाँ बना रहा था, सीमा का अतिक्रमण कर रहा था, तो कहीं भी भारत के फौजियों से उस की मुठभेड़ नहीं हुई, कहीं भी भारत की फौजों ने चीन को आगे बढ़ने से नहीं रोका। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस का कारण क्या है? क्या इस का कारण यह है कि भारतीय फौजों को घादेश दिया गया है कि जब तक चीन गोली न चलाये तब तक तुम गोलों मत चलाओ? इस बारे में सरकार को नीति स्पष्ट करनी चाहिये।

यह घोषणा की गई थी कि एक इंच भूमि भी चीन के कब्जे में नहीं जाने दी जायगी।

[श्री वाजपेयी]

यदि एक क्षण के लिये यह मान भी लिया जाय कि चीन ने दो हज़ार वर्ग मील पर कब्ज़ा नहीं किया है तो भी इस बात से इनकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि जितनी भी उन्होंने ने अपनी नई चौकियां बनाई हैं वे कम से कम एक इंच से ज्यादा के इलाके में हैं। आखिर ये इलाका चीन के कब्ज़े में कैसे जाने दिया गया। हमारे मुरझा मंत्री स के लए एक नया स्पष्टीकरण दे सकते हैं। उन्होंने ने कहा भी है :—

"India not to budge an inch from China Policy.

क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि सीमा पर तो हम हज़ारों वर्ग मील पीछे जा सकते हैं लेकिन जहां तक चीन की नीति का सवाल है हम उस से एक इंच पीछे नहीं होंगे? मैं इस प्रकार के वक्तव्य का अर्थ नहीं समझ सका हूं। आखिर चीन के प्रति हमारी नीति क्या है? आक्रमण पर आक्रमण को सहते जाना, अपमान पर अपमान के घूंट को पीते जाना, अपनी भूमि भी गंवाना और अपने सम्मान से भी हाथ धोना, सैनिक कार्रवाई के जवाब में कागज़ी विरोधपत्र भेज देना और सबसे बड़ कर पंचशील की दुहाई देना, क्या यही हमारी नीति है?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूं और बड़े दुःख के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक चीन का सम्बन्ध है, पंचशील मर गया ये पांच प्लेट पेंपर नहीं हैं, स्वतंत्र नहीं हैं, ये पंचशील के एक एक सिद्धांत की लाश के ऊपर चीन द्वारा रखे गये वे सफेद कफन हैं। जहां तक चीन का सवाल है अब पंचशील की दुहाई देना कोई अर्थ नहीं रखता। चीन आक्रमणकारी मनोवृत्ति ले कर चल रहा है, क्या इसका पता हमें इन तीन नई चौकियों से हुआ है? चीन की आक्रमणकारी मनीवृत्ति का पता तिब्बत पर जब चीन ने हमला किया था, तभी चल गया था। क्या उस आक्रमणकारी मनो-

वृत्ति को साबित करने के लिये और प्रमाण चाहिये?

जब कभी चीन के खिलाफ कार्रवाई करने की बात उठाई जाती है तो यह कह कर विरोधी दलों का, देश की जनता का मुंह बन्द करने की कोशिश की जाती है कि क्या आप लड़ाई चाहते हैं? हम लड़ाई नहीं चाहते।

आचार्य कृपालानी : जरूर चाहते हैं।

श्री वाजपेयी : लेकिन चीन लड़ाई पर तुला हुआ है तो आप लड़ाई से बच नहीं सकते हैं। लड़ाई के अलावा और जो रास्ते हो सकते हैं, मैं उनका उल्लेख बाद में करूंगा। लेकिन मैं सबसे पहले यह जानना चाहता हूं कि आखिर इन १८ महीनों में चीन के नये हमलों को खबरों से सदन को और देश को अंधेरे में क्यों रखा गया है। हमें नहीं बताया गया, देश की जनता को विश्वास में नहीं लिया गया। चीन नये अतिक्रमण करता रहा, हमारी भूमि पर चौकियां बनाता रहा, सड़कें कायम करता रहा, हवाई अड्डों का निर्माण होता रहा मगर देश की जनता को इन में से किसी के बारे में नहीं बताया गया।

३१ अक्तूबर का जो नोट, है, उससे पता लगता है कि १९६० में सुरैया में चीनी फौजें देखी गई थीं और १९६० के आठम में दौलतवेग के पास चीनी घुस आये थे। यह १९६० के आठम को बात है। मगर उसके बाद संसद की बैठक हुई, यहां प्रश्न पूछे गये, उत्तर दिये गये, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति के सम्बन्ध में विवाद हुआ, मगर सदन को कह दिया गया कि चीन ने और घुसपैठ नहीं की है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि चीनी अतिक्रमण की खबरों को देश की जनता से क्यों छिपाया गया। पहले जब चीन ने मला किया था तो भी खबरें छिपाई गईं

थीं और प्रवान मंत्री जी ने स्वीकार किया था कि ये खबरें छिपाई गई हैं ।

मि० चाऊ एन० लाई को उन्हींने एक चिट्ठी लिखी है जो श्वेतपत्र नम्बर २ में छपी हुई है । मैं उसके एक अंग को आपके सामने उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ । प्रवान मंत्री ने लिखा है :—

“We did not release to the public the information which we had about the various border intrusions into our territory by Chinese personnel since 1954, the construction of a road across Indian territory in Ladakh and the arrest of our personnel in the Aksai Chin area in 1958 and their detention. We did not give publicity to this in the hope that peaceful solutions of the disputes could be found by agreement by the two countries without public excitement on both sides. In fact our failure to do so has now resulted in sharp but legitimate criticism of the Government both in Parliament and in the press in our country.”

यह सन् १९५९ का लिखा हुआ पत्र है जिसमें स्वीकार किया गया है कि हम ने जान बूझ कर चीनी आक्रमण की खबरें देश की जनता से छिपाई, संसद् से छिपाई, और उस समय प्रवान मंत्री जी ने आश्वासन दिया था कि यह गलती हुई है और इस गलती को दोहराया नहीं जायेगा, लेकिन इस बार फिर इस गलती को दोहराया गया है । चीनी आक्रमण की खबरें हमें बतलाई नहीं गई । समाचार पत्रों ने जब विदेश मंत्रालय के प्रवक्तव्यों से सम्बन्ध स्थापित किया तो बराबर इस बात का खंडन किया जाता रहा कि चीन की कोई घुसपै हुई है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह बात क्यों छिपाई गई । अगर समाचार पत्रों की रिपोर्ट पर विश्वास करना हो तो नई दिल्ली के एक जिम्मेदार अंग्रेजी दैनिक पत्र ने लिखा है कि जब यह समाचार अखबारों में आया तो विदेश

मंत्रालय में बड़े अफसरों को एक बैठक हुई और उसमें विचार हुआ कि यह खबर बतलानी है या नहीं बतलानी है, और यह फैसला हुआ कि इसको बतलाना ठीक नहीं । यह फैसला क्यों हुआ ? पत्र लिखता है :

“Perhaps what weighed with the Government was the fear of the impact of this news on election prospects.”

यह मेरा कहना नहीं है, जिम्मेदार अंग्रेजी दैनिक का कहना है । चीनी आक्रमण की खबरें पहले छिपाई गई थीं इसलिये कि चीन और भारत के बीच शांतिपूर्ण समझौता हो जाय । अभी तो शांतिपूर्ण समझौता होने का सवाल नहीं है । इस देश की जनता, इस देश की संसद्, इस सदन के सदस्यों, को यह जानने का अधिकार है कि भारत की सीमा पर कहां पर अतिक्रमण हो रहा है । लेकिन हमको बताया नहीं जाता, और जब चीजों का पता लग जाता है तो उनको दबाया जाता है । पहले दिन भी इस संसद् में, इस लोक सभा में प्रधान मंत्री जी सरकार की तरफ से कोई वक्तव्य देने के लिये नहीं आये । इस के लिये हमको ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन मूव करने पड़े । उसके जवाब में भी गवर्नमेंट ने पूरी बातें सामने नहीं रखीं । लिखित प्रश्न के उत्तर में ३१ तारीख को चीन को भेजा गया नोट, और वह भी टुकड़ों में, रखा गया । मैं नहीं समझता कि ये महत्वपूर्ण तथ्य सदन से क्यों छिपाये जाते हैं ।

मैं जानता हूँ कि सरकार उस कुल में पैदा नहीं हुई जिसमें हाथी मारे जाते चीन के विरुद्ध सैनिक कार्रवाई करने का साहस आप में नहीं है यह हन समझते हैं । किन्तु कम से कम हमें आक्रमण की खबरों का पता तो लगना चाहिए । आखिर हमले की खबरें छुपाना यह कौन सी देशभक्ति है, यह कौन सी बुद्धिमत्ता है, यह कौन सा लोकतंत्र प्रेम है ? सरकार ने चीन के आक्रमण की खबरों को छिपा कर जनता के विश्वास को एक बार

[श्री वाजपेयी]

फिर से ठोकर लगाई है। हम चाहेंगे कि इस चीज की सरकार सफाई दे कि आखिर यह चीन के हमले की खबरें छिपाई क्यों गईं ?

लेकिन कभी कभी मुझे लगता है कि क्या सचमुच सरकार के मंत्रियों को भी पता था कि चीन अन्दर घुस रहा है ? सुरक्षा मंत्री ने २१ नवम्बर को वाशिंगटन में जो भाषण दिया, जो वक्तव्य दिया, उस में उन्होंने कहा कि मुझे तो पता नहीं, मुझे तो अखबारों से पता लगा है कि चीन अन्दर घुस रहा है अभी तक इस बात का खंडन नहीं किया गया है। तो क्या कैबिनेट को भी नहीं बतलाया जाता ? कैबिनेट के एक और भी मिनिस्टर हैं जो यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं। वह बम्बई में भाषण करने गये और उन्होंने कहा कि पाकिस्तान का हमला एकदम होने वाला है। चीन के बारे में कहा कि हम चीन से लड़ नहीं सकते, लम्बी लड़ाई चलेगी, देखा जायेगा। मगर उन के सारे भाषण का वजन यह था कि पाकिस्तान का हमला होने वाला है। हमला चीन का हुआ है; चीन हमारी सीमा में घुस आया है, चीन न पुराना समझौता तोड़ दिया, चीन ने नई चौकियां कायम की हैं, चीन में एक बार फिर हमारे स्वाभिमान को चुनौती दी है, भारत की सार्वभौम सत्ता को ललकारा है, और एक कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर वाशिंगटन में बैठ कर कहते हैं कि उन्हें अखबारों से इस का पता लगा है और दूसरे मिनिस्टर बम्बई में जा कर कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान का हमला होने वाला है। मैं नहीं समझता कि यह स्थिति क्या है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी सुरक्षा मंत्री की रक्षा करने की बहुत चिन्ता करते हैं। जितनी युक्ति और बुद्धि वह रक्षा मंत्री की रक्षा में खर्च करते हैं, अगर उतनी युक्ति और बुद्धि चीन के आक्रमण से भारत की रक्षा करने में खर्च करते तो शायद चीन का नया आक्रमण

नहीं होता। सुरक्षा मंत्री कुछ भी कहें, प्रधान मंत्री जी को उस को सफाई देना है। सुरक्षा मंत्री ने कह दिया कि यह होस्टाइल ऐक्टिविटी नहीं है तो कहा जाने लगा कि होस्टाइल ऐक्टिविटी का अमरीका में मतलब यह होता है कि दोनों देशों की फौजें आमने सामने तायनात हैं और लड़ रही हैं। लड़ाख में ऐसी तो कोई बात नहीं। हिमालय में बर्फ की शान्ति है। क्या कोई कह सकता है कि यह ऐक्टिव होस्टिलिटी नहीं है ? चीन ने नये आक्रमण किये हैं, नई भूमि पर कब्जा किया है, यह अगर होस्टिलिटी नहीं है तो क्या है ? ऐक्टिव होस्टिलिटी नहीं है यदि इस का मतलब यह है कि चीन तो ऐक्टिव है, मगर भारत पसिव है, चीन होस्टाइल है मगर हम डोसाइल है तब तो ठीक है। किन्तु क्या यह समझ में आ सकता है ? इस प्रकार के वक्तव्य दे कर देश का जनता को और विश्व के जनमत को भारत और चीन के संघर्ष में ठीक तरह से शिक्षित करने का काम नहीं किया जा सकता। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जो ने वहां चीनी सेनायें हैं या आर्म्ड ग्रुप्स हैं, इस का भी कुछ भेद किया। हम इस भेद को समझ नहीं सकते। मगर हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री तो इस से भी आगे बढ़ गये। उन्होंने वाशिंगटन में कहा कि वहां फौजें तो हैं नहीं, वहां कुछ चाइनीज एलिमेंट्स हैं, चीनी तत्व हैं। जैसे पंच तत्व होते हैं इसी तरह से चीनी तत्व हैं। सेनायें सामने खड़ी हैं, सेनायें इकट्ठी की जा रहीं हैं, और अधिक आक्रमण की तैयारियां हो रही हैं और हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री विदेशों में जा कर भारत के पक्ष को ठीक तरह से रख भी नहीं सकते।

मेरा निवेदन है कि यह हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री के एक वक्तव्य का सवाल नहीं है, जब से चीन का विवाद चला है, वह लगातार चीन के साथ हमारे संघर्ष कम कर के दिखाने की कोशिश करते रहे हैं। पहले उन्होंने कहा कि यह आक्रमण नहीं है क्योंकि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स

ने आक्रमण की परिभाषा नहीं की। मेरे घर में आग लगाई गई है और वह आग है या नहीं यह देखने के लिये क्या हम इंडियन पेनल कोड देखेंगे ? हमारी आग "आरसन" के अन्तर्गत आती है या नहीं इस पर कोरे कानून से विचार करेंगे ? फिर उन्होंने एंडमिनिस्टर्ड टेरिटरी के बारे में विवादप्रस्त बक्तव्य दे दिया। और यह उन का नया बक्तव्य है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कहां तक उन की रक्षा करेंगे ?

मेरा निवेदन है कि पिछले अप्रैल के महीने में मुरखा मंत्री ने यह बक्तव्य दिया था कि अब चीन का आगे बढ़ना असम्भव है, मगर चीन आगे बढ़ गया है। हमारी रक्षा व्यवस्था विफल हो गई है। इस के लिये कौन जवाबदेह है ? यह कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि हम चीन की आक्रमणकारी प्रवृत्तियों से परिचित हैं। देश की जनता यह जवाब चाहती है कि चीन की सेनायें आगे क्यों बढ़ीं ? आगे बढ़ीं तो उन्हें रोकने की कोशिश क्यों नहीं की गई ?

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि सैनिक स्थिति लद्दाख में हमारे अनुकूल हो रही है। किस आधार पर यह बात कही गई, यह मैं नहीं समझ सकता। चीन की चौकियां हम से ज्यादा हैं। लद्दाख में चीन की फौज हम से ज्यादा है, चीन ने सड़कें भी हम से ज्यादा बनाई हैं, हमारी बहुत सड़कें नहीं बनीं। तीन साल हो गये सड़कें नहीं बनीं। कहा जाता है कि सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० से ले कर यह काम फौज को दे दिया गया। मुझे पता नहीं कि सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० वहां सड़कें कब बना रहा था। क्या सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० को सड़कें बनाने का काम सौंपा गया था ? यह सदन तो इस विचार को ले कर चलता है कि शायद फौजों ने प्रारम्भ से ही सड़कें बनाई हैं। पर यह किस आधार पर कहा जा सकता है कि लद्दाख में सैनिक परिस्थिति

हमारे अनुकूल है ? मुझे आपत्ति है कि लद्दाख की रक्षा व्यवस्था को मजबूत करने के लिये सरकार को जितना प्रयत्न करना चाहिये था उतना प्रयत्न नहीं किया उस ने। नेफा में कितनी तैयारी की गई है, उस का पता तब लगेगा जब वहां चीन का नया आक्रमण होगा।

यहां एक बात हम याद रखें कि चीन ने किसी न किसी रूप में मैकमोहन रेखा को नेफा के अन्दर स्वीकार किया है, लेकिन वह लद्दाख में यह परम्परागत सीमा स्वीकार करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी इतिहासी नीति को मानती है। क्या इस का यह अर्थ तां नहीं है कि भारत लद्दाख को चीन के कब्जे में छोड़ने जा रहा है ? आज जो स्थिति है उस में मुझे यह सन्देह करने का कारण है, और इस सन्देह को दूर किया जाय, यह मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से अप्रार्थ करना चाहता हूं।

श्वेत पत्र से एक और बात भी स्पष्ट होती है कि भारत और चीन का झगड़ा कोई सीमा का झगड़ा नहीं है। बेलग्रेड सम्मेलन के बारे में चीन ने जो भारत विरोधी प्रचार अभियान आरम्भ किया है उस से यह स्पष्ट है कि चीन सारी दुनिया में हमें बदनाम करना चाहता है, चीन भारत के स्वाभिमान को मिट्टी में मिलाना चाहता है, चीन हमारे उठे हुए सिर को झुकाना चाहता है। चीन नहीं चाहता कि लोकतंत्री मार्ग पर चल कर भारत प्रगति कर के दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया और अफ्रीका के आजाद होने वाले देशों के सामने एक नया आदर्श रख सके। हमें इस संवर्ष के महत्व को समझना होगा। यह सैनिक संघर्ष है, मगर यह सैद्धांतिक राजनीतिक और कूटनीतिक संघर्ष भी है, और मझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कूटनीतिक क्षेत्र में भी चीन ने हम को मात दे दी है। हमारे पड़ोसी हम से दूर होते जा रहे हैं। चीन ने बर्मा और नेपाल के साथ समझौते किये हैं। आज इंडोनेशिया

[श्री वाजपेयी]

हमारी तुलना में चीन के अधिक निकट चला गया है ।

13 hrs.

हमारी विदेश नीति की सब से बड़ी विफलता यह है कि हम चीन के संकट से अपने पड़ोस के देशों को सावधान नहीं रख सके, उन्हें अपने साथ खड़ा नहीं रख सके, और आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि चीन के इस डिप्लोमैटिक आफेंसिव को विफल करने के लिए भी कार्रवाई की जाये ।

मेरा सुझाव है कि चीन की नई आक्रामक कार्रवाइयों को देखते हुए चीन के साथ कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध तोड़ लेने चाहिए । जब पीकिंग में बैठा हुआ भारतीय राजदूत भारत के हितों की रक्षा नहीं कर सकता बल्कि उसे अपमान भोगने के लिए विवश होना पड़ता है, तो उस राजदूत के वहाँ बैठे रहने का क्या उद्देश्य है ? हमें उसको वहाँ से वापस बुला लेना चाहिए और जो चीन का राजदूत भारत में बैठा है उस को अपना बोरिया बिस्तर बांध कर पीकिंग भेज देना चाहिए ।

मेरा दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि भारत सरकार को तिब्बत के आत्मनिर्णय के अधिकार का खुला समर्थन करना चाहिए । हम इस बात को भूल नहीं सकते कि यह तिब्बत को चुपचाप चीन के पैरों तले रोंदा जाता हुआ देखने के पाप का ही फल है कि आज चीनी सेनाएं भारत की सीमाओं में घुस आयी हैं । सन् १९५४ की सन्धि समाप्त हो रही है और आज तिब्बत को आत्मनिर्णय के अधिकार की मांग करने की पूरी स्वतंत्रता होनी चाहिए । यदि हम जन से, धन से या शस्त्रों से तिब्बत की मदद नहीं कर सकते तो कम से कम आत्मनिर्णय के अधिकार के लिये हमें उसको नैतिक समर्थन प्रदान करना चाहिए ।

मेरा तीसरा सुझाव है कि हमें नेपाल के साथ अपने सम्बन्धों को सुधारने की कोशिश

करनी चाहिए । नेपाल में लोकतंत्र रहे या न रहे यह इतना महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है जितना यह महत्वपूर्ण है कि भारत और चीन के बीच संघर्ष में नेपाल हमारे साथ रहे । हम लोकतंत्रवादी हैं, सारी दुनिया में लोकतंत्र कायम हो यह हमारी स्वाभाविक इच्छा है, लेकिन किसी देश में लोकतंत्र है या नहीं यह हमारे और उसके सम्बन्धों के बीच बाधक नहीं बनने दिया जा सकता । नेपाल के प्रति भारत सरकार को अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करने की आवश्यकता है ।

मेरा चौथा सुझाव यह है कि लद्दाख में सड़कों, संचार साधनों और रसद पहुँचाने के मार्गों को युद्ध स्तर पर बनाना चाहिए । केवल यह कहना पर्याप्त नहीं है कि हमारे जो टारजेट्स हैं वे पूरे हो चुके हैं । यदि युद्ध स्तर पर काम होगा तो टारजेट्स से ज्यादा काम हो सकेगा । हमें याद रखना चाहिए कि चीन बैठा नहीं रहेगा, समय भी हमारा इन्तिजार नहीं करेगा । चीन आगे बढ़ रहा है, आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि उसके आगे बढ़ने को रोकने के लिए सरकार सदन को आश्वासन दे कि इस तारीख तक लद्दाख के क्षेत्र में हमारी रक्षा व्यवस्था पूरी हो जाएगी ।

चीन के नए आक्रमणों से देश की जनता को बड़ा धक्का लगा है । यह किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है । चीन का आक्रमण एक राष्ट्रीय सवाल है, लेकिन अगर सरकार इसको पार्टी की नजर से देखेगी या चुनाव की नजर से देखेगी तो यह देश के लिए बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात होगी ।

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we are discussing this morning a matter of profound importance to our country. Anxious as I am to discuss this matter with the utmost of seriousness and integrity, I find it difficult to do so because of inadequacy of information, because of the semantic confusion

that the Prime Minister has introduced and because of the ambiguity of his approach. Let us take a very small point. Even when this matter was first referred to by the Prime Minister when this house re-assembled, he used the word check-post. He corrected it recently and said that we used the word 'check-post as a police post, it is military posts that are set up by the Chinese on our territories. I was not here when the correction was made. That is what I read in the newspapers. Thus, over and over again, we shall find that deliberately words are being used, and arguments put forward, which tend to suggest that the matter is not serious, that the matter does not require the deep involvement in the country which, in fact, it demands and necessitates today.

There is this ambiguity of approach. I do not know if the Prime Minister is clear in his mind as to the nature of the threat that China holds out to us and the manner in which that threat has to be countered. Again, I would like to take a very recent instance. Some time back, our distinguished Secretary General of the External Affairs Ministry was asked to visit Peking on his way back from Outer Mongolia. Some of us in this side of the House at that time pointed out that this was not wise and that it would not be useful. The Prime Minister said that he has old connections there, he has old relations there and his visit there would be of use. What do we find from the White Paper is that our Secretary General is charged with pevarication. For the last 10 years, this kind of ambiguity goes on.

The Prime Minister said the other day in the course of a lucid statement that he made, though not a satisfactory statement that there is such a thing as a chain of events, and that we cannot forge a single link today without being at the same time careful about and conscious of other links that will have to be forged. May

I humbly suggest that what is happening today is also one of the links in that chain which has been forged in the past. What have we been doing for the last 10 years? Ten years back, from what the Prime Minister says today, when Tibet was occupied by the Chinese, the Prime Minister became alert about the possible threat to our frontiers. He decided that what was necessary was to strengthen our defences in the N.E.F.A. area. He had to start somewhere on our long frontier. He chose to strengthen our position in that particular part of our country. But, the fact remains that he was aware that here is a threat against which we have to guard.

What was the atmosphere that was sought to be created in the country? In the country, the minions of the rulers of Peking, fellow-travellers of the Chinese Communists, were allowed encouraged, were fostered to create an atmosphere which sought implicit, unquestioned confidence to be put in the Chinese as if we were closer than blood brothers. When some people like my distinguished friend Acharya Kripalani dared to raise a voice of doubt and sound a note of warning, a note of caution, he was traduced and maligned, and in this campaign of maligning, the highest and the mightiest of the land did not interfere at all. An atmosphere was permitted to be created that China is like a shield-armour for India, almost as reliable as the mighty Himalayas were supposed to be.

As the Prime Minister has stated, over and over again the Chinese revolution is of a peculiar kind. As he has stated, Chinese history testifies to the fact that it is an aggressive country and this lava is sure to flow out. Knowing full well, the student of history as he is, and understanding as he does the dynamics of the Chinese situation so well, was he not a party to the creation of a certain miasma of misunderstanding in this country which is even today hindering us and

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

creating the situation of a patient suffering from a shock?

The Prime Minister said the other day that he is bound to tell the House the truth and he will under no circumstances be a party to falsehood. He said that in response to a suggestion made by a colleague of mine. May, I assure the Prime Minister, as far as our Group is concerned, whatever be our size, we shall never be guilty of asking him to take the side of falsehood in this House or outside. For us this democratic House is the best threshing floor for sifting truth from falsehood. That is the assurance that I can give, with the utmost honesty and integrity that I can command. But may I ask of him one thing? In the last ten years, when a certain atmosphere was permitted to be created in the country, and I remember that whenever Panch Sheel was referred to, my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani and I used to say that this thing had no greater validity than the Briand-Kellogg Pact. It meant good intentions; it meant desirable intentions; it might mean good intentions, but it was not likely to produce any results. At that time, were not all these hon. Members allowed to be restive, may I say, even encouraged to be restive, against any of those criticisms, which was supposed to be either arising out of malice or arising out of misunderstanding? When Acharya Kripalani pointed out in his own inimitable manner that this Panch Sheel was conceived in sin, the House was shocked. But today what is the result? We are disowning it like an illegitimate child. We are disowning it not because the principles are wrong; the principles are very sound, but the context which the Prime Minister has taught us over and over again is crucial. The Chinese have, however, debased and distorted them.

What was the context in which these principles were enunciated? Who were the parties with whom we were

trying to negotiate this kind of agreement? It was a Power which has an entirely different world vision, a power intoxicated by its own revolutionary *weltanschauung*. Today, the Chinese communists and the Russian communists seem to be drifting apart. There is growing tension, perhaps, conflict between them. The Prime Minister again knows far more than we can do about it. But, is it not obvious that behind this conflict, behind this tension, profound issues are involved such as an assessment of the balance of power in the world? The question arises of what kind of revolutionary *elan* is to be let loose just now. The question is one of how human material is to be treated, whether human beings are to be treated as the raw material of history, which was the *forte* of Stalin, which today Mao Tse Tung would like to do even in an aggravated form. As against that, we stand for something else. But, as far as China is concerned, China can assert its policies, the policies that have brought it into conflict even with its great ally and partner, the Soviet Union; China can assert its policy only by treading India under its feet, because unless India is hurt and humiliated, unless India's effort at creating a different phase or opening a different phase before the world, the phase of democracy, the phase of carrying on with the good-will and co-operation and confidence of the people, the phase, not of violent transformation, but of that kind of a cultured movement forward which alone has any meaning in the world of today, a world, which, the Prime Minister has told us, has changed so completely because of the onward march of science and technology and larger accumulation of surplus capital in the world, is set at nought, she cannot succeed.

At this time, China insists on pursuing a line which is counter to all that the other nations of the world want to do. And who are the stumbling

blocks? China cannot pit itself against the United States today. China cannot pit itself against the Soviet Union today. Whatever be its agenda for history, there is no doubt today that the first item on the agenda of China is India and India alone. The Prime Minister knew it very well. But, for the last ten years, why was this illusion allowed to be created? Why was this ambiguity introduced into our relationship? I understand courteous language; I understand soft language. We have been trained to use this language, and the Prime Minister himself has had a great share in training us in this manner. I do not doubt that. But what is important is not the language that you use but the impression that you create in the country.

The Defence Minister said in Bombay a couple of days back that China has betrayed us, that China has stabbed us in the back. When did he realise that China has betrayed us and stabbed us in the back? If he realised it only the day before yesterday, I feel I do not know what I should say about it. If he realised it six months before....

Shri Nath Pai: Only the day before yesterday in North Bombay.

Shri Asoka Mehta:...or one year back or two years back, I do not know when he realised the stab in the back. When he realised it, why did he not make it known to the country? If he did not want to make it known to the country, at least he should have shared his thoughts with his constituents on this subject. Here is a matter where a great country, a powerful country stabbed us in the back. And you keep it back till the time comes when the whole thing is erupting, and they have been moving forward.

As the newspapers have been pointing out, it is our posture, this weak posture, this hesitating posture, that has encouraged China in its forward march. In its policy of forward march we may not have been militarily prepared to meet China in Ladakh. But

why this deliberate weakness of our posture? I can understand if we had to deploy our resources at one place; we could not deploy them everywhere; we strengthened NEFA and said that we shall hold NEFA, and, therefore, we could not deploy them everywhere; in Ladakh. But that retreat has been aggravated, and has been made somewhat easier by the policy of softness, by the policy of equivocation, by the ambiguity of approach, which could have been avoided.

Then, there is this whole diplomatic dance going on, and we are treated with discourtesy from day to day. I have nothing to say about this exchange of notes which do not seem to be taking us anywhere. But, as far as the diplomatic position of India is concerned, have we not been weakened? I remember the Prime Minister saying, as the exponent of the policy of non-alignment, that we can have, and we do have an independent foreign policy. We are a non-aligned country, but we shall not be and we cannot be, non-aligned, where aggression is concerned.

Today, what is happening? Countries in Asia, our neighbours, our friends, are non-aligned even on the question of aggression of China against India. If they were non-aligned alone that would be bad enough, but they are leaning on the side of China today. Why is this happening? The reason is this. I am sure the Prime Minister knows it. What are the students in the University of Rangoon saying today? The students in the University of Rangoon say that India will not be able to stand up to the pressure of China, and they say 'why should we, therefore not line up with China?'

Some months back, I was in Singapore. I was talking to the Prime Minister of Singapore, and he said 'whether we can hold Singapore for democracy or not depends not on what we do, not on what anybody else does in Malaya or anywhere else,

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

but it depends upon how strong India is against the pressure of China.' He is a Chinese by birth but a democrat by profession. He said that in the ultimate analysis, the key to the freedom of Singapore lies in the pocket of the Prime Minister in New Delhi. Is that key being used properly? How does he feel today? If the sands today are caving in under the feet of such democrats in various parts of South-East Asia, is it not because we have diplomatically done hardly anything?

Take Indo-China. In Indo-China, we thought that we were there only to hold the ring, to keep people in check and to see that the rules of the fight were observed. We had no positive role to play. The Russians had to come in, according to the Prime Minister, to see that the Chinese do not throw their weight too much about; the Americans have to move in and create all kinds of complications there; we, of course, had no responsibility, and we were not supposed to make any positive contribution there to discover the right kind of vital forces and to encourage them not with a view to interfering there but with a view to see that this area is protected and strengthened.

What does a country do today? Every country tries to see, through friendship, through other associations and arrangements, that if ever a war comes—we do not want a war, but if ever a war comes—the war will not be fought, and the war will not begin in its own territory. It may be that the last battle of the war may have to be fought in your own territory. But it is the effort of every country worth the name, and every government worth the name, to see that the first battle of the war is fought somewhere else. Today, if a war comes, China will be fighting the battle on Indian territory, and our very first battle will be fought in a situation, in an atmosphere where really the last battle should be fought.

The Prime Minister talked about the grand strategy for winning the elections. He is welcome to have any grand strategy that he wants to elaborate there. But what about his grand strategy for defending our country? Every nation throws forward its *glacis*, throws up its own protective shield of friendship? Where is it today? In all this, we have been pushed back. If ever a war comes—let me make it clear that there are two charges that the Prime Minister can never make against me—I do not desire, I do not seek anchorage in any power bloc whatsoever. I do not pine for, nor do I whine for war. I am not a war-monger, I am not a war-seeker and I do not wish to be subjected to the surges of any power blocs. These are charges that, I hope, the Prime Minister will not make against us.

But the question still arises: was it not possible in the last 10—15 years for him, with a man of his personality at the helm of affairs, with the tremendous support that he has got from the country, with the massive respect that he enjoys the world over, to do something? But what is the result? The result is that with all these advantages, with all this input, the output is measly. In spite of this tremendous input, the output is so little, surely something must be wrong with the pipelines and the machinery.

I have no desire to see that the basic outlines of our foreign policy are changed. But is it not necessary for us today to have much closer relations, say, with Japan? I was happy that the Prime Minister of Japan visited India and that he was received with such courtesy and such honour. Again, it is the normal practice for countries the world over to see that when they are confronted by a very powerful opponent, by a powerful adversary, to try and have some kind of reinsurance by making friends with countries on the other side. All have done it. Stalin did

it with Laval. France, Republican France, Revolutionary France, did it with Czarist Russia. Those are things which have been done, living as we do in a cruel world. As the Prime Minister said the other day, a Peace Army may be a very good thing. But we cannot accept a peace army because we are living in a very difficult world. And in this difficult world, there has got to be closer relationship between India and Japan. What is being done in that respect?

One could go on pointing out a number of instances, if one had the time and the House had the patience, to show how in this whole area, in this diplomatic offensive, we seem to be hoping to see that something worthwhile will turn up and the ground slips under our feet.

Then again, look at the wrong assessment. A very eminent Member of the Cabinet—Dr. Subbarayan—he is not here; I told him that I was bringing up this matter; I am sorry he is not here; therefore, I shall have to bring it up in his absence—goes to Bombay and says that the real threat to India is from Pakistan. I do not deny that Pakistan has antagonistic intentions towards India. I will not under-rate the intentions of Pakistan. But Pakistan is a known enemy. We know every inch of Pakistan. Every capacity of Pakistan is known to us. Pakistan's capacity and Pakistan's possibilities of mischief—all these are known quantities for us. China is a great unknown quantity. The erupting volcano's lava flows in a massive manner. As Mao Tse Tung is reported to have said, he does not mind if 300 million Chinese are destroyed, but he should rule the world. This is the bigger menace against which we have to prepare ourselves. But Dr. Subbarayan declare that that cannot be the policy and that the real menace to India is from Pakistan. Goa may be a threat. Portugal may be a threat. Pakistan may be a threat. Tomorrow somebody else might become a threat. We have to be prepared for these. But in the context,

as I said, of time, if we look at the whole development, which is the real threat that we have to meet?

Then the Prime Minister says that if you take one step, all other steps will follow and you must be prepared for it; you cannot take one step unless you are prepared for other steps. When China takes one step, she is not bothered at all about other steps being taken. When Salazar's Portugal takes one step, it is not bothered about the consequential of other steps. This is so the world over. When the wall was built in Berlin, whether it is done by East Germany or at the instance of the Soviet Union, they took the risk of chain reaction of creating a crisis. But did the world blow into a conflagration? When the Americans push themselves inside the eastern sector of Berlin, a critical situation emerges for a while. But does the world get blown up in the process? Somewhere, in order to maintain the morale of our people, in order to maintain the morale of our army, in order to let the rest of our friends in South and South-East Asia know that India is not going to take it lying down, that India can also fight back, it is necessary for us from time to time to take at least one step to remove a military post here or there. This has got to be done. But not one single step is to be taken. Not only is not one single step is to be taken, but the whole thing is to be airily explained away.

My hon. friend, Goray, asked about the map. What was the question? It is not where the Chinese have put up their military posts. *The Times of India* says that a certain part of the country has been occupied in the past few months. The Prime Minister says that that is not so. We want to know from the Prime Minister, if that is not so, what part of the territory has been occupied. What is the use of saying 'I am willing to show the three checkpoints'. We can look up a map and find them out. The point is that there has been further shading,

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

there has been a further expansion—not sphere of influence but Chinese occupation. What has been that expansion? That has got to be shown. Why this kind of hesitation, why this attitude that 'I am willing to show them those three dots!' We can look up a map and find out where they are and we need not waste his time over it. The crucial question is: have they advanced? That cannot be explained away by saying 'It may be their influence'. I think my hon. friend, Shri Vajpayee, was right when he said that we would not accept any new definition of 'occupation'.

I hope the Prime Minister will not misunderstand me when I say this. 22 years ago, someone tried in Europe to trade the freedom of another country, and perhaps the territory of another country, in order to buy peace, and you know what happened. The result was that it only precipitated a war. We may have, rightly or wrongly, traded away the freedom of the innocent people of Tibet? Are we today willing to barter away our territory in order to buy time and say that during that period we will prepare ourselves. This policy has always resulted in far greater losses than those following a firm policy.

Once again, let me say. Nobody is saying today, 'Declare war on China'. I do not think that we should withdraw our diplomatic mission from China. I do not say that we should break off our relations with China. But it would be wrong on our part to keep on sponsoring China's case for a seat in the U.N. I would vote for it. If China is to come there, I am all for it. I want the United Nations to be a true representative, a global organisation. But I am not going to go about canvassing, of being a kind of John the Baptist crying in the wilderness for the coming of the new Christ. That is the role which I am not willing to play for China. Firmness means that you have got to convince the people of India, and what

is even more important, people outside India, that it is unwise, it is wrong, it is disastrous to follow any other policy.

What did the person who is likely to be the Prime Minister of Laos say? He said, 'We have 30, 20 or 10 years in which to exist when China is going to gobble us up'. If this is the feeling, if the boa constrictor is going to gobble us up, we must be prepared. The policy of 'he is going to gobble us up; let us make marry while time is there' has to be changed. The boa constrictor may have 650 million scales on it. Here is also a nation, a mighty nation, 430 million strong, brought together, welded together by this greatest, unique, nationalist and revolutionary movement in the world.

We are not frightened. We are not going to lose our heads. But we are not going to allow our hearts to collapse. We are not going to let our hands tremble. This feeling has to be communicated to Burma, Nepal, to Indo-China, to Japan and to the Philippines. But that is not being communicated in spite of the fact that here is a Prime Minister who enjoys an unparalleled position in the world today.

Therefore, this matter of China, as I said, has to be cleared up by getting rid of this ambiguity of outlook. It has got to be completely cleared. When he replies to the debate tomorrow, I hope at least on this point the Prime Minister will make it absolutely, firmly and unequivocally clear that there is going to be no ambiguity of outlook towards China.

I am glad that our relations with the Soviet Union are so good. I am not anti-Communist in the matter, but I am nationalist as far as the Chinese aggressions are concerned. I am willing to compliment the Prime Minister on having improved our relations both with the Soviet Union and the United States of America, but that improvement is meaningful only

to the extent we are willing to state clearly and unequivocally that as far as China's expansionism is concerned, as far as China's aggression is concerned, we realise the real motives behind it. It is not a question that we will drive them out. We realise the real motives of Salazar and there can be no friendship with Salazar's Portugal; similarly, there can be no friendship with South Africa, there can be no friendship with Mao Tse Tung's China. That has got to be made amply clear.

Secondly, there should not be this semantic evasion, wherein we try to explain away hard, brutal truths and realities by soft, deluding words.

Thirdly, there can be no miasma of misunderstanding in the country, no hiding of facts. The country has to be taken into fullest confidence. And let not Cabinet Ministers go about saying that the real enemy is A, B or C, that as far as China is concerned, it is only a minor matter.

I shall not take more of your time. Many things have been said in the House before. Many more things are being said by the press, and far more things are being said by the people. The Prime Minister has not the time to listen the people because he is very busy. Most of the time he is talking to the people, that is very important, but I hope he will find some time also to listen to what the people are saying in the market place, in their houses when they meet their near and dear ones, their doubts, fears and hesitations. He may be busy with the thundering victory that he wants for his party, but of what value is such a victory when the thunder is being challenged on our frontiers.

डा० राम सुभय सिंह (सहसराम) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन श्वेतपत्रों को पढ़ने से पता चलता है कि चीन का असली मंशा क्या है। इनमें पूरा पूरा जिक्र किया गया है कि कितनी बार चीन की ओर से हमारे देश की

सीमाओं का अतिक्रमण हुआ, कितनी बार चीनी हवाई जहाजों ने हमारे देश की एयर-स्पेस को वायोलेंट किया और वास्तविक रूप से १९५६ में जिस तक्को को चीन ने प्रस्तुत किया था, उसमें आगे बढ़ कर उसने अपनी नई चौकियां स्थापित कर ली हैं। इससे इस बात का भी पता चलता है कि ऐसा करने में चीनियों का असली मंशा क्या है।

पहले जब इस बात की चर्चा की गई थी उस वक्त यह बताया गया था कि हमारी सरहद सिक्कांग से मिलती है और वह सरहद जम्मू और काश्मीर की उत्तरी सरहद है। लेकिन जब चीन ने १९५० में तिब्बत पर कब्जा किया उस वक्त १९५१ की संधि में उन लोगों ने केवल इतना ही हक हासिल किया कि उसको एक आटोनामस स्टेट माना जाए। लेकिन बाद में आगे चल कर तिब्बत पर चीन के सावरन राइट्स को स्वीकार किया गया और इसे भारत सरकार ने भी स्वीकार किया। असली दिक्कत यह उठती है कि जो भी देश तिब्बत पर शुरू से अधिकार करता आया है, वह बराबर तिब्बत के पड़ोसी स्यानों में गड़बड़ी मचाता रहा है और १९५० में जब चीन का तिब्बत पर अधिकार हुआ, उसके तुरन्त बाद लद्दाख में, सिक्किम में, भूटान में, नेपाल में बर्मा में और दूसरी चारों तरफ वह अपने प्रभाव को स्थापित करने का प्रयत्न करने लग गया। लद्दाख में उसने जब अपना प्रभाव स्थापित किया और उसके बाद १९५४ में जो संधि हुई और जिसका देश को १९५७, १९५८ में पता चला, उसके पहले ही लद्दाख में चीन का काफी प्रभुत्व स्थापित हो चुका था और उस प्रभुत्व को स्थापित करने के बाद १९५४ की संधि के प्रति अग्र चीन की थोड़ी सी भी आस्था होती, या पंचशील के प्रति थोड़ी सी भी आस्था होती तो चीन और आगे बढ़ने के बजाय भारत की मंशा का अध्ययन करके दोनों देशों में प्रगाढ़ मैत्री स्थापित करने का प्रयास करता। लेकिन वैसी बात उसने नहीं की। पंचशील की तथा १९५४ की सांस्कृतिक

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

और व्यापारिक संधि की स्याही सूखने भी नहीं पाई थी कि चीन ने और जगहों पर आक्रमण करने प्रारम्भ कर दिए। चाहे हम उन दिनों उसको आक्रमणकारी मानें या न मानें, बाद में उसे आक्रमणकारी माना गया और मैं समझता हूँ कि वास्तविक रूप में उस समय भी वह आक्रमणकारी ही था।

जब मैं यह कहता हूँ कि सिक्खांग से हमारी सख्त मिलती है तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि मैं जम्मू तथा काश्मीर को भारत के लिए अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण मानता हूँ। जिस प्रकार शरीर के लिए मस्तक जरूरी है उसी प्रकार जम्मू और काश्मीर और उसमें भी लद्दाख और गिलगित हमारे लिए जरूरी हैं। लेकिन जब पाकिस्तान ने गिलगित पर कब्जा कर लिया और लद्दाख की स्कार्डू तहसील पर कब्जा हो गया तो जो शेष हिस्से थे, उनका हमें अध्ययन करना चाहिये था। पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण जम्मू और काश्मीर पर १९४७ में हुआ। उसके बाद जितने राजनीतिक दल हैं उनको तथा भारत सरकार को चाहिये था कि वे इसका अध्ययन करते कि उसकी क्या प्रतिक्रिया हो सकती है, पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण की भारत पर क्या प्रतिक्रिया हो सकती है, तथा जम्मू और काश्मीर का क्या सैनिक महत्व है। लद्दाख को या लद्दाख की स्कार्डू तहसील को निकाल कर, यदि हम कागिल और लेह की तहसीलों की बात सोचें तो भी मैं यह कहे बिना नहीं रह सकता कि उसका अध्ययन हम ने नहीं किया। यदि हमने इसका अध्ययन १९४९ में किया होता तो समझ में आ सकता था कि क्या करें। अक्टूबर १९४९ तक चीनियों का अपना आधिपत्य चीन में नहीं जमा था। तब तक कम्युनिस्ट राज्य की स्थापना चीन में पूरी तरह से नहीं हुई थी। उस वक्त पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण से होने वाली सैनिक कठिनाई को हम समझ सकते थे। उन दिनों हमको उसका आंश नहीं लगा।

उसके बाद जब १९५४ की संधि हुई, या जो पंचशील के सिद्धान्त अपनाए गए, उस वक्त भी और नही उसके बाद भी, उन इलाकों के महत्व की पूरी बारीकी के साथ किसी ने अध्ययन करने की कोशिश की। लेकिन जो होना था वह हो गया, उसकी मैं आलोचना करना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सब की क्या प्रतिक्रिया हो सकती है, इस पर आप विचार करें। लद्दाख एक ऐसा इलाका है जो आज से नहीं, मौर्य साम्राज्य से ही, जिसका उस पर कब्जा रहता रहा है, वही तमाम हिमालयी राज्यों पर प्रभाव डालता रहा है। अशोक का जिन दिनों उस पर थोड़ा बहुत प्रभाव था, उन दिनों भी उन्होंने वहां से चारों ओर बौद्ध मजहब का प्रचार किया। मुगल सम्राटों का जब उन स्थानों पर प्रभाव था, तो वहां से उन्होंने तमाम राज्यों को संचालित किया। अंग्रेजों का जब प्रभाव हुआ तो वे भी गिलगित को चाहे लद्दाख के हिस्से को सब से अधिक महत्वपूर्ण मानते थे। मुगलों ने भी जिस वक्त अपना राज्य यहां स्थापित किया उस वक्त कोई भी वहां का अधिकारी नहीं होता था, लद्दाख को लें या स्कार्डू को लें या कागिल को लें जिसको मुगल सम्राटों की मर्जी के अनुसार नहीं चलना होता था। मर्जी इसलिए नहीं कि वे उनका कोई व्यक्तिगत कार्य करते थे मगर इसलिए कि दिल्ली की रक्षा के लिए लद्दाख की रक्षा अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण समझी जाती थी। यह समझा जाता था कि जो कोई भी वहां कब्जा करेगा, जिस किसी की भी वहां ताकत बढ़ेगी, उसको दिल्ली, चण्डीगढ़, लाहौर, अमृतसर इत्यादि में आने में तनिक भी कठिनाई नहीं होगी।

आज यहां पर नक्शे की बात की जाती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रजासमाजवादी दल हो या जन संघ या कोई और दल हो, हर कोई इन तमाम बातों का अध्ययन कर सकता है, कोई रोक टोक नहीं है यह जानने के लिए

कि नक्षत्रों में क्या क्या चीज कहां कहां है । उन सैनिक स्थितियों का अध्ययन व्यक्तिगत रूप से सारी जनता कर सकती है और सामूहिक रूप से सरकार कर सकती है । लद्दाख के महत्व के बारे में अगर कोई कहता है कि वह हमारे लिए कोई महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है तो इसको मैं ठीक नहीं समझता हूँ । इस तरह की बात को मैं महत्व नहीं देता । जब तक हम उसके महत्व को नहीं समझेंगे उसकी स्थिति को पूरी तरह से नहीं समझेंगे तब तक यह सम्भव नहीं है कि भारत की सौलडैरिटी, भारत की इंटीग्रेटी की रक्षा हो । मेरी दृष्टि में भारत की सौलडैरिटी और इंटीग्रेटी, लद्दाख की सौलडैरिटी और इंटीग्रेटी से पूरी तरह बंधी हुई है और इसको मान कर हमें चलना चाहिये ।

जो चीनी वहां आते हैं, या चीनियों के वहां ब्रिगेड स्थापित होते हैं या हुई हैं, जहां जहां चीनी मिलिटरी का जमघट है या जहां जहां पोस्ट्स स्थापित हुई हैं या होती हैं, उन सब के बारे में आप यहां से जानकारी हासिल कर सकते हैं । आप यह भी जान सकते हैं कि कितने वायुयानों का प्रवेश हुआ, बद्दीनाथ, जोशीमठ या असकोट के क्षेत्र में । एक वायुयान अगर ४५ मिनट तक उड़ता है और रात में भी यहां उस के वायुयान आते हैं, नेफा में भी उड़ते हैं, सिक्किम में, उत्तर प्रदेश के हिस्से में और लद्दाख में उड़ते हैं, तो आप समझ सकते हैं चाइना की एअर सुपीरियारिटी कितनी है ।

अभी श्री वाजपेयी ने कहा कि अब तक सड़क नहीं बनी है, यह बात मैं नहीं मानता । सड़क बनी है और ऐसी सड़कें और बनाई जानी चाहियें । हवाई जहाजों के झुंडे बने हैं लेकिन और ज्यादा बनाये जाने चाहियें । यदि चाइना के हवाई जहाज रात में भारत पर आते हैं, ४५ मिनट तक बद्दीनाथ और जोशीमठ बंदी रह पर चक्कर काट सकते हैं तो हमारी भी एअर सुपीरियारिटी उस के समक्ष रहनी

चाहिये । इसलिये जरूरत है कि हमारे हवाई झुंडे ज्यादा हों और इतनी ज्यादा तादाद में हों कि जब चाहें और जहां चाहें उतार सकें, वहां पहुंच सकें, यह नहीं कि महीने तक हम इन्तजार करें एक जहाज भेजने के लिये । जहां तक लेह कारगिल सड़क का सवाल है, उस पर आलोचना नहीं करनी चाहिये, इस लिये मैं चाहूंगा कि श्री वाजपेयी इस स्थिति को समझें कि कितनी कठिनाई में इसे बनाया गया है और इस का मेनटेन करना जरूरी है । जितनी टूंक रोड्स हैं, उन को अच्छी तरह से मेनटेन करना चाहिये, लेकिन उसी के साथ साथ वहां पर एक के बजाय दो दो रोड्स बनाई जानी चाहियें हर जगह पर । आज हम श्रीनगर से कारगिल जाते हैं, वहां से लेह जाते हैं इस लिये जरूरी है कि मंडी से मनाली और मनाली से लेह तक सड़क बने । भले ही उस पर करोड़ों, अरबों रुपये लगें लेकिन उस को जरूर बनाना चाहिये क्योंकि चाइना का आक्रमण इस बात की निशानी है, उसे कोई समझे या न समझे कि उस से सारी फाइव इअर प्लैन प्रभावित होगी, जितने भी हमारे विकास के कार्यक्रम हैं उन सबों पर उस का असर पड़ेगा, जितना हमारा सामाजिक ढांचा है, उस सब पर इस का असर पड़ेगा । जितने हमारे पड़ोसी राज्य हैं उन पर तो आलरेडी असर पड़ गया है ।

नेपाल के महाराजा साहब वहां गये । उस देश पर सब की श्रद्धा है और हमारी सन्धि भी उन के साथ थी । हमारा डिफेंस कमिटमेंट भी एक तरह से था । पिछले साल पंडित जी ने भी कहा था इस के बारे में लेकिन जाने के पहले और जाने के बाद उन को भारत सरकार से अच्छी तरह सलाह मशिवरा कर लेना चाहिये था कि जो भी बातें उन्होंने की थीं उन से उन का क्या महत्व होता है । जितने भी सैनिक घुसे हैं नेपाल में, इतिहास के शुरू से आज तक, वे उसी रोड से आये हैं जिसे कोठारी से बनाने की बात है । हो सकता है कि आज कोई कहे कि आज के युग में सड़कों का कोई विशेष महत्व

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

नहीं है, लेकिन कोरिया में वह हालत थी कि जब चीनी मखिलियों की तरह से सैनिक लिवास में वहां घुसे तो वहां पर यूनाइटेड नेशन्स और अमरीका के आधुनिक विमान भी असफल हो गये। इसी तरह से ल्हासा से काठमांडू तक जो सड़क बनाई गई और भारत से काठमांडू तक, उनको भारत सरकार ने ही बना दिया। ऐसी हालत में इन तमाम चीजों के बारे में नेपाल को राय मसिवरा अवश्य करना चाहिए था।

मैं भूटान को दाद दूंगा, उसकी तारीफ करूंगा, कि वह एक ऐसा देश है जो बराबर चीनी प्रभाव को धक्का दे रहा है, और आज भी वह चट्टान की तरह खड़ा है। चीन कितना ही दबाव डाले उस पर लेकिन वह भारत से परामर्श किये बगैर कोई कार्रवाई नहीं करेगा। यह होता आया है। होता यह इसलिये है कि लद्दाख में जो हमारी शक्ति होनी चाहिए, जम्मू और काश्मीर में जो हमारी ताकत होनी चाहिए वह संगठित शक्ति होनी चाहिए, क्योंकि जम्मू और काश्मीर भी भारत का हिस्सा है और उसकी रक्षा करना हमारी जिम्मेदारी है। चाहे पाकिस्तान ही चाहे चीन हो, अगर कोई हिन्दुस्तान में घुस आता है और हम उसको तुरन्त दंडित नहीं करते तो यह ठीक नहीं है। यहां पर पान्ति सेना की बहुत चर्चा की गई, भले ही यहां पर कोई चर्चा होती रहे, भले ही कोई किसी को वार मांगर कहता रहे, लेकिन अ डरने को चीडरी की निष्ठा नहीं समझता। असली नेता वह है जो किसी बात से भी डरता नहीं हो। लेकिन वह बात सत्य अवश्य होनी चाहिए। आज देश भक्ति का तकाजा है कि देश के किसी हिस्से में अगर कोई विदेशी आ जाये तो हम उस को निकाल बाहर करें। आज मैं भारत सरकार की तारीफ करता हूँ कि उसकी ओर से गोवा में कार्रवाई करने

का संकेत दिया गया है। इसी तरह से चाहे जहां कहीं हो हमें इस नीति पर जमे रहना चाहिये। जम्मू और काश्मीर की अखंडता की पूरी रक्षा किये बगैर हमारा कल्याण नहीं हो सकता, और लद्दाख की एक एक इंच जमीन भी उसी तरह से सुरक्षित रहे। आज यदि लद्दाख की एक इंच भूमि भी चाइना के हाथ में है उसे हम भले ही दर निगाह कर दें, उसका कोई महत्व न समझें, लेकिन अगर भारत को जिन्दा रहना है तो उसे हमको चीनियों से छीनना पड़ेगा। जो आदमी अकसाई चीन, इंडस वैली, नुबरा वैली, चुसूल प्लेटो आदि पर कब्जा रखेगा, चुसूल के ऊपर डेमचोक, चांग बंग एरिया, ह्याट स्प्रिंग्स वगैरह का जो हिस्सा है, उस हिस्से पर जिसका कब्जा होगा उसकी शान और उसकी मर्यादा हर जगह बढ़ेगी। आज हमने अपने अकसाई चीन और चांग थांग प्लेटो के कोने को छोड़ दिया है। छोड़ इसलिये नहीं दिया है कि हमारी छोड़ने की इच्छा है। मैं मानता हूँ कि पंडित जी जैसा कोई नेता हमारे देश में नहीं है। दूसरा कोई नेता या दूसरे किसी दल का नेता ऐसा नहीं है जिसके नेतृत्व में भारत को इतना संगठित किया जा सके, या इतनी शक्ति देश में उपाजित की जा सके। बजराम सिंह जी चाहे जो कुछ कहें लेकिन उनके नेता में . . .

श्री बजराम सिंह : यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : आज उनके नेता में भी इतनी ताकत नहीं है कि वह इतनी शक्ति देश में पैदा कर सकें ताकि हम उस हिस्से को वापस ले सकें। इसलिये हम आज शक्ति के उपयोग की दृष्टि से विचार करें, हम पंडित जी के नेतृत्व को इतना बुनन्द बनायें कि अपने देश को वापस लेने में सफल हो सकें। आज रंगा साहब भी जानते हैं कि किसी को किसधरली कुछ कहने की

हिम्मत नहीं होती। मैं रंगा साहब से भी कहूँगा कि जब तक वे हमारी पार्टी में थे, उस वक्त तक उन्होंने कुछ नहीं कहा।

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Question.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : क्वेश्चन क्या ? अब वे हमारी पार्टी को छोड़ कर भाग गये तब बोलने लगे। लेकिन जहाँ तक लड़ कर मनवाने की बात है मैं चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी का एक एक आदमी देश की सुरक्षा के लिये कांग्रेस पार्टी से या पंडित जी से या किसी से भी मजबूती से बात करे। और मैं इसके लिये सरकार और अपने नेता को भी दाद देता हूँ कि वह लोगों की बात को मानते हैं, नीति बदलते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कायदे के अनुसार आज रूपनानी जी भी अपनी बात रखें, मजबूती से रखें। बांवांडोल स्थिति रखना ठीक नहीं होता। इसलिये आज सब जगह मजबूती की आवश्यकता है। भारत के भविष्य को सुखमय और सुन्दर बनाने के लिये आवश्यक है कि हम न केवल लड़ाई के बचे हुए हिस्से को ही पूरी तरह सुरक्षित बनायें बल्कि दूसरे हिस्से को भी कैम्पचर करें, उसको अपने हाथ में लें।

जहाँ तक १७ या १८ हजार फिट तक फौजें भेजने की बात है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि १४ या १५ हजार फिट तक तो कोई भी आदमी जा सकता है। हाँ, १७ या १८ हजार फिट तक जाने के लिये हमको सेना को सुधिक्षित करने की जरूरत है। इसके बारे में हमको सोचना है। हिन्दुस्तान में मरने वालों और जान देने वाले इन्सानों का अभाव नहीं है, हिन्दुस्तान में रिसोर्सेज की कमी नहीं है, इंजीनियर्स और घोवरसियर्स का अभाव नहीं है। दिल्ली में, पटना या बम्बई में सड़कें बनाने के बजाय सब इंजीनियरों को लड़ाई भेजा जा सकता है। सेना के लिये कम्बडे के यूनिफार्म्स को वहाँ भेजा जा सकता है और जितनी उनके लिए

आवश्यकताएँ हैं उन सब आवश्यकताओं को पूरा किया जा सकता है। १७ या १८ हजार फिट क्या, इससे भी ऊँची चोटी पर आज के वैज्ञानिक युग में आदमी या विमान भेजना असम्भव नहीं है। यह काम कठिन जरूर है लेकिन हमें कठिनाइयों को हल करना है और देश की सुरक्षा के लिये इन कठिनाइयों को तत्काल हल करने की जरूरत है। हमें उनको जरूर हल करना चाहिये नहीं तो भागे चलना कठिन हो जायेगा। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे सेना के जवानों में ताकत है, लड़ने की शक्ति है और उनकी इस शक्ति में और ज्यादा बढ़ोतरी होगी अगर उन्हें ठीक से मीका मिले। इसलिये उनका हौसला बढ़ाने की जरूरत है। इसलिये आवश्यकता है कि हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा विमान खरीदें, हेलिकॉप्टर खरीदें। चाहे कांगो में हो चाहे हमारे देश में, अगर हमारे सैनिकों पर आक्रमण किया जाता है तो हमको उनकी रक्षा के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये। मैं चाहूँगा कि हम नेफा में, लद्दाख में चीनी लोगों का मुकाबला करने के लिये अपने लोगों को तैयार करें और आज जितनी शक्ति है उसकी दुगुनी शक्ति वहाँ भेजें और दुगुने रिसोर्सेज वहाँ भेजें, और उनकी सुरक्षा और सुख सुविधा के लिये हर चीज की व्यवस्था करे।

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is universal concern throughout the length and breadth of the country over the Chinese incursions. The Prime Minister too has made a reference to these incursions in unmistakable terms when he said that the intentions of the Chinese were far from—I think he used the word honest. He did not use the word dishonourable but if I call them 'dishonourable', there will be no exaggeration. It has been said by various Members of this House from the Opposition as well as from our Party that we have to state the issue in clear cut terms and not try

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

to be little what is happening on our northern borders. There are three types of teeth we generally hear of elephant's teeth that are for the purpose of show, the teeth that everyone human beings and animals-uses for eating and the teeth of the crocodile which are curved inwards in such a manner that anything that goes in finds it almost impossible to come out. We are surrounded by neighbours that have these crocodile teeth; whether it is China or Pakistan they believe in taking whatever they can and they believe in going on making statements which are not correct. We go on making protests and pointing out the facts to them which belie the statements made by them. It does not make the least impression on them. The White Paper makes a painful reading of this type. We keep on telling them what has actually happened but it does not make any impression on them. They go to the extent of distorting the speeches made by our Prime Minister at the Belgrade Conference and when we refer to our official versions and say that they are wrong, they do not accept our version. These are the type of people we have to deal with. Sir, I believe we have been duped, not today but we have been duped in 1950 or 1951 when we entered into the first treaty with the Chinese.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav (Malegaon): That was the panch sheel agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: But that should not be disturbed from this side.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I hope the Prime Minister will forgive me if I say that whatever he may say, the verdict of history is going to be against us on this point. We made a mistake initially when we withdrew from Tibet irrespective of what the Chinese did at that stage. Our advisers in the Government of India at that time advised us wrongly. But there is no

use in going into past history. Now, we find ourselves duped again. They have entered our territory and they have occupied a portion of it; they had first the Aksai Chin Road, and according to the map that has appeared in newspapers. Now, the second road has also been built. I am relieved to learn from the P.M. that the shading that is shown in the newspaper map is not correct but the fact remains that if a line is drawn along the posts to which they had advanced, the newspaper map will probably be correct. Why has this happened? On the NEFA border we have our military posts and the Chinese are not advancing. They should also be afraid of doing so along the northern border.

Acharya Kripalani: In NEFA also they have advanced..... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We should allow the hon. Member to advance now.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I understand that we have defended our NEFA border fairly adequately. If we did the same with our northern border, they could not have surreptitiously come in. I do not see the reason why we should honour this agreement of keeping so many miles as no man's land when the Chinese do not honour those agreements and keep on advancing into that area. The territory is ours; not theirs and we must protect that territory. If we say that it is difficult to protect that territory at the height of 15000 or 18000 feet it almost amounts to our making a present of all our hill areas to the Chinese or to anybody who could protect them. Surely, we are not prepared to do that. We have been fighting over Kashmir in the Gilgit and other areas occupied by Pakistan and we want them to come back to us because we believe they are important to us. No hill areas are unimportant however high they might be.

13.56 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

When considerable portions of these heights are occupied by the Chinese, we cannot take up the attitude that the area is difficult to defend. I wish we did not have to defend that area and if Tibet had been there as in the past, we might not have been required to do what we have to do today. The Prime Minister has said repeatedly that it is not only today but God knows for how many generations that this difficult situation would persist. So long as the Chinese aggressive intentions continue, this difficult situation is bound to continue.

Acharya Kripalani: We shall leave it as an inheritance to our children.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: The hon. Prime Minister has himself stated that this difficult situation will be left for our children and that we must do something so that it does not happen. The Chinese are expansionists; they swallowed up Mongolia, then Tibet and now they are trying to swallow up our northern hilly areas. Are we going to be silent spectators? Are we just going to write to them and tell them: please withdraw; you are not being good boys and you should honour your word. This is the impression one gets on reading the White Paper. We go on telling them but they do not have even the good sense to accept the facts which are patent. They say that they are right and we are wrong. They say that we have kidnapped their men and when those men issue their statements to say that they came of their own free will and they do not want to go back, the Chinese do not take any note of that. These are the type of people we have to deal with.

We are not sending our army people to Bara Hoti because of a certain agreement. Now the Chinese do not want us to send our civilians either. In the White paper we have said, "as there is no agreement that we will not send our civilian officers". Why should we use such language? It is

jarring. Who are they to tell us whether we should send our civilian officers to our own territory or not? We should tell them to mind their own business and not to talk to us in this manner. We have to take a realistic view. We must admit what the Defence Minister has said that we have been stabbed in the back. We are being continually stabbed in the back. Is it wise for us to be continuously in this position where this stabbing in the back continues? Cannot we do anything? I do not know and I am not in a position to suggest what should be done. That is for the Government to think about. I am not one of those who believe in war; I do believe in peace. I wholeheartedly support the Prime Minister in trying to keep the cold war in abeyance. At the same time, we cannot have any ambiguity with regard to our own defence and our own borders. My feeling is that the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, from time to time, make statements in order to allay the fears of our own people and to build up the morale of our people. But the opposition is also there: I do not mean the Opposition in this House but I mean our enemies across the Himalayas. They abuse those statements of ours which are meant to allay our own peoples' fears. They have quoted on more than one occasion that the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister have said that no tree can grow on those heights; that no animal can live at such great heights. At the same time, the Chinese go there and occupy that area. Whether a tree can grow there or not and whether any animal can live there or not the area is ours and, it is important to us. It is none of their business to tell us what to think or do; they have no business to preach to us.

14 hrs.

I remember what happened when the question of Hyderabad was before us; Lord Mountbatten tried to dissuade Sardar Patel and our own defence people were also trying to tell

[Smt. Sushila Nayar]

him that Hyderabad was very powerful and that the Nizam could get the help of this, that and the other. Sardar Patel used to get impatient. He was a heart patient and the doctors used to advise him not to get worked up. But he felt strongly on this issue. He was clear that Hyderabad was part of India and would be part of India. He was, therefore, able to solve that problem. Similarly, we have to be clear about our northern borders and on the question of Chinese aggression. It is no use trying to soft-pedal it. It is enough for our Communist friends to do that. Let us not be like them. Let us be quite clear. We have to tell the Chinese what we think of them and what we think of the way they are dealing with this question. (*Interruption*).

I remember reading in Plato's *Arologia* that Socrates said once "when philosophers are kings there shall be peace in the world". We are fortunate in having philosophers at the helm of affairs. Our Vice-President is a well known philosopher. Our Prime Minister also is a philosopher. and Mahatma Gandhi, of course, who was our leader and led us to freedom, was one of the greatest philosophers that the world has ever produced.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: A government of philosophers!

Dr. Sushila Nayar: But apart from being philosophers, when philosophers assume responsibilities of administration, they have to have strong men, just as our Prime Minister had Sardar Patel at the time of the Hyderabad crisis to help them. Some people out of his colleagues today have to come forward and assume that responsibility. The Prime Minister has led India to great honour. He is respected throughout the world and the peace-loving people throughout the world look up to him for his peaceful stand. It is necessary that that peaceful stand should be maintained. But he himself has said that that does not

mean that we will bow to, or submit to, aggression on our own frontiers. Therefore, I wish and hope that the Prime Minister and his colleagues will see to it that this aggression is terminated and is not allowed to advance by a single inch.

I do not see why we should not look at things in a realistic manner and boldly face the challenge. All the third Five Year Plan resources can be diverted to the development of our border areas, to the building of roads, to the development of power, electricity and small industries, and whatever is necessary—including central heating—so that the people can live there in comfort. People live in great comfort and great happiness in the cold climates of northern Norway and Sweden. Our hilly areas can be as beautiful and as hospitable and as fine to live in, if we divert our attention to them. When we are threatened by an aggressor like China, when thousands of miles of our territory have been occupied, we should think of this problem rather than of any other. I do not say that we should go to war; I do not believe in war. But surely, if our border areas are developed and are occupied by our own people, the Chinese cannot walk into those areas surreptitiously. Of course, we may not be able to live at such heights as 18,000 ft. and so on, but we can develop a little lesser heights in those areas and put them to much better use than we are doing at present.

I am glad that some steps are being taken in this direction, namely, to develop the hill areas. Some new districts have been created in Uttar Pradesh on the border. But it is not enough. We have to take up this work on a war-footing, and divert all our energy and attention to this one item. We do not want panic, but we want our people to know the truth. Whether we like it or not, the very fact that the Chinese have advanced, is causing panic. Our people are talking in terms of panic in terms of lives and we have to relieve that panic.

We cannot remove that panic by saying that nothing has happened. We cannot do it by belittling what has happened. We have to relieve this panic, remove it from people's minds, by taking some concrete steps to assure our people that we will be able not only to resist further aggression but we shall vacate it too.

Mr. Speaker: Acharya Kripalani—not here. Shri H. N. Mukerjee—not present. Then, Shri Braj Raj Singh.

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह खेद का विषय है कि देश की सुरक्षा के सम्बन्ध में जब सदन में बहस चल रही हो तब प्रधान मंत्री महोदय यह उचित समझने हैं कि किसी दूसरे देश के राष्ट्रपति का स्वागत करने के लिये उन्हें पालम हवाई अड्डे पर जाना पड़ेगा और यह चीज माफ भी की जा सकती हो तो यह तो कदापि माफ नहीं किया जा सकता कि रक्षा मंत्री महोदय भी सदन से उठ कर चले जायें और उनकी भी इतनी फुरसत न हो कि वह भी सदन में बैठ सकें

अध्यक्ष प्रहोदय : वह खाना खाने के लिए जा रहे हैं । डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब बैठे हुए नोट्स ले रहे हैं ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : अब यही तो शायद इस सरकार की कठिनाई है कि इसके मंत्री लोग खाने, सोने, नाच देखने और स्वागत-सत्कार आदि करने में ही ज्यादा व्यस्त रहते हैं । देश की सुरक्षा के लिये जो दृष्टिकोण उन्होंने इन पिछले दस वर्षों में अपनाया हुआ है वह बहुत ही खेदजनक है

सामुदायिक विकास तथा सहकार उप-मंत्री (श्री व० सू० नूत) : आखिर वह भी इ.ता है ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : लेकिन देश उन्हें माफ नहीं कर सकता ।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : नाच का कोई सबाल नहीं है ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : इधर देश की भूमि पर रोज बरोज कब्जा होता चला जा रहा है और इधर नाच होते हैं । इन पिछले १८ महीनों में लगातार भारत सरकार के मंत्रियों द्वारा चीन और हिन्दुस्तान के सम्बन्धों के बारे में और चीन द्वारा लद्दाख में जो घुसपैठ हुई उसके बारे में जो वक्तव्य दिये गये हैं वे किसी भी सभ्य सरकार के लिये शर्म की बात है ।

अभी कुछ दिन पहले जब मैंने इस सदन में एक काम-रोको प्रस्ताव इस बारे में रक्खा था तब भी प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा था :—

“It has come to our knowledge that in the past few weeks—it is difficult to give the date—some new check-posts were built by the Chinese a little beyond their own check-posts between the two boundaries they claimed...”

मेरा निवेदन है कि २० नवम्बर को भी गलत सूचना सदन के सम्मुख रखी जाती है । श्वेतपत्र यह जाहिर करता है, समाचपत्र जिन्होंने कि संकट के समय हमारी बड़ी सेवा की है वह बतला रहे हैं कि यह चीनी घुसपैठ पिछले कुछ हफ्तों से नहीं बल्कि पिछले १८ महीने से लगातार चल रही है । उस चीनी घुसपैठ को हिन्दुस्तान की पालिय-मैट से छिपाया जाता है । यहां पर प्रश्न पुछे जाते हैं, काम रोको प्रस्ताव आते हैं और विदेशी मामलों पर बहस होती है तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय और सरकार के अन्य मंत्री लोग इस बात को छिपाते हैं कि चीन कोई घुसपैठ कर रहा है । इसके विरोध में इस देश के मंत्रीगण सारे मुल्क में घूम-घूम कर और मकानों की छतों पर खड़े होकर एलान करते हैं कि देश की एक-एक इंच भूमि की रक्षा की जायगी और चीनियों को आगे नहीं बढ़ने दिया जायगा । मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस सरकार के दिमाग में एक इंच की परिभाषा क्या है । एक इंच कितना होता है ? क्या

[श्री बजर्राज सिंह]

१,४०० वर्गमील का एक इंच हो गया है या २,००० वर्ग मील का एक इंच हो गया है? और अगर एक इंच इतना बड़ा नहीं है, तो फिर कितना बड़ा है, यह बताया जाये। बार-बार यह जानने की कोशिश की गई है कि आखिर सरकार की तरफ से इस बात का क्या अन्दाजा लगाया गया है कि हमारी कितनी भूमि पर चीनियों ने नया कब्जा किया है, लेकिन आज तक यह नहीं बताया गया है कि हमारी कितनी और भूमि पर कब्जा किया गया है। इस अवस्था में, जब हमें इस बारे में कुछ पता नहीं लगता है, तो हम को, और इस देश की जनता को इस पर विश्वास करने पर विवश होना जड़ता है कि हमारे देश के १,४०० या २,००० वर्गमील क्षेत्र पर चीन ने कब्जा कर रखा है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय में सरकार की नीति में महान् कम-जोरी रही है। हमारे मित्र, डा० राम सुभग सिंह, ने अभी कहा कि पंडित जी इस तरह के आदमी हैं, जो अपनी नीति को बदलने के लिये तैयार रहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर यही बात होती, तो देश का इतना बड़ा दुर्भाग्य न होता। अगर उन्होंने परिस्थितियों के अनुसार अपनी नीति बदली होती और अपनी गलतियों को सुधारा होता, तो एक दूसरा ही चित्र देश के सामने होता।

१९५० में चीन ने तिब्बत पर हमला किया। उस समय भी हम उस के विरुद्ध थे। तब हमने कहा था कि तिब्बत शिशु की चीन दानव हत्या कर रहा है और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार उसमें शामिल हो रही है। किन्तु प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय ने हमारी उस बात की और कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। आज भी मैं विश्वास के साथ यह कह सकता हूँ कि प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय अपनी व्यक्तिगत प्रतिष्ठा को इतना ऊंचा उठा लेते हैं कि वह समझने लगते हैं कि अगर कोई विचार क्रिमी ऐसे व्यक्ति

के द्वारा प्रकट किया गया है, जिसका हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति में दर्जा कुछ छोटा है, तो उसका कोई महत्व नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि ठीक दृष्टिकोण यह होना चाहिये कि कोई बात कौन कह रहा है, इससे मतलब नहीं है, लेकिन अगर वह बात सच है, तो उस को स्वीकार किया जाये और उसके अनुसार अपनी नीति बदली जाये। अगर इस सरकार और प्रधान मन्त्री का दृष्टिकोण यह होता, तो हिन्दुस्तान की वह हालत न होती, जो कि आज है।

माननीय सदस्य, डा० राम सुभग सिंह, ने कहा कि गोभ्रा के मामले में हम कार्यवाही करेंगे। अगर सरकार वहाँ पर कार्यवाही करे, तो मुझे खुशी होगी और सारा देश उस का स्वागत करेगा। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि चीन के बारे में क्या कार्यवाही की जायगी।

श्री त्यागी : उसका जिक्र हम इसलिये नहीं करना चाहते कि दूसरे लोग तैयारी कर लेते हैं।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : हम जानते हैं, लेकिन सम्भवतः सत्तारूढ़ दल के लोगों की ओर से इसका जिक्र होता है उन उद्देश्यों की वजह से, जिनका सम्बन्ध निकट भविष्य में होने वाली बातों से है। लेकिन हम उसका जिक्र नहीं करना चाहते। हम तो यह चाहते हैं कि देश की सुरक्षा के लिये जो भी कदम उठाना आवश्यक हो, वह उठाया जाना चाहिये हम उसका विरोध नहीं करेंगे, बल्कि हम उस का स्वागत करेंगे। गोभ्रा के बारे में उठाए जाने वाले छोटे से कदम से हम चीन के सम्बन्ध में उठाए जाने वाले उस बड़े कदम को भुला नहीं सकते, हैं, जिसकी आवश्यकता है देश की सुरक्षा के लिये, देश के जन-जन में यह विश्वास पैदा करने के लिये कि सरकार हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करेगी।

श्री त्यागी : जरूर करेगी।

श्री बजराल सिंह : आज देश में इस तरह की भावना पैदा हो रही है कि यह सरकार देश की सुरक्षा बनाए रखने की गारण्टी नहीं दे सकती है। मुझे यह खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज देश में हम में यह ताकत नहीं है कि हम इस सरकार को हटा कर कोई दूसरी सरकार बना सकें, जो कि देश की सुरक्षा कर सके। इस विषय पर परिस्थिति में कि यह सरकार देश की सुरक्षा करने में असमर्थ है और देश में कोई दूसरी ऐसी शक्ति नहीं है, जो कि सरकार की बाग-डोर अपने हाथ में लेकर इस देश का शासन चलाये, इस सरकार पर और भी अधिक अहिंसेदारी आ जाती है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारें बदलती रहती हैं और प्रधान मंत्री आते जाते हैं, लेकिन एक बार की गई हुई आजादी आजादी से नहीं मिल सकती है। हमने अपने इतिहास में देखा है कि जब हम गुलाम हुए, तो आजादी प्राप्त करने के लिये हजारों साल लग गए और लाखों करोड़ों लोगों को कुर्बानी देनी पड़ी। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि प्रधानमंत्री और इस सरकार को अपने घर को व्यवस्थित, इन आईर, करना चाहिये और मंत्रियों को देखना चाहिये कि वे क्या कह रहे हैं, मंत्रियों को चाहे कुछ भी कहने से रोकना चाहिए और इस मसले पर एक आवाज से बोलना चाहिये। हम देखते हैं कि एक मंत्री कहता है कि हम को पाकिस्तान से खतरा हो सकता है, चीन से नहीं। क्या प्रधान मंत्री महोदय इन मंत्रियों के लिये कोई वक्ता, क्लरिफिकेशन नहीं खोल सकते और उन्हें यह नहीं बता सकते कि हिन्दुस्तान की चीन और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में स्थिति क्या है ?

इस बारे में मुझे तो यह लगता है कि हमारे मंत्री बहुत आराम-तलब हो गये हैं और वे यह भी नहीं जानते कि हमारे यहां क्या हो रहा है। सुरक्षा मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि मुझे तो समाचार-पत्रों से ही मालूम हो रहा है कि चीन ने हमारे देश में घुसपैठ की

है। इस देश के लिये इससे बड़ी दुर्भाग्य की बात और क्या हो सकती है कि हमारे प्रदेश पर चीन ने कब्जा कर लिया और सुरक्षा मंत्री को उसके बारे में कोई ज्ञान नहीं है ?

श्री त्यागी : किनी सवाल को एवायड करने के लिये इन किस्म के जवाब दे दिये जाते हैं। इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि उनको स्थिति का पता नहीं है और वह कुछ जानते नहीं हैं।

श्री अ० मु० तारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : वह सब कुछ जानते हैं। यह डिप्लोमेसी है।

[شہری ع - م - طارق : جموں اور کشمیر) : وہ سب کچھ جانتے ہیں۔ یہ ڈپلومیسی ہے۔]

श्री बजराल सिंह : क्या यह डिप्लोमेसी है कि इस घोषणा के बावजूद कि एक इंच भूमि पर भी किंगो का अधिकार नहीं होने दिया जायगा, चीनियों की लगातार घुसपैठ हो रही है और इस विषय में कुछ नहीं किया जाता है ? जब से चीन से हमारे सम्बन्ध बिगड़े हैं, जब से उसने हमारे देश में घुसपैठ शुरू की है, हमारे आदिमियों को पकड़ा है, मारा है, कैद रखा है, तब से क्या किसी चीनी को, मारना तो दूर रहा, पकड़ कर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार इधर ला सकी है ?

श्री अ० मु० तारिक : हमने उनको बाहर निकाल दिया है।

[شہری ع - م - طارق : ہم نے ان کو باہر نکل دیا ہے۔]

श्री बजराल सिंह : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की मजाक की बातों से हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा की गारण्टी नहीं हो सकती। इस तरह हल्केपन से हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को कायम नहीं रखा जा सकता। हम इस बात पर गर्व नहीं करते कि हम आजादी की

[श्री राजराज सिंह]

मारफ्टी करेंगे, लेकिन हम अपने छोटे तरीके से कहेंगे कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा के लिये सतरा होगा, तो हम बिना किसी भेदभाव के अपने बदन के खून की प्राखिरी बूंद को बहाने के लिये तैयार रहेंगे, लेकिन अपने देश की सुरक्षा करेंगे। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि क्या उन लोगों की तरफ से कोई कार्यवाही की जा रही है, जिन पर इस देश की जनता ने यह जिम्मेदारी डाल रखी है ? इस बारे में कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की जा रही है।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह ने कहा कि प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय अपनी नान्तियों में परिवर्तन करने के लिये तैयार हैं, तैयार हो सकते हैं, तैयार रहने हैं। मैं उनसे कुछ विशिष्ट प्रश्न, कुछ साफ़ सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ।

क्या प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय यह घोषणा करने के लिए तैयार हैं कि जब तिब्बत की आजादी का हनन हुआ, तब हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का दृष्टिकोण गलत था और अब वह तिब्बत को एक आजाद मुल्क के रूप में देखना चाहते हैं और अब वह ऐसे किसी काम का समर्थन नहीं करेंगे, जिसमें तिब्बत को टिबेटन रिजल आफ़ चाइना कहा जा सके ?

चूँकि चीन की तरफ से इस तरह की कार्यवाहियाँ की जा रही हैं कि हमारे पड़ोसी मित्र राष्ट्र, नेपाल और बर्मा आदि, उसकी तरफ अधिक झुकते जा रहे हैं, तो क्या प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय इस तरह की कार्यवाही करने के लिये तैयार हैं कि यह देश हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ अधिक झुकें ?

क्या प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय इस बात के लिये तैयार हैं कि चीन ने जो नई चौकियाँ स्थापित की हैं इस बीच में—कुछ लोग इस अवधि को कुछ हफ्ते बताते हैं, समाचार पत्र बारह, अठारह महीने कहते हैं और विरोध-पत्र कुछ और बताते हैं—उनको ताकत के बल पर नष्ट कर दिया जायगा ? यह कोई लड़ाई नहीं है। अगर कोई बाहर का आदमी, कोई

विदेशी हमारी बैठक में आकर बैठ जाता है—हम किसी के घर में नहीं जा रहे हैं—और उस समझौते के बाद ऐसा करता है कि स्टेट्स को को मेनटेन किया जायगा, यथास्थिति रखी जायगी, तो क्या प्रधान मन्त्री की तरफ से यह आश्वासन मिल सकता है कि नई चौकियों को डिमालिश कर दिया जायगा, उन को नष्ट कर दिया जायगा और चीनियों को वहाँ से हटा दिया जायगा ?

श्री त्यागी : ज़रूर कर दिया जायगा।

श्री राजराज सिंह : यह बात हमारे मित्र, त्यागी जी, कह रहे हैं। मुझे ख़ुशी होती कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मन्त्री का जगह पर बैठे होंगे। लेकिन यह उनका अपना झगड़ा है। मुझे उससे मतलब नहीं है। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय के अपने मुँह से ये शब्द निकलें।

मैं उनको यह आश्वासन देना चाहता हूँ कि देश का एक-एक नागरिक बिना किसी राजनैतिक भेदभाव के उनके साथ होगा, उन लोगों को छोड़ कर, जिन की देशभक्ति के बारे में किसी को शक हो। लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय यह बात कहने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। इस तरह के वक्तव्य दिये जाते हैं कि चीन बड़ा मुल्क है। कौन कहता है कि वह बड़ा नहीं है ? लेकिन क्या हिन्दुस्तान कोई छोटा मुल्क है ? हमारा इतिहास यह बताता है कि हमने कभी भी किसी मुल्क की जमीन पर कब्जा करने के लिए लड़ाई नहीं लड़ी है। हमारा इतिहास इस बात का साक्ष्य है कि हम कभी भी बांग्लादेश नहीं रहे हैं। लेकिन जब अपने घर पर आ बर्ना हो, जब कोई हम को मारता हो, हम को अपने घर में न रहने देता हो, तो फिर भी क्या हम अपनी रक्षा के लिये शक्ति का प्रयोग नहीं करेंगे ? यह किस ने हमको सिखाया है ? राष्ट्रपिता ने हम को यह नहीं सिखाया कि अगर हम पर कोई हमला

करेगा, तो भी हम शक्ति का प्रयोग नहीं करेंगे ।

क्या प्रधान मंत्री महोदय इस बात के लिये तैयार हैं कि तिब्बत के आत्म-निर्णय के अधिकार को स्वीकार किया जायगा और यदि तिब्बत के आत्म-निर्णय के अधिकार को चीन नहीं मानता है, तिब्बत की आजादी को पुनः बहाल नहीं किया जाता है, तो फिर हमारी और चीन की सीमा-रेखा वह नहीं रहेगी, जिस को मैकमोहन रेखा कहा जाता है । जब तिब्बत की आजादी का हनन हो चुका है, जब हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के बीच में तिब्बत एक बफर-स्टेट, एक दीवार की तरह नहीं रहा है, जब चीन हमारे दरवाजे पर धा गया है, तब हिन्दुस्तान और चीन की सीमा रेखा हिन्दुस्तान के भूगोल के मुताबिक, उसके इतिहास के मुताबिक, उसके धर्म शास्त्रों के मुताबिक तथा परिस्थितियों को देखते हुए वह बनती है जहां से ब्रह्मपुत्र का उद्गम है, जहां से ब्रह्मपुत्र जन्म लेकर चलना शुरू करता है और पूर्व तक बहता रहता है । इसके साथ साथ ही भारत चीन की सीमा रेखा है । यह उस सूत्र में है जबकि तिब्बत की आजादी का हनन हो चुका है । इस सूत्र में इसके सिवा कोई दूसरी सीमा रेखा हो ही नहीं सकती है । तिब्बत की आजादी का चीन द्वारा हनन हो चुकने के बाद जहां से ब्रह्मपुत्र शुरू होता है और जहां तक पूर्व की ओर बहता है, वही सीमा रेखा हो सकती है । यह मैं उत्तरी सीमा के सम्बन्ध में कह रहा हूं । यह मैं उस सीमा रेखा के बारे में कह रहा हूं जिसको मैकमोहन रेखा कहा जाता है । जहां तक लद्दाख का प्रश्न है, वहां मैकमोहन रेखा ही नहीं है । वहां पर तो परम्परागत सीमा रेखा है । तिब्बत की आजादी का हनन हो चुकने के बाद, तथा तिब्बत को आजाद करने के लिये चीन तैयार नहीं है और दुनिया में कोई शक्ति नहीं है जो तिब्बत की आजादी उसको दुबारा दिला सके, वही सीमा रेखा बनती है जहां से ब्रह्मपुत्र चलना शुरू करता है,

जिसको कि सांगपो कहते हैं और पूर्व की ओर बहता जाता है । क्या भारत के प्रधान मंत्री इस बात को कहने के लिये तैयार हैं ? हमारा इतिहास साक्षी है और इतिहास ही नहीं बल्कि दस साल पहले का हमारा अपना ही रिकार्ड इस बात का साक्षी है कि मंजर गांव, जो मैकमोहन रेखा से ७० मील ऊपर पड़ता है, से हमारे अपने ही एक अधिकारी सरदार राम सिंह ने सन् १९५० में २५० रुपये बतौर मालगुजारी के दमूल किये थे । इस बात को हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार खूद मानती है । जब १९५० में मंजर गांव हमारे पास था तो आज क्या हो जाता है कि हम मैकमोहन रेखा की बात कहते हैं ? और यह बात भी उस सूत्र में करते हैं जबकि तिब्बत की आजादी का हनन हो चुका है । ऐसे हालत में हम मैकमोहन रेखा को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं ।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि इन सब प्रश्नों पर आखिर हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री क्या कहना चाहते हैं ? क्या वह इस तरह से अपनी नीति बदलने के लिए तैयार हैं या नहीं हैं ? मैं इस बात को उचित नहीं समझता हूं कि चीन से हम अपने राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध विच्छेद कर दें । कई माननीय सदस्य ऐसा सोच सकते हैं मगर मैं नहीं चाहता कि चीन से हम अपने डिप्लोमेटिक रिलेशंस तोड़ लें । लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहता हूं कि बार-बार चीन के प्रश्न को लेकर हम यू० एन० में बकालत न करें कि उसको उस संगठन का सदस्य होना ही चाहिए । हां, अगर चीन को उस संगठन का सदस्य बनाने की बात आती है तो हम उसका समर्थन कर सकते हैं । लेकिन हम बकालत उसकी करते जायें और उस सूत्र में करते जायें जब कि व बार-बार हमारी सीमाओं का अतिक्रमण करता जा रहा है, तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह कोई सही नीति नहीं है । इससे यह समझा जा सकता है कि यह हमारी कमजोरी है । यह समझा जा सकता है कि उसकी फलैट्री

[श्री अजराम सिंह]

करने के लिए, उसकी गुलामी करने के लिए हम ऐसी बातें कह रहे हैं ।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि भारत की चीन सम्बन्धी नीति में स्पष्ट रूप से परिवर्तन करने की जरूरत है । देश की जनता के दिमाग में सुरक्षा की भावना पैदा करने के लिए अच्छा रहा होता अगर सरकार ने इस्तीफा दे दिया होता । मैं जानता हूँ कि इसके बाद भी कोई दूसरा दल आज हिन्दुस्तान की वागडोर को सम्भाल रखने में समर्थ नहीं है लेकिन फिर भी हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री और हिन्दुस्तान के मंत्रिमंडल में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि आप इस नीति में असफल रहे हैं, देश की जनता को जगाना, देश की जनता को हिलाना, आपका काम है, क्योंकि आप शासक दल हैं, आप इस्तीफा दे देते और फिर से जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त करते । आपकी तरफ से कहा जा सकता है कि ऐसी बातें कहते वक्त हम बहुत ही कम गम्भीरता से, बहुत ही हल्केपन से इस चीज को लेते हैं और ढाई महीने बाद यह प्रश्न आ रहा है देश की जनता इसको तय कर लेगी । मैं मानता हूँ कि ढाई महीने बाद यह प्रश्न आ सकता है लेकिन उस समय यह मुख्य मसला नहीं होगा । आपको कहना यह चाहिये क्योंकि हम असफल रहे हैं, क्योंकि हम चाहते हैं कि देश की जनता का समर्थन प्राप्त करें, और अधिक शक्ति प्राप्त करें, इसलिये इस्तीफा दे रहे हैं । अगर आप ऐसा करते तो भी आप ही दुबारा यहां आते क्योंकि कोई दूसरी शक्ति नहीं है जो यहां आकर बैठ सकती थी । लेकिन इतनी ईमानदारी की हिन्दुस्तान के मंत्रियों से आशा नहीं की जा सकती । अगर आशा होती तो वे हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को जगते । आपको चाहिये या कि आप जनता में यह भावना भरते कि चीन ने जो हमला किया हुआ है, हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा किया हुआ है, उस कब्जे

को हटाने के लिए हम कुर्बानी दें । अगर यह भावना नहीं भरी है तो इसके लिए सब से ज्यादा जिम्मेदारी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की है जिसने इस भावना को जागृत नहीं होने दिया है, इस भावना को लोगों तक पहुंचने नहीं दिया है, जिसने तथ्यों को, रहस्यों को, सही बातों को जनता से छिपाया है ।

अगर आप समझते हैं कि आप जिस भूमि पर चीन ने कब्जा कर लिया है वहां से उसको नहीं हटा सकते हैं और उसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं, तो क्या आप यहां पर यह आश्वासन दे सकते हैं और गम्भीरतापूर्वक दे सकते हैं कि इसके आगे एक इंच भूमि भी चीन के कब्जे में नहीं जाने दी जाएगी ? अगर इस आश्वासन को भी आप नहीं दे सकते हैं तो मैं कहूंगा इतिहास में आपका नाम तो रहेगा, नाम तो रहा है अकबर और औरंगजेब दोनों का लेकिन विभिन्न तरीकों से रहा है, लेकिन भिन्न तरीके से रहेगा, ऐसे तरीके से रहेगा जिससे हिन्दुस्तान की आने वाली पीढ़ियां आपको कुछ अच्छे तरीके से नहीं, प्रसन्दतापूर्वक नहीं, बड़े खेद के साथ याद करेंगी । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इतिहास की धारा को बदलें, देश की सुरक्षा की गारंटी ।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ranga—or Shri Mukerjee.

Shri Ranga rose—

Mr. Speaker: Does he not want to speak? Then, Shri Mukerjee?

Shri Ranga: I want to speak, Sir, but I was told that he was to follow.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been trying to follow....

Mr. Speaker: If Shri Kripalani wants to speak I will call him first and Shri Mukerjee later on.

Acharya Kripalani: I will listen to his oration.

Mr. Speaker: Each is trying to follow the other.

An Hon. Member: They are trying to follow Shri Mukerjee.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been trying to follow the debate with a certain dispassionate spirit because I feel that in discussions of subjects of such gravity as the one that is before us we should try to avoid the demagogic way of approaching things. But I am afraid, Sir, that what I had anticipated has very largely taken place, and a kind of advantage has been sought to be taken of a difficult, deplorable and delicate situation, which I feel should not have been done.

Sir, it goes without saying that the reports of recent Chinese operations on India-China border have caused a definite deterioration in a situation which was already bad enough. That is a great pity and very much to be deplored. But it is perhaps a greater pity that in spite of the Prime Minister last week giving the House and the country a mass of factual material to put the picture in its proper perspective the speeches which I have heard—the mellifluous oration of Shri Vajpayee and the rather fast and loose but effective and powerful demagoguery of my good friend Shri Asoka Mehta and certain other speeches—have given me an impression that these friends of mine are trying to exploit the situation for purposes that are basically unworthy, for subverting the policy of peace and non-alignment which has served our country's interest best and has sustained our high standing in the world today in spite of whatever might have happened on the India-China border.

My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta in a very powerful oration has asked for the removal of ambiguities in the foreign policy of the Prime Minister. Certainly, Sir, if these ambiguities....

Shri Asoka Mehta: I would like to correct you there. I said: "removal of ambiguities of Government's policy towards China". I never said "foreign policy".

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Let it be "ambiguities to be removed in the foreign policy in so far as China is concerned". Surely, Sir, it is a very valid claim for anybody, especially in the Opposition, to ask for ambiguities to be removed from any aspect of the foreign policy or the internal policy of this country. But when a subtle attempt is made by playing fast and loose at the same time with words, when an attempt is made to point out that the security of our country has been so jeopardised today that the political policy which continues to be followed by the Prime Minister—and I take him at his word, whatever he says in the House and in the country—has got to be definitely changed, it is a very different thing from the removal of ambiguities from one particular item in the long agenda which the Prime Minister has on the table of his foreign policy department, and that is why I feel that on a subject of this description there is no doubt about the feelings in the country and there is no doubt about the unanimous determination of the country to defend resolutely the integrity of our borders. That does not mean to say that for the time being certain dents have not taken place; they have; but we have to take a view of the matter from at least the angle of parliamentarians who have to look after the interests of this country, the dignity of this country and the future, not only of this country but of the world about us. I admit that it is natural to feel something like exasperation at certain of the things which China appears to have done from all the reports that have reached us.

An Hon. Member: Appears to have done?

Another Hon. Member: It would always appear to them like that.

Shri (Madan?) (Shri) never interrupted the PSP or Jan Sangh spokesmen. They had their say.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: That is why I say there is reason for anger, exasperation, sorrow and that sort of thing. As far as we are concerned when the reports regarding the latest Chinese operation on the frontier were presented to this House on the 20th of last month, the General Secretary of our party issued a statement, and I am quoting the relevant portion of that statement. He said:

"Such acts, specially in the context of the dispute already existing, cannot but heighten tension, create deep resentment among the Indian people and further embitter the relation between the two countries. We demand that the Government of the Peoples' Republic of China must immediately put an end to such acts. We demand also that effective measures must be taken by them to ensure that such things do not occur again."

Shri Tyagi: It is a good idea.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We share the anger and exasperation at certain things which have taken place but, surely, in spite of whatever setbacks have taken place, we continue in our conviction—and from what the Prime Minister says, he also seems to share that conviction—that the dispute such as the one that we have between India and China in spite of serious things happening, can and must be settled in a peaceful way and through negotiations. This does not mean that the determination of our people to defend the Indian territorial integrity is at all weakened; this does not mean the vigilance on our border should be slackened and if there has been any factual default in regard to the vigilance in the border it should not be rectified, but this does mean that first things must continue to come first and the idea of an amicable settlement

through negotiation is not for a moment discarded. This is a proposition which, I think, is imperative, and absolute, and this is something which is essentially linked up with the foreign policy of our country.

From the 20th of last month when these reports came out in Parliament, a campaign of exaggeration crescendoing into something like hysteria, which was obviously planned in view of the coming elections, has been seen but this campaign should have been set in its proper focus by the Prime Minister's factual statement in the House, but it has, I fear, rather disreputable connotations. It is a part of the sustained campaign against India's foreign policy of peace and independence, a campaign which has many backers in many countries, Washington and other places, a campaign which aims at a swing to the right in the coming elections. I know it is rather like building castles of sand but, for the time being, this campaign is a danger and a nuisance, and that is why this Parliament has to put its foot down and has to look at the matter in the proper perspective. This campaign, therefore, has had its reflection in the debate and I was only glad to notice that the orators did not ask for breaking off of diplomatic relations and that sort of thing. I do not know why it was done because, in view of all that has been said, that was a logical culmination, but they did not dare do so, perhaps, in view of the fact that the country will not listen to them if they suggest such a course of action which goes so much against the foreign policy of our country.

The Prime Minister has placed some very revealing factual materials before us, and from that the conclusion that emerges is that while we must not be complacent about the border situation—I repeat it, we must not be complacent about the border situation—there is no need for panic and

there is no need for recourse to frantic measures either. I need not go into the details of the three check posts by China—they are no doubt reprehensible—but they do not imply, as the Prime Minister told us, of Chinese possession of any large area. We have learnt from him of the military and other steps which India has taken as long back as 1950 when India was alerted of the Chinese coming into Tibet. Military and administrative steps and other steps in regard to communication and so on have been taken so that our position on the north eastern frontier is more or less consolidated. In the Ladakh region India is having more posts and the building of strategic roads has been given added emphasis. There is no question also in the highest mountainous terrain of large armies manoeuvring and confronting each other. I am only quoting what the Prime Minister told us. All possible steps, according to the Prime Minister, for securing of our frontier are being taken and, from what I can see, the Prime Minister puts his trust in negotiations and wants to have an amicable settlement but, of course, he keeps his powder dry. That is a sane and sensible policy, but these triple, quadruple or quintuple alliances which I see in this House, and which will perhaps operate somewhere in the country, want him to spout thunder and venom and embark on an adventurist course which will be fatal to our country and the cause of peace itself.

So, I heard the other day some of our friends here asking for defence arrangements with Pakistan in order to fight China. But General Ayub Khan's fulminations have been too blatant for them to persist in that demand.

I know we are dubbed pro-China, unpatriotic and the rest of that kind of thing. Even the Prime Minister, in his own way, speaks of it, but our own people, with whom we work, they know what these slanders are worth. And, in any case, I cannot go

into this matter over and over again and refer to it. The elections are coming and will show that these slanders do not work with our people. We ask anybody, here or outside, to come and challenge us; come to Calcutta, from where I come, and see what happens when you talk of our being unpatriotic, our being pro-China and that sort of thing. In this House and elsewhere, we have been accused of conducting a pro-China campaign in the border districts. It is a complete fib. Whatever allegation was brought up was never substantiated and all the charges were completely rebutted. The names given by the Prime Minister on one occasion were absolutely baseless. I myself paid a visit to Darjeeling over a year ago and made a speech in regard to the language demand which was being put up by the Gurkha population. I was hauled over the coals in this House by friends of mine on the Congress side, and now the Congress party has accepted exactly the same proposition which I heard there and which I tried to uphold. This is the kind of thing which goes on, and that is why I say that this sort of attack on some of our own people who happen to be Communists and calling them pro-China lead us nowhere. It is necessary for us to put our heads together, because the country is facing a difficult situation, a delicate situation, a deplorable situation, a situation which we find it very difficult to understand and explain. I cannot understand, for instance, why there is this kind of relationship between India and China today, when between India and China there was growing such a wonderful relationship and why it has got this kind of obstruction. It is a difficult situation. It is not a situation about which you can formulate a conclusion, jump into suggesting a course of action, and that is why I want to be humble, I want to act with humility with whatever factual material that I have. The Prime Minister is supplying us factual material which suggests that we need not be complacent, but that we need not be panicky. Here is the suggestion of the Prime Minister

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

which we have to carry out for arriving at a settlement. At the same time, we have to keep our powder dry. That is the kind of a statement which we certainly support. That is the kind of statement which we support, keeping very firmly in view the idea of Afro-Asian solidarity, the idea of India and China and other countries of this part of the world being well knit together because, otherwise, we shall have to give up our policy of non-alignment; otherwise, we have to seek for arms from the countries with which some of our friends might be in a sort of alliance, which is the kind of thin which we certainly do not want.

There are amicable and non-amicable ways of resolving differences between States. We shall pursue to the bitter end the amicable ways of resolving differences between States. It is necessary for us to be circumspect and to take up a wise line which would do credit to us and would also never hurt the interests of our country.

It is often very provocative....

Acharya Kripalani: Even the hon. Prime Minister is not supporting him. He has gone away.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not happen to have to wait on the god pleasure of anybody in this House, whether he is the hon. Prime Minister or somebody else. I am not sorry at all if the hon. Prime Minister does not hear me. But perhaps Acharya Kripalani, who had depended a great deal upon the good pleasure of the hon. Prime Minister for his political advancement, would feel hurt if the hon. Prime Minister did not listen to his speech if he happened to make it.

It is not for me to make any excuses for China. I have already said that we have made our own position very clear. But I sometimes imagine that there is a growing pro-western orientation in our Government which per-

haps upsets China. Perhaps China calculates that the presence of the Prime Minister of India in the Indian Government is a kind of Godsend. He is a check on the right wing elements of the Congress leadership.

This morning I read in the papers a statement by a member of the Congress Party who has been pushed out of the Party in the other House. He gives a statement in the press saying, "Many of the Cabinet Ministers and leaders of the Congress Party feel the same way as I do." That is a kind of statement which is appearing. Press comments appear in regard to India-China dispute in a manner which perhaps to the brains of the Chinese people who are not brought up on the traditions of parliamentary government appear to be absolutely inexplicable. There are bases in Pakistan which are aimed definitely against the Socialist countries and possibly in regard to that part of the frontier China is almost demented. Perhaps this fear complex leads China to courses of action which are not understandable in terms which we normally can understand. That is why perhaps certain things happen from time to time. But I do not say that in extenuation or as an excuse for what has happened. I only say that the attitude of China is there. Even so, in spite of the attitude of China, we have to stress, as the hon. Prime Minister is doing at meeting after meeting in Calcutta, agra and elsewhere, the idea of a negotiated settlement, a peaceful settlement, by negotiations.

I repeat therefore that for the freedom and development of countries like ours the defence and the solidarity of Asian peoples is a categorical imperative. There is no question of the slackening of our resolute determination to defend the integrity of our country. At the same time, in spite of provocations let steps be evolved for the settlement of the dispute in a peaceful way. What is being screeched for in this discussion by some of my hon. friends in this House is a way

of unwisdom, of disaster, of the belighting of people's hopes in India and elsewhere. That is why I feel that we should carry on this discussion in as detached and dispassionate a manner as we possibly can muster. We are not in the market place. It is not necessary for us to be swayed away by certain ideas and for speaking as if we are asking people to come and give of their blood in order to fight for the country. If that was the situation, naturally we would have behaved very differently. If that situation had actually arisen, surely we would have said, "Let us go ahead and fight and push out the intruder from our country."

But I repeat the political policy of country in regard to foreign affairs has so far been pursued in relation to other countries as well as in relation to China, but in relation to China I do not think that the country's security is in jeopardy to the extent that the political policy which has paid us so much dividends will have now to be discarded. That is being suggested certainly by innuendoes and sometimes by open attack. That is the suggestion which the country and this House certainly will ask everybody to discard.

Acharya Kripalani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is very ennobling to hear of patience and restraint from the leader of a party which just has never shown these virtues even in this House.

I am not happy to criticize the defence policy of the Government of India. I had always thought that the defence policy should be common to all the parties in the country, excepting one (the Communists), and also to the people of India.

It becomes difficult to discuss important issues with the hon. Prime Minister's habit to indulge into generalisations and abstractions and to moralise philosophise and confuse issues before the country. He also expects his audience to accept the beauty of his language for the clarity

of his thought. Further he creates, as my hon. friend, Shri Asokh Mehta pointed out, semantic confusion. As a few examples, whenever this House has advocated strong action he has always said that "war solves no problems". He has further said that "war is not civilised behaviour." But it appears that in the Congo we expect war to solve some problems! We sent our soldiers because we thought that it was some kind of polite behaviour or not a very bad behaviour. He told us long ago in very poetic language that in the territory that has been occupied "not a blade of grass grows, not a human being lives." I am sure this expression is going to be classical and will go down in history. One of his Ministers in Bombay repeated it. We have been asked by many people in the world, "What are you bothering about when your Prime Minister says that not a blade of grass grows in the occupied territory and not a human being lives there?"

My hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, has pointed out how Longju was once considered to be in our territory. It is also so mentioned in the White Papers. Today it is on the border and it is not certain whether it is in our territory or is not in our territory.

An Hon. Member: It has been vacated.

Acharya Kripalani: It has been vacated but we dare not occupy it. Why has it been vacated? Why did we not occupy it? This is some thing which only the Government can understand.

Then there is this confusion of words. When we meet the Chinese representatives it is said to be a courtesy call or it is said that we are not meeting to negotiate. I do not understand what they meet for! The Chinese behaviour on the present occasion is called 'startling', yet 'nothing serious', we are told, has happened.

[Acharya Kripalani]

Then, there are many air violations of which my hon. friend in the Congress Dr. Ram Subhag Singh talked. We are told that the planes fly so high that it is impossible to identify them. If it is impossible to identify them, why not give a notice to all that any planes flying in our territory without our permission shall be shot at? Our plane in Pakistan was shot at. There was no war; no trouble at all. We took it as a matter of course. When the air strip of our territory is violated, action should follow.

About aggression, sometimes we are told by the authorities that they are surprised at their foresight. We were told that they were so farsighted that they saw trouble in 1950. In 1950 that very year we allowed the small kingdom of Tibet to be occupied by China. Year after year, I have raised my voice against this destruction of a buffer state. Its fate was sealed by what is called Panch Sheel. My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta said that the principles of Panch Sheel are very good. I do not now if they have any meaning at all. They do not apply to any political situation in the world. As I said once, *Panch Sheel* was born in sin, because we failed to depend a neighbour. Hitler did not go to war with England, but England declared war on Hitler. Even Kaiser did not go to war with England, but England declared war. Why? Because, in one instance a buffer kingdom was destroyed and in another instance also a buffer state was destroyed. Destruction of a buffer state is always considered as an act of enmity towards a country.

We also decided that we will not send patrols in our own territory. Why? The reason given, was because we want to 'tranquillise' the situation on the borders. We did not send people in our own territory in order to 'tranquillise' the situation.

The Defence Minister talks in the same style though not with that much of eloquence and poetry. When we

talked in this House about Chinese aggression, he told us that the U.N.O. has not defined aggression. For five years or six years, they have been at it and they have not been able to define it. I have got some pain in my body. I am told by my neighbour that a very eminent surgeon in Bombay has not defined it and so I have no pain! Unless that is defined, I can have no pain! It is a wonderful way of arguing.

When we complained of inhuman treatment of Tibetans by the Chinese, we were told that the Chinese have not accepted the Human rights item in the U.N.O. programme and therefore, they were at liberty commit inhumanities in Tibet! About the Hungarian revolt, we were told that it was a street broil.

Then, we were told, not an inch of our administrative territory will be yielded to China. We have in Rajasthan territories which are not administered, because these are desert lands. I suppose if Pakistan occupies this land we would have no objection.

An Hon. Member: Not a blade of grass grows there!

Acharya Kripalani: Not a blade of grass grows there, of course.

He also told us that the Chinese are not fools and they will not advance in our territory because they do not want to lengthen their lines of communications. He has never heard something like consolidating of positions and then going forward. He thinks, people go on conquering territories and they have learnt nothing from history and that they had not think of their communications.

The present utterances of his are very astounding, indeed. In America, he (Shri Menon) is reported to have said—and he has not contradicted it—that there is no "active hostility". A thief comes into my house, I put a quilt over myself! There is no ques-

tion of active hostility here, there is no hostility at all. Why did the Defence Minister say that there is no active hostility? He could have gone further and said, there is no hostility at all because he takes no action. He is found more in America than on our borders. I suppose we have got swaraj in foreign lands and he is defending it in America.

Then, the most astounding thing is—I think it is unique in the whole history of the world—that the Defence Minister says that all the information that he has about the new aggression of China, he has got from the papers. I cannot understand how a Defence Minister can say such thing!

Mr. Speaker: What paper? May be his own papers.

Acharya Kripalani: He said, newspapers. You may defend him. It is indefensible. I thought that newspapers get information from the Government about what is happening. Here, our Defence Minister gets his information from the newspapers, though aggression has been going on, as has been admitted, for the last 12 months and more. Not only that, but there have been protest notes sent about three months back. I suppose he was ignorant of the protest notes also. I hope some Communists will come and defend him. We are told by the Prime Minister that Mr. Menon represents his sentiments and his policies faithfully!

What is the result of all this? The result of all this is that our enemies take advantage of what is said by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister in defence, not of this country, but of the action that China takes against us. One of the great difficulties of our batch of officers who met their opposite numbers in China was that when they put conclusive facts before the Chinese delegation, when they presented them with maps, those people presented them with the utterances of our Prime Minister and our

Defence Minister and they had no answer to these at all. This is how things in our country are done!

Then, we must understand,—I hope the Government understands,—wherefrom these reports that are coming in the newspapers emanate. Take it from me that these reports emanate only from one source, and that source is the Government itself. There are certain patriotic officers who, when they find that things are becoming so very difficult that their country is in danger, they see no other way of exposing what is going on, and they tell it to the press.

15 hrs. ..

The press in India has no representatives on those high mountains, nor would the press be allowed to go there, as I know it is not allowed. Wherefrom then does this information come? It comes from the patriotic officers who are in the Foreign Department and who are in the Defence Department; I am afraid they will be found out and properly dealt with.

Shri Tyagi: You call such officers 'patriotic'?

Shri Goray: Of course, they are patriotic.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): They might be concocted from your imagination.

Acharya Kripalani: Again, take it from me that the Army that is stationed there has absolute orders to do nothing whatever the Chinese may do.

Shri Nath Pal: Shame, if it is true.

Acharya Kripalani: It is absolutely true, and I know it.

An Hon. Member: How do you know it?

Acharya Kripalani: How do I know it? I know it because if there are soldiers stationed in any place, if there is aggression, shooting would be automatic; they would not wait for

[Acharya Kripalani]

orders, because such action would be considered as self-defence. I do not think that our boys are so stupid as to see the Chinese advancing into our territory and not to hit; shooting would be considered in military language as self-defence. Self-defence does not mean that a soldier should be attacked, self-defence means that the country is attacked, and I cannot imagine that our boys who have fought on many fronts are so stupid as not to realise this. I think that it is maligning our Army people to think that the Chinese go on building posts and coming into our territory, and the army personnel, do not feel inclined to shoot even one Chinese. It is an impossibility which I cannot understand; I do not know how Congressmen can understand it, but I am sure they also do not understand it. It is only Defence Minister who understand it.

I have always seen that when you minimise evil, then, in a way, you justify it; and our Government has been minimising this evil and indirectly justifying it.

Another thing which is absolutely demoralising the country is that there is righteous and just indignation in the country against this Chinese aggression, but our Government is trying to see that this righteous indignation is not mobilised in order to defend the country. And when such righteous indignation is not mobilised people get demoralised, and at any time when you call them, they will not respond to your call.

I remember that in 1920 and 1930, Gandhiji saw the tempo of the people rising. He saw that people were taking to violent methods in order to drive away the British. What did he do? He mobilised our righteous indignation against the British Government, he did not try to suppress it. Even the impatience of the young, he utilised for the freedom of his country.

Whenever we have advocated other means to be used, we have been considered as "war-mongers." As a matter of fact, we, the people used other means, for instance, in Goa. The Government itself indirectly encouraged our *Jathas*, and our *satyagrahis* to go into Goa, but when once they had gone there, and our people had been killed, wounded and imprisoned for years...

Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav: And belaboured.

Acharya Kripalani: ...and belaboured, then we closed our borders ourselves, and we would not allow people to go, and we would not liberate Goa! In the last fourteen years, we have not been able to do it. But under Gandhiji's leadership, we achieved Independence from the British in 26 years, from 1920 to 1946. And 14 years have passed after Independence! And today, why is this question of Goa being raised? I have raised this question in the past, time after time, in this House. But, today, you see our communist friends are sponsoring it with all the enthusiasm they can command. Why? They are doing so in order to divert attention from China to Goa and the Government because of elections.

Whenever we talk of other measures, we are dubbed as war-mongers; then, it is said that we are adventurists. It is not adventurism, it is not even an adventure, to defend one's country. To defend one's country is not an adventure, but it is the duty of every citizen to defend the country. To call this thing as adventurism, I think, is playing with words, to the disadvantage of our nation and to the demoralisation of our people.

I remember that there was an adventure once in 1942, in our country, and I remember what Mahatmaji said at that time, when all the armies

of the different nations were present here.

The people were being demoralised by the scorching-the-earth policy of the British, and their cycles, their boats and their carts were being confiscated; Gandhiji then said 'I cannot allow this demoralisation of the nation', and against almost the whole world, he declared that 'The British must quiet India'.

Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav. The communists were there. Acharya Kripalani: I ask what reasons he had, this man, a were bundle of bones, in his old age! Remember that many of the members of the Working Committee were against that adventure. This was adventure. And, do you know what Gandhiji said? It is now history, and, therefore, I might repeat it here. He said 'You, the Congress, are a very respectable organisation, you are a very responsible organisation, you cannot take this risk but I have taken risks all my life, and "I shall go it alone'." He said 'I shall go it alone'. I tell you that we were shamed to follow that old man, and then we were all put into jail. And what happened? The nation gave the best account of itself.

It is not a question of prepared. We are told that after two years, when we are prepared, when we are ready, when we have constructed these jeeps and roads and this and that, then we shall fight the Chinese. I ask: Was England ready to accept the challenge of Hitler when it did accept it? Was America ready in the Second World War to accept the challenge of Hitler? They were not ready. They had nothing. But France was more ready, and she had the Maginot lines, which were considered to be unconquerable and impenetrable. But, England survived, and France was occupied. Why did this happen? It happened because the leadership in France failed. You will find it recorded in every history-book that the leadership in France failed, but the leadership in England did not fail. It was because the

leadership did not fail that the English people gave a good account of themselves.

Coming to our own history, what was the preparation of Rana Pratap, when he challenged the Empire of Akbar? He had only starving soldiers; in fact, they were not even soldiers, but they were Adivasis.

Shri Goray: They were bhils.

Acharya Kripalani: They were bhils. And wherefrom did he get money? He got it as a loan from a *bania*. He fought bravely and he has left a great name in history. What was Shivaji? What was he? He was only a Sirdar with a few soldiers. But he dared to challenge the might of the great Moghul Empire. His soldiers were the *Maulas*. They were half-naked; they were only langot and they had in their pouches *chana* (gram). Eating *chana* and riding on *tattoos*, not horses, bare-backed, they challenged the Moghul Empire. It is thus that nations are made. This is not of demogogy. It is a question of the leaders of the people giving the call to the people, giving the orders to the people. I am sure there are enough people in India even today who will sacrifice their all and see that this mischief at the borders is undone, that the territory occupied at the border is vacated, that our territory again becomes our own. Otherwise, take it from me, you will be crying:

हर हर महादेव

Mahadev's throne's gone. No more our's.

बम दम भेला नाव

But the throne is gone. Kailash is gone. Manasarover is gone. This is a very strange spectacle that we see!

Then the Government say that there is no danger. They say the situation is not critical. India, Sir, is a big

[Acharya Kripalani]

country, it has never fallen at once in the hands of a conqueror; the conqueror has to take it inch by inch. The Muslim conquerors took three to four centuries and they could not conquer the whole of India. The South remained free. The English people conquered India. How much time did they take? From the Battle of Plassey to the so-called Mutiny, it is 100 years. But when was India conquered by the British? When they opened their trade posts and when Indian Princes allowed them to have private troops to protect those commercial establishments. Their *kothis* were defended by their soldiers. At that time, India fell to the British.

Remember, this invasion of our territory by China is the thin end of the wedge. It will take centuries for China to be able to conquer India. But if we are not careful, we are doomed.

Shri Ranga: I find that contrary to the assurances given by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, the defences of our country so far as the Himalayas are concerned are not being developed as well, as satisfactorily and as energetically as they should be. Had they merely been serious about their claim as to the difficulties confronting our soldiers on the Himalayas, they should have sent forth a call to the youth of our country, to enlist themselves in the new cadres of the army which would be willing to go on to the heights of the Himalayas and defend the frontiers of our country. Just as the Americans are now recruiting for their peace army, also there should have been a Himalayan army or regiment recruited in our country from amongst the flower of our own youth. No such call has so far been sent out. If evidence were needed for proving that the Defence Minister has failed in his duty in regard to this particular matter, it is this that no special effort has till now come to be made by the Defence Ministry in this regard.

Secondly, I also charge the leadership as well as the Government for having failed the country during all these 15 years in regard to this particular matter. My hon. friend, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, was entitled, as he would be being a member of the Congress Party even now to be satisfied with the sort of leadership that he has been able to get. At the same time, surely it is not proper for him to have said that all of us were also supporting that leadership while we were there in the Congress. I also happened to be in the Congress at that time and then I took the Government and the present Prime Minister to task for having failed to raise his little finger in defence of Tibet. I have taken him to task for having accepted so coolly, so cruelly, the claim of Communist China, imperialist China for its imperialist hold, sovereignty or suzerainty over Tibet. I complained that I was not satisfied with his repeated references to Chinese suzerainty over Tibet. His reply is to be found in the collections of his speeches published recently by the Information department. I commend these 90 pages which are to be found in this book dealing with his speeches on China and the Himalayan territories.

Acharya Kripalani: He has a convenient memory.

Shri Ranga: Very convenient memory. He continues to forget it and then contradict himself. He says:

"I have spoken on China and more particularly on Tibet. Prof. Ranga seems to have been displeased at my occasional references to Chinese suzerainty over Tibet."

Then he goes on justifying himself for having accepted China's unjust claim, according to me, imperialist claim, for suzerainty over Tibet.

That was the way in which I had met my leader in those days when I was in the Congress. I never minced matters. I am saying it now only because my hon. friend has referred to that particular matter. I appeal to my hon. friends within the Congress Party to consider this matter and to profit from the experience of the members of the British Parliament. They also had a very high opinion of Mr. Eden, but when they found that Mr. Eden bungled, brought their country into disrepute and dishonour, they did not wait for Parliament to pass a vote of no-confidence. The Conservative Party saw to it that their leader resigned and gave place to another. It is most unfortunate that my hon. friends have not been able even now to see reason for changing their leadership. And they are going to the polls. They are welcome because they think that they can win franchise of the people with that leader, and with that Defence Minister.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, whose eloquence I always welcome, because he speaks so well, today spoke so ill for his own Party and also for my hon. friend, the Prime Minister. He said he did not understand why China is doing all this. But he is certainly pained at Chinese misdoings I am glad at least for that little bit, the flicker of a light coming from that side also, dark as it is.

Acharya Kripalani: It is Red.

Shri Ranga: When the blood grows cold, it becomes very dark.

There is Russia. Why did Russia go in for those satellite countries? What is the picture that has emerged after the second world war. Soviet Russia has emerged as the biggest empire with the largest number of satellites. Surely, China also should compete with her. Why should China not emulate that example, beastly as it is? That is exactly what is happening.

China is doing this. But the original sin was committed by the Prime Mi-

nister when he failed to stand by Tibet.

Acharya Kripalani has told us the importance of buffer States. The Prime Minister became the successor to the British as the leader of this Government. stand to the credit of the British Government and their diplomacy that they took every possible step to defend the frontiers of this country,....

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): Bring them back.

Shri Ranga: ...as those of their own country. They sent a military mission under Sir Francis Younghusband to Tibet, and since then they had kept their own men there. Why did they do so?—in order to see that the Himalayas would always be a dead frontier, a safe frontier. When they found Russia casting her evil eyes upon India, they knew Russia could not come over here except through Persia or Afghanistan or through Tibet. Therefore, they placed their own people in Tibet and saw to it that Russia would not be able to make use of the Trivishtapa in order to jump on to the plains of India. When they found that Russia was becoming too strong, they tried to frighten her, saying that China had sovereignty over Tibet, and that if Russia were to step in, they would call the Chinese to their rescue. Later on, when the Chinese wanted to assert their own so-called name-sake sovereignty, they told the Chinese they must beware of Russia. In that way they kept these two great giants away from Tibet, maintaining their own hold over Tibet, and maintaining peace in Tibet, with the result that India was able to enjoy peace so far as the Himalayan frontier was concerned.

There is a book written by Sir Francis Younghusband called *Where Three Frontiers Meet*. I dare say the Prime Minister has already read it. If he has read it, he has not become any the wiser; if he has not read it, I would like him to read it at least now, even though it is too late.

[Shri Ranga]

Tibet is already gone. The moment you gave up Tibet, you invited the Chinese on to our borders. He was complaining a few days ago that the Himalayan border had now become a live one. Who is responsible for this? I charge the Prime Minister with having been responsible for this. It is for my hon. friends to accept it as a gift from him. I was not prepared to accept it, and therefore demurred from his policies in the Congress Working Committee, various other places and also in this House, not once but repeatedly.

We have to build our defences the moment we came to power. What did we do? For the first two years possibly there was some excuse because we were too busy post-partition problems, but thereafter we have neglected it. I have already dealt with it earlier. Even now, what is the position? Are we dealing with our troops there in a satisfactory manner? Are we paying them any special pay, giving any special allowances, assuring their families here from the consequences of the accidents which these people will have to suffer from frost-bite and various other things including death, not at the hands of the enemy, but at the hands of the weather itself? We have not done anything yet.

We had the privilege of meeting some of these people recently in some connection or other, and they told me that they were being treated only as being on duty in Kashmir or in Ladakh. No special allowances are being given, no special salaries are being given to them, nothing whatsoever. And that is why every one of them, or most of them, has been trying his best to find somebody or other down here in the plains to plead for him with the Defence Ministry in order that he may be favoured with a transfer back to the plains. If this is the way in which we treat the people there, neglect their wants and needs, how can you expect our people to give a very good account of themselves at those heights?

It is easy for the Chinese to come down, because they are already inured to the climatic troubles at the top at 20,000 feet or so. It is much more difficult for us to go up step by step. That is all the more reason why special steps have got to be taken in order to strengthen our forces by increasing their numbers, by providing them the necessary comforts, by building roads and so on.

The Prime Minister said there was a defence sub-committee which appointed another special committee to study and indicate what special steps should be taken in order to strengthen our defences. It submitted its report. He said in the course of his own speeches that they accepted most of its recommendations. They were implemented, he said. As to how far he has implemented them, with what satisfaction, with what results he has not vouchsafed any information to us.

Later on, they appointed another committee also. He has not given us that report, nor has he told us what its recommendations have been.

All these years there was need for them to have built these communications, aerial as well as ordinary road communications. They have done so little, so precious little, that even today our own people complain,—people who are there stationed at those heights,—that while the Chinese have got effective communications to feed them, to strengthen them, to clothe them and provision them, our troops have no such communications at all even at the lower heights of 14,000 to 16,000 feet. They can only get supplies by air lift or mules, and the sappers and miners go there only on their two legs. If this is the manner in which our defences are being neglected, is there any wonder that the Chinese are making progress at those heights and are going on with their check-posts in ever new places?

The other day the Prime Minister wanted me to get myself educated as to how, when a check-post was planted, an additional area could not be

said to have gone under Chinese occupation. There is what is known as a triangle. There are two places already, and there is a third place. Once a third place is established on the strength of two other points, is it not ordinary common sense for any one to assume that the triangular area within the three points has already gone under the occupation or control of the people who have established the three check posts? In this manner they have been establishing the check-posts.

Acharya Kripalani: The British controlled the Indian States only in that manner.

Shri Ranga: While the Chinese have been doing it, our Prime Minister, because he is wedded to the fourteenth or tenth century outmoded morals of warfare, wants to stick to his own ideas of propriety. Longju he would not occupy even though the others had left it. Even though it had been claimed by our own people to have been our own post, he would not occupy it. He would not venture beyond our claims of 1956, whereas the other people have not only come up to their claims of 1956 but also to the border claimed in 1960.

While encroachment has been going on in that manner, here are our people our own defence forces, who have been expected not to stir out at all, not to come out of their shells which they are obliged to make in order to keep themselves warm with the aid of kerosene lamps and so on. Do you call this proper defence of our country? I say it is not.

Then, there is the boundary settlement. The Prime Minister has himself said that when the Chinese Prime Minister had come over here, he was wondering in his own mind—all that is to be found in these 90 pages; he has given that information himself—when and in what manner he could possibly raise the question of the boundaries, and he came to the conclusion after debating within himself not once but many times, just

like Hamlet, that he need not raise this question at all. Why? He says so he had already taken it for granted that this Himalayan border would never be questioned by the Chinese. Even then he had the doubt, but the doubt did not find any expression at all; and even when the Chinese Prime Minister came over here and confabulated with him, in spite of the warnings given that he should not invite that man at all here, for several days he did not have the hardihood, because of his soft feelings towards the other man who was his guest, to say that the Chinese had committed aggression on our country, that China was an aggressor and that therefore India was interested in vacating that aggression; and when he used that word after the Chinese Prime Minister's departure, Chou En lai took objection to that. The Prime Minister then turned round and said he should have understood why he had been called over to India. He would not have been called out to come here but for the fact that he was treated as an aggressor and that he was expected to vacate the aggression. If this is the manner in which our foreign policy has been adopted so far as China is concerned, then I can only say, God alone can look after this country, if this country is not able to vacate this party from power. (*Interruption.*)

I am very glad indeed for one thing that the Indo-China treaty is coming to an end. Neither China nor India is too keen on asking for its renewal and I hope that it will die unsung and unwept. In the same manner I hope that my friends would also try their best to change their leadership. If they do not do so, history will deal with that leadership in the same manner as that treaty is being dealt with.

My hon. friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee thought that nobody had any courage to ask for the breaking up of diplomatic relations.

An Hon. Member: He forgot you.

Shri Ranga: I am here to ask for it. It is time now that India breaks off diplomatic relations with China. It is only in this way that we can make it clear to China that she cannot go on claiming control over her so-called five fingers, the five fingers being Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, Ladakh and NEFA. Not only these five fingers; there are other five fingers also, from Indo China right up to Burma. All these countries have been friends with us. What do they now think of us because of our weakness, because of our continued failure because of inapt policy and inability to show any strength at all vis-a-vis China? Therefore, if we are to show to all these countries that we are determined in our fight against China, then we must break off diplomatic relations with China.

Secondly, we should no longer sponsor her claim for a seat in the United Nations. If we do so, we will be committing political suicide if not any other suicide. (*Interruption*).

Thirdly, it is high time that we revise our policy in regard to Tibet and begin to champion Tibet's right for regaining her national freedom. We will not be the only country who will be doing it. In regard to Algeria we have taken a similar attitude; in regard to the African colonies we have taken a similar attitude. The Western countries of the world have been championing the cause of the satellite countries of Soviet Russia. In the same way and in a better way and with greater justification we should begin to champion the cause of Tibet. Otherwise, we would not be doing atonement for the sins that we committed in regard to that sacred land. That is the only way in which we can possibly make any kind of offerings to our own ancestors who had believed in Kailash and Mansarovar, who had believed in the Himalayas not only as a place of saints but also as a place of worship and tapas.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): At the outset I should like to pay a tribute to praise to the men of our De-

fence Forces and to the men and women who are working in our diplomatic mission in Peking. The lives of the Indian personnel in our Embassy in Peking, the lives of those people, the lives of those men and women are not very happy ones. It is the most difficult diplomatic post of their lives to be in Peking right at present. And, I do hope that the Government of India will not retain this personnel for more than 2 years at a stretch in Peking but automatically transfer them when they have put in about 24 months of service in Peking to some other place.

I should also like to pay a tribute of praise to our gallant Defence Forces on the mountain passes who are fulfilling a very difficult job indeed. Theirs is a very, very hard life because some of our troops are not accustomed to these cold passes at above 20,000 feet. The Chinese are able to move railways on mountain passes above 20,000 feet except at winter time. Our troops are not so well clad in lather equipment. The Chinese troops, it appears are clad with full leather equipment except their noses which are kept open. If all the requisites are supplied to the other side, what about the Defence Forces on our side?

It is high time that we looked into the grievances or the necessities of our Defence personnel on these high mountain passes and this Parliament should generously vote any sums of money for these forces that live on these high mountain passes.

We have to view the whole episode in the view of a new China. The China of 40 years ago was a different China. The sale of women was a major industry in those days. The story was that in China the young children were put to sleep by the Chinese mothers with sugarcane smear- with opium. There were few

lines uttered by a Negro wash woman in America. She said:—

“Chinaman Chinaman

Eat Red Rats

Chew them up like ginger snaps.”

This old China is not there now. India has also changed during the last 40 years. China is aggressive. She is completely changed and she is in an aggressive mood, in an expansionist mood and is in no mood to take explanations from this side. We really do not know how the Chinese have lost their foresight of centuries when they have turned our friendship down the dustbin, when they have turned down this friendship of 2,000 years. It may take 5,000 years to regain that friendship which has been turned down.

Today we are facing a China with a different temperament, well-planned, well organised, with her tough policy for its men and women, for its boys and girls in the universities. I think that it is a warning that we should put our house in order. Unless we are internally strong we shall not be able to resist anyone on our borders.

Pakistan today has a three-pronged drive against us. It has got an effective liaison with the Portuguese in Goa; it has its hand in Kashmir front and has made terms her enemy of recent years, the Chinese themselves. Pakistan has infiltrated in Assam, disturbed our population with its invisible or visible or deliberate or indeliberate policy.

We have the Pakistan problem, we have the minor Goa problem—I still say that it is a minor problem because we can go into Goa within 24 hours or 24 days or 24 month—and we have also, now, this great problem of China, mighty and invincible. Unless we put our own house in order, our economy, our strategy, our way of thinking and our way of life, we cannot mind our own business in a perfect and equitable manner and also our defence

against our neighbours who are prowling round us.

On the last Foreign Affairs debate I was the only member who drew the attention of this House to the great threat of Chinese aerial incursions over our territory. I was the only person who mentioned three years ago that Pakistan would have the largest and biggest air force in Asia with which we would have to contend. Today the Chinese have expanded in the aerial line. It is one thing to unjustly occupy 24,000 or 40,000 sq. ft. or sq. miles of our territory under the heel of a foreigner but it is a different thing altogether if a foreign plane flies over our heads. These are days of swift aviation and very quick aviational progress. We cannot bear for one second or 5 seconds a single aerial invasion of our territory. We should be more careful. We are more vulnerable with regard to aerial incursions. If we are not careful about aerial invasion we betide our future security.

I have been taking some interest in aviation matters from the time I became a Member of this House. I was the first M.P., to visit the Farnborough Air show and see the British and French aeronautical factories. Even Germany which was laid prostrate can now fly planes over London. Even Germany has got its own planes. Here we had 5 planes flying over our territory. The Chinese say that they were not their planes and that they did not have planes which could fly at such great heights and that they were American planes. How can we accept that? If China had made this statement 10 years ago we could have accepted it. But, today we cannot accept that statement made by the Chinese howsoever real or true it may be.

When things have changed, when circumstances have changed, when security itself is in danger, when our border is threatened, when friends occupy friends' territory without notice, then it is time we did something. Reference was made to the five fingers of the Chinese on Nepal,

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Bhutan, Sikkim, and Nepal and NEFA. These are our regions. These are our regions of friendship. Are we going to give them away so quickly? Nepal has come to terms and has sold the Himalayan pass; and today none of us and very few of us, go to those territories. How many Members of Parliament go to those territories? I am glad my hon. friend Dr. Ram Subhag Singh went there and made a report. We are very keen to go abroad, but we are not very keen to visit our neighbours and tie them with hoops of love. If these areas are neglected, our first line of defence is gone.

Then there is Kashmir. Today we speak of a buffer state, because Tibet is gone. We have made a historical blunder. It may be too late to say that; but we have to face hard facts. We cannot allow these areas to go by default. It is time that more and more citizens of India, men and women, boys and girls, engineers and scientists, visited these regions in a spirit of friendship and equality, so that Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim and NEFA, may continue to be bound to us by love.

Then what about our friends like Burma, Thailand, Ceylon, Cambodia, North Viet Nam and South Viet Nam? In spite of India being the birth place of Buddha, India could not get elected as Vice-President of the World Assembly of Buddhism held recently in South-East Asia. What has happened to our diplomacy? What has happened to our cultural progress? The great stories of Ramayana and Maha Bharata are imprinted all over these areas. We have been celebrating Buddha Jayanti with so much of gusto under the aegis of a distinguished foreign visitor U Nu, the Prime Minister of Burma.

Our friends are perhaps silent they are not able to talk; they are not able to raise their arms. Not one Asian country has said a word about the great report produced by our experts or specialists on Indo-China border dispute. That report has moral san-

ctity behind it; there is justice behind it. They may perhaps be frightened; or they feel it is a quarrel between friends; or a legacy left by British. Whatever that may be our propaganda front is weak and ineffective. We have the Chinese devoting 118 hours for radio propaganda in South-East Asia, while we devote less than 70 hours. What is happening to the All India Radio? The Chinese put out seventy hours of propaganda for Africa, more than what we put out for South-East Asia.

This year I travelled in Africa. I may tell you that Chinese men, money, munitions economic aid and trade concessions are flowing into Africa. Our friends, the Chinese, are making into Africa; our own countrymen are doing their duty by daiming Africans as their equals. The Chinese are going far ahead of Russians and are carving out influence for themselves. This is a great danger to our security and we should not allow this to happen except by the Chinese walking over our dead bodies. Let me be frank. Unless we know what our dangers are, we won't be friendly with the Chinese. We appreciate what has been done. But today it is a question of survival; it is a question of security and we cannot afford to take any more risks. These are plain dangers.

It is true that the Chinese are piqued because we entertained the Dalai Lama. We lost favour with them because we threw our doors open to the Dalai Lama. They perhaps feel that what we gave by the right hand in the shape of Tibet we took away by the left. There is one more point. The Chinese desk in the Foreign Office must become the strong desk. We have experts there. But the Chinese have ten times that number. When Chou En Lai last came to India there were nearly fifty men with him. But how many people we have got in our Universities, who learn the Chinese language? We learn French. French is a dead language. Russian is fast

coming up as an advanced international language. But why should our boys not learn Chinese. It is time the Vice-Chancellors of Universities told our boys and girls: we have no place for you for any other foreign language; you should learn the Chinese language. We do not get even one hundred persons who know the Chinese language. It is a very difficult language. You and I cannot learn it. But our youngsters should learn it. It is time that our Universities devoted some time to this.

Last night I met the learned Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University, Dr. Mudaliar, by accident. I mentioned to him: you in the South took the supremacy in learning the English language; you may perhaps attain supremacy in Hindi too. But it is time that you trained your young boys and girls in the Chinese language. In time of war if the enemy knows that there is a batch of people who know their language, they would be demoralised. It is therefore time that we learned the Chinese language. It is not enough if we fight with weapons; we should also fight on the cultural or language front, not merely strategically or militarily from the defence point of view.

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

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir, I will take two more minutes and resume my seat.

In the Soviet Union they have an army of young lads, and young men who know every language of the world. They know Tamil, Telgu, Malayalam, Gujarati, Bengali and my own language of Konkani. I was told that some of them talk Punjabi better than any Punjabi. They want to have cultural contacts with the world. There is a school in Moscow where there are three hundred students studying Hindi and Urdu languages. The neice of Tolstoy spoke Punjabi better than many of our people. We

have a Foreign Languages Institute in our defence services which is doing a good job and where army officers and men learn foreign languages. But it is high time that we put our cultural front ahead of us, apart from our strategic or defence front—army, Navy and air force—and make it strong.

My hon. friends Acharya Kripalani and Professor Ranga are never tired of barracking and barraging the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is essentially a man of peace, a rare man you find amongst the galaxy of statesmen who speak one language and act another. We do speak the language of peace; but it can also turn into language of war. I think it is time that we made it known that our patience is at an end. You cannot get a man of the Prime Minister's calibre, who will stand up against his worst foes and never have that great weakness of fear. If we have fear we can be crushed down. When we are fearless, we are not afraid of anybody. That is the golden policy which Mahatma Gandhi taught us: never hate and never fear any one. These are priceless qualities for a nation.

My hon. friends were speaking about the British race. When bombs were falling on their head, when London streets were being wiped out, they used to go about calmly. A former Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court, Sir John Baument, mentioned to me that in the midst of blitz they would have their lunch calmly. They had the priceless quality of courage, though their is a small island. If we lose courage we have no future. If we are afraid of our enemies we have no future. To hate others is not the right thing. We do not hate the Chinese. We will not hate anyone; yet we will not fear anyone. These are the qualities which the Prime Minister has taught us, as the disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. So, it is time that our friends on the other side who do the barracking and barraging, took stock of the

[Shri Joachim Alva]

situation and assessed our assets and our weaknesses, so that we as a nation shall be ready for any eventuality.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Sir, I do not think there is anyone in this country who is not extremely exercised by the new attitude that the Chinese have taken, (unless of course their loyalties are beyond our borders), since their further incursions into the Indian territory. This White paper placed on the Table of the House makes interesting reading for it proves beyond shadow of doubt the attitude that China has taken. In spite of that Shri Mukerjee suggested that we should still try an amicable settlement. We have tried it many a time and we have failed each time. Now I think the time has come when we must realise that no such peaceful negotiation can ever be brought about.

One or two other points have come out in that White Paper. This time our Government was very alert in regard to this map that was produced. When the agreement between China and Burma was signed they brought to the notice of the Chinese Government that they were claiming territory which was really Indian. The answer of the Chinese Government was very interesting. They said that Diphu Pass lay between the three territories of China, Burma and India and they had not come to an agreement over that because the matter had to be discussed with India. In spite of the fact that our Foreign Affairs Ministry has pointed out again and again the clear position, they still stick to that old position. They have gone further than that when they actually entered further into the Indian territory, be it a mile or 20 miles. There should not be any question now that we are not alive to it. It is true that we were alive to it. If that has been so, even on these very difficult mountain tops which is much more difficult terrain from our side as we have been told, than from Tibet or China, we should have established centres

from which we could control and check any attempt to advance. Even so, we should have taken steps. I hope steps will now be taken by which there will be fairly near the border, settlements put up where people who are acclimatised to the mountain weather can be settled. There are many of them who are poor and who would gladly go to any such settlements if improvements are affected. Even if it costs thousands of crores of rupees and even if it makes our Third Plan not possible in all its phases, I feel that this House and the country will support the Government to the fullest in taking such measures so that in future no further incursions even of an inch, far from thousands of miles, can take place again. This is the point of view that every Indian in this country will have unless their loyalties are beyond the borders of India. I was very amazed to hear Shri Hiren Mukerjee saying one thing. He was talking about this being part of election propaganda on the part of some parties. I presume it is election propaganda against his party or I do not know if he meant the Congress - because Congress does not take it as such. He talked of election propaganda and he also talked of restraint. Which party has shown less restraint during the election time? Coming from West Bengal I may ask the communist party: to what extent they have shown restraint or do they not exaggerate and distort things to satisfy their aims? Today this is a national issue and everyone in the Congress, including the Prime Minister, is worried about it. Mr. Mukerjee says that we should have restraint about this. This is not an election issue. It is a national issue and everyone of us is exercised over it. Shri Mukerjee says that our foreign policy is one of non-alignment and therefore we should continue peaceful negotiation with China. We won our freedom through non-violence but it does not mean that we would sit quiet when the territorial integrity of our country is violated. Non-alignment does not mean handing over our territory.

In conclusion, I may say that this House will be willing to divert money from funds which are essential even for our children in the country to build up settlements in those areas where our civil and military and other people who are able to weather that climate can be settled. Whatever expenses may be incurred they will not be too great to keep inviolate the integrity of our land.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): I listened very patiently to the speeches from the Opposition and with the exception of Shri Asoka Mehta who had some compunctions of conscience, everybody let loose without any regard for history.... (An Hon. Member: ... or conscience) I feel that our conflict with China would have been better discussed in the broad context of our foreign policy. To isolate and discuss it distorts the whole picture as we see today. Most of the speakers on the Opposition Benches have shown less originality and much less understanding of history because they have more or less repeated the arguments provided readymade by one of the Bombay's leading daily today and a few days back. What is the position? Let us understand it very clearly. Can we judge our policy towards China in isolation? That is the first question. Can we sit in judgment today on certain acts of commission and omission that were there in the past?

Why I say this is to be seen. Immediately after freedom when we assumed responsibility for running the Government certain areas in the border were not under the administrative control of the Britishers themselves. There was a sort of political vacuum created in the outlying areas like Tibet and the border region where the Britishers exercised their influence. This is a fact which we should not brush aside while judging the evolution of our policy towards China. If we miss this historical antecedent the picture is not very clear. I am not pleading for the time being that what has been done recently by China is justified nor am I saying that our

taking the Chinese friendship for granted was justified. But the main question is this. Could we have followed any other line consistent with the broad picture of the fundamentals of our foreign policy? Unfortunately, the friends in Opposition are making subtle efforts to tilt the balance in favour of one block as against the other. Whether they like it or not they will usher in an era of cold war in this country. Our persistent attempt to keep out of cold war arena ought to be realised by every hon. Member and it has to be kept in view. It should be realised also that the future course of history would be determined not by these minor incidents. I call it 'minor' in the context of future history, having in view the future perspective. Our relations with China will determine the course of history and not only Asiatic peace or that of South-east Asian region but the whole world. That must be clearly understood. Today we must admit that in our assessment of Chinese behaviour, we have failed. But we are in good company; even the Soviet Union admits in some measure that they have also failed in assessing Chinese behaviour in the context of world communist movement. The Opposition says that they do not plead for a declaration of war. The wiser section in the Opposition, men like Shri Asoka Mehta, do not want the breaking up of the diplomatic relations. Then, what course is open for the Government? Let me ask them. What would they like to do at present?... (An Hon. Member: They should act) I am coming to that. The only course is to build up the defence.

16 hrs.

The other day, the Prime Minister gave a picture of our defence preparedness. We are definitely in a position to say now that we are not neglecting communications. We have manoeuvred to build up roads and check-posts in such a manner that we could check further aggression. The Prime Minister said that there should not be any adventurist move. I fully stand by it. In fact, when we are at

[Shri Khadilkar]

this juncture faced with a peculiar problem, the problem of dealing with China, whose mind is very much disturbed, very much suspicious that we might manoeuvre to outbid China in the international community, when we are under such a situation, I do feel that every step taken should be taken with a good deal of caution. If we build up our defence, I see no harm. If there is no declaration of war, if there is no demand for the break-up of diplomatic relations, what harm is there if pressure is brought to negotiate on the same basis as they negotiated with Burma and with Nepal? I do not see any harm in this course of action. It is not wisdom to simply criticise without suggesting an alternative course of action. Of course, if people have one eye on the electorate and take advantage of the failure in the past to twist the tail—well, everybody in the opposition would like just to twist the tail—of the Government.

Shri Nath Pai: It is better to twist the tail rather than polishing it.

Shri Khadilkar: They twist the tail, taking advantage of certain weaknesses of our policy towards China in the past. (*Interruption*). I want to ask, in all seriousness, that seeing the mistakes and weaknesses committed in the past... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him continue.

Shri Khadilkar: Whatever mistakes we have committed in the past, in regard to taking some steps on the border—I do admit that we have committed mistakes, not realising how China would act so far as Tibet is concerned, and what would be the intention of China once we recognised China's might and the growing might at that—we should realise one thing. Taking all these things into consideration, are we seriously considering that we should build up a certain amount of permanent hostility towards China, and is it consistent with the

general policy of peace that we are pursuing, which is beneficial to this country's development? Are we not following a policy of peace for building up our defence and have a powerful base of defence in this country, and to build up our industries and other things? If we have failed in this respect also, then the Opposition would well argue that we have not also done this. My humble submission is, after listening to the statement of the Prime Minister the other day, regarding the position on the border, certain confusion was created.

Shri Nath Pai: So, you agree.

Shri Khadilkar: I do agree, as I see the correspondence. The Chinese, at the time of negotiations, presented two maps. First, we relied on the 1956 map, but they were relying on the 1960 map. If we compare the present position as it is, one will realise that they are consolidating their position. So far as the territory that they claimed, according to the 1960 map, is concerned, certain confusion was created no doubt, when the Prime Minister said that aggression or incursion had taken place. Really, what has taken place? They have consolidated their position on the frontier; of course, that is a danger. There is no doubt about it. But China means business. We must understand that when they take a territory and claim it as theirs, they would always try to consolidate their position and sit tight. They are not doing it in the eastern region as they have said and as we see from the negotiations and from the papers that are before us. They do not so much claim the area in the NEFA territory on the Himalayan border.

Therefore, my humble plea is, so far as our policy is concerned, we should not make any attempt, by taking advantage of our conflict with China, to change the fundamental basis of our policy which has proved so beneficial to our country.

Another point is, no adventurist action of any nature should be pleaded on the floor of the House, because that would land us in greater difficulties as we are today. Let us admit it frankly. Unless we seek the umbrella of some big power, the protection of some big power, we are not prepared to stand and declare war on a nation like China which has built up its defence. Therefore, the only realistic course....

Shri Nath Pai: Who asked that?

Shri Khalikar: An hon. Member like Shri Asoka Mehta never pleaded it but some people do suggest it in a way.

An Hon. Member: Nobody has wanted it.

Shri Khadihar: I have noted what Shri Asoka Mehta said—showing a little wisdom. (*Interruption.*) Let us see the realistic position today. Instead of accusing the Government for past weaknesses, let us see what the Government have done so far and what they have achieved so far on the border and that should be properly assessed. We must see that Government is more cautious in dealing with China who are very diplomatic and more dialectical in their ways. It is very difficult to understand their approach to national and international problems. Even the Soviet Government could not take China for granted. So far as international Communist unity is concerned, they have created a rift; taking advantage of our position in Belgrade, they have created another rift in the international sphere and tried to isolate India not only from the south-east Asian countries like Burma and Indonesia, but others too. Even in the African nations, they are trying to spread a certain amount of vicious propaganda so far as the colonial issues are concerned. They allege it was played down by Panditji at Belgrade. So, all these things have to be taken together, and my submission is that the policy pursued by the Government is the most realistic and the least adven-

turist, and that it will ultimately strengthen the defences of the country and protect its integrity and sovereignty.

With these words, I conclude.

Mr. Speaker: Raja Mahendra Pratap. I am not going to call any other hon. Member hereafter.

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप (मथुरा) : श्रीमान जी, मैं दो हैसियतों से इस पर बोलूंगा, एक तो मैं संसार संघ के विचार से बोलूंगा और एक मैं धार्मिक विचार से बोलूंगा। तो मेरी दो हैसियतें हैं।

संसार संघ के विचार से तो मैं यह कहता हूँ कि सब से अच्छी बात तो यही है कि हम इन तमाम मसलों को यू० एन० ओ० के माारफत तै कराए।

बैसे तो मेरे तीन सुझाव हैं। मेरा अपना यह कहना है कि अगर हम चीन से इस तरह की सन्धि करें कि हिन्दुस्तान, चीन और जापान मिल कर अपनी बढ़ती हुई जनसंख्या को उन जगहों पर भेजें जहां पर खाली जगहें पड़ी हैं, तो मेरा अपना ख्याल है कि चीन हमारे साथ चलेगा, चीन का इसमें लाभ है। इन पहाड़ों में चीन का कुछ फायदा नहीं है। मैं यह एक चीज पेश करता हूँ।

दूसरी चीज मैं यह पेश करता हूँ कि अगर आप ने चीन पर दबाव ही डालना है तो जैसा मैंने श्रीमान् प्रधान मंत्री जी से निवेदन किया था, वह तरीका यह है कि हम जापान के साथ, ताइवान के साथ, सैंगोन के साथ, फिलिपीन के साथ और थाई के साथ समझौता करें और अपना दबाव डालें चीन पर। मगर अफसोस मुझे यह है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी इधर ध्यान नहीं देते। जब मैंने उनको एक त्त भी लिखा कि साहब आप कोई मसला हल नहीं कर पाये हैं, न चीन का मसला हल कर पाये हैं, न पाकिस्तान का मसला हल कर पाये हैं, न सीलोन का मसला हल कर

[राजा महेंद्र प्रताप]

पाये हैं और नेपाल और बर्मा में हिन्दुस्तान के और ज्यादा विरुद्ध विचार उत्पन्न होते जाते हैं, तो उन्होंने सिर्फ यह कह दिया कि आपके विचार कुछ और हैं और सरकार के विचार कुछ और हैं ।

मेरा यह बिल्कुल ख्याल नहीं है कि मैं सरकार का विरोध करूँ । मैं कहता हूँ कि कोई कांग्रेसी भाई अपने को ज्यादा कांग्रेसी न समझें । मैं सन् १९०६ से ले कर १९५२ तक कांग्रेसी रहा हूँ यानी ४६ साल । बहुतांश तो इतनी उम्र भी नहीं होगी । और फिर भी नये कांग्रेसियों ने मुझे निकाला, मैं ने इस्तीफा नहीं दिया । तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि आप यह न समझें कि मैं आप के खिलाफ बोल रहा हूँ । यह सरकार हमारी सरकार है । यह हमारा हाउस है । यहां जितने हम बैठे हैं सब मिल कर देश की कुछ सेवा करना चाहते हैं । तो मैं जो कुछ कहता हूँ वह सिर्फ इस विचार से कहता हूँ कि जो किसी प्रकार से हमारी सरकार नहीं कर पा रही वह मैं करना चाहता हूँ ।

मेरा यह ख्याल है कि चीनी लोग इतने बुरे नहीं हैं । मैं चीन में रहा हूँ । चीन में हमारे लिये बहुत अच्छे विचार हैं । वहां पर बौद्ध धर्म के जगह जगह मंदिर हैं । मैं खुद मंदिरों में रहा हूँ । मुझे तो चीनी लोग भी और जापानी लोग, जहां भी मैं रहा हूँ, नया बुद्ध समझते रहे हैं । यह मैं नहीं कहता । यह वह समझते रहे हैं क्योंकि ऐसा हुआ कि बुद्ध भगवान ने २९ वर्ष की उम्र में घरबार छोड़ा था और मैंने २८ वर्ष की उम्र में घरबार छोड़ा । यह भी हुआ कि जब मेरी २२ साल की उम्र थी तो मैं ने साढ़े २७ हजार रुपये साल की आमदनी वाली जायदाद दान में दी थी । यह तो इतिहास की बात है और यह मैं कोई बना कर नहीं कह रहा हूँ । मेरा कहना यह है कि जापान, चीन और तिब्बत में लोग मेरी बहुत इज्जत करते थे । पहले जो दलाई लामा

थे उनका मेरे पास अभी तक एक खत मौजूद है और वह खत मैं ने इन मौजूदा दलाई लामा को दिखाया था । उस में उन्होंने लिखा है कि आप ने सब कुछ इस तरह छोड़ दिया जैसे कोई थूकता है । मेरा कहना यह है कि आप मेहरबानी कर के मुझे मौका दीजिये ताकि मैं इस मसले को हल करूँ ।

चीन के हमले को हल करना मेरे खयाल में बहुत आसान है । वैसे अभी कल परसों यूगोस्लाव के जलसे में मुझे चीनी सफोर मिले । मैं ने उन से हाथ मिलाया । मैं ने उन से पूछा कि जनाब आप मुझे अपना दोस्त समझते हैं या दुश्मन । मैं ताईवान हो आया हूँ । उन्होंने कहा कि आप ताईवान ही नहीं हो आये बल्कि आप ने तो हमारी सरकार के खिलाफ भी बहुत कुछ लिख डाला । मैं ने कहा कि वह भी मैं ने अच्छे विचारों से और आप के साथ दोस्ती के खयाल से लिखा था । मेरा यह कहना है कि चूंकि मेरे दिल में कोई बुराई नहीं है इसलिए वे लोग मेरी बात को बड़े अच्छी तरह से सुनते हैं । मैं यह भी बतला दूँ कि मैं तो चीनी सरकार का मेहमान भी रहा हूँ और मुझे एक दफे नार्किंग में जब मैं एक अखबार निकालता था तो ५०० डालर महीना देते थे । अब यह जो पेंकिंग में बड़े बड़े लोग हैं उन में भी मेरे दोस्त हैं । जो वहां के उपप्रधान हैं वह और मैं सन् १९२५ में एक जगह पेंकिंग में बोले थे । वहां के जो हेल्थ मिनिस्टर हैं मैं उनका मेहमान रहा हूँ । मास्को में मैं उन से मिला । मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि कुछ तो पुरानी बातें हैं लेकिन आजकल जो लोग हैं उन से भी मेरा ताल्लुक है ।

चीन के मसले को हम तीन तरीकों से हल कर सकते हैं । धार्मिक तरीके से हम उस को हल कर सकते हैं और बुद्ध धर्म का प्रचार कर के कर सकते हैं । मेरा यह भी दावा है कि कम्युनिस्टों को भी मैं यह समझा सकता हूँ

कि भाई आप कुछ खयाल में पड़े हुए हैं।
 आप का यह विचार है।

अभी परसों तरसों युगोस्लाव के जल्से
 की बात है कि पोलैंड के ऐम्बैसेडर मेरे पास
 आये . . .

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member must
 conclude now.

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप: मुझे मालूम नहीं था
 कि वह पोलैंड के ऐम्बैसेडर हैं उन्होंने
 मुझ से हाथ मिलाया और फिर उन्होंने मेरे
 बारे में कहा कि

He is the most courageous man in the
 country.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य
 अपना स्थान ग्रहण करें।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : खैर जैसी आप की
 आज्ञा। वैसे कहना तो मुझे बहुत कुछ था।

सीधी ही बात यह है कि चीन, पाकिस्तान
 और सीलोन के मसले को मैं हल कर सकता हूँ
 अगर आप मुझे मेहरबानी करके मदद करें
 और मैं यह भी यकीन दिला दूँ कि उसकी
 तारीफ सरकार के हाथ में रहेगी। मैं तो एक
 सेवक की तरह से सेवा करूँगा।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Mi-
 nister will reply tomorrow.

16.14 hrs.

*DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY
 GRANTS (GENERAL), 1961-62

Mr. Speaker: The House will now
 take up Supplementary Demands for
 Grants (General). Three hours have
 been allotted for this.

DEMAND NO. 2—INDUSTRIES

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to
 the President to defray the

charges which will come in course
 of payment during the year ending
 the 31st day of March, 1962, in
 respect of 'Industries'."

DEMAND NO. 19-A—DADRA AND NAGAR
 HAVELI AREA

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 21,28,000 be granted
 to the President to defray the
 charges which will come in course
 of payment during the year ending
 the 31st day of March, 1962 in
 respect of 'Dadra and Nagar Haveli
 Area'."

DEMAND NO. 34—GRANTS-IN-AID TO
 STATES

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to
 the President to defray the charges
 which will come in course of pay-
 ment during the year ending the
 31st day of March, 1962, in respect
 of 'Grants-in-Aid to States'."

DEMAND NO. 41—ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to
 the President to defray the charges
 which will come in course of pay-
 ment during the year ending the
 31st day of March, 1962, in respect
 of 'Animal Husbandry'."

DEMAND NO. 60—MISCELLANEOUS
 DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER
 THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1000 be granted to
 the President to defray the charges
 which will come in course of pay-
 ment during the year ending the
 31st day of March, 1962 in respect
 of 'Miscellaneous Departments and
 Expenditure under the Ministry
 of Home Affairs'."