

12-17 hrs.

**DISCUSSION RE: CHINESE INCURSIONS—contd.**

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Prime Minister will now reply to the discussion on the latest Chinese incursions into Indian territory.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, in accordance with the wish expressed by you, I have had a map or chart of this area placed in the Central Hall, and also—I am not sure if you, Sir, have got it—a copy of the latest Chinese letter. If you would permit me to say, we have received a reply from the Chinese Government to our last protest note, which has been printed, our last protest note dated the 31st October, 1961.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** What was the date of that letter?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The date of the reply is 30th November, but it reached us naturally two or three days later; that is the Peking date; it came to us about three days ago, I think.

So, I should like to place this too on the Table of the House, to complete the record thus far. [See Appendix II, annexure No. 44(a)]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Prime Minister may give the substance of that letter to hon. Members.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha (East-Khandesh):** So that our records also would be complete.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I can give the substance. The substance is that they have, of course, as usual, denied and repudiated the various charges that we had made against them; and they have said that their line of 1956 in the Chinese map was not changed; it was more or less the same in the 1960 map, and the difference was just minor, which is not correct, because that is a factual matter where you and see the differences. Just to draw

the attention of the House to this matter, we pointed this out quite clearly in the report of the officials of the Government of India who met the Chinese officials; it has been dealt with there.

Then, they talk about our complaint about Chinese intrusions, more especially, about those three posts that I have mentioned.

In regard to one of them, Dambuguru, they deny the fact that they have got a post there. I have no doubt that they had it, and all I can conclude is that they have withdrawn it, as previously they withdrew another post near Demchok. For the rest, they say that at the other places they have been there all the time or for a long time.

Then they complain of the Government of India's stepping up military activity on the border and establishing new checkposts, and generally building up their military position along the border, not only there, but at Bara Hoti. Then they complain, denying our complaint, of Indian aircraft violating what they call Chinese airspace and state that the Chinese forces have been asked not to patrol within 20 kilometres on the Chinese side of the border. Then they sort of hint at the fact that if our military activities continue, they may have to take steps in defence by sending some troops across the MacMahon Line. This is broadly what they have said.

May I add that in the map I have placed—it is a very good map, not merely a chart but a regular map—there are two or three lines marked, the international boundary, the Chinese side's 1956 claim and the 1960 map of the Chinese. They are three lines. Three or four places are marked in it. Our post at Dawletbeg Oldi is not printed there, but it is marked there. This is the only post we have marked. We have not marked the other posts that we have, as I

stated the other day before the House. The three Chinese posts are, one on the Chip Chap river and the other two Dambuguru and Nyagzu; they two are marked in this. We have not marked other posts; we did not think it was desirable for us to mark our posts on the map. As for the Chinese side's other posts, some are on the other side of the 1956 line. They are stated in the documents and can be easily traced.

I have welcomed this discussion in the House because I want these matters or any matters that may create doubts in the minds of Members of the House or the country to be elucidated, explained and clarified in this way. So I have welcomed it, and I have found in the course of the debate that a good deal requires clarification. I have been accused of many things, including confusion and lack of clarity. It is rather difficult for me to speak about my own capacity to be clear-minded. My own impression has been that a number of Members, chiefly on the opposite side of the House, have been singularly lacking in any clarity of thought or expression.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** I take exception to this remark. Repeatedly we are asking Government to furnish us with maps. They do not furnish maps. Then they accuse us saying that we are lacking in clarity. This is not fair.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have not quite understood the hon. Member.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** You have not given us a single map. How can you say that we are lacking in clarity? It is your fault. You are suppressing facts, you are suppressing literature and then accusing us of ignorance and lack of clarity.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** This is an example of utter confusion and lack of clarity. Hon. Members like Shri Naushir Bharucha, as he has displayed now, lack clarity of thought completely.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** I do not understand. Let us make this

clear. We have been asking the hon. Minister to give us maps. Maps are not given. One map is placed there and then he comes up here and says that we are lacking in clarity of thought. May be we are lacking in that. We are ignorant because Government have kept us ignorant deliberately (*Interruptions*)

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** He does not enable me to finish a few sentences and starts protesting. That, I submit, is an attitude of utter lack of a coherent approach to any problem.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** You may say anything. You are no better.

**Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri:** (Nabad-wip): The Prime Minister must not be referred to as 'he'.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members must be a little more thick-skinned.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was not referring to Shri Naushir Bharucha. He brought it upon himself by referring to himself.

Now the other Members, two or three of them—Acharya Kripalani and others—repeatedly said that I lacked clarity of thought. As I said, I cannot obviously be a judge of my own virtues and failings. Others have to judge; the House will have to judge. But this charge which Shri Naushir Bharucha repeated, about my desiring to suppress facts, is so patently wrong that I am amazed that anyone should make it unless he himself suffers from some confusion in thinking.

One thing that is correct in that charge—we dealt with it during the previous debates—is that when for the first time, the Chinese started building or using the Aksai Chin road, when we first heard of it, we were not quite sure. So we inquired into it. We sent our people to inquire into it. Some of our people were arrested and things happened. Then we sent a protest to them. That is correct. It may be I was wrong there, that at that time I did not bring this fact immediately before the House because we were inquiring and finding.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

out what the Chinese Government's answer was.

**Shri Ranga** (Tenali): That is only an excuse.

**Shri Goray** (Poona): That is not the reason. You have stated in your White Paper. You stated that there should be no furore here, there should be no heart-burning and that sort of thing.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: Quite so. I am saying that we wanted to find out the Chinese Government's answer, etc., before we placed it before the House.

Apart from this particular fact, we have kept this House informed of almost every scrap of paper that has been used in this connection. The book that I placed on the Table of the House the other day, White Paper No. V, and the other four fat volumes, contain every letter that has gone and every letter that we have received. Naturally it is not possible or, I think, desirable for me to come to the House and tell them of every petty incident that occurs from time to time or of a protest made or a protest received. But every relevant thing has been stated.

Now, an hon. Member—I forget who—said that even on the 20th November, I kept back facts. I have my own failings, but I am not an unmitigated fool and for anyone to suggest that on the 20th I kept back a fact and that on the 27th I should be exposed by the hon. Member is a bit difficult to understand. How am I exposed by the papers I placed on the Table, which I knew I was going to place on the Table in a few days' time and which I said so? Am I going to keep back a fact which I know is coming up before the House at my instance? The fact of the matter is that in this matter of the fresh incursions, before I went to America, that is to say, just about the time we sent this last reply to the Chinese Government on October 31, we thought it was a very important matter and must be placed before this House. And we decided to prepare this White Paper No. V. It has taken

some time to prepare it, the House will see it. It is not produced in two days' time, and during this period it was being printed for being placed before this House. I returned from America in the forenoon of the 20th November. Almost immediately within an hour or an hour and half, I had to come to the House, and I came here. It was my intention to make a statement along with the White Paper as soon as it was ready, but the matter was raised as a motion for adjournment, and I made a brief statement then, and I said then that four or five days later I would place the papers and make a statement. That is the position. So, to say that I deliberately kept back anything, when we are giving everything in this printed book, is rather wide of the mark.

In this book there are some references to our Ministry having written about some Chinese patrol being seen somewhere. It is for you to judge, for the House to judge, whether every incident of that type has to be reported immediately to the House, because these petty incidents are occurring sometimes; they have occurred, and we take some action, we get some reply which comes up in a connected form before the House. It would be confusing for every letter that we write to be placed before the House immediately.

So, I do submit that there is a very great deal of misapprehension and misunderstanding about this matter, and I have ventured respectfully to treat this House, in regard to taking it into our confidence, more than is normally done in such matters.

**Shri Ranga**: No, no. He did not come to the House early enough.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: And I propose to continue to do so because the matter, as the hon. Member Shri Asoka Mehta said, is one of profound importance. Nobody in this House can disagree with that description, and certainly not I or any Member of our Government. Indeed, if the House

would remember, sometime back—I forget now—when speaking on this problem, on our broader problem in this House and the events that had given rise to it, I laid the greatest stress on the importance of this matter to India, not only in the present but in the future, and I said this problem in some shape or other might pursue us for a generation or more, and we could not consider it lightly or superficially. What happens on our border is a basic problem, it is a problem of historic importance. So that, nobody can charge me with not attaching enough importance to it. I think personally that it is more important basically for us than any other external problem.

**Shri Ranga:** Here, hear. I am glad you have come to that now.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Possibly, the noble Acharya, the gentleman of the Swatantra Party, will further follow my argument and find himself in agreement, though I rather doubt it.

My difficulty has been that this matter, the importance and profound importance of this matter, has not been thoroughly understood by the noble Acharya opposite. I am sorry I use the word "noble". I do not think it is quite parliamentary, and the right expression should have been "the learned Acharya".

So that, I would beg the House at least to accept this statement of mine that we attach the greatest importance to it, and it is not a party matter, it is obvious; it is a matter of national importance, and I would have hoped that we should have all treated it as a national issue of the highest importance.

A curious thing was said by one of the hon. Members opposite, that we had hidden this fact, that some daily newspaper in Delhi had said that a meeting of officials of the External Affairs Ministry was held which decided to keep it dark in view of the

elections. I have not seen it, but if it has appeared in any Delhi newspaper, this kind of thing really does little credit to that newspaper. I know of nothing, no meeting, and I have enquired about it in my Ministry. How could it be kept dark for months and months, when it is obvious, it is patent, that the thing was being printed to be placed before the House? The whole thing is ridiculous. As for doing it because of the elections, I should have thought that there could be no more foolish thing from the point of view of the present Government than to do this; and if I may say so—and I say so with some hesitation and without meaning or implying anything—certainly the impression created on my mind has been that part of the heat generated on the other side is due to the very elections in the foreground. May or may not be so.

The hon. Member Shri Braj Raj Singh asked the Government to resign on this issue and to face the electorate. Well, I am sorry to say I am not convinced by him, as I am seldom convinced by what he says. He demanded this on behalf of the people of India. Of course, I suppose that he is aware of the fact that, as a matter of fact, this Government will cease to exist in a few months, elections will take place, and the people of India whom he represents so stoutly will be given full opportunity to decide who should form the next Government. I do not know, I may guess but I do not know, what their decision will be, and whatever it is, it will be faithfully and loyally followed. But may I venture to say that we all represent, in a degree, the people of India; otherwise, we would not be here. But when Shri Braj Raj Singh stoutly talks on behalf of the people of India, I am reminded of an old story which has stuck in my mind almost from my childhood, of the three tailors of Tooley Street. The three tailors of Tooley Street issued a manifesto once, declaring "We, the People of England say this and that". It amused me when I heard of it first long ago, and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

somehow it suddenly came back to my mind listening to Shri Braj Raj Singh.

This is a matter of high importance, and I should like to deal with this matter in all seriousness. Basically, what has happened? A certain aggression has taken place on our territory, and many other things backing it have happened or are happening. And how do we deal with it? First of all, what is the objective? Obviously, our objective can only be to get that aggression vacated. How do we get that aggression vacated?—by diplomatic means, by various measures, and ultimately, if you like, by war. Now, our policy is to get that aggression vacated fully and wholly. Our policy also is, and always has been in regard to every matter, to try every method, every peaceful method, to gain our objective. It may be that the peaceful method is not successful. Even so, it is desirable to do that for two reasons; one because it is in consonance with our policy, internal and external; and, secondly, it should always be the necessary prelude to any other action.

I have again to refer—I regret to do so—to Shri Braj Raj Singh. I am sorry; but I want to be quite clear that his thinking and mine are not the same in this matter because he says that we should go out and occupy 70 miles beyond the McMahon line and reach the Brahmaputra and the Mansarowar lake.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):** With your permission, Sir, may I correct the hon. Prime Minister? I did not say, 'occupy'. I said if we are not able to get the Tibetan region, independence, as is called by the Prime Minister of China, then we should declare that our frontier is from the source of Brahmaputra as it flows to the east.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** If I have not correctly reported him, I am sorry.

Nevertheless, he says that we should declare that our frontier is the Brahmaputra and includes the Mansarowar lake. We will not claim that frontier and we do not propose to claim that because it has no historical or other validity. What we claim we claim for adequate reasons pointed out in the Officials' Book.

One of the reasons I should like to state here which is a deeper reason because the Himalayas are not only a part of our territory but, if I may say so, they are part of our hearts and minds; and it is a deep injury to us if anything happens to them. It has been associated with the thinking of our race, our forbears for thousands of years; and our whole cultural tradition is tied up with it; our literature is tied up with it; our mythology is tied up with it. So far it is an essential part of us, something deeper or greater and more important than merely some territorial claim.

When Acharya Kripalani and others took exception to the fact when I have stated several times that this area is a bare mountain, very few people hardly dwell there, there are no trees etc., they seem to think that I am saying that to minimise the importance of this area. (*Interruption*). They are mistaken. But we must know the facts; and I do not understand how you arrive at the truth by minimising the facts which are known to everybody else but we ourselves refuse to see them properly ostrich-like. The importance of it is very great for a variety of reasons and more essentially for the reasons which I have just mentioned. But, nevertheless, the fact remains that this area is a most extraordinary area in the world so far as terrain is concerned. At that rate, no tree grows anywhere in this wide area—there may be some shrubs.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** The Chinese Prime Minister when he met Mr. Nehru in Delhi used this statement of our Prime Minister against us

and he did not take it in the light our Prime Minister has mentioned it.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok** (New Delhi): There are so many regions like Baltistan and others where there grow no trees. Does it mean that they should be left out?

**Shri Tyagi** (Dehra Dun): No hair grows on my head. Does it mean that the head has no value?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I was stating our policy about this vacation of aggression; and so long as that aggression is not vacated, this basic trouble remains. This is a basic headache. How should we get that vacated? Always through peaceful methods. Apart from peaceful methods, there are pressures short of war; and then there is war.

Now, I am free to confess to this House that my whole soul reacts against the idea of war anywhere. That is the training I have received throughout my life and I cannot easily get rid of it at the age of 72.

**Acharya Kripalani** (Sitamarhi): Except in Congo.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: Hon. Acharya's interjections are sometimes not relevant and at other times have little meaning. He says, Congo. He should know that Congo is an entirely different type of case where in our duty to the United Nations and to the emergent nations of Africa we undertook a responsibility which may involve us in warlike operations; but it is not war all the same (*Interruption*).

However, how can any person rule out war? Why do we keep our Army, Navy and Air Force? We keep them. But the fact is that first of all one should realise that our desire is to avoid it, but not to submit to any evil if the avoidance of that means submission. Therefore, even if we have to take that step, we take it certainly, for defence and certainly for the vacation of any aggression. Because when I say defence, it includes action against

an aggressor. Obviously, aggression on our part would be if we cross our international borders outside; that is aggression. What we do inside our territory is defence. So, one cannot rule out war and we do not rule out war.

But, then, other facts come too, the factors which might broadly be called military factors. That is, when one takes a step, one does not take a step without being, so far as possible, quite prepared for success in that step, without adequately strengthening oneself in every way and that is what I call adventurist action.

The hon. Acharya Kripalani gave us instances—not very happy instances—of England joining the Second World War or France being defeated by Hitler. I do not quite know what the relevancy is to this. That is why I feel that the charge of confusion and all that may very well apply to some hon. Members opposite.

However, the point is a very simple fact that if you have to take anything in the nature of military action it should be thoroughly prepared and strong action, and not action which may come back upon you if you do not succeed in it; and it may weaken your position. It is a simple proposition which is applicable in war. Of course, if sometimes one has to take action immediately because there is no escape from it, that is a different matter. So, we have followed this policy, aiming at the vacation of this aggression, at the same time, through peaceful means, realising that we are not sure how far they will succeed. They may not; and I am not ruling out the possibility of their succeeding, because one must not go by all the brave words that are said in these communications to us by the Chinese Government. But other factors work also. Nevertheless we realise that that may not be brought about in that way. Therefore, we are taking all the steps that we can to prepare the ground for other methods to be employed.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Hon. Members will say that we are giving some information to the Chinese which will give them strength. But the fact of the matter is that we are dealing with a physical situation which was completely neglected for the last 100 years or more. And we are dealing with it pretty well, I think, administratively, militarily, building it up, preparing the ground for advance: we are advancing and we are putting up our posts, administrative centres and others. It is a neglected part and the whole of a hundred years is responsible for it; we started doing it ten years ago and did it fairly effectively in some parts of the frontier which is, remember, over 2000 miles. In other parts we did something which, let us admit, was not adequate to stop this aggression. It is true also—we say—that we did not expect this type of aggression from the Chinese, although we knew right from the beginning that fundamentally the change in the situation in our borders was a historic change, that would affect our frontiers and bring danger to them. That is why we took it. We did not expect that danger to come in that particular place, especially Ladakh, at that stage. All this came because of various developments in Tibet. Anyhow, we have been taking those steps and hon. Member says that we must jump into this fray in some other way without adequate preparation. I would submit that this is more from exuberance of his mind and excitement than from clear thinking.

**Acharya Kripalani:** In two years China may have the atom bomb. We will not have, because we do not want to use such weapons.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** What conclusion does the hon. Acharya draw from that?

**Acharya Kripalani:** They are not so ready if we oppose today; they will be more ready to oppose when that happens.

**Shri Tyagi:** Shall we risk all our strength, all our army, in this?

**Shri Ranga:** For fifteen years, the hon. Prime Minister says, we have been preparing. Yet he himself says that they were not adequate to prevent that aggression. Is that our preparation?

**Shri Nath Pai:** Why go on advertising unpreparedness?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I knew that you would say that; I prophesied that you would say it. I said that for hundred years nobody in India has thought of that frontier.

**Shri Ranga:** That was because Tibet was protected there on our behalf by the British. But you allowed the Chinese to come there and you made no arrangements.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I find it a little difficult to follow the tortuous working of the hon. Acharya's mind. I am talking about things about a hundred years ago. He talks about the British Government protecting Tibet all the time.

**Shri Ranga:** All the time Tibet was there to protect us: Tibet was looked after by the British (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not understand what the hon. Member is after. Some hon. Members said that Tibet should not have been given up, as if it was our property to keep or give up... (*Interruptions*). I really cannot understand how else or what other policy we could have adopted. We could have adopted two policies. One was the one which we have adopted. The other also involved our walking out of Tibet. We were in Tibet not in any great armed forces; we had a couple of hundred soldiers protecting the line, somewhere in Yarun or Yangtze; just a few. They could not possibly remain there. It was an impossibility. We could not march our armies into Tibet. We had to come out of Tibet. There was no way and not all the power in the world could prevent that. That is admitted. Therefore, the objection is not of the step

that we took but of the fact that we justified it by certain historical and political reasons. The step had to be taken; there was no doubt about it.

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** That is not the objection. You came back; that was the correct thing you did. But you agreed to the Chinese walking in; that is the objection. We wanted an independent and free Tibet, as it was always.

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** Yesterday, we heard every one of these hon. Members, with the utmost patience.... (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Nath Pai:** He can take care of himself; you sit down.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Let there be no interruptions.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The objection, as the hon. Member said, is that while the Chinese came there, we should have withdrawn such elements of forces we had there—we had to and the Chinese would have come in as they came in—but we should have registered our protest about their coming. It comes to this.... (*Interruptions*.) Whether that protest would have been of the slightest help to us or to the Tibetans is another matter.. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Ranga:** It is a matter of conscience.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Am I to speak or not, Sir? I cannot have half a dozen of them talking at the same time. I submit that I should like the hon. Members opposite to think what exactly could we have done, except if they think that we could have affected the fate of Tibet by condemning them in the United Nations or elsewhere?

**Shri Ranga:** Even that we did not do in the United Nations.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Hon. Member talks about the matters of conscience. There are many matters of

conscience. If we enter into the field of conscience, we may lose ourselves because not much of what has been said here relates to conscience. Many things happen in the world and in our borders. If we are looking at it from the point of view of India's interests, as we must and, naturally, from the point of view of doing the right thing, I regret to say that I am completely unrepentant about the policy we adopted towards Tibet. In practice, we could not have adopted any other policy except of course that foolish policy of accepting what has happened and bewailing our lot.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** We are suffering as a result of that policy.

**Shri Hem Barua:** You have said that Tibet is independent in your book..... (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I am not going to allow this sort of thing. Let there be no running commentary in this matter.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is a sign of bad conscience.

**Shri Hem Barua:** My problem is this, Sir. He has written in his book, *Glimpses of World History*, 1939 edition, page 842 that "Tibet was independent." Why is he withdrawing from that original position?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will have to ask him to withdraw if he interrupts like this.... (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** I request you to direct the Prime Minister to withdraw his remarks.

**Shri Hem Barua:** I am quoting from the book written by him.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Are we sitting here with a bad conscience?

That is the most objectionable thing; he must withdraw it now.



**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member perhaps does not understand English language adequately..... (Interruptions.)

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I understand as much as there is need to understand.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I said 'bad conscience' because I did not wish to impugn the quality of the mind opposite. I have to find some explanation and so I gave the most charitable explanation.... (Interruptions).

**Shri Hem Barua rose—**

**Shri Rajendra Singh rose—**

**Mr. Speaker:** Are the hon. Members here intent upon disturbing and not allowing the Prime Minister to go on with his reply?

**An Hon. Member:** It is a question of conscience.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Members had no hesitation in saying things the whole of yesterday; they were saying a number of things against the hon. Prime Minister and he has to explain. In doing so, he referred to this question of conscience and so on. Somebody referred to it; Prof. Ranga said so. Now, is the hon. Prime Minister to say: yes, mine is a bad conscience?? I cannot understand.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Are we discussing foreign policy or conscience?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member is not the only Member of the Opposition. There is the Leader of his Party. Let him keep quiet for some time.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** He is the Leader of the House, Sir and we expect good manners from him; not bad manners.

**Mr. Speaker:** Nothing is gained by being rather unruly like this. I would advise the leaders of his group to just check him.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** On that side also, let them check.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is improper. If he continues like that, I will have to take more drastic action.

13 hrs.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I submit that to suggest that a person has a bad conscience is not an offensive statement at all. I may also submit, with respect, that it is not only parliamentary but it is almost on the verge of extreme politeness.

Apart from that, I can very well understand hon. Members feeling strongly on the Chinese incursion and aggression. I understand that. We all feel it. Only there is a difference in our expression. We have to express ourselves, some of us at any rate connected with the Government, in a somewhat restrained way, because, normally civilised Governments function in that way. We agree with the broad objective. There may be differences in the ways we reach the objective. I have analysed, pored over and listened carefully to some of the speeches made.

First of all, Shri Asoka Mehta said that I create confusion and ambiguity by calling the check-posts military posts. I really do not understand what the hon. Member is after. I cannot understand it. I thought that by calling them military posts I gave them a greater significance.

**Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur):** It was the other way about. What I had said was, what were military posts originally had been characterised as check-posts; that you have been consistent in your attitude of understating the facts by using words which did not really express the real position.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not remember Shri Asoka Mehta raising this point ever before. It was I who raised the point and said they should be called military posts. He did

not say so. As a matter of fact, frankly, I may say that in this description, which is more correct, there is no thing down in the position, which you call it check-posts or military posts. But it was a more correct description, and therefore I am using it.

Then he said, "Why did you not use it before?" I do submit that it is a prevarication, and it has no importance. That is my difficulty. Except a strong feeling and, if you like, passions, I do not get any logical line of reasoning. First of all, I am accused of what happened ten years ago in regard to Tibet. Well, good or bad, there it is; it is over. We are dealing with the present position. (*Interruption*).

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

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

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Then, my difficulty is, Acharya Ranga cannot move up beyond ten years. He does not seem to realise that we are living today and facing all these problems and not ten years ago still.

**Shri Ranga:** We are facing problems today and this is the legacy of your rule.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Therefore, does he propose somehow to change the course of history of the past ten years? What does he propose to do? (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Let us discuss the present.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** We are a mature, responsible body. Take again Shri Asoka Mehta. He talked about the chain of events and our prevarication, etc. I really and honestly submit—I do not claim to be a very brilliant person but I have an average intelligence—that I am quite unable to understand this. I can understand some errors here and there, but charging us with a course of pre-

varication during all these years is something which I cannot understand. I do submit that something should be done and if he wants to do it, I shall be grateful to him. Let him write out an essay and we shall deal with it and we shall improve ourselves and get rid of our mistakes. Then there was the question, "What have you done for the last ten years?"

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** I never used the word "prevarication". I do not know who has taken down notes for you.

**Shri Nath Pai:** I remember what was said. You sent the Secretary-General to China. It was asked as to what you gained in return for this gesture of friendship. The Secretary-General is charged by the Chinese as indulging in prevarication. That is what was said. We did not charge you with prevarication, nor did we doubt your brilliance.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Thank you. But then you have accused us, that we have allowed to create an atmosphere, and in spite of all this trouble, of China being right and reliable. I do not know how; in our usual attempt at being friendly with every nation, we have opposed and objected to many things done by other countries. But we have avoided, nevertheless, shouting loudly against them. That is our broad policy and I think it is a right policy. That does not mean this; that is, sometimes, people imagine that politeness is subservience. That is a sign, if I may say so, of some hidden fears in one's hearts and not a brave, straightforward attitude to the world. We are friendly with every country in the world including China, but we will fight China if necessary. That is the whole lesson that I have been taught during the last 40 or 50 years of my life by Gandhiji and others: always to be friendly and never to give in. That is how we have carried on our campaign. The gentlemen opposite perhaps have not had that training and therefore they cannot appreciate what I say. But I propose always to avoid saying

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

or doing things which are unnecessarily offensive and which are not necessary. Sometimes an offensive thing has to be said, but ultimately, what I am aiming at is, either winning over the other party or weakening the other party in its own opinion and in the world's opinion and in my own. This is the normal practice.

**Shri Hem Barua:** We have done neither.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is for the hon. Member to judge. Others also judge differently. However, there it is. Then Shri Asoka Mehta referred to *Panchsheel*. Take this question of *Panchsheel* which the people seem to think is a kind of red rag to the bulls of the Opposition,—

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** The bulls are on that side.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** They have got the bulls as symbols.

**Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur):** It is their election symbol.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:**—or anybody else. Gradually, hon. Members are beginning to see and sometimes even say, as Shri Asoka Mehta, said, that the principles of *Panchsheel* are quite good but they should not be applied to China! Now, if *Panchsheel* is good, it is good, and *Panchsheel* is a method of international relations which I think is essential, unless you have war, ultimately. You may have intermediate stages too.

**Shri Hem Barua:** But China has not lived up to that.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** If you say that China has not lived up to that, I entirely agree. Because China has not lived up to that, we are taking all these steps aimed at and this situation has arisen. That is a different matter. But it is no good talking of *Panchsheel*. You might even say: "Truth is a good proposition, but it

does not pay. Therefore, we lie all the time because somebody else is lying!" I say that in the *Panchsheel*, the principles laid down are the only principles which a civilised society can have in its international affairs. The alternative leads to war. If you have war, there is no *Panchsheel*; then it is war. but there it is. That is completely right for us to adopt it here and elsewhere.

Our grouse is that China has broken its word, and in that sense betrayed its word. That is our grouse. But you seem to be annoyed at the mere fact that *Panchsheel* is mentioned or the five principles are mentioned; it is to our advantage that it is mentioned. I am only pointing out that they have broken their word.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):** What about my three peaceful solutions?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** As far as I remember, Shri Asoka Mehta said and most people said that they do not want war if possible. Of course, if it comes it cannot be helped. Shri Asoka Mehta does not even want us to break our diplomatic relations with China. I think I am right in saying that he said that. What then? Not indulging in a campaign of slanging—we do not want that—and instead of that, we exchanged notes which are sometimes strong notes, and we go on strengthening our position to deal with the situation whenever we think it is strong enough to be dealt with by us and not from a weak position.

Now, when we have arrived at this stage of preparation, etc.—we lay down the policy—the other matter goes inevitably into the hands of our military or air or defence advisers—the so-called experts. It is for them to decide what steps to take, naturally in terms of our broad policies, taking directions from us. But ultimately it is their decision and we have to follow that. We have been doing that and

building up our strength from the base upwards. The roads that we decided to build and have built today to a considerable extent are over 2,000 miles, all roads in mountainous areas. Just imagine the task we have undertaken—2,000 miles of roads—and we have built them. A great deal depends to them, because without those roads, that basic build-up does not come into play.

I have talked about adventurist action. Adventurist action is taking some action without having a base to support. That is not fair to our men. They are brave and fine men, but it is not fair to put them in that position and not fair for the nation to take some action which cannot be supported and therefore which ends abruptly. So, that is the broad policy; the rest becomes a question of military tactics, strategy and the resources one has at one's disposal.

Some hon. Member said, put the whole resources of the Five Year Plan there, which again shows an extraordinary lack of intelligence. If I get together all the engineers and others and dump them in Ladakh, what are they to do there? A variety of things are necessary. Material is necessary this and that—which has to be carried by air. Every little screw is to be carried by air. So, more aircraft is necessary. We get new aircraft; we have got it. The moment new aircraft come, new airfields are necessary, because they are too heavy aircraft to be supported by the old airfields. So, there are a hundred and one aspects of things. One seems to think that India should rise as one man and sort of oppose it, and if I may add, be about as capable as one man. These are phrases may be for political meetings, but when we are considering this very dangerous and highly important situation, one has to plan and do things which will lead to success.

Take again the most extraordinary statement made by Acharya Kripalani that according to his information, we

have issued orders that none of our people are to fire unless fired upon. It is absolutely wrong. There are our military posts and obviously they are there to defend, to attack or do whatever the position may demand. Then, there are reconnaissance parties—usually small parties—whose objective is to gain information and report to us. If this small reconnaissance party gets involved in some trouble, we do not get the information and the main objective is denied. Where we want to fight, we fight; the posts fight and others fight. But so far as the reconnaissance parties, which may consist of 3, 4 or 5 persons are concerned, we have told them to concentrate on getting information and telling us about it. They do not go spreading about, 10 persons spreading about, to engage themselves in major warfare; that is writing them off, which is unfair to them and we do not gain. So, we must distinguish between reconnaissance, getting news whether publicly or secretly and fighting. These are obvious things which Members may perhaps forget.

Much was said about friendship with Burma, Nepal, etc. I do not think we have ever been quite so close friends with Burma as we are now. Does that mean that we are to dictate Burmese policy? Take Nepal even. Much has happened in Nepal, which we have not liked and we have expressed ourselves about it. But we have not interfered, because we want to maintain their friendship. We are still continuing to help them. Some hon. Members opposite have expressed themselves very strongly against the present regime in Nepal, which has irritated them. We have restrained ourselves, although mildly we have said so and we are friends with Nepal still. It is true that things have happened there which are not to our liking and we have made it clear; we shall continue to make that clear. We cannot order about these things, because the mere act of doing that has the reverse consequences.

Broadly speaking, I think all these countries are in terms of quite close

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

friendship with us. The Malayan King is coming here; the Malayan Prime Minister is coming here within a few days. The hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta, should not attach too much importance to what a few students might have said to him in Rangoon or Singapore, I forget, or someone else there in Singapore or Malaya.

Somebody said that we should not sponsor the Chinese case in the UN. As a matter of fact, even last year, we did not sponsor it, but certainly we voted for it, because that has nothing to do with China being good or bad. In fact, we think that unless China is in the UN, we cannot proceed with disarmament or any major matter. There can be no disarmament, China being left out to arm. There are other reasons. It has nothing to do with our trouble with China. We shall deal with it.

Then, a number of statements by the Defence Minister were apparently not approved of by some hon. Members opposite. But again I would submit that they do not seem to have read them before disapproving of them, apart from headlines or may be something else. He was on the eve of coming back to India. He was asked something at the New York airport. That very morning something had appeared in the newspapers; I had made a statement here on the 20th November and there were big headlines there. He was asked, what is this about? In relation to what was said in Parliament, he said, "I do not know the latest developments". He know, of course, all the others. He said, he did not know what was happening just now. It was in relation to what happened in Parliament that morning that he said, "I do not know what the latest development there is".

**Shri Nath Pai:** He referred to developments on the China-India border.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It was in relation to the news that appeared that morning in the papers.

**Shri Nath Pai:** The news was about the Prime Minister's statement about 11 new incursions.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** In relation to what happened in Parliament, he said, "I do not know if anything happened in the last day or two". The concept there was, large armies were facing each other in Ladakh, to which he said that there are no active hostilities of this kind going on, not "hostility", but "hostilities" going on in this way, i.e., large-scale fighting.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** Pardon me, I am interrupting because the Defence Minister said that I have misinterpreted him. Actually, the words quoted in inverted commas are "active hostility" and not "hostilities". So, you will have to stick to that expression "active hostility" if you are quoting from the newspapers.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know, but surely the newspaper is not more reliable than what I am telling him.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** He says something and the newspaper reports it in inverted commas. He may remember having said something, but the only thing we have before us and you have before you is this. His actual words were not heard by you. All you have is the evidence in the newspaper. I am prepared to accept that he did not use those words, but until he makes that position clear, it is not fair to say that we have misinterpreted him.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not accusing hon. Members....

**Shri Ranga:** Why not allow the Defence Minister to defend himself? Why do you come to his rescue?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** With such gallant crusaders as the Acharya....

**Shri Ranga:** You are the gallant crusader for him.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is on his instructions that I am saying so. Anyhow, it is immaterial. He says that he used the word "hostilities". Nobody can be absolutely dead certain as to what was said, every word casually said when one is going to the airport. But the whole point was that the concept there was of large armies fighting, and he wanted to say that this kind of thing is not happening there now.

Sir, I was saying something about sponsoring China. Last year we did not sponsor it but we supported that, and that is our position this year too.

Well, Sir, there are many minor matters but the major position is this, and I hope that apart from our minor arguments that we throw at each other this question of our border and Chinese aggression there is of the most vital importance—I repeat—not only for India's integrity but for the future of Asia and of world peace. It is a matter of tremendous importance, and unless the world takes some other course in the next few years, which it might—I mean disarmament—and takes a vital turn, this will be one of the major trouble spots of the world, and we have to prepare ourselves not for today only but for tomorrow, the day after and years ahead. That is why anything that we want to do we want to do with full preparation.

I think, as I said the other day, that we have improved our situation in the border very much in the last year and half. I do not say that it is as good as we want it to be, but it will become that good progressively, growing better and better, and our policy can only be to get this vacation by the Chinese forces from India's territory. We work to that end, and therein we all agree.

Ultimately, if you analyse the situation, Sir, it becomes one of, possibly, some military tactics. We may differ on that. I may have some opinion, but I have to abide by the opinion of my, military advisers. I

know they are anxious to achieve results and they are working to that end. It is a difficult task. Anyhow it is no good saying that. When I say it is a difficult task, the Chinese will think we are afraid. We are not afraid, we are not accustomed to be afraid of anything. But that does not mean that we should function without due care, due preparation and due thought. That is what we venture to do. And, we have to see it in the context of a developing world situation. It is bad enough here. But the developing world situation has to be kept in view. You cannot isolate it. We are trying to do that, and I think that in doing so we have served the cause of India. We hope—we are not without hope—that we shall be able to succeed in getting this land vacated through pressures, through other things, whatever they may be, and without engulfing the whole world in a major war. These things are connected with each other. We cannot isolate them. In effect, therefore, there is little difference, except for strong accusations here and there, in the approach to this question from any side of the House.

I think—you may say that I am to blame for that—that even though I, right ten years ago, foresaw these developments I, nevertheless, trusted—perhaps that is not the right word—I thought that the Chinese Government would not function exactly as it did later. It is true. You may say I was mistaken in feeling that way. But I think that all the time basing one's policy on suspicion is not also a good thing. Sometimes one may be mistaken as one was in this case. But the success we have had in our foreign policy the world over is because we have tried to keep every country a friend and succeeded in creating that impression. Rightly, it was not that China specifically was isolated from others. China was one of the countries we dealt with as a great country, a big country and a country which is our neighbour. We have to adopt that policy; there is no other way, though otherwise all the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

trouble would have come perhaps sooner or in a worse form.

Anyhow, Sir, we have to face the situation as it is, and we propose to face it stoutly and with courage.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):** I want to seek one clarification regarding the latest communication. The Prime Minister said that China has intimidated India that she will march her troops on this side of McMahon line. May I know whether we will repel the march of these troops if it happens?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The answer is obvious, if that is done we shall resist and repel.

**Shri Nath Pal:** Mr. Speaker, a question which we had expected him to reply and which has been exercising the mind of all is what attitude Government is planning to take, intending to take with regard to the treaty with China which is about to lapse in June.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am glad the hon. Member has drawn my attention to this, because I wanted to mention it myself. Yesterday we received a communication from the Chinese Government pointing out that this treaty is expiring or will expire in a few months and the time for renewal of it ended, I think, day before yesterday, and suggesting that we should try, we should discuss the terms of a new treaty. That is what we received yesterday. We have, naturally, sent no answer to it. Well, in the course of the next few days we shall send an appropriate answer.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** What will be that answer?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I can't exactly say that. We have to consider it in our foreign affairs committee and the rest. But it is obvious that when such a request is received—unlike other Chinese communications that we have been receiving this is a

very polite communication expressing the hope that this and that will happen—merely to say that we will not discuss with you, *prima facie* seems rather wrong. Obviously, we cannot just say "yes" and go and discuss it. That too is wrong. Therefore, whatever we may say will have to be conditioned, and on certain conditions being satisfied we may.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** Why not try my peaceful methods?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member wants to go to China.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** He has the passport.

**Mr. Speaker:** If he has, let him go.

13.29 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (ELEVENTH AMENDMENT) BILL

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up the Constitution (Eleventh Amendment) Bill. Two hours have been allotted for this Bill. It is now 1:30. So this must end at 3:30. Let hon. Members be ready for voting at 3:30, or shall we have it at 4:00?

**Some hon. Members:** Let it be at 4:00.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. Let it be at 4:00. The discussion will go on on this and voting will take place at 4:00.

**Shri Tangamani (Madurai):** Sir, I rise to a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is usual to raise a point of order after the motion is made. Let him make the motion.

**The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration. Sir, the object of introducing this Bill has been set out in the Bill itself, particularly in the Statement of Objects and Reasons as