

Swamy, Shri N. R. M.  
 Syed Mahmud, Dr.  
 Thankha, Pandit S. S. N.  
 Tapase, Shri G. D.  
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.  
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.  
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi  
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati  
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.  
 Varma, Shri B. B.  
 Varma, Shri Niranjana.  
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.  
 Vero, Shri M.  
 Vidyawati Chatruvedi, Shrimati  
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.  
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.  
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES— Nil

*The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.*

#### SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION Re "THE UNTOLD STORY"

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think this august House can, when it wants, work with great speed and efficiency. We are now going on to the next item on the Order Paper—"The Untold Story."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): The other part of the story will now be told.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have quite a number of names. I hope with the same speed and efficiency, we shall unravel "The Untold Story." The first speaker will get 15 minutes and the rest, 10 minutes each.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to raise a discussion on the dis-

quieting disclosures contained in the book "The Untold Story" by Lt. General B. M. Kaul in relation to the NE-FA operations of 1962 and the Government's stand thereon. I shall invite the attention of the hon. Members to the first sentence in the book which says, "Destiny is not always kind." I beg to disagree with the first sentence in the book because I will show in my subsequent speech that destiny was extra-kind to this general, Mr. Kaul. He says "Many great statesmen, soldiers and saints have been its victims and their worth ridiculed" Again I beg to disagree. It is not his worth which is being ridiculed by the country. He has assumed to himself the right to ridicule our late lamented Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was loved by the entire country. He has tried to malign our Deputy Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, and he has tried to malign the ex-Defence Minister Shri Krishna Menon. And he is that person who enjoyed the favours of these people for a great length of time, and there could

be no further act of ingratitude than the reference made to these people distinguished people, in his book. Then he goes on to say.

"Though I have no pretensions to greatness, I have also been through a similar experience."

Here again I have to differ. He has assumed to himself the greatness and he has acted in a role as if he is the supreme man and he has been appointed to judge the acts of all and sundry, whether they were national leaders, or they were his seniors in the army, or his juniors in the army. That is the role he has given unto himself in this book which is named "The Untold Story", and here I would say that what he has said is only a portion of the story, and I am sure, one day, the real version of the untold story will also come before this country. Then another of his sentences is:

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

"This book, I hope, will enable the reader to see to what extent I—or others—are answerable for some happenings."

Here again he has tried to throw the blame on others, and I would presently bring before this august House some facts, and I ask of General Kaul to answer the unanswered passages in his book "The Untold Story". Then he goes on to say:

"I was selected for positions of responsibility from time to time, only after due application by Government of the prescribed yardsticks for such selections both in the pre—and post-independence eras.

Here again my main appeal to the hon. Minister is that this is the sentence which requires a thorough probe in the case of General Kaul. Let the country be assured, after a full and thorough enquiry, that proper yardsticks were applied as far as his promotions were concerned, that no undue favour was shown to him, that he was not allowed to supersede several Generals in the army, Generals whose valour was unquestioned, Generals who had earned a name for themselves in the field. And this gentleman has the cheek to condemn many of them, including General Choudhury who led the country to victory, if I may say so, against Pakistan in the India-Pakistan conflict of 1965. And then he refers to a letter from Panditji and quotas from it.

He says:

"When the suitable time comes, you can put some facts as you think necessary before the public."

Now this he has taken as a permission from Panditji to write whatever he liked, to tarnish the image of many politicians in this country, and tarnish the image of several Generals in the army. And now we have to go back to find out what really Panditji promised to the country. While speaking on the 9th November, 1962, Panditji was pleased to say:

"Among other things, I hope, at now but somewhat later, at a more suitable time, there will be an enquiry into this matter, because there is a great deal of misunderstanding and misapprehension, and people have been shocked, all of us have been shocked by the events that occurred from the 20th October onwards, for a few days and the reverses that we suffered. So I hope there will be an enquiry . . ."

and mark the words—

" . . .so as to find out what mistakes or errors were committed . . ."

and the next sentence is very important—

"... and who were responsible for them."

, My hon. friend, the Defence Minister, will rise and say that enquiry has been held by Major-General Henderson Brooks and Brigadier so and so. I quite agree that that enquiry has been made. But Panditji gave another assurance to this House and we demand from the hon. Defence Minister that that assurance be fulfilled now. The time has come when we cannot suppress matters any further, and that assurance of Panditji was that responsibility will be fixed on those who were responsible for the reverses in N.E.F.A. I would like to know from the Defence Minister what steps have been taken to fulfil this assurance given by the late Prime Minister to this House. Now General Kaul has raised a very fundamental question and that question has to be tackled some time or the other in this House and the other House, and the fundamental question I am referring to is the role of politicians vis-a-vis the army. He has said so much in his book about this relationship that it is high time that we in Parliament, in both the Houses, settled this question once for all. The question who is to control and in what spheres, whether the politicians have any say as far as the actual operations are concerned, or it is only

for the politicians to lay down the policy and for the Generals to implement it. That is a basic question which will have to be settled sooner or later.

Now I have spoken about the Prelude and preface so far. The reading of this book has left the impression on my mind that in the first fifty pages or so I was reading fairy tales. So much has been said that at times it is impossible to believe what has been stated, and I will quote some examples a little later.

We are told that when Sardar Bhagat Singh and Shri B. K. Dutt threw the bomb in the Central Assembly, this gentleman, as a young man, was present in the Assembly hall. I would say it was a very daring act if he were there, of course not knowing what was coming. And then he was detained on suspicion, he says. Well, there can be cases where people can be detained on suspicion. But later he goes on to say that he played a part in the underground revolutionary movement of those times. And then he goes on to say that he was selected for Sandhurst. Well, I cannot believe that the British Government of those days . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Five thousand was offered.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Just a minute, I am coming to all that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is running out.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I am not prepared to accept that the British Government of those days would have selected any person for Sandhurst if they had the slightest suspicion that he was connected with the revolutionary movement. That is the first question that I pose to Mr. Kaul to clear by giving some sort of proof that the first few pages in this book are true or correct.

I will just give two examples of the utter untruth, I will call it, of what has been written in this book. The first example that I cite is from page 131 where he says that "Brig. R. P. Chopra, my neighbour on Kushak Road in Delhi fell seriously ill in 1952" and then he says that he arranged for the travel by the Frontier Mail, that he took the patient to Bombay thirty minutes before time. Now, there are quite a few things in this statement. First of all, the crew of the Frontier Mail who leave Delhi do not go right up to Bombay. There are four changes on the way. If he arranged with one crew how did the information go on passing from one crew to another so that ultimately the fourth crew-man could take it upon himself to take the train thirty minutes before time? That is the second thing that has to be cleared. Also he says that the Frontier Mail was running on the Igatpuri-Bombay line. But the Frontier Mail, I may tell the House, never runs on the Igatpuri-Bombay line. That is the route of the Punjab Mail. So either the train mentioned is wrong or the route is wrong. And as for arranging with the crew, to me it seems impossible that from Delhi a gentleman can make arrangements with four sets of crew to take a train to Bombay and that too some thirty minutes before time.

Another fact that has to be remembered is that there is a jungle of signals when we reach Bombay. There are electric trains, local trains and so on, and as far as I have been able to see the railway system, it is almost impossible for any train to reach Bombay before time after passing through this jungle of signals. That is another thing which Gen. Kaul will have to explain to the public.

Then on pages 282 and 284, Gen. Kaul speaks about another incident where he takes upon himself the role of a great benefactor who was always ready to help others. In this case it happens to be Maj. Gen. Badhwar who was sent to the United States of America

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

to get his cancer treated. This gentleman, Gen. Kaul, says that he did all that he could, that he collected money, met the Ambassador, arranged for the treatment in time and so on. If I may take the House into confidence, I may add that I have been told by one of the very close relatives of Maj. Gen. Badhwar, that the role of this gentleman was very far from what has been stated in this book. He was nowhere in the scene.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was behind the scene.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: That again is something which he has to explain. Next I come to the major role played by this gentleman. I will take only five' more minutes, Madam. I come to the major role that he has played and that is his connection with the NEFA reverses. Again he has given a story about his part, about his having advised Prime Minister Nehru, his having advised the Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, against their taking this venture, against this and that. He has depicted everything as if ! he was in the right and all the world was in the wrong. Admitting that all that he has stated is correct, may I know from Gen. Kaul through the hon. Defence Minister, is it possible for a General to say all this and remain in his post? If he felt that he was not useful, that his advice was not being listened to, then any self-respecting man would have said, "I cannot hold this post. I cannot take the big responsibility of meeting the reverses in the field of thus endangering the security and safety and territorial integrity of this great country." He would have walked out with respect and he would have said, "Gentlemen, I have done the work as far as I could. Now it is not possible for me to carry on. Let somebody else do it." If he had taken that course, then I would have taken off my hat to him and I would have said, "Here is a brave man who

can come out, who can throw off his job for the sake of principles, in not being listened to, for the sake of the country." But he did not do it.

Another mysterious thing which is to be explained yet is, what was this disease that he had? Why did he run away from the spot, from the vital point and at that vital time when he was most required there? It is for a General to remain at his post, at his place and to give up his life rather than leave the field. That is what a true General does. One is not a true General if he leaves the field of battle, shows his back to the enemy and comes to the comforts of the capital of India and reports to the Prime Minister, 'Well, Sir I am here. I have left my post. Give me laurels.' This in short is the story.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): He got his laurels—Jayanti Shipping.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Only two more points and then I have done.

One is about the statement by the hon. Defence Minister in reply to my questions about Generals and others printing and publishing articles and books in their own names. The hon. Minister said that this question is being looked into under the Official Secrets Act. But I would ask him: What more truth does he want when confidential meetings have been described in the book, when conversations between two Generals have been described in the book, when conversations between the Defence Minister and Gen. Kaul have been described in the book, when conversations between himself and the Prime Minister have been described in this book? What, after all, is the Official Secrets Act? Is this something which has to be probed into in order to find out whether this Act has been violated? This is an obvious thing and anyone who reads the pages of this book can come to only one conclusion and that is that this gentleman has

been giving out secrets, secrets that he know in his official capacity as General Kaul.

The last point which I want to touch on—and again it is a basic one—is this. I ask whether our defence personnel, whether our Army General and others, should be free to mix with foreign dignitaries, go to cocktail parties and endanger the country and expose the secrets of the country by mixing with others, sometimes if I may say so in this particular context, under intoxication of liquor? I have myself—I am sorry to say it—been to one or two of these parties where I have witnessed high officials and highly placed people speaking all kinds of things under intoxication. That is a thing which has got to be stopped if the security and territorial integrity of this country are to be kept safe.

All that I demand from the hon. Defence Minister is that a thorough enquiry should be made into the conduct of this gentleman vis-a-vis the NEFA reverses. I may also add that this can be done without bringing in any question of public security and safety. A private enquiry can be held as far as this gentleman alone is concerned.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Mr.  
Ruthnaswamy, ten minutes each.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am not here to defend Gen. Kaul. I would only say that in view of the manner in which the Defence Ministry and the Government of India have treated Parliament and the public in regard to our defence position, in regard to the preparedness of our military forces to meet possible enemies and in view of the fact that they have been following a hush-hush policy in regard to the preparedness of our mili-

tary forces, I think the country ought to be grateful to Gen. Kaul for giving his version of the story about the state of our defences. If only the Government had been persuaded in response to requests from all sides of the House except the Government side to publish Gen. Henderson Brooks Report then and there we would have had in our hands facts and arguments with which to meet Gen. Kaul's allegations. To all our requests the Government turned a deaf ear. The other day the Minister of Defence in defending Government's policy in keeping Gen. Henderson Brooks Report secret said that there was in the Report information about the deployment of our troops, about the way in which our troops ought to be moved and so on and therefore it would serve the cause of the enemy if Gen. Henderson Brooks Report were to be published. Surely, no enemy is going to fight a new war based on the methods followed in the last war and as for giving away the secrets to the enemy, is the Government so childish as to think that a clever enemy like the Chinese do not know the things that they ought to know about our army? They have got battalions of spies in our country they have all kind of sources of information with which they can inform themselves about the state of our defences. Again and again I reminded the Government that they should follow the principle enunciated by Winston Churchill in regard to the publication of reports about the army that the Government should be prepared to publish everything that it is possible for the enemy to know. The enemy already knows about the state of your defences and why could not the Government take the public into confidence and publish these reports? General Kaul has made references to the state of unpreparedness of our army; our weapons were not modern; we were defective in our weaponry; we were defective in our equipment. For instance he pointed out and that was acknowledged by the Prime Minister of the day when he said that our

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy] army is not equipped with automatic rifles, a thing which every modern army possesses. And after the end of the Second World War we were in such a state of unpreparedness. Gen. Kaul also says that the army had not been prepared for guerilla warfare.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Even today.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: That is the kind of warfare in which the Chinese are experts. Mao Tse-tung has written a classic on guerilla warfare and his troops have practised guerilla warfare wherever they had been. In Vietnam for instance just now, in every country in which the Chinese trained troops have taken part.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not even the Americans say that the Chinese are there in Vietnam.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: They have been training them in this kind of warfare.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Training? Even the Americans do not say that the Chinese are in Vietnam, whether as homoeopaths or guerilla trainers or as political advisers.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I am glad to see that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta places credence in the reports of Americans. This is the first time that . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: . . . he has said a good word for the Americans. In view of all these facts I think we must be grateful to Gen. Kaul for publishing these facts. Even after the publication of this book the Government has not thought it fit to publish a reply. They say they are preparing a book. What kind of a Govern.

ment is this which allows allegations to go on unchallenged for six months? Naturally the judgement goes by default against them. So I hope and trust that at least as a result of the revelations of Gen. Kaul in his book, the Government will be persuaded in the future to take Parliament and the country into their confidence and publish information about our defence forces, about the state of our defence forces, about the preparedness of our army, without giving out any information not open to possible enemies. It is only in this way that they can ensure the confidence of the public in our army, in our defence forces and especially in the Government that is responsible for the preparedness of our armed forces. I am not concerned with all the personal details, the personal references of Gen. Kaul to his contemporaries, to the Prime Minister, to the politicians, to his fellow-Generals. It is rather interesting to know the story from one who has participated in the events. There is one very important remark that he has made in his book and that is that the state of unpreparedness of our army follows from the foreign policy of the Government, of the civil Government. Gen. Henderson Brooks himself says that the state of defence of any country, the strength of the defence of any country, depends upon the kind of foreign policy which the civil Government follows. What was the foreign policy of the Government of India? The foreign policy of the Government of India was that China would in no circumstances think of waging a war against India, that China is an Asiatic country, that China is a democratic country, that China is a Communist country and Communists never think of going to war against others; they are only thinking of peaceful development of their country, economic development of their country. It is this wrong foreign policy of our Government that has been responsible for the state of unpreparedness of our army.

Foreign policy and defence go together; one is the function of the other and it was because our foreign policy was so wrong, so false, so unreal . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):  
So real.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: . . . that our army was not prepared for the consequences of that foreign policy. So if anybody is to be condemned, it is the civil Government of the country for its wrong policy and for keeping the army unprepared. Give us a good foreign policy; give us a right foreign policy and our defence will be as right and as well-organised as we would like it to be.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have read this book with great interest and I have followed the two hon. Members who have preceded me. The point that I want to make is very simple. I am not concerned with what the author of "The Untold Story" has to say about himself, about his autobiography and all that. (*Interruption.*) I am not concerned with that. What we are concerned with is what this book reveals so far as the policies, the functioning and the preparedness of the Government Of India to meet any challenge on our borders are concerned. Now, Madam, you will remember and the House will remember that in 1962 when the Chinese invasion took place, not only this House, but the whole country's mind was greatly exercised over what happened. Now, this book has aroused the interest of the country to find out actually what happened at that time.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : That is untold by General Kaul

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA  
That has been told by General Kaul  
Now, I would like to know how fai

what he has told is a true story. What I am concerned with is to check from the hon. Minister whether he has told the true story in what he describes as the untold story. This we are entitled to know from the Government and, therefore, when I last participated in this debate I suggested and asked the Minister to tell us the whole truth, to tell us all the facts and that he could do very easily by giving us an opportunity to see the report of General Henderson Brooks. That would be a more authoritative story of this whole debacle, if I am allowed to call it, rather than get this story from a discredited General.

4 P<sup>N</sup>.M.

Now, the point I would like you to consider is this, whether it is in the interests of the country or whether it will endanger the security of this country if the report of the General is made public. Now, I would invite your attention to what General Kaul had only said yesterday at a press conference. He also considers that there is no point in keeping back certain facts from the public or from Parliament what is considered to be security risks. He has allowed nothing to remain untold in his book. He has told us everything. But what I say is that we see only one side of the picture. Throughout the book he has painted himself as if there was no responsibility on him. He was above board. He was discharging his duties honestly and diligently. He has painted everybody else right from the Prime Minister down to an officer as responsible for this debacle. He has tried to prove it convincingly in his book that the sole responsibility for this debacle did not lie on him or on the Army, but on the civil Government. I would like this to be clarified as to what is the truth. It is good not only to know the truth, but it will also be good for framing our future policies in these matters. I have no doubt in my mind that so far as the relationship between

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] the civil and military is concerned, as has been pointed out in the Constitution and otherwise also, the authority of the civil power in this country is supreme. There can be no doubt, there can be no discussion and there can be no debate on this point, but the civil power has also got responsibilities for the discharge of its duties in respect of the defence of this country. We have got to know the past, so that we can have a proper orientation of our policies, both with regard to defence and with regard to our foreign policy in future. It is not possible to do so unless we have a correct appraisal of what happened in NEFA in 1962. If the Government wants to clear many of the doubts and suspicions that have been thrown on it by this book, it is important that the other side of the story, or if I may say so the whole of the story, must be told to Parliament and to the public at large.

Now, the other point is regarding the disclosure of military secrets in this book. I think the Government has taken too long to make up its mind and tell us whether any military secrets or security matters have been disclosed or not, and whether any offence has been committed under the Official Secrets Act. They come forward and tell us all this time that they have been examining this book. It should not take them so long to examine the book. The whole difficulty is this. Parliament and the country thinks—rightly or wrongly I do not know, but there is an impression—that the Government does not make up its mind quickly on these matters. It is very important that they not only make up their mind, but make up their mind quickly on these matters and the necessary action flowing out of that must be taken and implemented also very quickly.

Now, there is only one more point and I shall have done and that is with

regard to the same point which was raised by me previously, namely, writings by our Generals as military correspondents of journals and newspapers. I would like to know categorically from the Minister what our policy is in this matter. How do we control it? Can we allow our Generals to go on writing and giving expression to their views on important military matters even when they continue to be in charge of the defences of our country? What is the convention in other countries? Are they allowed to do so while they are in active service? I would like to know that, then, what about the payments, if the Generals or other military officers have been given such payments. I would like to know how many of them have been given such promotions. We know from this book how General Chaudhuri used to be the military correspondent of a paper.

I  
SHRI A. D. MANI: The General himself has said it.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The General himself has said it. I would like to know how many more of our active officers, military officers, are permitted to be military correspondents of one journal or other, whether now or in the past. Do the Government keep any record of that? Do the Government have an organisation to keep a control and a check on their writings? What about the payments? Under the Service Rules I would like to know whether they do disclose whatever amounts they receive from these journals and newspapers and how these monies are accounted for. Do they pay this to the Government? Or are they allowed to retain this amount? Has the Government any control upon the remuneration that they receive for such services rendered to the newspapers? It is a very important and vital matter when the country's defences are involved. This must be explained.



Lastly, I want to say something about their meetings with the foreign dignitaries and diplomats. General Kaul has given in his press interview yesterday that he took verbal permission from the Defence Minister, that he reported verbally to the Defence Minister. The other day the Defence Minister told us what were the relevant rules. He had to take the written permission and then he had to give a written report. How are these things being done? Is this rule being properly enforced or left to the whims of the Minister? Can they permit the General to go on talking to somebody and not report in writing? After all the Defence Minister is here today and he may not be there tomorrow. These things have got to be kept in writing because we are dealing with the security of our country; hence it is all the more important. Are we following this today? This is very important. Therefore, we cannot permit any laxity on this ground. I would like to know whether the rules are being enforced, and why they were not enforced at that time. Have we got anything in writing by the then Defence Minister that he was permitted to do so, permitted to carry on conversations with foreign dignitaries and not to keep a proper record of the same? These are important issues which naturally rise in our minds. Therefore, I seek clarification on these points.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Banka Behary Das. I would request Members to keep within the limit of ten minutes. I have got 20 names before me. Everybody may not have a chance.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
माननीय मेरा नाम ?

उपसभापति : क्या कहते हो ?

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा नाम काहे को  
पीछे हालती जा रही हैं ।

उपसभापति : आपका नाम पीछे नहीं,  
नीचे है ।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिए बाक बिहारा  
जी का नाम 13 वां है, मेरा नाम छटवा  
है । आप कह रही थीं कि पीछे है, इसलिए  
मैंने आपको करक्ट कर दिया ।

SHRI C. D. PANDEY: (Uttar Pradesh): For the sake of convenience you may have a list, but you may not go by the list at all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Das.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Madam, when we are discussing this "Untold Story" vis-a-vis NEFA debacle, I want to request my friends to have an objective analysis of the whole situation. Two issues come out very prominently. One is, by writing this book, whether Mr. Kaul has transgressed the limit which has been set by the Official Secrets Act. The second issue is, what has been mentioned by Mr. Kaul about NEFA debacle how far it is objective. These are the two issues which stand out very prominently when we discuss this matter.

About the first issue, though it is a matter for the Defence Minister to look into, I want to remind him that our Official Secrets Act is to a greater extent synonymous with the Official Secrets Act of Great Britain, and in this connection I can remind the Minister and our friends also and ask when Mr. Churchill wrote the war memoirs which most of us have read, whether he transgressed that limit, whether he divulged any of the secrets, military secrets, that ought to have been kept secret in their country. So whether a matter is secret or not is not to be judged only from the technical point of view. It is to be judged as to whether sufficient time has elapsed between the actual happening and the writing of the book so that we can mention them or brand them as official secrets still. So, when the

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

Defence Minister or the Government judge this matter, they must keep in view this very fact that in other countries prominent statesmen, whether they are Ministers or they are officers, have written books about the war which depict more clearly and elaborately the military strategy of those countries. I will not go more into the matter because after all the overriding interest of the country has to be considered. In this case after a lapse of four or five years <sup>some</sup> of the matters that were official secrets at that time have lost their importance and have become historical facts for us, and if we want to keep them secret in the name of public interest, we are not going to serve this country. Nowhere any statesman has served his country by keeping everything secret for all time to come.

The second aspect is about this NEFA debacle. I want to say here also that it should be judged objectively. I have read this book from A to Z. I know that most of the chapters here are trash and have no relevance; he only talks more about himself. This is not a colourful career at all. But coming to the NEFA aspect of this book I want to say that as long as the Defence Ministry want to keep this Henderson Report as one of their secret documents, they are going to allow such things to be discussed. Here also I can point out that most of the things that have been mentioned about NEFA our unpreparedness, our debacle and so on, have been discussed in both the Houses. Here only a General comes with some first-hand knowledge and depicts those things. Moreover from the start I want also to suggest that this General was a "blue-eyed boy" of Mr. Nehru and Mr. Menon. We know how allegations were levelled against this gentleman and how Pandit Nehru and Mr. Menon showed him leniency in getting him promoted. So, Madam, all these aspects should not be forgotten when we discuss this matter. In this connection again I want to say that though in some aspects he

may be colourful, he has not spared himself or the army also from the blame that we are going to give. If I am allowed to quote—as there is no time to quote, I will not do that—I will say that not only he has blamed to a certain extent the civil administration, the Government, he has blamed also in this book the Indian Army which has not always given technical and strategic advice properly to the Government of the day. But here also in many places he has said that he wanted to take the share in the responsibility for this also.

So I want to say that when we objectively consider this book, we must go into all those aspects.

In this connection, I want to quote here from page 397 in which he has said:

"If Nehru, Menon and some others had acted in time, as represented by the Army repeatedly earlier, there might have been a different story to tell."

I want to emphasise this fact also that when the Government of India took a political decision to evict the Chinese from the soil of India, from NEFA, the military strategists who were consulted at that time categorically stated that we were not militarily prepared in such a manner as we could evict the Chinese from the Indian soil or attack them, and that was why the military personnel at the conference with the Government of India wanted that it should be given in writing that the Army should vacate the Chinese hordes from the Indian soil. I can quote here from page 362 wherein Mr. Kaul has stated:

"The Army Chief asked for a written directive from the Government for evicting the Chinese from this area, which was issued."

bo I am to say that it is not so much the fault of the Army General who has written this book nor the fault of the Army but it is the fault of the Government which was at that time pursuing a policy of appeasement towards China. And we also know how, when the Chinese Army was attacking our force<sub>s</sub> in NEFA and our people were in a helpless condition, the Chinese Army, chanting the slogan of 'Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai' were attacking our soldiers and murdering them in hundreds.

I do not want to quote elaborately. But here also on page 376 he has written how our Army was facing the Chinese hordes, even when the winter was coming, they had no warm clothing on them, they had no boots even. I want to tell the Defence Minister—it has been said so many times in this House—that our defence industries were producing coffee articles whereas boots were not produced in our defence industries. And here also in this book he has pointed out how Mr. Menon fought against the Defence Ministry when the different officers warned that we had no boots, that we should purchase them from the private sector. We talk so much about the private sector also. But when the question of defence comes up, when the Government is not prepared to give ever boots to our soldiers, here is a great man and a socialist who believes in the public sector, who takes the pie; that because in the public sector we are not having boots, therefore, the Army might go without boots also.

(Time bell rings)

I am not going into that elaborately because you have already read it issued the warning to me. But—it is in page 391—I want to say that our policy till then was not even to build border roads, and we know what the consequences were. In page 391 Gen. Kaul says:

"As a matter of policy, we have orders at the highest military level

not to build roads within close vicinity of our borders."

It is a shameful episode. Let us not now blame Gen. Kaul because he has come out with the truth. Even he has gone to the extent of saying that when six months before the Chinese attacked India, this strategic point of Thagla was to be occupied—the military personnel thought that it should be occupied—some of the highest military officers said not to occupy those strategic areas.

So, Madam, whatever responsibility may be placed on Gen. Kaul, I want to say that by only taking advantage of the Official Secrets Act, we are not going to silence the voice that the Indian people have raised already. Here, when we are objectively discussing a situation, I am to tell my friends on the other side that for the NEFA debacle, only the military personnel are not responsible, it is the Government of India which was headed by Mr. Nehru and Mr. Menon who always wished to have an appeasement policy towards China; that is more responsible for this affair and if the Henderson-Brooks'...

(Time bell rings)

One minute. Within one minute, I will finish.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute? Your one minute becomes so many minutes.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: If that Report is out, I can say that whatever Gen. Kaul has said will come to be true.

I want to say that the debacle that we saw in NEFA was also similar in Ladakh. In the Chusul Story, on page 431, Gen. Kaul has said categorically that like NEFA all our posts were occupied by the Chinese in the Ladakh area but actually there was no fighting at the Chusul Airfield, when every day now and then we were fed with false

[Shri Banka Behary Das] stories that the Army was there in the Chusul Airfield, that the airfield was attacked and that bombs were thrown. He has categorically stated them, these are the allegations which are there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thai will do, please.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: I want to say that instead of taking technical view of the whole matter as we are going to do here, we are to see all this from an objective angle and see that whatever mistakes they have committed, whatever mistakes the then rulers have committed, they should own them and the Henderson-Brooks' Report should be placed before the House and future action should immediately be framed accordingly. Thank you.

उपसभापति : श्री राजनारायण । दस मिनट आपके बोलने के लिए दिये गये हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : जितना सब बोले है उतना हम भी बोलेंगे ।

उपसभापति : मगर सब को दस मिनट दिये हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : हमने तीन मर्तबा रिजोल्यूशन दिया है । जहां हम खड़े होते हैं तहां आप हमको पहले ही कह देती हैं ।

उपसभापति : सब के लिए एक टाइम है ।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, यह किताब "अकथित कहानी" पढ़ने के बाद मैं ज़रा विरोधी पक्ष और सरकारी कांग्रेस पक्ष दोनों से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि क्या हमारे अन्दर लीडरशिप है या नहीं है ? अगर है, तो मुक्त कंठ से हम लोगों को कबूल करना चाहिये—नेता के रूप में एक डाक्टर राम

मनोहर लोहिया, पार्टी के रूप में एक सोशलिस्ट पार्टी । सारे रिजोल्यूशन को देखें आप, और सारे रिजोल्यूशन की सत्यता को आज अकथित कहानी उपस्थित करती है । हमने नेहरू के बारे में 8 नवम्बर, 1962 के दिन रामलीला मैदान में कहा था जिसमें मेनन के इस्तीफे की पुष्टि हुई थी, कि नेहरू अपनी पर्सनैलिटीज दो रखते हैं—लीडर ऑफ दि हाउस और लीडर ऑफ दि अपोजीशन, ये सरकार के भी नेता हैं, विरोधी दल के भी नेता हैं ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : नयी बात कह रहे हैं आप ।

श्री राजनारायण : नयी बात आप सुनेंगे । 13 अक्टूबर—पढ़ लिया जाय पेज 387 :

I returned to Headquarters 4 Corps at Tezpur and heard of the statement which Nehru made to the Press just before going to Ceylon. He said he had given orders to the Army to drive the Chinese out of our territory in NEFA. This was contrary to the orders he had given me on the night of 11th October in the conference held at his residence where he had told me, in the presence of the Army Chief, that instead of attacking the Chinese which we were not in a position to do, we should hold ourselves to our present positions."

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab). That refers to the Thagla Pass.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Just hear me.

जो कुछ भी हो । अब मैं इसको बताना चाहता हूं । कौल ने बिल्कुल सही बात लिखी है नेहरू के बारे में और अगर हमको कुछ हया है तो आज भी मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि बाकायदा हमको एक जांच आयोग बैठा देना चाहिये । उस जांच आयोग के सामने यह कौल की किताब भी आ जायेगी, जनरल

हेन्डरसन की भी स्पष्ट आ जायेगी। देश की सुरक्षा की बात को देश की जनता के साथ छुपाना देश के साथ गद्दारी है और आज भी कांग्रेस सरकार गद्दारी करेगी अगर इस रिपोर्ट के आने के बाद कोई जांच आयोग पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों का नहीं बनाया गया। मैं तैयार हूँ, हमारे पास सबूत हैं। अच्छा किया कौल ने किताब को लिख कर। उसने तारीख दी है 11 अक्टूबर को नेहरू जी प्रधान मंत्री के सामने और चीफ़ के सामने मीटिंग हुई। देख लीजिए, प्रोसीडिंग्स है। उस प्रोसीडिंग्स में सब बातें आ जायेंगी। एक एक करके हम कहेंगे, मैडम, घबराइयेगा नहीं।

पेज 389—इसमें हम एक चेप्टर पढ़ेंगे जिसमें हम पहले अपनी बात बता देते हैं। उन्होंने सिद्ध किया है कि फाइनेंस डिपार्टमेंट और डिफेंस डिपार्टमेंट में मतभेद था। एक तो पालिसीज का मतभेद था एक परसोनल का मतभेद था। यहाँ तक लिखा है कि जब चव्हाण साहब आ गये मेनन को हटा कर, एक करोड़ का उसने हवाला दिया है। एक करोड़ रुपया मांगा गया था कुछ फैक्ट्रीज को लेकर अपने वेपन्स को माइनाइज करने के लिये। उस समय फाइनेंस डिपार्टमेंट ने कहा कि नहीं, हम रुपया नहीं देंगे। मगर जब श्री मेनन हट गये और चव्हाण साहब आये तो फाइनेंस डिपार्टमेंट ने कहा कि एक करोड़ रुपया क्या, दो करोड़ भी लो तो हम तुमको देने को तैयार हैं और दिया।

इसमें यह भी दिया गया है कि एक 25 पाँडर तोप खरीदने का प्रस्ताव था तीन मतरवा फाइनेंस डिपार्टमेंट ने भेजा कि यह 25 पाँडर तोप क्या है, अगर 35 पाँड की तोप न बनाई जाये, 20 पाँड की बनाई जाये तो कितना पैसा कम होगा। फिर मिलिट्री डिपार्टमेंट ने उनको लिख कर भेजा कि साहब, 25 पाँड का गोला होता है जो तोप में रख कर छोड़ा जाता है, इस लिये

उसका 25 का 20 नहीं किया जायगा। फिर वह आया और कहा कि 25 पाँड के गोले की जगह 20 का बनाया जाये, 22 का बनाया जाय तो कितना पैसा कम लगेगा। यानी इस तरह से नोटिंग करके जब फाइल भेजी जाती है तो इससे बढ़ कर के पिस हंडडेन्स, मुल्क के साथ धोका, मुल्क के साथ गद्दारी, गैरवफादारी है किसी सरकार ने की। यह सब मैं फाइल के रिकार्ड से दिखाने को तैयार हूँ।

इसके बाद है यह 22 अक्टूबर। 20 नवम्बर को तेजपुर खाली हुआ। 20 नवम्बर को तेजपुर खाली क्यों हुआ, इसकी स्थिति साफ होनी चाहिये। डा० लोहिया ने कहा, हम लोगों में कहा, नेहरू जी को बाकायदा लिखा है, फाइल से मैं दिखा दूंगा जब कमेटी बैठेगी। नवम्बर में जब हम लोग गये थे तो वहाँ से एक आर्डर लाये थे। उसमें यह लिखा था कि "व्हेन दी डेंजर इज इमीनेंट", जब खतरा नजदीक हो, तो तमाम सामान को जला करके भाग आओ। यह किसका आर्डर था। कौन डिसाइड करेगा कि डेंजर इमीनेंट है। कौन डिसाइड करेगा कि किसको छोड़ो, कैसे भागो। उसी आर्डर के तहत तेजपुर खाली हुआ, जेल के फाटक खोले गये, कैदी छोड़े गये, बैंक के नोट जलाये गये और वहाँ के कलेक्टर साहब सब से पहले भागे। इतना शीघ्रदस्त मामला अब आया है जिसके ऊपर पर्दा नहीं डाला जाना चाहिये, यह मैं माननीया, आपसे अदब के साथ कहूँगा।

दूसरी बात। यह मैं हमेशा के लिये सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। एक तो हमारा यह कहना है कि एक जांच आयोग बने जिसके सामने सारी वस्तु स्थिति आये और लोग समझें। हाँ यह जरूर है कि जैसे स्टालिन नहीं है, तो अब बहुत से लोग कहते हैं कि वह तो हमको नचरता था। अरे साहब, उस समय क्यों नहीं बोले। ठीक है, कौल

[श्री राजनारायण]

साहब, तुम ने एक तथ्य दिया, इसके लिये तुम्हारी तारीफ है। अगर तुम इसे नेहरू के ज़िन्दा रहते दे दिये होते तो कुछ मज़ा आता। मगर अब हम अपने को समझते हैं कि हमने बहुत कुछ सही कहा था। इसलिये हम इसकी तारीफ करते हैं कि हमारी बातों की इसने पुष्टि की कि एक जांच आयोग बैठे। और हमेशा के लिये हम चाहते हैं कि सदन की एक स्टैंडिंग कमेटी बनाई जाय जिसमें चीफ आफ स्टाफ अपनी कठिनाइयाँ सब बता सके। उस कमेटी को चीफ आफ स्टाफ बतायेगा वह कमेटी खुद उनके पास जाकर के पता लगाये क्योंकि अब ऐसी स्थिति कांग्रेस सरकार ने पैदा की है कि इस सरकार के ऊपर मुल्क की सुरक्षा का भरोसा करना अपनी बेवकूफी को जाहिर करना है। जो इस सरकार के ऊपर मुल्क की सुरक्षा का भरोसा करेगा वह भी एक तरीके से मुल्क के लिये गैर-वफादार होगा।

तीसरे अब डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन को देखने के लिये हमारा मुझाव है कि उसके लिये भी एक संसद की कमेटी बने कि हमारा डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन ठीक तरह से होता है या नहीं, जो चीज़ हम तैयार करना चाहते हैं वह तैयार होती है या नहीं, इस समय हमें किस बात की कमी है या किस बात की कमी नहीं है। जब तक ये सब बातें नहीं होंगी, आज मैं सदन के सदस्यों को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि खुदा के नाम पर इस नालायक सरकार पर कभी कोई भरोसा मत करना क्योंकि कौल ने अपनी पुस्तक में लिख कर इस बात को साबित कर दिया है कि सरकार में बड़े से बड़ा कोई आदमी हो उस पर यकीन नहीं है, न उसका दिमाग है, न उसके पास वस्तु-स्थिति की जानकारी है और न वह इस मुल्क को बचा सकता है।

श्री श्री. मेहता (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : क्या सिर्फ कौल पर आपको यकीन है कि जो कुछ उसने लिखा है वह ठीक है।

श्री राजनारायण : जिस बात को हमने खुद कहा था, अगर उसी की कौल ताईद करता है, तो उतनी बात के लिये मैं उसका यकीन क्यों न करूँ। जहाँ कौल की गलती है, उसको भी मैंने उसकी किताब से छांटा है और वह हम बता देंगे, घबड़ाओ मत। देखिये, कौल की गलती बतलाता हूँ, कौल की खराबी बतलाता हूँ। एक तो इसमें यह गलती है कि एक तो वह अपने को ग्लोरीफाई बहुत करता है। छोड़ो उसे। मगर ब्रिगेडियर तक जो उसकी तरक्की हुई वह ठीक थी। ब्रिगेडियर के बाद जहाँ यह मेजर जनरल बना कई को सुपरसीड करके, यह गलती हुई। ले० जनरल जब यह बना था तो इसने सात आठ को सुपरसीड किया था। उसमें एक मेजर जनरल पो० एस० ज्ञानी और दूसरे मेजर जनरल शारदानन्द सिंह, इन दोनों ने इस्तीफा दिया। जब नेहरू जी ज़िन्दा थे जब उन्होंने इस्तीफा दिया था और पूछा था कि कौल को सुपरसीड कैसे किया, हम उनसे सीनियर हैं, हम उनसे सुपीरियर हैं, हमारा रिकार्ड देखा जाय। फिर नेहरू जी ने उनको बड़ा समझाया बुझाया कि इस्तीफा मत दो। फिर उनके साथ यह किया कि लोकल ले० जनरल बना कर उनको बाहर भेज दिया। नेपाल गये शारदानन्द सिंह जी और गाजा गये ज्ञानी जी। यह किसकी गलती है। यह नेहरू की गलती है। यह किसी दूसरे की गलती नहीं है, जिस नेहरू ने मुल्क की यह दुर्दशा कर दी . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : अपनी राय दे रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : राय नहीं फैक्ट दे रहा हूँ। अभी और भी फैक्ट आयेगे घबड़ाओ मत। माननीया अब मैं 332 दे रहा हूँ।

उपसभापति : अब आप का टाइम समाप्त हो गया है।

श्री राजन रायण : थोड़ा पांच मिनट दे दीजिये और घबड़ाइये नहीं । देखिये मैं इधर उधर नहीं जा रहा हूँ । तो इसमें यह दिया है :

"The Finance Ministry at various levels with rare exception split hair over each urgent proposal and sanctioned only a fraction of what was put up for approval."

यह कौल की किताब से है । मोरारजी को आना चाहिये मेनन को आना चाहिये वे जिन्दा हैं मरे नहीं हैं वे बतायें कि यह सही है या गलत है ।

दूसरे अब हम यह देते हैं . . .

उपसभापति : आप सारी किताब नहीं पढ़ सकते । Without losing much time. Another one or two minutes I will give you.

एक माननीय सदस्य : सब पढ़ा हुआ है ।

श्री राजनारायण : सब पढ़ा हुआ है तो मैं आपसे इतना ही निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि 16, 16 मिनट लोग यहां बोल चुके हैं । मगर जूँकि मैं वह बात कहता हूँ जो सत्य है इसलिये लोगों का हृदय विदीर्ण होने लगता है और लोग घबड़ाने लगते हैं ।

उपसभापति : अब आपको समाप्त करना पड़ेगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं आपसे इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि सदन में एक मर्यादा होनी चाहिये । मैं भार्गव जी की इज्जत करता हूँ और उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमने कहा "अ" तुम चोर हो तो दुनिया का नियम है सभ्य ससार का नियम है जुरिसप्रूडेंस का नियम है कि "अ" साबित करे कि हम चोर नहीं हैं या हम साबित करे कि चोर हो ।

282 RS—6.

मगर यहां साबित कैसे किया जाता है कि तुम हमसे बड़े चोर हो । तो कौल ने जो बात लिखी है वह सही है या गलत है इस पर विचार होना चाहिये । आप लोग कौल का छिद्रान्वेषण करें । एम० ओ० मथाई ने जो बात लिखी है प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में उसकी सत्यता को प्रमाणित करना चाहिये । मगर वह गाली देने लगते हैं एम० ओ० मथाई को । जब हम साथ रहेंगे हमारी आपकी पटेगी हम बहुत अच्छे हैं और जहां हमारी आपकी अनबन हुई हम बहुत बुरे हो गये यह जो कांग्रेस पार्टी की मनोवृत्ति इससे मुल्क तबाह हो रहा है, बर्बाद हो रहा है । कौल में जो अनेक दोष हैं उनको वह भोगे उसके लिये हम उसको डिफेंड करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं । मगर इस किताब को लिख कर जो उसने खिदमत की है उसके लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसकी सत्यता प्रमाणित हो और उसके लिये कोई आयाग बने और मुल्क के सामने जो वाक्यात छिपे हैं उन पर पर्दा नहीं डाला जाय ताकि भविष्य हमारा सुधरे और भविष्य हमारा बिगड़े नहीं । अब आप बोलने नहीं दे रही हैं इसलिये मैं परेशान हूँ ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pande. Very brief.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : I will not take even 10 minutes. Madam Deputy Chairman, the t\*pb'a'e has been tackled from a particular point of view. But I will tak<sup>c</sup> a slightly different aspect of the whole question which has not been cover"d so far. I have seen a tendency which is still prevalent today that Ministers, when they come to power, have certain likes and dislikes for certain officers. That like or dislike is governed some time by ideological predilections either on the right or the left as things go. This General Kaul is a particular victim or he is made » tool of that policy. The then Minister

[Shri C. D. Pande] of Defence, Mr. Krishna Menon, liked him so much that he gave him promotion after promotion. I know it from my own knowledge that he arranged three or four functions. One was the building of a house at Ambala for soldiers. It was said that the house was built at a cost of Rs. 16 lakhs. But the Ministry officers working there said that this Rs. 16 lakhs was too much. It could have been built for about Rs. 10 lakhs. The Government was so much impressed by the efficiency and performance of this General. Again there was an exhibition in the Eastern Court of the arms manufactured by our country and when I visited that, I found nothing there. There was a fat cow and a horse. I asked: 'What is this?' They said: 'These *tre* our army horses'. There was a cow. Those who have seen it must have known what that exhibition was. The then authorities were so much impressed by that exhibition that they said: 'Look here, our Army is doing something wonderful'.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): What did they say about the cow?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: It was a hoax of an exhibition. There was nothing.

श्री राजनारायण : आपने उस समय  
नेहरू जी के ध्यान में यह बात क्यों नहीं  
लाई ?

श्री सी० डी० पांडे : नेहरू जी भी उसी  
सरकार में थे ।

Then they wanted to impress Pandit Pant because he was not impressed very much. They said: 'Look here, here is a thing which the General has done.' He said: 'He is a smart man'. He was also taken in by the smartness. I am referring to the main question which is this. When the Minister likes a man he gets undue promotion. He superseded so many people. When it was raised, he said: 'He is the best General in the Indian Army'. What can you do? When people say that he

I is the greatest General that the Indian Army has, what can be done? I was give a parallel. There was one I.C.S. gentleman, who is no more in the service. I will not give his name. He was working with Mr. Menon everybody knows him." He was 20 places junior to most of the people working in the Ministry. Mr. Menon said: 'When this gentleman comes, I will not look at the seniority. Let them go.' That gentleman told me, 'Dr. Pande, why do you fight with Mr. Menon? Mr. Menon can be fooled like this. I have fooled him for 12 years. Cannot you put up with him for three months?' I said 'no'. Those officers fooled Mr. Menon so much. Mr. Menon believed that he was a wonderful I.C.S. officer and he deserved all praise and through him he annoyed so many seniors. People know that. That man has shown that. He is now in the U.S.A. He is serving as a professor in a certain University, getting 35,000 dollars a year and he says: 'Mr. Menon is a damn fool'. (*Interruptions*). But Mr. Menon was almost a fool and others were being fooled. The predilection is based on ideological likes and dislikes. I like the Minister for Defence now and through him the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister should see that the Ministers do not make fools of other Ministers. They should not be carried away by the ideological talks. The officers are very able persons. They know what a Minister likes. When they use a certain phraseology which pleases the Minister—they are more adept in that—the Ministers will say: 'He is a man of great intelligence, he has read many books and he is a man of culture and learning.' That type of thing the Ministers should be aware of. They should not get trapped. They should serve the country. I have nothing more to say except that the Ministers should mend themselves.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: The author of this book perhaps has depicted himself in the role of a hero. Perhaps he would have been a hero. There was an occasion for him to be a hero and he did not become a hero on that occasion. A large portion of the book



has been devoted to the unpreparedness of the Army and also the lapses on the part of the civil authorities. If one can examine the interview which he has given yesterday also, the object of writing this book is very clear, that is, to clear the blemish which has come upon him on account of the reverses. That seems to be the object and in order to clear himself, he has thrown the blame on the civil authorities and even on the Defence Minister. Many of the friends who have spoken seem to believe in his argument that the Army was unprepared! 'I have myself made a remark or two on this question on another occasion when I returned from Ladakh. Whatever the preparedness or unpreparedness of the Army as a whole may be, the Army which was responsible, the party which was responsible for the reverses, which was under his command was fully prepared. I am just going in a minute to show how this Army was prepared and how on account of the lack of ability on the part of the General to guide, to foresee and anticipate things that we had this shameful reverse. As everybody knows, the Chinese had taken their position at 15,000 feet, somewhere in October 1962 and then they came down. We had taken our position down below, at Tawang. At Tawang we could not fight with an Army which was far above us. Therefore they were waiting there but the Chinese later on came down to Tawang. Tawang is in the valley and then our next positions were at the same height, as the Chinese were originally. That means, far above Tawang, overlooking Tawang and then from Sela Pass we had, up to Tezpur, a good road by which even tanks could be brought. What happened was that this General, this Hannibal of the 20th Century, adopted such military tactics that all his Forces were concentrated on the road alone, forgetting the fact that from Sela Pass to Bomdila there was a jungle track which was left unguarded, so that the Chinese, after having come and established themselves in Tawang, instead of taking the road which was well guarded and well defended by our

troops, went by the trek road and trek road was the jungle road and -io big guns could be taken and so the tanks were out of the question. So a handful of Chinese taking hand-grenades and sten guns came to this place, and then they surprised our Army and at Sela Pass we had the tanks and everything. Our people were taken by surprise when they saw the Chinese coming that way. The trek path was called Mago Road. Coming through that road they were able to out-trick this great Hannibal and so it was not the unpreparedness of our Army that led to the reverses. Maybe our Army was not fully prepared by modern standards or by to-day's standards but there were full preparations there. There were the tanks which were later on captured by Chinese. It is evident that it is only the lack of ability of this General which was responsible for the reverses and in order to cover this the General has thrown the blame on the civil authorities and on the Finance Minister and even on the Defence Minister.

Shri Pande has said many things. He said that he was a victim. He was not. He was the most favoured person in the Army, as Shri Pande himself has said how he was elevated or how he superseded other Generals. This is the story which is untold by him. This untold story the public should know in order to see what was the main object of his writing the book.

With a few remarks I will conclude. It is wrong on the part of our Government to allow Generals to correspond with newspapers and to ventilate about military matters and to confide with foreign military officers. It should be only with the consent of the Government. In social parties of course they can mix but they cannot exchange military matters without the consent of the Government. It was wrong to have permitted the Generals to be Military Correspondents and certainly I can never condone the lapse of the Government in having allowed this General to have published this book. Certainly action should be taken. India is not a

[Shri C. D. Pande] country like England or the U.S.A. Of course instances were quoted by Shri Sapru and others how great Generals in U.K. and U.S.A. had written but we are not in that state, we are still in the infant stage so far as military matters go. And, therefore, we cannot allow our military people to dabble in military tactics and ventilate them to foreign countries and to newspapers. That is all.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may tell the House that we may have to sit beyond 5 P.M., perhaps up to 6 or 6-30 P.M. if every one is to be accommodated.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam Deputy) Chairman, I have heard people boasting but when I went through this book, [I thought 'here was the symbol of boastfulness.' He has gone to the extent of glorifying himself so much that it almost appears as a fiction. He has tried his level best to make it interesting reading; whether it is falsehood or truth he does not mind.

Now, Madam, the other day, I insisted that Gen. Kaul should be arrested under the Defence of India Rules. I will show from the book—he has himself confessed—that even when he was in service, he was passing on information to a private person in England. 'He says, "One of the first things I did on assuming command of this division was to write to Maj. Gen. T. W. Rees who had once commanded this formation and on whom I doted." This is on page 175. Then on page 176, he says "I kept giving him divisional news periodically which he was delighted to get till one day I heard a few years later that he was dead." Fortunately for him this General died and, therefore, the information was kept a closed secret. I do not know whether the pundits who are now examining the book on behalf of the Defence Ministry had any occasion to go through this particular passage in the book. That in itself would have been enough to arrest him immediately, because he

had passed even secret information while in service to a person who was no more in service, who had nothing to do with India, who was a Britisher . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: You like Britishers.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I don't like. Now, Madam, the Defence of India Rules are still in force. Persons like Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and Mr. Rajnarain are taken into custody in a moment if they stage a procession or demonstration.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: But they are also praising him. So they should also be arrested.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Now, Madam, if this could be used so easily in the case of Members of Parliament, here is a person who was passing on secret information from the Army and definitely acting against the defence of India, but he has not been taken into custody yet. I still insist that immediately he must be arrested. He should be arrested under the Defence of India Rules. He wants to be generous in sharing a part of the responsibility for the debacle. What a generosity? For a thing for which he should have been court-martialed, he wants to share part of the responsibility. He is the person who, on the pretext of illness flew to Delhi, when the jawans were fighting ill-fed and ill-clad under his very command. He wants to be a patriot. He wants to be called a hero. If he was such a patriot and if he knew of our defence unpreparedness, why did he not resign in protest then? I would have called him a patriot if he had done that. But he continued in service and enjoyed all the amenities and only when people started shouting against him, shouting against Mr. Krishna Menon to the point that Pandit Nehru's existence was in doubt, thereafter this General volunteered to retire. This does not make one a patriot, this does not make him a hero.

Then he has levelled certain allegations against persons who had been in authority. One of them unfortu-

nately is no more—Pandit Nehru. It was in very bad taste for him to have said anything after Pandit Nehru was dead. I was one of the bitterest critics of Pandit Nehru when he lived. I used to criticise him to his very face. This General, who got all the favours that nobody could think of from that very Pandit Nehru, starts criticising him in a book after Pandit Nehru is no more. The other one is Mr. Krishna Menon. I do not see eye to eye with Mr. Krishna Menon and his policies. But all the same, this book was published at a time when it very much adversely affected his election prospects. This may be completely a falsehood, but all the same this was allowed to be published immediately before the elections. Whether it was arranged for that or not, I do not know, but it definitely affected him very adversely. That is an injustice done to him. This General should have protested when he was in service, when he thought that these people were not taking action for the defence of the country. Now, Madam, he has also divulged another information, that we are short of foreign exchange to the extent that it might affect our purchases in Defence. This disclosure definitely nobody outside the Government knows—that is to what extent we are short of foreign exchange. But this General gives narration of the entire proceedings and all the talks that he had in the different Ministries, between Ministers and Ministers and to what extent the Army is handicapped because of shortage of foreign exchange. This is another disclosure. Nobody else would have known it unless he was himself in the Government service or he was a Minister in this country. Therefore, Madam, I would suggest that because of all this, the title of this General should be taken away. He should no more be called a General. He must be a private citizen of this country. Instead of punishment being given to him, what is happening now? Since this book has become a controversial book, he easily earns lakhs of rupees through royalty. Now each Member of Parliament has a

book in his hand. Each man in the country has a book in his hand and this blessed book cost Rs. 20. He is making hay out of this controversy.

SHRI A. D. MANI: This is private enterprise.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Do not bring in these things. My time is limited. Therefore, Madam, instead of punishing him, this country, this Parliament, this Government, is rewarding him. He has, I am told, earned through royalties to the tune of about Rs. 2 lakhs. Mr. Bhagat was, at one time, Minister in charge of Economic Affairs. I know how he has dealt with income-tax . . .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): How do you know?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I know, Mr. Bhagat, how you have dealt with income-tax. Do not tell me that . . .

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Whose income-tax?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Biju Patnaik's income-tax. Now let us come back to the point. Now, after we have this discussion and after this all-India publicity, the sale of this book would be boosted much more and we would be helping in the earning of this gentleman who has definitely acted against the interests of the country, against the interests of the service in which he was employed. He has denounced all other generals, his colleagues and others, as if he was the only gem and he was the only patriot and all others did not act in a way which should help the country. Thank you.

श्री जगत नारायण (हरियाणा) :  
मैडम डिपुटी चेयरमैन, मैंने इस किताब को  
थोड़ी दिलचस्पी के साथ पढ़ा है। मैंने भी  
इस पर एक सवाल किया था इस हाउस में।  
वजीर साहब ने जवाब दिया था कि बहुत  
से लोग इस किताब को दुस्त नहीं समझते  
हैं, यह "ट्रैश" है, बहुत से लोग इसके साथ  
एग्री नहीं करते हैं। मगर जहाँ तक बाहर

[ श्री जगत नारायण ]

भी और यहां भी बहुत सी बातें इसके सिलसिले में दर्शाई की गई हैं उसके खयाल से मैं यह समझता हूं कि डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री को इस किताब की तरदीद जरूर करनी चाहिये थी क्यों करनी चाहिये थी कि इसमें कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं जो कि मैडम, बहुत ही हमारे अपने फौजियों के लिये भी और हमारे देश के लिये भी और आपके डिफेंस के महकमे के लिये भी बहुत ही खराब हैं। इसमें जनरल ने लिखा है कि डिफेंस मिनिस्टर किस तरह से अपने जनरलों के साथ सलूक करते थे। इसमें लिखा है :

"When he addressed one to me, the tone of my reply was reciprocal. When he asked me why I had written such a note and found me unrepentant, he furiously flung the file at me."

इस चैप्टर में उसने चार पांच बातें लिखी हैं कि डिफेंस मिनिस्टर रात को एक-एक बजे, दो-दो बजे, बुला लेते थे जब कि कोई लड़ाई नहीं होती थी, बात नहीं होती थी। फिर उसने मखौल उड़ाई है कि एयर मार्शल इंजीनियर ने जब कहा कि "मिग" हवाई जहाज नहीं खरीदने चाहिये तो उन्होंने कहा कि आप हैं तो एयर मार्शल इंजीनियर लेकिन आपको इंजीनियरिंग का और इसकी टेक्निकलटीज का पता नहीं है। ये सब बातें लिखी हैं।

क्या मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछ सकता हूं कि क्या आजकल भी उनके महकमे में यही बात होती है कि जनरलों के ऊपर, अगर वह एग्जी न करे, तो फाइल फेंक दी जाती है, क्या उसका मखौल किया जाता है, रिडीक्युल किया जाता है। यह एक ऐसी चीज है जो किताब में लिखी है जिसकी तरदीद या ताईद करनी चाहिये। इसके अलावा, मैडम, इसी किताब में जनरल कौल ने कुछ ऐसी चीजें लिखी हैं कि मैं समझता हूं कि बड़े-बड़े आफिसर्स आर्मी के जो हैं,

उन पर बहुत ज्यादा इल्जामात लगाये हैं। यह सफा 317 है जिसमें उन्होंने लिखा है :

"Some of our senior army officers were in the habit of making tenacious and indiscreet remarks openly against our national leaders and extolled the erstwhile British rulers of India."

फिर आगे वे लिखते हैं :

"They also talked loosely at various cocktail parties and other places in order to win cheap popularity with foreigners in whose presence they derided India. All that some foreign dignitary had to do was to ask some of our officers for the 'low down' on any matter and, more often than not, he was promptly obliged. Much secret information leaked out in this and also in other ways and reached unauthorised groups and individuals."

तो मैं यह पूछता हूं कि यह एक ऐसा इल्जाम सीनियर आर्मी आफिसर्स पर लगाया गया है कि उसकी तरदीद क्यों नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर हमारा डिफेंस का महकमा चुप रहा तो फिर इसका मतलब यही लिया जायेगा कि बाकई जो हमारे सीनियर मिलिट्री आफिसर्स हैं वे मामूली काकटेल पार्टीज में देश के सीक्रेट आऊट करते हैं। मैं समझता हूं, इसके मुताल्लिक चुप नहीं रहना चाहिये। इसके मुताल्लिक कोई चीज आज तक तरदीद न करना पिछले चार, पांच महीने से, मैं समझता हूं आर्मी के लिये बड़ा डेरोगेटरी है, आर्मी आफिसर्स के लिये डेरोगेटरी है क्योंकि साफ लिखा है कि यह मामूली काकटेल पार्टी पर जाकर ये आफिसर्स अपने देश के मुताल्लिक सीक्रेट्स बता देते हैं।

मैंने पहले भी कहा है और मैं उसे रिपीट नहीं करना चाहता, कि जनरल कौल ने यहां वह इल्जाम लगाया है मेनन पर, नेहरू पर। मैं हैरान हूं अभी तक हमारी गवर्नमेंट

चुप क्यों है। उसके मुताल्लिक उनका बयान क्यों नहीं आता है। सब से ज्यादा जिस बात पर मैं वजीर साहब की तबज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि जनरल कौल ने अपनी इस किताब में यह भी इल्जाम लगाया है कि जब नेफा जाने के लिये मुकर्रर किया गया तो उस वक्त मुझे जनरल तो बना दिया गया लेकिन मेरे पास न कोई फौज थी, न कोई हेडक्वार्टर था, न कोई मेरी अपनी जगह थी कि जाकर मैं एक 'मिरेकल' कर दूँ और चीनियों को निकाल बाहर कर दूँ। यह भी इस किताब में उन्होंने कहा है।

इसके साथ इस किताब में उन्होंने एक बात और लिखी है और वह यह लिखी है कि जब पंडित नेहरू से मैंने बात की कि आप मुझे भेज रहे हैं तो इस वक्त मेरे लिये बहुत मुश्किल होगी चीनियों का मुकाबला करने में क्योंकि हमारे पास फौज कम है। तो उस वक्त पंडित नेहरू ने यह तस्लीम किया कि मेरे जो आफिसर थे फारेन मिनिस्ट्री के, वे मुझे गलती पर डालते रहे हैं, गलत कहते रहे हैं और गलत मशविरा देते रहे हैं जबकि चीन की फौज ने जो हमारे इलाके थे उन पर हमला कर दिया था और वह आगे बढ़ती जा रही थी। यह सब उन्होंने इसमें साफ लिखा है। इस लिये मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अपने डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से कि जब एक जनरल आप पर इतने चार्जज लगाये और आप चुप रहें, उसके मुताल्लिक कोई बयान न दें और आप सिर्फ यह कहते रहें कि वह झूठ का एक पुलिन्दा है, तो क्या कोई आपकी बात मानने को तैयार होगा। जब तक आप उसका जवाब नहीं देंगे, जब तक आप उसकी तरदीद नहीं करेंगे, लोग यही समझेंगे कि जो कुछ इस किताब में लिखा है, वह दुस्त है और वह बिल्कुल ठीक लिखा है। इसलिये मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से यह अर्ज करूंगा कि वे हैडरसन की रिपोर्ट को क्यों नहीं छापते, क्यों नहीं अपनी पोजीशन क्लियर करते और क्यों नहीं उसको पब्लिश करते ताकि लोग समझ सकें कि

हैडरसन रिपोर्ट में क्या है। मैंने उस दिन भी कहा था कि बहुत से लोग यह समझते हैं कि हैडरसन रिपोर्ट में पं० नेहरू पर इल्जाम लगाया गया है कि पंडित नेहरू का भी हाथ था इस डिबाकिल में।

अगर यह रिपोर्ट छाप दी जाय तो कम से कम लोगों का दिमाग साफ हो जाय कि पं० नेहरू का हाथ इस डिबाकिल में था या नहीं। इस लिये जब तक आप उस रिपोर्ट को नहीं छापेंगे तब तक लोग यही समझेंगे कि इस किताब में जो लिखा हुआ है वह बहुत हद तक सही है।

इसके साथ-साथ मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस किताब में बहुत सी बातें उस डिबाकिल के बारे में लिखी हुई हैं। मैं भी तेजपुर गया था और तेजपुर में उसी रेस्ट हाउस में ठहरा था जहाँ यह जनरल ठहरे हुए थे उन दिनों जब कि तेजपुर खाली हुआ था। तो वहाँ के लोगों ने मुझे बताया कि इस जनरल को मिलने के लिये वहाँ आसाम के दो मिनिस्टर आये थे ताकि वे उससे कह सकें कि तेजपुर को खाली नहीं करना चाहिये। मगर इस जनरल ने उनको मिलने का मौका नहीं दिया। वे चार घंटे तक बाहर बैठे रहे, लेकिन उनको मिलने का मौका नहीं दिया गया। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सारे मामले की इन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिये और जो कुछ इस किताब में लिखा है उसकी या तो ताईद की जाय या उसकी तरदीद की जाय। अगर उसकी तरदीद नहीं की जायगी तो लोग यह कहने में हक्क-बजानिब होंगे कि जो कुछ इस किताब में लिखा है वह ठीक लिखा हुआ है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश)  
आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदया, लगभग एक महीना हो गया, जब से यह पुस्तक

[श्री निरञ्जन वर्मा]

प्रकाशित हुई है, एक बहुत ही सनसनी फैल गई है जनता में और जो इसको पढ़ने वाले हैं उनके हृदय में भी। मगर सब से ज्यादा भय हमारे कांग्रेसी मित्रों को हुआ। कांग्रेसी मित्रों ने कभी यह नहीं सोचा था कि कोई ऐसी पुस्तक प्रकाशित होगी और जो उनके नेता हैं, जिन के हाथ में भारतवर्ष के भाग्य की बागडोर है उन नेताओं के ऊपर भी इस तरह के कटु आक्षेप हो सकेंगे। कांग्रेसी मित्रों की तरफ से बार बार यह कहा गया है कि भारतवर्ष के किसी जनरल ने अगर ऐसी पुस्तक प्रकाशित की है कि उससे किसी प्रकार की गोपनीयता भंग होती है तो उन्हें ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिये था। यह भी कहा गया कि इससे हमारी सीमाओं की जो स्थिति है उस पर भी प्रकाश पड़ता है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इसके पहले भी ऐसी पुस्तकें प्रकाश में आ चुकी हैं। हमारे कांग्रेसी मित्रों ने कहा कि इस पुस्तक की सच्ची कसौटी तभी हो सकती थी जब नेहरू जी के सामने ऐसी पुस्तक प्रकाशित की जाती। मैं कहता हूं कि नेहरू जी भी क्या कर लेते और आजकल के मंत्रीगण ही क्या कर लेंगे। एक पुस्तक और पहले प्रकाशित हो चुकी थी और उस पुस्तक का नाम था "मिशन विद माउन्टबैटन"। एक लेखक सर ग्लेन कैम्पबेल माउन्टबैटन के साथ आये थे और उन्होंने वह पुस्तक लिखी थी। उन्होंने उस समय कांग्रेस की हाई कमान्ड पर आरोप लगाया था कि उन्होंने किस तरह से हैदराबाद को स्वतंत्र राज्य बनाने की चेष्टा की थी और उसका दोष जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी पर सबसे ज्यादा डाला गया था। उसका भी उत्तर कोई नहीं दे सका था। उसके बाद एक दूसरी पुस्तक और भी प्रकाशित हुई और वह जवाहर लाल जी के मित्र और और कांग्रेस के बड़े नेता मौलाना अबुल कलाम आजाद ने प्रकाशित की। वह थी 'इन्डिया विन्स फ्रीडम'। उसमें यह आरोप

लगाया था कि कांग्रेस के छोटे से लेकर बड़े नेता तक सबकी यह इच्छा थी कि पाकिस्तान न बनने पाए लेकिन कांग्रेस के कई बड़े-बड़े नेताओं ने षड़यंत्र करके पाकिस्तान को बनवा दिया और हम और सरहदी गांधी रोते रह गए। इस तरह से दो पुस्तकों के प्रकाशित होने के बाद उसी सीरीज में यह तीसरी पुस्तक प्रकाशित हुई है और इसके प्रकाशित होने के लिए निश्चित रूप से कौल साहब को बधाई तो नहीं दे सकते क्योंकि उन्होंने एक नई परम्परा डाली है, परन्तु तब भी एक बात का उन्होंने बड़ा साहस किया है और वह यह है कि—हमारे मित्र श्री स्वर्ण सिंह जी इसका क्या उत्तर देंगे—कौल साहब पहले व्यक्ति हैं जिन्होंने प्रत्येक व्याख्या को नाम-नाम लेकर लिखा है—यह नहीं कि फलां व्यक्ति ने लकीर के साथ लिख दिया हो—कि उनके साथ हमारी वार्ता हुई, एक-एक आदमी का नाम, एक-एक स्थान का नाम लिखा है, जिन तारीखों में घटनाएं हुई हैं, उन तारीखों को दिया है और सारी रिपोर्ट उन्होंने यहां पर दी हैं।

एक टांग और उन्होंने कांग्रेस की खींची है कि कांग्रेसी मित्रों में एक परम्परा हो गई है कि जो आदमी उनके साथ रहता है, जो आदमी सत्ता में रहता है उसकी तो वे बड़ी तारीफ करते रहेंगे और जो आदमी सत्ता से खिसक गया या कांग्रेस के कैम्प में से निकल गया उसकी बुराई करने का बीड़ा उठा लेते हैं और उसकी बुराई करते चले जाते हैं। इस पुस्तक में सादिक साहब और गुलाम मुहम्मद के बारे में भी इस तरह की बातें लिखी गई हैं। गुलाम मुहम्मद के लिए लिखा है इसमें कि जब तक गुलाम मुहम्मद साहब वहां के मुख्य अधिष्ठाता थे तब तक कांग्रेस के सारे मित्र उनकी तारीफें करते थे, जवाहरलाल नेहरू से लेकर छोटा आदमी तक उनकी तारीफ करता था, लेकिन उनके बाद जब सादिक साहब वहां पर पहुंचे तब गुलाम मुहम्मद के लिए कोई स्थान नहीं है।

और अब सादिक साहब की परम्परा की तारीफें करना शुरू हो गया। इस प्रकार की बातें उन्होंने लिखी हैं।

इसके बाद कुछ स्थानों पर यह भी कहा गया है कि उन्होंने बाहर के आदमियों के साथ मिलकर हिन्दुस्तान की गोपनीयता के बारे में बातें की और एक विशिष्ट परम्परा को भंग किया। उसके बारे में उन्होंने बहुत साहस के साथ और दिलेरी के साथ कहा है कि जब कभी पार्टी वें या किसी सार्वजनिक स्थान पर बातचीत होती थी तो उसके लिए कोई मनाही नहीं थी, तो अगर बंकर साहब आ गए या चेस्टर बोल्स साहब आ गए, उनके साथ कोई बात हो गई तो किसी प्रकार का गुनाह नहीं है।

एक बात उन्होंने और कही कि यदि किसी में यह साहस है कि मैं जो ये बातें कह रहा हूँ या लिख रहा हूँ ये गलत हैं तो मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि पार्लियामेंट के भीतर के दायरे में मेरे ऊपर बहुत तरह की फब्तियाँ फसी जा सकती हैं और मेरे विरुद्ध कहा जा सकता है, मगर बाहर मैदान में आकर कोई कहे तो हम बताएं कि जूडीशियली अदालत में उसके साथ क्या होगा।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैदान से तो वे भागे थे।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मैदान से भाग थे— यह उनका कुनूर था जितना आपका है। यह आपको कृपा थी कि उनको 'जनरल कोल' बनाया गया। आपके नेता के रिश्तेदार थे इसलिए उसको आठ हजार रुपए पर तेजा की जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी में बंटा दिया गया। अगर किसी और देश में किसी जनरल ने इस तरह की गद्दारी की होती तो कोर्ट मार्शल कर उसको फाँसी के तख्ते पर लटका दिया जाता। यह तो आपकी कृपा है और यह अच्छी बात है कि जो इतना बड़ा आपका कृपा-पात्र रहा, जिसने आपके द्वारा ही इतने बड़े उच्च पद को प्राप्त किया वह

आपके घर में बैठ कर सुरंग लगा रहा है और आपको बेनकाब कर रहा है। इस पूरी पुस्तक को पढ़ने के बाद कांग्रेसी मित्रों को शोक, दुःख और बहुत लज्जा का अनुभव करना पड़ा लेकिन जो देश के रहने वाले व्यक्ति हैं उनके सामने एक तथ्य प्रकाश में आया और वह तथ्य यह है कि व्यक्ति विशेष को हम छोड़ दें, एक दूसरे के लिए कही गई कुछ बातों को छोड़ दें और शान्ति के साथ अपने देश की स्थिति पर विचार करें तो कोल साहब का कहना किसी अंश में बहुत अच्छा साबित हो सकता है। उन्होंने हमारे यहां की स्थिति को बताया कि हमारे यहां पर पोलिटिकल लीडर्स में और सेना के जनरलों में कितना मतभेद था, हमारे यहां की सेना इस योग्य नहीं थी कि वह बाहर लड़ाई लड़ सके, हमारे यहां की सेना की जो आवश्यकताएँ थीं हमारे नेतागण उन आवश्यकताओं को अनुभव नहीं करते थे और सेना को उसके भरोसे पर छोड़ देते थे। इतना ही नहीं इसमें हमारे पोलिटिकल लीडर्स के आचरण की भी समीक्षा की गई है कि कांग्रेसी नेता भाषण-शूर हुआ करते हैं। एक स्थान पर कोई काम पड़ जाय तो एक घंटे तक भाषण देने में अपने आपको गौरवान्वित समझते हैं और समझते हैं कि सबसे अच्छा भाषण हमने दिया। श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू के बारे में इसमें एक घटना लिखी गई है और उन्होंने लिखा है कि हमारे यहां के बहुत बड़े आदमी होने के नाते श्री जवाहर लाल जी में बहुत बड़ा दोष था कि मौके-बसोंके कभी-कभी जब उन्हें भाषण देने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी, जिन तथ्यों को प्रकाशित करने की जरूरत नहीं थी और जिनके बारे में मौन रहना अधिक उचित था उनके बारे में व भाषण कर देते थे और उसका खमियाजा देश उठाता था, सेना उठाती थी और सारे देश को बहुत गम्भीर परिस्थिति में से गुजरना पड़ता था, जैसे कि उन्होंने स्वेज कनाल के बारे में, क्यूबा के बारे में और दूसरे

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

स्थानों के बारे में गिनाया है। इस पुस्तक में सारी को सारी घटनाओं का जिक्र किया गया है। इन सारी घटनाओं को पढ़ने के पश्चात्, उपाध्यक्षा जी, एक बात बिल्कुल बेनकाब हो गई, यह तथ्य सामने आ गया कि कौल साहब ने जो कुछ लिखा अगर वह गलत है तो फिर हमारे डिफेंस मंत्रालय के मंत्री महींदर लक्ष्मण 15 दिनों से यह घोषणा क्यों करते रहे हैं कि हम किताब की छानबीन कर रहे हैं और देख रहे हैं कि कहां पर कौल साहब को पकड़ा जा सके, किस स्थान पर उन पर मुकदमा चलाया जा सके। आज तक वे कुछ नहीं कर सके और आज जब उनका भाषण होगा तब भी हम इस बात को सुनेंगे कि इस किताब की जांच कर रहे हैं, समीक्षा कर रहे हैं और अगर इसके खिलाफ कुछ निकला तो जरूर कुछ करेंगे, लेकिन हमारा विश्वास है कि उनकी दम नहीं है। सारी घटनाएं खोल कर रख दी गई हैं और जनता-जनार्दन के सामने उनको प्रकाशित करके रख दिया गया है कि हमारे नेतागण कौन सा आचरण करते हैं और उस आचरण का खमियाजा हमारे मंत्रिमंडल, हाउस और सारे देश पर पड़ता है और उसके परिणाम स्वरूप देश बराबर नीचे की तरफ चला जा रहा है।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, in my opinion I think the writer of this book 'The Untold Story', Gen. Kaul, is rather to be thanked for making two very important disclosures and I should say that these disclosures remain valid until they are properly contradicted by the Ministry. As they have not yet been contradicted by the Ministry I take it that the disclosures are valid even today.

Now the first disclosure is this; it is about the question as to who started the war. As a matter of fact, I am not talking about the intrusions because as Gen. Kaul has said the intrusions by the Chinese into Indian territory have happened before 1962 and

even thereafter. In 1965 also the Chinese intruded as far as Hathung Lathu La according to Gen. Kaul. These intrusions are certainly different from the question of war. Now the question was—and that question has been answered in his own way by Gen. Kaul—as to who started the war, and I will only place before you, Madam Deputy Chairman, certain things stated serially by Gen. Kaul and those things will clinch the issue, the issue as to the question of who started the war. Look at the diary of the 17th September 1962 on page 359 of the book. We find there that it was decided at a meeting in the Defence Minister's room that the Chinese pockets have to be captured. That was on 17th September 1962. The next date we will have to see is 22nd September 1962. The Army Chief had made it clear to the Ministry that they are not in a position to make any war upon the Chinese because their resources are slender. Yet it was decided at a meeting in the officiating Minister of Defence, Mr. Raghuramiah's room that the war must be carried out against the Chinese. The Army Chief then asked for a written directive or instruction and that written directive was given. Again on 30th September 1962—it is on page 363 of the book—the Defence Minister was contacted by the Army Chief and the Defence Minister said that the Government policy was to make an impact on the Chinese in NEFA. So the policy was to make an impact on the Chinese in NEFA. Along with that read also what Gen. Kaul says on the 2nd October, 1962 when Nehru was again told at a meeting in the Defence Minister's room that it was not possible to carry out any war against the Chinese. Then Nehru said he had good reason to believe that the Chinese would not retaliate if we made war upon the Chinese. Nehru was perhaps proceeding on the belief so sedulously built up before the Chinese People's Republic was set up in 1949 that the Chinese will not be the people to retaliate against any war which was



made upon them. That was on 2nd October 1962. The next date is 13th October 1962. Even in spite of the fact that on the previous day, that is to say, on the 11th October the Prime Minister says that instead of attacking the Chinese, if necessary, we should hold on to the present positions, in spite of that on the 13th October when Nehru goes to Ceylon he says that he had given orders to the Army to drive the Chinese out of our territory in NEFA. It is clear therefore from these dates, which are tell-tale dates and which do not make any mistakes that our Government at that time engaged in an adventurist war against the Chinese against all good counsel and yet we have been fed with another kind of propaganda. This is the first disclosure that has been made by Gen. Kaul and that is a very important disclosure from all points of view.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Would you not . . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: My time is limited.

Madam, the second disclosure which General Kaul has made is this that our policy of non-alignment is rubbish because we know that as early as March 1962 Mr. Chester Bowles comes as a special representative from the United States of America and everyone knows about it. Mr. Menon knows about it; Nehru knows about it. Mr. Chester Bowles comes as a special Ambassador from the United States and talks with Gen. Kaul about the affairs in NEFA in everyone's knowledge and in that interview they discussed the possibility of a Chinese attack in that very year, in September-October 1962. That itself shows that our Generals were keeping in touch with the United States of America and as far as defensive and offensive policies were concerned, when to attack and when not to attack, all that was being discussed with Mr. Chester Bowles, the special Ambassador from America. Not only that; here is another gem of a disclosure also made by Gen. Kaul. It is this that in that very year, on or

about the 25th October 1962 Gen. Kaul made two suggestions and one of the suggestions was that we should try to take military aid from some foreign power and it appears from this book that that suggestion was accepted and Nehru asked for foreign military aid from the United States of America to make war against one of our neighbouring countries. That clearly shows that whatever we may say about non-alignment, when we may talk with pride about this non-alignment, this non-alignment is really a sham and is really a l bosh.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I will finish in a minute. I will only say this—and Gen. Kaul also says it here—that as far as consultation « with foreign Generals is concerned, that was being regularly done by our Army Chiefs. Look at Gen. Kaul's statement on page 175 of the book. Gen. Kaul says that after he was appointed as a Corps Commander he began to establish connection with Major-General Rees of Britain. In this way, Maj. Gen. Rees, then Mr. Chester Bowles and various other American and British dignitaries have been coming to India and giving them advice, giving them counsel, and this is within the knowledge of all, Mr. Menon, Nehru and all others. All these disclosures nail the coffin of their so-called much-boasted non-alignment policy which they have been so long boosting up and which really has no foundation at all. That is all, Madam Deputy Chairman.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not know what the purpose of Gen. Kaul was in writing this book but it is his own affair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To provide us with a debate.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Perhaps to provide us with a debate but it is obvious that the book has thrown the Government into jitters and certain very interesting and very very impor-

[Shri Niren Ghosh]

tant questions have come to the surface. Let me take them one by one.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ALI AKBAR KHAN in the Chair)-,

Gen. Kaul says that some time in 1962 there was a change in the policy of the Government and he has designated the change as a forward policy. Now we ask the Government to tell us precisely whether there was such a policy change and if so what that policy was because Gen. Kaul says on page 365:

"On the same day, General Thapar saw the Prime Minister along with Lt. Gen. Sen. He pointed out that this was the first time we were going to use force against the Chinese, though for good reasons (as against walking into a vacuum, without opposition, a practice followed by us so far . . . ."

So it is clear that previously we did not go into the territory where the Chinese were and this was the first time we were going to use force. The question arises if Thag La ridge and Dhola ridge are within our frontiers, south of McMahon Line why did not the Government have a post at Dhola before? It was set up only in 1962. So was it a disputed area? Is it a fact that they were within the regular patrol range of the Chinese army? Was this attempt to set up posts in Thag La and Dhola the forward policy of trying to confront the Chinese and going in for clashes if that became necessary? If that was the change, the country and the Parliament should be told clearly. That is my first point.

Secondly as regards the interviews of Mr. Chester Bowles, Gen. Kaul and Mr. Chester Bowles agreed that there was going to be a clash in the autumn of 1962 and both agreed that foreign military aid should be taken. Now it is curious how on the one hand Gen. Kaul says that the thinking of the Government was that there was not going to be any serious clash or war with the Chinese while he and the

American special representative had agreed that it was not going to be so but that there was going to be a clash and that India should ask for foreign military aid. May I also point out to the Defence Minister that his American friends for whom they are very generous, those very American friends, indeed the Chairman of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor affirmed before the American Senate that it was India which provoked the clash with China. Fine friends they have who can really foresee what the Government cannot foresee. There had been a policy and throughout the entire book General Kaul pleads for getting foreign military aid and the American Ambassador agrees that this should be the policy. Is it not known to our Government that it is the policy of that Government to enmesh India in military blocs and subjugate it indirectly, if not directly? That is what has ultimately come to pass. So, can we not say that between a certain official strata of Generals and America there was a conspiracy in order to unleash this border conflict. They egged us on so that such a thing took place and put India into difficulties. That is the second thing that I would like the Minister to clarify. The third thing is on October 11 and 12 at a formal meeting of the Prime Minister, Defence Minister and the Generals it was agreed that we should hold on to the position which we already held, but not go forward to launch an attack. But the next day the Prime Minister said that he had given marching orders to the Army. Now, which is true? If General Kaul is here untrue, he is telling a deliberate lie, a very grave lie before the country. If such a position had been taken by the Government and Nehru went back on it, the Government should clarify what was the reason for going back on the decision taken at a formal meeting of the Prime Minister, Defence Minister and the General. This question is a very serious one, and look how these things could curiously move. One senior civil servant some time before

suddenly briefs the press that the Government has ordered our Army to drive the Chinese out of Dhola area or Thagla Ridge area, the most serious, grave and far-reaching decision that was broached before the public by a senior civil servant and not by the Government itself. It is a funny thing.

Now, another thing is this. Lt.-Gen. Kaul had taken press correspondents into the NEFA area contrary to the Defence Minister's orders. If there was such order, what business had General Kaul to countermand that order? No, he has to obey that order. He has gone contrary to the order of the Defence Minister and it seems that he is very thick and thin with the Americans and he is the blue-eyed boy of the Americans. He may write his apologia today, but it stands to reason that it was a deep-laid conspiracy between the foreign powers and certain official strata and Generals to provoke and incite Pome border clashes and put India into difficulties. General Kaul himself says that if Nehru had his way he would not have adopted a forward policy. If that is so, that shows his wisdom. But he was misled into taking a position which was not primarily tenable. Is it a fact or not? This point should be made clear to the country. These are very important questions surrounding the 1962 incidents.

Last of all I would like to pinpoint the fact that throughout the entire book he has made an apologia for himself. He has maligned the Government. After all, whatever wisdom Nehru had in not going in for a forward policy, that policy has been attacked from another standpoint, that India should have gone in for foreign military aid and long ago subjugated "itself to another foreign policy indirectly and lost its sovereignty. Now, actually about Indian sovereignty, of course, a question mark is being put nowadays. That is the position we have been reduced to. So, the entire episode, all the truth should be told

to the public. There is no use saying all these things, because some Joint Secretary—there are a hundred or two hundreds of them circling about New Delhi—has issued orders that the Army should go and drive out the Chinese. Is it a fact or not? If it is so, then it is a very sorry state of affairs. So, these are the points that the Government should clarify and take the country, Parliament and the people into confidence.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the net result of today's debate is going to be a boost in the sale of "The Untold Story", which has already run into its fourth edition and probably it may go up to ten editions and give Lt.-Gen. Kaul a sizeable amount of money for his literary labours. I was one of those who had taken a very critical view of General Kaul when we initiated the debate on the NEFA reverses four years ago in this House. I do not change my opinion that Lt.-General Kaul was an unsuitable Commander to be placed in charge of the NEFA operations. He did not have much battle experience, excepting the experience he had gathered during the years of the Second World War in the Arakans. His work was confined to the Supply Corps. I do not think that a person with such scanty military experience should have been chosen as the Corps Commander of NEFA. Though I do not change that view, after reading this book, I have a very genuine sympathy for Lt.-General Kaul in the situation in which he found himself when he light-heartedly accepted the command of operations in that area. We all recognise that Lt.-General Kaul was a flamboyant personality. He was perhaps a little egoistic. He perhaps got all the promotions that he secured in the Army through some kind of influence with Jawaharlal Nehru. I was deeply concerned to read in the book references to the state of morale in the Army. For example, Lt.-i General has set out at length the letter which he has written to Lt-

dijscussio

[Shri A. D. Mani]

General Chaudhuri regarding his illness. Lt.-General Chaudhuri was supposed to have had an alleged heart attack and Lt.-General Kaul had written a message of sympathy. General Chaudhuri was so angry with the letter that he said that he was not hitching his wagon to a star and so on and there was such an acrid correspondence. Lt.-General Kaul goes on to say at page 449:

"I also remember how he had requested me in 1961, as I have already described earlier, to put in a good word for him in the right quarter."

I am sorry to say that during the time of Mr. Krishna Menon political influences had already come to play a very big part in the determination of Command positions in the Army and as long as politicians decide the Generalships, not on the basis of merit, but on the basis of their capacity to massage and lubricate the right quarters, the Army will suffer in the long run and it has turned out to be so. What does this mean. "...to put in a good word for him in the right quarter"? It means that he wanted him to put in a word to Jawaharlal Nehru. I am glad that General Kaul has brought out all these facts. He has rendered a distinct public service by putting this picture. I do not believe all the things that he has said. If I had a chance of writing out the title of this book, I would put it as "Untold Half Story". He has told fifty per cent of truth. The other fifty per cent of truth is in the hands of the Government. But I think we should not allow an atmosphere of McCarthyism to develop in this House. We must have a sense of reasonable scale of values. On the one hand, the party which was responsible for the NEFA debacle has been returned to power in the 1967 elections and the man, who was responsible for the NEFA debacle, namely, Mr. Krishna Menon, is likely to win the North-East

Bombay election. If these things happen, to pinpoint poor General Kaul and say this person should be punished, action should be taken against him under the Official Secrets Act and so on, is taking a very savage and McCarthyist view of the situation. I personally feel that General Kaul has infringed the Official Secrets Act. This is page 360, 4th Edition—I would like the Defence Minister to take note of it. General Kaul sets down a note that Lieut. General Umrao Singh wrote to him<sup>1</sup>. He can publish what he wrote, but he cannot publish what another General wrote because that is a disclosure of official secrets. If you read Mr. Churchill's memoirs, Mr. Churchill has set down at length whatever he wrote to the Commanders during the time he was wartime Prime Minister of Great Britain. But General Kaul cannot quote what other people wrote or said because that is definitely an infringement of the Official Secrets Act. I would advise the Defence Minister not to take action under the Official Secrets Act because a large number of persons are not loyal even to the oath of secrecy they take when they are sworn in as Ministers in various States of India. Many of them disclose State secrets. No action is taken. General Chaudhuri is allowed to become a correspondent of a Newspaper and then an answer is given. What permission was given . . .

SHRI BHUFESH GUPTA: An ugly-state of affairs.

SHRI A. D. MANI: General Kaul has done a service by showing the state of our defences in NEFA. Our parachutes did not open . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Your time is up.

SHRI A. D. MANT: Only two minutes. He says in his book that our people were not able to identify the

enemy; our Intelligence service was poor; our parachutes did not open; our aircraft did not take off. These are all very serious disclosures which must be properly investigated. I feel that the Henderson Report should be published, and not only published but we should have an *in camera* parliamentary Commission of Inquiry to go into the truth of this whole matter. We need not publish it; we can have a secret session of both the Houses of Parliament; there must be a complete disclosure of what happened.

I would like to say one final word about the alleged illness of Lt. General Kaul. Before I took part in this debate I had occasion to check up facts. Whatever my hon. friend, Mr. Bhargava may say, Lt. General Kaul is a person who is not in good health today. He is very ill. Brig. Lall who is the Medical Superintendent of the Willingdon Hospital, whom all of us know, examined him. He had a weak heart; his pulse rate was 106; blood pressure was 190/120. I wonder how a person in this state of health made a Corps Commander. There must be a let-down in the standards of fitness in the Army if a person with all such ailments and Oedema of the heart was put in charge. I do not think General Kaul was a good General, but certainly he was a man of courage. Nobody has ever said that he has run away from danger, and he took a very grave risk in that shattered state of health to have gone to NEFA a second time after ten days. I think these facts must be recognised because General Kaul is a con-demned man but we should not tar him and blacken him by saying that he was a coward. He was not a coward though he might not have been a good General.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Sapru.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Sir, I think I should reply now. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN' (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I would request Members *now* to confine themselves to five minutes.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Most of the points are being repeated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Most of the points are not being repeated. Many points are still to come. Sir, I suggest that we continue the discussion tomorrow. I made a suggestion to the Chairman that the time should be extended. He was sympathetic to the suggestion. Let us not hurry through the discussion. We adjourn now and tomorrow we take it up. It is a serious matter and many more new points are to come. This is to be treated rather seriously, and two hours' time or three hours' time is not at all adequate. Since we have taken the trouble of studying the book, buying it and spending money on it, we should be given ample chance to express ourselves on the subject. Therefore, my suggestion is this. We adjourn after Mr. Sapru has spoken and then we take it up tomorrow.

SHRI AWADHESWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): I have been in this House for several years. Such motions are not carried to the next day. They are disposed of the same day. Two hours' discussion cannot be extended to the next day.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not that

....  
SHRI AWADHESWAR PRASAD SINHA: Let me speak or you speak. Two hours may be two and a half hours or three hours. But it cannot be made a whole-day discussion. This is never done. Today we should finalise it and finish it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, it is entirely at your discretion, I realise it. But I am very sorry that the hon. Member there wanted to mislead us by saying that this is never done. Similar motions have been discussed in some cases for the whole day although two hours have been fixed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Let us not take time in this way. We will sit down and we will finish this. You wanted to speak later, otherwise . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not talking 'about that. I say this not for me only; there are also others.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You leave others to me. Let him finish. Mr. Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Six, I wish to speak briefly. I have read the book. I cannot say I have read it very carefully. I have gone through the book and some parts of it are interesting and other parts amusing. Now every autobiography; every book of memoirs tends to be egocentric, and it is no disparagement or no condemnation of General Kaul to say that he is egocentric in his book. He gives his side of the story and as a man who feels that he was not treated quite fairly he gives his version of what the true facts were. He may be right or he may be wrong in his estimates of the various people he met but we are a democratic country; we are not a totalitarian State. (*Interruption*) I know the members of the Forward Bloc. I speak as a socialist. They should know what they talk . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You go on, Mr. Sapru. Do not take notice of interruptions.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Every biography tends to become egocentric and it is no wonder that General Kaul is somewhat egocentric in his book. He has given us some estimates of the men whom he served. We do not need to agree with those estimates. Those estimates may be wrong. His estimate of Mr. Krishna Menon may be right or may be wrong; his estimate of Mr. Nehru may be right or may be wrong. But we do not live in hero worship. If a person could not write about a dead person,

there would be no biography, there would be no history. Therefore, in my opinion, it is quite irrelevant. The real question is whether Gen. Kaul has disclosed any military secret. Does he come within the four corners of the Official Secrets Act or the Military Secrets Act? I know that in 1903 when there was the British Government in power in this country and the Official Secrets Act was passed by Lord Curzon, it was vigorously opposed by Mr. Gokhale and the Congress Party. Now, I see no reason why we who are a country, who are a democratic country who have inherited radical traditions who have inherited Gandhian traditions—should get upset because a retired General has tried to vindicate himself by saying something which is not to our liking. What is it that Gen. Kaul has added to our knowledge? We knew all about this NEFA debacle; we knew the main facts of the NEFA debacle; we knew that we were not very well prepared; we knew that Mr. Nehru before he left for Ceylon said, "Oh! throw them out". And we know that we suffered for the mistakes of our politicians as well as our military unpreparedness. That is. I think, what Gen. Kaul has said. He has said something nasty about Gen. Chaudhury. I may or may not agree with what he has said about Gen. Chaudhury. I have not had the pleasure of knowing Gen. Chaudhury. But a General has got a right to have his own estimate of his fellow-General.

I would therefore like to come by saying two things. I know for a fact that Gen. Kaul was grave\*\* at that period. This was told by a person who was in the immediate command, Gen. Thapar. And the second thing that I would like to say is that there should be some freedom to allow people to write biographies. After all, great generals have written biographies in England and in America and no one has bothered to say anything about them. It may not be permissible in totalitarian countries

to write books like this. But I would be sorry if the Defence Minister were to take notice of all that a retired general says, when one who feels that he has not been treated properly writes a book. I do not know about the timing of the book, I do not know . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR Ali KHAN): Thank you, Mr. Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Well, I could go on with that thesis. But I would say that it is deplorable that this House . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Do not say this.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I think it would be deplorable if this House were not to take a big view of the question.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Gen. Kaul has given his version of the NEFA debacle in his 'Untold Story'. The other version should have been given by the Government. Gen. Henderson-Brooke enquired into this NEFA debacle and he has submitted his Report to the Government. We have pleaded in this House as well as in the other House that this Report should be placed before us so that we can learn lessons from the debacle from which we suffered.

That the country was unprepared to meet the challenge from the Chinese was evident by the fact that our army retreated in 1962. If it were any other country, the Government would have been overthrown. Instead of the Government being overthrown, only the Defence Minister was overthrown. In the

282 RS—7.

Second World War when Mr. Chamberlain was not prepared to conduct the war, when the people thought that he was not fit to conduct the war, he was removed and Mr. Churchill was put in his place. A similar thing should have been done here. Now, in the last General Election, this Congress Party has been thrown out of power in eight States.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is a very important discussion that is now taking place. The people want the reasons for our unpreparedness as to why that debacle was there. It is our duty, as the representatives of the people, to know the entire story of this NEFA debacle. In the Gallipoli campaign when Britain suffered utter defeat, a Commission of Inquiry was appointed and it went into that debacle and that Report was published during the First World War. I would therefore urge very strongly that a Commission of Parliamentary Members should be appointed to go into this entire question. An *in camera* session may be held where the Henderson-Brooke Report may be placed before this House and discussed.

Some other important things are revealed in this book. Charges are made that Gen. Kaul got accelerated promotions. It is no doubt true that the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister went out of their way in defending the accelerated promotions that was given to Gen. Kaul. On the other hand, he has made similar allegations against other generals. Therefore a thorough inquiry into this affair—how the generals or the army officers were promoted because of certain influences, because of certain relationships with the higher-ups in the Cabinet—should be made. Otherwise, the Army officers will feel discontented that even though they are superior to others, because of certain influences at work, their promotions are denied, and the

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy] morale of the Army will go down if such things were to happen in our country. I, therefore, urge that a thorough enquiry into the accelerated promotions of these army officers during the last ten years should be made.

Another point that I would like to stress upon is this. Why is it that these generals are allowed to attend cocktail parties and meet diplomats and why should they discuss military matters with the diplomats?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Even political matters.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Military or political matters. Then what is the Defence Minister meant for? What is the Chief of the Army Staff meant for? It is the Defence Minister who with the help of the Army Generals in his presence should meet the diplomats or the high representatives of the other countries and discuss about military matters. And I do not know why the Prime Minister gave permission to this General to meet some of these American Ambassadors. Even if the Prime Minister had given that permission, it was the duty of the General concerned to obtain a written permission from the Army Headquarters which he did not do. It was gross dereliction of duty and also Indiscipline on the part of the General.

Another point that I would like to ask the Defence Minister is this. Why did the Defence Ministry permit General Chaudhuri, when he was in service, to be the Military Correspondent of the Statesman? May I know whether any investigation has been conducted into 'his affair'? The other day while answering this question it was said that the Defence Secretary permitted General Chaudhuri to act as the Military Correspondent for the Statesman.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not believe it.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Did he have the authority It is true\* that whenever an order is passed, it is not the Minister concerned that issues the order. It is the Secretary who issues the order. So in that case I do not think that it was the Defence Secretary who gave the permission. Though the order might have been signed by the Defence Secretary, the Defence Minister must have given the permission. On what authority did he give the permission to a General in service to be a military correspondent of a newspaper for that matter? The military correspondent of a newspaper gives out military secrets which may not be in the interest of the country. A gross indiscipline on the part of this General, a gross dereliction of duty on the part of the General and on the part of the Defence Minister is involved in this affair. Therefore, it is necessary that an investigation should be conducted into the whole affair. Who gave the permission and under what circumstances? What were the influences brought to bear on the Defence Minister or the Defence Secretary to issue that permission, and may I know whether the remuneration that was derived by the General from the newspaper was shared with the Government? I, therefore, urge that a secret Session of Parliament should be immediately convened to discuss Henderson-Brooke's report along with this 'Untold Story\*' of Lt-General Kaul and a Commission of Parliament consisting of Members of both the Houses should be appointed to go into this debacle and also into the story told by General Kaul and Henderson-Brooke's report should be appointed to give a finding so that we may learn lessons from the debacle that we all went through. It was a shame on the part of India. We lost our prestige in the outside world. There is no reason why we should believe some of the stories that are concocted in this book.



"Who started the war?", somebody asked. It is evident that the Chinese committed unprovoked aggression against India and we were taken aback. The Prime Minister at that time said that we were living in a world of dream and that we were taken aback. Let the same thing not be repeated again. Let us warn ourselves that we should be prepared to meet any challenge that may be thrown at us, and we should be prepared to learn lessons from what has happened in the past.

6 P.M.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, this 'Untold Story' of General Kaul has disturbed a hornet's nest and rightly so. The writing of the book itself has raised an important issue. Its contents have raised *some* other important issues. The question is being asked: Is it proper for a General so soon after their retirement to write their memoirs on controversial issues? Incidentally it is also being asked: Is it proper for a General to act as the Military Correspondent under a pseudo name of an important journal? Now as related by a previous speaker, Dr. Sapru, it is not uncommon for retired Military Generals, especially those who have figured in military activities of a very serious nature, to write their memoirs after the end of the event. After the first Great War and after the second Great War all the great Generals on both sides, within a few years of the end of the War, came out with their memoirs, and in no country was a very strict view, a very legalistic view taken of this endeavour. I am sure when a man writes a big book, when a General writes his memoirs it is just possible that inadvertently he encroaches upon fields which strictly come within the mischief of the Official Secrets Act. But then those who are in authority, those who are in power have to take a generous view of these endeavours because those Generals who write their memoirs give a certain picture,

a picture which is not relevant only for the past but is relevant for the present and more relevant for the future, because after these memoirs many a mistake has been corrected, many a deficiency in military policies, many a fault in foreign policy has been corrected. In that sense, I feel, the demand to hang General Kaul or to treat him harshly, in my opinion, is an unjustified demand.

Incidentally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, was it proper for General Chaudhri to act as the Military Correspondent of the Statesman under a pseudo name? I keep the question apart that he had obtained proper permission from the authorities concerned. I have read the collection of the articles from A to Z which have appeared under the title "Arms, Aspects and Affairs". Those articles had not disclosed any military secret, had not expressed any reflection either on our military policy or on our foreign policy. It was an endeavour only in education of public opinion on military matters, and from that point of view that was a justified endeavour and no serious view or adverse view should be taken of that endeavour.

Coming to the contents, there are some hon'ble Members who have felt hurt because General Kaul has cast reflection on our great leader, late Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, that he has cast reflection on Mr. Menon, that he has cast reflection on Mr. Desai who is the Deputy Prime Minister of India today. But, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are living in a democracy. The ethics of democracy are not the ethics of the court of the Moghuls or the court of the Nawab of Oudh. In a democracy when a man holds a high position he really holds a high position on the understanding that his actions are open to criticisms; even if his actions are right, the people have the right to say that these actions were not correct. The people have a right to say that even the Prime Minister or the President committed mistakes. I

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha] do not see why we should take a very feudalistic view of this sort of thing.

I remember Pandit Nehru, great as he was, in this House on many occasions, in the Party meetings, on many occasions had accepted that he had committed mistakes and apologies to Parliament and the Party, I know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, a much greater man than Pt. Nehru, Mahatma Gandhi was not averse to admitting what he sometimes called his 'Himalayan blunders.' In such a situation, in a democracy in which we are functioning, it will be improper to take a very feudalistic view of these things and then to condemn General Kaul simply because he has criticised or he has implicitly or indirectly criticised Gandhiji or Pandit Nehru or Mr. Krishna Menon or Mr. Morarji Desai or whoever he might be.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, one of the hon. Members drew certain conclusions from the disclosures of General Kaul. In his opinion General Kaul's disclosures make it abundantly clear that India was the aggressor and not China. The gentleman, who owes allegiance to a certain party, may I remind him of the teachings of Lenin? It was the view of Lenin that what determines whether a person is an aggressor or not is not the fact whether he fired the first shot or not. The aggressor and the aggressed have to be determined by a complex of circumstances. Suppose some intruders come and take possession forcefully of the house of a certain man and that man has no other go except to use violence to force them out and he uses violence. Then can it be said that the man who used violence to force some intruders out of his house is the aggressor? Lenin would never say that that person was the aggressor. What was the position about these two outposts which have been mentioned in the book and on which two hon. Members on that side spent a lot of words and a lot of breath? Those two areas are South of the McMahon Line. They are areas which had been

traditionally a part of the Indian territory. The Chinese came and took forceful possession of those territories. We tried to reason with them and they were not prepared to leave. In the circumstances if we used force to push them out, no rational person can say that we were the aggressors. Therefore the conclusion of those hon. gentlemen is, in my opinion, not correct.

General Kaul has brought out two things very prominently, that there was no coordination between our Defence policy and our foreign policy and because of that we had to receive this serious setback in NEFA. Unfortunately while earlier the emphasis was on foreign policy, on diplomacy to the neglect of Defence, I find today the pendulum swung violently to the other side. The emphasis is only on defence and defence preparedness and no attempt is made to coordinate our foreign policy with the demands of defence. I may be wrong but I have no time. Otherwise I will reply.

Lastly after the disclosures made by General Kaul, maybe he is giving only one side of the picture, the demand in my opinion for placing the report of Gen. Henderson-Brooke on the Table of the Parliament and for its discussion so that the public know what were our deficiencies becomes irresistible. It is said even after 5 years of the NEFA debacle and 4½ years of that report, we shall be affecting our security if we make the report public. But if we have not been able to correct the deficiencies which were pointed out by that report in 4½ years I do not think we would ever be able to correct those deficiencies and if the validity of that argument is accepted, then that leads us to only one conclusion that in no case will the Henderson-Brooke's report be placed on the Table. I would point out that in the Armed Services Committee of the American Congress there are Secret Sessions but immediately after the Secret Sessions are over, most of the evidence, except a very limited portion which really

immediately affects the security, is made public and that portion which a, for the time being treated as secret is, after a lapse of 2 or 4 years, made public. I do not know why we do not follow those practices. We have met this' debacle because we followed a hush-hush policy in respect of defence. I am afraid even after the debacle this policy is sought to be pursued. I therefore feel that the Government should have no hesitation in making public the report of the Henderson-Brooke's report.

Lastly, I again repeat that Gen. Kaul does not deserve really criticism. If anything, he deserves approbation for striking a new line.

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** आदरणीय वाइस चैयरमैन महोदय, यह हम लोगों की आदत नहीं रही कि जो हमारे आर्मी के लोग हैं उनकी समालोचना करें, बराबर हमने उनकी तारीफ की। जिस वक़्त बोमडीला का अधःपतन हुआ मैं उसी साइड में तेजपुर से लेकर डिब्रूगढ़ तक घूम रहा था और एक जनरल इम्प्रेसन हमारे जितने सैनिक थे, सिपाही थे उनके मन में था कि हमारे जनरल लोगों ने लड़ने नहीं दिया। दिल्ली में जो बात पता लगी और जो इस किताब में नहीं लिखी गई है—वह यह थी कि इस जनरल को यह कहा गया था कि ब्रह्मपुत्र में तो पानी था, तुम उसमें डूबकर मर क्यों नहीं गए। हिन्दुस्तान की एक बहुत बड़ी हस्ती ने ऐसी बात उनसे कही जिसको उस जनरल ने छपा नहीं, फिर अन-टोल्ड क्या है। इस चीज को उन्होंने छपा क्यों नहीं। उनको कहा गया कि इतना भारी अधःपतन हुआ और पेट में दर्द की बात का बहाना लेकर भाग कर आए, उसको कहा गया कि ब्रह्मपुत्र में आप डूबकर क्यों नहीं मर गए, ब्रह्मपुत्र में तो पानी था।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :** किसने कहा ?

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** हिन्दुस्तान की एक बड़ी हस्ती ने—मैंने यह पहले ही कह दिया, मुझे यह बताया गया। कुछ लोग जनरल

कौल को तारीफ करते हैं। जैसा हमने कहा, आर्मी के लोगों को हम चर्चा नहीं करते थे, लेकिन जो भगौड़ा है, जिसने वहां हमारी बे-इज्जती कराई, आज उसको हिम्मत हुई, जुरंत हुई कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के लीडरों, पंडित नेहरू, फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर और कृष्ण मेनन सबको धुलैया करे, यह शोभा की बात नहीं है। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेम्बरों को बहुत ठंडे दिल से विचार करना चाहिए। सप्रू साहब बिगड़ जाते हैं, सप्रू साहब सचाई में नहीं जाते, जज आदमी है, ला पाइंटस में रह जाते हैं, सचाई में नहीं जाते, उनको भी ठंडे दिल से सोचना चाहिए कि किस को तारीफ करें और किसको भत्सना। जय हिन्द।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Before you start your speech I would refer you to Rule 177 where it has been written that not exceeding 2½ hours in matters of such importance.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that but always the discretion of the Chair you will find. Anyhow you have already given it. Then you have violated the law, a good thing you have done.

Let me begin with the timing of the publication by the publisher. The book was published, interestingly enough, just on the eve of the elections and it is idle to say that it was not intended for any political use in the context of the elections. The fact that it has been used politically shows that it was intended to be used for the political purposes in the background of the election campaign. Gen. Kaul could have waited for the publication of the book till after the elections or published it earlier. He did not do anything of the kind. He waited evidently to bring out this book just at the time of the election when his book will get publicity and what I ne says will also be utilised along the [ lines he has in mind in the election

campaign against such persons as do not find favour with him.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Not only Mr. Menon is mentioned there but Mr. Morarji Desai and others are also mentioned in the book. It was not political . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Who are the publishers? The publishers of the book are the Allied Publishers. Which is that firm? The Allied Publishers, according to our information are even closely connected with the Congress of Cultural Freedom and you know it is actually a C.J.A. run agency. So it is found that the Asia Foundation had certain financial interests in the Allied Publishers. I would like to know whether enquiries have been made to find out the antecedents and associations of this particular concern.

Let me come to the book. I have read it, not once but twice or thrice and the more I read this book, the more I came to learn how the state of affairs at the very top are handled. The sum and substance is, if you read this book carefully, you will find that here is documentary evidence of how politicians intrude in strictly military affairs and how military people come into politics with the help of politicians. This is what we find in this Book. Pandit Nehru and other politicians used Lt.-Gen. Kaul for political purposes. And Mr. Kaul, having received the encouragement from such a quarter, functioned as half-Minister. Well, much of what he revealed shows that he was working in certain matters clearly in his political capacity and it would be a sad day for Parliamentary democracy if the functions of the military and the functions of the politician were combined behind the back of the Parliament in this manner. If Lt.-Gen. Kaul had not revealed what he has said, we would not have known many of the things. Now, who were responsible for it? Not just Tom Dick and Harry, but the Prime Minister

of the country and the other Ministers on the one hand and also Lt.-Gen. Kaul and the top brasses in the military on the other for throwing overboard certain fundamental principles of the functioning of a parliamentary democracy, that is, keeping the military away from these political functions. Well, now Lt.-Gen. Kaul was liked by many, Mountbatten liked him. He liked Mountbatten. Elsworth Bunker, the American Ambassador, liked him. Chester Bowles liked him and he also liked Chester Bowles. His connections are very wide. Obviously it is clear that he had been used as a political go-between between the Congress leaders at the top here and also these officials and the regrettable part of it is that a military officer was used for such a purpose. Now I will take page by page. Now how did he function politically? On page 177, you will find his reference to the Kashmir affairs. He actually writes in cold print that it is he who disregarded the order of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and got Sheikh Abdullah arrested. Well, first of all, I question his statement. Yet what he says we should take it as true and if it is true then what does it show? It shows that a certain general or military officer had the courage to disregard the order of the Prime Minister of the country and get a political person arrested in disregard of his order. This is a serious thing. On pages 146 and 147 you will find Lt.-Gen. Kaul writing patronisingly that Mr. Nehru later on, after all, took the credit for the task he did for the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah. He has said "he reconciled to what had happened and accepted this ironical compliment" when people supported the arrest. Now, this is a serious disclosure. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we cannot allow the Government to get away. We should like to know more about this thing. Then again when he was talking with Mr. Dhar, he was functioning in a political capacity, taking a political decision and disregarding the Prime Minister's order. Whether the orders were right or wrong is beside the point to-day.

The question is whether a military officer should disobey or disregard with impunity a clear direction of the Prime Minister of the country. For this offence he has committed, he should be indicted and courtmartialled in the military sphere or sent out of the service for this disobedience, no matter whether the decision was right or wrong. We are not concerned with the merits of it. Even if the military commander thinks the political decision is wrong, if the political decision was given from the Cabinet, it is none of the military's functions to go counter or go against that political decision. In England, there would have been impeachment if such a kind of activity on the part of General or military officer who dares to disregard or defy in this manner the orders of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and then goes on writing in his book that he did so and then say "Well, the Prime Minister took the compliment later on for what I have done" and also have a sting. In what he says now, here on page 180, you will find that he was invited by Elsworth Bunker, the American Ambassador and they developed very great friendship and we find there from page to page certain references to his political discussions with the American Ambassador and this Chester Bowles. Who authorised him? What was the Intelligence doing? Did the Government know that he was indulging in such a kind of conversation and talk? Yes, they know. On one or two occasions he sought the permission of the Minister in charge and the permission was not given. Even so, expressly he met them. And we know neither permission was sought nor any report was given. What has happened? Could we imagine that a British General going to talk to the Ambassador of France or of other countries in this manner in London? You could never imagine that. Such people will be suspended and thrown out of service and the Ministers responsible will have to bow out of the House of Commons and retire from public life. But in this country you, do whatever

you like and that is what has happened. It is not military secrets being revealed. It is a grotesque violation of the ways of parliamentary democracy in which the functions of talking to the diplomats on political matter\* are given to the Ministers and to nobody else. As far as the army is concerned, they can talk about military matters, after duly authorised by them, with corresponding military authorities. Yet this is what has happened.

And then, he makes allegations against the Defence Minister. I am not going into all that. These are meant for election consumption. Now, the Thimayya episode is referred to on page 218. What do I find? Everybody knows that it was a political stunt with a political purpose that the whole letter was released. We had an army general at the time disclosing the letter he had written to the Prime Minister and to certain Opposition leaders. In fact, it was given to the 'Statesman' and to a certain Opposition leader saying what kind of thing he was doing. He was invited by Mr. R. K. Nehru, Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry, to a dinner in 1961 where Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan was present. It was an arranged dinner. What business Mr. R. K. Nehru had to invite Lt. Gen. Kaul to a dinner party in 1961 where, according to him, they discussed the Chinese threat? And the Chinese threat discussed between whom? Between Mr. R. K. Nehru, Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry, Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan and this Lt. Gen. Kaul. Well, if somebody had revealed it that Bhupesh Gupta was present, Lt. Gen. Kaul was present and the External Affairs Secretary-General was present and American aggression in Kashmir was discussed what would you have thought? Now, I say this is how the External Affairs Ministry is functioning in this country. Well, we should have been invited also. If Mr. J. V. Prakash Narayan was given the opportunity to discuss such matters in the presence of the Secretary-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] General, in fact having been invited to dinner given by him, then why others of the Opposition were not also invited in this manner? My suspicion is that this kind of thing goes on depending on which parties are involved in controversy. I am sure the revelation here is a pointer to the danger of politicians and officials sitting in this Secretariat bringing about liaison between army officers on the one hand and certain acceptable politicians on the other. This has been revealed in this book. I would like to know what he has to say.

I am just sweeping through this thing. Then on page 283, he says that he approached the American Embassy in "my personal capacity"—that is what he writes—and had a long discussion with the Ambassador. Well, what are these people sitting there, I do not know. I can understand why they are losing the support of the country. They are busy with their factional and other affairs and they do not care for what is happening. Well, I say military secret has been disclosed, military documents may have been passed on and certain attempts have been made in such consultations as far as the Americans are concerned, to utilise Mr. Kaul to undermine and sabotage the policy of non-alignment involving India in such an action as would lead to a situation when the non-alignment policy would have to be given up. There was design and plan in the scheme. Yet the military officer goes there. But there we find the words "In my personal capacity." What personal capacity? Chester Bowles is not his father-in-law or some such thing. He went in a capacity outside his scope of employment for a political mission and I suspect that he was sent by certain political personalities in the Government in order to sound the Americans, cultivate them and to utilise his position with the Americans for certain political and other purposes of the Government.

Then at page 319 tribute is paid to Mr. B. K. Nehru, the Indian Amba-

sador even now. Mr Krishna Menon is gone; Mr. Kaul is gone; Mr. B. K. Nehru remains, and you see how this man is fond of our Ambassador in the United States of America. It does seem that Mr. B. K. Nehru played a good part in building up this gentleman, in maintaining and getting his connections with the Americans. Mr. B. K. Nehru should be dismissed from service on the basis of the disclosures in the book and the various other matters that have come to light. Mr. Vice-Chairman, at page 319 he writes:

"He complained to me . . ." 'He'

means Mr. B. K. Nehru—

"He complained to me that where as he was doing his best to foster good relations between India and USA, as was his charter, Menon was, leaving no stone unturned to undo his work....."

A startling statement when Mr Menon was the Minister here. You may or may not like him—that is a different matter—but Mr. Menon was the Defence Minister here, and an Indian Ambassador, enjoying the rank of a Minister, well, in the United States, he meets an Indian General and says things against the Indian Cabinet Minister to an Indian General. Is it not indulging in factionalism? Is it not indulging in linking up certain political consequences in the top ruling circle with the military? Here I say that even that is a grave offence. Imagine, if it were revealed in some paper . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): As an Ambassador he had a duty to improve the relations between India and America.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Mr. Vice-Chairman. You kindly note it. Has an Ambassador the right to say things against a Minister to a military official in this manner? Has an Ambassador, as the Ambassador shall we say, the right to say such things? Where is the Foreign Minister, Mr. Dinesh Singh, here? I am sorry; I have forgotten. It is the Defence Minister, and he is here.

Ilfe VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think you butter finish it

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As an Ambassador has he the right to say to a military officer in Delhi, as the Indian Ambassador, has the right to say to an Indian military officer that such and such Minister is spoiling our relations with certain countries when we are trying to build them up? Well, that is how disaffection is created; it is some people asking the army people, or the army people asking somebody else to revolt against these people indirectly. Here it is a clear case of instigation. Show me a single example from British history where in the services such a thing had been done. Therefore, well, don't blame Mr. Kaul for it; this is how they run the administration. They are factional. They quarrel among themselves. Gme party is utilised against another party. Again one Minister speaks against another, and this another Minister speaks against a third. This we know, but now we know also your Ambassador going and telling things to army officers against a Member of the Cabinet. It is a shocking cry unheard of in this kind of system.

Then I go to page 320 where it says:

"B. K. Nehru and I then discussed current affairs with special reference to Defence."

Is Mr. B. K. Nehru, is he the relevant authority here to discuss current affairs with special reference to Defence? And we get the indication; it was a wholesale political discussion. Mr. Vice-Chairman, then at page 341 we find references to discussions with Mr. Chester Bowles. On pages 341, 342 and 343 we get an inkling of how things happened. Americans call them at will; they go and meet them and take advice from them, well, share their thoughts and ideas with them in many matters. Am I to reconcile to such a situation when I find that our army officials go there and get tips from the Americans, share their thoughts with them and

ask them whether We should resign or not, or when they express their regret when one resigns here? He says all this in this book.

I should now like just to comment on lone or two things. On page 445 Mr. Kaul writes:

"I was betrayed by many who should have stood by me."

Who are these people who betrayed him? Well, we have got the name of Nehru, and many other names.

On page 451, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Kaul writes:

"Mr. Galbraith, the American Ambassador, called me for lunch and expressed his personal regret at my having asked for retirement."

Well, how is it? This Government should at least have taken an explanation from the American Embassy as to what warranted them to invite General Kaul, after he had tendered his resignation, and for Mr. Galbraith to express his personal regret in this manner. Well, I say it does not fall within the scope of the diplomatic functioning of a foreign envoy in our country to cultivate a kind of personal liaison with an Indian military officer to the point of telling him not to resign and then, after he had resigned, calling him for lunch and telling him that he was personally sorry that he had resigned. Now, much more things did happen; I am coming. Now I would like to know this. Then I come to the other things, and page by page I am referring to them.

On page 456 Teja appears on the scene. Many points ha^e come up before for this Teja to appear and for Mr. Kaul to meet him. Mr. Kaul says that he suddenly met Teja who was in Delhi in April, 1963. But the next day he received a letter from him giving him an appointment on a salary of \$20,000 per year which comes to, according to calculations at the prevailing, exchange rate, Rs. 8,000 per month. Well, am I to believe that Mr. Teja suddenly discovered this

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] wonderfui man at a party and, next \*lay, almost the next day, sent the Jetter to him, "Come, my chap, and join my firm. I shall give you Rs. 8,000 per month"? Who is going to believe it? But I am not here to speak. Well, I know this man from his book, but I should like to know from the Government who acted as the liaison between Teja, an international swindler, and this discredited gentleman. We knew who acted as the liaison between the Jayanti Shipping Company owned by Teja on the one hand, and the Central Government here on the other. That was Tmrumal liao. We should like to know which Rao, which Jain, which Gupta or Chaudhuri or Singh or Sardar or Panditji acted in this matter.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: On a point of order. He is naming an hon. Member of that House. This is not the way where names are brought in.

"SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is reported by the Enquiry Commission.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: This is not conducive to decorum in the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't you teach me about decorum. It ^is people who have no sense of shame talking about decorum. Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is included in the report by Mr. Sukhtankar. He has reported and I am quoting from that report. Wei<sup>1</sup>, in this there is nothing indecorous here or indecorous there, or decorum here or decorum there. But I am not concerned with it. I want to know who actually acted as the liaison between Teja and General Kaul and brought these two together, where one offers the other an appointment on a salary of Rs. 8,000 per month. Tell us

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Thank you very much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just a minute; I am finishing. So I shall leave this Teja affair at that since you have rung the bell.

Well, these are some of the things. Then, what does this book show as tax as the N.E.F.A. affair is concerned? There he makes a point. Let it not be thought that he was for a peaceful settlement. He wanted China to be fought because, after all, he was interested in that kind of fight. Now he says and of course in the P'i.\* conference yesterday he has said he should have sought a political settlement, a diplomatic sattlement, in the light of what had happened. But the difference between the po itical leadership in Delhi and Mr. Kaul was that, whereas he wanted to delay the attack a little, the Government of India, for political reasons, took the decision according to Mr. Kaul. This is what he has said. Therefore, let us not think that he is above reproach in this matter. We'l, the Government of India wanted to go its own way, but from the disclosures that are made in this book it shows the utter incompetence of the military, of the high command. Well many thing\* were not done in spite of the fact that he was the leader of the Division. Things did not exist even on paper properly, and many things which were sent to N.E.F.A. were absolutely found use'ess. And, well, these are revelations. Mr. Kaul said yesterday that Henderson Brooks' report should be published, because there is no secrecy involved in it. Why does not the Government accept that challenge and publish that kind of thing. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, here, therefore, we 3<sup>re</sup> concerned with a disclosure which has a far-reaching implication, not from the point of view of incriminating any person, or saying something for or against anyone; it exposes the utter disorder and utterly impermissible things happening at the top-most level, where Generals and politiciani become friends in order to utilise each other, may be, one for promotion, and may be, another, for other purposes, and all that, and it seems, as far as this man is concerned, it was with a view to utilising him to build up liaison between the American putho-rities on the one hand, and the Indian Government on the other. It goes



against not only the policy of non-alignment but it goes against the grain of whatever we understand as the parliamentary system of government.

Now, Mr Vice-Chairman, before I sit down I would like to say that the hon. Minister, Sardar Swaran singh, I understand, is trying to make out (that no secrets have been divulged). It is not for me to say whether they have been divulged or not. Only a proper enquiry and a proper examination can show that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He has not said anything, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the attempt. Mr. Chavan has said it, his colleague has said it and so, the Government has said it. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will agree that we are not competent military experts. I am not an expert in this matter. All these things can be found out only by a competent enquiry, by a proper enquiry, by experts who know how to read between the lines because we know how foreign secret service people can easily find out certain things by reading things which to our common eye, to the eyes of men like me, would seem innocuous. You know how they discover things, the American and other intelligence people. Therefore, I say on the basis of an enquiry we should like to know what happened and whether he has divulged any secrets or not. By now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, he has made another revelation and it is this, that Gen. Chaudhuri was writing for the *States man*. What is the answer of the Government to this? No answer at all has been given. I put it to the House that Gen. Chaudhuri was writing with the knowledge of some people and the Government would not own up Gen. Chaudhuri. He was getting some remuneration for his writings and yet he submitted nothing of this in his income-tax returns. He was under the service and conduct rules bound to report to the Government whatever his other earnings were. In fact, he was bound under the rules to produce

that money before the Government. Nothing of that kind was done. No money had been submitted. If it had been placed before Government the Government would have known. The fact that the Government had stated that they did not know anything about how much remuneration he got, shows that Gen. Chaudhuri had concealed how much money he had received. Yet such a man is made our Ambassador in another country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Gupta, that will do. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, these are serious political matters. The parliamentary institution has got to be protected. We all stand for the supremacy of the institution of Parliament. In this House you will remember when Nehruji came and spoke about the Thimayya letter in defence of the supremacy of Parliament, from this side of the House we got up and extended to him our full support. But today we find to our utter misfortune and shock that the supremacy of Parliament and the parliamentary system have been forgotten in dealing with matters ranging from the handling of the Kashmir situation down to the NEFA debacle. We find that parliamentary institution had been abused or some authority derived from such an institution had been abused by the Government. I say this not to sit in judgment on the past only. With the American intervention going on in our country, with the CIA activities growing wider and wider day by day in our country, my fear is that the entire administration has got to be made foolproof against all this. With CIA people behaving in this manner, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we do not know and we have no knowledge how many Generals like Mr. Kaul are still in service. I do not know how many Ambassadors we have got behaving like Mr. B. K. Nehru or how many politicians are behaving in the manner in which Mr. Kaul's friends and relations have behaved for the past years. Therefore a

proper enquiry is called for into the entire episode with a view to making certain fundamental, basic and guiding recommendations for Parliament and the country so that we know where Generals stand and where the politicians stand, so that we know when and how a General should meet foreign dignitaries, if at all he should meet them, so that we know that certain functions do not belong to the military and we also know that no politicians would not make use of the Military much less Indulge in their factional and other games or for their personal games or whatever they are.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Gupta, that will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All these have been exposed today and this book should be a reminder to the nation that the nation has got to be vigilant against this utterly incompetent, utterly callous, utterly non-vigilant Government in order that we may find out what is to be done to improve matters in the key centres of power, especially where the Military and the politicians are involved and at the highest level. Therefore, I submit along with the other Members of this House that there should be nothing short of a parliamentary enquiry with military and other expert advisers, that a commission composed of Members of Parliament from both Houses should be constituted in order to go into all the matters disclosed by this book and other related matters with a view to making such recommendations as that commission may think fit, in order to rectify some of the grave errors and grave evil methods which have come to light through this writing, and also in the course of its working to find out to what extent Mr. Kaul has told the truth and to what extent he has not told the truth. This, today, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is a national demand. No white-washed statement by the Government or by the Minister can be an

answer to this book. The answer to this book, Mr. Vice-Chairman, should be a public enquiry, a parliamentary enquiry, a competent enquiry which commands the confidence of the country as a whole. Let this enquiry be instituted now. Such an enquiry Parliament can be trusted. All parties will be there and we shall be guided by the findings and disclosures and advice of such a committee. We shall never, never be taken in or influenced by any unilateral statements by this Government which is in the accused dock as far as this book is concerned. Mr. Kaul and Government are co-accused in an evil conspiracy with a view to undermining parliamentary democracy and that too secretly and behind the back of Parliament. They should be placed before the gaze of the whole nation by a public enquiry, by a public scrutiny and if they have got the courage let them face it. Let them not indulge in any heroics again—even Teja cannot stage them—because we want to be saved from this capricious foolish, evil-minded Government in this matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Gupta, you should obey the Chair. Now, the Defence Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, this debate if I may be permitted to say so, has been interesting. I say this because I cannot find another word for it. It is interesting because hon. Members belonging to different parties have tried to find some material, some ammunition, in this book to propound their own pet theories on a number of problems, some historical, some of importance and others insignificant. But each hon. Member has tried to project his own viewpoint on certain events in accordance with his own ideas and has tried to support his own theory by quoting certain portions of this book.

Sir, before I attempt to answer some of the important points—and you will

agree that within the short time available I can touch only important points—I would like to say that in this honourable House, in this august House, we should try to understand the approach to and the manner in which we should handle a book of this type or of any type. After all, a book which has been written by any author has to be viewed in its proper perspective. All types of theories and all types of arguments cannot be built by presuming that what is contained in the book is correct or that it is something which has to be relied upon and if upon that basis you put forward certain propositions and they try to argue on that basis, then I should like to caution this august House that that would not be a very safe and a very proper approach.

The other point that I would like to mention is this. Several hon. Members have said that here certain allegations have been made or certain viewpoints have been expressed by the author, and if the Government does not come forward with an authentic contradiction of what has been said, then it should be presumed that what is not contradicted is correct. But, Sir, I am afraid in a democratic set-up where there is freedom of expression for the press for the commentators, for writers, for critics and for reporters, if the Government is to proceed on this basis they are expected and that they are called upon to contradict each and everything which appears in print, then it will be a hopeless task. I have no doubt in my mind that anyone ever believes that anything that remains uncontradicted is correct. So we can proceed on that basis and should try to tackle only those problems which are of importance and which do require any comment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): What is the point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point of order is, he cannot proceed just as

he likes. He must proceed according to your direction and within the four corners of the rule. Now when an allegation is made by one who was the General it is the duty of the Government . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is no point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No point of order? The point is, you should give direction to him. That is the trouble here; you hear me first.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have heard you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You heard my speech, not my point of order. There is a difference between a speech and a point of order. Now, my point of order is this.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, if the hon Member is permitted to go on as long as he likes, I may have to point out that there is no quorum in the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, he said that he was not going to proceed on this basis. It is not for him to say that. Certain allegations have been made, we have substantiated them and repeated them. The allegations have come from one who in the relevant period was in a particular employment and it is the duty of the Government to rebut them and say whether they are right or wrong. It should not be another Svetlana affair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): All right, now please sit down.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: There is no point of order as you rightly mentioned and it is for the Government to decide what should be contradicted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Gupta, so far as the reply is concerned, the

Defence Minister has the same right as you have and in the reply he will proceed as he thinks best.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And then you will say, yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I do not have to say, yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then I shall rise whenever I like on a point of order.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I can understand the excitement . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not excitement, it is indignation.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: ... of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta but we have heard him with the greatest patience and the least that I expect of a person and a Member of his seniority is to concede the same thing when another viewpoint is put across. He may not agree; I know I will not be able to convince him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a question of viewpoint.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No running commentary, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not questioning the viewpoint. He can give any view he likes but what I want is factual matter. He should confine himself to the facts and tell us whether they are right or wrong in point of fact.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would like very clearly to enunciate our position. It is no right of anybody, whether he is a General or a civil servant or a correspondent or anybody, just to say anything he likes and then to place the Government in the position of having either to contradict or confirm that. Whatever it is, even if it is half-truth, to say that the Govern-

\*mf\*nt rrmct omntrarfirt nr rrvnfirmit. T

lo not accept that position. I would like to state very categorically that we are not called upon to take up half-truths and . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do you know it is half-truth?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: . . . in trying to explain those half-truths I am not going to disclose other matters which might really create further complication in the sense of disclosing vital information. So all these things must be viewed in the proper perspective and there is ample use of . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. If he says . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not give way. In the midst of a speech there can be no point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I must say . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He has not yielded.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He can say that in public interest he will not divulge something and he has to satisfy the Chair, if necessary by going to your Chamber, that a particular information cannot be divulged in the House in public interest. It is not for the Minister to lay down what things he will say and what things he will not say.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Sir, may I say . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No, no Mr. Sinha.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Sir, please permit me to say only a word so that I can cut off Prince Charles's head conclusively. Now, the norms are different in Question Hour and in debates. In Question Hour when \*

question is put the Minister has to reply unless he takes shelter behind the plea that it is not in the interests of the security of the country to answer that question. But that norm does not operate in a debate. In a debate it is open to the Minister to reply only to certain substantial points and to ignore others. No person who participates in a debate can force the Minister to reply to all the points that he has raised.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has said 'vital information'. He cannot say that. I am sorry I will have to harass you a little because public duty demands that I should do it.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am not sorry at all because I am accustomed to this. Both of us know each other for the last 15 years and there is no scope for any misunderstanding.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: And I would appeal to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to think over this matter a little more calmly and I am sure that . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Have you read that book?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: . . . in calmer moments he will agree.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sure he has not read it; I have read it thrice.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That is why Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is more confused, because he- has read it thrice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And you are enlightened because you have not read it even once?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): It all depends upon intelligence, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You tell me, does a person get more enlightened by not reading a particular

book than one who has read it thrice? What is your view? —

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): There are some intelligent people who if they read once can do better justice than some people who may read over and over again and yet be confused.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But let him say that he has read it at least once.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, he is not only confused but he is a little obsessed also and therefore we have to put with these occasional sparks which all of us welcome. In fact, this House is cheerful on account of the great deal of heat that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta can raise even on insignificant matters.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On oath you say you have read it once and I will accept it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think there should be a limit, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I accept your ruling but in the name of God' he should say he has read it once.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you any God?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the points which do require some notice I will attempt to answer; some of them have already been answered but I would like to touch very briefly on some of the suggestions that have been thrown up. One is that this book discloses a state of unpreparedness. That is a point which has been urged by a large number of Members. I would like to say that this is not a matter which has been thrown up for the first time by Gen. Kaul. In fact, this matter was debated at very great length in 1962-1963 when you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, was also an hon. Member of this House, so was Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and I also had the

[Sardar Swaran Singh.] honour to serve this House and all of us know that both Houses of Parliament gave considerable time to discussing this matter ....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, we did.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: . . . and the late Prime Minister, our revered leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, made a very candid statement at that time. He said that there is no use blaming an individual officer or an individual General or a Minister. He said that all of us in a sense were responsible because we made an assessment about the Chinese intentions and that assessment turned out to be wrong. It was a treacherous act on the part of our neighbour, whom we had tried to befriend in every possible manner, and this was a disappointment for the whole country. After all, preparedness in a military sense also proceeds on certain assumptions, on certain political judgment on the behaviour of other countries. So, I do not know what new point has been thrown up in this book which has not already been discussed. This was discussed in this House and Shri Chavan made a statement, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement and I cannot improve upon those statements.

Another point that has been urged, as has been pointed out by some other hon. Members opposite, is about the decision to take action in relation to the Chinese pickets; That also is not a new subject. I have gone through the earlier debates and I find that this matter has been gone into in considerable detail at that time. Prime Minister Nehru himself had clarified the position that if Government saw that aggression had been committed or certain parts of the country had been occupied, it was not only proper but it was their duty to see that that aggression was vacated. So, if Government at that time took a decision, they were the

best judges and they took that decision. Then, about the timing or about the actual details of the operation there, it was left primarily to the military Generals and military strategists. This is not a matter about which any controversy need be raised at the present moment. In the matter of exercise of political judgment, hindsight is something which is known to the whole world and many critics, many people who indulge in this type of analysis depend a great deal upon this hindsight. But one has to take into consideration the circumstances that might prevail at a particular moment and those who have got the responsibility to take decisions take decisions and face the consequences. They have explained to Parliament if those decisions were incorrect. It is not proper that again and again, after three, four or five years, whenever somebody raises a point, we go over the whole range without any purpose. So, I would appeal to hon. Members of this House that we should view it in the proper perspective and not be carried away by considerations of that nature. I am sorry that an interpretation by Members of the Communist Party opposite there of the action is based on these facts, which is not fully justified and an attempt really to make a special plea on behalf of the Chinese is something which should be very strongly resisted. This is not . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What was the plea on behalf of the Chinese? Nothing.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: They have said more than that. They have said that the important thing that has been established here is as to who started the war. That was the type of question that was posed and it is indeed a very unfair way of presentation, particularly when our national interests are involved. It is one thing to ask our Armed Forces to vacate

aggression and another to interpret that or even by implication to suggest that by this action we had started the war. I think it is a twist -m the circumstances, which is completely unjustified. All that I would like to say is this. I do not want to enter into an argument on that basis. I would appeal . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is what General Kaul has said. Ministers should take responsibility.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please listen to him. It is a good suggestion.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH. As a matter of fact, Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is a matter in which I would not like them even to commit themselves more and more and I do not want, therefore, to enter into an argument on that basis. But if they carefully scan their own speeches, I am sure that they may not like to repeat themselves and may not like to use this as an argument, because to say the least, this is not a correct presentation of the events and the sequence also has not been fairly presented.

Then, an important thing is what should we do in relation to a book of this type. Now, there have been very interesting comments, which you must have heard, from various sections of the House. So, my task has been greatly lightened. There have been strong views expressed: Take immediate action, arrest him under the DIR. Others say: Impeach him, interrogate him. Some others say: Court-martial him. Some hon. friends over here said that he has not done anything more than what a historian does and why should we bother ourselves too much with what he has done and what he has said? I am not surprised at the expression of these different opinions. It is quite natural. This is a presentation of facts relating to a particular period. Now, personally I can be a little objective, because I was not directly concerned. Although I was a member of the

282RS-

Government, I was not directly concerned either with military affairs or external affairs of that period. I therefore, can bring about . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will be objective when you become Charan Singh.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I assure you, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that I am always Swaran Singh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Charan Singh is the Chief Minister of U.P.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I am sorry, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that is a sort of reflection.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is reflection? I say when he becomes the Chief Minister of another State.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is capable of giving compliments and also hurling accusations . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No. Compliments only.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: All I can say is that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will be extremely disappointed if he has any feeling in any corner of his heart that I can become a Charan Singh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry for it.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am sorry for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, because this matter of creating conditions for inducing others to cross the floor is something which is not consistent with the rules of democracy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He should leave the discredited party. That is what I am saying.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): This is not right.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: T is really the spirit, this is really the motive with which all this presentation is made on this book. The object is clearly political. Even here the political atmosphere clouds the thinking of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He reads in this book crossing of floors and is trying every argument against the ruling party, painting a picture so as to pull down the leadership. This is the type of pastime in which he and other Members of the Opposition want to indulge. This is the direct in which they want to drag us. They are trying really to paint a distorted picture of the events. I do not know whether . . .

7 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to know . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, have patience. I am not yielding. So, it is from this political angle that they are trying to utilise this book. They are not interested in finding either the truth or untruth. They want really to malign the Congress leadership all the time and then also they want to drag others who might be associated with the Government at that time. This is their objective which we have to take . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No . . .

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: You cannot speak.' Leave it to us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That leadership was micky-mouse leadership.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Leave it to our patience. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is making a running commentary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That leadership was not a powerful leadership . . .

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: There is a limit to your interruptions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is a limit to your not understanding. I say the leadership was micky-mouse leadership.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sometimes I have a feeling that when a point is made which is inconvenient for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, he suddenly tries to interrupt and tries really to divert attention, but I can assure him that just as I cannot divert his line of thought, he cannot also succeed in that. What I am mentioning is that this political exploitation of a situation of that type is something which we have to resist and we will continue to resist. It is a book written by a former General and principally, as he said even yesterday in his press interview, when he talked to pressmen, he wanted to clarify his position and he wanted to explain certain things which had been said against him. So, we should also view this book in that perspective and in that background. May be in his anxiety to defend himself sometimes he has used material which he should not have used. Sometimes he has done things, which, to say the least, or things done in bad taste or not according to high traditions either of authorship or of a former General. Having said all that, still we should not take an extreme view of other side. To a certain extent, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to remind you that two hon. Members of the same Party, my friend, Shri Lokanath Misra and his senior colleague, Prof. Ruthnaswamy, both of them presented a picture which was directly opposed to each other. Prof. Ruthnaswamy has said that we should be very thankful, that he has done a great task, that he has exposed our unpreparedness, and so on; whereas Mr. Lokanath Misra says that he should be hanged, he should at once be arrested under the Defence of India Rules and he should be court-martialled. This shows that in a matter like this, when we are concerned-



ed with the evaluation of a book, there can be such a violent difference of opinion. What are we after? What is the objective of all this analysis? What is the point at which we are driving? It is quite simple to my mind. We are not called upon to prove or disprove the correctness or incorrectness of many things that might have happened. That is not important. I attach importance to this book in fact in relation to matters about which a great deal of reference has been made in it, namely, the NEFA affair and as to what are the lessons to be learnt. On that we have already taken corrective action. We have undertaken the probe already. General Henderson Brooke's report is there and after that a long debate took place here. A statement was made by Mr. Chavan and he had given all possible information that could be given on the basis of that report and he also assured the House that all corrective action in the matter of training, in the matter of equipment in the matter of strategy, in the matter of co-ordination, had been taken. So far as the corrective action is concerned, so far as the remedial measures are concerned, this august House has already been informed of all the action that required to be taken or had to be taken. Here is a General trying partly to defend himself, partly introducing all types of material sometimes full of sauce and sometimes full of pepper; in order to make it readable he has introduced a number of things. We have in a matter like this always to separate the non-essential from the really essential things; and from our point of view for the future also it is very necessary that certain guide-lines are accepted and adopted by others who might be similarly disposed to try their pen and to put down their thoughts in the form of either articles or books. The important thing in this connection is that whereas we do not mind them producing books of a historical nature— and even politically our views may be different, but everybody has got the freedom to express different poli-

tical views particularly after retirement— any information the leakage of which really comes within the mischief of the Official Secrets Act should not be given. Some hon. friends cautioned me that we should not take a technical view. I agree that we should not take too technical a view. For this reason this is a highly difficult and a very complicated matter. Some Members' have accused us by saying that we have taken too long in examining this. In a matter of this nature we have to be quite sure about adequate proof. As you know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, as a distinguished jurist and lawyer mere statement in a matter like this is not enough in a court of law. Evidence has to be adduced or documents or other things have to be produced in order to substantiate that thing. This is not a simple matter and no action can be taken in a hasty manner or a haphazard manner particularly when there is such a violent difference of opinion even amongst the hon. Members of this House sometimes belonging to the same party— some say take action and arrest him; others say give him an award or appreciate his services; others say the author is right. The doubts which are expressed by different sections of this House also get reflected in the thinking of those who have to take a final decision. So it is not a matter, Mr. Vice-Chairman, about which we can take a light decision. We have to go into all those matters and then take a final decision. On principle I accept what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said, although he said it in a very dramatic or very flashy language, that there is a relationship in parliamentary democracy between the political leadership and the members of the Services, whether they are Civil or Armed. It is for the political leadership to lay down the policy and it is for the members of the Services, Civil and Military, the Defence Forces, to carry out that policy. That is a principle that is well established. I cannot swear

## discussion

fSardar Swaran Singh.] that there have not been any lapses. That there have been no lapses I cannot swear. Wherever those lapses may be, they have to be pinpointed and corrective action taken. Sometimes even punitive action is taken. It is taken in several cases, and I know as a matter of fact that certain slipshod statements that are made are statements which are made against Government policy, or attitudes which are adopted are inconsistent with Government's instructions on a particular point. We take serious notice of those things. But these should be regarded as lapses. There is no doubt either in the mind of the political leadership or of the members of the permanent Services, both Civil and Defence, about the correct relationship, and it is one which is to be adopted and to be carefully pursued. I am very sorry that most of the speech of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was attuned to a tirade against certain General or Ambassador B. K. Nehru. I would strongly urge that the very democratic principle upon which he is laying such a great stress also enjoins upon every Member of this House, even the worst critic, to bear this in mind that those who are not here to defend themselves should not be attacked in this manner. The fire should be directed against the Government, that is the Minister of that time, rather than against individual Ambassadors or individual Generals. This is a practice which is inconsistent with parliamentary democracy under the cover of which he was trying to build his argument. (Interruption) Please, you should be patient.

Now, Sir, I would like briefly to go over some of the other important points that have been raised by other Members. I would like to say that the attitude that we have taken with regard to the publication of Henderson Brooke's Report continues to be the same as it was when Shri Chavan made the statement. I have given careful consideration to this matter.

I am conscious of the fact that there is a demand by different sections of the House that we should publish this report, but I am convinced that the time has not yet come for publishing this report or for placing it on the Table of the House.

A demand has been made that an enquiry should be made. There is no case for an enquiry and there is no point in pressing a demand of that nature.

I would like now to say that the speeches that have been made are of two broad categories. Some are highly critical of specific things of General Kaul; others are laudatory, others are lukewarm. All that I can say is I take note of all these various viewpoints that have been expressed. It is not for me to make any reference either laudatory or critical. So far as I am concerned, I have to confine myself to this objective, namely, if there is any thing that is thrown up which requires any careful consideration for future . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about the connection of the Army commanders with the foreign embassies?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: . . . I am ready to be benefited by anything that might be thrown up. At the same time, if the law has been transgressed and the legal advisers and those who are experts—and proper experts at that—feel that there is anything actionable the law will have its course. It is not my attitude either to take . . . (Interruptions) a light-hearted view of these things nor am I obsessed by any idea of witch-hunting. It is not my . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: . . . objective. So, I will in a very objective manner be guided by the advice that is given to me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about the connection between the commanders and the American Embassy?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: A j careful analysis of the various points . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Contact between the Army officers an'l the Ambassadors.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You please carry on.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Well, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will get all the replies only if he does not cut into my time

Now, about the contacts between the Generals and the foreign missions, I would like to say that on this point also we should not take too narrow a view. We must not forget that every important embassy has got military attaches who are members of their ambassadorial staff. We have <sup>x</sup> got our military attaches posted in other countries. So, even in military matters, it is not uncommon to have contacts to get information, t<sub>0</sub> h?ve contacts . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very unfair, we did not say that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): At least listen.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: With all my patience, I must say i^hat it is not fair on your part to intervene. You do not even permit me to finish. That is not proper.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you putting words into my mouth?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Because you are intervening, that is why I am putting them, because i+. is inconvenient . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chester Bowles is not a military man.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: When you raised points, I yielded. You for get that, .

The point is this. This is not such a matter in which there is no contact between the defence forces of one country and another. There are contacts at various levels, at the ambassadorial level and the like. I agree tha\* at the same time a great deal of caution has to be exercised with members of the foreign ambassadorial staff at the various levels. I take that jn the same category, whether Ambassador or the charge d' Affaires or the First Secretary, they are all members of the diplomatic corps—our diplomats abroad and diplomats of other countries here. But what is expected is that in all important matters, in a meeting of this type they take permission from the Government and then they are expected to report to the Government. Generally these reports are written or some notes are there; some report is made and some record I<sub>s</sub> kept. So that is the custom that is invariably followed. Gen. Kaul in his book has tried to cover himself by saying that he did take some permission. Now, we have to take it for what it is worth. I cannot go on investigating into all those matters. I cannot see Mr. Krishna Menon to find out from him whether he did give him any permission or not. But according to his own showing—he says—he did take some sort of a permission. Whether Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or other Members of this hon. House are satisfied or not, it is for them to Judge.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not for us, it is for you to be satisfied as the Defence Minister.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: So far as the happening of that time is concerned, it was for the Defence Minister of that time to be satisfied and afterwards if anything is thrown up, we see if it was a lapse. If it is actionable, certainly action can b? taken. If it is inconvenient, then he can say that it is inconvenient that is not liked . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did he enquire?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not give in.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): This is not the way, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is not the way to answer. Have they found out?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You must listen to him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point is this. That is how he takes it. He should find out. If he raises a point and I oppose it, you should help us because we are an aggrieved party, we being small in number. Suppose we answer this question in the other Assemblies ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): It is not question and answer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One question is whether he has found out whether Gen. Kaul sought permission and whether he reported that this should be recorded. He could have found out.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: But I do not know why he is really getting agitated over this. I have said clearly that for this no record of a written permission is available. He himself does not say that he has got any written permission, in his book. (Interruption) If he has taken no permission, as to why no permission was taken, then the best thing for him would be to ask Gen. Kaul why he did not take permission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is absurd.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Intervention is absurd; I say that this intervention, to say the least, is absurd.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot say like that. Why should I ask Gen. Kaul? I will ask the Defence Minister of the country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is not (lie way. In your speech you raised certain points. He is answering them. You cannot have a running commentary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not make a reflection because you are a very good Vice-Chairman. But don't you think that it is the duty of the Chair to help the Members to get proper answers from the Treasury Benches. When certain questions are posed to them pointedly? I am not to be told to go and ask Gen. Kaul. What sort of Minister is he? That is not the answer.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You listen to him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why should he ask me to go to Gen. Kaul? Why should he not ask Mr. Krishna Menon, his past colleague, and find out what happened?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Krishna Menon can also be asked? You know that he is not within my reach. He is probably nearer to you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is again ...

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should ask Mr. Krishna Menon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Krishna Menon has said publicly that no permission was sought. It is your duty now to ask him.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Between the words of Mr. Krishna Menon and of Gen. Kaul, I will personally accept Mr. Krishna Menon's words. He was my colleague.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good. Then punish him.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: He has said about an oral report. Is there a resume of that oral report?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The important thing is, what is the object of this dialogue? What is the object of this cross-examination? What is the object of throwing up these points? It is quite obvious—each one of us has got his own ideas about certain important persons, I do not grudge it. All of us have got certain things. (*Interruptions*) If anything comes up which they feel hits any individual who is their idol or whom they think is the best person, then they get upset and try to build up arguments. This is only how I can explain. Otherwise, there are only certain aspects of the book which are of some importance to us. I am not concerned with all the details or all the conversations that took place either between a general and some other general or between one general or some other body unless that is . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You should be concerned. Security is involved. As Defence Minister, is he not concerned with what conversation took place between a military officer like Gen. Kaul and a foreign embassy?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would leave the hon. Members of this House to judge as to whether Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is really interested in hearing the replies. I am sorry, I have never said that. But if now the questions of the other Members remain unreplied, they have, I think, - o thank Mr. Bhupesh Gupta because this type of running commentary and this type of questions on matters which are absolutely uncalled for, to say the least, are not the way of conducting a debate in either a dignified way or in a useful way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Lecture? I protest against this lecture. You answer the point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we feel very strongly about it.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I feel more strongly about this. What is this? There should be some limit to this. When I do not give way, no Member has got the right to stand up.

SARDAR RAGHBIR SINGH PANJHAZARI (Punjab): There is no quorum in the House, Sir.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am sorry, Sir, that I did want to refer to certain points. But it is vrsy late now and I do not want really to prolong this . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I have stated the Government's position quite clearly. We are not going to be dragged para by para, or page by page into the contents of this book. That is our attitude. It is an author's presentation. Wherever any matter of security or anything which is actionable or penal is involved, we will go into it. Otherwise, so far as the other aspects are concerned, they are before the world. There may be other versions; there may be other critics. I cannot contradict all that. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta goes on saying everyday, and he does not even permit me to contradict. He asks me to contradict or to reply to those things where his own interest is involved or his own particular . . . (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:  
You need not contradict.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-five minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 5th April, 1967.