

[Shri B. Bhagavati.]

of section 7 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Departments of Communications and Civil Aviation):—

- (i) Notification G.S.R. No. 1164, dated the 11th August, 1962, publishing the Indian Wireless Telegraphy (Experimental Service) Rules, 1962.
- (ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 1165, dated the 17th August, 1962, publishing the Indian Wireless Telegraphy (Demonstration Licence) Rules, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-484/62 for (i) and (ii).]

ORDER ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER  
ARTICLE 359 OF THE CONSTITUTION

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under clause (3) of article 359 of the Constitution, a copy of the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification G.S.R. No. 1464, dated the 3rd November, 1962, publishing an Order issued by the President under clause (1) of the said article. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-450/62.]

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE LIMITATION BILL, 1962

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA (Mysore): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law for the limitation of suits and other proceedings and for purposes connected therewith, be extended up to Friday, the 30th November, 1962."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE INDIAN MARINE INSURANCE BILL, 1959.

SHRI B. RAMAKRISHNA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to codify the law relating to marine insurance be extended up to Monday, the 11th March, 1963."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS RE  
PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY  
AND AGGRESSION BY CHINA

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Lal Bahadur will move two resolutions which we would take up together.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, with your permission I rise to move the two resolutions on the Agenda together. I shall read them out:—

1. "This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th October, 1962, under clause (1) of Article 352 of the Constitution."

2. "This House notes with deep regret that, in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful co-existence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces."

This House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our Motherland.

This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all-out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.

This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

Sir, we have just now mourned the loss of three of our distinguished public men. But before I say anything on the Resolution I would like to pay my respectful homage—and I think I can also say this on behalf of this House—to those officers and jawans who gave their lives on our frontiers. Our heartfelt sympathies prayer fully go to the bereaved families.

Sir, this special session of both Houses of Parliament is in itself an indication of the fact that a grave emergency has arisen in the country. Hon. Members are, I am sure, aware of the developments which have taken

a turn for the worse since September 8, 1962. The development has been so sudden that it has no doubt taken us and the whole country by surprise. It must not have been so in the case of China which has been preparing all these days for launching a massive attack on our country. The Peking and the Chinese Radio broadcasts and newspapers are carrying on a ceaseless and scurrillous propaganda against India and blaming us for intrusion into the Chinese territory. Now they have been speaking much about our intrusion into the Chinese territory on the eastern front. Sir, I do not want to go into the past history but what the Chinese have been telling the world is far from the truth and the facts are altogether otherwise. I shall, therefore, like to recount quickly what had happened during the last few years.

The House is aware that the Government of India was the first to accord recognition to and establish diplomatic relations with China when the People's Republic of China came into existence in October, 1949. India has throughout since then tried to keep the best of relations with them. But this declaration of good faith was responded to after some time, that is, in July 1954, by the Chinese with a protest against the presence of Indian border forces in Bara Hoti in Uttar Pradesh. This was the first time that the Government of China had laid claim to any part of Indian territory. It was after this that China began laying claims to large areas of India and started on a course of aggression and occupation of Indian territory in the Aksai Chin area of Ladakh since 1957.

You all remember how in September 1958 an Indian patrol was captured by the Chinese at Haji Langar, and then in October 1959 an Indian police party was attacked by the Chinese near Kongka La and suffered heavy casualties. At about the same time the Chinese forces in superior numbers advanced towards

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

Longju and captured it. Thereafter the Chinese troops progressively enlarged the area of aggression in Ladakh. But at that time no claim as such was made in regard to the MacMahon Line which is our boundary. It was as early as November 20, 1950 that our Prime Minister had declared in the Lok Sabha that the MacMahon Line was our boundary and we would not allow anybody to come across the boundary. This definite declaration of policy had never been questioned by the Chinese authorities. It was, however, in September, 1959 that Premier Chou En-lai for the first time wrote to our Prime Minister laying claim to over 50,000 sq. miles of Indian territory of which 36,000 sq. miles were in the N.E.F.A. region and about 13,000 sq. miles in the middle and western sectors of the Indian border.

After that a number of things have happened but I need not further go into them. At the instance of the Chinese Prime Minister a meeting between the two Prime Ministers was held in Delhi in November 1959. An Official Committee consisting of the representatives of both the countries was set up and they went into the border and boundary problems in great details. The official report was published in India but not in China. In China, however, it was published very recently; it was published only after about 15 months, i.e., sometime in May or June 1962. The Report makes it clear on the basis of a vast amount of evidence that the traditionally delimited boundary between the two countries is what has been in the Indian maps and that the Chinese claims are totally unwarranted. Such evidence as the Chinese produced during the talks was scant and often mutually contradictory. Many of the Chinese documents in fact prove the Indian case. The Government of India, however, did not give up their efforts to resolve the differences by peaceful means. In their note dated 14th May, 1962 they again repeated the proposal

made in the Prime Minister's letter dated 16th November 1959 to Mr. Chou En-lai but the Chinese again in their reply dated 2nd June, 1962 not only rejected the proposal but adopted a threatening and aggressive attitude which could only serve to increase the danger of actual conflict. Well, the correspondence continued. In fact, the Chinese Government formally proposed in their note dated September 13, 1962 that the two Governments appoint representatives to start discussions from October 15 about the western sector first in Peking and then in Delhi, alternatively. Just about that very time the Chinese forces suddenly crossed the Thagla Ridge in the eastern sector of the Indian boundary on 8th September, 1962. This naturally came as a bolt from the blue and left no alternative for the Government but to resist aggression with all their strength.

Well, we have had a good deal of experience of the Chinese on the western front. Their technique has been to build roads, to improve means of communication and then advance further and establish check-posts. The House is aware that they had been doing this in the western sector and we had a number of clashes at different check-posts in that area. However, as I have said, when they started putting up posts and establishing posts on the eastern front or in the eastern sector, Government had to make up its mind. All of a sudden, as I said just now, they crossed the Thagla Ridge which is our frontier line and what we treat and accept as the MacMahon Line. Thagla Ridge is just the natural geographical division between Chinese territory and Indian territory, because watershed is generally considered to be the best point of distinction between one country and the other. And Thagla Ridge is our watershed. Therefore we have always said and the Chinese had accepted that the MacMahon Line is the real frontier of India. But, as I said, they crossed the Thagla Ridge

and came into a small valley where there is a small river. They crossed the river and beyond the river they established a few check-posts. It was obvious that we could not start negotiations or talks with them at that moment. As I said, the past experience made us to think and believe that there was no time for waiting and as they had crossed into our territory, the only course left open for the Government was to resist them and drive them back. We asked our troops which were there in our check-posts to resist them, which they did. There were some casualties mainly on the Chinese side. Then the Chinese tried to make further advances and they were trying to remove our forces which were posted there, which resulted in a further clash and in which again the Chinese suffered heavy casualties. It is said the number was about 100. Well, all this happened and we felt that perhaps the Chinese would realise that India means business and India does not want its borders to be attacked and our territories occupied and better sense would prevail among the Chinese. But that was impossible and I think it was wrong to have thought so in so far as China was concerned. Of course, they had one great advantage. In Tibet they had amassed enormous troops and forces. Up till now there have been border skirmishes and our detachments in those areas were small, because generally we tried to protect our borders by our check-posts and by our small number of troops. But the Chinese, as I said, had made earlier preparations. Of course, Tibet—Lhasa—is far-off. Yet all of a sudden on the 20th of October they made an attack, an unprecedented attack. Many thousands of Chinese troops collected near the Thagla Ridge and then they pressed forward. They removed all our check-posts in the valley and proceeded towards Dhola Post. Dhola Post is one of our very important points where we had a larger number of troops and Dhola Post was built with a view to strengthening our check-posts which were

established in the forward area. However, as I said, when they came in thousands and with deadlier weapons, it is true that we were not in a position to resist them or to fight them successfully. The Chinese forces came up to Dhola Post, captured it and then tried to advance further towards Tawang. Our forces fully realised the grave situation and felt that it might not be possible for them to fight in Tawang and they made a strategic move, evacuated from Tawang and went on to Se La Pass. Se La Pass was a more strategic position from where we could fight the enemy. When our forces went out of Tawang, of course, naturally, Tawang was captured by the Chinese. Now we are fighting them near Se La Pass as the House is aware. The Chinese are, in a way, carrying on a three-pronged fight. One is as I said, on this front, the Tawang or Jang front, the other in the Siang and Subansiri Division and the third is the area called Lohit area and we are fighting there near Walong. This is a three-pronged fight and the main battle is going on near Se La Pass and Walong. For the last few days, the Indian forces have established themselves in both Walong as well as Se La Pass with redoubled strength and they have been able to repulse the Chinese whenever they have made an attempt to advance further, both in Walong as well as at Se La Pass. I had an occasion to go to Tezpur and I must say that it was one of the happiest days in my life to have met the Corps Commander, the Brigadier and other officers who are posted there and who are in charge of that front. Their determination and courage gave me a new life altogether and I was amazed to see the Brigadier who had just returned from Se La Pass and the way he talked to me and the determination he showed. It is not an easy matter to travel from Se La Pass to Tezpur, to come back from a height of 10,000 feet or 12,000 feet or 14,000 feet to the plains and carry on the work in a normal way. It is really something remarkable. The Corps

[Shri B. Bhagavati.]

Commander and other officers were very confident that they would be able to stop the Chinese at those points. Of course arms and equipments were to be sent, more arms and equipment, more forces and that also was not an easy job because we had not adequate means of communication. Most of the things formerly we were sending through air by transport planes and we did suffer losses also on account of that because some of those things either fell in deep valley or sometimes, I do not know, they might even have been captured by our opponents and taken away. Still, as I said, when I went to Tezpur a few days before, from 24th or 25th or even a few days earlier and then later, the way our army had tried to reinforce itself successfully is indeed a very good job done. I do not want to make either our troops or the Members of this House take a complacent view of things. Our task is enormous and it is quite clear that the Chinese must also be building up their own strength and they will do so. However we cannot also feel nervous about it. We must have the courage and determination to face them and, of course, one cannot predict about these things but I have no manner of doubt that our officers in that area and our Jawans will put up a good show and produce good results.

The House is aware also that while making an attack on the Eastern front, the Chinese are not keeping quiet on the Western front. You are aware that they have launched heavy attacks on the Western border and have occupied fresh territories. They have advanced further and the latest report is that they are somewhere near Chusul. They are advancing from other directions also and they have captured Demchok. I do not want to go into details. It is a delicate matter also and especially at this juncture, it is advisable that we should not name places, and the points where we want to put up heavy resistance but I can only tell

the House that our resistance continues and it has to continue and will continue.

It might be said that we were caught napping whereas the Chinese had made such intensive preparations. We must accept, as I said in the beginning, that we have had a number of setbacks both on the Eastern front as well as on the Western front but I do think that the House is in a position to appreciate the way we have been trying to manage the affairs of the country. It is known to us and to the world at large that India is pledged to peace and we had not the faintest notion of even going an inch beyond our territory. We have no aggressive designs and it is much more important for us, after having attained our freedom after centuries, to try to develop our country, to remove the poverty and misery of our people. I know that this House and the whole country have been fully supporting the idea that India should not spend a heavy proportion of her budget on the army or on the armed forces. We, of course, could have done that. But then it was not wrong to think that when this country which had no aggressive intentions or designs at all, will be allowed to live in peace. What would have been the position of our country if during the last ten or fifteen years, we had spent 60 per cent. or 70 per cent of our budget in building up our armed forces or building up a strong military machine? I do not say that we have been able to achieve much on the economic front or on the industrial front, that we have done a lot. That is so because our ambitions are high and our problems are enormous. Therefore, even if we have not been able to achieve much, yet there was no alternative for a democratic form of government but to help in building up the economic position of the country, in improving the lot of the millions of our people. Therefore, we find ourselves outnumbered by the Chinese. Well, we cannot accuse any other country. They can adopt their

own policy. But what is the economic condition of China? We have had reports, not one but many, of famine conditions, of acute poverty, of near starvation, not of thousands, but of lakhs. Yet the Chinese have been building up their massive strength, to frighten not only India, but to frighten the whole of Asia. They thought that proper and their form of Government is such that they are not answerable to the people. They can get on, having a centralised form of government or absolute dictatorship. We may talk of parties, but there is hardly any other party there. There is only one party and it is the party which dominates and rules the country. The people have just to function on orders issued by the government and hardly there is much of that kind of voluntary spirit which we have in a democratic set-up. It is in this context that I feel that if we did not adopt the Chinese tactics or technique, well, it was not bad. In fact, it was the right thing to have decided to build up the country first economically, remove un-employment, remove poverty and help our people to go out of the misery which they had to face during the last century or more. Now of course, we are faced with this problem and I do not think that any other country in the world would have done what China has done. Of that I am absolutely certain. Pakistan is there. Often Pakistan is against us and they are very angry with us and militarily also they have built up their country. There are many border skirmishes; border conflicts, as I said. Yet none of these border conflicts has developed into a war. As I said, I do not think any country in the world except China, would have attacked India in this manner. If it is treachery, what can be done? After all, treachery is not to be met by treachery. It is highly regrettable, of course. When they said "Indi-Chini Bhai Bhai" we also responded. I am told that even near Dhola Post, they raised this cry of "Indi-Chini Bhai Bhai" and tried to tempt our officers to side with them. Of course, our officers and our

men, our jawans, later replied to them with bullets and with strong resistance. So as I said, if there is treachery, well, the only alternative left for our country is to deal with that treachery with firmness. We are now taking steps, and we have taken steps, to build up our strength on all those fronts. Our jawans have shown wonderful example of valour and courage. They have kept up the old Indian tradition of fighting to the end and not giving way. I do not want to relate those stories, because I do not want to take the time of the House, but some of the things I heard in Tezpur will go down in history as glorious examples of how our Indian soldiers met aggression and fought to the end and fought to the last.

Sir, I would like to say a word more. There is much talk of casualties. Casualties were heavy, it is true. The Prime Minister himself accepted it and gave the figures. But sometimes they are highly exaggerated and they are not quite correct. The Prime Minister has said only the other day—yesterday—that the figure was between 2,000 and 2,500. But as he said yesterday, about 1,000 or 1,200 or near about 1,500, are coming back. Hon. Members may be aware that when our men met the first massive attack on October 20th on the Dhola Post, the Chinese were in such large numbers and as I said, they had heavier weapons with them, and they encircled the whole of the Dhola Post and isolated our forces there from other parts. The result was that whatever battalions we had were encircled and it was not possible for them at that moment to move out. It was not known that a little later the stragglers who were coming will be able to tell us what actually happened. More than a thousand have come via different parts of that area and are reaching Tezpur. But, Sir, of course if a single soldier dies it is a matter of great sorrow and pain to us. Still, a man like me, who might perhaps be considered to be a somewhat peaceful person, does not

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

want to cry or weep when there are casualties on the war front. We must prevent it; we must check it; we must reduce it but what is this business, in a way, of demoralising our forces who are fighting on the front, of talking all the time that troops vanished, that troops were killed and the responsibility and blame being thrown either on the Commanders and the Generals or on the Government? After all, it is exchange of bullets. Exchange of bullets is not like exchange of namaskars or good wishes. I would, therefore, Sir, beg the House as well as our friends outside that the least—of course criticism is not denied—we criticise this thing the better it would be.

As you are aware, an emergency has been declared and an ordinance has been issued. The Government will have to come up with a Bill in order to convert the ordinance into an Act. I do not want to take the time of the House at this present moment to deal with the provisions of the ordinance. The Proclamation that a grave emergency exists which is before the House for approval was issued because the crisis was serious enough to justify the declaration of a state of emergency and the assumption by the Government of the necessary legal powers to deal with it. The Defence of India Ordinance, 1962, which was promulgated on 26th October 1962 in consequence of the declaration of emergency provides for special measures to ensure public safety and interest, the defence of India and civil defence. The Ordinance provides for framing rules by the Central Government for securing the defence of India, civil defence, public safety, maintenance of public order, for the efficient conduct of military operations and for maintaining supplies and services essential to the life of the community. It also empowers the Central Government to confer powers and impose duties upon the State Governments or their respective officers and authorities regarding various matters irrespective

of whether the power to legislate in regard to them vests in the Central or the State legislatures or both. Rules under the Ordinance known as the Defence of India Rules, 1962, have been issued. The purpose of the action taken is to streamline the entire apparatus of administration and legislation for achieving the objective dictated by the emergency. Needless to add that the House and the country fully realise the importance and need for this kind of Proclamation and arming the Government with the necessary powers. In fact, no one felt concerned over it as far as I know, and the reaction has been entirely to the contrary. It has been to my knowledge welcomed throughout the country. When I went to Assam, the same morning this Proclamation was announced and published in the Gazette and the people of Assam, when they read it, felt very satisfied. In fact, many people came to me and said that they were expecting this and that in fact it had been delayed. They said that they now felt that the Government was really serious about the situation. I am sure that this House will fully uphold the Proclamation of emergency and the issuing of the Ordinance.

I have said something so far about our armed forces who are trying to protect our frontiers and borders. But we have to lend our support to our armed forces—the people of the country—and if our morale is high, the morale of the armed forces will also remain high. In fact—I need not mention this—when I asked the corps Commander in Tezpur to take me to Se La pass he was willing to take me there. Of course I should not talk about myself. I was really keen to go, whatever the transport difficulties, etc. He said, 'It is your life; you may take the risk. I am prepared to take you there because our jawans will feel happy and will be encouraged and inspired.' So it is essential and it is much more important that the morale of our people remains high. And I know how the Prime Minister's first broadcast was received in the

country. Those words still ring in our ears and I do not know how to express our gratitude to our people for the magnificent manner in which they responded to the call. There are offers of cash, gold, ornaments and of many other commodities.

HON. MEMBERS: And blood.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Of course blood for blood bank; it is something different, but blood in the sense that young men, the youth of our country, are coming forward to offer themselves to go to the front. In fact, the work of recruitment has now become somewhat difficult. Hundreds and thousands are coming and waiting in queues and it is really a magnificent sight to see the temper of our people. I wish that this spirit is maintained and preserved and continued. I personally think that we may have to curtail our plans in different directions. Curtailment means not spending that amount but we may have to change our priorities. Of course production is very important and production has been carried on with redoubled strength, with much greater energy with the fullest support and co-operation of our workers. But the production will have to be geared to the needs of the present-day situation, to the needs of our army, to the needs of strengthening our defence forces. I, therefore, feel that we will have to be ready to make some sacrifices, to undergo some suffering and we may have to resort to austerity in different directions. Except for food-grains, clothing and other bare necessities of life, I think we should be prepared to forgo other things and help our country in building up its strength and finding the necessary resources.

In this hour of crisis it is a great encouragement to us to feel that we are not alone and that we have the sympathy and support of a very large number of friendly countries. So far about forty countries have lent their support, have written to our Prime

Minister, and they have accepted the fact that there was aggression on India and that it was wrong for China to have adopted that course. There is perhaps only one country, Albania, which has lent its support to China unequivocally. I might say that we are naturally grateful to those countries that are so readily giving us much-needed material help including equipment without any strict insistence on preconditions.

We have also to put a united front and fight shoulder to shoulder in this hour of crisis. The Chinese are trying to create confusion by making offers for negotiation and peaceful approach. They offered on 24th October, 1962 to withdraw twenty kilometres from what they called the line of actual control. This offer to withdraw twenty kilometres, after having advanced thirty to forty kilometres into Indian territory, on condition that India also similarly withdraws twenty kilometres back from this position, should deceive nobody. Subsequently they clarified what they meant by the line of actual control was roughly the MacMahon Line in the eastern sector—mark the words roughly the MacMahon Line in the eastern sector—and then, mark the words, 'the traditional and customary line' as claimed by the Chinese in the western sector. Since their demands keep on constantly varying and ever expanding, it is difficult to know exactly what they mean by the 'traditional and customary' line. Since they have now proceeded to occupy almost all this area, they evidently do not intend to withdraw from there. Needless to say that it is impossible to consider such a fantastic proposal. In spite of this, the Government of India expressed their willingness to undertake talks and discussions provided the Chinese forces withdrew along the boundary at least to the position where they were prior to the 8th September, 1962 and the situation prevailing at that time was restored. May I say that if the Chinese Government is really sincere in its professions of peace they should have no objection in agreeing to this



[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

arrangement? I must make it clear that there can be no talks as long as the aggression continues so that they are able to reap the fruits of aggression. We keep the door always open, but we cannot halt our resistance. We have had enough experience of the Chinese behaviour and their pattern of struggle. Our soldiers are resisting the aggression with great heroism and, as I said, they have written glorious pages of Indian history. We cannot betray them. I know that each and every young man and woman of this country is wholly behind them and they are prepared to sacrifice their lives if there is need for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Old also.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: However, I am sure that the situation will never be so desperate and that our Forces with the support of our people will be able to repel the aggressor and safeguard our country, so that the Indian people may live as a free nation. India has become one. There are no separate States now. All the Chief Ministers, who assembled recently in Delhi, have dedicated themselves, with a grim resolve, to fight back the aggressor and they have placed themselves at the disposal of the Prime Minister. Under the leadership of our Prime Minister we also should resolve to go ahead and meet the challenge of a powerful and ruthless aggressor. There can be but one outcome; our country is bound to emerge victorious.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): May I request that we stand up for a minute to pay our homage to those who have sacrificed their lives at our borders?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

[Hon. Members then stood in silence for one minute.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are nine amendments to Resolution No. 2,

which may be moved at this stage without any speech. They are by Shri Gaure Murahari, Shri Anand Chand, Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha, Shri A. D. Mani and Shri Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

1. "That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

'and not lay down arms till this is achieved.'"

2. "That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"This House resolves that India is committed to a Free Tibet, only with whom the MacMahon Line can serve as our boundary. The boundary with China can only be North of Kailash Manasarovar and East flowing Brahmaputra.'"

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): Sir, I move:

3. "That after the first paragraph of the Resolution, the following new paragraph be added, namely:—

"This House further notes with regret that the Government of India and more especially the Defence Ministry have exhibited complete lack of foresight and failed to take adequate steps to meet the threat of Chinese aggression which the latter have constantly posed to our country since their refusal to accept our well defined boundaries in NEFA and Ladakh.'"

4. "That in the fourth paragraph of the Resolution, after the words 'friendly countries' the words 'more especially the United States of America and the United Kingdom along with a majority of the Commonwealth Nations' be inserted"

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA  
(Bihar): Sir, I move:

5. "That in the second paragraph of the Resolution, after the words 'This House', the words 'apologises to the nation for the unpreparedness on the part of the Government to defend our frontier resulting from the policy of trust reposed in Communist China in total disregard of even the then prevailing facts and realities, and' be inserted."

(The amendment also stood in the names of Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy, Prof. Mukut Behari Lal, Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Faridul Haq Ansari, Shri R. P. Sinha, Shri Niranjan Singh, Shri Rohit M. Dave and Shri R. S. Khandekar.)

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move:

6. "That in the first paragraph of the Resolution, in line 8, after the words 'has committed aggression' the words 'by violating India's northern frontiers as demarcated by the MacMahon Line and the traditional boundaries of the Ladakh region,' be inserted".

7. "That after the first paragraph of the Resolution, the following be inserted, namely:—

"This House further regrets that by their naked aggression the People's Government of China have violated International Law and practices and undermined world peace and security."

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Sir, I move:

8. "That at the end of the second paragraph of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

'and regrets the unpreparedness of the Government to defend the frontiers of India against aggression and invasion.'

9. "That for the fourth paragraph of the Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House gratefully acknowledges and welcomes the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries, notably the U.S.A., U.K. and Canada in this grim hour of struggle against aggression and massive invasion, and trusts that Government will take steps to secure massive support from all friendly countries."

The questions were proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We meet again at 2.30.

The House adjourned for lunch at ten minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr Chairman, may I at the outset pay the respectful homage of our Group in this House to the men and officers of our Armed Forces who have made the supreme sacrifice in defending our frontiers and the honour and integrity of our country? The story of their bravery and sacrifice is yet to be fully told, but we cannot but record our deep appreciation of the manner in which they have held aloft the banner of our Motherland. Fighting against overwhelming manpower and firepower, our jawans and their officers have displayed their flaming patriotism and their irrepressible courage. In their martyrdom once again it has been demonstrated that the honour and integrity of our country are not going to be bartered away or surrendered. Permit me also on this occasion to send our deep sympathies and condolences to the bereaved

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]  
families of our martyrs on the frontiers. We also fervently wish that those men and officers who have been injured will soon recover.

The unity and resolve of the entire nation to face the Chinese aggression is perhaps the greatest tribute to the heroism and sacrifice of India's sons in soldiers' uniforms. The nation's abundant best wishes go to these men and officers who are fighting so valiantly to defend our country and to regain the territories that have been lost as a result of the recent Chinese aggression.

Sir, the nation is now in the midst of a grave situation face to face with the challenge to its territorial integrity and its honour. This has forced upon us the state of emergency and compelled us to direct our energies to the maximum possible extent so that India's honour and integrity are upheld at all costs. It is a tragedy that the Indian Republic and its Government which have been pursuing a policy of peace and tirelessly working for friendship among nations for the promotion of peaceful co-existence should have today been subjected to this open aggression.

The border dispute between India and China arose about three years ago. We have discussed in this House many a time various aspects of this dispute as the developments took place. I need not go into all that past history and recall what had already been said by the hon'ble Members of this House. I think we are now dealing with a situation the like of which perhaps many in this House never anticipated or expected. I fully agree with the Prime Minister that the crossing of the MacMahon Line by the Chinese forces was quantitatively and qualitatively a new development. Let alone the earlier period, even during the last three years, time and again the Chinese Government has given an assurance both in writing and otherwise that it would not cross the MacMahon Line. Today not only have

they crossed the MacMahon Line but they are in occupation of large parts of India's territory to the south of that line. This is an open aggression. We are shocked at the arguments that have been given by the Chinese side to justify the crossing of the MacMahon Line and the wanton violation of the solemn pledge given to our country. It is simply fantastic on their part to say that the Chinese forces had to cross the MacMahon Line in order to prevent what they falsely call the aggressive actions of the Indian forces to the north of the MacMahon Line. I repudiate this charge and allegation. I repudiate the charge that the Indian troops have crossed the MacMahon Line to the north. The military operations have since proved the hollowness of this argument. Anyhow, an act of aggression so patent and unabashed cannot be covered by such fatuous arguments. I think in this matter the Chinese side is doing less than justice to our commonsense.

Simultaneously with the large-scale military offensive in the south of the MacMahon Line, they have also launched an offensive in the Ladakh sector. All these have enlarged the conflict not only militarily but even otherwise.

What is more, this aggression took place at a time when the representatives of the Government of India were getting ready to meet the representatives of the Chinese Government for talks in regard to the border question and for paving the way for its solution through peaceful negotiations. The Prime Minister is right when he said that the aggression came to us as a thunderbolt. This is surely not how a constructive, peaceable gesture on the part of India should have been met by the Chinese side. The aggressive action on the part of China contradicts all their protestations about peaceful negotiations. It is surprising that even today the Chinese side have not realised that they must vacate aggression and restore the position that existed, before the 8th of September. We are disturbed to read reports about further concentration of the Chinese

troops both in the MacMahon Line area and in the Western sector. I may frankly tell that the only right and honourable course for the Chinese side is to make a right about turn and return to the positions where they were before the 8th of September.

The Chinese aggression has rightly roused the indignation of the entire Indian people. The manifold barriers of party, region and other affiliations which divide our people have as far as this issue is concerned simply disappeared. The nation has risen as one man to meet the challenge. We fully share the just patriotic indignation of our people. It would be the greatest folly on any one's part to imagine that a great nation like India can be intimidated, humbled and humiliated. India has not fought for long years and won her national independence to see it trampled underfoot on her frontiers. We have not become a free nation to have our freedom thus attacked and menaced. Hence along with the entire nation, our Party joins hands with all patriotic people and stands behind the Prime Minister's appeal for national unity in defence of the country.

The national defence is the supreme task of the hour. It is a sacred task which calls for sacrifice, unity and dedication. So long as China maintains its present posture and refuses to see the way of reason, so long as she persists in the aggression and occupies India's territory, all-out efforts for the defence of the Motherland naturally remain the crucial and central task. Defence efforts mean the efforts not only on the frontiers but also in the rear. Everything must be done to improve the fighting capacity of our Armed Forces. The needs of equipment and other needs must receive the topmost priority. Let it not be said that when they were fighting on the mountains with so much courage and spilling their warm blood, we who live in the rear did not rise equal to the occasion. We are sure, now that the Prime Minister himself is in charge of national defence, every step will be taken to im-

prove the position of our men and officers on the frontiers and meet all their needs. At this testing moment, the Prime Minister, if I may say so, symbolises the will and resolve of the entire nation.

It is not for me here to go into the details as to what should be done in the rear. It is for the Government to place the proposals and plans and call upon the people to do everything that is needed to step up our production and to bring about preparedness in every way. The response to the National Defence Fund and in many other ways has already demonstrated the unconquerable spirit and will of our people, their readiness to meet the challenge with all the courage they can command. In the coming weeks we shall no doubt see the further unfolding of the saga of popular initiative and enthusiasm. It is the task of the leadership to gather them together and to direct them into right channels. In this connection I wish to draw the attention of the House to the manner in which the working people—workers, peasants and others, and office employees—despite their many sufferings, have responded to the Prime Minister's call. The nation has indeed been awakened as never before in recent years.

Whatever may be the temporary reverses or setbacks we are confident that the lost territories will be regained and our national flag shall fly where our frontier lies. Anything else is an impossibility and is inconceivable.

Let it not be thought by our friends abroad that this recourse to arms by India was what she really wanted. India has been forced to take up arms, specially by the recent Chinese aggression. What else could she do when she saw the Chinese forces coming down the mountains into the sacred soil of our country? Surely no nation which is not morally or physically ruined can be expected to allow such a thing to pass unchallenged and unencountered.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

We appreciate the efforts of the friendly countries and Governments to end the present conflict and pave the way to negotiations. This is certainly what should be their basic approach. But we would expect them and indeed all peace-loving forces to exert their influence and moral power in order to bring about the cessation of hostilities. That way is to impress upon the Chinese side to withdraw their forces at least to the position which they occupied before they started the military operations on the 8th of September. Let the moral weight of the world public opinion assert itself in this manner to make the Chinese authorities retrace their steps and make them accept the Government of India's very reasonable proposals—I repeat very reasonable proposals. I have in mind the proposal with regard to the 8th of September position.

In this connection may I call what our esteemed President said on October 14? He said, "Much to our sorrow and much against our will, we are obliged to take part in this conflict. We hope that the Chinese, even at this late date, will withdraw to where they were before September 8, bring about a termination of hostilities and produce a climate wherein it will be possible to think of other things." This is a proposal which came from the highest in the land, a man of extraordinary brilliance and distinction, and has since been reiterated in more than one official pronouncements by the Government of India. Only yesterday the Prime Minister himself referred to this proposal at the Congress Parliamentary Party meeting. It passes our comprehension why the Chinese side should not have responded positively to this proposal and indeed accepted it. It is not enough merely to say that one is for negotiations. It has become absolutely essential and desperately urgent to match this profession and protestation with concrete practical deeds. So far the Chinese side has shown none.

It is no good whatsoever to go on repeating the proposals that were made by China on the 24th of October. No negotiation can start by compromising the dignity and honour of our country, or by making it look as if aggression pays. India's proposal is that India must at once get back what belongs to her and has been occupied as a result of the recent military operations. Let China at least get back to the north of the MacMahon Line in terms of the Government of India's proposal regarding the 8th September position. Let China give up the position which she has taken recently through military operations in the Ladakh sector. This will be a constructive approach and, we hope, will bring to an end the present hostilities and open the way to negotiations.

It is surprising that the Chinese authorities think that the acceptance of India's proposal would be a surrender to India's military might. Nothing could be a more absurd argument in the situation either in point of logic or in point of fact. If I may say so, the show of might is rather on the side of China, and the Chinese authorities will do well if they relax a little from this position. However, as far as the negotiations are concerned, naturally we leave it to the Prime Minister to decide when such negotiations can be undertaken consistent with the dignity and honour of the country. We totally repudiate the Chinese accusation that Prime Minister Nehru does not want negotiations, or he wants a military solution of the problem. The sooner the Chinese side has an objective and correct understanding of the sincerity of the positions of the Prime Minister in this matter, the better for all concerned.

The people and the Government of India are fully conscious of the terrible implications of a full-scale war between the two big powers. It is also clear that the continuation of this conflict will disrupt Afro-Asian solidarity, weaken the common struggle against imperialism and for

national independence and will harm the cause of world peace. Is it to be believed by anyone that Prime Minister Nehru and the people of India, who have all these years striven hard to uphold the principles of peace and peaceful co-existence for the sake of humanity, would like to abandon them today? Not at all. Hence, both the Government of India and the people are too anxious to avoid a major conflagration. But then they cannot be expected to surrender to aggression. Never will India surrender. This should be understood. Aggressive actions run counter to these principles of peace, independence and brotherliness among nations.

May I now say a word or two about the totally wrong, unobjective and hence untruthful evaluation of Prime Minister Nehru by the Chinese authorities. We are shocked that the Chinese radio and press are calling Prime Minister Nehru an agent of U.S. imperialism, expansionist, tool of U.S. imperialism, etc. Since when he became a U.S. agent? Since when he became an expansionist? When the Panchsheel was signed in 1954, and the Bandung Conference took place in 1955, the Chinese had exactly the opposite things to say in praise of Prime Minister Nehru. At that time they were of course telling the truth. What has happened since then? In the years that have followed the signing of the Panchsheel, and the Bandung Conference, Prime Minister Nehru has played an even greater part in upholding the cause of world peace, in supporting the liberation struggles against imperialism. His voice has been heard in championing such causes not only on the floor of this Parliament but also from the forum of the United Nations Organization. Indeed, under his able leadership, as a champion of peace and non-alignment, our country has played such a remarkable, constructive part for safeguarding world peace and against colonialism. Did he not stand up against aggression in Egypt? Did he not acclaim the Cuban revolution? Did he not support and

recognise the Algerian freedom movement? Did he not extend full throated support to the Congolese people and the people of Angola? Did he not liberate Goa defying the anger of imperialist quarters and Portuguese imperialism? Is he not even today supporting the cause of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations while some others are opposing it? Is he not maintaining good and friendly relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as well as with the non-aligned newly liberated nations? Why then is he so maligned and attacked? We totally repudiate this politically wrong and otherwise harmful propaganda by China? This does not certainly help to improve the situation. Today the newly liberated non-aligned nations are a big progressive force in the world. They are playing a great historic role, and how can you explain that role if you leave out India? In the forefront of the camp of peace-loving and non-aligned nations, playing a constructive role for the sake of peace and freedom, India occupies clearly the first place and we are proud of it. And is this position of India imaginable today without the role and leadership of Prime Minister Nehru?

May I mention that the progressive people the world over do not share the view of the Chinese in regard to Prime Minister Nehru? On the contrary, they acknowledge with profound respect and gratitude the constructive part Prime Minister Nehru has been playing in the international arena today. The sooner the Chinese side returns to truth and objectivity in regard to the assessment of Prime Minister Nehru and his Government, the better for them and for all those who are interested in strengthening the camp of peace and freedom. Normal relations with India can never be restored on the basis of this totally wrong assessment.

It is unfortunate that on the home front some people are trying to exploit the grave situation to attack and undermine the policy of non-align-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

ment and peace and foment war hysteria. Taking the Chinese aggression and the national emergency as if it is a godsend, the reactionary forces are trying to drag India into the imperialist camp. Once again, the non-alignment policy which has brought India glory and honour is under fire. We congratulate the Prime Minister that he has again reiterated India's firm adherence to this policy. He can count on the support of all patriotic and right-minded people within the country and the blessings of all humanity abroad. By selling the nation's independence at one counter, you cannot defend it in another place. Such has been the experience of contemporary history. The policy of non-alignment is not merely a question of the relation of India with other States. It is a question of our independence, our dignity and of our moral stature in this world of today. We have to uphold it, while at the same time fighting and striving for regaining what we have lost on the frontier. The policy of non-alignment and peace adds new force to our case against China.

I may mention here that the mistaken attitude and the wrong actions of the Chinese Government have done a great damage to the cause of peace and progress and they have strengthened forces of extreme reaction within the country and brought new opportunities for imperialism. That is why we say China must retrace its steps in the larger interests of peace and progress as well.

Our Party has pledged itself to participate fully in all activities for the promotion of national unity, defence and strengthening of the morale of the people. In many States our comrades are already taking their posts and sharing the responsibilities in this hour of difficulty. It is a question of principle for us as citizens of India, as sons and daughters of our motherland. Whatever may be the provocation from any quarter, we propose unflinchingly to play our part

along with the rest of our people in fulfilling the assignments the Prime Minister's call embodies. We only hope that while taking practical steps or making arrangements, the Prime Minister's call for unity will be borne in mind. Unity cannot be built on the basis of pettiness or prejudices or by trying to take narrow sectarian political advantage out of the situation.

It is the common experience that difficulties such as these are sought to be exploited by some anti-social people in order to earn excessive profits by hoarding, profiteering, etc. We hope the Prime Minister's directive to take stern measures against them will be implemented both by the Centre and the State Governments. Vested interests cannot be allowed, come what may, to carry on their profiteering when the people on the frontier are fighting and men in the factories and fields are summoned to toil hard. It will be legitimate to expect that in this situation nothing will be done to needlessly hit the material interests of the working people and add to their economic burdens. The working people will make their contribution through their precious possession, that is, their toil. Let the rich make their contribution through their accumulated resources. We hope all legislative and other measures which are likely to hit the masses will be withdrawn.

We have noted with great satisfaction the Prime Minister's condemnation of certain violent actions indulged in against our Party. The reactionaries are trying to misuse the popular indignation of our people against the Chinese aggression in order to rouse their feelings and frenzy against our Party. And yet, they pretend that they are responding to the Prime Minister's call for unity. When the security of our motherland is at stake, when the lives of thousands of our soldiers are in great peril, it is not a question of the safety of a few Communists or their security or their office that we propose to stress much

today here. This, of course, will have to be ensured and their rights will have to be guaranteed. But what we must stress today and build up is the unity of the nation so that the security of our country is ensured, because with that security every security lasts and with the disappearance of this security every security breaks and falls. These misguided actions of violence, however they may please certain people, are a clear disruption of the national unity and defiance of the Prime Minister's call. I think everything will be done to prevent such disruptive activities gaining the upper hand. We know we have conflicts and quarrels as between parties and ideologies. But this is not the time to hit each other in this manner. Those who are itching to strike down the Communists, taking advantage of the national emergency, will be doing good to themselves and the country if they will kindly postpone this assault on us till the problems with China are solved and the territorial integrity and the honour of our country are placed on secure and invincible foundations. This is no time for seeking narrow group and narrow party interest, no time for gaining political advantage by one over the other.

Let the fundamental greatness of the nation be displayed in its unity, in its resolve, in its patriotism, in its readiness to make sacrifices and in its dedication to the service of our country and its honour. We are convinced that our cause which is just and honourable will triumph and India shall emerge out of this grim test with flying colours. Let us then rally to this call of the nation, pledge ourselves altogether and all in unity. Once again on behalf of my Party, we extend our full support to the Prime Minister and to the Government in the tasks that lie ahead.

But before I sit down may I make a complaint with deep sorrow and agony? I wish I did not have to refer to it. You have read in today's newspapers that a number of Com-

munist have been arrested in different parts of the country. It pains us that the Government should have taken this action against our comrades when we are mobilising our Party in response to the Prime Minister's call for national unity and for national defence and for the defence of our motherland. I fervently hope that the Prime Minister, the Home Minister, for whom I have great regard naturally, and the leaders of the State Governments will realise that all this is absolutely needless and unwarranted and a waste of energy on their part. I hope they would find their way to releasing the comrades who have been arrested. The line of our Party has been clearly set forth by the recent resolution of our Party's National Council and we, as a disciplined party, every member of the party, are in dead earnest in implementing this line in all seriousness and with all sincerity. I once again appeal to the Government of India and to the State Governments not to take recourse to such needless actions against the members of our party.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate the pledge of our support in this hour of crisis in every way in this hour of peril or threat to our security and independence. No matter what the Government does, no matter how many Communists are put in prison, the Communists, every one of them, the leaders and the rank and file, shall take their place and posts alongside our compatriots in the defence of our motherland and for the protection of the honour and integrity of our country. I support the Resolution.

3 P.M.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the two Resolutions moved by the hon. Home Minister. The crisis has stirred and galvanised the whole nation. There is a widespread realisation that while we had been cultivating friendship with our neighbour,



[Shri G. S. Pathak.]

our neighbour had been guilty of perfidy and treachery all along, and treachery of a kind which is unsurpassed in the history of human relations. We were the first to accord recognition to the Chinese Government; we espoused their cause; we fought for them in the world forum against opposition and we acted in a manner which would have convinced everyone that we meant genuine friendship. The Chinese Government on the other hand ostensibly professed friendship but all along they were preparing and planning for an attack on our territory. All along they wanted to seize our territory by force while ostensibly professing friendship with us.

On the 29th April, 1954, the Agreement known as the Tibet Agreement was entered into. It embodied the five principles of Panchsheel and outstanding among those principles were non-aggression and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty. Later, in the middle of that year, Sir, Mr. Chou En-lai came to Delhi. In his Banquet Speech he said that for the last two thousand years there has been friendship between India and China and that friendship will be continued. Within a few months thereafter—we came to know later—that they had made intrusion into our territory known at Hoti plain. That was within a few months thereafter. Then in 1955 at the Bandung Conference Mr. Chou En-lai reiterated and re-emphasised these five principles. But all this time they were busy with building strategic roads, they were busy with planning how to attack Indian territory. Correspondence and negotiations were continued for a considerable time. During all this time again it would appear from the publications of the Government of India that they were preparing and planning mass attacks upon our territories and they wanted to take our territories by force. Therefore all this period is a history of fraud and force used by China and of trickery in the matter of negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the proposals that China has offered insult one's intelligence and mock us. After having deprived us—we are sure, temporarily—of a certain amount of our territory they want us to recede 20 kilometres and yield to them 20 kilometres peacefully. This would shock anybody's intelligence; this is mocking us, and the compromise which they have offered recently and to which reference has been made by the Home Minister also shows how vague they are in the terms of that offer. They again want us to be tricked into some commitment.

Now, Sir, we are opposed to any compromise unless it is consistent with out self-respect and honour. The terms that have been offered by the Government of India are the only terms upon which the country is agreeable. The country is not going to accept any compromise on any other terms whatsoever. And these terms—i.e., those offered by the Government of India—mean that withdrawal from the territory up to the line which marked the advance of the Chinese forces as on the 8th of September is to be only for the purpose of relieving tensions so that compromise talks may be had, but it is on the distinct understanding that we are not going to give one inch of our territory on this side of the MacMahon Line. Now, Sir, all these offers of compromise by the Chinese have no intention of any peaceful settlement behind them. The Chinese want military decisions. They have put forward a false claim bolstered up by fabricated maps. About these maps we all remember what our Prime Minister once said: "Map or no map, we shall defend our frontiers." We all know that mountains form the natural and traditional frontiers. At a time when mountainous areas were not easily accessible, when transport was difficult, the crest of mountains and the watershed could alone form the natural boundaries. That was so not only in the Himalayas but also in other regions of the world. That was an accepted principle. We find that no

claim was ever put forward by any Chinese Government to territory on this side of the MacMahon Line. Evidence has been disclosed in the publications of the Government that we have always been in occupation of the territory on this side of the MacMahon Line. Now, Sir, where is this question of any territorial dispute? China has created a controversy in order that it may find some excuse for its aggression and for the seizure of our territory. Now the problem is really deeper. This is not a mere question of a frontier dispute. China believes in expansionism, as it was said by the hon. Home Minister to-day, China is a threat to entire Asia and China believes that spread of communism throughout the world can be achieved only by resort to war. There are other countries, even Communist countries, which believe in co-existence. China does not believe in co-existence and China believes that war, not co-existence, is an instrument for the spread of communism in this world. It is in pursuance of this policy that China is expanding its hold or expanding its influence and trying to seize territories belonging to other nations in Asia. Now their creed can be thus described. They want a radical settlement of accounts with what they call Imperialism by force. That is their creed and that explains why China today has made this aggression against India. China wants to disturb our economy for the reason that China knows that industrial progress creates defence potential and China thinks that this is the time when that industrial progress should be arrested, should be disturbed so that in future it may not be possible for India to resist her onslaughts. That is at the back of this selection of time by China. This is a question of life and death for us. Did we achieve our freedom in order to make a present of it to China? Did Mahatma Gandhi strive for and attain for us Independence so that we may be deprived of our independence by a totalitarian country like China? Did we do all this—and through all these centuries we acquired a method of life, we

acquired a civilization which can be described as liberal thought—to be deprived of it or are all these processes to be reversed because a neighbouring country can throw masses of forces against us? Mr. Chairman, we shall all make any sacrifice that the country demands of us and we shall rededicate ourselves to the maintenance of our freedom, and to the preservation of the territorial integrity of our country. We are not going to yield an inch of our territory to any aggressor, however powerful that aggressor may appear to be. The question is still larger. This aggression raises vital issues, issues vital to the civilisation, issues vital to the international community. Can the international community tolerate expansionism of this type after the experience of the two world wars? Can the world community tolerate our social and economic progress to be impeded and arrested at the hands of a totalitarian State which wants to destroy it by brute force? Can any nation be allowed to commit what is known to international law as 'Crime against peace' in the mid-twentieth century? These are vital problems with which not only India but the whole international community is concerned. It is these problems which affect the future of mankind. Now it is universally recognised—I am saying this because a friend of mine put it to me in the Lobby. "What is the law on this?" and I am making a few observations on that point—that planning, preparation, initiation and waging of a war of aggression and waging of war in violation of treaties, agreements and assurances, is a crime against Peace. It is also universally recognised that promotion of national interests through war and securing of solutions of international disputes through war is against international law. Jurists have said that the resort to war contrary to the Kellogg Pact which lays down these principles is the commission of an international wrong against all the States of the world and not only against the victim of the use of force. That is why this aggres-

[Sri G. S. Pattak.]

sion by China has attracted such world-wide notice and we have got so much sympathy alround. Many countries have offered their help to us. Some countries have already given help to us. They have done so because dictates of justice, demands of humanity and principles of international law have prompted their action. We are grateful to the U.S.A., Great Britain and Canada who have given us aid. We are grateful to all the nations who want to give us aid and who have given us their sympathy. Now the aggressor cannot be allowed to reap the fruits of aggression. That is a feeling which is shared universally. It is said that it affects our foreign policy to some extent. In my humble opinion, there is nothing of the kind. Our non-alignment policy is not affected by the receipt of this aid. Those who give us aid do not attach any strings to the aid.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): It is not strictly aid, it is purchase.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: It is aid in the shape of purchase or whatever the terms which might be settled.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Assistance.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I though 'aid' meant assistance. I will not quarrel about the words. Where is the question of this policy being affected if no one asks us to enter into a military alliance, if no one attaches any strings and we do not accept this assistance at the cost of any of our principles? Sir, in a case where the very existence, the very security of the nation, is involved, we should not enter into these minute matters, because policy exists for the nation. Nations do not exist for policies, and I am certain that whatever is being done is consistent with our policy of non-alignment and this has not been affected in any manner whatsoever.

We have had a few reverses. Well, it is true that we had not had a full

preparation to meet the onslaught in the manner in which it has come. But history shows that very often, in the case of democracies, this happens. Ours is not a totalitarian country. Our aim has been that our economy and our money be applied to purposes other than war. We do not think in terms of war. A democracy, though it moves slow, moves effectively when it moves, because at the back of it is the resolve of a free people, and in the history of the world it has never happened that the resolve of a free people has failed. Therefore, it is certain that we are going to win this war. The Chinese are the gravest challenge to world peace and stability at the present moment. We have accepted this challenge. We, of course, believe in peace. We have striven for peace all along. We have sent our forces to several places outside on missions of peace. We are now determined that we will win our territory back and we are determined that it will be impossible for the aggressor to gain any more territory.

Sir, this response, this spontaneous response which we have seen today, we have seen not only because it is a question of territorial sovereignty and it is an attack on our territorial sovereignty, but also because it is an attack on our honour and self-respect. Our jawans are working hard, they are fighting the war under conditions which are very difficult. The mountains at these places are 14,000 feet high, and we salute, I salute and everyone of us salutes those soldiers of ours who are fighting there. All honour and glory to them. They are fighting and they are fighting for the entire nation and they are laying down their lives. We rightly pay homage to the martyrs there and the entire nation pays homage to those who have laid down their lives there.

Sir, the last thing that I want to say is about this Proclamation. It is fit and proper that this Proclamation was made. It imposes larger burdens

on the Union. That is true. But that is necessary. It takes away the fundamental rights, the exercise of the fundamental rights, for the time being, if the Legislature and the Executive choose to take them away. It also empowers the President to take away the remedial rights for the enforcement of the fundamental rights. But as has been said, the laws are silent where there is an armed conflict. We cannot enjoy any fundamental right if there is no safety, if there is no security. Unless we are able to preserve our nationhood, unless we are able to preserve our territorial integrity, we cannot enjoy those rights, however much we may cherish them and value them. Therefore, Sir, I support both the Resolutions. Both the Resolutions were made at a time when they could not have been delayed any further. Thank you.

**श्री गंगाशरण सिंह :** जनाब चेयरमैन साहब, चीन के विश्वासघात और आक्रमण के बाद आज हमारे देश में जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है उस पर विचार करते समय जिन दो बातों की ओर सब से पहले हमारा ध्यान जाता है उन पर हमें पहले ध्यान देना चाहिये। उनमें से पहली बात हमारे बहादुरों की बहादुरी है। अभी सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से या दूसरे कारणों से पूरे समाचार हमें नहीं मिले हैं और मिलने की जरूरत भी नहीं है, लेकिन अब तक जो समाचार मिले हैं, जो खबरें मिली हैं, उन खबरों ने सिर्फ यही नहीं प्रमाणित कर दिया है कि हमारे बहादुर सिपाहियों ने किस तरह से दुश्मन का मुकाबला करते हुए न सिर्फ हमारी परम्परा को कायम रखा है, हमारे देश के मुंह की लाली रखी है, बल्कि हमारे देश के लाखों करोड़ों लोगों के दिलों में प्रेरणा का संचार कर दिया है कि देश के लिये किस तरह से मर मिटना चाहिये।

आज और कुछ कहने से पहले मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि सिर्फ आज ही नहीं,

जिस रोज हमारा देश विजयी हो जाये उस रोज भी हमें इनको नहीं भुलाना चाहिये। कभी कभी ऐसा होता है कि विजय की खुशी में जो विजय लाने वाले होते हैं उनको हम भूल जाते हैं। जिस तरह देश के बटवारे से उत्पन्न परिस्थिति में हम ने अपने लाखों भाइयों को गले लगाया, उनके लिये इंतजाम किया, उसी तरह से आज इस सदन की तरफ से, देश की तरफ से, यह आश्वासन दिया जाना चाहिये, खुले शब्दों में कहा जाना चाहिये कि जो लोग हमारे मुल्क के लिये लड़ रहे हैं, जान दे रहे हैं, बलिदान कर रहे हैं, उनके परिवारों की, उनके आश्रितों की जिम्मेदारी सारे देश पर, हमारी सरकार पर और हममें से हर आदमी के ऊपर होगी। हमारे वीर सिपाहियों ने हम लोगों के सामने आदर्श ही नहीं रखा, बल्कि कायर से कायर आदमी में प्रेरणा का संचार कर दिया। यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात हुई है।

दूसरी बात यह हुई है कि बिना किसी प्रकार के प्रचार के, बिना किसी प्रयत्न के, देश का हर एक आदमी स्वयं उठ खड़ा हो गया है। आज ऐसा मालूम होता है कि हम लोगों के आपस के जितने बंधन थे वे सब टूट गये हैं, सीमाओं के झगड़े और भेदभाव, जितने हमारे स्वार्थ थे वे समाप्त हो गये हैं। आज सारा देश ४४ करोड़ आदमियों का नहीं है बल्कि सारा देश एक आदमी है। इस तरह की प्रतिक्रिया हमारे देश में हुई है और यह एक बहुत बड़ी चीज है।

हमारे देश पर पहले भी आक्रमण हुए थे, हमारे देश में पहले भी लड़ाइयां हुई थी, लेकिन जिस तरह से सारा देश आज एक हो कर लड़ने को तैयार हुआ है, एक स्वर से लड़ने को तैयार है, ऐसा मौका, ऐसी परिस्थिति इतिहास में पहले कभी देखने में नहीं आई। हमारे देश में दो चीजें इस समय ऐसी हुई हैं जो सब

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

से आऊटस्टैंडिंग है, सब से बड़ी है, जिनको हमें सबको बराबर याद करना चाहिये, याद ही नहीं करना चाहिये, बल्कि उन को भविष्य में भी बनाये रखना चाहिये। इसलिये हम सब लोगो का और सरकार का यह प्रयत्न होना चाहिये कि इस समय देश में जो एकता कायम हो गई है उसको हमेशा के लिये बनाये रखे। आज चीन के आक्रमण ने यह प्रमाणित कर दिया है कि हम लोगो की आपस में जो बहुत सी बाधाये थी, बहुत सी दिक्कतें थी, बहुत से छोटे-छोटे ख्यालात थे, बहुत सी ऐसी चीजें थी जो हमको और आपको परेशान करती थी, वे सब दूर हो गई हैं। आज हमारे सामने नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन का खयाली सवाल नहीं रहा बल्कि चीन के इस आक्रमण ने नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन का सबसे बड़ा काम किया है। हमारे बीच में जो भौगोलिक सीमाओं के, राजनीतिक सीमाओं के जितने सवाल थे वे सब आज नष्ट हो गये हैं। मुझे उम्मीद है कि जिस तरह आज यह हुआ है कि देश एक व्यक्ति की तरह खड़ा है, उसी तरह चीन को भगाने के बाद भी हमारा देश एक व्यक्ति की तरह बना रहेगा और उसी तरह हम आगे उत्तरोत्तर बढ़ते जायेंगे।

आज जब चीन ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया है, तो हमें क्या करना है, इस पर मोचने से पहले ज़रा हमें यह भी सोचना चाहिये और सजीदगी में सोचना चाहिये कि इस हमले का स्वरूप क्या है, इस की शक्ति क्या है, यह हमला हुआ क्यों हम पर ? और भी एशिया में बहुत से मुल्क हैं, छोटे छोटे मुल्क हैं, हमसे छोटे मुल्क हैं, उन पर यह हमला नहीं हुआ और हिन्दुस्तान जैसे बड़े मुल्क पर ही यह हमला क्यों हुआ ? इस चीज को अगर हम ठीक से समझेंगे, तो आज किसी के वर्गलाने से हम बहकेंगे नहीं। हमें यह नहीं सोचना चाहिये कि चीन आज थोड़ी सी ज़मीन लेना चाहता है, चीन सिर्फ अपनी सीमा बढ़ाना चाहता है,

चीन कुछ हमारे हिस्से पर दखल करना चाहता है, यह लड़ाई वह नहीं है। चीन हमको नेस्तनाबूद करना चाहता है। चीन छोटे मुल्को की तरफ क्यों नहीं गया और हम पर क्यों हमला किया उसने ? इस लिये कि आज चीन में जिस तरह की परम्परा चल रही है, चीन में जिस तरह का शासन चल रहा है, वह हमारे शासन से भिन्न है, वह हमारे तरीके से भिन्न है। चीन चाहता है कि सारे एशिया में, सारी दुनिया में वह हावी हो, सब पर उसी का तरीका चले, सब पर उसी का शासन चले, सब उसी के ज़ेरे साया रहें, सब उसी के कब्जे में रहे, सब उसी का मुह देखे और सब पर उसी की हुकूमत हो। उसके रास्ते में अगर कोई सबसे बड़ी रुकावट है तो वह हिन्दुस्तान है। हिन्दुस्तान एक बड़ा मुल्क है यह भी एक रुकावट है। हिन्दुस्तान की आबादी भी एक रुकावट है, हिन्दुस्तान की परम्परा भी एक रुकावट है, हिन्दुस्तान का प्राचीनता भी एक रुकावट है, और हिन्दुस्तान में जो पद्धति, जो सिस्टम, जो तरीका हम अपना रहे हैं, वह चीन के लिए सब से बड़ी रुकावट है और चीन उस रुकावट को दूर करना चाहता है, उसको खत्म करना चाहता है, उसको मिटाना चाहता है। वह सिर्फ यह नहीं चाहता है कि हम कुछ मील ज़मीन पर दखल कर लें। वह चाहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान को हम नेस्तनाबूद कर दें, हिन्दुस्तान में जो पद्धति चल रही है उसे पद्धति को हम नेस्तनाबूद कर दें और दुनिया के सामने यह प्रमाणित कर दें कि हमारी पद्धति सबसे बड़ी है और हमारा देश सबसे बड़ा है और ऐसे जितने बीच के लोग हैं या छोटे लोग हैं, वे हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ दखने के बजाय हमारी तरफ देखें। इसलिए इस पर्सपेक्टिव में, इस दूरदर्शिता के साथ और इस पृष्ठभूमि में हमें देखना चाहिये, इस चीन की लड़ाई को और चीन को। मैं सिर्फ यह दुहराना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन मैं सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा कि इसी सदन में, इसी जगह से कई वर्षों से मैं लगातार यह बान कहता आ

रहा हूँ और इस मूढ़ में मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि I told you so, या मैंने कोई बड़ी अक्ल-मन्दी की बात कही, लेकिन सिर्फ इसलिए मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि बार बार मैं कहता रहा आपका गुस्सा बर्दाश्त करके और फिर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप इसको छोटे दायरे में मत देखिये, आप इसको बड़े दायरे में देखिये वि० यह चीन का हमला किस तरह का है। जब आप इसको बड़े दायरे में देखेंगे, तभी इस मसले का समाधान होगा। अब तक हम इस मसले को छोटे दारे में देखते रहे और यही कारण है कि चीन हमारे ऊपर इतना बढ आया। अगर हम पहले से सतर्क रहे होते, अगर हमने पहले से होशियारी बरती होती, या पहले से हमने सब ख्याल किया होता तो शायद यह नौबत न आती।

कहा जाना है कि आज पोस्टमार्टम का जमाना नहीं रहा। मैं भी नहीं चाहता पोस्ट-मार्टम करना। मैं भी नहीं चाहता देश में पस्ती फैलाना। मैं भी नहीं चाहता पीछे की बातों का जिक्र करके उसमें वक्त बरबाद करना और उसके चलते देश का और अपना समय नष्ट करना। लेकिन जब हम आगे कदम बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, तो इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि हम इस पर विचार करें कि हम क्या थे, इस समय कहा है और आगे कहा जाना चाहते हैं। जब तक हम इस पर विचार नहीं करेंगे, तब तक आगे नहीं पहुँच सकेंगे। पोस्टमार्टम तो लाश का होता है और यह समस्या जीती जागती है यन् समस्या तो बर्निंग प्रॉब्लम है। हमारे सामने यह कोई मरी हुई लाश नहीं है जिसके पोस्टमार्टम का सवाल हो। यह समस्या हमारे सामने है, चीन का जो काम है वह हमारे सामने है, चीन ने पीछे जो कुछ किया वह हमारे सामने है, चीन आगे क्या करने वाला है वह हमारे सामने है। इसलिए हमारा नज़रिया बिल्कुल साफ होना चाहिये। पोस्टमार्टम कह कर इसको ढाला नहीं जा सकता, पोस्ट-मार्टम कह कर हमको बहलाया नहीं जा सकता।

इसीलिए मेरा यह कहना है कि चीन का सारा रवैया जो अब तक रहा है वह उसने आज अचानक नहीं अख्तियार किया है। चीन का सारा रवैया जो रहा है वह इसी डाइरेक्शन में, इसी दिशा में और इसी तरफ रहा है और उसी का यह परिणाम है कि आज उसने ऐसा वक्त चुना है जब हमने कुछ किया नहीं। आज छोटे मुल्कों में बहुत से मुल्क एशिया में ऐसे हैं जिनमें कुछ चीन की तरफ देखते हैं और कुछ हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ देखते हैं। लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान अगर मिट जायेगा खत्म हो जायेगा, तबाह हो जायेगा, तो उन मुल्कों के लिए जो हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ देखते हैं कोई ज़रिया नहीं रह जायेगा, कोई देखने की जगह नहीं रह जायेगी और उनकी रक्षा और उनके प्रोटेक्शन की कोई जगह नहीं रह जायेगी। उन छोटे मुल्कों पर इसलिए भी हमला नहीं किया गया कि शायद वहाँ अमेरिका का मज़बूत हाथ था और चीन जानता था कि वहाँ हाथ बढ़ाने पर वह हाथ तोड़ दिया जायेगा। वह यह भी जानता था कि हम शांति में लगे हुये हैं, शांति में विश्वास किये हुये हैं, हम अपना शांति का काम चला रहे हैं, हम लड़ाई की तैयारी नहीं कर रहे हैं—इसलिए और मुल्कों के छोटे होने पर भी चीन जैसा एक बड़ा मुल्क जिसके हाथ में काफी ताकत है वहाँ नहीं गया और हमको कमज़ोर समझ कर, शांति की तरफ झुका हुआ समझ कर, हमारे एटिट्यूड को समझ कर और हमारे रुख को समझ कर वह ज्यादा हमारे मुल्क पर आया बनिस्बत और देशों के। अगर वह समझता कि हमारा रुख यह है कि वे आयेगे तो तुरन्त उनको जवाब मिलेगा, अगर वह समझता कि हमारा रुख यह है कि अगर वे आयेगे तो हम उनको अपनी ज़मीन पर पैर नहीं रखने देंगे, अगर वह समझता कि हमारा रुख यह है कि हम पूरी तैयारी किये बैठे हैं, तो हर्गिज़ चीन की यह हिम्मत न होती कि वह छोटे छोटे मुल्कों, पर न जाता और हमारे मुल्क पर आता। इसलिए हमें अगर चीन के साथ लड़ाई लड़नी है तो हमको अपने

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

रुख में परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा और हमको दुनिया की जो तमाम चीजें हैं उनके बारे में अपनी समझ में परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा।

नानेलाइनमेंट की जो पालिसी है वह सही पालिसी है। हम शुरू से उसके साथ रहे हैं, आगे भी रहेंगे। लेकिन हमारा शुरू से ही यह कहना रहा है कि नानेलाइनमेंट की पालिसी जो शब्दों में कही जाती रही है, व्यवहार में उससे अन्तर रहा है। इसको फिर से एग्जामिन करना होगा। हम नानेलाइनमेंट पालिसी के पक्ष में उतना ही हैं जितना हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर या और कोई हो सकता है। यह आज से नहीं, हम पहले से कहते रहे हैं। इसलिए आज इसका सवाल नहीं है। सवाल आज बहुत सी चीजों का है। आज ये जो हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई हैं अभी हमारे मित्र भूपेश गुप्त ने स्पीच दी और उनका प्रस्ताव हुआ। मेरी जरा परेशानी ज्यादा बढ़ गई। परेशानी ज्यादा बढ़ गई इसलिए बाते अगर साफ कही जाती और उनमें थोड़ा सा उनका अपना अब तक का दृष्टिकोण भी होता तो मुझको खुशी होती। लेकिन यह जो सोमरसाल्ट हुआ बिल्कुल, आज हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर की प्रशंसा में सहस्र नाम गाया जा रहा है, जो विष्णु सहस्र नाम की जगह पर एक नया जवाहरलाल सहस्र नाम बन रहा है, आज उसकी क्या जरूरत है? मुल्क में किसी को शक है क्या जवाहरलाल जी की लीडरशिप में, जवाहरलाल जी को लीडर मानने में। मुल्क को इसकी जरूरत है क्या कि यह जवाहर सहस्र नाम इस समय गाया जाना चाहिये। जब आप से १२, १४ वर्ष पहले चीन के अखबारों में एक कार्टून निकला था और जवाहरलाल जी को कुत्ता की शक्ल बना करके यह लिखा गया था "Running dog of the British Imperialism" उस समय यह प्रशंसा कहा थी, उस समय यह चीज कहा थी? इसलिए आज इस प्रशंसा की आड़ में असल चीज को छिपाने की कोशिश की जा रही

है। आज दोहरे अर्थ वाले, दो माने रखने वाले शब्दों का प्रयोग किया जा रहा है, हमको आपको धोखा देने के लिए और देश को धोखा देने के लिए। इसलिए भी मुझे खतरा इस बात का होता है कि हमारा देश बाहर से उतना नहीं तबाह हुआ है जितना तबाह हुआ है भीतर के विश्वासघातियों से, गद्दारों से। इतिहास इसका साक्षी है। इसीलिए आज शब्दों पर विश्वास करने का जमाना नहीं रहा, खास करके ऐसे लोगों के शब्दों का जो दो मानी रखने वाले, दोहरे अर्थ रखने वाले शब्द बोलते रहे। और यह आज पहला मौका नहीं है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या दुनिया के किसी मुल्क की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने ऐसा किया है कि वहाँ बाहर की कम्युनिस्ट फौज गई हो तो उसने उसका मुकाबिला किया हो और देश का साथ दिया हो—कही इतिहास में नहीं है। जब बाहर की कम्युनिस्ट फौज गई तो वहाँ की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने उसका साथ दिया। इसीलिये यह जो बहुत मेलमिलाप की बाने करते हैं तो मुझे महाभारत की एक घटना याद आती है। महाभारत का युद्ध जब समाप्त हो गया तो धृतराष्ट्र ने कहा कि मैं सब पांडवों का आलिगन करना चाहता हूँ, उनको इम्ब्रेस करना चाहता हूँ, उनसे मिलना चाहता हूँ कृष्ण भी वहाँ थे। उन्होंने किया क्या कि जितने पांडव थे उन सब को तो जाने दिया आलिगन के लिये, लेकिन धृतराष्ट्र के सब लडकों को भीम ने मारा था इसलिये भीम को उन्होंने नहीं जाने दिया और उनकी जगह एक लोहे का भीम बना कर उन्होंने धृतराष्ट्र के सामने लगा दिया। धृतराष्ट्र अंधे थे, देखा नहीं। वे बड़े ताकतवर थे। ऊपर से तो उन्होंने आलिगन किया लेकिन लोहे के भीम को गुस्से के मारे इतनी जोर से पकड़ा कि वह चूर चूर हो गया।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member can aspire to be a Bheem. I can never do that.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): He wants to be a Dhritrashtra.

**श्री गंगाशरण सिंह :** वही तो मैं कह रहा हूँ कि आप धृतराष्ट्र हैं, भीम नहीं हैं। वही ठीक बात है और उसमें कोई मतभेद नहीं है। मेरा यही कहना है और उन्होंने एडमिट भी किया। सारा देश आज भीम है और वे धृतराष्ट्र हैं और इसलिए मैं देश को सावधान करना चाहता हूँ कि धृतराष्ट्र के आलिंगन से बचो, बचो। यह धृतराष्ट्र का आलिंगन बड़ा खतरनाक आलिंगन है, धृतराष्ट्र का आलिंगन तुमको चकनाचूर कर देने वाला आलिंगन है। इसीलिये आज इन बातों का सवाल नहीं है। हमको पूरा प्रकाशन लेना पड़ेगा, पूरी खबरदारी रखनी पड़ेगी। ऐसे शब्दों पर विश्वास करके चलने से ही आज हमारा देश इस हालत में पहुँचा है, इसलिये इन शब्दों पर आज विश्वास नहीं किया जा सकता है। आज कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की तरफ से यह हो रहा है कि यह चाइना ब्लाक है, यह नेशनलिस्ट ब्लाक है।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी ( बिहार ) :** कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता को मैदान में आगे बढ़ा देंगे।

**श्री गंगाशरण सिंह :** मैं इस तरह का कोई भेद नहीं मानना कि कोई ऐसी चीज़ है। मुझे वह दिन याद है जब हिन्दुस्तान के बटवारे का जमाना था तो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अपने लोगों को मुसलिम लीग में भी भेज दिया था। मुझे वह दिन भी याद है जब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अपने लोगों को हमारी पार्टी में भी भेज दिया था और उनके जो बड़े बड़े लीडर थे—उनका नाम मैं नहीं लेना चाहता—वे सब के सब हमारी पार्टी में थे। मैं बहुत भोग चुका हूँ। इसलिए कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग आज कहीं चले जायें कुछ भी कहें, कोई प्रस्ताव पास करें, मुझे उस पर विश्वास होना वाला नहीं है और मैं आप सबको सावधान

करने वाला हूँ कि इस धृतराष्ट्र के आलिंगन से बचो, बचो। नहीं तो देश को खतरा है।

अब सवाल यह आता है—दोनों तरफ से हमको चेष्टा करनी है। एक तो आन्तरिक सुरक्षा का प्रश्न है, दूसरे तैयारी भी करनी है। जो बात गुजर गई, वह गुजर गई। यह ठीक है कि चीन पर विश्वास करके हमको जैसी तैयारी करनी चाहिये थी वैसी हमने नहीं की। चीन के शब्दों पर विश्वास करके हमें जितना मुस्तैद होना चाहिये था उतना मुस्तैद हम नहीं हुए। लेकिन फिर ये बीच-बीच की बहुत सी बातें नहीं होनी चाहिये।

बात सफ़ाई की होनी चाहिये और इसलिये मैंने शुरू में कहा कि वह जो लम्बा दृष्टिकोण है, पर्सपेक्टिव है उसको समझना चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के लिये बहुत से लोग कहते हैं कि दोनों बड़े मुल्क हैं और दोनों में आज तक लड़ाई नहीं हुई लेकिन आज तक कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी नहीं थी, चीन में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का राज भी नहीं हुआ था। जब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का राज होता है तो फिर नेशनल कैरेक्टर नहीं होता है और कम्युनिस्ट कैरेक्टर होता है और इसलिये उनका नेशनल कैरेक्टर सब-मर्ज हो गया है, दब गया है और वह ऊपर नहीं आ सकता है। दोनों मुल्क बड़े हैं और आराम से रह सकते तो मुझे बड़ी खुशी होती लेकिन चीनियों ने जो कुछ किया और जो चीन की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्युनिज्म का रवैया है उसमें हम शान्ति की नीद नहीं सो सकते हैं। यह मामला सैद्धान्तिक भी है, आइडियालाजिकल भी है, भौगोलिक भी है और राजनैतिक भी है।

हमारा ऐसा भी खयाल है कि देश की और विदेश की जो परिस्थिति है उसको कूतने में, उसका अन्दाजा लगाने में या तो हमने सुस्ती की या हमसे गलती हुई। उसी



[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

का नतीजा यह है कि नानइलाइनमेंट की चर्चा हम करते रहे और हमारे नानइलाइनमेंट में हमारे जो साथी रहे उन में से कोई भी मुझे ऐसा नहीं लगता कि आज इस जंग में हमारे साथ है, नानइलाइनमेंट के जो साथी थे वे नहीं रहे। मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके माने यह नहीं है कि नानएलाइनमेंट गलत है लेकिन नानएलाइनमेंट का तरीका गलत था। मुझे खुशी होती और मैं थोड़ा सा कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के शब्दों पर भी विश्वास करता यदि दुनिया की किसी भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने हिन्दुस्तान का समर्थन किया होता, एक शब्द भी कहा होता हिन्दुस्तान के समर्थन में। चीन के समर्थन में सब के सब कह रहे हैं लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के समर्थन में कोई नहीं कह रहा है। इसके माने है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रूप है, जो इन्टर-नैशनल कैंरेक्टर है, वह ज्यों का त्यों बना हुआ है शब्दों में कुछ हो पर भीतर से वही है। आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बाहर को सोचने और समझने में हमने जो गलत अब तक को वह आगे नहीं करना चाहिये और आज यह देश का सौभाग्य है कि आज ऐसे देश भी निकले जो कि बिना किसी शर्त के, बिना किसी स्ट्रिंग के हमको मदद करने को तैयार है और मैं यह समझता हूँ कि ऐसे लोग हैं देश में और दुनिया में जो कि समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान-चीन की लड़ाई का प्रश्न सिर्फ एक देश की लड़ाई का प्रश्न नहीं है बल्कि यह एक सिद्धान्त की लड़ाई का भी प्रश्न है। ऐसे लोग दुनिया में सामने आयेगे जो कि समझते हैं कि यह सिद्धान्त की लड़ाई का प्रश्न है और इसमें बिना किसी शर्त के हिन्दुस्तान की मदद करनी चाहिये। नानएलाइनमेंट पर विश्वास करते हुए मुझे यह कहने में कोई हिचक नहीं होती है कि आज अपनी आजादी को, देश को बचाने के लिये हूँ मैं भी देश से जिस प्रकार की भी मदद हों वह लेनी चाहिये, इसमें कोई हिचक की या दविधा

की बात नहीं करनी चाहिये और बहुत मुस्तैदी के साथ देश को बचाना चाहिये। जब देश बचेगा तब उसके बाद और कुछ होगा, देश ही मिट गया, हम गुलाम हो गये तो फिर हमारे सारे सिद्धान्त उस गुलामी की चक्की में पिस जायेगे।

मुझे नहीं मालूम कि जानबूझ कर यह हुआ या अनजाने में हुआ—मैं आपका अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ, हमारे सामने इस हाउस की प्रोसीडिंग्स हैं उसमें, इस हाउस में भी, दूसरे हाउस में भी और देश में भी—बार बार कहा गया कि हम तैयार हैं। नेफा में तैयार हैं, अमुक जगह तैयार हैं, सारी जगह तैयार हैं। उस तैयारी के क्या माने थे यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर की, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर की स्पीच के कोटे-शस हैं, मैंने बोलने को अपने सामने रखा था लेकिन मेरे पास समय नहीं है और मैं अब पढ़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ, उनमें बार बार कहा गया है और देश में भी यह बात कही गई है कि हमारा देश तैयार है, कोई भी मौका होगा हम सब कुछ करने को तैयार हैं लेकिन आज यह पता चलता है कि बिल्कुल तैयारी नहीं की गई थी और तैयारी नहीं की गई थी इस चीज को बेशर्मी से छिपाने की कोशिश की गई। जब यह खबर फैली और हमारे एक चीफ मिनिस्टर ने भी कहा कि हथियार की बात क्या है जूते तक, बूट तक नहीं दिये गये थे तो उस पर हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर क्या कहते हैं? उन्होंने कहा कि मैं पूरी जिम्मेदारी के साथ कहता हूँ कि यह जो कहा जा रहा है कि बूट नहीं दिये गये यह बिल्कुल गलत है। कहा गया कि बूट तक नहीं मिला है और हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर कहते हैं कि यह कहना गैरजिम्मेदारी की बात है और गलत बात है कि बूट नहीं दिया गया।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी अब तो वह हट गये ।

श्री गंगाधर सिंह अब तो हट गये, पर च ज तो वही थी । जो तैयारी थी वह एक नमूना था । बूट के बारे में क्या है, पता नहीं, भगवान जाने हमको मालूम नहीं, लेकिन यह जवाब नहीं है, यह बेशर्मी का जवाब है, यह देश के साथ बड़ा क्रूर व्यवहार है कि जब यह कहा जाये कि देश तैयार नहीं था, हथियार नहीं दिये गये, तब जवाब में यह कहा जाये कि बूट तो दिये गये थे । यह बड़ा क्रूर व्यवहार है । हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को इतनी अक्ल है, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता इतनी समझती है कि क्या लड़ाई की तैयारी होनी चाहिये और क्या क्या लोगों को मिलना चाहिये । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की बात आइदा न की जाये । चाहे जानबूझ कर या अनजाने में ऐसा हुआ कि हम मुग़लते में रहे, खुद हमको भी रखा और जिनके हाथ में ताकत है वह भी रहे, कैसे हुआ यह मुग़लता, यह वह हमसे ज्यादा जानते हैं, लेकिन इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि वह मुग़लते में रहे और सदन को, देश को और सबको उसमें रखा । तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आगे हमें मुग़लते में नहीं रहना चाहिये । मैं यह जानता हूँ कि सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से सभी बातें आज नहीं कही जानी चाहिये और जनता को की इतना धीरज और सतोष होना चाहिये कि हर चीज को जानने की वह कोशिश न करे । जहाँ एक ओर हमारा काम है जनता को समझाना, कहना और जनता का भी यह काम है कि यह समझना कि हर चीज को जानने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिये, आज लड़ाई के जमाने में हर एक चीज नहीं बतलाई जा सकती है, वहाँ दूसरी ओर सरकार का भी यह कर्तव्य होता है कि ऐसी खबरें जिनको दबाने से कोई लाभ नहीं है, उन खबरों को दबाने की वह कोशिश न करे और कम से कम गलत कोशिश न करे,

गलत खबर न दे, गलत खबर देगी तो फिर जैसे १९१४ की लड़ाई के समय में ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के लिये जो चीज सोचते थे वही चीज आज हिन्दुस्तान के लोग सोचने लगेंगे और वह एक डेमोर लाईजिंग चीज होगी । अभी दिल्ली के एक अखबार में एक कार्टून निकला, छोटा सा वह कार्टून था, लेकिन वह जन-मानस का बड़ा प्रतीक है । उसमें दो आदमी हैं, एक आदमी गवर्नमेंट का कम्युनिक लिये हुए है जिसको वह प्रकाशन के लिए देना चाहता है, रिलीज करना चाहता है तो दूसरा आदमी उससे कहता है कि जो तुम कह रहे हो वह ठीक है लेकिन यह गवर्नमेंट कम्युनिक की तरह जायगा तो इस पर विश्वास नहीं होगा, इसलिये लोगों में इस बात को पहले रयूमर की तरह, अफवाह की तरह फैलाओ । मैं सावधान करना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ एक ओर रयूमर को रोकना चाहिये, जनता को समझाना चाहिये कि वह ज्यादा चीजों को जानने को उत्सुक न हो, व्याकुल न हो, वहाँ दूसरी ओर सरकार को भी यह खयाल रखना चाहिये कि गलत खबरें न दी जाये और ऐसी खबरें जो कि बुरी हो और और जिनसे नुकसान नहीं हाने वाला हो, उनको भी छिपाने की कोशिश न की जाये । सरकार की ओर से भी इन दो बातों का खयाल रखा जाये और जनता की तरफ से भी खयाल रखा जाये ।

आज हमारे देश में एक सब से बड़ी चीज हुई है । मुझे ताज्जुब हुआ, कम से कम ३०, ३५ सालों से मैं भी सोशलिस्ट रहा हूँ । मुझे आज ऐसा लगता है कि देश में जो वातावरण और जनमत तैयार हुआ है वह बहुत से ऐसे लोगों को भी, जो कि ज़िन्दगी भर एक दूसरी राह के आदी थे, उनको इसके लिये बाध्य कर रहा है कि उन्हें सही रास्ता अपनाना चाहिये और मुझे यह कहना है कि जनता का यह दबाव, पब्लिक ओपी-

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

नियन का प्रेशर, आगे बना रहना चाहिये । प्रत्येक मुल्क मे, जब युद्ध होता है तब उस युद्ध मे, चीजो की कीमतें बढ जाती हैं लेकिन एक बडे सौभाग्य का विषय है कि हमारे यहा चीजो की कीमते बढी नही है बल्कि आपको पता होगा कि सोने की कीमत पहले से बहुत ज्यादा कम हो गई है । १४५ रु० के बजाय ६८ रु० सोने की कीमत हो गई है और मैं समझता हू कि इस प्रवृत्ति को हमे जारी रखना चाहिये, इस प्रवृत्ति को हमे आगे ले जाना चाहिये, इस प्रवृत्ति को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये और हमारा ऐसा भी खयाल है कि हमारे देश मे एक नया जागरण, एक नया तरीका पैदा होगा । हमारी यह भी कल्पना है कि इस लडाई के बाद देश का जो रूपान्तरण होगा, देश का जो सामाजिक रूप हमारे सामने आयेगा वह सामाजिक रूप आज से बहुत भिन्न होगा, दूसरा होगा और इसीलिये जहा हम एक ओर लडाई की कल्पना कर रहे है, युद्ध की कल्पना कर रहे है, देश की रक्षा की कल्पना कर रहे है, वहा दूसरी ओर हमे यह भी देखना चाहिये कि आज इस देश मे जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है उसके चलते हमे बेसिक चीजो से, जो अपनी मौलिक चीजे है उन से, नही हटना चाहिये । क्या है वे मौलिक चीजे ? देश मे युद्ध होता है तो दो चीजे सामने आती है, एक तो बलिदान और दूसरा मुनाफा । जहा चीजे बनती है, हथियार बनते है, दूसरी चीजे होती है, सरकार को चीजो की सप्लाई करनी पडती है, तो वहा मुनाफे का भी प्रश्न उठता है और साथ ही साथ देश को बलिदान करने की भी जरूरत होती है । आज मैं जनता से भी कहना चाहता हू, सरकार से भी कहना चाहता हू कि हम सब का यह कर्तव्य है कि इन दोनों का सतुलन बनाये रखे, ऐसा न हो कि देश का एक हिस्सा तो ज्यादा बलिदान करे और दूसरा हिस्सा कम बलिदान करे । उसी अनुपात में, उसी प्रपोर्शन मे सैक्रीफाइस का भी बैलेंस, सतुलन

रहना चाहिये, त्याग का भी बैलेंस रहना चाहिये और अगर देश मे प्राफिट हो, मुनाफा हो, तो उसी अनुपात मे उस का भी बैलेंस और सतुलन रहना चाहिये । ऐसा न हो कि कुछ लोग प्राफिट ज्यादा कमा ले और कुछ कम कमाये, कुछ लोग खाली बलिदान करते रहे, कुछ मुनाफा करते रहे । वह देश के लिये घातक होगा और मिर्फ बाहर वाले ही नही, हमारे ये कम्यूनिस्ट मित्र उसका नाजायज़ फायदा उठायेगे । इसलिये, इस दृष्टि से भी, कहना चाहता हू कि यह निहायत जरूरी है । आज वेज फ्रीज़ की चर्चा हो रही है कि जो काम करने वाले मजदूर है, उन को जो मजदूरी मिलती है, उसकी सीमा बाधी जाये । अगर मजदूरी की सीमा बाध देनी चाहिये तो उसके साथ मुनाफे की भी सीमा बाधी जानी चाहिये । बिना मुनाफे पर सीमा बाधे मजदूरी की सीमा बाधना बहुत ही गलत कदम होगा, देश के लिये घातक होगा । इसलिये जिस समाज का निर्माण हम करना चाहते है, इस लडाई की चकाचौध मे उसको हमे नही भूलना चाहिये । हमे वही समाज बनाना है जिसमे इस लडाई के बाद भी देश मे पूजीवाद कायम न हो । इस लडाई के बाद हम अपने देश को राजनैतिक और आर्थिक दृष्टि से पीछे नही ले जाना चाहते है, बल्कि आगे ले जाना चाहते हैं और दुनिया को यह प्रमाणित करना चाहते है कि जनतात्रिक तरीके से लडाई लडते हुए भी देश समाजवाद की तरफ आगे बढ सकता है । यह एक बडा मिशन हमारे सामने है जिसका हमे बराबर खयाल रखना चाहिये और यह नही सोचना चाहिये कि इस लडाई के झोके से जो हमारी भीत थी, नीव थी वह कमजोर पड गई । इसलिये नीव का भी खयाल रखना चाहिये और अपने लक्ष्य का खयाल करना चाहिये । अगर हम लडाई मे जीत गये, लेकिन जिस लक्ष्य की ओर हमे जाना है वह हमारी नज़रो से ओझल हो गया तो फिर हम कही के नही रहेंगे और जीती हुई लडाई भी हार जायेंगे । इसलिये सब बातों मे जरूरी बात यह है कि देश का उत्साह तो बना रहे

भगर कम से कम हम और आप लोगों का, जो इस सदन के सदस्य है और दूसरे लोगो का भी दिमाग साफ होना चाहिये कि देश मे आज क्या करना है, इस लड़ाई का रूप क्या है और आगे इस लड़ाई मे किस तरह की अपेक्षा हम रखते है ? आज इसके सिवा कोई दूसरा सवाल ही नहीं है । देश ने स्पष्ट कर दिया है कि देश आज एक है । लेकिन दो, तीन बातों का देश को आवासन चाहिये, तभी यह एकता और ज्यादा बढ़ेगी, कायम रहेगी और यह उत्साह भी कायम रहेगा । कुछ लोग हर कदम पर, हर वक्त पर, निगोशियेशन की चर्चा करते है । यह ठीक है हर 'वार' मे, हर युद्ध के अन्त मे, समझौता किसी न किसी तरह का होता है । सरेन्डर मे भी समझौता होता है । लेकिन हर वक्त लड़ते समय बार बार निगोशियेशन क बात, सुलह-समझौते का बात नहीं का जाती है । लड़ाई और सुलह-समझौता दोनों साथ नहीं चला है । यह सार दुनिया जानती है । हर आदमी सोचता है कि कोई लड़ाई सौ वर्ष, पचास वर्ष चल जाय तो भी उसका कुछ न कुछ अन्त होता है, जब समझौते का बात होता है । लेकिन आप कहे कि हाथ मे बन्दूक ले कर भगती होडये, ब्लड दीजिये, खून दीजिये और फिर रोज रोज समझौते की चर्चा करे—मे समझौते के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ—तो उस से कोई लाभ नहीं होता है, उस से देश कमजोर होता है और इस की आड मे कुछ लोग देश की पीठ मे छुरा भोकते हैं । और उन के हाथ आप मजबूत करते है । इसलिये बार बार यह समझौते की चर्चा बन्द होनी चाहिये । समझौते का भी वक्त आयेगा, जब मुनासिब समझोगे हम पीछे नहीं रहेंगे लेकिन आज इस वक्त समझौते की चर्चा करना देश को डावाडोल करने की कोशिश करना है, देश की नींव हिलाने की कोशिश करना है । इसलिये इस समझौते की चर्चा बन्द होनी चाहिये ।

आज देश पर जो आक्रमण हुआ है उस का मुकाबला करने के लिये सरकार लोगों का साहाय्य माग रही है । लेकिन

आज जो संबंधित लोग है उन में मे अधिकतर लोगो को बहुत सी बातें स्पष्ट नहीं है । अभी तक भिन्न भिन्न प्रान्तो मे, पाच सात प्रान्तो मे हो कर मे आया हूं और जगह जगह घूम कर मे ने देखा है कि लोग तैयार बैठे है । लेकिन आज की स्थिति मे वे क्या करें, उन को बतलाने की जरूरत है । इसलिये आज सब मे बड़ी चीज यह है कि सरकार को क्या काम करना है, जनता को क्या काम करना है, अलग अलग यह जनता को बतलाया जाये । इसलिये सरकार का काम आज सिर्फ युद्ध को चलाता नहीं है बल्कि देश को नेतृत्व देना है । सरकार का काम सिर्फ मोर्चे पर जा कर सिपाहियो का संचालन करना नहीं है बल्कि देश मे रह कर, हमारे देश के हर आदमी का संचालन करना है जो देश के लिये जान देना चाहता है, देश के लिये मरना चाहता है । खबरे आती है, कि हजारो आदमी अपना ब्लड देना चाहते है लेकिन रक्त जमा करने के लिये कोई इतजाम नहीं है—क्यू लगा हुआ है । खबरे आती है कि हजारो आदमी फ्राँज मे भरती होना चाहते है लेकिन भरती करने के लिये काफी आदमी नहीं है । क्या अभी भी देश की रक्षा करने के लिये जो एक एटीट्यूड होता है, रख होता है, वह हम में नहीं आया है क्या ? हम अब भी सिर्फ एक नार्मल तरीके से चल रहे है क्या ? आज इस बात की नितान्त आवश्यकता है कि सरकार मे जो एक थोड़ी सी लियागजी, थोड़ी सी सुस्ती, जिम को शायद व शाति-प्रियता कहते हैं—मे शातिप्रियता नहीं कहता, सुस्ती और लियाजी कहता हूं—वह जो आ गई थी उस को दूर करना चाहिये । आज एक विशेष परिस्थिति मे हम काम कर रहे है और इस विशेष परिस्थिति के अनुकूल तमाम बातें होनी चाहिये—सरकारी दफ्तरों से ले कर जनता तक । इसलिये आज एक और चीज कर्नी चाहिये जिस से जनता को यह अहमाम हो कि सिर्फ वही त्याग करने नहीं जा रही है, जनता को यह मालूम हो कि सिर्फ उसी के सर पर बोझ नहीं है बल्कि

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

और लोग भी उस में सहयोग कर रहे हैं। हमारी पार्टी के जो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं, हम लोगों ने यह तय किया है कि एक महीने का वेतन देंगे। लेकिन जनता को उस से अधिक का विश्वास होना चाहिये कि सरकार के जो टीमटाम हैं, सरकार के जो फुजूल के खर्चे हैं वे हटाये और घटाये जा सकते हैं, और भी खर्चों में कमी की जा सकती है जिस से जनता को इस बात का आश्वासन हो कि सिर्फ व्यक्तिगत रूप से वही पैसा नहीं दे रही है बल्कि सरकारी काम काज में भी युद्ध के चलते बहुत सी अनावश्यक चीजें समाप्त की जा रही हैं। यह पार्टी है, ये मोटरें हैं, यह टयूर हैं, शान-शौकत के खर्चे हैं, मैं उन सब चीजों को नहीं गिनाना चाहता हूँ—आप लोग मुझ से ज्यादा जानते हैं—ये चीजें समाप्त होनी चाहियें।

दूसरी चीज जिस के बारे में चर्चा की जाती है वह है युद्ध के चलते प्लान को, हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना को, कम करना चाहिये। मैं ने जो अधिकारी लोग थे उन से कहा कि आप कुछ और चर्चा कीजिये लेकिन देश में युद्ध के चलते हुए एक पस्ती फैलाने की चेष्टा मत कीजिये कि हम प्लान को करटेल करना चाहते हैं। हमारा नारा यह नहीं है कि प्लान को करटेल कीजिये, कम कीजिये। प्लान को और बढ़ाने की जरूरत हो सकती है। सिर्फ प्लान में थोड़ा सा शिफ्ट हो सकता है। जो चीजें साधारण शांति के समय के लिये आवश्यक होती हैं उन चीजों का उत्पादन स्थगित कर के जनता के लिये आवश्यक चीजों का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिये। अगर आज इस देश में बार-बार यह आवाज उठाई जाये कि प्लान करटेल हो, यह हो, वह हो, तो उस से काम नहीं चलेगा। आप को तो प्लान को और आगे बढ़ाना होगा, सिर्फ शिफ्ट करना होगा। रुख को इधर से उधर करना पड़ेगा। लेकिन टोटल एमाउंट, कुल खर्च, जो कुछ करेंगे उससे काम नहीं चलने वाला है। इसलिये उस से पहले आप किरायतशारी कीजिये। आम

तौर से हिन्दुस्तान की जनता में आज ऐसा असर होता है। बहुत सी बातें ऐसी होती हैं जो दिखावट के लिये होती हैं, शान के लिये होती हैं। यह आप खुद सोचिये ऐसी कौन सी चीजें शान के लिये, दिखावट के लिये होती हैं और उनको आपको बंद करना चाहिये।

एक और बात जिस के विषय में मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ, वह यह है कि आज जिन तरह से कुछ लोग देश को खानिर अपना सोमाओं को छोड़ कर, अपने स्वार्थ को छोड़ कर ऊपर उठ रहे हैं, उसी तरह आज मैं निवेदन करना चाहूँगा—और बहुत अरब के साथ इस सदन में कांग्रेस के सदस्यों से और सरकार से भी—कि उनको भी अपनी सामाओं से ऊपर उठना चाहिये, उनका भी छोटे दायरे से, छोटे नज़रों से ऊपर उठना चाहिये। आज देश उनसे अधिक उ मद करता है। उनके ऊपर जिमेवारी बहुत अधिक है। मैं नहीं जानता उस जिम्मेदारी का उस हद तक अहसास करेंगे कि नहीं, और आगे तक भी कितने लोग उसके लिये तैयार होंगे? सब के सब तैयार हों, मेरी यह प्रार्थना है और अपील है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ सब के सब होंगे। आज बहुत से व्यक्तियों में चर्चा होती है पार्टी की, इस गवर्नमेंट की, उस गवर्नमेंट की। मैं तो कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त देश को आगे ले जाने के लिये जो भी आगे बढ़ेगा उसके साथ हम सब हैं। इसका सवाल नहीं है कि किस पार्टी की गवर्नमेंट है, किसकी नहीं है। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट से हम इतना आज जरूर कहना चाहते हैं कि आपके जितने आश्वासन थे, आपका जो अब तक का सोचने का तरीका था, चीन के बारे में और दुनिया के बारे में, वह दिल के भीतर महसूस कीजिये, गलत साबित हुआ है। इस लिये आप अपने रुख में परिवर्तन कीजिये। आज हम देखते हैं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर को पूरा सपोर्ट, पूरा विश्वास, देश का प्राप्त है। यह भी हम चाहते हैं कि जो भी आदमी कैबिनेट में हो उसको प्राइम मिनिस्टर का समर्थन और विश्वास प्राप्त हो ही, लेकिन उसके साथ

ही प्राइम मिनिस्टर के विश्वासपात्र लोगों को जनता का भी विश्वासभाजन बनना चाहिये, सिर्फ प्राइम मिनिस्टर के विश्वास से काम नहीं चलेगा। शर्म की बात है कि आज हमारे देश में जनता को अपनी बात कहने के लिये, प्राइम मिनिस्टर को समझाने के लिये जलूस निकालना पड़े, मिटिंग करनी पड़े, प्रस्ताव भेजना पड़े। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर क्या देश की जनता की आवाज को, उसके रुख को समझते नहीं है? देश का समय एक बेकार सी चीज में बर्बाद होता है, प्राइम मिनिस्टर तक बात को पहुंचाने के लिये वह वक्त देश के दूसरे काम में लग सकता था। तो बहुत नम्रता से मैं निवेदन करूंगा, आप सब कांग्रेस के लोगों से, कि आप पर बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है। आप आज सिर्फ एक व्यक्ति नहीं हैं, आप के ऊपर सरकार को, देश को, चलाने की जिम्मेदारी है। अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को मैं जानता हूं और मैं तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर का वही रूप देखना चाहता हूं जो राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन के जमाने में रहा है। वही रूप देखना चाहता हूं। और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर जो भी बलिदान देश से चाहेंगे वह बलिदान देश देने के लिये तैयार है और मैं तो यहां तक कहने वाला हूं कि देश का एक नया इतिहास बनने वाला है। दुनिया में आज तक कोई ऐसी लड़ाई नहीं लड़ी गई जिसका सिपहमालार ७३ वर्ष का आदमी हो। लेकिन वह सिपहसालार अपन लोगों पर भरोसा रख कर पहचाने कि कौन सा उसका दोस्त है, कौन उसका दुश्मन है। आज वे पुरानी जो खुशी या नाखुशी की बातें थी उनसे काम नहीं चलने वाला है, उनमें तब्दीली करनी है और इसी लिये मैं अंत में यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आज देश के लिये जी भी बलिदान मांगा जाये, वह देना चाहिये। लेकिन हमको और आपको उस बलिदान का पात्र बनना चाहिये और जिस चीज के लिये बलिदान मांगा जा रहा है उसकी ओर हमारी और आपकी नज़र साफ होनी चाहिये।

आज देश कुछ भी इन्कार करने को तैयार नहीं है, देश अपने आपको मिटाने के लिये तैयार है। अगर कोई खामी होगी तो हमारी तरफ से होगी, आपकी तरफ से होगी और आगे, हमारा आने वाला इतिहास बतलायेगा। आज हम इस एयर कंडीशन्ड मदन में बैठ कर भले ही जो भी बातें कह दें लेकिन यदि आज हमने जनता का साथ न दिया, जनता के रुख को न समझा और जरा भी कुछ उसमें आगा पीछा किया, तो सिर्फ आगे आने वाली पीढ़िया ही नहीं, हमारा सारा इतिहास हमारे नाम पर थूकेगा, हमको गालियां देगा। इसलिये आज सिर्फ हमारे देश का ही प्रश्न नहीं है, सारी दुनिया का प्रश्न हमारे साथ जुड़ा हुआ है। आज अगर हिन्दुस्तान गिर जाता है, हिन्दुस्तान हार जाता है, हिन्दुस्तान तबाह हो जाता है, तो मैं समझता हूं कि एशिया में नहीं बल्कि दुनिया में डेमोक्रेसी नाम की कोई चीज नहीं रह जायेगी, एशिया में जनतन्त्र के लिये कोई गुजाइश नहीं रह जायेगी। अगर भारत चीन को नहीं रोक सकता है तो एशिया का इतिहास बदल जायेगा, एशिया का इतिहास बदलते-बदलते दुनिया का इतिहास बदल जायेगा और उसकी जिम्मेदारी हम लोगों के ऊपर होगी। आज हमारे देश की रक्षा का ही प्रश्न नहीं है बल्कि दुनिया में जनतन्त्र की रक्षा का प्रश्न है। इसलिये एक बड़ी चीज आपके सामने है। छोटे दायरे में सोचने से काम नहीं चलेगा, हमें बड़े दायरे में इस बात को सोचना पड़ेगा। इस लिये मेरा कहना है कि आज जो कुछ हमारे देश में उपलब्ध हो सके उसको प्राप्त किया जाये। हो सकता है, अभी हम बिना तैयारी के रहे, अभी तक हम तैयार नहीं थे और हो सकता है कि हमें कुछ परेशानी भी हो लेकिन इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि अंत में विजय हमारी हो होगी।

एक खतरा से मैं सावधान कर देना चाहता हूं और वह यह है कि चीन ने हमारे देश पर जो

[श्री गंगाशरण सिंह]

आक्रमण किया उससे देश में जोश वह खरोश पैदा हो गया है। हो सकता है कि एक आक्रमण करने के बाद कुछ कब्जा करने के बाद, दुश्मन वहां पर अपनी शक्ति कंसोलिडेट करेगा, सड़कें बनायेगा और कुछ दिन वह फौज और हथियार लेकर आगे न बढ़े, इस तरह से लड़ाई की खबरें न आयें और उसके बाद "लल" का, सुस्ती का वातावरण हो जाये, लेकिन उस वक्त देश में कम्प्ले-सेन्सी, सुस्ती नहीं होनी चाहिये। जो "लल", जो शैथिल्य इस तरह से आयेगा उस से सारे देश को और सरकार को सावधान रहना चाहिये। सरकार को और हम सब को इस बात की चेतना पहले से ही रहनी चाहिये और इस तरह का जो "लल" होगा उसके लिये अगर पहले से ही सतर्क नहीं रहेंगे तो वे लहरों की तरह आ जायेंगे और लोग तरह-तरह की बातें फैला कर दुश्मन की मदद करेंगे।

अपना भाषण समाप्त करने से पहले मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं कि दुर्भाग्य से या सौभाग्य से हम अपने केस को इन्टरनेशनल, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर रखने में असमर्थ रहे हैं। यही कारण है कि शायद वे मुल्क जिनके साथ हमारा नान-एला-इन्मेंट का संबंध था वे तो आज हमारी मदद कर रहे हैं और जो हमारे दोस्त मुल्क मुहिम के वक्त काम देने वाले समझे जाते थे उनकी तरफ से इस संकट में कोई आवाज नहीं आई। उनमें से कुछ ने तो चीन का साथ दिया और कुछ बीच में पड़ कर बटवारे की बात कर रहे हैं। मगर इसमें मीडियेशन या बटवारे की क्या बात है? बटवारा तो तब ही होता है जब कोई शक हो। जो लोग हमारे घर में घुस आये हैं उनको जब तक बाहर नहीं कर दिया जाता तब तक उनसे कोई बात नहीं की जा सकती है और न इसमें कोई बटवारे की बात आती है। क्या दुनिया में कहीं इस तरह की बात हुई है? जब कोई दूसरे मुल्क वाला किसी कम्प्यूनिस्ट मुल्क के हमारे आसपास में कोई अड्डा बनाते हैं तो हमारे

कम्प्यूनिस्ट भाई हल्ला करते हैं कि इससे हमारे मुल्क पर हमला होगा, वहां से हमारे मुल्क में हवाई जहाज आयेंगे, लेकिन जब हमारे मुल्क पर एक कम्प्यूनिस्ट मुल्क का हमला होता है तो बटवारे, मुलहनाम और मेलजोल की बातें करते हैं। इस लिये सब से बड़ा खतरा जिसका हमें सामना करना है वह "लल" से, सुस्ती से बचने का है और यह जो मुलहनाम की बात है, यह बेजरूरत की चर्चा है। उससे बचना है। इससे हमारी सरकार और जनता को बहुत सतर्क रहना चाहिये और इस विश्वास के साथ आगे बढ़ना चाहिये कि चीन के साथ हमारी लड़ाई लम्बी होगी। हम अब तक तैयार नहीं थे लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है, देश तैयार है और देश यह समझता है कि लड़ाई लम्बी होगी। इसलिये समय आ गया है कि हमारे कर्णधारों को भी ज्यादा तैयार होना चाहिये।

4 P.M.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in supporting the two Resolutions so ably and in so forthright a manner moved by the hon. the Home Minister I wish to associate myself with the remarks, sentiments, hopes and aspirations which have been expressed by the speakers who have gone before me.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

While saying this, Madam, I have to dwell on one or two points of Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha's speech; probably it was due to my defective knowledge of Hindi; I wish I had understood him fully. Now he made an appeal to Congressmen and said that a heavy responsibility lay on the shoulders of Congressmen in this struggle and that they should make no difference between parties, etc. As far as I have understood the minds of my leaders and the ideology of the Congress, I can, without any fear, give this assurance that, as far as this national effort in preserving our freedom, in vindicating our national self-respect and in driving out the aggressor is concerned, there are no parties in this country, no Congress Party,

no Praja Socialist Party, no Socialist Party; there is only one party and that is India and the Indian people. He may rest assured about it, and the Prime Minister is the last person to make party or political differences in this context and at the present juncture. Our main interest would be the country and the country's freedom.

The other point on which I would like to say a word or two is about his reference to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I think I will have to single out Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to congratulate him for the stand he has taken—not that I have not appreciated the stand taken by the other two leaders; their patriotic stand is understood. But considering the ideology of the party to which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta belongs, I really appreciate the courage with which he has taken this stand; he has taken a patriotic stand and I have no apprehension that he will play the role of Dhritarashtra, and if he does so . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to be Yudhistira.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: . . . there is no Bhima in this country that would be entering into his embrace. On the other hand he will be crushed, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will be crushed by the people, and if unfortunately it otherwise happens, he will be crushed by somebody else. So I do not think that his bona fides in taking this patriotic stand should be questioned. And to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta I would like to say this through you, Madam. Now he took exception or rather he expressed regret that some of his comrades and friends should have been in custody today. There would have been no need for this if those friends had taken the same patriotic stand as the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has taken here. If they had not gone to the extent of distributing pamphlets criticising our Government stand against our national honour, against their own oath to . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I repudiate this charge. Let it be proved that any such pamphlet was distributed. I am very sorry to hear this.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I suppose you are in the habit of reading newspapers. Have you seen what has happened in Bombay, how leaflets have been distributed in Bombay? If that is true—well, I am qualifying it, if the newspaper reports are true—then that is not a patriotic stand, and the Government would have failed in its duty if it had allowed these unpatriotic people, who border on treason, to go abroad.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, let the hon. the Home Minister talk to us and I am sure . . .

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I assure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that not only members of his party but all others in this country need not have any fear of the Ordinances and the Defence of India Rules being applied if they are patriotic enough, if they prove to be true citizens of this country.

Well, before I begin to take up the subject-matter of the Proclamation and the Ordinances and Resolutions, it is a very sad thing, Madam, to see that circumstances have arisen in this country for a Proclamation of this kind. It was not in the remotest thoughts of any Indian that a national emergency of this nature would arise at all, for we have all along followed the path of peace, with charity to all, wishing well of everyone, with malice to none, being envious of no progressive nation in the world and absorbed deeply in building up our own economy, the economy of a country which has been exploited blood white by a foreign power for a century and a half. That even when we were following, as is obvious, this policy of peace there should have been aggression on our land is a great misfortune. There were times when possibilities of aggression were suggested to our Government by several sections



[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

in the country from time to time. But the Prime Minister being sure of our stand that we desire nobody's lands, that we were entirely absorbed in our own national effort, was sure that we would harm none and, therefore, nobody, including even a non-friendly neighbour, would have any intentions of committing aggression. But aggression has come. Madam, history tells us of no instance of either in the ancient past or in modern days of our ever committing aggression anywhere. It is true that in the ancient past we spread ourselves. But how did we do it? As our historians say, we went outside India with humility, to share with others the little knowledge that we had, the little culture and wisdom we had and in some instances even the material wealth that we had. We did not exploit any country. In modern days again we have gone out to serve though we regret that we went out to serve in some countries. Obviously, the whole world knows that absorbed as we are in our own struggle of eradicating poverty and illiteracy, still associating ourselves with the world's problems, our Government, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was outlining in detail, have taken a truly non-aligned stand. Wherever it was right we went out of our way to support it, even sacrifice for the cause of the right, and wherever there was wrong we have gone and said it was wrong, and we did what little lay in our might to help, to redeem what others did. In the face of this situation, in the face of our ancient culture, of peace-loving traditions in which we were conditioned that China should carry on a malicious propaganda that we are aggressors or we have intruded into their land reminds us of the old fable of the wolf and the lamb, in this case the dragon and the lamb. Well, I need not repeat the story. That has been so.

Madam, even with regard to our own territories, parts of our territories being in foreign possession, we did

not use force. For the territories which were illegally grabbed and maintained and exploited against the interests of India we waited patiently for centuries, so patiently that the people blamed that we were docile—we wanted that these should be resolved peacefully. We had the power, we had the strength and we had the means to drive out the aggressor after independence; still we did not use force. In one instance with cent per cent, peaceful means we got it back and in another instance we had to use the minimum effort and that only when we realised that that part being in the possession of that country threatened the national security of India, when there was evidence that that little effort should be put. That we should have been attacked, as these enemies have done, is really the strangest irony in history.

Madam, the tremendous response which has come from abroad, from countries with different political systems, with different social systems, countries which have come out in a very open manner, some expressing sympathy and giving support while others expressing sympathy and regretting that aggression should have been committed on such a peaceful nation as India, is evidence of the fact that the world knows today that India has been a victim of cruel aggression.

There is one point which has been made against the Government by friends opposite, not now, from time to time that we have been very friendly with China. That needs a little explanation. I myself feel a sense of guilt, as hon. Members have referred to my observations here to what good I saw in China before, but this could be easily explained. We wanted to be friends of all, and we have deliberately tried in every honest way to be friends of everybody in the world, and we cannot begin to be friends of everyone by suspecting the first man we meet with. And as far as China's behaviour till about five years ago was concerned, it was all friendly, very

friendly and nobody could discover a dagger in the silken hands that they were extending for shaking our hands with. It was, therefore, not wrong that we have been friendly with China. It is only when we discovered that forgetting the good that India did to China, forgetting the immense moral strength that India brought to China—India was the first country to have brought moral strength to the People's Republic of China—forgetting all that, forgetting all the hard fight that we were fighting for China for their admission into the United Nations in the General Assembly, forgetting all that they began to vilify India and particularly our Prime Minister, then our eyes were opened. I was a member of the India-China Friendship Executive Committee—I was its Treasurer although there was nothing to be kept in charge with the treasurer as is the position in all such organisations—but I resigned on that very day when I heard the first report . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Does it exist even today?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: It exists in name.

PROF. M. B. LAL: Why not wind it up?

SHRIMATI UMA NEHRU (Uttar Pradesh): It is gone.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Here is its Chairman, Shrimati Uma Nehru. She says it is gone, died its natural death. It is all right. But we need not be ashamed of how friendly we were with China before. As long as we did not suspect any hostile intentions on her part and as long as we did not suspect her expansive motives, it was but right that we should have been friendly with China, as Asian power which was trying to be friendly with us. Therefore, the charge that our Government was too friendly and that in a way it has brought this crisis upon itself is not well-founded, is not a charge to be made. I agree with

hon. Members that now we have to make every effort to drive out this aggressor.

Madam, I am not satisfied that we have made adequate preparations. It is admitted that we have not been too well prepared to receive the aggressor because we were always hoping that reason would prevail with China and that some peaceful way would be resorted to for resolving this question. And therefore we were not thoroughly prepared; of course, we should have been. I do not dispute with those who say that we should have been. For instance, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha and others have said that we should have been thoroughly prepared. Knowing China at least after we had our experience with regard to their real intentions we should have been thoroughly prepared. I was one of those who were taken to Leh. It was a depressing experience. The Defence Minister here must forgive me if I say that the Members of Parliament were not taken into confidence. The Brigadier who was sent to conduct us was the least responsive to our questions. The programme there was to keep us for two and a half hours, to take us to a military agriculture farm—No. 1—to an afforestation farm—No. 2—and then to have lunch with the Minister for Ladakh Affairs in the Kashmir Government, and then come back.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: Was he taken to Leh only to see the agriculture farm? There was no need to go to Leh for that purpose. That you can see anywhere in the country.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: In fact, we wanted to stay there and know something about military matters. Of course we all knew—we were responsible Members of Parliament—that we could not get into some of the facts the knowledge of which, if spread, would be an advantage to the enemy. Of course, we were all aware of that fact. But we wanted to know something about military matters. We put questions

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

to them whether any modern weapons, particularly automatic weapons, were supplied. It was a direct question, but there was no definite answer—neither 'No' nor 'Yes'. And then fortunately for us the weather was inclement and we had to stay there for a night. Then we met several military friends, captains and others, because we were entertained at a Dinner. We could see the full spirit in them but there was no cheer then. They were all determined people but without any cheer. We cannot say what all that was due to but by putting questions to certain individuals we could find out this fact that they were not satisfied with the equipment given to them. But it is not for that that I am making this reference.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA:  
Were they properly clad?

(Interruptions.)

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: They were as fully dressed as they are here; they were supplied with normal clothing, boots, etc. Madam, Shri Ganga Sharan referred to boots. They were supplied with boots. I do not think in the form of dress they lacked anything. The whole purpose of my referring to this thing is to show under what hard conditions our forces were working. If what we saw in Leh could be a measure by which we can judge the situation generally, we have to appreciate the heavy odds against which our people are working there, our Jawans, our Captains, our military officers and others. Anyway, I honestly felt that there was something wanting there, and some friends have already expressed their views and given Press statements to that effect. In fact, Madam, the Press people who were taken there after we went were given more information than we were given.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:  
(Bihar): Did you express yourself to the Defence Minister?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Well, I am not making any grievance of it. But we have to take into account those steep hillocks which they had to climb, the difficult conditions under which they had to build a road, that road towards Chusul. From Leh we went about 30 or 35 miles on that road built partly by our men as well as partly by Tibetan refugees, that first-class roads which will take even the biggest lorries and vehicles right up to Chushul area. Of course, there was some length of the road to be filled up then. I think it must have been done by now. All these things point to the adverse circumstances under which our forces have to work and considering this fact that they have made heroic resistance, it is something which we have to commend and which we have to be grateful for.

I have also in this connection, Madam, to join with others in expressing our gratitude to the various foreign countries which have given us assistance. I am one with those friends who say that any assistance from whichever country it comes should be accepted and that we should not mince matters now, whether it is a country of the Western Block or a country of the Socialist Bloc or a country which belongs to no Bloc. Whichever country is willing to offer assistance, we have to take that assistance from it, because as the whole world knows we have not been a nation expecting war, expecting aggression and, therefore, we are short of the modern equipment. Therefore, there is so much need to accept assistance in the form of equipment, arms and ammunition, etc. from whichever country it comes. In this connection I want to say that in this emergency the truth of the adage "A friend in need is a friend indeed" is very well emerging. All countries who are our real friends are coming to our aid today.

The next point that I would like to make is with regard to mobilising our resources. In fact, as has been said, there has been a tremendous and

a magnificent effort from the people who have been giving their everything, some in the form of gold, some in the form of cash, some in the form of blood and some in the form of so many other things. In every possible and conceivable way people have been coming forward to help the Government in this national struggle. I am aware that there is a National Defence Council formed, but I would like to suggest that there should be a separate Department either in the Ministry of Defence or in the Home Ministry, in any appropriate branch, for co-ordinating all this effort. I think during the Second World War we had such a Committee—War Committee or Council for War Effort, I do not exactly know the name—for co-ordinating the war effort. There must be a special effort made to pool this war effort to co-ordinate all the resources so that there is no time-lag in mobilising our resources. This effort which will be a longdrawn struggle may cost us even thousands of crores of rupees. I do not mind, Madam even if our Five Year Plans come to an end. It is national integrity and national security that should come first. Let us suffer starvation, let us suffer every privation, let us suffer all kinds of austerity, but let us devote every bit of our resources for our war effort to fight the enemy. Therefore, Madam, there should be no effort spared in mobilising the resources of the country. Only one word more since you have rung the bell. I am one with every other Member to say that sufficient responsibility must be entrusted to Members of Parliament and Members of Legislatures in the States. It pains me to see that even at this juncture in some States Defence Committees have not been formed or co-ordinated. Every public-minded citizen must be taken in now, his cooperation must be taken and some work must be assigned to him. It is just to co-ordinate this massive human effort apart from what the Government does that I suggested a separate department. Apart from what other private organisations do

the Government should make an effort to see that the reverses which we had the misfortune to experience are vindicated and that we not only gain our positions back but that we drive out the invader from the last yard of our borders. I have no doubt, as hon. Members have expressed, that our cause is right. That even when China should have committed this shameless aggression, we should have forgotten it and pleaded for the right cause regarding the admission of China into the U.N. must make it clear even to that blind enemy that India always insists on going on the right path. China had good traditions in the past. The Chinese came to India but not as invaders but to borrow from us, to take light from us, people like Hiuen-Tsang and others, but the present Government of China has given a go-by to all those traditions but have kept one tradition and that is the tradition of the dragon. The dragon is still their national symbol and dragon symbolises brute and blind force. So we cannot except a country with such a symbol as a brute and blind force, to see reason. Therefore, we have to increase our effort to bring reason to them and to make them leave this country. Thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the two Resolutions which were moved this morning by the hon. Home Minister and to add my humble support to the great words of courage and determination to resist which fell from him when he addressed the House this morning. I should also like to pay my homage as he did and others have done, to the Jawans who are fighting in the front and also our homage to the families of the Jawans who are in India and who have to bear the privations of the absence of their dear and beloved ones on the battlefield.

Madam, this current phase of hostilities with China is a new chapter in India history. We won our freedom in the year 1947 and we are asked by

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

time in 1962 to prove that we are worthy of that freedom and to retain it. As the Home Minister pointed out this morning, there is no question of national integration at all. That question does not come up in the present emergency and it was very heartening to hear the other day from the Leader of the D.M.K. Party at Madras, Mr. Annadurai, when he said that his Party pledged itself to support the Government in the present struggle. Mr. Annadurai happens to be here. We are certain that his Party, whatever views it might have on the complex question of Dravidistan, will give full support to the Government. I was also very much heartened to hear the speech of my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta, and I do hope that Mr. Gupta's speech means a revision of the Communist Party of India's attitude on current and international affairs. It will encourage us a good deal if the Communist Party gave up the hammer and sickle as its flag and accepted to work under an Indian national flag as an Indian Communist Party just as the Yugoslav Communist Party is doing so that we may accept their co-operation in the war effort in an increasing measure. Much has been said by those who participated in the debate about our shortcomings in defence in the past. I would agree with the hon. Minister when he said that mistakes might have been committed and it had happened in history that whenever a war had been declared, somebody had been blamed. When the war broke out in 1939, in England, Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Neville Chamberlain were blamed and even now in the U.S.A., President Kennedy is being blamed for his unpreparedness in regard to Cuba and to the location of Soviet bases there. It has always happened that some people will have to come in for blame. We do not wish to conduct an inquest into the past because this is a most inopportune time to conduct inquests. I may, in passing, refer to a very great event that took place yesterday which was the very courageous decision of the

Prime Minister to accept the resignation of the Defence Minister, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. It has been customary in British Parliamentary practice not to take up a controversy and continue it when a man has settled his account and paid the penalty. Since the Defence Minister has settled his account, I do not want to go into the short-comings . . .

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: He has still to pay the penalty.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, but the tradition is that when a man has settled his account and paid his penalty, we say, let the controversy end, though I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Sinha, that many mistakes have been committed in the past but the time has come for us now to forget the controversies and think about the grave future which lies before us of resisting Chinese aggression.

I would like to make a few points in this debate besides giving my humble support to all the efforts that the Government are going to make to meet this grave national peril but the first point I would like to make is that the Chinese Embassy is working in Delhi and our Indian Embassy is working in Peking, but the conditions under which our Embassy works are not the conditions under which the Chinese Embassy works here. We have got a democratic form of Government. Everything is being discussed publicly including our reverses on the front such as they may be. In China no such discussion would be permissible and our Embassy staff are not allowed to move freely while the Chinese Embassy staff are moving freely in the capital. They know what is being said in this House as well as the other House. This is a very curious kind of war. This is a phoney war. A war is going on but no war has been declared. The United Nations Organisation is functioning, which has been established to safe-

guard the security of the world and peace. That U.N. Organisation does not come into the picture. This is an unofficial war which is being carried on at the present moment. I know that a number of diplomatic difficulties will arise if an Embassy is closed. For example, an Embassy is closed only on the declaration of war. We do not want to declare officially a war on the Chinese Government because it has many other implications but we can certainly ask the Chinese Embassy to quit Delhi and we should withdraw our Indian Embassy from Peking because the existence of the Indian Embassy does not add to our information and the existence of the Chinese Embassy in India adds to the information that they have and they know exactly how our defensive installations are being manned and what troops are going to the front. Why should we give information? I would like the hon. Home Minister to throw some light on this matter and I do hope that now that we have taken the decision to resist and throw out the invader, as the Resolution says, we would ask the Chinese Embassy to quit this country and arrange for their passports so that we may not have a centre of espionage here.

I must express my disappointment that the great Soviet Union, from which we expected much, has not yet positively come over on the side of a reasonable solution of the dispute. We do not want to be critical of the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union has its own differences with Peking but I would like at least the sentiment to be expressed in this House that the future of socialism depends on the decision that the Soviet Union is going to take in this dispute. If the Soviet Union continues to extend its support to Peking, then socialism is finished in the sub-continent and there is no chance whatsoever of the Indian people listening to the message preached by socialists or communists . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL: Why confuse socialism with communism?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am using the word socialism in the terms of Marxist terminology. They always refer to it . . . (Interruptions) Communism will be finished in this continent and I do hope that the Soviet Union will come out more positively on our side and make China listen to reason and perceive the unreasonableness of its stand on the present dispute.

Madam, I would like to refer to some of the measures which the Government have taken to organize the war effort in the country on a national footing. A National Defence Council was constituted the other day. But if I may say so, the composition of this council is extremely disappointing. There is only one leader of a political party there, the others are distinguished individuals. This is a kind of national council which was created by the British during the war time, during 1940-1945. We do not want the present Government to commit the mistake of the British Government of having a council of agreeable and pleasant people. The Government must be prepared to meet the critics right across the table, including its staunchest critics. A person like Rajaji should be there on the National Defence Council, because the Council will be national only in name if other parties are excluded and I was very sorry that on the eve of the organising of the national war effort the principal political parties should have been omitted from the National Defence Council. I can speak about this, Madam, because I do not expect to get into the National Defence Council. I speak on behalf of the other parties in this House, because we would like to see all the parties join in this national effort.

There is another matter to which the Government has to pay attention. Once the National Defence Council is constituted, its function will not be to advise the Government with regard only to the operation of the war, but also about production and I would like the hon. the Home Min-

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

ister, who can rise above party feelings in this matter, to make a declaration in this House that there is no question of prestige about trade unions. If a trade union has a majority in an industry, that industry will recognise that union. Then the present trade union rivalries which go on between the various organisations will stop and I am sure that the industrial truce on those lines can be arranged provided all the parties are requested to take part in the work of the National Defence Council.

I should also like to refer to the kind of case which we are putting out to the public, about the hostilities on the frontier. The performance of the All India Radio is extremely disappointing and even in distant Aurangabad, far away from the capital, I found clusters of people listening to the Peking radio. And the Peking radio puts it from their point of view, a plausible case, every time speaking of India as the aggressor, that they are meeting the aggressors, that the Indian troops have marched forward and harassed the Chinese, and so on. I do not want the All India Radio to tell lies, because its performance in maintaining truth over a period of years has been fairly commendable, except on rare occasions, like that of the Central Government-employees' strike. Generally the All India Radio gives out factual accounts. But if we are going to carry on a war, if we are going to drive out the invader, for heaven's sake, let us put our cases, strongly. We must have talks about predatory Chinese communism, and state that what they are doing to India has been done to Indonesia, has been done in Burma already in the past, in 1960. It was done in Nepal. That the Chinese throughout have tried to encroach on the territories of other people is proved by history. They have an unresolved dispute over a boundary with the Soviet Union. All these things have to be put forward, in propaganda sheets and in radio broadcasts. I would like to ask the

Government, why are we still squeamish about hitting the Chinese? We know what Peking broadcasts. We do not want to hit the Chinese. We are a very peaceful people and we do not want to hit anybody. But let us put the case better than we have done. As a result of the way in which we have presented the case there is some confusion and some non-aligned countries doubt whether we have a strong case. We had the other day a message from Ghana that President Nkrumah had written to Prime Minister Macmillan asking him not to give aid to India. We had supported Ghana's struggle for independence. This country has had nothing but the warmest feeling and admiration for the people of Ghana. But here is a person, a friend of ours, who comes and tells the Head of the Government of the U.K. not to give us arms when we are fighting the Chinese. Why is it that our case is not well understood? Even in Yugoslavia all that the official newspapers state is that the Chinese occupation is impermissible—something negative. Nothing very positive. I would like the Government to gear up its propaganda effort. I have mentioned all these things previously during the foreign Affairs debate and I mention it again that we should put our case strongly. Now that we are fighting, let us try to put our case vigorously, including counter-propaganda. I should like what the Home Minister said this morning to be broadcast, that millions of people are dying of famine in China. Let this be told and let other things be told on the air. We should also support the struggle of the people of Tibet for autonomy and independence. If it is to be an all out war, why should we not support the people of Tibet? Why should we give the impression to anybody that we have some kind of mental reservation about these matters, that we are still thinking in terms of a negotiated settlement with the Chinese? I know that is not the intention of the Government. I should like this matter to be seriously considered by the Government.

Madam, I would also like to refer to the external front and our United Nations delegation. I do not want again to conduct an enquiry into the past. Many mistakes have been made. We tried to interpret the Soviet Union to the West and make them better understood. We largely succeeded in our effort. But we are not successful in making ourselves understood by other people. This has been the result of the work of our U.N. delegations. There is no point in thinking that some people are indispensable. It was Monsieur Clemenceau who said that if you see the cemeteries of the world, they would all consist of indispensable people. Therefore, I would like the Government to overhaul their ideas about the United Nations delegation. There is no point in trying to be an arbiter between the western bloc and the Soviet. Let us be arbiters between ourselves and our enemies now. And we know who our enemies are. I do not agree with the hon. Member Shri Govinda Reddy, when he said that we should vote for China's admission to the United Nations. I know that the U.N. will not be a universal organisation as long as China is not a member of United Nations. But I would like to repeat this view and at the United Nations' forum if I am asked to speak, I would say this: We know this organisation cannot be complete. But I am not prepared to vote for a country which has endangered world peace. It is my moral protest that makes me abstain from the Resolution. I do not know why the Prime Minister instructed our delegation to vote for China's admission to the U.N. It was left to a newspaper in Cairo to point out this fact.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That was the right thing to do.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: And the right thing has proved to be wrong.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Anyway, this is my view and I mention it. Madam, there is another point . . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Bringing China to the world forum is the right thing.

SHRI A. D. MANI: But this is my point of view and I have stated it.

Madam, I would like to make another point, and that is that the Indian troops now functioning in Congo should be recalled. The other day a spokesman of the Ministry here declared that the Indian troops would not be recalled and this was also confirmed by a statement made in New York. I know that we are very much attached to the U.N.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): This morning, the Prime Minister told the other House that he has asked the U.N. Secretary-General for the return of our troops.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am thankful to Mr. Samuel for giving me the latest information on this subject. He, as a very active newspaper man, is thoroughly posted with the information in the other House.

Then, Madam, I would like to mention another point and that is about the gold hoardings. I know that there has been a good deal of panic in this country and the Bombay Stock Exchange has collapsed, and there is no trading in gold bullion now. But this is the only time when we can unearth the gold hoardings. History is not going to give us another time in the future to unearth the gold hoardings. I would like to make one suggestion to the Government, that they should ask every person under the Defence of India Rules, to disclose his gold hoardings, on solemn oath. We need not seize that gold, but we must have an idea of how much gold we have in this country. The Finance Ministry's estimate is that we have gold hoardings of the value of Rs. 4,000 crores. It is only an estimate. We should know how much of gold we could lay our hands on by paying the price in an emergency. The suggestion that I am making has its implications. The moment we ask a man to make a



statement on solemn affirmation, he has got to tell the truth. If he does not tell the truth, he runs into trouble and I would like the Government to get this information about gold hoardings so that they may be available to the country in an emergency.

I would like to make one more suggestion about the functioning of the present emergency administration. A number of people have been arrested in Bombay. Probably with the kind of lead which my hon. friend, Mr Bhupesh Gupta, has been giving there will be fewer arrests but if there are others—prominent political leaders—we should also take into account civil liberties. Civil liberties have got to be preserved. During war-time administration civil liberty is as important as the prosecution of war and it has been the tradition of India that civil liberty has been maintained and I am sure that there will be no occasion for the misuse of the Defence of India Rules. I would like in every State an Advisory Committee consisting of leaders of political parties to be formed so that the State Government may pass on information about unusual happenings like this in an informal capacity on the basis that the information will be kept confidential. I am recalling to my mind the action that Mr Churchill took when he arrested one of his own members, one of the members of the Conservative Party. I forget his name now; he was a member of the House of Commons. He arrested him and informed the Leader of the Opposition why he arrested him. The information that he gave at that time was that he was in touch with enemy and nobody raised any motion in the House of Commons. I would like some such Committee to be formed in the States

Madam, I would now like to come to the two amendments about which I have given notice. The first amendment reads:

"That in the first paragraph of the Resolution, in line 8, after the words 'has committed aggression'

the words 'by violating India's northern frontiers as demarcated by the MacMahon Line and the traditional boundaries of the Ladakh region' be inserted."

The implication of this amendment is this. Whatever we are saying today and whatever Resolution we are going to pass will be read by the Chinese. We want to make it very clear that there is no question of settlement on the basis of September 8 line of actual control, but we go back to 1959 to the original aggression in Ladakh. That is the frontier which has been violated and that is the frontier which we should seek to return to our motherland. I am sure that is also the Government's point of view. When we put forward a Resolution of this kind which amounts to a declaration of war, let the enemy know what we have in mind. I wanted this to be made very clear and I do hope that there will be an affirmative statement by the Home Minister when he replies to the debate.

Now, I shall explain the implication of my second amendment. There I have asked for the addition of a new paragraph saying:

"This House further regrets that by their naked aggression the People's Government of China have violated International Law and practices and undermined world peace and security."

A number of other unaligned nations have not given that much support which we expected. They think that this is some kind of a border dispute. It is to them that this paragraph is addressed. This country—and I would like to use the words mentioned by the Home Minister himself this morning—this ruthless and unscrupulous country has violated world peace; not only the peace of India but world peace because what has happened to India may happen to Burma tomorrow, may happen to Malaya the day after and she has violated International Law and practices.

If we want to condemn, let us condemn them in strong and parliamentary terms. I attach very great importance to this Resolution because one hundred years hence this will be one of the historical documents of India. It virtually amounts to a declaration of war and when we adopt a Resolution of this kind let us put all the facts that we have at our disposal and let us express our opinion unflinchingly. I am sure the hon. Home Minister agrees with the amendments which I have tabled because they are non-controversial and I do hope that they will be accepted by the Government.

I do not want to say anything more except to add my support to what the Home Minister said that victory will be ultimately ours and till victory is achieved this country will not rest content. All of us in our moods, in our minds and in our working will be on a war footing.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):** Madam Deputy Chairman, one of the salutary provisions of our Constitution is article 352 which enables a state of emergency to be declared by the President. As to the state of emergency there can be no doubt. We are faced with a danger such as we have not faced during the 15 years of our existence as an independent State. We are the subject of external aggression by a power when we had befriended. I will not deliberately go into the incidents that have created the existing situation. Those incidents are of a heart-rending character. I will just, however, refer to a letter which I read in the *Indian Express* of 31st October. It is from a poor widow and she complains—she is proud of the fact that her husband gave his life for the country but she makes a legitimate complaint—that her husband was poorly equipped. For that poor equipment all of us are responsible and therefore I will not go into that question at all.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras):** Not all.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** However, Madam Deputy Chairman, a tribute is due to our gallant officers and our gallant jawans who have, against heavy odds, given an account of themselves of which their motherland might well be proud. Some of them have given their lives for their motherland and we are justly proud of them. That the aggressor should be an Asian country which professes to be a socialist country is a matter of deep sorrow for everyone who values decency in humanity; it is a matter for deep sorrow for everyone who values Afro-Asian solidarity.

Now, I would like to say that I was deeply impressed by the speech of my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. It was a patriotic utterance and it constitutes a departure from orthodox communist thinking. We are seeing in our lifetime the birth of, shall I say, communism as a patriotic force. Madam, Yugoslavia broke away from the Soviet Union and . . .

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:** Imperialist communism.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** I have no reason to distrust the Communist Party of India. There may be individuals who are not prepared to give their support to the war effort but the Defence of India Rules are there to deal with them. Action has been taken against some of them but as a party it is a matter for legitimate satisfaction that the Communist Party has supported the war effort of this country. And speaking for myself I do not want this war to become a war which will be fought only by reactionaries for reactionary ends. We have never submitted to aggression and we shall never submit to it.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Sapru, it is 5 p.m. You may continue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 9th November 1962.