

**GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS RE
PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY
AND AGGRESSION BY CHINA—
*continued.***

MR. CHAIRMAN: The discussion on the two Resolutions moved by the Home Minister yesterday and the amendments moved to Resolution No. 2 will now continue. Shri P. N. Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I was submitting yesterday that we are not prepared to negotiate under duress. There can be no doubt that we shall achieve our objective of ridding the country of the Chinese aggressors, but what we must be clear about is that we have now to negotiate—to use a phrase which I do not like but which I am going to use for want of a better one—from a position of strength. We cannot sacrifice our national territory in Ladakh, nor can we forget that the North East Frontier Area is of the most vital national importance to our country's defence. We cannot think of negotiations until the Chinese withdraw to the lines which the parties were occupying before the 8th of September in both the areas. We cannot allow our borders to be a continual threat to us. We have behind us a united country under the leadership of our noble Prime Minister to whom a tribute in touching language was paid by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Macmillan, during the debate that took place in the House of Commons the other day. Mr. Macmillan said:

"Those of us who have had the privilege of personal contacts with Mr. Nehru must know how keenly he feels the importance of the moral and spiritual values for which he has striven."

After pointing out that the policy of non-alignment is deeply based on Indian philosophy, Mr. Macmillan went on to say that in our efforts to deal with China Mr. Nehru had been

guided by high moral and ethical principles and that the Chinese were guilty of brutal and ruthless application 'of policies based on the most naked and realistic concepts of power. Critics of our non-alignment policy would do well to remember that it has—it is a long quotation from Mr. Harold Wilson's speech in the British House of Commons, but the gist of it reinforces the view that I have emphasised, but I regret to find that there are some persons in this country who are questioning the soundness of that policy—that it has contributed largely to the preservation of peace during the last fifteen years, and war in this age of thermo-nuclear weapons is something which is fraught with the gravest danger to the very existence of the human race itself. We have refused to allow our country to be used for purposes of building up military bases by any group of powers and we have not entered into entangling alliances dangerous for the preservation of peace either in South East Asia or in the Middle East.

We have received generous assistance from the United States and Britain as well as from other countries, and we are grateful to them for it. Between 1941 and 1945 the Soviet Union received massive help from the United States, but that did not affect its independent foreign policy. Today we have received support from as many as forty countries, but I must refer, in the warmest terms possible, to the friendly efforts of our very good friend, President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic. That those efforts have failed for the time being is not due to any fault of President Nasser or the Arab world, of which he is the undoubted and undisputed leader.

Both the Right and the Left—and there are occasions when both the Right and the Left should work together—are united in our country to fight this war with the will to win it.

We

are not expansionists, we are not jingoists, we are not chauvinists. We

are not irridentists. We are fighting with clean hands for what we believe to be right, what we believe to be ours by every legal and moral right.

There is an undeclared war so far. It is undesirable to declare an open war. It can have consequences, which we cannot ignore at the moment, of a far-reaching character. After all China and Japan were virtually at war in Manchuria for years before war was actually declared. Lord Simon described it as the Chinese incident tor Japanese incident.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) ;
The Manchurian incident.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: You are right. It is the Mukdeu incident. It is not necessary just yet to break off diplomatic relations. It may become necessary—I do not rule that out—later, but we must leave the Prime Minister free in regard to this matter. We must express no opinion on that point at this stage.

Nothing has united us so much as this war. It has lit the fire of patriotism in our hearts, in the heart of people, young and old, belonging to both the South and the North. Even the D.M.K. has begun to realise its identity with the rest of India. With this indomitable will to win, there is reason for optimism, for we are not— and let me say this emphatically—without friends both among the aligned and non-aligned countries.

I am myself somewhat of a pacifist, but cowardice ^s worse, as our great master taught us, than violence. We should be untrue to the ideals bequeathed to us by Gandhiji if we were to falter in our determination to fight the issue out today. Let there be no 'is', and 'buts' regarding our war effort. For behind this issue, there loom larger ones. The issues, as I see them, are whether force should be

the arbiter in border disputes between neighbouring States, whether perfidy, chicanery and fraud should pay dividends to a State which practises them. The issue is whether treachery should be encouraged by those who value certain decencies in human and international behaviour.

China and the Peking Radio have been attacking us and our great Prime Minister in indecent language. They have been trying to stir up trouble in our country. They have declared this to be an imperialist expansionist war waged by us. Our Prime Minister is for us, the people of this country, the symbol of the mystic unity that is India. He has the love, the affection and the respect of a united people behind him, and the Chinese should remember that though we are a country which believes in using decent language even about our opponents, we cannot descend to their level. They cannot stir up our workers and delude tour people with the false propaganda they have been carrying on. Outlawed by the international community of nations, China is just behaving like an outlaw, and this is a tragedy for all those who believe in Asian solidarity, for all those who believe in certain progressive ideals.

China, Mr. Chairman, claims to be a socialist country. It is covering up its failure on its domestic front by ventures abroad on our borders. This is the usual way with totalitarian States. We are engaged in the task of giving to our people higher standards of living. We are engaged in the task of equalising opportunity, in giving to the workers of our factories, the tillers of our soil, the clerks in our establishments, that economic security, that economic justice which is vital for the good life. Though defence must, in the circumstances which have been forced upon us, receive the highest priority, we should not neglect the domestic front. It would be fatal for us to do So, for it is

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] only an economically prosperous India, an India that pursues the path of social justice, it is only an industrialised India that can give to its workers decent living conditions, that can supply the country with the nerve and the vigour to fight what might eventually prove to be a long drawn out war. Let us in this hour of trial which may indeed prove to be our greatest hour of triumph show firmness and determination to stick to our principles, for socialism means for us not expansionism, not jingoism, not irredentism but a deep and abiding attachment to those humane ideals which can only make life a joyous adventure on this planet of ours.

I venture to think, Mr. Chairman, that China poses a big problem even for those countries associated closely with her. They cannot be happy, for China is unfortunately developing along lines which all those who have faith in certain human values must deeply regret. Let us dedicate ourselves in a spirit of genuine humility to that service of the motherland which alone can help us to build up a socialist economy imbued with the true spirit of humanism, social justice, liberty, democracy and freedom.

We should utilise, "Mr. Chairman, whatever military talent is available in our country, and give our Generals, some of whom have retired, an opportunity to serve their country, in such a manner as to create no dualism in authority. They should be closely associated with the defence effort of the country. There should be speed and expedition in carrying out problems created by the war. and problems should not be delayed by red-tapism or by bureaucratic methods.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give my wholehearted support to the Resolutions which have been moved by our distinguished Home Minister in stirring language. The country is

passing through a difficult time. It is the duty of everyone to stand behind the Government of the day. We have curtailed civil liberties to some extent, but I hope that the powers with which the executive has been vested will be used with moderation and Judgment.

I would also like to pay once again a tribute to the patriotic speech which was delivered by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta yesterday . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Comrade.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I do not mind using that word. I have no hesitation in using the word "Comrade". His speech shows that Communism as an international force in the world is disappearing. Perhaps the Communist Party in India will develop one day on the lines of the Yugoslav Communist Party. Thank you very much.

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

सभापति जी, हम एक महान राष्ट्रीय संकट की छाया में यहाँ एकत्र हुए हैं। आज हमारी अनमोल आजादी खतरे में है। हमारा अस्तित्व दांव पर लगा है। जीवन में हमें जो भी कुछ प्रिय है, पूज्य है, उसे मिटाने के लिये कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने अपना खूनी पंजा आगे बढ़ाया है। यह हमारे लिये जिन्दगी और मौत की लड़ाई है, हमें इस लड़ाई में से विजयी बन कर निकलना है। इस अग्नि परीक्षा में से कुन्दन बन कर चमकना है। लेकिन विजय की पहली शर्त यह है कि हम आत्मनिरीक्षण करें।

मुझे यह देख कर दुख हुआ है कि इस संकट की घड़ी में भी हम यह स्पष्ट शब्दों में मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं कि चीन के इरादों को, चीन की सैनिक तैयारी को और चीन के अतिक्रमणों को, सही रूप में समझने में

हमने शलती की है। हमें यह भी स्वीकार करने में संकोच नहीं होना चाहिये कि राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा की उपेक्षा करके हमने राष्ट्र के प्रति एक महान अपराध किया है, अपनी सीमाओं को असुरक्षित छोड़ कर हम एक महान पाप के भागी बने हैं और हमें उस पाप का प्रायश्चित्त करने के लिये तैयार होना चाहिये।

क्या यह लज्जा की बात नहीं है कि स्वाधीनता के पन्द्रह वर्षों के बाद भी हम छोटे मोटे हथियारों के लिये विदेशों का मुंह ताकें? क्या हम अपने देश में आटोमेटिक राइफल्स भी नहीं बना सकते थे? क्या हम अपने जवानों को पहनने के लिये पूरे कपड़े भी नहीं दे सकते थे?

उन जवानों की वीरता की गाथा गाना ही पर्याप्त नहीं है, उनके आत्मोत्सर्ग की कहानियाँ ही काफी नहीं हैं। हमारे जवान हरदम मौत से खेलते रहे हैं, जान हथेली पर रख कर लड़ते रहे हैं। लेकिन केवल जवानों की वीरता हल्दीघाटी के मैदान में हमारी पराजय को नहीं रोक सकी, केवल जवानों का बलिदान पानीपत के मैदानों के इतिहास की कालिमा को नहीं बदल सका। उन जवानों के लिये जो सीमा पर अपना रक्त देकर हमारी रक्षा कर रहे हैं, हम श्रद्धा से नत हो जाते हैं। मगर हम इन जवानों को पूरी तरह से तैयार नहीं कर सके, इस के लिये भी हमारा मस्तक लज्जा से झुक जाना चाहिये।

मेरा निवेदन है कि इस बात की जांच की जाये, पता लगाया जाये, कि नेफा की सीमा पर जिसके सम्बन्ध में कहा जाता था कि वहाँ सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था बिल्कुल पक्की है, पूरी संख्या में जवान क्यों नहीं थे, उनके हाथों में जैसे हथियार चाहिये वैसे हथियार क्यों नहीं थे। ८ सितम्बर को चीनियों ने पहला हमला किया और उसके बाद २०

अक्टूबर को बड़ा आक्रमण किया। इतने दिन हमें मिले और इन दिनों में हमने अपने को क्यों नहीं तैयार किया? आज इस चीज का विवरण देना होगा। इस सम्बन्ध में एक प्रश्न और भी उठता है और मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा कि हम नेफा में पूरी तरह से तैयार थे या नहीं थे क्या यह हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को पता था? अगर यह पता था तो विदेश यात्रा से वापस आने के बाद उन्होंने हवाई अड्डे पर यह क्यों नहीं कहा कि हमने सेना को चीनियों को देश की भूमि से बाहर खदेड़ने का आदेश दे दिया है। अगर यह कहा जाये कि उन्हें पता नहीं था तो फिर इस प्रश्न का उत्तर देना होगा कि उनको इस बारे में किसने अंधेरे में रखा। हम यह भी जानना चाहेंगे कि हमारे नेता इस संकटकाल में फिर से अंधेरे में न रखे जायें इसके लिए कौन कौन से व्यक्ति बदल दिये गये हैं, क्या क्या व्यवस्था बदली गई है? क्या शासन गारन्टी देने की स्थिति में है कि जो भल हो गई है उसे दोहराया नहीं जायेगा, जो पाप हमने किया है उसकी पुनरावृत्ति नहीं होने दी जायेगी?

मुझे सन्देह है कि सरकार अब भी चीनी इरादों को समझ पा रही है या नहीं समझ पा रही है। अगर समझ पाती होती तो ८ सितम्बर की सीमा रेखा तक चीनियों के वापस चले जाने के बाद, युद्ध विराम की वार्ता चलाने को तैयार नहीं होती। यह ठीक है कि ८ सितम्बर से पहले सरकार इस बात के लिए तैयार थी कि भारत और चीन के प्रतिनिधि मिलें और इस बात पर विचार करें कि दोनों देशों के बीच तनाव कम करने के लिये कौन से उपाय अपनाये जाने चाहिये। ८ सितम्बर से पहले हम समझौता की वार्ता करने के लिए तैयार नहीं थे, हम खाली तनाव को कम करने के लिए वार्ता पर तैयार थे। हमने उस समय "टाक्स" और "नेगोसिएशन" में फँक दिया था। क्या यह फँक आज कायम है? कल गृह-मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य में इसकी

[श्री ए० पी० वाजपेयी]
 चर्चा नहीं थी। मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी के भाषण को भी पढ़ा है लेकिन उन्होंने भी इस सम्बन्ध में दो टूक बातें नहीं कही हैं। कुछ दिन पहले सरकारी प्रवक्ता से पत्रकारों ने बात करने हुए यह प्रश्न उठाया था और खोद खोद कर पूछा कि अब जो बात होगी, अगर चीन ८ सितम्बर वाली रेखा तक वापस चले जाते हैं तो जो बातें होगी, उसका उद्देश्य क्या होगा? क्या वह तनाव कम करने के लिए बात होगी या फिर सारी सीमा पर विवाद शुरू हो जायेगा? और सरकारी प्रवक्ता इसका असंदिग्ध उत्तर नहीं दे सके। अतः मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में किसी को गलतफहमी में रहने देना ठीक नहीं है।

श्री अजुन अरोड़ा : मालूम देता है कि आपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब का परसों का भाषण पढ़ा नहीं। उसमें उन्होंने यह बात साफ कर दी है।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA
 (Orissa): Where was the speech made by the Prime Minister the day before yesterday?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : अगर उन्होंने यह बात साफ कर दी है तो बहुत अच्छी बात है। मैंने परसों का भाषण नहीं पढ़ा, आप सुना होगा, लेकिन मुझे पढ़ने को नहीं मिला। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो बातें कह दी गई हैं उनको फिर से दोहरा देने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में अपने मित्रों में या देश में किसी प्रकार की गलतफहमी का स्थान नहीं होना चाहिये। मेरे मित्र यह मानें कि अगर मुझे कुछ गलतफहमी है तो उस गलतफहमी को दूर किया जाना चाहिये, लेकिन यह गलतफहमी मेरे तक ही सीमित नहीं है और भी बड़े क्षेत्र में यह गलतफहमी है।

लेकिन सभापति जी, मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि क्या हम ८ सितम्बर के पहले जो

स्थिति थी, उस हद तक वापस चले जायें और यह मान लें कि ८ सितम्बर के बाद कुछ नहीं हुआ? क्या हम यह मान लें कि चीन जब चाहे तब लड़ाई कर दे और जब चाहे शान्ति का ढिंढोरा पीट दे। हम ८ सितम्बर से पहले बात के लिये तैयार थे, क्या ८ सितम्बर के बाद जो लड़ाई हुई है, चीन ने जिस तरह से हमें धोखा दिया है, जितनी बड़ी विशाल संख्या में हमारे देश में सेना भेजी है, जिस तरह से हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया और फिर यह आरोप लगाया कि हम ने हों पहले आक्रमण किया है, क्या हम इन बातों को भूल जायें? अगर हम इन बातों को भूल जायेंगे तो क्या इसका असर हमारे देश की जनता के मनोबल पर, हमारी सेना के मनोबल पर नहीं पड़ेगा? चीन हमारी सीमा के बाहर जा कर पुनः नहीं घुसेगा इस बात की क्या गारन्टी है? इसकी एक ही गारन्टी है और वह है हमारी ताकत। मुझे डर है कि अगर ८ सितम्बर की रेखा तक चीनी वापस चले गये, युद्ध विराम हो गया, टेबुल पर बातें होने लगीं, तो अपनी ताकत को बढ़ाने के जिसको हमें पहले ही बढा लेना चाहिये था, आज हम जो भगीरथ प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, वे प्रयत्न शिथिल हो जायेंगे। हम समझेंगे कि समस्या का हल हो गया। देश में फिर असावधानी का भाव पैदा होगा, शान्ति की लोरियां सुना कर लोगों को फिर से सुलाने की कोशिश की जायेगी।

आखिर हमें यह देखना है कि जो चीनी निरन्तर विश्वासघात की कहानी लिखते रहे हैं क्या हम उनके आश्वासनों पर विश्वास कर सकते हैं? जब प्रधान मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि लड़ाई लम्बी चलेगी, तो उस लम्बी लड़ाई के लिये जो तैयारी चाहिये, उस तैयारी के लिये देश में जो वातावरण चाहिये, लोगों की मनोवस्था चाहिये, शासन की सन्नद्धता चाहिये, क्या वह युद्ध विराम की बातों से पूर्ण हो सकती है? क्या युद्ध विराम की बातों से इस तरह का वातावरण

बनाया जा सकता है ? मुझे डर है कि इस तरह का वातावरण नहीं बनाया जा सकता है और इसलिये मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि ८ सितम्बर के बाद की घटनाओं के प्रकाश में हमें अपनी नीति निर्धारित करनी चाहिये। चीन ने दुनिया के सामने, पड़ोसियों के सामने और हमारी अपनी नजरों में हमें गिरा दिया और अपने आक्रमण से यह साबित कर दिया कि सुरक्षा के अभाव में हम कमजोर थे। अगर आज चीनी बाहर निकल गये तो वे शान्ति के अवतार का ढोंग रचेंगे। उनका जो उद्देश्य था वह एक दृष्टि से पूरा हो गया। चीन हमें पड़ोसियों की नजरों में गिराना चाहता है और हमारे अपमान और पराजय का यह कलंक तब तक नहीं मिटेगा जब तक हम शक्ति के बल पर चीनियों से भारत की भूमि खाली न करा लें।

यहां पर प्रश्न हो सकता है कि अगर वे शान्ति से चले जायें तो लड़ने की क्या जरूरत है ? मेरा निवेदन है कि अब तक चीनियों ने हमारे ८ सितम्बर के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं किया। लेकिन अगर चीनी ८ सितम्बर की रेखा तक नेफा से हट जायें तो लद्दाख में क्या होगा ? क्या लद्दाख की भूमि की कीमत पर हम नेफा में समझौता करेंगे, जिसके लिये चीनी आज तक कोशिश करते रहे हैं ? क्या हमें आक्रमणकारी को हर नये आक्रमण का मूल्य देना होगा ? जब चीनी नया आक्रमण करेंगे तो हम क्या हर बार नई शर्तें देंगे ? इस सम्बंध में किसी के दिल व दिमाग में कोई सन्देह नहीं होना चाहिये।

लेकिन यह कहा जाता है कि अगर हम चीनियों से ज़िल्कुल बात न करें तो दुनिया क्या कहेगी ? मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि यह किस दुनिया की चर्चा हो रही है। आज तो इस सवाल पर दुनिया एक नहीं है, कई भागों में बंटी हुई है। चालीस से अधिक देशों ने हमारा साथ दिया है, हमारा समर्थन किया है। अगर हम युद्ध विराम करने से इन्कार कर दें और यह संकल्प कर लें कि जब तक चीन

हमारी सारी भूमि खाली नहीं करेगा तब तक हम बात नहीं करेंगे, तब भी ये चालीस देश हमारा समर्थन करेंगे। जो देश इस सवाल पर हमारे साथ नहीं हैं, हम अगर ८ सितम्बर का प्रस्ताव मान भी लें और चीन भी उसे मान ले, तब भी वे हमारे साथ आने वाले नहीं हैं। जो राष्ट्र ऐसे हैं जो डांबा-डोल हैं शायद दुर्बलता के कारण या नैतिक साहस की कमी के कारण या कम्युनिस्ट चीन के और अपने सैद्धांतिक विचाराधारा के सम्बन्धों के कारण जो आक्रमण के सवाल पर चुप हैं, जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के घोषणा पत्र के उल्लंघन के सवाल पर चुप हैं, क्या हम उनकी चिंता करें और अपने जवानों और अपनी जनता के मनोबल की चिंता न करें। तो यह कहना ठीक नहीं है कि अगर हम सारी भूमि को खाली करने की शर्त लगायें तो दुनिया हमें यह समझेगी कि हम हम शान्ति नहीं चाहते।

आज भी कुछ लोग हैं, जैसाकि कल प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा जो हमें उपदेश दे रहे हैं कि हम लड़ाई बन्द कर दें, हम शान्ति कर लें। शान्ति में किसी को आपत्ति नहीं हो सकती है और कोई देश हमें शान्ति का उपदेश दे तो इस से बढ़ कर कोई विडंबना भी नहीं हो सकती। लेकिन शान्ति सम्मान की होनी चाहिये, अपमान की नहीं, शान्ति जीवन की होनी चाहिये मरघट की नहीं, और जो शान्ति हम आज प्राप्त करेंगे किसी की तटस्थता से, किसी की मध्यस्थता से, वह शान्ति शायद हमारी भूमि को ले आये, मगर हमारे सम्मान को वापस नहीं ला सकती। देश सम्मान पर और स्वाभिमान पर जीते हैं और आज स्वाभिमान का तकाजा यह है कि हम डटे रहें। जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि यह एक अवसर है देश को जगाने का, शक्ति प्राप्त करने का। इस अवसर का हम लाभ उठायें और शक्ति के संचय के अपने सच्चे प्रयत्नों में किसी प्रकार की शिथिलता न आने दें। लेकिन अगर

[श्री ए० ब० दाजपेयी]

युद्ध विराम हो गया तो काश्मीर के इतिहास की पुनरावृत्ति हो सकती है। क्या हम उस इतिहास को दोहराना चाहते हैं? अगर नहीं दोहराना चाहते हैं तो फिर आज डगमगाने की, लड़खड़ाने की जरूरत नहीं है। एक फोलादी संकल्प लेकर हमें आगे बढ़ने की आवश्यकता है।

हमें यह भी देखना होगा कि हमारा किससे मुकाबिला है, उसकी प्रकृति क्या है, उसकी शक्ति क्या है। चीन का आज तक का इतिहास विश्वासघात का इतिहास रहा है। फिर हमें पदाक्रान्त करने की कोशिश की गई, तब क्या हम फिर विदेशों से हथियार मंगाएंगे, क्या हम फिर संकटकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा करेंगे, क्या हम फिर अपने लोगों से रक्त देने की, स्वर्ण देने की अपील करेंगे? मेरा निवेदन है कि आज जो एक वातावरण बना है, उस वातावरण में किसी प्रकार का व्यवधान उत्पन्न हो, यह ठीक नहीं होगा।

चीन के पास २५ लाख नियमित सेना है। मनु ६१ की रिपोर्ट में यह दिया है। नई रिपोर्ट सरकार के पास होगी। उसके अलावा उनके पास मान लाख पब्लिक निक्सॉरिटी फोर्स है। तीन हजार से लेकर छह हजार तक उनके पास हवाई जहाज हैं। चीन में, कहा जाता है कि तीन हजार हवाई जहाज मिश्रित हैं। इनके अतिरिक्त पनडुब्बियां हैं। चीन के प्रधान मंत्री दावा कर चुके हैं कि अणु से चलने वाली पनडुब्बियां उनके पास हैं। इतनी सैनिक शक्ति का हमें मुकाबिला करना होगा। चीन जिस विचारधारा को ले करके चल रहा है उसकी भी हम उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते।

प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह कहना ठीक है कि हम इस संघर्ष को कम्युनिज्म और गैर-कम्युनिज्म का संघर्ष नहीं बनाना चाहते। हम तो बहुत कुछ नहीं चाहते। हम तो बहुत कुछ नहीं चाहते थे। हम तो चीन से लड़ना

भी नहीं चाहते थे। हम तो उनसे भाई चारे का सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना चाहते थे। हम तो तिब्बत के बलिदान के बाद भी मुंह पर ताला लगा करके बैठना चाहते थे। मगर हम जो कुछ चाहते हैं वह न दुनिया में होता था, न हो रहा है और न होगा, क्योंकि दुनिया हमने नहीं बनाई है। दुनिया में और भी शक्तियां हैं, और भी तत्व हैं, और भी विचारधाराएं हैं। हम किसी के साथ रहना चाहते हैं, मगर वह हमारे साथ नहीं रहना चाहता है, तो जो हमारे साथ नहीं रहना चाहता है उसकी विचारधारा क्या है, इसको हम दृष्टि से ओझल नहीं कर सकते। आज पीकिंग रेडियो क्या कहता है? पीकिंग के अखबार क्या कहते हैं? और चीनी सैनिकों ने क्या कहा? जो सीमा पर लड़ने आये, जो हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा करने आये, वे भाई चारे का नारा लगाते हुए आये। अतः केवल यह कहना काफी नहीं है कि वे साम्राज्यवादी हैं। यह साम्राज्यवाद १८वीं और १९वीं शताब्दी के साम्राज्यवाद से अधिक खतरनाक है क्योंकि यह हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई का नारा लगाता आता है। यह मुक्ति का सन्देश लाने का ढोंग रखता है। इस साम्राज्यवाद का विचारधारा के आधार पर समर्थन करने वाले कुछ देश भी दुनिया में मौजूद हैं। भारत के भीतर भी इस विचारधारा के आधार पर इस साम्राज्यवाद को साम्राज्यवाद न कहने वाले लोग मौजूद हैं। इसलिए इस साम्राज्यवाद का खतरा और भयानक है। आज किसी कारण से इस साम्राज्यवाद की लहर सीमा पर रुक सकती है, मगर वह हरदम के लिये नहीं रुकेगी। हरदम के लिए रोकने का तरीका एक ही है हमारी बढ़ती हुई ताकत। आखिर चीन ने हांगकांग पर अधिकार नहीं किया। मकाओ को पुर्तगाली साम्राज्यवाद से मुक्त करने की कोशिश नहीं की। हमारे पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान की सीमा का उल्लंघन करने का यत्न नहीं किया; फारमोसा पर हमला नहीं किया। उसने हमों को क्यों चुना? चीन ने जिन सिद्धान्तों को ले करके

बर्मा के साथ सीमा का समझौता किया, उसपर वह हमारे साथ समझौता करने को तैयार नहीं है। चीन नेपाल के साथ भाई चारे को बढ़ाने के लिये तैयार है, मगर हमारी मित्रता के हाथ को पकड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। इसका कारण क्या है ? इसका एक ही कारण है कि वह यह समझता है कि अगर दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया में ४५ करोड़ भारतीयों को झुकाया जा सकता है, अपमानित किया जा सकता है, दुनिया की नज़रों में गिराया जा सकता है, तो फिर छोटे छोटे देश उसका मुकाबिला नहीं कर सकते। इसीलिये उन सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर, जिन पर उसने बर्मा से सीमा सम्बन्धी समझौता किया, वह हमारे साथ समझौता करने को तैयार नहीं है। वह हमें चुनौती देना चाहता है, वह हमें मिटाना चाहता है, वह हमें झुकाना चाहता है, और मैं आप से कहूँ—कहना अच्छा नहीं लगता, बहुत दुःख होता है—कि जहाँ तक चीन का उद्देश्य है, वह थोड़ी मात्रा में पूरा हो गया है। बर्मा आज खुल करके हमारे साथ नहीं आता। नेपाल खुल करके आक्रमण के खिलाफ आवाज़ नहीं उठाता। हम उनको दोष नहीं दे सकते। तिब्बत पर जब आक्रमण हुआ तो उस आक्रमण को हमने अपने लिये खतरा नहीं समझा, तो हमारे ऊपर होने वाला आक्रमण हमारे पड़ोसी अपने लिए क्यों खतरा समझें ? मगर वे भले ही न समझें हमें यह समझना है कि उनकी रक्षा भी आज हमारी लड़ाई से होगी।

आज केवल इतना ही कहना काफी नहीं है कि हम एशिया की आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं। एशिया की आजादी की रक्षा करने के वास्ते हमें शक्ति भी जुटानी पड़ेगी। मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि हम केवल छोटे हथियार लें और बड़े हथियार न लें। लड़ाई कौन सा रूप लेगी यह नहीं कहा जा सकता। हो सकता है कि चीन एकदम विमानों का

प्रयोग कर दे। क्या तब हम विमान लेने के लिए दौड़ेंगे ? हो सकता है कि चीन नये मोर्चे खोल दे। तो क्या उसके लिए जब आग लगेगी, तब हम कुआँ खोदेंगे। केवल छोटे हथियार ही नहीं, मध्यम हथियार, बड़े हथियार, बम वर्षक और जितने भी हमारी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा के लिए हथियार आवश्यक हैं, हमें मंगाने चाहिये। हमें देश का सैनिकीकरण करना चाहिये। हमें २५ लाख सेना का मुकाबिला करना होगा। आज यह कहने से काम नहीं चल सकता कि तिब्बत में जितनी चीन की सेना है, उतनी तो हमारी कुल सेना है। इससे क्या चीनी सैनिकों का आगे बढ़ना रुक जायेगा। नेफा में चीन ने इतने सैनिक शोक दिये और हम तैयार नहीं थे। क्या हमारी इंटेलिजेंस ने रिपोर्ट नहीं दी कि चीनी सेना वहाँ इकट्ठी हो रही है ? क्या हम चीन की लड़ाई के तरीके को नहीं जानते ? कोरिया में चीन ने जिस ढंग से लड़ाई लड़ी, वही चीन का लड़ाई का तरीका है, वही चीन की रण नीति है, कि लहर के बाद लहर भेजना और आदिमियों पर आदिमी शोकते जाना। हमारी रण नीति के निर्माता यदि चीन के इस तरीके को न समझ पाये हों, तो यह बड़ी दुःख की बात होगी, दुर्भाग्य की बात होगी। उन्होंने नेफा में उसी हथकण्डे का प्रयोग किया जो उन्होंने कोरिया में किया था और जिसके सामने अमरीकी सेना भी एक बार स्तम्भित रह गई थी—लहर पर लहर भेजना। और हमने क्या किया ? हमने कुछ चौकियाँ बना दीं, चौकियों पर कुछ जवान छोड़ दिये और उन जवानों को जोड़ने वाली सड़कें भी नहीं बनाई। १० साल पहले एक बांडर डिफेंस कमेटी बनी थी, उसने क्या सिफारिशें कीं, उन सिफारिशों पर क्या अमल हुआ, यह आज पूछने का समय है। सड़कों के निर्माण का कार्यक्रम हमने बनाया था, वह हमारा क्यों पिछड़ गया ? फिर सबसे बड़ी बात यह

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

है कि तावांग कैसे चला गया? वहां तो जीप जा सकती है, सड़कें बनी हुई हैं? ८ सितम्बर को बड़ा हमला हुआ और तावांग तो बहुत बाद में गया है? यह कोई नहीं कहे कि यह प्रश्न आज उठाने की जरूरत नहीं है, क्योंकि अगर गलतियां दुहरानी नहीं हैं तो पुरानी गलतियों से सबक लेना होगा और चीन की बढ़ती हुई सैनिक शक्ति का मुकाबिला करने की शक्ति जुटानी होगी, हथियारों की दृष्टि से और फौजी जवानों की दृष्टि से।

एक प्रश्न इस विवाद में खड़ा किया जाता है जो मैं समझता हूं कि नितांत अप्रासंगिक है, अनावश्यक है और वह प्रश्न यह है कि हम दोनों गुटों से अलग रहने की नीति पर चलें या न चलें। मैं पूछता हूं कि आज इस प्रश्न को उठाने की क्या आवश्यकता है? कोई यह भी न कहे कि चाहे देश मिट्टी में मिल जाय हम तो गुटों से अलग रहने की नीति पर चलेंगे और कोई यह भी न कहे कि हमें उस नीति को छोड़ देने की ही जरूरत है। आज तो आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम अधिक से अधिक जस्त्रास्त्र लेकर अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा करें और अगर तटस्थता की पालिसी इसके बीच में आती है—मैं समझता हूं कि बीच में नहीं आती है—तो उस पर पुनर्विचार करें। फिर जब यह स्पष्ट है कि वर्तमान नीति सैनिक सहायता के मार्ग में बाधक नहीं है तो फिर इस बात की दुहाई देना कि यह नीति छोड़ दो, छोड़ दो और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को यह अनुभव कराना कि जो बात उन्हें प्रिय थी उसे छोड़ाने की कोशिश की जा रही है यह कोई अच्छी राजनीतिज्ञता नहीं है। लेकिन यह भी राजनीतिज्ञता नहीं है कि हम तटस्थता की नीति को दुहाई देते जायें, यह समझते हुए भी कि यह लड़ाई जिस कम्युनिस्ट चीन के साथ चल रही

है उसके किसी भी साथी ने, दुनिया की किसी भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने हमारी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को छोड़कर, इस लड़ाई में हमारा समर्थन नहीं किया है। क्यों नहीं किया? क्या चीन ने आक्रमण किया है यह हमारे मित्र रूस को नहीं दिखाई देता, रूस के संगी-साथियों को नहीं दिखाई देता? क्या आक्रमण से शान्ति को खतरा पैदा हो गया है इसकी अनुभूति उन्हें नहीं है? मगर वे विचारधारा के सूत्र में बंधे हैं। फिर भी हम अपने रास्ते से अलग जा कर उन्हें और रुष्ट बनायें, उन्हें अपना और विरोधी बनायें इसकी आवश्यकता नहीं है लेकिन शत्रु कौन है, मित्र कौन है, इसको हृदय में समझना होगा। अभी तक हमने इसको समझने में गलती की है, हम मित्रों का तिरस्कार करते रहे हैं, हम शत्रुओं का पुरस्कार करते रहे हैं। यह नीति बदलनी चाहिये। हम किसी को गलत ढंग से अपना विरोधी न बनायें, मगर किसी के झांसे में आने के लिये भी तैयार न हों और इसलिये इस सवाल को कि तटस्थता की नीति रहे या बदली जाय, उठाने की कोशिश न करें। मैं अपने सहयोगी श्री डाह्याभाई से कहूंगा, वह इस सवाल को छोड़ दें, यह सवाल अपने महत्व को खो चुका है, यह हमारे सुरक्षा के प्रयत्नों में बाधक नहीं बन रहा है, नहीं बन सकता। दूसरी तरफ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि "नानएलाइनमेंट" कोई पूजा की वस्तु नहीं है, वह एक नीति है, सिद्धांत नहीं है, नीति अगर देश के हित में है तो हम अपनायेंगे और जिस दिन वह नीति देश के खिलाफ चली जायगी हम उसको पुराने फटे कपड़ों की तरह से उतार कर फेंक देंगे। देश पहले है, नीतियां बाद में, नीतियां देश के लिये हैं, देश नीतियों के लिये नहीं है; नीतियां देश के लिये बनती हैं, देश नीतियों के लिये नहीं बनते। और हमने सब देशों से हथियार प्राप्त करके, उनकी सहायता के लिये

अपना आभार प्रकट करके इस बात को साबित कर दिया है कि हम किसी भी नीति को अपनी सुरक्षा के मार्ग में बाधक नहीं बनने देंगे ।

मैं कुछ कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के बारे में भी कहना चाहता हूँ । मैंने अभी निवेदन किया कि दुनिया में एक ही कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ऐसी है जिसने चीन को आक्रमणकारी कहा है, जिसने चीन को निन्दा की है और वह हमारी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है । कल हमारे कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त ने बड़े जोश से भरी हुई तकरीर की और हमारे कुछ मित्र उस तकरीर में बह गये । ऐसे लोगों के लिये जो एक बार पंचशील के नारों में बहें थे, जिन्हें हिन्दी-चीनी भाई भाई का मोहजाल खींच कर ले गया था, उनका कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के इस नये रूप से भ्रम में पड़ना कोई असम्भव नहीं है । लेकिन मैं अपने कम्युनिस्ट मित्र से एक प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ । आपने एक प्रस्ताव पास किया और उस प्रस्ताव को आप हमें दिखाते भी हैं और कहते हैं कि हम इस प्रस्ताव से बंधे हैं । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि संकटकालिक स्थिति की घोषणा के बाद जब जनता का रोष जाग रहा था, देशभक्ति का समुद्र लहरें मार रहा था, तब क्या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी इससे अलग और कोई प्रस्ताव पास कर सकती थी ? और अगर यह प्रस्ताव पास किया है तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव सर्वसम्मति से पास क्यों नहीं हुआ है ? ऐसे प्रस्ताव का किसी पार्टी में विरोध कैसे हो सकता है ? मेरी पार्टी में अगर कोई खड़ा हो जाय और कहे कि नहीं, सरकार को समर्थन देने के सवाल पर हमारा मतभेद है तो हम उसे अपनी पार्टी से निकाल देंगे । यह पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, देशभक्ति का सवाल है । मगर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी इससे इंकार नहीं कर सकती कि यह प्रस्ताव सर्वसम्मति से पास नहीं हुआ । वह ३०, ३२ या ३३ लोग कौन थे जिन्होंने इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध किया ? उन्हें कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से क्यों नहीं निकाला गया, उन्हें कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से क्यों नहीं बाहर किया गया ? दुनिया

की किसी भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने हमारा समर्थन नहीं किया इसलिये भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने उनकी निन्दा क्यों नहीं की, उनकी आलोचना क्यों नहीं की ? क्या आज भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्युनिज्म से अपना सम्बन्ध तोड़ने के लिये तैयार है ? मुझे लगता है नहीं ? जिस न्यू-एज' में भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का प्रस्ताव छपा है उसी में 'प्रावदा' का वह लेख भी छपा है जिसमें मैकमोहन रेखा को साम्राज्यवादी रेखा कहा गया है, जिसमें शान्ति की बात कही गई है, मगर इसलिये कि अगर लड़ाई चलेगी तो फिर भारत में 'प्रतिक्रियावादियों' की ताकत बढ़ जायगी । क्या इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि अगर लड़ाई से 'प्रगतिशीलों' की ताकत बढ़ती तो लड़ाई बुरी नहीं थी, तो आक्रमण आपत्तिजनक नहीं था, और भारत की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी यही तर्क दे रही है, दुनिया भर की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टियाँ यही तर्क दे रही हैं और अगर चीन से कहा जा रहा है कि तुम रुक जाओ तो इसलिये नहीं कि चीन ने कोई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय न्याय की हत्या की है, स्वतंत्रता पर डाका डाला है, मानवता को चुनौती दी है, वह सिर्फ इसलिये कि यह समय नहीं है आक्रमण करने का, इससे तथाकथित प्रगतिशील तत्वों की ताकत कम होगी और कल वह कह सकते हैं, देखा, ताकत कम हो गई न, एक मंत्रिमंडल के सदस्य हटा दिये गये, अब तो मान लो, ८ सितम्बर तक हट जाने की बात मान लो । मुझे डर है कि चीन शायद इस बात को मान ले क्योंकि वह एक चाल होगी, वह बात हृदय से नहीं मानी जायगी । इसलिये कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को देशभक्ति के प्रमाणपत्र देने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, उनके प्रस्ताव ठीक हैं, उनके भाषण उससे भी ठीक हो सकते हैं मगर उससे हम भ्रम में नहीं पड़ते, न पड़ना चाहिए ।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ । प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त करने के लिये अनेक समितियाँ बनाई हैं, एक डिफेंस कौंसिल बनाई है, एक

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

सिटीजंस कमेटी बनाई है, उसमें जहाँ तक पार्टियों का सवाल है प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी को छोड़ कर किसी को नहीं लिया गया है। खैर, हमें इसकी शिकायत नहीं है और हम में से किसी ने यह भी नहीं कहा कि अगर हमको नहीं लिया जायगा तो हम युद्ध-प्रयत्नों में सहायता नहीं देंगे। मगर मैं सदन के सामने मद्रास के कम्युनिस्ट नेता श्री मोहन कुमार-मंगलम् के एक भाषण का उद्धरण रखना चाहता हूँ और उस और आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। इस भाषण का अभी तक खंडन नहीं किया गया है। पी० टी० आई० का समाचार है :

"Mr. S. G. Mohan Kumaraman-galam, a leading member of the Tamilnad Council of the Communist Party yesterday warned the State and Union Governments that defence production and mobilisation efforts would be hampered if Communists were not included in the various committees formed to organise the country's defence;"

कहना न होगा कि कम्युनिस्ट नेता के शब्दों में एक धमकी है कि "अगर हमें शामिल नहीं किया जायेगा तो हम युद्ध प्रयत्नों में बाधक बनेंगे"।

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh) : Has he been arrested?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: He has not been arrested so far. अगर वह अरेस्ट किये जायेंगे तो कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता आपत्ति करेंगे।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): This is utterly a wrong interpretation of what he has said. I know that the Jan Sangh not only misinterprets things but burns also the Communist Party Offices.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी: यह जन संघ के मिसइंटरप्रेट करने का सवाल नहीं है। बक्तव्य सामने रखा है। आप जरा उसमें से दूसरा मतलब निकाल कर बतलाइए।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that in order that all the forces and trade unions could be mobilized and harnessed together into the common effort, Comrade Mohan Kumaraman-galam pointed out the need 'for inclusion of all. I think even the Jan Sangh's intelligence should not be missing this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Who is correct, the leader or the follower?

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: His leader has joined with the Jan Sangh. They go with them ...

(Interruptions)

This is vandalism . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should let Mr. Vajpayee proceed.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : देखिये, इसके आगे मिस्टर कुमार मंगलम् ने क्या कहा है। शलतफहमी के लिये गुंजायश नहीं है और अगर खंडन निकलना था तो 'न्यूज' में निकलता। देखिये, दूसरा खण्ड इस प्रकार है : "It would be at the peril of the nation that Communists who controlled millions of workers in factories, vital to defence production, are excluded from the defence committees." यह देशभक्ति की भाषा नहीं है। राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद् में आप स्वतंत्र पार्टी को ले सकते थे, श्री राजगोपालाचारी शामिल किये जा सकते थे, आचार्य कृपलानी लाये जा सकते थे, पंडित हृदय नाथ कुंजरु और डा० रघुवीर निमंत्रित किये जा सकते थे। आपने किसी को नहीं लिया। कांग्रेस पार्टी उन्हें लेने की आवश्यकता नहीं समझती यह खेदजनक है। लेकिन अगर कोई यह कहे कि हमें यहाँ नहीं लिया, वहाँ नहीं लिया, इसलिये हम सरकारी प्रयत्नों में बाधक बनेंगे तो उसकी जगह जनता के बीच में नहीं, सीखियों के पीछे है। कामरेड गुप्ता को

गृह मंत्री को धन्यवाद देना चाहिये कि जनता के रोष से बचाने के लिये उन्होंने उनके साथियों को 'प्रोटेक्टिव्ह कस्टडी' में ले लिया। अगर सरकार अपना कर्तव्य नहीं करती तो जनता चुप नहीं बैठती और फिर जेल से बाहर रहने वाले कम्युनिस्ट 'ला एन्ड आर्डर' की समस्या बन जाते।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do I interpret it as being another threat by the Jan Sangh that unless they arrested them, they will be burning Our offices and attack us? Do I interpret it that way?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, certainly not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should allow Mr. Vajpayee to proceed and say what he wishes to say.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मेरा निवेदन है कि जो भी पुरानी भूलें हुई हैं उनके प्रकाश में हमें अपनी नीतियां निर्धारित करनी चाहियें। आज सारा देश प्रधान मंत्री के पीछे खड़ा है। वे हमारी आज़ादी की लड़ाई के सेनानी रहे हैं, वे शांति के संदेशवाहक रहे हैं। मगर शायद इतिहास उनकी परीक्षा करना चाहता है कि जो शांति में नेतृत्व कर सके वह अग्नि वर्षा के बीच भी राष्ट्र को विजय के रम्य तट तक भी पहुंचा सकते हैं या नहीं। इसलिये आज केवल जवानों की परीक्षा नहीं हो रही है बल्कि भारत के एक एक नागरिक की परीक्षा हो रही है, जिसमें हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भी शामिल हैं। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जो जनता का उत्साह जगा है उसे ठोस रूप दिया जाय, उसे रचनात्मक दिशाएं प्रदान की जायें और हर एक व्यक्ति को जो यह जानना चाहता है कि आज की संकट की स्थिति में मुझसे क्या अपेक्षा की जाती है, उसे बताया जाय, उसे काम दिया जाय। खेती के क्षेत्र में, उद्योग के क्षेत्र में हम उत्पादन के नये लक्ष्यों को निर्धारित करें और लोगों को उन लक्ष्यों की पूर्ति के लिये जुटा दें।

लड़ाई केवल सीमा पर नहीं लड़ी जायेगी; सारे देश में लड़ी जायेगी—इतना कहना ही काफी नहीं है। सारे देश में हर एक मोर्चे के लिये हमें एक निश्चित कार्यक्रम देकर ऐसे व्यक्ति तैनात करने होंगे जो उस कार्यक्रम को पूरा करें।

तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में कुछ परिवर्तन करने आवश्यक होंगे। जिन योजनाओं का सम्बन्ध विकास के कार्यों से नहीं है, हम उन्हें मुलतबी कर सकते हैं। शानशोकत की सारी चीजें खत्म होनी चाहियें। राष्ट्र जीवन के हर एक क्षेत्र में एक नयी कर्म चेतना का परिचय मिलना चाहिये और इसका श्रीगणेश नई दिल्ली से होना चाहिये।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात कहूंगा कि लोग त्याग और बलिदान के लिये तैयार हैं लेकिन—जैसा श्री गंगा शरण सिंह ने कहा, हम इस बात के लिये सावधान रहें कि त्याग और बलिदानों का पलड़ा बराबर रहना चाहिये—अगर हम मजदूरों से ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम करने की अपेक्षा करते हैं तो उनके परिश्रम के बल पर लोग मुनाफे का भ्रमवार न खड़ा करें इस तरफ भी ध्यान देना होगा क्योंकि अगर हम त्याग और बलिदानों की बराबरी नहीं रख सकेंगे तो युद्ध प्रयत्नों में जैसा जनता का स्वेच्छा से सहयोग चाहिये, दूरगामी दृष्टि से उसे प्राप्त करने में कठिनाई हो सकती है। मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी की कोठी में जाकर देखा गरीब जीवन भर की कमाई अर्पित कर रहे हैं मगर मुझे अभी ऐसे धन कुबेर को देखना बाकी है जो सारे जीवन की कमाई भामाशाह की तरह से आज राष्ट्र की झोली में डालने को तैयार हो जाय। इस सम्बन्ध में, जिन्हें भगवान ने धन दिया है या जिन्होंने धन कमाया है उनसे मैं कहना चाहता हूं : केवल प्रिवीपस में दस प्रतिशत की कटौती करना काफी नहीं है, केवल एक महीने का बेटन देना पर्याप्त नहीं है। आज देश के लिये जितना धन

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

चाहिये, जिनके पास धन है, जिनमें देने की सामर्थ्य है, वे खुले हाथ से धन दें। लोग अपना रक्त दे रहे हैं, जिनके जवान बेटे मारे जा रहे हैं वे अपने आंसुओं का अर्घ्य दे रहे हैं। चालीस करोड़ का देश आज स्वतंत्रता की, स्वाभिमान की, रक्षा के लिये तिरंगा झंडा हाथ में लेकर आगे बढ़ रहा है। वलिदान के इस पर्व में हम में से कोई पीछे न रहे इस बात की आवश्यकता है और इस बात की भी आवश्यकता है कि जनता जितनी तैयार है, उसके नेता भी उतने ही तैयार हों। धन्यवाद।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon the next speaker, I would like to tell you that I have a very large number of speakers on the list. There are as many as 40 speakers from the Congress Party. I propose to sit through lunch today and on Monday but even that probably will not give us enough time. Even that would not give us time to allow everybody to make a long speech I would therefore request that Members may try to make their remarks brief. The Opposition Parties have been allotted time and they would see to it that they keep within the time but the number from the Congress side is so large that they would not be able to make speeches within the time if they do not apply some sort of restraint on themselves,

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Can we sit tomorrow?

श्री विमलकुमार मुन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया
(मध्य प्रदेश) : कल के दिन सीटिंग और बढ़ा
बी जाय तो कुछ और घंटे मिल जायेंगे, सदस्यों
को बहस में भाग लेने के लिये।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have tried to follow the general sense of the House, which is not to sit on Saturday but to sit on Monday.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We will sit on Saturday.

श्री विमलकुमार मुन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :

श्रीमन् के पास यादी काफी आ चुकी हैं और
ऐसी स्थिति में सदन की कार्यवाही कल भी
चले और सोमवार को भी तो अच्छा हो।

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is also my view that a long speech need not always be better and more effective than a short speech and therefore if Members impose some sort of restriction on themselves especially when from one party there is a very large number of speakers, that would work well. We should be able to allow time to all Members who want to speak provided the speeches are comparatively brief.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Even then we would require more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would depend on the extent of curtailment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am in favour of extending the time. More especially I would like the Members opposite to speak on this subject. After all they are the ruling party and it is their views which should be heard in defence of everything that is positive and good. Therefore, I would request you to extend the time and more specially give more time to the Congress Party so that good men from that side speak out their mind.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: It is a reflection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am quite sure the Congress Party appreciate* this advocacy. I think we shall be able to go through the list if we proceed as I have suggested today as well as on Monday. Mr. Khandubhai Desai.

12 NOON

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the two Resolutions before

the House with all the emphasis at toy command. There is no need for the criticism that has been levelled by Mr. Vajpayee. The Resolutions that have been placed before the House are fully self-explanatory. The Government is seized of the situation that has been a foisted on us by a treacherous neighbour and the Resolutions take full note of the situation that has come before the country. As such, in this hour of grave crisis be-foi'a the country, as a mature nation, we must consider this problem very coolly. The first paragraph of the Resolution lays down very completely how and under what circumstances we were made to face the crisis that has overtaken us after fifteen years. It is very clear that we hoped that a big neighbour on our north, a nation which consolidated itself almost simultaneously with us and got out of what they called feudalism, may be friendly with us. That was our idea and for the last so many years we have seriously tried to cultivated friendship and neighbourly relations with that nation*. But probably we were under a misapprehension. While on our side, as a peaceful nation, living as the Prime Minister said, in a peaceful atmosphere and in conditions of peace, we tried to cultivate friendship, the other party that came in for Panchsheel at the Bandung Conference, did so with some mental reservations. And it has come to us as something cruel, that a nation with which we assiduously cultivated good relations a nation which was an isolated nation 12 years back, to which we tried to give a little prestige in the world, should have d^{one} this. We wanted them to see the ways of the civilized world and there was nothing wrong that. But to our regret we find at the end that the confidence and trust and consideration, which we showed towards it, were ill-placed. That is very clearly enunciated in the first paragraph of this Resolution. In the last paragraph of the Resolution, the Government has stated that whatever may happen, now that the nation on our north has been found

out to be perfidious, treacherous, expansionist and imperialistic, however grim the struggle may be, however hard it may be, the challenge shall be faced with determination and whatever is necessary will be done—to see that the aggressor goes back. When these two main intentions are placed before the House, it is no use arguing now whether we had acted properly or not, whether we were taken in or not. Let us not rake up the past. As the Prime Minister said, let us now at this stage, as a united nation, not have what is called a post-mortem examination. But certainly introspection has been there and the inter-relations between the two countries have been taken full note of in the first paragraph and in the last paragraph of this Resolution. That should be enough for those who now try to criticise. Criticism at this stage is likely to come in the way of our effort to push back the invader. It is very clear that in the history of our nation, after our independence and for the first time, we are fighting face to face with a ruthless invader and in order to expel him from our territory, we require all our resources in men and material. It is a matter of very great satisfaction to those who have to conduct this struggle that the whole country has rallied round the Government. There is almost an upsurge. Here also we were not fully prepared to canalise this upsurge. Now the time has come to canalise this upsurge among our 45 crores of people who are prepared to sacrifice everything. Whatever they have, they are prepared to place at the disposal of the Government. Not only that. It is also a matter of great satisfaction that 40 nations have sympathised with our cause and some nations, particularly the U.K. and U.S.A., without any loss of time, have promised—not only in words but they have shown it in action—that whatever materials they can spare for us will be placed at our disposal. CM course, it is not good that we should have to rely upon others; but in the world as it exists today, there is no harm in taking help from other

[Shri Khandubhai K. Desai.] nations. Of course, we are grateful to all the countries that are coming forward with help in our hour of dire need and necessity, to face this ruthless and treacherous invader.

Sir, it has been said by the Government, and the Home Minister said this morning that the Plan has to be pruned. I will not use that word, but I would say that till the invader is out of our land, till we put them across the Himalayas, there will be a plan and it will be a war plan. Everything that has to be adjusted mentally, psychologically, materially and economically, whatever has to be adjusted to meet our war requirements that have been imposed upon us, should be adjusted. And if other countries are coming out to help us there is nothing to be surprised because in this country we are destined probably by providence to fight the battle of democracy. Let it be clearly understood—as far as I can understand it this is the position and it is my individual opinion—that this is a fight between democracy on one side and the Communist China's dictatorship on the other. I am reading in the papers many ideas trying to find out the motives of the Chinese aggression. To a layman the Chinese aggression appears to be clear. They want to humiliate India in the eyes of the Asian nations, if they can. •Secondly, our planned economic success during the last 15 years is a challenge to dictatorial rule in China. We all know that two systems of economic reconstruction are working in Asia in these two big countries. Lest we succeed and they fail in order to disrupt our Plan, in order to stifle our economy, they want to divert us from our economic progress. But, thank God, we have in the last fifteen years, built up a good base for meeting the struggle that we are now caught in. Though our development has not come up to that level when independently we can meet this challenge at least a good industrial and agricultural base has been built up In the last fifteen years. And with

a little patience, however grim the struggle may be, for whatever period it may continue, we can face it and face it effectively.

Now, Sir, I would like to refer to an event which happened only about two or three days back—the change of heart, if I may say so, to begin with that has come over the Communist Party of India. It has become a patriotic party. I welcome it and I hope and pray that the change that has come over them as a result of this cruel aggression by the Chinese will be of a permanent nature and not of a temporary nature to suit the expediency of time. To begin with I would not like at this stage just to question their bona fides; I would take it for whatever it is worth but the Communist Party should realise that during the last 40 years not only in this country but in other countries too there have been lessons to us to be learnt and we will take this change with a pinch of salt. The type of threat that • Mr. Kumaramangalam is placing before the people does not inspire confidence. It must be an unconditional support for the patriotic national struggle of this nation against China and at the same time

...
SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I, Sir, with your permission say this? Comrade Kumaramangalam is brought in. He is not of course in this House. If you read his speech in The Hindu* you will find how anxiously he was pleading that all people should be brought together in the common effort in order to step up defence production so that no one is left out. He never made the speech in the spirit in which it is interpreted.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: The nation would like to have a united struggle of everybody in the land against the Chinese aggressor. However, we were taken in by showing confidence in our neighbour; may it not happen like that in the future. Now, we should be forewarned about the attitudes and changing policies of

those who call themselves Communists. Therefore, I have said and very clearly said this; let the change that has come over, the patriotic fervour that has overtaken the Communist Party, be of a permanent nature and they will then be part and parcel of the nation. They are our citizens. But our experience in the past with Communist parties all over the world goads us to take this assertion with a pinch of salt. That is what we are saying. Let them give unconditional support to the war effort in the country. During the time the struggle will be on everybody would have to sacrifice, whatever vocations we may be pursuing, whether we are civil employees or workers or farmers and last but not the least the businessmen and industrialists. We must all sink, for the time being when we are waging a grim struggle, our sectional differences and let all our efforts, as I said, be planned for one and one aim only, that of pushing out the aggressors from our land. The working classes in the country have unequivocally pledged their support to the nation. They will work overtime; they will work on Sundays. Whatever we expect of them, they are prepared to place at the disposal of the nation. In addition to that, quite a large section of the working classes is pledging even monetary support to the different funds and bonds that may be issued from time to time. The nation will require resources. These resources must be made available from the current income by all sections of the society. I hope and pray that in a short period we may be able to show China that a country that has fought imperialism with nonviolence is also capable of fighting a violent aggressor with its own weapon. That is the call before the nation and I hope the nation has responded and will respond to it. As the Prime Minister has said in the Resolution itself, it is going to be a grim struggle. It is not temporary; it will go on till this challenge to democracy is either softened or is wiped out. Thank you

846 RS—2.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, speaking on the Resolution that has been moved so ably by the Home Minister in his characteristic way of disarming the Opposition, I would first begin by joining in paying my tribute to the brave men who have given their lives in defence of this country. Sir, I have always been appreciative, and I have admired the quality of our fighting forces. I have had my doubts of what we have been able to give them, whether it is the Defence Minister or whether it is the equipment. On a previous occasion I have referred to this in this House. What I had said had been sought to be laughed away. I am not trying to say that I am very prophetic or that I have been right. I am very sorry that we have come to this plight, that the suspicions that we have had about China have come true, but much more sorry I am to find our Government utterly unprepared for what was coming. On a previous occasion when I referred to this I was asked to read this and read that I never claim to be a scholar, but I asked people who are supposed to be well-equipped, well-read, whether they had not read the views of China, the claims of China, even during the Chiang-Kai-Shek regime. They have always laid claims right on Indian soil, on the Himalayas whether it is communist China or whether it is free China. And what were we doing? We have been preaching peace but preaching peace does not mean weakness or negligence. With great humility I will say that our Government has been caught napping and I expected the Government to have stood up in sack cloth and ashes apologising to the country. If the opposite Benches say that it is the fault of Parliament I am willing to join them. But today is an occasion when the Government should get up in sack cloth and ashes and apologise to the people of this country for their negligence, for bringing them to this plight. I would also say that when we go next to the United Nations, our representative—I hope it will not be Mr. Krishna Menon—will also go

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Pate].] there in sack cloth and ashes and apologise to our friends who have come forward so generously to help us, who have always been willing to help us but whom our representatives have insulted of and on. I hope that we will not have a repetition of this offence to our friends, this offence to the freedom-loving and really democratic countries and not the so-called democratic countries of the world. I hope there will be an end to that chapter. We have got very able people in our country. Why is it that one and the same person, whom everybody knows, has been selected for these two posts? I hope his exit from one will also mean his exit from the other. We have got an able person like Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit who fulfilled her tasks in the United Nations with such great credit. Why not we do send a person, more agreeable, more amenable and a person who would do our country's task more ably? I hope the Prime Minister will give some thought to this and reconsider the situation.

It is very gratifying to note that the people of this country have been able to assert their will. The will of the people has been asserted. And it is also gratifying that the Prime Minister has accepted the will of the people, the verdict of the people. The news that we got during the last two months would worry everyone, particularly those who have been in the freedom struggle and who have such personal and close relations with our Prime Minister. We were wondering what was coming over him. We did not want to say that Mr. Nehru was caught in any unpleasant mood. I would not say like Nero fiddling when Rome was burning, but I would say that he was found hesitating when action was necessary. I am glad that hesitation has been brief and our Government has made up its mind to stand up even though we have been caught unprepared. We have got friends all over the world. The free

world is there to befriend anybody who is in difficulties. If we have not got equipment, equipment will be available from people who love their freedom, because people who love freedom do not know any geographical boundaries. They value their freedom as much as they value the freedom of others and they are willing to come forward and help us. I hope no fetish will be made of seeking aid, seeking aid from sources ready to help us and in the quantity required. The Prime Minister has said that there is massive aggression. Well, we will need massive aid to encounter this and I hope the Government will not hesitate or make any bones about it. It is going to be a long-drawn struggle and admittedly that also, if I may say so, because of the fault of this Government. We did not check the Chinese aggression when it began first in 1956, as the Home Minister told us. Then, again, in 1958, why did we not stop it? We saw them making preparations, building roads, when they started building roads, what were we doing? When I referred to this aspect of the Chinese aggression, of their making roads, in this House, I was told that it was easier for the Chinese to build the roads. The terrain before us is very difficult and we cannot make roads. I am sorry this explanation is not at all convincing. The encroachment of China on our borders, upon our territory, has been going on from 1956 and 1958. We are in 1962 now. If it was easier for them to build roads in a year, could we not *do* something in four or five years? Therefore, I say that our Government has been caught napping. Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri did admit it very rightly. I wish there was a little more emphasis on this failing. Certainly, the country has stood up to a man to support the Government in this great task that is before us. The magnitude of the task is very great. Our fighting forces should know it, the way in which they fought in Korea where wave after wave of people came forward. They do not value human life. There is no con-

sideration for human life in China. It is power that the Communists want to wield and in that the difference between Russia and China is just a matter of difference of shade in colour. Their objective is the same. I would refer those who read so much and accuse me of not reading enough to this. Right from the days of Lenin, did not Lenin say that the road to Paris is through Shanghai and Calcutta? They have got Shanghai. What about Calcutta? In this very House I have been pointing out the activities of the Bank of China and the large number of Chinese agents selling eatables, peddling things, whether people buy them or not, whether they are really doing trade or they are agents of a foreign government, whether they are doing espionage work, whether they are there to create disruption and confusion in our country for the moment that China has been planning for years, I am sorry our Government has not taken note of the warning. On the contrary I remember the Finance Minister on his visit to Bombay, after what I said in this House, asking the bankers, who have been giving all this information to me, about the activities of the Bank of China. Sir, what is our Government doing? They have got a police, they have got a Special Police. They have got the C.I.D. I dare say that the Government will admit that we have got a large number of very patriotic citizens. Why don't they take them into confidence? Instead of taking the wrong people into confidence, why don't they take the right people into confidence?

Sir, this country has gone through an ordeal once before in its struggle for freedom. The Government should know who are the people who are with them. When this country was up in a struggle for freedom, my friends over there did not say that this was a struggle for freedom. It became a struggle for freedom only when Russia became an ally of Britain and the powers that were fighting. And then what happened? They got

large sums of money from the National War Front that was manned by toadies in this country and people who started calling it the people's war. Government has only just to look up the back files in their archives or the newspapers and they will find out where to find the right people.

This Government is forming a National Defence Council. They are calling it an emergency. I would like to warn the Government that the emergency is yet to come. It is just the beginning. This is a crisis, and I would like to warn the Government not to use this crisis as a means of taking more and more power unto itself. This Government is sufficiently greedy of power. Let not their greed for power overcome them to utilise this opportunity for taking more power and, if you please, more money to waste. The war is to be fought with guns and bullets and not with coffee percolators that our factories are making. The Defence Ministry should be making bullets, not making coffee percolators and¹ bath tubs. Those who are interested may go and see it themselves in the ammunition factories. I have got the greatest praise for our soldiers, for our workers, for the people who are working in these factories. I know what they have contributed. They are all willing to contribute their wages generously. They are willing to work on holidays and Sundays without overtime if it is necessary. It is only my friends here who misled the people all these years, and I am sorry that our Government has succumbed to that, in trying to ask too much of the rights of labour for the exploitation of labour. Right here in Delhi they use the labour in the Government P.W.D. I will not dilate on it, but the need of the hour is to gear up production. Is our Government doing it? I would not only blame these friends but the friends who have been pleading for the labour on the one hand and on the other hand who talk of planning. Mr. Nanda is pleading for labour, and everything has been com-

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.] pletely slowed down. Efficiency has go»e down in this country.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Those who say "question" are living in a different world altogether. We know what efficiency there was right in the offices of the Government of India, in the offices everywhere, in commercial offices, and why has it gone down? Because of the deliberate propaganda that has been made for going slow and misleading the people that there are only two classes, the capitalists who are the bloodsuckers and the labourers who are the downtrodden.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Downtrodders.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: This has been an absolutely wrong way of doing it. and my friends, the labour leaders, have been competing with the Communist friends in trying to get a better deal for the labour and to get their votes.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: Mr. Chairman . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I do not want to yield to him. I did not interrupt him.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: He is misleading the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can get only as much light as he pleases to give.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Thank you very much, Sir. I repeat that the I.N.T.U.C. people—I can even name them—have been competing with the Communist friends in trying to tell the labour that they are going to get this and that. They have never told the labour to give a fair deal wherever they are employed, give their full day's work. I wish they would do it now, it is not too late. I

Sir, the machinery of the All-India Radio has been used by Government very much to boost its own doings and its Prime Minister. May I say in all humility that the country is greater than even the Prime Minister? The country should soon realise this. Sir, on the day the emergency was declared, I happened to be in Delhi and a representative of the Associated Press came and said to me: "Why don't you say something?" I said: "You will not be able to print it". He said: "Surely I will". I said: "Government should take a leaf out of the book of democratic countries and proceed to form a Government that will inspire confidence in the people". I do not talk of National Government. I know there are certain friends sitting near me who talk of National Government because they are only hoping to be called to get in. I have no such hope. I prefer to perform the role of a healthy opposition that draws the attention of the Government to its failings. I shall be content to do that. I have not been trying to get into the Government. Certain parties are doing. I say very clearly that if the Prime Minister likes them, he can take them; I have no objection. But we must be assured that people in the Government are democratic people who believe in democracy, who believe in the freedom of this country above all. I say that the Government and their friends read so much. I just read to you what Lenin said. At a recent meeting of the Communist Party it was said: "We have to work like a woodworm. We have to eat into the beams of the Government and strike when it is weak and then it will crack. Then the whole country will be ours". This is how the Communist Party is proceeding. In the statement that I gave to that person I said: "Here you must follow the example of England". Sir Oswald Mosley was put into protective custody. I am glad to see that Government has put some of these friends in custody— they may be very honest, they may be patriotic—but the safety of the country comes before anything else,

and I would like to see many more of them there. There are too many of them roaming about in this country. There are too many Chinamen going about in this country. We have not got enough C.I.D. men to keep track of them. I would request Government to take steps to see that all of them are deported from this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I suggest that he be made the C.I.D. Chief?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I do not think that the hon. Minister is in a mood to take tips from you. You have had your long speech. You made a very good speech. Since he is interrupting me, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will be indulgent and allow me more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope Members would not compet" in giving the hon. Minister tips. You please carry on with your speech.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta made a brilliant speech in this House. Only it was too late. I would have liked a similar speech from him and to be assured of his patriotism on the 7th of September, not after the 8th of September after this fresh wave of aggression by China. So far he had been defending the Chinese aggression that had been taking place on this country in 1956 and 1958. When he saw the popular upsurge, he made this laboured speech and read every word of it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member cannot make such allegations. The proceedings bear testimony to my speech. He cannot say anything he likes.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I stand by every word that I have said. I do not need to make written

speeches because I am sure of my ground. I do not need to make a written and laboured speech, because I am saying what comes straight from my heart; I have nothing to hide; I have not to show to the world that I have changed my colours.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you angry? One should not get angry in a national emergency.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am not at all angry. I was only emphasising the point ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you please proceed?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I would request the Government to utilise this opportunity of popular enthusiasm to mobilise all the available resources to meet the aggression that has come before us. I should think that the emergency is yet to come. If the Government will ask the soldiers who have fought against the Chinese in Korea and other places, and take notes, they will know the Chinese strategy. They have got so much man power and perhaps they do not value human lives. You will get waves and waves of Chinese and they would not care even for the wounded and the dead but we, Sir, if I may be permitted to say so, live in a little more civilised world and we consider human lives valuable. I wish, when our Defence department had sent the first batch, they had sent them with sufficient cover and sufficient protection. I will not dilate on that, but I would like to say this that the Prime Minister's reference to some of the officers and the manner in which he defended Communism in the other House does not leave a clear picture, is not convincing to the people. He said, "All the officers in the Defence services were good. But in sheer courage and initiative and hard work I doubt if we can find anybody to beat him." This is what the Prime Min-

'Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

ister said in reference to a certain General whose conduct was called in question in the other House. Sir, I think this is a bit too far . .

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): Are you a better judge?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Most humbly I would point out to the Prime Minister that he is in the habit of calling people names; he calls people feudal. But what is he doing? What is he doing when he appoints his ambassadors and his generals? And was he not doing what the feudal lords had been doing, like the Mughals? I suggest, Sir, that all this needs a complete reorientation. The Defence Council, if it is to be really a Defence Council, must contain people who have experience, people who will convince the public that Government means business. Otherwise, of course you can collect gold; there are people to give gold. But gold is not going to win the war. If you are to win the war, if you are serious about it, then you must begin by asking the country to be prepared for the grim struggle. You must be prepared to act quickly, not hesitate and ponder. Unfortunately, our Prime Minister has the habit of hesitating when the time for action comes and he does not know what to do, whether to think of his Communist friends, think of what they will say about him, or whether to go ahead. It is a good augury that democracy has prevailed . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What he says—is that jealousy or politics?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The country will judge what I am saying.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): It is neither jealousy nor politics but idiocy.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I say that it is food that, people's desire prevailed and the Defence Minister had to go. I hope it will not

stop there. There are still many in the Cabinet who should make room for people in whom the people have more confidence. Similarly, it is necessary that the people who are to lead the armies should be people in whom the army itself and the people would have more confidence. Money alone is not going to get you victory. You must promise but not make big promises to the country. Like Mr. Churchill let us promise blood and tears because this is going to be a grim war with China. With what our neighbours are doing, with what Pakistan is doing, this is going to be a long drawn out affair and you will not be able to achieve victory easily, and I think that the first step that this Government should take is to make peace with Pakistan, come to terms with Pakistan. Going to the United Nations was a great folly, Mr. Menon going there year after year is no good. Let us end this. Let us come to an understanding with them. We gave them a rebuff when they tried sincerely to come to terms with us. I should say we have not understood them. They are people who are our flesh and blood; they have been in this country; they have been with us. Perhaps they were misled into asking for partition. But that should not make a difference to our course of action with them now. Let us come to an understanding with them and fight the common enemy.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: How much territory has Pakistan grabbed?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: How much territory has China added to its territory? Of course, I want it back. I am not saying that you should surrender territory to Pakistan. I only say that we have an honourable settlement with Pakistan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member has already given a number of suggestions. He need not give many more details.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Therefore, Sir, I would say that the Government has been late in awakening; Government has failed to take action in time, but now at least let it take up the task ahead of it in all seriousness. The country is greater than anybody, than even the Congress if it comes to that, and the country's will will be asserted whether you like it or not. The country if not going to tolerate our surrendering even an inch of our soil to the aggressor in this way. Therefore, take heed and prepare the country for what has come before us.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know, Sir, what he wants to be, Quarter Master General or a Cabinet Minister? After hearing his speech I am tempted to put this question, he had made many suggestions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is too curious.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In any case your suggestions will not be accepted by anybody.

श्री मैथिलीशरण गुप्त (नाम-निर्देशित) :
श्रीमन्, मुझे कुछ कहने का अवसर मिला है उस के लिये मैं आप का आभारी हूँ। मेरे पास वर्ण थे परन्तु स्वर्ण नहीं। मेरे भतीजे और मेरी पुत्र वधु ने इस सम्बन्ध में मेरी कुछ सहायता की है परन्तु मैं यहाँ पर अपने वर्ण ही प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

विजय-पर्व

ऋषि दधीचि से गांधीजी तक
मिली हमें जो दीक्षा है,
बन्धुजनो, प्रस्तुत हो, उसकी
फिर आ गई परीक्षा है।
फिर सब देखें कठिन नहीं निज
तपस्-त्याग बलिदान हमें,
परम्परा से पाया अपना
रखना है सम्मान हमें।

घर संभालने में, तटस्थ हो,
लगे हुए थे जब हम लोग,
और चाहते थे जब सबका
पंचशील-सम्मति सहयोग।
तभी पड़ोसी चीन अचानक
होकर लोभ-पाप में लीन,
चला हमारी भूमि छीनने
तन का मोटा, मन का हीन।
हम निर्माण-निरत थे, नाशक
अणुबम नहीं बनाते थे,
अपने साथ दूसरों की भी
शान्ति-समृद्धि मनाते थे।
आक्रामक हो कर ऐसे में
आ कर जो हम से अटके,
उठो, लगादो उन्हें ठिकाने,
वे मदान्ध भूले-भटके।
शताब्दियों के पहले हम ने
जिन्हें धर्म-शिक्षा दी थी,
विनिमय में धन-धरा न ली थी
मात्र साधु-भिक्षा ली थी।
आध्यात्मिकता से हट कर वे
नंगी भौतिकता में चूर,
ह्रिन्न-दृष्टि से गुरुकुल को ही
धूर रहे हैं कायर क्रूर।
राष्ट्र-संघ में शुद्ध-भाव से
हम ने जिन का पक्ष लिया,
हमें उसी के लिये उन्होंने
देखो क्या उपहार दिया।
उन की यह दी हुई चुनौती
हम क्या अस्वीकार करें,
कोई हम पर वार करे तो
हम भी क्यों न प्रहार करें।
ठोकर मार चिता दो उन को
देख रहे हैं जो सपने,
भूले नहीं प्रताप, शिवाजी,
गुरु गोविन्द हमें अपने।
आये जो जय-पत्र लिखाने
मृत्यु-पत्र लिख रखें वे,
लोहे के हैं चने हमारे
चखना है तो चक्खें वे।

[श्री मैथिलीशरण गुप्त]

अपने आप आ गया है यह
नई विजय पाने का पर्व,
न था कौरवों को क्या, यदि है
उन को बहु संख्या का गर्व ।
चर लें भले टिड्डियां उड़ कर
इधर उधर कुछ हरियाली,
पर जीते जी कहीं लौट कर
वे हैं फिर जाने वाली ?
दांतों में तृण धरे ढीट जो
पागल पशु से आ टूटे,
पंजे यहां चलावें जब तक,
पावें निज छक्के छूटे ।
पुरुखों की खाई अफीम की
पीनक छाई है जिनमें,
क्यों न तोड़ने चलें मलिन वे
निकट देख तारे दिन में ।
कृष्णा—गोदावरी—पंचनद,
गंगा-यमुना उमड़ीं आज,
किन्तु एक चुल्लू यथेष्ट है
यदि है रिपुओं को कुछ लाज ।
मार्ग न रहने दो जाने का
ऐसे आने वालों को,
मुंह की खानी हो, उन मन के
मोदक खाने वालों को ।
काल कठिन तो दृढ़ है हम भी,
स्वैर्य धैर्य साहस के संग,
आज वृद्ध भी युवा बने हैं
पाकर निज में नई उमंग ।
मातृभूमि की रक्षा में हम
सिर भी सहज कटा देंगे,
भू-दानी हैं, रहो लुटेरो,
तुमको धूल चटा देंगे ।
ऐसे आंख दिखाने से क्या
हो सकती है ऊंची नाक ?
पहले अपने को तो देखो,
पीछे यहां जमाना धाक ।
कब के प्रतिवासी होकर भी
जान न पाये तुम हम को
पाप-पुण्य जो नहीं मानते
मानों अब अपने यम को ।

हमें किसी का कुछ न चाहिये,
हम अपना भी छोड़ें क्यों,
बिना बुलाया संकट आया
उससे भी मुंह मोड़ें क्यों ?
अटल रहे विश्वास हमारा
सत्य धर्म पर हम आरुढ़,
आज नहीं तो कल लोलुप खल
होंगे किकर्तव्य-विमूढ़ ।
घर के सांप पंचमार्गी हैं
बाहर के रिपु से भी घोर,
आपस के मत-भेद भूलकर
सजग रहें सब दोनों ओर ।
हिन्दू, जैन, बौद्ध वा सिख हैं
मुसलमान या ईसाई,
अपने एक देश के नाते
हम सब हैं भाई-भाई ।
सावधान ! साधन-सामग्री
टूट न पावे आज कहीं,
तब है, एक दूसरे से जब,
कहला ले अब और नहीं ।
उत्पादन का हर्ष जहां हो,
वहां अधिक श्रम का क्या खेद,
रक्त दे रहे मुभट हमारे,
हमें बहुत क्या अपना स्वेद ।
बढ़ते हुए हमारे सैनिक
पिछड़ा हमें न पावेंगे,
जो स्वदेश पर बलि जाते हैं,
हम उन पर बलि जावेंगे ।
धन तो तन का मेल, किसे है
आज स्वयं प्राणों का मोह,
गूंजे जीवन-गान एक रस
क्या आरोह और अवरोह ।
बाहर के बल का पूरक है
सच्चा भीतर का बल ही,
शस्त्रों का कहना ही क्या, लड़
चुके निहत्थे हम कल ही ।
भौतिक भूत नहीं कर सकता
हमको अपने भय से मुक्त,
जीत जी स्वाधीन रहेंगे,
मर कर भी होंगे हम मुक्त ।

अपने आप लिया रिपुओं ने
न्याय बुद्धि का यह अभिशाप,
यही बहुत, बैरी बन आया,
कटने को यह अपना पाप ।
बलि देकर ही बल लेंगे हम,
भीम-भामिनो भीमा मे,
जो पर हैं, वे रहें परे ही,
हटें हमारी सीमा से ।

श्री गोडे मुहुरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
माननीय सभापति जी, आज जिस परिस्थिति का देश को सामना करना पड़ रहा है, उसको अगर हम सब लोगों को एक हो करके सामना करना है, तो उसके लिए जरूरी हो जाता है कि हमारी नीति साफ हो । पहले पहल में अपने जवान, जो आज बहुत सी मुसीबतों का सामना करके नेफा और लड़ाख फ्रंट में अपनी जानें कुर्बान कर रहे हैं, उनकी प्रशंसा करना चाहता हूं । वे बहुत सी मुसीबतों का सामना कर रहे हैं । कुछ मुसीबतें ऐसी हैं जो कुदरती हैं; लेकिन कुछ ऐसी भी मुसीबतों का उनको सामना करना पड़ रहा है, जो हमारी लापरवाही और गैर जिम्मेदारी की वजह से पैदा हुई हैं । जब इन सब मुसीबतों का सामना करके वे अपनी जानें कुर्बान कर रहे हैं देश की आजादी के लिए, तो हम सब लोगों को उनके प्रति आभारी होना चाहिये ।

साथ ही साथ में यह कहना चाहूंगा कि इस देश को अगर तैयार करना है इस मुसीबत का सामना करने के लिए और चीनी आक्रमण को रोकने के लिए, तो फिर हमारी नीति भी साफ होनी चाहिये । अब तक हमने क्या नीति अपनाई है, इसको भी आप सोचिये । १२ वर्षों से जो विदेश नीति और जो रक्षा नीति हमने अपनाई है, वह गलत साबित हुई है, और हम अगर आगे इस गलती को नहीं करना चाहते हैं और अगर हम मजबूती से चीनी आक्रमणकारियों का सामना करना चाहते हैं, तो हमको इस नीति को साफ करना पड़ेगा, इस नीति में परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा । चाहे कोई कितना बड़ा आदमी हो जिम्मे इस नीति

को चलाया हो, अगर यह नीति गलत साबित हुई है, तो उसको सामने आ करके कबूल करना चाहिये कि हमारी गलत नीति रही और १२ वर्षों से जिस नीति के अनुसार हम चले, उस नीति के फलस्वरूप हमको ऐसी स्थिति का सामना करना पड़ रहा है । इसमें उनकी कोई कमी नहीं होगी, वे और बड़े आदमी होंगे अगर वे ऐसा काम करते हैं कि वे अपनी गलती को कबूल करें और एक दुष्ट नीति देश के सामने रखें । तो मैं प्रधान मंत्री से अपील करना चाहूंगा कि वे देश के सामने आएं और एक मजबूत नीति सामने रखें । अब तक जो नीति हमारी रही है, वह गलत साबित हुई है । चीन आज हमारे ऊपर क्यों आक्रमण कर रहा है ? १२ वर्ष से जो कुछ नीति हमने चीन के साथ चलाई है, उसको अगर आप लोग देखें तो यह साफ है कि जिस दिन चीन ने तिब्बत के ऊपर अपना आधिपत्य जमाया उसी दिन से भारत के ऊपर उसका आक्रमण शुरू हो गया । जिस दिन हमने मूजरिनिटी और सावरेनिटी में फर्क किया और इन दोनों शब्दों में फर्क कर के तिब्बत को हमने बेच दिया, छोटे भाई का गला काट दिया, उसी दिन से हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला हो गया । जो कोई भी इतिहास का थोड़ा बहुत ज्ञान रखता है, उसको साफ हो जाना चाहिये था कि तिब्बत, जो कि हमारे और चीन के बीच में एक बफर स्टेट के रूप में था, जिसको हमें आजाद रखना चाहिये था, उसको हम बचा नहीं पाये, तो हमारे ऊपर मुसीबत आने वाली है और वह तिब्बत को खत्म कर के हमारे हिमालय पर भी आक्रमण करेगा लेकिन उस वक्त हम हिन्दी-चीनी भाई-भाई के नारे बुलन्द करने में रह गये और यह नहीं सोचा कि तिब्बत की जनता का और हमारी आजादी का क्या होगा ।

तो मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जब चीन ने सारे इंटरनेशनल ला को खत्म करके हमारे ऊपर हमला किया है तब हमको साफ कह देना चाहिये कि तिब्बत आजाद रहेगा और हम एक आजाद तिब्बत को मान कर हो रहेंगे,

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

और हमारी सरकार को यह भी कह देना चाहिये कि तिब्बत के साथ हमारी सीमा मैकमोहन रेखा हो सकती थी, एक आजाद तिब्बत के साथ हम मैकमोहन रेखा की बात करते थे, मगर चीन के साथ अगर कोई सीमा-रेखा तय करना है, तो वह कैलाश मानसरोवर तक, मनसर गांव तक, पूर्ववाहिणी ब्रह्मपुत्र के उत्तर में ही हो सकती है उसके नीचे नहीं हो सकती है। आज चीन कहता है कि मैकमोहन रेखा इम्पीरियलिस्ट रेखा है, सही है, हम भी मानते हैं कि वह इम्पीरियलिस्ट लाइन है लेकिन वह इम्पीरियलिस्ट लाइन इसलिये है कि भारत का कुछ हिस्सा चीन के, तिब्बत के कब्जे में दे दिया था। इसलिये मैं कहता हूं कि चीन के साथ हमारी सीमा-रेखा कैलाश मानसरोवर तक, मनसर गांव तक है। यह साबित हो गया है। आपको याद होगा कि लोक सभा में यह सवाल उठा था और इसके बारे में कुछ प्रश्नोत्तर भी हुआ है, जिसमें कहा गया है कि मनसर गांव मानसरोवर झील के पास है और उसकी जनगणना हिन्दुस्तान में होती थी और उसका टैक्स कलेक्शन भी हिन्दुस्तान में होता था। जब इतना सबूत हमारे पास है, तो हमको यह साफ कह देना चाहिये कि हमारी सीमा मानसरोवर और कैलाश के ऊपर मनसर गांव, जो तक कि हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है, पूर्ववाहिणी ब्रह्मपुत्र के उत्तर में है। तो इस तरह की एक साफ नीति हमें रखना है तभी हम लड़ाई ठीक से चला सकते हैं। लोग यह कहते हैं कि आज इस बात का कहना एक बहुत बड़ी बात होगी, जो हमारे पास है उसी को नहीं बचा पा रहे हैं, लेकिन मैं तो यही कहूंगा कि जो बचा नहीं पा रहे हैं वह तो बचा नहीं पा रहे हैं, परन्तु हम अपने देश के भाग को क्यों दूसरे के कब्जे में कबूल करते हैं। बचा नहीं पा रहे हैं, वह हमारी कमजोरी की वजह से है, अगर अपनी कमजोरी की वजह से कैलाश मानसरोवर और पूर्व-

वाहिणी ब्रह्मपुत्र के उत्तर में जो भाग है उसको अपना नहीं बना सकते हैं, तो यह इसकी कोई वजह नहीं है कि हम यह नहीं कहें कि वह हमारा हिस्सा है। हम यह मान सकते हैं कि आजाद तिब्बत है; तो हम अपनी इच्छा से अपना कुछ हिस्सा छोड़ना चाहते हैं तो छोड़ सकते हैं, कैलाश मानसरोवर तक, मनसर गांव तक, पूर्ववाहिणी ब्रह्मपुत्र के उत्तर में जो भाग है, वह तिब्बत के लिये छोड़ सकते हैं, आजाद तिब्बत के लिये छोड़ सकते हैं। तो इस तरह की एक साफ नीति सरकार के सामने होनी चाहिये।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

इसके साथ ही साथ विदेश नीति के बारे में जो चर्चा हुई है उसके बारे में भी कुछ इशारा करना चाहता हूं। जो कुछ विदेश नीति अब तक चली है, उसका परिणाम क्या देख रहे हैं? दुनिया में कितने ऐसे देश हैं जो कि हमारा साथ दे रहे हैं, इस मामले में? हमारी नानेलाइनमेंट की पालिसी के चलते चलते आज यह परिस्थिति है कि जो नैटो गुट के देश हैं वही हमारा साथ दे रहे हैं, ज्यादातर, और जो न्यूट्रल नेशंस कह जाते हैं वे हमारा साथ नहीं दे रहे हैं। क्या वजह है? मैं यह नहीं कहता हूं कि नानेलाइनमेंट की पालिसी छोड़ देनी चाहिये, मैं भी उसी पालिसी को चाहता हूं, सोसलिस्ट पार्टी भी यही चाहती है कि नानेलाइनमेंट की पालिसी रहे, लेकिन उसको इस तरह कार्यान्वित किया जाय कि जिससे हिन्दुस्तान की एक पाजिटिव नीति मालूम हो। हम यह नहीं चाहते कि कभी कुछ सालों तक किसी एक गुट का समर्थन करें और कुछ सालों तक बाद में दूसरे गुट का समर्थन करें। इस तरह के पेंडुलम जैसी नीति से, एक गुट से दूसरे गुट में जाने की नानेलाइनमेंट की पालिसी से हमारा काम नहीं चलेगा। हमारी नानेलाइनमेंट की पालिसी कोई क्रिएटिव पालिसी नहीं रही है, कोई पाजिटिव पालिसी नहीं रही है। अगर

यह पाजिटिव पालिसी होती, तो कांगो में लुमुम्बा की जो सरकार स्थापित हुई थी उसको हम उसी वक्त रिकग्नाइज करते, उसको बाहर नहीं करते, जब अल्जीरिया की प्राविजनल गवर्नमेंट बनी थी, तब उसको भी मान्यता देते और उसको बाहर नहीं करते और जब यमन में गवर्नमेंट बनी थी तो उसको मान्यता देने में हम १० दिन नहीं लगाते। हमने गलती कर के न्युट्रल देशों की जो कुछ सहानुभूति थी उसको भी गवां दिया। हमने जो सद्भावना और दोस्ती चीन और रूस के साथ दिखाई अगर वह कुछ हद तक दूसरे देशों के साथ में दिखाते, तो हमारी यह परिस्थिति नहीं रहती। फिर भी हम उन देशों के आभारी रहेंगे, जो कि आज हमारे रवैये के बावजूद भी हमें मदद दे रहे हैं, आज अमेरिका, युनाइटेड किंगडम और कॅनेडा हमारे रवैये के बावजूद हमें मदद दे रहे और उनके लिये हमको आभारी होना चाहिये। मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि चाहे जिस देश से भी हो, सहायता लें। आज हमको देश को बचाना है, चाहे जिस तरह से हो, लेकिन भीख मत मांगें, अपनी आजादी को मत बेचें और जिस तरह से भी हो, सहायता लेकर देश को बचावें। अगर हम लोगों को इस तरह की एक साफ नीति रखने पर सरकार को मजबूर करना हो, तो मैं कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्यों से भी कहूंगा कि जैसे एक श्री मेनन को जिन्होंने निकाला, उसी तरह से औरों को भी मजबूर कीजिये कि जो भी विदेश नीति और राष्ट्रीय नीति उन्होंने बनाई थी उन नीतियों को बदलें, उनमें परिवर्तन करें और एक मजबूत नेतृत्व देश को दें। आज जनता आगे बढ़ना चाहती है, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता आजादी को बचाने के लिये हर कुर्बानी देना चाहती है, लेकिन हमारे देश का नेतृत्व उसके लिये तैयार नहीं है। आज हम यह परिस्थिति देख रहे हैं। अगर इस तरह का नेतृत्व और दुर्लभ नीति चलती रही, तो फिर वह चाहे कितना बड़ा आदमी क्यों न हो, चाहे प्रधान मंत्री क्यों न हों, उन्हें बदलने को तैयार रहना चाहिये।

यह कांग्रेस पार्टी को करना चाहिये। मेरा कहने का मतबल यह है कि प्रधान मंत्री नहीं हटना चाहते हैं तो ठीक है, लेकिन वह अपनी नीति को बदलें और नीति को बदलने में उनका कोई छोटापन नहीं होगा, बड़े आदमी बनेंगे। देश प्रधान मंत्री से भी बड़ा होता है और अगर वह महसूस करते हैं कि उनकी १२ वर्ष की जो पालिसी अब तक चली है, वह गलत रही है, तो उनको उसे बदलने में कोई हिचक नहीं होनी चाहिये।

फिर हमारे देश में आज जो परिस्थिति है, उसके बारे में भी हम लोगों को सोचना चाहिये। यह सही है कि हम लोगों ने इमर्जेंसी डिक्लेयर कर दी है और इमर्जेंसी में बहुत कुछ सिविल लिबर्टीज दबाई जा सकती हैं, लेकिन इस चीज को हमें ध्यान में रखना चाहिये कि इमर्जेंसी की बात को लेकर हम ऐसा कोई कदम न उठावें, जो कि ऐसा हो कि चीनी आक्रमण का मुकाबला करने के बजाय खुद अपने घर में लोगों से मुकाबला कर बैठें। कुछ लोगों ने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के बारे में कहा कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने ऐसी नीति अपनाई है, जो कि देश के हित में नहीं है। ठीक है, जो भी उनकी नीति है, हम लोगों को उनसे सावधान रहना चाहिये, हर एक कम्युनिस्ट के ऊपर निगाह रखनी चाहिये लेकिन मैं ऐसा मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि उनकी पार्टी पर कोई प्रतिबन्ध लगाया जाय क्योंकि जैसे देशभक्तों की पार्टी में भी देशद्रोही हो सकते हैं, वैसे ही कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में भी देश प्रेमी हो सकते हैं। मैं इस नीति को मानने वाला हूँ, इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा कि एक एक कम्युनिस्ट पर निगाह रखो जाय और अगर कोई ऐसा काम कर, जा कि आक्रमणकारी को मदद पहुंचाता हो, तो उस पर कार्यवाही की जाय लेकिन इससे आगे नहीं जायें। तो इमर्जेंसी रेगुलेशन को जब हम लोग कार्यान्वित करते हैं, तब हमें इस चीज को याद रखना चाहिये।

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

देश को अगर आगे ले जाना है और चीन का मुकाबला करना है बां सारी नीतियों को हम सफाई से देश के सामने रखें और फिर मदद मांगें। जहाँ तक सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का सवाल है, अगर एक अच्छी नीति सरकार की तरफ से आती है तो कोई बजह नहीं है कि वह इसका साथ नहीं दे और इस काम में मदद करने की कोशिश न करे। हमसे जो कुछ बन पड़ेगा, उस करेंगे; क्योंकि हम उन लोगों में से हैं, जो कि आखिरी दम तक लड़ेंगे, हम कोई आठ सितम्बर या कोई दूसरी तारीख की सीमा को लगा कर वहाँ पर नेगोशिएट करके लड़ाई खत्म करने वाला नहीं हैं, हम तो चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो भी सीमा हम मानते हैं, उस सीमा के बाहर जब चीन चला जायेगा, तभी हम हथियार रखेंगे; उसके पहले हथियार नहीं रखेंगे और हम सरकार से भी यह चाहेंगे कि वह जो ८ सितम्बर की डेट लाइन लगाई है, उसके बारे में भी सावधान हो जाय। अब कोई फायदा नहीं है कि हम चीनियों के साथ इस तरह को बातचीत चलाते रहें, वे बातचीत मानने वाली कौम नहीं हैं। अगर बातचीत से कोई चीज तय होनी होती तो पहले ही हो गई होती। जिस तरह से चीनियों ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया है, उससे यह साफ हो गया है कि अब बातचीत की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। अब हम बातचीत उसी वक्त कर सकते हैं, जब चीनी हमारी सीमा छोड़ कर बाहर चले जायें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार एक दृढ़ नीति देश के सामने रखे।

violent and it_ was after a struggle of 150 years, a completely non-violent struggle in which Guru Go-bind Singh had to suffer the martyr-dom of his father, his great grand father, his four children and his mother that he came to a tragic conclusion. When he was asked how self-rule is established, how political regimes are run, he said:

“तब मुख भतिउं गरीब निवाज,
दस्त्रन के अधीन है राज।
बिना राज तह धर्म चलै है,
बिना राज सब दलै मलै है।”

That is to say, our Lord, the Master of the poor said; "Without the help of arms, no kingdom, no political regime, can run. Why should we run a political regime of our own? Why should we have any self-rule? It is because without self-rule, without self-government, righteousness cannot prevail, Dharma cannot prevail and without the prevalence of Dharma, no values that we cherish can be preserved."

“बिना राज सब दलै मलै है।”

Even in the present emergency, our dynamic Chief Minister, Sardar Pra-tap Singh Kairon, has declared his intention to offer 2 million recruits during the coming one month if we can train and arm them. There is unbounded enthusiasm in the minds of the people of Punjab as it is in minds of the people all over the country, from Kashmir to Kerala, and from Assam to Gujarat. For the first time we have come to realise that we are a nation which is not ridden with any kind of controversy over language, over caste, over provincial boundaries, over royalties on oil and so on and so forth. In* a moment, as if by a magic wand, we have been turned into a nation of warriors, everyone dedicated to only one cause and that is the cause of victory. But when all this is said, when we see large queues

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): Madam. I rise to support the two Resolutions moved by the hon. Home Minister. I belong to a part of India and a religious community whose blood is stirred by a call to a righteous war. We began as a peaceful people in history, a small community, devotees of God, completely non-

o-f people massing before the recruiting offices, when we see poor people giving away their life's savings to the Prime Minister's Fund or the National Defence Fund, when we see so much of enthusiasm for fighting for this righteous war that has been forced upon a peaceful and peace-loving country, in spite of all this enthusiasm, I would like to strike a note of caution. We all know why this debacle came. Though we may not admit—manv of us especially in the Opposition do not admit—it is almost an invariable rule of military history that whosoever shall strike first shall have the initial advantage. Take the case of the last war, when the best trained armed forces of Britain fell in Malaya, when France fell, when Belgium fell, when Britain had to beat a retreat at Dunkirk, when Russia had to evacuate almost half of the country before the onslaughts of the Germans. It is because Hitler in Germany and Fascist Mussolini in Italy and Tojo in Japan were all preparing for war while the democracies were most of the time preparing for peace. We were geared not merely during our struggle for independence lasting over 50 years to ways of peace but also after independence we thought that as long as possible war should be kept away from our borders so that we could build ourselves economically. Now, we have been building up over the last 15 years economically in a most peaceful way and that is whv whatever mistakes we committed, those were the mistakes of a civilised nation, the mistakes of gentlemanliness. They were not the mistakes of weakness and people who stand up today in this august House and say that it is all on account of our policy of non-alignment that we have come to grief have only to read the 'Daily Telegraph' of November 5 to realise that it is not so. The 'Daily Telegraph', which is the spokesman of the Conservative Party in Great Britain says, editorially:

"However dubious may be Russia's ability to restrain the Chinese, the out and out adherence of India to the Western Camp would inevi-

tably link the two Communist giants shoulder to shoulder and would involve the Western countries i" commitments more rigid than they would want."

Then I would read out a quotation from the 'New Statesman', well-known socialist British journal, which says:

"Britain must give all the help Mr. Nehru asks for, without sucking India in the cold war."

Mr. Galbraith, the American Ambassador to this country, has also spoken in the same strain. These gentlemen and these newspapers are about as responsive to the needs of their own countries and ideologies as our friends opposite here are. Therefore we should do nothing in the huff of the moment, in the excitement of this emergency to deviate from our path of non-alignment. If these incursions on the borders of India have not dragged the whole world into the flames of war, it is on account of that wise and sagacious policy that was evolved by that jewel of a man, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and supported by the Government of India and this Parliament. I would, therefore, say that this policy should, on no account be abandoned and nobody is asking us to do it, not the West which is helping us so generously. We are all very grateful that the U.S.A. and the U.K., out of motives of good neighbourliness and because of their faith in our democracy and on account of their faith in our peace-loving leadership and thf "roverment, have come forward with this generous response to our call. They are giving without committing us to anything and they are giving without settling terms. When people ask: Why could not we have arms earlier? My reply is that these could not be had earlier firstly because we were geared to the ways of peace, we were building up ourselves economically in peace; for peace, and secondly whenever we wanted to strike a deal with any firm or Government in the West for the manufacture of arms here or even for delivery of arms, then the dates that were given to us were far in advance of our requirements. All kinds of im-

TDr. Gopal Singh.]

pediments were put in our way, some financial, some political, some which I would not like to mention here. Therefore, I say that people who have accused us of being deliberately ignorant of the needs of the times are themselves ignoring the exigencies of the situation that developed from time to time. They advise us now to call all kinds of Generals who have retired, blessed be they, most of them are now in the Swatantra Party and therefore they should be here to advise us all the time! But I say, that I met General Thimmayya, the ex-Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army on 23rd September, 1959 and I asked him about the situation in Ladakh. I was then in Kashmir. This was printed in the 'Tribune' of Ambala on 24th September, 1959:

"Gen. Thimmayya said, 'There was absolutely no cause for anxiety on the Ladakh border.'

He said 'There had been no major incursions on our territory on this border and wherever the Chinese had advanced from Tibet or Sinkiang, they had been halted at some distance from our picquets'.

Asked how much area of Ladakh was shown in Chinese maps, he said it was not more than 800 sq. miles."

That was on 24th September, 1959, and Gen. Thimmayya was our Commander-in-Chief then and he should know and he ought to have known. When he said this, naturally, the country could not be prepared for war at that time. All the same, I must say that the Defence Ministry did produce and were producing more and more of war equipment. From a total of about Rs. 6 crores, the production rose to much more. When Mr. Krishna Menon took over, defence equipment worth Rs. 6 crores was being turned out from our ordnance factories. But the amount of war equipment that has lately been coming out of our factories is of the order of

about Rs. 60 crores per year, and the Government had plans for raising it to about Rs. 200 crores to Rs. 600 crores. But unfortunately, in our excitement, we forget that even though we tried our level best to build up our military apparatus here, there were quite a few impediments in our way, beyond our reach, that we could not surmount. It is only very recently that on account of and under the stress of this emergency, the friends who have come from abroad, generous friends, great friends—I pay my tribute to them—have offered us arms without conditions. But a few days ago, there were all kinds of conditions placed in our way and we could not buy our equipment from them and we could not manufacture with their permission the equipment that we wanted in this country.

Another thing mentioned here is about the border roads. I know something about the strategic roads— in NEFA and Ladakh and therefore I can say that these roads were deliberately not built. I may tell you why, because in military strategy these things are done. Sometimes roads are necessary, but sometimes roads are not necessary. For military reasons taking the cue from the British from whom we inherited our frontiers we decided that we shall not build roads on our borders far away, but leave them uninhabited and without roads, as far as possible, for the reason that these might become useful as much to us as to our enemy, if he advanced. He should be met and fought in depth. There is a term in military strategy—meeting in depth. It means that the enemy should be lured into our territory for quite a bit of distance so that we might cut off his supplies. He cannot bring his forces, his jeeps, his armaments and so on and he is denied supplies from the local population and then surrounded and decimated. That is the way. But when we got to know that there was absolutely no alternative for us but to build a few roads, we started building a few roads which were of strategic importance. There has been a debacle, but as I

ubmitted earlier, Madam Deputy Chairman, this debacle had to come, because anybody who has taken the initiative in a fight, who is the aggressor, will always have an initial advantage. That is one thing. Secondly, there is another thing. The Chinese came from the Thagla ridge and the Thagla ridge, if the hon. Members opposite have seen the map, is only about seven miles from the road-head of the Chinese; but we have to march for seven days on foot from the nearest road-head. That is why we could not send our troops out there on the border and that is why we were outnumbered. We could only have a few small picquets or pockets there. We could not post all our armies there. It was just not possible. We know it. We Sikhs from the Punjab have almost two-thirds of our families in the military, in the army, in the air force, in the navy or allied services. They know that it was just not possible to place large armies on the frontiers, on the Chinese borders. As for equipment, I have already submitted and I submit it once again that so far as the automatic weapons are concerned, they were *not* given even to the U.S. Army or the British Army till lately. So far as heavy mortars are concerned—we have small mortars—only the French have these heavy mortars and no other country in the world. That is because nowadays more and more emphasis is put on the air power, just as it was on the sea power some fifty years back, the sea power some fifty years back, round land power, then it became sea power and now the emphasis is on air power. So military strategy changes from decade to decade nowadays. Therefore, it should not be asked why we did not have a large army over there. Air power is important now. Shri Vajpayee was saying that the Chinese have about 8,000 pieces of aircraft, MIGs and so on, and said we should also get them. Now, tell me, wherefrom is all that money to come if the leader of the Swatantra Party says, "Do not ask us to part with our gold. Do not ask us to part with the ill-gotten gains, profits got

out of businesses and so on?" If you are really prepared to fight a war, then you should submit to the will of the Government. I think this is the most fitting time for the Government to declare gold as an illegal tender. Secondly, all the reserves and profits in industries should be taken over for deposit in the Defence Fund. Petrol, cement and steel should be rationed and what is more, the Rs. 100 and Rs. 1,000 currency notes should be demonetised, because there are large hordes of such currency notes in lockers. All these should be demonetised. This is what the British did at the time of the Second World War. They demonetised all Rs. 100 notes and above.

Next, I would like to take one or two minutes to submit a few suggestions about the military measures that we should take now. We are told that in Tibet the Chinese are building up their missile bases. We would also need to have anti-missile missiles. Perhaps we would need more air power also, because we cannot depend on the treacherous enemy and argue that because he has not yet used his air force, he will not use it in future too. If the war goes on, it will become a total war and, therefore, we ought, from now, to build up our air power. We cannot pay for whatever we want to have from abroad and, therefore, I would suggest most respectfully to the hon. the Home Minister that we should take arms on the basis of lend-lease. Even Russia did it and there is absolutely no political commitment involved in this. The American Ambassador, Mr. Galbraith, has very wisely stated that India is not going to be committed by any kind of assistance that she may ask. But I must give a warning here, that even the Western powers will go with us only to an extent, not because they do not want to, but because they have other commitments also. Therefore, we have to build almost everything that we need, in our own country. And for this we would request and implore the Western powers to help us as much as is in their capacity and power, to

[Dr. Gopal Singh.]

build our military apparatus within our own country.

One last word about our generals and Pakistan. We name our generals too often. It is never done, especially in a war emergency. But I have here a newspaper called "Current" in which it is given: "Kaul is out of NEFA" "Maneckshaw to take over." and so on. Similarly, there was a mention in another daily that Gen. Chaudhury was taking over the Eastern Command; then, this was denied. Now, this kind of silly effusions in the press should not be allowed. It demoralises the generals, the officers and the men. The Government is asked: "To fight the war, why not bring in the old generals?" I say the responsibility for our unpreparedness, if any, in which we are caught is as much the responsibility of the old veterans who have retired. Why should we get them now? Should they be put in command so that they can play their politics and create more confusion? Once again, I plead we should not mention our generals by name. We should not discuss them in public, because the morale of not only the generals, and officers and of the men, but of the whole country is at stake, and such newspapers as indulge in this type of gossip should have their mouth shut and if the Home Minister has taken powers under the Defence of India Rules, here then is a fit case where he should use them. He should shut the mouth of some of the newspapers which are printing the names of generals, 'demolishing' them, boosting them and which are playing with fire when the whole country's future is at stake.

Now, one word about Pakistan and I shall have ended. We have been told that we should immediately enter into a bargain with Pakistan and end our troubles with her so that our land frontier which is probably 8,000 miles is left to the mercies of Pakistan, so that we pull out our forces from there and put them on the borders with

China and wage war with China irrespective of what happens on our borders with Pakistan. I am very hopeful that General Ayub Khan who is a Pathan and who is a soldier who has fought in this country alongside his brother officers in the Indian Army would take no risks and would restrain whatever sentiment there is against India among the extremists in Pakistan. He should know that at the time of stress, any concessions under duress that he expects from us would not be worth the paper on which they are written. If this Government surrenders Kashmir or a part of Kashmir for an unsure gain in Ladakh, then I think the bargain would not be worth striking. Our people will repudiate it. However, I depend upon the goodwill of Pakistanis and Pakistan's Present who is a great army general and implore them not to take advantage of the trouble which we are facing, because this is a trouble which today is ours and tomorrow will be theirs.

Thank you very much.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, I support the Resolutions moved by the hon. the Home Minister. Before I deal with the relevant points, I would like to pay my humble tribute and homage to those brave and valiant, soldiers who have sacrificed their life for defending their motherland.

At last the Government have resolved and determined to fight and to expel the Chinese people who have perpetrated naked and open aggression against our country. This is not the time for recrimination or for apportioning blame. On the contrary, every citizen of this country should stand behind the Government and should declare his unequivocal support to any action that the Government might take for expelling the Chinese aggressors. On behalf of the Republican Party, I want to extend the wholehearted support of our Party and we will do everything that is possible for us to regain the terri-

tory which has been captured by force by China. On this occasion, *i* feel great pride that Mahar and Mara-tha battalions are at this moment fighting bravely on the border of NEFA and sacrificing their lives.

Madam, just now Mr. Dahyabhai Patel raised a controversy. He says that there are still some more Ministers in the Cabinet who should not be allowed to continue there. Perhaps he was leaning some other progressive Ministers in the Cabinet. I may point out to him that there are other people in this country also who demand that there should not be any Ministers who belong to the reactionary group or who want to safeguard the interests of capitalist people. There are, we know, people who do not like that Morarjibhai should continue in the Cabinet. At this juncture the question is, should we raise such controversies now? Is this the time to say that we do not want progressive Ministers or we do not want reactionary and capitalist Ministers in the Cabinet? I must point out to the House that we do not support Mr. Menon, we do not support Mr. Morarji Desai but we support, the nation supports, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister and his Government.

Madam, we had said long before that effective steps must be taken to remove the Chinese aggressors from this land. Even during the last debate in this House on 22nd August 1962 I had raised this question. I had urged the hon. Prime Minister to get military equipment from friendly nations because I thought that unless and until we strengthened our defences, unless and until we were militarily strong, it would not be possible to resist the Chinese aggression, it would be much more difficult to expel them from our territory. I will just read out what the hon. Prime Minister stated in reply. He said:

"They may send us some equipment, maybe some aircraft, if we 846 RS.—3.

are prepared to accept it. And the cost we pay for it, not in money but in other ways, will be far greater than its possible value. I am looking at it purely from the practical point of view, and the cost of it will be far greater, and it will weaken us ultimately, weaken us actually in fighting on the frontier, apart from 'other ways.'"

That was the point of view of the Prime Minister that if we accepted military equipment from foreign countries it would weaken our defences at the frontier and not strengthen them. I would refer to another portion in his speech where he said;

"It is not that we get a few guns or a few aircraft from another country and we defend our country. What happens if those aircraft are destroyed, or do not fly? Then we are helpless. We have nothing to fall back upon."

So, when I urged that we should get military equipment from foreign powers he tried to ridicule the idea by suggesting that the aircraft might be out of order and then we would have nothing to fall back upon. Ultimately, when there was massive aggression by China there was no other alternative but to get military equipment from whatever source we could get. I am sorry to say that even when there was this massive invasion by China our Government required five days to take a decision as to whether we should take aid from Western countries or not. Was that the time to think? Have we not allowed China to make progress during these five days which we required for taking that decision? However, the Western countries are willing and ready to give every sort of help to fight the Chinese. Therefore, we must wholeheartedly, without any reservation, thank all the Western powers, particularly U.S.A. and U.K., who have come to our rescue in the very difficult time which the country is facing today. Madam, the

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.] Western powers do not attach any strings; they do not want India to get involved in the cold war; they do not ask: our Government to give up the policy of non-alignment and therefore we should try to get their support and help. It is not a question whether we should have only small weapons or medium size weapons or large weapons; it is a question how effectively and at the earliest we can expel them from our territory. For expelling the Chinese forces if we require large size weapons we should get them from whatever source we could get them, from America, from U.K., from France or from Canada or even from Russia. But I doubt whether in the present context, in the present circumstances, we can get any military equipment from Russia. Because we know we reached an agreement to get MIG planes from Russia but in spite of the agreement the MIG planes have not been delivered so far. Therefore, we doubt whether we can get any military equipment from Russia. But there are many countries in the world which are willing to help us and, therefore, if we want to remove the Chinese from this land we must get weapons from whatever source we can get. I am sorry to say that sometimes confusion is created in the minds of the people. Only a few days back Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had given a clarion call. Emergency was declared. And again we heard that he wanted to have negotiations if the Chinese forces withdrew to the line which they had occupied on the 8th September. I fail to understand this attitude of our hon. Prime Minister. There is unanimous support in the country. Even the DMK, which was fighting for separation, for partition of this country, has declared its unequivocal support. They have said that they will suspend all their activities till the Chinese forces are removed from this country. Everybody is prepared and willing to sacrifice everything that one has got. They are giving gold and money. They are donating

their blood. They are sacrificing their lives. We have never experienced in the last fifteen years of our independence such tremendous support, such tremendous unity and integration as we are noticing today in this country. Not only that. We are getting international support also. Only the other day the hon. Home Minister told us that we have got the support of forty nations. So far we could not get the support of neutral nations. But only about four or five days back we have read in the papers that President Nasser had advised China to accept the conditions of the Indian Government. Otherwise, they would start propaganda against China. He had warned China. Not only that. When President Nasser made that statement, there were leading articles published in the Egyptian papers warning China that China should accept the conditions laid down by the Government of India. It means that there has been some sort of change in the attitude and policy of the neutral nations also. Therefore, today we are getting the wholehearted support of the neutral nations. Barring a few Communist countries, we have everybody's support. With internal support and international support, I do not understand why we should again use the language of negotiation and talk. There should not be any language of negotiation at all. We will negotiate, we will talk, we will discuss the question of border dispute by sitting round a table only when the last Chinese is removed from our territory, from our soil. Even if there is one single Chinese soldier in our territory, we will not sit round a table and discuss the border dispute with China. The first thing is that we must remove the Chinese people from our territory. Then, we can settle our dispute.

I will refer to one or two other problems. One is that we should try to have good relations with Pakistan. Of course, we cannot say definitely in the context of the present political

situation whether we shall be able to get the support of Pakistan. But no doubt we should try to solve this problem, to settle the disputes which are involving Pakistan and India and which are the causes of the strained relations. I remember about five or six months back even the Foreign Minister of Pakistan had declared that he would like to discuss the question of Kashmir with the Indian Government. I remember even General Ayub Khan was prepared to have some sort of compromise. We were given to understand in this House by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that he would like to solve this problem peacefully. Also, we were given to understand that our Government was willing to allow Pakistan to have the territory of Kashmir which is being occupied by Pakistan and that the Government of India should occupy the territory which is at present under the occupation of India. If we can solve the Kashmir issue on that basis, I think we can have friendly relations with Pakistan. I do not think Pakistan will be able to attack India either on the Kashmir front or on the eastern front at Tripura. We know that Pakistan had tried to have some sort of skirmishes on the Tripura border, but because of the United States of America's pressure, I think, she desisted from that attack. I do not think that in the future also Pakistan will be able to attack India, because if she attacks us, then it will be difficult for Pakistan to fight against India on two frontiers i.e. East and West Pakistan, due to vast distance between two parts. That will not be possible. Until and unless there is some chance for Pakistan forces to join hands with Chinese forces, I do not think Pakistan will ever be able to attack India. Only today in the morning we have read in the papers that Chinese forces at present are making attacks on Walong, and if they capture Walong, then it will provide access to the Digboi oilfields. Not only that. It has been reported in the papers today that it may open for them way

to Nagaland also. In that case there is a possibility that they may join hands with the Naga rebels. That has been reported in today's papers. In some way if Chinese forces run down to Pakistan border they will be able to support Pakistan in defending Eastern Sector and, in that case, Pakistan may launch attack on Kashmir. I hope fervently that such an eventuality will not happen. However, we should try to settle our disputes with Pakistan*.

Then, we should try to check the reactionary forces that are being encouraged in this country in the name of war. Everybody is making sacrifice for preserving the independence and integrity of this country. But in the name of war no person should be allowed to exploit the situation. The blackmarketers, hoarders and profiteers must be dealt with severely. There is a section of reactionary people who are not satisfied with the resignation of Mr. Krishna Menon. They want Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also to resign from the Prime Ministership. Madam, I was rather moved by the speech made by Mr. Vajpayee, but I will just refer to the last issue of the "Organiser", which is supposed to be the paper of Jan Sangh. Not only one, there are three or four articles in which the most scandalous propaganda has been made, not against Mr. Krishna Menon but Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I will quote only one sentence from this article. It says regarding the policy of the Prime Minister:

"His own decadent philosophy and anaemic politics have debased the descendants of Bharata, Chanakya, Buddha and Asoka, and Sivaji and a galaxy of gallant and blameless spirits to a flock of contemptible sheep. To transform them into the lions that their ancestors were, we want a leader other than—NEHRU".

This is what is mentioned in the Jan Sangh paper. At this moment we will not tolerate, the nation will not

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]

tolerate, any action that would undermine the importance, influence, prestige and position of the Prime Minister. To take out this country from the debacle that it has been placed into, the nation requires today, a man like Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in whom the nation has got full faith and confidence. If there are any reactionary forces in this country who want to remove a progressive man like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru from the helm of affairs of this country, we will not tolerate it.

Ultimately, I will refer to only one point and that is We should have conscription. Of course, so far as our people are concerned, our Republican Party followers are concerned, I have already mentioned that our Mahar Battalion is fighting on the front valiantly. Not only that. At all the centres, whether it is Nagpur or Bombay, all those Mahar people are enrolling themselves in the military. We are always prepared to sacrifice our life in the cause of the nation. We have sacrificed our life while defending Kashmir. We shall always do it. But if we want to regain our lost territory as early as possible, it is essential that we must have conscription also.

In the present circumstances, I do not think it does any good to have diplomatic relations with China. We are engaged in war. The Prime Minister has rightly said that it was a massive invasion perpetrated by China. I do not understand what sort of benefit or advantage we can get by continuing our diplomatic relations with China. In the present circumstances, it will only help them to carry on their espionage activities. Therefore, Madam, I urge that our diplomatic relations with China should be severed.

I thank Mr. A. D. Mani for taking up the cause of the political parties in this country. In his speech yesterday he referred to the National Defence Council and said that no other

political party was represented on it. Mr. Vajpayee also has pointed out that there are many other patriotic statesmen in this country who should have been associated with the National Defence Council. Past experience shows that the people have not been taken into confidence by Government regarding our defence preparations. We have often been told in this House itself that our defence position on NEFA front was extremely strong. But when the Chinese forces invaded our territory, we found that all our defences were very weak. Therefore, it is essential that other persons also should be taken on National Defence Council so as to create more confidence in the masses. Therefore, I think that representatives of important political parties should be associated with the National Defence Council.

श्रीमती सीता युद्धवीर (आन्ध्र प्रदेश):

उपसभापति महोदया, आज ये दोनों प्रस्ताव एक मुल्क की आवाज और भावना के रूप में हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत हुए हैं। इस मुल्क की भावना और इसकी आवाज को बड़ी शान्तिपूर्वक, गर्भरतपूर्वक हमारे सामने रख दिया गया है। इसलिये आज इसका समर्थन न करने का कोई मतलब ही नहीं है। आज, जब कि एक आततायी दुश्मन ने बिस्वासघात करके हमारे देश पर इतना बड़ा आक्रमण किया है इस वक्त इसके सिवाय और कोई चारा नहीं है कि उस आक्रमण का सामना करने के लिये तैयारी करें और तैयारी के लिये हमें इस इमरजेन्सी की घोषणा करनी चाहिये। निश्चय ही ये दोनों प्रस्ताव दुर्लभ हैं। किन्तु सवाल यह है कि आज इमरजेन्सी की घोषणा करने के बाद क्या हम इस संकट का सामना कर सकेंगे, जो कि आज हमारे सामने उपस्थित हुआ है। मैं नुक्ताचीनी की भावना से ऐसा नहीं कहती, किन्तु एक क्रियात्मक दृष्टि से कहना चाहती हूँ कि इमरजेन्सी के लागू होते ही भारतीय सुरक्षा कानून और उसकी सब धारयाँ भी लागू हो गईं और उनमें से एक धारा के

अनुसार, सुरक्षा के प्रबन्धों के सम्बन्ध में किस-भां प्रकार का अनधिकृत सूचना देना जुर्म है। आज आपको मैं यह बता देना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे तारघरों से ऐसी ऐसी अजीब खबरें तारों के जरिये भिजवाई जाती हैं कि उनसे ऐसा महसूस होता है कि जो हमारे सरकारी तारघर हैं वहाँ इमरजेंसी की कोई हिदायत नहीं पहुंची कि हमें किस तरह का सूचना भेजनी चाहिये। जब हमारे सरकारी तारघरों का यह हाल है तो अखबारों के विषय में मैं आपसे क्या कहूँ। युद्ध शुरू होने से पहले अखबारों में जो कुछ छपता रहा, जो कुछ लेख निकलते रहे, आज वही लेख लिखे जा रहे हैं, आज उसी तरह की खबरें छपी जा रही हैं। यहाँ बैठे हुए साथी समझते हैं कि हमारे प्रेस का बहुत सारा विभाग आज हमारे पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू और दूसरे नेताओं के बारे में, उनकी घरेलू नीति, विदेश नीति और सुरक्षा नीति के बारे में वही कुछ लिखता आ रहा है, जैसा कि पहले लिखता रहा है। आज उनके लिये यह युद्ध शुरू हुआ है, ऐसा नहीं लगता, आज उनके लिये यह इमरजेंसी की घोषणा की है, ऐसा महसूस नहीं होता। आज तो वे इस तरह के शब्दों का इस्तेमाल करते हैं, जिससे हमारी जनता भड़क उठे। इसके साथ ही मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमारी विरोधी पार्टी के कुछ लीडर इस किस्म की तकरीरें करते हैं कि ५९ मिनट तक तो वे हमारी नीति की, हमारी पालिसी की और जो आज तक हम देश के लिये करते आए हैं उस कार्य की नुक्ताचीनी करते हैं और ६०वें मिनट में बताते हैं कि देश संकट में है। इस तरह से उनकी दिखावट से निश्चय है कि जनता भड़क उठे। इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस तरह की नुक्ताचीनी करने वाले जो लोग हैं, जो इस तरह की भावना प्रकट करके जनता भड़काने वाले हैं, सचमुच में वे संकट में हमारा साथ नहीं दे रहे हैं,

ये हमारे देश के साथ विश्वासघात कर रहे हैं। इसलिये अगर हम इमरजेंसी का कानून लागू करते हैं तो सबसे पहले हमें इन चीजों पर नज़र डालनी चाहिये।

उपसभापति महोदया, आज हमारे देश में बहुत जोश उमड़ रहा है। यह जोश उमड़ना बहुत अच्छी बात है। जलूस, नारे और बड़ी बड़ी सभाएं और तकरीरें, ये अपना एक स्थान रखती हैं। इस जोश को हम "हिस्टीरिया" मचाने दें, इस जोश को हम शांतिपूर्वक और गंभीरतापूर्वक एक ऐसी शक्ति से बांधें, जिससे हम जनता को बता सकें कि आज हमें क्या करना है, क्या नहीं करना है।

उपसभापति महोदया, आज मैं इस वक्त दो एक बातें आपके सामने रखना चाहती हूँ। हमारे देश में कई सदियों के बाद यह संकट आज आया है। इस संकट का सामना हमको किस तरह से करना है, हमारी आम जनता को अच्छी तरह से मालूम नहीं है। उसे हमें मार्गदर्शन कराना है। मैं गणतंत्र के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, मैं तो सदैव उसकी हामी रही हूँ, मगर जब समय आता है उस वक्त जिस चाल से देश का फायदा हो, वही चाल हमें चलनी चाहिये। उपसभापति महोदया, नारी समाज की ओर से मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाना चाहती हूँ और यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि आज नारी समाज इस संकट में देश के साथ है, नारी समाज वात्सल्यमयी मां बन सकता है, प्यार भरी बहिन का काम कर सकता है, नारी समाज एक पतिव्रता स्त्री बन सकता है, नारी समाज आज्ञाकारिणी ब्रेटी बन सकता है, मगर समय आ जाये, तो रणचंडी भी बन सकता है। अपन नेता से मैं कहूंगी, आप हमको काम दीजिए, हम आपके साथ हैं, हम आप पर भरोसा करती हैं, आप हम पर भरोसा कीजिए।

[श्रीमती सीता पुढवार]

अब मैं दो, एक छोटे सुझाव आपके सामने रखूंगी; क्योंकि मेरे बोलने से पूर्व बार्डर एरिया और चाइना के बारे में इतनी ज्यादा तकरीरें हो चुकी हैं कि मैं उनको दोहराना नहीं चाहती। मैं पहले घर को ठीक करना चाहती हूँ, फिर बाहर की बातों में ध्यान लगाना चाहती हूँ। आज हमारी सरकार के पास इतनी ज़मीनें पड़ी हैं जिन पर मकान बनाने के नक्शे बने हैं।

आज इस संकट के समय में उन भवनों का निर्माण करने की बजाय, हम उस भूमि पर अन्न बोएं, जिसमें संकट के वक्त अधिक अन्न पैदा हो और समय आने पर महंगाई न हो।

दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि जितने भी छोटे बड़े, कारखाने हैं, उनमें जो अनावश्यक सामान बनाया जाता है जिसके बिना हमारी गुंजर हो सकती है, तो उस सामान का बनाना बंद करते हुए उनकी मशीनरियों में अगर कोई तब्दीलियां लाना चाहें तो सरकार उनको मदद दे और वहां पर हमारे देश की रक्षा के लिये ऐसा सामान तैयार किया जाये कि जिससे वक्त आने पर हम उसका अच्छी तरह से इस्तेमाल कर सकें।

उपसभापति महोदया, फिर से मैं आपसे कहूंगी कि आज बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि नौजवानों के साथ नौजवान लड़कियां भी हमारी नेशनल आर्मी में और कई ऐसे सैनिक स्कूलों में दाखिल हुई हैं। हमारे घरों में बहुत ज्यादा गिनती में ऐसी महिलाएं हैं जिनको मालूम नहीं कि हमें देश के लिये क्या करना है और क्या नहीं करना है। उनके लिये हम कोई ऐसा कार्य हूँ और - उनको ऐसे कार्य में लगाएं कि जिससे देश में वे बेकार न बैठी रहें।

अंत में मैं इन दोनों प्रस्तावों का समर्थन करती हूँ। इसलिये नहीं कि हमारे पूज्य नेता ने इसे प्रस्तुत किया है बल्कि इसलिये कि ४५ करोड़ जनता की यह आवाज

Aggression by China

है, उसका एक निश्चय है और दृढ़ विश्वास है। इसी विश्वास से मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे देश में सब कुछ है। हम दूसरों पर विश्वास करके सो गये थे लेकिन आज विश्वासघाती को देख कर जाग उठे हैं। आज हम सब में जाग्रति आ गई है और इस जाग्रति की आगे बढ़ते हुए मुझे विश्वास है कि कोई भी दुनिया की ताकत हमें हरा नहीं सकती।

2 PJVI.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, never before has this House met under the shadow of a threatening calamity such as has been posed by a powerful neighbour who, under the mask of pretended friendship, had been building up for several years a mighty war machine near our northern border. White constantly professing her peaceful intentions, China has mounted surprise attacks of a most massive character and has gained some initial success in the face of brave and sustained resistance by our troops. Our troops have been overwhelmed by the Chinese hordes coming in wave after wave from their higher positions behind mountain barriers. It seems probable that they counted upon our comparative lack of preparedness, military readiness, in that region, not only for seizing our territory but also to create confusion and terror in the people of this country. If so, subsequent events have shown how completely they have misjudged the stuff that our people are made of, their wonderful unity in the face of a common danger, their passionate devotion to their newly won freedom, their grim determination and spirit of sacrifice to recover and protect every inch of their territory from a wild, defiant, ruthless and treacherous aggressor.

The lessons of the last war have clearly proved that such initial successes and surprise attacks bear no ultimate fruit in the long run. This was established in America and also in Britain. Pearl Harbour took the

entire American continent by surprise, and the debacle at Dunkirk could not succeed in creating that terror and that sense of frustration in the British people which evidently Hitlerite Germany aimed at. On the other hand the people of Britain stood full scale face to face against this danger. I may recall the well-known observation by Napoleon Bonaparte that the people of Britain lose all their battles except the last to show that these initial successes achieved by our enemy on the Himalayan border should not for any reason whatsoever depress this country at all. The result has been just the opposite. The people have been stirred out of their complacency and sense of unpreparedness, and that is the answer which India is giving today to the treacherous, ruthless aggressor.

Now, Madam, while our armed forces, our brave jawans and their devoted officers are fighting our battles against heavy odds, we in this Parliament can only discharge our duty by standing solidly behind them and our Government in the fulfilment of the task which the nation has assigned to them. It will be an act of betrayal of our armed forces if we, by our word or deed, sow the seeds of discord and dissension which we must be very careful that none of us in this House would be permitted to do. The home front must be kept as strong and invincible as the fighting line far away in the Himalayas and we must be prepared to convert the entire country ranging from the Himalayas down to Cape Comorin into one solid mass which should be thrown against the enemy so that our forces can succeed in rescuing every inch of our land from his grip. The whole nation has responded to this mighty call with spontaneous unanimity. Let not political or personal ambitions or bickerings create any rift in this solidarity. Let not antisocial elements seek any advantage out of a national calamity. Unlike their predecessors, the present Defence of India Ordinance and the Rules dur-

ing this emergency are not an imposition by an alien Government. They represent the unanimous desire of the entire people and have only focussed and concentrated the national will in a concrete form. Government is to be congratulated on the promptness and thoroughness with which they have come out with these essential measures in this national crisis.

May I take this opportunity to refer in a few words to our other neighbour Pakistan. I have had occasion to come into contact, in another capacity, with Major-General Ayub Khan as he then was. I have a high regard for his practical commonsense and would appeal to his sense of realism to rise above narrow political considerations and make a broad statesmanlike assessment of the common danger ahead. The false cry of 'Pak-Chini Bhai Bhai' will go the same way as 'Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai' which the Chinese are not ashamed to raise even when dealing mortal blows on our soldiers on the front. A seasoned soldier like President Ayub Khan will, I hope, not be misled by the overtures of China and allow his country to fall into the trap. Nothing can be a more dangerous illusion for Pakistan than to prefer the treacherous hand of China to the sincere desire for friendship repeatedly expressed by India.

When I heard the Communist leader yesterday, I could trace in his speech the ring of the old Bengal revolutionary that Shri Bhupesh Gupta was. It was in that spirit that he championed the cause of India in his speech yesterday. I hope his followers all over India and the members of the Communist Party would not hesitate to tread the same path that he chalked out in his speech yesterday. He has given a glorious account of what the Communist Party intends to do in this crisis. Well, I wish that his followers also did the same everywhere.

He had put in a strong plea for softer treatment to all Communists in

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.] this country. A reference was made by Mr. Khandubhai Desai in his speech this morning to some observations made by a Communist leader in Madras with reference to defence production and essential production in our industrial establishments in this country during this emergency. Mr. Bhu-pesh Gupta stood up and tried to correct him. I will take this opportunity of quoting from a newspaper report which has also given a verbatim reproduction of the relevant portion of the speech of that Communist leader in Madras. He said:

"It would be at the peril of the nation that Communists who controlled millions of workers in factories, vital to defence production, are excluded from the defence committees."

SHRI AKBAB ALI KHAN: I think Mr. Vajpayee read it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Yes.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I was not present here. This is the language of threat out and out which has been held out in connection with defence production. And if that be the spirit in which the Communists should approach this problem and this danger, then the Government would be perfectly justified in dealing with them with an iron hand, at least those among them who can entertain such feelings at this crisis. I can quite understand a desire to be associated in Defence Committees after they have shown their merit, their desire in a practical form to assist Government in this crisis in the matter of defence production. But right from the very beginning to strike a note of threat of this character, I suppose, would be quite enough to justify the Government to take action, and I am glad the Government has been taking action.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): No.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: The Government has been taking action in particular cases where they feel that such action is justified and desirable. I cannot join my friend in making a general appeal to the Government on behalf of the Communists to desist from adopting any such course. There are instances which call for such action and there can be no difference of opinion with regard to that.

Now, Madam, I do not desire to prolong my observations. I can only say that the way in which the Indian people have responded to this call and to this requirement of the situation have strengthened us from every point of view, and it is our bounden duty in this House to strengthen the national will by solidarity, unity and unanimity in extending our support to the Government, to the great national leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, without any hesitation and without any difficulty or doubt or even raising those questions of the past which were favourite themes on which some of the Opposition Members have tried to thrive in this House. I was pained to listen to the speech that my esteemed friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, made this morning in this House. Well, I should have thought, had it not come from him but from any other person that it was an unabashed attempt to destroy all our efforts in the direction of attaining solidarity, unity and unanimity in this country. I am not charging him with any such attempt or any such motive, but coming from any other quarter I would not have hesitated in characterising such a speech with that label.

With these words I support the Resolutions.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the two Resolutions so ably moved by the hon. Home Minister. I must at the very outset pay my tribute to the bravery of our jawans and the sacrifices they are

making at the battlefield. The present crisis reminds me of the visit of Mr. Chou En-lai when he raised the slogan here of "Chini-Hindi Bhai Bhai" and all of us responded to it with a sincerity which we have always been used to. Looking back we find that all this was a deception. We had treated them as brothers even earlier. We had recognised and accepted their new Government. We had espoused their cause in the World Organisation for their membership; and shortly after this a slogan was raised, stealthily, some portion of our territory was occupied. When attention was drawn to the Chinese maps, we were told that they were very old maps and that we need not bother. As a peaceful country we corresponded with them, had negotiations with them, little suspecting that this small boundary dispute would result in an invasion of our country. But it seems that all this time they were making all possible military preparations to invade us. Looking in retrospect it seems that we trusted them too much. I am reminded of two lines of Ghalib. Of course, they are written in the present tense but I will change the tense when reading them, I think I recited these lines on the last occasion also. They are:

ہم کو ان سے وفا کی ہے امید -
جو نہیں جانتے وفا کہا ہے
†[ہم کو ان سے وفا کی ہے امید
جو نہیں جانتے وفا کہا ہے]

We were absolutely misled. We should have known that their ideals were, what was their way of working, what were their ideas of penetration and what havoc could these people play. But, as I said, we trusted them too much.

دیر آید درست آید
†[دیر آید درست آید]

Anyway, we have now realised that we were absolutely misled. We were trusting them too much and we had committed a mistake. The present dark clouds which we are facing have however a silver lining. Till yester-

tr J Hindi transliteration.

day, we were disintegrated; we were keen to have our country integrated; we were divided on the basis of caste, religion, language, etc. But what do we find today? This external enemy has killed our internal enemy. Today we stand united as one man, the whole nation as one man behind the Prime Minister. That is the greatest gain that we have had as a result of this Chinese aggression. Naturally, we are up against a very big country with a huge population which has made preparations for war for a long time and we have to make very great preparations to meet them. The war is going to be a long-drawn one. With the support of the whole nation and with perseverance and courage and also fully knowing that our cause is just, I am sure we will be able to face the enemy and the triumph will be ours.

We have been getting both moral and material help from a very large number of countries. It was suggested that our policy of non-alignment should not be affected. There are also some persons in the country who are of the opinion that we should align ourselves with a particular bloc. I think I must agree with Mr. Vajpayee when he says that the requirements of the country are foremost at the present moment and even if we have to align ourselves with any particular bloc, we should not hesitate to do so, if otherwise we cannot save our country. But that is not the position. We are getting aid without any strings. And what does the policy of non-alignment mean? It only means that we should not subordinate our freedom to any country; it should be open to us and we should be free to take any attitude that we like in respect of any international matter. There are no conditions being imposed by the countries helping us and friendly countries are coming forward to help us. We are very grateful to them and we will never forget their kindness; we will continue to be grateful to them. But that does not mean that we will attach ourselves to a particular bloc

[Shri Nafisul Hasan.] and agree to whatever the countries helping us say. We have throughout this period been advising all the countries in the interest of peace and in favour of peace. We will continue to do so even after this. The question of giving up our policy of non-alignment does not at all arise.

Then it has been stated that our Plan, the Third Plan, will go. Naturally, there shall have to be some modification in the Plan but in order to fight the war also we have got to have a Plan and not only have we got to fight the war in the battle-field but by development of our industries. We have got to develop our agricultural production. Therefore, the Plan will be there. It is only a question of priorities which may have to be changed but our success in the war will be the first objective and to attain that objective everything that is necessary to be done will have to be given top priority.

Something has been said about negotiations. We have essentially been a peaceful country. I think the position which we enjoy today and occupy today in the world is because of that attitude of ours. Although we are not prepared to negotiate under any circumstances or conditions which affect our national honour and dignity, still the door for a settlement will always remain open. But we can agree only on the terms which are honourable to us and in no way are we going to concede any portion of our territory. What is the claim of China as far as the land south of the Macmahon Line is concerned? It has been admitted that for the last fifty years at least this has been the boundary between the two countries. The only contention on their part is that this was fixed when the British were ruling this country. But at that time there was another Government in China and this boundary was fixed as a result of an agreement between the then Indian Government and the then Chinese Government. How can

the present Chinese Government claim anything from us? It was recognised that all the territory to the south of the MacMahon Line had been in our possession. And we also know that the Chinese were signatories to the principles of Panchsheel. The mere fact that they crossed that Line was an act of aggression on their part. If they had any grievance, they should have first negotiated with us. But the fact remains that before having any kind of negotiations with us they stealthily came in and tried to occupy that territory. There is therefore absolutely no justification whatsoever for the action that they have taken. As I said, it is going to be a grim and long-drawn struggle. We have got to practise austerity and all our resources have got to be mobilised and particularly we have got to take care that no profiteering is allowed to take place during this period. Some-reference has been made by an hon. Member just now that we should come to terms with Pakistan. Of course that is the desire of all of us. Nobody in India wants to go on quarreling with Pakistan but what is the present condition? The other day I saw an editorial in the 'Pakistan Times'. It was dated the 6th of this very month. What was the suggestion made in that editorial? They were opposed to the supply of arms to us. They said: 'Our association with the West and America has been of no benefit to us. It is just putting us in a wrong position and we must now find other friend;'. This clearly hints that they should go to join the Chinese and the Soviet Union. That was the editorial. I do not know what is the opinion of General Ayub Khan about it, but this might be another line. There is one line very well known to those who know Urdu:

میں ہوا کافر تو وہ کافر مسلمان ہو گیا

†[मैं हुआ काफिर तो वह काफिर

मुसलमान हो गया ।]

†[] Hindi transliteration.

When I went nearer his own friend, he has forsaken that friend. Why talk about these things? We are keen to settle everything with them but are they also keen? With the words I support the two Resolutions.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, a nation is born of common sufferings and common aspirations. National unity is forged by emotional upsurge of the people for the protection of the integrity, honour and vital interests of the motherland. National unity is cemented by the blood of martyrs. It is judged by the response to the challenge shown by a powerful enemy.

Recent events have judged us. The people's response to the challenge has amply proved that we are a nation. The national upsurge generated by aggression has embraced all sections of the community, transcending all classes, castes, creeds and linguistic and regional loyalties. Even those that were talking of the partition of the country are one with the rest of the nation in the fight against the aggression.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY) in the Chair]

That indicates that though there are certain tensions and every nation in the world suffers from certain tensions, our loyalty to our motherland transcends all tensions and we are today as good a nation as any other country in the world.

For long our Communist friends told us that a socialist country can commit no aggression and because Communist China is socialist, therefore, Communist China can never commit aggression. They failed to recognise that Communist China was aggressive, even when Communist China deprived Tibet of its freedom and occupied a large part of the Indian territory. In this very House they denounced the Western Powers for their sins against Algeria, against Cuba and so on but they had no word to say about the aggression committed

by Communist China against Tibet. They had no word to say against the expansionist policy of China with respect to South-East Asia.

Today when nearly 50,000 square miles of our territory are occupied by China, the Central Committee of the Communist Party, by two-thirds majority, decides that China has committed aggression. May I ask them whether they recognise that even a socialist country can commit an aggression and that a socialist country has committed an aggression? If they do so recognise, are they prepared to propose to the community of international Communism that because Communist China has committed aggression which is against the basic principles of Communism, Communist China be excluded from the community of international Communism? If they fail in this attempt, are they prepared to leave the community of international Communism?

I have no doubt in my mind that India will never be prepared to accept the Indian Communist Party as a national party so long as that Party remains a part of international Communism a section of which has committed aggression against India. I feel that if the Communist Party wishes to be recognised as a national democratic party, it will have to undergo a great transformation. It will have to modify the Constitution which it has passed at its Amritsar Congress. It will have to renounce its loyalty to international Communism none of whose members has extended to us even moral support in our crisis. It will have to renounce its faith in the doctrine of the fatherland of international proletariat. It will have to renounce its faith in the idea of people's democracy which is a camouflage and pseudo-name of Communist dictatorship. If the Party is not prepared to do so, it may claim to be a national party a democratic party fighting against reaction, the country will not be prepared to accept them as a national and democratic party.

[Prof. M. B. Lai.]

Shri P. N. Saprú may not be prepared to fight for the freedom of the country in association with, such forces which he considers to be reactionary. But I feel that a nation makes no distinction, between progressive and reactionary so far as the question of freedom of the country is concerned. We will fight as one united nation and we will settle with the reactionaries after we are able to preserve our own freedom in this country.

We reiterate our faith in the policy of non-alignment. But when we do so, we wish to point out that in the light of our experience, past and present, we will have to re-orient our policy of non-alignment. The policy of non-alignment does not deny to us, Sir, the right of military aid from others for the protection of our motherland, just as the policy of non-alignment did not deny to us the right of financial aid from different parts of the world. Of course, just as in the case of financial aid, his military aid also must be without strings. If countries that claim to belong to the camp of world peace, for reasons of their own, hesitate or refuse to extend their aid to us in time and if the Western powers offend the necessary aid to us, we will be justified in saying ourselves that aid or in saying that we will only buy military equipment on a commercial basis, and if we have no money to buy things just now, we will fight the Chinese unarmed? Only fools can charge us with reversing the policy of non-alignment because we have accepted military aid from Western powers when other powers did not think it proper to extend that aid to us.

Sir, to us Communist China which has launched this attack on us is the greatest imperialist power and to us all those who support Communist China are pro-imperialists. Sir, we can have no truck with Communist China so long as they do not revoke their course. We are bound to denounce it as a great menace to world

peace as long as it pursues a policy of expansionism in the South-east Asia. As a student of political science and of international affairs for more than thirty-five years, I have no doubt in my mind that not only for years, perhaps for generations, Communist China will be a menace to our peace and freedom and if we wish to live in this world as a free nation, we will have to prepare ourselves for facing that menace under all circumstances and at all times.

I am sorry, Sir, I am constrained to observe that our Government and our Prime Minister failed to face realities firmly and chose to live in a dreamland for years, pursued a policy of appeasement, vis-a-vis Communist China, and allowed both India and Tibet to be preys to Chinese perfidy and evil designs. That their China policy has proved a miserable failure can hardly be denied. Our Prime Minister the other day said that he is now facing the real world. Let us hope that now he will face realities firmly and will not allow himself to be deluded by a few soft words here and there by some statesmen or others.

We must admit that because of the vacillations of our Government and the Prime Minister, we failed to communicate to the world India's case against China properly and allowed China to hoodwink and confuse a great majority of the non-aligned powers. What do we see today? Forty powers are with us; but most of them are those whom we constantly, abused and rebuked for the last ten years. And none for whom we fought, with whom we worked for ten years chose even to shed a tear at this time when we are facing this crisis. I am sorry to say that just like our China policy, our diplomacy has miserably failed. We are today receiving help from other powers, not on account of our diplomacy but because we are a democracy and certain democratic countries

deem it their duty to preserve democracy against communist totalitarianism.

Sir, the mti'on's reaction to the challenge is undoubtedly magnificent and we have reason to be proud of it. But has the Government done anything in this matter? Is it not a fact that on the plea of avoiding panic, the Government did not inform the public about the situation, did not try to cultivate the spirit of resistance among the people? If the people have exhibited the spirit of resistance at this juncture, it is not because of the efforts of the Government, but in spite of the efforts of the Government because of the inherent love that we have for freedom and for our motherland. Even today, Sir, we see the All India Radio giving certain bare items of news, mostly news of reverses. We are not trying to> inform the people of the human values that are at stake. "We should tell the people that we are fighting for democracy, for the right of self-determination, that in Communist China there is no liberty for the people, that the people have no right of self-determination! and! self-expression, that they are slaves of a junta of a party.

For long, Parliament was told that we were prepared at least in NEFA. But today we are told that we were not prepared there and therefore, we suffered reverses. Do! we not owe an apology to the nation? Under the system of parliamentary democracy, Parliament is responsible for the failure of the Government wh'ch is responsible to Parliament. It is true that some of us sounded a note of warning but by and large Parliament supported the policy pursued by the Government and therefore Parliament is as much responsible for the unpreparedness on the part of the Government as the Government is and the representatives of the people owe an apology to the nation for their failure to discharge the duty entrusted to them by the people.

The Prime Minister, Sir, reminds us of the courage and determination of the British people after Dunkirk in the Second World War. May we hope that our Prime Minister will play the role of Mr. Churchill, will refuse to think of negotiations, will repudiate the policy of appeasement and will fight to the end for the preservation of the honour and integrity of the nation. So far as the nation is concerned, the national upsurge has indicated that the nation is prepared to back him. They are prepared to back! the Government not because it is headed by this man or that man but because they¹, know that no war can be fought except through the Government and whatever Government is in power must be supported by the people.

In the end, Sir, I wish to say that the people of India are fully conscious that this undeclared war is different from the first two world wars. They know that unlike the first two world wars the present war is a national struggle, is a people's war. When the Indian Communists declared in 1942 that the second world war was a people's war, our leader, Acharya Narendra Deo repudiated it saying that the second world war would continue to be an imperialist war until India attained freedom. Today India has attained freedom and the war with which we are faced today is a people's war and the people do realise it.

While the people are sorry that the Government failed to do what they could for the protection of the vital interests of the nation and smart under certain grievances, they have extended their wholehearted support to the Government for the prosecution of the war. They have willed to undergo sufferings for the preservation of certain values associated with freedom and democracy. They refuse to stand any domination or dictation; they refuse to submit to an aggression, to be a satellite of any power, to tolerate the imposition of

[Prof. M. B. Lai.]

any ideology and to be governed by a dictatorship. They want the Government to be responsive to their will under all circumstance and are determined to work out their own destiny in their own way according to their own will.

It is the duty of the Government and of the Parliament to serve the nation loyally, to preserve inviolate the national honour and integrity, as well as democratic values and institutions, and to assure to the people social justice.

I wish to point out that this is not an ordinary war. It is a people's war. Communist China has a certain ideology which is used to hoodwink a certain section of the community. In that sense the present struggle is also an ideological war. The drive towards equality, social and economic, must become a vital part of the defence effort. Only then can the present enthusiasm of the people be sustained and the revolutionary challenge of the age can be met. It is not a question of equal sacrifices and sufferings; it is a question of marching towards equality in the midst of war. Then and then alone we can mobilise the support of the toiling masses of the country."

H

In the end, I beg to pay my homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and Integrity of our motherland and offer my respects to men and officers of our armed forces for their valiant struggle on various fronts. I need not say that my party joins with the Government along with the rest of the country for the defence of our motherland. Our great leader, Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha, has assured the House of it yesterday and much before Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha spoke in the Rajya Sabha, we had begun to work for it. Let us march together to victory. That is our wish.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): "Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support

wholeheartedly the two Resolutions moved by the Home Minister. If I do not expatiate on Chinese aggression, the heroism of our soldiers, the magnificent response of the people, or the generous sympathy and assistance of disinterested foreign nations, it is not because I am less appreciative or grateful than any other Member of the House but only because I endorse every word of the first four paragraphs of the Resolution on China. The events of the past few weeks have been so tragic and the situation is so serious that we have to practise the utmost economy of every kind

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Including words.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I consider that economy of words is no less important than any other. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to the last and operative paragraph which says:

"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."

I hope it is a pledge and not a mere wish. If it is a pledge, it is essential that we should realise the real nature of the task before the country.

I agree with Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha that this is not a fight for mere border adjustments. I do not agree with those who think that if we had agreed two or three years ago to give up some portion of Ladakh, we would have had peace on the frontier. The Chinese would have taken it and then put forward further claims. They are adopting the same tactics as Hitler used in relation to Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland. I have no doubt that the Chinese are resolved to impose Communism by force on Asia. I would go even further and say that they are engaged in a struggle for the leadership of the Communist world.

I was listening with great interest to the eloquent speech made yesterday by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. I expected that he would carry his arguments to their logical end and appeal to Soviet Russia and East European Communist countries to denounce China and come forward to help India with arms. He did not do so. I do not wish to embarrass him by speculating on the reasons which prevented him from doing so. I can understand his situation and I am content with such courage and patriotism as he has been able to summon to declare boldly against Chinese aggression. I wish to appeal to all the Communists in India to retire from active politics for the duration of the emergency as it is not possible for the country to trust them fully.

It is also necessary for us to realise the embarrassing position in which Soviet Russia and other Communist countries which have been so far friendly to us find themselves. It is our duty not to say or do anything which will increase their embarrassment. We should make the utmost effort to retain their goodwill and ensure at least

their neutrality in the struggle. 3 P.M.
But it is altogether unrealistic

to expect active assistance from them. We have to seek assistance from those democratic countries which are opposed to Communism and are convinced that forcible extension of Communism anywhere is a danger to democracy everywhere.

Though I support the last paragraph of the Resolution as it stands, I feel that it is not adequate. I do not agree that time is with us. We must drive out the aggressor in the year 1963, then fortify the frontier and guard it indefinitely till the outlook and structure of Chinese Communism undergoes fundamental changes. If we allow the Chinese to fortify the position they have gained, the effort and sacrifice involved in driving them out will become increasingly difficult and heavy. So, I suggest that we should,

without any hesitation, make the resolve that we shall drive out the Chinese in 1963.

This involves mighty sacrifices. We have to create the necessary army divisions and equip them during the next three or four months when winter and snow will give us breathing space. It is true that the Chinese also will have this period to strengthen themselves, but we are fighting for our motherland, while the Chinese will be fighting far from their motherland separated by the wild areas of Tibet. I would deplore any talk of the difficulty of terrain. We have to take the terrain as God has given us. So long as we claim any part of India as ours we should find the ways and means of protecting it.

While I formally welcome all the voluntary contributions in money and gold, we have to face the hard fact that the possible total of all such gifts is bound to be a small fraction of what we need. So, I suggest that all Plan expenditure, except for completing works already started and for expansion of war production should be stopped for one year. The annual addition to our Plan expenditure is of the order of Rs 1,400 crores. I suggest that we cut it down by half and allowing for any reduction in expenditure to prevent inflation, the Government of India may be able to provide a sum of Rs. 500 crores for war effort, during 1963. I feel that this amount, together with our unlimited man-power, should be adequate to drive out the aggressor during 1963.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I have no doubt that the Government of India is aware of the need to cultivate world opinion. Though everyone in India is fully aware that what is going on on our borders is an actual war and not a mere skirmish, we cannot expect the people in other countries to realise its nature. The actual declaration of war against Chinese, though it may be fully justified, may not be expedient for many reasons.

[Shri K. Santhanam.] But I am convinced that the continuation of diplomatic relations is neither necessary nor desirable. While our Embassies and Consulates in China will become prisons for our people their counterparts in India are bound to be centres of intrigue. There are many nations who have no specific quarrel with China, but do not have any diplomatic relations with them. It would appear strange that we should continue diplomatic relations, in spite of the massive aggression. We should not blame the other peoples of the world if they think that it is a case of minor conflict.

I feel also that some severe measures of austerity and discipline should be taken to convince our people that we are in earnest. I suggest that the present unwieldy Central Ministry should be dissolved and replaced by a manageable small Cabinet of ten to fifteen persons.

AN. HON. MEMBER: At present there are only seventeen.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: All the work which is at present done or supposed to be done by the Ministers at States, Deputy Ministers and others should be undertaken by small Parliamentary Committees of three or five working honorarily for the duration of the emergency. This will be a flexible method of associating members of other parties and independents without the disadvantages of a coalition Government.

I also suggest that all ceremonies and receptions, except for welcoming distinguished foreigners, should be stopped. It has been a sickening phenomenon of our political life that Ministers travel from one end of the country to the other to perform a meaningless ceremony of laying a foundation stone or opening a building.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We have already issued instructions.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It is all right. Weekly or fortnightly visits to home States or the purpose of nursing the electorate have become a normal feature. All this may be justified to a certain extent during normal times. But today they must appear to the people as exhibitions of frivolity and irresponsibility. We should adopt all these measures of austerity immediately and declare that they will continue till the integrity of India is re-established and the loss of progress due to emergency is made up.

I entirely endorse the sentiments expressed by many Members that there should be graded sacrifice according to ability not mere equality of sacrifice. Like graded taxation, sacrifice also should be graded according to ability. I suggest that immediately excess profits tax should be levied on all companies and concerns in India. A maximum of six per cent dividend only should be allowed and all the extra profits should be handed over to the exchequer to fight the war. It is only by such measures as these that we can convince the masses that We are a war Government, that we are earnest, that we are going to fight the war with all our resources. Sacrifice of money by the rich can never be equal to sacrifice of life by the poor, but that is all that we can expect from them. And so I hope that the richer classes will not grumble or grudge any sacrifice they may be called upon to make in this emergency. The Finance Minister has announced certain measures. About them I do not want to speak in detail. But I cannot help saying that instead of his proposal for issuing gold bonds, if he had issued an order requisitioning all gold with every family over the value of Rs. 2,000—it may be that some people might have evaded this, as they are evading taxation—I have no doubt that a large number of patriotic citizens would have responded to it. Today we will not get as much gold as we want, and it is useless to get only Rs. 5 crores or Rs. 10 crores worth of gold. Unless we get Rs. 100 crores or Rs. 200 crores worth of gold, it is not

going to help in the procurement of munitions or foreign exchange. We must take really drastic and severe measures not only because they are necessary, but also because they will be the only sure index of our earnestness and of our resolve in the eyes of our masses. And unless we can get the whole-hearted and enthusiastic response of the masses, we shall not be able to prosecute the war to the end.

Thank you.

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himaehal Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, in saying a few words just now, you will pardon me if I recall to mind a similar debate which took place in September 1959 when the Dalai Lama had just come to this country and the Chinese had demanded something like 50,000 square miles of our territory. At that time I respectfully pointed out that we made a mistake, a blunder if I might say so, of retreating from Tibet or signing the treaty with China about Tibet in 1954 without getting from the Chinese in return an assurance or an acceptance of our borders with them. That was the basic mistake which we committed. That is the basic mistake under which we are still labouring, and I was rather disheartened to read in the speech made by the hon. Prime Minister in the other House that our boundary or our frontiers in the so-called MacMahon Line had never been accepted by the Chinese Government but that we did claim it by treaty or by usage because it had been our boundary for a long time. Now, that to my mind puts our case at a disadvantage. In other words, if we go to the logical conclusion of what the Prime Minister has stated, it means that the Chinese Government never accepted our boundaries as we say they are, and as such if they penetrate, there can be no aggression. That is exactly what they are saying today. We should reiterate, and I think we should have reiterated long ago, that the MacMahon Line is a well defined border of India with Tibet. It was a border which was defined by our treaties and usage when Tibet was not

846 RS—4.

absolutely under the vassalage of China, and even after the 1954 Agreement when Tibet did form an integral part of China and in consonance with the Agreement of 1954 when our forces withdrew from Gangtok and other areas, according to the agreement arrived at, there is no doubt that we have done this in recognition of the Chinese suzerainty and sovereignty over Tibet, because we are quite sure in our mind that the MacMahon Line as such is our international boundary. Or the boundary between India and Tibet, and therefore now between China and India.

The question is, China has come inside the MacMahon Line. China has penetrated in great force, had penetrated, in great strength, and we are retaliating; we must retaliate and will go on retaliating till they are driven out. The point that I would like to make out is this. As far as I have been able to see the legal aspect of the question—of course the hon. Minister can do it much better than I can—what the President has declared in his Proclamation is not war. A statu of emergency has been declared, if I might read out the exact words, because India is threatened by external aggression. Now, Sir, under article 352 under which this Proclamation has been made, there are three conditions under which an emergency can be declared: they are: if the country is at war or if it is threatened by external aggression or by internal disturbance. So if I read this Proclamation aright, it is not war with China but we are faced with external aggression. Technically that is the legal position which is set out and which to my mind flows out of this declaration of emergency.

Now, Sir, what is the difference between war and aggression? The dictionary meaning—I do not think it is very difficult to follow, I was reading it just now in the lobby—of aggression is a first act of hostility or injury, and

[Shri Anand Chand.] war, Sir, is a state of conflict between States or parties carried on by arms. It is rather a subtle difference, if I might point out, but the difference is there.

Some friends here have been suggesting all the time as to why we should not close our Embassy in China and recall our Ambassador, and why we should not close the Chinese Embassy in India and ask them to recall their Ambassador. I would respectfully point out that that scheme is not inherent in the declaration itself. It is only when aggression evolves itself into a war that the closing down or whatever it is will follow. The point that I am considering is this: when thousands of our soldiers have died, when China is building up its massive attack all along the line—it has* penetrated and it has occupied so many outposts and so on—it is still aggression or is it war? If it is aggression, then why the Defence of India Ordinance? They do not go together. I was going through it and I find that the Defence of India Ordinance issued by the President is exactly the same as the Defence of India Act passed by the late British rulers in 1939 with very little modification. Does it mean that a free India is to react to Chinese aggression in exactly the same way as the subjugated India reacted in 1939? We are now a free country. At that time the Defence of India Act was an instrument wielded by an alien Government. Today the Defence of India Act must be designed for reasons of internal security so that we are better able to meet the aggressor and throw him out. There is a big difference,

there is a basic difference, but our approach is entirely the same.

Then, Sir, what is our next approach? Our next approach is the creation of a National Defence Council. Such a Council was also created by the British—I think it was in 1942. The Viceroy was the Chairman of that Council. There were certain Rajas and Maharajas on it, and I think the Maharajah of Patiala was also on it and

there were certain private citizens, all of whom assembled together once in a while to advise the Government in the conduct of defence affairs. Now I wanted to go into that question a little more deeply, and I find on reading the papers that this new body is to advise the Government to take stock of the situation and arrangements for national defence and to advise the Government on matters relating to national defence, to assist in building up and suitably guiding the national will to fight the aggressor, and to suggest to the Central Citizens Committee such measures as may be considered necessary for the utilisation of the public co-operation in national defence. If we look into the constitution of this Council it has got the Prime Minister as the Chairman, and it has also got Members of the Cabinet who I think constitute the Sub-Committee dealing with the war or conflict or whatever it is. In addition it has certain retired Generals. Then it has certain other people from public life. Now, what will be the precise extent to which this large body can advise the Government of India in the conduct of national defence? Is not the Cabinet to be the responsible instrument of the people's will for fighting or for doing everything that is necessary to meet the Chinese aggression? If the last word is to vest in the Cabinet with the Prime Minister as it is, and when we have the same Prime Minister as the leader or as the Chairman of the National Defence Council where all these questions will be discussed, and if certain assurances are given in such a Council, would it not be very difficult to undo them in the Cabinet itself once an assurance is given? There on behalf of the Prime Minister and the same Ministers who are responsible for the shaping of policy in the Cabinet? Then another thing is that in times of war and in times of stress we have to be very careful as to what the actual defence potential of the country is. Now, by discussing all this in such a large body, is Government expecting the position that our preparedness or otherwise would remain a closely guarded secret? How could

it be possible? Under what oath of secrecy would the non-Government members of the Defence Council be not to divulge the secrets or the discussions that took place in that body, and if that body is to function as it is envisaged, in the form it has come out in the newspapers, I do not think 'they could hide giving such information as is asked for and supplied to the Defence Council, to their supporters. So the Defence Council becomes ineffective. To my mind there is a serious lacuna and unless this serious lacuna is removed, I think difficulties will crop up later on. I should have thought that in a free country, where the Government is elected by the will -of the people, the Cabinet Sub-Committee—call it War Cabinet if you like—assisted by the Chiefs of Staff would be an adequate instrument to deal with this, and if at all it was considered necessary to take the public into confidence, if at all it was -considered necessary to take the people, who are not conversant with, what I might call the strategy of war, into confidence, because we have to maintain the public morale and so on, then the setting up of the Defence Council should have been in such a manner that it would not compromise the position of the Cabinet Committee dealing with Chinese aggression with the Defence Council. In other words, the personnel of the Defence Council should not have contained at least the Prime Minister if not also, I should say, the other Cabinet members on whom the responsibility falls in . the ultimate analysis.

Having said these two things, Sir, I would not like to go into so many other matters connected with this— hon. friends here have dilated on them. There is no doubt that the country at large stands united to expel the Chinese invader. But what they want is a clear lead. Sir. I am no soldier; I am a civilian. Of course if the need comes. I can handle a gun and I can fight, but the point is that the large numbers of people who are today enthused, who are today in a

mood to; respond, must be clearly shown the way, how their response can very well be channelised and how their efforts and energies can be put to use. The Citizens Committee, which it is intended to constitute in the Centre here with its branches in all the States might be an answer, but I feel that this will not be a complete answer. Government would have to devise something more, so that the enthusiasm of the people for the war effort, whether it is their offer of gold or money or other monetary help or whether it is an offer of blood for the blood bank or whatever it is will be kept up. It should be done in a manner in which their enthusiasm is put to proper use

Then, Sir, I would like respectfully to submit that this aggression, as the Prime Minister himself says, the hon. the Home Minister did say yesterday, is going to be a long drawn out affair. Now, Sir, I personally feel that once we come to accept it as a long drawn out affair, it means, in other words that we accept the position that today we are no match to drive the Chinese out of our soil, that therefore we must build up the necessary armed might of this country when we will be in a position to drive them out and that therefore this war is going to be a long drawn out affair. To my mind of course this logic is quite right. But if we go on labouring under it, if we begin to compare the military potential of the two countries, the army potential of the two countries, the population and other resources which both countries can mobilise, one would be led to believe that even in that long drawn out affair, our ascendancy by figures alone, if not by arms, would not be well established. Today, for example, I do not know, it is a secret thing but I was reading somewhere and noticed that the total number under arms in the country, I mean our army today is somewhere near 500,000 or 600,000 strong. We have been giving training to people in the use of arms and so on; we have the reservists and

[Shri Anand Chand.] probably we can bring another million men under arms. Let us see the total war potential if we put this country on a war footing. It may come to roughly to li millions. But China today, Sir, even by very rough estimates has got an army of 21 millions. They have got people in the voluntary army well versed in the art of war whom they can mobilise overnight: a crore and twenty lakhs of people they can bring in straightway if they want them in addition to their regular army of 25 lakhs, and if what I have read is not wrong, of people who can go to war and fight, it is estimated that, the Chinese can put into the field something like 3 crores of people. Now, how will we match them? We can only match that by superior arms. We can only match that by a massive display of arms might. We can only match that by inflicting a blow on the enemy before he is able to put all that man power against us. In other words the aid or whatever the military instruments that we have at the present moment have to be much more in quantity and quality. Now how is this going to be achieved? Should we go on waiting for a long war? Should we say that because China has put in three crores of people and India today cannot afford to put more than 15 lakhs of people, for a period of four years or five years or ten years we have to go through all these hardships and sufferings? Is it really necessary to undergo all that? If it is not necessary and if we do not want it, should we not do something about it?

My friends here have been saying about the policy of alignment and about the policy of non-alignment. I am not going to say anything on the policy of alignment or on the policy of non-alignment. The point is who are the people who are going to give us arms. But they say, "Oh, the Swatantra Party is a lightest party. They want U.S. imperialism or other imperialism to come to India." Now, if Russia had given arms, they would

have then said. "Well, they are a good people because they are supplying us arms. The Socialist camp is good." My argument is not this or that. My argument is, let us get massive military aid in whichever way it is possible. We cannot pay for it because we have not got the wherewithal to pay for it. We want gold. Now, would all the gold that is coming out be able to purchase even one hundredth of the arms that we require? Would all the money coming in by way of voluntary donations form even an infinitesimal part of the money that we require if we were to purchase these arms in the open market? Even a country like Britain during war could not do it. Therefore, Sir, my suggestion is that we must ask for massive aid in arms as quickly as possible, and what is more, the possibility of getting these arms on a lend-lease basis should be fully explored. Only then can this country be able to build up quickly. Only then will this country have the necessary arms potential in a massive way to inflict a crushing defeat on the Chinese before they are able to mobilise their vast man power and resources, which a prolonged war will enable them to do and in the meantime, our hardships will mount up and not only so many lives of our gallant iawans who are fighting on there will be lost but, what is more, also the lives of the civil population, because a prolongation of this war is going to be something which we cannot today imagine, because it has only started; it is just the starting point.

It is also my suggestion, Sir, that for purposes of effectively putting the Defence Ministry into gear a Ministry of Supply should be created. We have a Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply. I think the time has come when we should have a Ministry of Supply. A Ministry for Defence Production has been created, no doubt, but I would like that it should be a Ministry of Supply as Great Britain did when the war crisis came in 1939. On the shoulders of that Ministry of Supply should not only be placed the-

burden of giving the wherewithal to the armed forces, whether it is the Air Force or the Army, but also to see that the needs of the civilian population are met as scarcity is bound to result once our production or potential is diverted towards war. That Ministry, to my mind, is an essential one. It is also essential that the manning of that Ministry, if it is created, should be by a person who is not only well-versed with the finances of this country but who is also an economist so that he can look after the supply of the war potential on the one hand and look to the supply of civilian needs on the other as difficulties will be created in the country for the civilian population. (*Time bell rings.*) Only one word more and I am done.

PROF. M. B. LAL: YOU are not goin? to be done so soon.

SHRI AN AND CHAND: I am *very* glad you give me that span.

My friend has said about the wasteful expenditure which must be eliminated. About the large number if these Ministries, especially in the States, that are still functioning, I think the Government of India is already taking steps. I think steps should also be taken whereby all wasteful expenditure is eliminated and the Plan is pruned to meet the requirements of today.

What I wanted to speak really about was something which the leader of my group said about Pakistan. I am sorry that the reaction was a bit premature and that the House did not hear him through. It is true that the relations between India and Pakistan are strained. It is also true that Pakistan recently declared as late as a few days ago—I think the Pakistan Foreign Minister said this the other day—that they would object even to the passage of arms through Pakistan if they are going to help India.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Even by air.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: They have not, in my opinion, conducted themselves wisely. But that does not mean that we should not at this hour of crisis try to come to some closer understanding with them rather than that Pakistan comes to a much closer understanding with China. That, I think, is essential from many points of view. That does not mean that we should thereby barter away our territory in Kashmir or elsewhere. It only means that, we should try to come to an understanding with them.

Some understanding, Sir, should also be brought about in our relations with Nepal. It might be that we do not want a kingly rule there. As a democracy we are opposed to it, we are opposed to autocracy. But I feel that if the Western nations could tolerate France, we could tolerate King Mahendra at least till such time as the war on our fronts ends.

Then, Sir, I have only one thing more to say. The responsibility for fighting is on the people of this country, on the leaders of the people—I would not say of the Congress Party—and the leaders of the Government and the responsibility for maintaining peace and order on the home front falls on the shoulders of my friend, the Home Minister. Small in stature, I know his shoulders are big enough to take this responsibility. I have full confidence in him and I at least would not advocate the hasty policy of witch-hunting of political parties or people with different political ideologies because I think at this time, if we begin to do that, we will lose our proper perspective and balance. Howsoever difficult the time may be, if we try to say, "Do not take people at their face value," or if we try to attribute motives to any party without watching its conduct, as I am sure Government will be watching, them. I think it will do us harm, it will do us injury, it will harm us in the democratic way of life that we have

[Shri Anand Chand.]

adopted. So, I would say that the policy of wait and see, which the Government has adopted, is the best, and I hope that no action under all this Defence of India Act and so on will be taken in a manner which would smack of any political prejudices or anything done simply to suppress a certain political thought, and that all action that would be taken, would be taken solely with a view to the maintenance of law and order in the country and for purposes of meeting and driving out the Chinese.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश):

सभापति महोदय, इस सदन के सामने दो प्रस्ताव हैं। एक प्रस्ताव तो जो इमर्जेंसी आर्डिनंस जारी हुआ है उसके बारे में है, और दूसरा प्रस्ताव चीन के आक्रमण के विषय में है। मैं इन दोनों प्रस्तावों का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस तारीख से हमको मालूम हुआ कि चीन ने हमारे देश पर हमला किया है तभी से गवर्नमेंट ने यह तय किया कि हम को जल्दी से आर्डिनंस निकालना चाहिये। इस में अब दो रायें हो नहीं सकती कि इस हाउस को इस इमर्जेंसी आर्डिनंस का पूर्ण समर्थन करना है और देश में हमें अपने प्रयत्नों को आगे जारी रखना है।

दूसरा जो प्रस्ताव है वह मौजूदा परिस्थिति के बारे में है और उसमें सामान्य बातें हैं जो कि आवश्यक हैं। चीन ने हमारे ऊपर जो हमला किया है उसके सम्बन्ध में इसमें यह बतलाया गया है कि यह एक बिट्टेयल है, विश्वासघात है। हमारी भी गलती है। हमने उनका विश्वास किया क्यों? लेकिन इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि चीन वाले पहले चुप रहे। सीमा के बारे में बार-बार भारतीय सरकार ने खत लिखे और फिर कई वर्षों बाद उन्होंने कुछ जवाब

देने शुरू किये और बड़े लम्बे-चौड़े दावे किये। उसके बाद आखिरी बात यह हुई कि उन्होंने अपनी फौज भेज करके हमारे इलाके पर कब्जा करना शुरू किया और वह चार पांच साल से चल रहा है। यह बरताव किसी भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यवहार के अनुसार अनुचित है और ऐसा कोई भी सम्य सरकार आज के ज़माने में नहीं करती। जैसा कि पंडित नेहरू जी ने दूसरे हाउस में कहा, यह बरताव ऐसा है जिसे १८वीं या १९वीं शताब्दी में साम्राज्यवादी ताकतें किया करती थीं और वही चीन ने किया और उसमें प्रसारवाद है, एक्सपेन्सनिज्म है और वह एक तरह का इम्पीरियलिज्म है।

इस अवसर पर मैं यह कहूँगा कि आज भी हमारे कम्यूनिस्ट भाई पता नहीं किस स्वप्न में रहते हैं, किस ख्वाब में रहते हैं। वैसे तो उनकी एक बड़ी बैठक हुई और दो तिहाई बहुमत से एक प्रस्ताव पास हुआ। लेकिन एक तिहाई लोग ऐसे भी रहे जो अभी भी कन्विस्ड नहीं हैं। शायद उनका खयाल यह हो कि कोई सोशलिस्ट कंट्री कभी किसी पर हमला कर ही नहीं सकता, वह हमला ही नहीं है; क्योंकि वह मजदूरों का मुल्क है और वह इस मुल्क में आयेगा तो क्या हुआ, आने दो। मेरा खयाल है कि संभव है ऐसा बहुत से लोग सोचते हों कि जैसे और जगह सैटेलाइट कंट्रीज़ बन गये, वैसे ही उनको भी यहाँ मौका मिल जाये और इस प्रकार यहाँ भी कुछ सैटेलाइट खड़े हो जाये। सब तरह के लोग सब जगह मिल जाते हैं। लेकिन मुझे पूरा विश्वास है और जैसा मिस्टर सप्रू ने कहा मेरा खयाल है कि यह कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी में एक नया मोड़ आने वाला है। जो उन्होंने कहा है अगर वह सच है और वह डबल टाक नहीं है और अगर सिसियरली कुछ काम उनकी तरफ से कुछ महीनों में ऐसे होंगे जो उनकी सच्चाई साबित करेंगे, तो यह समझना चाहिये कि दरअसल वे इंटरनेशनल कम्यूनिज्म का खयाल छोड़

करके नेशनल कम्युनिज्म की तरफ आगे बढ़े हैं तो मुल्क का कुछ भला होगा। उनका आर्थिक मामलों में कोई भी खयाल हो लेकिन देश की रक्षा के बारे में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का खयाल इस देश के साथ रहना चाहिये।

सभापति महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि लड़ाई है और पूरे जोरों की लड़ाई है। अभी हमारे दोस्त जो बहुत अनुभवी हैं राजा साहब आनन्द चन्द जी ने बताया कि चीन की बड़ी ताकत है और भारत का दृढ़ निश्चय भी है कि हम उसका मुकाबिला करेंगे, उसके सिवाय और कोई रास्ता नहीं है और हमको मुकाबिला करना चाहिये, लेकिन मैं दरअसल उस खयाल का हूँ कि कहने के लिये डिप्लोमेटिक भाषा अगर है तो ठीक है कि हम नानएलाइंड हैं लेकिन सच बात यह है कि एक ही मुल्क हम को मदद दे रहा है, एक ही कैम्प से हम को मदद आ रही है और दूसरे कैम्प से ज्यादा उम्मीद नहीं है और न हमें उनका मुँह देखना चाहिये और न उनका खयाल करना चाहिये। हमको यह समझ लेना चाहिये और उनके साथ हम को अच्छे ताल्लुकात बढ़ाने चाहिये और जैसा कि आनन्द चन्द जी ने कहा है कि हमें मैसिव हेल्प इसी वक्त चाहिये। लांग ड्रान आउट बैटिल की बात तो है लेकिन इस समय ही हमें चीनियों को मार भगाना है, जो थोड़ा बहुत बर्फ की श्रेणी से इधर आ गये हैं उससे इस वक्त मार भगाना बहुत आसान है। जब कि बर्फ गहरी पड़ेगी तो दिक्कत हो सकती है। पहले ही हमें पूरी ताकत लगा देनी चाहिये और जो थोड़े से इधर आये हैं, जो दो चार पासेज हैं, जो दो चार दरें हैं उन दरें से मार भगाना बहुत आसान है और जितनी जल्दी हो सके मार भगाना चाहिये। जब वे ज्यादा तादाद में आ जायेंगे, जब वे कंसोलिडेट कर लेंगे तो उससे क्या फायदा है, इसलिये मेरी आपसे, गवर्नमेंट से दरखवास्त है कि हम लम्बी लड़ाई का इंतजाम न करें और न देर के लिये तैयार करें मुल्क को बल्कि

हम यह कहें कि जितनी जल्दी होगा हम दुश्मन को भगा देंगे यहाँ से बर्फ पड़ने के पहले ही जब कि हमारी फौजें वहाँ जा सकती हैं। तो हमको बिजली की गति से काम करना चाहिये और फौरन उन थोड़े से आक्रमणकारियों का मुकाबिला कर के उनको वहाँ से हटाना चाहिये।

लड़ने के दौरान में बहुत से काम होंते हैं, शहरों पर बम्ब गिरते हैं, हम लोग जिस तरह से रह रहे हैं, उस तरह से नहीं रह सकेंगे। हमारे पुलों पर, हमारे कम्युनिकेशंस, सड़कें, रेलें सब के ऊपर बम्बाईमेंट हो सकता है तो आलटरनेटिव रास्ता अभी से हमको तैयार रखना चाहिये। जब कि सोचा ही हुआ है कि लम्बी लड़ाई होगी तो एक पुल जो टूट जाता है उसका आलटरनेटिव क्या है यह सोच रखना है। पुल को जल्दी बनाने के बारे में और तब तक सड़क को चालू रखने के लिये अभी से सोच रखना है। हर एक कम्युनिकेशंस के बारे में, रेल के बारे में, अभी से सोच कर एक दूसरा आलटरनेटिव रास्ता अभी से रखना चाहिये। रेलवेज हैं, बिजनेज हैं, वायरलेस और रैंडार हैं—आज कल लड़ाई रैंडार के यंत्र के बिना नहीं हो सकती है—तो इनके बारे में अभी से सोचना है और बहुत बड़ी तादाद में खुद भी इक्विपमेंट तैयार करना चाहिये। चीन से हमारा कोई समझौता हो सकेगा, उसको भूल जायें। डिप्लोमेसी के खयाल से, कहने के खयाल से कहते रहें लेकिन अब पीछे मुड़ मुड़ कर देखना कि शायद कोई समझौता हो जाये, बिल्कुल गलत है। हमें अपनी लड़ाई की पूरी तैयारी करनी चाहिये और समझौते की तरफ खयाल तक भी नहीं करना चाहिये।

प्रस्ताव में कहा गया है कि जिन सिपाहियों ने अपनी जान दे दी उनको हम श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करते हैं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि उन्होंने देश की रक्षा के लिये जान दे दी है और हम उनका पूरा आदर करते हैं और

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

उनके लिये अपनी पूरी श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करते हैं। सिपाहियों के पास हथियार कम थे लेकिन फिर भी चीनियों को उन्होंने बता दिया कि हिन्दुस्तानी भागने वाले नहीं हैं, चाहे ४ थे, छः थे या १० थे वे लड़ कर हटे हैं वहाँ से भागे नहीं हैं। इसलिये यह बहुत मुनासिब है कि यह हाउस उनके बलिदानों की कद्र करता है और उनकी प्रशंसा करता है।

जिन देशों ने इस समय मारल और मैटीरियल हेल्प दी है उनको धन्यवाद भी इस प्रस्ताव में दिया गया है। यह बहुत जरूरी है और हमको उनसे और अच्छी मदद लेनी चाहिये। देश में जो दृढ़ निश्चय है उसके बारे में इस प्रस्ताव में अंत में कहा गया है :
“... this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian People to drive out the aggressor” इसमें कोई शक हो ही नहीं सकता है। मुझे इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि सारा देश इसमें साथ है बल्कि आज देश हम लोगों से भी आगे बढ़ा हुआ है। देश की आम जनता चाहती है कि आप लड़ें और मजबूती से लड़ें और वह आपके साथ पूरी तरह से है।

अब, अभी प्रोफेसर मुकुट बिहारी लाल जी ने कहा कि देश के लिये रिसोर्सेज चाहिये, यह जरूरी है और मुनासिब बात है। लम्बी लड़ाई के लिये रिसोर्सेज चाहियें और वह होंगे लेकिन सैक्रीफाइस एकतरफा हो तो ठीक नहीं है। मालदार लोग सैक्रीफाइस न करें और गरीबों से सैक्रीफाइस चाही जाये यह ठीक नहीं है। जब तक मुल्क में समानता, भ्रातृत्व और बलिदान की समानता न हो तब तक इतनी बड़ी लड़ाई जीती नहीं जा सकती। यह पीपुल्स वार है, जनता की लड़ाई है इसलिये यह न हो कि इस लड़ाई के दौरान में मुनाफाखोरी बढ़ जाये, प्राइसेज बढ़ जायें या मालदार लोग समझें कि यह तो मालदार बनने का अच्छा मौका आया है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। यह पीपुल्स वार है, इसलिये सैक्रीफाइस जो

बर्दाश्त कर सकते हैं उनको करना है, ज्यादा मुनाफा जो है उसको समाप्त करना है, उन पर पूरी तरह से टैक्स लगाना है और रिसोर्सेज इकट्ठा करना है। आम जनता को भी टैक्स देना चाहिये लेकिन मालदार लोगों को भी तिजोरी भरने का मौका नहीं मिले बल्कि वह देश के लिये बलिदान करने को पूरी तरह से तैयार रहें।

मैं इतना ही और कहना चाहता हूँ कि मजदूरों से हम चाहते हैं कि वे हड़तालें न करें। मजदूर अगर इस दौरान में हड़ताल करेगा तो वह देश के खिलाफ एक बड़ा भारी जुर्म करेगा और इसी तरह से अगर पूँजीपति मुनाफाखोरी करते हैं तो वह भी मुल्क के हक में अच्छी बात नहीं है। इस लड़ाई के दौरान में हम न तो पूँजीवाद के चक्कर में पड़ना चाहते हैं और न किसी दूसरे वाद के चक्कर में पड़ना चाहते हैं। कम्युनिस्टवाद से तो कोई फायदा ही नहीं है। मुल्क देख चुका है कि इंटरनेशनल कम्युनिज्म क्या कर रहा है। तो प्लान को, योजनाओं को लेते हुए हमें सब से प्रथम यह तैयारी करनी है लेकिन साथ ही यह खयाल रहे कि देश में जो काम हो उसमें मुनाफाखोरी न हो और हमारी जो प्लानिंग की, सोशलिस्ट प्लानिंग की पालिसी है, डेमोक्रेटिक प्लानिंग की पालिसी है उसको जारी रखते हुए यह कोशिश करनी है कि मुल्क में से ही रिसोर्सेज पैदा हों। मुल्क में से ही रिसोर्सेज जब आयेंगे तभी काम चलेगा लेकिन जो दूसरे मुल्क सहायता दे रहे हैं उसको लेते रहना चाहिये और लड़ाई को जितनी जल्दी हो खत्म करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये। ये बात सही है कि लम्बी लड़ाई हो सकती है क्योंकि मोर्चा मुश्किल है और कठिन है लेकिन इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि मुल्क इस इस इरादे के साथ है और यह पार्लियामेंट इस इरादे को मंजूर करती है और इसका पूर्ण समर्थन करती है।

श्री प्रतुल चन्द्र मिश्र (बिहार) :
सभापति महोदय, मैं यह जो दो प्रस्ताव

आये हैं उनका समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह बतलाया गया कि अचानक चीन ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया और इस अचानक हमले के लिये हम लोग तैयार नहीं थे लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि यह अचानक नहीं है। चीन ने छः वर्ष का नोटिस दिया और हम आंख मूंद कर रह। छः वर्ष पहले उसने यह नोटिस दिया था कि बहुत सी जगह जो हिन्दुस्तान के इलाके के अन्दर है, वह मेरा इलाका है और वह हम लेंगे। यह बात सही है कि उन्होंने साफ तरीके से नहीं बतलाया कि कौन एरिया उनका है लेकिन यह कहते रहे कि बहुत सा, हजारों हजार स्ववायर माइल्स आप हमारा लिये हुए हैं और इसे हम ले लेंगे। और १९५४ में हमारी तिब्बत के बारे में जो सन्धि हुई, ट्रीटी हुई, उन्होंने अपना काम शुरू कर दिया। यह कहना कि हम तैयार नहीं थे, क्योंकि हमारे ऊपर अचानक हमला कर दिया गया, यह बात सही नहीं है। बात यह है कि हम चाहते नहीं थे कि युद्ध हो और हम सोचते थे कि चीन हमारे देश के ऊपर, जो कि गुलामी से आजाद हुआ है, हमला नहीं करेगा जब कि हमारा देश एक तटस्थ नीति अपना रहा था। यह गलती हम लोगों ने की और आज हमको साफ तौर से कहना चाहिये कि हमने गलत समझा और आज हमको यह भी साफ तौर से कहना चाहिये कि हमने गलती में रह कर तैयारी नहीं की। सदस्यों ने कहा कि हम लोग बहुत तैयार थे, हम हथियार के मामले में चीन से कम नहीं थे। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हमको बतलाया कि हम तैयार नहीं थे। हमें समझ में नहीं आता कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को हमारी तैयारी का पूरा पता था या नहीं। सीलोन जाने से पहले उन्होंने क्यों कहा कि चीन को भगा देने का आर्डर दिया है। इससे पहले छः वर्ष तक हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कभी ऐसी बात नहीं बोले। इससे मालूम होता है कि उनको भी गलत समझाया गया कि हम नेफा में पूरे तैयार हैं और चीन को भगा देना संभव होगा। इसलिये मैं समझता

हूँ कि हमें आज साफ तौर से यह सोचना चाहिये कि क्या गलती हमने समझने में की जिससे आगे वह गलती न हो। इसके लिये पूरी तौर से विचार करके काम करना चाहिये। यह बात सही है कि चीन ने भी अपनी शक्ति को बहुत ज्यादा समझा था और उसने सोचा था कि जिस तरह से लद्दाख में वे आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और हिन्दुस्तान की ओर से उसमें कोई रुकावट नहीं पड़ रही है, वैसे ही जहां भी कहीं वे जायेंगे, कहीं रुकावट नहीं पायेंगे। चीन ने जो समझा उसमें भी धोका खाया। आज हिन्दुस्तान की ओर से तैयारी न रहते हुए भी जिस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान की पल्टन ने चीनियों का मुकाबला किया वह सचमुच में हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में स्वर्णाक्षरों में लिखा जायेगा। उन्हें मालूम हो गया कि ऐसा नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान कमजोर है और जैसे चाहें हम उसके ऊपर अधिकार कर सकते हैं, इसलिए उनका दिमाग भी कनफ्यूज्ड है। चीन अपने प्रोपेगण्डा के जरिये से पीकिंग रेडियो से कहता है कि नेहरू गवर्नमेंट बिग बूरजुआ लैण्डलार्ड की गवर्नमेंट है, इसको हटाना चाहिये और इसी के साथ साथ कह रहा है कि हम उनके साथ समझौता करना चाहते हैं, समझौते का प्रस्ताव करते हैं लेकिन नेहरू जी ठुकरा देते हैं। नेहरू जी को हटाना चाहिये, उनकी गवर्नमेंट बूरजुआ की गवर्नमेंट है, हमारी लिबरेशन आरमी आ रही है, हम हिन्दुस्तान के उद्धार के लिये, जो जमींदारों की डामिनेट गवर्नमेंट है, सरकार है, उसको हटाने के लिये आ रहे हैं। और साथ साथ यह भी कह रहे हैं कि जब रशिया और कोमिन्टान्ग चाइना के बीच १९२९ में लड़ाई हुई थी तो हम कम्यूनिस्ट लोग जो आउट लाड थे, हमने लड़ाई में उनका साथ नहीं दिया, यानी हमने उस वक्त जो चीन की पयडल सरकार थी उसकी मदद नहीं की। इसी तरीके से वे चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश में जो कम्यूनिस्ट या उनके विचार में प्रोप्रसिड्वि विचारधारा के आदमी हैं वे चीन की मदद करें; क्योंकि सोशलिस्ट चाइना

श्री प्रतुल चन्द्र मित्र]

कभी किसी देश पर अधिकार करने नहीं जानता है बल्कि उसका उद्धार करने जानता है। इस तरह से वे प्रोपेगेंडा कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने पहले तो यह सोचा कि वे जो चाहे कर सकेंगे। लेकिन जब उन्होंने देखा कि थोका खा रहे हैं तो दूसरी ओर कहते हैं, हम समझौता करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन वे स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं कि उन्होंने थोका खाया है। हम लोग मानते हैं कि हमारी गलती हुई। लेकिन गलती किससे नहीं हुई? क्या अमरीका की गलती नहीं हुई? अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को मदद दी जिससे कम्युनिस्टों के साथ लड़ाई लड़ने में मदद मिले। आज पाकिस्तान क्या कर रहा है? पाकिस्तान साफ तरीके से बोल रहा है कि जो हमारे बगल में बड़े बड़े नेबर चीन और रूस हैं उनके साथ हमें दोस्ती से रहना है और वे यह भी बोलते हैं कि अब उनको अमेरिका के भरोसे पर नहीं रहना चाहिये। इसलिये आज यह कहना कि किसी हमारे खास आदमी ने गलती की या किसी खास मिनिस्टर ने गलती की, ठीक नहीं है। इस मामले में हमें सभी का एक ही दृष्टिकोण था और अब हम सब की जिम्मेदारी है कि गलती जो हम ने पहले की वह आगे नहीं करें। आज हम को सचमुच क्या करना चाहिये? हमारा अपना खयाल है, हमें अपने समचे डिपार्टमेंट को देखना चाहिये, उस के भीतर जांच होनी चाहिये कि कहां कहां हमारी कमजोरी है। खाली हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं, बाहर हमारी जो इम्बेसीज हैं उन के भीतर भी देखना चाहिये। चीन में हमारी इम्बेसी को यह खबर नहीं थी कि हमारे नेफा क्षेत्र से सात मील के भीतर एक डिविजन से अधिक चीनी फौज जमा हैं, उस की खबर नहीं मिलती है। चाइना जो बार प्रिपेरेशन करता है उस की खबर हमारे इम्बेसी को नहीं रहती है तो फिर वहां इम्बेसी रखने से क्या फायदा है? आपके पास यह खबर आनी चाहिये थी कि वह पूरी तैयारी लड़ाई की कर रहा है। आप की मिलिटरी इन्टेलिजेन्स,

इम्बेसी वगैरह कोई काम नहीं कर रही थी। आप को सभी ओर से देखने की जरूरत है। इम्बेसी को विदेश में जा कर पार्टी एंटेण्ड करना या ओर कुछ करना और वहां की गतिविधियों पर नजर नहीं रखना, यह ठीक तरीका नहीं है।

जो भी हो, अभी हमें क्या करना चाहिये? दो चार मुझाव हैं। आज जो प्रोपेगेंडा का ब्राडकास्ट इंडिया का होता है उस को हम सुनते हैं। कोई भी बार प्रोपेगेंडा उस में नहीं होता है। हां, कल ही शायद एक प्रोपेगेंडा हमारे रेडियो ने किया जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर की स्पीच रिले की गई है, वही एक प्रोपेगेंडा हुआ है। दूसरी जगहों में प्रोपेगेंडा का क्या तरीका होता है, उसे आप देखिये। बी० बी० सी० से आप सीखिये कमेंट करना। आप देखिये चाइना रेडियो किस तरह से प्रोपेगेंडा करता है। आज हर एक इश्यू पर कौन क्या सोचता है उस पर कमेंट होना चाहिये, खाली रेडियो से खबरें देने से आप के प्रोपेगेंडा का काम पूरा नहीं हो जाता है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : गाना भी होना चाहिये।

श्री प्रतुल चन्द्र मित्र : हम समझते हैं, ब्राडकास्टिंग के जरिये प्रोपेगेंडा का काम जरूर होना चाहिये। हम लोग जानते हैं कि आज चीन में क्या हो रहा है, किस तरीके से जुल्म हो रहा है, किस तरह से गरीब आदमी दुर्भिक्ष से मर रहे हैं, खाना नहीं मिल रहा है, खाली पलटन का सामान बन रहा है। इस के बारे में हमारे यहां से चाइनीज़ लैंग्वेज में या और दूसरी तरह से क्या कोई प्रचार किया जाता है? क्या कभी चीन के बारे में बोला जाता है?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : शास्त्री जी ने कहा है।

श्री प्रतुल चन्द्र मित्र : हम सोचते हैं कि यह प्रोपेगेंडा होना चाहिये और चीनी

भाषा में, चीनी लैंगएज में उसको समझाना चाहिये। वे नाम से अपने को कम्युनिस्ट, सोशलिस्ट बोलते हैं लेकिन एक बड़े साम्राज्यवादी के कायदे से चल रहे हैं।

दूसरी बात यह है कि बड़ी खशी की बात है सब पार्टियां हमारी सरकार का समर्थन कर रही हैं, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी समर्थन कर रही है। लेकिन हम को चौकन्ना रहना चाहिये। मैंने कल ही एक अखबार में पढ़ा था, कलकत्ता के 'आनंद बाजार पत्रिका' में, कि बंगाल में किसी जगह नेहरू जी की इफीजी जलाई गई, हावड़ा के नजदीक एक गांव में। उस में पांच आदमी गिरफ्तार भी हुए। वहां "चाऊ-एन-लाई" जिन्दाबाद कहा गया। तो यह चीज अभी तक होती है। कौन उस के पीछे है, यह मैं नहीं कहता हूं—कोई ऐसा ही गद्दार होगा। आप को गद्दारों से सावधान रहना है। आप जानते हैं बहुत से कम्युनिस्ट मेम्बर बहुत दिनों, दो वर्ष, तीन वर्ष चीन में रह कर आये हैं, उन लोगों से सावधान रहना चाहिये और देर नहीं करनी चाहिये, जल्दी उन को रोकना चाहिये। नहीं तो देर करने से ये लोग छिप जायेंगे और आप का ज्यादा नुकसान करेंगे। खास कर बार्डर एरिया में, बंगाल, आसाम वगैरह में, आप को सावधान होना चाहिये; क्योंकि कम्युनिस्ट लोग कभी मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी कभी गलती कर सकती है।

इसलिये मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि आप को चौकन्ना रहना चाहिये। हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई जो डिसिप्लिन की बात कहते हैं वह एक धोका है। आप को यह बात अच्छी तरह से मालूम हो गई होगी कि जब से लड़ाई हुई है कौन-कौन से लोग ऐसे हैं जो चीन की मदद कर रहे हैं। क्या डिसिप्लिन से देश-प्रेम आता है? मैं कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों के डिसिप्लिन की बात जानता हूं। जब दूसरे महायुद्ध में हम लोग इन के साथ जेल में थे तो जो फासिस्ट युद्ध उस समय दुनिया में लड़ा जा रहा था वह किस तरह से एक दिन में 'पीपुल्स वार' में बदल गया। इसलिये हमें यह बात अच्छी

तरह से समझ लेनी चाहिये कि ये लोग कभी भी अपनी नीति बदल सकते हैं। जो बात अभी ये कहते हैं उस पर हमें पूरा विश्वास नहीं करना चाहिये। अभी भी सोवियट रूस ने अपना रुख साफ नहीं किया है।

आप को मालूम होना चाहिये कि कम्युनिस्टों में भी दो विचार धारों काम कर रही हैं। एक तो जो रूसी विचारधारा के लोग हैं वे को-एग्जिस्टेंस की बात करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ चीनी विचारधारा के लोग हैं जो को-एग्जिस्टेंस के खिलाफ बात करते हैं। और कहते हैं कि यह कभी भी नहीं हो सकता है कि कम्युनिस्ट और नान-कम्युनिस्ट साथ रह सकते हैं। यह बात जितनी जल्दी साफ हो जाये उतना अच्छा है। सोवियट रूस ने इस लड़ाई में जो रुख अख्तियार अभी तक किया है उस से हमें निराशा नहीं होनी चाहिये। चीन हर बात में सोवियट रूस की बात नहीं मानता है। क्यूबा की बात में आप देख लीजिये। सोवियट रूस का क्यूबा के बारे में क्या एटीट्यूड है और चीन इस मामले के बारे में रोज रेडियो से क्या बोलता है? चीन क्यूबा वालों से रोज कहता है कि उसकी ६५ करोड़ जनता उसके साथ है। चीन आज शान्ति की बात नहीं बोल रहा है। वह हर बात को घुमा कर रूस के खिलाफ बातें कहता रहता है। इसलिए हमें इस वक्त यह नहीं समझ लेना चाहिये कि सोवियट रूस हमारे खिलाफ है या हमारे खिलाफ कार्यवाही कर रहा है।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश): सभापति जी, माननीय गृह-मंत्री जी ने इस सदन के सामने जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किये हैं मैं उनका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। शायद ही इस देश के इतिहास में, इस सदन के इतिहास में इतना गम्भीर मौका मिला होगा जिसका हम आज सामना कर रहे हैं और जो हमारे सामने विचाराधीन है। किसी भी रोग का इलाज करने के पक्ष उसका निदान करना आवश्यक होता है

[श्री महावीर प्रसाद]

आज सदन में दो दिन से हम इस बात पर विचार कर रहे हैं कि चीन ने हमारे ऊपर क्यों हमला किया है ? इस सम्बन्ध में प्रत्येक सदस्य ने अलग अलग बात कही । हमें पहले यह सोचना पड़ेगा कि क्या चीन हमारी बरफ से ढकी ऊँची चोटियों के लिए हमारी तरफ बढ़ रहा है, क्या हिमालय के ऊँचे शिखरों पर कोई कल-कारखाना खोलना चाहता है अथवा वहाँ पर खेती करना चाहता है? या चीनवासी निर्जन हिमालय में हमारी बात सीमाओं पर तपस्या के अभिलाषी हैं?

वास्तव में पिछले दस या पन्द्रह वर्षों से, जब से हमारा देश स्वाधीन हुआ है तब से वह शान्ति और अहिंसा की नीति पर चल रहा है; क्योंकि अहिंसा द्वारा ही उसने अपनी स्वाधीनता प्राप्त की और सारे संसार के इतिहास में यह एक अद्वितीय चीज थी । हमने आजादी के बाद शान्ति और अहिंसा का मार्ग अपनाया और यह ठीक ही समझा कि जिस महापुरुष ने हमें यह रास्ता दिखलाया है वह सारे संसार के लिए कल्याणकारी है । इसलिए हम ने उस महापुरुष द्वारा बतलाये हुए मार्ग का अनुसरण किया और संसार के सब देशों के साथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया । यह रास्ता हमने इसलिए अपनाया क्योंकि हमने देखा कि हम सारे संसार की मानवता को इसके द्वारा कल्याण की ओर ले जा सकते हैं । इसलिए हमारे देश ने सब से पहले जो तात्कालिक समस्या गरीबी की थी, पिछड़ेपन की थी, उसको दूर करने के लिए ध्यान दिया । हमारे देश की सरकार ने अपने देश को समृद्ध बनाने की तरफ, सुखी बनाने की तरफ कदम बढ़ाया और साथ ही सारे संसार के देशों के साथ मित्रता का एवं बन्धुत्व का हाथ बढ़ाया । इसलिए हमारी यह नीति रही कि दुनिया के सब देशों के साथ मित्रता के सम्बन्ध रख जायें । लेकिन आजादी के १५ वर्ष के भीतर केवल चीनियों

ने ही हमारे ऊपर हमला नहीं किया अपितु हमारी स्वाधीनता के कुछ ही समय बाद पाकिस्तान ने भी छिप कर हमारे देश के ऊपर हमला कर दिया ।

आज आजादी के १५ वर्ष नहीं बीते थे कि चीन ने हमारी मातृ-भूमि पर हमला कर दिया । कारण क्या था ? वास्तविकता यह है कि एक पुराना सिद्धान्त है "समानशील-व्यसनेषु सख्यम्" । पाकिस्तान एक थियोक्रेसी राज है और हिन्दुस्तान एक सिक्लर राज है, इसलिए इन दोनों देशों में कभी भी वास्तविक मित्रता नहीं हो सकती है, इस बात को मान लेना चाहिये । इसी तरह से चीन में कम्युनिस्ट राज है और हिन्दुस्तान में गणतंत्र राज है, इन दोनों देशों में भी कभी मित्रता नहीं हो सकती है । ये दोनों बड़े देश हैं, ताकतवर देश हैं और एक दूसरे की बात सहन नहीं कर सकते हैं । हिन्दुस्तान गणतंत्र के मार्ग पर तरक्की कर रहा है और मजबूत होता जा रहा है, यह बात चीनी कम्युनिस्टों को अच्छी नहीं लगती है । चीनी कम्युनिस्ट एशिया में अपनी नीति फैलाने के लिए गणतंत्रीय देश हिन्दुस्तान को बहुत खतरे की दृष्टि से देखते हैं । वह यह समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान जिस तरह से अपना कदम गणतंत्र के द्वारा आगे बढ़ाता जा रहा है उससे एशिया और अफ्रीका के देश उसके रास्ते चलने लगेंगे । इस लिये वह यह बात अच्छी तरह से समझने लग गया है कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान गणतंत्रीय तरीके से मजबूत हो गया तो सारा एशिया और अफ्रीका उसी पद्धति पर चलेगा और चीनी कम्युनिस्टों को एशिया और अफ्रीका में अपनी नीति फैलाने में अवरोध होगा । इसलिए हमारे हिमालय की चोटी पर उसने हमला किया और अपना कम्युनिस्ट साम्राज्यवाद फैलाने के लिए उसने हमारी उत्तर और पूर्वी सीमा के बहुत से भागों पर कब्जा कर लिया है । अतएव जो लोग यह कहते या समझते हैं कि यह आइडियालिजिकल युद्ध नहीं है, वह भूल

कर रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान से दोस्ती कर लेनी चाहिये, वे भी भूल करते हैं और वे इन देशों की आइडियलोजी को नहीं समझते हैं। हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने यहां कहा कि पाकिस्तान से दोस्ती कर लेनी चाहिये, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बात इस समय सम्भव नहीं हो सकती है। इस समय हमारे देश की सीमाओं पर जो अतिक्रमण हुआ है उसको दूर करने के लिये हमें हर सम्भव तरीके से काम करना चाहिये, ताकि अंतिम विजय हमारी हो। हमारी स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद से ही यह नीति रही है कि दुनिया के जितने देश हैं उनसे मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाया जाये। हम किसी देश की जमीन लेने के लिये लालायित नहीं हैं। साथ ही हम यह भी कभी बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे कि कोई हमारी सीमा पर आक्रमण करे। इसलिये हमें सदा अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये और इस बात को मान लेना चाहिये कि हमेशा युद्ध के लिये तैयार रहना ही शांति की रक्षा के लिये सबसे बड़ा उपाय है। खास कर ऐसे दो देशों से जिनसे इस वक्त हमारा सामना है, जिनकी विचार-धारा हमारे से बिल्कुल भिन्न है और जो अपनी विचारधारा को दुनिया में फैलाने के लिये हर किस्म का बेगा तरीका अख्तियार करने को तैयार हैं। उस देश से कैसे मित्रता की जा सकती है जो अपना वादा भूल जाता है, जो पंचशील का दुनिया में तो ऐलान करता है, बांडुग में पंचशील के सिद्धांतों को मानने का ऐलान करता है, लेकिन वाद में भूल जाता है और उस चीज को स्मरण भी नहीं रख सकता है। चीन कभी भी सच्चाई पर काम नहीं करता है? वास्तव में चीन की, सारे कम्युनिस्टों की जो फिलासफी है वह असत्य पर आधारित है, अन्याय पर आधारित है, अधर्म पर आधारित है, इस बात को सबको अच्छी तरह से जान लेना चाहिये। हमारी जो नीति है वह शांतिपूर्ण नीति है, वह सत्य पर आधारित है, न्याय पर आधा-

रित है, इसलिये दोनों देशों से किसी भी हालत में मेल नहीं हो सकता है। हमारी चीन के साथ दो हजार मील लम्बी सीमा है और उसकी रक्षा करना हमारे लिये अति-आवश्यक है। मैं यहां तक कहूंगा कि जय तक चीन और हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन एक दूसरे के साथ मिलती रहेगी तब तक सीमा की रक्षा करने की आवश्यकता पड़ेगी। इसलिये हमें अपने देश को, अपने देशवासियों को चीनी हमलावरों से बचाने के लिये तैयार करना पड़ेगा। पहले हमें चीनियों को अपनी सीमा से बाहर निकालना होगा और सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से जो कमजोरियां रह गई हैं उन्हें दूर किया जाना चाहिये। अगर हम अपनी तैयारी पूरी नहीं करते, चौकसे नहीं रहेंगे तो हजारों सालों तक हमारे यहां अशांति रहेगी। इस लिये हमें अपनी सीमाओं में सुरक्षा का बहुत पक्का इंतजाम करना है, ताकि दुश्मन फिर दोबारा हमारी भूमि पर हमला न कर सकें। सीमा की रक्षा में जब कभी भी हम बेखबर होंगे हमें हमेशा ऐसी ही स्थिति का सामना करना होगा। बर्हस के दौरान में कुछ सदस्यों ने यह बात कही कि चीन एक बड़ा देश है और उसकी फौज की ताकत बहुत बड़ी है और उसकी तैयारी भी बहुत है। मैं समझता हूं कि इस तरह की बातें कहने से हमारे देशवासियों का मोरल गिरेशा। यह बात सत्य है कि हमारी तैयारी में कुछ कमजोरियां थी लेकिन अब शत्रु का मुकाबला करने के लिये हमें हर तरह का प्रयास करना चाहिये। हर वक्त गलती दोहराने से काम नहीं चलेगा। गलती जो हां चुकी उसको सुधारना होगा और देश को मजबूत बनाना होगा। हिन्दुस्तान भी ४४ करोड़ आदमियों का देश है और एक हिन्दुस्तानी चार चीनियों के बराबर है, ऐसा मैं मानता हूं और उनका मुकाबला हम बहुत बहादुरी से कर सकते हैं। इसलिये हमें हमेशा इस देश को इस तरह से तैयार करना होगा ताकि कभी भी कोई उसकी भूमि पर हमला करने का साहस न कर सके।

[श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल]

जितनी बातें सदन में कहीं गई हैं कि किस प्रकार से हमें अपने देश को तैयार करना चाहिये उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। यह सौभाग्य की बात है कि हमारा देश इस समय एक इन्सान की तरह उठ कर खड़ा हो गया है। हमारा देश जिस नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के लिये लालायित था वह भावात्मक एकता अपने आप हमारे बीच में हो गई है। आज हमारा देश जाति, धर्म और राजनीतिक मतभेदों को मिटा कर एक दीवार की तरह उठ कर खड़ा हो गया है। आज हमारा देश उस महान नेता के पीछे खड़ा है जिसने आज्ञा की कठिन लड़ाई में कुशलता से हमारा नेतृत्व किया, जो गत पन्द्रह वर्षों से देश की नाव को आगे बढ़ाये ले जा रहा है। जो दुनिया में शांति और सहअस्तित्व के सुन्दर आदर्श को सामने रखकर अपना महान् कार्य कर रहा है। आज यह देश चीनी आक्रमण के खिलाफ एक होकर उस नेता का साथ दे रहा है, यह हमारे लिए बड़े आत्म विश्वास और गौरव की बात है। आज इस देश का जनता इस चीज के लिए बधाई की पात्र है और साथ ही हमारे नौजवान जो सोमा पर अपने रक्त और अपने जीवन का आहुति दे रहे हैं, हिमालय की शीत सीमाओं पर बहादुरी से लड़ रहे हैं, वे सब भाँ हमारा श्रद्धा और बधाई के पात्र हैं। मान्यवर जिन देशों ने हमारे देश की तरफ अपनी मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाया है और जो हमें सहायता दे रहे हैं, वे सभी हमारे धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं। और आज इस सदन में हम सब का यह कर्तव्य है कि जिस तरह से हमारे देश का उत्साह जगा है, जोश बढ़ा है, उसी तरह हम उसका नेतृत्व करें और उसको सही दिशा में ले जायें और उसके सारे उत्साह को, सारे जोश को इस तरह से संगठित करें कि हमारा देश दुश्मन से कामियाबी के साथ विजय प्राप्त करें और हमारे देश की पवित्र भूमि से दुश्मन हटे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इन प्रस्तावों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I speak on the Resolution moved by my friend and colleague, the Home Minister. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is necessary for anyone to speak in commending that Resolution because every party and group and every individual in this House, I gather, approves of it and gives it full support. And what is much more important, that support has come in a tremendous and magnificent measure from the people of this country.

I shall, therefore, say something about some points, some outstanding features of this situation more particularly about the way we have to condition our mentality to face it. Some people have criticised our unpreparedness and may I add that I hope, not now but somewhat later at a more suitable time, there will be an enquiry into this matter, because there is a great deal of misunderstanding and misapprehension and people have been shocked—all of us have been shocked—by the events that occurred from the 20th October onwards for a few days and the reverberations that we suffered. So I hope there will be an enquiry so as to find out what mistakes or errors were committed and who was responsible for them. But for the present that cannot be done and I do not wish to state before the House anything in regard to those matters though I do think that many of the charges made have little substance. The real thing, the basic thing, is that we as a nation, in spite of brave speeches now and then, have been conditioned in a relatively peaceful manner in a democratically peaceful manner which is somewhat opposed to the type of conditioning that a country like China at present, has had especially in the last dozen years or so. They have been conditioned, even previously they have been in a sense at war, I should say for 50 years in a condition of war, not war with foreign countries but war in their own country, and the House will remember how constantly this idea of

war was being put forward by them. America has been their chief *bete noire*, their chief enemy and constantly they were rousing up their people against America, against imperialists and the like so as to keep up that mentality of war, that constant preparation for war, for building up for war and all that. We, on the other hand, have constantly spoken about peace and we are, in spite of sometimes using excited language, a peaceful people and we have pleaded for peace^a all over the world and in our own country and naturally that conditioning is of a different type than the type of conditioning that China, for instance, has had during the last dozen years. Having conditioned their people, they can turn the direction, they can turn the people's thinking in any way they choose. It was against America; suddenly India becomes enemy No. 1. Not that America ceases to be in their minds the enemy but they turn it round and they turn it round saying that we are the stooges of America. Therefore, all the previous conditioning against America is turned round to us. For them it is really as if we are doing a job for America, as if it did not directly concern us. Now, in normal times, even apart from this conditioning and the rest, democratic countries do not normally behave like, well, countries—if I may give you an instance—like Hitler behaved in Germany. Now, great countries—not countries which are pacifists—like England, like France and the rest had powerful armies; yet they were not conditioned in the way that Germany was under Hitler and when war came the result was that in spite of their vast armies, the French army and the British army with the fullest equipment they had with them could not stand up against Hitler and they were swept off. France was humiliated and humbled and then the British army, almost the whole of it, was swept into the English Channel. Not that it was not a good army but the aggressor has an advantage and the conditioning of the aggressor makes it a more fit instrument for the initial attack. First of

all, the aggressor chooses the point of attack, the day and the time of attack, which is an advantage. So this has to be borne in mind. Now, we in the last many years have thought certainly of keeping our army, air force, etc., but we have thought that the essential way of gaining strength is: industrialising the country and improving our agriculture because struggles are fought today even more than at the battle front in the field and factory and we thought—and we still think—that even from the point of view of strengthening our defence forces the background behind them in the field and factory was essential. Without a proper industry no modern war can be fought. We may get a? we are getting—and we are thankful for getting them—arms from abroad because the emergency compels us to do so, to get them. Yet we cannot fight for any length of time with merely aid from abroad. We have to produce the weapons of war here and behind those weapons of war and behind that industry which is so essential is the agricultural background. No industry can be built up unless agriculture is functioning. So we come back to the growth of agriculture and industry and we have been trying to do that in the last so many years by Five Year Plans and the rest. Naturally, the Five Year Plans were meant to raise the level of living of our people, to give them certain amenities, to raise the national income and all that; but essentially, if I may venture to state to this House, they were meant to strengthen the country, to strengthen even the defence forces of the country. Now, many people thought, being used in the past to getting everything from abroad that this was the easiest way—getting arms and everything from abroad. Originally, our Indian Army before independence consisted of very brave men, but it was essentially an outgrowth of the British Army. Most of the officers, all the senior officers were foreign, were British. Gradually some of our officers rose in rank and a very, very few became Brigadiers. For the rest, I think, Colonel

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] was the topmost rank. All the policy—was laid down in Whitehall. They did not bother. They had to carry out that policy. Almost all the fighting material—not human beings but arms, etc—came from England chiefly. There was only a slight advance in our arms production during the Second World War, because it became very difficult to supply India from England. Their own demands were terrific and there was distance. Therefore, the British Government encouraged the production of certain arms and ammunition in our ordnance factories. Even so, nothing except the most ordinary arms were allowed to be made here. The rest had to come from there. That was the state of affairs when we took charge. First of all, all the policy, direction, etc. changed, from Whitehall direction to Indian direction. We had good people. Yet all the training and thinking was originally derived from Whitehall or from Sandhurst, etc., which is good training. I do not say that it is bad. And they are very fine men. Nevertheless, it was somewhat out of touch with Indian conditions. Gradually, we had to bring that round, to fit in more with Indian conditions, but more particularly the whole question of production was before us. We could not rely on foreign sources for arms, etc. After all, when one is forced to do, one gets it from anywhere, as we are doing it today. But that is not a safe thing and that does not produce a sense of self-reliance and self-dependence. Now, to build up a modern arms industry requires not only some prototype being obtained and copying it. That is difficult enough. But it requires an industrial background in the country. It is out of a background of industry that these things arise, not a specific thing. You make something which may be good for war without any background. We have to have a vast number of scientists, technicians, etc. and long experience of doing it. All these years we have been trying to do that and I think we have made very considerable progress. We have today in our Defence

Science Department—I do not exactly know it—I think more than two thousand scientists working. Because you cannot get the real thing here, to get some idea of it, you have to build up your own prototypes and then after building them up you have to experiment with them, try them, and then finally decide in favour and then produce them in large quantities. All this takes time. We have always had this idea that the way to strengthen our army is to go through these processes. It is true that in defence one has to fix some period with some idea in one's mind as to when one may be confronted with a war crisis. Suppose, we are confronted with a war crisis in a year's time. In our thinking everything else has to be conditioned to that year. We can not produce big things within that year. We have to do something. If a war is suddenly thrust upon you, immediately you have to do as best as you can. But in doing the best we can, for the time being, we really lessen our capacity for the future, even to carry on with war for the future, unless we build it up from below as I have said. That was the problem always before us. Every country when it thinks of arms, etc.—apart from this point of building up the arms industry—has to consider when the time for trial will come. I remember the first time I came into the Government, before I became Prime Minister, I was Vice-President of the Council and one day a problem came up before us about the Army. What Army should we keep? That was just after the World War. This was before Pakistan came into existence and before there was any particular danger. And we were put this question: "When do you expect, what time do you expect to have before a war will take place?" Any war. We had nobody in view. That is to say, we can concentrate more on preparations for it in the sense of long-term preparations. If we think the war is next year, then the approach is different. And it was said: "Let us think, for the moment, ten years." At that time there was no question

of building up the arms industry here. It was only a question of acquiring weapons. Ten years has no particular meaning. It was just a period, so that whatever we required should be spread out over ten years. That was the idea and that should be obtained from abroad. Later when we became independent we laid much greater stress on production here in this country. There were difficulties. Many people used to old methods, not only for our Army but for everything, for our railways, etc., preferred just giving a big order—a team going abroad and coming back here—for tanks, for this, that and the other. It was simpler and they knew that tank. And they rather suspected or were afraid that if we made it ourselves it may not be quite as good. It may fail us. But that was not good enough for a long-term effort. We had to do it ourselves and gradually it was built up. And then we had also, you will remember, always certain financial or foreign exchange difficulties, how much we should turn over to defence. Defence expenditure has gone up somewhat by normal peacetime standards considerably. It affected our whole planning, our First Plan and Second Plan. So we had to strike a balance somewhere. With all these difficulties and delays, nevertheless, we built up our defence industry, not by any means as we wanted it. The process continued and continues, but still I think with considerable success. If I could show you the rate at which our production in defence industry has gone up, you will notice that it is very considerable. I will not go into those figures. I am merely mentioning these things. Some people criticised that our ordnance factories have been making civilian goods. They have been making civilian goods. It was to the tune of about five per cent because when labour was unemployed it had to be turned to do something. And always the normal test is that ordnance factories or any arms manufacturing concerns cannot manufacture in peace time as fast as they are supposed to make in war time. Other-

wise, you get stocked up with things tremendously. You cannot do anything with them. They get spoiled no doubt. The normal rate is—I forget the exact figure—that in war time you have to advance your rate of production between 15 and 20 per cent, of peace time. Because you are spending so much, your ammunition is being fired at a tremendous pace, it must be replaced. In peace time you do it only when there are exercises. So, all these problems came to us. I was saying that our production has gone up very considerably—not civil production. It is a mere bagatelle, nothing—arms production for the Army, Navy and Air Force and especially for the Army and the Air Force. And now for the last month or two, of course, we have done extraordinarily well. I should like to say a word in commendation of those in charge of our arms production, the Director-General of it, who is a very able and very enthusiastic man, and all his workers and others. Their scientists and chiefly technicians are working today twenty-four hours a day. There is not a minute's interval when they stop. So, this process went on. It did not go on, I admit, completely, as fast as a country bent on war would do it, because we had always to check it, because the more we spent on it, the less we had! for other basic things, even for defence. As I said, I think agriculture is as important as guns in defence, I think the growth of industries is as important as guns. I think that power is as important as guns. All these things help in producing guns, all these things help in producing a well-fed army and well-fed country. All these things help us in conserving our foreign exchange. All these things are so interconnected. One must not think of defence as something by itself, training people, parading them about and handing them guns for defence. So this process has been going on naturally limited by our resources, limited by many other factors, limited by the growth of our industrial development.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

and it has made a fairly good progress. It might have made more.

And now I should like to carry this argument to its conclusion. I would like to say that we have today, as everyone realises, a terrific problem which cannot be solved obviously by brave gestures and processions or anything like that, which are good in their own way, but obviously it is something when we are up against one of the biggest powers in the world. We have seen in the past, in the Great War and others, how great powers mauled at each other till ultimately, after three or four years or more they were all exhausted, utterly bled, and the greatest powers were defeated, defeated absolutely France, Germany, Japan, for instance. They did not lack enthusiasm, they did not lack good armies or good navies or air force, they did not lack the industrial background. Yet they were defeated because it was a trial ultimately of something basic, not a question of a few guns or something but of the nerve and basic strength of a nation, the morale of a nation. That is what we have to face. I think we can face it with confidence, but I want you to think of the ordeals before us. We may have, as every army has, as every defence force has, reverses and all that. We have to survive them, we will survive them and not get terribly dispirited because we had a reverse. That is not a right outlook at any time but more specially when we are up against a highly organised and trained military machine like that of China which has, I believe, the biggest army in the world. Even in Tibet I understand, they have got a vast army, leave out the huge legions in China. That is the problem before us. Now, in facing it, we face it today, as we try to do, with all the material we have and all the material we can get from abroad, and we have asked a large number of countries to supply it. The main countries which have supplied us thus far have been the United States and

the United Kingdom, and we are grateful to them for it, but we have, if I may use the word, impartially asked many countries including the Soviet Union. I may add about the Soviet Union that all the previous commitments they made, I believe they stand by them. What further commitments they will make I cannot say. We have asked them, we have not got an answer yet. But on previous commitments they have said that they stand by them in spite of these developments.

So, we have to meet the situation, but if we realise, as we should realise, that this is a long-term effort, this may take, I cannot say how long, but mentally we must be prepared for a long long time, for years, two years, three years or four years, the people and the country straining themselves to the uttermost—it is not a question of giving some money to a fund, it is not a question of some people being recruited, but every man and woman in the country being strained to the uttermost. If that is so, that can only be carried on if together with it we are thinking constantly of increasing our industrial potential and behind that our agricultural potential, and the industrial potential and the agricultural potential give us the war potential. War potential is not something apart from industrial potential and agricultural potential. That is why I have said that we dare not even for the sake of this war and the defence of our country slacken our efforts at increasing our industrial and agricultural potential or in other words give up our Five Year Plan. We may give up some bits of it—that is a different matter—which we consider non-essential, but the basic things of that have to continue, if for nothing else, just for the sake of this war situation. That is how I would like the House to consider this problem because it requires, apart from what we do, a certain mental adjustment to it. If we have not got that mental adjustment, we will be constantly

having shocks, not being able to do what we can. It is not a hundred yards' race or a hundred meters' race where we make a violent effort and go as fast as we can for a hundred yards in nine or ten seconds. You do it if you are a fast runner and get exhausted at the end of it. It is a very long race, and if you have to run a long race, let us say, of three miles or more, you run differently from how you run a hundred yards race. You have to keep your breath and get your second breath and carry on whatever happens, so that in that sense we have to look at this and not exhaust our energy, our capacity in initial spurts and not have the energy left for something else because there is a limit to a nation's energy. To courage you may say there is no limit. Many men show courage unto death. Fewer men show courage living on the verge of death and yet working hard. That is true, but there is a limit to the totality of a nation's, I will not say courage but, strength, if you like, and you see that in these great wars that have taken place that limit was reached in the case of some countries like Germany and Japan. They collapsed six months before the other party might have collapsed. Mr. Winston Churchill, I believe, talking about the first World War said—I forget his words—just it was a pure chance, he said, ultimately which side collapsed. It is a very well worded thing but I do not remember it. However, one has to think ahead and preserve that memory so that we could outlast the other party, our opponent, our enemy. That is the problem before us, and this requires not only tremendous mobilisation of the nation's resources but a mental adaptation to it. Some of us are not accustomed to facing these questions of a nation's life and death in war time—and we are not accustomed, let us be clear about it—we have heard of wars, read about wars, the first World War, the second World War and all that, but we were not emotionally concerned with them in the sense of that type of terrible suffering which

people in Europe, people in the warring countries had, whether it was this side or that side, Germany, England, France and Russia. All these countries suffered terribly and to the ounce of their blood they went on doing it, and then those people survived who had just the last ounce more than the others, they survived. That is the kind of struggle we are in. It is not a joke. And now of course in a war one has to think of nuclear weapons; not we, we are not producing them and we do not intend producing them. China says it will produce them. It has not done so. It might—in a year's time—and even if it does, it will be an experimental thing, and it will not be a thing which they can use for several years. However, war now has become a different thing and that is why apart from our natural desire for peace in the world and in our country, it is too terrible to contemplate, even by people who like war but fear the annihilation of mankind. So, we have pleaded for peace, and the world generally has been responding to the call of peace, not our call but the general call of peace all over. Even the great leaders of nations are powerfully affected by it because they faced—as we faced only two or three weeks ago—suddenly a turn of events in Cuba, and the Cuba affair might have led to war, war in 24 hours or 48 hours. Well, they shrank back and wisely decided to avoid it. Now, that has been the past, and we, apart from—I imagine—every thinking person wanting to avoid wars—are particularly trained to some extent, even more, inclined that way because of Gandhiji, not that—I say—Gandhiji made any of us terribly peaceful or made us what he thought he would like to have made us, but we did not reach his ideal. So with all that behind us we pursued a certain policy which at no time—may tell the House—was a pacifist policy, which at no time meant weakening our defence forces but strengthening them to the utmost of our capacity having regard to the resources and finances at our disposal.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] Our defence forces, our array at the present moment is much larger than the limit placed on it by ourselves. It has simply grown by circumstances bigger. Even so it is a very small army compared to China's millions; there you go into many millions. We do not go into them; we only go into hundreds of thousands and, as I said, we thought of defence chiefly from the point of view, first of all, of defence science—which is the basis of defence production, of technicians and others. To get all that takes time. For a soldier to be trained, it does not take very much time. And in the same way we take weapons because it is often said that we did not give our people adequate weapons. That is both true and not true; that is to say, we have not an army shifted over completely to automatic weapons; we are in the process of doing it. It is a lengthy process, manufacturing it ourselves, and we did not want, previous to this crisis, to spend large sums of money in getting those weapons from outside. We decided to make them ourselves, and we are making them now. But when the crisis came we had to give them—that is a different matter. We are trying to give them now, and in this connection, I might say that even an army like the British Army has only recently got automatic weapons. They are changing over now, in the course of some months, because their thinking is along different lines now, and we largely have followed their thinking; our officers and others who are responsible for this kind of thing have been trained there, have been in contact with them and think that way. The whole concept of war has changed. First of all, the air arm has become very important. Secondly, the nuclear weapons have become so important that conventional arms get relatively less important, and there is an argument whether the conventional army should be built up, or nuclear. All that is going on there. For us there is no choice. We do not have nuclear weapons and we are not

likely to have them. But in the confusion of arguments this element of automatic weapons, even in an up-to-date and modern army like the British was neglected in their military thinking; they did not think it was necessary or essential; they preferred some other weapons, -303 rifles, something which we have. Anyhow for the last two or three years we have been thinking of making the automatic weapons, not only thinking but also moving in that direction. But then all manner of difficulties are involved in it, because we have to get the prototypes, we have got to get the blueprints of them, and we have to make them ourselves making some adjustments for conditions here. Then we have tests and trials of them. It takes a long time. Last year we had been carrying this out, and now they are being produced or will be produced next month. Meanwhile we have got many of them from abroad. What I was venturing to point out to the House, were the problems that we had to face all the time, and at no time did we think that we can be complacent about this matter, about China or about their doings. But we did think that we should build up the basic thing which will enable us to convert it into a proper war machine when the necessity arose, because, if we did not have the base, then the war machine would be without foundations, would be superficial and would depend only on some outside help that we can get. We get it no doubt as we are getting it now, but it will not be able to carry us through for very long, and also it was, shall I say, a question of judgment as to when this final challenge would come. Of course, previously hon. Members here and elsewhere asked us—I remember a speech delivered here too—"Why did we not push them out two or three years ago in Ladakh?" Well, it is rather difficult to go into that because that kind of thing, if one goes to details, may help our enemy, but broadly speaking we wanted to be fully prepared for that.

We did not want to go into it half prepared or quarter prepared, and again, the preparation involved roads, a tremendous deal of roads, and big arms factories being built, the old ones being modernised and enlarged and all that, which takes time. So we wanted that. It was no good our hitting out at the Chinese and being pushed back with force and being helpless after that. So, we prepared for that and tried to build up the roads and build up the Dosts, which posts were, obviously, not strong enough to hold them back if a big army came. A post of a 100 or 200 men is more a signal post, that tns far you advance and no more, but if they decide to bring in a big army, they can sweep it away. That was the position in Ladakh and, therefore, we tried to hold them there and prepared to make ourselves stronger for a future tussle. In the NEFA region, as the House knows, they had not come at all except, originally, to a small village Longju which again—according to them—they claimed to be on the side of the MacMahon Line. It is actually on the border, and even that, according to them, was not coming over the MacMahon Line. Apart from that they had not come over at all during all this period. What they had stated all this time, and their actions, say, in regard to the Burma-China Treaty and others, led one to believe that they would not encroach any further. That does not mean that they were satisfied with that. They might proceed further if they liked, but nevertheless there .vps this idea which was spread abroad by themselves, by their statements and activities. Although they said that this was an illegal MacMahon Line, that they did not recognise it, nevertheless they always said that they would not cross it, and all these years we were in a sense better prepared here than in Ladakh, and specially lately we have built some more roads. But again, however prepared we were, it is a comparative question. No man can say that he is thoroughly prepared to meet anything. A hun-

dred men may be prepared to meet five hundred men, but a hundred or five hundred or five thousand men are not prepared for a hundred thousand men to swoop down upon them or something. It is always a comparative thing. And we suddenly had to face a thing which certainly was not in our minds and we are, if you like, to blame for it, that an army of forty thousand or fifty thousand men will swoop down a small corner of NEFA and face our force which was about, I do dot know—I do not tfish to mention figures—but very much smaller.

Then, again, they have the facility of bringing large forces at short notice from Tibet. Tibet having a huge reservoir of Chinese army, they can bring it by road right up to the edge of the ridges because that is the end of the Himalayas there. They can bring it in, go over a little ridge there and down they are in our territory, the ridge being the watershed, while we' have to go hundreds of miles of difficult territory. Now, although we have some roads, we have built them, yet almost eve y-thing that we had to send to the army had been by air. It is a terrific strain on our Air Force which they have done remarkably well.

So, I want to keep this background before you that we were all the time thinking of producing conditions, both in our arms factories, in our defence science and the roads, etc. we built, which would enable us to meet them as strongly as possible. It was a question of whether we will be forced to face a big challenge, what lime we might be forced and we could hurry these things up, but there is a limit to your hurrying an arms factory being built. Now we are thinking, and I hone the House will also think, in terms of a long-term effort. We cannot say how long it will be, but as things are, we dare not allow ourselves to think of a short-term effort, because if we think so, we will be disappointed, and that is disheartening

(Shri Jawahar Lai Nehru.)

thing if you do not make up your mind for a long-term effort and prepare for a short-term one, because then all your calculations are upset. Also, if we think in a short-term way, we will prepare for a short-term thing; we would not be able, perhaps, to carry on for a long term. We must think in terms of years.

Also there is a good deal of talk on the Chinese side, a good deal of, what I may say, peace offensives. Now, whatever happens we shall always favour peace provided that peace is an honourable one, a peace that leaves our territory in our hands. That is a different matter. I hope that we shall never become war-mad and forget the objectives that we have, as in the great war and other wars, a certain madness seizes a nation for which they may even win the war but they lose the peace. That is so. We are all for peace always. Why should we spend vast sums of money? And money required for these things, for this kind of operations, is such that all the money we spend in our Five Year Plans is a bagatelle before it. enormous sums. We thought we are brave to put a certain sum for our Five Year Plans. But here there is no choice left. We have to spend much more for the initial stages of the war and for subsequent stages. So while we are for peace, we must not allow ourselves to be taken in by these so-called peace offensives which are not peace, which are merely meant to some extent to humiliate us, to some extent to strengthen their position where they are for a future advance maybe, because. I am sorry to say it, it has become impossible to put trust in the word of the Chinese Government.

Now, even now their descriptions all the time are that we have attacked them and the brave Chinese frontier guards are defending themselves, the brave Chinese frontier guards having come on our territory, we are apparently attacking them and they are defending themselves. Apparently, the idea is that they should have a free

run on our country and we should do nothing.

Some of the hon. Members have criticised our publicity arrangements and, if I may say so, there is a great deal of truth in that criticism. We are trying to improve them. I think, they have improved somewhat, and I hope, they will improve, because it is not an easy matter to build up these things in a few days, war publicity and all that, and also because we do not quite function, we are not used to functioning quite in the way the Chinese Government are used to functioning, that is, stating complete untruth, one after the other, a set of lies. We are somewhat much more careful about what we say. Take the 20th of October. Before even their own attack had commenced, they started broad-casting that we were attacking them. Before that, that is, a little before that, about half-an-hour before, I think, they started that. People said "Oh, we hurt them first and they afterwards." Now, what is one to do? Even before they attacked they started broadcasting that we were attacking them. Nothing was happening there. Then they attacked. When we learnt of that a couple of hours later they got an advance of two or three hours. So you have to face a machine of propaganda publicity which originally was often called Goebbels machine in Nazi Germany. There is extraordinary similarity in many things between the Chinese publicity, etc., and the old Nazi publicity. And, of course, that can only be carried on with a certain rigid authoritarian pattern behind it—nobody dare say anything.

Here, I do not wish to criticise our newspapers, but very often they say and do things which do not help the war effort, although they are very keen in helping it but they do not think in that way. Everybody can say anything in a public meeting, and many people say amazing things in public meetings here which certainly do not help the war effort. They shake their fists. "We will drive out the Chinese" and all that, and say all

manner of things which prevent the Chinese being driven out.

You have to face the background of a democratic country, democratic freedoms. To some extent they have to be limited. There is the Defence of India Act, which is not wholly functioning j now but it is meant for that. But even in working that Defence of India Ordinance or Act we do not do it wholeheartedly, we do not like to do it unless we are forced to. I do not know, in course of war it may gradually become stiffer in its operations. That is possible. But at the moment we have got inhibitions in acting, in stopping a man from writing or publishing something. But there it is, a completely regimented apparatus in private life and public life. That is helpful in a war effort, but I do not think it is ultimately helpful. I do think that a democratic background ultimately is the stronger of the two, and I think, you can see something of it; some glimpse of it you can have here even in the last fortnight, two or three weeks in India, by the wonderful response that we have had from our people. Now, that it is not a regi-minted response. It is a spontaneous response which has come out of the people's minds and hearts and it does show that our fifteen year old democracy has taken roots in the people, that, it is all ^{verY} ^{weu} ^{f^{or} us t^o} quarrel with each other and to make all kinds of demands, but when they see when they feel, that there is danger to their democratic set-up they have come up like this. That is a 5. P.M. very healthy sign, a very hopeful sign and something that has heartened all of us. So, I do think that the democratic apparatus is ultimately good even from the point of view of war, provided of course that the apparatus and everything else is r.ot. swept away at the first rush. But we can be sure that it will not be swept away. Therefore it becomes a question of utilising that enthusiasm in a democratic manner with such limitations as war imposes upon us and directing it to defend the country and repel the invader. There again

we have to think from a long-term view, and it should not be a question of our panting too soon, losing our breath too soon. We may have to run long long distances and for a long long time we have to carry on with determination and with fortitude. Wei', our demonstrations and processions will not help in that. They may be good for rousing enthusiasm here and there, but we require something much deeper, much stronger, much more enduring for that.

Now, one further matter, which I should like to mention is, that it is really painful and shocking to me—the way the Chinese Government has, shall I say, adhered repeatedly to untruths. I am putting it in as mild a way as I can. What are they doing t .day? In the other House, I said it is aggression and invasion which reminds me of the activities of the Western powers in the nineteenth or the eighteenth century. Perhaps I was wrong. It is more comparable to the activities of Hitler in the modern age, because one thought that this kind of thing cannot happen nowadays. Of c:urse, some aggression may take place here and there but this well thought-out, pre-meditated and well organised invasion is what one thought was rather out-of-date and not feasible. We know the whole Chinese mentality, of the Government at least. It seems to think that war is a natural state of affairs, and here we are disliking it, excessively disliking the idea of war emotionally disliking it, apart from not liking its consequences. We have, therefore, to realise that we are up against an enemy which is well conditioned, well prepared for the type of action it has taken and which is prepared also to cover it up with any number of falsehoods. And whatever we may do, to some extent this kind of propaganda of the Chinese, naturally, has some effect on other people in their own countries. I do not say that the Chinese persons are all against India but listening tn their own propaganda they are influenced by it. and other countries, the so-called non-aligned countries, getting that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] propaganda in full measure are affected by it, or at any rate", are confused by it. Therefore, it is no good our getting angry with them that they do not stand forthright in our defence, in support of our position, because they are confused. Not only are they confused, but sometimes they are little afraid too. So, whatever the reason, we have to meet this and meet it with truth. Now, in war, Sir, unhappily—it has been said—the first casualty is truth. That is perfectly true, and the sad part of a war is not that people die in large numbers—that is sad of course—but the sad part of it is that war brutalises a nation and individuals. Well, death comes to all of us at its proper time but the brutalising of a country and of people is a more harmful thing. Now we have undergone a process under Gandhiji which is the reverse of this. I do not mean to say that we in India—our people—are any better than other people. I do not agree to that. We have numerous failings, weaknesses and we are even violent in small matters when other countries may not be. But the fact is that basically we are a gentle people, basically we have been conditioned by Gandhiji, especially, in peaceful methods, and however violent we may become occasionally, at the back of our minds there is that training. And it alarms me that we should become, because of the exigencies of war, brutalised, a brutal nation. I think that would mean the whole soul and spirit of India being demoralised, and that is a terribly harmful thing. Certainly, I hope that all of us will remember this.

Now, only the other day—two days ago—I saw a statement made by Acha-rya Vinoba Bhave for whom I have the greatest respect. I do not agree with everything that he says. Of course, I have the greatest respect for him because I do think in the whole India he represents Gandhiji's thinking more than anybody else. And it heartened me—what he said about this Chinese invasion. He condemned it in his own gentle language, but he condemned it

and he said himself he was not a man of war, he could not take a gun and meet it, but inferentially, he said India had to do it. But then he added that he hoped very much that even in doing so we would not be full of hatred, our minds full of hatred and ill-will and brutalised and all that. Well, hope so earnestly. Now, what will happen. I cannot say, because war itself is a powerful agent for metamorphosis—varied experiences and brutalities. We may have to undergo all that, not the men. The men in the battlefield who face death all the time still sometimes survive this hatred. It is the people sitting behind who indulge in all this hatred. Then energy and courage of the men in the battlefield is exercised in action but the men sitting at the counters in their money-houses and who encourage them too indulge in all this hatred business and create this brutalised mentality. Well, I do hope that somehow we shall escape it; we shall try our best to escape it.

Now, some people criticise us for having suggested that we are prepared to talk to the Chinese representatives if they withdraw to the position before the 8th of September. And some people say "No, you must not talk to them, you must not do any such thing until they withdraw completely from Ladakh and everywhere." Now, the 8th of September was the day when they came in NEFA across the Thagla Ridge and also attacked Ladakh and went and captured some more territory in Ladakh. Now, let us be brave but let us also be sensible. Our saying to them "We will meet you only when you surrender and confess defeat" is not a thing which is likely to happen. Whatever happens, they are not defeated nor are we defeated. In fact, it is very difficult for China to defeat us and it is still more difficult for us to defeat China. We are not going to march to Peking. Even if we have success here; as we hope to, it does not defeat China and even if they have success in the mountains, it does not mean that they defeat India. You

must remember that this type of war is a war which may *go on* indefinitely, simply sucking the blood of either country and brutalising us. Therefore, to talk of conditions which are manifestly not going to be fulfilled in the foreseeable future is not a wise thing. What do we seek after that? We seek after that, if these conditions that we have set are fulfilled, to talk to them 'about what? It is to talk to them—our representatives and theirs—as to how we can introduce conditions to relax tensions, etc. may be other circumstances which will lead to the third stage which is talking to them on the merits of the question. We do not agree to anything in between and I think it is a perfectly fair and legitimate proposal, honourable to us. As a matter of fact, as the House knows, the Chinese have rejected it completely. So, the various friends

in these countries are putting forward numerous mediatory proposals, more or less all of them based on some kind of a cease-fire immediately and about the Chinese proposals. I need not go into them because they are so manifestly meant to favour their aggression and to give them a chance to establish themselves and push us out and then, may be at a later stage, to commit aggression again. But these people are confused. They put forward proposals which are very much to our disadvantage. Fortunately, after we had explained these various matters, President Nasser of the U. A. R. put forward certain proposals which are very, very near our proposals. They are not exactly the same but are very near; basically our proposals that they should retire behind Thagla Ridge, that conditions before the 8th of September should be produced. That is the basic part of his proposals. That too the Chinese have rejected. I think that the proposals we have put forward are honourable, legitimate and not coming through weakness but strength and they are having a good impression on the rest of the world. The rest of the world also counts in such matters.

Many people have said that we should close up our Mission in Peking

and they should close the Chinese Mission here. Now, that is a legitimate thing for us to say or to do but we have to balance certain advantages and certain disadvantages, and for the moment, I need not and I cannot go into all the details. For the moment, we do not think it will be advantageous to us to do that. When the time comes, if it is necessary, we shall do that. Again other Members, I believe, have talked about our withdrawing our forces from the Congo and the Gaza Strip. It is true that we would like to withdraw them. We have suggested that we should withdraw them but we have felt that we should not do something suddenly without adequate preparation for it on the other side, something which will upset all the two years' effort in the Congo and cast a heavy burden on the U.N. Therefore, we have told them that we would like to withdraw them and we would like them to make other arrangements but for the present we will not withdraw them till they agree to it. We have certain international obligations. It is true that where the safety of our country is concerned, that is the first consideration. Nevertheless, in the balance we thought that we owed something to the international community, to Africa, and withdrawing them in a panicky condition would not be good and the amount of help that we derive from it, would be less than the harm we cause by our acting in that manner, but of course, we want to withdraw them as soon as we conveniently can.

Finally, I should like to say that this is a tremendous challenge to our manhood and our nationhood, something which is far above our party bickerings and party conflicts. Of course, parties have their views and they are entitled to them, but for the moment, this is something bigger than those things and the challenge has also another aspect of it and that is, it is an opportunity to build up our nation, an opportunity to build up on right lines—that is my trouble—lest we in our excitement or in our folly should go into wrong lines because that would

[Shri Jawahar Lai Nehru.] be a tragedy, a deeper tragedy than war. That is not to be corrupted by war, to use war to the utmost of our strength, not to be corrupted and to use that war situation to change our pattern or economic and social structure on right lines. If we do that, then out of this great trouble that we face, good will come for the nation and I would like this House and our Parliament and our Members to give this lead to the nation that we are not interested in the so-called victory by itself, because victory is a hollow thing if you miss the fruits of victory. The fruit of victory is not a little territory. We have seen great wars in Europe and elsewhere, mighty countries fighting each other and countries have won, won decidedly and yet somehow the fruits of victory have escaped them. That is the lesson of the last two wars. It has slipped out of their Angers and new problems have been created which they cannot

solve today and they think of the third war. Therefore, we have to think of the basic things we aim at because something has come in the way, a very bad thing—aggression—which is bad from our national point of view, from every point of view, therefore, we have to get rid of it and we will try our utmost to get rid of it but that by itself is not enough. In doing so, because the process of doing so shakes up the nation completely, we have to see that that shaking up of the nation is of the right kind and they yield right results. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, November 12, 1962.

The House then adjourned at twenty minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 12th November 1962.