

GOVERNMENT MOTION RE COLOMBO PROPOSALS ON INDIA-CHINA RELATIONS—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can now go on to the discussion of the Motion. I might at this stage tell you that I expect the Prime Minister to join the discussion at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, during the recent years no other document has aroused so much interest and attention as that containing the proposals made by the six non-aligned nations at Colombo. Coming as it does after the unwarranted massive attack and declaration of unilateral ceasefire by China, it is quite understandable that every section of the people and their representatives have taken utmost interest in it.

Sir, frankly speaking, the proposals as they are shaped fall short of our expectation. But since the proposals accept the principle that the aggression made by China has to be undone, and they envisage also that the Chinese forces must make a withdrawal to a point which obtained before September 8, 1962, I think it deserves our closest consideration. At this stage, Sir, I must register my appreciation for all the efforts put in by the representatives of the six non-aligned nations who were motivated by the idea of maintenance of peace and Afro-Asian solidarity. Sir, we also have to thank those emissaries who represent these powers for presenting the case of the six non-aligned nations in a very peaceful manner.

Sir, at this stage I feel that some of the observations made on the floor of the House gave me an impression that there is a lot of divergence of views in connection with these proposals. I am equally pained to observe in the columns of the Press that our ideas have been put in a

fashion as to give an impression to the world that we are too much divided on this issue. This is too delicate an occasion, and we are dealing with too sanguine an affair and our expressions have to be too restrained and have to be expressed in a fashion commensurate with the difficult situation through which we are passing.

As far as the proposals are concerned, I will offer my observations in detail at a later stage. But in the beginning I must say that it would be a diplomatic blunder of the highest magnitude if we reject the proposals. Apart from the fact that we would be antagonising the six non-aligned Powers who have put in all efforts to maintain peace, we would be also losing the moral force of the world opinion which has veered round our own cause. For a moment let us think; if the proposals fail because of the intransigence of China, it is China that will stand indicted. We will get the support of not only the non-aligned Powers but also of those nations which have been so far silent and have not come out with their open support. Some of our friends have mentioned that negotiations would dampen our war effort. I respectfully differ from them. The instrument of negotiation is entirely different from our efforts directed towards defence purposes. I would be the last person to see that our war efforts or our defence efforts are slackened because we are in the midst of certain negotiations. In fact, our effort should go on with accelerated speed and at the same time we may not be lagging on the diplomatic front.

Sir, an esteemed colleague of ours on the other side of the House expressed that our diplomacy at home has been quite successful but it has failed abroad. I very respectfully submit that the instrument of diplomacy is too delicate. It is not wooden, it is flexible and if it is at all mature diplomacy, it must adjust itself to the norms and plans and exigencies that arise. If it cannot, it is a rotten piece of diplomacy. Assessed in that context,

I believe, Indian diplomacy has done well, not that I am singing swan-song to the achievements of our foreign policy. My conscience speaks when I say that so far we might have erred here and there but on the whole we have done creditably. Had it not been for our diplomacy, today the majority of nations would not have given their support to our cause. I believe that the diplomatic front is more effective today in this age than the war front and that a diplomat, if he knows to play his cards well, can avert so many tragic events leading to a war.

Our policy of non-alignment has also been very badly criticised by a few friends who happen to be here. They think that non-alignment has been thrown to the winds. I believe that it is non-alignment which has triumphed so well. It has received encomiums from East and West and all those friends who believe in the tenets of non-alignment.

Now, as far as the Colombo proposals are concerned, it is said that it is deviation from the earlier stand and principles. I fail to understand it. It has also been said that as far as the proposal of China was concerned, it was better than the Colombo proposals. This is a most amazing statement. I need give some clarification on this issue. If we see, in the Eastern Sector, we are quite to the point of what we need except Thagla ridge and Longju, which have to be settled in the course of our discussion. As far as the Middle Sector is concerned, the area known as Bara Hoti is still unoccupied either by the Indian forces or the Chinese and that has to remain undisturbed according to the Colombo proposals.

Now, the most contentious part about which we have to think is the Western Sector, that is the Ladakh area. I believe, as I see it clearly from the maps supplied to us, that we definitely are gainers. In one sense, I should say that the Colombo proposals envisage a position which

is advantageous to us, since they have not allowed the Chinese to reap the fruits of aggression. They have said that the Chinese have to make a withdrawal of 20 kilometres from the line of actual control. As such would it be proper to say that the Chinese proposals are better than the Colombo proposals? I would urge on hon. Member, who spoke in this strain, to examine his own statement with the help of the maps and also the statements made so far.

There is another great revelation in this House to me that we have been dubbed as Communists and probably as their fellow-travellers because on certain points we do agree. That is rather a most insensate statement. It has been said that there is a sort of suspicion that we may enter into agreement with international Communism. I do not suffer from any phobia, whether it is Communism or any other 'ism'. I have my own 'ism' and I am perfectly confident of that and I know that 'ism' has not to be diluted with any other 'ism'. As far as the question of co-existence is concerned, the alignment or policy or any 'ism' should not militate against it. I would point out this to the hon. Member who had the temerity of speaking in that strain that we probably are going to follow the line of international Communism or compromise with them. There was an occasion when Roosevelt met Stalin and today in the Cuban affair, either Kennedy or Khrushchev—you may take it either way—they had to concede to the other and the result was, a great military catastrophe was averted. That is why I said in the beginning that the instrument of diplomacy is too delicate and flexible. It must rise to the occasion and I say in the very spirit that Khrushchev and Kennedy played the game very well.

Regarding some of the points that arise out of these proposals, the whole confusion obtains because of the type of enemy that we meet, the type of opponent that we meet. We know that about 52 years back a very

[Shri Satyacharan.]

significant statement was made by one who happens to be a General, a great military genius of repute. It was in 1910 that General MacArthur paid a visit to India and after his visit, he submitted a report to the Government of the U.S. Therein he wrote that the strength and weakness of India lay in its geography. The Himalayas serve as a fortress. If the enemy is met at the gate, he stands repulsed but if he gets an access through the gate, Indians have always been defeated. There is some sense in it and the statement was made about 52 years back and I specially say when I examine the case to bear it in mind that all these passes, which lie either in the Eastern Sector or in the Western Sector or in the Middle Sector, have to be got back or maintained in the light of this statement made by a great General who is known as a military strategist of the world.

Sir, if the friends who are in favour of the rejection of the proposals wish war—because that is the only alternative—I would ask them this question: Will that proposition be feasible with our professions of peace and co-existence and the five principles of Panchsheel? Will it be not correct for us to adhere to them and to avoid war if we can avert it? If somehow or the other, by sitting round the table we can make the situation more favourable and peaceful, we would be contributing to the cause of peace in the world and in our own land. Sir, when I say that, I do not mean for a moment that I am prepared to endanger the freedom and integrity of our country; nor would I like to compromise on the issue of the honour and prestige of our country. These are the considerations which have so far animated us. I believe as far as our Prime Minister is concerned, he is the proper person, with all his historic background, with all his patriotic actions so far, to take care of it. To doubt his professions and intentions or actions would be, in fact, too bad. Therefore, Sir, I would recommend to the House that as far as these pro-

posals are concerned, they have to be accepted in principle. I do feel and I say, Sir, at the end that we can give the green light to our Prime Minister and to the Government to pursue this matter to its logical end, in conformity with the sentiments that have been expressed in this House.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
सभापति जी, कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों और उन पर प्राप्त स्पष्टीकरणों पर हमें कई पहलुओं से विचार करना होगा ।

कांग्रेस के सदस्य जिनमें हमारे विधि मंत्री भी शामिल हैं, कल से इस बात पर बल दे रहे हैं कि कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव ८ सितम्बर के पूर्व की स्थिति को कायम करने की उनकी शर्त को पूरा करते हैं ।

पंडित श्याम सुन्दर नारायण तन्ना  
(उत्तर प्रदेश) : करीब-करीब ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : करीब-करीब पूरा नहीं करते, उस सदन में तो यह भी कहा गया है कि कुछ पहलुओं में वे ८ सितम्बर, की स्थिति से भी अच्छे हैं ।

विधि मंत्री (श्री ए० के० सेन) : यहां भी कहा मैंने ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : लीजिये यहां भी गवाही हो रही है । मैं सब से पहले इसी कसौटी पर कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को कसना चाहता हूं क्योंकि जहां तक विरोधी दलों का सवाल है कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को छोड़ कर प्रायः सभी विरोधी दल, जिनमें मेरा दल भी शामिल है, इस मत के हैं कि कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को हम स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते । कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के बारे में मैं क्या कहूं ? उन्होंने तो प्रस्ताव प्रकाशित होने से पहले ही उनको स्वीकार कर लिया और जिस जल्दबाजी से उन्होंने स्वीकार किया है उससे कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों

के बारे में मेरी शंकाएँ बढ़ गई हैं। क्यों बढ़ गई हैं। इसे मैं स्पष्ट करने की आवश्यकता नहीं समझता।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): How did you reject it before it was published?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी: No, we did not reject before its publication.

पहली कसौटी यह है कि ८ सितम्बर, की जो शर्त थी, मैं सदन को याद दिलाना चाहूँगा कि वह कम से कम शर्त थी—“मिनिमम करेक्टिव मेजर”—प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने इन शब्दों में ८ सितम्बर के पूर्व की स्थिति को कायम करने की व्याख्या की थी। इस मिये कोई यह न समझे कि वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा बात थी और यदि उसमें से कोई बात पूरी नहीं हुई, तो हमें सन्तोष कर लेना चाहिये। वह शर्त कम से कम थी जिससे कम पर आना समझौता नहीं हो सकता, समर्पण हो सकता है।

अब हम कम पर आते हैं या नहीं, मैं इसकी चर्चा करूँगा। नेफा के बारे में बातें कही जा रही हैं कि हम अपनी सेनाएँ मेकमोहन रेखा तक भेज देंगे। मगर मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि थागला रिज का क्या होगा? क्या हम थागला रिज पर अपनी सेनाएँ भेजने के अधिकार को तिलांजलि देने जा रहे हैं? अगर हम कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव स्वीकार करते हैं, तो क्या हम थागला रिज पर अपनी सेना को भेजने के अपने अधिकार को छोड़ने नहीं जा रहे हैं।

प्रो० सत्याचरण: ऐसी कौन बात है कोलम्बो प्रोपोजल्स में, जिससे यह मालूम होता है कि हम फलां जगह अपने अधिकार छोड़ रहे हैं?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी: जी हाँ, जनाब पढ़िये उसे। पूर्वी क्षेत्र में, विधि मंत्री मेरी इस बात की ताईद करेंगे कि थागला रिज में हम अपनी सेना नहीं भेज सकते। इस पर कोई विवाद नहीं हो सकता और अगर मेरे मित्र इतना भी नहीं समझते तो फिर उनका सारा भाषण व्यर्थ रहा और कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों की उाकी वकालत कोई अर्थ नहीं रखती है।

यह ठीक है कि चीन से भी कहा गया है कि यह थागला रिज पर अपनी सेना न भेजे, मगर यह हमारे लिये कोई रियायत नहीं है। थागला रिज पर तो चीन की सेना पहले भी नहीं थी। ८ सितम्बर से पहले थागला रिज पर भारत की सेना मौजूद थी और जब चीन ने ८ सितम्बर को थागला रिज में प्रवेश करके हमारी सेना को हटा दिया, तो हमने कहा कि चीन ने यह नाया आक्रमण किया है और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि हम इस नये आक्रमण के सामने सिर नहीं झुकायेंगे। उन्होंने हमारी सेना को आदेश दिया कि चीनी सेना को थागला रिज से बाहर कर दो। स्पष्ट है कि उनके दिमाग में थागला रिज के बारे में कोई सन्देह नहीं था। लेकिन जहाँ से चीन का आक्रमण आरम्भ हुआ आज वहीं उस आक्रमण के सामने हम सिर झुकाने जा रहे हैं। हमारे लिये थागला रिज भारत के नक्शे पर एक बिन्दु नहीं है, थागला रिज किसी जमीन के टुकड़े का नाम नहीं है, थागला रिज एक सिद्धांत का प्रतीक है और वह सिद्धांत यह है कि हम हथियारों के बल पर किसी देश द्वारा सीमा को बदलने के प्रयत्नों के सामने सिर नहीं झुकायेंगे। मुझे बड़े दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों में थागला रिज में सेना न भेजने के अधिकार को स्वीकार करके आप उस सिद्धांत की हत्या कर रहे हैं जिसकी आपने सदन में दुहाई दी है, सदन के बाहर दुहाई दी है। हम थागला रिज में अपनी सेना न भेजें, यह हम कैसे मान सकते हैं? थागला रिज को विवाद

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

का विषय बनाया जाय, यह हम कैसे मान सकते हैं ? हम इस सिद्धांत को कैसे छोड़ सकते हैं कि यदि किसी भी विवाद को बल प्रयोग से हल करने का यत्न किया गया, तो हम उसका विरोध करेंगे ? मगर क्या कोई इससे इन्कार करसकता है कि कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव हमसे यही कहते हैं । हमारे प्रतिनिधि जब चीन के प्रतिनिधियों से बातचीत करने जायेंगे, तो वे क्या मुंह ले करके थांगला रिज के बारे में बात करेंगे । चीन तो यह कहता है कि उसने नेफा में इस लिये सेनायें भेजी क्योंकि भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था कि थांगला रिज में जो चीनी घुस आये हैं उनको निकाल दो । कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव उसी थांगला रिज को विवाद का विषय बनाना चाहते हैं, वे हमारी सैनिक कार्रवाई का उपहास उड़ाना चाहते हैं, वे हमें गलत स्थिति में रखने जा रहे हैं और हमने इन प्रस्तावों को मान लिया है ।

अब मैं लद्दाख की बात करूंगा । उस क्षेत्र में हमारी ४३ चौकियां थीं । चीन की भी चौकियां थीं । अब कहा जाता है कि चीन २० किलोमीटर पीछे हट जायेगा । कहां पीछे हट जायेगा ? भारत की भूमि में पीछे हट जायेगा और इसे बड़ा सन्तोष का विषय बना कर पेश किया जा रहा है कि चीन २० किलोमीटर हट जायगा । जैसे यह बहुत बड़ी बात हो जायेगी ? जैसे चीन अपने इलाके में चला जायेगा और हमसे कहा जा रहा है कि हमको २० किलोमीटर पीछे नहीं हटना है, हमारे हटने का सवाल ही कहां पैदा होता है ? हां, चीन हमको २० किलोमीटर पीछे हटाना चाहता है और उसको हमने ठुकरा दिया । कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के अन्तर्गत जिस भूमि से चीन २० किलोमीटर पीछे हटेगा वहां हम अपनी सेना नहीं भेज सकते । हम अपनी भूमि पर अपनी सेना भजने का अधिकार छोड़ रहे हैं । वह हम कैसे छोड़ सकते हैं ? यह हमारी "घाबरेनटी" का सवाल है, यह हमारी राष्ट्रीय

प्रभुसत्ता का सवाल है । असैनिक क्षेत्रों में दोनों देशों के चैकपोस्ट्स होंगे । कहां होंगे ? चीन हमारी छाती पर चैकपोस्ट बनायेगा । कल विधि मंत्री ने कहा, चीनी तो वहां पहले भी मौजूद थे । हमारी मर्जी से नहीं थे, हमारे विरोध के बावजूद थे । हमने उनका उपस्थिति को स्वीकार नहीं किया, क्योंकि हम कभी यह स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते कि हमारी भूमि पर उनके चैकपोस्ट रहें । मगर कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव हमसे यही कह रहे हैं । वे कह रहे हैं कि हम अपनी सेना न भजें, अपनी भूमि में अपनी सेना न भजें और अपनी भूमि में चीन के चैकपोस्ट्स को बनाना मंजूर कर लें । उन चैकपोस्ट्स में कितने आदमी हों, वे चैकपोस्ट्स कहां बनें, उन सिपाहियों के पास कैसे हथियार हों—हम इसकी चर्चा करें चीनियों से जाकर । हम कहें कि आप हमारी भूमि में रहिये मगर कृपा करके आप यह बताइये कि आपके पास हथियार कैसे होंगे, मेहरदबानी करके आप बताइये कि आपके आदमी कितने होंगे । यह कौन से सिद्धान्त का प्रतिपादन है ? जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा और गृह मंत्री ने इस सदन में दुहराया कि ८ सितम्बर की सीमा रेखा, ८ सितम्बर से पूर्व की स्थिति कायम होनी चाहिये—यह कम से कम शर्त है—तो क्या इसका मतलब यह नहीं था कि ८ सितम्बर की सीमा रेखा तक चीन जो भूमि खाली करके चला जायेगा वहां अब हम को अपनी सेना भजने का अधिकार होगा । यह अधिकार आज छोड़ा जा रहा है । जो कम से कम शर्त थी उससे सरकार और कांग्रेस पार्टी हट रही है और हमको कहा जा रहा है कि यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है ।

यह पूछा जाता है कि यदि हम कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को नहीं मानेंगे तो क्या होगा ? मैं इसका उत्तर देना चाहता हूं । नहीं मानेंगे तो क्या होगा—कहते हैं कि चीन फिर हमला कर देगा ।

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Who said that?

**श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी :** मैं नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। जब हमको यह बात समझाई गई और समझाने की कोशिश की गई कि हम कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार कर लें तो हमसे कहा गया कि अगर हम कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव नहीं मानेंगे तो चीन फिर हमला कर देगा।

**श्री ए० के० सेन :** किसने कहा ?

**श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी :** चीन फिर हमला कर देगा—क्या इसलिये हम घुटने टेक दें ? क्या कोई इन्कार कर सकता है कि इन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करने के पीछे एक भय की भावना है कि चीन फिर हमला कर देगा। जब हम चीन के साथ ८ सितम्बर से पहले बातचीत करने जा रहे थे तब भी तो चीन ने हमला कर दिया था। यह क्या गारंटी है कि हम बात करने के लिए "निगोशियेटिंग टेबिल" पर बैठ जायेंगे, तो चीन हमला नहीं करेगा। भारत सरकार तो ८ सितम्बर के पहले बात करने के लिये तैयार थी मगर चीन ने फिर हमला कर दिया और इसलिये हम ने कहा कि हम तब तक बात नहीं करेंगे जब तक कि नया हमला खाली नहीं होगा और आज कहा जा रहा है कि नया हमला तो पूरी तरह से खाली नहीं हुआ मगर कुछ लीपा-पोती हुई है और अब बात करो और अगर कहा जाता है कि बात नहीं करेंगे तो क्या होगा तो कहा जाता है कि बात नहीं करेंगे तो वह हमला कर देगा।

मेरा निवेदन है कि चीन अब भारत पर फिर हमला नहीं करेगा। इसलिये कि आज हमारी स्थिति पहले से अच्छी है, आज हम जागरूक हैं, आज हमारी सेना शस्त्रों से सज्ज है, आज नये सुरक्षा मंत्री हैं, नये सेनापति हैं, आज हमारे मित्र हमें मदद देने के लिये आतुर हैं और जैसा कि कल कांग्रेस की तरफ से कहा गया कि अब तो चीन कम्युनिस्ट पुट में भी अकेला पड़ रहा है। मतलब यह

कि चीन की स्थिति बिगड़ रही है। जब चीन की स्थिति बिगड़ रही है, तो वह हमला कैसे करेगा ? जब हम आक्रमण में ग्रस्त थे, जब हमारे जवानों को एक के बाद एक चौकी छोड़नी पड़ रही थी, जब हम जिन्दगी और मौत की लड़ाई में फंसे हुए थे, जब कम्युनिस्ट देश मुंह पर ताला डाल कर बैठे हुए थे और जब पश्चिमी मित्रों की सहायता हमको मिली नहीं थी तब भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने ४४ करोड़ जनता की शक्ति के बल पर कहा कि ८ सितम्बर की सेना सीमा रेखा कम से कम शर्त है। तब हम लड़ाई में फंसे थे, आज तो चीनी सेनायें नेफा से वापस जा चुकी हैं, अब तो आपके कहने के अनुसार कम्युनिस्ट चीन कम्युनिस्ट देशों में भी अकेला पड़ गया है, आज तो हम जाग गये हैं अतः आज चीन के हमले का उतना डर नहीं है।

लकिन अगर चीन हमला करेगा, तो स्पष्ट है कि हमें उसका सामना करना होगा। चीन के हमले को टालने का यह तरीका नहीं है कि हम दांतों में तिनका दबा कर आक्रमणकारी के साथ बात करने के लिये चले जायें। हम बात करने के खिलाफ नहीं हैं लेकिन हम बात अगर नहीं करते तो मैं यह मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि हम कोई असभ्यता का प्रदर्शन करते हैं। मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा है, मुझे पता चला है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि चीन से बात न करना असभ्यता होगी। यह कौन सी सभ्यता का पाठ हमें पढ़ाया जा रहा है ? कामरेड खुश्चेव ने—जो प्रेसिडेंट आइज़नहोवर से पेरिस में मिलने के लिये तैयार हो गये थे—प्रेसिडेंट आइज़नहोवर से मिलने से इन्कार कर दिया क्योंकि अमेरिका ने रूस में जासूसी करने के लिये अपना हवाई जहाज भेजा था और प्रेसिडेंट आइज़नहोवर और ब्रिटेन के प्रधानमंत्री पेरिस में बैठे रहे कामरेड खुश्चेव की प्रतीक्षा करते हुए और कामरेड खुश्चेव ने कहा कि मैं बात नहीं करूंगा। तब किसी भाई के लाल ने नहीं कहा कि कामरेड खुश्चेव

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

ने असभ्यता दिखाई। आज हमें सभ्यता का पाठ पढ़ाया जाता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर असभ्य बनने और मर्द रहने में चुनाव करना, होगा, तो मैं मर्द रहना ज्यादा पसन्द करूँगा चाहे जो भी हो। चीन से बात हम आज भी कर रहे हैं...

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ (दिल्ली) :  
प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने पहले भी कहा था...

श्री चन्द्र शंखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : औरत की नहीं बात है।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी :... चीन के साथ चिट्ठी-पत्र चल रही है, चीन के साथ पत्र-व्यवहार चल रहा है। जो पीकिंग में हमारे प्रतिनिधि हैं वे चीन के प्रधान मंत्री से, विदेश मंत्री से, मिलते रहते हैं, उनके साथ खड़े हो कर फोटो खिंचवाते हैं। जब हमारी सेनायें देश की स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा की कीमत अपने रक्त से चुका रही थीं, तो पीकिंग में बैठे हुए भारत के प्रतिनिधि आक्रमणकारी देश के प्रधान मंत्री, विदेश मंत्री के साथ खड़े हो कर फोटो खिंचवाते थे और फिर वह फोटो दिल्ली के अखबारों में बड़े गर्व के साथ छपा गया। मेरा निवेदन है कि बातें तो आप कर रहे हैं। जो नई दिल्ली में चीन का प्रतिनिधि है उसे भी दावत दी जा रही है, उसके भी कंबे पर हाथ रख कर यह विश्वास दिलाया जा रहा है कि पिछले १० साल के अनुभव से हम कुछ सीखने को तैयार नहीं हैं और अपनी गलतियों को भी हम भूलने को तैयार नहीं हैं। कहा जाता है कि इतिहास एक ही शिक्षा देता है कि इतिहास कोई शिक्षा नहीं देता—भारत और चीन के सम्बन्धों का इतिहास भी क्या यही शिक्षा देता है?

एक बात और कही जाती है कि अगर हमने कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार नहीं

किया, तो ये जो तटस्थ देश हैं ये हमसे दूर चले जायेंगे। मैं इस बात की कोई सम्भावना नहीं देखता। जो मध्यस्थता करते हैं वे किसी से नाराज होने की गलती नहीं कर सकते। अगर उनका एक प्रयत्न सफल नहीं होगा, तो वह दूसरा प्रयत्न करेंगे। अगर एक पक्ष उनकी बात नहीं मानेगा, तो वह ऐसे प्रस्ताव रखेंगे जिससे कि वह पक्ष उनकी बात मान ले। यह समझने का कोई कारण नहीं है कि अगर हम उनसे कहें कि हम बंधे हुए हैं देश को दिये गये वचन के साथ और इस संसद् में हमने जो प्रतिज्ञा ली थी उस प्रतिज्ञा के साथ—कि हम से कम शर्त जब तक पूरी नहीं होगी तब तक बात नहीं हो सकती है—तो वे हम से दूर चले जायेंगे। मगर मुझे लगता है कि कोलम्बो प्रतिनिधियों को यह समझाने की कोशिश नहीं की गई। जो देश का अपमान हुआ है, जो हमारी पराजय हुई है और उस अपमान की, पराजय की जो आग आज हमारे अंतःकरणों में धधक रही है उसकी एक चिनगारी कोलम्बो प्रतिनिधियों को भी स्पर्श कर सके, इसकी कोशिश नहीं की गई। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा—जब रात का भोजन हो रहा था कि “India has been humiliated to some extent”। यह “to some extent humiliation” क्या होता है? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि पूरा “ह्यूमिलियेशन” कब होगा? भारत के प्रधान मंत्री इस “humiliation” को “to some extent humiliation” कहते हैं तो कोलम्बो प्रोपोजल्स भी “to some extent” हमारी “minimum conditions” को पूरा करते हैं।

मैं कोलम्बो देशों को दोष नहीं देना चाहता, यद्यपि मुझे शिकायत है कि उन्होंने चीन को आक्रमणकारी नहीं कहा। मिस्र पर जब आक्रमण हुआ, अगर उस समय में हम

ब्रिटेन और फ्रांस को आक्रमणकारी कहने के बजाय, आक्रमणकारी में और जिस पर आक्रमण हुआ है उसमें मध्यस्थता करने की बात करते, तो प्रेसिडेंट नासिर और मित्र की स्वामिमानी जनता की प्रतिक्रिया क्या होती, यह बतलाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मगर भारत के प्रधान मंत्री की प्रतिक्रिया अलग है, वह अपमान को भुलाने के लिये तैयार दिखाई देते हैं।

सब से बड़ी बात तो कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को मानने से होगी वह यह है कि आक्रमण सीमा-विवाद से बदल जायेगा। चीनी यही तो चाहते हैं। चीनी अपने आक्रमण पर पर्दा डालना चाहते हैं और चीन दुनिया को यह दिखाना चाहता है कि भारत के साथ हमारा सीमा विवाद है। और भारत के स्वाभिमान और हित का तकाजा यह है कि हम इस सीमा-विवाद को आक्रमण के रूप में कायम रखें, इसको सीमा-विवाद में न बदले दें। भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने दुनिया के सब राष्ट्रों के प्रमुखों के नाम जो पत्र लिखा था उसका एक अंश मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था —

"This is not a mere boundary dispute or a question of small territorial frontier adjustments. Apart from the vast and fantastic claims that China has made, China had already occupied 12,000 square miles of Indian territory during the last five years. While notes were being exchanged for arranging talks and discussions to ease tensions and even dates and places were being suggested, further aggression by China started on 8th September and further areas of Indian territory were occupied in a new sector. The issue involved is not one of small territorial gains, one or the other, but of standards of international behaviour between neighbouring countries and whether the world will allow the principle of 'Might

is Right' to prevail in international relations."

हमने कहा, यह सीमा का विवाद नहीं। यह आक्रमण है। अगर हम कोलम्बो सम्मेलन के प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार कर लें, तो आक्रमण पीछे पड़ जाता है, सीमा-विवाद सामने आ जाता है।

८ सितम्बर से पहले सरकार कहती थी कि हम बात तो करेंगे मगर बात करने में तनाव कम करने के उपायों पर विचार करने के लिए, हम "टाक्स" करेंगे "निगो-शिएन्स" नहीं करेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, क्या आज वह स्थिति कायम है? क्या कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को मानने के बाद वह स्थिति कायम रह सकती है? कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव कहते हैं कि युद्ध विराम को स्थायी बना कर चीन से बात करिये सीमा-विवाद के बारे में। यदि वार्ता के आरम्भ में हमने कहा कि पहले आप साग आक्रमण हटाइए तब हम बात करेंगे, तो यह कोलम्बो देश हम से कहेंगे कि तुम समझौता नहीं चाहते, और तब उनकी दृष्टि में हम लड़ाई को उत्तेजन देने वाले बन जायेंगे और इस प्रकार हम उसी चाल में फँस जायेंगे जिसमें चीन हमको फँसाना चाहता है।

दूसरी बात यह होगी कि जो युद्ध-विराम रेखा हमने मानी नहीं है वह स्थायी हो जायेगी चीन यही तो चाहता है। चीन आज नेफा पर कब्जा करना नहीं चाहता। चीन ने तो नेफा में हमारी सीमा रेखा को मानने का वायदा किया था अगर हम लद्दाख में उसके आक्रमण के सामने सिर झुका देते। मगर हमने लद्दाख में हमले के सामने सिर झुकाना अस्वीकार कर दिया, तो इस का बदला उसने लिया नेफा में। और आज यही तो ही रहा है कि सारा लद्दाख विवादग्रस्त हो गया है और अगर हम बातचीत की टबिल पर बैठ कर कहेंगे कि तनाव कम करने के लिए यह जरूरी है कि पहले का "स्टेट्स को" रिसटोर करो। तो



[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

क्या हमें इसमें कोलम्बो देशों का समर्थन मिलेगा ? नहीं मिलेगा, क्योंकि वे तो हमसे आशा करेंगे कि हम सीमा विवाद को हल करें ?

आज तक चीन के साथ बात करने का इतिहास क्या है ? जब जब हमने चीन से बात की है चीन की मांगों पर, तो चीन की आक्रमणकारी प्रवृत्ति को बढ़ावा मिला है । हम ८ सितम्बर, से पहले बात करने को तैयार थे कि उसने नया हमला कर दिया । जब जब हम बात करने जाते हैं, वे नया दावा करते हैं, उनकी सीमाएं आगे बढ़ती हैं और आगे बढ़ने वाली सीमाओं के साथ सेनाएं आगे बढ़ती हैं । हृदय पर हाथ रख कर प्रधान मंत्री या विधि मंत्री बतलाएं कि जिस चीन पर उनका विश्वास नहीं था क्या कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव ने उस चीन की कायापलट कर दी है ? वह विश्वासघाती क्या अब अपने शब्दों पर चलने वाला चीन बन गया है ? क्या चीन का हृदय-परिवर्तन हो गया है ? चीन तो पहले से हमें बातचीत की टेबिल पर घसीटना चाहता है । हम लडाई के मैदान में हार गए मगर हमन हार मानी नहीं है । लेकिन अगर हम कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को मान लेंगे, तो हम अपनी हार भी मान लेंगे ।

हम कोलम्बो शक्तियों से बड़ आदर के साथ कह सकते हैं कि हम तो चप्पा-चप्पा भारत की भूमि को चीन के चंगुल से मुक्त कराने की प्रतिज्ञा से बंध हुए हैं । यह लोकतन्त्रवादी देश है, इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री को जनता की भावना का आदर करना होगा । और फिर, हम यह भी कह सकते हैं कि हमारी कम से कम शर्त जो थी, ८ सितम्बर के पूर्व की स्थिति कायम होने की, वह भी पूरी नहीं होती । चीनी थागलारिज से हट जाये लडाख खाली कर दे और जो क्षेत्र चीनी खाली करें उनमें हमें अपनी सेनाएं भेजने का अधिकार हो । हम अपनी भूमि पर चीनी चौकियों का रहना मजूर

नहीं कर सकते । इसके बाद जो बात होगी वह यही होगी कि तनाव कम करने के लिए चीन सारा इलाका खाली करके चला जाय । लेकिन कहा जाता है कि यदि चीन ने सारी भूमि छोड़ दी, तो बात क्या होगी ? मानो शत्रु के साथ बात बिना किए हम अपनी परम्परा के प्रतिकूल जाते हुए दिखाई देते हैं। चीन के साथ बात हो सके इसलिए उसके कब्जे में कुछ जमीन छोड़ना जरूरी है। मेरा निवेदन है, अगर चीन सारी जमीन खाली कर दे, तो भी बातचीत करने के लिए चीन के दाव रह जाते हैं ? चीन दावा रखे, चीन नक्शे लाए, चीन दस्तावेज पेश करें, चीन अपना मामला रखे, हमारी सीमा पर अगर चीन का दावा है, तो उस दावे को रखे, हम चर्चा करेंगे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा, हम मध्यस्थता के लिए तैयार हैं। चीन भूमि खाली करके चला जाये और दावे रखे । चीन ने दावा नहीं किया, बलप्रयोग किया और बलप्रयोग द्वारा हमसे अपना दावा मनवाना चाहता है और कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार कर हम उसे मानते जा रहे हैं । अपने को धोका देना ठीक नहीं है । यह स्वीकार करने में कांग्रेस के सदस्यों को सकोच नहीं होना चाहिय कि एक बार कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करके हम बातचीत की टेबिल पर चले गये, तो सारे आक्रमण को खाली करने की बात नहीं उठ सकती और अगर उठी भी, तो बात टूट जायगी। बात अगर टूट जायगी, तो चीन के हमले को उत्तजना मिलेगी और कोलम्बो देशों की सहानुभूति चीन के साथ होगी । इसलिए आज मौका है कि हम कहे यह प्रस्ताव हमारे अनुकूल नहीं है ।

इसका एक व्यावहारिक पहलू भी है । ससद् ने प्रतिज्ञा ली है कि जब तक आक्रमणकारी को पूरी तरह से निकाला नहीं जायेगा हम चैन से नहीं बैठेंगे । यह दूरगामी दृष्टि है कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों पर विचार करने की । क्या कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करके चीन के साथ बातचीत आरम्भ करने के बाद,

चीन के आक्रमण को अन्तिम रूप से समाप्त करने के लिये जैसी तैयारी चाहिये वैसी तैयारी चल सकती है ? हम जरा हृदय पर हाथ रख कर बताये ? यह कहना काफी नहीं है कि चलना चाहिये । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने मुख्य मंत्रियों को चिट्ठी लिखी है कि युद्ध प्रयत्नों में ढिलाई नहीं आनी चाहिये । सब नेता यही कहते हैं कि शिथिलता नहीं आनी चाहिये । मगर हम सब जानते हैं कि शिथिलता आ रही है, जब से युद्ध विराम हुआ है तभी से आ रही है । बातचीत शुरू हो गई तब तो जनता के उत्साह पर पानी फिर जायगा, लोगो का मनोबल टूट जायेगा, नेता को सकल्य को धक्का लगाया और जो हमारा अन्तिम उद्देश्य है उसकी पूर्ति में यह कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव बाधक बन कर खड़े हो जायेग ।

अभी ही माग की जा रही है कि “इमर-जेसी” खत्म कर दे । हमारे गृह मंत्री जी यहां बैठ हुए हैं । वह जरा विचार करे कि सकट की स्थिति खत्म कर देने से क्या हम पूर्व स्थिति पर नहीं चले जायेंगे । क्योंकि जब लड़ाई नहीं हो रही है और बातचीत चलने लगगी प्रयत्नों को उस गति में नहीं चलाया जा सकता है जिस गति से चलाना आवश्यक होगा और इसलिये इस उद्देश्य की दृष्टि से, कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव हमारे युद्ध प्रयत्नों को द्रुत गति से चलाने के मार्ग में बाधक है । साथ ही उनसे, जो समझ ने प्रतिज्ञा की है, वह पूरी नहीं की जा सकती । तात्कालिक दृष्टि से हम चीन के चंगुल में फंस जाते हैं । अतः मैं नहीं समझ सकता कि किस दृष्टि से कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करने की बात की जा रही है ?

केवल विवेकानन्द जन्म शताब्दी जयन्ती के दिन रामलीला मदान में जनता को यह कहना कि वह अभय का परिचय दे, काफी नहीं है । आज भारत का नतुत्व भी कसौटी पर कसा जा रहा है कि वह अभय का परिचय दे सकता है या नहीं और अभय की माग यह है कि हम किसी

भी अपमानजनक शर्तों पर चीन से बातचीत नहीं प्रारम्भ कर सकते । चीन जो चाहता है, यह प्रस्ताव उस की इच्छा के अनुकूल है, हमारे अनुकूल नहीं है । चीन ने उन्हें सिद्धान्ततः स्वीकार कर लिया, मगर हम ने सिद्धान्ततः स्वीकार क्यों किया ? चीन ने तो किसी रेखा के कायम किये जाने की माग नहीं की थी । हमने की थी । फिर भी चीन अड़गा लगा रहा है और चीन की अड़गेबाजी से इन प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करने के लिये हमारा उत्साह बढ़ता जा रहा है यह बड़ आश्चर्य की बात है । चीन इन प्रस्तावों को इसलिए नहीं मान रहा क्योंकि चीन समझता है कि अगर दबाव डाला जायगा, तो शायद और अच्छी शर्तें मिल जायें ।

यद्यपि वह जानता है कि उसका मीमिन उद्देश्य तो पूरा हो गया, उसने लड़ाई के मैदान में हम को पराजित कर के अपनी सैनिक शक्ति की धाक बैठा दी । कोलम्बो देशों ने तटस्थ देशों ने जब चीन को आक्रमणकारी नहीं कहा, तो एक दृष्टि से चीन ने कूटनीति के मदान में हमको पराजित कर दिया । अब केवल इतना बाकी है कि हम अपनी हार न मानें । कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करने का अर्थ होगा भारत की सार्वभौमसत्ता, भारत की स्वतन्त्रता, भारत की अखंडता, भारत का सम्मान, इन सब को आह्वन करना ।

पूछा जाता है कि हम क्या करें, हमें समय चाहिये । यह वे लोग कहते हैं जिनको दस साल का समय मिला और जो कल्पना के लोक में विचरण करते रहे, जिन्होंने न देश को सैनिक दृष्टि से तैयार नहीं किया । खैर, हम पुरानी बात भूल भी जाय, तो हमें समय चाहिये, यह सच है । लेकिन क्या हम यह समझते हैं कि हम ने कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को ठुकरा दिया, तो चीन हम पर एक दम हमला कर देगा ? हमारा ऐसा समझना गलत है । अभी समय है । उसे पिछले दो महीनों में समय मिला है और आगे भी दो महीने का समय मिलना है और मुझे आशंका होती है कि शायद वह सिक्रिम

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी.]

मे, भूटान में और उत्तर प्रदेश की सीमा पर गड़बड़ करने की कोशिश करेगा। आखिर तिब्बत में सेना क्यों इकट्ठी की जा रही है, हथियारों का सग्रह क्यों किया जा रहा है, ये सड़को का जाल क्यों बिछाया जा रहा है, ये हवाई जहाज किस लिए, जमा किये जा रहे हैं? यह चीन का विकराल सैनिक दानव अपने विशाल पजों को किस के लिए तिब्बत में पैना कर रहा है? कोलम्बो देशों ने इस चीन की प्रचण्ड सैनिक तैयारी से उत्पन्न सकट की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया। मगर हमें तो *आप्त जेतो चाहिये, हमें तो यह देखना चाहिये* कि जो समय हम चाहते हैं, वह समय चीन को भी मिलेगा। और अभी तक का अनुभव यह है कि जो समय मिलता है, उस का चीन खूब फायदा उठाता है, और हम नहीं उठाते हैं। हमें आशा करनी चाहिये कि अब हम को नया अनुभव होगा। लेकिन तैयारी तब तक नहीं होगी जब तक कि चीन के साथ संघर्ष जारी नहीं रहेगा। इस समय हमारे देश में जैसा जोश है उसे हमें समझना चाहिये, हमारे देशवासी जिस मिट्टी के बने हैं हमें उसे पहचानना चाहिये। पिछले १५ सालों से उन्हें एक शान्ति के वातावरण में पाला गया है और अगर वे फिर से असुवधान हो जायें तो हम उनको दोष नहीं दे सकते हैं। इस देश का शस्त्रीकरण तब ही हो सकता है, इस देश को आक्रमण का सामना करने के लिए तब ही तैयार किया जा सकता है जब हम कही भी, किसी भी प्रकार से झुकने से इन्कार कर दें। इसमें कोई असंभ्यता नहीं है, इस में कोई शान्ति की नीति के खिलाफ कार्यवाही नहीं है। हमें क्रुद्ध होने का, हमें अपमानित अनुभव करने का अधिकार है, और यदि हम कोलम्बो देशों को यह समझा नहीं सके तो इस के लिए मैं उन्हें दोष नहीं देना चाहता। जो समझा नहीं सके मैं उनको दोषी समझता हूँ। लेकिन अभी मौका है, हारी हुई बाजी को वापस लिया जा सकता है। चीन ने अभी कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को

पूरी तरह माना नहीं है। यह खाली "इन्टरप्र-डेशन" का सवाल नहीं है, चीन के विदेश मंत्री "अमेडमेट" की बात कर रहे हैं। यह पुराना अनुभव है, जब जब हम चीन के साथ बातचीत करने के लिए टेबिल पर बैठे तब तब उन्होंने नई बात शुरू की, तब तब उन्होंने ने झगडा शुरू किया और उस झगड़े को पूरा करने के लिए वे सेना को मैदान में लाये। आज फिर से यही होगा और मुझे इस बात से शतोष है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी इस सदन से, संसद् से, कोलम्बो के प्रस्तावों को मनवाने का प्रयत्न नहीं कर रही है। इसलिए हमने भी उन्हें *इकट्ठाने का कोई आधिकारिक प्रस्ताव नहीं* दिया है। लेकिन विवाद से स्पष्ट हो गया है कि कोलम्बो के प्रस्ताव के बारे में देश एकमत नहीं है। मुझे विश्वास है कि कोई भी अन्तिम निर्णय करने से पहले प्रधान मंत्री इस बात को ध्यान में रखेंगे कि देश की एकता कायम करने के लिए देश के मनोबल को बनाने रखने के लिये और इस अपमान की आग को जलाये रखने के लिए, जो अपमान हमें भुगतना पड़ रहा है, यह आवश्यक है कि कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों के सम्बन्ध में शासन अपने दृष्टिकोण पर पुनर्विचार करे और चीन की चाल में न फँसे। हमें "निगोशिएशन टेबिल" पर घसीटने की जो कोशिश हो रही है, हम उसको विफल बना दें और सेना के द्वारा, कूटनीति के द्वारा भारत की पराजय को विजय में बदलने का एक नया अभियान आरम्भ करे। भारत के प्रधान मंत्री इस बात के लिये तैयार है तो हम उन के साथ हैं। लेकिन अगर वे दुर्बलता दिखायायेंगे, ढिलाई दिखायायेंगे, अगर भारत के स्वाभिमान के प्रतिकूल जाने वाली कोई बात करेंगे तो हम उनके साथ नहीं हैं। और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को मानकर कभी चीन के प्रधान मंत्री से बातचीत करने के लिए कोलम्बो जाने की तैयारी दिखालाई तो उन्हें हमारी छाती पर पैर रख कर कोलम्बो जाना होगा।

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir very brave speeches have been delivered by the esteemed Leaders of the Opposition. One after another they have suggested that there should be no talk with China and that India should not sit round a table along with China which is an aggressor, unless the recent aggression committed by China is vacated and unless the one post in Thagla Ridge and two posts in Ladakh are reoccupied by the Indian forces. It is indeed very patriotic and noble of the Leaders of the Opposition to suggest these measures. Indeed, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Law Minister also here in this House have suggested that unless China agrees in toto with the Colombo proposals, along with the interpretations of the Colombo Powers, there is absolutely no occasion for the Government of India to sit round a table with China for any kind of discussions even though these discussions are going to be only preliminary. Now, after having said that, quite a few objections have been raised against negotiations themselves. It has been said, for instance, that the enthusiasm of the people and the Government will flag as soon as we try to sit round a table with China to negotiate even on the preliminaries, without prejudging any issues, without committing ourselves to anything.

It has also been said that our friends, the Anglo-Americans, who have helped us in this emergency will become very angry with us and perhaps their enthusiasm for helping us might also flag.

It is indeed a strange world in which we are living, because the same Leaders of the Opposition, not only in this House but also outside, have been pressurising the Government to sit round a table with Pakistan which has also aggressed upon our territory. Only recently 2,500 square miles of our territory in Kashmir have been surrendered by

Pakistan to China and not a word of protest has emanated from these esteemed Leaders of the Opposition.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): All sorts of things are being attributed to us.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): We protest against baseless charges.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: That shows the weakness of their case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think your shoulders are broad enough.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: But tradition demands that only truthful statements should be made in the House and not all sorts of allegations made here.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): We cannot go to the rescue of the Government with all their weaknesses.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Secondly, Pakistan is still occupying one-third of the territory of Jammu and Kashmir. It has refused to vacate the aggression. It has refused to sign a no-war declaration with us. It has refused to join hands with us against China even if we compromise with them on Kashmir. All kinds of suggestions about Kashmir have been made by the same Anglo-American friends who, our esteemed friends of the Opposition say will become very angry with us if we sit round a table with China. In the "Washington Post" there was a statement by Prof. Galbraith, the American Ambassador, that they have warned India that unless India comes to a settlement with Pakistan over the issue of Kashmir, the long-range assistance that is envisaged by the United States to this country might be jeopardised. Secondly, the British friends who were very generous in the days of the emergency have also started giving away their aeroplanes to China, though they have

[Dr. Gopa] Singh.]

said that it is only a commercial deal. Our friends in Canada and Australia are selling wheat to China. That of course is to feed them and not to arm them, but certainly better fed people will fight better. Then, the United States has also been negotiating with Russia and China over all kinds of things in Geneva, Korea and elsewhere. Therefore, we do not think that our friends, the Anglo-Americans, will misunderstand us if we also agree to sit round a table with China once the main demand that was put forward by the Prime Minister of India, namely that the Chinese vacate their recent aggression and go back to the 8th September line, is conceded by China. I hope that the Colombo Powers will make another attempt if this attempt fails to make the Chinese realise the gravity of the situation and make them agree to withdraw to the 8th September line so that we can sit round a table with them and discuss the preliminaries and not the merits of the case. It is only to lessen the tensions that the Prime Minister has said that we want to go and sit round a table with China. Now, we have been told that we should not sit round a table with China because China does not believe in co-existence, China does not believe in non-alignment and China believes in war to settle international problems.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

That is exactly why we should sit round a table with China and not fall into her trap which she has laid for us to defeat all our principles and objectives. It is for this very reason that we should sit round a table with China once our demand, that they withdraw to the 8th September line, is conceded by them. If they do not believe in co-existence, if they want us to abandon our policy of non-alignment, if they want us to settle every international problem through war, then it is for us to stand up against it, yes, for us who have been preaching to the whole world not only after independence but also before that that

all international problems should be settled through negotiations, through peaceful discussions, that there is room for every kind of philosophy to exist in this world, that there is room for co-existence, that there is room for people who are non-aligned to exist, that those people who are non-aligned and who do not fall into one camp or another have a right to exist. It is only if we want to fall into the trap of China that we should refuse to negotiate.

I do not say that we should negotiate from a point of weakness, that we should negotiate to surrender, far from it. But even if we have to fight, even if we have to wage a war against them to win a point, then diplomacy is also a weapon of war. If we can keep the enemy talking for some time and prepare in the meanwhile, it will help us as much, if not more than if we were to strike at once to gain one or two points which might be gained through negotiations or through friendly mediation. It is a great diplomatic victory indeed for us that China which had aggressed against our territory had also vacated that territory more or less on its own initiative. It is China which ceased fire on its own initiative. It is China which withdrew from our territory. It is China which asked us to negotiate and sit round a table with her, while we refused, and it is the non-aligned nations sitting in Colombo who gathered together to find a *via media* and to bring round the table the contending powers. It is, therefore, a great victory for us, a diplomatic victory for us such as has never been witnessed before in history.

Mr. A. D. Mani yesterday averred that the Chinese vacated our territory out of contempt for us. I dispute this point. No one in history so far has vacated anybody's territory out of contempt for the victim. It is because their supply line had been lengthened and there was an immediate fear of counter-attack it is because the Soviet Union had twisted the ears of China, it is because China had been isolated,

It is because China had earned nothing but ill-fame throughout the world and especially amongst the non-aligned countries, not only amongst the Western Powers but also amongst the Communist powers, that China withdrew from our territory and sought negotiations. It is not out of pity for us. Some people think that we have been defeated. I must say that such people alone are defeated in their own spirit. It is not the nation that has been defeated. In Ladakh, for instance, we stood our ground firmly. In Walong we repulsed fifteen assaults of the enemy one after another, and if in NEFA there were a few reverses, then these reverses have happened to almost any army in the world. Only if you go back to only twelve years, it happened in Korea; when General MacArthur wanted to cross the Yalu River, his forces were surrounded and cut off. Similarly, if we have been surrounded and cut off at places in NEFA, because we had to improvise everything in haste due to the sudden, unprovoked massive attack of the enemy, it does not mean that we have been defeated. We have only suffered a few reverses, and these reverses have been suffered by the best armies in the world. Therefore, there is no cause for defeatism amongst us, and there is every cause to be jubilant that the whole world has stood by us, not only the western nations but also the Communist countries, and that has been our greatest diplomatic victory, and we should rejoice in it rather than we should say that we have been defeated.

One word more about the Colombo proposals and I shall have done. The Manchester Guardian has in an editorial of the 22nd January said:

"These Proposals come far closer to India's demands than to China's. When the Chinese announced their cease-fire after having advanced in Ladakh and in NEFA, Peking demanded that neither side should have troops within 20 kilometers of the 'line of actual control'.

This would have left the upper region of the passes in NEFA undefended, and would have meant a further Indian withdrawal in Ladakh, so that the supply airfield at Chusul would be evacuated.

'The Indians would even have had to draw back from the middle sector where there had been no fighting.

Under the Colombo proposals, the Chinese are the only people asked to withdraw. The Indians may move up to the MacMahon Line in NEFA and stay where they are in the middle sector and in Ladakh."

Therefore, if as the Prime Minister has pointed out, the Chinese accept these proposals in toto along with the clarifications thereof, then there is absolutely no harm in our sitting round a table with China and discussing the preliminaries to reduce tensions. We are going to sit round a table without commitment, without prejudging any issue, without committing ourselves to any sort of stand or anything of the kind. We are only going to sit round a table to discuss the preliminaries, to remove tensions. That is all. Therefore, I think that all the shouting that has occurred on the Benches opposite would subside if they view the situation from the national standpoint and not from the opposition standpoint or from a party standpoint.

Thank you very much, Madam.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa):** It is not shouting. It is reasonable argument.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Madam Deputy Chairman, I heard with rapt attention the speech made by the leader of the Jan Sangh Party, Mr. Vajpayee. I wondered whether he was sitting in the Parliament of our country or in the Council of the NATO Powers or the Pentagon, because this kind of approach to problems of peace and war and international problems is sometimes heard where the NATO Generals meet and discuss their problems. But fortunately for the country,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

we are not given to such bellicose postures that we do not recognise the changes in the situation in order to formulate what should be the right course for the country which is peace-loving and has not, to our everlasting glory, given up that policy. But then it is not so with Mr. Vajpayee. Because the forces of reaction, we have seen, always flourish on tension, on crisis, on confusion and even to a great extent on military jingoism. Well, I should have thought that our friends of the Praja-Socialist Party would have found a better company than Mr. Vajpayee and I was sad and hurt when I saw the P.S.P. Members applauding him more than the supporters of Mr. Vajpayee. But such is life.

May I, Madam Chairman, begin by paying our tribute to the great constructive efforts of Mrs. Bandaranaike and her colleagues in the Colombo Powers Conference because whatever happens, the efforts they have made shall be enshrined in the hearts of men and shall find a place in the pages of history in shining letters which neither condemnation nor derision will ever be able to efface. Already the Colombo efforts are part of history and down the ages these constructive efforts of so well-meanning a people will resound to the glory of man. I, therefore, fully join with the Government of India in its appreciation of the efforts of the Colombo Powers. Such are the things and responses that bring credit and glory to a country like ours. I do not know what is meant by humiliation or non-humiliation. Mr. Vajpayee was posing a question as to when the humiliation would be complete. First of all, I do not think we have suffered any humiliation because of the reverses. The cause for which we have stood is just and honourable and it is for the world to judge it. Some reverses here and there do not make a great nation humbled and humiliated in that manner. But I can tell you that the humiliation, if ever at all we have suffered, will be complete when Mr. Vajpayee and his friends get an upper hand in

the political life of the country. Only then will national humiliation, if at all we have suffered any, be complete. But I hope that never shall such a day come.

Now, as I pay a tribute to the Colombo Powers, I feel distressed that Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, who always disappears after making a speech, should have thought fit to cast aspersions on them and ridicule them. He asked: Who says they are Powers? Well, even in this small matter he seems to imitate the Americans. When the Soviet Union called India a great Power and wanted it to be at all the Summit Conferences, the American jingoists and reactionaries said, "Who says India is a great Power?" The same derision was seen at that time as we see today. I do not know what to call it. Shall I call it stupidity or great-nation chauvinism? I do not know what it is. Fortunately, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel does not represent the nation. Therefore, I would not put it as the great-nation chauvinism. What shall I call it? That is for the hon. Members to judge. Now, he forgot that Indonesia is one of the Powers with ten crores of population. How many Powers in the world have got a population of ten crores? And the population of Indonesia is twice as much as that of England. Yet to Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, Indonesia is not even a Power. Well, such is how the Pentagon speaks. Power means if you have nuclear weapons; power means if you have atomic armaments; power means if you can send your troops to other countries and conquer land after land. If that is the definition of power, we are not a Power in that sense. Yet we are a Power recognised by all people with a sense of realism and above all by one of the greatest Powers in the world, namely, the Soviet Union. Well, I dislike this kind of derision. As far as Mr. Mani is concerned, he has to make a speech and he makes a speech. And as I said, he is the honorary member of the Swantantra Party. I will deal with the Swantantra Party

later. Nobody takes note of the doctorate when you get it *honoris causa*. When you pass your examination, submit your thesis and get a doctorate, people take serious note of the degree but a *honoris causa* degree is not taken much notice of. I conclude that portion with gratitude and indeed the gratitude of all mankind to Mrs. Bandaranaike and her five other colleagues who participated in it. I think the Government of India did the very right thing by acknowledging it. It is what we have got before us and not other matters that is, the Colombo proposals and the clarifications. We are called upon in Parliament to pronounce what our views were about them, whether they were acceptable as the basis for talks or not. Certainly, they did not settle the border dispute. The leaders of the Colombo Powers' Conference have made it very clear, the proposals make it very clear. They are only meant to get the two countries together to the negotiating table. Now that there is cease-fire. After consolidating the cease-fire, we have to judge it from that angle. Now we have to judge that proposal in the light of the basic policies of our country in regard to the international problems including our own problems with other nations. What is our basic policy? Our basic policy is not one of war. If we are aggressed and attacked, certainly we must defend with all our might. That is why in November last when we discussed this question of Chinese aggression, all our thoughts went to the frontiers where our jawans were fighting with courage. All our ideas were concentrated on how best to build up the defence of the fighting front in order to resist that aggression. Today, are we to view this thing exactly in the same way? Had there been no changes in the situation. Statesmanship should address itself to the changed situation also. I do not say that the entire situation is radically changed but a certain new phase has arisen in the present situation, which is why we are discussing this matter. Today I think we should approach it from that angle. Our policy is a policy of peace and peaceful

pursuits. I think the Government of India was very right in the joint communique that was issued after the Prime Minister's talk with Mrs. Bandaranaike. The joint communique that was issued on the 13th January said:

"Consistent with their dedication to peace and peaceful methods and their firm policy to explore all possible avenues of peaceful settlement of differences, the Government of India welcomed these distinguished visitors and expressed their gratitude for the trouble taken by them in coming to Delhi to explain the Colombo Conference proposals."

I entirely agree with it. Any man in his good sense will agree with it. Now this is the approach of the Government of India. Therefore I think from that angle we have to judge it today. Then again, we have to judge it also from the point of view of certain conditions which we want to be created before the two countries could talk in view of the aggression that has taken place since 8th of September. Well, I shall come to that later. But here I would like to make one thing clear. The Chinese unilateral cease-fire proposals came and it is being made out by China as if India has given no positive response to it. I disagree with that viewpoint of the Chinese. India reciprocated the cease-fire proposal, even though it was unilateral, by the *de facto* acceptance of the cease-fire and the Prime Minister made statements in both Houses of Parliament immediately after that nothing would be done to hinder it. On the 10th of December in the other House and in this House on the 12th of December he again reiterated that the Government of India was accepting it *de facto*. I am mentioning the word '*de facto*' and I think it was a *de facto* positive response which the Chinese should have taken note of. Therefore it is not as if one side brought about the situation and the other side did not make any positive response. I say this thing in all seriousness, because I do not like anybody to misunderstand our position. China did



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

not consult India before her unilateral cease-fire proposal, but India reacted to it, not in the Jana Sangh way, not in the P.S.P. way, not in the Swatantra way, but in the way which is consistent with the basic moral and political policy of the Government of India, which we have always supported. It was a positive response that way.

Now these two developments, the cease-fire and the *de facto* acceptance of it, plus the Colombo Conference and their proposals have brought about the present situation which we are discussing here. But then, there are some people who, when once they open the umbrella during the rains, would not shut it even after the rains are over—I am not saying that the rains are over in the sense that the dispute is over. At that time there were military operations going on; the crucial thing was how to defend the country, how to unite the nation for that at once. Today, Sir, some other situation has posed itself before us. Are we not to respond to the changed situation? Or are we to reiterate the phrases that we used at that time, brandish the sword in the same way Mr. Vajpayee brandished it when he spoke in November last? No. This is no statesmanship; this is no good politics; this is no wisdom; this is certainly not the way a peace-loving nation, an honourable nation, a great nation like ours, should function. As such it has not functioned so far. This is what I want to say.

Then, Madam Deputy Chairman, one other point I want to make clear. Much has been made out of the 8th of September proposal's acceptance or rejection by Parliament. It has been almost made out in this House and the other House that Parliament was never committed to the Government of India's position with regard to the 8th September line. I say it is a deliberate misleading of the Parliament. I have studied the proceedings of both Houses of Parliament and presently I shall show you

how the Parliament stands committed to the acceptance of the Government position with regard to the 8th September line. I hope the Government will do it also, but since I agree with the Government let me have the privilege of doing it also.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: It is surprising that the Communist Leader has come to defend the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would indeed be in the company of Jawaharlal Nehru than in the company of Mr. Vajpayee. I can tell you that.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: You are in the company of Mr. Chou En-lai.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not think so. You may think in terms of Mr. Kennedy and somebody else. Am I speaking for Chou En-lai here?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Yes, yes. You have been speaking. (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please ask them to hold their souls in rest for a little while when I am dealing with a serious proposition. Is or is not Parliament committed to the 8th September position? This is a very crucial question which has been put and it has to be answered.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, on the 10th of December the whole thing was discussed by way of a Motion in the other House—Lok Sabha—The India-China border developments were discussed. A Government Motion was there and the Motion in its final form as follows—

"This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, approves of the measures and policy adopted by the Government to meet it",

was carried with none voting against. That was the Motion that was passed,

and the Prime Minister made two speeches there, one the opening speech, and the other in reply to the debate. Well, he spoke in reply to the debate on the 10th of December, 1962—before this Motion was adopted with none dissenting—and he said—

“We decided long ago, two or three months ago, to suggest this 8th September line because, if accepted by the Chinese Government, it shows that all that has happened since then has been their aggression. It is a very big thing for them to accept, and they have not accepted it. It is an obvious thing that it will be a great gain for us to do that politically, diplomatically, psychologically and militarily.”

This is what the Prime Minister said in reply to the debate before the Motion was put to vote and was passed.

(Interruptions)

Then Madam Deputy Chairman, in this connection I searched the proceedings of the other House to find out if anybody had moved an amendment to this Motion, asking for the rejection of the 8th September position of the Government, because that was one of the crucial points in that policy statement. Only a substitute Motion I found and that was moved by the Socialist Party Leader, Mr. Yadav. And what did he say? It is here.

“This House, having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, is of opinion that the policy of the Government of India to start negotiations on the condition of withdrawal by the Chinese aggressors to the line of control as on the 8th September, 1962 should be rejected, and no negotiations should be undertaken till the Chinese aggressors withdraw to the Indian boundary as it existed on the 15th August, 1947.”

That was amendment No. 6. This was the only amendment which was put to vote.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Can the proceedings of the other House be quoted in this House?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: From my memory. This was the only amendment which was put to vote. When I am supporting your case, why are you not helping me? That was the only amendment which was put to vote. And do you know how many votes it got? Thirteen votes in favour and 288 against and the amendment was negatived. When I looked up the Division List—Division was taken on this amendment—to find out who voted in favour of it, I found not even our friends of the Praja Socialist Party in it. (Interruptions.) The Leaders of the Praja Socialist Party thought it fit not to join the elegant company of 13 consisting of Shrimati Gayatri Devi and, if you like, Professor Ranga, although now they say, “No”. Therefore Parliament stood committed when Parliament unanimously adopted that Motion . . .

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . on the basis of the speeches made by the Prime Minister where he reiterated forcefully in the beginning and also in the reply the Government's position with regard to the 8th of September. Well, after that, now you oppose it by saying, “No, we did not commit ourselves to it.” Why did not the Praja Socialist Party move an amendment there to this effect? Why did not the Praja Socialist Party get up and say, “We oppose the 8th September position.” I have looked up the proceedings. Let them bring a single speech to show that they were opposed to the 8th September position. Now it has come. They thought it will never come. Now that it has more or less come, they are opposed to it—wise after the event. (Interruptions.) I am very fond of interruptions. Shall I yield? All right, I do.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: To this Motion before the House the Communist Party has not moved an amend-

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.]  
ment that the Colombo proposals should be accepted. Are we therefore to take it—because this amendment has not been moved—that they are opposed to the acceptance of the Colombo proposals?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is very interesting. My friend Mr. Dave is a learned man and sometimes he asks questions. Praja Socialist Party politics does become the greatest obstacle to the flowering of all potential and actual erudition and scholarship. This is what I find.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: Instead of answering the question he is just evading it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that; I shall try to answer to your satisfaction. After all you are my dear colleagues. If I cannot convince you, why I am here? I shall try, and it will be my misfortune if I do not succeed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have five minutes more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But there have been so many interruptions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am just finishing. Let me leave that point then. In this House also on the 12th of December 1962, Prime Minister Nehru made a speech in which he gave answers to the three Chinese questions that were put to him, and this is what he said. The Prime Minister had stated:

"I made this reference first in the Lok Sabha and then here and I stated that if the present aggression, since the 8th September, is vacated, then—and I have stated it repeatedly in the letters as hon. Members would have seen—we shall consider various peaceful methods of deciding this problem. I have said that even if we have talks and they

do not yield fruitful results, I would be prepared for them."

Even he dwelt on the question of—well, I need not go into it. He again reiterated "8th September". I knew that it would be better to clinch the matters.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Please also read my objections raised on the point made by the Prime Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will take a lot of time to find it out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please do not take my time. After the Prime Minister made his speech, Madam Deputy Chairman, you will remember that I had observed . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): I made a categorical statement rejecting the September 8th position in the last Session.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you have to interrupt, why don't you come to the front? I had said:—

"I take it that my sentiments are shared by this House because I would like the Colombo Powers to know it that Parliament, when today, on the last day, the Prime Minister has made the statement, is unitedly behind him."

And, then, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like you to note—and that is very relevant—did not get up to oppose the 8th September position. On the contrary, he observed:—

"Sir, the Colombo Powers must know this that even the Communists are behind the Prime Minister."

Most strangely, the point for him at that time was not the "8th September" proposal but that the Communist Party was supporting this thing. Then I said that the Colombo Powers must know that the Jan Sangh, of all the

people, is behind the Prime Minister. I put that question straightway to Mr. Vajpayee and Mr. Vajpayee did not object to it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: All this is irrelevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And, Madam, then the Chairman remarked:—

“As long as both the Communists and the Jan Sangh are with you, everybody is with you.”

Therefore, from the debate a clear inference was drawn that not only myself but Mr. Vajpayee was also joining in supporting the Prime Minister with regard to the 8th September proposal. Then, Madam, the Chairman concluded the topic by saying:

“It is absolutely obvious that we are all united in our stand and we stand united behind the Prime Minister.”

The proceedings end. Mr. Vajpayee or anybody from this House did not come to protest against it. Now, here is the “Times of India” of December 13 which gives what happened in the Rajya Sabha on the 12th December. (*Interruptions.*) Please do not interrupt.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Do not misinterpret.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And this is what the “Times of India” reported:—

“Unlike in the Lok Sabha, there was no debate after the Prime Minister’s statement nor was there any formal resolution seeking to endorse the Government stand. The sense of the House, however, was clearly in favour of a suggestion made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta (Com.) that Members endorse the statement. The Chairman’s concluding remark, ‘That we are all united in our stand behind the Prime Minister’ was received with loud applause.”

After all that, are we to question what happened in Parliament with regard to the Government’s stand in regard to the 8th September line or are we to stand by the commitment that we had made at that time without a voice of dissent . . .

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: We have not made any commitment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is there. I have confronted them with facts, Madam Deputy Chairman. My esteemed friend, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha . . .

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Madam, even the Prime Minister has said that there is no commitment on the part of Parliament. It is only commitment in principle by the Government of India. It has been made out by the Prime Minister himself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is strange, Mr. Gurupada Swamy. How could Parliament make a commitment with regard to the Colombo Proposals on December 10 or 12? These proposals were not there then. The Conference was meeting. The question arose as to how Parliament viewed the Prime Minister’s suggestion that he was prepared to talk provided the Chinese forces withdrew to the position held by them before the 8th of September. I do submit before the House that Parliament fully, wholly, without a voice of dissent, endorsed the stand of the Prime Minister. This is what I have to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. no. Complete distortion.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: Parliament endorsed only the Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member is certainly entitled to have his disagreement now. But from the speech of my Esteemed friend, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha, which he made on the 8th of November in this House it is clear that he never opposed the 8th September proposal.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): Madam, I rise on a point of information. It would have been better if Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had not dragged my name. I would request him to confine to himself. He must not put certain things in my mouth which I never said. It would be better if he confines to himself. I would request my friend that whatever he has to say he may go on telling the House but he must not tell things about others which are not correct. Let him not put wrong things in others' mouths. This is not proper. This is not fair. He is taking undue advantage of the fact that he is speaking after me. He is telling again and again things which we never agreed to.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: May I point out that there was no formulation either by the Government or by anybody in regard to the September 8 line? It was a vague statement made by the Prime Minister and that does not mean that the Houses, both the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha, endorsed the statement. The statement was very vague and it was not put in the form of a formulation.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: So far as the question of general support to the Prime Minister was concerned, that was there. But the question of support to the Proposals did not arise. And, therefore, we or the House never agreed to it. Whatever the Prime Minister said in a statement must not be taken as the agreed view of the House. Madam, if the general support given to the Prime Minister is taken as the support to the 8th September proposals, it will be taking undue advantage of the goodwill shown by us and the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I should not like to have undue advantage of anything, least of all, of the speech of our friend, Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha, and I will

be very sorry if I have taken undue advantage of his goodwill.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: I have never accepted the 8th September proposal. Let the hon. Member show any document where we have accepted it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I can understand his saying this. I never said that he accepted it. All I say is that he never raised his voice against it, even in his speech. Not only that, when we discussed foreign affairs, with special reference to the border. I believe in August, then the proposal before the country was that the representatives of the two powers would meet, and in fact, they would have met in October but for the development that took place since the 8th September. In that debate also nobody said that the Government of India should not meet the Chinese Government representatives for discussion. None said it.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: The question did not arise.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: The whole thing has been put in a very wrong perspective.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please come to the next point.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Let Mr. Bhupesh Gupta read my statement wherein I rejected the September 8 proposal in the last Session.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Another interruption.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: Because you are wrong. You are saying things which are not facts and if it is not contradicted, tomorrow you will take undue advantage again. If you do not want to be interrupted, say correct things.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Must all of them interrupt?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: On a point of order, Madam. Is it justified for the hon. Member to persist in giving a distorted account of the proceedings of Parliament, persisting in misleading this House about what happened in the previous Session, which is not consistent with what an hon. Member said at that time? He is deliberately misleading this House about the proceedings of the previous Session.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to speak on the point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinha has clarified it. It is a matter of opinion. You pass on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to answer his point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would request you to reject outright this point of order because the proceedings of the House are before you. You can judge. Was it not a distortion of the proceedings of the House yesterday and the day before when it was almost tried to make out that our heroes of the P.S.P. were all opposed to the 8th September line when they could not prove by documentary evidence from any positive utterance to that effect from the proceedings of either House.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: You are to prove positively when we are declining definitely.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is all right. I leave it at that. I think I have got that point.

(Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can I wind up

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will give another 5 minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They are winding up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your one hour is over. That point has been cleared by Mr. Sinha—that distortion point. Everything has been cleared.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may ask me to stop but you will understand that for the last 15 minutes what is going on is no speech. It is all interruption. It is all right, if the hon. Members have doubts, certainly they can interrupt me but why should I be victimised for their interruptions?

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: No doubts, when you say wrong things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you think that I say wrong things, do by all means interrupt but do not victimise me for your interruptions.

I think I leave that subject. All I can say in this connection is that if you look back to the debates for August last year in connection with the proposals for talks between these two countries, of the House, you will find even there that nobody opposed it and were it not for the fact that aggression took place in September, perhaps these talks would have started. That is all I say. Therefore whatever way you look at it from, you come to the conclusion that the country and the Parliament are committed to this position. Individual voices can be here and there raised. Now I come to the concluding part and I hope there I shall not be interrupted. Even the Manchester Gurdian of 12th January has supported that this proposal should be accepted and you cannot accuse "Manchester Gurdian" of being a party to international communism.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: When did you become a lover of "Manchester Guardian"?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When you gave it up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If I can love the P.S.P., why I cannot, for a change, in order to prove my case, be a lover of "Manchester Guardian"? Now this is what appeared—I need not quote it. They have said that it should be accepted. The "Manchester Guardian" is a paper which takes a very anti-Chinese position. Here I would like to quote what Vinoba Bhave said. He wrote an article in the Amrita Bazar Patrika of 30th December after his meeting with the Prime Minister in Bengal. This is what he said:

"We must not say that we are not willing to talk with her; if our opponents give us the smallest opening for talks we should seize the opportunity to meet them half-way. It is those who have no self-confidence, who lay down conditions and insist on the letter rather than the spirit. These matters cannot be resolved on the basis of conditions. We must be bold enough to enter upon negotiations as soon as there is the slightest opportunity. That is the demand of our times."

Vinoba Bhave certainly is not a party to what is called international communism. Then he went on to say:

"Now it takes as much courage to leap into the area of peace as to leap into the battlefield of war. The timid and the cowardly can have no place either on the field of battle or in the councils of peace—they are doomed to defeat alike in both. It is the brave who go forward boldly to play their part in peace negotiations."

He, a wise man of our country not attached to any political party but an apostle of peace and goodness, gave this counsel to the country and the Government after he had had talks with the Prime Minister. This appeared in the Sunday Magazine section of the "Amrita Bazar Patrika" under the title: "Sino-Indian conflict—the right approach". Are we to reject it? Are we to denounce him by labelling him that he is an international communist or are we to turn to him, at this hour of crisis and need, for his wise, mature counsel, derived not only from long years of rich experience in his public life but from his close and deep association with the Father of the Nation Mahatma Gandhi. This is something I would ask.

In this connection I would also like to say something. When we endorse the proposal with clarifications, it is the position that we take with regard to the proposal and the clarifications. Well, we are not giving an opinion on what the Chinese are doing. We have been called upon in this House to express our opinion. I think they should be accepted as the basis for starting talks. Why should we give it up? Now, there again one point I would like to know. These clarifications have been given to the Government of India after Mrs. Bandaranaike had talks with the Chinese Prime Minister and the leaders. As you know, they went first to China, had talks there and later on they came here. The question arises therefore whether these clarifications were given with proper reference to them and whether they sounded the Chinese opinion in regard to these clarifications. That we do not yet know. However, as far as we are concerned, we take the proposals and clarifications together. The clarifications form a substantive part, as indeed they have mentioned in the Colombo proposals, and we would like them to be accepted as the basis of talks. Unless China accepts them, the talks cannot start, obviously. But I am called upon to express my opinion on the proposals plus clarifications. As far as 9th Septem-

ber position is concerned, I need not say much. Substantially our position is met by the Colombo proposals with the clarifications. It seems that there are two points in the Eastern Sector which should be decided in the course of discussions. As far as Ladakh sector is concerned, except for two posts, all posts fall on our side. Only two of our posts fall on the Chinese side after the 20 kilometres withdrawal but here again, from the study of maps, I find that in that area of 20 kilometres which was taken after September 8th or 20th October, there were not only Indian posts. We had 43 posts but the Chinese too had a large number of posts and it seems to me that they had more personnel there than our personnel. If, for example, any parity is obtained in the matter of joint control, as has been suggested by the Law Minister, it seems to me that even if two posts did not fall on our side, with regard to the other posts, in the matter of location of posts, we will have reached a better position than it was before 8th September and, what is more, the personnel would have been less on the side of China. I do not know about that. This aspect is also an important one to be considered especially in the context of our disengagement and so on. I need not say much on this proposal.

I support the proposal and clarifications and the talks should start and I hope, once the talks start, they will produce good results and naturally the strength of our case lies in its justice, in its validity. The Prime Minister did a signal service to the nation when he declared on the floor of this House that should the talks fail, he was for one prepared to let the matter to go to the Hague Court or certain other mediation, thereby ruling out the path of militarism or the path of armed actions as far as India is concerned. I can tell you that at the time when he made that statement on the floor of this House on 12th December the Colombo Powers

1081 RS—5.

were meeting in Colombo and this particular statement created a profound impression on the Colombo Powers and it will be for the historian to record how this statement of peace and goodness and reasonable approach in the matter made by the Prime Minister on the 12th December in this House created a favourable impression even in quarters where there was doubts and questionings about our case in India. I hope once these talks start they will not be continued in a protracted manner, because as far as India and China are concerned, the cold war between them assumes particular importance. It always helps the reactionary forces in the country to thrive in that cold war atmosphere and to put pressure on the Government and to make attacks on the democratic forces in the country, and on the democratic life of the nation. It is not like a cold war as between India and Pakistan. Therefore, I take this opportunity on the floor of this House to address my words to each and every quarter and say that this should go. Once the negotiations start, we hope this problem will be solved to the satisfaction of our country and a peaceful settlement will be arrived at speedily, of course, with honour for our country and our national self-respect. I say this in all seriousness, because I want the whole world to know that we are anxious for a solution and for a settlement of the problem in a peaceful and honourable way, that we do not want to keep up the cold war atmosphere for Americans and others to take advantage of and to put pressure on our Government to present Kashmir on a platter to Pakistan or some other power, in order that Kashmir can be turned into a military base against India and the neighbouring countries. We have seen what these countries have been doing. We want to defend our independence and we want to strengthen our defence potential without reliance on others. We have seen what it means to rely for arms on other countries—for the arms that we need. They give you arms with one hand



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

after some delay and then ask you to barter away your sovereignty, even a whole State of the Indian Republic, as has been done in the case of Kashmir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who has done that?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, we must rely on ourselves and I do hope that once the negotiations start India's position will be well explained to the whole world and I sincerely believe that our stand will succeed because our case is just and we are a peace-loving nation and we want to promote peace not only on our borders but throughout the world. At the same time we want to see that our national independence is maintained and that our territorial integrity is upheld with honour and dignity. This is the task of the leadership and I trust the Prime Minister in this matter to combine on the one hand our stand for peace and our pledge to maintain our territorial integrity on the other. It is to be peace with honour, peace with territorial integrity, peace for the sake of the good of all people. That is what we stand for. I appeal to this House in all seriousness. Let us on this great occasion rise to the call of the occasion. Let us not be carried away by pettiness, by small considerations of political advantages to be taken either against the Congress Party or against the Communist Party. Let the national unity which was symbolised and expressed when the country was subjected to aggression in September, October and November, be again reiterated and revitalised and asserted in our efforts for peaceful negotiations—and for peace, with honour of course. Let the world see that India knows how to stand up when subjected to aggression. Let the world also see that India also knows how to rise and respond to the call of peace when it comes from friendly non-aligned nations. That should be the approach, and, Madam Deputy Chairman, in my speech I have indicated our approach with regard to this

matter and I stand by it. Our colleague, Shri Govindan Nair, has explained the other aspects of the matter and I need not deal with them. Even as we were united in war, let us show that we are united in the context of peace.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: You were divided when there was war. Now you are united.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chandra Shekhar, you do not seem to be a good fighter, otherwise you would have been in the front here.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: We have seen . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Gupta, please wind up now. You have taken too long a time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My final word is this. Just as we have registered our national unity and symbolised in our speeches.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: We have seen how his friends have been arrested throughout the country for promoting disunity and sabotage.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is going on challenging other parties. So he must be ready to hear others also. They should go into the proceedings of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you should finish now. Please don't start your speech all over again.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As I have explained, let us accept the Colombo Proposals, again unitedly. Let us display the same unity and goodness and let us show that we stand for peace before the whole world and whatever might be our party positions, let us all combine together in bringing about such a constructive response to constructive proposals and glory shall

be that of our country and we are partners in that glory. That is what I say. As far as my friends of the P.S.P. are concerned . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not refer to them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They feel that non-alignment is no good and they want to keep up the tension. I would bag of them to give up this attitude. They should take up a constructive attitude and not an entirely negative attitude which will not bring any good to anybody, certainly not to India.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, this is the first time that I am speaking in this House after the wanton and dastardly attack on our land and I would like, first of all to take this opportunity to congratulate our jawans for their magnificent performance on the battle-field. They have shown great valour against heavy odds and have upheld the finest traditions of the fighting spirit of the Indian people.

Madam, Deputy Chairman, yesterday, after the debate began a new note had been injected into this discussion. We have come to know that the Chinese have not accepted the Colombo proposals in toto, and the Prime Minister has said yesterday in the Lok Sabha, and very rightly, that if China does not accept the proposals together with the explanatory memorandum, then we will not go to talk to them at the negotiating table. This is not to say that I am in any way belittling the efforts of the Colombo Powers. On the contrary, I express my appreciation of the efforts that those six non-aligned powers have displayed for getting a negotiated settlement of the border aggression.

Madam Deputy Chairman, when I listened to the various speeches here yesterday and today from the side of the Opposition, I almost felt that the Opposition was absolutely against any sort of negotiation, whether it be on the basis of the 8th September line or anything else. I would like to point

out to this House that on the 12th December, the Prime Minister had made a statement and in that statement he had referred to the letter which he had written to the Chinese Prime Minister in reply to a letter of the Chinese Prime Minister of the 28th November.

2 P.M.

Madam, it will be borne out by a reading of that letter that so far as the question of negotiation in principle is concerned, it had already been agreed to between two Prime Ministers and when the Prime Minister made that statement on the 12th December here—and the Chairman, *who was presiding at that time, said* that the whole country was behind the Prime Minister; he also said that the House should be grateful to the Prime Minister for this statement—not a single voice from that side was raised against it. I want to take this House through that letter of the 1st December which letter was in reply to the letter of the Chinese Prime Minister of the 28th November. We on our own accord, on our own volition, never made any move for a negotiation. On the contrary, it was the Chinese Prime Minister who made the proposals. It was he who came forward with certain proposals in his letter of the 28th November and I want to take this House through that letter of the 1st December. The letter reads like this:

“In the letters that have been exchanged between us since the further aggression by your forces commenced on 8th September 1962, the following principles, on the basis of which our differences can be resolved peacefully, have emerged:

(i) We should create a proper atmosphere for peaceful settlement of our differences. (This has also been mentioned in your message of 28th November)

(ii) We should settle our differences in a friendly way through peaceful talks and discussions. (This has also been reiterated in your message of 28th November)

[Shri N. C. Kasliwal]

(iii) There should be no attempt to force any unilateral demand on either side on account of the advances gained in the recent clashes. (Your letter of 9th November 1962)

(iv) The necessary preliminaries for talks and discussions suggested should be consistent with the decency, dignity and self-respect of both sides. (Your message of 28th November)

(v) The implementation of these proposed arrangements will not in any way prejudice either side's position in regard to the correct boundary alignment. (Your message of 4th November and your message of 28th November 1962)"

Now, the House will see that so far as the question of negotiation in principle was concerned, it had already been settled between the two Prime Ministers and that this House had endorsed on the 12th December. Not a single voice was raised when the Prime Minister referred to this matter and not a single voice was raised when the Prime Minister referred to the letter of the Prime Minister of China which contains these proposals. What did the Colombo Powers do? The Colombo Powers, if they did anything at all, put a kind of international seal on the agreement for negotiation which had taken place between the two Prime Ministers. The Colombo Powers stepped in only with regard to the withdrawal arrangements. There were disputes between the two Prime Ministers as to which side should withdraw and where. We stuck to the 8th September, and very rightly and even today we stick to the line of the 8th September. The Chinese Prime Minister said, "No. Let us go back to the 7th November, 1959 line". It is there that the Colombo Powers have stepped in and it is there that the Colombo Powers have made constructive suggestions. Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, it has been reiterated

ed in this House more than once that the Colombo proposals conform mostly to our point of view and I will point out how. In fact, they go even a little beyond. My hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, waxed eloquent over the question of Thagla Ridge and very rightly because Thagla Ridge at that time was in our possession but he forgot that the Chinese have all along questioned the location of the Thagla Ridge, whether it was on the south of the main water shed or on the north of the main water shed. This is a matter which has to be discussed by negotiation and the Colombo Powers have said nothing so far as the ownership of Thagla Ridge is concerned. All that the Colombo Powers have said is that we should sit down across a table, discuss and decide for ourselves where Thagla Ridge lies and to whom it should belong. Longju and Bara Hoti are on the same level. Neither is it in the possession of China nor have we moved up our forces in those areas. It has been so for a long time, for a number of years, I believe since 1959.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like to come to the question of Ladakh and it is rather unfortunate that although certain speeches have been made in which it has been suggested that most of the posts we took up would come back to us, only a few posts would be lost, it is forgotten that if the Chinese accept these proposals and if the Chinese act up to what they are saying, so far as these proposals are concerned, in certain areas the Chinese would have to go beyond the 8th September line and much further. There are also the areas which they had taken surreptitiously and by theft in 1959 and 1960. I will point out, Madam Deputy Chairman, those areas from which the Chinese are supposed to withdraw, if they accept the proposals. They are bound to withdraw from Demchok, they are bound to withdraw from Koyul, they are bound to withdraw from Rezang La, they are bound to withdraw from Hot Springs when they withdraw from Yula and Spanggur. Madam Deputy

Chairman, our great and mighty post in Chushul will be relieved and here I want to pay my tribute to our great fighting forces who, in spite of tremendous pressure on them, continued to hold one of the highest airfields in the world located at Chushul. They will withdraw not only from these areas but also withdraw from Chip Chap valley; they will withdraw from Galwan and they will withdraw from certain other minor areas. This is the position, Madam Deputy Chairman. Demchok, Tshigong and certain areas were not taken after the 8th September; they were taken much before and we have our civil posts stationed in those areas, do we lose or do we gain? This is a matter which I hope the Opposition will take into consideration. It is quite true, and I entirely agree with them when they say that the Chinese should withdraw from the existing area. I am in agreement, and I am in agreement with all those who have said that so far as the November Resolution is concerned, the enemy must finally leave our sacred territory. I am in agreement with all that but the whole point is this: Do we or do we not negotiate? Madam, I think it is right that we should go to the negotiating table; it is right that we accept the Colombo proposals; it is the right thing that the cease-fire should be stabilised.

Madam Deputy Chairman, there is only one more point to which I would like to refer and that is to what Mr. Vajpayee said today and Mr. Mani said yesterday that if we sit down on the negotiating table and talk to the Chinese, there will be slackening in our war effort. It is very unfortunate that they have said so. There is no ground whatsoever for saying this. In fact, the fact that they have made such a statement might lead to the slackening of the war effort. So far as we are concerned, we shall see that there is no slackening of our war effort; we shall see that there shall be no slackening in the build-up of our defence potential and we will do our best to see that we grow strong.

We shall do our best to see that if another attack takes place from the Chinese side, we shall be up to them, we shall rise to the occasion and kill every armed Chinese who is found on our soil. But, Madam Deputy Chairman, we must remain united, we must remain undaunted, we must remain inflexible and let our actions and deeds be such as would burn and glow in the gloom that surrounds us for the moment.

Thank you.

**श्री गोडे मुराहरि:** उपसभापति महोदया, आज जब हम कोलम्बो प्रोपोजल्स के बारे में बहस कर रहे हैं तो मैं आपके सामने सरकार के कुछ नोट्स का जिक्र करना चाहूंगा जो सितम्बर १९६२ के पहले चीन सरकार को भेजे गये थे। एक नोट तो वह "ह्वाइट पेपर" है जो ३० अप्रैल, १९६२ को भेजा गया था और उसका एक पैराग्राफ मैं पढ़कर आपको सुनाता हूँ :—

"While the Government of India are always willing to negotiate with the Government of China, they cannot obviously compromise with any aggression on Indian territory. . . Nor can they negotiate as long as their territories remain under Chinese occupation."

एक लैटर १३ मार्च, १९६२ को भेजा गया था जिसका अंश मैं आपके सामने पढ़ता हूँ :—

"The Government of China have, however, in recent years, disturbed the *status quo* by forcibly occupying an area which has always been the territory of India. The Government of India hope that the Government of China, in accordance with the principle which they have themselves stated so clearly, will withdraw from this territory and restore the *status quo*. Such a restoration of the *status quo* through the withdrawal of Chinese forces from

[श्री गोडे मुराहारे]

Indian territory, into which they have intruded since 1957, is an essential step for the creation of a favourable climate for any negotiations between the two Governments regarding the boundary."

यह १९५७ का स्टेटस-को क्या है ? १५ अगस्त, १९५७ को जो हमारी सीमा थी क्या उसको स्टेटस-को मान रखा था ? लेकिन आज हमारे सामने यह कहा जाता है कि हम ८ सितम्बर की लाइन को बेसिस बना कर बात करेंगे । यह ८ सितम्बर की लाइन की बात तब से की जाती है जब ८ सितम्बर के बाद चीनी सेना ने हमला किया । इसका मतलब यह होता है कि हम हर चीनी हमले के बाद अपनी पोजीशन शिफ्ट करते चले जायेंगे, हर हमले में हम अपनी थोड़ी सी जमीन देते चले जायेंगे और उससे बात करने के लिए तैयार हो जायेंगे, यह एक शर्मनाक बात है । चीन हिन्दुस्तान में हमला करने के बाद कुछ हिस्सा अपने कब्जे में कर लेता है । और उसके बाद एक नई तारीख देता है कि इसके बाद बातचीत की जा सकती है । इसी तरह से ८ सितम्बर की तारीख की बात भी है । आज वह कहता है कि ८ सितम्बर की बात पर बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार हूँ और कल फिर हमला कर देगा और आगे बढ़ जायेगा । इस तरह से वह एक नई तारीख देगा और फिर हमला करता रहेगा । २२ नवम्बर, १९६२ को जो हमारी पोजीशन थी उसके बारे में भी वह कह सकता है कि इस तारीख की लाइन से बातचीत करूँगा । इस तरह से निगोशियेशन नहीं होते हैं । यह भी कहा जाता है कि बातचीत करने से भाग जाना कोई सिविलाइज्ड बिहेवियर नहीं है । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अपनी जमीन को सरेन्डर करके, आत्म-समर्पण करके फिर बातचीत चलाया क्या यह सिविलाइज्ड है । मैं ऐसे को सिविलाइज्ड आदमी नहीं मानता हूँ । हमें ऐसा सिविलाइज्ड नहीं होना चाहिये । हम से यह भी कहा जाता है कि बीसवीं सदी

में जो रहने वाले हैं उनको हमेशा बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिये । बातचीत के लिए हम भी तैयार हैं लेकिन किस बेसिस पर और किस बिना पर बातचीत होगी ? बातचीत तो तब ही हो सकती है जब एक-एक इंच भूमि हमारी चीन खाली कर देता है । जब तक वह सीमा से बाहर नहीं चला जाता है तब तक उसके साथ सीमा का झगड़ा तय नहीं हो सकता है ।

जहां तक कोलम्बो प्रोपोजल्स की बात कही जाती है वहां पर अक्सर चिन की बात को भुला दिया जाता है । क्या चीन ने इस प्रदेश को एग्जेशन करने के फलस्वरूप नहीं लिया है ? चीन जो सन् १९५७ की लाइन की बात करता है क्या वह उसने जायज तरीके से लिया है ? तो फिर हम क्यों इस समय अक्सर चिन की बात को भूल जाते हैं ? हम क्यों थांगला रिज और लोंगजू की बात कह कर साबित करना चाहते हैं कि अगर हम कोलम्बो के प्रोपोजल्स को मान कर चीन के साथ बातचीत करना मान लें तो इस में हमारा बड़ा गेन है । इन क्षेत्रों में लड़ाई से पहले जो हमारी पोजीशन थी उससे हमें आगे बढ़ने का मौका मिल रहा है । हम पूर्ण सम्मा के साथ आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और यह हमारे लिए बहुत बड़ा गेन है । इस तरह का जो हमारे दिमाग का ढंका है उससे शक होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे लोग हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन को हमलावर के हाथ में रख सकते हैं और देश के साथ गद्दारी कर सकते हैं । इसलिए हम सरकार और प्रधान मंत्री को चेतावनी देना चाहते हैं कि वे इतिहास को पढ़ें और अपना दिमाग ठीक करें । हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूत बनाने के लिए इस तरह की बात करनी नहीं चाहिये और इस तरह की कमजोरी दिखाने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा । कमजोरी के साथ हम चीन से बातचीत नहीं कर सकते हैं । इतिहास यह बतलाता है कि जो देश हर साल अपनी बात बदलता रहता है उसका कोई ठिकाना नहीं है और आज हम जिस चीन के

साथ बातचीत करने जा रहे हैं वह अपनी बात पर टिका रहेगा इसका भी कोई ठिकाना नहीं है। इसलिए हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि जब थागला रिज जाता है तो उसके फलस्वरूप हमारे देश की क्या स्थिति होगी? हम थागला रिज में अपनी सेना नहीं रख सकते हैं और इसका मतलब यह होगा कि किसी भी दिन चीन हमारे देश में उस रास्ते घुस सकता है।

फिर कोलम्बो पावर्स ने जो प्रोपोजल्स रखे हैं वे हमारे लिए कहां फेरेबल हुए और हमें क्या कहा जाता है कि इन्हें मान लो? मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूं कि सरकार जो भी नीति बना रही है वह एक कमजोर नीति है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी अक्सर कहा करते हैं कि हमें एक "माइटी फोर्स" का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। इस तरह की हमारी दिल की मनोभावना है और इसी को सामने रख कर हम से कहा जाता है कि कोलम्बो पावर्स के प्रोपोजल्स को कबूल कर लेना चाहिये। इस तरह की जो नीति है वह देश के साथ गहरी है। हम भले ही हार जायें इससे हमें कोई मतलब नहीं है। हमारी भूमि चीन अपने कब्जे में कर सकता है लेकिन हमें अपनी बात पर टिका रहना चाहिये। हमारा यह ध्येय होना चाहिये कि हम आखिर दम तक लड़ते रहेंगे। आपने कहीं भी इतिहास में पढ़ा कि बाँर आत्म-समर्पण किये किसी देश ने बातचीत की? जब हम ने आत्म-समर्पण नहीं किया है तो किस तरह से हम चीन के साथ बातचीत कर सकते हैं। जब एक बार आत्म-समर्पण हो गया तो फिर बातचीत करने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता है। बात तो तब ही हो सकती है जब हम लड़ाई जारी रखें, इसकी कोई परवाह नहीं कि चीन लड़ाई करते-करते आगे क्यों न बढ़ता हो, लेकिन हमें अपनी बात पर अटल रहना चाहिये। हिटलर ने पिछनी लड़ाई में सारे यूरोप पर कब्जा कर लिया था तो क्या अंग्रेजों ने आत्म-समर्पण कर दिया था? सारी वैस्टर्न पावर्स की फोर्सेज इंग्लिश चैनल

पार कर चुकी थीं फिर भी उन्होंने आत्म-समर्पण नहीं किया और हिटलर से लड़ते ही रहे। क्या उन्होंने हिटलर से निगोशियेशन करना शुरू कर दिया था? उन्होंने हिटलर के खिलाफ लड़ाई जारी रखी और यूरोप में अपनी सेना को फिर ले गये और वैस्टर्न पावर्स हिटलर को हरा पाये। इन तरह की चीजें होनी चाहिये, इस तरह का मनोबल होना चाहिये। लेकिन हम यह देखते हैं कि आज सरकार कोलम्बो प्रोपोजल्स को मान कर अपनी जान बचाना चाहती है और उसने इसके बारे में पर्लिामेंट से भी कमेंट नहीं की। आज प्रधान मंत्री जो अपने को डेनकेट कहते हैं बड़ा दिमाग वाला कहते हैं, एक तरफ कहते हैं कि पर्लिामेंट का वरडिक्ट लेकर कोलम्बो पावर्स के रिजॉल्यूशन पर विचार करेंगे और अब यह कहते हैं कि मैंने "in principle" कोलम्बो प्रोपोजल्स को मान लिया है। इसे पहले श्री हम ने नवम्बर में इन सम्बन्ध में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया था जिम में हमने एक प्रतिज्ञा को स्वीकार किया था लेकिन आज हम फिर सदन में कोलम्बो प्रोपोजल्स की बात मान रहे हैं। क्या यह विश्वासघात की बात नहीं है, क्या यह पर्लिामेंट के साथ विश्वासघात करना नहीं है? इस तरह से राय लेकर और थोड़ा देकर कोई चीज नहीं हो सकती है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर सरकार को चीन के साथ ठीक तरह से लड़ाई लड़नी है, उन्ने देश की सीमाओं से बाहर करना है तो लड़ाई ठीक तरह से चलाई जानी चाहिये। इस तरह से "वीक विल" रख कर कभी भी लड़ाई नहीं चलाई जा सकती है। सरकार को यह बात तय कर लेनी चाहिये कि वह आत्म-समर्पण करना चाहती है या लड़ाई जारी रखना चाहती है। यह नहीं कि एक दफा लड़ाई शुरू कर दी फिर बीच में ही बेगर्मी से बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार हो जायें और उसके लिए हज़ारों दलील दें। यह तो ऐसा ही हुआ कि चोर घर में शाकर माल चुरा ले जाता है और बाद में हम से पूछता है कि तो

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

तुम्हारा हुआ और एक मेरा, और फिर घर वाला कहता है कि यह तो अच्छा प्रोजेक्ट है क्योंकि दो तो कम से कम मिल गये, एक रह गया उसके पास तो बचा ? इस तरह की सौदेबाजी हिन्दुस्तान की भूमि से नहीं हो सकती। इसलिये मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूँगा कि इस तरह के कोलम्बो प्रोजेक्ट्स हमारे सामने रख करके वह उनको मनवाने की कोशिश न करे और पूरी तरह से इन कोलम्बो प्रोजेक्ट्स को वापस कर दे। पार्लिमेंट की इराजत के बिना इन चीजों को अगर मान लिया जाता है तो फिर प्रधान मंत्री की स्तीफा दे कर के और देश भाग में जाकर के देश का मत लेना चाहिए कि क्या देश इन चीजों के लिये तैयार है या नहीं ?

**डा० श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द :** बहुत लड़ाइयाँ का अनुभव है आप को ऐसा मालूम होता है।

**श्री गोडे मुराहरि :** बहुत है। कम से कम आपके जितना तो है हो उम्र में कम होने के बावजूद भी।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** कैसे हो गया ?

**श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** यह अपने घर में रोज़ लड़ाइयाँ लड़ते हैं।

**श्री गोडे मुराहरि :** जितनी लड़ाइयाँ हम लड़ते हैं उनका दसवाँ हिस्सा भी आप लोग नहीं लड़ते हैं।

इसलिये मैं प्रधान मंत्री को और सरकार को यह चेतावनी देता हूँ कि अगर कोलम्बो प्रोजेक्ट्स को मानना है तो फिर देश का मत लें और उस के बाद मानें उससे पहले न मानें।

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND:** Madam Deputy Chairman, I feel at the outset I should say that

it is a pity that this important matter has taken such a turn in the debate in this House. To begin with I would say that the Law Minister has clearly stated the Government's case and as far as the points to be clarified are concerned, there is very little to be done because other speakers also have gone into details. I would only mention two things before I touch those points, namely, whatever we accept with regard to civilian posts in the areas vacated, we will have to see that this is discussed further and further clarification is sought. As a matter of fact, I think, even with regard to this, since the Prime Minister spoke in the other House, some further information seems to have come from which it appears that the clarifications sought by India have not been agreed to by China. Therefore, it may be one if these points on which clarification has not come forth. So, the Prime Minister himself—whom we consider is the best custodian of the country's honour and who has given his life and everything for the country's independence—can be trusted to do that. Secondly, with regard to the two posts, namely Dhola at Thagla Ridge, and Longju, it was stated that as far as the latter post was concerned it had been in the hands of the aggressor for a long time.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** No, no.

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND:** Negotiations have been going on over Longju for the last five years.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** It has not been in the possession of the Chinese or anybody else.

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND:** Madam, You might remember with regard to that post that Dr. Kunzru always used to ask questions and there was a dispute over that point.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** The Chinese withdrew and we did not occupy it.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Neither the hon. Member nor I have gone there. So, we do not know what actually happened there. But with regard to the other posts at Thagla Ridge, we have to see. On that we need to consider here openly on the floor of the House that the enemy by insisting on keeping it does not get an undue advantage. Perhaps that would also be one of the points on which there may not be any agreement.

Having said this, I would like to express my thanks to the Colombo Conference, especially led as it was by a woman, and I feel that if there had been a woman in power in China perhaps things would not have come to this stage.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: And also in India.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: No, I do not agree. We know that women have got the Hindu Code only because of our Prime Minister, who understands the sufferings of the down-trodden people. The Jan Sangh may not agree. Anyway, let me not be diverted from my point. What I want to say here is that negotiations could have started since 1959 or 1957—since the time Mr. Chou En-lai had promised that he would, when he got time, have these discussions—and then the officers from both sides had gone into details. If there had been a woman in power in China, I am quite positive that just as in the case of the lead given by the Colombo Conference, things would have taken a different turn. But it is no use speaking in an assembly of men when one is bound to be contradicted on the point. I would like to refer to the point which has been cleared up by another Member, namely, the point made by the Swatantra Party Leader in this House in calling into question the appellation of the word 'Powers' to these countries—that it was *sans decorum*. After all every country can be called a power.

There is no international measure of power. It may be a small power or it may be a big power. Similarly, to say that they have come forward to help us only to save their skin, as it were, also smacks of ingratitude. There is nothing wrong perhaps in trying to save a conflagration when it is at a distance. There is nothing wrong in saving the world from a conflagration. They have taken courage in both hands. Why should we not take it from that point of view? Perhaps if things take a bad turn, will not these very small powers, whom you do not want to call as 'powers', be the first target of that cruel tyrant who wants to have the leadership of Asia? Therefore, we should not be petty-minded and to say that is really a sign of an unhealthy mind. There is a good saying in Sanskrit:—

“बालादपि सुभाषितं ग्राह्यम् ।”

Just as a good saying has to be accepted even from a child, a good gesture even from a small nation should be accepted. When we have to deal with people who talk in this manner, we can describe them only by:—

“ये निघ्नन्ति निरर्थकं पराहितं ते के न जानीमहे ।”

I will not go further into this. I would leave the matter at that.

I would refer to another Member who used the word 'defeat' in the case of India, when the battle was in progress and is still in progress. Who knows—and the Prime Minister has himself said it—we should always be aware of it that it may go on for years. He said that China declared a unilateral cease-fire only out of contempt for our defeat. Now, the same Member was pleading that the Government should not take recourse to negotiations because the enthusiasm engendered in the country cannot be created again and again. Does he realise what type of effect it will have on the enthusiasm of the people in the



[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] country when the word 'defeat' is openly mentioned? After all, even if some forebodings are seen, people who are well-wishers, people who want to give a fight, do not give expression to such words. Take the case of a person who may be very ill in the house. Even if his condition is not very satisfactory, it is very rarely that people who have the interests of that person at heart and affection for him would ever say that his condition is critical. I would, therefore, urge these people not to go on talking in this demoralising manner because it is their words which would be more demoralising than any attempt at negotiations. Let us look at these negotiations. Before I go into that, I should like to mention one or two points about the cease-fire, because my hon. friend said that it was India's defeat that perhaps made China, out of contempt, to declare a unilateral cease-fire. Did that hon. Member make sure that the cease-fire was not the result of the round-the-clock help given by the western countries or it was not due to the intense cold weather that came in the way of taking supplies from Peking right up to our borders or it was not due to the attitude of the Russians or it was not due to the sudden end of the Cuban affair? Were these not at the back of the cease-fire? When we do not know anything of this for certain, to say only that it was because of our defeat that China had out of contempt declared a unilateral cease-fire is not doing any service to the country whose cause these Members are out to espouse by wanting to put the Government in the wrong.

I would like now to refer to one other important matter, and it is only for that reason that I am on my feet here today, because I feel that as far as the Government's case is concerned and as far as the two points on which the country's honour is to be considered, are concerned, we can safely leave them in the hands of the Prime Minister. I say this not only because I belong to the Congress Party but even as a citizen I feel that there is nobody else in the country today and

even Mr. Kripalani, the leader of an other Party, has said that there is no better person to lead the country today than the Prime Minister. Anyway, I would like to know whether we have given thought to the question that,—in our anxiety to safeguard our democratic rights in Parliament and to prove that we are an effective democracy—in regard to delicate matters where questions of war are concerned it is neither diplomatic nor profitable to discuss these questions by loud thinking. Has any other country done it? In countries like the United Kingdom, where the mother of Parliaments was born, when such questions are discussed behind closed doors, there is a guarantee that the proceedings are kept secret. Experience here has shown that when there is any effort to keep secrecy about proceedings of even ordinary meetings of different Parties, not only of one Party but of different Parties, a distorted version comes out, and therefore it is felt by those people that it is better to keep the proceedings open and not secret. It would have been in the best interests of the country and it should have occurred to all people and to Members of the Opposition too to send representatives of the various Opposition groups to discuss matters with the Prime Minister from time to time and to give their views, and as far as individual Members are concerned, both from this side and from the other side, nobody would have questioned their right to send any valuable suggestions which they wanted to make in this connection. It is no use publishing slogans in newspapers which only serve the purpose of publicity. Here what are they doing? We are here openly discussing what should be done, what should not be done, what would be our military asset, what would be political and economic asset or something else, and so on. Therefore, a country like China which would be in a bargaining mood, when it hears that the other side considers a certain point as an asset, would naturally like to turn the screw tight on that particular point. I therefore feel that it is very necessary in the future at least not to have such questions about delicate points of nego-

tiations discussed openly on the floor of the House where in spite of our determination to present a united front, spectacle of disunity, though it may not be real disunity, is presented to the world. I feel that this type of exhibition should be avoided in the future, and I hope that the leaders opposite particularly would give their thought to it.

I want to say one thing more about the present situation. I do not know what India should have done as a sane, modern nation if it was thought that she should have refused these proposals of the Colombo Conference nations. After all we have to depend on help from the outside world, from whichever side it comes. In this case, it will be more from the Western bloc, there is no question about that. They have already given proof of that, and we have always thanked them profusely. Would it be right to make those people feel that India turned down every chance of a reasonable and honourable negotiated settlement? Whether the settlement was going to be honourable and whether the conditions attached to those proposals were going to be honourable could be seen only if we gave it a trial. Under these circumstances, after all the Prime Minister had to say something, and I do not think he has done anything in contravention of what he had said earlier, that in principle he would accept it. The Prime Minister certainly would not ultimately do something which the country as a whole would not think honourable and which he would not think honourable. After all, somebody might question me, I do not know why the question has not been put, as to what has happened during the last four, five, six or seven years. The answer to that also is very simple. I do not want to go into that. It is a very simple answer, and all of us know the reason behind it, that we had to choose between bread and guns. So we thought that we being a peace-loving nation, nobody would, in spite of the great hatred any nation may have for us in spite of the great desire, that China may have to be the leader in Asia—China has al-

ways felt that way—attack us. I am glad Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is here. I do not know whether he thinks that it is in keeping with the pride of the country to let China feel, simply because she has the oldest civilisation and she is the largest Asian country with the biggest population, that she should be allowed to do anything to cripple any other country. I do not know whether China, which believes in equality of men and full opportunity for all, should think that because she has not had the opportunity she should come forward and cripple any other country like India which has been accepted as the leader of Asia—without India's seeking it, but other people thought that India was a fine country and so all the Asian people have been looking to India for lead. There is no denying, let the Communist leader hear it, that China feels that a success of Indian democracy spells the death-knell of her creed, and therefore China is trying to come nearer not for the sake of a little land here or there but only to show her might to the weaker nations in Asia that she can even cripple or harm or ruin any country that they consider is the biggest in Asia. Therefore, I feel that we have to give a fair trial to the Colombo proposals to proceed as far as they could with honour; and that expression "with honour" will always be there, and the only good this particular Session could have done is to have emphasized as if we are taking it for granted that that is the one thing irrespective of the cost to the country that the people want and that whatever be the sacrifice, the honour of the country would be kept first in mind.

I would make one last appeal. The solution of this problem is in the hands of the Soviet Union to my mind. If the Soviet Union wanted to give us some MIGs, I would ask why it was necessary for the Soviet Union, which possesses so many transport planes, to send the MIGs all the way by sea so that it took them a month and a half, when they could have been sent within three or four days. The cost involved was mentioned somewhere in

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]  
 the Press, I remember. In such things neither this country would have thought of the cost nor the Soviet Union should have thought of the cost. Whatever the number being sent is, they have to come all the way by sea. I feel that if the Soviet Union blames China for not believing in co-existence, she should see to it that she does not give war material on which China has to depend entirely on the Soviet Union—petroleum, aeroplanes, etc.—and that will teach her a lesson very soon. Neither does the Soviet Union believe that China has done a wrong. China never consulted the Soviet Union in taking this step of aggression and so the Soviet Union . . . .

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala): Why don't you ask Australia and the United Kingdom also not to supply them wheat and other things?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I do not think that the sense of justice of the Communist friends is so warped that they do not see the justice of the Western Powers in giving their help when India was attacked. India did not go and attack China. If India had gone and attacked China the question would have arisen. And that shows how the minds of our friends work where the question concerns China or the U.S.S.R. Anyway, I am making this appeal on the floor of this House to the people of the Soviet bloc that this thing should stop if world peace is not to be disturbed because there is no denying the fact that if this conflagration flares up, it might spread into a world war and the thing which Russia and the United States tried to avoid by calling off the Cuban affair, might again come up and also because of the position to which this country would be reduced ultimately if this goes on for a long time, and I do not know in what manner.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): In the present circumstances, it is not possible for us to accept the proposals of the Colombo

Conference. I do appreciate the efforts of the non-aligned nations who have tried to bring together India and China and to resolve the differences which we have experienced during the past few years. But the first mistake the non-aligned Powers have made is that they have not named China as the aggressor in this conflict. It was explained that the object of the Conference was to bring these two nations together and therefore they did not think it desirable to name China as the aggressor. But apart from this, even before the Conference, during the whole period of conflict these non-aligned nations have nowhere branded China as the aggressor and this fact we must take into consideration. We have noticed that during this conflict all other Western friends have definitely pointed out that China has committed treacherous and naked aggression against Indian territory but to our greatest surprise, those non-aligned nations and certain interested Communist countries have not named China as the aggressor.

Coming to the proposals of the Conference, as I have already said, we cannot accept these proposals. Firstly, these are most unfair to our country. It had been made out yesterday by the hon. Law Minister that these proposals are favourable to us. But if we consider all the three Sectors in this boundary, we will find that these are most unfavourable to us. In the Eastern Sector, the proposal is favourable to China because the two important posts will be in possession of China, Longju and Dhola. It is mentioned that these two posts are of importance, but the post of Dhola is more important to us. It was admitted by the hon. Law Minister yesterday that the massive invasion in October in the Eastern Sector was launched through the Thagla Ridge. This was mentioned by the hon. Law Minister yesterday. Therefore, the Thagla Ridge has got more strategic importance. Through the Thagla Ridge only can the Chinese people in future launch another mas-

sive aggression against India and therefore it is very essential from the defence point of view to have possession of the Thagla Ridge.

About the middle Sector, yesterday the hon. Law Minister said that Bara Hoti was never in our possession during past few years.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAHANARA JAIPAL SINGH in the Chair).]

But here I have got one map which has been prepared by the Government of India. In it it has been mentioned that Bara Hoti was in our possession. It is written, "Frontier separating Indian and Chinese forces on 7th September, 1962." This map shows that Bara Hoti was in our possession on 7th September, 1962. I want to know from the hon. Law Minister whether the statement made by him in this House that Bara Hoti was not in our possession on 7th September, 1962 is correct or this map which has been produced by the Government of India is correct.

So far as Ladakh is concerned, it has been mentioned that the number of posts that India will have to give up is a small one that the number is six or seven. It is not the question of the number of the posts. There are three important posts which India will have to lose, Sumdo, Dehra and Qizil Jilga. It is not a question of how many posts India will lose; it is a question of the territory that India will lose, if we accept this proposal. Qizil Jilga is about 50 or 60 miles away from the line to which the Chinese forces will withdraw. Dehra is about 25 to 30 miles from the line up to which the Chinese forces will withdraw. The total area of this particular portion will be about 2,500 square miles. If we accept the Colombo proposals, it means that in Ladakh also, we have to give up about 2,500 square miles of additional area. Therefore, all these proposals are unfavourable to India and it will be difficult for us to accept

the proposals of the Colombo Conference.

The second objection to accepting the Colombo proposals is that the neutral non-aligned nations have put India and China on an equal footing. There can be no equality, whatsoever between the aggressor and the victim. Madam, I may quote from the Note which was sent to the Chinese Government. This Note is dated the 19th September, 1962. It has been mentioned there that this proposal which was made by the Chinese Government for withdrawal by 20 kilometres "suffers from the serious defect that it leaves the aggressor who altered the *status quo* by unilateral action over the last few years in possession of the fruits of his aggression." Therefore it will be noted that if we accept these proposals, then China will be able to enjoy the fruits of aggression and therefore, as earlier mentioned by the hon. the Prime Minister, until and unless the whole aggression is vacated and the aggressor is not allowed to reap the rich harvest of his aggression, there should be no talks, which had been the earlier stand of the hon. the Prime Minister. So for these reasons the proposal is unfavourable to us. It has placed China and India on the same footing. Thirdly, since it leaves a large territory as the fruit of aggression in the hands of China, it is difficult for us to accept this proposal.

Madam, in the past, we have always noticed that whenever we have tried to negotiate or talk with the Chinese Government, fresh aggression has been perpetrated on our territory. About two or three years back, we had sent our Secretary-General for negotiations with China, and immediately after that fresh aggression took place. Only last July our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, declared that the situation on the border was extremely serious and that, therefore, our country must be prepared to face any eventuality. But immediately after the statement of the Prime Minister, we sent our then Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon,

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade ]  
to Geneva to have talks with China's Vice-Premier Chen-Yi and discussed and negotiated this question there. But immediately after that we have noticed that this Vice-Premier of China, in a radio interview or in some television interview, said that China had got 60 crores of people and that China would never tolerate any solution which is not acceptable to China. We got this rebuff from the Chinese Government. So, after that, even after we had sent Mr. Krishna Menon to Geneva, there was fresh aggression on this country. It means that whenever we express our willingness to talk or to negotiate with China, fresh aggression is perpetrated on our soil. Apart from that, what has been our stand in this respect?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Vice-Chairman, just a little correction. Mr. Krishna Menon did not go there to talk. He went to sign a certain Agreement at a Geneva conference where China was a party, and they met there. This fact may be noted.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Mr. Krishna Menon had definitely negotiations or talks with the Vice-Premier of China. (Interruptions.) Well, he did have talks there. It does not make any difference. And what has been the policy of the Government in this respect? In the beginning the Prime Minister stated that until and unless the whole aggression was vacated there could be no negotiations, there could be no talks whatsoever. That was the first stand taken by the Government of India. After some days the Prime Minister declared: Let the Chinese forces withdraw to that line which we accept as our boundary-line and India will be withdrawing to that line which is accepted as the boundary line by China, thus preparing a sort of no-man's land between these two lines. This was the second proposal given by the Prime Minister. Then we come to the third, the 8th September position. That was not endors-

ed by the Parliament, but it was the view of the Prime Minister and his Government that if the Chinese forces withdraw beyond the 8th September line, if the *status quo* as on 8th September, 1962 is restored, then we would have no difficulty to talk to or to have a round table conference with the Chinese people. That was the third stand. Now today's line is this. It does not matter even if we do not get whatever we wanted, even if we do not get all the posts that we had demanded. It does not matter even if the position before the 8th of September is not restored. But even then we must go and talk with the Chinese people. That is the policy of the Government now. These are the three or four different stands taken by the Government, Madam. Therefore, we have to think in the light of all these developments. Let us not shift our stand from time to time, because it only indicates our weakness. We are not afraid of China. It does not matter if in the beginning we have suffered certain reverses. But after that the whole country rose and was determined that it would fight to the last with the Chinese aggressors and remove them from our land. This firm resolve was expressed in this House when during the last Session this House resolved to "drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India however long and however hard the struggle might be". That was the firm resolve of this House, the firm resolve of the whole country.

Some people say that there is no parity between the Chinese forces and the Indian military strength. It is not a question of military parity or military strength. It is a question of determination and our people are determined to fight to the last moment. They have sacrificed blood, gold, money, everything. We have got our friends in the international sphere, in the Western world, who have come to our rescue and help, who have given us every sort of military help, military equipment, and therefore we can

face boldly and heroically the Chinese military forces. We need not be afraid of the Chinese forces when we have got the support of our own people and the support of the other nations. Why should we be afraid? When we are determined and when we can count on the help of our friendly nations, China will not dare to attack India again. Can China dare to attack Quemoy, such a small and tiny territory which belongs to China as a matter of fact? And if China cannot dare to attack such a small territory like Quemoy, how can China dare to attack India? It is because certain people show weakness in dealing with China. Let us not accept that we are weak. Let us have the strength. As Professor Galbraith, United States Ambassador, said a few days back, if we want to negotiate, it does not matter, let us go and talk, but let us negotiate from a position of strength. If we assume a position of strength, no matter how strong and powerful China may be, China will never dare attack our territory again.

As to why I oppose these Colombo proposals, there is another reason. It is because it has already dampened the enthusiasm of the masses so far as defence preparations are concerned. This may not be acceptable to certain Congress Members who have spoken now. But let anybody go to the countryside; let anybody go to the rural area and find out. There is no enthusiasm among the masses so far as defence is concerned, the enthusiasm that we had found about two months back. What is the reason? It is the vacillating attitude of the Government and the Premier that are responsible for slackening the defence efforts. About two or three months back there was solidarity and unity; everybody was resolved, everybody was firmly determined to defend our country. But today, unfortunately, because of the policy that has been pursued by the Government, what do we find? In this House, except a few Communist friends, the whole Opposition is opposed to the policy of the

Government and they say that there should be no negotiations, whatsoever, as it will be affecting the solidarity and unity of the people, which is very vitally essential for defending our land. In view of all these reasons, Madam Vice-Chairman, I do not accept the proposals of the Colombo Conference, and they should be rejected by the House.

SHRI K. K. SHAH (Maharashtra): Madam Vice-Chairman, let us not be lost in appropriating blame. Commitment or no commitment, I am not one of those who would like to take shelter under what happened in this House, when we decided and took a pledge to fight the Chinese. If the proposals are bad, they are bad. If they are good, then they must be looked upon as good irrespective of by whom they are presented and when they are presented, and therefore I would like to analyse the arguments of my friends from the Opposition Benches. The points that they have made out so far are that acceptance is an affront to Parliament. Another point made was that "Government is staging another Munich; it is a repudiation of the clear directive of Parliament to drive out the aggressor". "We are endorsing Chinese aggression", and as one of the friends put it, "The Prime Minister is in the habit of tight-rope walking", "Non-alignment has gone" and so on. These are some of the arguments which have been advanced by our friends.

3 P.M.

Now, Madam, let us look at the proposals. What are the proposals? Are we giving up any stand that we have taken? The Conference says by the sixth clause of the Colombo proposals that they will not be binding on any party. Whatever decision today you take will not be binding; it will be subject to negotiations that will be carried on. Therefore, before we go to the table, the Chinese are withdrawing 20 kilometres. Then, we have to decide about the posts. Even if you do not come to an agreement

[Shri K. K. Shah.] about posts, the Chinese will be occupying a position which is 20 kilometres behind the position they are occupying today. Now, is it to our advantage or is it to our disadvantage? Today, when the six nations call upon us to negotiate, they ask the Chinese to go back 20 kilometres. The question of force will be decided on the table by mutual agreement. If you do not come to terms about the mutual force, then also they will be 20 kilometres behind the present position when you will be attacking them. Is that position militarily a disadvantageous position to India? We are taking it for granted that we will come to terms about posts. They have yet to come to terms about posts. If today Chushul is threatened by three, four or five posts, and if they are going back from those posts and the future posts are to be decided are we not gainers? What was the pledge, what was the statement made by the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister's statement was that unless they go back to the position of 8th September, 1962, we have nothing to do with them. The question of future posts has to be decided after they have gone back. Therefore, the statement made by the Prime Minister is hundred per cent. accepted. On the contrary, when we go to the table, the number of posts that China had occupied by 8th September would have remained and we would have occupied our posts if China would have accepted the stand taken by the Prime Minister. Today, in addition to their going back, they will be vacating the posts which they would have otherwise continued to occupy. They would have taken the Prime Minister at his word that they are going back to the position of 8th September. May I know in what way these proposals are disadvantageous to us? May I know in what way the Prime Minister is not keeping his word?

My friends have been saying that when we are talking, we are negotiating our sovereignty. Are we negotiating our sovereignty or are we

going to the table to decide what should happen in future, where they should go back and what should belong to us?

My friends have been saying that the Prime Minister was wrong in writing to the Prime Minister of Ceylon that in principle he accepts these proposals. May I point out, Madam, that in Parliamentary practice it is the right of the Government to talk and it is the right of the Parliament to make a commitment. Now, does the Prime Minister make any commitment by talking? Can you take away the right of the Prime Minister, the right of the present-day Government to talk? There is no commitment made. The sixth clause of the proposals clearly lays down that there is nothing binding on us.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: He is not talking to the pressmen in Delhi. He is going to talk with Mr. Chou En-lai.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: If that is the response to my appeal I have nothing to say because I do not want tempers to fly. Is not discretion a better part of valour? Well, if you are for valour without discretion, you are entitled to take any line you like my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, I appreciate his sentiments. He is a good orator. But may I point this out to him? He said that if the Prime Minister, in spite of our warning, goes to Ceylon, he will walk over our bodies. But does he also realise that if a mistake is committed his sentiments will walk over the bodies of millions of our countrymen? This is not the time for an attitude which is dictated only by emotions. This is the time which requires that our approach must be guided by discretion. Discretion does not mean weakness. Discretion does not mean giving in. Valour without discretion is foolhardiness. At times exhibition of these sentiments is good. It is good that your oratory is utilised for expressing sentiments but sentiments alone will not help us. If he

expresses sentiments guided by wisdom it will be an asset to the country. We want such oratory. But in these times let not that oratory lead us to something which is devoid of wisdom. We have many instances in the past.

He was talking about our negotiating the sovereignty of this country. What are we negotiating with Pakistan? What is the case of President Ayub Khan? President Ayub Khan says that because there are Mohammedans in a large number in Kashmir it should go to Pakistan. And what is our case? Our case is that Hindus and Mohammedans enjoy equal rights in this country and, therefore, Kashmir, which is legally a part of India, must remain in India. And if we accede to the claim of President Ayub Khan, it means that you give up your secular character and you also say that because there are more of Mohammedans in Kashmir they must go to Pakistan. In other words, it means that if you accede to the claim of Pakistan, you admit that Pakistan is meant for Mohammedans and India is meant for non-Mohammedans. This is so far as Kashmir is concerned. You are not only negotiating your sovereignty there but you are negotiating the soul of India which is secularism in this country, and you are not ashamed of it.

Those friends who have been saying that we should have been ready to defend Tibet, that Tibet should not have been given up, may I point out to them that as soon as we became independent, unluckily we got involved in Kashmir. Now, do you want this country to open a second front? Is not Tibet as useful to Pakistan as it is to India? Would not a joint front have been helpful? But if Pakistan tries to exploit the situation created now, do you want to have another front and allow somebody to take undue advantage of these developments? A day will come when both of us when united, shall fight back this aggression in Tibet. But

till then you cannot open up another front and allow somebody to take undue advantage.

May I also point out that those who have been trying to understand the proposals put forward by the six Powers.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Madam, may I just tell the hon. Member that Kashmir is a very wrong analogy because the Kashmir problem arose out of the partition of India and the India-China dispute is something different.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: No, no. It arose out of Pakistan's aggression, not out of the partition of the country.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: The present approach is reprehensible.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: I am rather surprised to hear from a very informed Member like Mr. Gurupada Swamy that the Kashmir problem arose from the partition of the country. Nothing of the kind.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: It is a problem which arose after the partition of India.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: The few minutes which you have taken will not be added to my time. Whether the Kashmir problem is on account of the partition or not, one fact that my hon. friend admits is that we were involved in Kashmir against Pakistan. He is not quite right. Kashmir is not the outcome of the division of this country because after the division of this country it was left to every Princely State to accede to any Union it liked, and the Maharaja of Kashmir validly acceded to India.

Therefore, when it has validly acceded, it has become part and parcel of the territory of this country. It is not only an onslaught against the sovereignty of this country but it is an onslaught against, as I have put it, the soul of this country, against the secu-



[Shri K. K. Shah.]

larism to which we are wedded and my Mohammedan friends are right when they say that Kashmir is the security for equality of rights for Mohammedans in the country. If we want Kashmir then we have got to give equal treatment to the Mohammedans in India. So long as we give them equal treatment, we can keep Kashmir.

Again, one of my friends was saying—it was Mr. Vajpayee and he will forgive me if I take his name—that the Chinese have gone back on account of the valour of our jawans. It is true partly that it is because of the valour of our jawans that Chinese were obliged to go back, but are you quite sure that it is only on account of the valour of our jawans that an invading, victorious army, from their point of view, not from my point of view, went back before the American and English help could be utilized? Does this not demand an answer, Mr. Vajpayee?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: What answer?

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Does it not require an answer? (*Interruptions.*) He has made a good speech from his point of view. Good emotion he has let loose. One must appreciate that he is capable of doing that. If we ask him to let loose other types of wisdom and emotion, he will also rise to the occasion. Why should we not take advantage of it? I am only appealing to Mr. Vajpayee. (*Interruptions.*) You have been quite sure that your mind has been searching for the solution of a question that has been posed and that question is: Why did the Chinese who were advancing, go back? If they are going back to the positions which they had occupied before 8th September, 1962, all this labour is wasted. Was it only intended to create an impression upon the weaker nations that they are the only Power that counts?

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: May I submit that he has put me a question and I am prepared to reply to it?

(Time bell rings)

SHRI K. K. SHAH: My time is up and so I will finish.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajendra Pratap Sinha.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. K. K. Shah was at a few more points.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has had his time-limit. He has set a very good example.

Mr. Rajendra Pratap Sinha.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Madam, we are considering today the Colombo proposals and the clarifications given by the Colombo Powers on the question of the India-China dispute. I have no quarrel with the lofty motives and the ideals with which the Colombo Powers were moved and I have appreciation for the efforts they undertook to resolve the dispute, but I am sorry to say that their whole approach has vitiated the very concept of non-alignment. The Colombo Powers have equated the aggressor and the aggressed and they have not unequivocally said where the aggression lay. India has been championing the cause of non-alignment ever since she attained independence and on many occasions when aggression was committed, while keeping neutral and non-aligned, India never minced words and while trying its best to bring about a peaceful settlement of the disputes, unequivocally declared where the aggression lay. Today I am reminded of the attitude which India and the non-aligned Powers took when Egypt was invaded and also when Indonesia was a victim of aggression. On both these occasions, India played its part, not only to vacate the aggression but also to say definitely who were the aggressors.

Today, we find that we have been put on even keel with the aggression of China. What the attitude of India for all these years has been I would like to examine. Our dispute with China is not only a long drawn one but a multiphased one and today one phase is over. The military phase has receded to the background and we are face to face with the diplomatic onslaughts of China. We have to be very careful so that we do not meet the reverses in the diplomatic field also as we have met the reverses on the battle-field. The position is that we are asked by many friends on the other side, but not by any positive resolution moved by the Congress Party or by the Government, that we should give our approval to the Government accepting the Colombo proposals. The reasons advanced by the Prime Minister are that the Colombo proposals largely and in substance meet the Prime Minister's demand that the Chinese should withdraw to the position before 8th September, 1962. Does it mean that we were in a position to talk with the Chinese before 8th September? We were not. We had unequivocally, not once but on various occasions, declared that unless the fruits of aggression were vacated, we would not negotiate our dispute of the border with China. I would refer you to the White Paper VII—a passage appearing in the Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs to the Embassy of China, on 22nd August 1962, which says:

"If the Government of China are genuinely desirous of resolving the differences between the two Governments on the boundary question by further discussions and negotiations, they must realise that these discussions cannot start unless the *status quo* of the boundary in this region which has been altered by force since 1957 is restored and the current tensions are removed. There can be no pre-judging or acceptance of the Chinese claim before discussions start."

Not once, but also on 25th September, 1962 in their note to the Chinese Embassy and also on the 6th October, 1962 similar sentiments were expressed and the positions were re-iterated thus:

"The Government of India are prepared to hold further discussions at the appropriate level to define measures to restore the *status quo* in the Western sector which has been altered by force in the last few years and to remove the current tensions in that area. The implementation of such measures will create a climate of confidence between the two Governments which alone can make possible constructive discussions to resolve the differences between the two Governments on the boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials."

May I ask the learned speaker who preceded me whether that was not the corner-stone of our policy before the 8th September. After the 8th September, after further aggressions had been committed, in November 1962, Parliament resolved with hope and faith and affirmed the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India however long and hard that struggle may be. Now, if we accept the principle of starting negotiations on the basis that the Chinese withdrew to the positions occupied by them on the 8th September, 1962, I humbly submit that it would be a climb down from the position that we held before that. At this stage, I would like to say that the country and Parliament have never been committed to the policy of the Government, they have not committed themselves that they would agree to negotiate when the Chinese withdrew to the position of 8th September, 1962. Whatever my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may say, the Prime Minister has himself stated

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]  
yesterday in the other House that the House was never committed to that position and what he said in both Houses of Parliament was merely a policy statement of the Government and nothing more. There was no commitment on the part of Parliament to accept those proposals.

I understand from very unimpeachable sources that when the proposals were being discussed at Peking, the Chinese leaders stated that India considered her head was tall and, that they had invaded once and if necessary they would invade twice and thrice, to teach India a lesson. Now, these proposals have been prefaced by such threats by China. Are we going to submit to such threats and bullyings?

There is continuing aggression today as will be evident from the White Paper given to us only yesterday—White Paper No. 8. There you will find that there is an exchange of notes about Sikkim and Bhutan. The Chinese have been alleging that we have been violating Tibet on the Sikkim border. That is their old story. Before they commit aggression at any part of our border, they first allege that we have been committing aggression at that part of the border. I also understand that China has put up puppet regimes for Sikkim and Bhutan Governments. All this means that the aggression is continuing in one form or the other. Is it right for us to accept the Colombo proposals under these threats, when there is this continuation of the aggression, may not be armed aggression but aggression in many other ways?

What has been the image of India? The image of India has been that whatever may be the consequences, we shall never submit to aggression, that we shall never submit to threats, that we shall never submit to bullying. That image is withering away. If we accept the Colombo proposals, what shall we be giving up? Shri K. K.

Shah has stated that we will be giving up nothing if we accepted the Colombo proposals. I humbly submit to him that we will be giving up everything if we accepted these proposals. We are abandoning our vital principles. What are those vital principles? The principles are that we shall never submit to aggression, that we shall never negotiate unless the occupied areas—the fruits of aggression—are vacated. It is not as if the danger is only to us. It is a danger to all the countries lying on the periphery of China, because we should remember that it is not a border dispute that is going on between China and India today. China wants to humiliate India in order not only to weaken her will to fight the Chinese, but in order that a lesson may be given to the powers, the Asian powers, particularly those on the periphery of China that they must fall in line with China's diplomacy, otherwise they will meet with the same fate as India. It is not a question of the alignment of the border by adjusting a few hundred miles this way or that way. It is a question of bringing to their knees the countries which border China. We had seen some time back how China came to terms with Burma so far as that boundary was concerned. She gave up some 25,000 square miles of territory in return for Burma's accepting the position of toeing the Chinese line. Take the case of Nepal. Here they have been more generous and even the watershed alignment has been given up by the Chinese and what is it in return that Nepal has given to China? They had to accept the hegemony of China and to systematically undo the goodwill that exists between India and Nepal. They have done it in the case of Mongolia and they are going to settle the border with Pakistan. China thinks that it will loosen the bond that exists between Mongolia and the Soviet Union and also the bond that exists between Pakistan and the Western Powers. So they are carrying on their systematic approach to the problem. They

are not very much interested in conquering those countries, including India. I have no doubt in my mind that they will never try to occupy any of our territory. The whole purpose of theirs is to weaken our will to resist them in the political and in the diplomatic fields and in this it appears they have largely succeeded.

Now, coming to the proposals of the Colombo Powers, I find, Madam, that they are more akin to the proposals of the Chinese than the Indian proposals—the proposals of the Prime Minister of India when he said that they should withdraw beyond the 8th September line.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Let us take, for example, Ladakh. Their proposal was that both the sides should withdraw 20 km. from the line of actual control and that there should be a demilitarized zone of 40 km. The proposals are that the Chinese should withdraw 20 km. beyond the line of actual control and they had waived the corresponding obligation on the Indian side. The Indian forces will not withdraw but that element of demilitarized zone is there only, instead of 40 km. it is 20 km. Not only that, but our forces cannot march into the demilitarized zone.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): I would like to point out to my hon. friend their reaction. From their reaction to the Colombo proposals we get an idea of their attitude.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I am saying only that.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You said, China gave it . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: No, I am merely saying that these flow out of the proposals. Now, we cannot move our forces into the demilitarized zone and we are asked to recognise civil posts which the

Chinese will have on the demilitarized zone. We are asked to accept these proposals because then there will be parity. Moreover, they will only be civil posts. These are the two points that have been made by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister said that they were in a larger number in that area than we were and instead of military posts there will only be civil posts. As Mr. K. K. Shah said just now, any time we like, we can march our forces because it will be easy for us when there are not military posts.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Did he say like that?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Yes.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Wonderful.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: It is a peculiar argument which passed my comprehension. We are giving *de jure* recognition to a *de facto* arrangement, establishment of the posts by the Chinese against our will. While we were resisting, they had put up those posts and now we are asked to give *de jure* recognition to the occupation of our territories by China. We are then asked to sit on the table to negotiate about the number of posts and also the number of men and the arms that those men will carry in these posts. This is what the Chinese have been asking us to do, that we should come and negotiate with them and for all these years we have been refusing to fall into that trap. Now, by the Colombo proposals, we are asked to fall into the trap of Communist China.

Let us take the Eastern Sector. Here also we find that we are asked to vacate the Dhola post. It is here that the battle of NEFA started.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): You mean, not to occupy it. We had vacated it already.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Yes, not to occupy it; I am sorry. Now, we cannot move our army there and we cannot occupy this Dhola post which I regard as very important from the point of view of defence of the entire NEFA region. Here, we are asked to give up the watershed principle. Dhola post is on this side of the highest watershed. If we compare the maps that have been given to us, Map No. IV, we will find a green line and again comparing it with the mauve line in the map supplied to us lately, we find that we are not going up to the September position. Dehra was on our side on the 8th September and now it is about a few miles inside the Chinese line of occupation. We say that the 8th September line is no position that we should accept but even if we were to accept that or be guided by that, I still think we are not getting whatever the Prime Minister wanted in regard to the 8th September position. We are also told that we want time to build up and to organise our defences. Here, we differ from many of our friends, not all the friends, because many of the Congressmen also do not agree with the proposition given by the Prime Minister.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab):** Who?

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Many of my friends who could . . .

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** Name one?

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Why should I name anyone? You see the proceedings of the Executive Committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party.

**SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE:** He is not a member.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** He may not be but he can find out from the press reports of what happened in the Executive Committee meeting of the Congress Party.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** May I interrupt my hon. friend?

**SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Maharashtra):** What my hon. friend is saying is wrong.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** Utterly wrong. What my hon. friend is saying is utterly wrong.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** He is only giving his impressions.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Even the entire Congress Party is not behind the Prime Minister so far as this question is concerned. It is there in the press.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** Which press?

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** It is in the press of Delhi, the "Hindustan Times", the "Times of India".

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Don't be too inquisitive. He is only making a general statement.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** I am merely saying that the whole country is not behind the Prime Minister so far as this issue is concerned. Not only the Opposition but many Members in the Congress Party also do not agree with this.

**HON. MEMBERS:** No, no.

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR:** The voice is very weak.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Are we going to gain time by going to the negotiating table? That is the point. Our fear is that our borders will get permanently frozen as it has happened in so many other cases. It will be very difficult for us to start a campaign to drive away the aggressor at a later stage if we once accept the position as has been adumbrated in the Colombo proposals. Not only that, the very fervour of our people

will get softened and we will not be able to organise and mount our defences as we are doing today. There is the other aspect of the question. There will be relaxation not only in this country but also externally, in other friendly countries. With the tensions dying down, no other friendly power will try to rush military equipment that we so very badly need in order to protect ourselves. The whole diplomatic onslaught of China today is to see that we do not get the military equipment that we are likely to get if the dispute continues. I am perfectly clear in my mind that even if we reject these proposals there would be no major invasion of India by China.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know that?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I will tell you. Firstly they made this unilateral proposal to withdraw. Why? They could have marched further ahead. They knew that the Indian Army will give them a very stiff fight once they come down to the plains. Secondly, they know that there are other friendly powers who will come to our rescue and aid. That is why they chose that particular time to attack India when the other powers were engaged in the Cuban affair. When the Cuban question was amicably settled, China was most aggrieved against Soviet Russia. That time is gone; there is no appropriate time now for them to mount another major offensive against India.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): If my learned friend thinks that there is no fear of invasion of India again, does he expect his mounting crescendo of aid from foreign countries?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Please do not disturb me; I am making my points.

Sir, another reason, why there will be no major offensive, is that there is today a complete disruption of

relationship between Soviet Russia and China.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): I am not so sure about it.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: That is my reading of the situation. You may differ if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt him. I would, however, make use of this interruption to remind you that you have spoken for more than 25 minutes.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: These are the three grounds—they will not have the support of the Russians, the time is not appropriate, and they also know that there are other powers who will come to our aid if democratic India is attacked as they came to our rescue during their last invasion. So they are not going to invade our country. Therefore to ask for time by accepting these proposals is not a very wise thing to do at this stage. There is no fear of invasion and if we keep our border simmering, it will give an edge to our efforts both externally and internally to build up the country and to mobilise the country to meet the aggression. As the Prime Minister himself has said, this is not going to end for some years to come. This is a long-drawn battle and for that we have got to get prepared and the only way to get prepared is not to enter into any negotiations with China. This is my submission.

Thank you.

SHRI S. C. DEB (Assam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: First of all, I would request you to make your speech very brief because there is a very long list and there is not much time left now.

SHRI S. C. DEB: Thank you, Sir.

I appreciate the stand taken by our Government and I also appreciate the

elaboration that was made while bringing the proposals before the House. First of all, I would like to offer my gratitude to those six powers who have taken upon themselves the trouble of bringing together the contending parties for a peaceful negotiation of this important matter in the interests of world peace. They are trying to bring the contending parties together for negotiations for the sake of world peace. That is the whole intention of the Colombo powers. Now, we are saying that they are small powers. There are no small or big powers. All the powers are equal; may be the area is big or the area is small. So it is very wrong to argue like that and say that small powers are meeting there and that they are afraid of China. It is not the spirit in which we should express ourselves in the House. This is a sovereign House it has a dignified position and so when we talk we should talk in a dignified manner.

Now, coming to the proposals, the whole spirit behind the proposals is to ask the two contending parties to come together and discuss round the table all these matters of importance. They are not binding any country to go beyond their sentiments and ideals and common thinking. That is the whole attitude of the Colombo powers, and we must appreciate it. While we discuss the proposals we must fully appreciate this attitude of theirs. They are coming to India and they are going to China, discussing with this Government and that Government, so that they can make the two parties meet together. And what is our attitude? When the aggression by China was very intense, our Prime Minister appealed to the countries of the world saying that we are a peace-loving country and that we are always for peace in the world. Should we now forget that? Should we forget that spirit when we approach these proposals now? Should we take a one-sided view? Should we not have an optimistic outlook, that outlook of diplomacy? We know that the Chinese

by their diplomacy put us in the wrong, when they invaded India, by their false propaganda and other things. Now, we should be on our guard. We should have courage and that diplomacy so that we may turn the world opinion to our side, so that we may sever China from the rest of the world and single them out as aggressors. Our Prime Minister said in the other House that China has not accepted these proposals. Now, we being a sovereign Parliament, should we also say like that? Certainly not. We should have that diplomacy; we should have that courage. We have got the backing of the nations of the world which China could not get. We must think over that. The Opposition members should think of the proposals in that spirit. They are saying that by these proposals we are not honouring what the Prime Minister has said—that we shall not negotiate if they do not go back to the position as it existed before the 8th September 1962; first of all let them take that position; if they do not there is no argument. What we have done is, we have got the most powerful nations on our side. That is one thing. Another thing is, we have attained the friendship of Russia. They have declared openly. Yet another thing is, now in the Communist world there is a tussle going on between China and Russia. Should we not take advantage of that situation? We must have that outlook. How are we moving? How things are shaping? How America and Russia are compromising in their attitude? What powers they are? One should know the background, how these proposals were being shaped by these six powers, 'small powers' as they are called, how in the very time of aggression these six countries met and discussed the matter how the Chinese were moving every country, placing their viewpoint, propagating their own views and taking them to their side. We must understand all these before we express our opinion. Now, one thing I ask of our Government. Our propaganda machinery should be such as the Chinese. They are making all this propaganda.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** They are saying lies.

**SHRI S. C. DEB:** I do not mean that. I am saying that we must have a powerful propaganda machinery, so that we can combat the world propaganda of China. That is my attitude. It is not the attitude of speaking lies. Ours is a great country. It has a great culture. It has a great future and it has a great heritage also.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** But the All India Radio is not so great.

**SHRI S. C. DEB:** May I ask our PSP friends whether they were not trying to be friendly with China some time ago? They are now so furious even before our Government have committed themselves. They were very enthusiastic to befriend China. Now, everybody in India is very careful about the Chinese attitude. We know that it is very deceptive, it is cruelly deceptive. To meet that our Government is preparing themselves militarily. Also, we are strengthening our propaganda machinery. Not only that. Also, our diplomatic channels should be strengthened and geared up.

Thank you.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** Mr. Chairman, I feel that this discussion is rather premature and somewhat hypothetical. Yesterday the Prime Minister told the Lok Sabha and the Law Minister read there a telegram from the Prime Minister of Ceylon that they have not accepted our clarifications. So far as India is concerned, the clarifications are even more important than the proposals, because, it is the acceptance of the clarifications that will indicate whether China is really in a mood to talk in a reasonable manner. If China does not accept the clarifications, it means that it is still in the same arrogant temper and there can be no talk. The Law Minister has made it clear that without the acceptance of the clarifications there is no question of any kind of talk. Now many people have been speaking about negotiations and bor-

ders. The entire proposals are not in relation to a settlement of the border dispute or negotiations. They are on the question whether there should be a cease-fire between India and China. If there is no cease-fire, it means that at its will China can invade India at any place where it may find us weak, while we shall have the same liberty to get into and get back occupied India as and when we find we are strong enough. Should that condition exist or should there be a cease-fire which will pave the way for further talks for creating a climate for negotiations and then further negotiations? All that we are asked to decide is whether it is desirable to have a cease-fire between China and India or not. Now, as I have said, the acceptance by China of the clarifications will mean that China is anxious to have a cease-fire. Now, why should China be anxious to have a cease-fire? We should consider that. It may be due to many reasons. To give it the most generous interpretation, the Chinese Government may feel that it had embarked upon a foolish adventure from which it wants to withdraw with as much face as it can.

The second reason may be that it is not in a position to carry on its war or attack against India and, therefore, there is no purpose in having the quarrel and it wants to settle the quarrel. A third purpose may be that it wants to disorganise the united front of all the civilised world in favour of India and show that because India is unreasonable it is not able to have a cease-fire or peace. From all these three possible standpoints, I would ask my friends in the Opposition whose patriotism I do not in the least doubt and whose emotions I share to a great extent, whether it will not be advantageous to India to say that we are ready to have a cease-fire on reasonable conditions? From the very beginning of this invasion our Prime Minister has declared from every platform, over the radio and on the floor of the House that if the Chinese will vacate their aggression and go back to the position on the



[Shri K. Santhanam.]

8th September, we shall be ready for talks to prepare the way. Here our Opposition Leaders were very anxious to clarify that it will not be for negotiations, but it will be for talks to make a preparation for negotiations.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: It was the Prime Minister who initiated this. He made a difference between talk and negotiations.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: What about my friend, Mr. Vajpayee?

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: It was the Prime Minister who made this difference between talk and negotiations. He started it.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: But you were very anxious to have that clarified.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE. Do you think that this distinction can now be maintained?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: That is another issue. But you were very anxious to make that distinction between talks and negotiations. There is no doubt about it. I am only stating facts.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Do not quarrel over words.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Now, Sir, it may not be advantageous to declare to the world that we are not willing even to accept a cease-fire on the conditions which our Prime Minister had declared from the very beginning and which nobody repudiated. Whether we accepted it or not, nobody thought of repudiating it because we never expected in those days that China would unilaterally withdraw. We thought that we would have to fight every inch and drive them out of our country. Therefore, if we could find the strength to drive them out to the 8th September position we knew that it would be a favourable situation for us to think of a cease-fire. Now, because the Chinese have voluntarily gone back, whatever be the reason,

can it be a proper reason for us to say that we shall not now want a cease-fire? Some people suggest that if we accept this proposal for a cease-fire, our British and American friends may not be willing to help us. I think they are doubting the intelligence and wisdom of our American and British friends. They are not foolish enough to want India to be engaged in this fighting, day-to-day fighting, before India becomes strong. Some one, my friend Mr. Mani, I think, said: Can we have talks across the table and then prepare ourselves to be strong?

4 P.M.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I did not say that at all. What I said was that with people who have broken their word every time there can be no question of talks. You are confusing somebody else's speech with mine.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I think I am not confusing. He had better read his speech. This was also another point he made. He made the clear point that once we go to the table, we shall not be able to prepare ourselves for a future battle. I say we can and we must prepare. We know that during the Second World War while the U.S.A. was at peace with Hitler it was preparing for war. Similarly, even though Stalin had signed a pact with Hitler, he was preparing for war against Hitler. Therefore, so long as we do not believe in the bonafides of the Chinese, we are bound to prepare, and at the same time it is not right for India with all her historical backgrounds, with all her ideological backgrounds and with all her professions of peace, to neglect any opportunity to have a cease-fire and negotiations when we can do it with honour. I say that when a body of powers, friendly powers come together and make proposals which nearly approximate to the conditions which we ourselves wanted, it will be highly foolish on the part of India to say that, because we want to have revenge, because we have been humiliated, because the Chinese have invaded our

soil, unless we fight them militarily and defeat them, till then we shall not talk of peace or negotiate. What else does it mean? What does the oration of my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, mean when he says that unless we defeat the Chinese armies, we shall have no peace on our frontier?

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is necessary for the moral of our forces. Unless we defeat them in the battlefield, we will not be successful in the negotiations.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I think it is a fifteenth century idea to say that unless you fight and kill a man, your honour will not be safe. But we are not surrendering, we are not submitting. We are accepting as reasonable certain proposals made by our friends and that too not unconditionally. They have gone very near to our conditions, and it has been declared that unless China accepts these clarifications we do not accept them. Therefore, I think our position is entirely safe, it is entirely honourable. I say it is the only reasonable position, and I hope that if the Chinese see it fit, see reason to accept the clarifications, the Government of India will have no hesitation to accept the proposals, and the whole country will stand behind the Prime Minister not only during the talks but for all the preparations and for all the sacrifices which will be necessary if the talks are to be real and fruitful, because the Chinese will be watching how India is getting stronger; the stronger we get the greater will be their inclination to come to real peace with us, and when they know that India has become very strong and that they cannot dream of again invading India, then their mind also will change and they will think it worthwhile to be at peace with us, if not as friends. For them strength is the only thing that counts, and it is necessary that we should get the strength, and it is also necessary that to get strong we should be reasonable, and we should uphold our desire for peace with as little blood-

shed and with as little violence as possible.

Thank you.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, I must apologise to the House for not having been present here while this debate has been going on. I have endeavoured to read the transcript of some of the speeches delivered here but I cannot say I have read them all, and therefore if I do not deal with any point referred to by any hon. Member, I hope he will forgive me.

CONT.

What exactly are we discussing? We are discussing, considering, the Colombo proposals. How do these Colombo proposals come before us? The Colombo Conference idea started towards the end of November. It was originally suggested that they should meet on the 1st of December; then they met on the 10th. The Prime Minister of Ceylon did not ask us to hold that Conference or invite some people. We were informed that they had invited some people, and naturally we waited, we wanted to see what they did. They were not invited at our instance or at our consent. Now the questions before us are rather limited. We are not thinking—we may in the larger context—of the Chinese aggression, our reverses or all that they have done or which we have done previously. We can deal with that too to see the full context of events. But the real question before us is this. First of all the question has been raised about the 8th of September line because Government has stated that ever since November last. Why do I say ever since November? I think the first time they stated it was the end of October when the Chinese first proposed it, on the 24th October, they made a proposal, a three-pointed proposal; I need not repeat those points, we rejected those points, that proposal. Subsequently three weeks later or more than three

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

weeks, nearly a month later, they came out with that proposal with some changes in it, and the main change was that they proposed unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal. There that matter rested because we asked them for some clarifications or explanations, whatever it was, but we did not express our opinion in regard to them. Meanwhile the Colombo people met, and ultimately about a month ago or a little more than a month ago they framed some proposals which they sent to us requesting us not to publish them; because they were under consideration, our consideration and Chinese they would like us not to publish them. So we did not publish them.

Then Mrs. Bandaranaike went to Peking, discussed them, and then she came here and discussed these. The first thing we did when they came here—the Prime Minister of Ceylon, the Prime Minister of Egypt and the Justice Minister of Ghana—was to ask them what exactly those proposals which they had made in the Colombo Conference meant, because there was some doubt about them and there was a possibility of interpretation in various ways. We put them some questions and they elucidated those proposals in writing. Then we told them that we shall consider them. We told them before they were leaving that we were prepared to accept them in principle but we should like to place them before Parliament. That is the past history.

Now, when they made those proposals, naturally we looked upon them from the limited point of view of how far they met the 8th September line which we had suggested towards the end of October, which we had repeated many times subsequently, repeated in this House and in the other House. Some hon. Members, I understand, have said that this House has not accepted them. That is perfectly true in the sense that this was not put to the vote here. As a matter of fact, it was put to the vote in the other House

and both positively and negatively, negatively in the sense that an hon. Member asked the House to reject this, the 8th September line, and that was defeated by a large majority, and positively because the main Resolution, the main argument that I had put forward, was broadly accepted there. But apart from that, a government functions in such matters or in war matters not by constantly referring to Parliament and taking their vote. Government would in all important matters keep the House informed. It is open to the House, of course to move a vote of censure or disapproval of any action of the Government. That is a different matter. And I have taken the trouble, since the end of October, repeatedly to mention to this House and the other House that this is what we have suggested in the counter-proposal to the Chinese proposal. And the basis of that proposal was that the aggression that they had committed since the 8th of September or in a sense from the 20th of October should be vacated and the original position should be restored. Then we said that we were prepared to discuss matters with them, first of all, as to how to reduce the tension and create conditions for talking and then to talk about the merits.

Now, the first objection raised here, so I am told, is that this House or Parliament is not bound by the 8th September proposals. Well, whether that is so or not, one can argue about that. I should say that it is not bound in that sense but it is in another sense, because it was repeatedly stated—this Government's policy. Government kept both the Houses fully informed. And in fact, the presumption is, even from reading the proceedings which I took the trouble to read today, that this House accepted it. But even if it did not expressly accept it, the fact is that it was repeatedly laid down before both Houses that this was the Government's policy. Government obviously cannot go behind its own statements, its own attitude which it has taken up before the world, before

the Colombo Powers and anywhere and before our own people. The position was that if a certain thing was done, if they vacated those territories and restored the position of the 8th September, then we would be prepared to take the next step whatever that might be.

Therefore, when the Colombo Powers sent us these things, we looked at their results, first of all, before Mrs Bandaranaike came here, and we were not quite satisfied because those results were not quite clear in regard to one or two points, important points. So, we waited till they came and asked them to elucidate them and they did elucidate them very much according to our thinking. Then we felt that this matter was worthy of acceptance in principle and of putting forward before Parliament for its consideration. That is the simple position.

Now, for hon. Members to deliver impassioned speeches about the evil that China has done to us, they are perfectly entitled to do that. But it somehow by-passes the issue before us. We all agree that China has done a great evil to us, China has committed aggression, invasion on us, China has betrayed many things. All that is said. It is agreed to, and we have taken a pledge to resist that. We agree to all that but the immediate issues are these. As I have said, the two things are—again I repeat—whether we are in some sense committed to the attitude that we have taken for the last two or three months and repeated innumerable times not only in the two Houses, but also in public speeches, in the press and in the radio—everywhere this has been repeated—whether we stand by that or not.

The second thing is how far that is fulfilled by the Colombo resolutions. These are the immediate issues. The larger issue of China and India is, of course, a vital issue about which we have spoken and we shall speak again. The House will remember that almost from the first day of this major issue, of this major aggression from the 20th of October, I have repeated it, I have often said it; on the 24th October I said so on the radio that we were in for a struggle which might last five years or more, a long time anyway. That is, I considered it a very serious development, and as undoubtedly we are not going to submit or surrender and we have to meet this very serious invasion, I thought that this would last for years. It is a serious matter. I could not fix the time or say what would happen. But I saw that apart from the fact of their having invaded us which hurt and pained us, in the context of history something very big had happened, the conflict between India and China, two very big countries and actually or potentially powerful countries, two countries which are situated in a way that they are neighbours, they cannot run away from geography. Therefore, it is going to last a long time. I am not referring to other points of conflict between China and India, their different outlook, their different structure, their different ways of doing things and all that. So, I have looked upon it all the time as a long-term struggle. And I have stated subsequently, even when these proposals, the cease-fire and the withdrawal took place, that we must not be misled by these into thinking that the struggle may be over. It may be that fighting is not taking place on our frontier or wherever that may be. It may be that the so-called cease-fire may last for some time. Whatever that may be, the real struggle between the two countries, the basic struggle, will remain. How long I cannot say but it will take a considerable time, because I did not see it resolving itself soon or quickly. I have also stated that if we look at the struggle between the two countries

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]  
situated as we are, it is a little difficult within any foreseeable time to imagine that China is going to defeat us in the sense of real defeat or that we will be able to defeat China in the sense of real defeat. I am not referring to battles. Battles may be won and lost. But it is the country's defeat. For instance, in the last Great War, Germany was defeated, utterly defeated. That kind of thing between India and China, I have said, is not likely to happen in the foreseeable future. We may defeat them, we may create pressures, that is accepted. It is extraordinarily difficult for either country to do that completely, whatever its strength, whatever strength it may gather, so that we would almost be having an indefinite war till something happens internally or externally, whatever it may be. Here I may say, I understand from reading a part of Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee's speech that he has taken exception to my having said somewhere that India has been humiliated to some extent. And he said, "Why to some extent?" I do not understand it. I refuse to say that India has been humiliated, even to some extent. What is this business of everybody feeling humiliated

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Why did the hon. Prime Minister said that India has been humiliated to some extent?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am trying to explain it. Humiliation does not come from a battle lost or won. It in the limited sense. We felt—Mr. Vajpayee felt and I felt—some what humiliated. That is the reaction of events. To say that India has been humiliated, if I said so, is not one hundred per cent. correct because humiliation comes more from an act that we ourselves do. Suppose we surrender to evil, that is greater humiliation. That is one's own, but a battle lost is humiliating in the sense, if you like, that our soldiers have lost a battle but it is not national humiliation. That is a much deeper and gra-

ver thing. However it is a matter of words. What I am surprised at is that you should take strong exception to my saying that India has been humiliated to some extent and that I should have said "to a large extent". I do not understand this mentality at all. (Interruptions). I do not know what the hon. Member said.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Was it necessary to qualify that humiliation by saying, "to some extent"?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Of course, because I refuse to say that India has been humiliated to a large extent.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: But you did say that India was humiliated and then you qualified it by "to a certain extent".

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: What is the wrong with it?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not understand, this at all. I simply said it. As a matter of fact, a very truthful way of saying for me would be that India as a nation has not been humiliated, but something has happened which has to some extent hurt us and humiliated us, Indians, but as a nation we are not humiliated because something happened here and there. But if I go a step further and say that India has been humiliated . . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Accepting the Colombo proposals would be humiliating us further.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: On reading through the proceedings of this House I find, if you permit me to say so, that they are mostly interruptions and less speaking. I would beg that I may be permitted to say whatever I have to say. If any hon. Member wants to ask me a question, certainly he can ask me a question, but it is impossible to go on amidst constant interruptions as I saw them when my colleague, the Law Minister, was

speaking here—one barrage of interruptions. It is impossible to speak in those conditions.

So this is merely a minor matter, perhaps an understanding of words and phrases and sentences. May be my understanding is somewhat different from the hon. Member opposite. It has no great relevance. The fact is that something has happened which has pained us deeply. We may say that we have been humiliated by some just as I may be humiliated by any action taken by my colleagues, or others.

**SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE:** Is there any comparison of the humiliation from your colleagues and the humiliation that India has suffered at the hands of the Chinese?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** He is explaining it.

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** There are two ways of considering this. I refuse to consider India such a country as to be humiliated solely by a battle being lost. A country is a much bigger thing. You might as well say that in the last Great War England was utterly and absolutely humiliated when Hitlerite forces drove out the last remnants of the British Army into the sea. As a matter of fact, in England, by the Prime Minister of England, that has been described as the finest hour of England. There is a way of looking at it. He described that moment when the British Army suffered the last reverse, when there was no British Army left and England was being attacked by air all the time, as in fact he headed his book, as "The Finest Hour of England". That is known. That is the way of looking at things. One looks at disasters as great things when you overcome them.

(Interruptions.)

I am afraid this House has the practice of interruptions more than the other House. So it is a way of looking at it. Let us put it at the worst. A disaster has occurred. A disaster

has occurred which has pained us, pained all of us, pained the country. Well, we do not bow down before the disaster. We prepare ourselves to meet the disaster, to overcome it, to do what we can, but we do not sit down and tear our hair and shed tears. Because a disaster has occurred we are humiliated. Is that the way for a brave man or a brave nation to behave? I do not understand this at all.

There is another matter. Mr. Vajpayee said something about boundary dispute because sometimes it is referred to as a boundary dispute, sometimes as something bigger. But it is both; obviously it is both. If it is meant by a boundary dispute just a narrow strip of the boundary, it is a narrow strip. It may be described as aggression, as invasion, as every word that you can think of of that type. It is not incorrect to say that it is a boundary dispute. A boundary dispute may be about a strip of the boundary but here it includes vast areas of India. I do not understand this business of catching hold of words, just like people catch—hold of the word "aggression". I am asked, "Has so and so, that country somewhere in Africa or Asia, described it as 'aggression'?" Some have, and some have not. But it is of no great import, because the import is their general outlook on this question, and if their general outlook is against us, well, it is against us; we regret it; we do not approve of it. But to catch hold of a word and say that they do not describe it as such does not make any great difference to the meaning. We do not, and it would be a good thing for us, if I may say so, to see ourselves as others see us. We are an inbred people living in a world, which is a large world, and rather forgetful of what we appear like to others in the world. It is a good thing, because others do not have exactly a high opinion for ourselves just as we have, which may be said of every country, but more so a big country like India, more so of China. We suffer from the same disability to a lesser degree than

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

China. China is a terribly inbred country, which is its world, and nobody else counts and the others are barbarous and the rest. They always thought that, they continue to think that, and since they have become Communists, they think just still more, in fact, rejecting other types of Communism in other countries, so that we must not get excited as to what others say about this. Others have their difficulties; they cannot do otherwise. May be they are wrong; may be it is a weakness of theirs; may be probably they do not know enough facts—whatever it may be just as we are accused of our propaganda being not adequate. That may be so. I am prepared to accept that our propaganda is not good enough. We try our best. It does not always succeed; it fails. But hon. Members forget that the chief propaganda from India is not our pamphlets and other things, but the horde of foreign correspondents, who live here, who send their reports. They live here. They take their facts as they can. They get, of course, all the facts from us, but they make their own judgments and report accordingly. Their judgments are often wrong, they are coloured. They are coloured because they have preconceptions about India and they go wrong. But this amazed me. Recently a book appeared—I shall not mention the name of the book—in which I appeared as one who had been frequently interviewed by the particular person, and I was amazed to see that utterly wrong things are said which I am supposed to have said here. I cannot help that. The point is this. We seem to think that if we can sent a report, let us say, of the speeches in Parliament to foreign countries, well, everything will be clear to them, they will fall on their knees before us. Well, they don't. They have other ways of judging, a wrong judgment if you like, but they don't. So in this matter of propaganda a thing appears somewhat differently from different points of view, just as we look at the world

situated as we are. We are geographically here in Delhi or in India and there is the world, a certain world near, Pakistan one side, Burma, Ceylon, further China, further Russia, Afghanistan and all that, and further away, Europe, and further Africa. Now think of a person looking at the world from the heart of Africa. How does he look at it? India is a very big country, he knows, which is a distant country. He is not so frightfully interested in India as we are—Indians—or a person sitting in Washington or London or Moscow. Each has a geographically different viewpoint apart from other things, apart from the knowledge he may have. The nearby countries appear to him. Well, they are nearby and he is more interested in them, and a far country is not so important to him—it may become important—so we must not think that there is only one viewpoint. Surely this is not, and if I may refer to it, this has never been the viewpoint of Hindu philosophy, that this is one thing which you must believe and nothing else. Truth has many faces. So facts have many faces too. We see some facts and others do not. That has nothing to do with China and India, but I am merely referring to it. We are so inbred, and living in a large country we think this is the world, this is the nation, and the others outside the nation are some outside the world. Of course, China has been peculiarly prone to this obsession, right from old times and even now. They consider all the rest of the world as some inferior species; they do not accept them as civilised human beings.

So, I was talking about the boundary dispute. It is a matter of saying it. We all agree. The world agrees that it is a major issue, it is a major invasion, whether you call it invasion or aggression or what ever you like. It is that. Some people, even if they call it a boundary dispute, they are not wrong. It is a boundary dispute because a boundary may be 100 miles or 200 miles. It is a major boundary.

Boundary does not mean half a mile boundary or strip. These are words. So, to come back, here we are first of all facing an issue of enormous importance, to us of course, who have suffered from it but of enormous importance to Asia and the world because it matters a great deal to Asia and the world, what happens between India and China. We are two huge countries, developing countries, incipiently powerful, if not actually so, likely to become so more and more and power today depends far more on industrial growth and modern science than merely on putting up some armies. Armies are the outgrowth of that power. The great countries of the world today are the industrially-developed countries, not others. Others may borrow some guns, may borrow an atom bomb or two. They do not become powerful in that sense. That is why the two biggest Powers today are the U.S. and the Soviet Union which are industrially developed, scientifically developed. So anyhow, China and India are countries which have everything, given time and opportunity, to make them strong prosperous and powerful. They may work in different ways, as they do completely but they have everything. We have no desire to be a great Power in that sense. Certainly I have none. I do not believe in this great power system but India has everything in her, given the time and development, to make her a great Power, even in that sense. So has China of course. Now when two countries of the size of India and importance of India come into conflict, it is a major world event, apart from boundaries, this and that. It is a major world event which will affect the history of Asia and the history of the world, apart from the fact that this itself may lead to a major clash in the world, a world war. Therefore it has to be considered with the greatest care and in some perspective apart from the immediate difficulty. That has to be considered; we have to meet it and prepare for it but it has to be seen in perspective and what it might lead to. That is as the background I am

saying. If I may venture to mention again, from the very first day this happened, I have been looking at it—immediately of course we have to but in perspective I am mentioning it all the time, five years, be ready for five years and I have mentioned it again and again. It does not matter whether there is a so-called truce or cease-fire or fighting has stopped but the struggle, the real struggle continues and we have to be ready for it. I am saying that merely to show the approach, my mental approach to this problem and I think that is the approach which every hon. Member here who has to decide these major questions, should take.

Secondly, it is a huge problem and I gladly agree that all Members of the Opposition are very patriotic. I hope they will agree that we are also patriotic. Patriotism does not depend on the passionate speeches that we might deliver here or elsewhere. It requires a deeper insight and a deeper character and ultimately it is exhibited by a person's life not by a few words or phrases that he might use. Now the question is—this has been the background—what in the present instance we are to do. Normally, as I think I said, one does not come to Parliament for every step that one takes just as every General does not come to Parliament or even to his Government. He is given a certain broad direction as to how to proceed or how to function and he does so. Even if he is referring to Headquarters and the Headquarters refers to the Government authorities, that is all right but he has to do it; otherwise it is impossible to fight a war. Somebody said, I forget, I think it is Macaulay who said it: "Many bad Generals have won battles but no debating society has even won a battle." It is obvious. You have to decide immediately and do something but it is right and I personally believe in it that in a democratic structure like ours, Parliament must be kept fully informed of what happens so that Parliament's views may be known and Parliament may stop a certain



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

process or a certain procedure if it disapproves of it but we cannot stop the course of events merely by consulting Parliament, by calling a sudden Session of Parliament for it. Now, therefore, when we had this proposal of the Chinese Government, almost immediately after the October attack—on the 20th October they attacked and on the 24th October they made a proposal to us, this three-point proposal which we rejected—within a day or two we rejected it, we could not leave it at that, it was impossible to leave it at that, we have to put forward some kind of proposal on our part. It is a position which, I think, is not only morally wrong, politically wrong but impossible to justify anywhere that we will never talk to them. That I do not believe in. I shall always be prepared to talk but we may say that the talks should be under certain conditions, or, not conditions about the talks but certain things may be done before the talks. That is a different matter. Therefore we could not morally reject their proposals but we had to say something positive and the positive thing that we said was—if they retired to the 8th September line etc. There was no virtue in the 8th September. 8th September was the date on which they came into NEFA. That is the only reason why we took that line. Before that there were many aggressions in Ladakh. They were there but it would not have been quite practical or had any meaning if we said, "You retire completely to China before we talk to you." Hon. Members may in their enthusiasm say that but that is not a practicable proposition. We said therefore, "You must retire to your 8th September line and all your recent aggression must be put an end to, vacated, before we can discuss any other subject with you." Any other subject was, first of all we said: "We will discuss how to reduce tension and then discuss the merits." Now when I stated about the 8th September line, I shall repeat it, I stated it in this House and in the other

House, though there was no formal Resolution and you were pleased to say after my statement that the House agreed to it. I do not bind down any Member to that but so far as the House was concerned, this was expressed. In the other House there was an actual resolution to this effect and that was passed and an amendment against it was rejected by a huge majority and we have gone on saying it in the world. Obviously, so far as the Government is concerned, it is completely and wholly bound by it. No Government . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Not the House . . . . (Interruptions.)

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member might be given some time . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI: The House can change the Government . . .

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): You cannot change it.

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) : ریفرنڈم

کرار دیکھو، نو پتہ لگ جائے گا آپ کو -

[† श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब):  
रिफरेंडम कराकर देखो तो पता लग  
जायेगा आपको।]

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member has got into a bad habit. Let him speak occasionally. He cannot suppress himself while others are speaking. If I may say so, in considering any matter of importance, international or national matter, one cannot proceed in this casual interruptionist way. It shows a mentality which is neither deep nor anything. It is a shallow mentality which is bubbling ever all the time.

Now the Government, I say, was completely bound by it and the Government was bound by the 8th September line and I would say certainly the other House was completely bound because it allowed us to go on and

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

this House was not completely but to some extent also. However, even if this Resolution had not been passed in Parliament, the fact that it was repeatedly mentioned there and they knew our policy and they allowed us to go on itself is consent in the normal Parliamentary practice. What happens is the Prime Minister or a Minister comes and declares a policy and there the matter ends, unless that policy is rejected later on by the House. So when these Colombo Proposals came, the only way we could look upon them was how far they satisfied the 8th September line and how far they did not. That was the only thing left. We could not start afresh with some other proposals. That would have placed us on the wrong box all over the world, that what we have been saying we are going back on them. Today, the question now that we have to deal with is how far the Colombo Proposals satisfy the 8th September line.

I have read some of the speeches delivered here with amazement, astonishment and I am surprised that even without trying to understand what these Colombo Proposals are, some hon. Members have used the strongest language in denouncing them. And—I do not know if it was done here—some of them denounced the Colombo Powers. That again, if I may say so, is an inbred habit of looking at ourselves in a mirror and not seeing what others are, imagining that the world should be according to our liking. It is not according to our liking, unfortunately. Well, I want an examination of these proposals on their merit. It does not matter whether the Colombo Powers are good or bad. We have got some proposals from them and there is some importance in the fact, though not a vital importance, there is some importance in the fact that some friends of ours, some friendly countries of ours have, through goodwill I think made some proposals, and we should give them the courtesy at least, if not more, of examining them carefully and

try to see what they have tried to suggest to us, unless it is harmful in which case no matter what the powers have done, if it is harmful and dishonourable, we cannot accept it. There the matter ends. I think Mr. Vajpayee used strong words like “dishonourable” this and that. I am really totally, wholly unable to see what is dishonourable in these proposals. One might agree or disagree on this matter, that they do not go to the 8th September line. But what is dishonourable is beyond my poor intellect, and I submit it would be beyond the intellect of other Members also, including Mr. Vajpayee, if he examines the matter carefully. Now, how far these proposals fit in. First of all remember that the Chinese proposals went very far. They said that we are to retire 20 kilometres in NEFA and in Ladakh, from the whole territory which is an amazing thing to do—that they are also going to retire; and in the space we retire from we will put up civil posts, and they will also put up some civil posts. We rejected it. These were their proposals right up to the end. Well, I am not going into all the details. Now, the Colombo Proposals state that we are not to retire in any place. In fact, in NEFA we are to advance right up to our boundary. Two points were left for decision later, one being Longju and the other Dhola near where there is a ridge. For the rest we are there covering all that territory. These points were not decided. On the other part we are not at all to retire. They were told to retire. Now, where were they to retire these 20 kilometres? What do these 20 kilometres mean? They did not proceed, rightly or wrongly, on this basis for their vacating and reaching the 8th September line. But that will be the consequence. But they did not proceed on that basis.

Hon. Members may also say and complain: Why did they not say that China is the aggressor. It is for them to answer. But the answer is obvious. If a person comes and tries to mediate between two parties, that person may

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

be entirely in favour of one party, but it is not his job as mediator to go about shouting that the other fellow is the wrong party, is the evil-doer. The job of the mediator ends then and there if he does it. He cannot say so, even if he felt so. It is obvious. Take a particular case, the Prime Minister of Egypt—Mr. Ali Sabri—who came here. Now I should like to pay my tribute to the Egyptian Government for all that they have done for us in this matter. They have not only individually but their whole Government, their Cabinet, have passed a strong resolution supporting us. I think—I am not sure of the word that they used—they may not have used the word “aggressor” but they used something stronger than “aggressor”, and they passed it. Mr. Ali Sabri has been helpful throughout. And when he came here as a mediator our newspapermen cross-examined him and said: “You say whether China is an aggressor or not”. It does not pay. I am sorry, I cannot pay much tribute to the intelligence of the newspapermen who were at that conference. It is absurd, when a man comes as mediator to try to pin him down to a thing. It makes his position difficult and uncomfortable and it spoils the work that he is trying to do here. So their approach could not and should not have been that, and if any hon. Member here was in their position, it could not have been. Whatever they believed would have affected them, but they would not say: “Accept the Indian point of view hundred per cent. and give effect to it.” “That would not have led to any result. But what they did did lead to that result. They did not talk of vacating the aggression etc. But having accepted this point of withdrawal, what was the result? China had to withdraw from all further aggression they had made since the 8th September. There is some confusion about what some people call “dual control”, “partnership” and what not, which is wrong. In that area which becomes a corridor between the area where our forces are

and the area behind where their forces remain, in that area—I do not know exactly—about 40 or so posts were there and about an equal number or more of Chinese posts. Now, at the present moment, of course, our 40 posts have been liquidated because they advanced over them, overpowered them. The Chinese posts remain there and many others. In fact, it is the Chinese front. There was no line there before. What was called the 8th September line was no line. There was a jungle of posts, Chinese and Indian posts, one behind the other, one to the side of the other. Suppose it is restored as we have said and they say: “All right,” we will have to accept it, because they have repeated whatever we have said, then it is not a happy position for us. It is not a good position, because of this intermingling of posts, and in the balance they will be much more powerful, talking in a military sense. They are much bigger posts and they have communications behind, roads where lorries can come and bring them reinforcements and supplies, while we have to go over various mountains. So their remaining there, even if our posts also were there as they were on the 7th or 8th September, would not have been very much to our advantage. But we have made a vague, general statement about the 8th September line, and if they had said the 8th September line, we would have accepted it. But what was suggested was that they should retire completely from these areas and posts. And we shall retire—in fact we are not there now. And in this area a few civil posts should be allowed, an equal number of civil posts of the Chinese and an equal number on the Indian side, whatever it may be, not the 40 or so posts, but about seven, eight, nine or ten each. Where they are to be allowed is a matter to be determined by India and China. Their officials will meet our officers and decide on the basis of this. There must be parity, parity in the number of the posts, parity in the number of the people who remain there, parity in the arms they possess, and because

these are civil posts the arms would be more or less police arms, not more. Now, it seems to me that this situation is far better from the Indian point of view than what would have resulted in the old posts being revived, interlaced and being dependent upon the others. Therefore, in looking into this whole picture, undoubtedly the object of our saying that the 8th September line should be revived has been attained fully, attained hundred per cent. I say, there is no question of less. People say, you have not obtained this, you have not obtained that, one post has been left out. One post may have been left out but the total effect is withdrawal from the aggression that had taken place there. That is the effect. I am not entering into small details but that is the effect and I think it can be shown clearly that this is clearly the effect.

Then, there is no choice left for us but to accept that as a fulfilment of the 8th September line. Now, as it happens, the Chinese have not agreed to that. Well, that is not my lookout. I have to agree to what we have said we would agree. The Chinese have raised some points. They had raised them previously. I do not yet know what all the objections may be but one important objection is that they do not want us to come into this corridor, both in NEFA and here. They do not want us there. They are vital areas. They object to that. It is for them to object and we cannot agree to their objection if their objection holds, then there is no agreement on these points and whatever else may follow, this particular matter falls, the Colombo proposals are not agreed to by the two parties.

Now, the line we took up in regard to the Colombo proposals was that if they were not good enough, we would reject them and if they are good enough, as we think they are, we should accept them in toto, not arguing about this and that because the

moment we start arguing about this and that the Chinese would also start arguing about this and that. We say, both the parties should accept them or not. The present position is that we have expressed our acceptance in principle to these proposals and if we are so directed by Parliament, we shall accept them but acceptance always means that we accept these plans and proposals without any qualification or lessening, without any change in the various matters but the real acceptance comes in when both the parties accept. That is obvious and that is the reason why, one of the reasons why, we had not put forward a precise resolution for Parliament to pass, for us to accept them or not. In fact, it is acceptance. I might submit that if we lay before Parliament something, and after hearing everything, they are broadly of opinion that Government should follow the policy it had been following, then we go ahead and deal with it because final acceptance will only come in when they have accepted it. If they are not accepting, there the matter ends. I submit to you that there is nothing dishonourable at all. Some people say that by our accepting this, we recognise their position in certain parts of Ladakh or certain other parts. That is not correct because the whole purpose of this exercise is like this: These are talks between two parties that have been in conflict, at war. Even in the middle of war, people talk, Generals talk, others talk. It does not mean that they give up any right. As a matter of fact, they have to retire everywhere; we have not to get out of any place. We go forward. Now, are we to say that we refuse to go ahead and occupy part of our own territory till they go out? That seems to be rather ridiculous. As a matter of fact, in NEFA they have withdrawn almost entirely except for a tiny little bit beyond Tawang. We have occupied it and our civil administration runs there. Are we to tell them. "No, we will not go there. We do not accept your proposal"? It will be manifestly rather absurd.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: We go further than that. It is not just a question of going along there. It is our own territory. It is an absolutely ridiculous way of putting it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The gentleman comes up again. I am sorry, I do not wish to be rude but there is a story which I remember from my childhood, Jack in the Box.

They conquered it and they came with their military forces. We did not agree to it. By their withdrawal, we go part of the distance. We do not agree to their remaining anywhere else. It may be said, that we agree, but while there is truce or whatever it may be, we do not attack them. That is true but the truce itself is of short duration. I do not know what duration but it is for us, if it comes about, to determine for how long it has to last. When we want to do anything else, nobody can force us. The choice is ours and that has to be judged from many points of view, as the House will realise, the military, political and other points of view, to put us in a better position to deal with the situation later and we must not refuse to take the better position because we want the best position straightway, and we cannot realise the best position straightway. I do not think that is a valid argument practically or in any sense morally right. Therefore, I would submit to this House that in this particular matter, there is, far from there being any dishonour, a definite, if I may use the word, I do not want to use strong words, advantage to us gained by diplomacy which we should accept and use it to our advantage later, whatever steps we may take. This is the general opinion, if I may say so, of the press in other countries which consider this a diplomatic triumph for us. Now, if the Chinese refuse to accept this, they are in the wrong. Well, let them refuse it. We remain where we are. If they accept it, it is to their disadvantage, I do not say any major disadvantage but it is to their

disadvantage and to our advantage and if they do not, well we are happy either way. If we do not, then, their refusal will be covered and our refusal will be played up. That was their game, to make us do something which they can take advantage of in the larger context of things. One of the definite attempts of the Chinese, it is almost admitted by all political analysts and those who examine these things, was to force us into giving up our policy of non-alignment. They wanted to do it. It is an odd thing but they wanted to do it. This is a fact and this is the conclusion that most people have arrived at in various countries because they want a polarization of the position in the world. Well, they have failed in that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take much more time but I want to make it clear that unless Parliament tells us not to do something, we shall naturally proceed with what we are doing. It is obvious. In fact I would have had no objection but would have gladly put up here and in the other House a specific amendment or resolution to this effect that you allow us to do but, as I said earlier, I do not wish at this stage, particularly when the Chinese position is uncertain, to commit the House to any particular thing.

5 P.M.

But I would like the House to realise and I beg the House to give me a directive, indirectly the authority, to carry on the policy we have been pursuing in this matter. And I submit that that policy is honourable, wise and will help strengthen us. It won't solve the problem. I do not expect any solution of the problem so easily. I have said previously that we are prepared to submit the merits of this question to the International Court of Justice at The Hague or to arbitrators or anything because we are not warmongers. But war we have to accept when it is thrust down upon us, and fight as hard

as we can. At the present moment it is largely a question on the one side of preparing, of strengthening ourselves, as much as we can and, secondly, of diplomatically gaining as much advantages and improving our position as we can. These are the two approaches. And for the rest the problem, as I referred to right at the beginning, is a very difficult one, very big one, and although we have to consider our own side of it very carefully—that affects us—we should also look at it in its broader perspective of the world. That also affects us and only then would we see our problem in the proper context. I am no prophet to say what will happen in the world but we must remember that the world is a changing world—All kinds of big things are happening—and also that while as I have said we have to fight and fight well—it is no use fighting indifferently with the best weapons—either you produce them or you get them from abroad—but even while we fight I think we must not give up our basic approach which is, that international problems are settled peacefully and that it is rather gradually, rapidly getting out of date to think of war to settle international problems. If it is thrust upon one, if one is invaded one has to fight. We shall fight and we are fighting; that is true but nevertheless the method of peace has always to be kept in mind, and more so in our minds because wars are created in the minds of men as the UNESCO Preamble says and we should keep peace in our minds even though we handle the sword and the gun from time to time.

SHRI A. D. MANI: On a point of clarification, Sir.

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.  
(Interruptions.)

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am very happy that you are giving an exhibition of your intolerance before your leader.

On a point of clarification, according to a Reuters message from Hong Kong this morning Mr. Ofori-Atta has said that there was no need for China and India to agree to all the Colombo proposals before going to the conference table to settle their border dispute. This is an interpretation given by one of the sponsors of the proposals. Does the Government accept that interpretation? It means that even the mental reservations that the Chinese have, the Conference may begin immediately. Does the Government now share this view?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Prime Minister made it abundantly clear.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, no. It has got to be made clear.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): He has said, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that clarification is necessary if you have heard the Prime Minister.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have answered now, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, May I draw your attention to another minor matter . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Wadia.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not feel very happy that this debate is taking place in this House on account of the questions of the type that we are discussing. It is really the duty of the Government and not so much of Parliament and even if it was felt that on democratic grounds Parliament should have the right to discuss these questions it would have been much better if there had been a secret session and not an open session where our opinions would be broadcast over

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]  
the entire world. Sir, the Colombo proposals are not in themselves very precise. I am afraid both sides are expected to go to the conference table with certain set conceptions and that would not create a clear field for really frank negotiations. Whether we agree to Colombo proposals or not I do feel that we should be grateful to the six nations who have come forward in the interests of peace and as friends of India and also of China to persuade us to come to some reasonable terms.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: Sir, we cannot hear him.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I would respectfully move for adjournment. I think after the explanation given by the Prime Minister, we can now close the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a long list of members. Please continue.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Sir, I felt very pained yesterday when some of my friends on the other side made practically a frontal attack on all the six nations. I do not think it was justified nor was it in good taste.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Comparisons were made to Munich.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: He is talking of the six nations, not of the Prime Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is enough that he is talking; not you two.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I have to talk because he interrupted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He was interrupting all the time.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Sir, we should express our gratitude to the six nations for the interest that they have taken. Now, I do believe in negotia-

tions. My friend, Mr. Pathak, yesterday waxed very eloquent on the need for negotiations but unfortunately on this occasion the conditions in which negotiations can be successful are not there. We have to recognise the fact that there is no common ground between our country and China on the boundary lines. Practically every statement of ours has been almost negated by them sentence by sentence and all the maps in which we put our complete faith have been negated by China and they have put forth their own maps.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But the Report of the officials is largely in our favour.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: In these circumstances it is extremely difficult for the two countries to come to a common understanding. My own feeling is that we have been—to use legal phraseology—guilty of contributory negligence. I am afraid we have been too soft to China. We have been trying to appease them too much and ever since the time we gave up Tibet perhaps China got the impression that we wanted peace at any price and that we were not prepared to fight even for a good cause as of our own country, and that has probably encouraged China to take up a very warlike attitude. Now that is very unfortunate.

Well, Sir, I do not know what the reasons are behind the cease-fire, behind the unilateral cease-fire on the part of China. It is something almost unheard of in history that a victorious party or a victorious army should voluntarily declare a cease-fire and go back. It is conceivable that a Power which is high-principled might do it but unfortunately we have no reason to believe that China would come in that category. There must be some deep play behind it. What that deep play is, it is very difficult for us to say. Ordinarily

from the commonsense standpoint it would have been open to us to have taken advantage of the cease-fire and continued fighting and tried to regain our lost posts. We have not cared to do it.

I dare say that there are very valid reasons for it. These are military secrets and I do not expect the Government to give them out on the floor of this House. Perhaps, the reason is obvious that we were not quite prepared to fight. We ourselves stood in need of time to build up our forces, to produce our equipment, to get as much help as we could from our friends across the seas. That may be one of the reasons why we did not take any military advantage of the cease-fire.

Now, Sir, there is only one humble suggestion that I should like to make. I am not confident that these negotiations are going to be successful, nor are we at the present moment in a position to fight. I think a suggestion has been made in certain papers and I think it is a very reasonable suggestion that we should refer our case to the United Nations. Now, we did it once in the case of Kashmir and burnt our fingers very badly. But on the present occasion circumstances are all in our favour. I am perfectly certain that all the Western nations would support us and I am equally certain that the Afro-Asian countries will also support us. And I hope I am not unduly optimistic when I say that even the Soviet bloc countries will support us, if not by openly voting, at least by abstention. Now, that will be a great victory for India. We shall stand justified in the eyes of the world and when the highest international body in the world today supports our cause, it would mean that India is not humiliated but that India is able to look up and to stand up on her own feet. I think this is a possibility which should be explored. Now, I do feel that the United Nations have even got the power of imposing economic blockade. If that is done and if China feels

completely isolated, apart from her half-a-dozen followers in South-East Asia, China will be brought down to her knees and she will be able to understand that she is fighting a losing war. I think that will be a great gain to our country and I do wish the Government will seriously consider this possibility before we take up serious fighting.

One thing is certain. All of us, even perhaps including the communists, have lost faith in China. We no more believe in their honour or in their capacity to abide by their agreement. And, therefore, in future, I am afraid we shall not be able to be as peace-loving as we have tried to be all these years, and we shall have to build up our military power to the best of our capacity, so that the experience that we have had in recent months may never again be repeated in the history of independent India.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, after the great speech of the Prime Minister my task has been very much lightened. The first point which has been made by some speakers, notably Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, is that the Prime Minister has not kept his word that no decisions on the proposals would be taken without consulting Parliament. The position as I see it is that under a parliamentary system of government, it is for the government of the day to supply leadership on all questions of policy.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The conduct of diplomatic negotiations is invariably a matter within the hands of the executive, and what this Parliament is asked to do and what, I think, it was intended that this Parliament should do is to approve or disapprove of the action which has been taken by the executive Government. Considered in this light, there is, according to my way of thinking, no breach of faith with Parliament. It was clearly incumbent on the Prime Minister to indicate



[Shri P. N. Saprū]

what his reaction to the proposals was. He could not have conducted negotiations or have had talks with the Colombo powers had he taken the line that he was not in a position to indicate his reaction without first finding out what the reactions of Parliament were. I am, therefore, unable to endorse the view that has been propounded here that there has been a breach of faith with Parliament. I think this Parliament has been consulted and that the Prime Minister has consulted Parliament in the only way he, as the constitutional Prime Minister, could do.

The second point which I would like to say is that the part which the Colombo Powers have played in endeavouring to bring China and India together is a worthy one. I do not definitely agree with the view that has been emphasised by some Members like Mr. R. P. Sinha, that the Colombo Powers, whose sincerity they do not doubt, are in some way to be blamed for not denouncing Chinese aggression. The object of these Powers was not to accentuate the trouble that has arisen between India and China, but to find a basis on which they could have direct talks regarding the manner in which negotiations can take place on terms honourable to both sides regarding the border issue, which has led to a virtual state of war between two big countries of Asia and which would, if prolonged, have had serious disastrous effects for the entire world. It would not have been right for the Colombo Powers, acting as they were as mediators, to take violent sides in disputes between the two parties. Had that been their approach, they would not have carried any weight at all with China. The task of a mediator is not an easy one. It is more particularly difficult when questions of national honour and prestige are involved in disputes between two great countries. The Colombo Powers, be

it said to their credit, approached their task, knowing their strength, in a spirit of humility and with every desire to find a *via media* between countries which were finding themselves unfortunately engaged in hostilities. I am, therefore, full of gratitude for the goodwill that prompted them in endeavouring to bring about conditions which would make talks possible between our two big countries. What the Colombo Powers did not say is not of so much importance as what they actually did. Reading the proposals as a whole, with the clarifications which the Colombo Powers have given and which, in our opinion, are indispensable, there is little doubt that they looked upon China as the party responsible for invading our country. Had they said this openly, they would have been out of court with China. It was not on their military strength, but upon their skilled diplomacy and their concern for the future of the sub-continent that they were relying. Tribute is, therefore, due to the noble lady, Mrs. Bandaranaike, who took the initiative in arranging the six-Power conference, which is responsible for the Colombo proposals. The question raised is not one of alignment versus non-alignment but of the future course of events, for a continued struggle between China and India is bound to have world-wide repercussions just about the time when the world is expecting some relaxation of tension. A tribute is due to the Colombo Powers for the dedicated service they have rendered to this country and to the world at large. I would, apart from Mrs. Bandaranaike, pay a warm tribute to Mr. Ali Sabri, the Prime Minister of the U.A.R., for the part that he has played in evolving these proposals. The U.A.R. has been a good friend of this country. It has not hesitated enough to denounce China. The House will be lacking in realism if it will not approach a proposal which they have put forward in a spirit of understanding and sympathy for their efforts.

Having said this let me go on to add that on a fair analysis of them the proposals were such as a well-intentioned mediator might well put forward. They may not have mentioned the 8th of September line to which pointed reference was made by the Prime Minister. But their proposals more or less approximate to the position that the parties must go back to the position as it was before the date on which the recent aggression started.

In regard to the western sector, the Chinese will have to withdraw 20 kilometres from their military posts. In regard to the eastern sector, without prejudice to a solution of the border dispute, and this is important, the area vacated by the Chinese will be a demilitarised zone to be administered by civilian posts from both sides. Undoubtedly, for the time being Dhola and Thagla Ridge will be in Chinese hands. But all this is temporary. What is important to remember is that the proposals do not constitute the basis for peace, they constitute the basis on which peace can be negotiated.

I said in the speech which I made in this House on the last occasion that there should be no extreme rigidity about our attitude regarding this matter. The attitude of "no parley with the enemy" is no doubt heroic and appeals to the dramatic instincts, but the business of the serious statesman is not to indulge in heroic attitudes but to find solutions in a spirit of realism for the problems facing us. We have to take a realistic view of what is practicable with the resources, military or otherwise, at our command. It is not defeatism but realism and a sense of responsibility towards our country and our future generation that makes me think that there should be a positive response to the proposals on our side. We should accept them, with the clarifications of course.

It is not correct to assert that world opinion as voiced by organs of public opinion in the West is against these proposals. It was pointed out by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that the "Guardian", which is a leading radical paper in Britain, has supported these proposals. I have got the cutting from the "Guardian" on this point. The "Guardian" thinks that the proposals form a reasonable basis for talks. And I think this is the view which the "New Statesman" and the "Economist" have also taken. I do not know what the reaction of the Americans is. But I believe it cannot be very much otherwise.

We shall neither be serving our country nor the cause of world peace which we have consistently espoused if we show ourselves to be regardless of the fact that the cessation of nuclear tests and easing of world tension is now a near-possibility. This attitude cannot win for us the support of peace-loving people the world over. My sympathies are with the people of Tibet—and I say this because reference was made to it by some of the speakers. But we cannot be Don Quixotes fighting other people's battle. Our attitude cannot be that of jingoes and chauvinists. I am afraid that some of our Opposition Members have displayed an attitude hardly different from that of jingoes and chauvinists.

Much was said about Munich by Mr. Mani yesterday. It was a powerful speech. But I wish he had delivered that speech for a better cause. I was one of those who criticised Munich at the time when it was enacted. But reflecting over world events, I am not sure if Mr. Neville Chamberlain did not do a good job in agreeing to Munich in 1938 because it gave to Britain a year for preparation. Our attitude is not definitely one of surrender at all costs. China has rejected the proposals in toto or is prepared to accept them only with such modifications as are not acceptable to us. We have made our position clear. We have made a positive

[Shri P. N. Saprū.]

response to the proposals. It would have been contrary to our history, to our tradition, to the attitude that we have taken up as a peaceful country, had we acted otherwise and the Prime Minister would not have been worthy of the great office which he is holding if he had taken a different line.

I must emphasize that it will be a long time before we shall be able to trust China, before we shall have normal relations with China. We have, therefore, to build up our military strength not necessarily by massive aid from Western or friendly countries but by concentrating on our own industrial strength for it is industry and technology, health and education that in the ultimate analysis make a people great even in the military sphere.

There is a desire on our part to indulge in talks but I see little appreciation of the dangers involved in continuing a struggle which may spell disaster for this sub-continent of ours. I am, therefore, all for a peaceful approach towards this problem. A peaceful approach does not mean that our approach should be one of complete surrender. But a peaceful approach does mean that there should be desire on our part not to accentuate the unfortunate developments which have arisen between us and China, not to accentuate the trouble on the Indo-Chinese border, but to bring about, as far as possible, a peaceful solution of the problems which are facing us. If we approach our task in this way, we shall have the support of all the saner elements in all the countries of the world, whether aligned or non-aligned.

There is a group of politicians who think that this is a suitable occasion to attack the policy of non-alignment which this country has pursued so far. I am afraid they are living in a fool's paradise if they think that even the

power blocs are genuinely anxious that India should belong either to the one or the other bloc. I do not think that the U.S.A. would welcome India as an aligned country. I do not think that Britain would welcome India as an aligned country. I think we serve a more useful purpose so far as the maintenance of world peace is concerned by remaining as a non-aligned country. So far as military aid is concerned, well, we have got it from all friendly countries, and we could not have got more aid had we been an aligned country.

The position has, therefore, got to be viewed by us realistically, and we should not in a light-hearted manner reject these proposals. We do not know how the future will shape itself, and the path of wisdom lies in accepting the principle of these proposals, and if that is possible we should negotiate with China so that the border issue may be solved in a manner which is consistent with the honour and dignity of our country. It may be that this is not a mere border issue, it may be that China has greater ambitions, I am not prepared to deny that, but this is not the occasion to go into the real motives behind the Chinese attack. We have before us a limited issue. That limited issue is whether we should accept the proposals which have been placed before us for consideration by the Colombo Powers or not. This Parliament will be lacking in a sense of realism if it were to say "no". Fortunately, the Opposition can only impede the work of this Parliament by interruptions but it has not got the strength to form an alternative Government, and we may be certain that, say or do what they may, the caravan will pass by. I would not wish to repeat the phrase which was used by Sir Samuel Hoare on a famous occasion; he said: the dogs bark but the caravan passes by. I do not say that Members of the Opposition can be compared with dogs. That is far from my intention. But I do say that responsible men shout but the caravan passes by.

### شری عبدالغنی : جذاب دیتی

چیرمین صاحبہ - اس سے پیشتر کہ میں جو پروپوزلس ہیں ان کو وٹور دیتی، چانکیہ دیتی اور ملک کی دیتی کے مطابق دیکھوں میں کولمبو پاورس کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے ہمارے لئے چین کے لئے اور دنیا کے امن کے لئے اس طرح کا قدم اٹھایا ہے - میں اپنی سرکار کو اور اپنی سرکار کی پارٹی کو بھی مبارکباد دیتا ہوں کہ جو ان کے من میں تھا جو چاہئے تھے قریباً قریباً وہی کولمبو پاورس نے کہہ دیا ہے - اگرچہ مجھے اس کا صدمہ ہے کہ ۸ ستمبر کی جو بات کہی گئی ہے وہ بالکل غلط تھی - ہر نقطہ ناکہ سے نکلی تھی اور کسی بھی دانا حکومت کو ایسی بات کہنا کہ جس میں اس کی ایسا کہنے سے ہیتی ہوتی ہو نہیں کہلی چاہئے تھی - مقدم میں یہ بات کیوں کہتا ہوں کیونکہ چین والے کہتے ہیں کہ ہم نومبر ۱۹۵۹ ع کی پوزیشن میں جانا چاہتے ہیں اور ہم کہتے ہیں کہ ۸ ستمبر ۱۹۶۲ کو جو پوزیشن تھی وہ ہم کو ملنی چاہئے تو اس کے معنی صاف ہو گئے کہ ۱۹۵۹ ع میں جو پوزیشن تھی اس سے آج ہم آگے ہیں - ہمارے پرائم منسٹر نے یہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر کے ساتھیوں نے یہ کبھی زحمت گوارا نہیں کی کہ وہ بتائیں کہ ۱۹۵۹ ع اور ۸ ستمبر ۱۹۶۲ ع کے بیچ میں کیا ہوتا رہا - کیا جو

چینی ہمارے علاقہ کے اندر گھس آئے ہم نے انہیں پیار سے ہٹادیا طاقت سے ہٹا دیا ملت سے پوچھے ہٹا دیا کس طرح سے ہٹا دیا یہ بات کسی نے نہیں بتائی تو اس کے معنی یہ بھی ہوئے گاندھی جی کے لفظوں میں کہ اگر ہندوستان کے پرائم منسٹر کی پدوی پر ایک ہریجن بیٹی ہوتی تو وہ سادھارن کہتی کہ اس کی بات چیت چلیملکی جب ۱۹۴۷ ع پر دووں ملکوں کے حیثیت تھی اس کے مطابق یہ بات چیت چلائی جائے یا یہ کہتے کہ تھیک ہے جہاں تک آپ آئے ہو ہم ابھی بھی ساری دنیا کے سامنے اپنا کیس رکھتے ہیں کہ آپ نے زبردستی کر آپ نے نکمپن کیا لیکن ۸ ستمبر کی بات کہہ کر یہ ظاہر کیا کہ ۱۹۵۹ کے بعد ہم آگے بڑھے ہیں جب بڑھے ہوں تو اس کے بعد چین کا یہ کہنا ہے کہ ۱۹۵۹ ع میں جہاں وہ تھے انہیں وہیں رہنے دینا چاہئے انہیں ہٹایا نہیں جانا چاہئے اور تب یہ بارڈر کا جھگڑا ہوا اور اب بارڈر کا جھگڑا ہمارے سامنے آنا ہے اس پر ہماری سرکار کہتی ہے کہ یہ جو کولمبوں نے پروپوزلس ہیں تحاریر ہیں اس کے متعلق جتنے بڑے بڑے قابل ترین ساتھی بولے ہیں ہمارے بھوپیش کہنا نے ویاکھیان دیا ہے اس میں کہتے کہا ہیں کہ قریباً ایک سی چیز ہے تو میں یہ مطلب سمجھوں کہ ۸ ستمبر کی جو پرائم

[شری عبدالغنی]

ممسٹر نے بات کہی تھی یا جو اس کی گورنمنٹ نے کہی تھی اس کے معنی یہی تھے کہ چین ۸ ستمبر کی لائن سے پیچھے ہٹ جائے ملٹری طور پر فوجی طاقتی طور پر وہ اپنے کو پیچھے ہٹالے لیکن ان کی چوکیاں ان نے تحت دھیں - یقیناً ان کی اس طرح کی کوئی بات سمجھ میں نہیں آئی اس لئے یہ کہنا کہ جو پروپوزل ہے تجاویز ہیں وہ بالکل قریب ہیں اسکے جو ہماری سرکار نے کہا تھا - میرے خیال میں یہ بڑی بھول ہے یہ بھول بھلیاں ہیں جو ملک کے سامنے کہی جاتی ہیں - میں بڑا خوش ہوں کہ وہ اس موڈ میں ہیں کہ یہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہم نے بڑی بھاری کامیابی حاصل کی ہے۔ میں ان پاورس کی بات نہیں کہتا ان کا شکریہ ہے کیونکہ انہوں نے امن کے لئے کوشش کی لیکن میں ان سے کہتا ہوں کہ اگر ان میں ذرا بھی صبر ہو یہ یہ ہر عوام کی جو چلتے پھرتے ہیں اس کو رائے اس کے متعلق سنیں تو ان کو شاید صدمہ ہو وہ اپنے اکھڑ زبان میں کہتے ہیں وہ جان پہچان لائیں پائے لوٹ کے بدعو گھر کو آئے؟ میری نظر میں یہ جو ہیومن ریلیشن ہوئی ملک کی میں نہیں مانتا - میں نہیں کہتا کیونکہ وہ بیچارے . اندازن زبان میں اور اکھڑ - زبان میں بولے ہیں - میں یہی عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہماری ہیومن ریلیشن کی ذمہ داری اگر ہے

تو وہ پرنٹ مسٹر پر ہے ہر نقطہ نگاہ سے اگر چیلنج ۱۹۵۹ء کے آگے بڑھتے چلے آئے تھے تو کیوں ساری دنیا کو نہیں پکارا کہ چینی ہماری حدود میں ہمارے دیس میں ہماری بھارت کی سرزمین پر آگے بڑھتے چلے آ رہے ہیں دنیا ان کو سمجھائے میرا چھلی ہلدی بھائی بھائی کا نعرہ میرا پلچ شیل بھنگ کیا جا رہا ہے ان کو کوئی سمجھائے - اگر اس وقت انہوں نے آواز نہیں اٹھائی تو یہ کس کا قصور ہے کس کی بھول ہے - اس نے بعد جب یہ تشریف لے جا رہے تھے لٹکا تو جاتے جاتے کہہ دیا کہ ان کو مار کر بھگا دو اب یہ کوئی چپراسی کو حکم دینا تھا یا کسی پولیس آفیسر کو حکم دینا تھا کہ عبدالغنی کو مار کر بھگا دو - یہ دو ملکوں کے سبندوں میں ہوا اور دوسرے ملک کی طاقت اتنی کمزور نہیں تھی جس کو آسانی کے ساتھ بھلا دیا جائے - اگر ہماری تیاری نہیں تھی تو پھر اور بھی ظلم ہے - شکست کو میں کوئی بری بات نہیں مانتا شکستیں ہوتی ہیں اور شکستیں ہونے کے بعد فتح بھی آتی ہے کیونکہ میرا یقین ہے -

پھر ہا ہے سیل حوادث سے کہیں

مردوں کا منہ

شہر سیدھا تھرتا ہے وقت رفتی

آب میں

لیکن ظلم یہ ہے کہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر  
 جو کہیں وہ سچ کیونکہ ایک بڑی  
 اکل پیت جو ہے ایوزیشن کے آپس  
 میں پیوٹو، یعنی سے یہاں موجود ہے  
 اور کہتے ہیں کہ ہم جو کہتے ہیں وہی  
 سچ ہے اور یہاں سے ہیں کی سی ہٹانے  
 والا نہیں ہے۔ میں ان سے میڈم  
 بڑے ادب سے عرض کرتا ہوں کہ آج یہ  
 بالکل بھول رہے ہیں یہ بالکل غلط  
 راستے پر جا رہے ہیں انہیں سمجھ  
 میں نہیں آ رہا ہے کہ اس وقت یہ  
 دیس کے ساتھ کیا کرنے جا رہے ہیں  
 جب کہ یہ کہتے ہیں کہ کولمبو والے  
 وہی چیز پھر کرتے ہیں تقریباً تقریباً  
 جو ہمارے من میں تھی اور جو ہم  
 کہتے تھے۔ کیا یہ خود کہتے تھے کہ  
 دوسروں کا دخل ہماری زمین پر ہو  
 اور وہاں سے وہ ملحدی طور پر پیچھے  
 ہٹ جائیں۔ ایسا اگر یہ کہتے تھے تو  
 ملک کی آواز ایسی نہیں ہے اور اگر یہ  
 ان کے دماغ میں ہے کہ ایسا ہے تو  
 میڈم کل جب بات چل رہی تھی اور  
 بات چلتے چلتے میں نے پہلے بھی کہا  
 تھا اور میں اب پھر ان سے کہنا ہوں آپ  
 کے دواڑا کہ ان میں ہمت ہے تو صرف  
 دلی میں ہی ریفرنڈم کر دیکھیں۔  
 ان کو ۲۵ فی صدی ساتھی ہیں ملیں  
 گئے جو یہ کہیں کہ اس وقت کولمبو  
 پورس کی تجاویز کو ماننا ملک کی  
 ہائی فہم ہے ملک کی ذلت نہیں  
 ہے اور اس حکومت کی ذلت نہیں

ہے۔ میں بڑے ادب سے کہتا ہوں کہ  
 آج آپ جو چاہیں طاقت کے گھمٹ  
 میں کہہ سکتے ہیں لیکن جب ہم ان  
 تجاویز کو دیکھتے ہیں اور جب ہم ان  
 کو پڑھتے ہیں تو ہم اس میں دو  
 باتیں محسوس کرتے ہیں۔ ایک یہ  
 کہ اس وقت اس کو ماننا دینا بے امن  
 کو بچانا یہ کہتے ہیں نہیں ماننے تو  
 ورلڈ وار ہو جائے گی۔ میں اس سے  
 اتفاق نہیں کر سکتا ہوں۔ اتفاق نہ  
 بھی کروں تو ایک بات پر اتفاق ضرور  
 کرتا ہوں کہ ہمارے دیس میں جب  
 ہم تو اور ذاتی کی لڑائی لڑتے جا رہے  
 تھے تو کچھ بھائیوں نے یہاں پیوپلز وار  
 کا نعروں لگا کر کے اس کو سیپٹیج کیا  
 تھا اور پھر اس کے بعد ان کی حیثیت  
 کچھ نہیں رہی تھی۔ کمیونسٹوں کو  
 ملک نفرت کرنے لگا لیکن جب آزادی  
 ملی ہماری چونکہ نوبت یہ تھی کہ ہم  
 سب هندوستانیوں کو برابر کا حق دینا  
 چاہتے تھے ہم بھول گئے تھے کہ  
 کمیونسٹوں نے اس وقت کیا رول ادا  
 کیا تھا۔ یہاں تک کہ ہماری قدیم  
 کریسی میں ان کو کھیل میں اپنی  
 حکومت بگانے کا موقع ملا لیکن اس  
 نے بعد جب پھر ایک امتحان آیا کہ  
 ایک کمیونسٹ پارٹی نے چھین لے  
 ہندوستان پر جارحانہ حملہ کیا ہمارے  
 سپاہیوں کو ہمارے بہادروں کو اور  
 ہمارے نوجوانوں کو تہہ تیغ بے دریغ  
 کیا تو سارا ملک اس وقت ایک زبان

[شری عبدالغنی]

سے ایک دماغ سے اور ایک قدم سے اس حکومت کے پیچھے ہوا۔ اس وقت بھی کمیونسٹ پارٹی والے دو حصوں میں بٹ گئے ایک چین کے حق میں تھا اور ایک روس کا ہم خیال تھا۔ لیکن کوئی بھی اس خیال کا نہیں تھا کہ چین بھارت پر جارحانہ حملہ کیا ہے آج وہ پلڈت نہرو کی عظیم پارٹی کی پناہ لے کر پنی اس کمزوری کو یہاں چھپانا چاہتے ہیں۔ یہ نان الاٹمنٹ کی پالیسی میں کہتا ہوں کہ آپ کو مبارک ہو۔ لیکن آپ اپنے عزت و ہاتھ دیکر دہے کہ کیا آج آپ کی وہ پالیسی قائم ہے اگر قائم ہے تو ایک ہی ہے کہ اس وقت کمیونسٹ پلڈت نہرو اور ان کی پارٹی ایک ہیں باقی سارے ملک ان کے خلاف ہے۔ الاٹمنٹ یہاں تو ہے اس وقت کمیونسٹ اور کانگریس ایک ہیں۔ اس پروپوزل کے بارے میں میرا یہ کہنا ہے کہ ہمارے دیس میں جہاں سے چھلی ہٹے لگے وہاں ان کے سہولین آفیسرس دھینگے یہ تو میری سمجھ میں آگیا کہ اس پروپوزل کے یہ معنی ہیں لیکن اگر ایسا ہوا تو میں ان سے کہتا ہوں کہ ڈیفنس آف انڈیا رولز کا نام لے کر اپنی طاقت کا گھمنڈ کر کے آپ ان نچاویز دے دیتے ہوئے صلح کی بات کرنے جانا چاہیں تو جائیں لیکن ملک کو اپنے ساتھ نہیں لے جا سکیں گے۔ آپ کو مجھ جیسے ہزاروں

دیوانوں کی زبانوں کو کاٹنا ہوگا ہمارے ہاتھوں میں ہتھکڑیاں ڈالنی ہونگی ہمارے پاؤں میں بیڑیاں ڈالنی ہونگی اور ہمارے خون کی ندیوں میں آپ کو نہرنا ہوگا۔ یہ دیس کسی ایک پارٹی کا نہیں ہے اس سرکار کا نہیں ہے کہ جو اس کے من میں آئے وہ کہے آپ چاہے کسی کو کمیونسٹ کہیں چاہے کسی کو ری اکشنری کہیں اور جو آپ کے من میں آئے وہ کہیں لیکن مقدمہ مجھے اس وقت بڑا رنج ہے جب پلڈت نہرو کے سانہی کہتے ہیں کہ کشمیر جو ہے وہ یہاں کے پانچ کروڑ مسلمانوں کی ضمانت ہے یہ بالکل غلط ہے مسلمانوں کی ضمانت یہاں کا ودھان ہے یہاں کا سیکولرزم ہے ان کا اپنا ایمان ہے ان کی اپنی خود اعتمادی ہے۔ اگر یہ نہیں ہے تو ان پانچ کروڑ مسلمانوں کو مٹ جانا چاہئے بجائے اس کے کہ کشمیر کی ضمانت ان کی ہو۔ میں اس بات کو بھی نہیں مانتا کہ انگریز نے ٹھیک کہا تھا کہ راجہ نواب جدھر چاہیں ادھر اپنے آپ کو مدغم کر لیں اس کو نہ ہم نے مانا اور نہ ہم نے اس پر عمل کیا۔ کشمیر کے عوام ہیں جو بھارت کے ساتھ رہنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اس بارے میں یہ کہنے والا راجہ کون تھا تمام ہندو اور مسلمان وہاں کے یہ چاہتے تھے کہ وہ بھارت کے ساتھ رہیں۔

پاکستان اگر نہیں تو اس کے گریلہ سرحدی پتھانوں نے ظلم کر کے جد و جہد کر کے راجہ کی کمزوری کا فائدہ اٹھا کر کشمیر کے ایک حصہ پر قبضہ کر لیا جو ہمارا حصہ ہے - میں ہمیشہ کہتا ہوں کہ کشمیر بھارت کا انگ ہے جس میں اور کشمیر پر اگر پاکستان نے قبضہ کیا تو اس کے خوف وہاں کے لوگ لڑے۔ شیخ عبداللہ کی رہنمائی میں اور انہوں نے اس کا بہادرانہ مقابلہ کیا۔ آج اگر پاکستان بھی اگرسر ہے تو ہم کب کہتے ہیں کہ اس کے ساتھ جاکو بات چیت کرو۔ کیا اپوزیشن کی مرضی سے ایسا کرتے ہو۔ (Time bell rings)

میں دو منٹ اور لے کر کے وہ نہیں کروں گا جو بھوپیش گپتا نے کیا کہ آپ گھنٹی بجاتی رہیں اور وہ مزے سے ہم کو گالی دیتے رہیں -

میں یہ عرض کر رہا ہوں کہ ایسا نہیں ہوا - کشمیر کے عوام ہیں جو ہمارے ساتھ آج ہیں اور مجھے کوئی فہمراہت نہیں ہے اس بات سے کہ اگر آج کشمیری عوام کو تپ قربانی کی کسوٹی پر آزمایا جائے تو وہاں کے ہزاروں نہیں بلکہ لاکھوں ہندو اور مسلمان قربانی کے لئے تیار ہوں گے چاہے چائڈا مقابلہ میں آئے چاہے پاکستان مقابلہ میں آئے۔ اگر انگریز کی بات صحیح ہوتی تو پھر جرنل گڈھ اور مائیکرول کے نوابوں نے نواب ہوتے ہوئے اپنے آپ کو یہ سمجھا تھا کہ ہم یہاں کے سب بلڈگن خدا کے مالک ہیں اور

انہوں نے یہ کہا تھا کہ ہم پاکستان سے ملتے ہیں تو پھر ویسا ہو جانا لیکن وہاں کے لوگوں نے کہا کہ نہیں ہم ایسا نہیں - اتنے تم کون ہو ہم یہاں کے بسنے والے بھارت کے ساتھ رہینگے اس لئے ایسی باتیں کہنا کہ کشمیر ضمانت ہے مسلمانوں کی اس سے آپ اپنی بھی ہیتی کرتے ہیں اپنے سیکولرزم کی ہیتی کرتے ہیں اور اپنے ودھان کی ہیتی کرنے ہیں۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ اس وقت اگر آپ نے اپنی خودداری کا ثبوت نہیں دیا تو اس کا نتیجہ تھیک نہیں ہوگا - اب بے شک شکریہ ادا کیجئے ان پاورس کا لیکن ادب سے کہہ دیجئے کہ جو راستہ آپ ہمیں دکھا رہے ہیں وہ راستہ نہ تو گاندھی جی کا بتایا ہوا راستہ ہے نہ بدور کا بتایا ہوا راستہ ہے نہ چاکھیہ کا بتایا ہوا راستہ ہے نہ ہمارے بھارت کے انتہاس کا بتایا ہوا راستہ ہے بلکہ یہ راستہ دلت کا ہے - آج انہوں نے ہم سے کچھ جگہ چھینی ہے کل اگر ہم میں ہمت ہوگی تو دنیا ہمارے ساتھ ہوگی چاہے وہ کمیونسٹ بلاک ہو، چاہے وہ مغربی بلاک ہو چاہے وہ غیر جانب داروں کا بلاک ہو اور جب دنیا کی آواز ہمارے ساتھ ہو گی تو میرا یقین ہے کہ یہ پاجوج ماجوج جو چین میں بیٹھے ہوئے ہمارے ایمان کو ہماری مصیبت کو اور ہمارے دست تعاون کو ٹھکرا رہے ہیں ان کی



[شری عبدالغنی]

دلت ہوگی اور ان کو جھکنا ہوگا لیکن اگر آپ اپنی جگہ سے ہٹ گئے تو پھر بڑی مشکل ہے - پرائم منسٹر صاحب اپنے زعم میں جو چاہے کہہ دیں ان کو حق حاصل ہے لیکن ان کو سمجھ آئی چاہیئے کہ آج جو کچھ ہوا وہ انہی کی غلط پالیسی سے ہوا ان کی سرکار کی غلط نیتی سے ہوا ان کی غلط تہاری سے ہوا جو تہاری انہوں نے پلدرہ برس میں کی اس کی وجہ سے ہوا - کوئی دنہا کا پرائم منسٹر ایسا نہیں ہو سکتا کہ کہے کہ کرشلامیلن تھیک تھے کرشلامیلن نے بڑی ترقی کی باتیں کہیں - فوج کو بالکل سائنٹیفیک لائن پر تیار کیا اور اس کے باوجود ان سے استعفی مانگ لے - اس کے لئے اگر آپ یہ کہہ سکتے کہ یہ عوام کی رائے تھی تو آج بھی عوام کی رائے لیں - عوام کی رائے اس کے لئے قطعی نہیں ہے - گھر میں بیٹھ کر جو چاہے سرکار کر لے یہ سمجھ کر کہ ہم گدی پر براجمان ہیں ہم جو کچھ چاہیں گے جو کچھ مناسب سمجھیں گے وہ کریں گے لیکن پارٹی کی اکثریت کی بنا پر چل دھاتوں کی اکثریت کی بنا پر چوالیس کروڑ انسانوں کی قسمت کا فیصلہ کر دیں یہ غلط چیز ہے - میں یہی کہتا ہوں —

قریب ہے یارو روز معشر چہے کا  
کشتوں کا خون کیوں کر  
جو چپ دھ کی زباں خنجر  
لہو پکارے گا آستیں کا

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : जगाव डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहिबा । इससे पेशवर कि मैं यह जो प्रोपोजल्स है उनको विदुर नीति, चाणक्य नीति और मुल्क की नीति के मुताबिक देखू, मैं कोलम्बो पावर्स का शुकिया अदा करता हूं कि उन्होंने हमारे लिये, चीन के लिये और दुनिया के अमन के लिये इस तरह का कदम उठाया है । मैं अपनी सरकार को और अपनी सरकार की पार्टी को भी मुबारक बाद देता हूं कि जो उनके मन में था, जो वह चाहते थे, करीबन-करीबन वही कोलम्बो पावर्स ने कह दिया है । अगरचे मुझे इसका सदमा है कि आठ सितम्बर की जो बात कही गई है वह बिल्कुल गलत थी, हर नुकते निगाह से निकम्मी थी और किसी भी दाना हुकूमत को ऐसी बात कहना कि जिसमें उसकी इस कहने से हेटी होती हो, नहीं कहनी चाहिये थी । मैडम, मैं यह बात क्यों कहता हूं क्योंकि चीन वाले कहते हैं कि हम नवम्बर, १९५६ की पोजीशन में जाना चाहते हैं और हम कहते हैं कि ८ सितम्बर, १९६२ को जी पोजीशन थी वह हमको मिलनी चाहिये तो इसके माने साफ हो गये कि १९५६ में जो पोजीशन थी उससे आज हम आगे हैं । हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने या हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर के साथियों ने यह कभी जहमत गवारा नहीं की कि वह बताये कि १९५६ और ८ सितम्बर १९६२ के बीच में क्या होता रहा क्या जो चीनी हमारे इलाके के अन्दर घुस आये हमने उन्हें प्यार से हटा दिया, ताकत से हटा दिया, मिन्नत से पीछे हटा दिया ; किम तरह से हटा दिया यह बात किसी ने नहीं वनाई । तो उसके साइने यह भी हुए गांधी जी के लफ्जों में कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान के प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पदवी पर एक हरिजन बेटी होती तो वह साधारण तौर पर कहनी कि इसकी बातचीत तब चलेगी जब मन १९४७ में दोनों मुल्कों की जो हैसियत थी उसके मुताबिक यह बातचीत चलाई जाये या यह कहते कि ठीक है जहां तक आप आये हो हम अभी भी सारी दुनिया

†[ ] English transliteration

के सामने अपना केस रखते हैं कि आपने जबर-दस्ती की, आपने निकम्मापन किया। लेकिन ८ सितम्बर की बात कह कर यह जाहिर किया कि '५९ के बाद हम आगे बढ़े हैं जब बढ़े हैं तो उसके बाद चीन का यह कहना है कि १९५६ में जहाँ वह थे उन्हीं वही रहने देना चाहिये। उन्हें हटाया नहीं जाना चाहिये और तब यह बोर्डर का झगड़ा हुआ और अब बोर्डर का झगड़ा हमारे सामने आता है उस पर हमारी सरकार कहती है कि यह जा कोलम्बो के प्रॉपोजल्स है, तजाबीज है उसके मुनल्लिक जितने बड़े बड़े काबिलतरीन साथी बोले हैं, हमारे भूगोल गुप्त ने व्याख्यान दिया है, उसमें कहते क्या है कि करीबन एक मी चीज है। तो मैं यह मतलब समझू कि ८ सितम्बर की जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बात कही थी या उसकी गवर्नमेंट ने कही थी उसके माने यही थे कि चीन ८ सितम्बर की लाइन से पीछे हट जाये। मिनिट्री तौर पर, फौजी ताकती तौर पर वह अपने को पीछे हटा ले लेकिन उनकी चौकिया उनके तहत में रहे। यकीनन उनकी इस तरह की कोई वान समझ में नहीं आती। इस लिये यह कहना कि यह जो प्रॉपोजल्स है, तजाबीज है वह बिल्कुल करीब है उनके जो हमारी सरकार ने कहा था। मेरे ख्याल में यह बड़ी भूल है, यह भूल भुनैया है जो मुल्क के मामले कही जाती है। मैं बड़ा खुश हूँ कि वह इस मूड में है कि यह समझेंगे हैं कि हमने बड़ा भारी कामयाबी हामलि की है मैं इन पावर्स की बात नहीं कहता उनका शुक्रिया है क्योंकि उन्होंने अमन के लिये काशिश की। लेकिन मैं उनसे कहता हूँ कि उनमें जरा भी सन्न हो, यह अवाम की जो चलते फिरते हैं उसकी राय उसके मुनल्लिक मुने तो उनको शायद सदमा हो। वह अपने अक्खड जुबान में कहते हैं, "जान बची लाखों पाये, लौट के बुद्धू घर का आये"। मेरी नज़र में यह जो ह्यूमिलियेशन हुई मुल्क की, मैं नहीं मानता। मैं नहीं कहता क्योंकि वह बेचारे साधारण जुबान में और अक्खड जुबान में

बोले हैं मैं यही अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी ह्यूमिलियेशन की जिम्मेदारी अगर है तो वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर है हर नुक्ते निगाह से। अगर चीनी सन् १९५९ के आगे बढ़ने चले आये थे तो क्यों सारी दुनिया को नहीं पुकारा कि चीनी हमारी हद्द में, हमारे देश में, हमारी भारत की सर-जमीन पर आगे बढ़ते चले आ रहे हैं, दुनिया उनको समाझाये। मेरा चीनी-हिन्दी भाई-भाई का नारा, मेरा पचशील भग किया जा रहा है उनको कोई समझाये। अगर उस वक्त उन्होंने आवाज नहीं उठाई तो यह किसका कमूर है, किमकी भूल है। इसके बाद जब यह तशरीफ ले जा रहे थे लका तो जाते जाते कह दिया कि उनको मार कर भगा दो। अब यह कोई चपरासी का हुक्म देना था या किसी पुलिस आफिसर को हुक्म देना था कि अब्दुल गनी को मार कर भगा दो। यह दो मुल्कों के सम्बन्ध में था। और दूसरे मुल्क को ताकत इतनी कम-जोर नहीं थी जिसको आसानी के साथ भुला दिया जाय।

अगर हमारी तैयारी नहीं थी तो फिर और भी जुल्म है। शिकस्त का मैं कार्ट बुरी बात नहीं मानता। शिकस्ते होती है और शिकस्ते होने के बाद फतह भी आती है क्योंकि मेरा यकीन है —

फिरता है सेले हवादस से कही मर्दों का मुह, शेर सीधा तैरता है वक्ते रफ्तन आब में ॥

लेकिन जुल्म यह है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर जो कहे वह सच क्योंकि एक बड़ी अक्सरियत जो है अपोजिशन के आपस में फूटें रहने से यहाँ मौजूद है और कहते हैं कि हम जा कहते हैं वही सच है और यहाँ से हमें कोई हटाने वाला नहीं है। मैं उनसे, मैडम, बड़े अदब से अर्ज करता हूँ कि आज यह भूल रहे हैं, यह बिल्कुल गलत गमते पर जा रहे हैं। उन्हें समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि इस वक्त यह देश के साथ क्या करते जा रहे हैं जब कि यह कहते हैं कि

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

कोलम्बो वाले वही तजबीज करते हैं तकरिबन-तकरीबन जो हमारे मन में थी और जो हम कहते थे। क्या यह खुद कहते थे कि दूसरों का दखल हमारी जमीन पर हो और वहां से वह मिलिट्री तौर पर पीछे हट जायें। ऐसा अगर यह कहते थे तो मुल्क की आवाज ऐसी नहीं है और अगर यह उनके दिमाग में है कि ऐसा है तो, मंडम, कल जब बात चल रही थी और बात चलते चलते मैंने पहले भी कहा था और मैं अब फिर उनसे कहता हूं आपके द्वारा कि उनमें हिम्मत है तो सिर्फ दिल्ली में ही रिफरेन्डम करके देखें। उनको पच्चीस फीसदी साथी नहीं मिलेंगे जो यह कहें कि इस वक्त कोलम्बो पावर्स की तजबीज को मानना मुल्क की हानि नहीं है, मुल्क की जिल्लत नहीं है और इस हुकूमत की जिल्लत नहीं है। मैं बड़े अदब से कहता हूं कि आज आप जो चाहें ताकत के घमण्ड में कह सकते हैं लेकिन जब हम इन तजबीज को देखते हैं और जब हम इनको परखते हैं तो हम इसमें दो बातें महसूस करते हैं। एक यह कि इस वक्त इसको मानना दुनिया के अमन को बचाना है। यह कहते हैं नहीं मानते तो वर्ल्ड वार हो जायेगी मैं इससे इत्तफाक नहीं कर सकती हूं। इत्तफाक न भी करूं तो एक बात पर इत्तफाक जरूर करता हूं कि हमारे देश में जब हम डू और डाई की लड़ाई लड़ने जा रहे थे तो कुछ भाइयों ने यहां पीपुल्स वार का नारा लगा कर इसको सबोटेज किया था और फिर इसके बाद की हैसियत कुछ नहीं रही थी। कम्युनिस्टों को मुल्क नफरत करने लगा। लेकिन जब आजादी मिली हमारी चूंकि नीयत यह थी कि हम सब हिन्दुस्तानीनियों को बराबर का हक देना चाहते थे, हम सब भूल गये थे कि कम्युनिस्टों ने उस वक्त क्या रोल अरा किया था। यहां तक कि हमारी डेमोक्रेसी में उनको केरल में अपनी हुकूमत बनाने का मौका मिला लेकिन उसके बाद जब फिर एक इम्तहान आया कि कम्युनिस्ट पावर ने चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान पर जारहाना हमला किया, हमारे सिपाहियों को,

हमारे बहादुरों को और हमारे नौजवानों को तहे तेरा बेदरगा किया तो सारा मुल्क इस वक्त एक जुबान से, एक दिमाग से और एक कदम से इस हुकूमत के पीछे हुआ। उस वक्त भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वाले दो हिस्सों में बंट गये एक चीन के हक में था और एक रूस का हम ख्याल था। लेकिन कोई भी इस ख्याल का नहीं था कि चीन ने भारत पर जारहाना हमला किया है। आज वह पंडित नेहरू की अजीम पार्टी की पनाह लेकर अपनी इस कमजोरी को यहां छिपाना चाहते हैं। यह नान-अलाइनमेंट की पालिसी, मैं कहता हूं कि, आपको मुबारक हो लेकिन आप अपने हृदयों पर हाथ रख कर कहिए कि क्या आज आपकी वह पालिसी कायम है। अगर कायम है तो एक ही है कि इस वक्त कम्युनिस्ट पंडित नेहरू और उनकी पार्टी एक हैं बाकी सारा मुल्क उनके खिलाफ है। एलाइनमेंट यहां तो है इस वक्त कम्युनिस्ट और कांग्रेस एक हैं। इन प्रोपोजल्स के बारे में मेरा यह कहना है कि हमारे देश में जहां से चीनी हटेंगे वहां उनके सिविलियन आफीसर्स रहेंगे। यह तो मेरी समझ में आ गया कि इन प्रोपोजल्स के यह माने हैं। लेकिन अगर ऐसा हुआ तो मैं उनसे कहता हूं कि डिफेन्स आफ इण्डिया रूल्स का नाम लेकर अपनी ताकत का घमण्ड करके आप इन तजबीज के होते हुए सुलह की बात करने जाना चाहें तो जायें लेकिन मुल्क को अपने साथ नहीं ले जा सकेंगे। आपको मुझ जैसे हजारों दीवानों की जुबानों को काटना होगा, हमारे हाथों में हथकड़ियां डालनी होंगी, हमारे पांवों में बेड़ियां डालनी होंगी और हमारे खन की नदियों में तैरना होगा। यह देश किसी एक पार्टी का नहीं है, इस सरकार का नहीं है कि जो इसको मन में आये वह कहे। आप चाहे किसी को कम्युनिस्ट कहें, चाहे किसी को रिएक्शनरी कहें और जो आपके मन में आये वह कहें लेकिन, मंडम, मुझे इस वक्त बड़ा रंज होता है जब पंडित नेहरू के साथी कहते हैं कि कश्मीर जो है वह यहां के ५ करोड़ मुसलमानों की जमानत है। यह बिल्कुल गलत है। मुसलमानों की जमानत

यहां का विधान है, यहां का सेक्युरिज्म है उनका अपना ईमान है, उनकी अपनी खुद ऐतमादी है। अगर यह नहीं है तो उन ५ करोड़ मुसलमानों को मिट जाना चाहिए बजाए इसके कि कश्मीर की जमानत उनकी हो। मैं इस बात को भी नहीं मानता कि अंग्रेज ने ठीक कहा था कि राजा नवाब जिधर चाहें उधर अपने आपको मदगम कर लें। इसको न हमने माना और न हमने इस पर अमल किया। कश्मीर के अवाम हैं जो भारत के साथ रहना चाहते हैं। इस बारे में यह कहने वाला राजा कौन था। तमाम हिन्दू और मुसलमान वहां के यह चाहते थे कि वह भारत के साथ रहें। पाकिस्तान अगर नहीं तो उसके गुरिल्ला सरहदी पठानों ने जुलम करके, जहोजहद करके, राजा की कमजोरी का फायदा उठा कर कश्मीर के एक हिस्से पर कब्जा कर लिया जो हमारा हिस्सा है। मैं हमेशा कहता हूं कि कश्मीर भारत का अंग है। जम्मू और कश्मीर पर अगर पाकिस्तान ने कब्जा किया तो उसके खिलाफ वहां के लोग लड़े शेख अब्दुल्ला की रहनुमाई में और उन्होंने इसका बहादुराना मुकाबला किया। आज अगर पाकिस्तान भी एग्रेसर है तो हम कब कहते हैं कि उसके साथ जाकर बातचीत करो। क्या अपोजीशन की मर्जी से ऐसा करते हो? (*Time bell rings*) में दो मिनट और लेकर वह नहीं करूंगा जो भूपेश गुप्त ने किया कि आप घंटी बजाती रहें और वह मजे से हमको गाली देते रहे।

मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा हूं कि ऐसा नहीं हुआ। कश्मीर के अवाम हैं जो हमारे साथ आज हैं और मुझे कोई घबराहट नहीं है इस बात से कि अगर आज कश्मीरी अवाम को आप कुर्बानी की कसौटी पर आजमाना चाहें तो वहां के हजारों नहीं बल्कि लाखों हिन्दू और मुसलमान कुर्बानी के लिए तैयार होंगे चाहे चाइना मुकाबले में आये, चाहे पाकिस्तान मुकाबले में आये। अगर अंग्रेज की बात सही

होती तो फिर जूनागढ़ और मंगरोल के नवाबों ने नवाब होते हुए अपने आप को यह समझा था कि हम यहां के सब बन्दगाने खुदा के मालिक हैं और उन्होंने यह कहा था कि हम पाकिस्तान से मिलते हैं तो वैसा हो जाता। लेकिन वहां के लोगों ने कहा कि नहीं हम ऐसा नहीं मानते। तुम कौन हो? हम यहां के बसने वाले भारत के साथ रहेंगे। इसलिए ऐसी बातें कहना कि कश्मीर जमानत है मुसलमानों की इससे आप अपनी भी हेटी करते हैं, अपने सेक्युरिज्म की हेटी करते हैं और अपने विधान की हेटी करते हैं। मैं कहता हूं कि इस वक्त अगर आपने अपनी खुदारी का सबूत नहीं दिया तो इसका नतीजा ठीक नहीं होगा। अब बेशक शुक्रिया अदा कीजिए इन पावर्स का लेकिन अदब से कहिए कि जो रास्ता आप हमें दिखा रहे हैं वह रास्ता न तो गांधीजी का बताया हुआ रास्ता है, और न बिदुर का बताया हुआ रास्ता है, न चाणक्य का बताया हुआ रास्ता है, न हमारे भारत के इतिहास का बताया हुआ रास्ता है, बल्कि यह रास्ता जिल्लत का है। आज उन्होंने हमसे कुछ जगह छीनी है। कल हम में हिम्मत होगी तो दुनिया हमारे साथ होगी चाहे वह कम्युनिस्ट ब्लाक हो, चाहे वह मशरबी ब्लाक हो, चाहे वह गैर जानिबदारों का ब्लाक हो और जब दुनिया की आवाज हमारे साथ होगी तो मेरा यकीन है कि यह याजूज माजूज जो चीन में बैठे हुये हमारे ईमान को, हमारी मुहब्बत को और हमारे दस्तेतुआवन को ठुकरा रहे हैं उनकी जिल्लत होगी और उनको झुकना होगा, लेकिन अगर आप अपनी जगह से हट गये तो फिर बड़ी मुश्किल है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब अपने जईम में जाँ चाहे कह दें उन को हक हासिल है लेकिन उन को समझ आनी चाहिए कि आज जो कुछ हुआ वह उन की ही गलत पालिसी से हुआ, उन की सरकार की गलत नीति से हुआ, उन की गलत तैयारी से हुआ जो तैयारी उन्होंने १५ वर्ष में की उस की वजह से हुआ। कोई दुनिया का प्राइम मिनिस्टर ऐसा नहीं

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

हो सकता कि कहे कि कृष्ण मेनन ठीक थे, कृष्ण मेनन ने बड़ी तरक्की की बातें की, फौज को बिल्कुल साइन्टिफिक लाइन पर तैयार किया और इस के बावजूद उन से इस्तीफा मांग ले। इस के लिए अगर आप कहेंगे कि यह अवाम की राय थी तो आज भी अवाम की राय लें। अवाम की राय इस के लिए कतई नहीं है। घर में बैठ कर जो चाहे सरकार कर ले, यह समझ कर कि हम गद्दी पर विराजमान हैं हम जो कुछ चाहेंगे जो कुछ मुनासिब समझेंगे करेंगे लेकिन पार्टी की अक्सरियत की बिना पर चन्द हाथों की अक्सरियत की बिना पर चवालीस करोड़ इंसानों की किस्मत का फैसला कर दें यह गलत चीज है। मैं यही कहता हूँ—

करीब है यारो रोज़े महशर  
छुपेगा कुश्तों का खून क्योंकर  
जो चुप रहेगी जुवाने खंजर  
लहूँ पुकारेगा आस्तीं का।]

**श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) :** उप-सभापति महोदया, हम ने एक पुरानी कहानी पढ़ी थी कि करे तो डर और न करे तो डर। यह हम ने पढ़ा था। इस के बाद हम ने जो पढ़ा था वह यह था कि एक आदमी कुछ कहता है और दूसरा कुछ कहता है लेकिन एक आदमी ही दो तरह की बात कहता है यह मैं इस हाउस में ही देख रहा हूँ।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है कि मैं इस हाउस में यह देख रहा हूँ। मैं देखता हूँ कि अभी जो साहब बोले वह एक तरफ तो यह एतराज करते थे कि चार, पांच, छः साल से जब से हमला हो रहा था तब से बराबर क्यों खामोश बैठे रहे और साथ ही उसी सांस में यह भी दूसरी तरफ कहते थे कि चलते वक्त पंडित जी ने/यह क्यों कह दिया

कि उन को हटा दिया जाय। ये दोनों मुतजाद बातें एक ही साहब के मुंह से निकलना कुछ शोभा नहीं देता, उस से हाउस की प्रेस्टिज कुछ बढ़ती नहीं है।

شری عبدالغنی : میں نے یہ کہی نہیں کہا - میں نے یہ کہا کہ جب تیار نہیں تھے تو کیوں اس طریقہ کا حکم دیدیا - میں نے کہا کہ ان کو نکالو نہیں -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : मैं ने यह कभी नहीं कहा। मैं ने यह कहा कि जब तैयार नहीं थे तो क्यों इस तरीके का हुक्म दे दिया। मैं ने यह नहीं कहा कि उन को निकालो नहीं।]

**श्री राम सहाय :** आप के गलत प्रपोजेंट करने से नहीं होगा, यह तो आप की स्पीच में होगा। मुठी भर आदमियों की नुमाइंदगी करने वाला जनता की दुहाई दे और यह दुहाई दे कि सारी दुनिया, सारा हिन्दुस्तान उन के हाथ में है यह बड़ी अफसोसनाक बात है। हर एक आदमी को जब कभी वह कुछ बात कहे तो कम से कम अपने अस्तित्व को, अपनी हैसियत को ध्यान में रख कर के उस को बात करनी चाहिये, बिना वजह के बात को बिल्कुल एक डोबेट का मुकाम बना लेना और बहुत लम्बी चौड़ी बात करना, इस से कोई लाभ नहीं होने वाला है। इस से आप किसी को धोका नहीं दे सकते हैं बल्कि अपने आप को ही धोका देते हैं। जब इस तरह की बातें करते हैं तो सिवाय इस के कि आप अपने आप को धोका दें और कुछ ज्यादा नहीं कर सकते हैं।

आप से इतना निवेदन कर के मैं कोलम्बो प्रपोजल्स जो हमारे सामने आये हैं उन के सम्बन्ध में निवेदन कछंगा कि उन पर हम गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करें और देखें। हम यह समझें कि चीनियों ने

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

यह प्रोपेगेंडा किया, यह प्रचार किया— जब से उन्होंने कार्यवाही शुरू की तब से वह बराबर, निरन्तर कहते रहे— कि आओ बैठो और बातचीत करो, आओ बैठो और बातचीत करो । आज हमारे लिये यह फब्क की बात है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो बात कही थी उसको कोलम्बो में जो ताकतें बैठी थी, उन्होंने भी माना और उस को मान कर के चीनियों से यह कहा कि हटो और अपने को नहीं कहा कि तुम भी हटो । तो जब इस प्रकार की बात है तो मैं नहीं समझता कि उन प्रस्तावों को मानने में हमें क्यों संकोच करना चाहिये । एक बड़े ताज्जुब की बात यह है कि जिस गवर्नमेंट ने, गवर्न- 3 मेंट के जिस नुमाइंदे ने, गवर्नमेंट के जिस नेता ने यह बात रखी थी कि जब तक वे सितम्बर की रेखा से पीछे नहीं हटेंगे, तब तक हम उनसे बात नहीं करेंगे, वही जब कह रहा है कि वह डिमांड सौ-परसेंट पूरी होती है तब उस पर वे लोग, जिन्होंने कि उन मामलात को देखा नहीं है, जिन्होंने उन मामलात को स्टडी नहीं किया है, जो हालतों को नहीं जानते हैं, जो नहीं जानते हैं कि हमारे फ्रंटियर पर क्या हालत है, जिन्होंने उन स्थानों को देखा नहीं है, जिन्होंने उसे ख़ाब में भी नहीं देखा है, इस तरह की बात करें कि यह हमारी डिमांड को पूरा नहीं करता है यह एक बड़े ताज्जुब की बात है । मुझे बड़ा अफसोस होता है कि ऐसे जिम्मेदार हाउस में बैठ कर हम इस तरह की बात करें । यह कुछ मुनासिब नहीं है ।

मेरी अर्ज यह है कि हम यह देखें कि उन प्रस्तावों में कहा क्या गया है । उन प्रस्तावों से हम किसी तरह से भी पाबन्द नहीं होते हैं, हम किसी हक को नहीं छोड़ते हैं, हम केवल इतना करते हैं कि हम बैठ कर आपस में बात करते हैं । हम वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् के सिद्धान्त को मानने वाले हैं,

सारा संसार हमारा कुटुम्ब है । जब हम यह बात मान कर चलते हैं तब हम यह बात भी न मानें कि दूसरे देश से बैठ कर बातचीत करें, तो यह मुनासिब नहीं है, किसी तरह से भी यह अच्छी बात नहीं कही जा सकती । जब हम बात करने के लिये बैठेंगे तब सम्भव है कि कोई रास्ता निकले और अगर बात करने के लिये भी नहीं बैठते हैं तो फिर यह जो गलत प्रचार चल रहा था, वह चलता रहेगा कि 'हम तो बात करने के लिये बैठना चाहते हैं लेकिन वे नहीं बैठते हैं' । जो पत्र-व्यवहार हुआ है उस को मैंने देखा है और उस में हर वक्त यह कोशिश है कि दुनिया में यह जाहिर करें कि हम चीनी तो बात करना चाहते हैं । वे बार-बार कहते हैं कि आओ बैठो और बात करो और इसी प्रकार प्रचार से उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को ज्यादा बदनाम करने की कोशिश की है । तो मेरा अर्ज करना यह है कि इन कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों द्वारा हम जो कुछ भी स्वीकार कर रहे हैं, वह बिल्कुल मुनासिब है और वह यह है कि हमको बैठ कर उन से बातचीत करनी है, अपने हृद के बारे में जो भी जिस प्रकार से हम ठीक समझते हैं उस प्रकार से हम निश्चय करेंगे और उनसे बातचीत करेंगे और उन को मनवाने की कोशिश करेंगे । तो यहां जिस प्रकार की बातें की गईं, इस प्रकार की बातें करने से हम किसी लम्बे नतीजे पर नहीं पहुंच सकते हैं ।

यहां किसी साहब ने कुछ हार की बात भी कही । कहा कि हम इस मामले में कुछ हारे । मेरा अर्ज करना यह है कि लड़ाई का जो आखिरी नतीजा होता है उसी को हमें नतीजा समझना चाहिये । पिछली लड़ाई जो हुई थी, उसमें कितनी उथल-पुथल हुई, कई देशों का नामोनिशान तब मिट गया था और दूसरी जगह जा कर उन को रहना पड़ा था और अपनी गवर्नमेंट बनानी पड़ी थी । लेकिन फिह वे अपने-अपने

[श्री राम सहाय]

स्थानों पर वापिस हुए और आज भी वे अपने देशों पर हुकूमत कर रहे हैं। तो यह बात हमें अपनी आखों से ओझल नहीं करनी चाहिये। जब हमला होता है तब इस तरह की थोड़ी-बहुत बात हो ही जाती है। जब इतनी लम्बी फ्रंटियर हो और फ्रंटियर पर एक शक्तिशाली देश हो, तो वह किसी वक्त, किसी मुकाम पर हमला करेगा, यह उस के अधिकार की चीज है—हम तो कोई एग्रेसर नहीं थे, वह एग्रेसर था और उस ने जहां चाहा वहां हमला किया—और उस की वजह से हमें नुकसान उठाना पड़ा, लेकिन यह कहना कि हम हार गये या हमारी जलालत हुई एक गलत चीज होगी। हमारे जवानों ने जो काम किया है वह सराहनीय है, उन्होंने ने हमारे देश की रक्षा के लिये जो भी इमकानी कोशिश हो सकती थी, वह की है और अब भी कर रहे हैं। हम यहां महज कड़े शब्द कहें या बहस-मुबाहिसा करे तो उस से तो कोई लड़ाई नहीं जीती जा सकती। उस से तो हम अपने दिमाग को और खराब कर लेते हैं और दिमाग में जो शान्ति होनी चाहिये उस को भी हम बर्बाद कर देते हैं और इस तरह सही बात सोचने के तरीके को भी बन्द कर देते हैं। मेरा अर्ज करना यह है कि ऐसे मौके पर हम को बहुत शान्ति से—अपनी स्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए, हमारे जो साधन हैं उन सब को ध्यान में रखते हुए—विचार करना है, तभी हम किसी सही नतीजे पर पहुंच सकते हैं। महज हम यह खयाल कर लें कि हम देश के बहुत बड़े आदमी हैं और हम बहुत बड़ा कुछ कर सकते हैं, यह ठीक नहीं है। हम में जितनी शक्ति है, उस शक्ति का अंदाजा करिये और वह अंदाजा करने के बाद फिर इस को सोचिये।

अभी हमारे श्री वाजपेयी ने यह कहा कि इन प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करने के पीछे

कुछ भय की बात है, इस के पीछे कुछ डर की बात मालूम होती है और डर की वजह से हम इसे स्वीकार कर रहे हैं। हमारे वाजपेयी साहब ने एक दफा इसी सदन में इस बात का दावा किया था कि स्वतंत्रता की लड़ाई में उन्होंने भी भाग लिया है। वह आज अपने उन साथियों, जिन्होंने उनके साथ स्वतंत्रता की लड़ाई में भाग लिया था, छोड़ कर दूसरी जगह चले गये हैं लेकिन उन के पुराने साथी अपने स्थान पर मुद्द है, मजबूत हैं और मजबूती के साथ देश को अपने साथ ले कर चल रहे हैं, उन के बारे में उन का यह कहना है कि उन के दिमाग में डर आ गया है, यह मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि ठीक है। इस के लिये मुझे अफसोस होता है। यह एक प्रकार का लाइन है जो उन्होंने महज अपनी पार्टी के खयाल से लगाया है। उन्हें यह याद रखना चाहिये, उन्हें यह मालूम कर लेना चाहिये, कि महात्मा गांधी के जो अनुयायी हैं, महात्मा गांधी ने जिस को अपना उत्तराधिकारी बनाया है वह कभी किसी भय के पीछे, डर के पीछे अपना माथा टेक नहीं सकते हैं। मैं नहीं

6 P.M.

समझता उन के खयाल में इस प्रकार की बात कैसे आई। जिस प्रकार का इल्जाम उन्होंने लगाया और और भय की बात बताई, वैसी कोई बात इन प्रस्तावों से झलकती भी नहीं है। वह तो मेरे खयाल से उन के दिमाग की उपज है जो उन्होंने यह सोचा कि भय की वजह से यह सब बातें कही जा रही हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि जिस प्रकार से उन में भय उत्पन्न हो गया है, वह एक ऐसे समाज में शायद दाखिल हो गये हैं जिस से उन्हें भय दिखायी देता है और इसी कारण उन्होंने हमारे ऊपर भय का लाइन लगाया, इन प्रस्तावों को भय के कारण स्वीकार करना बताया। मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इस प्रकार की कोई बात उन प्रस्तावों में भी नहीं है और न कोई इस प्रकार का इतिहास है जिस से यह बात समझी जा सकती कि उन के पीछे भय की बात है।

मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव में जो दूसरी बात कही गई है कि २० किलोमीटर उन को पीछे हटना चाहिये तो वह २० किलोमीटर हट जाने से लद्दाख में भी उन की जो चौकियां इस तरफ की हैं, जो उन्होंने बनाई हैं और डधर बढ़ गई हैं, वे भी एक प्रकार से समाप्त हो जाती हैं और हम अपनी चौकियों पर जहां से पीछे हट गये थे, वापस पहुंच जाते हैं। मैं नहीं समझता किस प्रकार इस बात में सन्देह किया जाता है। नेफा में तो मैकमाहन लाइन के पीछे उन को जाना पड़ रहा है, वे उसके पीछे रहे हैं। हम बैठकर विचार करें कि दरअसल यह सरहद का झगड़ा किस प्रकार से निपट सकता है, किस प्रकार से यह सारा मसला हल हो सकता है। इस पर विचार करने के लिये हम आपस में बैठें भी नहीं यह कैसे मुमकिन हो सकता है। आज हम यू० एन० ओ० में जाने की बात करते हैं लेकिन आपस में बैठ कर बात करना हम बुरा समझते हैं, यह एक अजीब सी बात है। मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि हमारे सामने जो प्रस्ताव हैं उन को हमें अवश्य ही स्वीकार करना चाहिये . . . . .

**श्री राजेन्द्र प्रताप सिंह :** कोई प्रस्ताव नहीं है स्वीकार करने का।

**श्री राम सहाय :** स्वीकार करने से मेरा मतलब यह नहीं है कि प्रस्ताव जैसी ही कोई चीज है। मेरा मतलब यह है कि जो तरीका उन्होंने बताया है, जो उन्होंने हम से अपेक्षा की है कि हम मिल-बैठ कर बातचीत करें, वह हम को करना चाहिये। यह स्वीकार करने की बात आप दूसरा मतलब लगा कर खींचें तो शब्दों की खींचातानी से कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलने वाला है। जो इस चीज की भूमिका है, उसके अनुसार आप को मतलब निकालना चाहिये।

तो मैं आप से अर्ज करूं कि मेरे खयाल से जैसे पहले दोनों देशों के आफिसर्स बैठे थे, उस वक्त कुछ नतीजे निकले थे, और उन्होंने कुछ बातें तय की थी और हम ने उस वक्त अपना केस बहुत ही स्ट्रांग बनाया था, वैसे ही आज भी हमारा दावा है कि जब हम सच्चाई पर हैं तो निश्चय ही हमारा केस बहुत स्ट्रांग है और हम दुनिया के सामने ऐसी बातें रख सकेंगे कि जिस से दुनिया को मालूम हो कि जो बातें हम ने कही हैं वे सही हैं। प्राचीन इतिहास हमारा साक्षी है कि यह जितना भी देश है वह सब हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा रहा है। कैलाश पर्वत और मानसरोवर की बात हमारे तमाम प्राचीन ग्रन्थों में मिलती है। फिर हम नहीं समझ सकते कि किस प्रकार से हम उन सब बातों को नजरअंदाज कर सकते हैं और कैसे दुनिया को चीन वाले धोके में डाल सकते हैं।

मैं समझता हूं कि पंडित जी के बयान के बाद इस सम्बन्ध में और कुछ अधिक कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। बस मैं इतना ही अर्ज करना चाहता हूं।

**KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think all the points have already been covered by the previous speakers and after the Prime Minister's speech there is not much clarification of anything to be given. But I would like to say a few words to some of those hon. Members, particularly Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha, who said that many of the vital papers were not available and, therefore, how could they give any opinion on this matter. I would also address a word to Mr. Mani who pointed out that when Parliament was meeting here, why did the Prime Minister talk with the Colombo Powers and why, even in principle, did he accept their proposals, and so on and so forth? I think my hon. friend, who must be well-versed



[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]

with the facts of history, will appreciate that it is only our Government that places all the facts before Parliament, before the country, whenever any major decision is taken, or whenever any major development takes place in the country or any plans are made, or any schemes are made for the country itself. Here everything is placed before the public as well as Parliament and nothing is kept secret. If you look at the history of the European powers, the Western powers or the Communist bloc, you will notice that they have always made all kinds of international treaties, various types of agreements with other nations, as well as taken decisions affecting their own country, sometimes even appropriating territories of other countries which became a part of Russia or of America or of England, they even created their own sphere of influence in other parts of the world, without taking their country or Parliament into confidence. Many vital decisions affecting international politics were taken and they became known to the people at large after twenty, thirty or even forty years. Therefore, to say that on this matter, which is hardly a week old, or to say that in the last session also the meeting of the Colombo Powers was known to us and the proposals were communicated to us only a few days back is hardly fair. Sir, the entire proposals of the Colombo Powers and their clarifications have been placed before Parliament. I would like to ask those hon. Members who are great champions of freedom, democracy and the rest of it whether these democratic countries always took their own Parliaments into confidence before making agreements or treaties and all sorts of things. Therefore, to find fault with our Government, which has always placed all the fundamental things before the country and Parliament is very unfair indeed. I am sorry that we do not appreciate the fact that at every step Parliament and the rest of the country is taken into confidence. I am sorry that we do not give the Government that much credit.

So also, Sir, some of our hon. Members said that this should not have been done and we should not negotiate with China. Mr. Vajpayee asked as to what decency and good manners were involved while talking to a country associated with evil and bad manners and so on and so forth. Sir, twice the Chinese proposals came before us and the Government of India rejected them. The Government had the courage and the confidence and the strength, to reject them though we were losing post after post and we continued fighting. In October and November last the Government refused to talk with the Chinese Government about any sort of negotiation or truce though peace offers came and we were losing. Now, the pre-condition to these proposals is that the Chinese withdraw to the position of 8th September. They are the people who have won, who have come further into our territory and now they are willing to vacate all that they have occupied so far, and even beyond that, that is 20 kilometres, they will go in the Ladakh area and so on. They will give up all the military posts which they had, much larger in number than ours. Even their personnel that was there is in much larger number than ours, which will be removed by them. They have been able to occupy a part of our territory from which they are going to withdraw and then we call it bad manners to talk to them and all that. I think it is good manners if we talk to them when they are withdrawing from these areas. Of course, it is quite proper to say that every nation should talk on honourable terms. At no stage has the Prime Minister ever said that he would be willing to negotiate without honourable terms. The Prime Minister has said it repeatedly, he has put it time and again, that we shall have negotiations only on honourable terms. But the propaganda is carried on that we do not want to have any negotiations with them, and if at all we do, that will be on very bad terms or we will be selling away our country. Nobody can imagine particularly the Prime

Minister or his present Government doing anything which would go against the interest of the country. While we may talk with China, while we may discuss various proposals with that country, the fact remains that our country must be defended against any type of foreign aggression in future. China has awakened us to the reality of the modern life, to the modern type of warfare to which every country is exposed. We cannot ever forget that fact, at least now because in previous times, we were going on, more or less like a medieval society or, so to say, a society or a State or a country taking to modern way of life almost in its very early, preliminary stages but this Chinese invasion has certainly shocked us in a way, it has hurt us and it has made us alive to the realities of the modern world and that we can be open to any attack from any country at any time. Therefore this is a war, this is a defence of this country for which every single citizen, man, woman or child, has to be ready and this is not only what we have to be ready for but I think even our children and grand-children will have to be ready to look after the defence of this country. This is not going to be settled today or in six months or one year or across the table with China and so on. China may attack, Pakistan may attack or some other trouble may come and it may be that anything may happen in this world. Therefore, to think that we should not talk with China and all these proposals are very bad and we should not even look at them, this I think is very incorrect and unrealistic. If we are realistic, we do not want even diplomatically to antagonise the Colombo Powers. We cannot be sure and I do not know how Mr. Vajpayee and other Members say that there shall not be any attack from China. How do they know about it? Have they had any consultation with China or have they any authority or have they their own C.I.D.s. in China that they can say that there shall not be any attack?

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:**  
Have you any information that they will attack?

**KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT:**  
We have to be ready for any attack from anywhere. It is not a question of whether they are attacking or somebody else is. When for the last two times we have been having consultations and meetings with Pakistan, why is it that all these parties who become so disturbed and concerned and feel disconcerted about these particular negotiations today, do not worry about our talks with China? Have they asked what is it that you are discussing with China and what is your basis and what are you discussing?

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:**  
Pakistan.

**KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT:**  
I am sorry, Pakistan. Why is it that these parties who are worried about the Chinese are completely silent about the negotiations with Pakistan though Pakistan had also committed aggression, though Pakistan had also violated our territory? Is it that the Pakistan's violation of our territory and invasion becomes a *de jure* and correct thing because it has been 15 years' old and therefore a compromise there will be all right? Or is it only that China's is a new wound and therefore it hurts us more? I think the hon. Members should apply the same criterion while dealing with China or Pakistan or any other country. It is our territory and we want to fight for it, to look after it and we want to be prepared for it in the future for ever and ever. They are so worried about any talks with China; even when six other Powers are intervening they ridicule them, they spoil the atmosphere; but when the talk with Pakistan was going on, our Members, even the Opposition Members and others, quietly felt 'No, we should not mention anything about Pakistan. This is a very delicate matter'. But when anything concerning China comes, then that is not a delicate matter at all. There we can be

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]

brutal, we can ridicule them, we can jeer at them, we can make fun of the Powers and mediators, poor people who, in their goodness and friendliness have come in and tried to help to bring the two parties together to talk about matters affecting our country. We have not the decency to appreciate and pay tribute to those non-aligned powers who have tried in their goodness and in their way to bring about some sort of agreement between India and China but we jeer at them as if the Chinese problem will be solved by really making fun of them or laughing at them. That is not how your battle is going to be fought. It is not making fun of them or ridiculing them that is going to take us very far. For that we have to be prepared at the industrial level and the country has to be prepared militarily. There has to be preparation and diplomatically we have to see. We criticise the non-alignment policy of the Government, that it has gone out of the window and so on. I beg to submit that it is the non-alignment policy which has been appreciated by both the blocs. That is the reason why we have the support, as much support as they could give, from America and England and from the Western Powers, and from the Communist countries. It is a very great development of history, of the world history. It is a very outstanding and significant development that the Communist Parties have not appreciated the aggression committed by China but they have really condemned it. It goes greatly to the credit of Russia, East Germany, Poland and other countries in the Communist area that they have taken a very objective view and I think their prestige and status have certainly gone up by this objective outlook on their part. If they had taken the side of China, we would have been somewhat disillusioned and somewhat disappointed that they did not take an objective view. I am very happy indeed that they have taken a very objective view and have condemned China. China stands today very

much isolated and condemned not only by the other powers and most of the world opinion but by their Communist countries also. Thereby the status, position and standing of the Communist countries have gone up because they could say that one of their own Communist countries that is China, has not been very fair to us and has committed aggression and has violated our territory and so on. That is a very outstanding development of the modern world, if I may say so, and it goes to show that our policy was successful and has done well for us to have been able to get the appreciation of almost the overwhelming nations in the world, all the countries of the world more or less barring one or two or say North Korea, North Viet-Nam and China and maybe a few others but mostly, by and large practically all the countries of the world have supported India and have even appreciated our policy of non-alignment. Had we been aligned one way or the other, things would have been very different. Automatically the Communist bloc would have gone against us if we were aligned with the Western powers and the Western countries would have supported us. If we were aligned with the Communist bloc, we would have the sympathy of Russia, automatically the Western countries would have been against us. Today we are in a fortunate position and we are grateful for that that all these countries have been sympathetic towards our stand and that I think is a very great gain for the foreign policy of our country and the fact that we have been able to get their sympathy by our following the present policy.

So also Mr. A. D. Mani was rather very categorical about various points yesterday. I fail to understand all that and I think he is so much used to *benami* transactions as Mr. Arora said the other day, that I never know whether he is speaking on behalf of the Jan Sangh or the Swatantra Party or on behalf of the P.S.P. or all of

them together. Nevertheless, I wish he would speak for himself rather than for other people and in other people's tone and style and give their views.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** He is a general distributor of all those . . .

**KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT:** Shri Ganga Sharan also said that other powers would be angry with us and would not like us to proceed. Mr. Mani also said 'We will lose the sympathy of Western countries and we should not accept these proposals and we should reject them'. I think more than anything else, the Western countries always want that you should, for a change follow your own conscience. You should be independent in your opinion. You should stand for your own convictions. If you are only going to toe their line, this is not the spirit of democracy by any means at all. Even the democratic people want—they may use various people and sections for their own purposes to propagate this or that—but even their own basic principle is this that people do live as they want to live, they follow their own beliefs and their convictions and their opinions and they govern their own country in their own way, as they think best. If we are only going to be guided in our country's affairs by what so and so will say, the Americans are not the people who ever even say: 'I am doing this because so and so will say this'. They follow all they want to follow and what their own convictions may be. If we want really to be truly democratic in our country and truly free people, we must follow our own conviction and our own conscience and our own judgment in this. We cannot be guided only by fear that the West will not side with us or so and so will not side with us or so and so will be angry or so and so will not like it. The funniest thing is this. How can we say that the West will not support us? I think they have already given us support and they

will continue to give us support and in no way are we likely to alienate the sympathy of the Communist countries or of the neutrals now in the world, by accepting these proposals. It may interest Mr Mani to know—I am sorry he is not here—that some of the newspapers and some of the opinions expressed in America as well as in the United Kingdom have supported the Chinese stand and have not supported our stand. Even a great man whom most Indians like very much and for whom we have great regard and respect, I mean Sir Bertrand Russell, has asked why India should be a war-monger. Why does she not want peace with China when the Chinese Prime Minister has put forward his peace proposals? Why is it that the Prime Minister of India does not want to have peace talks and negotiations? Why have they become so haughty that they do not talk about these things? Therefore, they also want us to talk and it is not fair and we should not mistake the Western powers in this way, and create this impression that they will not like it. They would not mind it. Our own leaders will do everything to have a settlement and an agreement that is honourable and fair and befitting the spirit of our country and the aspirations of our country. It is going to be a long, long battle. It is not going to be settled at one table. It is not going to be settled sitting across one table, or two tables or three tables. This is a question which this country will have to look after and be prepared for, by preparing its own defences. Therefore, bringing forward these observations at a tangent and these arguments, etc., does not really help us. These proposals have come to us and we should try to understand them and appreciate them and also the spirit of these proposals and the spirit in which the great powers have tried to intervene to help us in this matter and to bring the two parties together to sort out the various points. We should try to appreciate the work of these neutral nations and what they are trying to do and

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]  
we should leave it to the Government to take further action as it thinks best.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is very interesting to find men like Shri A. D. Mani referring to the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi. Few people in this country read the newspaper which Mr. Mani has been editing for a record time, but I happen to be one of those who do and I remember very well that when Mahatma Gandhi was alive and was leading the freedom fight, Mr. Mani's paper distinguished itself by attacking him and the freedom fight. It is all right for him to talk of national honour now. But when national honour was at stake he was attacking the fighters for freedom. It is also very interesting to find that Mr. A. D. Mani now reminds us and the U.A.R. of our condemnation of the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt in 1956. Mr. Mani probably preserves the files of his newspaper and it will do him and his friends a lot of good to turn back those files of his paper. His paper was one of the few in the country which attacked the Government of India for rushing to condemn the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt in 1956. He thinks public memory is very short and like a chameleon he can change his colour today and indulge in heroics.

It is very strange that a serious political leader like Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee should get up and ask yesterday the question while interrupting a learned Member of this House—Shri Pathak—that we should ask Col. Nasser how he would have felt if India had not condemned the Anglo-French aggression against Egypt in 1956. He probably reads only "The Organizer", his own party's weekly. He does not know a word, I should think, about the attitude which the United Arab Republic had taken. I would like to remind the country and particularly the Janasanghites that the U.A.R. tried to

convene a conference of Afro-Asian nations even before the Colombo Conference was held. The U.A.R. was the first country to take the initiative in the matter. It is another matter that that initiative failed and that conference was not held and ultimately the Colombo Conference was held. Then again at Colombo, the spokesman of the U.A.R. took a very firm stand. He took his stand on this principle that aggression is not to be rewarded and it was, thanks to his efforts, that the Colombo proposals, as they are, have emerged.

It is true that all the non-aligned countries in the world do not see the truth in this India-China dispute. But if they do not see the truth it is not the fault of India or of the U.A.R. After all, the non-aligned countries are also non-aligned among themselves, and once they are non-aligned they have the right to judge each issue on its merit. While we may disagree with their judgment, while we may not like it, we cannot deny them the right to do so. All the same, the fact remains, the Prime Minister has mentioned, that twenty-six non-aligned countries, many of them of Asia and Africa, have supported us in this stand. As the Prime Minister correctly pointed out this evening, it is immaterial whether they used the word "aggression" or not. As far as the U.A.R. is concerned, its stand has been clear and it has been made much more clear recently. The official magazine of the UAR has published an article on this issue and that article has, by chance, been reproduced in this country only by the 'Statesman'. The papers which beat so many drums about their patriotism have not reproduced it or have not said a word about it.

AN. HON. MEMBER: The "Hindustan Times" also has published it

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: In that article, the U.A.R. has come out openly in condemnation of Chinese aggression. That article reveals that

the U.A.R. thinks that it is proper to give India full support. So, let us recognise our friends and what they do. Let us not run away with the idea that we are left alone and, therefore, we should jump into the lap of some American millionaire. We are grateful for the help that we received from the West, from America and Great Britain in a time of crisis but the quantum of that help has to be remembered. The American sources themselves have revealed that this help was worth fifteen million dollars. Now, this sum of fifteen million dollars only comes to seven crores of rupees and even my friends of the PSP will recognise that this sum of seven crores is nothing. If we mobilise our own resources, if we build up the economic potential of the country, arms aid to the tune of seven crores should be nothing. We are forty-five crores of people and if this sum of seven crores is to be distributed to each one of us, we will get less than fifteen naye paise per head, just enough to buy a good Gold Flake cigarette. Now, is it for this that Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha gets up again and pleads that before we do anything we should consult our Western friends.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: At no time has it been said.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He has said it.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: No, it has never been said. Because there is no argument in this debate, they are putting words and words in our mouths which we have never uttered.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I will remind Mr. Rohit Dave of the exact time he said. He said it in November, when the Prime Minister announced that the cease-fire had taken place. He got up and said it. You check up the proceedings.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: We have checked it up and we know exactly what he said. He only said that these

powers should also be informed. At no time has it been said that their views should be taken into account. My memory is quite sharp and I know what he said.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You should know it. The learned spokesman, the weighty spokesman of the PSP, Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha, got up and said that if we accept the Colombo proposals, the Western powers would come to the conclusion that we are not serious about fighting.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: Where is the question of advice? He said that the Western powers should be informed. He never said that the advice of the Western Powers should be taken into account. He has never said that.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He used the word. It was a rare phenomenon of Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha speaking in English on the 22nd November, 1962, and I remember the word correctly and in spite of the protest of my friend, Mr. Dave, I will stand by the truth.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: It is strange the hon. Member using the statement in a manner which is nothing but lie and falsehood.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Lie is unparliamentary. That, I think, he should know.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: It is not.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Now a truth will not become a lie merely because Mr. Rohit Dave makes a point to say so and repeats an unparliamentary phrase again and again.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: It is not unparliamentary.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I hope, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you are aware that lie is not parliamentary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I rise on a point of order. I think the statement the hon Shri Arjun Arora made was on the basis of what he claims to be the reading of the proceedings in English. When that statement has been made, Mr. Rohit Dave should have contradicted it by pointing out that it was not in the proceedings. Instead of that, he said that he told a lie. First of all, it was very unparliamentary and, therefore, it should be expunged from the proceedings, and . . . .

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: It is not

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot say 'lie'. You can say untruth

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta himself used the word 'lie' a dozen times.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With regard to other things, not in this context. Here, the hon Member was making reference to the proceedings.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: He has said that the Minister was telling a lie

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha is supposed to have said it. He has said it on the basis of the proceedings of the day. Mr Rohit Dave, who is not in possession of the proceedings at the moment, could certainly refer to it. Instead of that, he said that it is a lie. I think, this is unparliamentary and should be expunged. I would request you to consult the hon. Member, Shri Arjun Arora, and find out from the relevant proceedings what exactly Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha said. I am also reminded that something of this nature he said on that but I cannot vouch for the words because I have not consulted the proceedings but none the less, it should be found from the proceedings exactly what he said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): A point of order has been raised. I have got a book

before me, "Unparliamentary Expressions" and I find that 'lie' used in some context is unparliamentary.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: What is it in this context, parliamentary or unparliamentary?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Only yesterday, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha gave expression to similar sentiments when he said that because the Western countries helped us, they would not take us seriously if we entered into negotiations on the basis of the Colombo proposals. So, the whole idea is that our friends of the PSP led by their weighty spokesman Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha, are prepared to surrender Indian sovereignty to America for seven crores of rupees.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: No

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: That is the point they want to make.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: . . . . and not to Russia and not to your bloc either.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Our bloc is the Congress bloc which rules this country and will continue to rule the country for times to come.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: Unfortunately

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: As far as your party is concerned, of course, it is likely to disappear in two or three weeks' time to be merged in Dr Lohia's group.

Coming back to American aid, I am not ungrateful. I am grateful but I do realise that the aid so far received amounts to seven crores of rupees and because of that we are not going to surrender our sovereignty to America, as Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha pleads, nor are we going to . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: What is the point in saying that Ganga Sharan Sinha said this or that, that we should surrender our sovereignty to America. He has never said like that.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: A lie repeated a dozen times does not become the truth.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Nor is it necessary to put undue emphasis upon words . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Certain conclusions from his speech emanate and I am drawing the conclusion from his speech. We are not going to surrender our sovereignty on Kashmir either, as some Americans hope.

Coming back to the Colombo proposals . . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It is time to wind up.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am winding up. I will take two minutes more. But for these interruptions I would have finished long ago.

I do feel that as clarified and explained by the Mission to Delhi, the Colombo proposals come very close to India's position of the line of the 8th September. The Colombo proposals are based on the principle that the latest Chinese aggression must be vacated. The Colombo proposals naturally do not seek to undo the Chinese aggression which began in 1956 but they are of advantage to us because they are based on the principle that the latest aggression which came to notice on the 8th September, 1962, should be undone. Then, the Colombo proposals envisage the withdrawal of the Chinese forces both in NEFA and Ladakh. They nowhere envisage or think of the withdrawal of the Indian troops even by an inch. It is strange that people who shout hoarse about their patriotism have in

this House, yesterday and today, condemned the Colombo proposals and used, what I should say, not very dignified language against the Colombo Powers because they have put up proposals which may mean the Chinese withdrawal and not our withdrawal. They never want us to withdraw.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Sir. When the hon. Member was speaking, his statement was challenged and in a most unfair way. Here are the proceedings of the 21st November, which show the interruption of Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha and Mr. Arjun Arora was absolutely right in what he said. Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha said,

"... I would personally like—and I think all hon. Members also would like—that those who have come to our aid should also be taken into confidence and I do hope our Prime Minister will keep these things in view."

After the Prime Minister spoke, he repeated,

"I did not mean that on every one of our letters or notes on every matter, they should be consulted. But in coming to a final conclusion they should be taken into confidence and we should consult them."

This is what Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha said and I think it is most unfair for an hon. Member of this House to challenge another hon. Member by saying that he had lied. It is unfair on his part not to have seen the statement. Without verifying the statement from the proceedings here, he used that expressions, 'lie'. It is most unfortunate that Mr. Rohit Dave, an intelligent person like him, should have indulged in this kind of acrimony and attacks against the hon. Member there who seems to be,



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]  
according to the proceedings, one hundred per cent. correct in what he said in this context.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: Exactly what I said. He has said that they should be taken into confidence; not consulted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Taken into confidence and consulted. The Americans should be taken into confidence and if I read the whole thing you will find that he was saying that if you did this there will be a lull, arms will not come and so many other things. I need not go into all that. You can see it for yourself. I have read out the relevant portion word for word and I think we should congratulate Mr. Arjun Arora for having taken pains to read this thing and inform this House on matters on which we are sometimes liable to be misled by some hon. Members.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Thank you, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I will take only one more minute, Sir.

The only substantial criticism against the Colombo proposals relates to Dhola. It is really surprising that the Chinese do not recognise the well established principle that the highest water-shed is the international border, and that is the crux of the dispute. Once the Chinese accept this internationally accepted principle they will have to go back many miles in Ladakh and a few miles in NEFA. The Colombo proposals do not insist on Dhola, I think, merely because that involves the crux of the whole dispute. The Colombo proposals are not aimed at a final solution of the dispute; they are only aimed at enabling the two parties to meet at the negotiating table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Your one minute is over.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Thank you.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे इस वादविवाद के अन्त में कहने का समय दिया है। मुझे ज्यादा कहना तो नहीं है लेकिन आपके दिये हुए अवसर का लाभ उठाना चाहता हूँ। चीन ने हमारे नेहरू जी के साथ जो बर्ताव किया, वह ऐसा ही मालूम पड़ता है जैसे शिवजी और भस्मासुर की कहानी से निकलता है। शिवजी बहुत भोले भाले थे, बड़े देवता थे और हमेशा कृपालु हो जाते थे। चीन की हमारे लोगों ने, हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने और नेहरू जी ने बड़ी मदद की लेकिन अन्त में वह भस्मासुर साबित हुआ। उसने हमी पर प्रहार करना शुरू किया। आखिर में भस्मासुर का नाश हो गया था। तो यह उसका जो अनुचित कार्य है अब वह समाप्त किया जायेगा। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो बिल्कुल आखिर में कहा था, उसके बाद मुझे ज्यादा लम्बा भाषण करने में फायदा नहीं है। नेहरू जी ने अन्त में साफ दलील देकर कहा कि यदि अपोजीशन की पार्टियाँ समझती हैं कि हममें ही देश-भक्ति और बहादुरी वगैरह है तो उनको यह भी समझना चाहिये कि इधर, इस पक्ष में भी बहादुर भी हैं, देशभक्त भी हैं जिन्होंने सारा जीवन देशमेवा के लिए लगाया है। यह कोई शिकायत नहीं कि उसी तरफ के लोग ही देशभक्त हैं। वे लोग भी देश के हित की चिन्ता करते हैं, सारा जीवन उसमें लगाया है। इसलिए यह कल्पना करना कि उनके इस देश का नुकसान हो जायेगा या देश के विरुद्ध हैं, यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है।

वाजपेयी साहब ने यह कहा था कि यदि कोई नैगोसिएशन शुरू हो जाते हैं तो हम अपने को स्टैन्थन करने में, अपने डिफेन्स के काम को करने में कमी करेंगे, यह बात भी बिल्कुल गलत है और यह ख्याल करना कि हम अपने देश को मजबूत करने का

काम छोड़ देंगे वह भी बिल्कुल गलत है। दूसरा जी का और सब लोगों का, हर एक का ख्याल है, कि देश में अपने आर्मीमेंट्स बनाने चाहियें, अपने हथियार बनाने चाहियें। शस्त्र बनाने का जो काम अभी तक नहीं किया गया था, वह काम किया जायेगा और उसमें कोई शंका करना बिल्कुल अनुचित है। जहां तक मैरिट का सवाल है, कोलम्बो प्रपोजल्स के बारे में काफी कहा जा चुका है। हमारे पाठक जी जैसे आदमी ने यह राय बतलाई कि हम आजकल एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में रह रहे हैं, कोई आइसोलेशन की दुनिया में नहीं रहते हैं। जहां हमको सब राष्ट्रों के बीच में रहना है, वहां अगर कोई प्रपोजल आता है तो उस पर गौर करना पड़ेगा। उससे कोई भारत की इज्जत जाती है या गौरव जाता है, ऐसी बात नहीं। उन प्रस्तावों के अन्त में ही आखिरी दो पैराग्राफ हैं कि जो प्रपोजल्स हैं कोलम्बो के, उसमें लिखा हुआ है कि इससे दोनों पार्टियों का जो हक है या उनके मैरिट्स हैं बाउन्डरी के बारे में या और कोई, वह हक ऐसे नहीं हैं कि अपनी-अपनी बात मनवा ली जाये। वह सिर्फ बातचीत करने के लिए है और उनमें प्रिपेरेटरी बातचीत करने के लिए एक शुरुआत की चीज है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि उनसे देश का गौरव नहीं गिरता है और न कोई मान-हानिजनक बात है। अपनी गवर्नमेंट को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए हमको आजाद रखना चाहिये और गवर्नमेंट जिस ढंग से चलती रही है और जो उसने यत्न किये हैं देश के हितों को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए, उसके बारे में कारेस्पोंडेन्स करने या नैगोमिएशन करने का मामला हमको गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर छोड़ना चाहिये। वाजपेयी साहब ने एक बड़ा जोशीला भाषण दिया था। शुरू शुरू में जब प्रपोजल्स आए थे उस वक्त पूरा क्लेरिफिकेशन, पूरा स्पष्टीकरण उसके साथ नहीं था और बहुतों का ख्याल

दूसरा था। मुझे भी यह ख्याल हो रहा था यह कहां तक मुनासिब है हिन्दुस्तान के लिये लेकिन जब उसका स्पष्टीकरण वगैरह देखा तो मालूम पड़ा कि हम उनको मंजूर कर सकते हैं और ऐसा करने में हिन्दुस्तान को कोई नुकसान नहीं होता और न हमारा कोई गौरव गिरता है। इसके अलावा आज सबको मालूम है कि यह बहस एक तरह से एकेडेमिक सी है क्योंकि चीन उनको मान नहीं रहा है। अगर यह बात है तो कोई सवाल ही नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान "इन टोटो" उनको मानता है या बिल्कुल रिजेक्ट करता है। इसलिये अगर हमारी गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि हम उनको उसूल में मानते हैं और "इन टोटो" मानते हैं और अगर चीन मानता है तो भी मानते हैं तो ऐसी पोजीशन लेना भी गवर्नमेंट के लिये कोई हानिकारक नहीं है और हमारे देश के लिये भी हानिकारक नहीं है हमको न तो इन प्रस्तावों पर बहस करते वक्त, जैसा कि अर्जुन अरोड़ा साहब ने बताया, न अमेरिका को कन्सल्ट करने की जरूरत है न रूस को कन्सल्ट करने की जरूरत है। हमारा देश तो बीच के रास्ते पर चल रहा है। हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो कर देश को मजबूत करेंगे यही नेहरू जी का दृष्टिकोण है।

आज हमारे देश के प्राइम मिनिस्टर का दृष्टिकोण देखकर जो बहुत ही एक दार्शनिक और फिलोसोफर का था और बहुत ही दूरदर्शी दृष्टिकोण था, हम यह कह सकते हैं कि हम अपने हितों का ध्यान तो रखते ही हैं लेकिन और ज्यादा ऊंची बात नेहरू जी ने यह कही कि हमको संसार में युद्ध ज्यादा न फैले, किसी हृद के अन्दर रहे, और अपने देश के गौरव की रक्षा करते हुए हम कोई कदम उठाएँ, इसके लिये प्रयत्न करना चाहिये—यह दृष्टिकोण भी हमको रखना चाहिये। मैं कहता हूं, नेहरू जी ने यह बहुत ऊंचा उठकर बात कही है और

[श्री गोपी कृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

इससे उनकी उच्चता में और ज्यादा चार चांद लग जाते हैं।

इतना कहकर मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि हमें अपनी गवर्नमेंट को देश के इन्टरिस्ट को देखते हुए, जैसी भी सहायता हो वह देनी चाहिये जिससे हम देश के हित को आगे बढ़ाएं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The Law Minister will reply tomorrow morning.

The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at forty-nine minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 25th January 1963.