Administration. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-339/62.]

THE RAILWAY PROTECTION FORCE (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1962

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY): Sir, on behalf of Shri Shah Nawaz Khan I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 21 of the Railway Protection Force Act, 1957, a copy of the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) Notification G.S.R. No. 1018, dated the 18th July, 1962, publishing the Railway Protection Force (Amendment) Rules, 1962. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-341/62.]

TARIFF COMMISSION REPORT *re* PRICE-LINKING FORMULA FOR SHARING SUGAR PRICE AND RELATED PAPERS

SHRI RAM SUBHAG SINGH: Sir, on behalf of Shri A. M. Thomas I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the revision of Price-Linking Formula for sharing sugar price between sugar factories and cane growers.

(ii) Government Resolution No. 8-63/61-SEXP, dated the 22nd August, 1962.

(iii) Statement under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why the documents referred to at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section.

[Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-356/62 for (i) to (iii)]

THE EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT AND FOR PLANNING (SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: I introduce the Bill.

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION *RE* SITUATION ALONG INDIA-CHINA BORDER

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 153 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted the whole of today for the consideration of the Government Motion regarding the India-China border situation. The House will sit through the lunch hour.

MOTION *RE* SITUATION ALONG INDIA-CHINA BORDER

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the situation along the India-China border, particularly in the Ladakh region, be taken into consideration."

Before dealing with this subject, perhaps you will permit me, Sir, to refer to one or two developments of international significance, which have no relation to this subject, but I feel the House will perhaps appreciate my references. One is the recent agreement arrived at between the Indonesian Government and the Government of the Netherlands in regard to West Irian. I should like to congratulate both those Governments on the peaceful settlement of a very difficult and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

delicate problem and—I should like to add—more especially congratulate the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, who took the initiative in this matter, and also, if I may, Mr. Bunkers, who played an important role in these negotiations. This removes one source of conflict in South-East Asia. A little while ago there was the Laos settlement, which also has removed another source of conflict in South-East Asia. There are still other conflicts going on in South-East Asia, but the settlement of these two is a matter of good augury for the peace of South-East Asia, and we are particularly happy not only because of our intimate contacts with the countries concerned but also because, in a sense, we are part of South-East Asia, and we earnestly hope that there will be peace there.

Another matter I should like to refer to is the recent *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry to India. This matter has been pending for a large number of years, and most of us and many Members of this House must have felt rather frustrated at the great delay in this transfer. But ultimately it has taken place. We realized then and we realize now that France was going through a difficult period, and there have been big constitutional changes in France and therefore, although we pressed for it, reminded them of it, we did not wish to say or do anything which might injure our relations with France. I am glad that the policy of patience pursued by us has led to a successful result. Now, Pondicherry and the other old French Settlements are part of India, and presently the matter will come up before this House in another form. But the main thing is, we have done this, in accordance with our habit and practice, peacefully and without injuring in any way our relations with France, and I should like to express my appreciation of the French Government and specially of its eminent President, President de Gaulle.

Sir, coming to the subject of my motion, there is little that is new that I can place before the House. On the first day of this Session of Parliament I made a brief statement in this House as well as in the other and placed the latest White Paper on this question. That brought matters up to date so far as the giving of information is concerned. Subsequently, in the last few days there has been a debate in the other House also. Now, nothing in the shape of incidents has happened since then. The position remains much the same. There have been certain charges and counter-charges of firing taking place. But apparently if this took place, it took place at some long distance and it hurt nobody. At the present moment, therefore, the situation remains much as it was and I cannot say if it has definitely improved; it has certainly not grown any worse.

There are some indications—I do not know how far they are likely to be correct—that our post at Galwan may be reached by a column that we had sent by road. Meanwhile they have been sent supplies by air regularly and there is no lack of supplies to any of our military posts. In spite of the fact that the situation has not grown worse, essentially the situation is a bad one, is a serious one by the mere fact that, according to us, a large part of our territory is under the Chinese occupation and so long as that continues the situation is bound to be exceedingly serious.

We have followed in the last few months and years, in fact, the policy of trying to strengthen ourselves to meet this menace, strengthen ourselves in various ways more especially on the borders themselves, by building road communications and the rest and by putting up posts, and at the same time not giving up our hope that it may be settled by peaceful means. We follow this dual policy because we feel, apart from our general feeling, that war, as is usually undesirable, is peculiarly so in

the present age with the development of weapons, and because of the fact that India and China are so situated, any war between them would be disastrous for both and would be a very prolonged war. We do not want a war as I have said often enough, nor do we want any occupation of our territory by a foreign Power. We have, therefore, to proceed on these dual lines It may be a little difficult to achieve our objective in the near future and we must, therefore, be prepared for some time to elapse before we achieve it.

I just mentioned two cases, one was of West Irian which for ten years has been a matter of conflict It has at last been settled And even on the Pondicherry issue, many of our friends sometimes asked us to deliver ultimatums to the French Government But we thought we would settle it peacefully and we have succeeded

Now, the present position is that in the military sense we are much stronger than we were a year or two ago We have put up a certain barrier to further encroachment or aggression and we, I think, in regard to these communications and other factors, will increase our strength in the future but we do not intend to bring about a major conflict on our part Of course, if the other party takes some steps to that end, we shall face it naturally I still think that our case is so good that under a proper consideration I do not see any adequate reply to it

The Chinese make charges that we have occupied their territory, that we committed air violations because of our planes flying over their territory They say that they have always had that territory I do not understand on what basis they say that, because it is quite clear that ten or twelve years ago, anyhow they were not there, not even in Tibet It was after they went into Tibet and took possession of it that they reached these frontiers.

Now, the old Tibetan Government did not lay any claim to these wide territories in Ladakh. There were one or two points on our frontier about which there was some argument with the old Tibetan Government, long-standing arguments They were small points here and there. They never laid claim to it Now, the Chinese apparently are there, and the Chinese Government is a successor to the old Tibetan Government and they claim this as a part of China which means part of China through its being part of Tibet Obviously, they were not there, they were not in Tibet at all They came to Tibet about ten or eleven years ago and after that But for some years there was no particular move on their part in this direction Round about 1957 they are said to have made that road in the north-east corner of Aksai Chin, that is, made road over a caravan track. And it was really in 1959 that they marched into eastern Ladakh in a big way. There can be no doubt that they were not there before So, I do not understand the argument of the Chinese that they have been in possession of these areas in the past and continuously, as they say Maybe, it is some metaphysical conception of the Chinese Empire which existed in past ages Even that does not hold water as the report of our officials clearly demonstrated and the abundance of arguments and evidence that they have placed, which they have probably seen.

I need not before this House justify our claim because I take it everybody realises, apart from the sentiment of it and the proof that has been produced in regard to it, the validity and strength of our position in regard to these areas The question arises, therefore, what we should do about it As I have ventured to state, our approach is a dual one, one is to go on strengthening ourselves and holding, as far as possible, the Chinese and at the same time to explore such avenues as we can find to achieve a peaceful settlement of this difficult problem. It is not an easy matter. I realise that.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

It may take time, but it is better for it to take some time than for us to plunge into war. The main thing is we cannot acknowledge, or in any sense bow to their aggression, surrender to it or acknowledge it and we must strengthen ourselves to meet them in any way that it becomes necessary.

I had once said and asked them, in order to prepare for fruitful talks and negotiations, to withdraw. That is, I had suggested that both sides should withdraw to the line of the other side, to the map line of the other side. That would have left a large area unoccupied by the military forces and there would be no question of any conflict and we could then consider the matter, consider the evidence and other factors concerning this place. The Chinese Government at the time did not agree with that proposal because obviously it involved their withdrawing over a large area and our withdrawing over a very small area. I hope they will consider that because that, I think, is the fairest and the most reasonable request and it does not, in any sense, bring or lead to any, if I may use a popular phrase, loss of face of any party because it is obvious that while this major aggression exists, it is not possible to have any fruitful negotiations. We cannot negotiate when there is active tension, etc. Therefore, we have suggested or we are going to suggest to them that in order to prepare the ground for fruitful talks on the main subject, the first thing to consider is how to create a situation which will be free from tension and which will involve withdrawal and for that we are prepared to talk on this limited issue. If it leads to anything further, then further talks may be indulged in. That is our present position. I may say that the last Chinese letter came dated the 4th August. I have said the last but it is not the last because since then several have come—complaints—subsequent letters are complaints of our air violation on their space and one or two charges of our people in Ladakh firing at them and so on but they are charges. The main letter came on the 4th of August. To that no reply has yet been sent by us. Probably, we shall send it on the lines I have indicated fairly soon. That is the position. I do not wish to take up the time of the House now in repeating what I have previously said many times because it will be better for hon. Members to have more time for their comments and criticisms so that I can deal with them and reply to them at the end of the debate. I beg to move, Sir.

The question was proposed.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

3. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion—

(i) that Government's China policy has been a dismal failure inasmuch as full eight years after China committed its first act of blatant aggression on Indian soil by constructing the Aksai Chin highway across our territory, Government has not merely failed to redeem Chinese-occupied territory, but has been unable to check-mate China's continuing forays and encroachments and, more deplorably still, continues to betray an utter confusion of mind and suicidal illusions in respect of Chinese objectives and intentions, with the result that our attitudes very often seem humiliatingly incongruous with the situation, provide positive encouragement to the aggressor in its misdoings and undermine our prestige and credit in the eyes of world opinion and particularly of our neighbouring countries in Asia;

(ii) that the policy enunciated by the Prime Minister recently in respect of unconditional talks acting as a prelude to further negotiations, consti-

tutes a major and retrograde departure from the hitherto avowed Government policy about negotiations;

(iii) that the Note of July 26, 1962, sent to China seriously compromised India's position because the Note, as drafted, impliedly committed India to acceptance of China's claim-line of 1956 and was, therefore, tantamount to a virtual offer to cede a major part of the occupied area; but welcomes the Prime Minister's subsequent affirmation that India would not accept anything other than the traditional international boundary as the basis of any talks;

(iv) that the continuing acts of aggression by China and the content and tone of its communications to India make it amply clear that China has not the slightest intention of relenting its hold on the Indian territory it has surreptitiously or forcibly seized;

(v) that in the face of the Chinese attitude, Government's present probings for opening of talks, whether in the form of the Defence Minister's parleys with the Chinese Foreign Minister, or as indicated by the Prime Minister's recent pronouncements, reflect adversely on India's self-respect, smack of a policy of abject appeasement and serve only to whet the aggressor's appetite;

and this House, therefore, calls for an abandonment of this policy and a categorical declaration by Government that vacation of aggression by China is an absolute pre-requisite for negotiations.'"

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

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion—

(i) that Government should be congratulated on strengthening our defensive positions on the border;

(ii) that no useful purpose would be served in Government offering to negotiate the border dispute with the Government of China unless the Government of China give clear and unambiguous indications that they are as anxious as the Government of India for a settlement of the border dispute on the basis of the traditional boundaries as indicated in the Government of India maps, and further the Government of China are prepared to vacate aggression on Indian territory; and

(iii) that adequate steps be taken by Government to present the essentials of India's case on Chinese aggression in the forum of the United Nations and generally in countries abroad.'"

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House approves of the policy of Government in this regard.'"

The question were proposed.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House and also the previous statement on this issue leave no doubt in the minds of anybody that a new stage has been reached in our border dispute with China. We were happy to hear that in the recent firing that took place, nobody was hurt but at the same time the armies are poised against each other and active tension exists. It is true that the Heads of

[Shri Govindan Nair]

Governments of both these States have assured that they would see that these incidents do not develop into major conflicts but at the same time, because of the fact that these armies are poised against each other, any moment, whatever be our policy, certain developments may take place which may go out of our control So, it is our responsibility to see that the situation does not get worsened

AN HON MEMBER: Not China's?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR Both

AN HON MEMBER Say so

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR Both the countries should see that the situation does not get worsened That is why we wish to lend our support to the Prime Minister in his efforts to bring about a peaceful negotiated settlement of the border question even while taking necessary measures for the defence of the borders of the country He has also suggested that, in order to lessen the tension, the armies in the border area may be withdrawn to the borders He has made the suggestion that both the armies may be withdrawn to certain borders So, either this or any other agreeable suggestion by which the tension can be lessened should be accepted Against this policy now pursued by the Prime Minister, certain criticisms have been raised I do not want to go into all the criticisms that were raised both in the other House and also in the press I would however like to draw your attention to a certain line of thinking

Now, in one of the amendments moved by an hon Member it has been suggested that the Chinese may vacate to the international boundary. I will be the happiest person if they have done so but unfortunately the fact of the matter is that they are disputing our claims and they are clinging on

SHRI M S GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore). Is it not aggression?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: We have to find out some other way of setling this dispute Even though some of the critics are paying lip-service to a negotiated settlement, their main emphasis is on a military solution of the problem I feel it is quite wrong This is not my view only I will draw your attention to a statement made by Gen Thimmayya where he deals with this question He deals with the entire defence problem and when referring to China he says this

> "Whereas in the case of Pakistan I have considered the possibility of a total war, I am afraid, I cannot do so in regard to China I cannot even as a soldier, envisage India taking on China in an open conflict on its own"

And he says that it must be left to the politicians and diplomats to ensure our security

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) What is the hon Member quoting from?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR I am quoting from "The Seminar" of July 1962, a magazine which deals with the question of Indian defence, to which your General has contributed.

AN HON MEMBER He was India's General

SHRI B D KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra) What are the views of General Cariappa?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Let my hon friend be enlightened by some other hon Member about the views of Gen Cariappa I have just put forward the view expressed by Gen. Thimmayya

AN HON MEMBER You may enlighten us on that also

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) Not that we particularly like him But once he has told the truth

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: When we say that we fully agree with the Prime Minister and his policy of negotiated settlement, and his defence policy for the country, we bear in mind this fact, that India and China are two newly liberated countries. We are 450 millions and they are 650 millions. Are these two nations to waste their energies in a mutual conflict? Or are they to utilise them in developing their countries so that they may catch up with the other modern nations of the world?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Put it to China.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Yes, I am putting it to them also. It is not a one-sided question. It is a two-sided question. Only those who want Asians to fight Asians will be pleased over such a development.

AN HON. MEMBER: Those who want one Asia?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: It is not a question of one Asia. It is a question of one India and one China. Do not mix up things like that.

So, I feel what is needed in the present context is not brave deeds but real statesmanship so that without surrendering our interests, without surrendering our honour, we may have a negotiated settlement. Now, two examples were given by the Prime Minister himself to show how complicated questions were solved through negotiations.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Goa issue was not settled like that.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I will come to that. I would not take up the time of the House by quoting other examples. There is also another factor which we have to bear in mind. India and China were two countries which had maintained mutual friendship for a pretty long time. For more than 2,000 years we were neighbours, there was no conflict between our two countries. Of course, it may be said that during those days, according to our modern terminology, those States were headed by fendal deposits. But today in India we have in the person of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru one of the world figures of this century. And on the other side the leadership is in the hands of those who believe in proletarian internationalism.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Expansionism.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: So, if these two international figures were to come together, the problem could be solved.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Is the hon. Member giving a certificate to the Chinese?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Otherwise posterity would not forgive us.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: What is this international proletarianism?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: You come to me and I will teach you what it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Not here.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: So, that is why when they heard that our Defence Minister and the Foreign Minister of China had some informal talks, some people here were upset. They seem to be very allergic to the very name of the Defence Minister. Why should he clink glasses with the Foreign Minister of China? That is the question they ask. Well, if we had been in mediaeval days when disputes used to be settled by means of duels, and these two had fought against one another and settled the dispute, I would not have hesitated to accept that settlement. But that is not the position. Times have changed and we have to stick to some norms of civilised behaviour and there was nothing wrong in the Defence Minister talking with the Foreign Minister of China.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Is aggression civilised?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They are opposing us when we support the Government.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I will come to that.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): The support of your party makes his position awkward.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You should have more confidence in the strength of the Defence Minister and the Prime Minister. They cannot be easily embarrassed.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I am not at all bothered whether they are embarrassed or not. I do not hold any brief for the Defence Minister. Here it is not a question of attacking or supporting the Defence Minister. Behind this concerted attack on the Defence Minister there is this sinister policy of trying to reverse the defence policy of our Government, to weaken our defences and to drag us on to to some military bloc. (*Interruptions.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: The Defence Minister can defend himself. But I would say that the defence policy of the country is not the monopoly of any particular party or any particular individual.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are the saviour.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: You will remember the occasions when the Defence Minister was under fire. Everybody knows that no defence can be strong without the country having its own defence industries. You know when the Defence Minister started the development of those defence industries here, what an amount of attack he had to face from certain quarters. Also I remember another occasion when he was attacked. You know that according to the British tradition, the military was considered to be the preserve of certain races only. There were certain races called the military races, and they alone had the opportunity to serve in the military. That conception was given up and when people were promoted from all ranks, when the common man was allowed to come up . . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): All this is irrelevant.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: It is all relevant. All these are connected. Is it your complaint that the defence of our borders has been weakened after 1957? I put this question to you. Can you say that today our defence or our military position has deteriorated? (*Interruptions*) It is not a question concerning the Prime Minister. It is a question of the defence of the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be very economical of time and energy if we let the hon. Member proceed without interruptions.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): They are supporting themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why can not we support if we like?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: The defence policy of the country may be propagated by them but it is the common property, the property of all parties. So, what they do with regard to our defence is a matter of equal concern to us as well as to you. So, when I say that the policy pursued by the Defence Minister is something which has actually strengthened our defences and has tried to put it on its own feet, I cannot understand why some friends get angry about it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: We are sorry for you, not angry.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member does not know the difference between anger and sorrow.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: I do not want again to go into that kind of controversy because these are friends who

are discussing amongst themselves whether they should liquidate themselves or whether they should permit themselves to be liquidated by others, and I do not take the comments of such people seriously. In the present context, as the Prime Minister himself has pointed out, however protracted, however complicated the situation may be, we have patiently to follow the policy of negotiation and peaceful settlement. At the same time, we should not be left mercilessly at the hands of our neighbours and our defences have also to be properly strengthened. That is the correct policy which the Government is pursuing and we lend our support to that policy.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the speech of our revered Prime Minister with rapt attention and I am glad to note that he has made a very candid and frank appraisal of the historic problems that confront us today here in India and China too. Sir, it has been his persistent effort to see that the Sino-Indian border dispute is settled in the climate of amity and concord but unfortunately the situation as it is obtaining today has frustrated his hopes and of all of us who believe in the principle of co-existence.

Sir, before I come to certain conclusions, I would like to enumerate, certainly catalogue, some of the incidents that have been instrumental in frustrating the whole thing. Firstly, we see that there had been different claims on behalf of the Chinese Government. It was in 1956 that one particular line was alleged to be the Chinese frontier along the Indian border. Again, while handing over a map to our officials at a later period, they gave a different line which meant that they had gone further towards the west, a considerable chunk of territory being shown as belonging to them. Now, Sir, this is a most embarrassing position. If you want to have any kind of negotiation, you must have a precise line on which you can place your argument but because of the shifting ground so often by the Chinese Government, our task became extremely difficult in matters of negotiation. Secondly, very recently, I am talking of the month of July, there had been a lot of breast-beating about the firing business, accusations and counter-accusations, protests and counter protests. The Chinese forces, between July 27 and August 4, fired on Indian forces on three occasions and the areas involved were Pangong Lake area, and the Daulat Beg Oldi area, and as the Prime Minister said, no material damage was done. This was of course a fortunate position. On the other side, the Chinese have also protested that our forces fired on four occasions in the Chip Chap River area, Nyagzu area and the Galwan area. Our Government have probably sent a note to them saying that this allegation of theirs is thoroughly incorrect. Whatever the position may be, Sir, it is quite obvious that because of the uncertainty of this international line and secondly because of the protest regarding the firing, the situation has verily become serious and the seriousness of the situation has been further heightened by the recent statement made by the Foreign Minister of China in Europe. It was probably on the Swiss-Italian Television that he commented on the statement of the hon. Prime Minister that both the forces, the Indian forces and the Chinese forces, should withdraw from their present positions leaving an area of about 11,300 square miles as "No man's land" which would create the proper climate for further negotiations. This thing has been misunderstood unfortunately and the Foreign Minister has said that under no circumstances would the Chinese forces withdraw. He has gone a little further and has involved the 650 million Chinese people by saying that they are in no mood to brook this and that they would never allow this kind of thing. He has further accused our hon. Prime Minister of having designs of war. This is too much, Sir. I deprecate it and I think the Government of China has not properly understood our spirit.

Now, Sir, the country has to know about its defence measures. We have

[Shri Satyacharan.]

been charged with absence of firmness in our foreign policy and we have been asked to take some radical measures. I do not know what radical measures we can take. At the present moment, I take the House into confidence and will enumerate only what the hon. Prime Minister said in the other House and elsewhere from time to time by way of cautioning the country. Just for our information and also for edification of our mind, I would like to say that our Government has not been allergic to all these challenges coming from the Chinese side. We have taken all precautionary measures to build long roads. Mind you, the difficult terrain and the enormity of the distance—all these things have to be taken into consideration. Secondly, we have also built a fine airfield at Chusul and it is said that this particular airfield at an altitude of about 14,000 feet is the highest airfield in the entire world. Here is a fine engineering feat shown by our military engineers. Now, this is also a very important base for air supply to the army and that is how we are today in a better position, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, militarily. Sir, we have also formed a special Border Roads Development Committee to look after these things. Whereever it is necessary, either on the border of Assam, U.P. or Punjab, we have taken all possible measures to counteract the deep designs of the Chinese forces.

Sir, I have to pay tribute to the hon. Defence Minister in this context. I knew that he was a good diplomat, a statesman adept in the art of diplomacy as is warranted by external affairs, but I have found him a genius in matters of production of military weapons. It is no mean achievement on the part of our nation to have supersonic aircraft and also certain other weapons within such a short period. This has been possible only because of the Defence Ministry which has been so ably guided by our hon. Defence Minister. Sir, these are a few things that I have quoted about the achievements of the Government of India to counteract the Chinese designs.

Now, the question is, as is often said, we have to take radical measures. I wish to put this question to the hon. Members on the other side whether they would like to charge us with infirmity or lack of initiative. I say, what are we to do? Should we plunge into war? If not war, then the other alternative is only negotiation. If we wish to plunge into war, we have to think about the present situation. By 'present situation' I mean the types of weapons that are being produced, the thermo-nuclear weapons with all their implications, their destructive nature and the money involved and whether it is at all desirable that we should take recourse to such a deadly war because it will leave in its trail something a most poisonous hangover to the posterity either of India or of China. Are we going to sully the entire younger generation? We have also to think about the Chinese side too. It is well known that the Republic of China is wedded to the concept of violence and constant struggle but in spite of it, they have been so far unable to annex the two tiny islands known as Quemoy and Matsu which lie under the very armpit of the Republic of China. May I know why? I know it and I say that it is certainly because of the presence of the American fleet in the Pacific just adjacent to these two islands. They serve as a deterrent to the designs of the Republic of China. Now, if a nation which is wedded to the concept of violence could keep itself in reserve, could keep itself away from any military adventurist design, there is some sense in it and we who have been nurtured in a different cradle, in a different atmosphere, an atmosphere of peaceful co-existence, can never think of such a war. War, as I said just now, would leave in its trail animosity, hatred and abhorrence to the next generation, that is, to posterity.

We are also not to forget one very important thing which is confronting us today. And it is that we are today encircled, rather flanked, by two nos-

tile enemies. Permit me, Sir, to use the word 'enemies' about those two countries in spite of our normal diplomatic relations with them. I am not satisfied with the word 'hostile' alone. It is in spite of their inimical designs that we have been patient enough to continue our diplomatic relations. I speak on the one hand about Pakistan and on the other hand about the Republic of China. If we plunge into war with China, Pakistan will have a heyday and get us sandwiched between these two nations. It is a job for the militarists to think whether it will be a right strategy or a wrong strategy but I would plead at this juncture that it would be folish to think of war. I would very humbly make my submission to those who think of radical measures, who challenge the Government on this score, that they should give some other proposition, a proposition which may prove fruitful and also constructive.

Sir, after all there is no other option except negotiations and the hon. Prime Minister has rightly said that before negotiations talks are necessary because negotiations is a very delicate instrument of international diplomacy. That has to be taken up or brought into action only when a proper climate is created, when a proper atmosphere is before us and that is why either Mr. Menon had talks with the Foreign Minister of China or some unscheduled talks go on between Indian officers and Chinese officers. It is only to create a congenial and cordial atmosphere for the greater feat of diplomatic negotiations.

Sir, there is another matter. People have often said that we should align with certain Powers which are powerful. I do not know whom they mean. It appears to me to be an extremely foolish proposition. What does alignment mean? With whom are we going to align? Are we going to align with powerful Powers or with Powers inferior to us? These are the two pictures and naturally everybody would like to say that we should align with powerful Powers, Powers or nations which are in a position to give us military aid. Sir, nothing is so abhorrent to me as this theory of alignment with powerful allies because this alliance is always a heavy burden on the weaker partner who has to play second fiddle to the greater nation. India, I must say, has a proud record of dignity. It always believes in the evolution of its own individuality and if we are to make a mark in the comity of nations, we can never accept the subservient position of having to play second fiddle to another big Power, however big it may be, by accepting military aid. We have seen how Pakistan had to suffer, Pakistan being an ally or having alignment under so many Pacts, CENTO, SEATO and God knows how many. But what happened when there was the American U-2 episode? Russia gave a warning to Pakistan and Pakistan had the most anxious time. So, instead of military security it had to suffer from the most difficult position. This much I would say that the time is entirely different. Great nations have only the other day counselled Laos to keep itself away from any sort of alignment and to be neutral and independent. This itself has proved the triumph of the theory of non-alignment which we have been pursuing and which we have been counselling the emergent Republics of Asia and Africa to do and they are now following the same policy. Well, we do not take any credit to ourselves that we are its torch-bearers. Anyway we firmly followed this policy and I am glad that the same policy has been adhered to by many other emergent nations. Therefore, as far as the theory of alignment is concerned, I believe that we do not believe in alignment with other Powers. We have to look after ourselves and we believe in our own potentiality. At the same time I must make it clear that as far as our policy is concerned, we must have friendly relations with all other countries with no designs of grabbing others' territories. But at the same time we must be militarily equipped to see that no other nation has such a design as to throttle us and sully our position. With these words I support the motion moved by hon. Prime Minister and I believe

1 P M.

AN HON MEMBER What about your amendment?

SHRI SATYACHARAN And my amendment is to that effect to support the policy of the Government I believe this will be whole-heartedly supported by all sections of the House, whether on this side or on the other side

Thank you

MR. CHAIRMAN Prof Mukut Behari Lal

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. I hope the Professor has not gone to the borders

MR. CHAIRMAN Mr A D Mani

SHRI A D MANI Mr Chairman, in commending my amendments to the acceptance of the House, I should like to observe that from the statement of the Prime Minister this morning, it is quite clear that the Government of India are thinking of negotiating on the basis of the text of their letter of 26th July addressed to the Government of China There are points in the letter to which the country and various parties have raised objection and I should like in this connection to draw your attention to a sentence occurring in this letter The sentence is:—

> "It is true that the Government of India contest the validity of the 1956 Chinese map claim, but the Chinese local forces should not go beyond their own claim confirmed by Premier Chou En-lai"

The interpretation that has been placed on this sentence is that the Government of India somehow has mentally reconciled itself to the acceptance of the Chinese claim-line of 1956 Though the Prime Minister has often stated that he would accept nothing less than the international boundary, still we would welcome a declaration from him on the floor of this House that this interpretation which has been placed abroad is not a correct interpretation and that the Government of India stands by the traditional boundaries as indicated in their maps

The letter of 26th July goes on to speak about the Government being prepared to enter into negotiations as soon as the current tensions ease So far, the Government of India has been offering to negotiate with the Chinese Government on this matter and they have shown almost stoic patience in spite of the fusillade of abuse which the Chinese Government have directed against us The question I would like to ask the Prime Minister is, whose responsibility is it now to create the climate of opinion for negotiations? This is a question which we have to ask him because it is clear from the forest of press notes which have been issued by the Government of China that the Government of China is not thinking in terms of a settlement In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a remarkable publication "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," by William L Shirer, who has discussed the psychopathology of aggression by the Nazis Almost an identical parallel can be drawn in the case of China, which has shown no willingness whatever to negotiate terms with our Government on a basis which is acceptable, with self-respect, to our country

All that I would like to ask the Prime Minister—now that he has made his point that he would like to negotiate on the basis of the 26th July letter—is, is there a climate on the other side? The climate has been there on our side from 1956 onwards, from 1951 And is it proper to continue negotiations with the Chinese Government unless the climate is created by them? Further we should like to make it clear that anything other than the traditional boundaries will not be acceptable to the country The 1956 claim-line of the Chinese includes the Pangong Lake and comes up to Demchok which is regarded as the gateway to Himachal Pradesh.

That will be 130 miles away from the Chinese frontier. Now, the 1956 claim-line itself threatens our territorial integrity. The withdrawal of the forces by 20 kilometres or 30 kilometres or 100 kilometres does not alter the situation that the claim-line and the 1956 map of the Chinese Government are inadmissible as far as India is concerned.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Madam, therefore, I would like to press my amendment wherein I have said that we should not enter into negotiations with the Chinese Government, unless a clear climate prevails in China and there are indications that the Government of China are going to settle on the basis of our traditional boundaries, as indicated in our maps.

There is also a reference to our congratulating the Government on strengthening our defensive positions on the border. Being an unattached and independent Member, I cannot take a severely partisan line in this matter. Undoubtedly, the Government of India has improved our defensive positions in the frontier. In October 1959, on three consecutive days, there were clashes. One Indian patrol was killed and ten were captured. But in the Galwan operation in spite of the fact that the Chinese outnumbered the Indian forces by about 50 : 1, our forces held their own and today the Chinese Government is aware of the fact that if they try to push their border line and try to take 2,000 miles of territory, so that the area which they occupy may be actually according to their 1960 map, they will meet with resistance and our Indian patrols will harass the Chinese patrol in the rear. Therefore, I think this House should congratulate those brave young jawans who are fighting at an altitude of 15,000 feet and in almost harassing conditions, and a word of cheer from this House will go a long way to strengthen them in their resolve to fight the Chinese.

I would like to raise the point about the need for marking our stand quite clear on the maintenance of our international boundaries, because the attitude of the Government of India in the last few years has somehow not steadied the morale in Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. Even our own neighbouring country, Burma, ten days ago brought out an official publication in which the Chip Chap Valley was shown as a part of Chinese territory. Somehow in these countries the impression has gone abroad that while there may be irritation on both sides, we are not prepared to fight for our territorial integrity. It is for that reason that I would appeal to the Prime Minister to stand by the traditional boundaries and not by the letter of July 26, because the climate for negotiation is not there on the other side. We realise that while we have been talking of negotiations, we have also been strengthening our positions, but then it cannot be unilateral and unless the Government of China at least gives a very clear and unmistakable indication that they will not be rude, that they are in a mood to talk business, we should not enter into negotiations even on the basis of the letter of July 26. I should like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the attitude of the Chinese Government even to what he said in the Lok Sabha. In Tokyo on the 18th August, the Chinese news agency "Hsinhua" published the following statement:—

> " 'The Indian Prime Minister,' says the despatch, 'devoted a great part of his speech to his Government's preparations for war and the progress it made in occupying Chinese territory, illegally in the last two years.' ".

While we are talking of negotiations, this is the reaction that they are putting out in foreign countries.

In this connection, I should like to mention that we do not seem to have adopted an aggressive policy—I am not using the word 'aggressive' in any derogatory sense of the word—in putting our case across on China. We have got our publications on Goa. We have got

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

our publications on Kashmir. I should like to ask the External Affairs Ministry whether any publication has been brought out about our dispute with China.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): Yes, yes.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I have not seen that. In any case the official handbook which is being circulated abroad makes confusion worse confounded, because nobody has got the time to go through the forest of fresh notes which have been issued on both sides. In the other House during the last session a question was asked of the Minister of Information and Broadcasting whether the All India Radio was trying to do anything to counteract the Chinese propaganda, and his answer was "no". The All India Radio is not interested in putting out counter-propaganda setting forth our point of view. While I agree that the Government of India's position has been appreciably strengthened and the volume of press support which we have received from froeign countries is overwhelming, in the Eastern countries, in the neighbouring countries we have not been able to make an impression.

I made a suggestion in one of my amendments that in the forum of the United Nations we should somehow seek publicity for India's case. I had been on one of the United Nations' delegations, Madam,—thanks to the generosity of the Prime Minister—and I know that we cannot raise this matter for inclusion in the agenda, but at least when the question of China's admission comes before the United Nations, our permanent representative or the leader of the delegation, whoever he may be may go up to the forum and say that we are voting for China's admission because we believe that the United Nations will not be an effective organisation until China is admitted. Later on we can make a brief statement about our dispute with China. I am most anxious that this point of view should be put forward because in this propaganda battle statements are made from time to time and there are a number of countries in the world who do not know the details of India's dispute with China. They think that it is a border dispute. We should tell them that it is a case of clear aggression. It requires, therefore, a little shift in the thinking of the External Affairs Ministry on the Chinese problem. We have put our case about Kashmir very vigorously, but we have not put the case of China as vigorously as we have done on Kashmir. My point is that we somehow seem to think that with Pakistan it may not be possible for us to come to terms while it may be possible for us to come to terms with China. That is the impression that is left on the minds of those who have seen the propaganda statements, the publicity statements that have been put out on both sides. I do hope that in the forum of the United Nations, without being offensive and without being irrelevant, we should on the occasion of China's admission to the United Nations bring up this matter. I should like to mention that the House is grateful to the Government for not sponsoring China's admission last year. There was a change in policy when India voted for China's admission but did not sponsor it. We would like this to be carried a little further. I would also like the All India Radio to put out our point of view as often as possible. We need not be abusive because that is not in line with our tradition, but at least let us put our case forward.

I would like to make one final statement on this matter, and that is that we realise now that there has been a change even in the attitude of the Government of India towards the problem of China. I believe the Government realises that China does not understand Panchsheel as much as we do and that China understands the stutter of guns much better than Panchsheel. At least the Galwan Valley incidents have shown that when it comes to a question of fighting, the Chinese are prepared to respect us. While we would not like to place any

serious obstacles in the way of negotiations with the Government of China, there is no point in weakening the morale of this country by trying to negotiate on the basis of any kind of a settlement because everything that we say in good faith is twisted by the other side We have got an opponent who is unscrupulous—I am sorry to say that—and who is prepared to misuse every utterance of our Prime Minister, to slander us and to paint the blackest picture of our intentions Thank you, Madam.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : महोदया, चीन के सवाल पर देश में विशेष मतभेद नहीं है और जैसा कि प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने लोक सभा में कहा यह किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं और न हम इस सवाल पर शीतयुद्ध को अपनी सीमा पर लाना चाहते हैं । लेकिन यह बात जरूर है कि देश में कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं जो यह मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं कि चीन ने भारत पर आक्रमण किया है, जो यह भी नहीं मानते कि सीमा के सवाल पर हमारा जो मामला है वह एक पक्का मामला है और जिस जमीन पर चीन ने कब्जा किया है वह हमारी जमीन है और हमें वापस मिलनी चाहिये ।

अभी हमने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के प्रवक्ता को सुना । वे इस बात को दुहाई देते हैं कि वे प्रधान मन्त्री की नीति के साथ सहमत हैं । लेकिन प्रधान मन्त्री ने तो चीन के आक्रमण की बात कही है, प्रधान मन्त्री ने यह भी कहा है कि चीन ने जिस क्षेत्र पर अधिकार किया है वह हमारा है और चीन जब तक उस क्षेत्र को खाली करके नहीं जायेगा तब तक समझौते की बात शुरू नहीं होगी । क्या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी प्रधान मन्त्री के इस दृष्टिकोण से सहमत है ? स्पष्ट है कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी इससे सहमत नहीं है । फिर यह कहने का कोई मतलब नहीं है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी प्रधान मन्त्री की नीति से सहमत है और उसके लिये अपना समर्थन देना चाहती है ।

प्रधान मन्त्री चीन के सवाल पर खुला हाथ चाहते हैं । वह किस बात के लिये खुला हाथ चाहते हैं, मैं अभी तक इस बात को नहीं समझ सका हूं । । क्योंकि अभी तक उन्होंने जिन बातों की घोषणाएं की हैं, जो आश्वासन दिये हैं, उनके साथ वे बंधे हुए हैं । उन्होंने कहा है कि हम खाक में मिल जाना पसन्द करेंगे लेकिन चीन के साथ कोई अपमानजनक समझौता नहीं करेंगे । उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि समझौते की बात तब तक नहीं होगी जब तक चीन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परम्परागत सीमा-रेखा तक वापस नहीं चला जाता । इस स्थिति में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि किस बात के लिये वे खुला हाथ चाहते हैं । अब मैनोवरिंग की गुंजायश हो कहां है ? उन्होंने यह फर्क करने की कोशिश की है कि हम चीन से बात तो करेंगे, मगर समझौते की बात नहीं करेंगे । मेरा निवेदन है कि बात तो आजकल भी हो रही है, चीन के साथ हमारा अनबोला नहीं है, जो चिट्ठियां आती जाती हैं, यह भी बात का एक तरीका है । और जहां तक चीन का सवाल है यह कारगर तरीका है क्योंकि चीन मह से की गई बात से पलट सकता है, पलट चुका है इसलिए लिख कर बातचीत करना ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

और फिर हम मौखिक ढंग से भी बात कर रहे हैं । प्रधान मंत्री ने सेक्रेटरी जनरल श्री आर० के० नेहरू को पेकिंग भेजा था चीनियों के दिमाग का पता लगाने के लिये । अभी हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री ने चीन के विदेश मंत्री से जिनेवा में बात की है और स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी ने चीन के राजदूत को अपने घर बुलाकर, दावत देकर, उनके साथ बातचीत की । यह बातचीत चल रही है और अब वह कौनसी नई बातचीत करना चाहते हैं ? कहा जाता है कि यह बातचीत इसलिये की जायेगी ताकि अनुकूल वातावरण उत्पन्न हो जाये । मैं बड़ी नम्रता के साथ प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि वे किस बात से समझेंगे कि अब वातावरण अनुकूल हो गया

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

है। क्या वह चाहेंगे कि चीन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परम्परागत सीमा रेखा तक हट जाय, या चीन १९५६ की चाउ-एन-लाइ रेखा तक हट जाय या चीन उनके इस प्रस्ताव को मान ले कि दोनों देशों की सेनाएं विवादग्रस्त क्षेत्र से हट जाये ? आखिर यह कब समझा जायेगा कि बातचीत के लिये उपयुक्त वातावरण पैदा हो गया है ? उसकी शर्तें क्या हैं ? इस सम्बन्ध मे देश को विश्वास मे लिया जाना चाहिये। चीन के साथ बातचीत करने में किसी को कोई विरोध नही है और मैंने आपसे निवेदन किया कि बातचीत आज भी चल रही है। मगर बातचीत का आधार क्या होगा, यह अभी तक स्पष्ट नही है ? मै आशा करूगा कि इस सम्बन्ध मे प्रधान मत्री जी प्रकाश डालेगे।

मुझे यह देख कर ताज्जुब हुआ कि चीन ने जो २७ जुलाई को पेगाग लेक एरिया मे, २९ जुलाई को पुन. उसी क्षेत्र में और ४ अगस्त को दौलत वेग ओल्डी में गोलिया चलाई, उनके सम्बन्ध में देश को कोई जानकारी नही दी गई। प्रधान मत्री ने विभिन्न दलों के नेताओं की एक मीटिंग भी बुलाई थी। उसमें भी जब यह कहा गया कि २० तारीख के गोलीकाड के बाद क्या सीमा पर गोली चलने की घटनाये हुई हैं, तब इस सम्बन्ध में उनको जानकारी नही दी गई। इतना ही नहीं, हमने जो विरोध पत्र भेजे हैं, वे केवल २७ जुलाई और २९ जुलाई के गोलीकाडो के बारे में भेजे गये हैं। मगर ४ अगस्त को दौलत वेग ओल्डी में जो गोली चली, उसके बारे मे हमने विरोध पत्र भी नही भेजा। मै जानना चाहूगा कि इसका क्या कारण है ?

मै यह भी जानना चाहूगा कि भारत सरकार ने चीन के सामने यह प्रस्ताव क्यो रखा कि जब तक दोनो देश एक दूसरे के बीच में आने जाने वाले नोटो को प्रकाशित करना मजूर न कर ले, तब तक चीन अपने नोट न छापे। क्या इसका उद्देश्य यह है कि हम सीमा पर होने वाली घटनाओ से देश की जनता को और संसद् को पूरी तरह से अवगत नही रखना चाहते ? हमें स्वय चीन से आने और चीन को जाने वाले नोटो को तुरन्त प्रकाशित करना चाहिये। अगर हम आशा करते हैं कि देश की जनता इस आक्रमण के खिलाफ जाग्रत रहे और अगर प्रधान मत्री जनता से यह अपेक्षा करते हैं कि वह इस सवाल पर उनका समर्थन करे, तो सीमा पर घटने वाली घटनाओ से जनता को निरन्तर परिचित रखना जरूरी है। अगर मान लीजिये चीन नोटों का प्रकाशन मजूर न करे क्योकि चीन का ढाचा अलग है, चीन मे उस अर्थ मे स्वतत्रता नही है जिस अर्थ में भारत में है और चीन में पार्लियामेंट नही है, तो क्या हम अपने नोटों का प्रकाशन तब तक नही करेगे जब तक चीन हमें इजाजत नही देगा ? क्या सीमा पर होने वाली घटनाओ से हम देश को और ससद् को तब तक अन्धेरे में रखेगे जब तक चीन हमें उन्हे बताने की छूट नही देगा। मै नही समझ सकता कि यह एक स्वस्थ परम्परा है। इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार को अपने दृष्टिकोण पर पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये।

मै यह भी अभी तक नही समझ सका हूं कि २६ जुलाई को नोट जिस भाषा में भेजा गया, उस भाषा में क्यों भेजा गया। प्रधान मंत्री जी जानते है कि उस नोट ने लोगों के दिलों में एक आशका पैदा की है। इसलिये नही कि हम चीन के सवाल पर सरकार की खिलाफत करना चाहते हैं। सरकार की खिलाफत करने के लिये और भी बहुत से सवाल हैं, केवल चीन का ही सवाल नही है। प्रधान मत्री को कुछ इधर के लोगों की देश भक्ति पर भी विश्वास होना चाहिये। २६ जुलाई के नोट की आलोचना अगर की जाती है तो यह इसलिये कि उसमे से ऐसी ध्वनि निकलती है कि भारत सरकार अपनी पुरानी स्थिति को बदलने का विचार कर रही है। आखिर चीन को यह कहने की क्या जरूरत थी कि आप १९५६ की चाऊ-एन-लाई की रेखा तक तो चले जाइये। हम अभी तक

यह कहते रहे हैं कि जो हमारी पूरी अन्तर्राष्ट्री सीमा है वहां तक चीन की सेनाएं हटनी चाहियें । प्रधान मंत्री जी ने २६ जुलाई के नोट का स्पष्टीकरण करने का प्रयत्न किया है, मगर वह पर्याप्त नहीं है । जो भी नोट भेजे जाते हैं उनका एक एक शब्द तोल करके लिखा जाना चाहिये । जो भी वक्तव्य दिये जाते हैं उनमें एक एक बात सोच समझ करके कही जानी चाहिये । चीन के और हमारे सम्बन्ध एक नाज़ुक स्थिति में हैं । कोई भी ग़लत शब्द, कोई भी ग़लत कदम जहां एक ओर जनता के मनोबल को तोड़ता है, वहां चीन के आक्रमण के इरादे को और भी पक्का करता है ।

इस बारे में मैं सुरक्षा मंत्री के जेनेवा में दिये गये भाषण की ओर सदन का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं । उन्होंने कहा : "These are largely unoccupied areas." लद्दाख क्षेत्र के बारे में वे कहते हैं : "These are largely unoccupied areas." एक ओर हम उन क्षेत्रों को अपना क्षेत्र बताते हैं और यह कहते हैं कि हम उस वक्त तक चैन से नहीं बैठेंगे जब तक उन क्षेत्रों से चीनी चले नहीं जाते, खाली करके चले नहीं जाते, और दूसरी ओर हम कहते हैं कि वे "अनअकूपाइड एरियाज़ हैं" । क्या हम अपने देश की किसी भूमि का "अनअकूपाइड एरिया"के रूप में वर्णन कर सकते हैं ? मगर हमारे सुरक्षा मंत्री जी इससे पहले 'Administered or unadministered territory' की बातें कर चुके हैं । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि ऐसा वक्तव्य क्यों दिया जाता है ? क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी इन वक्तव्य का औचित्य सिद्ध कर सकते हैं ? काश्मीर का सवाल आता है तो सुरक्षा मंत्री के वक्तव्य पर कोई उंगली नही उठाता । जब वे सुरक्षा परिषद में काश्मीर पर बोलते हैं तो सारे देश की भावनायें उनके मुख से और उनकी वाणी से प्रगट होती हैं । मगर क्या कारण है कि जब वे लद्दाख के बारे में, चीन के बारे में बोलते हैं तो ऐसी बातें बोलते हैं जो हमारे दिल में खटक जाती हैं ? हम सुरक्षा मंत्री के खिलाफ नहीं हैं । हम चीन के सवाल पर सरकार के विरुद्ध भी वातावरण पैदा करना नहीं चाहते । मगर देश भक्ति का तकाजा है कि अगर भारत की भूमि पर आक्रमण हुआ है तो उस आक्रमण के विरुद्ध देश की जनता के रोष को जगाने के लिये जो बातें कहनी चाहियें, उनसे अगर अलग बातें कही जाती हैं तो वे सन्देह पैदा करती हैं । चीन के राजदूत को बुला करके प्रधान मंत्री ने दावत दी, इसमें हमें आपत्ति नही है । हमारे सुरक्षा मन्त्री चीन के विदेश मन्त्री से मिले, इसमें भी हमें आपत्ति नहीं है । हम उनसे बात कर रहे हैं, इसमें भी हमें आपत्ति नहीं है । आपत्ति इस बात में है कि जब जनता इन कामों को और हमारे प्रवक्ताओं के वक्तव्यों को मिलाकर देखती है, तो उसका कुछ अलग अर्थ निकालती है । आखिर, यह कहने की क्या जरूरत है कि चीन लड़ाई नहीं चाहता ? क्या हम जानते कि चीन क्या चाहता है ? क्या हम अभी तक चीन के इरादों को नहीं समझे हैं ? आखिर चीन लद्दाख में क्यों घुस आया है ? क्या इस लिये कि तिब्बत में बगावत हुई थी ? क्या इस लिये कि हमने दलाई लामा को अपने देश में शरण दी ? यह कहना कि इन कारणों से चीन ने लद्दाख पर हमला किया है, अपने को धोखा देना होगा और इतिहास कभी इस दृष्टिकोण को माफ नहीं करेगा ।

चीन ने आक्रमण किया है क्योंकि चीन भारत को झुकाना चाहता है, क्योंकि चीन दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया में फैलना चाहता है । चीन की सेनायें हमारी सीमा के भीतर बैठी हैं क्योंकि चीन बड़ी शक्ति के जोम में हमें दबाना चाहता है । यह जो बड़ी शक्ति का जोम है, यह केवल हमारे ऊपर नहीं है । यह हमारे सारे पड़ोसियों पर दिखाई पड़ता है । इस प्रभाव ने भारत और नेपाल के बीच में खाई पैदा की । यह जो बड़ी ताकत का एक उन्माद है, घमंड है, उसे बर्मा भी अनुभव कर रहा है तभी तो बर्मा का जो सरकारी अखबार है वह लिखता है कि चिप चैप वैली चीन की है ।

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपयी]

मैं गैर सरकारी अखबार की बात नही कर रहा हू। यह बर्मा सरकार के सूचना विभाग द्वारा प्रकाशित पत्र है और वह ऐसी गलत बात लिखता है। क्या हमने बर्मा के लोगो को, बर्मा की सरकार को अपना केस ठीक तरह से समझाया है ? क्या कारण है कि दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया का कोई देश चीन के सवाल पर खुल करके हमारा साथ नही देता ? मै इससे सहमत नही हू कि हमें उनका एक सम्मेलन बुलाना चाहिये और उनक साथ कोई सैनिक गठबन्धन करना चाहिये। लेकिन अगर गठबन्धन का प्रस्ताव रखा जाय, तो प्रधान मत्री ने जिस भाषा में उसका विरोध किया है, वह भाषा एक राजनीतिज्ञ की भाषा नही है। मै समझ सकता हूं कि लोक सभा में प्रधान मंत्री जी स्वतत्र पार्टी के नेता से नाराज थे और वे गुस्से में ऐसी भाषा का प्रयोग कर गये जो उन्हे नही करना चाहिये। मगर जब उनसे प्रेस काफ्रेंस में पूछा गया, तब भी उन्होने वैसा ही जवाब दिया मै उसको पढ कर के सुनाना चाहता हू

"In reply to a question whether he would consider calling a conference of non-Communist countries in South-East Asia to discuss the question of containing Chinese expansionism, the Prime Minister said, . . "

मै कोट करता हूं

"I should like to see the list of those countries and know how much strength they have to contain anything including themselves"

यह भाषा क्या है ? दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया के देश छोटे होगे और उनमें ताकत नही होगी। मगर हमें उनकी मित्रता चाहिये, सद्भावना चाहिये, चीन के सवाल पर हमें उनका नैतिक समर्थन चाहिये और जब काश्मीर का सवाल जनरल असेम्बली में जायगा तो हमे उनका वोट चाहिये। क्या यह कह कर कि उनमें कुछ ताकत नही है, वे अपने को भी नहीं बचा सकते, उनके हृदय मे हम अपने लिये सद्भावना पैदा करेगे ? अगर हम चाहते हैं कि दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया में जो लोग रहते हैं, उनके हृदय में हमारे प्रति मित्रता हो, तो हमारे प्रधान मत्री और ढंग से इस प्रस्ताव को ठुकरा सकते थे। मगर ऐसी भाषा का प्रयोग करना, जो उन देशो के निवासियो के दिल में चुभ जाय और जिस का चीन फायदा उठाने की कोशिश करे, ऐसी भाषा के प्रयोग की आशा हम अपने प्रधान मत्री से कम से कम नही करते। मगर ऐसी भाषा का प्रयोग किया गया और मै समझता हू कि इस सबध में सावधानी बरतने की जरूरत है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA The Prime Minister wanted a list Let us have that list He wanted a list of those countries

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE The Prime Minister has got the list of those countries He may or he may not convene conference of those countries but he should not refer to those countries in such a contemptuous language That is my objection

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Madam, on a point of order, it is not contemptuous language.

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE There is no point of order It is a question of opinion I hold my opinion The hon. Member has no business to interrupt me

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr Vajpayee, he can raise it as a point of order, and it is for me to give my ruling (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE Is it not for me to make my submission? I am quite right in saying that there is no point of order

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Anyway you have five minutes more and you may have your say

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That five minutes may be utilised for supplying the list.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैं समझता था कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता थोड़ी सी अक्लमन्दी का प्रदर्शन करेंगे मगर प्रधान मंत्री के समर्थन में वह इतना आगे जाना चाहते हैं कि जो शायद उनकी पार्टी की नीति से भी मेल नहीं खाता ।

खैर, मैं इस बात को यहीं छोड़ता हूं । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि सीमा पर जो भी *स्थिति है वह गम्भीर स्थिति है और उस स्थिति* को सुधारने की पूरी कोशिश की जानी चाहिये । अभी हमारे कांग्रेस के मित्र कह रहे थे कि हम लड़ नहीं सकते । तो हम क्या करें ? मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर हम देश की स्वतंत्रता की, सीमा की और सम्मान की रक्षा के लिये भी नहीं लड़ सकते तो फिर हम किस के लिये लड़ेंगे ? इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि हम आज ही लड़ें ।

श्री अकबर अली खान : उन्होंने यह तो नहीं कहा कि हम नहीं लड़ सकते ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : स्वाभाविक है कि हम देखेंगे कि अगर आज लड़ना सैनिक दृष्टि से अनुकूल है तो हम लड़ेंगे । लेकिन अगर हम नहीं लड़ सकते तो क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि हम चीन के सामने झुक जायें ? क्या हम अपनी पुरानी नीति को बदल दें । क्या और कोई रास्ता नहीं है ? और रास्ता है । अगर हम चाहें तो चीन पर दबाव डालने के और रास्ते अपना सकते हैं, हम चीन के साथ अपने कूटनीतिक संबंध तोड़ सकते हैं, हम तिब्बत पर चीन की प्रभुसत्ता को स्वीकार करने से इंकार कर सकते हैं और दुनिया में, जहां कहीं हमें मौका मिले हम चीन के इरादों से दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया के देशों को और चीन के स्वरूप से संसार के देशों को सावधान कर सकते हैं । संयुक्त राष्ट्र में हमारे प्रतिनिधि चीन के बारे में बोलते हैं, मगर जब बोलते हैं तो कहते हैं कि चीन के साथ हमारी "कांट्रोवर्सी" है और जब यही बात बर्मा का अखबार लिखता है, बर्मा के नेता बोलते हैं, तो हमको खटकती है कि चीन के साथ हमारी खाली "कांट्रोवर्सी" नहीं है चीन ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया है । स्पष्ट है कि लड़ाई के अलावा कूटनीतिक क्षेत्र में भी अनेक पग उठाये जा सकते हैं । क्या हम समझते हैं कि ये कदम नहीं उठाये जा सकते ?

दूसरी बात यह है कि हम सैनिक दृष्टि से अपने को मजबूत करें । हम सड़कें बनायें, संचार के साधनों का विकास करें और हम देश में ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करें कि आज नहीं तो कल चीन के कब्जे में जो भूमि चली गई है उसको हम वापस लेंगे । लेकिन मुझे डर है कि यह मामला अगर ज्यादा दिन लटकता रहा तो क्या होगा और इसके लटकने के लक्षण दिखाई दे रहे हैं । अभी कहा जाता है कि सीमा पर स्थिति नाजुक है, स्थिति तो नाजुक इसलिये हुई है कि हम आगे बढ़े हैं और अगर हम चीन के कब्जे से अपनी भूमि निकालेंगे तो स्थिति और भी नाजुक होगी । क्या उपयुक्त वातावरण उत्पन्न करने का मतलब यह है कि चीन थोड़ा पीछे हट जाय मगर हम आगे नहीं बढ़ेंगे ? यदि यह होगा तो चीन के कब्जे में जो भूमि चली गई है वह कभी वापस नहीं आयेगी । क्या समझौता वार्ता द्वारा वह वापस आ सकती है ? अभी तक तो चीन ने इस तरह का कोई संकेत नहीं दिया है । चीन के सामने हमने जो भी प्रस्ताव रखा वह ठुकरा दिया गया । चीन तो हमारी भूमि को अपनी भूमि कहता है और उससे हटने के लिये तैयार नहीं है । मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर शांति से संभव हो तो शांति के द्वारा लेकिन यदि सैनिक शक्ति के प्रयोग की आवश्यकता है तो सैनिक शक्ति के प्रयोग के द्वारा जो भी भारत की भूमि चीन के कब्जे में चली गई है वह वापस आनी चाहिये और अगर आज नहीं आ सकती तो हम देश की ४४ करोड़ जनता के हृदय में इस आग को प्रज्वलित रखेंगे कि पंचशील पर

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

दस्तखत करने वाले देश ने---जिसको सारी दुनिया में हमने सम्मान का स्थान दिलाने की, अपने रास्ते से बाहर जाकर, कोशिश की---उसने हमारे सम्मान को ठोकर मारी है, उसने हिमालय को झुकाना चाहा है, उसने पीठ में छुरा भोका है और हम तब तक चैन से नहीं बैठेंगे जब तक यह अपमान धुल नहीं जाता है ।

मैं प्रधान मंत्री से एक बात कह कर खत्म कर देना चाहता हूं कि आज यह सरकार यदि चीन के कब्जे में चली गई भूमि को वापस लेने की स्थिति में नहीं है तो परमात्मा के लिये चीन के साथ कोई अपमानजनक समझौता तो मत करिये । मुझे विश्वास है कि प्रधान मंत्री ऐसा करेंगे नही, मगर कभी कभी शक होता है और इसलिये साफ घोषणा करने की जरूरत है कि आज नहीं तो कल हम उस भूमि को वापस लेगे और अगर यह सरकार वापस नहीं ले सकती है तो इस सरकार के बाद जो सरकार आयेगी वह उस भूमि को वापस लेगी । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Madam Deputy Chairman, the problems created by the intransigence of China on our northern borders have been with us for several years now. We genuinely desire a peaceful settlement of the issues created by her incursion. China also professes that she desires genuinely a peaceful settlement, but her actions belie her profession. They indicated a certain line in 1956, and in that line included several thousand square miles of our territory. After illegally occupying that area, the area up to the line indicated in 1956, she indicated a further line in 1959 or 1960, and by now the Chinese have occupied a portion of the line indicated by them in 1959 or 1960. We were under the impression that the Chinese at least recognised the McMahon Line, but the latest correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of China clearly indicates that they are not in a mood to accept that Line also for, in several of their communications and in several of their letters, they have said that an area south of the so-called McMahon Line India has occupied illegally. Moreover the foreign relations of Sikkim or Bhutan are conducted through us. In one of their latest letters they have tried to controvert this position also. Therefore, while professing peace, while professing a genuine desire for settlement by negotiations, they have been slowly and methodically encroaching on our territories, advancing into our territories.

Madam, to me the intentions of the Chinese are very clear. The Chinese Government is a Communist Government, and classical communism believes in expansion of communism by armed action. What happened in Eastern Europe after the last Great War is proof positive of that assertion. Chinese are no exception to that. They want to occupy strategic areas on our borders. They want to advance to a line south of the Himalayas so that in future, when they try to take advantage of that situation, there would be no natural barriers between their mechanised armed forces and the defences of India. That is their intention and, Madam Deputy Chairman, they are emboldened because there are Trojan horses in our country. On the one hand they prepare for armed aggression on our borders; on the other hand they create forces in this country, which are subversive of the security of this country.

There is a party in this country, Madam Deputy Chairman, which has openly and also consistently expressed its sympathy with the claims of China. Only three days back or four days back—I refer to a Bengali journal, the "Swadhinata" of Calcutta; that journal is edited and run by the Communist Party of India—in that journal, on the 15th of August, when this matter has assumed certain proportions in this country, a cartoon appeared, and that cartoon

snows that, at the border of India and China, the armed Chinese soldiers with rifles are extending grains of rice or grains of wheat to the famished or starving Indians. This is how that party, this is how the representatives of that party, this is how the organs of that party are trying to break the will of the Indian people to resist aggression on the country's borders. With such Trojan horses, and with what they have done before or propose to do in future on our border, the intentions of the Chinese become very clear. They are slowly and methodically advancing into our country. It is said, "China does not want war". They would be mad to go to war at this stage for they have been achieving what they desire without going to war. Lenin, one of the prophets of Communism, has said so many times, "War is a continuation of politics by other means." If they can achieve their political aims, their strategic aims, without firing a shot, there is no reason why they should go to war. Madam, it is said that China does not want war. In this connection I am tempted to read a quotation from the greatest authority on military strategy and tactics Karlvon Clausewitz. The lines are:

> "The conquerer is always a lover of peace. He would like to make his entry into our State unopposed."

That is what the Chinese believe in, and that is what the Chinese have been doing and achieving.

Madam, in face of Chinese action, in face of Chinese intention, what is it that we are to do? How should we meet this situation? Only a mad man will suggest that India should resort to adventurist armed action on our northern borders at this stage. That action is not indicated, because even now my feeling is that the balance is not so much in our favour that we can safely go to war to regain possession of our territory. But then what to do? In my opinion we should pursue two aims: the short-term aim and the long-term aim. The short-term aim should be to increase our armed preparations or military preparations on the strategic regions to such an extent that any further encroachment into our territory by the Chinese becomes impossible, and this we should achieve, whatever the cost, in the shortest possible time. The question of regaining territories that have been illegally taken possession of by China, that in my opinion is a long-term problem. It is not going to be solved in a day or in the near future. My own feeling is that this problem will not be solved by negotiation because the Chinese Foreign Minister, after he met our Defence Minister in Geneva and exchanged his views, thereafter referred to the will of the 650 million Chinese people. That clearly indicates that they are in no mood to solve this problem by negotiation in the near future. I see no possibility of the Chinese leaving it except by a development of circumstances adverse to China. But then let us wait patiently. In the meantime we should go ahead with our armed preparation on the border. We should be helpful in creating a situtation in which in future China would lie low and prostrate because only in that contingency China will leave those borders which she had illegally occupied. I do not urge that we should give up our policy of non-alignment here and now. I do not urge that in any foreseeable future we should give up our policy of non-alignment and establish alignment with this bloc or that bloc. That is not indicated today. That is not indicated in the near foreseeable future. But if a situation arises in which China by a combination of forces is placed in a weakened position we should not then, because we hold fast to certain high principles, fail to take advantage of that situation and in that situation we should regain those territories. Till then, Madam, we should go ahead with our armed preparation on the frontier.

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

The rate at which our Government has been building up our defences is, in my opinion, satisfactory. But more effort has to be put into it because it is clear that even now there is no parity between the armed strength of China and India on the border. During the last few months while they have established twelve or fourteen check-posts, we have been able to establish only three or four. It clearly indicates that even now there is no parity. That parity has to be established in the immediate future and no sacrifice, no cost, should be too great for that. The nation, if told frankly of the situation that the nation faces on these borders, shall be prepared to make any sacrifice.

We are told, Madam Deputy Chairman, that the nation must have morale. It is true that without morale wars are not won, without morale battles are not won. But then for morale it is essential to have adequate arms. It is essential to have adequate armed preparation. Nations do not win battles, nations do not win wars, only on the basis of morale. They win wars with arms. As Nepolean once said, "Providence always fights on the side of stronger legions". Let us make our legions stronger than the legions of the Chinese on the border. Morale will come when the nation is assured that it is in a comfortable military situation, armed situation. The nation will develop that morale. I have no doubt that even now the nation does possess adequate morale.

But while continuing our build-up, while expanding our military production, we should not give up hopes of pursuing a peaceful settlement with China. We should negotiate because war, after all, is the last arbitrament. It is not the first arbitrament. Even our history, our genius, shows that in this country people have tried to evolve peaceful solution up to the last. In the Mahabharata it was only when Duryodhana said:

सूच्यग्राम न दास्यामि बिना युद्धन केशव

सत्यमेम जयते that Lord Krishna and Yudhishthira decided to go to war. And if war comes in such a situation, I am confident that the result of that war shall be in our favour because then the enthusiasm, the anger, of five hundred million people will be behind our armed forces, because we believe, Madam, that it is ultimately truth that prevails. That is our motto— सत्यमेव जयते ।

But while pursuing our efforts for a negotiated settlement, we should not relax on the military front because I at least am not hopeful of a negotiated settlement. Therefore, while making every effort in that direction, we must go on strengthening our military position both on the borders and inside the country by developing our production.

Then, Madam, in a negotiated settlement, I feel, the Prime Minister or whoever is in charge of these negotiations should have a free hand. I would simply put one restriction on him. Whether it is the Prime Minister, the Defence Minister or the Government of India, one restraint has to be put on them. The words "Nothing will be done which sullies the honour of India" appear to me to be too vague. I would put only one restraint: "In any bargain, in any settlement, do not bargain away those territories which are of a strategic value to India, whose occupation and possession would put China at a positive advantage in any future contingency.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): Or any territory.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Anyway you are free to put your restriction. That is the only fetter that I would put on any negotiator who wants to pursue negotiations. Madam, it is a difficult situation.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I will finish with this line. It is a situation in which the whole nation is united except for certain persons belonging to a

party of treason, and I hope in whatever steps the Prime Minister takes, this country will accord him full support.

PROF M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, we all know that Communist China has played foul with us as well as with its professed faith in Panchsheel. It has proved more imperialist in its attitude than even the Manchu imperialists of China. While the Manchus claimed some sort of suzerainty over Tibet, Communist China converted that claim of suzerainty into sovereignty and converted Tibet into a Chinese colony and I should say, a military camp. It has also extended its claims over territories which never belonged to China. It has no respect for international frontiers. It is expansionist. It wishes to expand its domain to the extent it can. It dreams of a sub-Himalayan federation under its control.

It has proved itself absolutely unworthy of any trust in its dealings with India. It has played foul with our Prime Minister. For long it professed friendship with India, professed faith in Panchsheel but at the same time planned aggression and penetrated into our territories. For long China gave an impression to our Prime Minister that it does not question the international frontiers claimed by us but in 1959 it presented us a map of 1956 wherein China claimed a large part of Indian territory as its own and in 1960 it presented to us another map wherein it claims another additional chunk of Indian territory as its own. In 1961 May, when our Secretary-General met the Chinese Prime Minister and had talks with him about Kashmir, he said:

> "Can you cite any document to show that we have ever said that Kashmir is not part of India?"

Yet, recently it sent another letter where it says:

> "Can you cite any document to show that we have ever said that Kashmir is part of India?"

In the first talk he says:

> "Can you cite any instance when we said that Kashmir is not part of India?"

In the second document they say:

> "Can you cite any instance wherein we said that Kashmir is part of India?

From all this it is but obvious that China is shifting its ground, trying to exploit our differences with Pakistan, trying to extend its domain over Indian territory to the extent it can. Its profession of friendship to Pakistan is also obviously untrue because of the fact that it is claiming more than 3,000 square miles of territory which is under the occupation of Pakistan today.

With such a Power we must be very careful in our dealings and in our talks. In the international world, it is not possible for us to avoid talks. But the talks must be carefully carried on so that they may not be misused by Communist China. They must not give an impression to the world and the people of India that our Government has begun to pursue a policy of appeasement of the aggressor. I beg to submit that our letter dated 26th July 1962 to China gave some such impression even to China. That is why China published that particular letter, though it did not publish any document or letter of ours before. The Prime Minister has told the other House that his letter was not properly interpreted, that he did not mean what China thought it meant. This statement of the Prime Minister is surely reassuring but we beg to submit that in future, in our dealings with China, in our correspondence with China, in our talks with China, we should be very careful.

Our Communist friends wish to give us the impression that they stand by the policy of the Prime Minister, that they support the stand of the Prime Minister but this is really a travesty

[Prof M. B. Lal.]

of truth. We know that they do not endorse the stand of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister definitely says that China is pursuing an aggressive policy, that China has committed an aggression on our territory, that China has occupied about 12,000 square miles of Indian territory, that the international boundary is chalked out by our Indian map. None of these ideas are ever endorsed by the Communist Party. They, on the other hand, continue to say that a socialist party and a socialist government can never commit aggression. They have denied that aggression has been committed over us. In the other House their representative rather disliked even the use of the word 'unfriendly' for a Power which had committed aggression over our territory, occupied 12,000 square miles of our land. . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: In which speech?

(*Interruptions.*)

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: It is amazing.

PROF. M. B. LAL: In the speech delivered in the Lok Sabha. While the Prime Minister makes a distinction between talks and negotiations and says that while talks for the relaxation of tension for the creation of proper conditions may continue, negotiations would start when the Chinese troops withdraw themselves from Indian territory, the Communists make no distinction between talks and negotiations and wish to negotiate even when China is in possession of Indian territory. It is not possible for us to do so. India cannot condone China's aggression and India cannot accept the violation of the old *status quo* as an accomplished fact and cannot consent to start negotiations on that basis.

2 P.M.

It seems that the Communist attitude has cast some baneful influence on a handful of Congressmen also. But the interruptions here clearly indicate that the great bulk of Congressmen are as much opposed to the Chinese aggression as any man in opposition parties. The questions from the Congress benches also clearly indicate that they do not wish to be identified with the Communist policy or the Communist attitude in this particular matter.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister wishes to have freedom to talk. We are glad the Prime Minister has made a distinction between talks and negotiations. We are glad that the Prime Minister has also indicated the limits of the talks in his speech that he has delivered today. Madam Deputy Chairman, we do not wish to deny him opportunities of talk with China for securing the withdrawal of the Chinese troops from Indian territory so that under a peaceful atmosphere negotiations for a peaceful settlement may be carried on. But we wish him also to remember the distinction between talk and concession. We wish to request him that the talks should be so conducted that they may not give the world an impression of appeasement of China and may not lead our countrymen to suffer from complacency. They must be aimed, as he himself says, at the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Indian territory. Negotiations must be preceded by the vacation of aggression.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister assures us that we are stronger and better prepared today than we were two years before. This is obvious to us also. But China gives us the impression that its preparations are progressing with much greater speed. Can the Government assure the Indian people that this is not a fact, that our defence preparations are at least equal to the Chinese designs and aggressions? Are our posts so manned and so equipped that further Chinese penetration in Ladakh is not possible? Madam Deputy Chairman, we must be careful on all our fronts. Are we prepared to resist aggression on all fronts? Recently, in one of the papers we read that China aims to build some air bases in or near Nepal. That fact also has to be faced now. We must be prepared not only to face an emergency in Ladakh, but also on all fronts facing China and India.

The Prime Minister in his speech on Independence Day has appealed to the people of India to rise to the occasion and to be prepared to face the situation with courage and determination. I hope this appeal would be responded to by all in this country. All, irrespective of party affiliations, must stand united in the determination to maintain the territorial integrity of the country. Madam Deputy Chairman, the people of India should no more be fed with hopes and good intentions of China and then made to suffer from complacency. They should be awakened to the gravity of the situation and assured that our territorial integrity will be preserved inviolate under all circumstances. Of course, no one wishes to create an alarm or panic in this country. What we want is to steel the people's heart, to strengthen their determination to face aggression. This is necessary even to save the country from alarm and panic to which ill-informed and ill-prepared people are an easy prey. The danger is not to be underestimated. It has to be faced with proper preparation. Resistance will have to be planned on all fronts, strategic, industrial as well as psychological. Fear of panic and alarm will have to yield place to the desire for strengthening the people's will to resist. That way alone the morale of the people can be sustained.

No one wishes that so far as the Government's policy is concerned, it should give up its policy of non-alignment in international matters. But our policy of non-alignment does not and must not mean indifference to the cultivation of goodwill in the world for the Indian case. It must, on the other hand, entitle us to mobilise and secure the moral support of the entire world. Madam Deputy Chairman, I feel it is our duty to keep this in our mind and to place our case before the whole world in as intelligent and convincing a fashion as possible and to give the world the impression that we are determined to stand by our claims and are not prepared to yield to any pressure against our claims Madam Deputy Chairman, worldwide, repercussions of the Chinese aggression cannot be ignored or belittled. This will have to be taken note of and world opinion will have to be created in favour of India's claim. This is all I wish to say now. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, I welcome the statement of the Prime Minister made this morning, because whatever doubts there may be among people in this House or outside about the policy of the Government of India, all those doubts, I am sure, would be cleared by that statement. As far as I am concerned, I may say that the policy of the Government of India all along on this question has been crystal-clear. But ever since the letter of July 26 was sent, all kinds of interpretations are being put on that letter. In fact, a malicious campaign of calumny is being carried on against the Government and some people are saying that there is a reversal of the policy.

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

Some people are saying that the Government is agreeing to a cease-fire line, as though there was a war going on and India had the worse of it. Hon. Members on this side, most of whom have spoken, have also referred to the letter of July 26 and Mr. Vajpayee has put in an amendment to the effect that it is a compromise of India's position and is, therefore, tantamount to a virtual offer to cede a major part of the occupied area. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to point out that the interpretation which is being put on this letter of the 26th July is completely wrong and unfounded. I shall make a comparison of this letter with the letter of the 12th July and point out that the letter of 26th July is nothing more than a repetition and a paraphrase of what has been said in the letter of the 12th July. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman the sentences which are being impunged in the letter of the 26th July are these:

[Shri N. C. Kasliwal.]

"Even if the Government of China are inclined to contest this boundary, the Government of India fail to understand why the Government of China do not restrain their forces from going beyond even their 1956 Chinese map claim line which is capable of easy and quick verification."

Then much is made of these words, 'It is true that the Government of India contest the validity of the 1956 Chinese map claim-line but the Chinese local forces should not go beyond their own claim-line confirmed by Prime Minister Chou En-lai'. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, let me draw your attention to the letter of the 12th July which is contained in White Paper No. VI, page 84. I will again show that the letter of the 26th July is not in the least a departure from the previous letters. If at all, the letter of the 26th July is nothing but a repetition and a paraphrase of the previous letters, the letter of July 12 and other letters. In order not to take the time of the House, I will only refer to the sentence which is contained on page 84.

"Although this 1956 Chinese alignment is itself fallacious and untenable . . ."

Mark the words, "fallacious and untenable". We were even then contesting the claim of the Chinese.

" . . . the fact that Chinese forces have pushed even beyond it is indicative of China's unlimited territorial ambitions in the region."

I would ask you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in what way this letter is contradictory to the letter of the 26th July?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member but the difference is clear.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: If you listen to me, I will explain it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: In this letter we did not say that the Chinese should confine themselves to the 1956 line. We did refer to the 1956 line but we did not implore them to confine themselves to this line.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: In that particular letter, we have referred to the international boundary.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: If you read the last sentence again of the letter of the 26th July and add the other sentence to this sentence, the sentence that I read out to you just now, you will see that the position becomes very clear. In spite of this, I fail to understand how it is presumed that we are going to give up our claim to the entire area as Mr. Vajpayee seems to think. The letter of the 12th July has gone further and says:

"These new Chinese posts, deep inside Indian territory, constitute further serious violations of India's territorial integrity. Not only are Chinese forces now poised in menacing proximity to existing Indian posts in the area, but their incessant aggressive and provocative activities are increasing tension and, if not restrained, may create a clash at any moment."

Mark the words "increasing tension". What is said in the letter of the 26th July is this. They have made a claim up to the 1956 line. All right, let us now proceed and have a relaxation of the tension in that area and nothing more. If you read it continuously with all these previous letters, Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is nothing in this particular letter to justify any criticism by Mr. Vajpayee or anybody else on the side of the Opposition. I would request that in a matter like this, which is a national issue, at least derogatory remarks on the policy of the Government should not be used in the way that they have been used.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: What are the derogatory remarks?

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: Please read what the papers have said. They have

said that it is the road to dishonour, that it is a reversal of policy and so on and so forth.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will come to another point. Supposing the interpretation which has been put on this letter by Mr. Vajpayee is correct, what would happen? It would happen and it should happen that the Chinese should jump at it for more than one reason. Firstly, Mr. Vajpayee has said that India is going to concede the claim of China up to the 1956 line and, therefore, the Chinese get about 12,000 square miles. Secondly, the Chinese say that the 1956 line is the same as the 1960 line although we dispute it. In this case, the Chinese get everything that they have been asking for from Karakoram to Kangra and they should have accepted it but have they done so? Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will now point out to you the letter of the 4th August which is in reply to our letter of the 26th July, Have they said that they accept what we say? On the contrary, in the last paragraph it says that things should not be made very difficult for such discussion. It says that there should not be any pre-condition for such discussion. The Chinese are wiser than my friend, Mr. Vajpayee; they did not put that interpretation that he intends to put on this letter of the 26th July.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Should we negotiate with them without any condition?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Order, order. Let the hon. Member proceed. You are losing time, Mr. Kasliwal.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, having said so, I will go further and say that no reference has been made to the letter of the 4th August which has been sent to us in reply to our letter of the 26th July. Now, one thing is clear and that is that this letter is couched in much more respectful terms than the previous letters which have been sent from the Chinese side and there is another thing in it. They have now, I believe it is for the first time, agreed to have some kind of negotiation on the Report of the two teams of officials. The words are—

> "The Chinese Government propose that such discussion be held as soon as possible and that the level, date, place and other procedural matters for this discussion be immediately decided upon by consultation through diplomatic channels".

Mr. Vajpayee and our friend, Mr. Mani, have objected to the talks and as some papers have said, these talks are only about talks. Very well, if we are going to negotiate, some preliminary talks must take place and all the time the Prime Minister has been trying to stress that certain preliminary talks, for the negotiations, must take place.

Now, having said so, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will again refer to this letter of the Chinese dated the 4th August. They have complained that India has set up 27 military strong points. This is the first time that the Chinese have begun to realise the strength of India. I believe, if the Chinese understand any language they understand the language of strength and I must congratulate the Government on the steps they have been continuously taking to step up all our military preparations and to set up check-posts in that area. It is not necessary for me to go into all the things of military preparedness, etc. Certainly, we must be prepared; we must build up our strength. A famous General has said that history does not long entrust freedom in the hands of the weak or the timid. We have never been timid; we have always been brave. The Indian nation as a whole has always been brave and courageous. Certainly, at times we have been a little weak and the Chinese have taken advantage of our weakness in that particular area.

[Shri N C. Kasliwal.]

because as somebody has said those areas are unoccupied. And may I say that this interpretation which is being put on the words 'unoccupied' is absolutely wrong? Unoccupied only means that there are no inhabitants, that there are no people living in those areas. That does not mean in the least that India had never had possession over it.

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE: Occupation means habitation?

SHRI N. C KASLIWAL: Definitely; occupation means habitation and nothing else. "Unoccupied" does not mean that we have lost possession. Possession is constructive; possession is legal and all the time it has been the stand of the Government of India that we have continued to be in possession of these areas although it is quite true that the areas were unoccupied in the sense that there were no people inhabiting these areas. Mr. Vajpayee forgets that in 1957 our troops which were under the command of one Capt. Iyengar came into clash at Hajilangar which is quite near the Aksai Chin road with the Chinese troops So it is futile to say that we had no possession of those areas.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You will have to wind up now.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: I was going into the question of strength. We must build up our military strength and the nation as a whole feels confident that under the great leadership of the Prime Minister and the dynamic personality of the Defence Minister we shall grow from strength to strength.

There is only one last point which I want to make again and that is with regard to the amendment of Mr. Vajpayee. In the last sentence it is said that "this House therefore calls for an abandonment of this policy and a categorical declaration . . ." Which policy? I do not understand. Does it relate to the policy, as he alleges, that is in the letter of the 26th July? And his amendment goes on: " . . .and a categorical declaration by Government that vacation of aggression by China is an absolute pre-requisite for negotiations." The Prime Minister all the time maintained that aggression must be vacated. He has all the time said that the international boundary must be the traditional boundary. Our case has been proved to the hilt by the two official teams and it is not necessary for me to go into all that but the whole point is this; should talks take place for negotiations or should they not take place? That is the whole question and I believe that the Prime Minister is quite right when he says that if we have to have aggression vacated by negotiations preliminary talks must take place.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Sir, as I rise to take part in this important second debate on foreign policy, I must confess to a sense of despondency because the Prime Minister makes a statement, his supporters support it and the Opposition bring in counter-arguments but the result is the same, that the majority approves of the foreign policy and the conduct of the foreign policy by the present Government. The work of the Opposition in this respect seems to me like the work of Sizyphus who used to push a piece of rock up a mountain and when it reached the top the rock would come down and his labour would have to be repeated again. It is in this Sizyphian labour that the Opposition is engaged when it discusses foreign policy or for the matter of that any other policy of the present Government.

Before I take up the substance of this foreign policy statement, may I appeal to the Prime Minister to refrain from indulging in ironic references to the Opposition, to the arguments of the Opposition, and to the

leaders of the Opposition? I gladly confess and thankfully confess that the vituperative vocabulary of the Prime Minister is rather limited. He rings the changes on such words as "nonsense," "fantastic nonsense," "zamindari party", "gallant Maharajas," reactionary party . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): But the Prime Minister did not use them here.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: But he used them elsewhere. Feudal, medieval and so on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And helicopter party.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: There used to be a Minister in England in the early Victorian days who was in the habit of damning everybody and everything. Lord Melbourne who was the Prime Minister said when he attended a Cabinet meeting: "Let us take for granted, gentlemen, that everybody is damned and everything is damned and let us proceed to consider the business of the Cabinet."

Now, this business of the border and the policy of the Government of India is a very anxious problem not only for the Government but for the people also. In my first speech I pleaded that the foreign policy of the Government should be founded on facts, geographical and historical, on the facts of the international situation. There is one fact which I should like to deal with in this debate and that is the character and the political ideas of the other party, in this context of China and its leaders. We must take into consideration in dealing with the Chinese and the Chinese policy, the Chinese idea of foreign relations and their conduct of foreign relations.

Let us deal with the ideas of some of the representative leaders of China. Mao Tse-tung the maker of modern China and the leader of modern China, as early as 1938 in "Problems of War and Strategy" had said:

> "The essential and the highest form of revolution is to solve all problems by war."

Again on the eve of the inauguration of the Communist regime in 1948, he said:

> "In order to attain victory and consolidate it we must lean to one side and one side alone, namely, the side of the Communist bloc."

In 1949 writing in commemoration of the 28th anniversary of the Communist Party he advised his people in external matters to unite in a common struggle together with the nations of the world which treat them as equals. He went on to say:

> "We ally ourselves with the Soviet Union and the Peoples' democracies and with the proletariat and the broad masses in all other countries and form an international world front."

Then he designated the Powers which he did not like, the freedom-loving Powers, as paper tigers as contrasted with the real tigers of the Communist bloc.

Then if we go on to Chou En-lai who is velvet glove to Mao's mailed fist, in his offer at Bandung of peaceful negotiations for the solution of international troubles, he reserved the right to liberate the countries in which he was interested, Formosa at that time, Tibet later and now Ladakh. In October 1950 in exchange of notes with the Government of India regarding Tibet he charged the Indian Government with submitting to "outside obstruction".

Again, in a note of his Ministry dated 31st May, 1962, he characterised Indian commitment to the defence of Sikkim and Bhutan as "Great Power Chauvinism". Then, there are other ideas of liberation illustrated in the case of Tibet. Then, they have the theory of

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

two camps, that there is controversy perpetually and constant opposition between the two camps, namely, the camp of the communist Powers and the camp of the non-communist Powers. They also believe in cold war. Another Chinese leader, Huin Sin, said:—

> "We definitely cannot wait for peace. We must go to fight for peace."

In other words, they must wage war for the sake of peace.

The Prime Minister himself had an inkling of these ideas of China and the Chinese leaders. He charged the Chinese with using the language of the cold war regardless of truth and propriety in his speech in the other House on April 27, 1959. Again, making a statement in the other House on September 4, 1959, he said:—

> "If anyone asked me what these border incidents indicate, I shall say probably, I do not know what might be in the minds of the other party, whether it is just local aggressiveness, or a desire to show us our place or something deeper, we do not know."

Parenthetically we might say that these speculations of the Prime Minister in regard to the mind of the Chinese Government may be due to a number of causes. It might be irritation at the welcome given to the Dalai Lama when he had to flee from Tibet. And may I say that it was one of the finest acts of the Prime Minister in the whole of his political career? It might be also displeasure at the overthrow of the communist Government in Kerala. It might be due also to internal troubles in China itself.

To resume reference to the speeches of the Prime Minister on the subject, speaking in the other House on 25th June, 1959, he recognised the need to see China as it is, as we have to deal with what is called a one-track mind, a one-track mind which has been proved by the history of Chinese imperialism in these latter days.

That being so, what of the future? We must negotiate, as more than one Member has advised. We must negotiate as the Prime Minister thinks we must. We may even go to the preliminary "talks about talks" without any preconditions, which the Chinese Government insist on. But, while we negotiate, let us keep our powder dry, negotiate and fight at the same time. Fighting need not frighten us, because since the end of the last World War, the peoples of the world and the Governments of the world have learnt to spell 'war' with a small 'w'. There are such things as local wars, fought in Korea, fought in Indo-China, fought all over the world, which do not commit the great Powers to the great global war. And so my suggestion to the Government of India would be, fight back any further attacks on our border, while negotiating at the same time. Do not let the Chinese troops invade, make any further incursions into our border. Let the "green light" go from the Government of India to our troops and officers on the border that any fresh attack by the Chinese troops must be resisted, whether the Government is engaged in negotiations or not. And let us have fighting Commanders on the border, Commanders who have had battle experience, who have been under fire, not drawing-room Generals. For instance, why is not Lieut.-General Choudhuri on the northern border? Why is he allowed to cool his heels in Bombay or in Poona? He is a man with war experience, experience in the last World War, in Burma and on other fronts. He has had experience of "police actions" in Hyderabad and recently in Goa. It is such a man that we must have as our Commander on our northern border. And such a man must be given confidence, must be given full freedom to act as he

pleases, that is to say, to fight these local wars and to prevent any further incursion of the Chinese into our territory. Let negotiations go on, but at the same time let us keep our powder dry, and show the Chinese that we will not stand any more of their nonsense, that we will not allow any further inch of our territory to be taken by them. It will not lead to war, as these local wars have not let to great global wars. And in this way, while negotiating and keeping our powder dry, by being prepared to repel any further incursion into our territory, we may be serving not only the cause of peace, but also the cause of freedom.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated): Sir, one naturally feels some hesitation in discussing matters affecting our relations with China, and also with Pakistan, under the circumstances which guide our deliberations here. I do not know if in many Parliaments discussions take place as they take place here relating to matters which, I think, need to be debated differently. We sometimes speak as if we are addressing public audiences and sometimes we are not conscious that it is not only the audience in India which is listening to us, but also audiences in the very countries with regard to which we have certain views to express. And these views relate to matters of possible war, defensive measures, then naturally one has to speak with great restraint. Now, I have no doubt in my mind that the manner in which we have been recently conducting our discussions will improve the morale of the countries which today may not be friendly with us and spoil the morale in our own country. I have no doubt that patriotic feelings inspire what most people say here. But I have a feeling that an unconscious party complex influences what we say here and if we unconsciously even become subject to that complex, when dealing with China and Pakistan, it is a matter greatly to be regretted in the interests of the country. Until new conventions are established and new forums, maybe within Parliament itself, are created, where we can discuss matters in greater detail and with greater freedom, one has, while participating in discussions, to observe the maximum restraint. With these preliminary remarks I will deal only with one or two main points as there is no time to deal with all.

There can be no doubt that the position of India on the border, specially Ladakh, is definitely as satisfactory as it can be under the circumstances. During the last few months, maybe a year or more, we have made a substantial advance in all directions, and as a result of this advance we have reached a position where the maximum possible resistance, humanly maximum possible resistance, can be offered to any further advance by the Chinese. Most of us possibly are not familiar with the terrain there. I am not repeating a common place when I make a reference to terrain. High mountains overlap each other, hills overlap each other. It is possible for a party of twenty to be within two miles of you behind a hill and still be invisible to you. These things happen in all hilly regions. Therefore, it is possible that here and there we may be encircled as here and there we may encircle the other party. Therefore, we need not become very nervous when we come to know that here and there somebody has advanced a mile or two or three and when it may appear as though we were encircled. These things happen in all hilly and jungle countries, and we need not become unnecessarily unnerved. As a matter of fact I consider it to be a sign of unconscious weakness, lack of self-confidence, when the smallest news of that type creates a sensation in our country. We cannot forget that an area claimed by the Chinese as their own—I do not know, they may be genuinely feeling on account of whatever reasons that it is their own—35,000 square miles of NEFA,

[Shri Jairamdas Daulatram.]

is under our occupation. Legitimately we have a right to occupy it. They think they have a right to occupy it. But the fact that 35,000 square miles are under our occupation, administration and control, military and civil control, does not make them nervous, does not make them talk of declaring a war against India, because wars on small matters can be possible only between two small countries.

I do not want to say anything which is derogatory to anybody, I am including myself in that, but we have no experience of preparing for and handling wars. For the last two hundred years, as I said on an earlier occasion, the British fought our wars. We did something in Kashmir. (*Interruption*) I do not want to be interrupted. We did something in Kashmir for a brief while. We did something in Hyderabad for a few days. We did something in Goa for a few hours. Big nations do not rush into a war for any small reason. It requires a lot of thinking and preparation before war is declared. We have not handled such affairs formerly and let us not be hustled into a mistake now.

I think we need not also be afraid of the word "negotiation". Gandhiji fought all his life, Gandhiji negotiated all his life. He negotiated while he fought, while he prepared for a fight. It is an entirely wrong understanding of Gandhiji's tactics to think that he was only a fighter. He was a great negotiator, more a negotiator than a fighter. Fighting, struggle, war—these are the ultimate unavoidable alternatives. War has to be for India also the last, unavoidable, ultimate alternative when forced upon us. I wish the Prime Minister were not present here when I say what I say because it is something personal, but I believe that nobody, in the politics of this country or in international politics, in internal problems or in dealing with persons, is using friendly approach of Gandhiji in practical life as the Prime Minister does. If we try to repudiate what he does, we are really repudiating the method and approach which Gandhiji always employed. I am surprised, pained, that there should be friends who should think that the Prime Minister will surrender or sully the honour of India. Among the millions that live in this country I know of no one who is more incapable of it, temperamentally incapable of it. I know also—many may not know—that he resisted Gandhiji himself when he thought the issue of honour was involved and here I am referring to the Gandhi-Irwin Pact of 1931. Many may not know that he resisted it probably right up to the end, as some of the terms were, according to him, not in consonance with the honour of the nation, or maybe the entire Pact. Though later events must have led to a change in that opinion, for the time being he resisted Gandhiji, and possibly a night of great anguish was passed by him when that Pact was signed. Possibly the most sleepless night of his life was passed when that Pact was made, because he felt that the honour of the nation was involved and that we should not have that Pact. So, it is a very painful though significant indication that friends in India should be capable of saying that he will compromise the nation's honour. I am saying this because the Chinese are listening. The press gallery is not representative of only India. I am really pained at the way in which we carry on our debates dealing with these problems.

I would certainly say that after the definite declarations made by the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha with regard both to the question of sustaining the honour of the country and also keeping the Lok Sabha or Parliament informed, there should be absolutely no hesitation in entrusting him with any task. It is when we feel nervous ourselves, we feel weak ourselves, we have no confidence in ourselves, we do not think we are

strong, that we are afraid of talking. The strongest man in India was Gandhiji, and yet the greatest talker. He talked directly, he talked indirectly. He talked to news correspondents, deliberately gave interviews to try to feel the way, to open the window, to open the door wide and create a situation where talks could take place. I think it is entirely wrong tactics, and even from the point of view of those friends who want that we should have this entire area vacated soon it is wrong to shut out all talks and all negotiations. My own feeling is that we should give the fullest freedom to the Prime Minister. Let him carry on talks with whomsoever he likes and in any manner he likes and prepare the ground for the major talks and the major negotiations. Let us give him on behalf of Parliament our heartiest good wishes and abundant goodwill to carry on those talks.

I happen to be a nominated Member of the Rajya Sabha. I have also had for some years official association with the Government after Independence, but I am basically a nationalist. Many may not know of my national association going back to nearly sixty years.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I went from my province when a mere school-boy to attend the Congress at Bombay in 1904 when, men whose names are a legend now were there, when Sir Henry Cotton and Wedderburn and all other great makers of the Congress were there. When I speak today I speak as an Indian nationalist. As an Indian nationalist I feel that great mistakes are being made in the manner in which we conduct our debates and sometimes we are overconscious of our being partymen. I also feel pained at the way in which we are coming in the way of a prompt, right, early and desirable solution of a very complicated problem. We cannot always be at tension with our neighbours, whether it is Pakistan or China. Here I may be in a minority of one, but I personally feel that we must evolve new conventions as to how, where, in what forum within Parliament, we can carry on most of our debates on these two countries. Otherwise I think we are not acting in the interests of our nation. In conclusion, I repeat, let us give the fullest freedom to the Prime Minister with our heartiest cheer and utmost goodwill.

SHRI ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am really very glad and gratified that the Prime Minister at the very outset of his speech made a reference to the recent settlement on. West Irian and on Pondicherry. I think it symbolises the triumph of peaceful negotiations, as he very appropriately said. Any other alternative course, I think, is fraught with dangers. That course has been tried and the result was Korea, the Congo, Indo-China, Laos, etc. And I think that his reiteration of a very firm conviction that we will continue to pursue the policy that we have been pursuing is most welcome and should be appreciated by all of us. Some Members of the Opposition are in the habit of seizing upon a word here and a phrase there and like a politician, instead of making two and two add up to four, they invariably make it five. I do not think there is much in that so-much talked about and advertised letter which, unfortunately, was also dramatised by our press, particularly the English press, in our metropolis, with editorials characterising that letter as an ignominious betrayal that would bring ruin, dishonour and the rest. Certainly, our press is free but I hope that it will deal with such matters of great importance with a little more sense of responsibility and not rouse unnecessary speculations, misgivings and apprehensions in the minds of the people.

Certainly, the Chinese have disillusioned us, all of us. We cannot

[Shri Anup Singh.]

forget that not very long ago, we were chanting 'Hindi-Chini Bhai, Bhai', and now it looks more like 'Bye-Bye'. But I think the question that we should ask ourselves is, what the Chinese have gained, precisely what their reaction is and what is the reaction to it in the world at large. I recently came from an unofficial Congress in Moscow and what transpired there, I think, perhaps will be of some interest to the Members here. The Prime Minister of the Soviet Union addressed that Congress for two hours and thirtyseven minutes, and he eulogised the role of the Afro-Asian Group in particular. But he mentioned only one name—the Prime Minister is present here—of a person who has made—I do not remember his exact words—a notable contribution to the stabilisation of peace. Only one name was mentioned as an outstanding statesman of the day. And I think that my friends who were there will bear me out that when that reference was made, there was a spontaneous, tremendous chorus of applause by everyone. We did not get a chance to see the reaction of the Chinese who were on the side and behind. But I was told later on by some people who had the opportunity to talk to some of the Chinese delegates that they were rather irritated, and one of them said within my hearing later on that it was very indiscreet and inappropriate on the part of the Soviet Premier to single out a man for appreciation and eulogy of his peaceful role, who was obviously an aggressor and was following a policy of aggression. That was the Chinese reaction but the reaction of the other people—there were 2,400 delegates from 110 countries in their unofficial capacity—was different. Any reference to India immediately brought a chorus of applause, no matter what the subject-matter was.

In this connection, I might say that we should be prepared for a long drawn-out crisis. No one can predict, and we can only hope that it may end tomorrow. I had a very casual talk with a Chinese delegate. I do not think he could presume to speak for the Chinese Government or the Chinese people any more than I. I asked him very casually, "How long is this situation between your country and my country going to go on?" And with a very cynical smile, he said, "Mr. Singh, like you Indians, we are also a very ancient people. We have a great deal of patience." I said, "Anyhow, how long is it going to last? We do have infinite patience but certainly there must be some end to this present tension." He said, "Oh! it can go on for two or three centuries. What is two or three centuries in the life-history of a country like yours or mine?" Now, that may be said in a very casual and jovial way but I am inclined to think that they are also getting reconciled to the idea that this may persist and that we should get ourselves reconciled to a long drawn out dead-lock.

Secondly, I believe that the Chinese have been isolated. I am not speaking in terms of what I witnessed at the Moscow Congress. Incidentally, their delegation was the smallest, even smaller than that of Ceylon. They could not tolerate the idea of Moscow sponsoring the Congress and they wanted to show their indifference. I am not talking about what the Congress achieved. They were talking about disarmament and the cessation of nuclear tests. Right in the midst of the deliberations the Americans conducted high-altitude test. I think the Russians had perhaps been a little more discreet, they resumed their tests when we came back to Delhi. I am not saying that we have not achieved anything there. But the Chinese actually went out of their way to belittle this Congress. And I might say that they were rather irritated—and I speak from personal experience—and when the Indians were pushed into the forefront of the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman, our friends, the Chinese, did not relish it.

Now, in another sphere what have they gained? There are obviously two great Powers who count and any kind of rapproachment between the two, I think, is an indispensable prerequisite to any kind of settlement anywhere. The Americans are certainly not approving what the Chinese have done. The Russians may have been discreet for diplomatic reasons but I think there is enough evidence to show that they are rather perturbed at the Chinese behaviour, and they would like to see the end of this difficulty between the two countries. I do not know of any other country, big or small, or its delegates who did not privately confess to us that China was definitely the aggressor. They may not come out and say so publicly, and I think that is something that we should bear in mind and not be sidetracked by little things here and there.

I repeat, Madam Deputy Chairman, that the policy that the Government of India has chosen to pursue with respect to the Chinese question has been correct. I think it has been vindicated in the sense that our position is quite clear and that people are on our side. Certainly, a good deal of territory has been occupied and nobody is going to part with it even to win applause and platitudes of the rest of the world. But I think this is the only policy we should pursue. As one statesman in his message to another Congress said, he would rather have five years of protracted negotiations than five minutes of modern war.

Thank you.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Madam Deputy Chairman, India's Note of the 26th July has raised a great deal of controversy and created apprehensions in the minds of the people in this country. I would like to say that our attitude is this that there are certain circumstances which compel us to draw the inference that many people from India have drawn and people from many places have also drawn. Just now Mr. Anup Singh and previous to him Mr. Kasliwal have pointed out that there should have been no strong reaction from the press. Madam, I would just quote one or two instances which compel us to draw this sort of inference.

3 P.M.

Only about one month back we were informed that Indian and Chinese troops were facing each other in the Galwan Valley. If I remember correctly, it was only one month back that the Prime Minister had given the clarion call to the whole nation that the whole nation should be alert. What is the meaning of this clarion call? Why this clarion call was given to the nation? And then within one month's time, what was the necessity to press for talks and negotiations after that clarion call was given.

The second incident which compelled us to draw this conclusion or inference is about our Defence Minister's visit and his talks and parleys with the Vice-Premier of China, Marshal Chen-yi. Of course, I do not mind if a representative of this Government and country holds parleys and talks with a representative of the Chinese Government. Normally, I would not have minded it. Our Defence Minister can discuss this problem with Marshal Chen-yi, but I am worried and perturbed about the reaction which we have provoked from the representative of China. And what did Marshal Chen-yi say afterwards? In a radio or television interview he said that the 600 millions of people of China will not tolerate this thing. Did we send our Defence Minister to Geneva to evoke this sort of reaction from the Chinese representative?

May I recall one more instance, Madam? It was one or two years back that we had sent our Secretary-General to China, as pointed out by

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]

Mr. Vajpayee, to discuss the same border dispute. And then also our country had to suffer dishonour and humiliation. Are we to go on talking just to suffer indignities and humiliation, to suffer dishonour? So far as I am concerned, there is no harm if we talk. We must talk if we want to solve the problem peacefully and if there is any hope of solving the problem that way. I will come to this question later. But then, Madam, in view of those facts that our troops were facing the Chinese troops in the Galwan Valley only one month back and the hon. the Prime Minister had given the clarion call to the whole nation that the whole nation must be alert to face this aggression and after that immediately these events were followed by our Defence Minister's visit and that ultimately the Indian Note of 26th July comes forth, are we wrong, is the whole press of India wrong in drawing the conclusion that we are rather reversing our policy so far as the border dispute is concerned? Why should we criticise the people, other political parties if they say that there has been some sort of reversal in the policy? Only the other day, while discussing this question in the Lok Sabha, the Prime Minister has said that the language used by the Opposition leaders was infantile nonsense—that is the word used, Madam. Supposing if we say that we have drawn this conclusion, are we wrong? We are not in a minority today, and I must point it out that everybody in this country is pointing out that there has been some sort of reversal. The parleys that took place along with Marshal Chen-yi created in the minds of the people the apprehension that there might have been some tacit understanding between the Defence Minister and Marshal Chen-yi that we are prepared to surrender our 12,000 square miles of territory to China, which was claimed wrongly or rightly by Mr. Chou En-lai in 1956. There is that apprehension in the minds of every citizen in this country. So, why should that word be used, the word "infantile"?

Madam, I will quote another instance. Events have proved that sweet or abusive language will not solve the problem of borders, or they will not hide the failure of the policy of the Prime Minister. Madam, just now one hon. Member has referred to the opinion of General Thimayya. Let me point out to you what General Cariappa said in 1959. He had said that if immediate steps were not taken to dislodge the Chinese troops occupying Indian soil in NEFA and Ladakh areas, "it certainly will become a hundredfold more difficult and more costly in all respects to do so later." This was the warning given by Gen. Cariappa who knows something about our defence problems and who had headed the Army in this country. And what did he say further? "Panchsheel or no Panchsheel, non-violence or no non-violence, we have got to be men, and act boldly and resolutely." And what was the reaction of the hon. Prime Minister? The hon. Prime Minister in his usual way said: "Gen. Cariappa was off the track both mentally and otherwise." And what have subsequent events proved? Was Gen. Cariappa wrong or the hon. the Prime Minister wrong? Did not Gen. Cariappa give the warning that if we did not remove the Chinese people from our land within a short time it would be very difficult for us and a problem for us to remove them later.

So from all these facts, from all these events, if the people draw the conclusion that . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have two minutes more.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Madam, I have been speaking for only eight minutes. I should be allotted fifteen minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more makes it ten minutes.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Therefore, there is some apprehension in

the minds of people. Now, we do not mind solving the problems by negotiation and talks, but let us talk honourably. If we can solve the problem we have no objection. If we can kill the enemy by giving one chocolate we need not give poison. But what is the assurance or guarantee that we can kill them by giving only chocolates?

I have already quoted the two instances when we sent our Secretary-General to China and when we sent our Defence Minister to Geneva. If we want to talk, let us talk through embassies. The Chinese Government has got their representative here. We have got our representative in China. Let us explore the possibilities, whether there are the chances of our coming to some sort of agreement even in talks, not even in negotiation. Let our Ambassadors or our Embassy people go there. Let their Embassy people who are here, come to us, talk to us and find out the possibility whether we can come and sit together, and then only let us send our people like the Secretary-General or the Defence Minister to other places to have talks even, not negotiations.

Madam, I will refer to only one or two more instances and try to finish as early as possible.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: The hon. the Prime Minister this morning referred to one analogy, and that is, if we could liberate the French enclaves by peaceful negotiations, why should we not try to pursue the same policy? Leaving apart the question of Goa, which we could not solve peacefully, let met point out that there is one basic and fundamental difference so far as the problem of French enclaves is concerned and so far as the question of Sino-Indian border is concerned. The problem of French enclaves was a static one, in the sense that there was no danger of fresh incursion, there was no danger of fresh aggression from the French people. But here what do we find? Here there is danger of aggression at every moment. We sent our Secretary-General in 1959. Afterwards fresh aggression took place. Then we sent our Defence Minister to Geneva and again afterwards fresh aggression took place. Therefore, whenever we talk or negotiate there is always the fresh danger of aggression. What sort of assurance is there that there will be no fresh aggression, that there will be no fresh incursion? And supposing there is fresh incursion, then in that case I would like to know from the hon. the Prime Minister what action he is going to take to stop the Chinese from making fresh inroads.

In the end I would say: Let the hon. the Prime Minister tell this House frankly what sort of freedom he wants. Let him tell us what will be the basis of talks and negotiations. There have been three different lines of negotiations and talks. Firstly, he told us that we would not talk and negotiate with the Chinese people until and unless they vacated their aggression. The second position taken was: Let the Chinese people vacate the areas which we claim as our own and we will vacate the area which the Chinese claim as theirs. This was the second position. And the third position which we find in the Note of 26th July is: Let the Chinese people hold that area which Mr. Chou En-lai claimed to be his in 1956. This is the third position. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to which one of these situations he desires to be the basis for further negotiations and further talks with the Chinese people. I have no objection to this problem being solved by negotiation, by peaceful talks. But if we cannot, let us strengthen our military forces. We do not ask you to ally with any other foreign Power, but at least . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are beginning your point again. Please wind up.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I will finish with this point. We do not ask you to ally with any foreign Power, but at least take military help from other countries to defend ourselves. Even on the 30th July we know that the Galwan Valley had been encircled, a check-post had been established at Chip Chap by the Chinese Government as also at Pangong. If fresh incursions are going to take place, should we not strengthen our military strength by taking militar·· aid from whatever foreign country we can get it? That should be done. If possible, we should try to solve our dispute with Pakistan. Only the other day . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Khobargade, I have requested you to wind up. I have already given you more time. I do wish the hon. Members who are going to speak would restrict themselves to ten minutes so that we can finish the list of names that I have here.

श्री मोहन सिंह (पंजाब): मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, चीन के साथ उत्तरी सीमा पर जो हमारा झगड़ा चल रहा है और उसके बारे में हमारी सरकार ने जो पालिसी अख्तियार की है, मैं उसको पूरी तरह से सपोर्ट करता हूं। मगर इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि ऐसी नीति के चलते चलते जिस किस्म के हालात उधर पैदा हो गये हैं वह सब हम को पसन्द हैं। ऐसे हालात किसी भी हिन्दुस्तानी को पसन्द नही हो सकते हैं। लेकिन यह भी असलियत है कि इस नीति को बेहतरी में बदलने के लिये न मेरे पास कोई ठोस तजवीज है और न ही किसी शख्स ने हमारी सरकार के सामने कोई ऐसी तजवीज रखी जिससे हमारी मौजूदा नीति को बदलने में कुछ बेहतरी नजर आये।

पाकिस्तान और चीन दोनों हमारे पड़ोसी मुल्क हैं और मैं समझता हूं कि हमारी सरकार का यह एक बुनियादी फर्ज था कि कि इन मुल्कों के साथ दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात पैदा करने की कोशिश करती। इस बात को जानते हुये भी कि इन मुल्कों की नीयत खराब है, उनके मन में पाप है, धोखा है, फिर भी मजबूती के साथ उनके हर धोखे के मुकाबिले की तैयारी रखते हुये भी हमारा यह फर्ज था कि हम उनसे अमन और दोस्ती पैदा करने की कोशिश करते रहते। हमारी सरकार पर अगर कोई इल्जाम लगाया जा सकता है तो वह यह है कि उसने हर किस्म के झगड़े को निबटाने की कोशिश की और इन मुल्कों को सबक सिखाने के लिये झगड़ा बढ़ाने की कोशिश क्यों नही की ? ईंट का जवाब पत्थर से क्यों नही दिया गया और राइफिल की गोली का जवाब तोप के गोले से क्यों नहीं दिया गया ? दूरदेश और समझदार सरकारें अक्सर ऐसा नहीं किया करतीं। वे इस तरह के प्राब्लम्स और मसले को तदब्बुर, अक्लमन्दी, होशियारी और किसी कारआमद नीति से निकालते हैं। हमारी सरकार अब इस मामले के बारे में काफी चौकन्नी है और इस खतरे का मुकाबला करने के लिये हर किस्म की अहतियात ले रही है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस नाजुक समय में काफी दूरंदेशी और संजीदगी से काम लिया है। जो भी मुनासिब कदम उठाने चाहिये थे वे उठाये गये हैं वरना हालत बहुत बिगड़ सकती थी।

अब इस सारी समस्या का बैकग्राउण्ड थोड़े से शब्द में कह देता हूं। हमारी आज़ादी के फौरन ही बाद चीन में मौजूदा लोगों की हुकूमत कायम हुई और हमने उस सरकार का स्वागत किया और उसे रिकगनाइज भी किया, यह दुरुस्त था। चीन चूंकि हमारा पड़ोसी मुल्क था इसलिये हमने उसके साथ दोस्ताना, बिरादराना ताल्लुकात पैदा करने की कोशिश की, यह भी दुरुस्त था। चीन की यू० एन० ओ० का मेम्बर बनाने के सवाल में हम मुद्दई बने। हम समझते हैं कि यह भी हमारी इण्टरनेशनल ड्यूटी थी और दुरुस्त ड्यूटी थी। हमारी तरफ से इस किस्म की दोस्ताना नीति रखने के बावजूद भी चीन ने जो हमें धोखा दिया, मैं समझता हूं, कि इससे

उनका पाप दुगना नहीं बल्कि चौगुना हो जाता है। वह सारे मुल्कों में और दुनिया के सामने बदनाम हो गया है, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता में जहां एक वक्त उसके लिये प्यार था, मुहब्बत का जज्बा था वह अब बेइन्तहा नफरत और हिकारत के जज्बे में बदल गया है। वे लोग यह बात समझें या न समझें मगर हिन्दुस्तान जैसे मुल्क में उनके बारे में नफरत पैदा हो जाना, एशिया के तमाम मुल्कों में उनके खिलाफ शक पैदा हो जाना, उनको खतरनाक समझना, इस तरह की बातें चीनियों को काफी नुकसान कर गई हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि उनके इस रवैये से सब से ज्यादा नकसान अगर किसी को हुआ है तो वह हिन्दुस्तान के कम्युनिस्टों को हुआ है।

हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब एक नेक, बाउसूल, अमन और शांति में अकीदा रखने वाले पुरुष हैं। इण्टरनेशनल जीवन की उनके मन में एक बुनियादी कद्र है। मगर चीन के जो मौजूदा हुक्मरान हैं, जिनके साथ उनका वास्ता पड़ा है, उन्होंने न ही अपने मुल्क का राज महात्मा गांधी जी के उसूलों पर चल कर अमन और शांति से कायम किया था और न ही इन उसूलों पर चल कर राज कर रहे हैं। मैं यह समझता हूं कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब जो ऊंची ऊंची उसूलों की बातें करते हैं वह उनकी समझ में नही आती हैं क्योंकि उनके जीवन का जो नजरिया है वह दूसरे किस्म का है। मैं उनके जीवन के नजरिये को जो कुछ समझा हूं, उसकी छोटी सी तस्वीर हाउस के सामने रख देना चाहता हूं।

मेरा ख्याल है कि नान-कम्युनिस्ट मुल्कों में से हमारा मुल्क पहला था जिसने जरूरत से ज्यादा आगे बढ़कर उनकी तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया और उनको "भाई, भाई" कहकर ऐसा शोर मचाया कि अपना गला भी बैठा लिया। मगर उन महापुरुषों ने सब से पहले वार हम पर ही चलाया। मैं समझता हूं कि वे कुछ इस किस्म की जहनियत के लोग हैं कि जो उनको दोस्त बनायेगा उसको और किसी को दुश्मन बनाने की जरूरत ही नहीं रहती। यह डबल एज्ड वैपन हैं जो दोस्त और दुश्मन, दोनों का काम कर जाते हैं। जो भी उनको फूल की माला समझ कर गले का हार बनायेगा वे उसको सांप बन कर काटना अपना परम धर्म समझते हैं। यह इण्टरनेशनल लाइफ और बड़े बड़े प्रिंसिपलों की जो बातें हम करते हैं उनकी माडर्न सूझ के मुताबिक एक पुराने जमाने की खतमशुदा बुर्जुआ सोसायटी के चन्द एक बचे हुये गुडी गुडी किस्म के लोगों के बेमानी शब्द हैं, जिन समझना भी वे अपनी हतक समझते हैं। हम जो पंचशील के बड़े सुन्दर उसूलों की बात करते हैं, वह उनके लिये एक इण्टरनेशनल मजाक है। उनके साथ कोई ट्रीटी या कोई मुहायदा करना महज एक कागजी टुकड़ा है जिसको जब चाहा रद्दी की टोकरी में फेंका जा सकता है। उनके साथ कोई वर्बल एश्योरेंस या कोई रिटन गारण्टी करना महज जबानी जमाखर्च, लफ्जों का हेरफेर, और तिफ्ल तसल्लियां हैं जिसका कोई भी मतलब नही। डेमोक्रेसी से वे बहुत नफरत करते हैं और न्यूट्रल शब्द को समझते ही नहीं और जो उनके दोस्त नहीं हैं उनको वे अपना दुश्मन समझते हैं। हम लोग हर रोज हर मामले को पुरअमन तरीक से हल करने की कोशिश का जो ऐलान करते हैं इससे वह अपने नापाक इरादों को और भी पक्का करने की कोशिश करते हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि उनकी एक ही नीति है और वह यह है कि जो भी उसका पड़ौसी मुल्क हो उसके साथ धोखा, ठगी, मक्कारी और साजिश करके उस मुल्क पर कब्जा किया जाये और अगर वह इस नीति में कामयाब नहीं हो सके तो उस मुल्क में किसी साजिश से वहां की हुकूमत को पलट कर अपनी मनचाहा हुकूमत बनाने की कोशिश की जाये। वे कोई उसूल मानने के लिये तैयार नही हैं। वे ऐसा क्यों करते हैं ? चीन की कम्युनिस्ट

[श्री मोहन सिंह]

पार्टी दुनिया की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टियों में से यंगेस्ट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है, जिसको इस कदर बेनज़ीर कामयाबी इतने थोड़े से अर्से में हुई कि उसने दुनिया के सब से बड़े मुल्क पर अपनी हुकूमत जमा ली । इन सस्ती और जल्द कामयाबियों ने उनके दिमाग़ में नशा भर दिया है । वे उस नशे में बदमस्त हो कर कोई और किस्म का नजरिया देखने के लिये तैयार नही है और ये जो तरीके मैंने उनके बताये हैं, इन सब को उन्होंने पावर कैपचर करने में इस्तेमाल किया है और ये उनके आज़मूदा हथियार हैं । अभी जो उनको ज्यादा तकलीफ है वह हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से और हमारे मुल्क से है । वे बरदाश्त नही कर सकते, उनको जेलसी है कि हिन्दुस्तान जैसा मुल्क, जिसमें डिमोक्रेसी है, वह तरक्की में उनसे बढ़ रहा है, प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब का नाम पूरी दुनिया में लिया जा रहा है और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब दुनिया की एक बड़ी शख्सियत समझे जाते हैं । यह जो नानएलाइनमेंट की हमारी पालिसी है, इसने हमारे मुल्क को और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को इतना ऊपर उठा दिया है कि वे इस चीज़ को बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकते ।

यह जो कुछ उधर हो रहा है और जो कुछ लद्दाख में हुआ, यह कोई ऐसे ही नहीं हो गया, यह कोई ग़लतफहमी की वजह से नहीं हो गया । यह बड़ी नपी-तुली और सूझी-बूझी साजिश और स्कीम के मातहत हो रहा है । इसका कुछ अर्थ है । वरना क्या ज़रूरत थी कि वह जो हमारी पुरानी सरहदें हिमालय की चली आ रही थीं जिसने सदियों तक हमें आपस में लड़ने नहीं दिया, उसको तोड़ कर इंटरनेशनल लुटेरों की तरह वे हमारे मुल्क में दाखिल होते और हम लोगों को इतना अपने मुखालिफ कर लेते । इसका एक कारण है । वह कारण जो मैं समझा हूं वह यह है कि चीन की मौजूदा हुकूमत यह बिलकुल नहीं चाहती कि चीन और हिन्दुस्तान के दरमियान कोई बफर रीजन रह जाये । वह हिमालय की जो हमारी सरहद है उसमें थोड़ा आगे बढ़ कर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता से सीधा सिलसिला कायम करना चाहती है और हिन्दुस्तान को मुसीबतों में उलझा देना चाहती है । चीन की हुकूमत पाकिस्तान के साथ गठजोड़ करती है तथा नेपाल को हमारे खिलाफ भड़काना चाहती है । इसी के साथ वह सिक्किम और भूटान को बरग़लाना चाहती है । इस तरह जो उसका शरारत करने का तरीका है वह बहुत ही हैरानकुन है । कोई भी हिन्दुस्तान से लड़ना चाहे तो वह उसकी मदद करने के लिये भी तैयार है । हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर कोई हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत से बग़ावत करना चाहे तो वह उसकी मदद के लिये तैयार भी है । तो चीन की हुकूमत सब कुछ कर सकती है । मगर मैं समझता हूं कि फिलहाल उसका हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करने का इरादा नहीं है । इस वक्त उसकी नज़रें साउथ ईस्ट एशिया की तरफ लगी हुई हैं ।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, I agree with the line of discussion that has been suggested by my respected friend, Shri Daulatramji, in matters connected with international affairs, particularly so when we are dealing with a very delicate matter and that also with reference to definite and specific issues. There are two glaring facts before us. Let us recognise them. In view of those two facts, I submit my comments regarding some of the points that have been raised by our friends on the Opposite side. One thing is very definite and clear and that is that China has committed aggression and she is the aggressor and she has occupied our territory. As regards that, what should be our policy? The other thing is, these two big countries with such vast population are existing, they will exist and they will have to exist in a friendly

way Let us not forget this fact If it is so, having these two facts in view, what should be our policy? How should we conduct our foreign affairs, how should we tackle this question of aggression? That is the question before the House I submit that so far as aggression is concerned, the fact that we are determined to meet the aggression and the way that the correspondence has been conducted during the last two months which is evidenced by the copies supplied to us recently, show that China feels a little perturbed which she did not feel before That shows that our defence preparation has improved considerably I must pay my humble tribute to all those people who are standing now face to face against the Chinese people to defend their motherland That also shows that the position that we occupied a couple of years back has considerably improved now in view of the improvement in the communications and other defence arrangements So regarding that, let us be very clear and very definite that so far as that is concerned, we have to defend ourselves at any cost so far as this aggression is concerned but so far as this other question is concerned, these two people have to live together Are we to irritate them? Are we to do all those things as suggested by some of my friends like breaking away the diplomatic relations or do propaganda against them and make the relations bitter in a way so that even the remote possibility of these two great people coming together is excluded? Is that the aim at all of this august House? I am sure, 'No' Neither this House nor the other House nor the country desires that anything should be done to aggravate or accentuate the feelings that are present now in these two countries

Shri Govindan Nair of course supported the Government's policy We are thankful for that but he has put the aggressor and the aggressed on the same footing Is it right Do you really think that the country has not been transgressed? Have they not occupied our territory? This then, as Shri Daulatramji correctly pointed out, in international affairs makes our position rather difficult in this way that there is a Party which does not consider China the aggressor It is with great sorrow and distress that I saw the cartoon in the "Swadhinata" of my friend on the 15th August I am sure that in the calm moments even the extreme Communist friends will feel sorry On 15th August our people are being given food by the military men of China across the border I am surprised Probably there are legal difficulties Why should not this Editor and all concerned be called to explain? I think it is nothing short of treason to do anything like that Let us be clear, let us not mince matters in such important and delicate things So, I do hope that when they support our policy, they will also support us in all these matters and try to control their organs and their other Members by seeing that they do not do such things which really are tantamount to stabbing in the back

Now, regarding other hon friends, much has been made of the letter of the 26th July Let me say that I wish that it had been worded in a better way

AN HON MEMBER Tha is our point

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But if you read the letter, the very next paragraph clearly says that our boundary is the international boundary, as we have pointed out in our several documents In the letter of the 26th July, we have again emphasised the same thing, that our boundary is the international boundary It says

> "It is obvious that the Chinese authorities are either themselves confused or are deliberately confusing the question of the international frontier that has been clearly established and indicated in the maps that have been handed over to the Chinese Government by the Indian side at the meetings of the officials of the two Governments"

I can quote any number of letters and this point has been made abundantly

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

clear. But if somebody is determined to make propaganda or to do things which would place India in the wrong box, that is a different thing.

PROF. M. B. LAL: The Chinese publish their documents.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I know. So far as that is concerned, my professor friend knows very well that our methods are different from the Chinese methods. At the same time, let us see ahead and let us do nothing which would make these two big countries enemies for a long time. Let that period be reduced as much as possible.

Some points were raised by my hon. friends, Mr. Mani and Mr. Vajpayee. What is this weakness that is being referred to? I want to know and understand what is meant by that. So far as that is concerned, we have always taken a firm policy, a policy that has been absolutely intelligible, a policy in which we have said that this is aggression and this should be vacated. Our point is that we should limit our dispute, our conflict, only to that portion of it and not make out as if it is a case which cannot be settled by negotiations in this peaceful way. Having this in mind, I would like to say that I was distressed, as most others have been distressed, by the statement of the Chinese Foreign Minister. I believe, that again is a matter of approach and history, and how they won their freedom and how we won our freedom. I am sure the junior-most Minister in the External Affairs Ministry would not have made the statement that the Foreign Minister of China had made. That is something demagogic, I mean speaking of 40 crores and 60 crores and so on. It may be all right from a platform or in some election meeting. But for a Foreign Minister to say that and in that way, did really pain me. But it is not right for me to say anything so far as the Foreign Minister is concerned. It shows that at least he does not want things to improve. So far as we are concerned, I think that in view of all that has been done so far, we must ungrudingly and most willingly entrust this matter in the hands of the man whom we have seen for the last fifty years serving the nation with the highest devotion and distinction that any man is capable of. I support the motion.

شری - اے - ایم طارق (جموں اور کشمیر) : میڈم ڈپٹی چیرمین - آج صبح جب وزیراعظم نے یہاں تقریر کی تو انہوں نے اس تقریر میں جو بہت مختصر تھی ان تین باتوں کی طرف ہماری توجہ دلائی - پہلی بات یہ تھی کہ نہ ہم جنگ کرنا چاہتے ہیں اور نہ ہم یہ برداشت کریں گے کہ کوئی باہر کی طاقت ہماری زمین پر یا ہماری سرحد پر قابض ہو - دوسری بات جو انہوں نے فرمائی وہ یہ تھی کہ جہاں تک ہماری فوجی طاقت کا تعلق ہے ہم پہلے سے بڑی حد تک مضبوط ہیں - تیسری بات انہوں نے یہ فرمائی کہ ہم کوئی بڑا تنازعہ یا جھگڑا کرنا نہیں چاہتے لیکن اگر دوسری طرف سے ایسی کوئی بات ہوئی تو ہم اسکا مقابلہ کرینگے - یہ تین ایسی باتیں ہیں جن پر ہماری خارجہ پالیسی یا فارن پالیسی کی بنیادیں ہیں -

انرینل شری جے رام داس دولت رام نے بھی یہ فرمایا کہ ایسے معاملات میں جب ملکوں کے مستقبل کا اور ملکوں کے حال کا مسئلہ درپیش ہو تب ہمیں غصہ نہیں کرنا چاہیئے

ہمکو چین کا مسئلہ بھی دنیا کے لوگوں کے سامنے رکھنا چاہیئے - ہم نے بے حد کوشش کی اور یہ حقیقت ہے کہ ہم نے کشمیر کے مسئلہ کو دنیا کے سامنے رکھا لیکن دنیا کی بڑی بڑی طاقتوں نے ایک خاص انداز کے مطابق، ایک خاص پالیسی کے تحت، ہمارے حقائق کو سمجھنے سے انکار کیا - جہانتک اس چیز کا تعلق ہے کہ کمیونسٹ پارٹی کے ایک اخبار نے ایک کارٹون بنایا ہے میں اسکی مذمت کرتا ہوں اور مجھے امید ہے کہ اس ایوان میں کمیونسٹ پارٹی کے لیڈر اس ایوان سے، اس ایوان کے لیڈر سے، دوسرے لیڈران سے، اور اس ہندوستان کی جڑ کے سامنے اپنے افسوس کا اظہار کریں گے لیکن ہمیں صرف ایک پہلو نہیں دیکھنا چاہیئے ہمیں ریاست جموں اینڈ کشمیر کو پوری ریاست کے طور پر دیکھنا چاہیئے- ہم صرف لداخ کو کشمیر سے الگ نہیں کر سکتے - کشمیر کے بارے میں بڑی بڑی طاقتوں کی جو پالیسی ہے، بڑی بڑی طاقتوں کا جو نظریہ ہے، ہمیں اس کی طرف بھی اپنی توجہ کرنی چاہیئے - یہ مسئلہ جہاں ایکطرف چین کا ہے وہاں دوسری طرف سارے کشمیر کا ہے - ہمیں باہر کے ملکوں کی طرف سے ایک خاص انداز یا رہبری ملتی ہے کہ اگر ہمکو چین کا مقابلہ کرنا ہے تو ہمیں پاکستان سے مصالحت کرنی چاہیئے، ہمیں ہمیں نہایت تحمل سے اور بردباری سے اپنے حقائق کا اظہار کرنا چاہیئے - انہوں نے گاندھی جی کی مثال دیتے ہوئے کہا کہ ایک طرف وہ انگریز سے آزادی کی جنگ لڑتے رہے لیکن دوسری طرف انہوں نے کسی موقع پر، کسی بھی وقت پر بات چیت کرنے سے انکار نہیں کیا - وہ لندن کی گلیوں میں گئے، وہاں لندن کے کچھ لوگوں نے جو اس وقت برسراقتدار تھے انہیں ننگا فقیر کہہ کر پکارا، ان کا مذاق اڑایا لیکن گاندھی جی نے غصہ نہیں کیا - انہوں نے صبر کیا کیونکہ وہ جانتے تھے کہ ان کے غصہ میں ہندوستان کا مستقبل ہے، انکے صبر میں ہندوستان کا حال ہے - ہمیں اس بات سے سبق سیکھنا چاہیئے- جہاں تک حملہ آور کا تعلق ہے اس کے لئے یہ بہت ضروری نہیں ہے کہ ہم اتنی ہی فوج رکھتے ہوں جتنی کہ وہ رکھتے ہوں - کبھی قوموں نے فوجوں کے بل بوتے پر جنگ نہیں جیتے ہمیں اور جنگ کو جیتنے کے لئے یقین، امن اور اپنے رہبر کے خلوص پر اعتماد ہونا چاہیئے - جن قوموں کے پاس یہ تین چیزیں ہوئیں انہوں نے کم ہوتے ہوئے بھی فتح حاصل کی ہے -

میں اپنے دوستوں کی دو تین باتوں کی طرف توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں - شری منی نے اپنی تقریر میں یہ فرمایا کہ جس طرح ہم نے کشمیر کا مسئلہ دنیا کے سامنے رکھا ہے اسی طرح سے

اس کے بعد میں آپکے سامنے یہ تیسری کتاب پیش کرتا ہوں "The Living Commonwealth" جو ابھی لندن میں چھاپی گئی ہے -

This book carries a few words from His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh.

اس میں پیج نمبر ۲۳۶ پر ہندوستان کا نقشہ دیا گیا ہے—ہندوستان اور پاکستان کا نقشہ دیا گیا ہے -

The Indo-Pakistan sub-continent, the Republic of India, the Republic of Pakistan and Kashmir. All the three have been shown as different states and independent states.

اس معاملہ میں جب ہم کو ایک طرف دیکھنا چاہیئے تو دوسری طرف یہ بھی دیکھنا چاہیئے کہ تمام دنیا میں یہ بڑی بڑی طاقتیں ہیں جنکے بل بوتے پر یہ سب کہا جاتا ہے - یہ جو کشمیر کو الگ سمجھنے کی کوشش کی گئی ہے، میرے خیال سے سچسٹ کیا گیا ہے - تو ہمیں اپنی ساری قوت کو، ساری طاقت کو، خالی چین کے بارے میں ختم نہیں کرنا چاہیئے بلکہ ہمیں خبردار رہنا چاہیئے -

دنیا میں بہت لوگ بیمار ہوتے ہیں یعنی اس عمر میں مجھ جیسا ہٹا کٹا آدمی بھی بیمار ہو جاتا ہے لیکن اگر وزیراعظم کی صحت چند دنوں کے لئے بھی خراب ہوئی تو ایک معمول بن گیا ہے - تمام دنیا میں ایک ایسی

[شری اے - ایم - طارق]

پاکستان کے ساتھ سرحدی معاملات میں گفت و شنید کرنی چاہیئے - جہاں ہم ہیں اسکو قبول کرنا چاہیئے- ایک طرف یہ پالیسی ہو رہی ہے - لیکن میں ان دوستوں سے جو چین کے معاملہ میں بہت تیز گھاڑ بیٹھے ہیں اُنسے یہ پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس مسئلہ میں انکی رائے کیا ہے - جہانتک کمیونسٹ پارٹی کے اس پرچہ کا تعلق ہے میں نے اسکی مذمت کی ہے لیکن میں مخالف دوستوں سے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ چند کتابیں میرے پاس ہیں جنکو میں ایوان میں آپکے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں - ان میں سے کچھ ایسی ہیں جو دنیا کے باہر لکھی گئی ہیں کچھ ایسی ہیں جو ہندوستان کے لوگوں نے ہندوستان کے بارے میں لکھی ہیں -

میڈم ڈپٹی چیرمین میں سب سے پہلے یہ کتاب پیش کرتا ہوں -

"What is the Commonwealth", published by Her Majesty's Government. On page 9 of this book there is a map of the world in which Kashmir has been shown as an independent State.

اس کے ساتھ میں آپکے سامنے ایک دوسری کتاب پیش کرتا ہوں -

"Jawaharlal Nehru" by Frank Moraes. There is a map in this book where Kashmir has been shown as a disputed territory.

نظریہ پر، ہماری پالیسی پر، کسی باہر کی طاقت کا یا کسی غلط فہمی کا اثر نہیں ہونا چاہیئے -

ایک اور صاحب نے ہمارے دوست باجپائی صاحب نے جنکے لئے مجھے کافی احترام ہے یہ فرمایا کہ جب کرشنا مینن کشمیر کے بارے میں تقریر کرتے ہیں تو انکا دل بلیوں اچھل جاتا ہے لیکن جب وہ لداخ کے بارے میں بولتے ہیں تو اُن کے دل میں مایوسی چھا جاتی ہے - میں ان کی خدمت میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب کشمیر کے بارے میں کرشنا مینن بولتا ہے اور جب ان کا دل بلیوں اچھلتا ہے تو کرشنا مینن نہیں بلکہ پنڈت جواہر لال ، ان کی فارن پالیسی، بولتی ہے اور جب وہ لداخ کے بارے میں بولتا ہے تب بھی پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو کی فارن پالیسی بولتی ہے جس میں ہم سب ویک ہیں -

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : पंडित जवाहर लाल ने कभी नहीं कहा "अनआकुपाइड टेरीटरीज" ।

(*Interruptions*)

شری اے - ایم - طارق: پرائم منسٹر نے کہا ہے جو اس بارے میں پرائم منسٹر کی رائے ہے وہ خود اپنے جواب میں دینگے میں تو کوئی اس ملک کا وزیرآعظم نہیں ہوں -

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to finish in two minutes.

شری اے - ایم - طارق : میں یہ بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایک فرد واحد پر بات پیدا کی جا رہی ہے جیسے کہ سارا ہندوستان ہی بیمار ہو رہا ہے - جواہرلال جی نے اپنی زندگی میں جس قدر ہندوستان کو مضبوط کیا ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں اس میں وہ شاید ہی کبھی بیمار ہوئے ہیں - میرے ایک دوست نے جزب مخالف سے کہا تھا کہ کانگریس جماعت میں بہت سے لوگ میرے ساتھ ہیں - میں ان سے دعوی کے ساتھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کانگریس میں ہی نہیں اس پارلیمنٹ میں، صرف کانگریس پارٹی ہی نہیں بلکہ کانگریس پارٹی کے باہر، ہر ایک فرد واحد جواہر ل کے ساتھ ہے - جس نے مصیبت کے دن جواہرلال کے ساتھ کاٹے ہیں اور اس ملک کی خوشحالی جواہرلال کے ساتھ دیکھی ہے - اور اگر اس ملک کی تباہی دیکھنی ہوگی تو وہ بھی جواہرلال نہرو کی راہبری میں دیکھنی ہوگی جو اس قسم کی باتیں پیدا کرتے ہیں کہ کانگریس پارٹی میں کچھ لوگ ان کی حمایت کرتے ہیں میں سمجھتا ہوں وہ سیاسی دیانتداری کا ثبوت نہیں دیتے -

ہم اس معاملہ میں جو اس ملک کی ایک فارن پالیسی ہے ہندوستان کے وزیرآعظم کے ساتھ ہیں اور ہم یہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ جہانتک حملہ آور کا تعلق ہے چاہے وہ چینی ہو، چاہے پاکستانی ہو، ہمارا نظریہ صاف ہونا چاہیئے، ہماری پالیسی صاف ہونی چاہیئے - ہمارے

اگر پھول کی پتی سے ھیرا نہیں کٹ سکتا تو کسی ایسے آدمی پر جو مشتعل ھو، جو اپنے آپ کو نہ جان سکتا ھو، تو اس پر نرم و نازک باتوں کا اثر کیسے ھو سکتا ھے - ھم جنگ بھی نہیں چاھتے لیکن ھم یہ بھی نہیں چاھتے کہ ھمارے خلوص، ھماری محبت، ھماری شرافت کو ھماری کمزوری سمجھا جائے - ھم چاھتے ھیں کہ ھمارا ملک آپکی زندگی میں، آپکی رھبری میں، جہاں اور چیزوں میں ترقی کر رھا ھے وھاں فوجی معاملات میں بھی ترقی کرے، صرف جنگ کی خاطر نہیں بلکہ جیسا کہ آپ فرمایا ایٹمی طاقت جو ھم حاصل کر رھے ھیں وہ اس ملک کی بھبودی کے لئے کر رھے ھیں مجھے امید ھے کہ آپکی زندگی میں یہ سب مہیا ھوگا -

میں آخر میں یہ درخواست کرتا ھوں کہ ھندوستان کی جنتا آپکے ساتھ ھے اور اس جنتا کی طرف سے میں آپ سے عرض کروں گا -

لے چل وہاں منجدھار میں لے چل
ساحل ساحل کیا چلنا

میں تو ساحل پر رھکر بھی خوگر ھوں
طوفانوں کا

[شری اے - ایم - طارق]

ایک خاص نظریہ کے تحت ایک خاص بدعنوانی کے تحت اس پر حملہ کرنا ھم پر حملہ کرنا ھے - کرشنا مینن کے ساتھ یا کانگریس کے ساتھ اس ملک کی تمام جنتا ھے، تمام لوگ ھیں - اس کا فیصلہ ھو چکا ھے - بار بار ایسی باتوں کو دوھرانے سے کسی ایک فرد واحد کو علیحدہ کرکے ھم سب پر حملہ نہیں ھو سکتا - جہاں تک اس ملک کی فارن پالیسی کا تعلق ھے اس کے بارے میں ھم سب ایک ھیں - اس کے ساتھ ھی ھم سب وزیراعظم سے یہ درخواست کرتے ھیں کہ جہاں تک ان کے تدبر، ان کے صبر، جہاں تک انکی دانشمندی کا تعلق ھے، اس میں کوئی دو رائے نہیں ھو سکتیں لیکن ھم چاھتے ھیں کہ چین کی سرحدوں کے بارے میں اور کشمیر کی سرحدوں کے بارے میں جو پاکستانی قبضہ میں ھیں ھمیں ایک واضح پالیسی کو اختیار کرنا لازمی ھے - ھم ایسے لوگوں سے جو تدبر کو یا صبر کو نہیں سمجھتے کسی خاص قسم کی پالیسی کا اظہار کیسے کر سکتے ھیں - راجہ بھرتری نے سینکڑوں برس پہلے کہا تھا :

پھول کی پتی سے کٹ سکتا ھے
ھیرے کا جگر

مرد نادان پر کلام نرم و نازک
بے اثر -

†[श्री ए० एम० तारिक (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन आज सुबह जब वज़ीरेआजम ने यहां तकरीर की तो उन्होंने इस तकरीर में, जो बहुत मुख्तसिर थी, इन तीन बातों की तरफ हमारी तवज्जो

†[ ] Hindi translation.

दिलाई । पहली बात यह थी कि न हम जंग करना चाहते हैं और न हम यह बरदास्त करेंगे कि कोई बाहर की ताक़त हमारी ज़मीन पर या हमारी सरहद पर काबिज हो । दूसरी बात जो उन्होंने फरमाई वह यह थी कि जहां तक हमारी फौजी ताक़त का ताल्लुक है हम पहले से बड़ी हद तक मज़बूत हैं । तीसरी बात उन्होंने यह फ़रमाई कि हम कोई बड़ा तनाज़ा या झगड़ा करना नहीं चाहते लेकिन अगर दूसरी तरफ से ऐसी कोई बात हुई तो हम उसका मुकाबला करेंगे । यह तीन ऐसी बातें हैं जिन पर हमारी खारजा पालिसी या फ़ारेन पालिसी की बुनियादें हैं ।

आनरेबिल श्री जयराम दास दौलत राम ने भी यह फ़रमाया कि ऐसे मामलात में जब मुल्कों के मुस्तकबिल का और मुल्कों के हाल का मसला दरपेश हो तब हमें गुस्सा नहीं करना चाहिये, हमें निहायत तहम्मुल से और बुर्दबारी से अपने हकायक़ का इज़हार करना चाहिये । उन्होंने गांधीजी की मिसाल देते हुये कहा कि एक तरफ़ वे अंग्रेज से आज़ादी की जंग लड़ते रहे लेकिन दूसरी तरफ उन्होंने किसी मौके पर किसी भी वक्त पर बातचीत करने से इंकार नहीं किया । वह लंदन की गलियों में गये, वहां लन्दन के कुछ लोगों ने जो उस वक्त से बरसरे इक्तदार थे उन्हें नंगा फकीर कह कर पुकारा, उनका मज़ाक उड़ाया, लेकिन गांधी जी ने गुस्सा नहीं किया, उन्होंने सब्र किया, क्योंकि वह जानते थे उनके गुस्से में हिन्दुस्तान का मुस्तकबिल है, उनके सब्र में हिन्दुस्तान का हाल है । हमें इस बात से सबक सीखना चाहिये । जहां तक हमलावर का ताल्लुक है उसके लिये यह बहुत जरूरी नहीं है कि हम उतनी ही फौज रखते हों जितनी कि वह रखते हों । कभी कौमों ने फौजों के बलबूते पर जंग नहीं जीते हैं और जंग को जीतने के लिये यकीन, अमन और अपने रहबर के खुलूस पर एतमाद होना चाहिये । जिन कौमों के पास ये तीन चीजें हुईं उन्होंने कम होते हुये भी फतह हासिल की है ।

मैं अपने दोस्तों की दो-तीन बातों की तरफ़ तवज्जो दिलाना चाहता हू । श्री मणि ने अपनी तकरीर में यह फरमाया कि जिस तरह हमने काश्मीर का मसला दुनिया के सामने रखा है उसी तरह से हमको चीन का मसला भी दुनिया के लोगों के सामने रखना चाहिए । हमने बेहद कोशिश की और यह हकीकत है कि हमने काश्मीर के मसले को दुनिया के सामने रखा, लेकिन दुनिया की बड़ी-बड़ी ताकतों ने एक खास अन्दाज के मुताबिक, एक खास पालिसी के तहत हमारे हकायक को समझने से इंकार किया । जहां तक इस चीज का ताल्लुक है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के एक अखबार ने एक कार्टून बनाया है मैं उसकी मुज़म्मत करता हूं और मुझे उम्मीद है कि इस एवान में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लीडर इस एवान से, इस एवान के लीडर से, दूसरे लीडरान से और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के सामने अपने अफ़सोस का इज़हार करेंगे । लेकिन हमें सिर्फ एक पहलू नहीं देखना चाहिये । हमें रियासत जम्मू और काश्मीर को पूरी रियासत के तौर पर देखना चाहिये । हम सिर्फ लद्दाख को काश्मीर से अलग नहीं कर सकते । काश्मीर के बारे में बड़ी-बड़ी ताकतों की जो पालिसी है, बड़ी-बड़ी ताकतों का जो नज़रिया है हमें उसकी तरफ भी अपनी तवज्जो करनी चाहिये । यह मसला जहां एक तरफ चीन का है वहां दूसरी तरफ सारे काश्मीर का है । हमें बाहर के मुल्कों की तरफ से एक खास अन्दाज या रहबरी मिलती है कि अगर हमको चीन का मुकाबला करना है तो हमें पाकिस्तान से मसलहत करनी चाहिये, हम पाकिस्तान के साथ सरहदी मामलात में गुफ्तोशनीद करनी चाहिये । जहां हम हैं

[श्री ० एम० तारिक]

उसको कबूल करना चाहिये । एक तरफ यह पालिसी हो रही है, लेकिन मैं उन दोस्तों से जो चीन के मामले में बहुत तीर खाये बैठे हैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस मसले में उनकी राय क्या है । जहां तक कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के इस पर्चे का ताल्लुक है मैंने उसकी मुज़म्मत की है लेकिन मैं मुखालिफ दोस्तों से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह चन्द किताबें मेरे पास हैं जिन को मैं एवान में आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं । इन मे से कुछ ऐसी हैं जो दुनिया के बाहर लिखी गई हैं, कुछ ऐसी हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में लिखी हैं ।

मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, मैं सब से पहले यह किताब पेश करता हूं —

"What is the Commonwealth", published by Her Majesty's Government. On page 9 of this book there is a map of the world in which Kashmir has been shown as an independent State.

इसके साथ मैं आपके सामने एक दूसरी किताब पेश करता हूं :—

"Jawaharlal Nehru" by Frank Moracs. There is a map in this book where Kashmir has been shown as a disputed territory.

इसके बाद मैं आपके सामने यह तीसरी किताब पश करता हूं 'The Living Commonwealth' जो अभी लन्दन में छापी गई है ।

This book carries a few words from his Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh.

इसमें पेज नं० २३६ पर हिन्दुस्तान का नक्शा दिया गया है । हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का नक्शा दिया गया है ।

The Indo-Pakistan sub-continent, the Republic of India, the Republic of Pakistan and Kashmir. All the three have been shown as different States and independent States.

इस मामले में जब हमको एक तरफ देखना चाहिये तो दूसरी तरफ यह भी देखना चाहिये कि तमाम दुनिया में ये बड़ी बड़ी ताकतें हैं जिन के बलबूते पर यह सब कहा जाता है । यह जो काश्मीर को अलग समझने की कोशिश की गई है मेरे खयाल से सजेस्ट किया गया है । तो हमें अपनी सारी कुव्वत को, सारी ताकत को खाली चीन के बारे में खत्म नहीं करना चाहिये बल्कि हमें खबरदार रहना चाहिये ।

दुनिया मे बहुत लोग बीमार होते हैं यानी इस उम्र में मुझ जैसा हट्टा कट्टा आदमी भी बीमार हो जाता है । लेकिन अगर वज़ीरे-आज़म की सेहत चन्द दिनों के लिये भी खराब हुई तो एक मामूल बन गया है । तमाम दुनिया में एक ऐसी बात पैदा की जा रही है जैसे कि सारा हिन्दुस्तान ही बीमार हो रहा है । जवाहरलाल जी ने अपनी जिन्दगी में जिस कदर हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूत किया है मैं समझता हूं उसमें वह शायद ही कभी बीमार हुए हैं । मेरे एक दोस्त ने हिज्ब मुखालिफ से कहा था कि कांग्रस जमायत म बहुत से लोग मेरे साथ हैं । मैं उनसे दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि कांग्रेस में ही नहीं, इस पार्लियामेंट मे सिर्फ कांग्रेस पार्टी ही नहीं बल्कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के बाहर हर एक फर्देवाहित जवाहरलाल के साथ है । जिस ने मुसीबत के दिन जवाहरलाल के साथ काटे हैं और इस मुल्क की खुशहाली जवाहरलाल के साथ देखी है, और अगर इस मुल्क की तबाही देखनी होगी तो वह भी जवाहरलाल नेहरू की ही रहबरी में देखनी होगी । जो इस किस्म की बातें पैदा करते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी में कुछ लोग उनकी हिमायत करते हैं, मे समझता हूं कि वह सियासी दयानतदारी का सबूत नहीं देते ।

हम इस मामले में जो इस मुल्क की फारेन पालिसी है हिन्दुस्तान के वज़ीरेआज़

के साथ हैं और हम यह समझते हैं कि जहां तक हमलावर का ताल्लुक है चाहे वह चीनी हो, चाहे पाकिस्तानी हो हमारा नजरिया साफ होना चाहिये। हमारी पालिसी साफ होनी चाहिये। हमारे नजरिये पर, हमारी पालिसी पर किसी बाहर की ताकत का या किसी गलतफहमी का असर नहीं होना चाहिये।

एक और साहब ने, हमारे दोस्त वाजपेयी साहब ने, जिन के लिये मुझे काफी एहतराम है, यह फरमाया कि जब कृष्ण मेनन काश्मीर के बारे में तकरीर करते हैं तो उनका दिल बल्लियों उछल जाता है लेकिन जब वह लद्दाख के बारे में बोलते हैं तो उनके दिल में मायूसी छा जाती है। मैं उनकी खिदमत में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि जब काश्मीर के बारे में कृष्ण मेनन बोलता है और जब उनका दिल बल्लियां उछलता है तो वह कृष्ण मेनन नहीं बल्कि पं० जवाहरलाल, उनकी फारेन पालिसी बोलती है और जब वह लद्दाख के बारे में बोलता है तब भी पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू की फारेन पालिसी बोलती है। जिसमें हम सब शरीक हैं।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कभी नहीं कहा अन अकुपाइड टेरीटरीज (Interruptions)।

श्री ए० एम० तारिक : प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा है जो इस बारे में प्राइम मिनिस्टर की रय है वह खुद अपने जबाब में देंगे मैं तो कोई इस मुल्क का वजीरेआजम नहीं हूं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to finish in two minutes.

श्री ए० एम० तारिक : मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं कि एक फर्देवाहिद पर एक खास नजरिये के तहत, एक खास बदउनवानी के तहत उस पर हमला करना हम पर हमला करना है। कृष्ण मेनन के साथ या कांग्रेस के साथ इस मुल्क की तमाम जनता है, तमाम लोग हैं इस का फैसला हो चुका है। बार बार ऐसी बातों का दोहराने से किसी एक फर्देवाहिद की अलहदा करके हम सब पर हमला नहीं हो सकता। जहां तक इस मुल्क की फारेन पालिसी का ताल्लुक है इसके बारे में हम सब एक हैं। इसके साथ ही हम सब वजीरेआजम से यह दरख्वास्त करते हैं कि जहां तक उनके तदब्बुर उनके सब, जहां तक उनकी दानिशमन्दी का ताल्लुक है उसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती, लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि चीन की सरहदों के बारे में और काश्मीर की सरहदों के बारे में जो पाकिस्तानी कब्जे में है, हमें एक वाजह पालिसी को इख्तियार करना लाजिमी है। हम ऐसे लोगों से जो तद्ब्बर को या सब्र को नहीं समझते किसी खास किस्म की पालिसी का इजहार कैसे कर सकते हैं। राजा भर्तृहरि ने सैकड़ों वर्ष पहले कहा था —

फूल की पत्ती से कट सकता है हीरे का जिगर,
मर्दे नादां पर कलामे नर्मोनाजुक बे असर।

अगर फूल की पत्ती से हीरा नहीं कट सकता तो किसी ऐसे आदमी पर जो मुश्तइल हो, जो अपने आपको न जान सकता हो, उस पर नर्मो नाजुक बातों का असर कैसे हो सकता है? हम जंग भी नहीं चाहते लेकिन हम यह भी नहीं चाहते कि हमारे खुलूस, हमारी मोहाबत हमारी शराफत को हमारी कमजोरी समझा जाये। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा मुल्क आपकी जिन्दगी में, आपकी रहबरी में जहां और चीजों में तरक्की कर रहा है वहां फौजी मामलात में भी तरक्की करे, सिर्फ जंग की खातिर ही नहीं, बल्कि जैसा कि आपने फरमाया एटमी ताकत जो हम हासिल कर रहे हैं वह इस मुल्क की बेहबूदी के लिये कर रहे हैं। मुझे उम्मीद है कि आपकी जिन्दगी में यह सब मुहय्या होगा।

[श्री ए० एम० तारिक]

मैं आखिर में यह दरख्वास्त करता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता आपके साथ है और इस जनता की तरफ से मैं आपसे अर्ज करूंगा —

ले चल हो, मझधार में ले चल, साहिल-साहिल क्या चलता,
मैं तो साहिल पर रह कर भी खूगर हूं तूफानों का ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, immediately I would like to dispose of a rather unfortunate issue that cropped up in the debate which is supposed to be some cartoon in some paper I have not seen the paper; if the cartoon is as is made out here, then of course it is entirely wrong but would it be right, Madam Deputy Chairman, to judge the policy of a party by the cartoons that appear in the various papers even though the papers may be associated with some parties?

SHRI A B. VAJPAYEE. It is the official organ of the party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Whatever it may be, I have not seen the cartoon but I can give you my immediate reaction to it. I would have no hesitation in disapproving of any such cartoon if it offends national sentiments or goes against our policy But then if you go by the cartoons always then many of us by now ought to have become women because very often I see us in the garb of women Any way, it is not the right thing Only recently our Party in its National Council meeting adopted a resolution on this very question and this has been published and it should be available to all Members Tell us where we have gone wrong? Maybe we do not use the same accents or exactly the same words which many of you opposite use but tell us in essential policies where we have gone wrong This is the crux of the matter. Now, it is all very well to utilise this subject for having a fling at us and, what is more, for attacking the foreign policy of the Government of India; but then are we thereby taking steps that take us towards either understanding the problem or its solution? I should have thought that this game had been played out We are discussing this matter today in the context of certain new developments, whatever they are, and we are not discussing now as if we were discussing in 1959 when this tragic problem arose. Well, must we be repeating the old things that we had been saying, criticising something exactly in the same way we had been doing not only in this House but outside more especially at the time of elections? It seems some hon. Members would like to live in the past and forget the future. I am not one with them because I believe that the right way to solve the problem is the peaceful way However painful it may be, we have to go through it. The sooner it comes, the better for us and we shall be happy if the process could be expedited Whoever makes a contribution in this direction would not only win applause from our country but from every country in the world for peace-loving people all over the world want a solution of this problem This is what I would like to say in a peaceful way.

I too attended the Congress on Disarmament in Moscow and there we took a common stand There were my Congress friends Did we speak in different voices? Ours was one delegation which had a unanimous report to the Congress and we proclaimed to the world—such a gathering included all shades of opinion—that Indian national opinion was united. What was the basis for it? All of us combined together because of the foreign policy of Prime Minister Nehru, the foreign policy of peace and non-alignment. It was these things that brought us together before that world audience. Has it not brought credit to this Government? Has it not brought credit to our country that we had done well by presenting ourselves before the audience in

this manner or, should we have spoken in the manner in which some hon Members opposite speak? I can understand these friends because they want to subvert the foreign policy What would have happened if, for example, today such a great personality as the Prime Minister was not on the scene? Would not these trickles of attacks on its foreign policy have developed into a treacherous torrent? It would then have been difficult for many to resist Therefore today when we support it, we are supporting not merely the position with regard to the India-China border question but we support what is basic to our understanding, what is basic to our tradition and what, above all, is needed by all peace-loving mankind, the policy of peace India's stature today has gone up in the world at large, not by shouting aggressive slogans or by sabre-rattling of the type that we have had here I know how the people like our policy, because it is the policy of peace I know how the non-aligned countries like it, countries which believe in peaceful policies and I know also how the socialist countries like it It is not for nothing that Prime Minister Khrushchev got up at the Disarmament Congress and to our applause—rightly so—mentioned that India is a country contributing to the cause of world peace and I am fully with him in this matter So where is the difference?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL (Gujarat) You are with him in everything

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I do not care who felt how I support it, that is the main thing and Mr Khrushchev was quite right in mentioning my country and the Government's foreign policy in this matter That is what I would tell any Russian I meet, anyone I meet Therefore, let us not debate over this matter But the trouble is not that Our friends dare not come out openly against this policy They want to hit from the right and from the left and then they would like to deal a knock-out blow They find the Prime Minister is a tough customer and hence they choose the Defence Minister Mr Krishna Menon They think he will be more vulnerable to their attack It is their strategy I was in the Moscow hospital when I heard about the Prime Minister's speech and I had some American and British papers They came out with an attack against him and they were quoting the Opposition speeches, saying that the entire Opposition was against the Prime Minister Only they forgot that there was the Communist Party in the Opposition which fortunately for those who cherish peace occupies the first place in the Opposition in the Central Parliament and I can tell you, with the permission of my friend, that we did not give up that position in the third General Election, nor do we propose to give it up in the fourth Now, that is the position

This India-China border question undoubtedly is an important one but you must also judge it in the larger context of the world situation The Prime Minister advises Mr Khrushchev and Mr Kennedy to talk over such explosive problems as the problem of Berlin He is absolutely right Now, these friends here ask him to go with a sword in hand on the mountain top to fight the Chinese Somebody was asking, "Why not send Chowdhury there?" I should have thought that he should have suggested that Mr Vajpayee should be sent there This is a wrong approach, that is what I say

Now, the Defence Minister met the Chinese Foreign Minister and there was an uproar in this country. Many people did not understand that, I can tell you that much because whenever there is an occasion like this people talk The Chinese are talking with the Americans They do not have diplomatic relations for the last so many years Mr Khrushchev talked to Mr Kennedy and Mr Kennedy may also like to talk to Mr Khrushchev They met in Vienna But even when they were signing a joint agreement on Laos, they would not like them even to have informal talks The Prime

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Minister has committed, according to them, perdition. This is how they are attacking. It is not the talk only; it is the approach in international relations that you are attacking that has rightly brought our country prestige and honour. It pays in the long run as you will have seen.

Then I found that the Prime Minister invited the Chinese Ambassador to lunch. The Jana Sangh did not lead a demonstration to disturb the occasion but certainly they started howling against it. Well, if people much more poised against each other, almost on the point of war, could sit together in order to have normal diplomatic relations, why should it not be done? But even these things will not be tolerated.

Madam, the letter of July has been called into question. I found the same criticism of this letter being made in the American Press and in the British Press and, what is more, they were quoting some of the Opposition speeches, not our speeches, but the speeches of certain Opposition leaders in order to justify how the Prime Minister was wrong, how these papers were right and how there was a reversal of the entire policy. Now, am I to speak, am I to echo what is being said in papers in Washington or in New York or in the City of London or West Germany? I would like to know. If that is your politics, say it is your politics. Now, what is this July letter? Such letters are to be written. We hope we receive also such letters and I would like this approach to be continued by the Prime Minister of India whatever the provocation from whichever quarter. That is my approach because it sets a good example not only before the nation but in this world tormented by threats of war, it sets the tune of the world in a different way which makes for peace. That is why we support it.

Now, Madam, these are being attacked. All the essentials of India's foreign policy are being attacked. Only our friends do not have the courage to say, "We want this foreign policy to go". Mr. Vajpayee who was suggesting that the Prime Minister should have an alliance or a conference with South East Asian nations—he did not use the word 'non-aligned' . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I did not say, alliance.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What did he say, Madam?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I criticised the Prime Minister's reference to South East Asian countries. I am not for any alliance; I stand for the policy of non-alignment. It is the Communist Party which wants alignment, not with the American bloc, but with the Russian bloc and the Chinese bloc.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There you are. The Jana Sangh has never understood international politics perhaps because they are interested in internal troubles. A party which does not know how to keep two communities within the country together, how can you expect this party to know how to keep the world together on the common plank of peace, of mutual good relations, of brotherhood amongst nations? You will never understand, Mr. Vajpayee, I can tell you.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I can never understand the attitude of the Communist Party which is nothing but treason.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Of course, if you had understood the Communist Party you would have applied for the membership of the Communist Party or you would have at least applied for the membership of the Congress Party. You have done nothing of the kind. I can quite understand that. But that is not the point. Don't tell me which is obvious. Tell something which is new.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: According to you, membership of

the Communist Party is equal to the membership of the Congress Party?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Of course, it is better to be in Congress any day than in the Jana Sangh. If I were to be a member of any other party than the Communist Party, I would rather prefer the Congress to Jana Sangh. But I found a better party in the Communist Party of India. What can I do?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have only two minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, therefore let not Jana Sangh condition the politics of our country either in internal matters or in foreign matters. The Swatantra Party, as you know has also its politics more or less akin. Therefore, they join together in many matters.

So, Madam Deputy Chairman, we support this policy of negotiations. If you rule out war, if you think war should be avoided at all costs. . . .

SHRI RUTHNASWAMY: At all costs?

MANY HON. MEMBERS: At all costs?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: At the cost of Indian territory? At the cost of honour?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not honour; honour is mantained by fighting for peace and Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, above all, has shown how the policy of peaceful negotiations, how the policy of peace, enhances the honour of our country. You may not share that honour. But I would any day like to share that honour with the Members opposite as indeed I did at the peace Congress. Therefore, let us not go into that. I can understand their policy. It is one of war that presents itself in this language. But the moment you come to the policy of peaceful negotiations everything must conform to this basic approach. The policy of negotiations, the policy of peace, the policy of peaceful settlement, all these steps must be measured by that yardstick but not by the yardstick of those people who believe in warmongering. And in our country today you have seen how the right wing press, the millionnaire press, some right wing people have launched a vitriolic attack against Prime Minister Nehru and India's foreign policy by methods and suggestions of falsehood and suppression of truth. What is suggested clearly is that his policy is wrong. It is not only the border policy, but the entire policy is wrong. Panchsheel according to them was born in sin, according to them, lives in sin and according to them it should be discarded. And the sooner it is done the better. Then what will we have after all? This kind of stand and approach is totally wrong in international politics. Panchsheel has won the support of all right-thinking men throughout the world. Are we not to promote it? Are we not to proceed by it? Are we not to take to its fundamental tenets, whatever be the irritation, whatever be the provocation or whatever be the difficulty? Or are we to seek the pleasure of Jana Sangh or the Swatantra Party and abandon that policy and take to the path that leads to ruin and war? This is the question that is placed before you.

4 P.M.

Therefore, I suggest we support this policy. I suggest we all support it. They dare not vote against it. Never. You will see that after all the speeches they will vote with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I always vote for him, always as far as foreign policy is concerned. I have been in this House for ten years and when have I opposed the foreign policy of the Government of India? The border dispute came only recently, in 1959. Whatever they have said against us, however our *bona fides* may have been

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

questioned, we have not allowed our belief to be overwhelmed by passion or prejudice or by a negative approach in this matter. The basic policy is correct and right. The policy of peace and non-alignment appeals to all.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I interrupt? What about the cartoon in the Bengali paper? Does that support the foreign policy of our Prime Minister?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member comes. You see the cartoons. Now, it has been said that there is military in it. Not at all. I do not know how you make that out of it. Anyway, read it, because you could not read the paper, you do not even know the name of the paper. Therefore, you are saying all this. This is not right. It is bringing the debate to partisan acrimony, rather than approaching a broad national question. If we support you, you should accept that support, because today there are communist forces in the world with a good grace. I tell you there are communists also in the world and there are many communist countries. It would redound to the credit of your policy to have that national unity, brought about on the basis of that policy. Everyone who stands for peace supports it. Why bring in such acrimony?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not wish to say much, but I hope that provocation will not be given quarter by any responsible person in this House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Madam Deputy Chairman, first of all may I endeavour to clear up some misunderstandings that may have arisen? Prof. Ruthnaswamy advised me not to indulge in vituperation. As an example of vituperation he said I had called possibly . . .

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I took care to say that the vituperative vocabulary of the Prime Minister is rather limited.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That may be so. But he gave examples of it, because I had called some statement of a colleague of his in the other House nonsense. I do not quite know if he expects me to applaud statements made by his colleague, which I consider nonsensical. I do not think 'nonsensical' to be exactly vituperation. It is often a statement of fact so far as his Party is concerned.

Then, another thing which he took exception to was my referring to the leader of his Party in the other House as the gallant Maharaja. I thought that was hundred per cent. parliamentary. I really do not know whether he objects to his being gallant or being a Maharaja. I for my part would welcome the day when Maharajas cease altogether in this country. That is a different matter. But so long as they are there, I am entitled to call them Maharajas.

Then, another gentleman, Shri Khobaragade, objected to my calling some argument infantile. Well, I confess that the word I used seemed to me to fit the argument raised. The argument was, I said, infantile. I did not call anybody infantile. I said it about this argument of not having tea with somebody, of my not inviting the Chinese Ambassador, or the Defence Minister not speaking to somebody. Quite apart from the fact that it is not good manners, it is not modern diplomacy. It is a perfectly infantile way of dealing with a serious problem and I repeat that—this kind of approach. And I gave as an example

two countries which are entirely opposed to each other, more opposed than any two other countries probably are, that is, the United States of America and China. For many years their Ambassadors have been talking at Warsaw. They do not recognise each other, mind you. They have no official dealings with each other, no representatives. Yet, because they had no representatives they tried to meet in Warsaw. Their Ambassadors for years now have been meeting every month, sometimes every week, and trying to discuss problems. That is the normal way. This kind of thing is a relic of our ideas of untouchability, something which has been put an end to in our Constitution, to say that you must not talk to somebody, you must not have tea with somebody. I confess I have never heard of this before in my life in any circle in any country. I confess it must be due to some relic of the caste system here and untouchability. Whether you are friendly with a person or you are hostile or inimical, you have to deal with him. You may have to deal with him in battle, but otherwise you have to deal with him in the council chamber and other places, discuss with him. In what form you deal with him depends on circumstances and it is nothing short of absurdity to say: "Oh, you must not do this till he conforms to all your wishes". That is not the way any country, even the mightiest in the world, deals with any other country.

Then, may I say that I welcome very much what the hon. Member, Shri Jairamdas, said about the approach to this question? He was good enough to say a good deal about me. I am not referring to that part of his speech. But rather when we are dealing with any serious problem—even when we are dealing as between individuals but more so when we are dealing with national problems, great nations opposed to each other—it is never right, if I may say so—we may fight, if necessity arises one fights—or wise to run down the other party, to curse it and to use strong language. Of course, one may do so in our own circle and it sounds all right. We may do so at a meeting in the Ramlila grounds here, it sounds all right, and we enthuse people by it. One always enthuses people by cursing somebody else or some other country. But when that voice of ours and that language of ours reaches that particular country as well as other countries, then it does not produce the right result. It is obvious that by our strong language we do not frighten the other country or defeat it. If we have to gain what we seek to gain, apart from the field of battle, we have to do it by talking to it—there is no other way—by political pressures, military pressures or other pressures. There is no other way. And if we merely shut the door to any such approach and also when we create a position by our language or other acts—the other party or ourselves, it applies to the other party too using that language—when it becomes a tremendous question of honour and prestige—that is how language makes it a question of honour and prestige when the other party does not give in at all, when it might otherwise—that is entirely opposed to all the training I had in the past. Shri Jairamdas Daulatram referred to the Gandhian period of our struggle for independence. Gandhiji was not a weakling, nobody called him a weakling, but he was always soft in his language and tried to win over the other party.

Take even our reactions to China. Why are our reactions so strong and angry? Certainly it would be because they have occupied our territory. But I venture to submit that the real reason for our anger is not even that. It is the way they have done it and the way they have behaved and the way they have treated us, our country. It is conceivable that they could have claimed a frontier revision or something and asked us for talks without occupying it. But after all that we had done for them it would seem a peculiarly ungracious thing for them to

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

behave in this way. That has hurt us apart from the major hurt of their occupying the territory. They knew very well, I am not going into the rights and wrongs of this question, I am convinced that we are right, but apart from that they knew absolutely what our frontier was according to us, according to our maps. Our maps have not varied like theirs every few months or few years. Our maps have been there clearly defined, good maps which have been handed to them. Their attention has been drawn to them and for years past they never really challenged them. They did not accept them, I will admit that, and they said their own maps should be considered afresh, their old maps and all that. But they knew very well what our maps were, where our boundaries were. I do submit quite apart from the merits of the question that it was utterly and absolutely wrong for them then to cross those boundaries without reference to us or without telling us that this is so and afterwards, when we raised this question, to produce maps which go on changing from year to year.

So, my point is that we must be as strong as we like in our expressions but not use language which needlessly hurts national prestige, because that makes it frightfully difficult for any kind of talks or any kind of possible, if it is possible, settlement to be arrived at. This applies to every country. In other words, we must not indulge in what is commonly known as the language of the cold war. The cold war does not help. You may disagree with a person, you may even fight him, but the language of the cold war is the language, if I may say so with all respect, of lack of civilisation. We should behave in a civilised manner. Civilised manner does not mean behaving weakly, but it ultimately helps, and it is becoming for civilised countries to behave in a civilised manner.

Then there are one or two other matters. Mr. Mani asked us about our publicity about this matter. I am sorry that our publicity has not reached him, but we have issued a number of pamphlets and books on this subject which have been widely circulated and often translated in French, Spanish, Arabic, Sinhalese, Burmese, Nepalese and Japanese among other languages. As for the All India Radio, the Radio broadcasts daily in Mandarin and separately in Cantonese, two broadcasts directed to China, one in Mandarin for 45 minutes, one in Cantonese for 45 minutes; one in Tibetan for 45 minutes; one in English but directed to China, Korea and Japan for an hour, daily. In South East Asia the daily broadcasts are: Indonesian or Basa as it is called for 1½ hours daily; Burmese for 1 hour 35 minutes daily; English for South East Asia for 1½ hours and French news for Indo China etc. for 15 minutes daily.

SHRI A. D. MANI: May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the Lok Sabha on June 11th? I am reading from a newspaper report:

> "All India Radio does not intend to launch any special broadcast to counter the Chinese broadcasts beamed to India and other Asiatic countries."

This was stated by Dr. Gopala Reddi in answer to a question from Mr. D. N. Tiwari in Lok Sabha. This is the basis on which I made the statement that the A.I.R. was not putting out broadcasts.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That I do not know. Presumably it means a special broadcast about the frontier question. These broadcasts, as I said, are broadcasts generally putting the Indian viewpoint, Indian news, Indian everything, to China and South East Asia in the course of which the frontier question also comes up. The hon. Member will appreciate that this kind of direct broadcasts for a particular matter have less effect, have less publicity value than in a general

broadcast of news etc. something being said relating to the frontier.

Then reference was made to our letter of the 26th July. I really do not understand it. I have no doubt that some Members could have perhaps worded it better, but I really do not understand why so much stress has been laid on the fact that it has said something else than what it was meant to do. Possibly this is due to the fact that some newspapers went on repeating without rhyme or reason that it did so. As an hon. Member quoted it, apart from that, the very next paragraph made that further clear. It is obvious that the whole point of reference to the Chou En-lai map claimline was to show that they have been misbehaving still further. It had nothing to do with our accepting that line. That is absurd, to say that it conflicts with all that we have said or that we are likely to say. But it was to lay stress that they are, even according to their own Prime Minister's statement, committing aggression. That surely does not mean that we admit the previous aggression.

The hon. Member, Mr. Vajpayee, quoted a Burmese daily about Chip Chap Valley or River. The Burmese daily—that is what he quoted from—it was a quotation in the Burmese daily of a Chinese newspaper. Subsequently that same Burmese daily gave, when its attention was drawn to it, a full statement about the Indian position in regard to the Chip Chap Valley.

Shri Vajpayee referred to my reference to South East Asian countries. I should like to say that if any impression has been created in his mind or in any mind of any discourteous reference of mine to South East Asia countries, I am sorry because I did not certainly mean it. I could not have meant it because we have very friendly and cordial relations with all these countries. I did not mean it. Some of these countries and the SEATO are tied up with military alliances. And as the House will know, the SEATO has not done any wonders in South East Asia. In fact, according to us, the coming of SEATO has made the position worse in South East Asia. It has not helped at all. However that may be, I was referring to this position that some are in the SEATO and others are non-aligned more or less. Others may, without belonging to any military alliance, incline one way or the other. We may agree with them here and there, and in some matters we may not. But Mr. Vajpayee is quite right in saying that anything that might be construed as any discourtesy, any reference, is quite wrong, and I certainly did not mean it. Of course, we have very good relations with them.

Then, an hon. Member—I forget who it was—asked me: When I ask for a free hand, what kind of freedom do I want? My reference to a free hand was in relation to an amendment that had been moved which wanted to tie me up to that amendment. I said that I was not going to accept that amendment, that I wanted a free hand subject, of course, to the basic things that we stood for. But it is absurd to ask a person to deal with a matter and tie him up hand and foot. He cannot deal with the matter. He must have some freedom to manoeuvre.

Now, most of the speeches in this House, apart from stressing this aspect or that aspect, have not been radically different, and I think I may well say that broadly, the policy pursued by us has been approved, although Mr Vajpayee's amendment is thorough disapproval of almost everything that has been done or may be done. That is my difficulty because hon. Members talk in contradictory languages sometimes. They approve of it and yet they put something in writing or in words which is not only disapproval but condemnation. I have tried to understand their mentality and all this leaves me to think that there is a fundamental difference in our approach which comes out. Even though it may overlap sometimes, it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

comes out. There is a fundamental difference in our approach. In spite of what the hon. Members of the Communist Party have said, there is a fundamental difference—not in this particular matter—in our approach to some of these problems. It comes out occasionally. Take the Swadhinata cartoon to which reference has been made. It may or may not refer to this matter but it is a highly objectionable thing, and he may not agree with it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would ask the Prime Minister not to give an opinion. I shall find out and send him this thing. And if it is wrong, we shall admit the mistake.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am merely saying that the ideas of the members of the Communist Party perhaps on non-alignment may somewhat differ from mine, although they may . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We support everything that you say in that respect.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I said, they may differ. So also, when Mr. Vajpayee expresses agreement on non-alignment, I have some doubts in my mind about his idea of non-alignment.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: May I know what the doubts are?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I would submit that your amendment itself indicates the doubts.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, my amendment has nothing to do with the foreign policy or non-alignment. It is confined to the Government's China policy only.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is true but it is all part of the whole.

Some hon. Member—Mr. Khobaragade, I think—suddenly in the middle of other things just put in one sentence: "Why don't you take military help from other countries?", which, of course, is basically and fundamentally opposed to a non-alignment policy. Taking military help means practically becoming aligned to that country. So, at the back of their minds there is that thing lurking which leads, them, I think, to utterly wrong conclusions.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: No, Madam, I would just like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what steps they are going to take to train people and strengthen our military defences, because in spite of these protests and our desire to settle those problems by peaceful negotiations, the incursions are going on. Even the hon. Prime Minister had said two months back that he had some sort of a hunch that China desired some sort of peaceful settlement. But even then, there have been fresh incursions. Suppose tomorrow also fresh incursions take place, what steps are you going to take to strengthen our defences and our military position? Or should we allow China to make fresh incursions again into our country?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your statement is being interpreted.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry that I have not quite understood what the hon. Member has said. It is my fault. But I should like to assure, first of all, that this question of our trouble with China on our border is a military question and a political question; there are many other aspects of it as well. Limiting it to the military aspect, I should like the hon. Member, if he has ever considered military matters, to consider as to what country, and how, can give us military aid in this particular matter. In one way, of course, they can give it, by having a world war and diverting attention. But that is a different matter. About the defence of our frontier, how can any other country help us? They can help us in one way, if we are prepared to take it. That is they can give us free the things we want, whatever they may be, aircraft or other things. But

otherwise, how do you expect any big country or small country to send their armies to our North East frontiers to protect them? Obviously not. (*Interruptions*) That is what I have said. They may send us some equipment, maybe some aircraft, if we are prepared to accept it. And the cost we pay for it, not in money but in other ways, will be far greater than its possible value. I am looking at it purely from the practical point of view, and the cost of it will be far greater, and it will weaken us ultimately, weaken us actually in fighting on the frontier, apart from other ways. It surprises me that these patent facts are not obvious to everybody. Of course, the sympathy of the countries is always welcome, and it helps us. I think we have the sympathetic understanding on this issue of many countries.

Some hon. Members have referred here and elsewhere to the countries of South East Asia and to Nepal and said that we ought to be able to convince them to act differently than they have done in some matters. Well, I do not wish to go into each individual country's policy. That is for them to determine but it is not an easy matter. We either bring pressure on them which has the wrong results or we seek to make them understand our policy and, I believe, normally we succeed But they have to deal with all kinds of pressures on themselves, sometimes the pressures may lead them in other directions. Broadly speaking, most countries, whether in Asia or Europe, understand our position in this and sympathise with us. But there are very few of them which can really help us except that it may be in regard to military equipment. We take military equipment from countries, we buy it. But the few crores that we may save if we got those military equipment as a gift would be far outbalanced by the tremendous loss in prestige, in position and even in sympathy that we may have from the rest of the world. It is obvious. Therefore it is essential, so far as I see, for us to maintain our non-alignment policy and retain the friendship of all nations on that basis. Now it is agreed—and there is nothing much that I can say—about the broad features of this policy as applied to the frontier, that is, to strengthen our defences, and at the same time be always ready for any opportunity that might lead to fruitful results in the way of a settlement. I must say, looking at it at the present moment, that the prospects are not good. But that should not lead me to jump into a wrong direction. Maybe later, because of various things happening including our own position, as it improves, it may lead us to better results. We may have to wait for it.

Again to say that we must not negotiate and not have talks seems to me very unrealistic. You may say that negotiation should come at the right moment—what the right moment is, you cannot exactly define; broadly you may indicate it; that is all right—because negotiations at the wrong moment may injure us. That I accept. But you cannot rule out negotiations, much less can you rule out talks. It is an attitude; it is a brave attitude but not a wise one. Hon. Members should remember that in our history there has been no lack of courage, tremendous courage, superhuman courage, but tremendous lack of wisdom, which has made that courage to lose in the conflict. That is our history. Whether it is the Rajputs or others, there was no lack of courage, but the Rajputs did not win in the end because they did not understand things. They lived in a world of their own; they did not know that the world was progressing, and as I said in the other House, they did not have, and even the Marhattas, gallant as they were, did not have a decent map of India, while a handful of Europeans, Frenchmen and others, in this country, had much better maps, had much better informers. In every Court in India they had their spies informing them, paid spies, and some-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

times the Ministers of the Court were their spies, of the English people and the French, specially the English, apart from the fact that they had better weapons, modern weapans, and the other people simply ta'ked about hordes. And the result was natural; with all the courage in the world they could not face the superior weapons and superior organisation and knowledge. It is extraordinary, if you read history, how you find it, how these people fought great battles—and were fine persons—without a map even, without knowing where they have to go to and knowing little beyond their borders.

So, we have to look at the position today realistically. Certainly the personal element is of the greatest importance—determination, courage, unity, etc. But in war we have to deal with modern weapons, not only modern weapons but other modern equipment, and in effect, today a war is something very different from a few armies fighting it. It is a war of peoples. Not that I want it—I am merely saying that; it becomes a nation in arms. It means the development of industry, the economy and all that, and therefore, preparation for adding to your strength means developing your economy and industry essentially. It is not that we get a few guns or a few aircraft from another country and we defend our country. What happens if those aircrafts are destroyed, or do not fly? Then we are helpless. We have nothing to fall back upon. So, it is better to have slightly second rate arms with a nation behind them and producing them than rely on things supplied from outside, which may or may not come at the right moment, or the spares may not be there in hand. That is why our policy has been to build up defence industries, to build up defence equipment, and all that, and we have done that, not only in rather showy things, such as the supersonic aircraft, H.F.24, that we have built at Bangalore—that is certainly a great feat for us to accomplish—but in hundreds of other things. The war-time equipment that we are making in our ordnance factories today were not made before. We started at the time of independence practically from scratch, because the British policy previously was to supply everything to us, everything including ideas, including policies—policies and ideas were made in Whitehall—everything came. Only in the last War some kind of simple ammunition was made in this country, because they could not get it from elsewhere So, we started almost from scratch, and we have built it up and we have built it up well, and we have got some very fine specialised men, engineers, etc., in the Army, the Air Force and the Navy, so that we have to take all these into consideration.

Some hon. Member referred to Marshal Chen-yi talking about 650 million people not doing this or that. Well, with all respect to Marshal Chen-yi that does not impress anybody, that kind of saying, nor does it impress me. When somebody tells me that we have got 45 crores of men, that we will stand as a man, it does not impress me at all. That is a source of weakness, not of strength unless those people are well-trained and well-fed and the country's economy is good. That is a source of strength—not numbers. Number have always been a source of weakness to India.

Another thing; Shri Vajpayee referred, and others have referred to what the Defence Minister is reported to have said, namely, that a great part of Ladakh was unoccupied. Now, I really am surprised that they do not understand what the simple phrase means. He was asked what part of Ladakh was occupied by the Chinese forces. And the answer was that a great part of Ladakh was unoccupied, that is, even where the Chinese are, they have got only military posts here

and there And you may draw an imaginary line and say that all the land behind them is occupied or not It may be, to some extent, under their control, but it is not correct to say that they occupied all the land In fact, since then, part of the area which, we thought, was under their control, has come under our control Out of 12,000 or so, about 2,500 square miles have, in a sense, in that vague sense, come under our control because of our posts So he said "unoccupied", not meaning uninhabited Their posts are there—there of course it is uninhabited but not actually occupied by the Chinese, which is perfectly a correct statement

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE May I know then why no contradiction was issued? The Prime Minister is giving quite a different version

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU What?

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE The way in which the Defence Minister's statement was reported, it created an impression that he was referring to our own territory as being unoccupied We should have issued a contradiction immediately

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU Contradiction of what? I do not understand

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE That the Defence Minister made the statement in reply to a question whether the whole of Ladakh was occupied by the Chinese or not

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU I confe s I do not know Perhaps, he is completely right We should not use the English language—as I understand English, there is only one meaning and no other meaning—if people should pretend not to understand a simple phrase The question and answer were given in the papers It never struck me as anything else But the fact of the matter is, as some hon Members said today, some people have got an allergy for the Defence Minister, and they try to exploit every little phrase, every word that he says, in an attempt to show off their allergy As a matter of fact, the growth of modern arms and production in the defence industries, the scientific progress in defence, is almost entirely due to our present Defence Minister who has taken great interest in it Naturally, it is due to the fact that we have good men, good engineers and others who can do it, otherwise it is all his work

I would like to say a few words about the background of this frontier trouble As everyone knows, Ladakh is a part of Kashmir and Kashmir was a State under a Maharaja and the defence of Kashmir lay with the Maharaja except when necessity arose—in the British times—the Government of India might be called upon to help There was no fear in those days of any attack from the Tibet side or from any side in fact on Kashmir. The only fear in the olden days was—the fear of the Britishers that is, what the British felt was—that possibly Russia might come down through Kashmir to India or through Afghanistan to India That was the fear in the old Czarist days I am not talking so much of the later developments in Russia Right through the 19th century there was this fear of Russia in the British mind Anyhow, that has nothing tc do with what I am saying I say that the eastern borders of Kashmir and Ladakh with Tibet were never considered by the Maharaja's Government at all necessary to be protected from Tibet There was some slight argument about one or two parts In fact there were 3 or 4 villages in the heart of Tibet, far from the Ladakh border, which were the zamindari of Kashmir and every second or third year the Kashmir Government sent a little Mission to get some revenue It was not very much I think it was Rs 100 or Rs 200 Just to assert its zamindari right it sent them to the 2 or 3 villages and the thing was peaceful No question arose of having any protective apparatus in that border in the Maharaja's time Of course, as

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

everyone knows, the border itself and all the territory was a very difficult terrain and hardly inhabited.

Then came independence and together with independence, almost a month or two later, came the trouble with Pakistan over Kashmir—the invasion of Kashmir by the tribals and later by the Pakistani troops. During the whole fighting in 1948, part of Ladakh was occupied by the Pakistani troops. In fact they cut off the main access to Ladakh which is the main road from Srinagar to Leh, passing the big pass Zoji-La and we were compelled to use another route, a very difficult route from Manali in the Kulu valley over very high mountains in a round-about way, to reach Leh. We did reach Leh but it was impossible to do much if the main route was occupied by the Pakistanis. It was a remarkable effort of our army to drive the Pakistanis from the Zoji-La Pass. In fact they built the road. Some hon. Members may have seen it. It is a sudden rise of about 3,000 feet, 2,500 to 3,000 feet and you have to go in a winding way up the mountain and if you reach the top of the mountain, you see on the one side the wooded valley of Kashmir and on the other bare rocks, tree-less rocks of the uplands of Central Asia, the little Tibet as Ladakh is called and it goes on to Tibet. So they built a road there and took the tanks up there and thus drove out the Pakistani troops and gradually assured the protection of Leh and east Ladakh. Even then, a part of western Ladakh was in the possession of the Pakistani troops and even now the area occupied by Pakistan in Kashmir is a bit of Ladakh also and when I say the northern part, I mean the border part about which they want to talk to China.

So, this is the background. There was no kind of defence or anything in the Maharaja's time and after that, for a year or two, we were busy fighting the Pakistanis there and we drove them out. Just about this time, the Chinese came to Tibet and without suspecting them of any evil intentions, we saw that the situation had changed. A great Power was next to us. It is not a weak Tibet and this would have serious consequences in the future. Our judgment of the situation was that the danger lay from the NEFA part and therefore, from then on, we tried to protect the NEFA border. Gradually we have built up outposts and much more than that, administration has gradually spread in NEFA. It was an unadministered territory. We also, even at the same time, thought of Ladakh too, not that we realised that they were going to come in in such large numbers but still we thought that this has to be protected, but it was a very difficult task to reach the place where now our posts are. It takes about 3 weeks or a month's journey by road. We sent some small teams to survey and they did go several times, backwards and forwards from the actual frontier, crossed Ladakh and that is the evidence we have that no Chinese were there at that time. These repeated teams had crossed Ladakh and we established an airfield there, not against the Chinese there but because we wanted to cover Ladakh and not leave it unprotected and I remember—I forget the year—about 6 years ago or 7 years ago, I went to that airfield and flew there simply through curiosity because our Air Force were very pleased to have made an airfield. This they called the highest in the world It is about 14,000 feet. You must remember that in the whole of Ladakh, practically speaking, there are no trees because trees do not normally grow above 11,000 feet. You can grow them. In Leh there are some trees and we have a farm in Leh too but that is by very special efforts. Normally no trees grow. It is a bare rock or some very small shrubs and sometimes even flowers but no trees. So I went there and it was interesting and I told Mr. Chou En-lai: "Yes, I can speak from my own evidence, apart from others'. I went to our airfield then, you were not there anywhere near that and I

went another time and I saw your people, not at the airfield but at the hill-top nearby So you have come since" To that he had no particular answer That is the position The main thing is, quite apart from any claims based on history, they were not there and they are there It was a peaceful frontier, it is not now a peaceful frontier, not because we have done something but because they have come here These are the arguments which we placed before them but I was pointing out how difficult it was for us to organise any defence system in Ladakh We were doing it and we have gradually done it but you cannot simply put forward a defence post unconnected with the rest It has to be in tiers, connected especially hundreds of miles from any base The very first thing necessary was to build the road to Leh There was not even a road to Leh That was built and a good road exists now Other roads have been built Even now it is far Roads are being built, but mostly our communications are by air and our Air Force have done a very fine piece of work in supplying these posts by air And of course, the actual military that are there at the posts, they are a fine lot of men and I should like to express our high appreciation of them

This background may lead the House to understand that just before the Chinese came to Tibet, we could not hold them, I mean to say, we could not hold them at the frontier There was nobody at the frontier who could help us to hold them We are proceeding gradually The one place which we adequately protected, more or less adequately, was the NEFA border. There we succeeded I am quite sure if we had not held them there, they would have walked in They did walk in, more or less, on the Ladakh border First of all they built that road in the Aksai Chin area, in the northern area of Aksai Chin That was an old caravan route which probably had been used previously too They made it a road and they used it for communication between Tibet and Sinkiang That was in 1957, or may be, a little earlier But the main advance came in 1959 which coincided with the Tibetan revolution, when large forces of Chinese came over to Tibet So, to say that we did not protect Ladakh is rather to ignore the circumstances that existed in those times, in the Kashmir Maharaja's time and subsequently

One thing which has been mentioned—a thoroughly opportunist adventure—is Pakistan and China trying to collaborate together in this matter It is very surprising that Pakistan which is the champion standard-bearer against communism, and a member of CENTO, SEATO and all that, should now try to club up with China, and that China should, to some extent, appreciate this and meet it, in spite of their utterly different policies Apparently, the only policy in common between them is a certain dislike of India There is nothing else in common

So we have to face this situation, and in facing it remember that it is not merely a frontier incursion or aggression That is bad enough But it is something much deeper that we have to face It is the future relationship of two of the biggest countries of Asia, namely, India and China It means a great deal, what that relationship is going to be An hon Member said that some Chinese gentlemen had told him that they would wait for centuries for a solution of this problem Well, the world moves much faster now Still it may be a long time and it may involve some years before we can solve this But in this changing world frontiers may cease to have significance Of course, we see these cosmonauts and others flying all round the world and no frontiers count The world is changing very rapidly But apart from this, it is an important matter for us to consider, the future between our two countries

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

because continuing hostility for generations will affect us, affect China and affect Asia and have other far-reaching effects. It will be a tremendous burden for all countries concerned. When this world is changing very fast to something different—I hope something better—for us to be tied up with these continuing wars, would be unfortunate. At the same time, it is obvious that no country worth its strain, and certainly not India, can submit to bullying tactics, can submit to force being used to take away its territory and otherwise to show that it can be treated casually, by any other country. It is impossible, whatever the consequences might be. So we have to face this difficult situation with our courage and strength. And may I say, strength, of course, depends on what we do on the frontier, but strength ultimately depends upon our unity of effort in the country, and everything that comes in the way of that unity of effort is really weakening the country and our campaign or the efforts that we make on the frontier.' I would particularly like to say this, because some people live in compartments. They talk about our unity in connection with the frontier and yet, in our work for economic growth and so on, they come in the way all the time—work for industrial growth, economic growth and all that. The two do not fit in. I do not mean to say that everyone should agree with the Government's policy. But there are certain broad features of it which we must keep in mind, features which go towards the unity of the country and the growth of our economy and industrial progress.

I am grateful, Madam, for the general support that hon. Members have given me. I regret I am wholly unable to accept Mr. Vajpayee's amendment which is a negation of all that we have done. As for Mr. Mani's amendment, part of it is unexceptionable, but part of it does not appear to me to be right. I shall accept Mr. Satyacharan's amendment.

SHRI A. D. MANI: On a point of information, Madam. May I ask the Prime Minister whether the latest claim has been staked by the Chinese for 3,700 square miles in the Pakistan-held part of Kashmir? I understand that they have now staked a claim for 3,700 square miles which is an area now occupied by Pakistan in Kashmir territory. I would also like to ask him whether this area has been shown in the 1960 map which the Chinese have prepared, or whether it is outside the 1960 map.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I don't know exactly where their map line goes, but they have claimed part of this territory, I don't know how much. In fact, it may interest the House to know that when I went to Pakistan two years ago, or maybe two and a half years back, I tried to profit by that occasion and I discussed China and the frontier issue with President Ayub Khan, because whatever our differences were on Kashmir or elsewhere, I thought it would be advantageous to have a uniform policy with regard to the Chinese aggression. And we showed them various maps and other things, even in regard to the territory occupied by Pakistan, the Kashmir territory, and they told us what their line according to them was. There was some slight difference between them and us. There was another question which related to the area which belongs to the Mir of Hunza. We discussed that too. But I am sure that the Chinese map claims some area which according to us, even in the Pakistani—occupied territory, should be on this side.

5 P.M.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I just want to make one clarification. When I referred to military aid, I did not have in mind our inviting foreign troops to assist us in getting the areas occupied by the Chinese vacated. What I had in mind was something different. We have got enough number of people who can be converted into troops. What I wanted was that we should get modern military equipment from other

nations even though we do not desire to ally ourselves with them

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Before you put the amendment, since they say that they are in broad agreement with this policy, may I request Mr Mani and Mr Vajpayee to withdraw the amendments as a good gesture and indicate to the world that we have a broad agreement here?

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE: Provided my friend is prepared to call China the aggressor

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA There is no such amendment before the House

SHRI A D MANI Madam, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment

**Amendment No 2 was, by leave, withdrawn*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

3 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion—

(i) that Government's China policy has been a dismal failure inasmuch as full eight years after China committed its first act of blatant aggression on Indian soil by constructing the Aksai Chin highway across our territory, Government has not merely failed to redeem Chinese-occupied territory, but has been unable to check-mate China's continuing forays and encroachments and, more deplorably still, continues to betray an utter confusion of mind and suicidal illusions in respect of Chinese objectives and intentions, with the result that our attitudes very often seem humiliatingly incongrous with the situation, provide positive encouragement to the aggressor in its misdoings and undermine our prestige and credit in the eyes of world opinion and particularly of our neighbouring countries in Asia,

(ii) that the policy enunciated by the Prime Minister recently in respect of unconditional talks acting as a prelude to further negotiations, constitutes a major and retrograde departure from the hitherto avowed Government policy about negotiations,

(iii) that the Note of July 26, 1962, sent to China seriously compromised India's position because the Note as drafted, impliedly committed India to acceptance of China's claim-line of 1956 and was, therefore, tantamount to a virtual offer to cede a major part of the occupied area, but welcomes the Prime Minister's subsequent affirmation that India would not accept anything other than the traditional international boundary as the basis of any talks,

(iv) that the continuing acts of aggression by China and the content and tone of its communications to India make it amply clear that China has not the slightest intention of relenting its hold on the Indian territory it has surreptitiously or forcibly seized,

(v) that in the face of the Chinese attitude, Government's present probings for opening of talks, whether in the form of the Defence Minister's parleys with the Chinese Foreign Minister, or as indicated by the Prime Minister's recent pronouncements, reflect adversely on India's self-respect, smack of a policy of abject appeasement and serve only to whet the aggressor's appetite;

and this House, therefore, calls for an abandonment of this policy and a categorical declaration by Gov-

*For text of amendment *see* cols 2883-2884 Supra

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

ernment that vacation of aggression by China is an absolute prerequisite for negotiations.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House approves of the policy of Government in this regard.'"

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the amended motion to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Shall we all stand to indicate unanimity?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the situation along the India-China border, particularly in the Ladakh region, be taken into consideration and having considered the same, this House approves of the policy of Government in this regard."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Friday, the 24th August, 1962.

The House then adjourned at three minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 24th August 1962.

GMGIPND—RS—613RS—18-10-62—550