

12. 15½ hrs.

MOTION RE: BORDER SITUATION
RESULTING FROM THE INVASION
OF INDIA BY CHINA

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China be taken into consideration."

About a month ago, on the 8th November, I placed a Resolution before this House on the Proclamation of Emergency resulting from the aggression and invasion by China. This was followed by another Resolution dealing with this aggression and invasion and how China had betrayed the friendship and goodwill of India as well as the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed between the two countries. After recording the high appreciation of the House of the valiant struggle of the men and officers of our armed forces and paying its respectful homage to the martyrs who had laid down their lives in defending the integrity of the motherland, this House recorded its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that had arisen. The House affirmed the firm resolve of the Indian people to rid the sacred soil of India of the aggressor, however long and hard the struggle may be. There was a long discussion on this Resolution and a very large and record number of hon. Members spoke on it. On the 14th of November, this Resolution was passed not only unanimously, but in an unusual manner, by all Members standing and pledging themselves to what it contained. By that pledge we stand.

Two or three days later, the Chinese forces mounted a massive attack on our position at the Sela Pass as also at Walong. This resulted, on the 18th

November in our forces having to withdraw from Sela and Walong, and somewhat later from Bomdi La.

On the 21st November, the Chinese Government issued a statement making a unilateral announcement of cease-fire as from the midnight of November 21st-22nd, and a withdrawal of their forces from December 1st. On the 23rd we asked for some clarifications, and received a reply on the 26th November. On the 30th we sought further clarifications.

On the 22nd November, the Government of Ceylon announced that they had called a conference of six non-aligned countries in Colombo. The date for this was subsequently changed, and it is due to begin, or rather has begun, in Colombo today.

On the 28th November, a letter was received from Premier Chou En-lai, urging the Prime Minister of India to give a positive response, that is to accept the Chinese offer of cease-fire and withdrawal, with all the other provisos contained in it. I replied to this on the 1st December. These letters have been given in full, together with some maps in the pamphlet issued by the External Affairs Ministry entitled "Chinese Aggression in War and Peace".

The cease-fire took effect as stated, though there were a number of breaches of it on the Chinese side in the first few days. It is not yet quite clear how far the withdrawals of the Chinese forces have been effected. To some extent this has been done, but considerable Chinese forces are apparently still in some forward positions.

On the 5th of December, the Chinese Red Cross handed over 64 wounded and sick prisoners of war to the Indian Red Cross Society at Bomdi La. They have stated that they will hand over more such wounded prisoners within the next few days.

Soon after the Chinese attack on the 20th October, a three-point proposal was made by the Chinese, sug-

gesting a cease-fire and withdrawal of their forces, provided India agreed to these proposals; otherwise, the fighting may restart. On the 22nd October, stated that we were unable to accept this proposal and that our proposal about the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September was a simple and straightforward one. This was the only way of undoing at least part of the great damage done by the latest Chinese aggression. The Chinese proposal made on the 21st November for cease-fire and withdrawal was a repetition of their proposal of the 24th October with the addition of a unilateral declaration of a cease-fire and withdrawal.

I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai on December 1, indicating that the three-point proposal made by the Chinese violated the principles that the Chinese had themselves been advocating in their documents and correspondence. We could not compromise with this further aggression nor can we permit the aggressor to retain the position he had acquired by force by the further aggression since 8th September, 1962, as this would mean not only letting him have what he wanted but exposing our country to further inroads and demands in the future.

To this letter, no direct answer has been received from Premier Chou En-lai. But the Peking Radio has broadcast yesterday a long statement rejecting our proposal about the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. There was a further broadcast later yesterday which stated that our Charge d' affairs in Peking had been given a note asking the Government of India three questions. These questions are: (1) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree to a cease-fire? (2) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the 7th November, 1959 line of actual control, and (3) Does the Indian Gov-

ernment agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two sides should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of the armed forces of each party to form a demilitarised zone, establishment of check-posts as well as the return of captured personnel?

Before I answer these questions, I should like to remind the House of the past history of these incursions and aggressions. I shall not go back five years or more when these aggressions started in Ladakh. That has been repeatedly stated in this House, but I should like to remind the House that before the 8th September, 1962, there was no active aggressions on the NEFA frontier by the Chinese except in regard to the small frontier village, Longji. Not only was no further aggression there but in the past repeated assurances were given that the so-called MacMahon line would not be crossed by the Chinese and that although they considered this line an illegal one and imposed by the then British Government, they would acknowledge it as indeed they acknowledged the continuation of this line in Burma. Thus, the aggression across this line near the Thagla pass on the 8th September, 1962 was not only at variance with these assurances but constituted a major crossing over their frontier for the first time in history.

This was a clear case of imperialist aggression and expansion. The Chinese forces continued to cross the frontier in large numbers and on the 20th October they delivered a massive attack on the Indian positions and overpowered them by superior numbers. In the five-year long story of Chinese aggression, this was the first instance when massive attacks were made by large forces and a regular invasion of the Indian territory took place.

No longer were these mere frontier incidents as previously in Ladakh. A well-organised and well-prepared invasion on a big scale had been mounted by China.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

On the same day, a similar invasion took place in the western sector in Ladakh. Thus, it was obvious that this was a fully coordinated attack along various parts of our frontier. Soon after, that is, on the 24th October, the Chinese made their three-point proposal which, if agreed to, would have given them the benefit of their recent invasion and placed them in an advantageous and dominating position for further aggression in the future. We could not possibly accept this and consequently we rejected it.

I would like to repeat that these invasions, which took massive shape on the 20th October can only be described as imperialist aggression. It has to be noted that the Chinese Government, which often states that it is against imperialism has itself committed one of the grossest acts of imperialist aggression. The fact that the Chinese had never entered into NEFA territory previously is very relevant. But, for the moment, we may set aside the question of the merits of their claim. Even according to them, the McMahon line was indicated about 50 years ago. This was not a line drawn by McMahon, but a recognition of a previous fact, that is, the watershed was the frontier. Ever since then and in fact long before that, it is clear that the Chinese were not there.

Since our independence, we have tried to develop this area of NEFA and build schools, roads, hospitals, etc. Suddenly the Chinese break through our frontier and deliver massive attacks. Is this the way of peaceful negotiation and settlement by peaceful methods? I repeat that whatever the claims may be, this well-prepared invasion was at variance with the Chinese professions and can only be described as blatantly imperialist expansionism and aggression.

In answer to this, was stated that we could not proceed to any talks

with them until at least this latest aggression was vacated and the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 restored both in NEFA and in Ladakh. This was the least we could do and that is the position we have consistently held during the last few months. Anxious for peace as we are, we suggested this minimum condition which might lead to a peaceful approach. They have rejected our proposal. The result is that at present, there is no meeting ground between us. We have repeatedly laid stress on our considering this matter by peaceful methods. But it is not possible to do so when aggression continues and we are asked to accept it as a fact.

As for the three questions that had been asked on behalf of the Chinese Government, the first one is whether we agree or do not agree to a cease-fire. The declaration by the Government of China was a unilateral one. But in so far as the cease-fire is concerned, we accepted it and nothing has been done on our behalf to impede the implementation of the cease-fire declaration.

The second question is, do we agree or not that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the November 7, 1959 line of actual control. We are in favour of the disengagement of the forces on the two sides on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement. But such an arrangement can only be on the basis of undoing the further aggression committed by the Government of China on Indian territory on the 8th September, 1962. If the Government of China disputes that this was Indian territory, this is a matter for a judicial or like decision. The fact, however, is that it has long been under Indian occupation and this cannot be disputed. The Government of India have given their understanding of the so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959. They do not agree

with the Chinese interpretation, which is not in accordance with actual facts. It should be easy to determine the facts even from the correspondence between the two Governments during the last five years. The Government of China cannot expect us to agree to a so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959, which is manifestly not in accordance with the facts. What we had suggested is a simple and straightforward proposal, that of restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 when further aggression began. This is clearly factual and is based on the definite principle that the aggression must be undone before an agreement for a peaceful consideration can be arrived at. We have dealt with this matter fully in the correspondence which has taken place with Premier Chou En-lai and which, I take it, Members of the House have read.

There has been, the House must have, no doubt, noticed, an amazing cynicism and duplicity on the Chinese side on these developments and these discussions. They accuse us of being aggressors. We are supposed to aggress on our own territory and they come as defenders on our territory. They come to a place where they have never been, so far as I know of history, at any time of history. And, they preach against imperialism and act themselves in the old imperialist and expansionist way. Altogether, their policy seems to be one of unabashed chauvinism. They have referred, as hon. Members may have noticed, to their frontier guards being attacked by Indian forces and acting in self-defence. It is curious that acting in self-defence they, have occupied another 20,000 square miles of Indian territory. The whole thing is so manifestly and so outrageously, what shall I say, improper and wrong, and utter misuse of words that it is a little difficult to deal with persons who use words with different meanings, what we may call, double talk. I regret to say that I have been forced

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

to the conclusion that the word of the Chinese Government cannot be relied upon.

The Chinese threat against India is a long-term one and the last five years, and even more to the last three months, have brought out the basic expansionist and imperialist attitude of China. This is a continuing threat to the independence and territorial integrity of India. We cannot submit to this challenge and must face it with all the consequences that it may bring.

As the world knows, we are a peaceful people and have always tried to adhere to peaceful methods. It is not any choice of ours that we have been driven to war-like activities. But the defence of our motherland is the first essential duty for every Indian, and imperialist and expansionist challenge to that is not only a challenge to us but to the world, as it is a flagrant violation of international law and practice. If this aggression is tolerated and acquiesced in today, it will continue to be a threat not only to India but also to other countries in Asia and will be a bad precedent for the world. We will, therefore, endeavour to the utmost of our ability to face this challenge and to protect our motherland. But, at the same time, we shall always seek peaceful methods to resolve and dispute but conditions for a peaceful approach have to be created if this is to yield any fruit.

What China has done is an insult to the conscience of the world. That is clear from the great response that we have received from a large number of countries. We still hope that our peaceful and reasonable approaches will be agreed to. Otherwise, this conflict may spread and bring disaster on a wide-spread scale, not only to India and China but to the world. Once these preliminary conditions that we have suggested are met, we can consider further the

peaceful methods that should be used for resolving the basic disputes.

Hon. Members may have read the pleas which we have repeated several times in our communications to the Chinese Government or the Chinese Premier that we should explore avenues of peaceful approach; apart from meeting each other, explore other avenues of settling these questions peacefully. I am prepared when the time comes, provided there is approval of Parliament, even to refer the basic dispute of the claims on the frontier to an international body like the International Court of Justice at The Hague. I submit that there is no fairer and more reasonable approach than what I have indicated. But that also can only come when the aggression is vacated and the position as it was before the 8th September is restored.

The Colombo Conference which is meeting today is considering what recommendations honourable to both sides it might make to resolve the differences between India and China. We recognise their friendly feelings and their well meant attempts to solve, or at any rate to lessen, this crisis. I trust, however, that they will appreciate that there can be no compromise with aggression and an expanding imperialism and that the gains of aggression must be given up before both the parties try to resolve their disputes.

We have long followed a policy of non-alignment, and, I believe firmly that this was a right policy. It means our not joining any military bloc or military purpose. I think that policy should continue. But we must take all necessary measures to defend our motherland and take the help of our friendly countries who are willing to assist us in this sacred task.

We are very grateful to the countries which have come to our aid at this moment of crisis and have extended their full sympathy and support to us. I believe that even they

appreciate that it would be wrong for us to abandon the policy of non-alignment. It is odd—it is well to remember—that the one country that does not approve of non-alignment for us or for anybody is China; they take some satisfaction in that. They go on repeating that by circumstances they will compel us to abandon it and so we have abandoned it. So, it is clear and hon. Members can themselves realise how the Chinese outlook in this matter is utterly different not only from ours but from that of most countries in the world.

All of us in this House and in the country, naturally, and, if I may say so, rightly feel strongly on this subject. Nevertheless, I have endeavoured to speak in a moderate language because I have felt that the issues are grave and cannot be dealt with lightly or merely by abuse. The future of our country is at stake. We have to rise to the occasion to consider the mighty problems that face us. They have many aspects—military, economic, the future relations of two of the greatest countries in Asia and the future of world peace. Though we may feel passionately about these problems, we may not allow our passions to run away with us and lead us to wrong courses. But it is clear that the future for us is a hard one and our people must therefore prepare themselves in every way to meet it. We shall have to strengthen ourselves in every way and mobilise our country for it. We are trying to do that.

Even though there is no actual fighting at present, the emergency and the danger continue and will continue so long as China's present policy and military postures continue to be a threat to our independence and integrity. Let us, therefore, give all our strength to meeting this threat and, at the same time, not forget that we have to win the peace and further the cause of peace.

Soon after the Chinese invasion of the 20th October, the House may remember, I indicated that this struggle or war, whatever shape it might take, will be a long one. It may even last five years or more. I think, the country and all of us should bear this in mind. It is a long and big effort that we have to make. I feel, and I speak in all honesty.

I feel confident that we shall win in the struggle. But it will require our hardest effort and many sacrifices and a refusal, whatever happens, to bow down to these imperialist tactics of China. We have to remember above all that we fight not for fighting's sake but to save our country. It is a matter of survival of freedom and a free society in India, and to further the cause of peace in the world, because it would be a poor thing if in attempting to save our country we somehow helped in the process of converting this into a terrible world war. We have to keep all this in mind. But, for the moment, the major thing before us is to protect our country and our freedom which we achieved after so long, after so many difficulties and sacrifices. This House has already expressed itself in the Resolution which it passed on the 14th of November and clearly stated what it is determined to do and taken the pledge. By that pledge we shall stand and I hope we shall honour it in full.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): One, minute, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No. Let me put the Motion.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Let us accept this motion unanimously without any further debate. I would request hon. Members to withdraw their amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member has not read the motion. What can we accept here? It is only to be considered.