

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENTARY BOARD

The Parliamentary Board of the Party met in Madras on January 12 and 13. The Board reviewed developments in connection with the Chinese Offensive, the Cease-fire and the National Emergency, and adopted a Statement. Three resolutions were adopted by the Board; one on the misuse of Emergency powers, another on the constitutional amendment regarding the Attorney General, and the third on the Gold Control Order. The Statement and Resolutions will be found in Annexure A.

The Board placed on record its appreciation of the manner in which Prof. Ranga, the Leader of the Party in Parliament, and his colleagues in both Houses of Parliament had given expression to the views and policies of the Party in connection with the Communist Offensive and Cease-fire and the National Emergency.

ORGANISATION SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

Orissa and Delhi Executive Committees reconstituted:

The Sub Committee approved the unanimous recommendation received from Orissa in regard to the reconstitution of its Executive Committee. The following are its office bearers:

President

Mr. R. N. Singh Deo, M.L.A.

Vice-Presidents

Mr. Harihar Das

Mr. P. K. Deo

General Secretary

Mr. G. C. Roy

Joint Secretaries

Mr. Ghasiram Majhi M.L.A.

Mr. Khetramohan Panigrahy M.L.A.

There are twenty five other members on the Executive.

Similarly, the unanimous recommendation received from Delhi Pradesh was approved, with the following office bearers:

President

Col. H. R. Pasricha

Vice-President

Mr. R. C. Sharma

General Secretary

Mr. A. C. Bisaria

Treasurer

Major S. K. Lall

There are twenty four members of the Executive.

It was decided that the Central Organising Committee and General Council should meet in Bombay on February 9 and 10 respectively.

REJECT COLOMBO PROPOSALS

In a statement to the Press on January 20, Rajaji said that while the acceptance by India of the Colombo proposals would save her from the immediate problems of an active military campaign, it would make China a continuing menace and 'her hegemony in Asia will be an accomplished fact.' If the proposals were rejected — as in his opinion, they deserved to be since they went contrary to India's state — it would mean renewed fighting against an enemy whose military strength at present was obviously bigger than India's.

On the other hand Rajaji suggested full cooperation with anti-Communist powers abroad by which he meant "whole-hearted allied support from the West — not merely weapons on a commercial or gift basis but full cooperation as from allies bound by treaty."

Addressing a public meeting some days later, Rajaji said that to expect Communist countries like Russia and Yugoslavia to aid India against China, was to live in a vain hope.

A friendly attitude towards China by India would be disastrous, said Rajaji. He stressed that India should join Britain and the United States, in common defence, for the alliance itself would serve as a deterrent to Chinese ambitions for Indian soil.

In answer to the Party's call to hold public meetings all over India on the eve of the meeting of Parliament to consider the Colombo Proposals, the Bombay Unit of the Party organised a meeting to enlighten the people on the grave perils acceptance of these proposals entailed.

In his speech from the Chair, Mr. Piloo Mody said: "There are only two alternatives before the Country — we can fight to the bitter end and regain our honour or we can appease the Chinese, encourage International Communism and humiliate our country". He added that the war between India and China is not merely a border war, but a war of conflicting ideology. China must not be allowed to turn India into a Peking Satellite. The country should be thoroughly cleansed of her enemies, on her borders and within her territories.

Mr. Munshi, the Vice-President of the Party, said the aggressor was "a most ruthless enemy bent on becoming a world Power". He added that the Chinese have "imposed unilateral peace on India for their own sinister purposes". India was their strongest democratic neighbour, and would have to be subdued

before they could realise their designs of taking over a whole of South East Asia piecemeal.

Sir Homi Mody, asked whether the Colombo proposals offered an honourable basis for negotiations. The Government's first reactions to these proposals were unfavourable, but they were now having second thoughts. This situation is fraught with peril to the country. Criticising the approach of most of the Colombo Powers, he stated that they sought to equate the aggressor with the victim.

Speaking on the phlegmatic manner in which the Government has behaved, since the declaration of the Emergency, he said that the people of India to a man, barring the Communists, had risen to give unstinted support to whatever action the Government would take to repel the invader. The country would not accept a solicitation which eclipsed the nation's honour, integrity and interests.

Mr. M. R. Masani said that "while Mr. Nehru considers it 'uncivilised' to refuse to talk with the enemy after the military defeat India has sustained, the Indian people hold the view that it is the only patriotic attitude to adopt. In the face of practically nationwide unanimity in rejecting the Colombo proposals given expression to by all democratic Opposition parties and prominent Congress spokesmen like Mr. C. B. Gupta, Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Mr. K. Hanumanthiah M.P., and Seth Govind Das, M.P., the Indian Government will be taking on a heavy responsibility if it tries to persuade Parliament, against its better judgement, to give it the liberty to negotiate with the enemy while he is still on Indian soil."

Mr. Masani quoted Mr. Khrushchev who had said in a speech at Leipzig; "History teaches us that conferences reflect in their decisions the established balance of forces resulting from victory or capitulation in war or similar circumstances."

The weak-kneed policy of the Indian Government had already taken the country to the brink of disaster and Parliament must see to it and realise that India's national interest lay in refusing to negotiate with the enemy, he added.

The General Secretary moved the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the meeting: "This public meeting of the citizens of Bombay respectfully reaffirms the firm resolve given expression to by Parliament on November 14, to drive the aggressor from Indian soil and hopes that Parliament will, consistently with its resolve, reject categorically the Colombo proposals that will be placed before it."

The General Secretary of the Bombay unit, Mr. R. V. Murthy proposed a vote of thanks.

Speakers at a public meeting organised by the democratic opposition parties in Delhi on January 22 demanded the rejection of the Colombo proposals and called for steps to throw out the aggressor with the help of friendly democratic countries.

Among those who addressed the meeting were Mr. J. B. Kripalani, Mr. Balraj Madhok of the Jan Sangh, Mr. Brij Mohan Toofan of the PSP, Col. H. R. Pasricha of the Swatantra Party, Jaswant Singh of the Akali Dal and Mr. N. L. Kanodia, Forward Bloc.

A resolution unanimously adopted at the meeting said that, apart from the loss of territory, the accept-

ance of the proposals would leave China in a better strategic position and expose India to further invasions.

Further, the resolution pointed out that the acceptance of the proposals would push the question of Chinese aggression into the background and give grist to the Chinese propaganda mill that it was just a border dispute. The Government of India's policy in regard to China was "weak-kneed and amounted to appeasement of the aggressor, it said.

Meanwhile in Parliament, Prof. Ranga speaking during the debate in the Lok Sabha on the Colombo proposals said that he did not "consider these proposals to be honourable, just or fair to us." In the Rajya Sabha our leader, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel also spoke out against accepting the Colombo proposals. Relevant extracts from their speeches form Annexure "B".

RAJAJI'S INVITATION TO P. M. TO DISSOLVE PARLIAMENT

Addressing a public meeting in Bangalore on January 29, Rajaji touched upon a number of topics of current political interest in the context of the present emergency.

Despite the cease fire and withdrawal, the Chinese retained the initiative completely in their hands not only militarily but in the peace negotiations. The non-aligned countries, who had put forward the Colombo proposals, were non-aligned even between China and India. He continued that though Parliament had voted in favour of the Colombo proposals by 349 votes, the opposition votes numbering 59 represented the real feelings in the country. "I am sure if the Prime Minister agrees to dissolve Parliament, we will win hands down even without a party organisation," Rajaji asserted.

Rajaji pleaded for a proper reshaping of India's foreign policy to set at rest doubts in the minds of friendly countries desirous of helping us in meeting the Chinese menace.

He said that the Prime Minister was prone to look upon the Chinese as the brother who had become a wolf whereas, according to Rajaji, it appeared that it was the wolf, which had all along posed as the brother.

Rajaji said that to prolong the operation of the Defence of India rules would be a confession of the failure of democracy in this country. Adverting to the donations being collected for the National Defence Fund, Rajaji was of the opinion that it would be better to levy a tax and raise funds for defence than to continue the present practice of collecting donations. That would ensure normal administrative control and the proprieties being observed and the elimination of unscrupulous practices. He gave a word of warning that any indirect compulsion would boomerang on the Congress Party.

In the course of a letter to the press on January 23, Rajaji has gone into the need for India entering into alliances and gathering strength, with remarkable clarity. The letter forms Annexure "C" to this News-letter.

A 14-CARAT GOVERNMENT

Criticising the Gold Control Order, Rajaji said at the meeting reported above that it was wrong on the part of the Government to deprive the poor people of their saving in gold. Gold, he said, was the self managed bank in the world which the poor carried on their person. He was not sure that any facilities afforded by the Reserve Bank of India would make up for the loss of credit which the people had enjoyed hitherto. He hoped the Gold Control Order would be withdrawn even as the collective farming scheme had been put into cold storage in deference to the opposition it created. The order, he said would only result in new type of offences. He thought it a humiliation to ask people to use 14-carat ornaments. But unfortunately for them, it was a 14-carat Government that was going on.

Writing in *Swarajya*, Rajaji referred to the Government's ban on the use of finer gold and said that it would almost clip the wings of the rural economy. The peasant and the artisan will now be far less tempted to save, for gold to him was a medium of his small savings, being obviously a common standard superior to the paper currency.

An administration which would give to the people "16 annas rupee for a 16 anna taxation" would prove a better media of education of the masses than any legal enforcement to hand over surplus money to the Government.

The Vice-Chairman of the Bombay unit of the Party in a press statement said that the market price of gold like commodity prices, reflected the prevailing state of inflation. The new gold rules had not depressed gold prices but would only drive gold transactions underground. Smuggling will continue despite the Gold Control Rules, as smuggled gold will be melted and sold secretly. It will deprive the State of the taxes on incomes from gold transactions and the enforcement of the rules will only harass the honest citizen.

MISUSE OF EMERGENCY POWERS

A glaring instance of the misuse of Emergency powers by the authorities has been reported to us from Hassan district in Mysore State.

Among other things the report states:

"The members of the Swatantra Party (in the small town of Saklasapur) played a major role in arranging public meetings and collecting *voluntary* contributions from the public. The donations to the National Defence Fund came liberally from coffee planters and workers, cardamom growers and merchants, agriculturists and businessmen to the best of their ability. The whole atmosphere was surcharged with a sense of new awareness, purposeful demonstrations and unbounded enthusiasm..."

"But unfortunately, after a month or so the same

atmosphere began to fill with a sense of fear and grave uncertainty, gloom and depression and even cynicism. The coercive powers under the Defence of India Act were (are still being) used by the Deputy Commissioner and other officials in demanding monetary contributions under various threats, such as arrests, seizing of shop and property, punishment for imaginary income-tax or sales-tax defaults and above all labelling as anti-national element anyone who requested even slight reduction in the imposed dues! The District Commissioner moved around the town flanked on both sides by the Inspector and the Deputy Inspector of Police and several constables, followed by a few Congressmen."

CABINET MINISTER IN COURT

Commenting on the Prime Minister's proposal to merge the office of the Attorney-General with that of the Union Law Minister, Rajaji said the Attorney General "may have quite often to appear before the Supreme Court and High Courts on behalf of Government. The former is primarily and essentially a lawyer while the Law Minister is primarily and essentially a Minister."

"It would be most anomalous for a Cabinet Minister to appear in the clothes of a lawyer and most embarrassing for the Judges."

"Government can, and should, get the best legal talent to accept the office of Attorney-General. But the same cannot be said of the Law Minister's place. The best lawyer may not accept the job."

"The 'advice' of the Attorney-General is as binding on the Government as the Cabinet's advice is binding on the President."

"We must", added Rajaji, "give an intent and purpose to Article 76 of the Constitution and its provisions."

WORLD LIBERALS MEET IN ISRAEL

The Liberal International organised a meeting in Tel Aviv, Israel, on January 3 and 4 to consider the prospects of Liberalism, especially in the new states of Asia and Africa. The meeting was attended by representatives of Liberalism from seventeen countries spread over four continents. Representation from Africa was particularly encouraging. From Asia there were three participants, Mr. M. R. Masani, one of the Patrons of the Liberal International, Mr. Jeremias Montemajor, President of the Federation of Free Farmers, Manila, Philippines, and Mr. Gunwardene, a journalist from Ceylon. The text of a statement adopted by the Conference, which refers *inter alia* to the progress made by the Swatantra Party as one of the encouraging developments in Asia, will be found in Annexure D.

NEWS FROM STATE PARTIES

ANDHRA PRADESH

In response to a circular from the Central Office calling upon Party units to hold public meetings against the Colombo Proposals a meeting was convened by Mr. G. Latchanna, Leader of the Party Group in the Andhra Legislature. A resolution was unanimously adopted at this meeting held in Sompeta, Srikakulam District and telegraphically communicated to the Prime Minister. The resolution stated among other things that "carrying on peace negotiations with China by accepting the Colombo Proposals before the enemy goes to the September 8 position as originally declared by yourself in Parliament is not only suicidal and undemocratic but also dangerous to the nation." The resolution also demanded the withdrawal of the Emergency Act immediately.

DELHI

The Party unit in Delhi and its Executive Committee are to be congratulated for their attention to organisational work. The unit has already remitted the Centre's share of membership enrolment fee of over 3000 members in Delhi. So far, this unit has been the only one throughout the country to do so.

A largely attended public meeting was held at Hauz Quazi Chowk. Mr. Narendra Singh Mahida and Mr. P. S. Solanki, M.P. addressed the meeting and explained the implications of Governmental policies and their effect vis-a-vis the Chinese invasion.

Sardar Buta Singh, M.P. addressed a Swatantra Club meeting on 'How to meet the present crisis.'

The Swatantra Party Unit is making every endeavour to spread itself in Delhi. Numerous party units have been inaugurated all over Delhi; Subzimandi, Lajpat Nagar and Paharganj, have now units of their own. Mr. M. R. Masani during his visit to Delhi, met members of the Committee and discussed various organisational matters.

MYSORE

While details of a speech delivered by Rajaji in Bangalore on January 29 have already been reported elsewhere, we are reporting here a speech delivered by the State General Secretary, Mr. V. T. Sreenivasan. He said that, taking advantage of Chinese Aggression our "Rulers" have unleashed a cold war on the peaceful citizens of our country. Although there is no Emergency now, the fundamental rights of the people are being taken away with no sign of their being restored in the future. He drew attention to the fact that during the Second World War when the British enacted the Defence of India Act, the Indian National Congress had then stated that the Act had been passed to defend India against the Indians. He said that it is the same Congress Party that had passed the Defence of India Act with even more stringent provisions. "Our experience of this new act has made

it clear that it has been passed not to defend India against Communist China but to defend the Ruling Party against all other democratic parties in India."

Adverting to the Gold Control Order, Mr. Srinivasan stated that by a stroke of the pen thousands of jewellers who had been following their honourable profession for generations had been converted overnight into a class of potential criminals while lakhs of goldsmiths had found their occupation gone. He estimated that the Gold Control Order had brought starvation and misery to more than 40,000 goldsmiths in Mysore itself.

Quoting a popular Kannada saying, Mr. V. T. Srinivasan said, "Adventurers with an atrophied conscience are having a field day while the honest and law-abiding are going to the wall."

PUNJAB

Numerous new Committees have been formed to channelise the fervour of the people of the Punjab, against Chinese aggression. The Maharaja of Patiala, has formed the "Sikh Defence Sahayak Committee". The Opposition Parties of the Punjab have formed the Anti-China Aggression Committee. The Swatantra Party Unit President, Jathedar Udham Singh Nagoke, and the Party Secretary Sardar Basant Singh, are members of this Committee.

The Anti-China Aggression Committee has been involved in a controversy with the Chief Minister of the Punjab. Jathedar Udham Singh Nagoke in a press communique said that, the Chief Minister of Punjab had caused confusion and mislead people by his denial of the allegations made by the Anti-China Aggression Committee regarding the inadequate representation of the Opposition parties on the State Defence Council and the State Citizens Committee. On this Council and Committee popular leaders like Sant Fateh Singh, Master Tara Singh, Captain Keshab Chander, amongst many others had been left out.

It seems the Chief Minister is trying to placate the Communist Party in return, for its being dropped from the Anti-China Aggression Committee.

If the Chief Minister should continue to pursue this line of action, then the Anti-China Aggression Committee may be forced to reconsider their policy afresh.

At the Anti-China Aggression meeting called at Bhatinda, and numerous other places the State Party office-bearers recalled, that the Swatantra Party had foretold of Communist and Chinese treachery towards India. The Party Manifesto has often been explained from these and various other platforms wherever there has been a large audience, as at the Annual Fair at Fatigarh Saheb where over four to five lacs of people gather from all parts of the Punjab.

RAJASTHAN

Shri Laxman Singh, the President of the Swatantra Party Unit, Rajasthan, toured extensively the various districts of Udaipur, Dungarpur and Jaipur.

In the Salumbar and Lasadia constituencies, the M.L.A.'s Shri Mawa, Shri Udailal Vardia and Shri K. N. Sharma accompanied him.

Various meetings were held in the different district constituencies. The President and Shri K. N. Sharma, explained and criticised the inertness of the Government's neutral and non-alignment policy. They stressed that India must change her foreign policy, and prepare to defend herself with massive military aid, which she can receive from other friendly nations. She must better her relations with neighbouring countries like Pakistan, Ceylon, Nepal, Bhutan and Burma.

The President also explained at length the faulty economic policies pursued by the Government; the inherent weakness, of the "Licence Permit" system, and the economic implications that have arisen because of it, and which have driven the country to the verge of bankruptcy.

Vast crowds, had lined the route of the State President's tour, and cheered him wildly.

Presiding over the annual function of the Government College at Dungarpur, in his speech to the students, and to a large number of citizens assembled there, Shri Laxman Singh severely criticized the outrageous desire of the Government wanting to send Shri V. K. Krishna Menon as leader of the Indian Delegation to the U.N.O.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi, M.P., along with other M.L.A.'s, addressed various meetings in Jaipur and other districts.

Speaking on India's defence against the Chinese Aggression at Sanganer Town, she said: "India's defence and Tibet's freedom are closely linked." Making this point the theme of her speech, she added, that the Dalai Lama should be given unrestricted powers to mobilize a resistance force amongst his men to liberate Tibet. The Dalai Lama should also be

recognized as the external ruler of Tibet. She further suggested that India should raise the question of Tibet's freedom in the U.N.

The M.L.A.'s Shri Bhanu Prasad, Shri Ayuwan Singh and Shri Radhay Shyam Dhamor were amongst the others who addressed the meeting and condemned Chinese aggression in trenchant terms.

Public meetings were also organised at Saugauer, Lalsot, and along with Gayatri Devi, they were addressed by Shri Ram Sahai, M.L.A., Shri Vijay Singh, Shri Ayuwan Singh, Shri Gopidan Bareth, Shri Hameed Ahmed and Shri Bhanu.

Maharani Gayatri Devi recently completed a tour of her constituency.

WEST BENGAL

A meeting was organised by the Swatantra Party, West Bengal, under the Presidentship of Mr. Dev Sankar Roy at Calcutta on January 20 at the Swatantra Party Hall.

Mr. Bireswar Bhattacharjee, Mr. Ram Shankar Lal, Mr. Satyananda Nandi and Mr. Kali Banerjee were amongst the various speakers who addressed the meeting on the pitfalls if the Colombo proposals were accepted.

Mr. Satyananda Nandi pointed out that "both our territorial and democratic rights are already usurped to a large extent. It will be more so if we yield to China's peace offensive and accept the principle of the Colombo proposals."

A resolution was passed unanimously urging upon the Government to take a firm stand on the basis of the solemn resolve announced in the Parliament on November 14, 1962 and not to accept even in principle the Colombo proposals.

Annexure A

STATEMENT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY BOARD ON THE PRESENT SITUATION

While the Parliamentary Board of the Swatantra Party warmly approves of the Government of India's rejection of the Chinese terms for negotiations, it feels bound to place on record the popular distress that no action is being taken to recover as yet the territory lost in the last Chinese offensive in NEFA, not to speak of what had been occupied by them earlier.

2. The passive acceptance by the Government of India of the Chinese unilateral cease-fire and the reoccupation of territory only when and where the enemy has withdrawn from it and by the enemy's permission indicate an unwillingness to take the offensive in order to repel the aggressor, recover Indian territory and thereby fulfil the promises made by the Government to the nation. The *de facto* acceptance of the insulting action of the Chinese has resulted in national humiliation.

3. The Board notes with concern that, beyond

rejecting the Chinese invitation to negotiate on their terms, nothing has been done to carry into execution the nation's determination to repel aggression or to invite and obtain full cooperation of other nations in the common cause of resisting Communist China's aggressive ambitions.

4. The Swatantra Party urges on the nation and the Government to take into full consultation those countries of the world who are one with India in this respect so as to enable the attainment of the common objective as early as possible and to establish national security on a firm basis. After what has unfortunately happened to the freedom of Tibet, there is no way to build up sufficient power against aggressive China in Asia except by securing the cooperation of the USA, Britain and other nations willing to help us.

5. The Swatantra Party is of opinion that the Prime Minister should be authorised by the nation to achieve friendship and understanding with

Pakistan on such terms as he thinks fit so as to enable the defence of the Sub-continent to be secured against Communist aggression.

6. The Swatantra Party is convinced that, while we may maintain the present relations with Soviet Russia, it is prudent not to expect anything like positive help from that quarter to oppose Communist China's ambitions.

7. While the Swatantra Party is not opposed to the Government retaining such powers as are necessary for meeting the Chinese menace, it is opposed to an indefinite continuance of the powers taken by Government under the Defence of India Act when there is no military activity in operation. In any event, such emergency powers should not be used for stifling *bona fide* criticism or for merely strengthening the Party in office. The Swatantra Party urges on the nation not easily to submit to the erosion of democracy and its processes, such as, for instance, the suspension of by-elections.

8. While noting with satisfaction the action taken against some members of the Communist Party of India in the interests of national security, the Swatantra Party desires to impress on the people and the Government that no risk can be taken in regard to that Party which is ideologically at one with the enemy, whatever the dissent it may express in respect of the timing and method of operation. In this respect, the lesson of history is that we should take no chances with such a Party.

RESOLUTIONS

Misuse of Emergency Powers

The Parliamentary Board of the Swatantra Party notes with concern the warnings recently issued by the Home Ministry to *Current*, the *Organiser*, the *Hindustan* (an Urdu daily of Bombay) and the *Panchjanya* (a Hindi weekly of Lucknow) in regard to matter appearing in their publications and the arrest and continued detention under the Defence of India Act of three public workers of Delhi, Mr. Dharam Pal, Secretary of the Association of Voluntary Agencies for Rural Development, Mr. Rup Narain,

Secretary of the Himalaya Bachao Sammelan, and Mr. N. N. Datta, Secretary of the Committee against Chinese Aggression, for addressing to members of Parliament an Open Letter criticising the Prime Minister's policies in regard to Chinese aggression. The Board is of the view that these actions show a disturbing tendency to exceed the needs of the emergency and improperly to bring *bona fide* criticism of the policies of the present Government under the category of acts prejudicial to the defence of India.

Attorney General

The Parliamentary Board of the Swatantra Party condemns the proposed amendment to the Constitution to enable the Law Minister to hold also the office of Attorney-General as the proposal is contrary to the principles and purpose of the Constitution and would constitute an unwarranted change in its structure.

Gold Control

The Parliamentary Board of the Swatantra Party is of the view that the new regulations for the control of gold are economically unsound and not calculated to further the purposes for which they are stated to be devised. Since the inflationary policies of Government and the consequent high level of prices are the basic cause of the smuggling and hoarding of gold and since the price of a commodity like gold is linked with the general level of prices in the country, the Board fears that the attempt at control, quite apart from creating fear of expropriation, inflicting harassment on large numbers of people of moderate and small means and depriving an important class of artisans of their livelihood, will push the precious metal underground and deprive the small traders and the agricultural population of an important source of credit. The Board disapproves of any operation at present against gold being held by the common people which has been the ultimate reserve of the country's economy throughout history.

Annexure B

Prof. Ranga's speech during the debate on the Colombo Proposals in the Lok Sabha on January 23, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to dissociate myself from the suggestion made by my hon. friend, the leader of the Communist Party and also the stand taken by the Prime Minister in regard to the Colombo proposals. I do not consider these proposals to be honourable, just or fair to us. My hon. friend the leader of the Communist Party has gone into the credentials of these non-aligned countries and their governments which have thought it fit to intervene and help us to achieve a correct solution and smoothen the relations between India and China. They have failed to live up to the expectation of being fair in this conflict as between the countries

that are involved in this conflict. Nowhere have they been willing to say that India has been just in her approach. Nowhere have they showed the moral courage to declare China to be an aggressor. My hon. friend wants us to believe that every one of them is completely non-aligned. If that is so, why was it that the dictator or the President of Ghana took exception to England's offer of support to our efforts in self defence.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): They are non-aligned between India and China.

Shri Ranga: Why is it that he had to be brought round after a lot of coaxing from various countries, including the UAR as was suggested by my hon. friend the Prime Minister? Are these countries completely non-aligned? With whom are they non-aligned?

The whole world knows how so many of them have come to be impressed with the established might, the demonstrated might of China. My hon. friend is not even prepared to say in this House, even today, that Communist China committed aggression on our country and is an aggressor. He is anxious that the House should consider them both as non-aligned countries.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: So many resolutions have been passed. Why should he say that we have not said it?

Shri Ranga: Is he saying it now?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Not only now.

Shri Ranga: If he has said so, then it is very strange for him to say that there are two countries which are fighting and they have got to be treated fairly, justly and equally, on a par and all the rest of it. The whole purport of his speech is very clear. Here are these two countries which have been at war with each other. Is it not clear which one is on the right side and which one on the wrong side? He says: we are not concerned with that at all; we only want peace and therefore let them come to terms.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am sorry he has not followed my speech.

Shri Ranga: That was the purport of his speech and it is for the House to draw its own conclusions.

These countries have come and offered a proposal which my hon. friend the Prime Minister is prepared to consider as being reasonable and almost approximating to his own offer of peace that he had made earlier. Is it reasonable to expect us to allow the Chinese to come into partnership, territorial and administrative partnership with us on our own soil which she had grabbed? Is it reasonable for them to take into account a corridor which is farther and very much away inside our area from some of the places which had been shown to be ours and to be on the line of September 8th on the maps circulated by the Government themselves, by the Defence Ministry or the External Affairs Ministry? There are two places, very important places which are indicated here; Sumde and Dehra. Dehra was almost on the line that was indicated by the maps circulated by the External Affairs Ministry or the Defence Ministry, on the line that was supposed to have been the September 8th line. Yet here in this map that has been supplied to us by the Government through the courtesy of Colombo Powers we find that it is more or less 15 miles away from the mauve line which is supposed to be the outer fringe of this corridor.

In the whole of this corridor China is expected to become our partner.

Till yesterday they were our partners in fighting, in dealing death blows to our people, in inflicting defeat on our troops and humiliating our country and in holding our own Prime Minister and the whole country to the world's ridicule. With that China we are expected now to become partners and embrace them! It is an extraordinary type of co-existence that my hon. friend of the Communist Party is suggesting here. In this area, we had more check-posts than the Chinese in the past, only in the recent past. Yet, there is to be parity between the two. Who is to decide which particular check-post has to be occupied by whom? There has got to be a conference of

Ministers and officers. If they are not able to agree among themselves, as had been the case in the past tortuous negotiations that we had to carry on with the Chinese during the past four or five years, who is to decide—the Colombo powers. Therefore, they have got to have an office either in Delhi or in Colombo and be in permanent conference in order to be able to arbitrate on every one of these petty points according to them—important points according to us—which would arise between our officers and their officers. All these things have got to go on only in the preliminary process and that may take one year or many years. We would not have the initiative at all just because we are now thinking of giving up that initiative which we ought to have had and which we should seize at least now and begin to protect the honour of our country.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister made so many statements in our country and if I am to quote the relevant passages from them the whole of my time will be taken up. I need only mention one or two things here. He said, "resisting the aggressor will cost us dearly." Are we thinking of resisting? We are only thinking of reaching a partnership with China according to the proposals. "Would you agree with me,"—he was addressing the heads of various Governments—"that this high cost must be paid to maintain our independence and territorial integrity?" Are we thinking in those terms? It is for the Prime Minister to answer later on.

Then, he wanted to preserve the honour and integrity of India. Are we going to do that through these proposals? Have we not declared that she has been an aggressor? She has declared war on us. She has broken so many of her own plighted words. She could not be trusted at all. She was talking with double tongue and her double talk cannot be comprehended by the Prime Minister and various other people also in our country. What happens to all these things? "We must reach an agreement some day." My hon. friend the Prime Minister says, "how can anybody in his senses think in terms of defeating China?" Whoever has suggested it? In Korea, was China defeated? Was China conquered? Did the United Nations troops have to go all the way to Peking in order to push them beyond the 38th parallel? Surely, could not we think of a similar thing here also without having to destroy or defeat China as a whole and declare ourselves to be the conquerors? Would it not be possible for us some day, with our troops and with all those friends who would come here as our allies, to drive them outside our own territory and regain the territorial integrity of our country and then make it impossible for the Chinese to cross the border as has happened in Korea?

China is today the conqueror. That is why she has gone back; not because of any soft corner towards India. It is because she has been able to kick our own country in such dishonourable and disgusting manner; it is because she has been able to establish before the whole world in spite of Soviet Russia's frowns, in spite of the preferred support from America and England and all those other countries and in spite of the brave speeches that we are making, and by the leader of the House. She has been able to

demonstrate to the whole world that she is the victor and she can afford to declare a unilateral cease-fire and go back, leaving us prostrate and panting for our breath and not even having the strength to throw off the dust from our clothing and from our body in our parlous condition. That is why she has done this. It is this China that we are now inviting into a partnership over the huge corridor which we have had all this time.

The Prime Minister of China confabulated with our own Prime Minister in spite of protests made by so many here in this House, by Shri Masani, who unfortunately does not happen to be here in this House, who had the courage to protest against extending that invitation to the Prime Minister of China, when our Prime Minister invited him here. What did he do? While they were discussing things here, and afterwards, even before the ink dried on the paper on which they had written their joint communique, the Chinese troops were occupying our places in the north-eastern frontier. That is the China of today.

The Prime Minister himself has given the answer by sending appeals to all the countries all over the world and welcoming the support that came from a number of western democratic countries. They are there ready to help us one by one, if that is absolutely necessary. Otherwise, we can seek the aid of the United Nations? Why do we not ask for it? Why is that we do not assure all those who would be willing to help us that we are determined to win back our territory? Every moment of our war preparations, we are also talking about peace. Therefore, they may feel that any moment we may let down everybody and make them look ridiculous; not only ridiculous, but also helpless in their own countries vis-a-vis their own electorate, because they have to go to their electorate; they are democracies. They have to collect all the funds and provide us with all the assistance. They have to assure all their people that India is really determined to win back her lost territory, achieve her own territorial integrity and take necessary steps and build herself up in such a way through her own "Plan for Victory" that it would not be possible for China once again to cross our border.

Had China ever had the temerity to cross the 38th parallel in Korea once she was driven away? America, England and all those nations cooperated with the United Nations in order to see that the Chinese communist aggression was vacated and kept back. Then, why should we be afraid? Nasser was not afraid. We seem to be thinking somehow or other that we are helpless. Nasser was helpless vis-a-vis England and France. Yet, he had the strength of mind and spirit to stand against them. Why should we be afraid of Soviet Russia or China or any of those countries, lest our non-alignment policy should be affected and destroyed?

As the President has put it sometime ago, in his own spiritual manner, in this secular State, of which he happens to be the Head, "this is a time of crisis of spirit." This is indeed a crisis of spirit.

It is for us to decide and determine for ourselves whether we are going to stand by our national honour and dignity, as the Prime Minister himself has coupled those two terms, and do our best to protect the national integrity of our country. Even if we were to have this mauve line all for ourselves, even thereafter, right up to Aksai Chin Road and beyond, there is so much of our motherland, more than 12,000 square miles, nearly as much as Belgium itself or half as much as West Bengal itself. We have got to win back all that.

Speech of Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel in the Rajya Sabha on 23-1-1963

I am rather nervous about accepting what has been placed before us as the position of the Colombo Powers or their suggestions. There is something absolutely unreal about all this. Why do you call them 'Colombo Powers'? Are they Powers? They are the weakest nations perhaps that you can find in the whole world. Were even reluctant to express an opinion when the Chinese aggression came about. It was the free world that rallied round and came forward to condemn Chinese aggression, not these people who are called the 'Colombo Powers'.

Why don't you seek the advice or help, if you want, of people who are in a position to help us, instead of running after people who have been sitting on the fence? Why do we want to join another camp of tight-rope walkers though our Prime Minister has been in the habit of doing it quite often? Why do we mention *Bandung*? I do not understand. *Bandung* has gone by the board long ago when the senior partner or the junior partner of the *Bandung* Conference invaded this country with his massive forces. The spirit of *Bandung* has gone, non-alignment has gone. Why do we go on talking about them? I do not understand it.

Sir, I say that we have been looking the wrong way. Why have these people come forward with these proposals? Who asked them? Why have they come? They have come forward because of the fear of China, of Chinese aggression. They are looking at this situation in that sense. If it is India today, what about 'us' tomorrow? So, let us make peace with China at the expense of India. Ask India to concede what China has already swallowed, the 8th of September line. Don't talk of Aksai Chin or anything, though if you look at the meaning of the word 'Aksai Chin', the original meaning is the border of China. That place is called Aksai Chin because it is on the border of China.

Our Government has failed to take notice of the fact that China was building roads across it even though at least on this side of the House we have been pointing to it not after the aggression started but years before. We have been expressing our doubts about the intention of the Chinese for the last four or five years at least from this side of the House. Unfortunately we were not listened to and now we have come into this situation.

When this country became free, it was under the Treaty rights of this country to defend Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, and there was no reason to give up our

right to defend Tibet without even asking Tibet, without even informing the Tibetans that "we are going to do this; be prepared", and we forsook our sacred duty.

Shri P. N. Saprú: Nepal is an independent State and it cannot be classed with Bhutan and Sikkim.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: I am quite entitled to give my view of the background, and I think the facts that I am giving are perfectly correct; these cannot be challenged. This country was warned against this happening by many eminent people. It is well known. History records it. But for certain reasons, for the sake of the friendship of Mr. Chou-En-lai all this was ignored. Sir, against the background of what has happened in the last few months one must look at the comments of the press here and abroad. Recently there was some big conference in Europe and Mr. Khrushchev was angry with China, not because India was invaded but because Chinese aggression against India has not served the cause of International Communism. We do not go to the world that is willing to help us, that can help us, and we give so much importance to these six small nations, and with the best of intentions that they have they would not be able to defend themselves even. If this situation comes, what are they going to do? And what is the first sugar-coating of their pill, one on which there is all this trouble in this House since this morning? The first sugar-coating "that you accept is the 8th of September position, which means that you give up what has been taken already. Sir, this country will never accept it. If that is the intention of the Congress Party....."

Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel:I suggest they hold General Elections to face it.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: It is not their intention, they think.

Shri Chandra Shekhar: It is not the intention of the Congress Party but that of the Prime Minister.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: I hope the Congress Party will at least now be able to stand up to the Prime Minister if that is his intention. (interruptions) The Prime Minister himself put forward the thesis that the aggressor should not be allowed to take advantage of his aggression. I submit, Sir, in all humility, that the aggressor will get all the advantages if we accept the proposals that are before us. It gives the aggressor the advantage of having beaten us and thereby frightened the smaller nations around us to go and tell us, "Now make your peace with these people." They forget the earlier aggression.

The other point I would like to mention is that the Prime Minister should have taken this House into confidence before finally accepting the proposals of these nations—the Prime Minister has not been taking us into confidence, telling us things. If my information is correct, the Prime Minister has written to the Prime Minister of Ceylon to say that he is accepting their proposals.

Diwan Chaman Lall: No, no; what he has said is that he is accepting them in principle.

Shri A. K. Sen: I am very sorry to interrupt and say that it is quite different from what the Hon.

Member is saying. While the Prime Minister is being quoted, I hope he will be quoted correctly. I used his exact words and I do not want any misreading of that quotation.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: I could not follow what you said. Please correct me if I am wrong; I shall be very grateful.

Shri A. K. Sen: You said that your information was that he had accepted them, I mean that gives the impression as if he has accepted them finally, and that is some other information, apart from what I have stated, and I stated, Sir, that it should not be taken in isolation regardless of what followed it. He has said that in principle he was accepting them, that no final word could be given until the proposals were placed before Parliament. The whole thing is to be read together.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: I hope it is an improvement and I would stand corrected thereby, if I was mistaken. But as to what is meant by acceptance of these proposals in principle, I should like it to be cleared. Does it condone, does it accept as a *fait accompli* the earlier aggression?

Hon. Members: No, no;

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: Sir, I am glad to see so many protests from that side. If that is so, particularly after having heard the respectable speaker who spoke just before me, if that is the mind of the Congress, I would be only too glad, and if only they go a few steps forward, then they will think exactly as I am thinking.

Shri Govindan Nair: You have a number of friends there.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: Sir, the history of our relations with China is unfortunately a history of the failure of our Government at every stage. Time has come when this country must take stock of these failures and end them if it is not possible to mend them. But in the circumstances, as they are, it does not look as if they can be mended. We have been going on abusing the free world unnecessarily, rightly or wrongly pleading the cause of the people...

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: ...who do not believe in peace, who believe in international communism, and we have got a lesson that we deserve for doing so.

Shri M. Govinda Reddy: Why this complex?

Shri Akbar Ali Khan (Andhra Pradesh): Even the free world stands non-aligned, my hon. friend will appreciate.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: I do not believe in this sort of non-alignment that you remain neutral and peaceful as long as it suits you and go on chewing up the other man's territory and go on lying to the world, and then you call it non-alignment. This sort of Chou En-lai non-alignment I am not capable of understanding. I have got limited intelligence, I am quite prepared to admit.

It is the duty of this country to stand up, and I hope the Prime Minister will stand up and tell this country that we are in for trouble, we are in for a long-drawn war and we must face it.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: After hearing your speech he will say that no doubt.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: If he and Comrade

Dange do not go and mislead him, I am sure he will listen to me. But the trouble is that he has been listening to these people a bit too often. In this House I have been saying it not today, not yesterday, but for the last three or four years since I came here that it seems to me that he listens to the leader of this party who is sitting here. I repeat it again today

and I would ask this House to consider in all seriousness to end this partnership between international communism or partnership between China and this country, to enable them to give up the sacred soil of this country according to the pledge that we took before the country, a pledge that was acclaimed all over.

Annexure C

STRENGTH THROUGH ALLIANCE

"Sir,—Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru agrees explicitly as by necessary implication that China is a permanent menace not only by reason of superior military potential but also by its ideology of expansion by force of arms and refusal of the possibility of co-existence. We cannot, it must be obvious to the meanest intelligence, meet a permanent menace across the border of this nature by temporary measures, be it the receiving of arms now from America or elsewhere or even by intimidating and scrapping together all the gold and brass in the country and putting it in the treasury.

Gold on the bodies of our womenfolk, by the way, is in better custody than in the hands of the Government. As a national reserve in the last resort, the gold on the bodies of our women can serve better than when it goes into the Government's hands, where it is likely to be used up in the first attractive adventure.

Is it really "inconceivable," as the Prime Minister is reported to have pleaded before Parliament, that India should be in a position to get help from abroad permanently? Does he believe that we can get help off and on whenever there are hostilities and we may

lapse into mutual indifference in the intervals?

Is this an intelligent understanding of human nature, or the nature of Governments? Can we hope by some manipulation through temporary assistance to make India much stronger and able by itself on the self-sufficiency basis to meet the menace of China, which will also have utilised the time in furtherance of her own ideology of expansionism?

Or, does the Prime Minister think (which is probable) that, after some temporary aid, we could make peace with China and convert her to friendship or at least bring down the menace to tolerable proportions? Not even if we get China to swear by Marx and Lenin could we possibly do this.

It would be folly to believe that China will give up her expansionism or her opposition to co-exist in the conceivable future. To meet the menace which admittedly is permanent, there is no other way but to acquire strength through alliance with Powers opposed to the expansionism of China, enabling assistance to come whenever hostilities demand such assistance. What is needed is much clearer thinking than we find exhibited on the Government side."

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari
(*Indian Express*, January 23.

Annexure D

COMMUNIQUE OF THE LIBERAL INTERNATIONAL.

Tel Aviv, 3rd & 4th January 1963

The Liberal International meeting in Tel-Aviv on January 3 and 4, 1963, as the guests of the Israeli Liberal Party, considered the prospects for Liberalism, especially in the New States.

Although the scale of the problem is so large that work must be continued and increased and further meetings held; certain conclusions can be made following the discussions in which representative of seventeen countries from four continents took part.

First, it is clear that Liberalism is advancing, even in countries where the regime is anti-Liberal. The need for liberty is becoming evident in the Soviet Union, while in South Africa the Minister of Justice has recently declared that Liberalism is a greater danger to apartheid than Communism. In India the Swatantra Party has made striking progress within four years of its foundation, while in Belgium, Canada, Germany, Great Britain, Israel and Italy, to mention only the most striking examples, the Liberal parties have made great progress in the last few years.

The reason for this advance are various, but they are all bound to grow in strength in the future. Economically the Market system, when protected against the pressure of private or State monopoly, has proved itself much more efficient than the statist system. The Dilemma posed by Marxists of "Bread or Freedom" is demonstrably a false one.

The annual rate of growth of the liberal economies of Western Europe has far exceeded the expansion of the Communist economies. In India, although the problem of poverty is still immense, greater progress has been made than in Communist China, where the so called Great Leap Forward has proved a terrible failure.

It is particularly significant that private industry has surpassed its targets in the Indian Five Year Plans, while the State has failed to reach its goals.

Behind the Iron Curtain, the only Country where agricultural production has reached its target is Poland, which is the only Communist State where agriculture is not now collectivised.

The diffusion of property in the economically advanced countries has disproved the Marxist dogma that in market economies, extreme concentration of Capital and pauperisation of the masses is inevitable.

All these examples are proofs of the practicality of economic Liberalism. This practicality becomes more and more obvious as technical progress compels the training of research workers and technicians who can only carry out creative work in conditions of freedom.

It follows that the formation in all sections of society of open cadres, continuously renewed and consisting of free individuals, in the New States is a decisive step towards escape from poverty as well as towards the development of democracy.

Democracy can best flourish where there are freely-acting social groups, such as farmers, trade unions, entrepreneurs, and the professional classes. The growth of these groups in the new States is therefore of primary interest to Liberals and aid to the New States should emphasize educational programmes.

As the economies of the New States develop, they will need to sell more and a greater variety of goods in world markets. Liberals have a special responsibility in the economically advanced countries and especially in the European economic community, in itself inspired by liberal ideals, to press for the reduction of barriers to imports from Asia, Africa and Latin America in general as well as from specially affected countries like Israel and New Zealand.

In performing this role, Liberals will be doing their duty as internationalists. Here too they demonstrate their superior practical understanding of the modern world. While welcoming the independence of the New States, which is, in origin, inspired by the liberal demand for self-determination, Liberals recognize the fact of inter-dependence. That is why they have been in the vanguard of the movement towards Western European Unity, towards the development of the United Nations and towards such associations as the British Commonwealth and the French Community, which are all recognitions of the necessity for international cooperation. For the same reasons the Liberals welcome in Asia, Africa and Latin-America the development of outward-looking associations, in the interests of world trade and a more equitable distribution of world wealth.

But Liberal internationalism derives from a realistic and not a sentimental view of the modern world. Liberals know that hand in hand with the desire to cooperate peacefully must go the determination to defend freedom from attacks from any quarter.

Internally, as well as internationally, Liberals must be on their guard against anti-Liberalism. It is dangerously complacent to assume, even in democratic countries, that Liberal institutions and practices are secure. Although Conservatives and Social-Democrats have absorbed much Liberalism, their bias in some cases and especially in times of crisis is still non, or even anti-liberal. Socialists still tend to etatism and sentimentality about Communism. Conservatives still tend to take refuge in social rigidity, authoritarian politics and hostility to change.

Liberals have to maintain a continuous struggle to assert their twin demands for liberty and legality.

This involves a vigorous attack on all expressions of its liberalism such as chauvinism with the danger it presents to peace in different parts of the world, racialism, extremes of wealth and poverty, religious coercion, social traditions frozen into superstition and mystiques, sex inequality, and the concentration of State or private power in the media of mass communication.

✓ Liberals must learn to be intolerant of intolerance, for it is only by their waging a continuous struggle that mankind can hope to advance towards a peaceful, prosperous and humane world.

To maintain and extend liberalism, the Liberal International will devote increasing attention to the task of manifesting solidarity with, and offering its cooperation to, those engaged in the fight for liberalism on the periphery of the free world and in particular in the New States.

Swatantra Answer to Chinese Communist Challenge

C. Rajagopalachari
N. G. Ranga
K. M. Munshi
M. R. Masani
H. P. Mody
N. Dandekar

A Swatantra Publication

Price 30 nP.

*Available from the Central Office of the Swatantra Party,
143, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.*

(For Private Circulation)