

24

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. M.R Masani at a public meeting held at the K.J.C. College under the auspices of the Swatantra Party, Bombay Region, on January 21, 1963.

Mr. Chairman:

In the last few days in trying to understand what the Colombo proposals are, and how they differ from the 8th September Line so beloved of our Prime Minister on the one hand and the Chinese Communist Ultimatum of November 21, on the other. I think therefore, I might take two or three minutes to try and very briefly outline to you as I understand it the purport of the Colombo Proposals.

On the Western Sector, Ladakh, the Colombo Proposals contemplate that the Chinese would withdraw to the line that they held on September 8. But it is stipulated that India must now reoccupy the territory that was taken over in October and November and that the 43 posts military posts which fell during that fighting must now be re-established. What is proposed by the Colombo formulae is that this territory which was ours on September 8, but is no longer in our occupation, should be jointly occupied by civil posts established by both sides, Chinese and Indian. It should be otherwise neutralised. From this you can imagine that if we agree to this neutralisation of the territory taken over the new aggression, any question of our recovering Aksai-Chin and the territory that was lost before September 7, is out of the realm of possibility and must frankly be conceded to have been surrendered.

In the middle sector, opposite U-P. Barahoti, the Chinese ultimatum of November 21, had asked India to withdraw its troops 20 kilo meters back from where they were. This idea is no longer stressed in the Colombo proposals but Barahoti which is Indian is claimed by the Chinese and its fate would remain in doubt.

Turning to the ~~main~~ eastern sector of NEFA, the ultimatum of November 21 had agreed to India occupying militarily or territory lost in NEFA upto 20 kilo meters of the McMahon line. The Colombo proposals are worst than the Chinese ultimatum, because, since that time of 30th December, Mr. Chow en-lai modified his ultimatum to make it more drastic by saying that the Indian troops shall stay where

they are and this is what the Colombo proposals today states. It is true that the Indian government had asked for a modification or a-mendment to enable our re-occupation of the lost territory except for Longu and Dhola. But that demand has not been accepted by the Chinese government. The idea of the Chinese under the Colombo powers seems to be that India is not forced to withdraw its troops 20 kilo meters.. In the middle sector as a quid pro quo, the permission to reoccupy lost territory in NEFA must be given up. This is how it is reported from a message in Delhi in the Times of India this morning. In other words, if the Indian troops in Ladakh are to stay where they are now without withdrawing to a distance of 20 kilo meters, as suggested in the Chinese three point proposals, they should stay in their present position in the Eastern sector as well, and not attempt to enter the NEFA area vacated by the Chinese invader. So this is a kind of deal suggested that we do not go back 20 kilo meters in Ladakh and Barahoti and in return we do not advance back to the McMahon line in NEFA. The territory that thus remains un-occupied will be neutralised and there should be posts by both sides to see that neither has exclusive possession. In other words, so far as NEFA is concerned, the Colombo proposals are worst than the Chinese cease-fire ultimatum of November 21 which we thought we had rejected. It is clear therefore Mr.Chairman that an acceptance of these proposals are amounts to two things. First, a climb down from the September 8 line which the Prime Minister himself has suggested. The Swatantra Party had never accepted the September 8 line. Neither has the Praja Socialist Party the Socialist Party or the Jan Sangh. These patriotic parties have stuck to their demand that the entire territory of India as it was in 1947 or 1950 must be evacuated by the Chinese Communist troops before there can be any question of our sitting round the table with ~~Raz~~ them or touching them with a barge pole. The new proposal that Parliament should consider and undoubtedly be asked to accept these Colombo proposals is therefore an abject abandonment by the Cabinet and the Prime Minister of their own position as it was a few days back. Now I say a few days back, because it was as recently as December 11, in the closing debate of the last session of Parliament that the Prime Minister amidst cheers by the whole House that the Lok Sabha said that there could be no negotiations or resort to other peaceful methods until the Chinese vacated their recent acts of further aggression. Not to insist on this, he said, would be not only to let the Chinese retain whatever they have captured by their blatend acts of aggression since September 8, but also to expose India to the danger of further aggression. That, Gentlemen, was December 11. Yesterday,

Yesterday, the same Prime Minister said that it would not be civilized to refuse to do what he said would be unpatriotic and a betrayal of December 11. What was unthinkable on December 11 has now become the height of civilization. Mr. Nehru is entitled to his own concept of civilization, he can keep them to himself, so far as we are concerned. But if I understand the minds of the Indian people they consider it to be civilized not to sit round the table or otherwise talk or negotiate with somebody who had double crossed you and cheated you over and over again, whose word as our Prime Minister said a few weeks ago cannot be trusted any more, people have shown themselves to be a gang of bandits and decoits and nothing better. Such people are not entitled to any recognition as a civilized government with whom we should deal. And as I understand civilization, it is to keep one's hand clean and not to soil them by shaking hands with murder, decoity and thuggery. That I understand to be the Indian People's idea of civilization. Not only is an acceptance of the Colombo proposals, a climb down for the Prime Minister from his 8th September line, but what is more important, it is a complete resiling from the solemn resolve and Pledge made by the Indian peoples through their parliament and made unanimously on the 14th November, and to that action our own Party and our own members of our Parliament were party. You remember that on the 14th November, the Lok Sabha standing up passed a resolution unanimously, which embodied the National resolve, and the last part to the resolution said that "with hope and faith this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be". This resolution was moved by the very civilized gentleman in Delhi, who now think it is uncivilized to carry out this resolution. He may have gone back on his resolve, but I do not know that the Indian people have yet agreed to follow him in that dishonour. Mr. Chairman, I think with your permission and if the meeting so desires, I would like to consider that we move a resolution and adopt it unanimously here as our Parliament adopted it on November 14, reaffirming the solemn resolve of the Lok Sabha on November, 14 that this national objective of clearing our soil of the invader and not negotiating till that is done should be our common opinion conveyed to our Parliament on this occasion, and if that is the general feeling of the meeting as I understand it would be, may I air, with your permission beg leave to move the following resolution for adoption at this meeting.

THIS PUBLIC MEETING OF THE CITIZENS OF HOMBAY RESPECTFULLY REAFFIRMS THE FIRM RESOLVE GIVEN EXPRESSION TO BY PARLIAMENT ON NOVEMBER 14 TO DRIVE THE AGGRESSOR FROM THE INDIAN SOIL AND IT HOPES THAT THE PARLIAMENT WILL CONSISTENTLY WITH THAT RESOLVE REJECT CATEGORICALLY THE COLOMBO PROPOSALS THAT WILL BE PLACED BEFORE IT LATER THIS WEEK.

I should be glad sir, if later at the appropriate time, you will secure the endorsement of this House and this meeting to this resolution and conveys to the proper authorities in Delhi. I was saying Mr.Chairman that this acceptance of the Colombo proposals would be both a betrayal of the Government's own stand of September 8, and the national resolve to regain our territory. But there are more fundamental objections to this line of thought.

the national self respect and honour on the one side and the democratic Indian way of life on the other. Both these have been horribly assailed and mowed by what happened on our frontiers in October and November. and until that humiliation has been wiped out, until our gallant soldiers have been given opportunity properly armed and equipped to give the enemy a bloody nose, which they want to give until we have thrown them out of our territory, I think it is unworthy of any brave country with any man left in it to negotiate under such conditions. As far as I can see at this stage after suffering the military defeat that we have in October and November the very possibility of negotiations with the conqueror must be ruled out. That does not mean that we attack him tomorrow. But it might mean that we keep our hands free and we keep our hands clean and when the time comes when we are managed to re-establish a balance of power more favourable to us we feel free to move forward to throw him out and then say when the country has been safely crossed now, let us sit down and talk at the conference table.

Mr.Khrushchev, a great favourite of some of our national leaders in Delhi. Since that is so, let me quote him, to prove

my point. Mr. Harry Kissinger in his book "The Necessity of Choice" on page 173 quotes a very sensible and sound proposition advanced by Mr. Khrushchev. He says this is Khrushchev and he said at Lipzig on 7th March 1959 in East Germany. Khrushchev said "history teaches us that conference reflect in their decisions. The established balance of forces resulting from victory or capitulation in war. Conferences reflect the established balance of forces resulting from military defeat or victory." What is our position today. We have undergone a crushing ~~defeat~~ military defeat thanks to the negligence or worth of our previous Defence Minister and those who sheltered him and kept him in office. If today we sit on the Conference table, and if today we negotiate with the Chinese Communist victors, then let us speak perfectly clear to ourselves it is no good kidding ourselves, we shall be going to the conference table to accept defeat. There can be no other meaning of negotiations after a military defeat. Just imagine Mr. Chairman what would have happened if Mr. Winston Churchill had accepted an armistice offered by Hitler immediately after the debacle of Dunkirk. What would Britain be today should have been a satellite during the rest of the war of the Nazi Germany and that Mr. Chairman is what is being offered to us today. Our great Leader Rajaji, in an article that will shortly appear in 'Swarajya' has tried to visualize what India's position would be if she accepts the Colombo proposals and makes peace on these terms. He says that 'if we are induced for the sake of Afro-Asian solidarity to agree now to negotiate on China's terms or what amounts to it, we shall for ever be satellites of China, isolated from those nations of the world, who were willing to help us against Communist aggression. We shall never be free from the menace that has descended upon us. We shall be in exactly the same position as Poland or Hungary or the other Eastern nations of Europe vis-a-vis Russia. And this will be our permanent pass, there being no hope of winning an isolated race with China in military or industrial power. The key to save ourselves from this threatened status of satellitism under China is now to resist her with the support of the anti-Communist powers of the west, and to await peace and neighbourliness to grow out of mutual and balanced respect. To be afraid of seeking or accepting Western co-operation now and to accept any terms of peace under the advice of the Colombo nations, when China is flushed with victory, is to surrender our honour and sacrifice, our future and accept Communist China's hegemony in Asia.

I think sir, that Rajaji's statement is one to which no exception could possibly be taken.. Even today the Indian people who as Sir Homi described rose to great heights during the fighting in October and November are all most unanimous on this point. We have seen in our Newspapers this morning that all the democratic opposition parties have banded together to move parliament to reject these ignoble proposals. Not only the Opposition parties but two or three leading Congressmen have spoken in the last two or three days in the same direction. Mr.C.B.Gupta the Chief Minister of U-P. under a headline in Hindustan times says " Mr.Gupta urges the rejection of the Colombo proposals. Mr.Gupta said that all parties in Parliament were committed to the resolution that there could be no talk with the Chinese unless they first withdraw to the pre 8th September line . It was a pledge to the nation and he was sure that no leader of government in this country would be so ill-advised as to break that pledge. We sincerely hope that Mr.Gupta is right in judging the statement of his own leaders in Delhi. Mr.Hanumanthiah, a leading Congress member of Parliament, and former Chief Minister of Mysore has made two speeches in the last few days in Bangalore. In the first one says the Deccan Herald, he characterise the external policy of the Government as a frog in the well thinking, and their planning on this point thoughtless. In the next meeting he said he indicted the government's policy of non-alignment as untenable, unrealistic and impracticable. Mr.Hanumanthiah declared this was the 16th of January, five days ago "We cannot fight alone it is high time we align ourselves with some powers". So that here are two congressmen and there are many others who will say these things in different ways who have come out on the same side as the patriotic oppositions. I make bold to say that if it wasn't for the wrong lead the Delhi is trying to give this country would be unanimously rejecting the Colombo proposals. and we still hope that parliament will stand up to this pressure from high quarters and will reject this misleading advice that they should give serious ~~thought~~ credence to these proposals which lower our flag and as Rajaji has said set on us the satellite status for the rest of our life. Mr.Chairman, history is quite prepared to forgive people who make a mistake. for the first time. But every great philosopher has said from time immemorial that while ~~fixxix~~ the first mistake is forgivable, to make the same mistake a second time is a crime for which neigther history, nor posterity will forgive.

---