

Mr. Masani

229

This is an occasion of considerable gravity. Even apart from the gravity of the situation in our own country its also a grave moment in the destinies of the world. I do not wish today in anything I say to prejudge the decisions that may be taken by the Central Organising Committee of our Party when it meets shortly. Therefore I must explain that anything I say today is a personal point of view until the leadership of our Party collectively defines its attitude to what is happening.

I said that it is a very difficult time for the world as a whole. At this very moment, there are two crises acutely erupting - one on our own frontiers and one around Cuba. If a proper cure for a situation needs a good diagnosis, then it is very important that our Government and our people understand the relationship in what is happening in different parts of the world. At this point I will only make the remark, that what is happening in Cuba today, the situation in Berlin, the fight for the defence of Viet Namese freedom and the fight for the defence of Indian freedom are different sectors of the same world fight. There is only one war on - that that is the international war between international communism on the one side and the security and defence of the free countries of the world on the other. Anyone who thinks that the fight in NEFA is isolated from what is happening in Cuba or Viet Nam or Berlin has begun to understand the significance of what is happening within our own country. In this context, perhaps it is just as well that the position of the Soviet Government has been made clear only today. There are people in our country who have been misguided enough to hope that the Soviet Government was going to come to our aid against their Chinese allies. For such, it will be news that the Soviet official paper Pravda, which is the mouthpiece of the Soviet Government, has today praised as constructive the Chinese proposals made yesterday and rejected immediately by our Government and Prime Minister as being worthy of praise for a settlement between the two countries. From the Soviet support of this attempt at dictating a humiliating surrender on this country we can judge of the impartiality and the goodwill for us of the Soviet dictatorship.

The second thing that I would like to say is that this is a moment for national unity and solidarity and for discipline. We of the Swatantra Party have stood and continue to stand for freedom of enterprise of the people, for the people producing things to serve their needs, and for the Government doing its proper task of police or umpire activities. In this context, ~~discipline~~ the need for discipline has to be stressed on the economic plane. In a democracy, discipline is not something enforced by law or by controls but discipline is something that the people of a country exercise on themselves. In so far as economic activities concerned, I think that this is the time when our business and industrial class, our labour class and all sections of society will have to exercise voluntary discipline. Last July in Ahmedabad, I made the suggestion that Indian business might do well to consider the appointment of a non-official Ombudsman on Scandinavian lines. Since the Government of India would not subject themselves to that scrutiny, let Indian businessman subject themselves to a person appointed by themselves of high repute and integrity who would exercise a role of vigilance against anti-social activities on the part of any business enterprise or industrial enterprise. If that was a good idea in peacetime, today, when the country needs to be given the confidence that its business class will play fair by the people, I would venture to suggest it might be a still better idea for our Party to consider the

possibility of taking the initiative in inviting business and trade associations and other voluntary and social associations to set up a non-official vigilance machinery which will keep its eyes open, investigate and if necessary expose anti-social practices like blackmarketing, profiteering, hoarding and otherwise exploiting the present shortages and the situations that arise. That in my view is the democratic way and not governmental controls that might otherwise have to be imposed.

And now I come to the major point I would like to make. A great deal has been said of the need for national unity. That cannot be denied. We must have national unity in so far as our fight against the Chinese aggressors is concerned. But there are two kinds of national unity in wartime — totalitarian unity and democratic unity. Ours is a democracy. We do not need the unity that supported Hitler and Stalin during their wars. We need the kind of unity that a democracy like Great Britain or the United States has exhibited in the past two World Wars. I would like to draw attention to what happened in Britain during the last war because it provides a precedent and a model for what should happen in a country like ours at the present time. Throughout the last world war, both in Britain and America, there was complete freedom of expression of opinion, the press was left unfettered, the courts functioned normally, habeas corpus was not abolished and freedom of criticism and opposition was maintained in the Democracies. That is important, because if you cannot discuss freely, you cannot arrive at correct policies to fight the enemy. Before you can have purposive action, you must have free and purposive discussion. So in a democracy, opposition parties continue to oppose during wartime the government of the day. The answer to the problem of national unity is support for the war effort, yes, support for the armed forces, yes, support for every policy which will help us to win the war and repel the enemy, yes, but unconditional support for the policies of the Government of the day, no. Why this distinction which is so important? Because it may be that many of the policies of the Government of the day, and I am not speaking of India at the moment, I am speaking in the abstract, may not be desirable, may not be the right policies for winning the war.

In 1939 when Britain started the war under Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the first year of the war ended with great reverses for Britain. When the Labour Party was asked to join the coalition with the Conservative government, the answer was a flat 'no'. The British Labour Party said, they would not enter into a coalition unless Neville Chamberlain, the apostle of appeasement, was thrown out of the Prime Ministership. And not until the Conservative Party jettisoned Chamberlain and invited Winston Churchill to become the war time Prime Minister did the Labour Party enter into a coalition and Britain had a national government.

And what happened after that? Even after the coalition government was formed, Arthur Greenwood, a senior member of the Labour Party, and a large number of Labour MPs were allowed to sit in Opposition and to act as the opposition throughout the war because Churchill and the National Government realised that even a National Government needs an opposition during wartime. That is the strength of a Democracy. Nobody accused the Labour Party or Arthur Greenwood of lacking in patriotism. On the contrary, they were accepted as a loyal, democratic opposition performing a very valuable function in furtherance of the war effort. I am saying all this because in our country many people have a very peculiar idea about what national unity and solidarity means! They seem to imagine that national solidarity means giving blind, unintelligent, uncritical support to good, bad and indifferent policies of the current government.

Today we find in India that, as a result of ten years of wrong policies, ten years of confused neutralism, ten years, as Mr. Moraes said this morning, ~~of a policy of non-alignment between the two camps, the~~

of being unable to distinguish between our friends and our enemies, we have landed ourselves in this horrible plight. Ten years of appeasement of Chinese communist expansionism permitting them to attack Korea, helping them to fight in Viet Nam helping them to occupy Tibet, has led us to this plight. As this was in spite of warnings. I have a booklet here called "For a Democratic Foreign Policy", which contains six speeches in Parliament by Hridayanath Kunaru, Shamprasad Mukherjee, N.G. Ranga, M.R. Masani, Frank Anthony and P.N. Deshpande. These were six speeches made in Parliament in November 1951, in a debate on Tibet, when the Chinese first attacked Tibet in 1950. These six speeches, each of them, warned the Prime Minister that if we allowed Tibet to be overrun by the Chinese communists, India's turn would come next. This was in November 1950. Each of these warnings was brushed aside with contempt by the Prime Minister who said we were alarmists. The occupation of Tibet had nothing to do with India. It had no implications for the security of our country.

And today there is not one word of regret. Not one sentence to show that the Prime Minister and those who stand with him have learnt lesson. Nothing to admit that the policy was wrong. On the contrary, there is persistence in error. Our men are asked today on the frontiers to fight with hands tied behind their backs. They are being butchered today because they are not being given the political support by those in office, to which they are entitled. We have not got automatic weapons, automatic rifles. We are being outclassed and outflanked. The firepower on the other side is stronger. I read in today's Indian Express: "Sources in Washington said that India rejected an offer by a Western firm to set up a factory for the manufacture of automatic weapons. The reason given for the rejection of the offer, it was stated, was that those who were responsible argued, firstly that that 303. the present weapon which is proving inadequate, was adequate for the Indian Army and secondly that as the automatic weapons were of the type used by the NATO, acceptance of these weapons would go counter to the Indian policy of non-alignment". If these automatic weapons had been in our hands today, our soldiers would not have been driven back by the Chinese. They would not have been butchered as they are being butchered today. But because of that fatuous argument, this offer was rejected. Now then was the MIG being thought of? Is it suggested that because the Soviets use the MIG, it makes us aligned if we use the same aeroplane? What kind of logic was this? So our soldiers are being sacrificed to the politicians in office for their misguided policy.

There is another way in which we are letting down our men at the front. Only day before yesterday, General Ayub, the President of Pakistan, announced that, according to information, 80% of the Indian Army was deployed on the frontiers of Pakistan. I do not know whether his figure is right; it may be 70%, it may be 60%. But if anything of what he believes is true, then we are tying the hands of our men with 80 or 70 per cent facing the wrong enemy, while those are attacking our country are faced by 20% or 30%. ~~Is~~ Is it any surprise that we are being outmanned and outweaponed. Most of our weapons and our men seem to be deployed on the wrong frontier, where nobody is fighting us at the moment.

There is an ancient Indian classical doctrine coming down from the times of the ancient Hindu empires, from classical Indian diplomacy Your enemy's enemy is your friend. When you are fighting with another country, make friends with a third country on the other side, so that your enemy has to fight the war on two fronts. Obvious commonsense. In such a situation, what does a government in India do today which is concerned with defending Indian interests. The most obvious thing for an Indian Government today is to get in touch with the Chinese National Government in Formosa and to say; "let us open a two-front war against these bandit who are attacking us. We are fighting him from one side, you attack him from the rear, and we will catch him between two fires and destroy him, and liberate the people of China."

Has even this thought occurred to anyone in our Government yet? Has even the idea been discussed or considered? I can assure you that it will not be considered. It will not be considered because those in office today are not only not wanting to make friends with our enemy's enemies, but they are trying to remove our potential ally from the United Nations. Only two days ago they declared to their shame that, inspite of our being at war with China, which is what it is, we are going to vote for removing the Chinese Nationalist Government from the United Nations and giving a seat on the Security Council to this bandit government in China so that there would be two Soviet vetoes, not one, when we should go for assistance if Delhi or Calcutta should be attacked tomorrow. We are thus with our eyes wide open, helping our enemies and turning our back on our friends. That is why I say, that our Government is asking our troops to fight with their hands tied behind their backs.

During the last war there was only great war leader out of the Big Four who spoke up publicly in support of Indian independence. President Roosevelt wanted India to be free at the end of the war, Churchill was opposing it. Stalin kept quiet. He could not care less. There was one great war leader who publicly remonstrated, and said we owe India her freedom here and now, so that a free India can fight side by side with us. Who was that man? That man was China's great national leader, General Chiang kai-shek. That was the friend on whom we turned our backs, whom we treat with contempt, while we constantly tell our enemies and the bandits in Peking that we are always ready to talk to them. I am very glad that our Government has turned down the ignominious offer which Mr. Khrushchev seems to be recommending to us as highly constructive. But that is not enough.

Now in these conditions can any patriotic citizen or any patriotic party go to the unconditional support of this present government? Obviously, large changes in policy have to be made. I am very glad that it is the Congress Members of Parliament who seem to be as active as any others in demanding a change of policy. I read a most encouraging report in the Hindustan Times of yesterday: "Congress members of Parliament at present in the Capital met at an informal meeting to express concern. The members expressed their sense of shock and concern at the reverses suffered by our forces in the NEFA area particularly when Parliament had been assured time and again that our position on that front vis-a-vis the Chinese aggressors was very strong, compared to the Ladakh area where conditions were less favourable. They thought that the responsibility for the situation should be fixed and that those responsible for misleading parliament, the Prime Minister and the country should be properly dealt with. The members are also understood to have felt strongly that when the country was confronted with a war situation and its freedom threatened, there should not be allowed to remain any suspicion in any section of the people about the bona fides of any individual in position of high authority." Let me make it quite clear what these gentlemen were talking about. They were pointing a finger at that communist who is in our Government at present — V.K. Krishna Menon. I can say this that — so long as that Defence Minister is not removed, we may expect a succession of defeats and, if he is not removed even then, we may expect an abject defeat and a surrender on the part of our country.